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ABSTRACT

The underlying concern of this thesis is to shed light on the history of Medina during the Ayyübid period, discussing and analysing the Shi'a emergence in the city in that time, and the transfer to them of power, the judiciary and the key religious positions. It also discusses their influence over the various facets of life there. The study comprises an introduction, six central chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter includes a general introduction, beginning with a historical background of pre-Islamic Medina, and then proceeds to present an overview of the importance of the subject and the reasons for choosing it. It then moves on to an exposition of the key issues which the study will discuss, and the methodology which it follows. The second chapter provides a concise account of the significance of Medina in the Islamic sources (the Qur’an and the hadith), discussing the role of the city and its inhabitants in their support for and propagation of Islam. It also gives a short account of the history of Medina following the death of the Prophet up until the Umayyad period, and briefly discusses the key historical events during that period. The third chapter examines the state of the Islamic World prior to and during the Ayyübid period, and discusses the key historical events that occurred in Medina at that time and their connection with what was happening in the Islamic World. The fourth chapter studies and analyses the emergence of the Shi'a in Medina during the Ayyübid period, and examines certain accounts of this. It also tracks the history of the Shi'a in Medina prior to the Ayyübid period by providing critical examples of some of the accounts on the subject. The reasons behind the emergence of the Twelver Shi'a doctrine in Medina during the Ayyübid period will also be studied and analysed, and the chapter will explain how the Shi'a came to assume the key political and religious offices in the city. Their relations with other Shi'a sects will also be examined, and the way in which their control of Medina came to an end will be discussed. The fifth chapter discusses political life in Medina during the Ayyübid period and the influence of the Shi'a upon it, studies and analyses the political relations between the emirs of Medina and each of the neighbouring tribes, the emirs of Mecca, the sultans of the Ayyübid state and those of the Banū Raṣūl in Yemen, and explains the influence of the Shi'a on these relations and the role which they played in the political life in the city. The sixth chapter discusses social life in Medina during the Ayyübid period and the influence of the Shi'a upon it, by studying the composition of civil society and its groupings, the distinguishing features apparent in each grouping, and the elements of social life and its economic conditions, as well as the constructive interplay between them, in order to present an accurate picture of the city's social life. The seventh chapter discusses the state of learning in the city during the Ayyübid period and the Shi'a influence upon it, by examining some of the accounts mentioned by certain historians and travellers. It will also include a refutation of these negative accounts by presenting a thorough, extensive description of the state of learning in Medina, through studying the teaching lectures which were current in the Prophet's Mosque and the madrasas of that time, the kuttābs, the syllabuses, the teaching methods, the most notable 'ulamā' and their key works, the role of the Sunni 'ulamā' in the flourishing of learned activity and, lastly, the Shi'a influence upon it. The eighth chapter summarises and discusses the study's most important findings and draws conclusions from them, before making suggestions for future research.
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter one

Introduction

Despite its undoubted importance to Muslims, Medina has not - in comparison to Mecca - received the attention it deserves from historians, and the Ayyūbid period in particular has been neglected. This study attempts to provide a reliable account of Medina during this period by a thorough study of the extant documentary sources. It seeks to discover the reasons for the neglect of Medina by historians of the period, and particularly (but not exclusively) to understand the role and influence of the Imāmi Shi'a in the city and to examine especially what might be called the conventional wisdoms on this matter, which have largely been constructed on the basis of texts by Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhūn.

It will critically examine these texts, and others, to see whether any of assertions contained therein can be substantiated; most importantly, the assertions (or impressions given) that the Shi'a were particularly numerous and all-powerful in Medina during that period, that the city's intellectual life was at a low ebb and that these were linked in so far as the Shi'a's domination of socio-economic, political and intellectual life has been held by some to be a key factor in the city's allegedly undistinguished record of intellectual achievement.

A further issue to be investigated is that of the conversion of Sunni inhabitants to the Imāmi Shi'a (specifically the Ḥusayni) doctrine: did this take place to any great extent, or at all? It will also be important to establish in what ways the Shi'a emerged in Medina: was the process gradual or rapid, and what were the factors of the growth and decline of their influence?

Thus this study will seek to discover the truth or otherwise of the widely held view that the Shi'a dominated the city in an oppressive manner or indeed whether they had any marked effect on the day-to-day life of its inhabitants during this period. However, while the influence of the Shi'a on Medina is an important part of the study, the research is also concerned with the many aspects of the citizens' lives that were unaffected by that influence, as well as with the significant events taking place in the wider Muslim World that impacted on the city.
The study does not seek to prove a particular thesis but to investigate and explore the accounts given by mainly Sunni historians of events, conditions and developments in Ayyūbid Medina in order to test the veracity of those accounts, and discover whether the conventional wisdoms offered in some of those sources can be sustained when other sources are examined with questions in mind that aim to examine the social, economic and intellectual life of Medina in this period.

1.1. Historical background

Prior to Islam, Medina was known as Yathrib and the first people to populate and cultivate it, occupying houses and smallholdings, were a tribe of the ‘Amāliq called Sa‘l and Fālij, said to be the tribe of ‘Ubayl b. ‘Imlāq b. Arfakshadh b. Sām b. Nuwh. Their leader was called Yathrib and so the city was named after him. Stories differ over the subsequent settlement of Jews in Medina, but three are more commonly known. The first is what Ibn Zabāla (d. 199/ 815) recounts regarding the reason for the Jews settling in Medina, namely that the ‘Amāliq were fiercely guarding Hijaz from the Banū Isrā‘il, and they complained about this to Moses, so he dispatched an army to the Hijaz, commanding it not to spare a single inhabitant of the region from among the ‘Amāliq, whose immorality and wickedness abounded. The army advanced upon them, and Allāh rendered them victorious. They killed them all save for one young scion of al-Arqam b. Abī al-Arqam, the ruler of Hijaz. This young man was a most excellent individual, so they did not slay him, and they said: ‘We have taken him prisoner so that we can present him to Moses and he can decide what is to be done with him’. So they set off with the young man, but Moses died before the army arrived, and when the people heard them, they went out to meet them and asked about the young man, and they said: ‘We spared none, save for this young man, in order that Moses should decide his fate’. And so the Banū Isrā‘il said to them: ‘This is because of your disobedience and going against your prophet’s order. By Allāh, never

---

1 While the documents examined were mostly Sunni, the study did not neglect Arabic Shi‘a sources, but none of these were found to be relevant. It may be that Persian sources shed light on Ayyūbid Medina, but these lie beyond the scope of this study.

2 al-Samhūdī, Wafā‘ al-Wafā‘, 1/10 (this abbreviation means volume 1, page 10).


enter our country again.' So the army said: 'If you are banished from your homeland, there is no city better than the city from which you have departed'. Medina at that time was one of the richest cities in terms of vegetation and water, and so this army became the first Jewish inhabitants of Medina.\(^6\)

The second story, which is mentioned by al-Tabari, tells of how the Banū Isrā'īl arrived in Medina when Nebuchadnezzar subdued the countries of the Levant, sacking Jerusalem, and so the Banū Isrā'īl dispersed throughout the land, a group of them settling in Medina.\(^7\)

The third story is what Ibn al-Najār recounts, namely that the rabbis of the Banū Isrā'īl had found in the Torah a description of the Messenger of God who would migrate to a city where there were date palms between two volcanoes, and so they came from Syria in search of what was described.\(^8\)

As for the Aws and Khazraj inhabiting Medina, historians are in agreement that they were two Qaḥṭāni tribes which came from the Kingdom of Saba (Sheba) in the Yemen following the breaking of the Ma'rib Dam.\(^9\) When they arrived in Yathrib they were astonished by its fertile soil and abundant springs. An oath and a pact were concluded between the Jews, the Aws and the Khazraj which guaranteed mutual peace, coexistence and the defence of Yathrib when faced with attack; and so they committed themselves to this, abiding by it for a period of time during which the numbers of Aws and Khazraj grew, as did their prosperity. The Jews were in need of a workforce to exploit their increasing plantations and wealth, so they allowed them to stay in the unpopulated areas of Yathrib and employed them in their plantations. But when the Jews saw the rise in numbers of Aws and Khazraj, they broke the pact and killed a number of them, bringing them into subjugation. The Aws and Khazraj remained this way until there appeared among them Mālik b. al-‘Ajlān, who

---


\(^7\) al-Ṭabari, Ṭārikh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk, 1/203.

\(^8\) Ibn al-Najjār, al-Durra al-Thamīna, pp.12-13. Among the Arab inhabitants of Medina before the Aws, Khazraj and Jewish tribes were the Banū Anīf, a branch of the Balā tribe, who it is said were a remnant of the ‘Āmāliq; the Banū Murid, also a branch of the Balā; the Banū Muṭawwiyā b. al-Ḥārith b. Bahatha b. Salīm; and the Banū al-Jadhamiyya, one of the Yemeni tribes. The region which they inhabited was Qubā’ and around Bi‘r Adhqr and other springs. One of their poets has said: ‘If Qubā could one day speak, it would say that we settled here before the ‘Ad and Tubba’. Our forts are strong and lofty, looming at a distance, threatening and obstructing our enemies’. See Ṣalāḥ Salāma, Akhbār al-Madīna, p.169.

appealed to his cousins the Ghassanids in Syria. They answered him and sent an army which defeated the power of the Jews, and they reverted to the agreement, living life once more in equilibrium. During this stage of the agreement the Aws and Khazraj tribesmen moved outside of the belt in which they had been restricted and built houses and forts all over Yathrib, expanding plantations, and each of their sub-tribes came to own many localities. At that time the Jews planned to regain their control over them by means of a new strategy, that of dividing them and setting them against each other. Thus they restored the alliance with them, making each of their tribes enter into an alliance with one of the Aws or Khazraj tribes, in order to bring about dissention between them. The Banū Nadir and the Banū Qurayṣa aligned themselves with the Aws, and the Banū Qaynuqa拿起 sided with the Khazraj. Each Jewish faction then began to incite its ally against the other party, and enmity and discord flared up amongst them. The plan succeeded and devastating wars broke out which raged for almost one hundred and twenty years, ending only when Islam came and extinguished them.  

In the year 622 A.D., the Prophet’s hijra from Mecca to Medina began, since the Prophet (PBUH) arrived in Qubā’ on Monday the eighth of Rabī‘ al-Awwal of the first Hijri year and stayed there for four days, building the Qubā’ Mosque. He then journeyed from Qubā’ to Medina and his camel knelt down at the site of his mosque, and once he had erected his mosque there, he built a house for himself and his family. The Prophet changed the name of the city to Medina, ceasing to call it Yathrib, and therein brought the Muslims together as brothers. Thus began a new age for Medina, which became the first Islamic capital. The Anṣār alongside their brethren the Muhājirun formed the first force to champion the Prophet and
with him witnessed the historic battles which were to pave the way for the triumph and spread of Islam. All the military expeditions and raiding parties were launched from Medina, some of the most important being the Battle of Badr, and the Battles of Uhud and Khaṇḍaq (Battle of the Trench), which took place close to the city.¹⁴

1.2. The Importance of the Subject

Medina¹⁵ is the second most important holy city among Muslims, after Mecca. It is where the legislative verses from Allah were revealed to His Messenger, who lived there until his death. In it lies his mosque, to which a journey should be made: the Prophet said, ‘Do not undertake journeys but to three mosques: this mosque of mine, the Mosque of al-Ḥārām [in Mecca] and the Mosque of al-Aqṣā’.¹⁶ The city also houses his grave and many of the blessed places, such as the Rawḍa, which is one of the gardens of Paradise: the Prophet said, ‘That which exists between my house and my pulpit is a garden from the gardens of Paradise, and my pulpit is upon my trough’.¹⁷ The city also contains many of the ancient remains and vestiges, the glorification of which is connected to the life of the Prophet.¹⁸

Although Medina’s political role as the capital of the Islamic State came to an end after the fourth caliph, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, moved to Kufa, its scholarly role and religious status has continued until the present day. Throughout the ages, Medina has been a religious city which many Muslims have aspired to visit and to pray in its mosque, about which the Prophet said: ‘One prayer in my mosque is better than a thousand prayers in any other

---

¹⁴ The history books, sīra, and books of the Prophet’s military campaigns (al-Maghāzi) discuss the life of the Prophet in Medina and mention the key historical events in the city during his lifetime. Two of these books are Sirat Ibn Ḥishām and Sirat Ibn Ishāq.


¹⁶ Muslim, Sāhiḥ Muslim, 2/1014, No:1397.

¹⁷ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 2/224.

mosque, excepting al-Masjid al-Harâm'.¹⁹ It has also been a centre of learning for the study of the Qur'ānic sciences, the hadīth, the Islamic sciences and other such disciplines, and even today its mosque is filled with people attending lectures. Scholars still flock to the city, as they always have done, to teach, study or learn the hadīth. Describing the scholars of Medina, the Prophet said: 'Men will all but beat the livers of their camels [riding hard] in pursuit of knowledge, but they will find no-one more knowledgeable than a ʿālim of Medina'.²⁰

Due to Medina's importance and status as mentioned above, once the practice of recording had become widespread among Muslims, writing about the city commenced and continued, generation after generation until the present day, until there was no generation which did not have some of its sons write of its merits, its landmarks or its akhbaar (news).²¹

Discussion of the merits of Medina constitutes an extensive field. Many books have been written on the city, since its excellence is reported in numerous ahādīth and traditions appearing scattered amongst books of hadīth, and books on Medinan history, and amongst the endeavours of ancient ʿulama' and hadīth scholars.²²

Thus Medina possesses a great legacy, whether found in individual books on the city or among the pages of large bodies of work. For researchers, however, this legacy is problematic in several ways; the most important are summarised as follows:

1- A substantial proportion of it is still in manuscript form; the copies are dispersed among public and private libraries, and it is difficult to get hold of them because

---


²⁰ al-Tirmidhī, Sunan al-Tirmidhī, 5/47.

²¹ 'Usaylān mentions more than 700 titles compiled about Medina, in his book al-Madīnā al-Munawwarā fī Āthār al-Muḥāfīz. Of those who love Medina and are eager to write about its history, al-Samḥūdi says: 'Moreover, hearts were naturally disposed to loving it, and longing for news of it and its affairs, as is the want of every lover'( al-Samḥūdi, Wafā' al-Wafā', 1/2).

²² Among those who have singled out this aspect in their writing are: al-Bukhārī (d.256), who set aside a chapter of his book Šaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, calling it Bāb Faḍā'il al-Madīnā (The Virtues of Medina), in which he brought together all the authenticated ahādīth which report on the merits of Medina; and al-Janādī, in his book Faḍā'il al-Madīnā; Šalih al-Rifā'ī, al-Abādīth al-Warida fī Faḍā'il al-Madīnā; Muhammad al-Ṣalihī, Faḍā'il al-Madīnā al-Munawwarā; al-Sūyūṭī, al-Ḥujaj al-Mubīna fī al-Taftāl bayn Makka wa al-Madīnā. (For more details about books on the history of Medina and its merits, see al-Ṣā'īdī, Muṭjam mā Ulīf'an al-Madīnā; 'Usaylān, al-Madīnā al-Munawwarā fī Āthār al-Muḥāfīz, which mentions 45 books specifically on the merits of Medina).
some of those who have inherited these manuscripts either lock them away or do not grasp the extent of their importance.23

2- A further proportion is scattered in the pages of books on all manner of learning, such as general history, biographies, *adab* and the like, and tracking it down and extracting it requires arduous and time-consuming effort.

3- A large proportion of these books is concerned with describing the Prophet holy places in Medina, which, in spite of their importance, became lost without trace because Medina no longer had the status it had been accorded in the time of the Prophet, and the authors who concerned themselves with writing about these remains lived in much later times and so most of their conclusions were based on supposition.24

4- A considerable number of these books are compilations concerning literary life or certain historical events, but they are deficient and unclear because their authors did not consult all writings on the subject, such as books of *siyar* and *tarājim* (biographies), because they did not realise the importance of the history they contain and because of the difficulty of extracting the information.

5- In other books most of the subject matters and ways of exposition resemble one another, as if their authors are copying what others have said before them. These books generally concern the following subjects: the founding of Medina, its history during the time of the Prophet, its merits, its names, its boundaries, the key landmarks and remains there, the architecture of its mosque and its features, and the etiquette associated with *ziyāra* (visiting the Prophet's Mosque).25

---


6- Modern sources (which published after 1980) about Medina focus for the most part on a specific period, namely the age of the Prophet, and a century before and after it. It is true that the first Hijri century was Medina's golden age; however, this was observed by books of the Sunna and the sīra, and these recent authors then redrafted and rearranged them in varying forms, so that the subsequent history of Medina was for the most part absent from these books, or rarely discussed. One of the most important of these neglected eras was the Ayyūbid period and in particular the emergence of the Shi'a in Medina. This will be the main focus of the study in the following chapters.

1.3. Key Sources used in the study

Primary sources:

It is useful at this point to provide some information on the significant sources used in this research, which are as follows:

Ibn Taymiyya, (661-728/1263-1328) Minhāj al-Sunna al-Nabawiyya; al-Fatāwā al-Kubrā and Majmū' al-Fatāwā, Ibn Taymiyya mentions accounts indicating that many of the Medinans during this time converted from Sunni Islam to that of the Imāmi Shi'a, accepting the financial incentives offered by the Shi'a du'āt. These accounts require critical study and analysis because their author fails to provide sufficient information on this subject, or any evidence to substantiate his remarks (all that he says is that these conversions occurred during this period, without going into the details and without mentioning any testimonies or events to support his assertions).

---

26 See 'Usaylān, al-Madīna al-Munawwara fi Āthār al-Mu'llifin, pp.24, 27, 30-34, 36, 42, 44-57, 60, 103, 128, 137-141.

27 Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn Taymiyya was born at Harrān on 661/1263 and died at Damascus on 728/1328. He was Ḥanbali theologian and jurisconsult. Ibn Taymiyya was forced to leave his native town in 667/1269 before the approach of the Mongols and to take refuge in Damascus with his father. It was in Damascus, where his father was the director of the Sukkariyya madrasa, that he was educated. He succeeded to his father's office at the Sukkariyya and, in 683/1284, gave his first lesson there. Ibn Taymiyya's first incursion into political life took place in 693/1293, at the time of the affair of 'Assāf al-Nāṣrānī, a Christian of Suwaydā' who was accused of having insulted the Prophet: Ibn Taymiyya's intransigence in this affair led to his being imprisoned for the first time, at the Adhrāwiyā. On this occasion he wrote his first great work, al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl 'ālā shātim al-Raslūl. See Laoust H., Ibn Taymiyyah. In: The Encyclopaedia of Islam, 3/951-954; Hugh Goddard, Ibn Taymiyya, in: I. R. Netton, (ed). Encyclopedia of Islamic Civilization and Religion, p.270.
Ibn Farḥūn, (693-769/1294-1368) 28 Nasīḥat al-Mushāwīr wa Taʿziyāt al-Mujāwīr. This is an encyclopedic work, which describes the social, political and cultural life in Medina, and recounts the biographies of eminent men of that time, thus providing more information than any other source about the state of learning in Medina. Ibn Farḥūn devotes a chapter to the lives of certain mujāwīrūn, former sheikhs and ‘ulamā’ of Medina. He relates stories about them, and describes some of their circumstances and the problems that certain of them experienced with the sharifs and the Shīʿa. He will be cited often in this thesis.

al-Sakhāwī, (d. 902/1496) al-Tuḥfa al-Latīfa fi Tārikh al-Madinatu al-Sharīfa. This book is a biographical book, which opens with a discussion of the political and religious situation in Medina in the Ayyūbid period. It is noteworthy that the book lacks some biographical information and draws heavily on Ibn Farḥūn’s Naṣīḥat al-Mushāwīr.

Ibn al-Najjār, (d. 643/1241) al-Durāh al-Thamīna or Akhbār Madīnāt al-Rāsūl. This book outlines the history of Medina, and despite its brevity, gives a clear account of the historical phases of Medina from its emergence until the 7th century AH, the significant archaeological sites in the area and the Prophet’s Mosque building. This book is distinguished by its objectivity.

al-Fayrūz Abādī, (d. 817/1414) al-Maghānim al-Muṭāba fi Mālim Ṭāba. This is a valuable and wide-ranging source on Medina’s history, distinguished by its good classification and organization, and its data has been documented by detailed observation. It supplies useful information about economic activity and social life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and also gives a list of biographies of the residents of Medina who were known to the author or his teacher. It provides information about the political situation in Medina during that time. The book is not just a narration and collection of events, but more of a review. These sources will provide references and documentation for this study’s discussion of the period under research, including the situation in the Islamic world in the Ayyūbid era, and the Ayyūbids’ origin and their state.

Secondary sources:

The following are some of the recent books which in various ways touch on the history of Medina during the Ayyūbid period, but do not do the subject justice in terms of study and

---

28 Abū Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn ʿAbdullāh b. Muḥammad b. Farḥūn al-Tūkāsī was born at Medina on 693/1294 and died at Medina on 769/1368, Mālikī theologian and jurist consult. He was a teacher in the Prophet Mosque until his death. About his biography see Ibn Farḥūn, Naṣīḥat al-Mushāwīr, pp.9-10; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuḥfa, 2/85.
analysis, to such a degree that they neglect to discuss one of the most important issues of that time, namely the emergence of the Shi'a.

'A'ishä bā Qäsi, Biläd al-Ḥijāz fī al-ʿAṣr al-Ayyūbī (1980), the author discusses Medina during that period, but very briefly compared to what she says about Mecca. Furthermore, she does not broach the issue of the Shi'a in the city, and one also notices the paucity of authoritative sources consulted about Medina.

'Abd al-Bāsiṭ Badr, al-Tārikh al-Shāmil li al-Madīna (1993), this contains information about Medina's political history during the Ayyūbid period; however, the author neither turns his attention to the social, cultural and economic issues in Medina, nor discusses the Shi'a presence in the city during that era.

'Awātīf Nawwāb, al-Rihlät al-Maghāribiyya (1996), this book is almost entirely concerned with Mecca and barely mentions Medina. It also does not enter into a discussion of the reasons for travellers' reticence to describe Medina compared to Mecca, nor discusses the issue of the Shi'a presence in the city during that period.

al-Mudayris, al-Madīna fī al-ʿAṣr al-Mamlūki (2001), the author addresses the issue of the Shi'a in Medina during the Mamlûk era but neither explains how the emergence of the Shi'a in the city came about during the Ayyūbid period, nor discusses the accounts given by 'ulamā' on this issue. Indeed, he has merely copied what he has found in the books of previous authors without close examination.

Sulaymān al-Maliki, Biläd al-Ḥijaz Mundhu Bidäyat ʿAhd al-Ashrāf (1993), this too is a book which is concerned with the history of Mecca; the information on Medina is very scant.

1.4. Reasons for choosing the subject

Amongst the motives for choosing this subject is the shortage of written material about Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and the lack of a single book specific to the study of Medina's history during this period, despite its significance and its being characterised by key events reported very briefly in the writings previous authors. There are accounts which confirm the occurrence of an important turning point in the history of Medina during this period, these are contained in the reports of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farḫūn. The authors of these accounts did not provide any detail about this change or how it occurred, the reasons
behind it and the effect it had; or even mentioning what information is linked to the subject.

This important change or turning point was the emergence of the Shi'a in Medina during the Ayyubid period, and the transfer of power, the judiciary and the key religious positions to them.

However, this shortage of information raises a number of questions, which require more research and studies in order to find answers to them, the most important of these questions being:

- What is the reason for the scarcity of information on Medina during the Ayyubid period? What were the key historical events which occurred in the city at that time, and what was their connection with the rest of the Islamic World?
- What is the reality of the accounts surrounding the spread of the Shi'a doctrine among Medinans during that period?
- Why did Shi'ism emerge in Medina during this period in particular, and why did this change occur in the balance of power between the Shi'a and the Sunnis?
- How did power and influence in the city during the Ayyubid period pass from the Sunnis into the hands of the Shi'a?
- What effects did the emergence of the Shi'a in Medina have on the various facets of life in the city, such as political, social, economic and scholarly life?

In order to answer these questions, this study will examine the history of Medina during the Ayyubid period and in particular the emergence of the Shi'a in Medina.

It will discuss and analyse the accounts related to this subject, namely what Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhun report concerning the majority of Medina's inhabitants at that time. "That the inhabitants they converted from Sunnism to Imami Shi'tism due to the arrival in Medina of certain Imami Shi'a from Qashan who set about using financial incentives to induce the city's inhabitants to abandon their doctrine and embrace Imami Shi'ism".

Moreover, Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhun neither provide any details about the subject, nor determine a specific date for the arrival of the Qashani Shi'a in Medina; nor do they mention anything about these family, such as the names of their sheikhs, leaders and prominent individuals, or even the name of a single individual from amongst them. Likewise, they do not put forward any evidence to substantiate what they say or support this view of theirs, nor do they mention the source of their information.
In order to correlate and compare these so as to determine a timeline of events, to dispel the misapprehensions surrounding them, to fill in information which is lacking, to interpret and comment on key events which are mentioned in certain accounts without the causes and outcomes of these being explained or revealed, and to rectify some of the erroneous information about Medina’s history, the following methodology is being used:

- Studying the history of Medina prior to the Ayyūbid period.
- Assessing the influence of political events in the Islamic World on life in Medina, and investigating whether that played a part in the emergence of the Shi'a sect in the city.
- Studying, discussing and analysing the accounts relayed by ‘ulamā’ concerning the majority of Medina’s inhabitants converting from the Sunni doctrine to that of the Shi'a during the Ayyūbid period; as well as ascertaining their credibility, the extent of their truth, and criticising and refuting them.²⁹
- Studying, discussing and analysing the reality of the Shi'a emergence in Medina, and their influence over the various facets of life there.

Finally, the study will present researchers and those interested in the history of Medina with an historical and a civilised portrait of Medina with key events during the Ayyūbid period.

The study is divided into an introduction, six central chapters and a conclusion:

**Chapter One (Introduction)** begins by providing a historical background of pre-Islamic Medina, and then gives an overview of the importance of the subject and the reasons for choosing it. It then moves on to an exposition of the key issues which the study will discuss, the methodology, and lastly a presentation of the structure of the study and its main subject areas.

**Chapter Two** presents a concise account of the significance of Medina in the Islamic sources (the Qur'ān and the hadith), discussing the role of the city and its inhabitants in the support for and propagation of Islam, and gives an account of the major battles which took place in Medina or close by, notably the Battle of Badr, the Battle of Uhud and the

²⁹ It should be noted that all translations are my own except where otherwise stated.
Battle of the Trench. It also presents a brief account of the history of Medina following the
death of the Prophet up until the Umayyad period, and a brief discussion of the key
historical events during that period.

Chapter Three examines the state of the Islamic World prior to and during the Ayyūbid
period, identifying the most important forces and political events which were associated
with Medina, and discusses the key historical events that occurred in Medina at that time
and their connection with what was going on in the rest of the Islamic World.

Chapter Four studies and analyses the emergence of the Shi‘a in Medina during the
Ayyūbid period, and examines certain accounts which contain much exaggeration about
the majority of the city's inhabitants converting from the Sunni doctrine to that of the
Shi‘a, as well as identifies how true they are and compare these with what there is in the
way of further evidence. It also traces the history of the Shi‘a in Medina prior to the
Ayyūbid period by providing critical examples of some of the accounts on the subject. The
reasons behind the emergence of the Twelve Shi‘a doctrine in Medina during the Ayyūbid
period are also studied and analysed, and the chapter explains how the Shi‘a came to
assume the key political and religious offices in the city. Their relations with other Shi‘a
sects are also examined, and the way in which their control of Medina came to an end are
discussed.

Chapter Five discusses political life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the influence
of the Shi‘a upon it, and explains this through an overview of the names of Medinan emirs,
the reign span of each of them where possible, and what relations there were between
them. The political relations between the emirs of Medina and each of the neighbouring
tribes, the emirs of Mecca, the sultans of the Ayyūbid state and those of the Banū Rasūl in
Yemen, are also studied and analysed and the influence of the Shi‘a on these relations and
the role which they played in the political life in the city are explained.

Chapter Six discusses social life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the influence of
the Shi‘a upon it, by studying the composition of civil society and its groupings, the
distinguishing features apparent in each grouping, and the elements of social life and its
economic conditions, as well as the constructive interplay between them, in order to present an accurate picture of the city's social life.

**Chapter Seven** discusses the state of learning in the city during the Ayyūbid period and the Shi'a influence upon it, by looking at some of the accounts mentioned by certain historians and travellers about the poor state which education came to during that era, which some attributed to the presence of the Shi'a. It also attempts to refute these accounts with what evidence and texts there are, and with what it is possible to conclude from subject areas on which there are no conclusive texts, through comparison with what occurred subsequently in the city and was chronicled in the history books. The reasons for some of Medina's visitors failing to provide a thorough and extensive description of the various facets of scholarly life in the city, and the failing of some of those who came later (and documented the city during that period) to study meticulously and research the subject in a better way, are also considered.

The chapter also includes a refutation of these negative accounts by presenting a thorough and extensive description of the state of learning in Medina, through studying the teaching lectures which were current in the Prophet's Mosque and the madrasas at that time, the *katātib*, the syllabuses, the teaching methods, the most notable 'ulamā' and their key works, the role of the Sunni 'ulamā' in the flourishing of learned activity and lastly the Shi'a influence upon it.

**Chapter Eight (the Conclusion)** summarises the main findings of the research work, discusses its limitations, and presents suggestions for future research that it is hoped will lead to a more detailed, nuanced and accurate history of Medina and its legacy.
Chapter Two

Background to Medina

This chapter is divided into three parts: the first focuses on the importance of Medina and its position in the main sources of Islam, that is, the Qur'ān and the Prophet's tradition (the ḥadīth); the second discusses the battles that took place there, which marked the beginnings of the spread of Islam in Arabia. The third concerns the period of the four Rightly Guided Caliphs, and the Umayyads are also considered with reference to their influence on Medina.

2.1. Medina in the main sources of Islam

2.1.1. Medina in the Qur'ān

Before we start looking at the part of the Qur'ān revealed in Medina, it may be helpful to define briefly the meaning of the Qur'ān, and distinguish the Meccan verses from the Medinan. The Qur'ān is the fundamental source from which beliefs, law, and rules are derived to create a legal and moral constitution in Islam. Muslims believe that the Qur'ān was revealed to the Prophet Muḥammad (PBUH) over a period of twenty years, addressing and resolving the real-life issues that confronted the Prophet and his followers. This is why the Qur'ān is believed to offer guidance regarding how life should be lived, rather than being restricted to theology.

The interpreters of the Qur'ān have identified two types of chapter (suwar): the Meccan chapters, which were revealed to the Prophet while he was in Mecca, and the Medinan.

---


2 The phrase (Peace Be Upon Him) will be used at the first mention of the Prophet's name in each chapter.

chapters, which were revealed to him after his migration to Medina (hijra). Each of these is characterized by certain traits, which will be discussed later. However, distinguishing between these two types is facilitated by the study and knowledge of the causes of revelation (Asbāb al-Nuzūl), which help identify the Meccan and Medinan verses.

Thus, one of the methods for understanding whether a chapter of the Qur'ān was revealed in Mecca or in Medina, is to consider the events that the chapter refers to. For example, since in Surat an-Nisā (the fourth chapter), some of the events mentioned take place in Medina, it is clear that the revelation took place there. Al-Bukhārī deduced that the fourth chapter was revealed in Medina because Zayd b. Thabit said: ‘After the battle of Uhud, there were differences among the followers of the Prophet as to how to deal with those who let the Prophet Muhammad and his followers down in the run-up to the battle, they were usually known as “the hypocrites”.’ Knowing about this event makes it easy to identify the place of revelation of the Qur'ānic verse which reads: (O O1 V’ ? 511. ) ‘Why should ye be divided into two parties about the Hypocrites’, since it is known that the battle of Uhud (2/631) took place in Medina.

2.1.1.1. Characteristics of the Medinan Qur'ān

The part of the Qur'ān that was revealed in Medina can be distinguished from that revealed in Mecca in many respects.

- The chapters of the Medinan Qur'ān are directed mainly towards the Muslim community, and usually contain instructions and directions for the believers of Islam. Thus, many of the Islamic teachings and rules are contained in them, such as all of the specifications of

---

5 See Abu Ammaar Yasir Qadhi, An Introduction, pp.107-122.
7 Al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 8/104.
8 The Holy Qur’ān ETMC, 4: 88. It should be noted that the edition used in this study is the large translation issued by the King Fahad Holy Qur’ān printing complex, in Medina, 1990, entitled “The Holy Qur’ān; English Translation of the Meanings and Commentary”. This will be referred to as The Holy Qur’ān ETMC.
9 See al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 8/104; Mujāhid, Tafsir Mujāhid, 1/268; Ibn Kathīr, Tafsir al-Qur’ān al-‘Azīm, 1/467.
Islamic worship, for example the hajj and Ramadan fasting, as well as the rules concerning the family, trade and money lending.

The chapters revealed in Mecca, however, are often distinguished by their use of threatening and strong language, since the discourse is aimed at a community of non-believers.\textsuperscript{11}

Also, each chapter that has a \textit{sajda} (prostration)\textsuperscript{12} is known to be a Meccan one.\textsuperscript{13}

- Every chapter that contains the term ‘\textit{al-Munāfiqūn}’ (Hypocrites) is a Medinan one, except \textit{Sūrat al-‘Ankabūt}.\textsuperscript{14} It is known that ‘hypocrisy’ appeared in Medina during the growth of the power of Islam. Those groups who resented the rule of the Prophet in Medina could not afford to express their dissent openly due to the power of the Muslim community, so some of them pretended to agree with the Prophet out of fear for their lives, while plotting against Islam and the Muslims. Thus it is noticeable that the Medinan chapters sometimes refer to that phenomenon.\textsuperscript{15}

- Every chapter that contains a Commandment for \textit{jihād} (holy war) is a Medinan one. Jihād became an obligation only after the \textit{hijra} to Medina, because when the Muslims were in Mecca, they were an oppressed minority and there was no mention of jihād during that time.\textsuperscript{16}

- Chapters that contain the phrase ‘\textit{O you, who believe}’ are usually Medinan, while all those that contain the phrase ‘\textit{O mankind}’ are Meccan. This is because the discourse in the Medinan chapters focuses mostly on the idea that a community should live under one paradigm and needs to be taught about its religious affairs and the organization of a


\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Sajda} (prostration) is an act of submission performed while reciting the Qur’ān. In the Qur’ān, there are 10 places where prostration is required, though Islamic jurists differ on whether the prostration is obligatory or a \textit{Sunna} (recommended customary practice). See al-Bukhārī, \textit{Sahih al-Bukhārī}, Bāb Sujūd al-Qur'ān, 2/50; Ibn Hajar, \textit{Fath al-Bāri}, 2/441; Abū Dā'ūd, \textit{Sunan Abū Dā'ūd} (Mawsū'at al-Ḥadīth), No: 1401-1415, p.1327.


\textsuperscript{14} Al-Zarkashi, \textit{al-Burhān}, 1/188.


distinct way of life. However, in Mecca, the discourse was directed to people who did not yet believe in the guidance of the new religion.\textsuperscript{17}

2.1.1.2. The linguistic characteristics of the Medinan revelation
In terms of wording and phrases, the Medinan revelation is characterized by the following:
- Most of the chapters and verses are lengthy in comparison with the Meccan chapters and verses.\textsuperscript{18}
- The scholars of the Qur’ān realised that some of the discourse in the Medinan verses was explanatory and that the arguments were full of logical proofs because they were concerned with the followers of the two holy books, that is, the Jews and the Christians. However, when the verses concerned the hypocrites, the style of language became more powerful and threatening.\textsuperscript{19}

2.1.1.3. The objectives of the Medinan chapters
The main objectives of the Medinan revelation are as follows:
- It explains and classifies the general facts and details about Islamic legislation, the worship and duties of Muslims towards their Lord; it also gives guidance on dealings and relationships, and explains the principles of punishment.\textsuperscript{20}
- It informs the Prophet about the social dynamics and developments in Medina as it clarifies the situation and the positions of the different social groupings, and warns of danger from them.\textsuperscript{21}
- It sets out and explains the rules and legislation concerning \textit{jihād}, and the wisdom behind its legislation.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{18} For example \textit{Sūrat al-Baqarah}, Āl-‘Imrān and an-Nисā, compared with \textit{Sūrat Quraysh}, \textit{al-Masad} and \textit{al-Humza}.
\textsuperscript{21} See \textit{The Holy Qurān}, \textit{Sūrat al-Ahzāb} and al-Munāfiqün.
\textsuperscript{22} See Ibn Ḥajar, \textit{Fath al-Bārī}, 6/2-146.
- It calls or invites the People of the Book (Ahl al-Kitāb) to Islam, and establishes the
evidence to counter their doubts as to the authenticity of the Prophet Muḥammad’s
mission as a messenger of God.23

2.1.1.4. The objectives of the Meccan revelation
As for the chapters revealed in Mecca, their main objectives are:

-To establish the fundamentals of faith, and to call all humankind to monotheism, referring
to the prophets in order to highlight how previous nations responded to their messengers
from God and how God punished those who refused to obey his commands. The Meccan
revelation also encourages the implementing of fundamental morals and values, such as
charity, faithfulness, kinship ties, and the avoidance of greed and envy in dealing with
others.24

2.1.1.5. Examples from the Medinan revelation
The Medinan chapters that confirm the above objectives and themes include the following:
Sūrat al-Baqara (the second chapter) is the longest chapter of the Qurān. The majority of
the verses are concerned with the principles of legislation regarding worship, general
dealings, marriage and divorce. Though the main focus of the chapter is the details of
Islamic legislation, it also deals with issues such as faith and monotheism, and mentions the
start of the creation of mankind.25
Sūrat Āl-Imrān (the third chapter) also includes various pieces of Islamic legislation which
were not imposed until after the Muslim community was established, such as the hajj and
jihād. The chapter also discusses the battles of Badr, Uḥud and Ḥamrāʾ al-Asad, and the
important economic concept of ribā (interest). However, the subject that dominates the
greater part of the chapter is the confirmation of the existence of Allāh, his right to

23 See Abū Shahba, al-Madkhal li-Dīrāsāt al-Qurān, pp.231-232; ‘Adil Abū al-Ulā, Khaṣṣā‘īš al-
Suwar, pp.45-47; Fahl al-Rūmī, Khaṣṣā‘īš al-Qurān, p.148; ‘Abd al-Razzāq Aḥmad, al-Makkī wa-
24 See al-Suyūṭī, al-Itkān, 1/53-54; al-Zarkashi, al-Burhān, 1/189; Ahmad Badawi, Khaṣṣā‘īš al-
25 See The Holy Qurān, chapter 2; al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Tafsīr; al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr al-
Ṭabarī, v.1-4; Mujāhid, Tafsīr Mujāhid, 1/69-119; Ibn Kathīr, Tafsīr, 1/47-300; al-Wāḥīdī, Asbāb al-
lordship and his entitlement to be worshiped alone. The issue of faith is not as central as in the Meccan chapters, however, since there it was a fundamental pillar, here it is simply a reminder.

*Sūrat an-Nisā* (chapter 4) expounds in detail the guiding principles of Islamic society. Thus, the chapter begins with the smallest social unit, the family, and ends with the largest, the nation, which rests on Islamic solidarity rather than on a geographical or ethnic domain. Indeed, both of these are considered as anomalies to the Islamic nation.

*Sūrat al-Mā'idah* (chapter 5) is one of the last chapters to be revealed. It discusses two of the most important matters dealt with in the Medinan revelation, which are:

Firstly: Legislation to organize Muslim affairs, which relates to matters concerning their interaction and relationship with those with whom they associate.

Secondly: Arguments backed up by evidence to demonstrate the truth about Islam and its authenticity, and to nullify the arguments made by the People of the Book attempting to prove that Muḥammad's mission could not be genuine.

Ibn Taymiyya comments: 'It is the Sura in the Qurʾān which contains most of the sections on the legislation of permissions, bans, commands, and prohibitions.'

*Sūrat al-Anfāl* addresses some issues related to war, which arose as a result of the battle of Badr. It contains more war-related legislation and advises Muslims regarding how they should act amongst themselves and towards the enemy.

It does not stop at the call and encouragement to *jihād*, but explains to the believers how to take the necessary precautions and behave in combat, such as showing steadfastness and discipline when meeting the enemy, listening to and obeying the leadership's commands,

---


and avoiding internal disputes and differences, which the Qur'ān considers to be causes of failure.\textsuperscript{31}

Sūrat at-Tawba is mainly concerned with the battle of Tabūk, which took place in the month of Rajab in the ninth year after the hijra (630 AD),\textsuperscript{32} and also discusses the battle of Hunayn, which took place during the month of Shawwal in the eighth year after the hijra (629 AD).\textsuperscript{33} This chapter deals at length with the hypocrites, highlighting the seriousness of this issue to the Islamic community, which was then embarking on a series of wars. Thus, in that chapter, there is a clarification of Allāh's command regarding how Muslims should deal with non-believers and the People of the Book.\textsuperscript{34}

2.1.1.6. The references to Medina in the Holy Qur'ān
Medina is mentioned in the Qur'ān in five different places; one of these references gives it the name Yathrib, which was the name of the town before the Prophet migrated there (وَاذَ قَالَتْ طَائِفَةٌ مِّنْهُمْ يَا أَهْلِ يَثْرِبِ لَا مَقَامٌ لَّكُمْ فَارِجُوا 'Behold! A party among them said: Ye men of Yathrib! Ye cannot stand (the attack) therefore go back!).\textsuperscript{35}

The second reference is (وَقَلَّتْ طَائِفَةٌ مِّنْهُمْ يَا أَهْلِ يَثْرِبِ لَا مَقَامٌ لَّكُمْ فَارِجُوا 'Certain of the desert Arabs among you are Hypocrites, As well as among Medinan folk: they are obstinate in hypocrisy'.\textsuperscript{36} This verse refers to those who defected from the battle of Tabūk.\textsuperscript{37} Those who did not obey the call to war came to be known as hypocrites, a name that describes the state of their faith in God and in the Prophet's message. Many of them were


\textsuperscript{36} \textit{The Holy Qur'ān} ETMC, 9: 101.

people whom the new power structure had affected negatively, such as 'Abdullāh b. Abī Salūl, chief of the hypocrites. 'Abdullāh had been expecting to become leader of the Medinan, which failed to occur due to the changing political situation heralded by the leadership of the Prophet Muḥammad and his migrant followers.38

The third reference occurs in verse 120 of Sūrat at-Tawba (chapter 9): (حولهم من الآعراب أن يختوا عن رسول الله) ‘It was not fitting for the people of Medina and the Bedouin Arabs of the neighborhood to stay behind Allāh’s Messenger’ and the fourth in verse 60, chapter 33 (أنن لم ينهي المسافرون والذين في ظوبم مرض والمجردون في المدينة لغزير بك) ‘Truly, if the Hypocrites, and those in whose hearts is a disease, and those who stir up sedition in al-Madinah, desist not...’.39 The reference is to the same people who excused themselves from obeying the aforementioned call to war by the Prophet. It is related that this party made their apologies to the Prophet regarding what they had done, and so the verse revealed a kind of retribution for them.40 The sixth concerns the story of those hypocrites who made a small incursion upon some of the Arab tribes and were accused of killing one of the Prophet’s tax collectors.41 As the Muslim army halted to let their camels and horses drink, an argument arose over the water source. Then the chief of the hypocrites, angry at the way he had been treated during the jostling, threatened that when they got back to Medina, they would turn the powerful into the powerless, by which he meant the Prophet and his migrants ( يقولون لنن رجعا إلى المدينة ليخرجن الأعز منها الأنل) ‘They say, if we return to Medina, surely the more honourable (element) will expel from there the meaner’.42

When the news reached the Prophet, an enquiry was held into the fight and the man denied having made such a threat. Thus the verse revealed that the accusations made against him were true. When his son, who was among the believers, heard the verse, he

---

39 The Holy Qurān ETMC, 9:120, and 33:60.
42 The Holy Qurān ETMC, 63:8.
offered to execute his father, but the Prophet forbade him to do so and instead asked him to remain dutiful to his father.43

2.1.2. Medina in the ḥadīth literature
Medina is mentioned in numerous ḥadīth in order to emphasise its sanctity and high status among the Muslims. These references attracted the interest of Islamic scholars, who devoted great efforts to their study. Indeed this topic occupies a central place in many famous works on the Prophet’s ḥadīth, and the topic of Medina’s position in the Prophet’s legacy also aroused great interest, as is evident from the huge amount of writings on this subject.44

Different themes occur in these aḥādīth. For example, many delineate the territory of Medina and describe it as a sacred place, as in the Prophet’s comment ‘Medina is sacred from that hill to that hill. Thus, despite the interpreters’ differences as to what exactly ‘that hill and that hill’ means, there was no difference of opinion as to the sanctity of the immediate territory of Medina.45 Moreover, the sanctity of Medina transcended the human dimension to include its wildlife and plants. Indeed, the Prophet needed to give Medina the same status as Mecca. He said: ‘Abraham consecrated Mecca and prayed to God for its inhabitants, and I consecrated Medina as Abraham consecrated Mecca and I prayed to Allāh about its sä and mudd [measures of volume]46 twice as Abraham did for Mecca’.47 He was referring to verse 126 of chapter 2, where Abraham is quoted to have said (وَأَنَّا لِكُلٍّ مَّأْمُوْرٍ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ My Lord, make this a City [Mecca] of peace, and feed its people with fruits).48

44 See al-Mufadāl al-Janadī (d. 308/921), Fadā’il al-Madīna; Khalīl Mula Khāṭīr, Fadā’il al-Madīna; ‘Abdulrahmān Badr, Fadā’il Sayyidat al-Puldān.
45 Al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 2/21; Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, (Mawsū‘at al-Ḥadīth), p.904; Abū Dā‘ūd, Sunan Abū Dā‘ūd, 2/81; Ibn Hajar, Fath al-Bārī, 4/65; Ibn Zabīlā and al-Samhūdī gives more details about this hadīth see Ṣalāh al-Madīna, Akhbār al-Madīna, pp.189-192; al-Samhūdī, Wafā’ al-Wafā’, 1/60.
46 A mudd is a volume roughly equal to 18 litres, and a sä‘ is equal to 4 mudds and is the central measure in Islamic jurisprudence. See al-Fayrūz Abādī, al-Qāmūs al-Muḥāfī, p.955.
47 See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, (Mawsū‘at al-Ḥadīth), No: 3313, p.904; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, 5/363.
48 The Holy Qur’ān ETMC, 2:126.
Indeed, the parallel with Mecca is often found in the hadith literature. It is related that the Prophet said: 'Oh Allāh, Abraham made Mecca a ɻ Haram [a sacrosanct territory], and I will make what is between the two tracts of the black stones in Medina a ɻ Haram'.

As mentioned above, the sanctity of Medina included its trees and wildlife. When the Muslims overreacted by cutting down the palm trees of the Banū al-Nağīr, before the latter were expelled from the city, the Prophet was displeased, and those who had committed the offence felt guilty until the revelation of the verse that excused the deed as a fait accompli that God had already ordained. It was also stated that Abū Hurayrā said, 'Had I seen a gazelle in Medina, I would have left it to graze and would not have frightened it'.

Likewise, the Prophet intended to encourage his followers to put their faith in the growing community and to give them a sense of identity. Thus, there was an emphasis on the status of Medina. It is related that he said: 'I was ordered to a town which will eat up towns. They used to say Yathrib, but it is al-Madina. That town removes the bad people from it like the blacksmith's furnace removes impurities from the iron'.

He said also, 'O Allāh! Bless them in their weights, and bless them in their šār and mudd'. He meant the people of Medina.

Abū Hurayrā reports another occasion when the Prophet asked God to bless the city: 'When people saw the first fruits of the season, they brought them to the Messenger of Allāh, may Allāh bless him and grant him peace. He took them and prayed, 'O Allāh! Bless us in our fruits, bless us in our city, bless us in our šār and bless us in our mudd. O Allāh! Abraham is your slave, your Khalil [intimate friend] and your Prophet. I am your slave and your Prophet. He prayed to you for Mecca. I pray to you for Medina, for the like of what He prayed to you for Mecca, and indeed for twice as much'. Then he called the smallest...
child he saw and gave him the fruits'. This reference to Mecca shows that it had been hard for the Prophet and his followers to leave Mecca, their hometown; the migration had created an emotional void in many of them and an overwhelming sense of homesickness, as is evident from the following narration. ‘Ā'isha said, ‘When the Messenger of Allāh came to Medina (from Mecca), Ābū Bakr and Bilāl caught an infectious fever. Once I visited them and said, ‘Father, how are you? Bilāl, how are you?’ Ābū Bakr replied, “Every man is struck down among his people in the morning - death is nearer to him than the strap of his sandal”. At that time Bilāl was starting to recover; he raised his voice and spoke in a nostalgic tone, looking forward to returning to his home in Mecca: “Would that I knew whether I will again spend a night in the valley of Mecca, smelling the aromatic herbs of Idhkhir and Jalīl around me. Will I go one day to the waters of Majinna? Will the mountains of Shāmā and Tufail appear to me?” ‘Ā'isha continued, ‘I went to the Prophet, and informed him of that. He said, “O Allāh! Make us love Medina as much as we loved Mecca or even more, make it sound and bless us in our sä‘ and mudd”. The Prophet expressed the deep feelings he held for Mecca on several occasions. Firstly, when he said: ‘Oh Allāh, send your curse on Shaybah b. Rabī‘ah, ‘Utba b. Rabī‘ah and Umayya b. Khalf as they caused us to flee our land to that of the epidemic (plague)’. He then asked God to lift the epidemic from Medina: ‘O Allāh, remove its fever [from Medina] and put it in al-Juhfa’. The Prophet continued to instil love for this new centre into his followers. He said, ‘There are angels at the entries of Medina, and neither plague nor the dajjal will enter it’. The Prophet also said, ‘Yemen will be conquered and the people will be attracted to it, taking their families and whoever obeys them. Medina would have been better for them, had they but known. Al-Shām will be conquered and the people will be attracted to it, taking their

57 Idhkhir, Jalīl, Majinna, Shāmā and Tufail were names of places in Mecca. See Yaqūt al-Ḥamawi, Muṣājam al-Buldān, 3/315 and 5/59.
58 See al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 2/22; Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, (Mawsū‘at al-Ḥadith), p.905; Abū Dā‘ūd, Sunan, 2/82; Ibn Ḥajar, Fath al-Bārî, 4/78-80; al-Samhūdi, Wafā‘, 1/60.
60 The word derives from Syriac and means 'the Charlatan'. It is often translated to signify an Islamic ‘anti-Christ’. He will arrive on earth during the last days, of which he himself will be a major sign. He will preside over forty years (or forty days) of injustice and licence, after which Jesus will destroy him and the entire world will convert to Islam. (Netton, A Popular Dictionary, p.66).
families and whoever obeys them. Medina would have been better for them, had they but
known. Iraq will be conquered and the people will be attracted to it, taking their families
and whoever obeys them. Medina would have been better for them, had they but known.}\(^{62}\)

2.2. The battles that took place near to and in Medina and their significance

Months passed following the Prophet’s *hijra* to Medina before Allāh gave the Muslims
permission to fight, then the following verse was revealed: (٥٧٠َٜٜٞٞٞٞٝٞٞٝٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞٝٞ_
Although the expeditions and raiding parties are considered part of the history of Medina, historians have written about them in al-Sira al-Nabawiyya or the Prophet's biography. They are part of Medina's history because they set off from Medina with men from the city's populace and with war materials prepared in Medina. The horses and camels which were made ready for jihad were reared by the Muslims on Medinan land, since the Prophet had established the ḥima (protected area) of al-Naqi′ for these animals. Whenever economic life in Medina was good, the army was well equipped, and the Prophet and his Companions in Medina lived in a constant state of jihad. If the Prophet and his Companions were not on a raid or an expedition, they would be preparing for a raid or an expedition, and this is shown by the correlation between the Prophet's Sunna and fiqh and the events of expeditions and raids, since there are many aḥādīth and aḥkām which report on the subject of raids and expeditions, for example: the Chapter on the Fear Prayer, the Book of Shortening the Prayer, the Book of Jihad, the Book of Juzya, the ḥadīth al-İfık story, tayammum, mutʿa marriage, the ‘umra, muzāra’ā etc.

Given this strong link between the history of Medina in the time of the Prophet and the military expeditions and raiding parties, three of the largest military expeditions will be discussed: Badr, Uḥud and al-Khandaq (the Trench), as will their connection with the history of Medina.

2.2.1. The Battle of Badr (2/624)\(^{71}\)
Since the main reason for the Prophet's migration to Medina had been the severe pressures that the Quraysh tribe of Mecca put on him and his followers,\(^{72}\) it was not surprising that the Muslims took the opportunity to retaliate. Medina's geographical position straddled the


main Meccan trade route to Syria. Thus, when the Meccan migrant Muslims in Medina heard that Mecca's trade caravan was approaching, they decided to obstruct its path and take the goods as booty in retaliation for the Quraysh's confiscation of their property in Mecca. Moreover, they decided to mount an economic blockade of Mecca by disrupting its main trade route and thus force it to recognize the growing Muslim community. The Prophet also intended to highlight the power of the new Islamic centre in Medina, so that it might serve as an incentive to the other Arab tribes to ally with him. However, when Abū Sufyān, the leader of the caravan, discovered the intention of the Muslims he responded quickly by diverting the caravan route, taking it close to the Red Sea. More importantly, he sent news to Mecca to tell the Muslims' enemies about the new developments. Thus, while the Muslims were preparing themselves for a small venture, the news came to the Prophet that the Meccans were assembling a massive military force to attack him. The Muslims now made hasty preparations for battle.

Since the initial contract between the Prophet and the Medinans was that they would defend him in case of aggression against him while he was in Medina, he had to consult them anew about their readiness to go to war. Both the migrant Muslims and the Medinans agreed to confront the Meccans. However, the battle was, ultimately, won through the efforts of the Muslims, who numbered just over three hundred while the Meccan army was composed of almost a thousand men. As the Qur'ān puts it: Allah had helped you at Badr, when ye were Helpless: then fear Allah: thus may ye show your gratitude. Remember thou saidst to the Faithful: Is it not enough for you that Allah should help you with three thousand angels (specially) sent down? Yea, if ye remain firm, and act aright, even if the enemy should rush here on you in hot haste, your Lord would help you with five thousand angels clearly marked. Allah made it but a message of hope for you, and an assurance to

74 See Ahmad Shalabi, Mawsū'at al-Tarikh al-Islāmī, 1/297; Philip Hitti, History of the Arabs, p.116.
75 al-Aţāmī, The History of the Qur'ānic Text, p.32.
76 See The Holy Qur'ān, 8:7.
77 See al-Bukhārī, Šaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, (Mawsū'at al-Ḥadīth), kitāb al-Maghāzī, No. 3952, p.323.
your hearts: (in any case) there is no victory except from Allāh, the Exalted, the Wise',
and (in-bi rīq fūdībīkum in maddikum bi-madikum mālima) RemembeR ye implored
the assistance of your Lord, and he answered you: I will assist you with a thousand of the
angels, ranks on ranks'.

The battle had important consequences. Since the news of the Muslim victory spread all
over Arabia, the tribes were compelled to recognize the new Muslim power. Indeed, more
allies among the Arab tribes rallied to the Prophet following Badr. Moreover, in Medina,
the victory tilted the balance of power away from the Jews towards the Muslims, with
serious consequences for the Jews in the future. The Muslims also gained considerable
wealth from the booty. Indeed, so significant was the battle that a whole Qur'ānic chapter
was revealed which contains important principles for Muslims about how to divide war
booty, how to prepare for war and terrorize the enemy, how to deal with a surrendering
enemy, and how to deal with war hostages. Moreover, the chapter went on to praise the
believers for the sacrifices they had made in the name of God. These pillars still underlie
Islamic literature.

The following are some of the battle's events connected with Medina:

- The route from Medina to Badr began at Naqb al-Madina, and it is understood from
  the context of narratives that Naqb al-Madina was at the end of al-‘Anbariya
  Street, near to the Hijaz railway station. The route then passed through Wadi al-
  ‘Aqiq from the part which begins at Jisr ‘Irwa up to Ābār ‘Alī (Dhū al-‘Hulayf).
- After the victory the Prophet dispatched two messengers to the people of Medina to
  bring them the good news. He sent ‘Abdullah b. Rawāḥa and Zayd b. Ḥāritha.
- There were those among the prisoners of Badr that knew how to read and write,
  and among these were some who had no money (to pay their ransoms), so it was
  settled that if they taught ten children of Medina to write they would be set free,
  and so many of the Ansār learned to write.

79 The Holy Qur'ān ETMC, 8:9.  
80 See The Holy Qur'ān, Sūrat al-Anfāḥ, Ibn Hishām, al-Sīra al-Nabawīyyah, 2/211-270 and 3/5-20;
  Ibn Sa’d, al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā, 2/8; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya, 3/201; Kennedy, The
  Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates, p.36; Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, pp.10-15.
- The first Eid al-Fitr celebrated by the Muslims in Medina was the Eid of Ramadan in which occurred the Battle of Badr, as fasting during Ramadan was prescribed in the second year of the hijra.

- The Muslims at Badr numbered 317: 86 Muhajirun and 231 Anṣār, 61 from the Aws and 170 from the Khazraj. Also bearing a strong connection to life in Medina is what is reported concerning the Prophet dispatching two scouts from Medina to the mushrikūn (polytheists) to bring him news of his enemies. The two scouts were Basbas b. 'Amrū and 'Uday b. Abū al-Zaghbā' and were from the Juhayna tribe, allies of the Anṣār. This indicates that there were Arabs in Medina other than the Aws and the Khazraj, yet it is said that the Anṣār were from among the predominant Aws and Khazraj tribes, as indeed most of them were.

2.2.2. The Battle of Uḥud (3/625)

It is well known among scholars that the battle occurred in Shawal during the third year of the hijra. Among its causes were: the desire of the Quraysh to avenge the killings at Badr, and their fear that the power of the Muslims would intensify and their influence would spread, particularly along the trade route. The coastal road which passed through the outskirts of Yanbu' had become unsafe for the Quraysh to use, due to the presence along it of the Prophet's allies, and when the Quraysh changed their trade route to the Najd road, it too became unsafe because the Prophet sent out scouting missions and raiding parties. So the Quraysh prepared for a further encounter with the Muslims. This time the Meccans took the initiative, and their army marched all the way to Medina, where they camped at the foot of Mount Uhud (a large hill outside the city). The Muslims were divided over their war strategy, whether to meet the enemy outside Medina or to let them venture into the narrow streets of the city itself and then use the advantage of their own knowledge of the place. Eventually, they decided to meet the enemy outside the city, which was contrary

---

83 Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, 2/14-32.
84 Ibn Ṣa`ād, al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā, 2/24; Muḥammad Abū Fāris, al-Sīra al-Nabawīyya, p.293.
to the opinion of the Prophet, and so the two armies met at the foot of Mount Uhud. Despite the Muslims' initial success in the battle, a mistake committed by a company of archers, who had been ordered to remain in place to protect the army from any surprise attack if the scattered enemy should regroup, caused an unexpected shift in fortunes, which resulted in victory for the Meccans and humiliation for the Muslims.\footnote{See Ibn Hishām, \textit{al-Sīra al-Nabawiyyah}, 3/5-137; Aḥmad Shalābī, \textit{Mawsūʿat al-Tarikh al-Islāmi}, 1/308-310; Akbar Shah, \textit{The History of Islam}, 1/171-175.}

The archers' disobedience created confusion in the Muslim ranks, and demoralised the Muslim combatants, who briefly abandoned the Prophet and some of his Companions to the encircling enemy, and he was injured. It is particularly interesting that the Qur'ān encouraged the Prophet to forgive his followers for their mistakes and to keep consulting them in matters of common concern.\footnote{See \textit{The Holy Qur'an ETMC}, 3: 152-159.} For it was their opinion that had exposed the Muslim army outside the town, and the mistakes of some of them that had led to the ultimate defeat in the battle, due to their desire for worldly gain, represented by the booty carried by the Meccan army.\footnote{See Ibn Hishām, \textit{al-Sīra al-Nabawiyyah}, 3/5-137; Ibn Saʿd, \textit{al-Ṭabaqāt}, 2/28; Ibn Kathīr, \textit{al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya}, 4/9-51.}

The following are some of the battle's events connected with Medina:

- The site in Medina where this battle took place was Jabal Uhud.

- The Prophet prayed at his mosque in Medina and then headed north towards Uhud until he arrived at a place called al-Shaykhayn,\footnote{To pinpoint the location of al-Shaykhayn: it lies to the right as one heads in the direction of Jabal Uhud, around 2km before reaching the mountain. Nowadays the al-Mustarāḥ Mosque lies on the site, on the western corner of Sayyid al-Shuhadā' Street.} where he stopped and reviewed the troops, sending back those whom he found too young to fight. He then performed the Maghrib and 'Isha prayers at this location.

- The Prophet wanted to choose a spot for the Muslim army next to Jabal Uhud, but the Meccan army in front stood between him and the mountain, so the Muslims took another route to Uhud which passed through the lava-field (ḥarrā) and plantations of the Banū Ḥāritha, leaving the 
\textit{mushrikūn} army to the west. The Prophet arrived at the Jabal Uhud gorge at the mouth of the wadi and camped
with his troops facing Medina and with his back to the mountain, so that the mushrikūn army lay between the Muslims and Medina.\textsuperscript{90}

- When the Muslims lined up for battle, Jabal Uhud was behind them and they faced outwards towards Medina; to their left was Jabal 'Aynayn upon which fifty archers were positioned. Jabal 'Aynayn was south-east of the Muslim camp at a distance of approximately 150 metres from the Islamic army's location, which indicates that the archers were stationed at the southern foot of the mountain, guarding the breach through which it would have been possible for the enemy to sneak and surprise the Islamic army from behind.\textsuperscript{91}

- It is apparent from the course of the battle that in the early stages the Muslims had the advantage over their enemies. When the mushrikūn tried to advance towards the Muslim camp, the archers showered them with arrows and their right flank retreated. The Muslims rushed upon them with great force, sweeping through their ranks and they began to flee, leaving behind their weapons and equipment. The battle looked as though victory for the Muslims was certain; some of the Muslims began to gather the spoils and when some of the archers saw this they ran down, leaving their posts. Khalid b. al-Walid\textsuperscript{92} noticed that the Jabal was devoid of archers, and so he turned his cavalry towards the mountain, ascending it from the rear, surprising the remaining archers, who were very few in number, and killing them. He then rushed down from the mountain with his cavalry and overpowered the Muslims from behind, chaos spread throughout their ranks and many were martyred.\textsuperscript{93}

The day after the battle, the Prophet rode out with the troops who had been with him at Uhud to Ḥamrā' al-Asad, in order to show their strength and protect their city against a


\textsuperscript{92} The famous Muḥammadan general. He fought against the Muslims at Uhud and defeated the Muslim army. Afterwards Khālid embraced Islam and became one of its most powerful champions. See Hughes, \textit{A Dictionary of Islam}, p.263.

sudden reprisal from the mushrikūn should they think to return and attack Medina. Ḥamrāʾ al-Asad was 20 km to the south of Medina.94

2.2.3. The Battle of the Trench (5/627)95
The Meccan leaders did not abandon their idea of getting rid of the Prophet Muḥammad; they felt that Muḥammad was not only a religious rival but also a threat to their cherished regional trade. Thus they accepted the Jewish idea to mount a decisive attack on Muḥammad and the Muslims, which led to the Battle of the Trench. As for the Jews of Medina, parallels may be drawn between them and the Meccan elite: the Prophet was both a religious rival and an economic and political threat.96

The direct cause of this encounter was that a group of Jews (Banū al-Naḍīr), who had been ousted from Medina by the Prophet, made a visit to Mecca and convinced the Meccan elite to wage war against him. The Jewish leader (Ḥūyayy b. Akhtāb) promised to support any effort made by the Meccans. After winning over the political elite in Mecca, they called on the leaders of one of the major tribes of Arabia, known as the Ghatafān, whom they also convinced that it would be to their advantage to go to war against Muḥammad. And so a coalition of many tribes, headed by the Quraysh of Mecca and commanded by Abū Sufyān, marched towards Medina with a force of about ten thousand warriors.

When the Prophet heard the news, he consulted with his followers about a strategy. A Persian follower called Salmān al-Fārisī proposed that a trench be dug around the northern perimeter of the city. This was accomplished with great effort, and when the coalition forces arrived, they chose to camp north of the town, beyond the trench it was almost impossible for their horses to leap across the trench. The Muslims, who numbered around three thousand, remained inside the trench, patrolling its weak points. At that juncture, the Prophet sought help from one of the Jewish clans of Medina, who had made a common defence agreement with the Prophet, but now they revoked their contract and

95 It is sometimes called the Battle of al-Khandaq (the Trench) or the Battle of al-Ahzāb (the Confederates), as in the Qurʾān. See the whole Surat al-Ahzāb; al-Bukhārī, 4/1505-1510; Muslim, 3/1430; Ibn Hishām, al-Ṣīra al-Nabawiyyyah 3/185-218; al-Ṭabarī, Ṭārikh, 2/96; al-Khudārī, al-Dawla al-Umawiyyya, pp.120-125; Balqīs al-Ruzayqī, al-Īslām fi al-Madīna, pp.221-225; Kennedy, The Prophet, p.40.
refused to participate in the defence of Medina. This disconcerted the Muslims, who feared an attack on two fronts: from the coalition and from the Banū Qurayza.\(^{97}\) However, as the coalition army was making sporadic, limited assaults on those who were guarding the trench, a tremendous wind started to blow, which disrupted the camp, to such a degree that Abū Sufyān decided to withdraw the Meccan armies and hence the other armies, with no war having been waged: (\textit{There came down on you hosts (to overwhelm you): but we sent against them a hurricane and forces that ye saw not}).\(^{98}\) For the Muslims, this was yet more evidence of the divine providence that was protecting them, especially in the light of the consequent revelations that told the Prophet how God was working on behalf of his followers, which gave the Muslim community a deeper sense of attachment to Medina as a land of peace that had witnessed all of these remarkable events.\(^{99}\)

Some of the battle's most important events connected with Medina:

- It took place in Medina when several tribes agreed to attack the Muslims in the city.

- One of the reasons for this was that after the exile of the Banū al-Naḍīr, the Jew Ḥūyayy b. Akhtāb left Medina and went to Mecca to instigate the Quraysh to wage war on the Prophet. Meanwhile, the Jew Kinana b. al-Rayb b. Abū al-Ḥaqiq went to the Banū Ghaṭafān to incite them to fight against the Prophet, and 'Uyayna al-Fazārī consented to this. He wrote to his allies the Banū Asad and Ṭalaḥa b. Khuwaylid showed his allegiance and complied. Abū Sufyān rode out with the Quraysh, halting at Marr al-Zahrān where they were met by those of the Banū Sulaym who also had responded and they became great in number.\(^{100}\)

- The siting of the trench: Medina is surrounded by natural fortifications to the east, the south and the west, since it is encircled by lava-fields and a narrow gorge, which are difficult for armies to traverse, not to mention the plantations and houses that lie between them. However, the northern side is exposed and unprotected, and at

\(^{97}\) See Ibn Kathīr, \textit{al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya}, 4/76.


that time was unpopulated. Therefore, the Prophet commanded the digging of this trench, which had been suggested to him by Salmān al-Fārisī (the Persian), from the far end of the eastern lava-field at the thicket of al-Shaykhayn up to the pass in the western lava-field of the Banū Salama to the east of the Qiblatayn Mosque. Its length was around 2700 metres, in the shape of a wide arc, and its breadth was greater than the distance a horse could leap, and a horse can leap approximately six cubits. Given this, its breadth may have been eight or nine cubits, which is equivalent to roughly five and a half metres. As for its depth, that was equal to the height of an average man standing with his arms raised, or even deeper than that, so that anyone falling into the trench was unable to get out. They also banked up the earth removed from the trench on the Medinan side as a further obstacle in the face of the enemy after that of the trench itself.

- After the Prophet had determined the location of the trench, he divided it in two, one half for the Muhajirūn and the other for the Anṣār, allotting every ten men forty cubits. The digging lasted between six to eight days, as it commenced once news had reached the Prophet that the mushrikūn were returning to attack Medina and was completed by the time they arrived, and they were surprised by the presence of the trench.

- The Prophet was camped to the north of Jabal al-Rāya during the digging; once it had been completed and during the siege he camped at the western foot of Jabal Silī in the gorge in which there are now seven mosques, with his back to the mountain. The Prophet would send out patrols along the length of the trench around the clock.

Among the outcomes of the Battle of the Trench was the elimination of the Banū Qurayṣa, because they had broken the agreement. With their removal, the Jewish presence in Medina came to an end.

101 Muḥammad Abū Fāris, al-Sīra al-Nabawīyya, pp.351-353; Shurrāb, al-Madīna, 1/158.
102 Shurrāb, al-Madīna, 1/160.
103 Shurrāb, al-Madīna, 1/164; Muḥammad Abū Fāris, al-Sīra al-Nabawīyya, pp.353-367.
2.3. The important events occurring in Medina after the death of the Prophet Muḥammad

Due to the collapse of the Quraysh's power in Mecca after it was taken by the Muslims on 20 Ramaḍān 8/630, Medina became a centre to which a constant procession of delegations from various Arab tribes of Arabia came voluntarily to declare their loyalty to Islam. From Medina, delegations were sent out to Tabūk, Dawmat al-Jandal and Yemen to spread the word of Islam. As a result of this social dynamism, Medina prospered and flourished, and the domain of Islam expanded rapidly. However, the Prophet did not live long after the conquest of Mecca. Soon after his return to Medina from the season of pilgrimage to Mecca in 11/632, the Prophet fell ill, and he ordered Abū Bakr to take over the duty of the imām in the prayers, a move that had political implications after his death. He died in the month of Rabī‘a al-Awwal, in the eleventh year of the hijra (June 632 AD), and Medina became the capital of the Islamic Umma, emerging as a centre for the Islamic nation and holding a great legacy of Islamic values.

After Muḥammad's death, four of his companions succeeded him as leader of the Muslim community. During most of this time, Medina, as the capital of the growing and developing Islamic Umma, became the centre of education and guidance for the Muslims and for the spreading of Islam in the newly conquered territories. It developed into a centre of political organization and decision-making.

2.3.1. The important events occurring in Medina during the caliphate of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq (11-13/632-634)

The absence of the Prophet Muḥammad as a messenger of God created a power vacuum among his followers. Medinan Islamic society was founded on the two pillars of al-Muhājirūn (migrants) on the one hand and al-Anṣār (helpers) on the other, and this raised the question of who was entitled to the succession as caliph. Both sides argued for the legitimacy of their claim to the caliphate. After the initial arguments, however, the Anṣār proposed that each party should offer one representative and so there would be two

---

caliphs. But this opinion was not endorsed by ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, who insisted that political leadership cannot be divided between two people, and concluded that the person whom the Prophet had delegated to lead the prayer, which, for ‘Umar, was more important than worldly leadership, should also be entrusted with the political leadership. Hence Abū Bakr was elected, and one of the first duties that he was keen to fulfill was the dispatching of the army, which had been prepared by the Prophet before he died, to the borders of Syria, under the leadership of Usāma b. Zayd. He also fought the tribes who were refusing to pay Islam’s welfare tax (zakāt), and the tribes who had fallen into apostasy following the death of the Prophet.

After these limited campaigns, Medina and the rest of the Islamic territories enjoyed a period of peace, after which Abū Bakr directed the activities of the Muslims to the conquests of Syria and Iraq. Many of the people of Medina joined in the jihad and a large number of them died in those wars. Most of them were among the ḥuffāż (memorizers) of the Qur’ān. However, the death of the Ḥālī prompted Abū Bakr to embark on the collection of the Qur’ānic chapters into one reference work, due to his fears that it might disappear. Thus Abū Bakr ordered the Qur’ān to be gathered and arranged into book form.

---


109 See al-Ṭabarî, Tārîkh, 2/244-246; al-Ya’qūbī, Tārîkh al-Ya’qūbî, 2/127; Muir, The Caliphate, pp.8-10.


111 They are sometimes called Ḥuffāż al-Qur’ān, which means the memorizers of the Qur’ān, while at other times they are called Qurrā’ al-Qur’ān, which means the readers of the Qur’ān. According to the Arabic dictionary, the word Qurrā’ is the plural of the word Qārî, which means al-Nāṣik, al-Mutā’ābid (hermit, worshipper), and there is no relationship between the word Qurrā’ and the word Qurawî or Ahl al-Qurā (village people) as some writers have maintained. For why should Abū Bakr have ordered the Qur’ān to be gathered and arranged into book form if Ahl al-Qurā or villagers had died in the wars? On this point, see al-Baladūrî, Futūḥ al-Buldān, p.79; Ibn Manṣūr, Lisān al-‘Arab, 1/130; al-Munjid fi al-Lughah, p.626; Shaban, Islamic History, pp.23, 52-54.

Abū Bakr died on the twenty-second of Jumadā al-Ākhir in the thirteenth year after the *hijra* (634 A.D.) He left Medina as the capital of an expansive Islamic territory, which encompassed all of the Arabian Peninsula and the southern part of Syria.\(^\text{113}\)

### 2.3.2. The important events occurring in Medina during the caliphate of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (13-24/634-644)

In the thirteenth year after the *hijra*, ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb succeeded Abū Bakr. He showed diligence in the administration of his responsibilities. He sent armies to wage jihād to expand their conquests into Syria, Iraq and Persia.\(^\text{114}\) The result was that immense wealth poured into Medina. ʿUmar summoned a council to dispose of these spoils and granted an annual allocation of wealth to everyone born of a Muslim family.\(^\text{115}\) During this time, ʿUmar appointed officers for the army. He personally reviewed and inspected the citizens’ affairs. He went out night and day, touring the markets and streets, observing the conditions of his people with great concern; as a result Medina remained calm, peaceful, and secure for many years. He expanded the Prophet’s Mosque due to the increase in the size of the population of Medina,\(^\text{116}\) executed the commands of the Prophet Muḥammad, and expelled the non-Muslims from the Arabian Peninsula. His rule brought a period of relative prosperity and welfare due to the annexation of the fertile lands of Iraq. ʿUmar was later assassinated in an act of private vengeance: Abū Lu’lu’ah al-Majūsi stabbed him and he died in Medina on the first of Muharram, in the year 24/644.\(^\text{117}\)

---


2.3.3. The important events occurring in Medina during the caliphate of ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān (24-35/644-656)

‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān was the Prophet's son-in-law, and a small council of leading Companions elected him caliph after ‘Umar's murder.118 During his rule, the population of Medina increased and the buildings spread, as the city expanded in all directions from Mount Sil'ā, Qiblātin and Qubā’, eventually reaching wādi al-'Aqīq.119

In the twenty-ninth year after the emigration, ‘Uthmān renovated and expanded the Prophet’s Mosque, having it reconstructed from chiseled stone.120 In the thirtieth year, he assigned some of the Companions who were familiar with the original copy of the Qur’ān, which had been gathered together in book form in the time of Abn Bakr, to scrutinize and verify it. He then possessed one exact and perfect, error-free written copy, which adhered to the original. Copies of this were then sent out to all of the territories to maintain the integrity of Allāh’s Revelation.121

During these six years, ‘Uthmān was generous, mild, and fair with regard to the people's worldly affairs. He established the borders of Medina and shared the wealth between the ever-increasing numbers of Medinans.

In the thirty-second year after the hijra, unrest began to stir in the city122 which culminated in the murder of ‘Uthmān. Thus the greatest challenge the caliphate had yet faced arose from the unrest and confusion that prevailed in Medina.123

118 See al-Dhahabi, Ta’rikh al-Islam, pp.300-303; Stephen Humphreys, Islamic History, p.9; Shaban, Islamic History, p.63.
121 The Qur’ān’s first compilation was made in the reign of Abū Bakr during the wars he waged against the apostates, which led to a massive loss of the Ḥuffāẓ. Abū Bakr ordered Zayd b. Thābit to organize the hitherto scattered chapters and verses of the Qur’ān into systematically written sheets. Abū Bakr kept these sheets and they later passed to the second caliph, ‘Umar, and then to Ḥafṣa. However, in the year 30 AH, during ‘Uthmān’s reign, Hudhayfa b. al-Yamān, who had attended the fall of Armenia and Azerbaijan, warned ‘Uthmān that he saw in these places people differing in the way they recited the Qur’ān. He warned ‘Uthmān of what might happen in the future if people were not given a standardized form of the Qur’ān. ‘Uthmān therefore sent for Ḥafṣa requiring the pages of the Qur’ān to be copied by a group of writers. Subsequently, ‘Uthmān sent official copies to Basra, Kufa, Syria, Yemen and Mecca and kept one with him in Medina. See Ibn al-Jazrī, al-Nashr fi al-Qirāṭ al-‘Ashr, 1/6-10; al-Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh, 4/290; Fathī Ahmad, Fikrat al-Nuṣūm, p.15; Watt, Introduction to the Qur’ān, pp.42-46.
122 About this unrest see al-Dhahabi, Ta’rikh al-Islam, pp.429-462; Ahmad Shalabi, al-Ta’rikh al-Islāmī, p.427; Kennedy, The Prophet, pp.69-75; Martin Hinds, Studies in Early Islamic History, pp.1-55. Also see chapter 4 in this thesis, p.88, footnote 38.
2.3.4. The important events occurring in Medina during the caliphate of ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib (35-40/656-661)

‘Ali took over at a time that was plagued by schisms provoked by the murder of ‘Uthmān; disputes immediately arose over what was to be done with the murderers. The fact that ‘Uthmān was from the Umayyad clan made it difficult for ‘Ali, who was from the Hāshimiyya dynasty, to be accepted by those who demanded the immediate execution of the killers of ‘Uthmān, a party led by Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān, ‘Uthmān’s kinsman and governor of Syria. However, ‘Ali’s first concern was to restore peace, order and calm to Medina, to find the causes of the problem, eradicate the unrest that was spreading in the territories, and dislodge the conspirators. His sincerity was doubted by the pro-‘Uthmān party. Indeed the voices of those who were attempting to capitalize on the circumstances that brought about the turmoil were growing louder. ‘Ali brought security back to the outskirts of Medina and then began to rectify the affairs of the territories, but to no avail. Mu‘āwiya refused to pledge fealty to ‘Ali as caliph, and so, ‘Ali journeyed to Syria in order to confront him. Sahl b. Ḥanif al-Anṣārī was appointed regent of Medina, and the situation grew calmer, as the citizens distanced themselves from what had transpired in Iraq and Syria. Further emigration to Medina was halted and the only ones who remained were the people of Medina and those who were visiting the Prophet’s Mosque for religious purposes. Thus the population decreased and its economic activity consequently declined.

When ‘Ali was assassinated in Kiūfa in 40/661, the people swore their allegiance to al-Ḥasan (d. 49/669), the son of ‘Ali, as caliph. What remained of the unrest abated when al-Ḥasan renounced his right to the succession in favour of Mu‘āwiya and returned

125 See R. Stephen Humphreys, Mu‘āwiya ibn Abī Sufyān, pp.77-84; Hawting, The First Dynasty of Islam, p.28; Mahmoud M. Ayoub, The Crisis of Muslim History, pp.93-105.
126 See Ṭabarī, Tārīkh al-Islam, p.44.
129 See Ibn Khayyāt, p.199.
to Medina,\textsuperscript{130} which soon metamorphosed into a city of religious affairs and lost its political status to become one of the provinces of the new Umayyad state.\textsuperscript{131}

2.3.5. The important events occurring in Medina during the Umayyad period and the rule of its emirs (40-132/661-750)

Life in Medina passed through three stages during the Umayyad period. Initially, stability and order, but eventually unrest and turmoil were characteristic of life there. The pursuit of knowledge and engagement in economic activities advanced during the early period, in which the Medinans were able to reap the benefits and advantages of the availability of the legacy of the Prophet, his caliphs and the generation after them, through building up an authentic and rich Islamic jurisprudence.\textsuperscript{132} Lectures and lessons were held in the Prophet’s Mosque to expand and spread Islamic knowledge.\textsuperscript{133} Agriculture and commerce also prospered,\textsuperscript{134} and this was reflected in the growth of the city and its population. However, at the end of the Umayyad period, unrest and confusion flared up once again. The people were threatened by the arrival of an army and a governor was appointed who antagonized them. Tumultuous times ensued and, although the Medinans continued to pursue their agricultural and commercial activities, their agitation brought about a deterioration in the conditions of their formerly stable life, resulting in difficulties and hardship. Eventually however, the occupying army departed and the unwanted governor was dismissed.\textsuperscript{135}

Therefore this period may be divided into three stages; the first is the time of Muʿāwiya and his son Yazid, the second is the period of rule of Ibn al-Zubayr, and the third is the remainder of the Umayyad period.\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{130} Ibn Khayyāt, p.203; Muir, \textit{The Caliphate}, pp.290-291.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 1/458-462.
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 1/432-439.
2.3.5.1. Medina at the time of Mu`awiya and his son Yazid (41-64/661-683)

The Umayyad era began in Medina in the year 41/661, when al-Hasan b. 'Ali relinquished
the caliphate to Mu`awiya b. Abi Sufyän (41-60/661-680), who secured a pledge of
fealty from the people of Medina. He moved the seat of the caliphate to Damascus to make
the administration more central to the entire Islamic state, thereby relegating Medina to
the status of a mere province, as mentioned above.

Mu`awiya visited Medina and, under his guidance, the grants were restored to the people,
in order to reconcile and placate them. He appointed Marwän b. al-Ḥakam as the
governor of Medina. Marwän undertook a series of projects in Medina, some of which were
at the behest of Mu`awiya, among the most important being the building of the Dar al-
Imāra or the governor's palace beside the Prophet's Mosque, and the tiling and paving of
the passageways around the Mosque. Marwän also saw that the Prophet's Mosque had
need of water, particularly whenever visitors came before or after the hajj season, so he
ordered the construction of underground channels to carry water from one of the springs to
the Mosque. This spring was named al-`Ayn al-Zarqa (blue spring), in reference to him
because his eyes were blue. Marwän also turned his attention to supplying the remote
areas of Medina with water, and al-Samhüdi reports that the water channels stretched
from al-Ālia south of Medina up to near Jabal Uhud, north of the city. He also built castles,
and took an interest in agriculture and trade. In the year 49/669, Mu`awiya dismissed
Marwän from the emirate of Medina, appointing Sa'id b. al-Āṣ in his place. This was due
to the amount of complaints from some of Medina's inhabitants over Marwän's harshness
and severity, and also because Mu`awiya feared that given time Marwän would grow in
strength and establish himself with his entourage which would challenge the caliphate or
develop into an influential force.

---

137 See al-Ya`qūbī, Tarikh al-Ya`qūbī, pp.149-156; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya wa al-Nihâya, 8/134-140;
Kennedy, The Prophet, p.82; Shaban, Islamic History, p.79; Muir, The Caliphate, p.292; Hitti,
p.189.
138 See al-Ṭabarî, Tārikh, 5/165; `Abd al-Bāṣīṭ Badr, al-Tārikh al-Shāmil, 1/323-326; Muir, The
Caliphate, p.298.
139 `Arif `Abd al-Ghani, Umarâ al-Madina, p.51.
140 `Abd al-Bāṣīṭ Badr, al-Tārikh al-Shāmil, 1/326.
141 ibid., 1/458-460.
142 Al-Sakhâwi, al-Tuhfa al-Latîfa, 1/83; but Ibn Khayyât gives the year as 48/668, see p.208.
When Mu'awiya wished to secure allegiance for his son Yazid so that he would be caliph after him, he dismissed Sa'id from the emirate of Medina and reinstated Marwan, realizing he had greater determination and ability to secure allegiance for Yazid than Sa'id. Moreover, the political factor which had caused him to dismiss Marwan in 49/669 was still apparent from Sa'id's dismissal, as Mu'awiya preferred that Medina should not be governed by an Umayyad for long enough to establish himself in power and build a personal armed force, although he realised that Sa'id had been competent in handling the affairs of the emirate.

In the year 60/679, Mu'awiya died and the period of relative peace came to an end. Indeed, his death ushered in a period of unrest, unease and turmoil. The people of Medina gave their fealty to Yazid, with the exception of al-Husayn b. Ali, Abdullah b. al-Zubayr and a few others, who went to Mecca, threatening a schism by secession.

The Battle of al-Harra

One of the most significant events to take place in Medina during the reign of Yazid b. Mu'awiya occurred between the inhabitants of Medina and Yazid's army. It was caused by the Medinans rebelling against Yazid and renouncing their allegiance to him. The reason for this withdrawal of allegiance was that a delegation of Medinans had gone to Yazid in Damascus to pay homage to him, and they saw him drinking wine and playing musical instruments. When they returned to Medina they informed its inhabitants of what they had seen and that they had ceased to acknowledge Yazid as caliph. Many Medinans followed suit, and they selected one of their townspeople as governor. Yazid dispatched an army led by Muslim b. Uqba al-Murri to confront the people of Medina. The army arrived and encamped before the city in the lava-field. Then a battle commenced in which the Medinans fought bravely, but victory did not smile upon them. Muslim permitted his troops three days in which to do as they pleased with the city, so they killed the men and plundered the wealth. Muslim's army took control of Medina and re-established allegiance.
to Yazid by force. Many of the Companions and Successors (Tābi‘ūn) were killed during this battle.147

On the death of Yazid, ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr declared himself caliph in Mecca.148 The people of Medina did not hesitate in pledging their loyalty to him.149

2.3.5.2. Medina under ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr and his allies (64-72/684-692)
This period saw the consolidation of power by ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr and a number of his helpers in Medina. There were battles between them and the allies of the Umayyads. Authority in the province of Medina was invested in the governor, ‘Ubaydullāh b. al-Zubayr, the brother of ‘Abdullāh.150 Subsequent governors were: ‘Ubaydullāh’s brother Mus‘ab b. al-Zubayr,151 who treated the people well; ‘Abdurrahman b. al-Ash‘ath, who was severe and widely feared; Jābir b. al-Aswad;152 and finally Ṭālḥah b. ‘Abdullāh, whose period of office ended when the Umayyad armies arrived and returned Medina to the authority of the Umayyads.153

2.3.5.3. The Final Period of Umayyad Rule (72-132/692-750)154
This period is noted for its order, stability, and peace. Some of the governors of Medina were good and generous; others were unyielding and harsh.155 Its populace devoted themselves to learning, agriculture and commerce. The period began with the appointment of Ṭāriq b. ‘Amru as governor;156 then al-Ḥajjāj (41-95/661-714), who made the people

---

151 Ibn Sa’d, al-Ṭabaqāt, 5/182.
156 ‘Arif ‘Abd al-Ghani, Umarā’ al-Madīna, p.79.
suffer, was appointed governor of al-Ḥijāz in (74-75/693-694). After that, Abūn b. ʿUthmān assumed power.

Medina prospered during the Umayyad Caliphate, especially under the governorship of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in the years 86-93/705-711, when justice and affluence prevailed, learning flourished and the citizens were accorded due respect by ʿUmar. During his governorship, he renovated the Prophet's Mosque by order of Caliph al-Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik (86-96/705-715).

Then a number of princes assumed the governorship in Medina; the last was Yūsif b. ʿUrwa, whose rule ended when the caliphate was seized by the ʿAbbāsid in the year 132/749.

2.4. Conclusion

The main aim of the chapter has been to highlight very briefly the importance Medina had in political Islam and Islamic history at various times, but not at others. The Qurʾān constantly explained and emphasised to the Prophet the state of politics inside Medina, by telling him what the 'hypocrites' and the Jews were about to do that would affect the nascent Islamic society. It also excused the believers when they committed mistakes and praised their good deeds. The role of the ḥadīth was similar, since, from the start, the Prophet tried to give the new town a position like that of the well-established Mecca. Thus, the ḥadīth set a moral code for the inhabitants by making it ḥaram, like Mecca, and accomplished the difficult mission of unifying the emigrants and the Companions by stressing their brotherhood.

Moreover, the chapter has shown how the constant engagement with other Arab tribes created a sense of identity among the followers of Islam, as highlighted by the results of the various battles fought in Medina's environs, in which the emphasis was on the notion of martyrdom, which was highly valued by the Muslims. We also saw how that state of

160 ʿAbd al-Bāṣīṭ Badr, al-Tārikh al-Shāmil 1/384. For more information about the all Princes of Medina see ʿĀrif ʿAbd al-Ghānī, Umarāʾ al-Madīna, p.49-110.
mobilization contributed to the expansion of Medina's population and enrichment of its culture, especially when new lands were conquered.

However, it has also been shown how political factors at the end of the Prophet Muhammad's era led to competition over the political leadership and how that ultimately weakened the power base of Medina, especially by the time of the violent political struggle between 'Ali and Mu'awiya. Medina lost its political importance, so only had a District Commissioner to manage its political and administrative affairs, but continued to preserve its cultural, historical and religious importance.
Chapter Three

The political situation in the Islamic world in the 11th and 12th centuries, and its effects on Medina

Chapter Two presented a historical background of Medina and studied the city's significance in the Islamic sources; this chapter will examine the state of the Islamic World prior to and during the Ayyūbid period, identifying the most important forces and political events which were associated with Medina and discussing the key historical events occurring in the city at that time and their connection to what was going on in the Islamic World.

This chapter is divided into two parts: the first discusses political life in the Islamic World during that period by highlighting the state of weakness that was caused by internal political and armed struggles and the Crusaders' invasion and how the Zangids, the Seljuqs, the Ayyūibs and the Fāṭimids resisted it. The second concerns the specific impact of all these events on Medina.

3.1. The state of the Islamic World during the Ayyūbid era

Among the main problems confronting the Islamic World in the 5th and 6th hijrī Centuries (11th and 12th A.D.), were the competition between the ‘Abbāsids and the Fāṭimids on the one hand, and the Crusaders' onslaughts on the other. Indeed, the struggle between the ‘Abbāsids and the Fāṭimids led to grave internal weaknesses represented by the appearance of militaristic authoritarian governors. In Baghdad, the Seljuqs' leaders started to interfere in high politics by appointing princes and expelling them from office, even on occasion deposing the caliph himself and imprisoning him. These Seljuq leaders managed to initiate their own emirates, which were only nominally linked to the ‘Abbāsid's authority. In Cairo also, the Chief Minister experienced their
authoritarianism and interference in the appointment of the caliph.\(^6\) Despite the cessation of the war between the two caliphates, many of the neighbouring emirates continued to wage war among themselves, (like Mosul with Wasit and Damascus with Aleppo).

As for the Crusaders, they managed to encroach on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean in the fifth hijri century (11\(^{th}\) AD), where they created their own emirates in Edessa (al-Rahā)( Rabi. al-Awwal 491/February 1098),\(^7\) Antioch (Anṭakiyā) ( Rajab 491/ Jun 1098), Tripoli ( Dhillijh 502/ Julay 1109), and Jerusalem ( Shaʿbān 492/ Julay 1099);\(^8\) they also besieged Damascus, Aleppo and Mosul.\(^9\) The Crusaders also built military castles in the places they occupied. All this was happening when neither of the two caliphates nor the warring emirates were able to do anything due to internal weakness and the personal ambitions of their leaders, who were even ready to cooperate with the common enemy against a Muslim prince when they felt that their authority was in danger.\(^10\) That is the broad picture of the Islamic World during that period; in the following section the characteristics of each caliphate will be highlighted.

### 3.1.1. The ‘Abbāsid caliphate\(^11\)

As noted above, the 11\(^{th}\) and 12\(^{th}\) centuries were times of weakness for the ‘Abbāsid caliphate.\(^12\) This was mainly due to the following factors.

---


\(^8\) Ghunaym, p.113-154.

\(^9\) Ibid., p.173.


\(^12\) Medina in the early ‘Abbāsid caliphate was a centre of knowledge and science for all people of learning resident in the city. At the forefront of these were the scholars of ḥadīth and fiqh, such as Imam Mālik b. Anas. Agriculture was the mainstay of the economy; as for building activity, it was halted due to the aggression of the Bedouins and the meagreness of the city's financial resources. See Ibn Khayyāt, Tārikh Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, p.630. In the year 145/763, a rebellion broke out and spread, led by Muḥammad b. ‘Abdullāh, known as ‘al-Nafs al-Zakīyah', who claimed that he was entitled to the caliphate. This insurrection continued for approximately two months, until al-Manṣūr (754-775) sent an army and put the rebellion down. See al-Khuḍārī, al-Dawla al-‘Abbāsiyya, pp.58-65; ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dūrī, al-’Āṣr al-‘Abbāsī al-Awwal, pp.86-92; Kennedy, The
a- The dominance of military personnel over the government

From the beginning, the 'Abbāsids depended on non-Arab ethnic groups, such as Turks. These people were first brought as slaves to create a powerful and detached army. However, when the numbers of these groups increased, they became influential in the running of the government. Indeed, they started to replace the princes in issuing the political orders and decrees and ultimately became the de facto rulers.

b- The rise of statelets

After the relative unity of the Islamic nation in the early days of the Prophet (PBUH) and the four rightly guided caliphs, internal weaknesses arose due to conflicts concerning who was to be the successor of 'Uthmān, the third caliph, who had been assassinated. Despite those weaknesses the main political feature of the Islamic state, which was its centrality, was not endangered. This was maintained throughout the Umayyad period. However, with the rise of the 'Abbāsids to power, there was a gradual loosening of the state's grip on central power and the gradual empowerment of hitherto marginal elements, such as the non-Arab ethnic groups who, as noted above, started their political career as mere soldiers in the 'Abbāsid military establishment. That tendency led to what came to be known as the Islamic statelets, which belonged to the 'Abbāsid rule by name only. One of the statelets that played a significant role in the shaping of events was that of the Seljuqs.

---


14 Ibid.
The Seljuqs came from Turkish Ghuzz tribes, and their name was derived from their ancestor Seljuq, who unified these tribes and initiated their political glory after they moved from their original home in Turkistan down to Bukhāra and Samarqand, where they embraced Islam. They collaborated with the Sāmānids to spread the religion among the Turkish tribes. However, in their march towards Khurasan, under the leadership of Tughril Beg (429-455/1038-1063), they conquered many towns and places and lastly took Isfahan as their capital city. These events occurred between 433 and 437 (1041-1045). The Seljuqs were Sunni Muslims who showed no leniency in resisting the Shi'a at a time when the 'Abbāsid caliph was sidelined by the powerful Shi'ite Būyid princes. The 'Abbāsid caliph, al-Qā'im(422-467/1031-1075), took advantage of the hostility between the Sunni Seljuqs and the Shi'ite Būyids to call for the Seljuqs to salvage his power from the Būyid and Fātimid dynasties. Indeed, the Seljuqs under Tughril Beg succeeded in reinstating the deposed caliph and conquered Baghdad in the year 447/1055. That was the era which saw the end of the Būyids in Baghdad, the triumph of the Seljuqs and the installation as sultan of Tughril Beg, who issued a new currency bearing his name for the first time. After his death, his nephew 'Aḍud al-Dīn Alp Arslan (455-465/1063-1073) succeeded him, and continued the armed struggle against the Shi'a throughout his reign, bringing under his authority Aleppo, Ramla, and Jerusalem. He also fought against the Byzantine Empire. Romanus Diogenes IV had penetrated into Islamic territories as far as Malāzgird, where he engaged in a massive battle against Arslan, who was victorious, thus
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bringing Byzantine penetration of the Islamic lands to a halt in 463/1071. This battle paved the way for Arslan’s taking hold of the Byzantine possessions in Asia Minor, to which he sent his cousin Sulaymān Qutlumush, who established the Seljuq domination of the Byzantine state. When Arslan died, his son, Malik Shāh (465-485/1073-1092) succeeded him and Damascus fell to him in 468/1077. Malik Shāh appointed his brother Tutush as king of Syria and instituted the hereditary system of rule for his family. As a result, a Seljuq state was established in Damascus to resist the Fātimids’ incursion from Egypt into Syria.

The Seljuq dynasty started to show weaknesses following Malik Shāh’s death. He was succeeded by four of his sons: Maḥmūd I (485-487/1092-1094), Berk Yaruq (487-498/1094-1105), Muḥammad I (498-511/1105-1118) and Sanjar (511-552/1118-1157), and this led to the dividing of political power between them. These brothers started to compete over who would influence the ‘Abbāsid caliph and hence inherit the title of sultan. This competition continued through the following generation. There was also rivalry in Syria among the sons of Tutush, Riḍwān (488-507/1095-1113, in Aleppo) and Duqaq (488-497/1095-1104, in Damascus), and also his uncles and their sons in the eastern provinces.

One of the main symptoms of the weakness and failure of the Seljuq state was the independence of the Atābik throughout their provinces. The Atābik (leaders’ in Turkish) ruled on behalf of the Seljuq sultan. Among the Atābik who started to show independence from the Seljuqs’ authority were the Atābik of Mosul, founded by ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī (520/1127).
Partly due to the initial Islamic expansion in the Mediterranean basin after the defeat of the Byzantines and their retreat back to Asia Minor, and partly due to the later Umayyad expansion into European territories such as Spain, hatred and propaganda spread among the Christians in Europe that ultimately led to a series of military encroachments against the Islamic world. These campaigns dated from 488/1095, when the Conference of Clermont (27 November) in southern France was convened at the demand of Pope Urban II (1042-1099). At that conference, the Christians were mobilised by the Pope to fight the Muslims in order to free the Eastern Church from the Muslim yoke. However, that effort would not have been possible without the enhancement of European power in the 11th and 12th centuries. The first campaign instigated by the Pope comprised men, women and children, who gave these campaigns their name due to the red-crossed clothing they wore (to commemorate the crucifixion of Jesus) when they were marching to Jerusalem under the leadership of Cardinal Boutros. That campaign failed due to an ambush by the Seljuqs, but other campaigns followed, which were organized according to the chivalric code of the feudal system. Being more effective than their predecessors they managed to
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conquer Nicaea, the capital of the Roman Seljuqs, in 490/1097. They also captured Antioch in the following year, while the Muslims failed to recover it due to internal fragmentation. After the fall of Antioch, some of the Crusaders headed to al-Jazira, where they captured the town of Edessa (al-Raha), while others headed southwards, being constantly supplied with arms from the Italian vessels. Most of the Syrian towns and ports gave in easily to them, their subjects receiving cruel treatment from the invaders. Neither the Seljuqs nor the Fāṭimids learned from these defeats: while the Seljuqs underestimated the extent of the new campaigns since they thought that it would be an extension of the Byzantine campaigns that they were used to, the Fāṭimids refused to unify their ranks with the Seljuqs to repel the common enemy. It was the Fāṭimids, moreover, who reached an agreement with the Crusaders to secure some possessions belonging to the Seljuqs. Indeed, the Fāṭimids made use of the Crusaders’ defeat of the Seljuqs at Antioch to push towards Palestine, which had been under the Seljuqs’ authority. They managed to secure Jerusalem in 492/1099, but this coincided with the Crusaders’ attack, which resulted in a terrible massacre after the Muslims were forced to yield the city after a seven-week-long siege. Thus, the Crusaders managed to establish the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, which included, in addition to Jerusalem, Jaffa (Yāfa), Aila, Ramla, and Hebron (al-Khalil). It
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47 Antioch was an ancient city on the eastern side (left bank) of the Orontes River. It became the modern city of Antakya, Turkey. In 16/637, during the reign of the Byzantine emperor Heraclius, Antioch was conquered by the Muslims during the battle of Iron Bridge. In 1098, the siege of Antioch by the Crusaders took place during the first Crusade. See William Walker Rockwell, Antiochus. In: The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2/130-132.
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seems that the achievements of the crusaders during the first campaign encouraged them to set out on a new one, but at the same time, the Seljuqs learned from the tough lessons of the previous campaign to unite in the face of the invaders. In a unified effort, the armies of Kilj Arslän, the sultan of the Roman Seljuqs, Riďwān, the prince of Aleppo and al-Għāzi, the prince of Sebastia (Śiwās) managed to defeat the Crusaders and disperse their leaders. However, the Crusaders of Jerusalem slowly managed to establish their authority over the neighbouring areas although these were scattered, while the Islamic and Arab opposition remained dormant. Thus, in 494/1101 they conquered Caiffa (Ḩāfā), Arsuf, and Caesarea (Qīṣārīyā). In 1104, after a siege that lasted for seven years, the crusaders captured Acre (‘Akkā) and then Tripoli and thus the third emirate of the Crusaders was established after al-Raha (the first emirate), and Antioch (the second). As for Jerusalem, it had earlier been established as a kingdom.

3. 1. 1. 1. The Zangid Dynasty

The origin of this dynasty can be traced back to a Turk called Aq Sunqur, whose childhood friend, Malik Shāh, inherited the rule of the Seljuq dynasty in 465/1073. Thus, Aq Sunqur was delegated to rule Aleppo (479-487/1086-1094). When Malik Shāh died, rule passed to his son Berk-Yaruq, who contended with his uncle Tutush for power. Aq Sunqur chose to defend the position of Berk-Yaruq against Tutush and died in the military struggle between the two. In recognition of this, Berk-Yaruq fostered the family of Aq Sunqur.

---
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Sunqur, particularly the son of Aq Sunqur, ʿImād al-Dīn Zangi (521-541/1127-1149). 64 ʿImād al-Dīn received military training and fought several battles against the rebellious power centres within the Seljuq state and against the Crusaders. As a result, he was appointed governor of Başra and Wāṣīt, where he displayed dexterity in extinguishing internal seditions. However, his real glory began in 521/1127, when a decree was issued by the caliph al-Mustarshid (512-529/1118-1135) and approved by the Seljuq sultan appointing ʿImād al-Dīn, who had also been decorated by the ʿAbbāsid caliph, ruler of Mosul and al-Jazīrā (in Iraq), in addition to whichever of the Syrian lands he could conquer. That was the real start of Zangid rule. 65

As soon as he took over, he started to strengthen his position and that of his emirate. He waged limited wars to unify the contending emirates, thus establishing a unified and impressive power to confront the Crusaders. With this force, he expanded eastwards, taking Mosul, Aleppo, Harrān and Irbil. 66 ʿImād al-Dīn also had a good relationship with the ʿAbbāsid caliph who had decorated him. His main achievement after this was to expel the Crusaders from many of the territories they held after defeating them at the castle of Athareb. 67 After this pivotal battle the Crusaders lost their aura of invincibility in the eyes of the Muslim masses, and he defeated them again at al-Rahā in 1144. 68 His reign came to an end when he was killed by one of his subjects during the siege of Jaʿabar castle on the Euphrates. 69

His sons divided his rule among themselves. In Aleppo, Nūr al-Dīn continued in his father’s footsteps by trying to unify the country and continue the struggle against the invaders; notably, when they tried to retake al-Rahā, he resisted and defeated them. 70 He rescued

---
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Damascus from the Crusaders when he took it in 549/1154, and he also took Ba’labak in 550/1155. Despite his military engagements with the Crusaders, Nūr al-Dīn failed to show concern about the Two Holy Mosques, but sent money to build a new wall around Medina in 558/1163.

In Egypt, the activities of the government were constrained by the competition over power, corruption, and the weakness of the Fāṭimid caliph. This led to the incapacity of the political power in Egypt to confront the Crusaders, especially when the corruption and the misconduct of the minister Shāwar induced Ḍirghām, one of the army generals, to lead a rebellion against him; he was decorated by the caliph for expelling the minister from power. Seeking revenge, Shāwar went to Nūr al-Dīn and asked him to mount a campaign against Egypt. Nūr al-Dīn consented to his request, fearing that the chaos prevailing in Egypt might encourage the Crusaders to invade the country. He therefore sent an army under the leadership of Asad al-Dīn Shīrkūh, who was accompanied by Shāwar. Also present when the army entered Egypt in 559/1164 was Shālāh al-Dīn. However, Shāwar feared Shīrkūh, and plotted with the Crusaders to expel him. Indeed, this alliance managed to expel Shīrkūh and his army in 1164 and again in 1166. Eventually, in 564/1169, Shīrkūh invaded Egypt at the demand of the Fāṭimid caliph (al-‘Ādīd), where he killed Shāwar and took power, but he died two months later, whereupon Shālāh al-Dīn succeeded him upon the directive of the Fāṭimid caliph.

3.1.1.2. The Ayyūbid State
The Ayyūbids were a Kurdish family from Dwain in Azerbaijan, who were descendants of a man called Ayyūb b. Shādī b. Marwān, known as Najm al-Dīn. He was the father of Shālāh
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al-Din. Their story is similar to that of the rise of the Zangids to power. Šhādī, the grandfather of Šalāḥ al-Dīn had a friend called Bahrūz, who had worked under the Seljuq sultan Malik Shāh and then under his son Masūd. Thus, he was appointed viceroy of Baghdad and was given Tikrit as a governorship in 512/1108. Bahrūz called on his friend Šhādī and gave him the rule of Tikrit. After the death of Šhādī, his oldest son, Najm al-Dīn, took over in 525/1132.

In 526/1133, ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī was waging a battle near Baghdad; his army was defeated and he was injured and evacuated to Mosul. On the journey, he reached Tikrit, where his wounds were tended by Najm al-Dīn, who also lent his vessels to the army of ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī so that it could cross the river, meanwhile giving ʿImād al-Dīn treatment and care till his wounds healed. Six years later, relations between Bahrūz and the Ayyūbīd family worsened due to the killing of one of his men by Shīrkūh, and he expelled the Ayyūbīds from Tikrit. It could be argued that this killing merely served to exacerbate an already existing tension, because the growing influence of the Ayyūbīds and the good relations between them and the citizens of Tikrit were making Bahrūz envious. However, the Ayyūbīds, under Najm al-Dīn, left Tikrit in 532/1137 and headed towards ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī, who was in Aleppo and was still favourable towards them. On the way, a son was born to Najm al-Dīn, named Yūsuf, who later become the great leader Šalāḥ al-Dīn.

When the Ayyūbīd family arrived in Aleppo, ʿImād al-Dīn welcomed them, and involved them in his wars. When ʿImād al-Dīn conquered Baʿbalabak, he appointed Najm al-Dīn viceroy there in 534/1139.

When ʿImād al-Dīn was killed, the lands he ruled were divided among his sons, and as a result Nūr al-Dīn came to rule over Aleppo with the aid of Shīrkūh. This made Shīrkūh one of the major leaders under Nūr al-Dīn, who placed great trust in him. It has been shown that, when Šhāwar asked for the aid of Nūr al-Dīn, the latter responded by
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dispatching an army to Egypt under the leadership of Shirküh and his nephew Şalāḥ al-Din, which brought Şalāḥ al-Din to power in Egypt. Şalāḥ al-Din was successful in carrying out this order in Egypt, by suppressing the revolts and contenders and in 567/1171 putting an end to Fāṭimid rule according to the instructions of Nūr al-Dīn. Other sources, however, argue to the contrary that Şalāḥ al-Din meant to establish a solid power base in Egypt due to his fear of being replaced or expelled by Nūr al-Dīn. Şalāḥ al-Din sent his brother, Tūrān Shāh, to Nubia to conquer it, but found it too economically deprived, so he sent him to Yemen, which was suffering from internal unrest, although Nūr al-Dīn died before Tūrān Shāh reached it. Şalāḥ al-Din finally rose to power and unified Syria and Egypt. Some scholars believe that the political career of Şalāḥ al-Dīn can be divided into two periods. During the first period, from 570-582/1174-1186, Şalāḥ al-Dīn was mainly occupied with the cementing of the internal Islamic front and the merging of small power pockets that, at times, collaborated with the Crusaders. Therefore he waged limited wars against those rebellious emirates but at the same time did not forget to prepare the state for a longer, more sustained war. Thus, he built defences, erected castles, and also built a fleet to defend the coastal towns. Moreover, he spreading schooling across his territories. He also cared for the Two Holy Mosques and those in power in Mecca and Medina by sending money to princes and imams.

The second phase stretched from the year 582/1186 up to his death in 589/1193, and was characterised by the wars he waged against the Crusaders from Damascus, which he used as a base for his campaigns. He started by attacking the Crusaders in Crac (al-Karak), al-
Shubik, and Thabaria (Ṭabarīyya), and won the vital battle of Ḥaṭṭīn in 583/1187,⁹⁶ where he killed huge numbers of their soldiers and knights and captured their leaders and secured the Mediterranean coast from Acre (‘Akkā) to Sagitta (Ṣaydā).⁹⁷ He also managed to liberate Jerusalem in the same year after a siege.⁹⁸ After that, he moved his campaign northwards, reaching Antioch in 584/1188.⁹⁹ His victories caused shockwaves in Europe, which began a powerful campaign led by the European kings and leaders. That campaign managed to acquire parts of the Mediterranean coast and reach an accord with Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 588/1192, that came to be known as the peace treaty of al-Ramlah, which stipulated that each party should remain in its positions.¹⁰⁰ A few months later, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn died, leaving the mission of resisting the Crusaders to those who succeeded him.¹⁰¹ The Ayyūbid leaders divided up what Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn had unified from the Islamic territories. His son al-Afdal took Damascus and the surrounding territories as far as Egypt and also retained the overall supremacy over the Ayyūbids. His second son, al-‘Āzīz ‘Uthmān, took Egypt, while his brother al-‘Ādil took Jordan, the Peninsula, and Diyār Bakr. He managed to unify the territories under his authority while disputes arose among Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s sons.¹⁰²

3.1.2. The Fāṭimid Caliphate (297-567/909-1171)¹⁰³
The Fāṭimid caliphate in Egypt, like its counterpart in Baghdad, suffered from marked weaknesses, which first appeared under the leadership of ‘Ubaydallāh (al-Mahdī), who
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⁹⁷ Muhammad Ṭaqūṣī, Tārikh al-Ayyūbiyyn, pp.158-172; Stevenson, p.249.


¹⁰¹ See Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmīl, 10/218; Abū Shāmah, al-Rawdatayn, 4/190-211; Muhammad Ṭaqūṣī, Tārikh al-Ayyūbiyyn, pp.200, 205.

¹⁰² See Abū Shāmah, al-Rawdatayn, 4/237-270.

¹⁰³ See Muḥammad Surūr, Tārikh al-Dawla al-Fāṭimīyya, pp.101-120; al-Abbādī, p.223-225; M. Canard, Fāṭimids. in: The Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2/850-864; Bosworth, The New Islamic Dynasties, pp.63-65; Lane Poole, The Mohammadan Dynasties, pp.70-73.
nominated himself as deliverer and called himself the 'prince of believers' in 297/909 in Ifriqiya (Tunisia). However, when the Fatimid caliphate took over Egypt, Syria and parts of the Arabian Peninsula, it started to show weaknesses due to the corruption of certain ministers, a factor that had also contributed to the weakness of the 'Abbasids' rule. At first, the Fatimid caliphs were independent and even those ministers used by them, rather than being political ministers, were more like executives. Even when they started to employ ministers during the time of the caliph al-ʿAziz bi Allāh (365-386/975-996), these were known as executive ministers. However, towards the end of al-Mustansir bi Allāh's caliphate (427-487/1036/1094), which was plagued by famines and droughts on the one hand, and by uprisings and seditions on the other, these disasters and disruptions caused frequent changes of government. Indeed, in a period of four years, over twenty different ministers were appointed.

When chaos threatened the internal order in Egypt, al-Mustansir felt unable to abate it and resorted to his viceroy in 'Akka, Badr al-Jamāli, who was of Armenian stock, asking him to come to Egypt to restore order. al-Jamāli welcomed this idea and set out for Egypt with a large Armenian army in 466/1074, with which he managed to restore order. The caliph rewarded him with the position of minister and the leadership of the armies. As a result, his authority covered all aspects of the state, as he became the chief army commander and the supervisor of the Islamic judges and the Fatimid mission. Thus, his rule was a totalitarian one and lasted until his death in 487/1094. During this time he managed to restrict al-Mustansir's political power.

After the death of al-Jamāli, a series of delegated ministers followed, first among them was al-Afdal (487-515/1094-1121), the son of Badr al-Jamāli, who was so powerful that he
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managed to bring to the throne the younger son of al-Mustansir, al-Musta'li (487-495/1094-1101), despite the claim of the older son, Nizār, who was more eligible due to his age.\footnote{Muhammad Taqqūsh, Tārikh al-Fāṭimiyyn, pp.293-388; Ibn Maysar, Tārikh Miṣr, pp.35-37; Muḥammad Surūr, Tārikh al-Dawla al-Fāṭimiyya, p.103; Farhad Daftary, The Ismā‘īlis, p.222.} In 495/1101 however, he poisoned al-Musta'li and replaced him with his son al-Manṣūr (495-542/1101-1130), who was then only five years old. He nicknamed him al-Āmir bi Aḥkām Allāh (the one who instructs according to the orders of God) and restricted his public appearances to twice a year. However, on reaching adulthood, al-Manṣūr managed to free himself and regain his power in 515/1121 after poisoning al-Afdal.\footnote{Muhammad Taqqūsh, Tārikh al-Fāṭimiyyn, pp.393-402.} After the death of al-Afdal, al-Ma‘mūn al-Bītāhī became minister. He tried to follow in his predecessor's footsteps but was also poisoned by instruction of the caliph in 519/1125.\footnote{See Abū Shāmah, al-Rawdatayn, 1/350; al-‘Abbādī, pp.305-311.}

Al-Āmir was killed in 524/1130 by the followers of his uncle Nizār, as he was considered, like his father, a usurper of power.\footnote{See Abū Shāmah, al-Rawdatayn, 1/350; al-‘Abbādī, p.305; Mayer, p.118; Keightley, p.349.} Since al-Āmir left no heir, nominal power shifted to a close relative, ʿAbd al-Majīd, (525-544/1131-1149) who was nicknamed al-Ḥāfīz li Din Allāh. During his rule, the de facto ruler was the minister al-Akmal b. al-Afdal, who had poisoned the caliph and taken his palace, money and antiques. However, al-Akmal was killed in 526/1132, and al-Ḥāfīz was released from jail. That date became an anniversary known as the 'day of victory'.\footnote{See Abī al-Māḥāsin, al-Nujūm al-Zählrah, 5/240; Ibn Maysar, Tārikh Miṣr, p.74; Muḥammad Surūr, Tārikh al-Dawla al-Fāṭimiyya, p.108; Muḥammad Taqqūsh, Tārikh al-Fāṭimiyyn, p.402.}

After the death of al-Ḥāfīz in 544/1146, the competition for power was fierce among the top state officials, a situation that was made worse by the lack of experience on the part of the caliphs who followed al-Ḥāfīz. Thus, many ministers changed, as well as caliphs. The last of these ministers was Abū al-Ashbāl Dirghām, who served the last Fāṭimid caliph, al-‘Āḍid (555-567/1160-1171) and managed to defeat Shāwar, who defected to Syria to request the aid of the Zangids.\footnote{See al-‘Abbādī, pp.305-311.}

As stated earlier, Egypt, which was rich in men and resources, was coveted by both the Zangids and the Crusaders. Neither party was patient enough to await the natural end of Fāṭimid rule there, since each was intent on fortifying and entrenching itself against the
other. Indeed, political order in Egypt had deteriorated, especially after the death of al-Afdal. Thus, in 545/1150, Baldwin III (1129-1162) began to enhance the fortifications of Gaza, thus disclosing his plan to attack Egypt. In 548/1153, the Crusaders managed to take Asqalān, which had been under the rule of the Egyptian Fātimids and which represented a danger to the Crusaders in Palestine. Therefore, a mere fifty years after the first campaign, the Crusaders managed to take the Palestinian coast and balance their defeats on the northern front with the victories against the decayed Fātimid state.

When Baldwin III died in 558/1162, it appeared that his foreign policy, which was based on invading Egypt, would be continued by others, as shown by the relentless attempts of his successor Amyrlik (‘Amūri) 1163-1174. This was made necessary by the unification of Aleppo and Damascus under Nūr al-Din Zangi, because it would be disastrous to the Crusaders’ statelets to see Egypt under the Sunnis, who already had the rule of Syria. However, because Nūr al-Din was well aware of the importance of Egypt to him, there was no chance that ‘Amūri would be able to surprise him. Thus both of them were ready to snatch Egypt and the start of their race was signaled by the death of the Fātimid minister al-Šāliḥ b. Ruzaiq in 556/1161, and the subsequent power struggle between his son al-‘Ādil on the one hand, who only ruled for fifteen months in partnership with Shāwar, who had killed Ibn Ruzaiq, and on the other hand the aforementioned Dirghām, who assassinated the important princes through fear of their competing with him. As noted above, Shāwar fled to Nūr al-Din when ‘Amūri found an opportunity to invade Egypt on the grounds that the Fātimids there had not paid the tax which was imposed on them during the reign of Baldwin III. Thus, in 1163, a force crossed the Gulf of Suez and besieged the town of Balbis. However, due to the resistance of Dirghām to that
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campaign, who used the stored water of the Nile dams to muddy the delta, the army was forced to retreat back to Palestine, albeit temporarily.\textsuperscript{126}

Meanwhile, Shāwar was relentlessly attempting to gain the support of Nūr al-Dīn in Damascus in order to regain his position in Egypt. Nūr al-Dīn agreed to send a military campaign, on condition that Shāwar agreed to finance its expenditures, leave some of the Egyptian territories to him, and pay a third of the state revenues.\textsuperscript{127} On the acceptance of these conditions, a campaign was sent with Shāwar under the leadership of Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh and his nephew Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, as mentioned before.

However, Dirghām, who had heard about the alliance of Shāwar and Nūr al-Dīn, started to make his own political moves by closing ranks with the Crusaders. He also engaged in an agreement with ‘Amūrī who did not hesitate to send a campaign to invade Egypt,\textsuperscript{128} and in the subsequent six years, ‘Amūrī tried to conquer Egypt five times.\textsuperscript{129} Thus, the struggle between Nūr al-Dīn and the Crusaders transferred from the north of Syria to Egypt.

‘Amūrī’s failed attempts at invading Egypt produced two important results: firstly, the depletion of the human and material resources of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem; and secondly, the tilting of the political equation towards the Islamic and the Arabic powers. Moreover, Dirghām and Shāwar had been killed in the midst of these events while Asad al-Dīn became a minister for the Fāṭimid caliph, al-Āḍid. After the death of Asad al-Dīn in 564/1169, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn came to power and became the minister for the Fāṭimid caliph.\textsuperscript{130}

Subsequent events proved that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was the real hero of that period, and his rule represented an interval in which his political mastery eclipsed that of all other personalities. Also the failure of ‘Amūrī’s plan to invade Egypt in alliance with the Byzantines in 1169, and their fifty-year siege of Dumyāt which ultimately failed to achieve its targets, are proof of the stability of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s rule. Throughout this period, Nūr al-Dīn’s power was exercised in large territories with many capitals: Damascus, al-Rahā, Aleppo, Mosul and Cairo. For most of that period, Nūr al-Dīn was urging Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn to announce the end of the Fāṭimid caliphate and the establishment of the Sunni caliphate,
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but Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn waited until the opportune moment, which came in 567/1171 with the passing away of al-‘Ādid, the last Fāṭimid caliph. ¹³¹

As a conclusion of what has been said above that the Fāṭimid caliphate collapsed for the following reasons. First, the Crusaders’ wars, which caused widespread insecurity, especially among the small dynastic statelets. Many princes agreed to abandon their rule voluntarily to Nūr al-Dīn in return for security from the Crusaders. This was also true of Egypt, which waited for Nūr al-Dīn to rescue it from the looming danger of the Crusaders. Secondly, the way that the Fāṭimids displayed in clinging to their doctrine and their intolerance towards Sunnis caused alienation inside Egypt and there is little wonder that people felt loyal to Nūr al-Dīn. Thirdly, the power struggles between caliphs and ministers and at times the nominating of children as caliphs corrupted the whole system, which led to the ultimate destruction of the state. ¹³²

3.1.2.1. Medina in the Fāṭimid period (363-436/974-1044)

In the first half of the fourth hijrī century, Medina was a small town. When the Fāṭimids occupied Egypt in 358/969, the governor of Medina declared his allegiance to them, the reason being the subsidy the city received. ¹³³ The Fāṭimid caliph, al-Mu‘izz li-Dīn Allāh (341-365/952-975), ¹³⁴ was happy with this allegiance and dispatched wealth and gifts. However, the relationship between the Medinan governors and the Fāṭimid caliphate was unstable, because the Fāṭimids displayed a general lack of interest in the needs of the Medinans and their weak administration. For example, Caliph al-‘Azīz bi-Allāh (365-386/975-996) ¹³⁵ showed so little interest in Medina that its governor severed relations with him in the year 365/975, and transferred his fealty to the ʿAbbāṣids. The caliph then dispatched his army to intimidate and threaten Medina. ¹³⁶ The governor returned to his original position of allegiance to the Fāṭimids, but returned to the ʿAbbāṣids after a year (in al-Muṭṣir lillāh’s time, 368/978), as they sent a large sum of money to build a strong wall

¹³² See Aḥmad Shalabi, Mawsū‘at al-Tārikh al-Islāmi, 5/147.
around Medina and improve the conditions of its people. Fealty was not returned to the Fātihīds until the year 380/990, when they laid siege to Medina. This persuaded the governor, Tāhir b. Muslim, and his sons, and once again, the khutba (sermon of the Friday prayer) was delivered in the name of the Fātihīds (during the rule of al-Ḥākim bi-Amrillāh 386-411/996-1021); but the Medinans did not succumb to the call of the Fātihīds, who were Shi'a, to adopt their religious beliefs, because the Medinans' traditions and heritage were deeply rooted in the Sunna of the Prophet Muḥammad. In 436/1044 the subordination of Medina to the Fātihīds ended, and Medina returned to embrace the 'Abbāsid caliphate. The Fātihīds did not have any memorable or lasting effect upon Medina, or on the Prophet's Mosque. They also had no intellectual influence on cultural development, literature or architecture.

3. 2. 1. The Major Events Related to Medina in the Islamic World
Medina was only nominally under 'Abbāsid rule since actual power rested in the hands of the princes of the Ashrāf families there, until 'Ubayd allāh b. Tāhir (d. 329/941) established his authority by plotting against his local rivals and sending an envoy to the caliph asking him to bless him as de facto ruler. Thus the local prince was not accountable in any sense to the caliph and sent no revenues to the central authority; but he expected some support from the caliph to spend on local matters, though he also levied taxes on his subjects.

Since competition was fierce in the fourth hijrī century, between 'Abbāsids and Fātihīds, for nominal supremacy over the Two Holy Mosques; it is not surprising that financial support played an important part in that competition. Thus when the Fātihīds came to power in Egypt, high envoys from Mecca and Medina visited them, receiving a grand
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welcome and many gifts to the value of 400,000 dirham. However, the ‘Abbāsids used
the same tactic to sway the loyalty of the princes of Mecca and Medina, in which they were
successful several times. In (368/978), ʿAḍud al-Dawla al-Buwayhi sent huge sums of
money with the leader of the Iraqi pilgrimage delegation to the prince of Medina, Ṭāhir b.
Muṣlim al-Ḥusaynī (366-381/976-991). This happened at a time when the Fāṭimid
were busy subduing Palestine and Syria and were hence unable to send assistance to the
Two Holy Mosques. Thus, the Iraqi delegation’s leader managed to convince the prince of
Medina to shift his alliance to the ‘Abbāsids after he offered him a sum of money to build
a wall around Medina in order to defend it from the attacks of the Bedouins. However,
when the Fāṭimids finished their campaigns against Palestine and Syria, they sent a large
military force against Ṭāhir b. Muṣlim (366/976), the prince of Medina, and caused him to
shift his loyalty to them once again, the Fāṭimids still continued to give financial aid to
the power centres in Medina as well as to its poor.

During the rule of al-Qāʿim bi-Amrillāh, the same scenario repeated itself when the
Fāṭimids once again failed to honour their commitment towards the Two Holy Mosques and
again the ‘Abbāsids managed to attract the loyalty of those princes by offering financial
support. According to Ibn al-Jawzī, the prince of Mecca responded to this first and then the
prince of Medina, after having received the pledges of the ‘Abbāsids caliph. But the
‘Abbāsids did nothing to influence the running of day-to-day political affairs, which
remained in the hands of the local princes and their families, especially the Muḥammād
family from the Ḥussainī family; which leads to the conclusion that the rule of Medina was
largely autonomous from the days of Ṭāhir b. Muṣlim up to the rise of the Ayyūbids.

It is worth noting that, despite the importance of Medina and Mecca to the Islamic world,
the ‘Abbāsids did not station an army there, even though the spread of sedition and war in
many parts of the state is evident from the many wars among the different dynasties
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mentioned above. Even the Fāṭimids, who lost the loyalty of Medina, failed to send a permanent army to subdue the princes, but instead resorted to limited campaigns for the settling of specific disputes, generally for the same reasons as the ‘Abbāsids. All of this was combined with the advent of the Crusaders, who were kept busy in Syria, Palestine and, later, Egypt. This reflected negatively on the general security around Medina, since no power was able to deter the nomadic tribes, who developed the habit of banditry, especially against pilgrim caravans. Even when the Fāṭimids tried to solve this problem by bribing these tribes, this only made the situation worse, since it had the effect of encouraging them to continue their raids.\textsuperscript{152} Even when military campaigns were considered, they merely provided a short-term answer to a deep-rooted problem. No radical solutions were offered, like changing the mindset of these tribes through education or economic means and thus the phenomenon continued to represent a serious challenge to those visiting the Holy Mosques or even living inside Medina. This ultimately led to the dwindling of Medinan revenues.\textsuperscript{153}

In 540/1145, the Zangid’s minister, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Īṣfahānī, sent money to renovate the wall of Medina after the one built by ‘Aḍud al-Dawla al-Buwayhi was ruined due to the raids of the Bedouins.\textsuperscript{154} It is believed that the new wall was built on the base of the old one\textsuperscript{155} and that the residential area was not expanded beyond the boundary of the old wall, although nearly eighty-seven years separated the building of the two walls. Even if the residential areas had expanded before the re-erection of the wall, they were abandoned at the time of the renovation in 540/1145. This meant that other aspects of the city's life, such as economic activities and the attraction of Medina as a place to live, even for those who normally came to reside near the Prophet's shrine, were reduced, and Medina did not immediately expand beyond the old perimeter, as was to happen in subsequent years. There is no doubt that good economic conditions and the maintaining of security aid the prosperity of any city, and the narration of al-Samhūḍī reveals the role that the new wall played in bringing security to Medina.\textsuperscript{156}

\textsuperscript{153} See Sulaymān Mālikī, pp.63-67.
\textsuperscript{156} al-Samhūḍī, \textit{Wafā’ al-Wafā’}, 2/767.
Buildings grew up during the ensuing decades, both inside Medina and on the outskirts, although the security that encouraged people to build did not last long because the placing of new buildings outside the wall encouraged the Bedouins to raid them. Historians record that seventeen years after the building of the new wall, Nūr al-Dīn Zangī visited Medina after performing a pilgrimage, and was requested by those living outside the wall to help them by building a wall to safeguard them and their animals from raids, which he did in 558/1163. Thus only seventeen years passed between the previous renovation and the building of the new wall. This might be attributable to the waves of migrations after the enhancement of the city's general security and the flow of money from Nūr al-Dīn, who sent money regularly to provide public amenities. The Fatimid minister, Ṣawq b. al-Ṣāliḥ, also sent money for the Two Holy Mosques.

3.2.2. The Crusaders and Medina
As mentioned above, the Ayyūbid era was characterised by an aggressive confrontation with the Crusaders, although the Arabian Peninsula was far removed from the hotbeds of Syria and Egypt. In that regard, the historical sources record three incidents of serious proportions; the attempt of several Christian subjects to steal the body of the Prophet Muḥammad, and two attempts to invade Medina.

3.2.2.1. The attempt to steal the body of the Prophet
Several historical sources describe this incident in detail. Briefly, Nūr al-Dīn saw in a dream two blond men hurting the Prophet, and so he went to Medina and discovered that two Christian men of German origin had dug an underground passage from their residence to the shrine of the Prophet. After interrogation, they pleaded that they were acting upon instructions from one of the Crusader kings, who had paid them to do it. Nūr al-Dīn killed them both and ordered that a trench be dug all around the holy grave and filled with iron to prevent any further similar incidents.

---

158 al-Maqrīzī, Ittiṣāb al-Ḥunaifi, 2/171.
3.2.2.2 The first attempt to invade Medina

There were two attempts to invade Medina. The first was in 577/1181, when one of the Crusaders called Urnat (Reynald of Châtillon) (1125-1187) decided to attack the Two Holy Mosques. He prepared a big campaign and reached Taymā, from where his journey to Medina was not interrupted, a matter which caused grave concern among the Muslims because it was the first time the Crusaders had ventured into the Arabian Peninsula and because no standing army was there to deter the invaders. However, when the news reached Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, who was busy with arrangements in Mosul and Aleppo, he sent for his deputy in Damascus, Farkh Shāh, who organised a quick campaign that succeeded in forcing the Crusaders to abandon their plan to invade Medina. Instead they made an agreement with Farkh Shāh that secured Muslim routes and caravans. 160

3.2.2.3. The second attempt to invade Medina 161

Despite the agreement that Urnāṭ had concluded with Farkh Shāh, he formulated a plan to invade Medina via the Red Sea and take it by surprise. Therefore, he started to build ships secretly in al-Kark and carried them dismantled on the backs of camels to the Red Sea. He crossed the gulf of al-‘Aqabā to the Egyptian coast and from there he attacked the port of ‘Izābb. His forces raided the ships they found there and also confiscated some ships coming from Yemen loaded with goods, after which they sailed to the coast of the Arabian Peninsula, where they conquered al-Ḥawrā‘ and Yūnba‘ after attacking the villages and Bedouins whom they encountered. When the news reached Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, he ordered his brother in Egypt, al-‘Ādīl, to sail after the Crusaders at speed. The Muslim fleet, under the command of Ḥūsān al-Dīn Lu‘lū‘, found the Crusaders’ ships in al-Ḥawrā‘ in 578/1182. Ḥūsān al-Dīn freed several Muslim traders who had been taken hostage by the enemy, and then pursued the Crusaders’ force of about 300 men, which was heading towards Medina. As soon as the enemy realised that the Muslim army was behind them, they began to fear that they would be compelled to confront two forces because they knew that the people of

Medina would also resist them. Thus, they fled to hideouts in the mountains. After five
days, Lu'lu's army found them and engaged them in a fierce battle during which 150 of
them were killed and 170 arrested and later executed by order of Šalāḥ al-Din, because
they knew the road to Medina.  

3.3. Conclusion
This chapter has presented a short historical overview of the Islamic world during the 11th
and 12th centuries, particularly those places that fell under the authority of the Ayyūbids, in
order to clarify the dynasty's political role during that period and examine how they
influenced the major events in the Islamic world, and specifically Medina. The chapter
considered two main points; firstly, it discussed the political life in the Islamic world during
that period by highlighting the state of weakness that was caused by internal political and
armed struggles and by the Crusaders' invasions, and by describing how the Zangids, the
Seljuqs, the Ayyūbids and the Fāṭimids resisted those invasions.

162 See Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya, 12/332; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, 11/500; Ibn Wāsil,
Mufarrij al-Krub, 2/133; Šulaymān Mālīki, pp. 46-47; Sa‘īd ‘Ashūr, al-Ḫaraka al-Šalbiyya, 2/786-
787. Raynald met his death in 1187, when Šalāḥ al-Din invaded the kingdom and defeated the
Crusaders at the Battle of Hattin, taking many prisoners. Most prominent among these prisoners
were Raynald and King Guy, both of whom Šalāḥ al-Din ordered brought to his tent. The
chronicler Imād ad-Din al-İsfahani, who was present at the scene, relates:

Šalāḥ al-Din invited the king [Guy] to sit beside him, and when Amat [Raynald]
entered in his turn, he seated him next to his king and reminded him of his misdeeds.
'How many times have you sworn an oath and violated it? How many times have you
signed agreements you have never respected?' Raynald answered through a translator:
'Kings have always acted thus. I did nothing more'. During this time King Guy was
gasping with thirst, his head dangling as though drunk, his face betraying great fright.
Šalāḥ al-Din spoke reassuring words to him, had cold water brought, and offered it to
him. The king drank, then handed what remained to Raynald, who slaked his thirst in
turn. The sultan then said to Guy: 'You did not ask permission before giving him water.
I am therefore not obliged to grant him mercy'. After pronouncing these words, the
sultan smiled, mounted his horse, and rode off, leaving the captives in terror. He
supervised the return of the troops, and then came back to his tent. He ordered
Raynald brought there, then advanced before him, sword in hand, and struck him
between the neck and the shoulder-blade. When Raynald fell, he cut off his head and
dragged the body by its feet to the king, who began to tremble. Seeing him thus upset,
Šalāḥ al-Din said to him in a reassuring tone: 'This man was killed only because of his
malfeasance and perfidy'.

See Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya, 12/332; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, 11/500; Ernest Barker,
'Raynald of Châtillon', in: The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 22/936.
The second point is the impact of all these events specifically on Medina, and it has been demonstrated how Medina was affected both positively and negatively by the struggle between the 'Abbâsids and the Fâtîmids, who were both keen to prove that the affiliation to the Two Holy Mosques belonged to them. It has also been demonstrated how the financial dimension was important in maintaining the alliance of those in charge of Medina and Mecca and how that at times contributed to the wellbeing of Medina in terms of economic prosperity and security.

There was a negative side to the competition between the Islamic rulers, however, since it caused them to neglect the importance of stationing a force in Medina to protect it from the widespread banditry in the surrounding area. This was aggravated by their preoccupation with the internecine wars in the north and later the resistance to the Crusaders' invasions, and also by the lack of economic resources in Medina, since the major economic activities of its residents, traditional agriculture and trade, were negatively affected by security problems.

Medina was also affected by the Crusaders' invasions, which caused Şalâh al-Dîn to send his armies to protect it.

The following conclusions may be drawn from this chapter. First, the relationship between Medina's princes and the 'Abbâsîd caliphate was no more than a pragmatic bond through which the former received money and the latter was mentioned during the Friday sermon in the Two Holy Mosques. Indeed, the 'Abbâsîds neglected Medina because it was not attractive economically, so much so that it was considered a financial burden. This last point explains the opening through which the Fâtîmids managed to infiltrate themselves and at times displace the 'Abbâsîds in Medina as the legitimate protector of the Two Holy Mosques, thus negating the idea that the Fâtîmids were only a splinter from orthodox rule, represented by the 'Abbâsîds. However, the Fâtîmids did not manage to proceed with their plans regarding Medina due to their internal struggles, which prevented them from building a consistent relationship with Medina's princes that would have enabled them to spread their beliefs among its residents as they had hoped. Secondly, the lack of proper concern for Medina by those states caused many internal problems, such as poverty, lack of
security, and a power struggle among its princes, as shown by the decrease in Medina's population during these periods. 163

The next chapter will examine and analyse an important phenomenon appearing in Medina in the Ayyūbid period: the emergence of the Shi'a.

---

163 See 'Abd al-Bāṣīṭ Badr, al-Tārikh al-Shāmil, 2/4-195. Chapters 5 and 6 will discuss all these matters.
Chapter Four

History of the Shi'a in Medina during the Ayyūbid period

Having studied the history of Medina prior to the Ayyūbid period in Chapter Two, and the key historical events which occurred in the Islamic World during the Ayyūbid period in Chapter Three, this chapter will examine and analyse an important issue that transpired in Medina in Ayyūbid times, mention of which occurs in certain sources in such a way that makes it necessary to pause and study it in order to discover the truth of the matter. This issue is the spread of the Shi'a doctrine in Medina during the Ayyūbid period. Both Ibn Taymiyya (661-728/1263-1328) and Ibn Farḥūn (693-769/1294-1367) mention accounts indicating that many of the Medinans during this time converted from Sunni Islam to that of the Imāmī Shi'a, accepting the financial incentives offered by the Shi'a duʿāt.¹

These accounts require study and analysis because their authors fail to provide sufficient information on this subject, or any evidence to substantiate their remarks (all that they say is that it occurred during this period, without going into the details and without mentioning any testimonies or events to back up their remarks). Furthermore, only a few accounts, scattered among a very small number of books, touch upon this issue briefly, so it is impossible through these alone to become acquainted with all of the aspects of this subject.

Therefore, this chapter will discuss all of this, and also answer some key questions in order to illustrate the reality of the Shi'a presence in Medina. These questions include: are the historical sources in agreement on this issue? Is it true that most of Medina's inhabitants converted from Sunnism to Shi'ism in exchange for money, and, if so, how did that come about and why? If this is not the case, what then is the truth of the matter and how has it been handled in the historical writings? Then, why were those who came later reticent about discussing this issue, and content to pass on accounts about the Shi'a presence in Medina during and after the Ayyūbid period?

This chapter can, therefore, be divided into three sections:

Firstly: a discussion and analysis of the reports by the 'ulamā' and historians about the emergence of a Shi'a sect in Medina and its spread therein, identifying how true these reports are and responding to these with what there is in the way of rational evidence and what can be provided by accounts in other writings.

The reasons behind the failure of many of the historical sources to provide useful and complete information about this issue (namely, the spread of the Shi'a in Medina and the transition of power to them) will also be discussed, such as how and when this occurred and why.

Secondly: an explanation of the historical background of the Shi'a in Medina prior to the Ayyūbid period, in order to make it easier to understand what happened next, in which the reports by the 'ulamā' and historians about the history of the Shi'a in the city will be discussed, from their emergence in Islam up to what preceded the Ayyūbid period.

Thirdly: a discussion of the history of the Shi'a in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, which will entail the study and analysis of the reasons for the spread of the Twelver Shi'a doctrine in Medina; how they came to assume authority and control in the city during Ayyūbid times; the length of time the Imāmis spent propagating their doctrine in Medina; a study of the relationship between the Twelver Shi'a and other Shi'a sects in Medina, that is the Ismā'īlis, the Zaydis, and the Kaysānis; a comparison between Shi'ism in Medina and Mecca; and, lastly, how their control there was terminated and their power came to an end.

4.1. Discussion and analysis of the reports by the 'ulamā' and historians on the emergence of the Shi'a in Medina and their spread therein

Two accounts presented by Ibn Taymiyya and one by Ibn Farḥūn indicate that the majority of Medina's inhabitants converted from the Sunni doctrine to that of the Shi'a due to their desire for money, and that, with the onset of the seventh century, most of its inhabitants had become Shi'ite.

Ibn Taymiyya observes that:

In the year six hundred and ninety-nine [1300 AD], the people of Islam were brought into such degradation and disaster the like of which in all the world Allāh alone knows, and the stories of this abound although this is not the place for them. This was because the inhabitants of the Yemen at this time are feeble and incapable of jihad, or neglectful of it, and they are obedient to whoever rules this country. Whereas those who live in the Hijāz, most of them or many of them deviate from the
true path, and amongst them are those who practise Allāh knows what innovation, error and immorality. The people of the Faith and the Religion are weak and feeble, whereas the power and might at this time lies with those who were not the people of Islam in this country. For, if this sect were debased, Allāh forbid, then the Muslims in the Hijāz would be amongst the lowest of people, especially as Rāfiḍism has prevailed amongst them.

He goes on to say:

As for Medina, people have spoken of the consensus of its inhabitants, and Mālik b. Anas [94-179/716-795] and his companions became well known for holding that the consensus of its inhabitants was authoritative. The other Imāms opposed them in this, and what then was spoken of was their consensus in these pre-eminent periods, but, after that, people spread the opinion that the consensus of its inhabitants was no longer authoritative, since then there were ‘ulamā’ in other places, particularly from the time when Rāfiḍism appeared in it. Thus its inhabitants held fast to their doctrine of old, adhering to the school of Mālik, until the start of the year six

2 ‘Rāfīḍi’ means Rejecters, a general term of abuse used by the Sunnis of the Shi’a, especially in mediaeval times, because the Shi’ites reject the legitimacy of the caliphates of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān, and hold that the first legitimate successor of the Prophet Muḥammad was ‘Ali. Ibn Taymiyya, Minhāj al-Sunnah, 2/96. However other stories and different meanings have been attached to the term Rāfīḍi; e.g. Jafri notes that according to one tradition Zayd b. ‘Ali (d. 122/740) said to the deserters: “You have abandoned me (rafaḍūtumūni)”, and zealous Shi’is have since been called Rāfīḍa. See S.H.M.Jafri, The Origins and Early Development of Shi’a Islam, p.266, and see his references in p.285. (On the term Rāfīḍi, see al-Qummi, al-Maqāṣid wa al-Fīraq, p.76; al-Shahrastānī, al-Mīlāl wa al-Nīḥal, 1/138; Ibn Ḥazm, al-Faṣl fi al-Mīlāl, 4/137-138; al-Baghdādi, Mukhtasar Kitāb al-Farq bāyn al-Fīraq, p.222; Ibn Manẓūr, Liṣān al-‘Arab, 7/157; Ian Richard Netton, A Popular Dictionary of Islam, p.210; and “The Travels of Ibn Jubayr’, in: I. R. Netton, (ed). Islamic and Middle Eastern Geographers and Travellers, 2/89-171). Here one can see that Ibn Jubayr exaggerates and seems to claim a though knowledge of the doctrine of all the people of the Hijāz. He also exaggerates when forced to pay some taxes to the Emirs of the Hijāz: ‘Let it be absolutely certain and beyond doubt established that there is no Islam save in the Maghrib lands. There they follow the clear path that has no separation and the like, such as there are in these eastern lands of sects and heretical groups and schisms’. (See Ibn Jubayr, al-Rihla, pp.54; R. J. C. Broadhurst, The Travels of Ibn Jubayr, pp.70-71; and ‘The Travels of Ibn Jubayr’, in: I. R. Netton,(ed). Islamic and Middle Eastern Geographers and Travellers, 2/89-171).
hundred, or before or after that, and then there came to them Râfidiâtes from the
eastern lands, from the people of Qâshân and others who subverted the doctrine of
many of them, particularly those who were of the Prophet's lineage. They presumed
to impose upon them books of innovations, contradicting al-Kitâb [the Qur'ân] and
the Sunna, and gave them much wealth. Thus innovation proliferated amongst them
from that time, whereas, in the three pre-eminent periods, the Medina of the Prophet
knew no innovation whatsoever, and from it proceeded no innovation from the
principles of the religion, as happened in other countries.  

An account relayed by Ibn Farhûn states that:

A Shi'a family, the Qâshânis,4 came to Medina from Iraq. They were wealthy and
wished to propagate Imâmism in the city, and worked cleverly to this end. They were
helped by the general conditions at that time. Medina's revenues were meagre and
the economic conditions of its inhabitants were modest, so they appealed to the poor
and the vulnerable with money, teaching them the principles of their doctrine. They
continued to do this until their faith had gained the upper hand and had many
devotees, and the sharifs during that time assisted them in this. They had no
opposition; no one in Egypt or in Syria paid them any heed because al-Malik al-Âdil
Nûr al-Din Zengi was the ruler of the two countries, and preoccupied with jihad and
restless. Then, al-Malik al-Nâsîr Şalâh al-Dîn al-Ayyûbi succeeded him and
proceeded in the manner of the rule of al-Malik Nûr al-Dîn and surpassed him. The
Emir of Medina, Abû Falîta Qasim b. al-Muhanna (557-583/1162-1187),6 was with
him during the conquests and accompanied him on campaigns, and no one at that
time dared to speak out about Imâmism at that time.7

Through analysing and studying these texts, it is possible to pose the following questions:

4 Ibn Taymiyya, Majmû' al-Fatâwâ, 20/300.
5 Al-Qâshâni, popularly a family known as al-Qâshî, were connected with Qâshân, a city near
İsfahân, which is often mentioned together with Qum. Abû al-'Abbâs Ahmâd b. 'Abbâs al-Qâshî (died
after 500/1100) said that its entire people are Imâmate Shi'îtes, see Yaqûr al-Ĥamawy, Majmû' al-
Buldân, 4/295-296. The Qâshânis were mentioned as inhabitants of Medina in accounts of the
volcanic eruption of 654/1256. see Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya wa al-Nihâya, 13/202; al-Samhûdî, 1/143;
Îbn al-Nadîm, al-Fahrist, 1/300.
6 This is 'Izz al-Dîn al-Qâsim b. Muhanna al-A'araj b. al-Ĥusayn b. Muhanna b. Dâwûd b. al-Qâsim
for his biography see: al-Ĥasán b. Shuqûdî al-Ĥusaynyî, Nukhbat al-Zahrât al-Tamînî fi Nasab
7 Ibn Farhûn, Naṣîhat al-Ârushwîr, p.211.
what does Ibn Taymiyya mean by what he says in the first account? Was it possible for a single individual to know the doctrine of the population of a large region such as the Hijāz, and determine whether the majority of those living there were deviating from Islam in his view or not? Did he form his opinion after visiting the Hijāz, or was he relaying information he had heard about it? If he did visit it, which cities did he visit and was Medina among them? How long did he stay in each city? Was that length of time sufficient to judge that most of its inhabitants were deviating from Islam? If he was relaying the information he had heard about it, what then were the sources from which he was deriving this information, and why does he not refer to them? By ‘deviating from Islam’, does he mean their connection to the Shi'a doctrine, or something else? Is there evidence for what Ibn Taymiyya says? Could the reason for this account be that the emirs and qādīs of Medina, and the Imāms and khatibs of the Prophet's Mosque at that time, were all adhering to the Shi'a doctrine, and so Ibn Taymiyya, or whoever told him the information about the city, believed that the majority of its inhabitants did likewise, and that the people were following the same religion as their rulers?

With regard to the second account by Ibn Taymiyya, is it possible that the consensus of the people of Medina was transformed: having an authoritative status while they held fast to the Mālikī doctrine until the sixth century, then undergoing a major change, with most of their people becoming Rāfīḍīs⁸ and deviating from Islam? Also, why did Ibn Taymiyya not give any explanation of what he meant by the term Rāfīḍ, which he continued to use in an undifferentiated manner?

Is it true that the majority of people deviated from Islam for material reasons, as described by Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farḥūn, and converted to the Shi'a doctrine? Could it be that the Shi'a who were in Medina during the Ayyūbid period were those from among the Shi'a of Iraq and others who migrated there, who purchased young slaves from inside and outside the city and undertook to educate them in the Shi'a doctrine, and, therefore, some people believed that they were Medinan Sunnis who had converted to the Shi'a doctrine? Why have Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Farḥūn and other historians not provided a shred of evidence that the people of Medina converted from the Sunni doctrine to that of the Shi'a? Was it easy to induce people to change their belief by offering money, especially if these people were among the Medinans whose practice or 'amal Ibn Taymiyya describes as being

---

⁸ See page 75, footnote 3.
authoritative for other Muslims and whom he describes as holding fast to the doctrine of Imām Mālik until the beginning of the sixth Hijri century?

To answer all of these questions is no simple task, due to the dearth of accounts which report on this matter. However, some will be answered in this section, and the rest will be answered during the course of what is yet to come in this chapter and those that follow.

Firstly: it must be understood that Mecca and Medina were the key cities of the Hijāz. This Ibn Taymiyya himself confirms in his book al-Fatāwā al-Kubrā. 9

Secondly: with regard to the conflicting dates which appear in the first two accounts, there are two possibilities which explain the difference between them:

1) that there is a contradiction between what Ibn Taymiyya reports in his first and second accounts, since he asserts in the first account that, in the year 699/1300, most of the inhabitants of the Hijāz were deviating from Islam and that Rāfiḍism10 had prevailed amongst them, whereas in the second account, he says that the inhabitants of Medina had held fast to the Māliki doctrine until the beginning of the year 600/1202, or before or after it, and that their doctrine became corrupted after that. One can see that the difference in the dates is almost a century. This possibility, however, is unlikely in the light of the second possibility.

2) that the characteristics that Ibn Taymiyya attributes to the inhabitants of the Hijāz were apparent before the seventh Hijri century, which would indicate that this transformation took place over a century, so that it had reached the state which he describes by 699 A.H. If so, then it means that this change in the doctrine of the people of the Hijāz, and in particular the Medinans, began before the Ayyūbid period. This is what Ibn Taymiyya confirms in the second account, specifically when he says:

`...particularly from the time when Rāfiḍism appeared in it. Thus its inhabitants held fast to their doctrine of old, adhering to the school of Mālik, until the start of the sixth century, or before or after that, and then there came to them Rāfiḍites

---

10 See page 75, footnote 3.
from the eastern lands, from the people of Qāshān and others who subverted the doctrine of many of them.  

Thirdly: Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farḥūn say that those who corrupted the Medinans’ doctrine were a family of eastern Rāfiḍites from among the Qāshānis. Yet, it is strange that neither Ibn Taymiyya nor Ibn Farḥūn or others provide any information about this family, its prominent individuals or any one of its members.  

Fourthly: after researching some writings which deal with the biography of Ibn Taymiyya, nothing was found which would indicate that Ibn Taymiyya visited Medina and stayed there long enough to form an opinion on the doctrine of all of its inhabitants, whereas in Ibn Taymiyya’s biography in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, the year that he performed the hajj and the period of time he spent on the pilgrimage are mentioned. It states that he performed the hajj in 691 A.H., corresponding to November 1292, and completed his pilgrimage and then returned to Damascus after approximately four months, in 692 A.H., corresponding to February 1293.  

This means that the length of time he spent on the hajj was less than four months, and it is difficult to believe that this period was sufficient for him to acquaint himself with the doctrines of all the people of the Ḥijāz, and to say with certainty whether they were Sunnis or were deviating from Islam, or that Shi‘ism had prevailed amongst them.  

Fifthly: there is a possibility that Ibn Taymiyya did not visit Medina, and instead derived his information from sources who relayed to him their reports, since he says:  

---

11 This contradicts what will subsequently be explained; namely, that the Shi‘a did not assume important positions in Medina until the end of the Ayyūbid period, and that the Fāṭimids did not actively spread the Shi‘a doctrine in the city.  


I was told by reliable sources having experience of the country who spoke of the state of its natives giving particulars, and an example of this is that there are, in the Hijāz and the coasts of Syria, Rāfiḍites who claim infallibility. We have seen the state of those who were on the Syrian coasts like Jabal Kesrawān and elsewhere, and news reached us of others and we had not seen in the world a more perverted sect than they were in religious and temporal things. We have seen people subject to the unbridled power of kings in a better state than them, for those who are under the power of infidel monarchs, their position in religious and temporal things is better than that of their heretics, such as the Nusayriyya and the Ismāʿiliyya. Like them are the Ghulāt, who preach the divinity and Prophethood of others than the Messenger.15 Yet, one notices in this account that Ibn Taymiyya does not mention the identity of these 'reliable sources', just as he does not support what he says with any evidence to validate the truth of their reports, such as at least mentioning the names of prominent Shiʿites, their leaders in Medina or anything about their activities therein.

Sixthly: if what Ibn Taymiyya says about the inhabitants of Medina is true, how did this transformation take place, from the practice (ʿamal) of the Medinans and their doctrine being one of the soundest, to most of them deviating from Islam and Shiʿism prevailing amongst them?

I feel that Ibn Taymiyya should have explained how that came to pass, given that elsewhere in the same book he describes the ʿamal of the Medinans and their doctrine as being one of the soundest doctrines of the first three Hijri centuries. According to Ibn Taymiyya, when he was asked about the soundness of the principles of the Medinans' doctrine, and the status of Mālik to whom their school of practice is attributed in the Imāma and in religion, and who had mastered the shariʿa learning possessed by the leading ʿulamāʾ of the various capitals and reliable and experienced persons of all periods, he answered:

Praise be to Allāh that the doctrine of the people of the Prophet's city is of the House of the Sunna, the House of the hijra and the House of al-Nuṣra, for there Allāh prescribed to his Prophet Muḥammad, may Allāh's peace and blessing be upon him, the customs of Islam and its law, and the Muḥājirūn emigrated there to Allāh and His Messenger, and in it were the Anṣār who occupied the place, and the faith was before them. Their doctrine in the time of the Companions and those who followed and those

15 Ibn Taymiyya, Minhāj al-Sunna, 6/418.
who followed them was the soundest of the doctrines of the Islamic cities from East to West in terms of principles and branches, and these three ages are the pre-eminent three centuries.  

Seventhly: why did Ibn Taymiyya not see or hear of any of these ‘ulama’ whose lectures were delivered at the Prophet’s Mosque, or any of these Sunni families who were in Medina, these Sunni Mujāwirīn who had emigrated there out of worship and in pursuit of knowledge, or any of these madrasas which were teaching only the Sunni schools?  

Given that there is not one account which states that there was a single madrasa in Medina which taught the Shi’a doctrine, or, if it was true that most of the Medinan inhabitants were Shi‘ites, then was there not all the more reason for Shi‘a madrasas to be widespread? Where are the ‘ulama’ and notables of Medina, and why did they do nothing in the face of this Shi‘a expansion, and how did they allow the people of their city to convert to the Shi‘a doctrine? There will be consideration and discussion, but it is possible to state here that there were many ‘ulama’ in Medina, all of whom were Sunni, and that al-Sakhāwī (831-902/1428-1497) alone documented the lives of more than 113 Sunni ‘ulama’ who were present in Medina during the Ayyūbid period. Most of them were teachers at the Prophet’s Mosque and in the madrasas, ribāts and houses in the city. These ‘ulama’ also had Sunni students and likewise all of them had Sunni families - all of this will be explained in the next chapters. How then does this accord with what was said regarding the majority of Medinans being Shi‘ites without mention of the names of their luminaries or ‘ulama’?  

Eighthly: if Ibn Taymiyya had said this because the emirs, sharifs, qādis, Imāms and khaṭibs at the Prophet’s Mosque were Shi‘a, then this does not prove that most of the inhabitants were Shi‘a.  

On the other hand, if he said this because the Fātimids had been in control of the Ḥijāz for over a hundred years - as he mentions on more than one occasion - this too does not

---

16 Ibn Taymiyya, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 20/299.  
17 There will be detailed discussion in chapters 6 and 7 concerning the Medinan population, its ‘ulama’, the teaching lectures at the Prophet’s Mosque and the Medinan madrasas, during the course of which it will be demonstrated that the majority of Medinans were neither Shi‘a nor Rāfidites, nor were they deviating from Islam.  
18 Ibn Taymiyya says: ‘Banu ‘Ubayd outwardly exhibit Shi‘ism. They took what they did from Morocco and built al-Mahdiyya. They then went to Egypt and were in control for two hundred years. They had control of the Hijāz and Syria for around a hundred years, and held Baghdad during the al-Basāṣiri unrest’. Elsewhere he says: ‘For when the judge made his pilgrimage, Shi‘ism had emerged in Medina and the Egyptian ‘Ubūdis had assumed control over it and the inhabitants of Mecca’. See Ibn Taymiyya, Minhāj al-Sunna, 6/421, and Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 22/344.
prove that most of the inhabitants were deviating from Islam or that Shi‘ism had prevailed amongst them.

Ninthly: it can be understood from a narrative relayed by Ibn Farhūn concerning Sulṭān b. Najād, a shaykh of the al-Wahāhīda (one of the tribes living in the Medina region) that one Shi‘a qādī in Medina would steer clear of cases involving contentious issues which affected the Sunnis, and would instead placate them, even if the matter outwardly impinged on his faith. Sulṭān b. Najad says:

I witnessed that Qādī Sinān b. ‘Abd al-Wahāb b. al-Ḥusayni19 preaches from the minbar [pulpit], speaking well of the Companions, and then he goes home and repents of this by sacrificing a ram and giving it away to charity. He does this every Friday after the prayer.20

If it were true that the majority of Medinans were Shi‘ites, as Ibn Taymiyya says, then why would the Shi‘a qādī need to avoid cases involving contentious issues with the Sunni Medinans, placate them by deviating from his beliefs, or go in fear of them?

Tenthly: in a discussion concerning the end of the Shi‘a influence in Medina, it will be demonstrated that they were not the majority in Medina. Ibn Farhūn and others have recounted how Shi‘a influence did not remain during the Mamlūk period, and this occurred without war, fighting or forced migration. Instead, the Mamlūk Sultan sent a Sunni qādī, entrusting him with the positions of both khatīb and Imām, and ordered the Emir of Medina to be gracious towards him and the Sunni inhabitants of the city. Thus ended Shi‘a control, and it was said that they all reverted to Sunnism. If most of Medina’s inhabitants had been Shi‘a, why was it so easy for them to change in this simple manner, or to extinguish their influence and to return control to the Sunnis?

Eleventhly: Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Farḥūn, al-Sakhāwī, al-Samḥūdī and al-Fayrūz Abādī fail to provide the name of a single person from amongst the Medinan inhabitants who was Sunni and who converted to Shi‘ism. Furthermore, the accounts presented by Ibn Farḥūn and Ibn Taymiyya are the only ones which talk about the beginnings of Shi‘ism, the arrival of the Qāshānī people in Medina and the preaching of their doctrine.

Twelfthly: amongst the things which indicate that there were no large numbers of Shi‘a living in Medina is the fact that Ibn Farḥūn only mentions the names of three families of

19 Al-Sakhāwī said he was alive in the year 654/1256, al-Tuhfa, 2/195; and see al-Bilādi, Mu‘jam Qabā‘l al-Ḥijāz, p.233; Ḥamad al-Jāsir, Rasā‘il fi Tārikh al-Madīna, pp.148-150.
20 Ibn Farḥūn, p.209.
Shi'a: the Sharifs, the Sinan and the Qäshänis. He also fails to specify their numbers. How, then, could the majority of Medinans have become Shi'a? Chapter Six will give an explanation of the groups that lived in the city, which will demonstrate that most of them were Sunni rather than Shi'a.

Thirteenthly: in addition to the writings which have been used as references and sources for this research, other books have been consulted. However, they have failed to yield the names of any ‘ulamā’ or a single important or celebrated personality from amongst the Shi'a in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, or to discuss the spread of Shi'ism therein, in spite of Ibn Farhûn confirming the presence of Shi'a ‘ulamā’ and dārūr in the city during that period.

In view of all this, can it not be assumed, if what Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhûn say about the conversion of many Medinans to Shi'ism is true, that the Shi'a books, historians and others would mention this occurrence, it being a positive phenomenon for them since converting the inhabitants of Medina to their doctrine would have been no simple matter and would have lent force to their doctrine and given it better status? If the opinion of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhûn is correct, it would be very strange for the Shi'a historians to neglect to mention this matter and omit the names, biographies and history of the Shi'a in Medina.

Dictionaries about Medina were also consulted, such as Murjam mā Ullif ‘an al-Madina (a Dictionary Compiled about Medina) by ‘Adb al-Razāq al-Ṣā‘īdī, al-Madina al-Munawwara fi Ārār al-Mu‘allifin Qadi man wa Ḩadithan (the Medina Dictionary of Great Writers' Works) by ‘Abd Allāh ‘Usailān, Makhtütät Maktabat Bashīr Aghā bil-Madina (Dictionary of

---

21 Ibn Farhûn, p.24.
23 Ibn Farhûn confirms the existence of Imāmī Shi‘a ‘ulamā’ who had places in the Prophet’s Mosque where they would teach. According to Ibn Farhûn, during his account of what happened concerning the addition to the noble chamber and the building of a great maqsura initially as protection from the sun when it was strong, the Imāmī Shi‘a used it as their place of worship, a site for their teaching and a retreat for their ‘ulamā’. However, Ibn Farhûn fails to mention the names of any of their ‘ulamā’ or teachers; Ibn Farhûn, pp.22, 24. He also mentions that he observed the Imami reciters and their imāms sitting around the Rawda once the month of Ramadan began, reciting from their books and raising their voices. Yet he does not specify the names of any of these reciters or imāms.

Fourteenthly: furthermore, when Ibn Farhūn talks about the Shi'a, he does not mention individuals by name, but is content to mention the family name, saying: it was the Sināns, or the Qāshānis, or the Sharifs. An example of this is what Ibn Farhūn says about noticing the innovation which was being carried out by the sharifs of the Sinān family and others:

> When the time of the hajj drew near, they would hasten to the chamber with boxes and chairs, arranging them around the chamber to use them as places, and would then perform the supplication so that people would give them money and offerings. 24

One notices that Ibn Farhūn groups the Imāmi Shi'a in Medina into only two families; namely, the Sinān and the Qāshānis, as in the following account:

> I was aware of a group of mujāwirin and khādiim who recited their books and listened to their Prophet's ḥadīth only in secrecy until the arrival of al-Sāhib b. Ḩannā (704/1304) 25, who opposed the Sinān family and the al-Qayāshin; and they were in awe of his standing with the Sultan, and yielded to him, practising taqiyya [dissimulation]. 26

Lastly, no one can deny that the Shi'a were present in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, nor that they had in their possession some of the key positions in the city; however, one cannot say for certain that most of the inhabitants converted to Shi'ism.

It is true that there were Shi'a in Medina in Ayyūbid times, just as it is true that they had an influence over different aspects of life within the city, but they were not the majority,

---

24 Ibn Farhūn, p.23.
their influence was not great or powerful, they did not change the course of events and their presence did not lead to the outbreak of the sectarian wars. This will be discussed and demonstrated later in this chapter and in those that follow it.

4.2 Historical controversy surrounding the Shi'a in Medina prior to the Ayyúbíbid period

Any discussion of the spread of the Shi'a in Medina involves returning to the events that were tied to the emergence of the Shi'a prior to this period, and exploring their history, the phases through which they passed and their spread throughout the Hijáz, so that a clear picture of the subject can be presented, which may help to answer all of the questions posed in this chapter.

First of all, it is necessary to define the meaning of 'Shi'a', as it is possible to define the word as simply meaning a 'faction' or sect. The Qur'ān states: (*-p I,; -)9 ýyý11 J) 'As for those who divide their religion, and break up into sects?; 27 that is to say, 'parties' or 'groups'. In conventional usage, however, the Shi'a are the followers of 'Ali and his offspring, 28 and it has been said that they are those who sided with 'Ali and asserted his status as Imám and his successorship by text and testament. They believed that the leadership or Imáma should not pass from his children, and stated that the Imám is not bestowed by the choice of the community at large; instead it is a settled rule, a pillar of the faith, which the Prophet is not allowed to disregard nor delegate to the community at large. 29

Scholars have differed in pinpointing the period in which this group emerged, and have linked its origin to political events. Amongst these viewpoints is that which traces the emergence of this group back to the time of the Prophet Muḥammad - i.e. in Medina -

29 Al-Shahrastānī, al-Milāl, 1/146.
since certain of the Companions favoured 'Ali over all other Companions. Amongst those who favoured 'Ali were 'Ammār b. Yāsir, Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, Salmān al-Fārisī, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī and the Banū Ḥāshim. Some proponents of this view have been guided by fabricated ahādīth allegedly spoken by the Prophet. They say, in a commentary on the word of Allāh: (إن الذين مَّثّوا وعملوا الصالحات أولئك هم خير اليرب) 'Those who have faith and do righteous deeds, they are the best of creatures', that the Prophet said of 'Ali: 'By him in whose hands is my soul, he and his followers shall verily be the victors on the Day of Resurrection and shall arise at ease in themselves and in favour with me'. Other Shi'a adopted this opinion, holding that the call to Shi'ism began on the day on which the following āya was sent down: (وَانْذَرُوا ٱلْوَسَّاتِينَ) 'And admonish thy nearest kinsmen'. According to them, the Prophet gathered the Banū Ḥāshim in Mecca and said to them: 'Who among you will support and help me in the call to Allāh, and be my brother, my heir, my trustee (wāṣi) and my successor (Caliph) over you after me?' When no one acceded to his wish except 'Ali, the Prophet said to them: 'This is my brother, my heir, my trustee, my aid (waṣī) and my successor after me, so hear him and obey'. Another Shi'ite says that those who supported 'Ali during the time of the Prophet were from the first called 'Shi'a'; and this was the title given to four of the Companions: Abū Dhar, Salmān, al-Miqdād and 'Ammār. He also says that the forty thousand who pledged allegiance to 'Ali on the day of Ghadir Khum (10/632) were Shi'a also.

---

31 Muḥammad Kāshif al-Ghata'ī, Aṣīl al-Shī'a wa Awtūlahā, p.87; al-Qummi, al-Maqlālāt wa al-Firaq, p.15; al-Nabikharī, Firaq al-Shī'a, p.17; and see Aḥmad Šubkī, Naẓariyyat al-Imāma Lādā al-Shī'a al-Ithnā 'Ashariyya, pp.28-31; al-Qifārī, 1/78-82.
32 The Holy Qur'ān ETMC, 26:214.
33 Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Muḍaffar, Tārikh al-Shī'a, p.9. His strange that the messenger should have asked his tribe to listen to and obey 'Ali, when they did not yet believer in the messenger. Religious scholars have said that this is one of the hadiths that have been fabricated about the Prophet. See Ibn Taymiyya, Minhāj al-Sunna, 7/299-303.
34 Muḥammad, al-Shī'a fi al-Tārikh, p.25.
35 Ibn Taymiyya, Majmū'a al-Fatāwā, 3/154; Minhāj al-Sunna, 7/32,45,51,54,313,319; Moojan Momen, An Introduction to Shi'i Islam, p.15. It was said that in Ghadir Khum - a place between Medina and Mecca - the Prophet said to 'Ali: 'of whomsoever I am a master, then 'Ali is also his master. O God, be thou the supporter of whoever supports 'Ali and the enemy of whoever opposes him'. This was when he came back from the farewell hajj, for the story of Ghadir Khum see al-Shahristānī, al-Mīlāl wa al-Nihāl, 1/163; Ibn Taymiyya, Minhāj al-Sunna, 7/32; al-Mufid, Kitāb al-Irshād, pp.119-126; Halm, Shiism, p.8; Dwight M. Donaldson, The Shi'ite Religion, p.1; Waines, An Introduction to Islam, pp.155-156.
It is possible that these assertions are true; however, one must bear in mind that no thinking or beliefs emerged amongst these Companions that differed from those held by the rest of the Muslims. Rather they saw in ‘Ali qualities which caused them to love and favour him over the rest of the Companions.

The proponents of this view were some of the Shi`a ‘ulamä’ who were eager to trace the origins of Shi`ism to the time of the Prophet in order to afford it a pure Islamic pedigree, and they refuted what was circulated about their doctrine; namely, that its elements had foreign origins.

Another historian group traces the beginnings of Shi`ism to the death of the Prophet, since a band of Companions rallied around `Ali, deeming him the worthiest of the succession due to the attributes they saw in him.”

---

36 After the death of the Prophet, the Muslims disagreed over who would be caliph. This was the first matter on which a dispute between Muslims arose. It did so because the Prophet did not appoint a successor prior to his death to lead the Muslims, and no Qur’anic text defines that. As soon as the Prophet died, the Muslims felt the necessity of deciding who should lead them. al-Ansär hurried to Saqifat Banî Sä‘îdah to discuss the matter. Abû Bakr, ‘Umar, and Abû ‘Ubayda b. al-Jarrâh from al-Muhäjirün followed them. During that meeting, the Muslims were divided into two parties. One of them (al-Ansâr) wanted the caliph to come from among their number; because they honoured the messenger when he immigrated to them, believed him and aided him in spreading the religion and protected him and his friends from their enemies. The others (al-Muhäjirün) wanted the caliph to be from among their number, because they were the messenger’s tribe, his people, the first that believed and endured harm with him, and they were from Quraysh. Arabs do not acknowledge domination from anybody except Quraysh. The Prophet said ‘ the governors from Quraysh, if they will be just ‘. See ‘Ali b. Abî Bakr al-Haithami, Majma‘ al-Zawâ’id, 5/194; Laura Vecchia Vaglierri, The Patriarchal and Umayyad Caliphates. In: P. M. Holt and Ann K. S. Lambton and B. Lewis (eds). The Cambridge History of Islam. v. 1, pp. 57-103. Therefore, in offering the caliphate, Abû Bakr said to ‘Umar: ‘Give me your hand to be recognized as caliph’. ‘Umar replied: ‘You are better than I am, Allâh’s messenger ordered you to lead people in prayer when he was ill, so then why don’t we accept you for our life?' Then ‘Umar stated Abû Bakr’s good attributes and shook his hand, recognising him as caliph. Consequently, all who were present in the house recognised him as caliph. On the second day in the mosque, ‘Umar said to the people: ‘Allâh has unified you by choosing Abû Bakr to be the caliph, the friend of Allâh’s messenger and the second one in the cave and the best who can take care of your matters'. Then the people elected him as caliph and the sedition stopped. (See Ibn Hishâm, al-Sirah al-Nabawîyya, 4/260-261; al-Ṭabarî, Târîkh, 3/202-206; al-Balâdhurî, Ansâb al-Asrâr, 1/581-582; al-Nuwaïri, Nihâyat al-İrâb, 18/385; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmil, 2/325-332, and al-Dhahabi, Târîkh al-Islâm, ‘Ahad al-Khulafâ’ al-Rashîdîn, pp.5-14; al-Yaqûbî, Târîkh al-Ya‘qûbî, 2/137; Mohammad al-Mudhafar, The Caliphate; Mahmoud M. Ayyub, The Crisis of Muslim History, pp.8-25; William Muir and T. Weir, The Caliphate, pp.2-4; Momen, pp.18-20.)

But it can be said that there was another opinion about the caliphate which implied that it should be kept within the Prophet’s house, and that it should be given specifically to ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib. (See al-Nuwaïri, Nihâyat al-İrâb, 19/39; Dâ‘îrat al-Ma‘arîf al-Islâmiyya, 14/58; Aḥmad Mâhmûd Şûbî, Aḥmad Mâhmûd Şûbî, Aḥmad Mâhmûd Şûbî, Aḥmad Mâhmûd Şûbî, Aḥmad Mâhmûd Şûbî,
There is a third group that traces the origins of this faction back to the rebellion against 'Uthmān,38 or the movement of Ibn Saba', who preached the idea of the holiness of 'Ali, and that he had first right to the successorship (caliphate). Ibn Saba' was the first to attack the first three caliphs, considering them usurpers.39 Some proponents of this view think that Shi'A thought has non-Islamic roots, or, more
precisely, Jewish roots, and, accordingly, all of the Shi'a factions have deviated from Islam. 40

Some scholars have responded to proponents of this view by saying that it is impossible that Shi'ism as a creed had emerged as early as the time of 'Uthmān, and that Ibn Saba' could not have had such a profound effect on thinking as to cause this doctrinal rift among the Muslims. Indeed, some have denied the very existence of Ibn Saba', arguing that the historians who mentioned Ibn Saba' and his role in the civil strife wished to pin the responsibility for dividing the Muslims and their internal strife on someone who was not a Companion, and so concocted the story of Ibn Saba'. 41

It appears that those sceptical of the Ibn Saba' story have based their argument solely on their own personal opinions. What is there to preclude the existence of Ibn Saba', and his having such organised thinking and the desire to create dissention among the Muslims? The argument that society was still tribal and that such thinking could not have been possible is unconvincing, as evidenced by the power which this tribal society attained in a short period of time. Similarly, the argument that Ibn Saba' was not mentioned at the battle of Siffin does not disprove his existence, as Ṭāha Ḥusayn maintains in his book 'Alī wa Banūh, 42 because it is known that 'Alī banished him to al-Madā'in after he told 'Alī: 'You are God'. As for those who were unconvinced by the story of Ibn Saba' because of the presence of the Prophet's Companions during that time, there were, during the time of the Prophet himself, those who would listen to the Munāfiqīn or Hypocrites, as the Qur'ān says: (وإِذْ نُصْرُوا فِي خِيلٍ مَا زادُوكُمْ إِلَّا ذَلَّةً وَأَرْضَوْا خَلَاكَمْ يَبْخَوُكُمْ الْقَتَاءَ وَذُكْيِمْ سَمَّاونَ لَهُمْ) 'If they had come out with you, they would not have added to your (strength) but only (made for) disorder, hurrying to and fro in your midst and sowing sedition among you, and there would have been some among you who would have listened to them'. 43

Then, there are those who say that the origins of Shi'ism can be found during the caliphate of 'Alī, particularly the arbitration between 'Alī and Mu'āwiya and the emergence of the

41 See Bernard Lewis, Usūl al-İsmā'iliyya, trans. by Khalīl Jīlū and Jāsim al-Rajāh, pp.86-87; Ṭāha Ḥusayn, 'Alī wa Banūh, pp.98-100; Aḥmad Ṣubḥī, Naṣariyyat al-Imāma Ida' al-Shī'a al-Ithnā 'Ashariyya, pp.39-40, and see the Sunni scholars' answer to this opinion in: Sulimān al-ūdā, 'Abdullāh Ibn Saba' wa Atharuh fi Abdāḥ al-Firmā; Ṭāma' al-Ṭālibī, Ārā' al-Khawārijj, pp.74-81; 'Īzzat'Atiyya, al-Bid'ā, pp.64-90; al-Qifrī, 1/87-94.
42 Ṭāha Ḥusayn 'Alī wa Banūh, p. 98.
43 The Holy Qur'ān ETMC, 9:47.
Khārijites, when ‘Alī’s supporters rallied round him in the face of his opponents. In fact, those who trace the beginnings of Shi‘ism to this time are actually seeking to pass judgement on ‘Alī’s supporters at the battles of the Camel, Šīffin and Nahrawān; his supporters did not share a common creed, so most them were motivated instead by obedience to the Caliph.

Lastly, there are those who think that the martyrdom of al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī on the battlefield at Karbalā’ at the hands of the Umayyads marked the beginning of the emergence of Shi‘a doctrine, since Shi‘ism prior to his death was merely a political standpoint, but, once al-

---

44 Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān, who had been appointed governor of Syria by ‘Uthmān, claimed revenge and refused to induct ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib as caliph. The dispute between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiya increased when ‘Alī deposed Mu‘āwiya from his position as governor of Syria. Mu‘āwiya then instigated people to fight ‘Alī in retaliation for ‘Uthmān, and the Syrian people agreed. After the battle of the Camel, ‘Alī went to Syria to fight Mu‘āwiya’s army. They met in the Šīffin area in the month of Muharram, 37/658. During the battle, Mu‘āwiya felt that he would be defeated, and so he resorted to deception. He used the Qur‘ān as an arbiter and ordered his soldiers to place the Qur‘ān over their swords to avoid defeat. ‘Alī agreed to appoint two mediators, ‘Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ and Abī Mūsā al-Asbārī. (See Tārikh Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, pp.191-196; Ibn al-Athīr, 3/276-349; al-Dhahabi, Tārikh al-Islām, pp.537-554; Momen, p.24; Halim, Shi‘ism, p.11.) However, a group from ‘Alī’s army refused, seceded from him and announced that there would be no arbitration, except by Allāh. Thus, the Khārijites were the first sect to emerge in Islam. The most important tenets of the Khārijites are: 1) The caliph must be appointed by the Muslims’ free will. He must not resign from his duty as caliph as long as he is delivering justice. Otherwise, he must be deposed. 2) It is not a prerequisite to have the caliph from the Quraysh or Meccans. This is in reference to what the Prophet said: ‘Listen and obey even if you are ruled by an Abyssinian slave with a very black head’. 3) Faith is not belief alone; it is rather belief and application. Therefore, they consider the fatal sinner a disbeliever, even if he believes in Allāh and His messenger. 4) Furthermore, their doctrine calls for no leniency or tolerance in religion. They call people to wage war with no possible truce on any who disobey the Shari‘a, no matter what his social or political position. The outcomes of such a war are not taken into consideration. (See ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Sha‘bān, Adwā’, pp.39-42; al-Su‘ūti, al-Dur al-Manthūr, 2/574; al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīh al-Bukhārī, 1/246.)


Husayn was killed, Shi`ism became an established faith consisting of basic tenets, and began to gain an increasing number of followers.\(^{48}\)

In fact, it is possible to combine all of these viewpoints - if taken as true - and consider them as phases through which passed Shi`ism or partisanship for `Ali and his offspring, since it can be said that Shi`ism passed through several phases, the first being the preference of certain people in Medina for `Ali and their love of the qualities which they saw in him, without them adopting thinking and beliefs different from the rest of the Muslims. Then, as time passed, the situation changed, `Ali took over the caliphate, and the number of his supporters outside Medina increased. It can be said that, with `Ali's departure from Medina after taking over the caliphate, his party left with him, and, with the increasing controversy between `Ali and his Shi`a on the one side and their opponents on the other, the ensuing wars and fighting, and then the killing of al-\-Husayn b. `Ali, Shi`ism became an established faith in the hearts of the Shi`a, consisting of basic tenets, thinking, and beliefs, particularly concerning *Imāma*, *wilāya* and *wisāya*.\(^{49}\) These ideas and beliefs were to multiply and change depending on the dispute and the disputants;\(^{50}\) therefore, several factions among the Shi`a emerged holding different philosophies on certain matters.\(^{51}\) This means that Shi`ism, as a doctrine with its own beliefs and ideas, did not exist in Medina during that time, but rather that it was brought into the city from outside.


\(^{49}\) Al-Shayybi says that Shi`ism was an Islamic bloc, a tendency emerging in the time of the Prophet, and that its political orientation crystallised after the murder of `Uthmān, with the term acquiring its exclusive connotation after the killing of al-\-Husayn. `Abd Allāh Fayyād, *Tārikh al-Imāmiyya wa Aslāhihim min al-Shi`a*, p.50.

\(^{50}\) According to one Shi`a scholar, the actions of the Umayyads and the `Abbāsids who came after them against the Ahl al-Bayt, and their oppression of them, were among the key factors which caused people to be sympathetic towards and side with the Ahl al-Bayt. al-Ghata`, Asl al-Shi`a, p.56.

\(^{51}\) It is perhaps important to understand that Shi`ism was not homogeneous: there were moderates who favoured `Ali over all the Companions without any of them being charged with unbelief or being impugned, and without placing him on a sanctified level, exalting him over all humanity; and there were those who went to extremes in venerating and sanctifying `Ali and setting him on a level superior to that of the Prophet. The Sabā`iyya were a Shi`a sect which was extreme in its veneration of `Ali. `Abd al-Mun`īm Sha`bān, pp.60-61.
4.3. Shi'ism's emergence in Medina prior to the Ayyubid period

It can be said that the first dispute to appear among the Muslims arose after the death of the Prophet concerning who would succeed him as leader of the Muslims in religious and temporal matters. A group of Muslims emerged in Medina who deemed 'Ali b. Abi Talib as a more worthy successor than others due to what they saw in him. Yet, when Abü Bakr became Caliph, there is no mention of their having created their own faction in opposition to the Muslim community. Neither is it reported that any of the Muslims in Medina rebelled against the Caliph. The situation persisted during the caliphates of 'Umar b. al-Khattab and 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, until civil unrest broke out among the Muslims at the end of 'Uthmān's caliphate, which can be said to have played a large part in the dispute that subsequently left the Muslims divided; then, the Shi'a emerged as a sect with its own tenets and thinking.

Certain scholars have maintained that the cause of that, and the instigator of this civil unrest, was the very founder of the doctrine of Shi'ism for 'Ali and making him God-like, and that was 'Abd Allāh b. Saba'. After the murder of 'Uthmān and 'Ali's assumption of the caliphate, some Muslims refused to acknowledge 'Ali, demanding that whoever took part in 'Uthmān's murder should be killed. Thus, the Muslims split into three camps: those who sided with 'Ali and demanded allegiance and obedience towards the new caliph; those who did not wish to pledge their allegiance before 'Uthman's murder had been avenged; and a third camp which sat on the fence and did not take part in events. This situation led to the outbreak of wars between the Muslims and the distinct emergence of the Shi'a branch of Islam. However, if we exclude 'Abd Allāh b. Saba' and his company, one can see that all of those who sided with 'Ali b. Abi Talib did not differ from the rest of the Muslims in usul or

---

52 It is necessary at the outset to distinguish between 'Shi'ism' or partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt, which meant their love and loyalty; and embracing the Shi'a doctrine, adopting its thinking and beliefs, which ran contrary to those of the Sunni Muslims. This was because partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt had been in existence, according to certain historians, since the time of the Prophet, whereas the adoption of the Shi'a doctrine was not clearly apparent among the inhabitants of the Hijāz until the Ayyūbid period, when the Shi'a sharifs had strengthened their grip on the emirate and the Shi'a had taken over the key positions therein.

any branch thereof, nor did they invent new thinking in the religion or change it in any way, but instead supported and defended ‘Ali against his opponents.

The years passed and Medina underwent transformations with regard to allegiance and political backing only, but there are no reports of the city’s inhabitants converting from Sunnism, in spite of there being a large number of the Prophet’s Ahl al-Bayt in the city, and they adhered to the Sunni doctrine.  

The best evidence for this is when al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali decided to withhold his allegiance to the caliphate of Yazid b. Mu‘āwiya, and assert his own right to it. Not one of Medina’s inhabitants supported al-Ḥusayn, or rode out with him or assisted him against Yazid. Instead, we hear how the people of Medina acknowledged Yazid immediately, when they were requested to do so by the Governor of Medina, al-Walid b. ‘Uttaba b. Abi Sufyan, and tried to dissuade al-Ḥusayn from his decision to ride out to Kufa and lay claim to the caliphate. Even when Ibn al-Zubayr rebelled in Mecca after the Umayyads had killed of al-Ḥasayn, the Medinans did not do likewise and it was enough for them to be distressed and curse the perpetrators. Perhaps one of the reasons why the Medinans did not rebel against the killing of al-Ḥusayn was that they did not agree with his having ridden out. With the exception of some of his close relations from the Banū Häshim, not one of the city’s inhabitants accompanied him on his march to Kufa. In light of this, it can be said that Shi‘ism - as a doctrine with tenets and thinking which set it apart from others - did not exist in Medina at that time.

Further evidence for Shi‘ism’s lack of influence in Medina during that time is the fact that ‘Ali b. al-Ḥusayn, known as Zayn al-‘Abidin, lived in Medina throughout his life (36-94 /656-712), was a scholar, worshipper and jurist, and was surrounded by a great number of students, who included his pupils as well as relatives from the Banū Häshim; but in spite of this family connection, he and all those around him were Sunnis, and there are no accounts

---

54 After the killing of ‘Ali b. Abi Ṭalib and his son al-Ḥasan’s abandoning of the caliphate to Mu‘āwiya, the Prophet’s family returned from Kufa to Medina. Amongst them were al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn and their wives and children. Also returning to the city were most of those who had ridden out with ‘Ali at the Battle of the Camel and served with him in his wars against Mu‘āwiya. See Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, 3/406 and Ibn Taymiya, Minhāj al-Sunna, 4/10-11.
56 Ibid.
57 Al-Sakhâwî, al-Tuhfa, 3/220.
of him adopting any Shi'a beliefs. Indeed, he denounced all that ran contrary to the Sunna of the Prophet.

Incidents and uprisings connected to the Ahl al-Bayt did occur in Medina, and some of the city's inhabitants took part in these. However, they were not embracing the ideas and beliefs of Shi'ism; rather their support for it was purely political. These incidents included: the movement of Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya in Medina in 145/762, backed by 250 of the city's men; the Sudan movement in Medina as an effect of the movement led by Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya and his brother Ibrāhīm; and the movement of al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn in 169/685, which included 26 of the prominent ʿAlids living in Medina. Also residing in Medina was Yaḥya b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm b. Ismāʿīl b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAli b. Abī Ṭālib (245-298/859-911), and when the Yemeni tribes of Ṣa'dah decided to dispatch a delegation to summon him, he responded and returned with them to Ṣa'dah in 280/893, leaving Medina. Thus, he was the first Zaydi imām in the Yemen. This indicates that there were no followers of Shi'ism in Medina at that time; otherwise, he would not have departed from it when he found supporters elsewhere. It is also possible to conclude this from Ibn Taymiyya's account, which was cited earlier about the inhabitants of Medina holding fast to their old doctrine, and adhering to the school of Mālik up to the beginning of the sixth Hijri century, or shortly before or after that.

Therefore, it can be said that Shi'ism did not spread in Medina during the first five Hijri centuries, in spite of the comings and goings of a great many of its followers and dā'ūs, as
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59 ibid, p.187.
60 Al-İsfahānī, Maqāṣid al-Ṭālibiyyn, p.446 (He does not say they were Shi'a); ‘Abd Allāh al-Munṣād, al-ʿAlawiyyn fi al-Ḥijāz, p.193.
61 Ibn Ḥazm, Jamharat Ansāb al-ʿArab, p.28; Muḥammad ‘Abd al-ʿĀl, al-Ayyūbyyn fi al-Yaman, p.36.
63 Ibn Taymiyya, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 20/300.
64 ‘Abd Allāh Fayyāḍ mentions the areas inhabited by the Shi'a in the first four centuries, and does not include Medina among them; see Tārikh al-Imāmiyya, pp.58-71. In addition, some historians argue that the Shi'ites of Medina today, who are known as al-Nakḥāwla, are the unfortunate offspring of Yazid b. Muʿāwiya's soldiers whom Yazid had unleashed on Medina in the days of the al-Ḥarra battle, mentioned in the second chapter. However, a clear fanaticism is noted in this opinion because, if this is correct, then what is the relationship of those children to Shi'ism? And if the people of Medina, as some narrations said, had exiled their sons from there to an outlying district of Medina, then why did not those sons reject their stigma and scatter over the land? That would have been more logical than to live together until today in a suburb of Medina. Actually,
visitors and sometimes Mujawirs. When Medina fell under Fāṭimid control in 363/974, the Fāṭimids did not endeavour to propagate their doctrine in the city, contrary to what some believe. The evidence for this is that the Shi‘a doctrine which subsequently emerged in Medina was that of the Imāmi Shi‘a (the Twelvers), whereas the Fāṭimids were Ismā‘īlīs. If it were true that Shi‘ism was introduced to Medina by the Fāṭimids, as some claim, then the Shi‘a doctrine in the city would have been Ismā‘īlī rather than Twelver. Furthermore, the scholars of Fāṭimid History observe that they were not concerned with propagating their doctrine in Medina. Consequently, this rules out there being a direct link between Fāṭimid control of Medina and the spread of Imāmism therein. It is true that no sooner had the Fāṭimids conquered Egypt than Tāhir b. Muslim announced his autonomy in the emirate of Medina in the year 363/974, and recognized the Fāṭimid al-Mu‘izz in the khutba for the first time. However, one notices that material inducement was what determined the continuation of political relations between the emirs of Medina and the Fāṭimids, as explained in Chapter Three.

4.4. The history of the Shi‘a in Medina during the Ayyūbid period

4.4.1. The emergence of Twelver Shi‘ism in Medina

This first section of this chapter mentions an account by Ibn Taymiyya concerning Shi‘ism’s emergence in Medina, according to which the ‘inhabitants held fast to their doctrine of old, adhering to the doctrine of Mālik, until the start of the sixth century, or before or after that, and then there came to them Shi‘ites from the eastern lands, from the people of Qāshān and others’.

On the other hand, with Ibn Farhūn, whose account was also mentioned earlier, in which he discusses the starting point of the Shi‘a’s emergence in Medina and the arrival of the
Qāshāni family from Iraq to establish the Imāmi doctrine in the city, one notices that he does not specify the period in which the Qāshāni family came to Medina. Instead, he states that they were present during the reign of Nūr al-Dīn Zengī (541-569/1147-1174), and this means that Shi'a missionary activity or da'wa began before the Ayyūbid period. This conflicts with Ibn Taymiyya, who places it within the beginning of the sixth hijri century. Ibn Taymiyya also differs from Ibn Farḥūn about the sharifs, Ibn Farḥūn stating that the backing of the sharifs had a significant effect on the spread of Qāshāni da'wa, whereas Ibn Taymiyya says that it was the da'wa of the Qāshānis that corrupted the beliefs of the Medinans, particularly the sharifs.

It is possible that some of the Ḥusayni sharifs and emirs of Medina personally embraced Imāmism before the sixth Hijri century, but did not take it to extremes or convert others to it. Ibn Khaldūn provides a passage that lends weight to this view, mentioning with reference to Muḥammad b. ʿUbaydillāh b. Ṭāhir b. Yahya, known as Muslim, that the Shi'a called him 'Ḥujjat Allāh' and that he played a key role in the Fāṭimid invasion of Egypt. Then his son Ṭāhir (Emir of Medina 366-381/977-991) came to Medina and assumed control of the emirate. It is likely that he brought the Imāmi doctrine to Medina, and the Muhanna family later inherited from him. However, there is no clear evidence to support this view, other than Ibn Farḥūn's report of the sharifs' backing of the Qāshānis in propagating their da'wa, but that does not put the matter beyond doubt.

It is significant that Imāmism was so diffuse among the Ḥusayni sharifs in Medina prior to the seventh Hijri century that their name in the writings of Ibn Farḥūn became

68 Ibn Farḥūn, p.211.
69 Ibn Farḥūn mentions that the Qāshāni da'wa targeted the weak, yet the sharifs were a distinguished social grouping which included the ruling family. It has already been stated that the Shi'a were rallying around the Ahl al-Bayt, even though the Ahl al-Bayt were Sunni and did not accept many of the beliefs of the Shi'a; but it is possible that, as time went by, some of the sharifs changed and were influenced by the Shi'a, who seduced them with support and assistance and encouraged them to fight for power. The sharifs suspected that they would not obtain the support of the Shi'a unless they approved what the Shī'a were doing, and so they may have embraced the Shi'a doctrine as a means of gaining power.
71 Ibn Khaldūn, 4/140.
72 ʿĀrif ʿAbd al-Ghani, Umrāʾ al-Madīna, p.223.
73 See Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmiʿ, 8/694; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuḥfā, 2/257.
synonymous with Imāmism. Al-Sakhāwī mentioned those who were inclined towards Imāmism and those who were Sunni.

In the light of this, one can conclude that the emergence of Shi‘ism in Medina occurred in stages, the first of which was the adherence of certain sharifs. However, they did not aim to propagate the Shi‘a doctrine in the city, either because they were engrossed in competing with one another for the emirate, or because they were moderate Shi‘a, who preferred to maintain good relations with the Sunnis, or because they feared that the caliphs and sultans would punish them for this. The second phase was the arrival in the city of certain Imāmī Shi‘a du‘āt seeking to propagate their doctrine and carry out missionary activity, among whom were the Qāshāni family.

It has already been mentioned that amongst the general circumstances which assisted the spread of Imāmism in Medina was Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s preoccupation with the jihad against the Crusaders, as well as the Emir of Medina Abū Falīta Qāsim b. al-Muhanna, who was Imāmī, accompanying Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn on his campaigns, and also that there was no one venturing to speak out about Shi‘ism at that time. This shows that the Emir of Medina was a prudent Imāmī Shi‘a, who improved relations with the Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, the ‘Abbāsid Caliph and the Sunnis as a whole, and, if true, then one would expect that he would reveal nothing of the points of dispute with the Sunnis, and not do as the extremist Imāmis did in insulting certain Companions or focusing on issues of historical disagreement. If he had done that, he would not have achieved such respect.

From the portrayal of life at the start of the seventh century, one can conclude that the balance altered and the Imāmis’ assumption of key positions had an effect on societal life. In the reign of Emir Munīf b. Shīha (646-657/1248-1258), the qādī of Medina was an Imāmī, and it was he who wrote the long letter which has been passed down in historical writings and in which he describes the events surrounding the volcanic eruption in the year 654/1256. His name was Shams al-Dīn Sinān b. ʿAbd al-Wahāb b. Numayla al-Ḥusaynī. After that, the office of qādī remained for a long time in the hands of the Sinān family. One
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can also gather from the narrative recounted by Ibn Farhūn concerning Ṣultān b. Najād, mentioned previously, that the qādī at that time was an Imāmi Shīʿa.78

4.4.2. The length of time that the Imāmis spent trying to propagate their doctrine in Medina

The length of time spent by the Imāmis in trying to propagate their doctrine in Medina, and assemble a base of converts to it, was less than a century - if it was the Qāshāni family who were the first to introduce Imāmism to the city and set about propagating it. Ibn Taymiyya supports this view in his account mentioned earlier, in which he states that the inhabitants of Medina held fast to their doctrine up until the beginning of the sixth century.79

Al-Sakhāwī states that the first Shīʿa to take over the office of qādī was ʿAbd al-Wahāb b. Numayla al-Ḥusayni,80 which further reduces the length of time and points to the success of the Qāshānīs and those who acted likewise in attracting numbers of people and convincing them of their doctrine. Since emirs from among the descendants of Abū Falīṭa al-Qāsim b. al-Muhanna succeeded each other during this period,81 since it witnessed disturbances and wars with the Qatāda family in Mecca,82 and since the Ayyūbid state, to which Medina was nominally subordinate, was preoccupied with intermittent struggles between Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's offspring, which ended in power passing to the Mamlūks in 648/1250, these troubled times were ripe for any missionary if he applied himself assiduously, and also an opportunity for the emirs of Medina to support the Imāmis and pass to them the control of the judiciary, or at least to accord them precedence and oversight over it. There is no better evidence for this authority than the picture that Ibn Farḥūn paints of the judiciary in Medina around the mid-seventh century:

> If a marriage contract were entered into in the city without the authorisation of ʿAlī b. Sinān, he would send for those who had done so and punish them, and the sharifs would be hard upon them. If the mujāwirun and the Sunnis wished to contract a marriage or settle a dispute in accordance with their doctrine, and went to one of their sheikhs to draw up the contract for them or to make a settlement between them, he would say: 'I will do nothing until they bring me permission from Ibn Sinān', so they
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78 Ibn Farhūn, p.209.
81 They were all Imāmis. See Ibn Farḥūn, pp. 212, 247; al-Sakhāwī, *al-Tuhfa*, 1/91-94.
would go to him and give him a sum of money and he would write them a letter which permitted their sheikh to make the contract or the settlement. 83

4.4.3. Reasons for the emergence of the Twelver-Imämi (Ithnä ‘Ashariyya) doctrine rather than the other Shi’ä doctrines in Medina

As mentioned previously, the historical sources state that the Shi’ä order which was present in Medina during the Ayyūbid period was that of the Twelver Imāmis. 84 Imāmism 85 was one of the factions which took the part of Imām ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, and was so called because it championed Imāma, making it the corner-stone of its doctrine, and exclusive to the Imām ‘Ali and his sons by Fātimah the Prophet’s daughter, designated one after the other. 86

The Imāmis divided into several sects, among which were the Twelvers, who were the Shi’ā of Medina during the Ayyūbid period. They were called Twelvers 87 because they claimed that the Awaited Imām is the twelfth in the line of ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, 88 and traced the Imāmate from ‘Ali al-Riḍā to his son Muḥammad, then to his son ‘Ali, then to his son al-Ḥasan and then to his son Muḥammad al-Qā‘im, the Awaited Twelfth. 89

83 Ibn Farḥūn, p. 211.
85 The Kaysanis were the first to assert the idea of the Mahdi Imam, which subsequently became part of the Imamī creed. Their leader was also the first to apply it; see ‘Abd Allāh Fāwyād, p. 55.
86 For the Imāmīs’ beliefs, see Ibn Ḥazm, al-Fasāl fi al-al-Milal, 4/137-140; ‘Abd al-Mun‘īm Sha‘bān, Adwā’, pp. 74-89; Ẓāhir al-Qūṭā, al-Kāmil, 10/26; Aḥmad Subhī, Naẓariyyat al-Imāma, pp. 104-111; Momen, pp. 147-171; Henry Corbin, History of Islamic Philosophy, pp. 31-36.
87 They were called Twelvers because they acknowledge twelve principal Imāms after the death of the Prophet Muḥammad (Iran Netton, A Popular Dictionary of Islam, p. 131); and see al-Bughdādī, Mukhtaṣar Kitāb al-Farq bayn al-Firaq, p. 51; ‘Ali b. Ḥazm, al-Fasāl fi al-al-Milal, 4/137-140; ‘Abd al-Mun‘īm Sha‘bān, pp. 74-89; Momenn, pp. 161-171; Kohlberg, Belief and Law in Imamī Shi‘ism, xiv, pp. 521-534; and Early Attestations of the Term "Ithnā ‘Ashariyya", in: Paul Luft and Colin Turner, (eds). Shi‘ism, 1/158-172. Moreover, many historians called them Imamīs, and spread this name to refer to them in their books (see Ibn al-Nadim, al-Fahrist, p. 275; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, 10/26; al-Ḥillī, al-Rijāl, p. 46; ‘Abd Allāh Fāwyād, p. 84.
89 Al-Bughdādī, Mukhtaṣar Kitāb al-Farq bayn al-Firaq, p. 60; Jassim M. Hussin, the Occultation of the Twelfth Imam, p. 1, Halm, pp. 29-37. The names of the twelve Imāms are: ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib al-Murtada, then his son al-Ḥasan al-Mujtaba, then al-Ḥusayn al-Shahīd, then Zayn al-Abīdīn b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sajjād, then his son al-Bāṣir, then his son Ja‘far al-Sādiq, then his son Ẓāhir, then his son ‘Ali al-Riḍā, then Muḥammad al-Taqi al-Jawād, then ‘Ali b. Muḥammad al-Naqī, then ‘Ali b. Ḥusayn al-Mujtaba, then his son Muḥammad al-Ḥujjja al-Qā‘im al-Munṭazār (al-
But why were the Twelvers the only sect to emerge in Medina? The reasons can be summed up as follows:

Firstly: because the Medinan emirs were sharifs descended from al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī, and the Twelvers believed that Imāma lies with the offspring of al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī only.90

Secondly: because in the cemeteries of Medina were many graves of the Ahl al-Bayt, the grave of Fāṭima, the Prophet's daughter, and some of their Imāms.

Thirdly: because the sharifian emirs of Medina embraced the Twelver doctrine.

Fourthly: because the Qāshānis, who came from Iraq and actively propagated Shi'ism in the city, were Twelvers.

Fifthly: because the qādis of the Sinān family were also Twelvers.

Sixthly: the distance of Medina from the seat of the Caliphate in Baghdad, and the preoccupation of the caliphs and sultans with their problems and wars enabled the spreading of the Twelver Shi'a in Medina and the consolidation of the sharifs' autonomy in ruling over it, their subordination to the Abbasid Caliphate being nominal only and taking the form of invoking the Caliph in prayers offered up from the minbar in the Prophet's Mosque.

4.5. Relationship between the Medinan Twelver Shi'a with the Ismā'īlis91

If one wishes to understand the relationship between the Ismā'īli sect and the Shi'a in Medina, one has to understand the relationship between the Fātimids (who were Ismā'īlis)
and the sharifian emirs of Medina (most of whom were Twelvers). This relationship was based on political interests from the Fāṭimids' point of view, and financial interests from the point of view of the Medinan emirs.

Al-Fāsī and al-Maqrīzī report that the Fāṭimids made several attempts to control Medina or the daʿwa which they had there. Among such attempts was al-Muʿizz's seizure of the opportunity presented by the fighting between the sharifs of the Banū ʿAli b. Abī Ṭālib and those of the Banū Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālib to send delegates and money to make peace between them, and bear the cost of the blood money for those who were killed. The sharifs saw this as a good action on his part, and it secured for him the strong support of the sharifs of the Ḥijāz. So, in return for this favour, the sharifs, upon renouncing their submission to the ʿAbbāsids in the year 358/969, recognised the Fāṭimids in the khutba and invoked them in prayers offered up from the minbars.⁹²

Historians differ in their opinions regarding the history of the Fāṭimids' innovation in Medina. Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn al-Athīr, al-Yāfī, and Ibn Kathīr all mention an account reporting the Fāṭimid al-Muʿizz being recognised in the khutba in Mecca and Medina during the ḥajj in 363/974, and the ʿAbbāsid Caliph al-Taʾīr being no longer acknowledged in the khutba.⁹³ Al-Maqrīzī, however, states that the first year in which al-Muʿizz was invoked in Mecca and Medina was during the Ḥajj in 364/975.⁹⁴ This conflicts with what has already been said, so perhaps he means here that the allegiance of the whole of the Ḥijāz to the Fāṭimids and their invocation from the minbars of the Two Holy Mosques were restored. Therefore, the opinion of Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn al-Athīr, al-Yāfī, and Ibn Kathīr - who are older and precede al-Maqrīzī - is to be upheld.⁹⁵

The reasons behind the historians' divergent views of the history of the Fāṭimid invocation in Medina relate to the fact that the allegiance of the Ḥijāzī sharifs to the Fāṭimids, and their invocation from them in prayers offered up from the minbars in 358/969, was in response to al-Muʿizz's favour and as a reward for his efforts in making peace among the sharifs and sending money and gifts. This was only a nominal allegiance to the Fāṭimid
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⁹⁴ al-Maqrīzī, Itttīʿāẓ al-Ḥunafa, 1/225.
state, and did not last long, as the sharifs' allegiance returned once again to the ‘Abbāsids in the following year. What happened in the year 363/974, however, was the result of a military campaign instigated by al-Mu‘izz to subjugate all of the Ḥijāz to the Fātimid state, and, despite the campaign's initial failure to achieve its aims, the Fātimids succeeded in restoring their influence in the Ḥijāz and were recognised in the khutba delivered from the manābir of the Two Holy Mosques.

Ibn al-Athir and al-Maqrizi also mention that the sharifs of Mecca and Medina discontinued their recognition of the Fātimids in the khutba after the death of al-Mu‘izz and the succession of his son al-‘Aziz in the year 365/976, and they recognised the ‘Abbāsid Caliph al-Ṭā‘ī in the khutba. 96 This indicates that the sharifs' allegiance to the Fātimids was due to a material interest only, and the closeness of the doctrines did not influence this relationship. Al-Fāsi, Ibn Fahd and Ibn Khaldūn report that al-‘Aziz was displeased by the return of the Ḥijāz to ‘Abbāsid influence, so he sent an army to Medina to bring the city back under the influence of the Fātimids. 97

The Fātimids tried to maintain their invocation in Mecca and Medina, sometimes by using force, and at other times by offering money and gifts. However, as is explained in the writings of al-Qalqashandi, with whom many historians agree with regard to the ‘Abbāsid-Fātimid struggle for the Ḥijāz, the ‘Abbāsids never ceased to assert their right to reclaim their control of the Ḥijāz, 98 and it appears that they used the same tactics as the Fātimids. 99 From the foregoing, it can be concluded that the allegiance of the Medinan sharifs to the Fātimids depended, for most of the time, upon the money and gifts which were offered to them, and occasionally upon military force. 100

Doctrinal closeness did not enter into this relationship, the evidence being that it was not durable and relied upon what the Fātimids offered in the way of money. It seems strange that the Fātimids did not attempt to exploit the affinity between their lineage and doctrine in order to achieve their political aims; but material inducement proved to be both swift and effective. It is clear that the reason which prompted the sharifs to announce their subordination to the Fātimids so quickly was the weakness of Medina, its lack of economic
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and human resources and its ongoing need for external assistance in order to repel the enemies who attacked it. Therefore, some are mistaken in thinking that the factor of the affinity of lineage and doctrine of the Ismāʿīlī Fāṭimids and the Twelver emirs of Medina played a role in both sides agreeing on how to achieve their common interests. It is surprising that the adherents of Ismāʿīlism, whether Fāṭimids or not, did not attempt to propagate their doctrine in Medina, but it is clear that they did not, since there is no evidence to suggest that any of the city's sharifs or inhabitants converted to Ismāʿīlism, or that any Shīʿa Ismāʿīlis migrated or became mujāwirūn there. This indicates that the Ismāʿīlis made no efforts to propagate their doctrine in the city.

4.6. Comparison between Shīʿism in Mecca and Medina

It is reported that most of the Zaydi imaams were descendants of al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, and that was because they saw in the Zaydi doctrine accommodation for themselves and for their activity in ʿilm and Imāma. Since one of the prerequisites for the office of imām among the Zaydis was that the Imām be a descendant of Fāṭima, and because the emirs of Mecca since the fifth Hijri century were descendants of al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī, they therefore followed the Zaydi doctrine. The Twelver Imāms, on the other hand, are descended from al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, like the emirs of Medina, who were of the lineage of al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī.

Ibn Jubayr mentions that, during his travels in 579/1183, the Holy Mosque in Mecca had four Sunni imaams and a fifth imām for the Zaydi Shīʿa order, and that the sharifs of Mecca were of their doctrine. Al-Fāṣi reports that the most renowned of those who took over the judiciary in Mecca throughout the sixth century was the al-Ṭabarî family, who were Shāfīʿi Sunnis, among whom were Abū Ishāq al-Ṭabarî (d. 523/1128), Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Shaybānī al-Ṭabarî (d. 545/1150), his brother Abū al-Qāsim (d. 554/1158) and Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ṭabarî (d. 605/1208).
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According to Ibn Jubayr, the Friday sermon in the Holy Mosque in Mecca was conducted by the Shafi'i khatib. He also mentions that the main body of people in Mecca followed the Shafi'i school. As for Medina, the emirs, khatibs, qadis, imams and reciters were Shi'a. The question here is, what caused the spread of Shi'ism in Medina during the Ayyubid period, and specifically amongst those who held key positions, such as the emirs, qadis, imams, reciters and khatibs, whereas there was no such spread in Mecca in spite of many of the city's emirs being Shi'a?

Possible answers to this question include the following:

1) Mecca held greater importance for the caliphs and sultans than Medina, because Muslims performed the hajj there and whoever was in control of the city was the legal guardian of the Muslims.

2) Medina housed the graves of many members of the Prophet's Ahl al-Bayt, and the Twelver-Imami Shi'a attached great importance to visiting the graves of the Ahl al-Bayt and weeping and praying beside them. Therefore, it was natural that they should visit Medina, which may have led to some of them migrating to the city and establishing themselves there.

3) The Shi'a were wary of propagating their da'wa in Mecca due to the abundance of incomers to the city, particularly the hajj caravans coming from Iraq, Syria and Egypt, because the caliphs and sultans would send people to represent them in leading the hajj caravans to Mecca, and guards would ride out with these caravans to protect them from danger. These caravans naturally brought news of Mecca to the caliphs and sultans. Therefore, if any doctrinal change befell the key positions in the city, it would be apparent and they would inform the 'Abbâsids and Ayyûbids, who assuredly would not accept this. These caravans, however, seldom visited Medina, and, if they did, they would not stay for long. Thus, Medina was more secure for the Shi'a da'wa.

4) Medina was closer than Mecca to the cities of Iraq, which made it easy for the Imami Shi'a dâ'is to go there.

5) The Qâshânis migrated from Iraq to Medina, and this family was renowned for its missionary activity on behalf of the Twelver doctrine.

---
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6) The Medinan emirs (Twelver Shi'a) had good relations with the Abbasid caliphs and the Ayyubid sultans.

7) The emirs supported and assisted the Shi'a dā'īs, which led to the freedom of movement for the dā'īs.

8) Because the emirs of Medina were Twelvers and were in charge of appointing qādis and khaṭibs, it was only natural that they should appoint Twelver Shi'a individuals to these key positions.

4.7. The end of Shi'a authority and power in Medina

According to al-Sakhāwi:

In 750/1349, the Emir Sa'ad b. Thābit b. Jammāz prohibited the Sinān family from giving rulings and making marriage contracts, and restored all of these matters to the Sunnis, fawn to the Mamlük sultans, with the Sunnis victorious and innovation extinguished. He ordered, in a public announcement at Medina, that none save the Qādi Shams al-Din b. al-Sab' could give judgement. And, as of that day, the Shi'a cause in Medina was at an end. ¹⁰

If we were to draw a timeline of the development of Imāmism and its authority in Medina, this line would start in the second half of the sixth hijri century, growing quickly to reach its apex in the early seventh hijri century, when the Imāmis took over the qādiship and the office of khaṭīb in the Prophet's Mosque; this continued until the middle of the seventh hijri century, when this line begins to decline, fluctuating, falling a little at times then gaining slightly at other times, until it reaches the end of the Mamlük era and then stops rising completely during the 'Uthmāni period.¹¹

The decline of Imāmi authority set in during the last third of the seventh hijri century, and the first point of focus was the position of khaṭīb at the Prophet's Mosque. In 682/1283, the Mamlük Sultan Qalāwūn dispatched Shaykh Sirāj al-Din 'Umar b. Aḥmad from Egypt with a decree entrusting him with the khaṭibship in the Prophet's Mosque, and he took over from the Sinān family, with whom remained the offices of imām and qāḍi. Shaykh Sirāj al-Din encountered harassment from some of the Imāmis and was not secure in the position. The Sultan learnt of the ill-treatment that he had received, and as a result began sending with the pilgrims a person to act as khaṭīb and imām to the Sunnis for half of the

¹⁰ al-Sakhāwi, al-Tuhfa, 2/125.
year, and then another person would come for the other half of the year. It was only with difficulty that all of those who came were able to stay for half the year, due to the power wielded by the Imāmi sharifs and others against them.112 During the first decade of the eighth century, that is to say, about twenty years after the khaṭībship was removed from the Imāmis, the second step took place, and this was the bringing to an end of the Imāmis' exclusive possession of the qāḍīship and the appointing of a qāḍī for the Sunnis. This step occurred at the request of the mujāwirūn (the Prophet's Mosque's neighbors), who had grown larger in number and who asked the Mamlūk Sultan al-Nāṣir Muhammad b. Qalāwūn if there could be a qāḍī for the Sunnis to give rulings according to their doctrine. Qāḍī Sirāj al-Dīn was appointed, and he received the robe of honour and a thousand dirhams.113 Shaykh Sirāj al-Dīn had been familiar with the situation in Medina when he had been khaṭīb there, so realised that he would encounter problems from some of the Imāmis for having taken over a large part of their authority and source of livelihood. The Imāmis' judges had been receiving their fees, or a portion thereof, from the disputant parties, and the migration of the Sunni disputants - of whom there were many - to another judge would affect their income. Therefore, Sirāj al-Dīn knew that, if he did not arrange sufficient protection, he would expose himself to harm, and that he had to conduct himself shrewdly and wisely. He requested that Emir Mansūr b. Jammāz should attend the inauguration ceremonies, saying 'I cannot assume office until Emir Mansūr is present'. Once the Emir was in attendance, Sirāj said to him: 'I have been given the Sultan's decree to assume the qāḍīship of the Sunnis, and I will not accept it until you are my patron, for, if you are not with me, my task will not be accomplished and my judgement will not be executed'. The Emir told him 'I assent and approve: adjudicate, but change nothing from our judgements or our judges'.114 The situation continued in that fashion for a period of time, with the Sunni qāḍī giving judgement over the Mujāwirūn and the Sunnis and the Sinān family adjudicating for the Shi'a. If a dispute occurred between a Sunni and a Shi'a, then it was the Shi'a qāḍī who adjudicated between them.115
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In spite of the Emir's protection, Sirāj al-Din encountered problems from certain extremists and fanatics from among the Imāmi Shī‘a, some of whom would pelt him with stones while he delivered the sermon from the minbar, close their door against him or sully it with dirt, but he bore this patiently and offered it up to Allāh.

In addition to that Qāḍī Sirāj al-Din was able to withstand those problems with his good conduct and maintaining of contracts with the Imāmis and with their qāḍīs and shaykhs in particular, and he did not assert precedence over them, despite being appointed by Sultani decree. He would avail himself of their officers (āwān; sing. ‘awn) and would rely, for the execution of judgements, on their men and on the prison which they controlled. The relationship between them developed to the extent that he married the daughter of their leader and faqih, al-Qāshāni, and the ill-treatment of him ceased.116

Sirāj remained in his offices (khatib and qāḍī) until 726/1326. The period in which he held office as khatib and qāḍī was a well-managed transitional period which prevented complications arising out of the transfer of the khaṭibship and qāḍiship from the Shī‘a to the Sunnis. Relations between Imāmis and Sunnis in the courts also improved. After his death, his posts were divided up: his successor as qāḍī was Ya‘qūb b. Jamāl al-Qurashi al-Hāshimi, and, as khatib and imām to the Sunni inhabitants, his successor was al-Bahā‘ b. Salāmā al-Maṣrī. After two years, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Amyūṭi took over, a strong and energetic personality, who opposed the innovations that had occurred under the Fāṭimids and which had continued until the Mamlūk period, such as the mid-month night celebration in Sha‘bān.117 He tried to unite the Muslims in Medina, regardless of their doctrine. The Imāmis performed their Eid prayer separately, at a place near the Sunni Eid praying ground, in which lay the ‘Aḥī b. Abī Ṭālib Mosque. In 736/1336, al-Amyūṭi united the prayer in a single location, and banned the Shī‘a from the Friday noon prayer. When he saw a man performing the four-prayer worship on Friday, he came down from the minbar and struck him, in his eagerness to bring unity to all Muslims.118 He was helped in this by Emir Wuddi b. Jammāz’s tenure of the emirate:119 Ibn Ḥajar described him as ‘an
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upholder and promoter of the Sunna, and a repudiator and expeller of the Rafidites'.
This explains the tilting of the scales in favour of the Sunnis during his tenure as emir.
However, al-Amyuti and Emir Wuddi were unable to eliminate the Imāmis' own judiciary,
and their qāḍīs continued to give judgements on the cases which were brought before
them. After al-Amyuti, the offices of qāḍī, khatīb and imām were taken over by ʿAbd al-
Raḥmān b. ʿAbd al-Muʿmin al-Huwarinī, and he continued the policy of his predecessor in
prohibiting innovation, and combating separatist manifestations peculiar to the Imāmis,
particularly temporary marriages and the vilification of the Companions.
His deputy, ʿAbdullāh b. Farḥūn, was extremely skilled at winning people over, and they
turned away from the Imāmi qāḍīs, so that their income from judicial work ceased, virtually
or completely. Their control over the courts became weakened from that time, and their
influence and power began to wane. After al-Huwarinī, al-Badr b. Aḥmad al-Qaysī took
over and followed the policy of his predecessor, but Tūfayl b. Manṣūr blunted his zeal and
prohibited him from interfering with the sharifs. In the year 750/1349, Saʿād b. Ṭabībit
b. Jammāz assumed control of the Emirate of Medina, with Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b.
al-Sabīc taking over as qāḍī, and matters were finally laid to rest: the Imāmi qāḍīship was
abolished and the office of qāḍī was restricted to Sunnis who were appointed by the
Sultan. Al-Sakhāwī says of Saʿād's tenure as Emir:

He began by preventing the Sinān family and their like from interfering with
judgements, marriage contracts, and other things. Everything reverted to the Sunnis,
coming closer to sentiment in the Sultanate for the upholding of the Sunna and the
extinguishing of innovation. He ordered in a public announcement in Medina on 18th
Dhu al-Ḥijja in 750/1350 that none save the qāḍī Shams al-Dīn b. al-Sabīc could give
judgement, and whosoever resisted that would only have himself to blame. And as of
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that day, the Shi'a cause in Medina was at an end, and their power over the offices of qādī, kharīb and imām was no more.124
After this, the Imāmis continued as a group within the population of Medina, amongst whom were the Ḥusaynī sharifs and those who inherited Imāmism from their forefathers from the time of the al-Qāshāni family's missionary activity, and they were joined by Mujāwirūn from the Iraqi and Persian Shi'a, and others.

4.8. Conclusion
This chapter has considered the topic of Shi'ism in Medina: Discusses the events and at what time the Shi'a doctrine spread in Medina and established a foundation, and how large it was; to which of the Shi'a sects the Medinan Shi'a belonged; whether it was true that most of the city's inhabitants converted from Sunnism to Shi'ism, or whether the Shi'a of Medina were incomers; how this subject has been handled in the historical writings; and, lastly, why those who came later were reticent about discussing this issue.
In order to consider these matters it was necessary to divide this chapter into three sections:
Firstly: a discussion and analysis of the reports by the 'ulamā' and historians about the emergence of a Shi'a sect in Medina and its spread therein, identifying how true these reports are and responding to them with what there is in the way of rational evidence and what can be provided by the existing accounts and other writings.
The reasons behind the failure of many of the historical sources to give useful and complete information about this issue (namely, the spread of the Shi'a in Medina and the transition of power to them) were discussed, as were questions such as how, when and why did this occur? and how did it come to an end?
Secondly: an explanation of the historical background to the Shi'a in Medina prior to the Ayyūbid period, in which the reports by the 'ulamā' and historians about the history of the Shi'a in the city were discussed, from the start of their emergence in Islam up to what preceded the Ayyūbid period.
Thirdly: a discussion of the history of the Shi'a in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, which entailed study and analysis of the reasons for the spread of the Twelver Shi'a
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doctrine in Medina: how they came to assume authority and control in the city in Ayyūbid times; the length of time the Imāmis spent spreading their doctrine in Medina; a study of the relationship between the Medinan Twelver Shi'a and other Shi'a groups, a comparison of Shi'ism in Medina with that in Mecca; and, lastly, how their control there was extinguished and their power came to an end.

The key conclusions of this chapter are:

- The transition of power and influence from Medina's Sunnis to the Shi'a Imāmis was one of the most significant occurrences in the city during the Ayyūbid period; it is astonishing to the scholar of Medinan history in the Ayyūbid era that the emirate, judiciary and offices of imām and khaṭīb at the Prophet's Mosque all came into the hands of the Shi'a.

- Despite the significance of the transition of power to the Shi'a occurring in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, one notices that most writings about the history of Medina neglect to discuss this subject. If one does find an account or two in one of the sources, one finds inadequate information on what is reported, neither backing up what it says with evidence, nor mentioning the source of the information.

- Shi'ism as a doctrine did not exist in the time of the Prophet.

- Although some of the historical sources differ in determining at what time Shi'ism emerged in Medina, However, Shi'ism did not emerge at any time in the first five Centuries, according to the information appearing in the available sources used in the Chapter. Indeed, the 'amal of Medinan people was authoritative for others, and they held fast to Sunnism and belonged to the school of Imām Mālik b. Anas.

- The Fāṭimids were unable to propagate their doctrine in Medina throughout the period of its nominal allegiance to them.

- Among the most significant historical accounts concerning Medina in the Ayyūbid period are those which report that many of the city's inhabitants converted from Sunnism to Imāmī Shi'ism due to their need for money; but, having studied these accounts and consulted other historical writings in order to ascertain the truth of such reports, it became noticeable that, in some of them,
there is much exaggeration and that they are not supported by evidence which establishes their truth.

- It is impossible for anyone to pass judgement on the population of a large region, such as the Hijāz, from a brief visit or from information passed on to them by others.

- One can conclude that the emergence of Shi'ism in Medina occurred in stages, the first of which was the appearance of certain Shi'i sharifs in Madina. However, they did not propagate the Shi'a doctrine in the city, either because they were engrossed in competing with one another for the emirate, or because they were moderate Shi'a who preferred to keep good relations with the Sunnis, or because they feared that the caliphs and sultans would punish them for this. The second phase was the arrival in the city of certain Imāmi Shi'a dā'is seeking to propagate their doctrine and carry out missionary activity, among whom were the Qāshāni family; and the third phase was their acquisition of the offices of qādi, imām and khatib.

- Amongst the most important reasons for the transfer of power and influence to the Imāmis in Medina was Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's preoccupation with the jihad against the Crusaders, as well as the Emir of Medina, Abū Falīta al-Qāsim b. al-Muhanna, who was Imāmi, accompanying Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn on his campaigns, and also the fact that there was no one venturing to speak out about Shi'ism at that time.

- Among the factors that assisted Imāmi Shi'ism in Medina and led to its consolidation was the fact that the sons of Abū Falīta al-Qāsim b. al-Muhanna, who were Imāmis, were in charge of the emirate; and the Ayyūbid state, to which Medina was nominally subordinate, was preoccupied with the intermittent struggles between Saladin's offspring, which ended in power passing to the Mamlūks in the year 648.

- In a short space of time, the Shi'a were able to gain control over the key positions in Medina, which gave them considerable influence over all areas of life in the city - as will be discussed later.

- Although the Shi'a controlled the key political and religious positions in Medina, it can be said that they did not propagate their doctrine amongst the
city's inhabitants, the evidence for this being that not one of the historian sources used in this study has reported them as having madrasas for teaching their doctrine, nor mentioned the names of any of their 'ulamā', sheikhs or dā'is.

- No one can deny the Shi'a presence in Medina during the Ayyūbid period; however, it is noticeable that some have exaggerated their portrayal of it, without talking about Shi'a-related events or mentioning the name of a single inhabitant who converted from the Sunnī doctrine to that of the Shi'a.

- Many historians are reticent about discussing the city's Shi'a population. Some of those who say that most of the inhabitants of Medina were Shi'a fail to mention Shi'a-related events or the names of prominent Shi'a inhabitants, nor do they provide a picture of their daily lives.

- There are only a very few sunni accounts of the history of Medina during this period which actually talk about the Imāmi Shi'a; most of these are to be found in Ibn Farḥūn's book. Unfortunately, for the most part, any discussion of individuals or families is along general lines; for example, when Ibn Farḥūn mentions a subject which relates to them, he says: 'amongst such innovations which Imāmis have brought about in Medina', 'what happened to Sheikh Ya'qub with one of the prominent Imāmis', 'the place in which the Imāmis pray', etc., without specifying the names of those to whom he is referring (for more details see section 4.1).

- Control and influence in Medina remained in the hands of the Shi'a for around 150 years, from about 600 to 754 A.H., the date when Imāmi authority was brought to an end.

Following on from the foregoing discussion and analysis of the issue of the Shi'a's emergence in Medina, and the study of accounts and narratives concerning this subject, the next chapters will provide further evidence which reveals the reality of the Shi'a presence in Medina and their influence on various facets of life therein.
Chapter Five

The political life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the influence of the Shi'a upon it

Having studied in the previous chapter the history of the Shi'a in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and how they came to assume authority and control in the city, this chapter will examine and analyse political life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the influence of the Shi'a upon it.

The prevailing sectarian divisions in Medina as well as the emergence of the Imāmate Shi'a faction had an effect on some of the political developments in the city. This influence was augmented by the fact that the emirs and rulers belonged to this faction, so it was only natural that political events would be influenced by these Shi'a emirs, and their doctrine might have been a factor in their relationships with others.

This chapter will, therefore, discuss political life in Medina during the Ayyūbid era and the influence of the Shi'a there. This will be done through a survey of the names and reigns of the successive emirs of Medina and the relations between them. A close analysis will also be made of the relations between these emirs on the one hand and the various tribes around Medina, the emirs of Mecca, the sultans of the Ayyūbid state and finally the sultans of the Rasūlid state in Yemen.

5.1. Emirs of Medina in the Ayyūbid period (569-648/1174-1250)

It is clear that determining the names and reigns of the emirs of Medina during the Ayyūbid era and the preceding period is an extremely difficult undertaking. This is because no accurate records about the history of Medina and the names and periods of rule of its emirs were preserved in the history books.

The obvious absence of any comprehensive, authoritative and reliable references to the history of Medina, coupled with an abundance of published material on the subject which lacked rigorous knowledge about Medina and the complex concepts, terminology and context of the textual material they had to deal with, have resulted in the present state of confusion and the numerous contradictions in modern historical accounts.
Examples of such confusion are words with different meanings, like 'emir', which has sometimes been used for leaders of pilgrimage caravans. However, writers like 'Ārif 'Abd al-Ghani mistook some of these caravan leaders (emirs) for emirs of Medina or Mecca. Even contradictions regarding key dates (as will be discussed later) were not uncommon. For instance, al-Sakhāwī puts the start of the rule of Ṭāhir b. Muslim as 366/976; Ibn Khaldūn asserts that it was 365/975; whereas al-Fāsi insists that Ṭāhir declared that Medina was an independent Emirate by 360/970. Some mention certain individuals as emirs of Medina, yet others identify them as deputy emirs. Quite often, the same confusion and contradiction is observed in the sequence of the succession of various emirs and the length of their reigns.

The present chapter will, therefore, attempt to ascertain the names and order of succession of these emirs through a sensible approximation and comparison between the available textual materials. It might be reasonable to consider initially the era before that of the Ayyūbids in Medina to help understand the process of their succession. It might even help in resolving some of the historical confusions and contradictions.

At any rate, to understand the complicated web of political relations in Medina during the period of Ayyūbid rule (both internal and external), a historic review of the situation of Medina prior to that period should be illuminating. To that end, therefore, a brief initial consideration will be made of the Bani Muhannā Dynasty, which ruled Medina from the fourth hijri century throughout the Ayyūbid era.

5.1.1. Emirs of Medina Prior to the Ayyūbids
The descendants of ‘Ali b. Abī Taib always felt that they were more worthy of the succession to the Prophet Muḥammad (PBUH) than others. Their cousins, the ‘Abbāsids, supported them in that claim until the end of the Umayyad dynasty. That support eventually disappeared and turned into enmity when the ‘Abbāsids claimed that Abī

---

1 See ‘Ārif ‘Abd al-Ghani, Limarā’ al-Madina pp.252, 257 and 258.
2 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, 2/257.
3 Ibn Khaldūn, 4/233.
4 al-Fāsi, Shī‘a il-Gharām, 2/190.
5 The conference held in 125/743 at al-Abī‘ (which is a place near Medina), between the descendants of ‘Ali and the descendants of al-'Abbās testifies to that support. The two parties nominated Muḥammad b. ‘Abdullāh b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abī b. Abī Taib, nick-named ‘al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah', to be leader of the Ḥashimites and successor (Caliph) over all Islam after the Umayyads had been removed. See al-Balādhuri, Ansāb al Ashrāf, 3/87; Masan lbrihih Masan, 1/334; al-Mudayris, p.19; ‘Abdullāh al-Musnad, al-'Alawiyyn fi al-Hijāz, p.70.
Hashim °Abdullāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Ali b. Abi Ṭālib had relinquished his claim to the succession in favour of the ‘Abbāsids. The ‘Abbāsids became the main opponents of the Umayyads, eventually removing them and establishing their own dynastic rule. ‘Ali’s descendants thus felt that their right to the succession had been usurped by their own cousins. This moved them to lead a number of revolts in the various provinces of the realm. One such revolt was in Ḥijāz, which resulted in the establishment of Ḥusaynī dynastic rule in Medina.

During the 4th hijri century, the government of Medina alternated between the households of al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali and Jaʿfar b. Abi Ṭālib. This alternation continued until the Ḥusaynis banished the Jaʿfaris to southern Egypt, at a time when the emir of Medina was the Shiʿī Ṣubayd Allāh b. Ṭāhir b. Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn b. Jaʿfar b. ‘Abdullāh b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali b. Abi Ṭālib. However, there is little, if any, certain information about Ṣubayd Allāh on his date of succession or how he became the emir of Medina until his death in 329/940. The accession of Ṣubayd Allāh is considered the start of the rule of the Ḥusaynis over Medina, which continued for Centuries. He was succeeded by his sons al-Qāsim and Muslim.7

Ṭāhir b. Muslim (366–381/976–991)8

8 Such emirs included Muhammad and ‘Ali, sons of al-Ḥusayn b. Jaʿfar, who spilt the blood of their opponents, confiscated property and paid devoted allegiance to the household of Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālib. Medina remained without Friday prayer congregations or even daily public prayer. See Ibn Khālūd, 4/251.
9 About Emir Muslim’s rule see Ibn ‘Adhārī, al-Bayān al-Mughrib fi Akhbār al-Andalus wa al-Maghrib, 1/221, who states that Muslim mentioned the name of Caliph al-Muʿīzz in the khutba as early as 358/969. See Richard Mortel, The Origins and Early History of the Ḥusaynid Amirate of Medina to the End of the Ayyūbid Period, p.64.
Tahir b. Muslim b. ‘Ubayd Allāh came from Egypt to Medina and was welcomed by his cousins, who installed him as Emir over them. It is not clear who was the Emir before him in Medina and whether the accession was by consent or force. Yet, the very fact of the establishment of the Ḥusaynis in Medina is strongly correlated to the political power of the Fātimid state in Egypt. It is interesting to consider the nature of the relationship between these two entities. With the rise of the Fātimids in Egypt, the Ḥāshimis - particularly the Ḥusaynis - aspired to take over power in Medina, no doubt hoping to benefit from Fātimid support. It seems possible that it was indeed the Fātimids who had encouraged and supported Tahir to take the Emirate of Medina during a period of turmoil and instability. Being aware of the effective Fātimid support for Tahir, the Ḥusaynis easily accepted him as an ideal solution to their own internal strife and to bolster up their efforts to confront their enemies. Thus, the ruling of the Ashraf, the descendants of the Prophet, started with Tahir b. Muslim al-Ḥusayni and his heirs, whom subsequently came to be known as the Bani Muhanna family. The whole family adhered to the doctrine of the twelve Imams. It is perfectly possible that the Fātimids gave Tahir their full support in order to bring Medina under their jurisdiction.

al-Ḥasan b. Tahir (381-390/991-1000)

On the death of Tahir in 381/991, his son al-Ḥasan succeeded him. Al-Qalqashandi was alone in reporting the succession of al-Ḥasan after his father. His rule over Medina continued up to 390/1000, when he was ousted by al-Ḥasan b. Ja’far, the emir of Mecca. A sign of the Twelvers Shi’a influence on Medina during the reign of al-Ḥasan b. Tahir can

---

11 See al-Qalqashandi, Šubh al-‘Ashâ, 4/298; Ibn ‘Inabah, ‘Umdat al-Ṭālib, p.414; Mortel, The Origins and Early History of the Ḥusaynid Amirâte, pp.64-65. It is not known why and how Tahir b. Muslim and his father came to live in Egypt. See Ibn Khaldün, 4/233, for the story of his leaving Egypt and his assumption of the emirate in Medina. ‘Arif ‘Abd al-Ghani gives a different account of these events without citing the references he used, pp.225-226.


be found in al-Maqrizi who reports that a man was flogged and disgraced in Medina simply because the book of Mālik b. Anas (al-Muwatta') was found in his possession.\footnote{al-Maqrizi, Ittiāz al-Hunafā, 1/237.}

Due to an ideological dispute between al-Ḥasan b. Ṭāhir and the Iṣmā'īlī Fāṭimids, he refused to mention them in prayers and refused to swear allegiance to them. This led the Fāṭimids to encourage the emir of Mecca to conquer Medina and remove its emir. It appears that al-Ḥasan b. Ṭāhir was a staunch Shi'ī, who opposed not only the Sunnis, but also other Shi'a factions, like the Iṣmā'īlī Fāṭimids, who did not believe in the Twelver Imamate doctrine. He paid for his extreme ideology by losing his power and being banished from Medina.\footnote{Ibn 'Inabah, pp.235-236; al-Maqrizi, Ittiāz al-Hunafā, 1/237; Ārif ‘Abd al-Ghani, Umarā’ al-Madīna, pp.228-229.}

\begin{center}
\end{center}

In the year 390, Abū al-Futūḥ al-Ḥasan b. Ja'far, the emir of Mecca, invaded and occupied Medina at the command of al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh al-Fāṭimī, who wished to spread the Shi'a ideology to Medina, even forcibly, and temporarily deposed the household of Muhanna (the descendants of al-Ḥusayn). However, when he attempted to remove the body of the Prophet from Medina to Egypt on the orders of al-Ḥākim, the people revolted against Abū al-Futūḥ and almost killed him. \footnote{His reign did not last long, as his son Ḥānī succeeded him in the same year. For his biography see al-Azwargāni, p.60; Ibn ‘Inabah, pp.112, 174, 335; Ibn Khaldūn 4/233-216; al-Rashidi, pp.110-112; Zambawer, Muḥjam al-Uṣūrāt al-İlämīyya al-Ḥākim, p.31; Ibn Ḥāzim al-Andalusī, Jamharat Ansāb al-ʿArab, p.47; ʿAḥmad al-Ḥusaynī, p.112; Ārif ‘Abd al-Ghani, Umarā’ al-Madīna, p.232; and Tārikh Umarā’ Makka, p.421.} A storm simultaneously hit Medina and threatened to blow away the buildings. Abū al-Futūḥ became scared and retreated to Mecca.\footnote{al-Fāsi, 4/77; ‘Umar b. Fahad, 2/437; al-Rashidi, Ḥusn al-Šafā, p.110; Ārif ‘Abd al-Ghani, Umarā’ al-Madīna, p.231.}

\begin{center}
The descendants of al-Ḥusayn thus returned to rule Medina. Abū ʿAli Dāwūd b. al-Qāsim, the cousin and son-in-law of al-Ḥasan b. Ṭāhir, became emir of Medina by order of al-Ḥākim al-Fāṭimi. He was subsequently put in charge of the two Holy Cities (Mecca and Medina) following the rebellion of Abū al-Futūḥ against the Fāṭimids. He reigned for only for a short period due to his advanced age.

Hānī b. Dāwūd (401/1010)²⁰
He took over from his father and reigned for only a short period.

Abū ʿUmārah Ḥamzah al-Muhanna b. Dāwūd (401-408/1010-1017)²¹
He became emir of Medina after his brother. During his reign, famine struck Egypt. Therefore, he switched his allegiance from al-Mustanṣir al-Fāṭimi and praised the ʿAbbāsids in his sermons.

In the following period, neither the names nor the reigns of the emirs were known with any certainty. Some of these include al-Ḥusayn b. Dāwūd 418/1027;²² who was believed by some historians to have ruled after his brother Muhanna. However, little, if any, evidence has been found to support this and no specific dates of his reign have been confirmed, so it remains doubtful whether he succeeded his brother immediately or after the reign of several others.

al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muhanna al-Akbar b. Dāwūd (428-469/1036-1076)²³
He assumed the emirate of Medina after his uncle al-Ḥusayn b. Dāwūd. Al-Sakhāwī states that he was the first emir from the Ashrāf in Medina.²⁴

²⁰ Ibn Taghribardī was the only one to assert that Hānī ruled before his brother Muhanna; yet he did not specify the length of his reign see Ibn Taghribardī, al-Manḥal al-Ṣāfī, 4/189; for his biography see al-Azwarqānī, p.60; Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī, p.112; ʿĀrif ʿAbd al-Ghani, Umarāʾ al-Madīna, p.233.
²² al-Azwarqānī, p.61.
²⁴ It is not clear what al-Sakhāwī meant by this; see al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfā, 1/93. I think that, during the reign of this emir (al-Ḥusayn b. Muhanna), it had become acceptable to call the dynasty that descended from the Prophet and that ruled Medina by the name ʿAshrāf in order to distinguish
Shukr b. Abi al-Futuh\textsuperscript{25}

He succeeded his father in Mecca. He waged war against Medina and conquered it, then ruled the two Holy Cities until his death in 453/1061.\textsuperscript{26}

Däwüd b. al-Hasan b. Däwüd b. al-Qäsim\textsuperscript{27}

His year of accession is not known, nor how he came to be emir. This shrouds his reign in doubt. It is possible, though, that he fought against and conquered his cousin. His rule must have been only brief, because it is known that his cousin al-İlusayn b. Muhanna remained as emir until emir Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad (Mukhayat) ousted him in 469/1079.\textsuperscript{28}

Over that whole period, it was common for cousin to remove cousin and brother to fight brother over the title of emir.

Muḥammad b. Ja'far (454-487/1062-1094)\textsuperscript{29}

This emir ruled Medina in 465/1072. He deployed an army composed mainly of Turks and invaded Medina, ousting the descendants of al-İlusayn and ruling in their place. However, no credible evidence exists regarding how long he reigned.\textsuperscript{30}


He ruled as emir of Medina in 469/1079 for seven months. He was resident in Egypt, where he was nick-named (Mukhayat) or stitcher, as he used to suture people's wounds.\textsuperscript{31}


\textsuperscript{26}al-Sakhāwi, al-Tuhfa, 2/222; Mortel, 'The Origins and Early History of the Ḥusaynid Amirate', in: Studia Islamica, p.68.

\textsuperscript{27}‘Arif ‘Abd al-Ghani, Umarā‘ al-Madina, p.240.


It has been reported in 'al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah' that he conquered emir Ḥusayn b. Muhanna and banished him from Medina, returning it to the political control of al-Mustaṣir.\textsuperscript{32}

Mālik b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muhanna b. Dāwūd (otherwise known as Shihāb al-Dīn) (470/1080)\textsuperscript{33}

He began his reign over Medina after 469/1079. Only Ibn ‘Inabah mentions Mālik’s assumption of authority, and without giving exact dates or independent references to support his assertion.\textsuperscript{34} It seems more likely that he repossessed the throne of Medina after the demise of al-Ḥusayn b. ʿĀdhmad and declared himself emir.

Muhanna b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muhanna b. Dāwūd (up to 495/1102)\textsuperscript{35}

Again, Ibn ‘Inabah is the only historian to mention the reign of this emir over Medina, without giving any dates.\textsuperscript{36} It seems probable that Muhanna and his brother Mālik held alternate rule over Medina up to 495/1102. The order in which they ruled is not certain but it seems more likely that Muhanna was the last to rule, as it was his descendants who reigned afterwards.

Mansūr (or Manzūr) b. ʿUmārah (495/1102)\textsuperscript{37}

Historical accounts disagree about his assumption of the rule of Medina and his death. It is quite possible that he either took over after the death of Muhanna b. al-Ḥusayn or even during his lifetime, as it was common for cousins to take over from one another while both were still alive. This may mean that he ruled before 495/1102, as he died in that year. This is the opinion of Ibn al-Athīr,\textsuperscript{38} who relates a story that demonstrates the resentment of this


\textsuperscript{33} Ārif ‘Abd al-Ghani, Umarā’ al-Madina, p.240.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibn ‘Inabah, p.335.


\textsuperscript{36} Ibn ‘Inabah, p.335.


\textsuperscript{38} Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, 10/352; Ibn Khaldūn disagreed with this author and states that this emir died in 497/1104, arguing that his name was Mansūr not Manzūr as stated by Ibn al-Athīr. See Ibn
emir towards Shi‘ism. He executed the architect sent from Qumm (Qom) in Iran by Majdd al-Mulk al-Balasāni (killed 492/1099) to erect domes on the tombs of al-Hasan b. ‘Ali and al-‘Abbās, the uncle of the Prophet, as domes were a major symbol of Shi‘ism.

Mansūr was then succeeded by his son, whose name and the duration of his reign the historians fail to mention.40

al-Ḥusayn b. Muhanna al-A‘araj41

Again, it is not known when or how he became emir. However, a historian called Ibn Funduq narrates how another emir, Abū Falīta al-Qāsim b. al-Muhanna, took Medina by force, ousted his brother, al-Ḥusayn, telling him that his time as emir was up, and took charge of Medina42.

5.1.1.1. Comparison between emirs who were supported by the Fāṭimids and those supported by the ‘Abbāsids

It must now be abundantly clear that Medina was important to all Muslims and that they were willing to accept as their legitimate ruler any caliph who demonstrated he was the best protector and custodian of the two shrines in Mecca and Medina. Hence, all of the caliphs were anxious to assume full control over these holy cities in order to gain legitimacy.


39 Majd al-Mulk Abū Faḍl As‘ad b. Muḥammad was first appointed governor and later took complete control of the state of Sultan Barkyāruq. He was a staunch Shi‘a, favouring ‘Ali, but spoke well of the Companions of the Prophet. See Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, 10/290.

40 Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, 10/352; Ibn Khaldūn, 4/234; Ibn Taghrībardī, 4/270; Mortel, ‘The Origins and Early History of the Ḥusaynid Amirate’, in: Studia Islamica, p.68. After that, the names of the emirs of Medina and the periods of their rule are unknown. This is because historiographic references did not cover the whole history of Medina continuously, nor did they have complete lists of the names of the emirs and the duration of their reigns. This is particularly true during the period 495-558/1101-1163. However, Ayyūb Şabrī Pasha produced a list of the names of emirs of Medina in which the chain of names for the Muhanna family is complete and runs as follows:


42 Ibn Funduq, p.533.
for their reign.\textsuperscript{43} The intervention of the Fātimids in Ḥijāz started when conflict erupted between the descendants of al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib and the descendants of Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālib. Caliph al-Muʿizz il-Dīn Allāh al-Fāṭimi took the opportunity to offer to act as arbitrator. He sent envoys to the warring parties with gifts and money. He ingratiated himself with them by reconciling them and paying the blood money for those killed in battle. Later, in 362/972, when al-Muʿizz moved to Egypt, the Ashrāf acknowledged him as imam and caliph for all Muslims.

This they did by mentioning him in their prayers from the pulpits of the two shrines until his death in 365/975.\textsuperscript{44} However, this allegiance shifted away from the Fātimids some time later and was given to the ʿAbbāsids; for instance, during the reign of al-ʿAzīz bi-Allāh al-Fāṭimi, who had to send an expedition to lay siege to Mecca and Medina and restore them to Fāṭimid control.

Also, during the reigns of al-Ḥākim, al-Ẓāhir and al-Mustansīr, Medina yielded to the Fātimids so long as the gifts and money kept coming. Thus, it appears that the relationships and allegiances of the emirs of Medina at the time were offered to the highest bidder.\textsuperscript{45}

\textit{Table 1: The allies of the Fātimids and the ʿAbbāsids among the emirs of Medina}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emirs allied with the ʿAbbāsids</th>
<th>Emirs allied with the Fātimids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥasan b. Ṭāhir (381-390/991-1000)</td>
<td>Ṭāhir b. Muslim (366-381/976-991)\textsuperscript{47}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An indication of his allegiance to the ʿAbbāsids was that, when Abū al-Futūḥ conquered Medina, al-Ḥasan left it for Khurasan, an ʿAbbāsīd outpost under Sultan Maḥmūd b. Sapktakin. He opposed started by allying with the ʿAbbāsids, until 366/976, when the Fāṭimid armies laid siege to Medina until he paid homage to al-ʿAzīz\textsuperscript{48} in the Friday sermon from the pulpit.

\textsuperscript{43} al-ʿAbbādi, p.341.
\textsuperscript{44} al-Maqrīzī, \textit{Itrāẓ al-Ḥunafā}, p.145.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fāṭimid ideology. Also, during the reign of his father he visited Damascus and met with deputy Emir Bakjūr in 373/983.(^{46}) He may have wanted ‘Abbāsid protection, as he was a zealous Shi’a Ithnā ‘Asharī.</th>
<th>Abū ʿUmārah Ḥamzah al-Muhanna (401-408/1010-1017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During his reign, when he learned about famine in Egypt and the financial support stop coming. He switches his allegiance by stopping mentioning the Fāṭimids in his prayer from the pulpit instead he was praising the ‘Abbāsids(^{49}) in his sermons.</td>
<td>He conquered Medina and removed its emir (from the Muhanna dynasty) in compliance with the wishes of the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh (486-511/1093-1117).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He attempted to dig up the tomb of the Prophet and remove his body to Egypt for prestige.(^{50}) He also prevented the pilgrims from entering Medina.(^{51}) He revolted against the Fāṭimids in 401/1010 and claimed the caliphate.(^{52})</td>
<td>Abū al-Futūḥ al-Ḥasan b. Ja'far (390-401/1000-1010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is mentioned in <em>al-Nujūm al-Zāhira</em></td>
<td>Abū ʿAli Dāwūd b. al-Qāsim b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ẓāhir (401/1010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He took charge as emir over Mecca and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{47}\) Mortel reports that Ẓāhir b. Muslim gave his allegiance first to the ‘Abbāsids but had to shift it to the Fāṭimids in 366/976, when Caliph al-ʿAziz sent an army to Medina to secure the Fāṭimids control there. See Mortel, 'The Origins and Early History of the Husaynid Amirate', *in: Studia Islamica*, pp.66-67.


\(^{52}\) See the story in ʿArif ʿAbd al-Ghani, *Umarāʾ* al-Madīna, p.230.

that (Mukhayat) al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad conquered Medina and expelled its emir, al-Ḥusayn b. Abī ‘Umārah, who fled to Malikshah al-Saljūqī, which indicated that he was pro-ʿAbbāsid. (Mukhayat) restored the prayer to the Fāṭimids. Medina on the orders of the Fāṭimid al-Ḥākim when Abū al-Futūḥ withdrew his allegiance from the Fāṭimids.44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He was emir of Mecca. The Seljuq Sultan Alp Arslān (455-465/1063-1073) offered the emir of Medina, Muhanna b. Dāwūd, 20,000 Dinars, plus an extra 5000 every year, to switch allegiance to the ʿAbbāsid Caliph al-Qāʾim bi-Amr Allāh (422-467/1031-1075). But Muhanna refused, so the Seljuq sultan incited Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar to attack Medina and bring it under his rule. He did so with help from the Seljuqs and ʿAbbāsids, and occupied it in 465/1072, mentioning Caliph al-Qāʾim in prayers in both Mecca and Medina.56</td>
<td>He conquered Medina in 469/1076 and restored the prayer to al-Mustanṣār al-Fāṭimi. He also expelled Emir al-Husayn b. Abī ‘Umārah.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manṣūr b. ʿUmārah (495/1102)</th>
<th>Muhanna b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muhanna (after 470/1078)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He opposed all Shiʿa practices in Medina and even killed the architect sent by Majd</td>
<td>During his reign, he mentioning the Fāṭimids in prayer from the pulpit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

55 Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, 10/61.
56 ʿĀrif ʿAbd al-Ghani, Umarāʾ al-Madina, p.238; al-Mudayris, p.60.
5.1.2. Emirs of Medina during the Ayyubid Period

Izz al-Din Abū Falīta al-Qāsim b. Muhanna (558-583/1163-1187)⁵⁹

His name appeared at that time in association with the name of Şalāh al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī, who honoured him for his noble ancestry and kept him by his side during several of his battles.⁶⁰ He would seat him close by on his right and would miss him badly if he failed to visit. He believed that his friend is blessed, and indeed in all the battles Abū Falīta attended Şalāh al-Dīn was victorious, which confirmed the commander's belief in the miraculous powers of this noble descendant of the Prophet.⁶¹ Both Şalāh al-Dīn and the 'Abbāsid caliph loved him for his noble character.

Historians differ on the year of his accession and the year of his death. Ibn Khaldūn and al-Sakhāwī state that he remained in office for 25 years,⁶² and also that Caliph al-Mustaḍī' b. al-Mustanjīd al-Abbāsī (566-575/1170-1179) installed him as emir over Medina.⁶³ He died in the year 583/1187.⁶⁴ According to this reckoning, the period between the assumption of the caliphate by al-Mustaḍī' and the death of al-Qāsim was 17 years rather than 25. What is more probable is that al-Qāsim was emir in 558/1162, which is well before the caliphate of al-Mustaḍī'. Then, when al-Mustaḍī' assumed the caliphate, al-Qāsim either wrote to him or went to see him to congratulate him on his accession, whereupon al-Mustaḍī' confirmed him in his position as emir. He was also on good terms with the 'Abbāsids. Indeed, he was charged by the Iraqi emir of the hajj, on orders from the 'Abbāsid caliph, to be emir of both Mecca and Medina. He took charge of Mecca for just


⁶³ Ibn Khaldūn, 4/235.

three days before asking to be relieved, due not only to the difficulty experienced in ruling the two holy cities, but also to his consins' - the Ḥasanis- conflict over Mecca. Ibn Khaldūn disagreed with al-Sahāwi regarding the genealogy of Abū Falītā and asserts that he was al-Qāsim b. Jammāz b. al-Qāsim b. Muḥanna. However, al-Sahāwi's narration seems to be more commonly accepted and probably nearer the truth, as both al-Fāsi and Ibn Fahad quote him and he wrote a comprehensive history of Medina. However, there is another reference by al-Sahāwi to al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥanna (557-558/1161-1162) in which he described him as brother to al-Qāsim b. Muḥanna and that he preceded al-Qāsim as emir of Medina. Yet, it is unclear when he assumed the emirate.

It is mentioned in another reference, viz. Lubāb al-Ansāb, that al-Qāsim took Medina by force and expelled his brother, al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥanna, from there in the year 558/1162. However, other historical sources state that it was Jammāz (583-612/1187-1215) the elder son of al-Qāsim b. Muḥanna, who succeeded his father, but they do not give any detailed information about his life and death or the end of his rule, except for what Ibn al-Athīr reports: that he travelled in 590/1194 to Syria, which was then under King al-Afḍal b. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. There is, however, no evidence of the relations between the two.

Other sources state that the one who assumed the emirate after al-Qāsim was his son Sālim (583-612/1187-1215). It was he who fought battles with Qatāda, the emir of Mecca. One such battle, named al-Maṣārīf (many deaths) was fought in 601/1204.
He was succeeded by his nephew, al-Qāsim b. Jammāz (612-624/1215-1226), after the death of Sālim in battle against Qatāda. Al-Qāsim succeeded his uncle, Sālim, and carried on the fight against Qatāda with first one then the other being victorious. When finally the war between them was ended by Qatāda’s death in battle, his son succeeded him only to be ousted by the Ayyūbids who put an end to the rule of the Qatāda dynasty. Qāsim feared that he too would be removed by the Ayyūbids and decided to attack them in Mecca, but he was killed in battle and his army fled back to Medina.

He was succeeded by Shīha b. Hāshim (624-647/1229-1249), who fought wars against the rulers of Yemen, the Rasūlids, and occupied Mecca (629-637/1232-1240) by order of the Ayyūbid sultan, who was ruling over Egypt. But soon he left Mecca and returned to Medina on hearing news that caused him concern for the security of Medina and his rule of it.

War erupted between him and his cousin, ʿUmayr b. Qāsim b. Jammāz, over Medina. This ended with the defeat of ʿUmayr and his flight from Medina to Iraq, where he was killed by the Banū Lām in 647/1249. He was succeeded by his son, ʿIsā (647-656/1249-1258), who was opposed by his brothers Munīf (656-657/1258-1259) and Jammāz (657-700/1259-1300). The enmity between them was caused by his father’s preference for ʿIsā over his eight brothers. Reseiving this partiality, the two brothers gathered a force and

75 Al-Sakhawī states that he assumed the emirate after his father. However, ʿUmar b. Fahad and al-Dhahābī were both writing before al-Sakhawī. The drift of later events strongly indicates his accession to the emirate in Medina after his uncle Sālim. See ʿUmar b. Fahd, 3/20; al-Sakhawī, al-Tuhfā, 3/399.
77 For his biography see al-Sakhawī, al-Tuhfā, 3/382; ʿĀrif ʿAbd al-Ghanī, Umarāʾ al-Madīna, p.262.
78 He is Munīf b. Shīḥāb (see above). For his biography see al-Sakhawī, al-Tuhfā, 3/382; Ibn Taghrībīdī, al-Manḥal, 3/193; Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī, al-Mushajjar al-Kāshīf li Auṣūl al-Sādah al-Asḥāfī, p.112; ʿĀrif ʿAbd al-Ghanī, Umarāʾ al-Madīna, p.263.
attacked 'Isā. They ousted him and kept him in prison. Historical accounts differ as to whether it was Munif or Jammāz who succeeded 'Isā. Ibn Khaldūn\textsuperscript{80} maintains that it was Jammāz whereas al-Sakhāwi states that it was Munif.\textsuperscript{82} Al-Sakhāwi may have been confused, as he also states elsewhere in his book that Munif assumed office in 657/1259, the year Munif died.\textsuperscript{83} Ibn Kathīr mentions that Jammāz was emir of Medina in both 659/1261 and 679/1280.\textsuperscript{84} The inference from these accounts must be either that the two brothers participated jointly in ruling Medina until Munif died or they ruled alternately, which sounds more likely. This means that Jammāz assumed the emirate between 649/1251 and 653/1255, passing it to Munif, who ruled from 653/1255 to 657/1259, when he died. Jammāz then took over as emir until 700/1300, when he abdicated in favour of his son \textit{Maṇṣūr (700-726/1300/1326).}\textsuperscript{85}

5.2. Relations with the neighbouring Bedouin tribes

In order to understand the relations between the Medinan people and the neighbouring tribes, and the rule of the Shi'a emirs at that time the following points are considered:

5.2.1. The raids which certain neighbouring tribes made on Medina, and their causes

Medina had no control over its neighbouring tribes; rather, these tribes were entirely independent\textsuperscript{86} and lived by Bedouin tribal law, governed by custom and tradition, and Medina possessed no military force capable of defending itself.\textsuperscript{87} Therefore, certain of these

\textsuperscript{80} Ibn Khaldūn, 4/141; al-Sakhāwi, \textit{al-Tuhfa}, 3/383. Before 'Isā was removed from office a momentous event came to pass. In 648/1250 Ayyūbid rule was brought to an end by the Mamlūks. The last Ayyūbid ruler, Turān Shāh, was killed in Egypt. 'Isā was imprisoned, then released to live as an ordinary citizen for thirty years, dying in 683/1284 during the rule of his brother Jammāz. No evidence exists that he tried to restore his rule. See 'Abd al-Bāṣīṭ Badr, \textit{al-Tārikh al-Shāmil}, 2/221.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibn Khaldūn, 1/414.

\textsuperscript{82} al-Sakhāwi, \textit{al-Tuhfa}, 1/423.


\textsuperscript{85} The evidence for this is that when Medina was under attack, the neighbouring tribes would not lend assistance.

\textsuperscript{86} The evidence for this is that when Medina was under attack, the neighbouring tribes would not lend assistance.

\textsuperscript{87} It is possible that the reason for there not being a military force in Medina was that the emirs feared being overthrown by the army, for, if they formed a force, it would be drawn from the local people, the majority of whom were Sunni. Even when one of the caliphs or sultans sent a military force to Medina to defend it, it would only remain in Medina for a short period and then return, apparently because the emirs were apprehensive about this force staying in Medina due to the
tribes carried out raids, looting and pillaging Medina and the caravans travelling to and from it. It seems that ignorance, poverty, the arid conditions and the harsh lifestyle of the Bedouin initially drove them to this behaviour. However, it was not long before they made this their livelihood, and looting, pillaging, and levies became a legitimate income, as some Fāṭimid caliphs made payments to appease certain tribes dwelling along the pilgrimage route, in return for them not molesting the Egyptian pilgrimage caravans. This aggravated the problem. Other tribes wanted to have a similar arrangement and obtain similar payments, and thus the raids on Medina, Mecca and the pilgrim caravans increased.

It is strange that not one of the caliphs, sultans or emirs thought to find a radical, lasting solution to this problem, such as dispatching du’āt and teachers to these Bedouin tribes, settling them, or transforming their territories into trading stations along the pilgrims' route, so that there would be income for them and they would have no need to indulge in highway robbery. These raids included:

5.2.1.1. The Zūbb tribe’s raid on Medina

Certain tribes neighbouring Medina, with the Banū Zūbb at their forefront, took advantage of the absence of the emir of Medina, Jammāz b. al-Qāsim b. Muhanna, who in 590/1194 had travelled to Syria, which was ruled by Sultan al-Afdal b. Ṣalāh al-Dīn. The reason for that visit is not known, nor is the nature of the relationship between them, but Medina was subordinate to him politically and bound by an allegiance following the death of his father, Ṣalāh al-Dīn. These tribes set out to raid Medina in Jumada II, 590/ May 1194. The news reached Medina, and Emir Ḥāshim b. al-Qāsim, the brother of Jammāz and his deputy in the emirate, gathered what men he had and went out from Medina with them to

doctrinal difference. We can exclude the possibility that it was due to the Medinans' lack of financial resources as it is inconceivable that these tribes would have had greater financial resources than those of Medina, enabling them to form a force capable of attacking it. See ʿAbdūbāṣīt Badr, al-Medīna, p.75; Jamīl Ḥarb, al-Ḥijāz wa al-Yaman fi al-ʿAsr al-Ayyūbī, p.179. See Alice C. Hunsberger, Nasir Khusraw, The Ruby of Badakhshan, pp.179-181.

90 These tribes gained a lucrative income from these payments, which did not require them to do any work, or even any fighting. It was enough for them to threaten or launch a single raid for a stern message to be sent, after which they would receive the payments. This levy became a legitimate right under their Bedouin custom: if the other party was in violation of it, they were permitted to loot and plunder.

91 ʿAbdūlāzīz b. Fahd, 1/355.

92 Jamīl Ḥarb, pp. 79-80.
fight the raiders, hoping to prevent them from besieging Medina and destroying its walls. A bitter battle commenced, during which Hāshim and his men fought heroically; however, the numerical superiority of the raiders led to the death of Hāshim and some of his men. The rest fled for Medina followed by the raiders, who profited from the state of terror which gripped Medina’s inhabitants, and they entered it, looting shops and houses, and staying for a few days before returning to their tribes.93

Emir Jammāz returned and set about restoring the walls and what had been destroyed inside Medina by the raiders, but he did not concern himself with creating a standing military force in Medina to protect it from the greedy ambitions of the raiders.94

5.2.1.2. The participation of the Banū Lām and other tribes in the capture of Medina

The absence of Emir Shiḥa b. Hāshim from Medina, and his preoccupation with fighting the Rasūlidhs over Mecca, sparked the interest of certain Bedouin living in the surrounding area, particularly after they realised that the armed forces were absent. The Bedouin invaded the outskirts of Medina, and looted what they could lay hands on. Other tribes assisted ‘Uma‘īr b. Qāsim b. Jammāz, the nephew of Emir Shiḥa, to attack Medina and to seize the emirate from him, but Emir Shiḥa was able to attack ‘Uma‘īr inside Medina, evicting him and his men from it, and recover his emirate.95

5.2.2. The effect of the Shi‘a on these relations

It can be said that the Shi‘a emirs had no desire to dispatch Sunnī du‘āt to the Sunnī Bedouin, as they had no interest in whether their situation improved or not, being content to protect only themselves and the emirate. Furthermore, the emirs knew that if they sent out Shi‘a du‘āt then they would not be able to prevent their being killed. As for settling them, this too would not be in the interest of the Shi‘a emirs because the Bedouin were not easy to control, especially in view of the doctrinal difference, they are sunnī and that could pose a potential threat to the emirs, as the Bedouin would become a new force within Medina and might think to expel the Shi‘a.

93 Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, 12/111.
It appears also that the Shi'a emirs resisted all outside intervention from the 'Abbāsid caliphs and the Ayyūbid state, which tried to retain a permanent force to protect Medina, because naturally this force would be Sunni, a disturbing prospect for the Shi'a emirs.

5.2.3. Outcomes of the Bedouin raids on Medina
In the year 540/1145, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Āṣfāhānī, the Zangids' wazīr in Mosul, on request from the Sunni inhabitant of Medina following his visit, he sent funds for the building of a wall around Medina, and so a new wall was built on the site of the old one, which was demolished. Thus were Medina's inhabitants protected from Bedouin incursions, for a time, but this was not the case with the pilgrim caravans.96

In 558/1163 Nūr al-Dīn Zangi ordered the building of a second wall around Medina seventeen years after the construction of the previous wall, when people living outside that wall complained of Bedouin aggression against them.97

As a result of the attacks on Medina by the Banū Lām and some of their allies in the time of Emir Shīḥa, Shīḥa was forced to abandon fighting the Rasūlīds and leave Mecca to them.98 He concerned himself with strengthening the wall, improving the installations that had been damaged during the fighting, and punishing the Bedouin who had attacked Medina. He was later killed by the Banū Lām, which he had subjected to heavy reprisals for their attack on Medina and assisting his enemies against him, and so they avenged themselves while he was on his way to Iraq to visit Caliph al-Mustaṣim bi-Allāh, the last of the 'Abbāsid caliphs.99

5.3. Relations between Medina and the Ayyūbid state, and the effect of the Shi'a
It is possible to explain these relations by studying the following:

5.3.1. Medina coming under Ayyūbid rule
Ḥasanīn Rabī' says that after Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn had ended the Fāṭimid caliphate in Egypt in 567/1171, he began to look at extending his influence to Ḥijāz, since it appears that the Muslims regarded him as the Protector of the Holy Cities, and that gave him the opportunity to expand his control over the Islamic World and the Red Sea trade, on

97 al-Samḥūdī, Wafā' al-Wafā', 2/767.
account of the war against the Crusaders. While Sulaymān al-Mālikī says that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was encouraged to accomplish this by the instability in Ḥijāz, and the spreading of unrest and disorder towards the end of the Fāṭimid period, in addition to the weakness of the emirs of Medina and Mecca, who were sometimes on the side of the Sunni ʿAbbāsid caliphate in Baghdad and at other times on that of the Shiʿa Fāṭimid caliphate in Cairo. It has already been said that the emirs of Mecca and Medina declared their allegiance to the caliphate which paid them more. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn set his sights on Yemen, which was renowned for its treasures and plentiful resources, so that he would be able to control the Red Sea trade and secure for him self a kingdom if Nūr al-Dīn Zangī ousted him from Egypt. Therefore Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn sent a military expedition in 569/1173 to Ḥijāz and then to Yemen, led by his brother, Turān Shāh. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s expedition arrived in Ḥijāz, entering Medina and Mecca without fighting, and the emirs of Mecca and Medina declared their allegiance to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. The expedition then headed for Yemen to conquer it and make it a stronghold should the Zangids oust Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn from Egypt. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was content with the mention of his name after that of the ʿAbbāsid caliph in the Friday sermon from the mosques of the two Holy Cities. He confirmed the ʿIlūsaynīs as emirs in Medina, and did not intervene in their internal affairs.

Here two questions arise:

1- Why did the Ayyūbīds confirm the Shiʿa emirs of Medina in their position, and not bring their rule to an end as they did with the Fāṭimids in Egypt?

2- What is the reason for the lack of information about this relationship?

Regarding the first, it can be said that there were several likely causes, among these being that the Shiʿa emirs of Medina were not among the zealots and fanatics of that denomination, or at least they did not outwardly show their championing of the Shiʿa and

---

101 Sulaymān Mālikī, p.40.
103 Ibn al- Athīr, al-Kāmil, 11396; Sulaymān Mālikī, p.40.
104 See Izz al-Dīn al- Abāsānī, Shīfāʾ al-Qulūb, p.186; Ibn Khaldūn, 4134; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk li- Marifat Duwal al-Mulūk, 152. There is another possibility (as ʿAbd al-Bāṣīṣ Bādī asserts) with regard to Medina falling under Ayyūbīd rule, which is that it was under Zangīd control which automatically passed to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn after the death of Nūr al-Dīn Zangī. This runs contrary to what has been stated above. ʿAbd al-Bāṣīṣ Bādī, al-Madīna, p.50.
105 Sulaymān Mālikī, p.41. After Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, emirs of Medina declared their allegiance to the Ayyūbīd sultans who ruled Egypt.
their hatred of the Sunnis; Şalâh al-Dîn’s preoccupation with fighting the Crusaders; the
high status of the Holy Cities in his mind; and the high status of the emir of Medina in
particular. This last was probably the most important factor, due to what has already been
said about the outstanding qualities of Emir al-Qâsim and Şalâh al-Dîn’s liking for him,106
which means that he was not one of the fanatical Shi’as who insulted the Companions of
the Prophet, waged war on the Sunnis, and were hostile towards them on every occasion,
like the Fâţimid Shi’a.

As for the second question, it could be that no significant events occurred in Medina, and
that life in the city was normal and quiet; also, perhaps, most of its emirs did not undertake
any weighty or far-reaching acts, since Ibn Khaldûn states that not one of Medina’s emirs
deserves mention, except for Abû Falîta al-Qâsim b. Muhanna, for his high standing and
good conduct.107 Another possible reason is that certain of Medina’s emirs preferred not to
have a direct relationship with the Ayyûbids because of the doctrinal difference between
them, which might lead to bad relations and result in the forfeiture of sharifian
independence and the bringing of Medina under Ayyûbid authority.

Historians may have been occupied with the major events in Syria and Egypt, and the
confrontation with the Crusaders. The wars of the emirs in these regions could have
distracted them from mentioning the history of Medina during that period, perhaps
because there was less to observe. This seems likely, given the frequency of Emir Abû al-
Qâsim’s journeys and his accompanying of Şalâh al-Dîn on most of his campaigns. If there
had been grave and significant happenings, then it would have been difficult for him to
abandon the affairs of the emirate for long.

5.3.2. The relationship between Şalâh al-Dîn and Emir Abû Falîta

According to Ibn al-Athîr ‘With Şalâh al-Dîn on most of his conquests was Abû Falîta al-
Qâsim b. Muhanna. He is the Emir of Medina and Şalâh al-Dîn was happy to see him and
had good fortune when he was with him. He treated him with honour and consulted him
on everything he did’.108 Ibn Khaldûn describes him as the worthiest of Medina’s emirs
from the Banû al-İhsâyyn, mentioning his revered status.109 He held the position of emir for

107 Ibn Khaldûn, 4/140.
109 Ibn Khaldûn, 4/140.
a long time, and had a good standing with the ‘Abbāsids,\textsuperscript{110} to the extent that the emir of
the Iraqi hajj, whom the ‘Abbāsid caliph had entrusted with solving the problem of the
Meccan emirate, chose al-Qāsim b. Muhanna to be emir over it, together with Medina. He
held it for three days and then declined it, due to the difficulty of being in charge of both
holy cities and there being many disputes over Mecca between his cousins, the Ḥasanīs.\textsuperscript{111}
This relationship had a direct effect on the strengthening of the Imami Shi‘a doctrine in
Medina during that time. Evidence of this lies in what Ibn Farḥūn mentions about the
relationship: Abī Falīta accompanied Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn on his campaigns, and yet no one
ventured to take issue with the Imami or to resist its spread during that time.\textsuperscript{112} This shows
that the emir of Medina was a prudent Imami Shi‘a, who improved relations with Sultan
Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, the ‘Abbāsid caliph and the Sunnis as a whole, as stated previously, and, if
this is true, then one would expect that he would not raise points of dispute with the
Sunnis, or insulting certain Companions of the Prophet or focusing on issues of historical
disagreement. If he had done so, he would not have achieved that high standing.

5.3.3. The Ayyūbids’ abolition of the tax which the Medinan emirs levied on pilgrims and
traders

Medina’s emirs had had the right to impose such taxes as they wished on pilgrims and
traders arriving in the hajj season. This began when the Fātimids made their kinsmen, the
‘Alīds, rulers over Ḥijāz, so that they would offer up prayers in the name of the Fātimid
caliph from the manābir of the two Holy Cities in order to give them the status of
legitimate supremacy over the Islamic world. The Fātimid caliphate pledged to send annual
donations to the two emirates of Mecca and Medina; however, the ‘Abbāsids did not let
this pass unchallenged, and set about competing with the Fātimids for the allegiance of the
Ḥijāzī emirs. What determined this allegiance was the arrival of these donations or their
being suspended. If the donations were suspended by either party, the emirs had the right
to impose taxes as they saw fit on the pilgrims and traders to compensate for the funds
which had been withheld. The imposition of these taxes caused much unrest, and so
Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ordered the emirs of Medina to stop levying them on the pilgrims. He
reimbursed them for the income they lost as a result, and dispatched money and foodstuffs,
promising to send this every year. However, no sooner did material support from the Ayyūbid state fall into arrears than the emirs resumed levying the taxes. Furthermore, whenever the emir of Medina entered into a dispute with one of his adversaries, the first thing he would do, in order to carry out the fortifications and strengthen his army, was to bring back the taxes. Doctrinal differences also played a role in the imposition of these taxes. Šalāḥ al-Din preferred to send food supplies to Medina to be distributed among its inhabitants, for, if he only sent money, it was not certain that the emir would distribute it amongst the Sunni inhabitants, as happened in Mecca. It appears also that one of the reasons for the cessation of the money sent by the Ayyūbid state is the fear that these funds could be used against the Sunnis in Medina.

5.3.4. The Ayyūbids' care of the Prophet's Mosque
Šalāḥ al-Din provided for the Prophet's Mosque, since some of the sources say that he was the first to establish the system of attendants wholly dedicated to its service, who subsequently became known as the Aghāwāt. Abū Shāma records 'He sent a number of carefully selected Mamlūks [slaves] to be attendants at the Prophet's Mosque and created adequate endowments for them. There were around twenty of these attendants'. Ibn Jubayr, who visited Medina in 580/1184, describes them as young Abyssinian men, elegant in appearance and neatly dressed. This is the earliest description of them, and it is not known in which year their work began there. Details about them will appear in the treatment of the social aspect.

Agricultural produce and money were also sent to Medina in the time of al-Malik al-Ādil, Šalāḥ al-Din's brother. He took an interest in the two Holy Cities and was invoked in the prayers offered up from the minbar of the Prophet's Mosque in 601/1204.

---

116 See Abū Shāmah, al-Rawdatayn, 2/3; al-Sakhāwi, al-Tuhfa, 163; 'Abd al-Bāṣīṭ Badr, al-Madīna, p.79.
117 Abū Shāmah, al-Rawdatayn, 2/3.
119 'Abd al-Bāṣīṭ Badr, al-Madīna, p.79.
5.3.5. Intervention in the conflict between Qatāda b. Idrīs, the emir of Mecca, and the Medinan emirs

This happened twice, the first occasion being the manifestation of a kind of alliance and assistance against the emir of Mecca in the time of the Medinan emir Sālim b. Qāsim in 612/1215. The Ayyūbids were on the side of the emir of Medina, and al-Malik ʿIsā b. al-ʿĀdil sent him an army to fight against Qatāda. The campaign was successful in punishing Qatāda and defeating his army, and afterwards good relations existed between Emir Sālim and al-Malik ʿIsā b. al-ʿĀdil.

On the second occasion, the Ayyūbids backed Qatāda against Emir ʿal-Qāsim b. Jammāz, who did not benefit from the former alliance of his uncle with al-Malik ʿIsa. Al-Malik al-Kāmil al-Ayyūbi, the King of Egypt, sided with Qatāda and sent his deputies to guard Yanbū from al-Qāsim b. Jammāz. The emir of Medina did not seek any help from al-Malik ʿIsa, who was in Syria and between whom and al-Malik al-Kāmil there existed a mutual dislike, and so al-Qāsim was defeated at the battle of al-Ḥamīma. It is possible to conclude, therefore, that relations between the emir of Medina and the Ayyūbids were static during that period. There was no allegiance, no alliance and no dispute, as evidenced by the fact that al-Malik al-Kāmil was content to assist Qatāda in protecting Yanbū and did not dispatch a force to help him against al-Qāsim. Details on this will appear in the discussion of the relationship of the Medinan emirs with the emirs of Mecca.

5.3.6. Anger of the emir of Medina, al-Qāsim b. Jammāz

In spite of the good historical relations between the Ayyūbids and the Muhanna family, emirs of Medina since the time of Ṣāliḥ al-Dīn, and despite the great respect which the Ayyūbids were continuing to show the emirs of Medina and the city's inhabitants, one historian mentions that the martial spirit in al-Qāsim b. Jammaz and his delusion regarding his power caused him to take a false step. In 622/1225, that is to say two years after al-Malik Masʿūd al-Ayyūbi, the sultan of Yemen, seized Mecca, al-Qāsim mobilised an
army from the inhabitants of Medina and the surrounding Bedouin, and with it set out for Mecca to wrest it from the grasp of the Ayyūbids. But upon his arrival, a great battle took place in which al-Qāsim b. Jammāz was killed, and his army withdrew to Medina.

But what were the real reasons which drove al-Qāsim to this hopeless or at least unequal battle? Was martial spirit alone enough to make him carry out this attack? Or did he have other reasons?

It is possible that there were other reasons, particularly in view of the fact that al-Qāsim had carried out a raid on Yanbu', taking from its harbour a large quantity of money and weapons brought by Altin Bugha, one of the Ayyūbid military commanders from Egypt. Moreover, there was the doctrinal difference: it is possible that, because al-Qāsim was a Shi'a, he wanted to oust the Sunni Ayyūbids as rulers of Hijāz, or prevent them from advancing to Medina and removing him, such as had happened with the emir of Mecca. He feared that the Ayyūbids wished to end the Shi'a presence in Hijāz. But why did the Ayyūbids not take Medina from its emirs, the Muhanna family, as they had done in Mecca? I think it was because the emirate passed to Emir Shīha, who declared his allegiance to the Ayyūbids immediately upon assuming control.

Table 2: The following is a comparison between the allegiance of the emirs of Medina to the Ayyūbids, and that of the Meccan emirs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegiance of the Medinan emirs to the Ayyūbids</th>
<th>Allegiance of the Meccan emirs to the Ayyūbids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The allegiance of Emir al-Qāsim Abū Falita to</td>
<td>‘Isa b. Falita, the emir of Mecca in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şalāh al-Dīn, his participation in his</td>
<td>569/1173, announced his submission to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expeditions and the invoking of him in the</td>
<td>Şalāh al-Dīn and undertook to mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophet's Mosque during the Friday prayer</td>
<td>him in the prayer after the ‘Abbāsid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alliance of Emir Sālim b. al-Qāsim with</td>
<td>caliph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 Jamil Ḥarb, p.80.
128 Ibn Naẓīf al-Ḥamawī, al-Tārikh al-Maṣfūri, p.116. Yanbu' was storing supplies and weapons for the Ayyūbids, because of its strategic location, far from the Crusaders and close to Egypt.
the Ayyūbids against Qatāda, the emir of Mecca, after which followed good relations between Emir Sālim and al-Malik ʿIsa b. al-ʿAdil

A war occurred between al-Qāsim b. Jammāz and the Ayyūbids, resulting in his death

Following Ayyūbid orders, Shiḥa b. Hashim entered into wars with the emir of Mecca and with the Rasūlīds, at the request of the Ayyūbids

| the Ayyūbids against Qatāda, the emir of Mecca, after which followed good relations between Emir Sālim and al-Malik ʿIsa b. al-ʿAdil | ʿIsa, emir of Mecca, and Sayf al-Islam Ṭaghtakīn, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's brother, due to the taxes which Mukthir imposed on pilgrims

A dispute occurred in 611/1214 between Qatāda b. Idrīs, emir of Mecca and al-Malik ʿIsa b. al-ʿAdil due to Qatāda's poor reception of al-Malik ʿIsa, which led to the Emir of Medina's alliance with and assistance to ʿIsa against Qatāda

Rājīḥ b. Qatāda cooperated with the Rasūlīds, rulers of Yemen, against the Ayyūbids in order to seize Mecca

5.3.7. The defence of Medina against Crusader attacks

It can be said that the most important undertaking of the Ayyūbids was their protection of Medina from Crusader attacks. The Crusaders attempted to attack Medina on more than one occasion, and, in 577/1181, the first attempt was led by the ruler of al-Karak, ʿUrnat. However, this campaign failed disastrously for various reasons, among which was the exposure of his men to the intense heat and their lack of water, which caused them to halt, exhausted, at the oasis of Taymā. Meanwhile, the leader, ʿIzz al-Dīn Farkh Shāh, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's nephew and his deputy in Damascus, had attacked the al-Karak fortress, which forced Reynald to abandon his campaign and return in haste to protect his domains.

There was a second attempt by ʿUrnat in the following year, and he was able to reach an area very close to Medina. However, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ordered his deputy in Egypt, his brother al-Malik al-ʿAdil, to prepare a great fleet with supplies and men and set out to engage the Crusader fleet in the Red Sea on one front, and repel the Crusaders attacking Medina on

---

133 Mention of this has been made in chapter three; it will be discussed briefly here.
134 Or (Reynald of Châtillon), see Lyons and Jackson, Saladin, p.157.
the other. The Ayyūbid army was able to capture the Crusader vessels and took the entire Crusader army captive. Şalāh al-Dīn remained diligent in his efforts to protect Medina from the Crusader threat.¹³⁵

5.3.8. The Ayyūbid relationship with Medinan Shi'a
The Ayyūbids did not do to the Shi'a and the family of the Prophet what others had done before them, and, consequently, the Shi'a in Medina did not do anything to anger the Sunnis and Ayyūbids.¹³⁶

Despite the Shi'a doctrine requiring that the imamate be held by a member of the Prophet’s family, meaning that they did not acknowledge any caliph who did not belong to the family of the Prophet, we find the Shi'a emirs of Medina acknowledging the 'Abbāsid caliphs and the Ayyūbid sultan, and invoking them in the Friday prayer.

5.4. Relationship with the Emirs of Mecca
Among the events that shed light on the form of the relationship between Medina and Mecca during this period are the battles and wars that were waged between them, since the familial connection between the emirs of Medina and the Meccan emirs, and they were all Shi'a, that was insufficient to prevent the wars waged between them for domination and to rule Ḥijāz.

Relations were good between the emirs of Medina and Mecca until the beginning of the Seventh century, when Qatāda b. Idris thought to annex Medina to his emirate Mecca, and so numerous battles and wars were waged between him and his nephews, the emirs of Medina. In order to comprehend these battles fully, we should analyse them by identifying

¹³⁶ See Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, 9/195; al-Asqalānī, Shi'ā al-Qulūb, p.157; Ibn Khaldūn, 4/140; Jamīl Ḥarb, p.68; ‘Abd al-Bāṣīt Badr, al-Tārikh al-Shāmil, 2/182; ‘Abdul’azīz b. Fahad, 1/545; Ibn Farḥūn, p.212. The Umayyad and ‘Abbāsid caliphs were often fearful of Ahl al-Bayt and the intensity of the attachment of their followers to them, for that reason they were always oppressed and treated badly in way to stop them claiming the Caliphate. This was exploited by agitators who made a show of zeal for Islam and love for the Prophet's family, while concealing hatred, malice and animosity towards Islam. They began to exaggerate the status and merits of the Prophet's family and raise its members to prophetic status, or even deify them, whilst at the same time reviling the Companions of the Prophet. This made the majority of Muslims turn against them and cause them harm. However, during the Ayyūbid period, we hear of no disputes occurring between the emirs of Medina, who were Twelver Shi'a, and the Ayyūbids because of their doctrinal differences.
the time, place and causes, comparing the numbers of the two armies, and considering how they were matched, the organisation, the weapons used, the plan, and the results. Among these battles were the following.

5.4.1. The Battle of al-Maṣāfī
Firstly, the date was the year 601/1204, according to all accounts of the battle. This means that it took place in the time of the emir of Medina Sālim b. al-Qāsim al-Husaynī and the emir of Mecca, Qatāda b. Idrīs al-Hasanī. It has been mentioned previously that Emir Sālim and all of the Muhanna family were Twelver Shi`as, while Emir Mecca Qatāda was a Zaydi Shī'a.137 Even thus they all Shī'a and from Ahl al-Bayt that did not prevent them from fighting each other.
Secondly, the place was Dhi al-Hulaifā, a ḥajj station for the inhabitants of Medina about three miles distant from it. This meant that it was Qatāda who was the aggressor and made the attack on Medina.
Thirdly, the causes: it is clear that Qatāda's desire to extend his control to Medina, and so become ruler of Ḥijāz, was the driving force behind this battle. The proof of this is that there had not been any dispute or problems between the two sides prior to the battle,138 and the Medinans were astonished at the emir of Mecca's hostility, having done nothing previously to cause him offence. So they decided to face and fight him before he reached Medina.
Fourthly, the numbers of the two armies: some sources mention that Qatāda's army was larger and more experienced than the Medinan army, and it appears that it was also able to take advantage of the element of surprise. The Medinans had no time to prepare a large army at short notice, and the stability and prevailing peace between the two sides had meant that there was no need for a large army to defend Medina. What is surprising, then, is that the Medinans fought heroically in spite of their lack of numbers and experience in defending Medina, and they inflicted great losses on the army of Qatāda. But Qatāda's army was greatly helped by its size and it was able to place the Medinan army under pressure, forcing it to retreat inside Medina, and then to lay siege to the city.
Fifthly, the organisation: this battle reveals the extent of its importance in reversing the balance of power. Qatāda was content to lay siege to Medina, believing that the city would

137 Ibn Jubayr, al-Rihla, p.78.
surrender to him. But he misjudged both himself and his army, and underestimated the inhabitants of Medina. The army of Medina regrouped and replaced its losses with men who had not participated in the previous fighting, and a number of the men took turns in guarding the wall so that Qatāda’s army would not take them unawares by infiltrating or destroying the wall.

Sixthly, the weapons: it appears that the emir of Medina decided to use other weapons, in addition to the weapons of war, and these were cunning, politics and money. He dispatched a number of his men to seek out those members of Qatāda’s army that they knew, particularly their leaders, and to start a dialogue with them, holding them back from fighting by saying that Qatāda was the aggressor and that it would not be right for Muslims to fight each other, and reminding them of the family connection between them.

Seventhly, the results: it seems that the Medinans succeeded in winning over certain important men in Qatāda’s army, obtaining from them firm promises that they would not fight, if fighting broke out. It also appears that a number of them returned to Mecca. According to the account of Ibn Khaldūn, Qatāda despaired during the siege. It seems that he discovered that some of his army were refusing to do their duty and decided to withdraw. However, immediately after his withdrawal, there arrived in Medina support from the Lām tribe (a branch of the Hamdan tribe), and, fortified by this, Sālim set out in pursuit of Qatāda. He caught up with him at Badr and a bitter battle was fought between them. A great number of men were killed on both sides. But, because some of Qatāda’s men had abandoned the fight in fulfilment of their pledge to the Medinans, the people of Medina were victorious, capturing a number of men, and Qatāda fled to Mecca with what remained of his army. Ibn Khaldūn called this battle al-Maṣāraʿ (deaths or killings), because, during it, Qatāda recited a verse of poetry: ‘Killings in the lineage of the Prophet come back as . . . they began, but this time amongst relatives’. Another result of this battle was that it awoke the desire for revenge among the Medinans, which led to more battles between the two sides. Emir Sālim decided to pursue Qatāda and destroy his power so that he would have no further ambitions regarding Medina, and he set out after him the following day. Qatāda knew this and made haste, entering Mecca and closing its gates against him. When Sālim and his men reached Mecca, they laid siege to it,
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and the position was reversed. Those who yesterday had been besieged now became the besiegers and the aggressors the defenders. Qatāda and his men fought courageously in defence of Mecca, and refused to submit to the besiegers. Qatāda resorted to the same weapon which Sālim had used, and he asked those Meccans who had connections with the Medinans and who had changed their minds about fighting in the previous battle, to win over the Medinans and convince them to cease the bloodshed and respect the sanctity of the Holy City. Just as the Medinans had influenced the Meccans previously, and made some of them pull back from fighting them, so also the Meccans influenced some of the Medinans and stirred up dissent among them, especially after the Medinans lost the strong motivation to fight that they had had previously, when they were fighting to protect themselves, their people, their money and their city. Finer feelings and greater responsiveness to good acts were in the nature of the Medinans, and, as a result, some of them began to question the benefit of the siege and the wisdom of the war. The news reached Sālim and he realised that a number of his men, including some of his chiefs, might turn against him, and that if the people of Mecca made a sortie against him, he would not have his previous strength. A message came from Emir Qatāda asking for reconciliation and an end to the siege. This letter satisfied Sālim, for it confirmed Qatāda's defeat and his feelings of regret. This was sufficient for Sālim, and made him feel that he had had his revenge. He ended the siege and returned to Medina. But why did Sālim not negotiate with Qatāda, or conclude a treaty of non-aggression with him? Why did he not put in order the future relations between the two cities? It appears that the reason was his mistrust of Qatāda's promises, because he was aware of his ambitious character. Qatāda would be unlikely to keep such a promise, especially since he was the besieged party.

As can be seen the struggle between the Emirs of Medina and Mecca was not to consolidation themselves in key positions so they can spread Shi'tism, rather it was struggle for power only.

141 Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, 12/205.
143 Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, 12/205.
5.4.2. The Battle of Wādī al-Ṣafra’

Firstly, the causes: the cause of this battle differs slightly from the one preceding it, and this is due to the entering of a third party into this struggle; namely, the Ayyūbids. Medina had retained its allegiance to the Ayyūbids, and Sālim corresponded with al-Malik ʿIsa b. Muḥammad al-Ayyūbī, the sultan of Damascus, and with al-Malik al-Kāmil, the sultan of Egypt. In 611/1214, al-Malik ʿIsa came from Syria, intending to perform the hajj, and passed by Medina, so Sālim and a number of Medinan dignitaries went out to receive him and they welcomed and honoured him extravagantly. They presented him with all the horses and supplies that his caravan required, and Sālim handed him the keys of Medina as proof of his submission and allegiance. He lodged him in his own house, seeing to his every comfort, and al-Malik ʿIsa was pleased by this.144 When ʿIsa set out from Medina for Mecca, Emir Sālim accompanied him and went down with him to Mecca.145 Qatāda attempted to assassinate Sālim, sending some of his men to kill him. Sālim was expecting Qatāda’s treachery and he and his men kept close to al-Malik ʿIsa’s entourage, so that, when Qatāda’s men attempted to murder Sālim, they were prevented by al-Malik’s men.146 The news reached al-Malik ʿIsa and he was furious with Qatāda, who had not received him well, nor presented him with what the emir and the people of Medina had. This was the cause of the battle.

Secondly, the time: the battle took place after al-Malik ʿIsa returned from the hajj in 611/1214. Since the hajj is performed at the end of the Hijri year, and because travel in those days was time consuming, it is probable that the battle took place in 612/1215. As for the battle site, it was in Wadi al-Safra’, on the outskirts of Mecca.

Thirdly, the plan: Sālim seized the opportunity of al-Malik ʿIsa al-Ayyūbī’s anger towards Qatāda, and informed the sultan of the continual attacks of Qatāda and his men on Medina and the numerous complaints about him, asking ʿIsa to help him destroy Qatāda power. ʿIsa promised to send Sālim an army immediately upon his return. Here, one can observe the shrewd and intelligent plan which Sālim drew up and executed to rid himself of his only enemy, Qatāda, fearing that he would renew the attack on Medina. He succeeded in

144 Abū Shāmah, al-Dhail ʿala al-Rawdatayn, p.87; ʿAbdulʿazīz b. Fahad, 1/556; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya, 13/73.
145 It is possible that Sālim was aiming to leave with al-Malik ʿIsa for Mecca in order to provoke Qatāda and make him attempt to murder him while he was under the sultan’s protection, thus angering al-Malik.
146 al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 1/180.
gaining the backing of al-Malik ‘Isa by the extravagance of his reception, knowing that the sultan would be disappointed by the treatment he received in Mecca; and then by his going with al-Malik to Mecca, a move designed to provoke Qatāda to violence, and indeed Qatāda did try to kill him while he was under the sultan’s protection.

Fourthly, the numbers of the two armies and how they were matched: the bringing of al-Malik ‘Isa into the war alongside Emir Sālim tipped the scales against Qatāda’s army. The sources almost all agree that an army came from Syria to Medina, rested for a short while, and then, accompanied by some of the men from the city, went out to fight Qatāda.147

Fifth, the results: in comparison with the previous battle, it is to be noted that, in that battle, neither side was assured of victory; but this battle was different, since victory was from the first clearly within the grasp of the army coming from Syria and Medina. Qatāda was defeated and fled to Yanbu’, and the battle resulted in huge booty and many prisoners.148 Again the start of the second battle was not for a religious matters between the Two Emirs, rather it was a revenge of the Emir of Medina to the ambition and the greed of the Emir of Mecca.

5.4.3. The Battle of al-Ilumayma Village
Firstly, the causes: al-Qāsim b. Jammāz took over the emirate of Medina during the struggle with Qatāda. He devoted considerable attention to military matters, enlisting a number of men from Medina and seeking the assistance of some Turks who had come from Syria with the Ayyūbid army. When he felt that he was strong enough, he decided to expand his emirate and strengthen his influence and authority. He seized Wadi al-Qurā on the road between Medina and Mecca, acquiring much booty with which to better equip his army. He then began planning to capture Yanbu’ and Mecca, to eliminate Qatāda once and for all.

Secondly, time and place: The battle took place on the tenth day of Dhu’l-Ḥijja in 613/1217 by the village of al-Humayma,149 which was closer to Mecca. It appears that al-Qāsim wanted to use the factor of time to his benefit, since he chose the day on which the
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emir of Mecca and the city's inhabitants would be most preoccupied, and that was the Day of ‘Id al-Aḍḥā (10. 12. 613/20. 3. 1217).¹⁵⁰

Thirdly, organisation: when Qatāda learnt of what Emir al-Qāsim b. Jammāz was preparing, and the scale of his force - one capable of annihilating his army - he decided to resort to another strategy; namely, to seek the help of an external power to assist him in his war against al-Qāsim. So he sent to al-Malik al-Kāmil al-Ayyūbī, the sultan of Egypt, and asked him to protect his emirate from al-Qāsim and his army. The Ayyūbids' relations with the emirs of Medina were better than their relations with the emirs of Mecca, for reasons such as the high standing of al-Qāsim b. Jammāz with the Ayyūbids, and also the fact that the Medinan emirs had not deviated from their allegiance to the Ayyūbids and continued to invoke them from the minbars. But although some of the emirs of Mecca had gone against the Ayyūbids, and some, particularly Mukthar and Qatāda, had maltreated pilgrims, al-Kāmil nonetheless responded to Qatāda's call for help, and sent him a force which arrived at Yanbu' and organised itself to protect the town. It is possible that the reason al-Kāmil assisted Qatāda was the dispute which had broken out between al-Kāmil and his brother al-ʿĀdil, the sultan of Syria, and al-Kāmil's fear that the emir of Medina would vanquish Qatāda, expelling him from Mecca and annexing the city to his emirate, which would then bring it under al-ʿĀdil, since al-Qāsim b. Jammāz was a liegeman of al-ʿĀdil and invoked his name from the minbars.¹⁵¹ The reason could also be the Ayyūbids' desire to maintain a balance between the emirs of Mecca and those of Medina.

Fourthly, the results: when al-Qāsim discovered that al-Kāmil was lending assistance to Qatāda and had dispatched an army to Yanbu', he changed direction from Yanbu' to Mecca. Qatāda rode out in haste, and the two armies met by the village of al-IIumayma. Both sides fought bitterly, Qatāda was victorious and al-Qāsim withdrew to Medina.¹⁵² In addition to the Ayyūbid support that Qatāda had during this battle, it seems that an important factor in Qatāda's victory was the Medinans' decision to bypass Yanbu' and head straight to Mecca; this long march exhausted the army and led to the defeat.

Another outcome of this battle was that it fuelled the struggle and contention between the emirs of the two cities. Qatāda began to prepare a campaign to capture Medina, which

¹⁵⁰ The feast of sacrifice, one of the greatest feasts in the Muslim calendar; it is celebrated on the 10th day of the month of Dhū 'l-Ḥijja. See Netton, A Popular Dictionary, p.116.
¹⁵¹ Abū Shāmāh, al-Dhail 'ala al-Rawdatayn, p.92.
¹⁵² al- Fāsī, al-Iqd, 7/44-45.
caused al-Qāsim to set about reinforcing his army and preparing for a new battle. But after
the Meccan army had got halfway to Wādi al-Fara', Qatāda fell ill and was unable to
continue, so he placed his brother and his son, al-Ḥasan, in charge of the army and ordered
them to continue to Medina, while he returned to Mecca. A dispute subsequently arose
between the two leaders which resulted in Qatāda's son slaying his uncle. He returned to
Mecca with the army, and he killed his father, after learning that Qatāda, enraged at the
news of the murder, intended to kill him.153 Maṣūd, the king of Yemen, then seized the
emirate from al-Ḥasan b. Qatāda, and drove him from Mecca, and thus ended the struggle
between the two cities.

Some results of these battles between Medina and Mecca were as follows.
Medina benefited through being made stronger, and punishing the Bedouin tribes which
tried to raid it, pursuing them and inflicting the harshest of reprisals upon them. This led
to Medina enjoying security, and thus the scholarly activity in the Prophet's Mosque
continued uninterrupted, schools were established, and trade revived. Gardens appeared as
there was time to attend to them and harvest the fruit and dates. One historian says that
the hajj was very safe and comfortable and water was in abundance during those years.154
As for the negative effects of these battles, they ignited the martial spirit in al-Qāsim b.
Jammāz. He believed that he had become strong enough to oust Maṣūd al-Ayyūbī, the
sultan of Yemen, from Mecca. He raised an army from the inhabitants of Medina and some
of the surrounding tribes, and proceeded with them to Mecca in order to seize it from the
Ayyūbids, as mentioned previously. At the gates of Mecca, a fierce battle was fought, in
which al-Qāsim b. Jammāz was killed, and what remained of the Medinan army withdrew,
leaving behind it a number of dead and prisoners.

5.5. The relationship with the Rasūlids and the influence of the Shi'a on them
The Rasūlids Dynasty started in 626/1229, when Sultan Maṣūd, the ruler of Egypt and
Yemen, passed away, the governance of the Yemen was assumed by one of his retainers,
Nūr al-Dīn al-Rasūlī. Initially, he offered allegiance to the Ayyūbids, but then declared his
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independence from them in 629/1232, giving himself the title al-Manṣūr and invoking himself during the Friday prayers. 155

5.5.1. The relationship between the emirs of Medina and the Banū Rasūl
This relationship can be defined by two important events:

The first event was when Nūr al-Dīn al-Rasūlī prepared an army led by Ibn ʿAbdān and al-Sharīf Rājih b. Qatāda, and set out with it for Mecca in order to expel its Ayyūbid emir, ʿAqhtakin b. ʾAbdullāh al-Kūmili. 156 The reason behind this attack by the Rasūlid emirs on Mecca is not known for certain, but it can be said that, when Nūr al-Dīn al-Rasūlī declared his independence from the Ayyūbids in Yemen, he feared that they would send an army against him by way of Mecca, and he found that the best means of defence was to attack and capture the city. 157 When the Yemeni army drew near to Mecca, its leader, Ibn ʿAbdān, set to work to win over its inhabitants. He reminded them of Nūr al-Dīn’s goodwill towards them when he was governor over them, and they were swayed in his favour. ʿAqhtakin sensed this and fled to Yanbuʿ, the centre of the Ayyūbid troop concentration at that time. 158 From there, he sent word to al-Kūmil, requesting assistance in recovering Mecca. Ibn ʿAbdān entered Mecca and made it a Rasūlid Emirate. 159 Al-Īsfāḥānī says that when the news reached al-Kūmil, he prepared an army, led by Emir Fakhr al-Dīn Yūsuf b. ʿAṣhr al-Dīn. 160 Al-Khazrajī says that he also sent to Emir ʾAṣhr b. ʾĀṣira b. Ṣāʿad b. Ṣāposal a. ʿAli b. Qatāda, asking him to do the same. 161 The emir of Medina had succeeded in avoiding wars for several years and had established good relations with the Ayyūbids and their governors in Mecca. However, he
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was unable to refuse the request of the Ayyûbîd sultan. He went to meet the army arriving from Egypt, and he and his men set out with them to Mecca. On the way, they were joined by the force from Yanbu' and the vast army proceeded to Mecca and laid siege to it. Ibn 'Abdân marshalled his men and rushed forth with them beyond the wall. The two sides met in an unequal battle, in which Ibn 'Abdân and a great many of his army were killed. Râjîh fled with those remaining to the distant Meccan hills, and the Ayyûbîd army entered Mecca along with the emir of Medina and his men. But Daqhtakîn was not satisfied by the victory that had been achieved, and allowed his troops to plunder whatever money and property they could lay hands on that day. This led to an important outcome; namely, the anger of al-Kâmîl, who removed Daqhtakîn and summoned him to Egypt, and the anger of Emir Shîhâ and his return to Medina with his men. He decided never again to participate with the Ayyûbîd army in one of its wars. In the same year, Râjîh b. Qatâda gathered some of his retainers and raided Mecca. Its Ayyûbîd governor departed, but Emir Shîhâ made no move, or sent any force from Medina. Al-Kâmîl was forced to dispatch troops from Egypt, led by Emir al-Zâhir, which, by the end of that year, were able to restore Mecca to Ayyûbîd submission, and have the hajj conducted in peace and security. Emir Shîhâ maintained his neutrality during the struggle, which continued for seven successive years, that is to say until 637/1239, since the Ayyûbîds and the Rasûlîds each held Mecca for a period, then left it when a larger force from the other side came along.

The second event occurred when Sultan al-Šâliîh Najm al-Dîn Ayyûb assumed the governance of Egypt after two years of contention with his brothers, following the death of their father, al-Kâmîl, in 635/1237. Al-Fâsî says that al-Šâliîh asked Emir Shîhâ to lead a campaign to oust the Rasûlîds from Mecca, and return it to Ayyûbîd control. Emir Shîhâ consented to al-Šâliîh's request, departing from the neutrality that he had maintained for seven years. He set out with the troops which al-Šâliîh had dispatched to Mecca. The Rasûlîds had entrusted the emirate of Mecca to Emir Râjîh b. Qatâda, who had been
helped by the people of Medina and its emir, al-Qāsim b. Jammāz, against the Ayyūbids in 622/1225.\textsuperscript{168}

Shiḥa arrived with his army on the outskirts of Mecca, and learned that Rājīḥ was travelling to the Yemen, and that those in charge were the leaders of the Yemeni army stationed there.\textsuperscript{169} Shiḥa held off and did not attack Mecca, hoping that the Yemeni army would surrender and the Meccan inhabitants would side with him, particularly as it was known that he had been angered by the looting permitted there during the campaign of Ḍaghtakīn in 638/1241. In fact, the Yemeni army left Mecca after they had learnt of the strength of his army, and Shiḥa entered without any bloodshed in 638/1241.\textsuperscript{170}

The struggle for the emirate of Mecca continued between the Ayyūbids and the Rasūlids. No sooner had Shiḥa consolidated his rule over Mecca than he was informed that Sultan Nūr al-Dīn al-Rasūlī was preparing a great army headed by Emir Ibn al-Nādirī to take back Mecca from him, and was sending with it Rājīḥ b. Qatāda. When Shiḥa had confirmed that the army was on the move and of considerable size, he withdrew with his army to Medina.\textsuperscript{171} However, al-Fāsī says, he regretted this withdrawal and requested al-Ṣāliḥ to send another army with which to confront the Rasūlīd force. 

‘Umar b. Fahad says that al-Ṣāliḥ acceded to Shiḥa’s request and dispatched a large army, led by the two emirs ‘Alam al-Dīn al-Kabīr and ‘Alam al-Dīn al-Ṣaghir.\textsuperscript{172} It is strange that al-Ṣāliḥ responded to this request while the Crusaders were menacing Egypt and had captured some of its coastal cities; and the Islamic effort was thus dissipated at a time when the Crusader forces were trying to take back what had been wrested from them by Ṣāliḥ al-Dīn and his brother, al-‘Ādil, and the Tartars were threatening the Islamic cities of the north and the east, approaching Iraq and Syria. The struggle for the emirate was a drain on the Muslims’ energy and money.\textsuperscript{173}

Emir Shiḥa took the army remaining in Medina along with the new army and set off for Mecca in Rajab 638/1241. Sensing his adversary’s strength, Rājīḥ decided to withdraw from Mecca, and Shiḥa entered it and took over the emirate.\textsuperscript{174}

\textsuperscript{168} al-Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, 5/23; Jamāl Ḥarb, p.81.
\textsuperscript{171} See al-Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, 6/346, and Shiḥa‘al-Ghrām, 2/201; al-Khazrajī, 1/64-65.
\textsuperscript{172} ‘Umar b. Fahad, 3/57.
The dispute over the emirate of Mecca continued between the Ayyūbids and the Rasūlids, with each side trying to gather a larger force. The Rasūlids equipped a larger army, headed by ʿAli b. Qatāda, with which they intended to take Mecca, so Shīḥa asked al-Ṣāliḥ for swift support, and he sent him one hundred and fifty cavalrmen. Al-Fāṣi and al-Khazraji say that, when his adversaries were informed of this support, they also asked for additional backing from the Rasūlids. Nūr al-Dīn al-Rasūli was eager to provide this and ordered the preparation of as large a force as possible, and decided that he himself would lead it. Al-Fāṣi mentions that the Rasūlid sultan left the Yemen at the head of a great force, and set out for Mecca. Before he reached it, news came from Medina about the security situation there, and of the impending threat, so Emir Shīḥa left Mecca with his men in haste, leaving behind the Ayyūbid army. The battle took place with the Rasūlids victory. Although the Two sides were Sunnies, the struggle was not a religious problems as mentioned before, the disputes were always a power motive.

5.5.2. Outcomes of the emirs of Medina’s wars with the Rasūlids

First, the absence of the emir of Medina and his preoccupation with his wars against the Rasūlids and the emir of Mecca aroused the ambitions of his relatives in the emirate as well as certain Bedouin living around it, especially since the armed force was away. The Bedouin swept down on the outskirts of Medina, taking whatever spoils they could lay hands on. Al-Sakhāwi says that ʿUmayr b. al-Qāsim b. Jammāz, Shīḥa’s cousin, mobilised and began gathering troops around him in order to seize the emirate from Shīḥa. He succeeded in gathering large numbers of Bedouin and retainers and was on the verge of attacking Medina. Emir Shīḥa returned in haste, but ʿUmayr surprised him with a large army at the end of Safar the same year, storming Medina’s walls. His men spread throughout Medina, and Shīḥa fled. As a result of the emir of Medina’s wars with the Rasūlids and the emir of Mecca, a new dispute over the Medinan Emirate arose amongst members of the al-Muhanna family. Shīḥa sought help from some of his friends and began
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sending messages to his men in Medina to come out to him, and he gathered a force with which to attack Medina. He was successful in expelling ‘Umayr and his men, and returned to his emirate.

This incident was a hard lesson for Emir Shiha, after which he was content to distance himself definitively from the struggle against the Rasūlids over Mecca, and did not intervene in its affairs despite the continuing struggle over it between the Ayyūbids and the Rasūlids, which lasted until the end of the Ayyūbid period.

One can say that not ‘Umayr nor the Bedouins have a religious ambition in waging those wars in between each other. As mentioned above the Bedouins were looking for a better life and ‘Umayr looking for the power and leadership.

Second, there were two disputes over the emirate of Mecca: a major and a minor struggle. The major struggle was between the Ayyūbids and the Rasūlids. It was the Ayyūbids in Egypt who had equipped the force that intimidated the Rasūlids and expelled them from Mecca, and it was the Rasūlids in Yemen who had equipped the force that ousted the Ayyūbids. There were two causes of this struggle: the Ayyūbids' desire for revenge on the Rasūlids for their independent rule over the Yemen; and the ease with which whoever had control over Mecca could control the rest of Hijāz, which would constitute a threat to both states and their interests. This dispute cost both sides much money and effort, which the Islamic front was in the most acute need of in order to face its real enemies, the Crusaders and the Tartars.

The minor struggle was between the emirs of Medina from the al-Muhanna family and the emirs of Mecca from the family of Qatāda. This dispute had historical antecedents dating back to the time of Qatāda in 601, when he marched on Medina and laid siege to it. Sālim b. al-Qāsim then struck back at him, pursuing him back to Mecca and besieging him there. The emir of Mecca was thus the instigator, driven by his ambitions to bring Medina under his authority, whereas the emirs of Medina were initially the defenders, and then became the attackers, but not in order to expand their influence, rather as local leaders carrying out the wishes of the Ayyūbids.

It is clear that this struggle was of no benefit to Medina, as it lost some of its men and its emir, al-Qāsim b. Jammāz, and almost lost its other emir, Shiha. It is known that contending parties, if they are simply proxies for others, will be the losers whatever they gain. In addition to this, the dispute between Medina and Mecca was but one of the many
struggles between the kingdoms of the Islamic World at that time, and this was what made it easy for the Tartars to seize parts of the Islamic Empire.\textsuperscript{182}

5.6. Conclusion

This chapter has examined political life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the influence of the Shi'a upon it. This was explained through an overview of the names of the Medinan emirs, the reign span of each one of them, and what relations were between them. The political relations between the emirs of Medina and each of the neighbouring tribes, the emirs of Mecca, the sultans of the Ayyūbid state and those of the Banū Rasūl in Yemen, and the influence of the Shi'a on these relations and the role which they played in the political life of the city, were also studied and analysed.

The following are the most significant conclusions drawn from this chapter:

1. The first thing which can be observed is that there was no power to rival the Ayyūbids in maintaining the emirs' allegiance, and their allegiance lay with the Ayyūbids throughout the Ayyūbid period (with the exception of Emir al-Qāsim b. Jammāz, who waged war on the Ayyūbids, although it is noted that he did not transfer his allegiance to anyone else).

2. It can also be observed that all the emirs during the Ayyūbid period, and before it, were from the family of the Prophet, and they had no rivals. Furthermore, none of the caliphs or sultans tried to change them or send other governors or emirs.

3. Despite the dominance of Shi'a on the key positions in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, there were no alarming incidents related to Shi'a fanaticism, such as had occurred during the time of Abū al-Futūḥ, who attempted to transport the body of the Prophet to Egypt by order of the Fāṭimid caliph.

4. During the Ayyūbid period, the Shi'a of Medina worked to strengthen their tutelage, exploiting the alliance of Medina's emirs with the Ayyūbids, and the Ayyūbids' preoccupation with their wars with the Crusaders, whereas, prior to this period, the Shi'a of Medina had been unable to strengthen their tutelage in Medina in the same way as in the Ayyūbid period, due to the instability of the emirs' allegiance to the Fāṭimid, and the doctrinal variation between the emirs, who were Twelver Shi'a, and the Fāṭimid state.

5. Most of the Medinan Sunnis were not minded to offer any resistance to the tutelage of Shi'ism in Medina or to seek assistance from the leaders of the Islamic world, who were preoccupied with warring amongst themselves or against their enemies.

6. The emirs of Medina in the Ayyūbid period followed a policy of goodwill towards the members of the Sunni community and their theologians, in order to create a kind of equilibrium in domestic policy so that the Sunnis did not feel persecuted.

7. A single family from the Ḫusaynis assumed control of Medina. They were descendants of Ṭāhir b. Muslim al-Ḫusaynī, who had declared sharifian rule of Medina in 360/970. This family was known as Banū Muhanna, and all of them were Twelvers.

8. When we look at domestic events in Medina under sharifian rule, the lack of achievement of this family, which ruled Medina autonomously, is evident, as they undertook no radical restoration, nor are any construction efforts attributed to them. They were also unable to protect the inhabitants of Medina, the visitors coming to see the Prophet’s Mosque or pilgrims passing through Medina. Instead, they imposed a tax on the pilgrims and visitors wishing to enter Medina or pass through it on the way to Mecca. All these happened because, they were struggling constantly amongst themselves for the ruling of the emirate and also the lack of resources.
Chapter Six

Social life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the Shi'a influence upon it

The student of history will notice that most of those who recorded the history of cities and peoples devoted most of their attention to political events and to civil unrest, revolutions, governmental issues and war, seldom concerning themselves with a discussion of societies and the circumstances of their populations. Consequently, a picture of the social life is all but missing from their writings, without being given a specific treatment as such, except by way of sundry references in passing to events. Ibn Farḥūn and al-Sakhāwi are the historians who have the most to say about certain social aspects and phenomena which bear no relation to politics and which are able to help construct a partial view of social life. Unfortunately, however, Medina during the Ayyūbid period finds mention in their books in only a few scattered lines. Similarly, the travellers who visited Medina during this period were unconcerned about giving an account of the social life there, or of the inhabitants’ relations with one another, being content to include only some descriptive passages about the Prophet's Mosque and certain other basic references. In their writings, the description and historiography of Mecca and Medina are not given equal attention. Accordingly, I will rely on a few isolated passages which occur in the writings of historians and travellers and in some biographical works, in order to deduce certain features about the social life of the city during the Ayyūbid period.

Therefore, this chapter will discuss social life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the influence of the Shi'a upon it, by studying the composition of Medina society and its groupings, the distinguishing features apparent in each grouping, the elements of social life and its economic conditions, as well as the constructive interplay between them, in order to present a true picture of the city's social life.

This chapter is concerned with three main subjects: the first being 'groupings of Medina society'; the second, 'the Medinans' habits and folklore'; and the third, 'the influence of economic life in Medina on the city's social life'.
6.1. The groupings of Medina society

Medina society was composed of several groups in varying degrees of co-existence with each other, and mutual relationships varying in nature and degree, which, in aggregate, combined to create the flow of daily life with its distinctive events. It is possible to summarise these groupings as follows: the sharifs; those who held religious offices; al-Mujāwirūn; the slaves; the attendants at the Prophet's Mosque; the general populace; and the Twelver.

6.1.1. The Sharifs

It has already been stated that the title of 'sharif' was assigned to the Family of the Prophet (PBUH), and the families of 'Ali, al-'Abās and Ja'far were also addressed as Sharif.¹ When the descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, the two sons of 'Ali Ibn Abi Ṭālib, assumed full control of Mecca and Medina, the Fāṭimids assigned to them the title of sharif. From that time onwards, this title was given to the emirs of Mecca and Medina, and to the members of their families on whom they depended for managing the affairs of the emirate.² During the Ayyūbid period, the sharifs enjoyed an eminent social standing and were accorded respect and high esteem.

If we suppose the presence of a social pyramid in Medina during this era, the Ḥusaynid sharifs formed the top of this pyramid. Among them was the family who were the hereditary rulers of the emirate for three centuries, their control fluctuating between complete independence and subordination to the Meccan emirs.

The sharif grouping consists of several branches, some living within Medina, others in the outskirts and surrounding villages.³

The sharifs can be divided into three groups:

- Sharifian emirs:
  - The sharifs who were the hereditary emirs of Medina were from the Muhanna family. After the Sixth century A.H., this family split off into a number of branches, among which

² Ahmad al-Sibā'i, 1/217; Ṣubhi 'Abd al-Munīm, p.227. When Abū Namā ruled Mecca he saw in 932/1526 that the 'Ali b. Abi Ṭālib family had multiplied in number and internal groupings and, wanting to distinguish between them, he called the Banū al-Hasan 'sharifs' and the Banū al-Husayn 'sayyids', but it appears that this designation was current only in Hijaz, and in all other the regions they were called Sayyids. See 'Atiq al-Bilādi, Mujam Qabā'J al-Hijāz, p.20.
were the Jammāz and Shi'a families, the majority of them were Twelver. The emirs lived their lives with a measure of distinction, and were allotted specific portions of the money sent to the city by certain caliphs, sultans, viziers, and wealthy persons.

Sharif relatives:

They were sharifs who did not take part in ruling and political activities, and the whole family was well versed in religious science and asceticism (zuhd), like, for example, the family of Abū al-Sa'ādāt b. Māhmūd b. 'Ādil al-Ḥusaynī, four of whose members al-Sakhāwī chronicled in his book al-Daū' al-Lāmi. They are 'Ābd al-Kabīr, who was engaged in jurisprudence (fiqh) and its principles, the Arabic language and calligraphy; 'Ābd al-Raḥmān, who occupied himself with syntax (nahw) and grammar (ṣarḥ) and even more with recitation (tilāwa); Abū al-Khair, who knew the Qur'ān and Nawawi's Forty Hadith by heart and performed charitable deeds; and Abū al-Faraj, who was an outstanding calligrapher. This is an example of a cultured family of sharifs who were not involved in political life and were in an esteemed and respected position. Through the biography of Abū al-Sa'ādāt family in al-Sakhāwī's book, it is possible to conclude that it was not among the Shi'a sharifs as, otherwise, al-Sakhāwī would have mentioned this fact, and this is one of the pieces of evidence that not all of the sharifs were Shi'a. It appears that the family of Abū al-Sa'ādāt had no share in the ruling of the emirate because they did not embrace the Twelver Shi'a doctrine, since the Shi'a will not offer financial backing or moral support to those who did not follow their doctrine - as happened with the al-Qāshāni family. Also, among the families who took no part in political life were the Munāyfah family, who lived next to al-Shihābīyya School adjoining the Prophet's Mosque; the Mudācaba family, who lived in the attendants' quarter also near to the Prophet's Mosque; the Budūr family, descendants of Badr b. Fāyd b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim who traced their lineage to 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and lived in and around al-Ḥasan's courtyard, and the Waḥāḥidah family, which was descended from 'Abd al-Wāḥid b. Mālik b. Ḥusayn b.

---

4 Ibn Farḥūn, p. 211; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, 1/98.
5 al-Sakhāwī, al-Daū' al-Lāmi; 11/113.
6 ibid., 4/304.
7 ibid., 4/79.
8 ibid., 5/19-20
9 ibid., 11/127, and see 'Abd al-Bāṣīt Badr, al-Medīna, . .196.
10 Ibn Farḥūn, p.84; al-Mudayris, p.131.
Muhanna al-Akbar b. Dāwūd and lived in al-Suwayqa - a place close to Medina in which lived only the sharifs from the house of ‘Ali.  

Ṭālibī sharifs:  
They were those who traced their lineage to Abī Ṭālib, the Prophet's uncle, and they had a guild known as the Ṭālibite Guild which traced its authority back to one of the distinguished sharifs.

6.1.1.1. Relations between the sharifs and the Sunni and Shi'a citizens of Medina  
The relationship between the sharifian emirs of Medina and the Sunnis was characterised by instability and tended to differ from one emir to another. Sometimes, it was uncongenial due to the oppressive conduct of certain emirs against Medina's Sunnis, and entailed the imposition of taxes, the lack of charity provision for their poor, and the punishment of whoever stood in the way of the Shi'a du’āt. At other times it was agreeable, if the emir was popular among his subjects and did right by everyone without differentiating between Sunni and Shi'a; or else relations were unexceptional, with neither problems nor a direct relationship or connections.

Among the Sunni families who had unstable relationships with the sharifs, was a family called al-Majd. At times, the relationship was close, such as the sharifs' relationship with the imam of the Prophet's Mosque who came from this family, whom they held in high esteem and was popular with them, and to whom they gave money and property. However, this relationship changed with al-Majd children and his descendants, as Ibn Farḥūn observes: “They were harassed by the sharifs, so they departed with their children, leaving their property behind, and when some of the sharifs were sent asking them to return to Medina and giving assurances so they can benefit from them, they did not do so fearing that thinks may happen again to them.”

One of Sunni scholars' families was also a victim of some of the sharifs acts. Al-Nizām family which owned property in Medina, but was forced to leave it behind and move away as a result of being subject to oppression and persecution by some of the sharifs.

---

14 Ibn Farḥūn, p.87.  
15 ibid.; al-Mudayris, p.190.
Certain emirs' harassment of the Sunnis was actively encouraged by the Imāmi. If one of the shaykhs or Imāmi duʿār was angered by a Medinan, they would set the sharifs on him. Most of these oppressive acts were inflicted on mujāwirūn and the Mosque attendants, as they stood against the spread of Shiʿism and fought against innovation (bidʿa). However, as mentioned previously, this relationship was not always negative, and many of the emirs were distinguished by their beneficence towards Medina's Sunni inhabitants, attending their majlis gatherings, and appointing some of them as viziers. At times, the mujāwirūn, attendants and other inhabitants of Medina were devoted to their emirs, defending them and assisting them in wars against their rivals.

However, this fluctuating relationship, which linked Medina's sharifs with the Sunni Fuqahāʾ or legal scholars, raises a question concerning the issue of their taking sides. The actual policy which governed the relationship between the sharifian emirs of Medina and the populace, particularly the Sunni inhabitants, was one of benevolence towards the Sunni Fuqahāʾ in order to create an equilibrium of sorts in the internal policy. So what was it that caused this policy to change at certain times? It is possible that this was because the Imāmis sensed an increase in their power, influence and numbers, or because they took over key positions in Medina, such as quḍār (judges), aʿimmā (prayer leaders), khutābāʾ (preachers), or because of the emirs' support for them when the sultans were otherwise occupied with their wars against the Crusaders, or due to all these factors.

As for the sharifs' relationship with the Shiʿa population of Medina, it appears that the Fāṭimids influenced the Shiʿa perception of their sharifian rulers. The Fāṭimids regarded their Imām as a sacred individual, surrounded by an aura of veneration and divinity. In Medina, after the emirs had, in the eyes of their subjects, failed to show themselves as being marked with divine qualities in the way in which they ruled, the sharifs were able to create around their positions a degree of veneration, and induced the Shiʿa to treat them as holy. The Shiʿa took this to excess, to the extent of treating as holy every sharif who could trace his lineage back to ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. There was also a strong relationship between the Shiʿa from the Qāshānī family and the sharifian emirs (see above in chapter four). Ibn

---

16 See the biographies of Abū Falīta and Shiḥa see al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, 3/399, 3/404.
17 Such as ‘Alī b. al-Salīṭī and Nūr al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Yahya, Minister to Emir Mansur. They had a good relationship with all the inhabitants of Medina - whether attendants or emirs. See Ibn Farḥūn, p.84.
18 Ibn Farḥūn, p.109; al-Mudayris, p.140.
Farhun observes, in his account of the Imami doctrine's penetration of Medina through the efforts of the Qashahi family, that the support and assistance of sharifs for them had a significant effect on the spread of Imamites in Medina. The financial support the emirs received from the Shi'a du'at also played a role in preserving this strong relationship.

6.1.2. The religious office holders
This grouping included qudāt, a'imma at the Prophet's Mosque, khutabā', reciters, scholars, fuqahā' and those who held other offices. During the Ayyubid period the positions of imām, khatib and qādi were under the control of the Shi'a. The first of them to take over these positions were the family of Sinān b. °Abd al-Wahāb b. Namilā al-Husayni, with the sons inheriting them from the fathers. The first to assume control was °Abd al-Wahāb b. Namila al-Husayni, followed by his son Shams al-Dīn Sinān b. °Abd al-Wahāb b. Namilā, who wrote a letter to Damascus with news of the volcanic eruption to the east of Medina on the night of Wednesday 3rd of Jumada II in the year 654/1256. The fact that he sent this letter means that it was he who addressed the caliphs and sultans, and this is indicative of the standing enjoyed by the qādi at this time. He would deliver a sermon from the minbar (pulpit), invoking the Sunny Companions of the Prophet, using the grace of Allāh attributive in relation to them, and then would go home and atone for this by immolating a ram and giving it away as charity. He would do this every Friday, and this was because he was an Imāmi Shi'a - the Shi'a who disliked the Companions the most. The question here is why would he mention the Companions favourably during the sermon? Does this mean that he was intimidated by the Sunni inhabitants, or that he did not wish to create problems between the Sunnis and Shi'a?

It could be that this was part of the Imāmi Shi'a doctrine, that of taqiyya (dissimulation). Also, many of the Mujāwiên and Medina's Sunnis attended the Friday prayer, and the use of Allāh's grace attributive for the Companions was a kind of dissembling to them.

---

22 A family which held the office of qadi in Medina; they were Shi'a, and their rule came to an end in 750/1349 with the termination of Shi'a control of Medina. See al-Bilādi, p.233; Ḥamad al-Jāsir, Rasā'il, pp.148-150.
25 Ibn Farhun, p.211.
Sinān had a number of sons: Hishām, ‘Alī, Isā, Qāsim, al-Najm Muhanna and Ya‘qūb. Some of them held the offices of imāma, khāṭība and qaḍī.26

As for the Sunnis, they had none of these religious offices, except for the imam who performed with them the five prayers (Ṣalāt).27 In 682/1283, khāṭība was taken away from the Shi‘a and Shaykh Sirāj al-Dīn al-Khuḍārī al-Shāfī was appointed. He held the offices of both imāma and khāṭība,28 then these two positions were held by Sunni scholars of the Shāfī school, such as Shams al-Dīn al-Ḥalābī,29 Sharaf al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī,30 al-Bahā’ b. Salamah al-Masīrī,31 Sharaf al-Dīn Abū al-Fatḥ Muḥammad al-Amyūṭī,32 Jamāl al-Dīn al-Maṭarī and ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ṣalaḥ.33

One can see that there is a connection between the offices of imam and khāṭīb. It is probable that the khāṭība was specific to the Friday Prayers, while a number of imams took turns to lead the people in the five prayers at other times. It is also clear that most of the Sunni imams and khāṭībs in the second half of the Seventh century A.H. were Sunni.34

As for the office of qaḍī, this continued to remain in the hands of Imāmī Shi‘a from Bānī Sinān until the end of the seventh Hijri century. After mounting complaints about Shi‘a from Medina’s Sunni inhabitants to the Mamlūk sultan, Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn, for them to have a qaḍī to judge amongst them according to Sunni doctrine and consensus, the sultan appointed Sirāj al-Dīn ʿUmar al-Khuḍārī al-Shāfī as qaḍī to Medina’s Sunnis.35 It appears that the authority of the new qaḍī was limited to adjudicating between Sunni parties, while imprisonment and other matters remained under the control of the Sinān family, indeed the Shi‘a qaḍīs adjudicated between Sunni parties who came to them.36 After him, the qaḍishīp in Medina was held by Sharaf al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Amyūṭī who, despite his severity against the sharīfs and the Shi‘a, was unable to oppose their judges

26 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfā, 2/196.
28 Ibn Farḥūn, p.209.
29 ibid.
31 Ibn Farḥūn, p.90; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfā, 1/54.
32 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfā, 3/467.
33 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfā, 2/533; and al-Ḍa‘ū al-Lāmi, 4/131; al-Mudayris, p.205.
34 al-Mudayris, p.206.
36 ibid.
who adjudicated amongst the Shi'a, and al-Amyūti used the same prison as the Shi'a used.\(^37\)

Mu'adhdhīnūn or muezzins\(^38\) were also among those holding religious offices in Medina. The *adhān* is considered one of the fundamental duties in the mosque, since it is the signal to come to prayer. Given its religious importance, those who performed this function were meticulously selected: they had to be pious and devout individuals who knew the Qur'ān and the appointed times.

In the mid-seventh century, there was no one in Medina who could be relied upon to know the times and their sequencing, so three *mu'adhdhīnūn* were sent from Egypt: Aḥmad b. Khalf al-Anṣāri al-Khazraji al-'Abbādi al-Maṭāri, he being the head *mu'adhdhin*, Ibrahim b. Muḥammad al-Kināni al-ʿAsqalāni, and ʿIzz al-Din al-Mu'adhin.\(^39\) Thereafter the office of *mu'adhdhin* remained in the al-Maṭāri and al-Kināni families, handed down from father to son.

6.1.2.1. The relationship between the religious office holders and the rest of Medina's Sunni and Shi'a inhabitants

One of the Shia gādis in Medina, Qādi ʿAli b. Sinān, held authority over the Medinan Sunnis, and no Sunni dared to contract a marriage or decide a dispute without his knowledge. After having been given money in exchange for his approval, he would write to one of the Sunni legal scholars to contract a marriage or settle a dispute.\(^40\)

When Sirāj al-Din took over as khatīb, and later as qādis, he encountered much antipathy and offensive behaviour from the Imāmi Shi'a, but he bore it patiently, anticipating recompense from Allāh. Among their hostile acts towards him was pelting him with stones as he preached from the minbar. When many of them did this, the Mosque attendants would move forward and stand around him, protecting him from the Shi'a hostility - this was the reason for the row of attendants standing in front of the khatīb during the Friday sermon, and they were replaced by their slaves, serving and protecting the qādis. The Shi'a would also lock the front door of Sarāj al-Dīn's house from the outside, sometimes spattering it with filth, and following this up with every kind of hostility. Nevertheless, he

---

\(^37\) al-Mudayris, p.230.

\(^38\) Muezzin is the person who gives the call to prayer from the minaret of the mosque. Ian Netton, *a Popular Dictionary of Islam*, p.172.


remained unmoved, perhaps forgiving them their anger at their loss of the offices of imam and khāṭīb after these had become hereditary amongst them.\footnote{ibid.}

But when Shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn al-Āmīṭi took over as qāḍī, imam and khāṭīb in the Prophet's Mosque, he was known for his severity against the sharifs, and his aggressive measures against the Imāmī Shi'a, as he insulted them from the minbar and prohibited them from performing the four noon prayers on Friday in the mosque, because they refused to perform the Jum'a prayer, owing to their belief that this prayer could be performed only behind an imam who was ma'sūm or infallible.\footnote{Ibn Farrūn, p.91; Ibn Hajar, al-Durar, 4/276.}

The Sunnī qāḍīs treated people well, and this led people to forsake the Imāmī qāḍīs, who were taking money from the parties for adjudicating between them. They clamped down on the Imāmīs regarding temporary (mu'rā) marriage, penalising those who engaged in this, fought against Shi'a innovation, and punished those who insulted the Prophet's Companions. Thus, the Sunna came to the fore.\footnote{Ibn Farrūn, p.92; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfā, 2/509; al-Mudayris, p.230; (and see section 6.1.7.1).}

6.1.3. The mujāwirūn
This word applies to those who came to Medina or to Mecca, staying in one of the two in order to be close to the Holy Places, for an unspecified period; it could be a month, years or for the rest of their lives.\footnote{Ibn Manẓūr, Isān al-‘Arab, 1/530-531.} This term was used in Medina to signify the neighbourhood of the Prophet's Mosque. During the Ayyūbid period, the neighbourhood became more spread out as the numbers of mujāwirūn increased. They came to form a significant percentage of Medina's populace, having a cultural, social, economic and sometimes political influence. The large number of mujāwirūn was due to the religious incentive current in people's beliefs at that time, which was based on a collection of hadith about the excellence of Medina, the merits of living there, and the great rewards for those who prayed in its mosque.\footnote{al-Bukhārī, Sahih al-Bukhārī, Bib Fāḍīl al-Madīna 3/53-63. The following are examples of Ḥadīth about the virtues of Medina: the Prophet said: 'That which exists between my house and my pulpit is a garden from the gardens of Paradise, and my pulpit is upon my trough.' (al-Bukhārī, 2/224). And he said: 'One prayer in my mosque is better than one thousand prayers in any other mosque, excepting al-Masjid al-Ḥarām.' (al-Bukhārī, 3/63, No:1190). And he said: 'Verily, Belief returns and goes back to Medina as a snake returns and goes back to its hole.' (al-Bukhārī, 2/222). And the Prophet said: 'Do not undertake journeys but to three mosques: this mosque of mine, the
Medina witnessed an influx of numerous mujāwirūn from Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Morocco, Yemen, India and Persia. Among the mujāwirūn were scholars, students, persons of various professions and those who held offices, such as muʿādhḥīnūn, mosque attendants and reciters. The spread of special hostels (arbita; sing. ribāt) to house the mujāwirūn helped to increase their numbers. What characterised them most were their piety and receptivity to teaching, and the good relations amongst themselves on the one hand, and between them and the rest of Medina's inhabitants on the other. These relations were apparent in intermarriages without regard for original nationality, thus intermingling ethnicity and blood. The mujāwirūn relations with the people of Medina were marked by friendliness, respect and esteem. This was due to the conduct which characterised the majority of mujāwirūn, and which made them accepted and popular since they had good morals which they abided by, they were congenial and companionable to others, and were dignified and respectful, setting a good example and giving good counsel. Some mujāwirūn were scholarly and upstanding individuals, who did good and eschewed wrong, such as Ahmed b. Muḥammad Zaḥīn al-Dīn (d.704 A.H/1304 A.D.), who cleared away the tree near to al-Rawḍa as-Sarīfī because of the dissension and disturbance created by the people's belief that it carried a blessing.

6.1.3.1. Relations between the mujāwirūn and the Medinan emirs

In general, the mujāwirūn did not concern themselves about political events, the struggles for the emirate and the wars between the Medinan and Meccan emirs. They had no political aspirations; their goal was to devote themselves to worship. Therefore, the mujāwirūn in Medina acquired the patronage of the emirs for the most part, but some disputes did occur; for instance, Ibn Farḥūn mentions that a share of the date harvest from the Mosque of al-Ḥarām (in Mecca) and the Mosque of al-Aṣā. (Muslim, Sahih Muslim, 2/1014, No:1397). And he said: 'Men will all but beat the livers of their camels [riding hard] in pursuit of knowledge, but they will find no-one more knowledgeable than an 'alīn of Medina'. (al-Tirmidhi, Sunan al-Tirmidhi, 5/47).

A ribāt is a simple accommodation set up by certain sultans, wealthy people and 'ulamā'; as endowment for the benefit of mujāwirs, the poor and Sufi adepts. A full definition of this word will be presented in Chapter seven.

27 Ibn Farḥūn, pp.69, 177; al-Sakhāwī, al-Ḍauʿ al-Lāmī, 1./41, 222.
28 Ibn Tağhrībardī, al-Manhal al-Ṣāfī, 1/147.
30 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tufa, 1/229.
the *awqāf* (endowments) was distributed among the *mujāhirūn* every year. The person responsible for this *awqāf* was the head attendant at the Prophet's Mosque. He would take some of this share for himself - which was not permissible under Islamic law, and so certain *mujāhirūn* refused to take their share, one of them saying to the head attendant: ‘You have offended against the *awqāf* and lawful conduct, and we will be brought into ill repute if we partake of these’. The head attendant was angered and referred the matter to Emir Jammāz b. Shihā, who ordered that whoever refused to take the dates be banished from the city. However, prominent *mujāhirūn* intervened, pleading with him on their behalf until he pardoned them.52

Similarly, one of the *mujāhirūn* did not remain silent before Emir Jammāz when he uttered derogatory words with regard to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar, but accused him of unbelief and left the majlis, but he did not escape the wrath of the emir: his house was plundered, which forced him to leave for Mecca.53

Ibn Farḥūn also made mention of the Shi'a sharifs' desire to get rid of the *mujāhirūn* and attendants due to the abundance of their complaints against them to the Sunni caliphs and sultans, yet they were unable to do this due to the arrival of Sultan Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn for the hajj year 712/1313.54 Since the time of Nur al-Dīn Zangi, the sultans had taken an interest in Medina's *mujāhirūn* and required the emirs to honour and provide for them.55 It could be that the reason for this was that the sultan considered himself as the Protector and Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, and one of the basic features of these titles was to ensure the protection of the *mujāhirūn*. Therefore, when Sultan Muḥammad learnt of Emir Manṣūr's mistreatment of certain *mujāhirūn* he ordered that he be arrested and not released until he had pledged that he would not mistreat the *mujāhirūn* but honour them.56 Furthermore, when the sultans sent money to Medina, they would allocate a share to the *mujāhirūn*. Nūr al-Dīn Zangi and Ṣalaḥ al-Dīn sent money to the inhabitants of Medina and the *mujāhirūn*.57

---
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It is clear that, at times, the sharifs adopted a hostile stance towards the *mujāwirūn*, and it appears, from what has been mentioned previously, that the reason behind this was doctrinal differences, since the *mujāwirūn* were opposed to manifestations of Shi'iism in Medina as well as missionary activity.

In the year 394/1003, they sided with the people of Medina against Emir Abū al-Futūḥ, when he received an order from the Fāṭimid caliph to vilify certain Companions as well as some of the Prophet's wives, and so were able to prevent him from doing so. In 410/1019, they also managed to kill a religious dissenter known as the ‘Guide of the Faithful’, who was alleged to have called for the worship of the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh, the cursing of the Prophet and the spitting on the Qur'ān. He had been staying as a guest of Abū al-Futūḥ, under his protection, yet the *mujāwirūn* were able to kill him.

However, the above should not be taken to mean that the relationship between the *mujāwirūn* and the emirs was entirely dominated by hostility and discord. At times, both parties were on good terms, and the cooperation and harmony between them were apparent. There is no better evidence of this than the fact that certain *mujāwirūn* occasionally provided the emirs of Medina with the money they required at critical times, and also many of the emirs welcomed them at their majlis gatherings and honoured them. We may conclude, therefore, that the *mujāwirūn* remaining in the city suggests that the Shi'a were not generally oppressive nor was the city's apparent reputation as the home of oppressive Shi'a enough to prevent them from coming to Medina in the first place.

Among the well-known *mujāwirūn* of this period were: Rabī' b. ‘Abdullāh b. Muḥammad al-Ḥanafi (d.602/1205), who lived in Medina for twelve years as a mendicant dervish, fasting often; Razīn b. Mū'āwiya b. 'Ammār al-Andalusi al-Sargasti (d.525/1131), a Mālikī imam in Mecca who then moved to Medina, became a *mujawir* there and wrote a book on matters there and who was a ḥadīth scholar and author of a book compiling the five Sahih and the Muwattā; Khalaf b. ‘Abd al-'Azīz al-Ghāfiqi al-Ishbili (d.704/1304), who was a
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zahid imam and religious scholar; Saba' b. Shu'aib al-Yamani (d.665/1266), who was Mufti of the Two Holy Mosques. Some of the mujawirun came to Medina with their families, such as: Sa'id al-Rakwāl-Mughrabi, a pious individual who migrated to Medina with his devout wife, both of whom died there after the year 720/1320; Afīf al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad Abū al-Salām b. Mazruʿ al-Baṣrī, a faqīh, and a hadith scholar who knew the scriptures by heart, and who was a mujawir in Medina for nearly fifty years, dying in 696/1297: many were taught by him and scholars from across the Islamic Empire met with him, benefiting from his learning and considering him one of their shaykhs.

6.1.3.2. The economic situation of the mujawirun

An examination of the biographies of certain mujawirun reveals an aspect of real life in Medina and the actual condition of the mujawirun grouping. Just as mujawirun came from different countries, so also they differed in terms of their economic resources. There were those who were rich, who had brought with them a substantial sum of money on which they lived, and had no need to work, such as Shaykh Dhiyā' al-Dīn al-Hindi, in whose house 400,000 dirhams were found hidden. There were the merchants who moved their businesses to Medina and divided their time between work and worship, enjoying life in Medina, such as Muhammad b. `Ali b. Yahyā al-Gharnāti, who had both a business and property. There were those with a profession from which they earned their living, such as the Shaykhs Abū al-Ḥasan al-Kharrāz and Abū `Abdullāh Muḥammad al-Kharrāz, both of whom worked in the same trade as cobblers. Some were poor, without wealth or skills, living the life of ascetics, and alms were distributed among them. Ibn Farḫūn observes that there were annual alms for mujawirun which were disbursed among them, and, if one of them died, his share would pass to his inheritors. A number of mujawirun of average means worked in child education and teaching the memorising of the Qurān particularly those who did not attain the rank of scholar (ālim; pl. `ulamā'), and found that this
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profession assisted them in their difficult circumstances, such as Muḥammad b. Maymūn al-Jazā'iri. Some of them lived in the madrasas or had employment there.

It appears then that the mujāwirūn were a group of people who had come to Medina from both Arab and non-Arab countries and formed what was from the outside a well-structured community which was concerned with worship and of which a significant number engaged in religious science and education. The rest of them were of slender or average means and were involved in simple occupations, receiving at times some money from alms. It is clear that a large proportion of mujāwirūn became integrated into Medinan life, breaking off from their original roots - except for the name and lineage they carried - particularly when the second generation of their children appeared, those who were born and raised in Medina. Their language and culture and a great many of their customs and traditions became absorbed into the Medinan pattern of locally resident cultures and peoples. They also brought facets of their cultures, customs and traditions with them to Medina, making them an integral part of its heritage within a generation or two.

6.1.4. The Slave Class

Slavery was practised during the Ayyūbid period, and trade caravans carried male and female slaves to Medina as they carried them to other cities of the world. The slaves were imported from countries as diverse as Abyssinia, India, and Nubia, and they can be divided into two groups. The first includes the emir’s retinue, aides and private retainers, who waited on him, protected him, served him and carried out his orders. Every emir had a group of slaves, large or small, depending on his standing and wealth. The second group includes those slaves who worked in the houses of the wealthy, on the plantations, or for merchants, buying and selling and transporting merchandise. These slaves mostly worked in agriculture, and, from this, generally received a quarter of the produce and were considered part of the families to which they belonged. Sometimes, it was stipulated that the slave should have as his wages food, clothes and lodging for many years. A slave could
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work on his own account with his master's agreement in return for a sum of money, and could save the rest in order to emancipate himself or get married.77

As for slave girls and bondmaids, they were imported to Medina from the slave markets in various locations, and were Abyssinians, Indians, Greeks, Caucasians, and Arabs who were born in Medina, Egypt, Taif and Najd.78 The people of Medina had disliked taking bondmaids and slave girls as the mothers of their children, until 'Ali b. al-Hasan b. 'Ali Abi Ṭālib (whose mother was Persian) grew up amongst them, outshining the Medinans in terms of legal scholarship, learning and piety, and then they became desirous of taking bondmaids.79

As the use of male and female slaves became prevalent throughout the homes of Medinan emirs and notables, so too spread the movement for emancipation - it was one of the ways of finding favour with Allāh and was practised by many Medinans, mujāwirūn, Shaykhs of the Mosque, and wealthy men and women. Ibn Kathīr notes that, when the volcano erupted in 654/1256, Emir Munif b. Shiyha left his palace for the Prophet's Mosque to perform the ṣalāt and voluntary prayer and freed all of his slaves in an entreaty to Allāh, and thus many of Medina's inhabitants did likewise.80 Ibn Farḥūn mentions that one of the Mujāwirūn, Shaykh 'Abdullāh al-Wadrishi, himself freed thirty slaves.81 Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Abū Bakr b. Aḥmad al-Salāmī was a wealthy man of considerable property which he relinquished, emancipating all of his slaves and mamlūks, seeking recompense and reward from Allāh.82 Shaykh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Gharnāṭi also freed all of his slaves; after entering the Prophet's Mosque as an attendant, he freed his servant Najīb, who became one of the attendants at the Mosque. ‘Ali b. Maymūn al-‘Ujailī also emancipated his slaves.83

The spread of emancipation in Medina led to the emergence of a new social group of freedmen who lived close to their former owners (like al-Nakhāwla), or independently worked in the trades and occupations in which they were proficient, staying mostly among the communities of average means or lower, and joining in the flow of everyday life.
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Famous slaves in Medina include Sa'id, a slave of Muhammad al-Balasi (d. 738/1337) who was freed and made an attendant at the Mosque.

6.1.4.1. Their relationship with the rest of Medina’s Sunni and Shi’a inhabitants
The Imāmi Shi’a du`āt were eager to win over young slaves as they were easy to indoctrinate and became Shi’a when they were older - this worked well for them, as most slaves who worked in agriculture became Shi’a. In time, they became freedmen and formed another social grouping of Medinans. They came to be known as al-Nakhwäla, due to their working in date farming. All of them were Twelvers, and the community can still be found in Medina today. It is clear that this grouping did not mix with Medina’s Sunnis, as they lived in areas specific to them, and the people did not share in their economic and social life.

6.1.5. The old Medinan population
These were the descendants of the Muhājirūn and the Ānṣār. The Ānṣār were the original inhabitants of Medina, the Aws and the Khazraj tribes, who were the Medinans who became Muslims during the time of the Prophet. Many of them left for the Islamic cities during the Conquests and later, while some remained in Medina, preserving their lineage and cohesion up to later times (Ibn Farḥūn observes: ‘In Medina there is a community of the Ānṣār, they have their own quarter in which they live, ‘Abdullāh al-Ḥādhī is one of them’). In his biography of Medinan notables, al-Sakhāwi mentions many names of those who had preserved their lineage to the Ānṣār, among them ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Khalīf al-Anṣārī al-Khazrajī (729-772/1329-1370) and his son Muḥammad, who held the office of head Mu’ādhdhin, qāḍī of Medina, imām and khaṭīb, and ‘Ali b. Ḵūz al-Dīn b. Yūsuf al-Anṣārī (772/1370), the first Ḥanafī qāḍī, who was the Sunni champion against the Shi’a.

As for the descendants of the Muhājirūn, the ‘Umarīyyūn were renowned amongst them, tracing their lineage to ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. They were a large tribe which spread in such
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a way that they can still be found today in Medina. Ibn Farhūn referred to them as being among the prominent inhabitants of Medina: 'In Medina there is a community of 'Umariyyūn descended from 'Umar b. al-Khattab. They were a substantial community, possessing bravery, honour, and influence. They were people with horses, slaves, and retainers, and they were those who assisted the people of the Sunna and the associates of the mujāwirūn and the attendants. They also owned vast properties in Medina.'

Some of them took up important positions in the administration of Medina. Muhammad b. 'Abdullāh al-'Umarī was a vizier to Emir Widdī b. Jammāz. Ibn Ḥajr spoke highly of him, describing him as a just vizier. One of their leaders was 'Ali b. Muṭrif (d. 728/1327), who sat with the most eminent of 'Umarīs and their shaykhs on either side of him.

In the sources available to us, we find no mention of the 'Umarīs taking part in incidents of civil unrest, revolution, and struggle for the emirate, and it appears that they had no impact on peaceful everyday life, despite being a large community with power and influence.

From the names of certain notables who are mentioned by historians, we can surmise that there were numerous Medinans who traced their lineage to some of the Prophet's Companions; among them was 'Abd al-Malik b. Aḥmad al-ʿUthmānī al-Umawī, who claimed descent from 'Uthmān b. ʿAffān and Jamāl b. Yūsuf al-Qurashi al-Ḥāshimi.

The biographies of these notables indicate that they held various occupations and rankings, such as muʿadhdhīnūn, merchants, students, rich and poor, and reveal their eagerness to trace their lineage to Medina's ancient past on which they prided themselves. This lineage was an intrinsic social value showing the purity of their Medinan affiliation.

6.1.5.1. Their relationship with the rest of Medina's Sunni and Shi'a inhabitants

They enjoyed an excellent relationship with the rest of Medina's inhabitants, the mujāwirūn, the attendants and others, supporting one another in piety and devoutness. Many of the wealthy Medinans gave a great deal in charity to the poor, and marriages between original Medinans and certain mujāwirūn also occurred. They liked the
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mujāwirūn and called them to their majlises, enjoying their company and helping them with their problems. As for their relations with the sharifs, some of them were viziers for the emir of Medina, such as Muḥammad b. ‘Abdullāh al-’Umārī and Nūr al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Mashḵūr,⁹⁸ and certain of them opposed the Shi’a innovation and fought against them, like ‘Īzz al-Dīn Ḥasan b. Y’alā al-’Umārī (d. 706/1306).⁹⁹

6.1.6. Attendants at the Prophet’s Mosque

Serving as an attendant (khādim; pl. khuddām) at the Prophet’s Mosque is actually considered a religious office, but, due to its importance, and the sheer numbers of those engaged in this work, I prefer to regard it an independent grouping. This office is regarded as of the great importance, and one to which many people aspire. Although mosque attendants had existed since the time of the Prophet, the use of eunuchs did not occur until the time of the Umayyad Caliph Muʾawiyā b. Abī Sufyān (d. 60/680).¹⁰⁰ It appears that serving in the mosque after this time was voluntary, alongside the official attendants, as one historian recounts that those acting as attendants in the mosque during the ‘Abbāsid period were fuqahāʾ, Sufis, and people of learning and good conduct.¹⁰¹ The only reference I can find in the historical sources to the existence of official attendants after that period is from the second half of the sixth century A.H., when there is a text of Ibn al-Najār which attests the presence of attendants in the Prophet’s Mosque: he believes that they were appointed by Sultan Nūr al-Dīn Zangi. He states that, in 554/1159, during the emirate of al-Qāsim b. Muhanna, an unpleasant odour emanated from the chamber housing the Prophet’s grave in the Mosque (because a bird had died there): ‘A mosque attendant ‘Bayān al-Aswād’ of a black eunuch went down to it and cleaned it’.¹⁰²

However, Ibn Farḥūn gives contrasting information regarding the above, since he says: ‘Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī was the first to establish the system of the attendants at the Mosque of the Prophet, granting them awqāf, of which they still have the deed of endowment today.’¹⁰³ Ibn Iyās confirms Ibn Farḥūn’s opinion:
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Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was the first to decree eunuch attendants in Medina. The reason for this was that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn wished to gain favour with the Medinan emirs, so he sent to them gifts and money until they gave Medina over to him. When he achieved authority over it, he appointed twenty-four eunuch attendants, setting over them a leader called Badr al-Dīn al-Asadi. He endowed them with two towns in Upper Egypt, Naqāda and Qubāla.

From the above, it can be said that the office of mosque attendant existed before the Ayyūbid period, but it began to have specific organisation from the Ayyūbid era onwards, and the title given to its leader was Shaykh al-Khuddām, or Head Attendant. Specific permanent funds were, moreover, allocated to these attendants from awqāf, endowed by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, so that they would be wholly dedicated to serving at the Mosque, i.e. they would partake in no other work than serving as attendants.

The oldest text describing the attendants at the Mosque during the Ayyūbid period is in the Rihla, or Travels, of Ibn Jubayr, when he visited Medina, and reports that they were young Abyssinian men, elegant in appearance and neatly dressed.

The function of the attendants can be summed up as guarding the Mosque, cleaning it, laying carpets, seeing to its needs, opening it up for worshippers, closing it at night, caring for the Prophet's tomb, accompanying the imam to the prayer, sitting around him in the front rows during the sermon, lighting the lamps at night, incensing the Mosque, organising its storehouses, laying the carpets for the emir when he attended the prayer, and standing with his guards. The Shaykh al-Khuddām's office was considered a most superior position, to which distinguished persons were appointed. The authority to appoint lay with the sultan alone, and it was he who issued the decrees for appointment and dismissal. Thus, in this regard, the Shaykh al-Khuddām was on an equal footing with the emir. He was usually selected from the sultan's retainers who served the ruler at his residence, and it generally happened that he was a close companion. When the sultan wished to honour a favoured retainer for his service, he would appoint him as Shaykh al-Khuddām in the Prophet's Mosque.
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It was customary that the head attendant was a eunuch, so that he would have no wife or children and could devote himself entirely to serving the Mosque. This *bid'a* (innovation), as al-‘Ayni called it, had been in place since Şalâh al-Dîn al-Ayyubi sent eunuch attendants to serve in the Holy Mosques in Mecca and Medina. Therefore, when al-Ashraf Barsbay (825/1422) appointed Muḥammad b. Taqqî al-Dîn Qâsim, who was not eunuch, as Shaykh al-Khuddâm in the Prophet's Mosque, his appointment caused dismay and uproar. ‘Ali al-Sayrafi commented on the news in his *Nuzhat al-Nufûs wa al-Abdân*:

> What has been wellknown since times of old is that the position of Shaykh al-Khuddâm is intended for castrated servants - that is to say eunuchs - and so said our Shaykh al-Badr al-‘Aynî and Shaykh Taqqî al-Dîn al-Maqrizî: the office of Shaykh al-Khuddâm of the Prophet's Mosque has not, since Şalâh al-Dîn, been entrusted to other than castrated servants.109

Whoever was chosen to be the Shaykh al-Khuddâm would usually have a venerable personality, combining righteousness, piety, asceticism (*zuhd*) and proficiency in worship with an energetic administrative personality that was capable of properly managing a large number of attendants and maintaining good relations with official and social figures in Medina. Ibn Farḥūn describes one of the Shuyukh al-Khuddâm or head attendants whom Nāṣîr al-Dîn ‘Aṭâ‘ullâh met, and says of him:

> He was the finest person in appearance and the most complete in form. He knew the Qur'ân by heart, fasted often, commanded respect in gatherings without harming or threatening: if he gives an order it is carried out and he did not change his mind for anyone.110

6.1.6.1. Their relationship with the rest of Medina's Sunni and Shi'a inhabitants

The head attendants were all Sunni, since they were always appointed by the Ayyûbid sultans and Mamlûks, as stated previously, and they enjoyed good relations with the Sunni Medinans. Ibn Farḥūn describes the relationship between the attendants and the Medinans as exemplary; they were diligent in good works, offered solace to the poor and showed

---
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affection to the young. Moreover, if one of the merchants fell into financial difficulty, they helped him without gain, and relieved him of his situation.\(^{111}\)

Their relationship with the *mujāwirūn* was also good, as Ibn Farḥūn observes:

No mujāwir, young or old can pass by them without their rejoicing over him and welcoming him to their majlis. And if the Emir of Medina is displeased with one of the mujāwirūn, the most prominent among them will go out to the palace to see the Emir and redeem him, perhaps by assuaging the Emir with something in the way of money. Likewise if one of them suffers a loss, or a crime or a heavy debt, they come to his aid and assist him.\(^{112}\)

Ibn Farḥūn relates that certain of the Shuyukh al-Khuddām had commendable social interactions with the people of Medina, such as ʿĪz al-Dīn Dīnār al-Badrī, who would concern himself with the city's poor, seeing to their needs and preparing medicines for them himself. He would visit them in their homes, bringing them food and money. He had servants and slaves, yet he carried these things to the poor himself and did not want them to carry the gifts for him.\(^{113}\) We find in the *akhbār* of certain Shuyūkh al-Khuddām that they disbursed funds to the poor and needy, and some of them set up *rubūt* (accommodation for the poor and Sufis) and schools, such as Rihān al-Hindi, a long-serving and well-known attendant at the Prophet's Mosque, who erected two large *arbitā*, a plantation and a well for the city's poor;\(^{114}\) and Shaykh Muftāḥ, who endowed a plantation in al-Ḥasā and another in Biʿr ʿĪz al-ʿArab as *waqf* for the poor. His practice every year during the month of Rabīʿ I, the Prophet's birthday, was to disburse large amounts to the poor of Medina.\(^{115}\)

Their relationship with the sharifs, however, was unstable. At times, it was good and, at others, bad, subject to the prevailing political, economic and social circumstances. Ibn Farḥūn mentions one of them standing up to the Shiʿa emirs. He was Shaykh Ẓahir al-Dīn al-Ashrafi (d. 723/1323), who, through his energetic management, was able to safeguard the *awqāf* of the Prophet's Mosque, and recover from the emirs' *awqāf* and properties that
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which they and their forefathers had misappropriated. Due to his prestige and power, the mujāwirūn and their attendants joined forces and their bravery gained in strength.\(^{116}\)

Ibn Farḥūn also narrated in his book that relations between some of the attendants and some of the Shīṭa of Medina were not good at sometimes:

> I was aware of a group of mujāwirūn and khuddām who recited their books and listened to their Prophet's ḥadīth only in secrecy until the arrival of al-Sahīḥ b. Ḥanna,\(^{117}\) who opposed the Sinān family and the al-Qayyashin [Shīṭa]; and they were in awe of his standing with the Sultan, and yielded to him, practising ṭaḥfiyya.\(^{118}\)

However, relations between the attendants and the sharifs were not always poor; certain Shuyukh al-Khuddām had friendly ties with the sharifs - the emirs and others. Among such shaykhs was ʿAzīz al-Dawla, known as ʿAzīzī (d. 700/1300): he was, according to Ibn Farḥūn, 'on good terms with the sharifs, and did them many a good turn, so much so that he was accused of their doctrine because of his consorting with them and meeting their needs'.\(^{119}\) What is meant by accusing him of their doctrine is that he embraced the sharifs' Twelver Shiʿa doctrine.

The Mudāibība family, who were from among the sharifs, lived in the Attendants' Quarter near to the Prophet's Mosque, and, as a result, they interacted with the attendants of the Mosque. For this reason, Ibn Farḥūn believed that they enjoyed good relations with the attendants.\(^{120}\)

### 6.1.6.2. Economic situation of the attendants

The attendants of the Prophet's Mosque had an annual allowance, which came from the proceeds of the awqāf set up for them, and the service of the Mosque in general. There were several awqāf, some in Medina, some in Egypt, Syria, and India.\(^{121}\) When Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn inaugurated the Mosque's attendance system, he endowed awqāf for them in Egypt, consisting of agricultural land, the yield from which was sent to the attendants of the
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\(^{116}\) ibid, p.36, and see ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ Badr, al-Medina, pp.217-219.

\(^{117}\) He was Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Zain al-Dīn b. al-Ṣāḥib, who became a mujāwir in Medina in 701/1302. He died in 704/1305 in Egypt. See Ibn Farḥūn, p.24; al-Sakhāwi, al-Tuhfa, 2/141; Ibn Ḥajar, al-Durar, 1/283.

\(^{118}\) Ibn Farḥūn, p.22.


\(^{120}\) Ibn Farḥūn, p.84; al-Mudayris, p.132.

The sultans who came after him took over the care of these awqāf, increasing them so that they reached the stage where they were used as a means to exert pressure on the emirs. In addition to this, there was the money and gifts which the kings, sultans, caliphs and the wealthy sent to Medina and of which the Mosque's attendants received a share. This indicates that the attendants of the Mosque lived a comfortable life, and it appears that certain Shuyukh al-Khuddām were on a level with the wealthy, which enabled them to spend on worthy causes. Many of them were the servants of the sultans, and perhaps some of them amassed great wealth before becoming Shuyukh al-Khuddām at the Prophet's Mosque, and so had no further need for wealth and began to disburse it.

In general, the attendants at the Prophet's Mosque were, for the most part, devout, practising zuhd and humility and treating others with kindness. They had a fine awqāf and donations which were plentiful during the hajj and the visitation seasons. Some were renowned for their charity and kindness, and many bequeathed their homes and plantations to the Prophet's Mosque and to charitable works, particularly as the majority of them were without wives and children. A large proportion of them were also very learned, attending theology lectures as both pupils and teachers, such as Yūnūs b. ‘Abdullāh Abū al-Faḍl (d. 675/1226), one of the Shuyukh al-Khuddām. He learned the hadith from Abī Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahāb and others, and transmitted it, so that others, in turn, learnt it from him. Al-Sakhāwī mentions that a number of attendants sat around him learning from him. Among them also was Šawāb al-Shams al-Ḥamāwī al-Nāṣirī, Shaykh al-Khuddām (d. 719/1319).

6.1.7. The Imāmis (the Twelver Shi'a)

The Shi'a doctrine did not spread in Medina during the first five hijri centuries, despite a significant number of its followers and du`āt coming and going, as visitors and mujāwirūn for long periods of time. When Medina fell under Fāṭimid control, the Fāṭimids...
endeavoured to propagate their doctrine in the city, and failed due to the Medinan emirs' fluctuating allegiance between them and the Abbasids.

The student of Medinan history will be surprised to learn that, after this period, the ruling family in Medina was Imāmi and that the qadiship, from the sixth to mid-seventh hijrī centuries, was in the hands of the Imāmis, as well as the Friday sermon in the Prophet's Mosque. But how did this transformation occur?

Ibn Farḥūn relates that a Shi'a family, the Qāshānīs, came to Medina from Iraq. They were wealthy and wished to propagate Imāmīsm in the city, and worked cleverly to this end. They were helped by the general conditions at that time. Medina's revenues were meagre and the economic conditions of its inhabitants were modest, so they appealed to the poor and the vulnerable with money, teaching them the principles of their doctrine. They continued to do this until their faith had gained the upper hand and had many devotees, and the sharifs during that time assisted them in this. It appears that certain sharifs had already converted to Imāmī Shī'ism before the arrival of the Qāshānīs - an explanation of this is given in Chapter four. The Qāshānīs did not, however, carry this to excess or force people into it.

After the arrival of the Qāshānī family, Imāmīsm spread among Medina's sharifs to the extent that their name, in the writings of Ibn Farḥūn, became analogous with Imāmīsm, including those sharifs who took over the emirate of Medina. Al-Sakhāwī mentions those who were biased towards the Imāmīs and those who favoured the Sunnis. With the spread of Imāmīsm among Medina's sharifs, the balance of power began to shift, with Imāmīs obtaining important positions which influenced the city's social life. In the time of Emir Munif b. Shīḥa, the chief qāḍī in Medina was Imāmī, his name was Shams al-Din Sinān b. ʿAbd al-Wahāb b. Namilā al-Husaynī. After that, the qadiship remained in the hands of the Sinān tribe for almost a hundred years.

---

129 See Ibn Taymiyya, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 28/533.
131 ibid., p.70. (Ibn Farḥūn mentions this, and so it is uncertain whether these missions actually took place).
132 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuḥfa, 1/93-97.
134 Ibn Farḥūn, p.202. (Between Shams al-Dīn- the first Shīʿi qāḍī- and Najm al-Dīn- the last Shīʿi qāḍī- about one hundred years).
Al-‘Ilbābiya were of this tribe: they were a large family of Medinans, among whom was Yūsuf al-Sharbashir, the Shi’ā shaykh and faqih. Their ancestor was a Sunni Moroccan who married Shi’ā Medinan girl. He died while his children were infants, and so they were raised in the doctrine of their mother, and then multiplied and spread, embracing the Shi’ā doctrine and taking it to excess.  

6.1.7.1. Their relations with the Sunni Medinans

Ibn Farḥūn mentions, in reference to Sulṭān b. Najād, that the qāḍī Shams al-Dīn Sinān would steer clear of contentious issues which affected the Sunnis, and instead was courteous towards them, even if the matter outwardly impinged on his beliefs. However, in the time of ‘Ali b. Sinān, when the Shi’ā had become more powerful, their treatment of the Sunnis changed. With regard to this, Ibn Farḥūn observes that if a marriage contract was drawn up in Medina without the authorisation of the qāḍī ‘Ali b. Sinān, he would send for those responsible and punish them for it. Naturally, the change of equilibrium in Medina led to a change in the social relations among certain groupings of the population. Some negative incident occurred owing to a lack of tolerance on the part of certain individuals on all sides; conversely, positives also emerged which helped to maintain good relations among the parties concerned. Some of the biographies and historiographies related minor negative occurrences in which an individual offended another or one party caused some harm to another; however, the issue stopped there, which shows the speed at which the problem was controlled and kept within the bounds of an individual-to-individual matter, and was prevented from escalating into a sectarian dispute or civil strife. It also proves that peaceableness and coexistence were firm principles in Medina society at that time.

Undoubtedly, the attitude of the emirs had a significant influence on maintaining good social relations among the groupings of the inhabitants, when they handled matters well, and dealt with any problems arising swiftly and fairly, preventing them from developing and reaching critical proportions. It would seem, from the absence of major events and civil conflicts from the history books and chronicles, that the clashes were too few to mention
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136 This was cited in Chapter four.
137 Ibn Farḥūn, p.209.
and that their consequences reached a critical level only in emotional terms. Some historians have related minor incidents which occurred because of doctrinal differences, such as: Emir Mansūr imprisoning Sharif Ya‘qūb because he had argued with one of the Imāmis and worsted him;\(^{139}\) what was done to Shaykh Dīyā’ al-Dīn al-Hindi by Emir Jammāz b. Mansūr;\(^ {140}\) the killing of the Sunni qāḍī Shams al-Dīn b. al-Zaman by a Shī’a;\(^ {141}\) and the punishment which Emir Zubayr inflicted on a Sunni man who had insulted one of the Shī’a by calling him a Rāfidi: he was beaten to death.\(^ {142}\) Certain emirs would take the side of the Shī’a and others would favour the Sunnis. Ibn Farḥūn makes no mention of any major incident which would reveal the presence of unrest and clashes between the factions, and it was highly likely that social relations were normal, with normal friendships and relationships, and although, as in the everyday life of any community, there were minor individual disputes and emotional outbursts, these were contained. Amongst the examples of such outbursts given by Ibn Farḥūn was that which occurred when certain Imāmis were holding private prayer meetings in the Prophet's Mosque during Ramadan and disturbing those who were performing the tarāwīḥ (nightly prayer during Ramadan), and some of them also sat in the way of visitors coming into the Mosque in order to receive gifts from them; this angered some of the Sunnis; one of the Shī’a heard a reciter reciting ‘...As well as (desert Arabs) among the Medina folk they are obstinate in hypocrisy’,\(^ {143}\) and so he struck the reciter.\(^ {144}\) It is certainly conceivable that the reciter had recited this as a subtle insult, as had been done by al-Ḥalabi, an Imāmi, who passed close by to a majlis in which the Sunni qāḍī al-Sirāj was present, and cried ‘A lying, sinful forelock!’\(^ {145}\) An event which led to tension between the Sunnis and the Shī’a was that of a fire in the Prophet's Mosque, which some attributed to Allāh wishing to cleanse the Mosque after it was touched by the hands of the Rafidites. Abū Shama says:

\(^{139}\) Ibn Farḥūn, p.92.
\(^{140}\) al-Fāsī, al-‘IQD, 2/292.
\(^{141}\) Ibn Iyās al-Ḥanafi, Badā‘i’ al-Zuhūr, 3/145.
\(^{142}\) al-Sakhāwi, al-Tuhfā, 2/80.
\(^{144}\) Ibn Farḥūn, pp.16-18.
The Haram of the Prophet did not catch fire due to an incident which threatened it or shame which befell it. Rather it was the hands of the Rafidites touching that noble thing, and so the fire cleansed it.\textsuperscript{146}

Aside from this, there were highly positive descriptions of the good relations between both sides, some of which are recounted by Ibn Farhūn: he speaks very appreciatively of the Imāmi qādī Najm al-Dīn Muḥannā b. Sinān (d.754/1353), stating that he was a most impressive individual, friendly towards the mujāwirūn, associating with them, and endearing himself to them, praising them for their excellent qualities and attending their majlis gatherings, although he was the Imāmi leader and the person who sat in judgement over Shi'a, their marriages and their contracts.\textsuperscript{147}

Moreover, certain Sunni dignitaries accommodated the Shi'a by participating some of their customs. The Imāmis had introduced a prayer called the \textit{al-Raghā'īb} Prayer, a supererogatory collective prayer which they performed on the first Friday night of the month of Rajab, and Shaykh Sirāj al-Dīn - a Sunni qādī - performed this prayer with them out of courtesy.\textsuperscript{148}

There were also various instances of marriage between Sunnis and Shi'a; among these, the marriage of Qādī Sirāj al-Dīn to the daughter of the head of the Imāmis and their faqīh at that time, al-Qāshānī; and the marriage of a Moroccan mujāwir to a Shi'a girl with whom he had children, and when he died while the children were still in their infancy, they adopted the doctrine of their mother and became a large family of Shi'a, called the al-\textsuperscript{149}Abābiya.

The attitude of the Ayyūbid sultans and the Mamlūks towards the Medinan emirs played a part in preventing some of the quarrels, and in reining back the extremist tendencies among the Imāmis, and perhaps also in opposing them, and in advancing the Sunnis. Sultan Šalāh al-Dīn ordered the emirs of Medina to remove the taxes which they levied on the native population and the pilgrims. Emir Ṭufayl b. Manṣūr (728/1328) protected the Sunni qādī Ibn Farhūn and would not hear the complaints of the Shi'a qādīs against him, after his receipt of a letter from Sultan Qalāwūn to that effect.\textsuperscript{150} Saʿād b. Thābit suspended

\textsuperscript{146} Ibn Farhūn, p.194; al-Sakhāwī, \textit{al-Tuhfa}, 2/407
\textsuperscript{147} Ibn Farhūn, p.202.
\textsuperscript{148} ibid., p.17.
\textsuperscript{150} ibid., p.217.
the Imāmi courts, and Jammāz b. Hibā b. Jammāz showed support for the Sunnis to the point where many Imāmis became annoyed with him.

In short, it is possible to say that the Shi'a had a marked influence at times on the social relations among Medina's inhabitants, and it is to be observed that certain Shi'a emirs had a racial bias based on doctrine, which unfortunately was shown towards some of the Sunni Medinans and the mujāwirūn. They imposed taxes on the wealthy amongst them, harassing them and giving their poor none of the money which was sent by the sultans, and they may have gone so far as to seize some of their property. Some of the emirs encouraged the Shi'a missionary activity against the Sunnis, and no-one could say anything about the Shi'a, according to Ibn Farḥūn. There were several periods of oppression experienced by the Sunni inhabitants, which made some prefer to emigrate in order to escape from the oppression of the emir and harassment by the Shi'a. If one of the Shi'a complained to certain emirs about one of the Sunnis, the emirs took the side of the Shi'a without investigating the truth of the complaint. The support of the emirs for the Shi'a grew stronger until they ended up transferring judicial authority to them. As for the Shi'a du'aṭ, their shaykhs and certain of the qudāt, they behaved badly towards the Sunnis, insulting the Companions of the Prophet, or establishing doctrinal innovations which angered the Sunni, offending and alarming them. Most of the time, the Sunnis were unable to do anything due to their weakened state and their fear of the emirs' punishment, and certain Shi'a qudāt would not allow any of the Sunni 'ulamā' to make marriage contracts or to adjudicate between Sunni disputants, unless they were paid a sum of money to authorise this. This shows the extent to which some emirs and the Shi'a were in concert together in persecuting the Sunnis. When a Sunni held the offices of imam and khaṭib, he would be were met with considerable maltreatment and harassment from the Imāmis.

However, this does not mean that the relationship was always bad; rather, these were minor isolated incidents occurring over a period of almost a hundred years, as a result of the emotional tensions between people due to doctrinal differences which did not escalate

151 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, 2/125.  
153 Ibn Farḥūn, p.211.
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into sectarian unrest. Otherwise, relations between the Sunnis and Shi'a were normal, if not always good, governed by friendliness and mutual closeness.

6.1.8. The general populace
This term denotes the vast majority of the people. This grouping consisted of the merchants, who worked in foreign trade between East and West or in internal trade, having a shop or premises from which they sold the basic merchandise required by Medina's inhabitants; the peasants, most of whom were poor, as they worked as labourers for wealthy plantation owners; and the craftsmen, who were skilled in a basic trade, such as cobblers, tanners, goldsmiths, smiths, carpenters and others. The larger families were well known and came to be given the same name as their trade.

This grouping suffered from many difficulties, the most significant being the large number of taxes imposed on them by the sharifs, as well as the lack of rain and consequent droughts which harmed their crops and led to increased poverty. Many were forced to emigrate to Egypt during the Fatimid period, and to stay there in search of a better life. According to the Rihlah of Nāṣir Khusrū: 'Many people from the Hijāz, some of them Medinans, were enlisted into the ranks of the Egyptian army during the reign of the Fatimid Caliph al-Mustansir'.

Some approximate statistics concerning the inhabitants of Medina and their countries of origin
In order to become acquainted with the social origins of Medina's prominent and notable inhabitants, I carried out a survey of anyone who I found had had a biography (tarjama; pl. tarājim) written about them, or who was mentioned in the history and biographies books I came across. On referring to these biographies of Medina's inhabitants and newcomers during the Ayyūbid period, we find that al-Sakhawi alone (the only chronicler to compile a book of biographies of Medina's notables, from the time of the Prophet until his death in 902/1496) documents the lives of 119 personalities, and most of who were mentioned by Ibn Farḥūn and al-Fayruz Abādı (both historians of Medina in the eighth Hijri century
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154 Nāṣir Khusrū, Safarnāmā, p.94; Ṣubḥi 'Abd al-Mun'im, p.240.
155 It should be borne in mind that obtaining the names and biographies of individuals who lived in Medina during the Ayyūbid period from these sources was no simple matter, and required that all the history books, sirās and biographies be read, as the sirās were not mentioned in chronological order, but alphabetically by name.
who wrote biographies of Medina's notables in the sixth and seventh Hijri centuries) are found amongst al-Sakhawi's biographees, although Ibn Farhun adds four personalities to al-Sakhawi's list. Naturally, these statistics can not possibly include all of the inhabitants of Medina during the period under study; moreover, al-Sakhawi, Ibn Farhun and al-Fayruz Abadi did not write the biography of any person who was not of professional or scholarly renown, just as they unfortunately did not write the biography of any merchant, peasant or simple tradesman. On top of this, al-Shakhwii's book is incomplete due to the last section having been lost. Therefore, I have attempted to fill in the gaps from other Medinan history books and certain biographies. Nevertheless, these biographies can provide an indication, albeit approximate, of the composition of the population of Medina and the relative size of its constitutive elements. The statistics show that indigenous Medinans about whom biographies were written are at the forefront, numbering thirty-five persons. This figure would be increased if the biographies were to include tradesmen, professionals, merchants and peasants, as most Medinans fell into these groups. As for those who were originally from Mecca, there are nineteen persons, and it is possible that the close proximity of the two cities created a constant flow of movement between the inhabitants of both cities. In third position are individuals who came from Iraq, of whom there are seventeen. Several factors contributed to the increase in this number, amongst them the existence of the 'Abbasiid Caliphate with its flourishing activity in the fields of science and learning and its concentration of 'ulamä'; and the desire of these 'ulamä' and students to benefit and learn from other scholars or indeed to spread their knowledge throughout the Islamic regions - the most significant being Mecca and Medina. It is possible that this was also due to the desire of the Iraqi Shii'a to propagate their doctrine there, such as happened with the al-Qashani family which came from Iraq to spread Shi'ism in Medina. In fourth position are people who came from Egypt and Iran, and here there are nine individuals from each country. It appears that physical proximity was a factor attracting numerous Egyptians, be it for studying or teaching at the Prophet's Mosque, or with the intention of worshipping and bringing themselves closer to Allâh as well as being near to the Prophet's Mosque. Then, in fifth position, come the Abyssinians, eight in number, most of whom worked in the service of the Prophet's Mosque. Despite Syria's proximity to Medina, only five Syrian personalities came to Medina, and there was the same number of mujawirun from Morocco. We then find four
people hailing from al-Andalus (Muslim Spain), and two from both the Yemen and Tunisia. As for Turks and Greeks, I found biographies for only one from each country, and there are three individuals about whose origins I found no mention.

6.2. Customs and traditions in Medina and the influence of the Shi'a upon them

One notices in the travelogues of those who visited Medina that there is a dearth of information about the social life and the customs and traditions of its inhabitants, which may stem from the brevity of the visitors' sojourns there. Among the few references which I found in the travelogues relating to the notable customs of the people of Medina was Ibn Rashid's reference to their welcoming reception for the pilgrims, offering them dates by placing the fruit in small containers tied to sticks and passing them around those seated inside domed structures covered with cloth.\(^\text{156}\)

With regard to the Medinans' customs related to leisure and recreation, al-`Ayyäshi and al-Baranüni observe that they would leave for an outing to Medina's outskirts on Tuesdays and Fridays after the 'Asr Prayer, and would return in the evening, referring to this as \textit{maqyäl}.\(^\text{157}\) They would go singly or in groups, or some would set off at first light carrying their provisions with them. The most favoured recreation resorts during that time were Wädi Qanäṭ and Wädi al-`Aqiq.\(^\text{158}\)

Ibn Farhün is counted among those who have provided useful information about the social life of Medina, by relaying biographies of some prominent individuals from among the inhabitants, through which is it possible to derive certain general features of the customs of its people during that time. Although Ibn Farhün's description of Medinan social life during the Ayyübids period amounts to no more than simple and scattered references in his book, it is still a useful portrayal, as it highlights certain customs of the population, as exemplified in what follows.

From what Ibn Farhün says of the Medinan `ulamä, it can be understood that it was their custom that if one of them wanted to teach or to issue \textit{fatwä} (legal judgement or view)\(^\text{159}\).

at the Prophet's Mosque, he would reserve for himself a specific place there and occupy it unvaryingly, even placing a sign upon it so that people would know it to be his place.\textsuperscript{160}

Another custom was that when a wealthy man wished to pray in the Prophet's Mosque, he would order a servant to go in advance to the Mosque to reserve a place for him to sit, or to put down a rug for him, and, when the master came, the servant would stand up from the place or sit by it.\textsuperscript{161}

When rain fell on the Jabal Uhud both rich and poor would set out for the grave of Ḥamza, the Prophet's paternal uncle, and spend the night in prayer and worship. They would take with them many varieties of luxury and ordinary foods, and different varieties of sweetmeats, laying tables with these foods and sweets and feasting on these together.\textsuperscript{162}

It appears that a new custom emerged which was absent from early Islam - since there is no text mentioning it - namely, women taking part in funeral processions, as happened at the funeral of Shaykh Abū al-Ghumr al-Ṭanjī, who died in Medina in 718/1318. The women followed at the rear, yet Ibn Farhūn does not disapprove of this nor find it strange. In fact, he says of the funeral: 'I never saw so many men and women processioners, young and old, than at his funeral',\textsuperscript{163} which shows that this was not the first time that women had followed a funeral procession.

Other customs which spread through Medina during that period were certain beliefs and practices connected with Sufism, such as people relaying reports of saints and pious individuals, their miracles and extraordinary powers.\textsuperscript{164} Among these saints were those known as 'Aṣḥāb al-Khutwah' (lit. 'Those with the Stride'), before whom some people believed that the ground folded up, allowing them to transport themselves from one place or town to another in a very short time.\textsuperscript{165}

\textsuperscript{160} Ibn Farhūn, p.14.
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\textsuperscript{165} See Ibn Farḥūn, pp.107, 129; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfā, 2/121-122.
A further custom involved one of the reciters sitting in the Mosque before the Friday Prayer and reciting the Qur'ān in a loud voice, bothering those who were praying in the Mosque and disturbing them in their worship.166

It was also customary that the doors of the Prophet's Mosque were locked at night, an hour after the 'Ishā praye, and did not remain open, as they did at the Holy Mosque in Mecca. The doors of the Prophet's Mosque were opened again an hour before the Fajr prayer, and, frequently, there was a rush once the doors were open, because of overcrowding and everyone wanting to pray in the front row.167

Each community would pray side by side in the mosque, and one would see a row of Qurayshis, a row of 'Umaris, another row of Baṣris, a row of Persian mujāwirūn, a row of Moroccan mujāwirūn, and a row of the Mosque's attendants and servants.168

When a drought afflicted Medina, it was customary for the inhabitants to perform a prayer for rain; at times, this was performed over two days, the first day for Medinans and the second for mujāwirūn, such as happened in 637/1240, when the Medinans prayed for rain but none came, so the mujawir al-ʿAbbiis b. Altmad al-Qaṣṭalāni al-Māliki al-Miṣrī distributed an abundance of food to the poor and needy, praying with the other mujāwirūn, after which rain fell.169

**Shī'a influence on these customs**

One notices the degree of similarity between many of the customs which were observed in Egypt under Shī'a Fāṭimid rule and those observed by the inhabitants of Medina during the Ayyūbid period, as it seems clear that many of the religious festivals which were held in Medina were actually Shī'a festivals, with aspects relating to their doctrine and beliefs; for example, the mawlid or birthday of the Prophet, the mawlid of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib and of his sons Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, the mawlid of the Prophet's daughter Fāṭima and the day of Husayn's killing, which is actually considered a day of mourning.170
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The building of cupolas over graves also spread, and this was a Shi'a practice, initially appearing in Egypt in the days of the Fāṭimid state. The proof that this phenomenon had Shi'a origins lies in the fact that, in Medina, cupolas were only initially built over the graves of those who belonged to the House of the Prophet and the House of ʿAlī, and it was the Shi'a who took to excess the building and decoration of these cupolas. In his travelogue, al-Batnūnī describes the cupola which the Shi'a built over the grave of al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī as being the most splendid of cupolas, made of copper and engraved with Persian script. The Shi'a also worked to spread certain innovative customs among some of Medina's general populace, the pilgrims and visitors, such as the account in the Rihla of Ibn Jubayr about the tree stump from which the Prophet would preach before using the minbar was constructed, and a section of it being retained in the Mosque that people would kiss, seeking blessing by touching it and stroking its sides. Yet these actions were bida' (innovations) and had not occurred in the days of the Prophet or the Companions and those who followed, given that Ibn al-Najār observes that the tree stump had disappeared in the time of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and its whereabouts were unknown.

Ibn Jubayr notes that, in the Prophet's Mosque, there was a flat, square stone, yellow in colour, every inch of it shining brightly, which was said to be a mirror that had belonged to the Persian king, Khusrā (Chosroes), and above it was a small box, said to be Khusrā's cup. Some of the Shi'a said that this had contained the pearls of Fāṭima, the Prophet's daughter, and people began to seek blessings from it, rushing forward to touch it. Certain Shi'a also tried to attach stories to a small grille near the ground in the eastern side of the Mosque, saying that it led to the house of Fāṭima, hoping to inveigle money out of people.
Al-Batnûṭi observes that, in the middle of the Mosque, there were some small palm trees growing beside a tall palm tree. The Shi'a spread word that this was the site of the palm tree of Fāṭima, the Prophet's daughter.\(^{180}\)

Ibn Farḥūn takes note of the customs observed by the Imāmī Shi'a that angered the Sunnis, such as that performed by the Sinān family and others when visitors arrived at the Mosque: they would hasten to put out chairs and tables at the Prophet's tomb, the tree stump, the grave of Abū Bakr and Fāṭima's house, and would then recite various prayers which the visitors would repeat after them - this was in order to take money from the visitors afterwards. If the visitors had with them candles, rose water and similar presents for the Mosque, they would take these from them.\(^{181}\)

Another custom involved the Imāmī reciters and their imams, when the month of Ramadan began, taking the candles into the Mosque - a candle for each of their number - and placing them in their majlis gatherings after the 'Ishā prayer. They would then start offering up supplications and uttering verses in praise of 'Alī b. Abi Ṭālib and his kin. They would raise their voices in the Mosque and the people who were performing the tarāwīḥ were unable to pray with due submissiveness or hear the recital of their imams above the raised voices; many people would gather around them and these supplications interfered with the timing of their prostrations.\(^{182}\)

The Imāmīs also had a prayer unique to them called al-Raghā'ib, which they performed on the first Friday night of the month of Rajab, praying collectively in the Prophet's Mosque, with none of the Sunnis being able to take them to task for this because of their weak position.\(^{183}\) The Imāmīs were also not in the habit of praying in rows during collective prayers and the rows became broken up by them, with many gaps. Often, one of their men would pray on his own behind the row, even though there was a place for him within it.\(^{184}\)

As time went by, certain bida' became accepted, which impelled many 'ulamā' to oppose them.\(^{185}\)

The Imāmī Shi'a in Medina were also accustomed to taking certain locations in the Mosque as private for themselves, reserving them and cordonning them off so that no one else would
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\(^{181}\) Ibn Farḥūn, p.23.

\(^{182}\) ibid., p.24.

\(^{183}\) ibid.

\(^{184}\) ibid., p.26.

pray there. These private areas cut into the rows and irritated the Sunnis who were at prayer,\(^{186}\) as the Shi’a would raise their voices whilst studying together in these areas.

Ibn Jubayr tells of the length of time that the *khatib* would sit on Fridays after the first sermon to collect money from worshippers, and would not resume preaching until he was satisfied with what they had offered him. This was a Shi’a practice, since Ibn Jubayr describes the *khatib* as following unsatisfactory procedures.\(^{187}\)

It is strange that certain Shi’a customs in Medina remained and were practised by many Sunnis and Shi’a alike, even after Shi’a rule and influence over Medina had vanished. The most striking of these customs is the celebration of the Prophet’s Birthday, which Muslims in Medina continue to observe to the present day.

6.2.1. Marriage

There was a marital custom among the Medinans whereby, when a young man wished to wed, his mother would search for a suitable bride. Once she had found one, she would first consult her husband and inform him about the girl’s family. If the father was in agreement, she would tell her son about the girl, her attributes and her family. If the young man agreed, his legal guardian would ask the girl’s father or legal guardian for her hand in marriage. If he were accepted, the marriage ceremonies would proceed, starting with the drawing up of a marriage contract in the Prophet’s Mosque. The young man and his family would then go to the home of the girl’s family. A celebration would be held that night, involving a feast called *al-Naqiā*. On the following day, when the marriage would be consummated, another celebration would be held by the groom’s family in which there would be contests between young men throwing spears, and there was also feasting. The bride would leave her family’s home in a procession, decorated in all her finery and decked in gold and silver jewellery. The women would sing along the way of the exploits of her kinsfolk, until she arrived and the festivities came to an end; then the women would bid farewell to the bride, invoking blessings on her and wishing the couple well before taking their leave.\(^{188}\)

---

\(^{186}\) Ibn Farhūn, *Naṣīḥat*, p.22.


6.2.2. ʿĪds and religious celebrations
Unfortunately, neither the historians nor the great travellers have described the celebrations of the inhabitants of Medina during ʿĪds and religious occasions as they have done for Mecca; both Ibn Jubayr and Ibn Battūţā provide accurate descriptions of the Meccan festivities on such occasions.\(^{189}\) It appears that this is due to their not having been present in Medina during ʿĪds and other religious celebrations, coupled with the brevity of their stays in Medina compared to Mecca, rather than because the inhabitants of Medina did not celebrate these occasions. The evidence for this lies in a few references made by certain historians about these occasions and, the celebrations current in Medina during that period. Therefore, from these few references, as well as by comparing, making analogies and approximating between Medina and the festivities occurring in Mecca, and also in consequence of the physical proximity of the two cities and the similarity in doctrine, it is possible to deduce some of the customs observed during the Medinan ʿĪds and festivals during the Ayyūbid period.

6.2.2.1. Celebrating the Prophet's Birthday (al-Mawlid)
The Medinans would celebrate this day on the 12\(^{th}\) of Rabīʿ I annually. It appears that the Fāṭimid Shiʿa in Egypt were the first to celebrate the Prophet's Birthday,\(^{190}\) and the custom of celebrating this day moved on to Medina during the time of the Fāṭimids and continued throughout the Ayyūbid period.\(^{191}\) They would disburse vast amounts of money, people would pay for the provision of tables laden with different kinds of food, and certain practices would be carried out which some considered to be at odds with Islam and to be bidāʿ innovated by the Shiʿa.\(^{192}\) Something else which accompanied the Birthday celebrations and spread during this period was the manifestation of the Prophet during sleep to certain Medinans, commanding them to do things in celebration of the occasion.\(^{193}\)
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\(^{192}\) al-Mudayris, p.158.

\(^{193}\) Ibn Farḥūn, p.41; al-Mudayris, p.158.
6.2.2.2. Celebrating \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d al-Fi\(\text{\textit{t}}\)r and \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d al-A\(\text{\textit{d}}\)h\(\text{\textit{a}}\)

It was customary for the Medinans not to pray in the Prophet's Mosque during the \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d; instead they would pray in the \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d oratory situated to the west of the Mosque. The Imāmī Shi'a did not worship alongside the Sunnis during the \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d, and would pray in the 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib Mosque instead.\(^{194}\) Ibn Baṭṭūṭa provides a description of how Meccans celebrated the \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d, which I think is similar to what took place in Medina: in the morning of the \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d, people would dress in new clothes and go out to the oratory, while the emir, his retainers and men of governance would also go out to pray. After the prayer, people would stand up, some giving \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d greetings by shaking hands and embracing, then they would return to their homes and exchange visits with their kin, neighbours and friends throughout the day, playing games and listening to singers and poets at night-time.\(^{195}\) Women tended to celebrate in their homes, especially on the fourth day of the \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d, which is known as the Women's \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d (\(\text{\textit{I}}\)d al-Nisā\(\text{\textit{h}}\)), when they would visit one another, exchange sweets they had made themselves and sing and dance.\(^{196}\)

During \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d al-A\(\text{\textit{d}}\)h\(\text{\textit{a}}\), the Medinans celebrated no less than they did for \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d al-Fi\(\text{\textit{t}}\)r. After the \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d prayers, they slaughtered animals as a sacrifice, giving a third to the poor and needy, another third to their friends and relatives, and eating or storing the remaining portion. People would visit one another, starting with their relatives and then going to their friends and neighbours. The streets and quarters would be filled with children playing, and Medina would sparkle with lights.\(^{197}\) It was the Shi'a qāḍī from the Sinān family who prayed with the people, celebrating the \(\text{\textit{I}}\)d in Medina during Ayyūbid times, as the Sunni inhabitants held no sway over affairs.\(^{198}\)

6.2.2.3. Celebrating the month of Ramadan

In Medina, Ramadan was glorified and held in high esteem due to its religious significance. A custom observed in the city during this month was that of the musahhārātī, who awakened people for the pre-dawn breakfast, known as sahūr, so that they could eat before the fasting began. mu'ādh dinūn at the Prophet's Mosque usually performed this function, since they stood in the minarets to deliver the call and remind people of the merits of

\(^{194}\) Ibn Farḥūn, p.219.

\(^{195}\) Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, al-Rihla, p.154; Sulaymān Mālti, p.116

\(^{196}\) al-‘Ayyāshī, al-Madīna bin al-Mādī wa al-Ḥādir, p.217; Sulaymān Mālti, p.117.

\(^{197}\) Jamīl Ḥarb, p.239.

\(^{198}\) ibid.
The people of Medina honoured Ramadan with varieties of food and sweetmeats which they only prepared during this month. It was customary for the emir to order the beating of drums to announce the start of the month. Festivities would take place in the Mosque and candles and lamps were lit so that the Mosque was bright with lights. The tarāwīh would be performed from the first night of Ramadan, and the entire Qur'ān would be recited during the last ten days. It was also customary for the Medinans to break their fast in the Prophet's Mosque during this month.

With regard to the Shi'a influence on fasting during Ramadan, Ibn Jubayr mentions that the Shi'a sharifs in Mecca and Medina insisted that people fast on a day of uncertainty, which was contrary to the Sunni practice that, if the crescent moon of the month of Ramadan fails to appear, then people are to end the month of Sha'bān after thirty days.

6.2.2.4. Celebrating the month of Rajab

It is one of the blessed months for the people of Hijāz in general, and one of their biggest ʿĪds. It was also one of the sacred months in which fighting was prohibited during the pre-Islamic Jāhilīyya period. When the sighting of the crescent was confirmed, the emir would order the sounding of drums and trumpets to herald the start of the month. The inhabitants of Medina would mark this month by performing the ʿUmra pilgrimage to Mecca, which is considered equivalent to the hajj in terms of merit in the eyes of Allāh, and, as such, they made great celebration during this month. People would set out looking their very best, in their finest clothes, and even the camels they journeyed on to Mecca were adorned with the most splendid of decorations. Celebrating the month and performing the ʿUmra would last the whole month long. The mid-month was marked by an increase in acts of worship, such as fasting, the ʿUmra and prayer. On the 27th of the month, the townsfolk would hold a huge celebration and it is said that this night was the night journey and ascension of the Prophet (laylat al-Isrā' wa al-Mi`rāj).
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6.2.2.5. Celebrating the Night of Mid-Shaban
This was considered a blessed night, celebrated by the people of Ḥijāz in general, when they attempt to outdo one another in acts of charity and kindness. They may go to Mecca to perform the 'Umra, and some gather in the mosque to recite the Qurʾān, while others pray collectively or individually one hundred rakʿāt or prostrations, reciting with each rakʿa al-Fātiha and Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ ten times over. Many candles and lamps are lit in the mosque on this night.  

6.2.3. Dress
Medinans' dress would differ according to the individual's status, occupation and social rank: emirs had special attire, which no one else was permitted to wear, particularly for important occasions and ḤIDS. Their robes and turbans were made of white silk and decorated with gold and silver. These were usually given as a robe of honour from the caliph to signify their appointment as emir of Medina.  

Qudāt and khutabā' would dress in black robes and turbans, embroidered with gold thread. The head mu'adhdhin would also wear black attire for the Friday prayers, and carry his sword.

The ordinary people of Medina, such as merchants and students, were known for dressing in clean, elegant white robes made from linen or cotton during the summer months, and wearing fine white woollen turbans on their heads. In the winter months, they wore woollen robes. Some 'ulamā' and students would wear a white turban, a burda and a jubba (outer garment) made of cotton, both called qiftān, with different colours depending on the šālim's scholarly ranking.

As for the mujāwirūn, many of them were zuhhād (ascetics) and wore the cheapest clothing, although some of them were wealthy. Many were also keen to dress in their
national costume, particularly on religious occasions. A great number of the Medinans would wear perfume and kohl, and clean their teeth with a siwāk.\(^{213}\)

6.2.4. Food and drink

A great variety of foods was eaten by the Medinan population due to the diversity of nationalities which arrived in the city, and it seems that the large number of mujāwirūn of differing nationalities led to the emergence of new varieties of food and cooking techniques. A well-known dish cooked in Medina at that time was harīṣa. Al-‘Ayyāshi provides a description of its ingredients and how it was prepared: it was made from wheat, meat and clarified butter.\(^{214}\) It appears that it was brought to Medina from Egypt, since those who made it were called ḥarrāṣīn, and the Fāṭimid State appointed supervisors to oversee harīṣa production in the market, to prevent it from being adulterated.\(^{215}\) Another dish was idām, made from aubergines and meat and usually prepared in a pot over a fire.\(^{216}\) Meat appears to have been a basic staple of the Medinans' diet: al-‘Ayyāshi describes them as meat-lovers and that it helped them to keep their bodies cool during the summer months.\(^{217}\)

Amongst the cooked foods was ḥarīra - a Moroccan soup, made from flour and milk.\(^{218}\) Also rice, peas\(^{219}\) and rishda\(^{220}\) - an Algerian foodstuff made from wheat and resembling macaroni - to which meat is added. The Medinans would also make bread from wheat, and eat fish.\(^{221}\) Dates were a staple in Medina,\(^{222}\) as date palms were widespread, and were a food of the rich and the poor alike. Al-Nābulṣī mentions the names of the dates in Medina, of which he counted around 113 varieties, the most renowned being Barnī, Shalabī and
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\(^{213}\) Ibn Baṭṭūtah, al-Riḥla, p.143. (siwāk is a piece of stick from the arāk tree; it has a pleasant smell and is used to clean the teeth).

\(^{214}\) al-‘Ayyāshi, al-Riḥla, p.176.


\(^{216}\) Ibn Farḥūn, p.32; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuḥfā, 2/187.
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Halwā which he described as being large in size and very sweet. As well as dates, Medina was famous for its grapes, which al-‘Ayyāshī described as extremely good. Among the vegetables cultivated in Medina at that time were carrots, legumes, múlúkhīyya, okra, onions and turnips. The Medinans would use fat extracted from milk in their food which was of high quality and delicious, as well as pickles. As for sweetmeats, there were many varieties made from honey and sugar syrup, to which they would add various kinds of fresh and dried fruit. It would appear that there was a Fatimid influence on these sweets from the description given by al-Maqrīzī of Egyptian sweetmeats at that time.

It was customary that there would be one serving of the food and that people should eat as much as they wished. It was good manners for the host to serve his guests throughout the meal, showing them friendliness and good humour, and it was the guests' duty to eat the food, and not to claim they had no appetite or be over-indulgent.

6.2.5. Hammāmāt (bathhouses)

During this period Medina's inhabitants and newcomers habitually frequented the public bathhouses or hammāmāt which were widespread throughout the city and outside it, in order to bathe and relax. al-Samhūdi relays a text confirming the existence of public hammāmāt in Medina prior to the eighth Hijri century, as he says, in relation to the hammām built by the Mamlūk Sultan Qā'it Bay (872-901/1468-1496) on the Bāb al-Salām side of the Prophet's Mosque, that before this there had not been a hammām in Medina for a long time. This shows that he is not denying the existence of public baths prior to this, rather he is pointing out that no hammāmāt had been built for many years.

In his travelogue, al-Nābulṣi mentions a bathhouse called the Prophet's hammām (hammām al-Nabī), situated to the east of the Prophet's Mosque, describing it as a
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beautiful and grandiose hammâm, from which emanates the aroma of incense. Al-Näbulsi also speaks of another hammâm outside the city walls near to the al-Misrî Gate.232

6.2.6. Housing
Where Medinans lived varied according to their social grouping: for example, emirs lived in palaces on the outskirts of the city in areas surrounded by gardens and wadis, whereas we find that most of the mujāwirūn, in view of the nature of their social and scholarly background and the purpose for which they came to Medina, lived in the vicinity of the Prophet's Mosque in arbiṭa (simple accommodation set up by certain sultans, wealthy people and ‘ulamā’ as endowments for the benefit of mujāwirūn, the poor and Sufi adepts)233 and madrasas (schools, part of which certain mujāwirūn used for housing, as some of them had rooms adjoining the madrasa specifically for living quarters which were called buyūṭ),24 as most of them had limited income or were poor and could not afford to buy or rent homes. Those who were wealthy, however, would often live in houses which they purchased or leased.235 When arriving in Medina, some of the ‘ulamā’ and students would stay with relatives or acquaintances until they found a place to live and moved out, as did Shaykh Abū Hādi, who came to Medina in 752/1324 as a mujāwir and stayed with Shaykh ‘Abdollāh b. Farḥūn, residing in the lower floor of his house.236 Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. Muhammad al-Talmasānī also stayed with Ibn Farhūn, then moved to the Daghlā Ribāt and later was able to purchase a small house beside the Prophet’s Mosque where he took up residence.237

There were numerous quarters which housed mujāwirūn, among these al-Ḥiṣn al-‘Atiq which was one of the city’s quarters near to the Prophet’s Mosque. Certain sharifs, ‘ulamā’

233 Among the most famous arbiṭa (sing. ribāṭ) in the sixth and seventh Hijri centuries were al-‘Aṣfahānī and the Marāgha Ribāt which was restricted to Moroccan Sufis, al-Shirāzī, al-Taṣṭarī, al-Salāmī, al-Bughdādī, al-Baghlā, and al-Sabil. See Ibn Farhūn, p.57; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuḥfa, 1/65; al-Mudayris, p.148.
234 Among the most famous madrasas was the Shihābiyya Madrasa, built by Shihāb al-Dīn Ghāzī b. al-Malik al-‘Adīl al-Ayyūbī. Some of the mujāwirūn who lived in the madrasa would undertake repairs and restoration work, such as Ibrahim al-Rūmī (d.730/1329), who lived in the Shirāziyya Madrasa for over fifty years and undertook restoration work through fear of it falling into disrepair. Only people of the best quality lived there. See al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuḥfa, 1/65.
236 Ibn Farhūn, p.74. This demonstrates that some houses in Medina during that period consisted of two storeys.
237 ibid., p.30.
and students also lived there, such as Muḥammad al-Harwi, who resided there in 695/1295. His house apparently had a window overlooking the Prophet's Mosque, which confirms that this quarter was adjacent to the Mosque. As for the Mosque attendants, they lived in a locality named after them, sharing it with some of the other social groups, such as certain sharifs and mujāwarīn. Dwellings varied according to the financial situation and social standing of the individual; for instance the head attendant would have a bigger house than the rest of the attendants.

The Italian adventurer, di Varthema, who visited Medina towards the end of the Mamlūk period, notes that it comprised more than three hundred houses, surrounded by mud-brick enclosures with stone rendering on the walls. Al-Nābulṣī also described Medina as follows:

In Medina there are two long thoroughfares: one running from the west in front of the citadel and lined with houses, palaces and markets, and a second running from the east from outside the Bāb al-Salām of the Mosque in a westerly direction to the Bāb al-Miṣrī, all of it lined with shops, houses and palaces. There are many alleyways in the city branching off one another, some of which are very narrow and some of which are wide, and the houses in them abut each other.

When comparing the houses in Medina with those in Mecca, one notices, from the descriptions given by some of the great travellers, that, in many respects, they were similar in appearance but smaller. It appears that the reason for this was that their streets were narrower, particularly those in the vicinity of the Prophet's Mosque.

From a description of one traveller, it seems that the best buildings in Medina were in the al-Sāḥa quarter, to the west of the Mosque. The buildings in Medina before the eighth Hijri century were within the confines of the inner wall built by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Īsfahānī in the mid-sixth Hijri century, which was then expanded by Nūr al-Dīn Zangi in 558/1163. Upon its battlements were war cannons to repel the incursions of the Bedouins, who would periodically attack the Medinans. Most of the outer wall was destroyed, and in between the
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two walls lay vacant land said to be a halting place, as most of the pilgrims would tether their camels there and stay there for the duration of their visit. Ibn Jubayr affirms this in his Rihla, in which he writes of visiting Medina in 580/1184:

Medina has two walls, each of which has two gates standing directly opposite two gates in the other wall. These gates have names, they are: Bāb al-Ḥadid, because this gate is made entirely from iron; then there is Bāb al-Sharī'a; then Bāb al-Qibla, which is closed off; and then Bāb al-Baqī'. The trench which was dug by the Prophet and the Companions prior to the Battle of al-Hzāb is outside the walls to the West. 244

6.3. Economic life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the Shi'a influence upon it

There is a paucity of information concerning economic life in Medina during this period compared with that of Mecca. By way of the few references taken from travelogues and historians and comparing these with the economic conditions in Mecca, it is possible to construct a simplified picture of the economic life of Medina during the Ayyūbid period.

6.3.1. Economic activities practised by the inhabitants of Medina

6.3.1.1. Agriculture

Agriculture was one of the major economic activities in Medina, relying on rainwater, springs and wells - rainwater being the main source of the irrigation necessary for cultivation in Medina. During the Ayyūbid period, agricultural land was divided up into smallholdings for the general populace and large holdings for the sharifs. Cultivated areas in the Medinan region were distributed amongst many locations, such as Qubā' and al-'Awāli, situated south of Medina, and al-Sāfilā, situated north of Medina on the Syria road, which contained many gardens. One of the most prominent agricultural crops in Medina was the palm tree, the dates of which were a staple in the diet of the inhabitants. Al-Nābulsi mentions that there were one hundred and thirteen varieties of date in Medina. The yield of dates was so great that the peasants delayed harvesting them,
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offering them to people free of charge, and even then they found no one who wanted them, so the dates piled up for two or three years and still no one took them. Many economic benefits resulted from the palm trees: in addition to using the dates for food, the date stones were used as camel fodder, and the palm fronds were used to make many utensils, such as fans, mats, brooms, bags and baskets.

Other agricultural produce cultivated in Medina included wheat, barley and maize - which were the principal foodstuffs for many Medinans due to the low production of wheat. Maize was grown in al-Ṣafār - a region close to the city with many wadis - and Khaybar - a well-populated village to the north of Medina. Barley was grown in Medina; it was what the inhabitants depended on most after dates, the harvests meeting part of their requirements for grain.

They also cultivated several varieties of vegetable, such as gourds, turnips, carrots, mūlūkhiyya, peas, onions, okra, tomatoes, courgettes, potatoes, aubergines and cucumber; as well as fruit, such as grapes, watermelons, figs and pomegranates.

Agriculture was an important economic activity for those of Medina's population who depended upon it for their livelihood, particularly al-Nakhāwla, who were Imāmi Shī'a, so-called after their work in date cultivation, and many of whom did nothing else. Ibn Farḥūn confirms that certain of the mujāwirūn owned plantations in Medina, and some worked the land themselves, such as Yūsuf al-Khūlī, Ḥasan al-Khūlī and Muhammad al-Miknāsī. However, some of those who owned agricultural land used slaves to cultivate it.

As agriculture in Medina had a clear effect on the level of prices and abundance of foodstuffs, it stimulated economic activity generally and invigorated the social life of the inhabitants, except during periods of economic crisis resulting from drought and dry spells. Substantial rainfall would guarantee agricultural prosperity and low crop prices, but if there
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was no rain and the ground dried out, prices would rise and costs would be high, as happened in the year 579/1183.\textsuperscript{260}

Just as agriculture was common throughout Medina, so too did many of its townsfolk work in sheep, cattle and camel husbandry. Grazing was widespread in the wadis surrounding the city, such as Wadi Sāyah.\textsuperscript{261}

6.3.1.2. Occupations and trades

Other economic activities practised by the Medinans during the Ayyūbid period, in addition to agriculture, included the work of artisans and tradesmen, who played a very important role in the life of civil society, providing basic services for everyday life. However, the sources do not provide sufficient material about these activities for the period in question, except for a few references in the history books and biographies from which it is possible to deduce certain aspects of such activities.

**Building construction**: There is an extract in Ibn Farhūn's biography of the life of one of the mujāwirūn which indicates that some of them were known for their work in building and architecture, such as Ibrāhīm al-Banna and ʿAllāh al-Fārāsh. However, it seems that they were not extensively versed in the fundamentals of this occupation, the evidence for this being that, when they wanted to build the Bāb al-Salām minaret in the Prophet's Mosque, they were assisted by some of the townsfolk and ceased work after digging the foundations, awaiting the season when visitors would arrive, in the hope that there might be one among them who was skilled in this trade.\textsuperscript{262}

**Tailoring**: Certain mujāwirūn were renowned for this occupation, the cloth used usually coming from outside Medina. Most tailors worked on clothes for both men and women, while female tailors worked only on women's clothes.

**Water-carrying (al-siqāya)**: This occupation was prevalent in and around the Mosque, given the people's need for water. The demand for water-carriers rose during the hajj season, due to the presence of a great number of people. Water-carriers would bring water to the houses and markets, as well as to people praying in the Prophet's Mosque. Connected to this occupation was another trade, that of making pottery and vessels in

\textsuperscript{260} Şuhbî ʿAbd al-Murīm, p. 280.
\textsuperscript{262} Ibn Farhūn, p.43.
which to carry the water. Medina had favourable soil for making pottery, and the production of vessels flourished - some were even exported out of Medina. 263

Carpentry: Ibn Farhün names several carpenters, some of whom worked on the architecture of the Mosque after the fire, such as Abū Bakr b. Yūsuf al-Najjār, who replaced the minbar. Ibn Farhün relates: 'He fashioned the minbar, producing good workmanship and carpentry, and carved his name upon it, this was in 666/1268'. 264 There was also a large and famous family in Medina called al-Najar, one of whom was the author of Kitāb al-Durra al-Thamina fi Akhbār al-Madina.

Cobbling: This involved sewing leather 265 to make shoes, bags, and various garments. Ibn Farhün and al-Sakhāwi wrote biographies of a number of individuals who worked in this trade and who came to be named after it, such as Abū al-Hasan al-Kharrāz and Abū ʿAbdullāh Muhammad al-Kharrāz. According to Ibn Farhün, they lived together in the same house for over thirty years, working in the same trade, they and those with them, making shoes and other articles. 266 Among them also was ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar al-Kharrāz and ʿAyyād al-Kharrāz 267. This trade was linked to tanning, and it is possible that some practised both trades in order to provide themselves with the raw materials for their work, while others might buy the tanned and dyed hides.

The firewood trade (al-Ḥitāba): There is a reference in Ibn Farhün which points to the existence of this occupation in Medina at that time. In his biography of the mujawir Shaykh Muhammad al-Hazmiri (the date of his death is not given), Ibn Farhün states: 'He came to Medina and stayed there a long while, subsisting only on selling firewood. He would come with his bundle, sell it and live off the proceeds'. 268 One can deduce from this short summary that firewood vending was the occupation of those without a trade. Al-Samhūdi mentions that there was a market in Medina called the Ḥatṭābin Market. He does not say when this market was first established, yet he does mention that it was situated in the cemetery to the north of the city near to the Rāya Mosque and Thaniyyat al-Wadār. 269

263 Ibn al-Najjār, p.331; Ibn Farḥūn, p.8; al-Samhūdi, Wafā’ al-Wafā; 2/678-679; al-Mudayris, p.103
264 Ibn Farḥūn, pp.148-149.
266 Ibn Farḥūn, pp.114-115.
268 Ibn Farḥūn, p.165.
This occupation was dependent on trees, particularly mimosa, which was the preferred
wood for heating and cooking.\textsuperscript{270}

**Perfumery (al-\'Itāra):** The perfume-seller in former times performed the role of a physician,
druggist and seller of spices and perfumes. Most of the substances were imported from abroad. Al-Samhūdī notes that among Medina's markets was the 'Aṭṭārīn Market, near to the
gold market.\textsuperscript{271} As the perfumery profession required those engaged in it to have had
lengthy experience in its practice, it was carried on by families where it was passed down
from father to son, such as the family of Ibn Mashkūr who came from Mecca, and the
Shakalīyn family, also of Meccan origin.\textsuperscript{272}

**Gold- and silver-smithing (al-\'Siyāgha):** This means the fashioning of ladies' jewellery from
gold and silver. Medina was famous for this type of smithing, due to the ready supply of
raw materials close by in the Mahd al-Dhahab (Cradle of Gold) region to the north of
Medina.\textsuperscript{273} Al-Samhūdī observes that there was a market in Medina known as al-\'Sāgha
Market,\textsuperscript{274} where jewellery was smithed and sold, such as rings, anklets, and necklaces,
which were inlaid with precious stones.\textsuperscript{275}

### 6.3.1.3. Commerce

Medina's location had a bearing on the traffic of commercial exchange within the Arabian
Peninsula and beyond. It lay on the trading caravan route between Syria and Yemen,
which was the main trade route through the peninsula at that time. These caravans would
pass through Medina laden with Yemeni, Abyssinian and Indian goods, returning with
Syrian and Egyptian products.\textsuperscript{276} The Medinan population benefited, when these caravans
made a halt there, through the services they offered them, such as food and
accommodation. Merchants would also purchase goods from these caravans.

Medina was also situated on the route of some of the hajj and 'Umra pilgrim caravans
coming from Iran, Syria, Iraq and Egypt, on their way to or from Mecca. Economic activity
flourished as a result of some of these caravans halting in Medina, renting accommodation
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for rest, purchasing foodstuffs and other necessities, and hiring camels and guides to
complete their journey safely and peacefully. 277

In addition to the importance of the location, the presence of the Prophet's Mosque in the
city was a major influence on the commercial traffic there. Many thousands of Muslims
would come to Medina every year both to visit and to trade, and this stimulated buying and
selling activity in its marketplaces. Pilgrims would bring goods from their countries which
were unavailable in Medina and would sell them there. 278

6.3.1.3.1. Varieties of imported and exported goods in Medina
A great variety of goods and merchandise would come into Medina from the east, the west
and the north, and, therefore, it was considered a major nexus for the commercial
exchange between these regions. However, most of this trade took place at a specific time
of year, namely the hajj season, and this had an effect on commercial traffic. Commercial
exchanges in Medina were also affected by the pillaging attacks which the Bedouin tribes
launched against the city and passing caravans on the Hijaz route. Political unrest arising
from the internal struggle of the Medinan emirs and their disputes with the Meccan emirs
also led to a steep deterioration in the city's economic conditions and a decline in
commercial traffic. 279

In spite of this, several historians testify to the presence of commercial traffic in Medina,
whereby goods were imported and exported. Of these, seasonings were amongst the most
important, due to their necessity in cooking. Much pepper was sold in Medina during the
fifth and sixth Hijri centuries at prices ranging from fifty to one hundred and fifty dinars, 280
suggesting that it was in high demand. The Medinans would also export their surplus of
spices arriving from India, Persia and Egypt. 281 One of the most profitable spices was
cinnamon, which fetched a higher price than pepper. As for cloves, their price was double
that of pepper. The Arabs imported them along with galangale, a spice which came from
the East across the Persian Gulf, and then by land with the caravans or by water passing
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through the Red Sea. Likewise, ginger, saffron, cardamom and nutmeg were amongst the seasonings most widely used in Medina, and the demand for them was no less than for spices; they were also imported to Medina from the East.

Commercial activity in Medina was not restricted to seasonings and spices but also included precious stones, Persian rugs, perfumes, and incense, such as musk, frankincense, amber and sandalwood, all of which came from the Far East and Iran. Ibn Jubayr mentions that he saw many of the caravans which came to Hijaz from Yemen, Egypt and Syria buying and selling various goods in Mecca, and it is possible that the commercial activity occurring in Mecca was also taking place in Medina, since it lay on the route of many of the pilgrim and trade caravans, and visitors and pilgrims passed through it on their journeys to and from Mecca, in order to visit and pray in the Prophet's Mosque in Medina. Therefore, by analogy with what was taking place in Mecca, it is possible to conclude that this was also occurring in Medina, and in this connection Ibn Jubayr describes caravans arriving in Hijaz from Yemen in order to trade, bringing raisins, almonds, grains, sugar cane, butter, honey, leather and incense. The Yemenis brought with them certain African produce, which came to Yemen via the Gulf of Aden, such as gum, ivory, flour and animal hides. There were also caravans that came from Syria carrying oil, olives, cereals, and textiles. Due to Egypt's fertile land and abundant agricultural and artisanal produce, the scarcity of Medinan resources and the ease of movement between the two countries by land or sea via Yanbu, which was very close to Medina, Egypt was able to have a significant influence on the economic life in Medina, since communications and the carriage of goods between the two countries were a simple matter. The major imports from Egypt were cereals (all varieties of grain, such as wheat and barley), foodstuffs and horses.
Thus products from India, Abyssinia, Yemen, Egypt, Syria, Persia, Iraq and the Maghreb came together in the Medinan markets.

6.3.1.3.2. The coinage (sakka)\textsuperscript{291} used in Medina

Coins were an important instrument in the commercial business of buying and selling, and constitute an important historical source. Their significance stems from the fact that they reveal the extent of the state's progress and economic and cultural blossoming, as well as its relations with other states. The Islamic currency comprised the dinar, which was the name given to gold coins, and the dirham, which the name applied to silver coins.\textsuperscript{292}

The Medinan population had used coinage issued by the ʿAbbāsid caliph, and, when the city fell under Fāṭimid sway, people traded in Fāṭimid coins due to commercial exchanges and the arrival of visiting Egyptians in the city; and also certain Medinans would travel to Egypt for various reasons. Among the Fāṭimid coins used in Medina was the Muʿizzi dinar.\textsuperscript{293} When the Fāṭimid state was no more and the Ayyūbid s assumed control of Medina, the inhabitants used the new currency minted by Salāḥ al-Dīn in the name of the ʿAbbāsid Caliph ʿal-Mustādī bi-Amr Allāh.\textsuperscript{294} In the year 583/1187, he abolished the coinage of Egypt and minted gold Egyptian dinars, and Nāṣīr dirhams from silver mixed equally with copper.\textsuperscript{295} During the reign of al-Malik al-Kāmil, in 622/1225, new round dirhams bearing his name were minted, made of two-thirds silver and one-third copper, and these continued to be used throughout the Ayyūbid period.\textsuperscript{296} These coins were used in Medina as well as other coins which were minted in Mecca, where there was a mint producing coins that were equivalent to the Egyptian ones.\textsuperscript{297} Al-Maqrīzī observes that, in the time of Abū al-Futūḥ, Emir of Mecca and Medina, coins were minted in Mecca bearing
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the name of al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh. In the year 581/1185, Sayf al-Islām Tughtegin minted dirhams and dinars in Mecca in the name of his brother, Salāḥ al-Dīn.

Al-Qalqashandi refers to the varieties of coinage which were in use in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, saying that there were two types of dirham: the silver Kāmilī attributed to the Ayyūbid Sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil, known as the *daḥm al-naqra*; and the silver Masʿūdī dirham attributed to al-Malik al-Masʿūd the Ayyūbid King of Yemen, which was square in shape and made of pure silver. Gold dinars were also in use, but al-Qalqashandi does not describe them.

It appears that there was a mint in Medina, as al-Sakhāwī relays a text which proves this, yet he himself does not mention this and neither do any of the other historians or great travellers. According to al-Sakhāwī, one of the mujāwirūn whose biography he wrote, one al-Zubayr b. ‘Ali al-Aswānī al-Ṣhāfī (660-748/1262-1347), said: ‘In those days people traded in alawiyya, which were pieces of silver minted in the name of the lord of Medina, each one was worth half a dirham’. One can deduce from this that there was a mint in Medina, as it would have been difficult for the emir to command a ruler of one of the other states to mint coins for him. But does this prove that there were places in Medina where one could change and exchange currencies, or that the inhabitants of Medina dealt in and accepted all the currencies which the pilgrims, visitors and merchants brought with them? And what is the dirham referred to in the text? Is it the Kāmilī, the Masʿūdī or another variety? It is impossible to say for certain, due to the lack of references in the history books, travelogues and biographies.

There is, however, another text relayed by al-Sakhāwī which reveals the existence of a copper currency used by people in Medina, which has gone unmentioned by historians and great travellers. Al-Sakhāwī relates: ‘Ayman b. Muḥammad Abuū al-Barakāt al-Saʿādī had strong teeth, he would take a copper dirham and bite it in two.

Just as the Medinans used coins for buying and selling, it is also known that they had a system of bartering; that is, exchanging merchandise for other merchandise. Al-Maqadīsī

---

mentions that certain of the Yemeni tribes, known as the al-Suru, were in the habit of doing this: instead of selling the raisins, honey, almonds and butter that they brought with them to Mecca and Medina for cash, they would barter them for the cloth, garments and dates that they found in the markets there. 303

6.3.2. The Shi'a influence on economic life in Medina
The Shi'a influence on economic life in Medina manifested itself in five ways:

1- The Shi'a emirs imposed taxes on the pilgrims, merchants, tradesmen and wealthy mujāwirūn, which led to the weakening of economic life and the emergence of many disturbances and crises. The amount of tax levied on pilgrims was seven and a half dinars, and no pilgrim was permitted to enter the city without paying this tax. 304  
 лучше al-Dīn frequently tried to abolish the tax imposed on pilgrims, ordering the Medinan emirs not to levy it, and sending them money and crops in compensation, but, when the Ayyūbid kings were late in sending supplies to Medina, the emirs would once again revert to imposing these taxes. 305 Some mujāwirūn were also maltreated by certain of the emirs if they refused to pay the taxes to which they were subject, as happened with Emir Jammāz and Shaykh Dhiyā' al-Dīn. 306

2- Political disputes and struggles among the Shi'a sharifs affected the emirate by destabilising the economic situation. If an emir wanted to mobilise troops in order to deal with a rival, he would demand money from the Medinans, and, when one of the sharifs seized the emirate from a relative, the first thing he did was to appropriate as much of the city's wealth as he could lay his hands on, and thus the restoration work was reduced and services were not provided. 307

3- The Shi'a presence in Medina affected the awqaf and alms payments which came from the caliphs, the sultans and the wealthy. Often, the awqaf were restricted to the mujāwirūn and attendants at the Prophet's Mosque, because the sharifs would take the money from

306 Al-Fāsī, al-Īṣaṣd, 2/292.  
the alms that were sent to the city, spending it on themselves and on their wars with their rivals. 308

4- Some of the Shi'a did contribute to the economic blossoming in Medina, and this was through their work in date palm cultivation, since dates were and remain one of the major agricultural crops in the city and were in high demand as the main dietary foodstuff of the inhabitants. Some of the Shi'a in Medina were the group most deeply involved in date palm cultivation, to the extent that they were given the title of al-Nakhāwla, after the date palm (al-Nakhl). The fact that they did not acquire renown for any work other than the cultivation of dates indicates that they were proficient in it, and that, in most cases, they owned plantations. 309

6.4. Conclusion

This chapter has examined the economic and social life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and the Shi'a influence upon it. It is divided into two main subdivisions, the first being a study of the social conditions in Medina in Ayyūbid times, and the second being a study of the economic conditions in the city during the same period. This was achieved by splitting the first topic into two main subdivisions: firstly, a study and analysis of civil society through its social groupings apparent during that period, the distinguishing features of each grouping and its economic circumstances, the social relations between each grouping, and the effects of doctrinal differences (between Sunnis and Shi'a) on these relations; and secondly, a study and analysis of the social customs prevalent during this period, and the influence of the Shi'a on the emergence of new customs in Medina.

As for the second topic, it has been discussed by studying the economic activities practised by the Medinan population, such as agriculture, crafts, and commerce; by studying and analysing the texts mentioning the currencies used at that time, and, finally, by looking into the Shi'a influence on the economic situation in Medina.

The following are the most significant conclusions drawn from this chapter:

308 'Abd al-Bāṣīt Badr, al-Madina, p.207.
1 - There is a shortage of information about social life in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and it is difficult to obtain this scant information, which is scattered throughout the history books and biographies (siyar) under different headings.

2 - Medina's religious status in the hearts of Muslims had a clear bearing on the arrival of many newcomers of different nationalities in the city, which led to the proliferation of the groupings and races that lived there, as well as the emergence of new customs.

3 - If we suppose the presence of a social pyramid in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, which reveals the status of each grouping in the city, we find that the sharifs form the top layer of this pyramid; then come the religious office-holders; then the old Medinan population, descendants of the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār; then the mosque attendants; then the mujāwirūn; then the Imāmī Shi'a; then the slaves; and, at the base of the pyramid, the general populace, as they make up the largest segment of the population and among them are the poor and the workers.

4 - Despite the spread of Shi'ism among the emirs of Medina in Ayyūbid times, most of them followed a policy of benevolence towards the city's Sunnis in order to create an equilibrium of sorts in the internal policy, so that the Sunnis did not feel oppressed.

5 - Not everyone who belonged to the sharif class was Shi'a; in fact, many sharifs residing in Medina during the Ayyūbid period were Sunni and renowned for their learning, piety and good conduct within the Sunni community. However, they held no political positions nor had any stake in the position of emir.

6 - The backing and assistance given to the Shi'a dā'is by the sharifs had a major influence on the spread of Imāmīsm in Medina, and, in turn, the financial support administered to the emirs by the wealthy Shi'a and their dā'is played a role in maintaining good relations.

7 - The office of qadi was the most important position after that of the emir, and was monopolised by the Imāmī Shi'a throughout the Ayyūbid period.

8 - It was the Imāmī Shi'a who held the reins of power in Medina, as the emirate, the qadiship, the khatibship and the office of imam were under their control, and these were the most important and powerful positions at that time.
9 - The mujāwirūn constituted a significant element of the Medinan population due to their numbers and their scholarly and pious status among the sultans, kings and the Sunni Medinans.

10 - The Imāmī Shi'a ādār were keen to bring in juvenile slaves from India and Abyssinia to work on their plantations and in their properties, as it was easy to indoctrinate them with the fundamentals of Shī'ism, so they became Shi'a when they were older, thus increasing Shi'a numbers in Medina.

11 - The use of eunuch attendants in the service of the Prophet's Mosque was in existence before the Ayyūbid period, but Salāh al-Dīn was the first firmly to establish this office, giving it a specific organisation, designating a fixed salary to each attendant, and appointing them a leader known as the Shaykh al-Khuddām.

12 - If we were to draw a timeline of the development of Imāmīsm and its authority in Medina, this line would start in the second half of the sixth Hijri century, growing quickly to reach its apex in the seventh Hijri century, when the Imāmīs took over the qadiship and the office of khatīb in the Prophet's Mosque; this continues until the middle of the seventh Hijri century when this line begins to decline, fluctuating, falling by a couple of points at times then gaining a point at other times, until the end of the seventh Hijri century.

13 - The change in the equilibrium in Medina led to a change in the social relations among certain groupings of the population. Some negative aspects emerged which were brought about by the fanatics and extremists on all sides; conversely, positives also emerged which helped to maintain good relations among the parties concerned. Some of the siyar and history books relate minor negative occurrences in which an individual offended another or one party caused some harm to another, although the issue stopped there - and this shows the speed at which the problem was controlled and kept within the bounds of an individual-to-individual matter, prevented from escalating into a sectarian dispute or civil strife. It also proves that peaceableness and coexistence were firm principles in civil society at that time.

14 - The attitude of some emirs had a significant influence on maintaining social relations among the groupings of the inhabitants, when they handled matters well and dealt with any problems arising swiftly and fairly, preventing them from
developing and reaching critical proportions. It would seem, from the absence of major events and civil conflicts in the history books and biographies, that the clashes were too few to mention and that their consequences reached a critical level only in orehational terms.

15 - One notes from the writings of the great travellers who visited Medina that they do not afford the same attention to Medina as they do to Mecca.

16 - In spite of Ibn Farhūn's references to Medinan social life in his book being simple and scattered, they constitute valuable information, bringing to our attention certain customs practised by the population at that time.

17 - It is possible to deduce from some of the customs practised by the Medinans during the Ayyūbid period that Sufism was prevalent in the city at that time.

18 - Certain Shi'a customs became widespread in Medina during the Ayyūbid period which had not existed previously, particularly with respect to religious celebrations. Certain phenomena also became widespread, which indicate the spread and force of the Shi'a doctrine, such as building over graves and placing cupolas on them.

19 - Many of the religious customs of the Shi'a angered the Sunnis, who considered them bid'a and outside Islam.

20 - The great number of mujāwirūn in Medina led to the emergence of new customs, primarily concerned with food and dress.

21 - Agriculture was one of the major economic activities in Medina, as much of the population made their living from it, the Shi'a in particular.

22 - There was no developed artisanal industry in Medina, like that in Egypt and Syria; instead there was a small number of elementary simple crafts.

23 - Medina's geographical location had a bearing on the economic life of the city, as it was situated on the trade route between Syria and Yemen, and on the route of the hajj caravans coming from Iraq, Egypt, Syria and Iran.

24 - The presence of the Prophet's Mosque influenced the commercial traffic in Medina, due to the large influx of visitors to it every year.

25 - The Shi'a had a positive effect on the economic life in Medina, since most of those who were proficient in the cultivation of date palms were among their number. They also had a negative influence, since the Shi'a emirs imposed taxes on pilgrims, merchants, caravans and wealthy persons.
Chapter Seven

Learning in Medina

Having discussed the political, social and economic circumstances in Medina during the Ayyūbid period in the two previous chapters, this chapter will discuss the state of learning in the city during the Ayyūbid period and the Shi'a influence upon it. A separate chapter has been allocated to learning in Medina, due to what has been said by certain historians and travellers about the poor state of education during that era, which some attributed to the presence of the Shi'a. Moreover, some\(^1\) of those who visited the city failed to provide a thorough, extensive description of the various facets of scholarly life there, and also some\(^2\) who came later and documented the city during that period failed to study meticulously and research the subject in an improved manner. Therefore, this chapter will discuss these accounts, analyse them and look for the motives behind them. It will also attempt to refute them with whatever evidence and texts are available, and with whatever it is possible to conclude from subject areas on which there is no conclusive text, through a comparison with what occurred subsequently in the city and was chronicled in the history books.

Therefore, it appears profitable to divide this chapter into two basic core topics: a discussion of the accounts of 'ulamā' by historians and travellers on learning in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and a study of the motives behind those that are negative; and a refutation of these negative accounts by presenting a thorough, extensive description of the state of learning in Medina, through studying the teaching lectures which were current in the Prophet's Mosque and the madrasas at that time, the katātib (Qur'ān schools), the syllabuses, the teaching methods, the most notable 'ulamā' and their key works, the role of the Sunni 'ulamā' in the blossoming of learning, and lastly, the Shi'a influence upon learning in the city.

---

1 For example Ibn Jubayr and Ibn al-Najjār.
2 For example al-Samhūdī and al-Fayrūz Abādi.
7.1. A discussion of certain accounts of historians and travellers on learning in Medina during the Ayyūbid period

That which has been written about Medina by the great travellers during their journeys there for the hajj and ziyara, and what historians of that time wrote about the city, are considered among the most important sources for students of Medinan history, since they are accounted as the primary source and the easiest from which to obtain information about that period, since they saw, visited and witnessed events for themselves and have relayed them to us. Yet, unfortunately, the reports appearing in some of these books about the state of learning in Medina during the Ayyūbid period are very scant or negative. Therefore, this section will discuss the accounts of historians and travellers on the state of learning in the city during the Ayyūbid period, and refute the accounts of those who describe it as being poor. It will also discuss the accounts of those who claim never to have come across a single ‘ālim in the city and describe the inhabitants as ignorant. The motives for these accounts will also be examined.

There follows an exposition of the accounts by certain historians and travellers on learning in Medina, a few of which can be considered as evidence of the deterioration and poor state of learning in the city during the Ayyūbid period, and the feebleness of the role played by the Sunni ‘ulamā’ with regard to learning there.

7.1.1. Ibn Jubayr (539-614/1144-1217)3 visited Medina in Muharram 580/1184, and the only description he gives in relation to the state of learning at the Prophet's Mosque is that of the occasion when Ṣadr al-Dīn, the head Shafi‘i ‘ālim from Isfahān, came to Medina to give a lesson in wa‘z (admonishing sermon) at the Prophet's Mosque after midnight - due to his late arrival - on 7th Muharram 580 A.H. The Mosque was filled with an expectant

---

audience and a chair had been set out for him beside the Rawda and he went up to it. Ibn Jubayr observes:

The Koran-readers took post before him and began to intone with sweet melody and moving and affecting modulation, the while he gazed upon the sacred tomb and wept openly. He then gave a sermon of magical eloquence of his own composition. Then he went through the methods of waqf in the Arabic and Persian languages, and recited marvellous verses of his own, continuing on with his waqf until souls were sensitised and tremulous and the Persians fell about him proclaiming contrition. He then began the supplicatory prayer and the voice of the people rose in sobs.  

Ibn Jubayr also mentions having seen a large copy of the Qurʾān in a locked case in the Prophet’s Mosque, and said that it was one of the four Qurʾāns which ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān had sent to the Islamic metropolitan cities. Also in the Mosque, beside the maqsūra on the eastern side, Ibn Jubayr saw two large coffers containing books and Qurʾāns endowed in waqf to the Prophet’s Mosque. He relates that he met with one of Medina’s ʿulamāʾ, Ibrāhīm b. Isḥāq al-Tūnisī, describing him as a learned, pious sheikh and imam, successor to the ʿulamāʾ and the doyen of the jurists.

This is all that Ibn Jubayr mentions, and he had a connection with learning and education in the city. When comparing what Ibn Jubayr reports on learning in Medina with his account of Mecca, one finds that the information about learning in Medina is very scant indeed, and it has been said that this is evidence of the low level of learning in the city and that no scholars resided there, although there were many in Mecca. However, after examining the reasons for this deficiency in Ibn Jubayr, it can be said that the lack of information about Medina in his travel account is due to the brevity of his stay. He only stayed there for five days, arriving on Monday evening and leaving on Friday evening of

---

6 Ibn Jubayr, al-Rihla, p.171.
8 On Mecca he says, inter alia, that it was awash with lectures scattered throughout the Masjid al-Haram (the Holy Mosque), see Ibn Jubayr, al-Rihla, pp.68-72; ʿAwāṣīf Nawwāb, p.256. He also mentions many of Mecca’s ʿulamāʾ; whereas he only speaks of one of the Medinan ʿulamāʾ; see Ibn Jubayr, al-Rihla, pp.68, 72, 81, 102, 110, 123.
9 As ʿAwāṣīf Nawwāb mentions in her book (al-Rihlāt, p.258).
the same week. This is an insufficient amount of time to have documented or described the circumstances in Medina in their various aspects. If what one of the travellers has reported is true about Tuesday and Friday being days off for ‘ulamā’ and students,11 this would explain the lack of information relayed by Ibn Jubayr about the lectures which were held in the Mosque.12 Furthermore, Ibn Jubayr’s preoccupation with providing a meticulous description of the Mosque, taking its measurements himself during that short period, visiting the Qibā’ area, its mosque and the tombs of the Uḥud martyrs, visiting the Baqī’ cemetery, and describing everything,13 meant that there was insufficient time for him to follow the teaching lectures and meet the ‘ulamā’.

When comparing the period of Ibn Jubayr’s residence in Mecca with the duration of his stay in Medina, one finds that he stayed in Mecca, from the day he arrived on Thursday 13th Rabia 579 A.H. to the day of his departure on Thursday 22nd of Dhu al-Hijja of the same year, for eight months and ten days,14 whereas he stayed in Medina for four nights only.15 This substantial difference explains why Ibn Jubayr failed to describe learned activity in Medina, as he did in the case of Mecca.

In spite of the lack of information offered by Ibn Jubayr on Medina - like other travellers (al-‘Abdari, Ibn Rashid and Ibn Baṭṭuta), due to the brevity of their stays - he does provide references which, to a certain extent, are useful in giving an idea of the state of learning in Medina during his visit. On the basis of what he provides, one is able to learn how wa’z lectures took place in the Mosque, what the method of delivery was, the number of attendees and the types of people they were, and the fact that they would be held during the night if circumstances demanded. It also appears that someone coming from outside

---

12 The brevity of his stay, coupled with the fact that these two weekdays were holidays, did not allow sufficient time for attendance at lectures.
15 The reason that Ibn Jubayr and other travellers stayed longer in Mecca than Medina was the benefits and blessing which Allāh had bestowed on Mecca, the presence of the sacred hajj stations, and the fact that the hajj is a religious duty incumbent upon every Muslim, which takes a certain amount of time to perform; furthermore, the ‘umrā or ‘lesser pilgrimage’ is the most meritorious of the voluntary observances. On the other hand, visitation or ziyāra to Medina and prayer in the Prophet’s Mosque are among the activities for which one is rewarded, but not punished for omitting, and also are relatively brief to perform.
the city, which was known for learning and virtue, was able to give instruction on wa'z without any difficulty, as was the case with the Iṣfahāni sheikh who delivered his teaching immediately upon his arrival in Medina. In his description of the Prophet's Mosque, Ibn Jubayr also confirms the presence of two large coffers for books, which points to its inhabitants' interest in learned books and copies of the Qurān; and his praise and commendation of one of the city's 'ulamā', describing him as 'the doyen of the jurists', is further evidence of the distinction of the Medinan 'ulamā' in learning and repute, and their ability to attract many seekers of knowledge.  

7.1.2. Ibn al-Najjar (578-643/1183-1245) is one of the most celebrated historians of Medina; he travelled to Syria, Egypt, Persia, Medina and Mecca, a journey taking 27 years, during which he compiled many books, among these al-Durra al-Thamina fi Akhbār al-Medina and Nuzhat al-Warā fi Akhbār Umm al-Qurā. In al-Durra al-Thamina, he provides a detailed description of Medina, its Mosque and places of importance at that time, yet does not touch on its social, economic and cultural circumstances. In fact, the real reason behind Ibn al-Najjār's lack of concern about describing the various facets of life in Medina, and what the state of learning was like during his visit, is unknown. Yet, in his description of the Prophet's Mosque, he provides information about the copies of the Qurān which were there and the times at which they were read from, which suggests that there was a large library in the Mosque. After mentioning a text by Ibn Zabāla referring to the copies of the Qurān that existed in his day in the Mosque, Ibn al-Najjār says that most of these Qurāns were gathered together in the maqsūra beside the Bāb Marwān:

In the sacred precinct are numerous copies of the Qurān endowed in waqf in beautiful script and stored in teak chests in the middle of the maqsūra, behind the Prophet's seat.

---

16 This chapter will give an exposition of the hadiths about the Prophet which urge students of learning to acquire it from Medina's 'ulamā', which supports the above discussion.

17 He was Muḥyibb al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd b. al-Najjār from Baghdād and was a mujāwir in Medina for a considerable period.

18 Nājī al-Anṣārī, al-Taʾrīf, p.268.

19 However, during a study I carried out for my master's degree, I noticed that most of Medina's historians adopted a similar methodology in chronicling the city, as if some of them had borrowed from others, and the majority were concerned with the description of the buildings and well-known places, as well as the ziyāra decencies. See Şalāḥ Şalāma, pp.265-270.

And there is a large stand, upon it a locked Qur'an, and beside it are two copies of the Qur'an upon a stand from which the people read on Thursdays and Fridays after the morning prayer.  

7.1.3. Muhammad al-'Abdari (688/1289) visited Medina after performing the hajj in 689/1290, and provides a description of the state of learning in Medina at that time. In spite of only staying in the city for one full day and part of another, he describes the state of learning there as stagnant:

In spite of thorough inquiry, insistent requests and repetition of the question, I saw in Medina no one marked by learning nor anyone known for any skills therein. I met with the imam of the Mosque and khatib of the minbar, and I found him to be ignorant, having no knowledge whatsoever. I asked him about instruction and the 'ulama', and discovered that he did not know about them. It was as if I was talking to one who was dumb, and he possessed unpraiseworthy characteristics. Yet he did tell me of a sheikh from Iraq who is a mujāwir in the city with an interest in learning and in imparting it, having long since journeyed to the Hijaz and long having sojourned there, one 'Afif al-Din Abī Muhammad ʿAbd al-Salām al-Ṭammar. So I asked for him until I found him in the Rawda, and I found him to be a sheikh of dignity and fine appearance. He had travelled the land, met with people and learnt from sheikhs and 'ulama'; then he had settled in Medina as a mujāwir. I asked him to give

---

22 His birth and death dates are not known, we just know his Rihla dates.
23 Although this journey took place in the Mamlūk era, one finds that certain contemporary historians writing on learning in Medina during the Ayyūbid period (such as 'Ali al-Sayyid, Jamīl Ḥarb, 'Awāfī Nawwāb and al-Mudayris) quote what he says regarding the poor state of learning at that time. It appears that this was because this era was close in time to the Ayyūbid period, and that some sources reveal the names of several Medinan 'ulama' during the Ayyūbid period who were present in the city until the beginning of the Mamlūk era; in addition, the Shi'a occupied their positions and maintained their grip on power in the city until that time. Thus, it is possible that they saw no harm in quoting from them for these reasons. Therefore, al-'Abdari's remarks will be discussed and analysed, with reference to his motives and a refutation of them, as far as possible.
24 al-Mudayris, p.290.
25 This is an inaccurate description compared to the reports of other travellers and historians.
26 The Rawda is one of the most important and well-known places in the Prophet's Mosque, so how can al-'Abdari say that upon 'thorough inquiry' and 'insistent requests' he did not see a single 'ālim in Medina, and then add that he met with one of the 'ulama' who was sitting in the Rawda and perhaps giving instruction there. This is an example of the hastiness, failure to ascertain and investigate accurately, and contradiction to which al-'Abdari succumbs.
me *ijāza* [written authority to teach] regarding all that he was imparting and he licensed me verbally. 27

It would appear from the above that al-'Abdari was not impressed by the imam of the Mosque and its *khatīb*, considering him ignorant and knowing nothing about the learning on which he questioned him. It is not known what exactly inspired this feeling, which he may have acquired from others, or whether it was due to the short period he stayed in Medina and the fact that he met only a small number of people, or because he found that the emir, the imam, the *qādī* and those in high positions in the city were Shi'a, and so assumed that most of the inhabitants of Medina were of the same doctrine.

It is illogical that al-'Abdari should pass his judgements on learning and the *'ulamā'* of Medina, since he only stayed there for one or two days. This is not enough time to become acquainted with the whole of the Prophet's Mosque. Furthermore, if he had visited the famous sites in Medina, such as Qubā', the martyrs of Uḥud, and al-'Aqiq, each site would require a day to get there and back, as they are not close to the Mosque and there were no quick means of transportation. In addition, if he had arrived in Medina on Friday night, leaving on Saturday morning, it would have been difficult for him to see one of the *'ulamā'* or the students and lectures, as instruction was rarely given at night and because Friday was a holiday for both *'ulamā'* and students, as noted by certain historians. 28

One sees also that al-'Abdari contradicts himself: he states at the beginning of his account of Medina that he was diligent in his aim to become acquainted with one of the city's *'ulamā'* but found none and considers the Prophet's Mosque to be devoid of scholars and *fuqahā'*; then, at the end of his account, he mentions that he obtained a licence from one of the *mujāwir* *'ulamā'* whom he then describes in the most glowing terms, which points to there being in the city scholars possessing a high level of learning. 29 Certain scholars have criticised al-'Abdari in this regard, such as Ḥamad al-Jāsir, who describes al-'Abdari as follows: ‘The traveller al-'Abdari lacks restraint in his speech, yet his lack of restraint should not pose an obstacle to benefiting from his learning’. 30 Ibn Ṭālib al-Salām al-Nāṣirī also criticised al-'Abdari on this matter, although does not deny his learning or his merits. 31

29 Nāji al-Anṣārī, p. 271.
7.1.4. Ibn Rashīd al-Fihri (657-721/1258-1321) travelled to Medina on 23/11/684 A.H.,
20/1/1286 A.D., and mentions that its inhabitants gave him a warm reception, offering
gifts of Medinan dates. During his stay in the city, he met with a number of 'ulamā’ who
taught at the Prophet’s Mosque:
- the faqih and grammarian ‘Afīf al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Zajjaj and his fraternal nephew
Abū al-Qāsim who came from Baghdad for the hajj, whom he met and whose lessons he
attended.
- Umm al-Khayr Fātimah al-Batābi (625-711/1227-1311), whom he met at the Mosque,
describing her as a senior lady of good works and writings. He read to her while she was at
her lesson and she granted him a certificate in respect of all she had narrated.
- Sheikh ʿImād al-Dīn al-Shiqārī (d. 699/1299), whom Ibn Rashīd had listened to and
described as a great and honourable sheikh, obtaining from him a written certificate
authorising him to speak on all that he had learnt from him.
- Sheikh ʿAfīf al-Dīn al-Basri al-Hanbali, to whom he listened and who gave him a written
licence in respect of this.
- The faqih Abū Iṣḥāq Ibrāhīm al-Fāṣi, whom Ibn Rashīd met at his house to the east of
the Mosque, saying of him: ‘He was a great and eminent sheikh, a good man, pleasant to

32 One can also note that this journey took place during the Mamlūk era, but it was close in time to
the Ayyūbid period, and certain ‘ulamā’ whom Ibn Rashīd mentions in his Riḥla were present in
Medina before that. In addition, the Shi’ā occupied their positions and maintained their grip on
power until that time. Therefore, given this explanation, there is no harm in citing this source.
37 Ibn Rashīd, 5/65; ʿAwārif Nawwāb, p.283. Here one notices the year of her birth, for if she had
become a mujāhir in Medina at a young age, she would have acquired her learning from the
‘ulamā’ of Medina during the Ayyūbid period. Furthermore, she herself could have lived in the city
during the Ayyūbid period, and therefore been one of Medina’s female scholars at that time.
39 Ibn Rashīd, 5/41.
meet, intelligent and of noble conduct'. He recited all of the *Thulāthiyāt al-Bukhārī* and gave him a written licence in respect of this.40

-

- 'Abd al-Salām b. Muḥammad b. Mārzūq (625-696/1227-1296), was a *mujāhir* in Medina for fifty years. He was a ḥadith scholar (*muḥadith*), who had knowledge of various sciences and composed poetry. Ibn Rashīd met him and praised him highly.

Here one notices two things: firstly, that 'Abd al-Salām is the very same person who met al-‘Abdārī, so how can Ibn Rashīd have met all of these other 'ulamā‘ when al-‘Abdārī met only this scholar, and this through 'thorough inquiry' and 'insistent requests'?; and, secondly, that this scholar was a *mujāhir* in Medina for fifty years; in other words, during the Ayyūbid period. It could be that he was not alone in having lived in the city during that time, and that there were many 'ulamā‘in Medina during the Mamlūk era who had been in the city since the Ayyūbid period, but it may be that those who have relayed the history of that period were unconcerned with them.

Nevertheless, one notices that Ibn Rashīd does not allude in detail to the lectures in the Prophet's Mosque, and does not offer any information on the city's madrasas, teaching methods or syllabuses. It is as if he is saying that the imparting of learning in Medina is restricted to the 'ulamā‘whom he met.

7.1.5. Ibn Baṭṭūta (703-770/1303-1368)42: As for the traveller Ibn Baṭṭūta, who visited Medina in Shawwal 726 A.H./September 1326 A.D., in most of his descriptions of Mecca

---


43 It is true that Ibn Baṭṭūta's visit fell after the Ayyūbid period, but one may still profitably refer to its passages on Medina due to the renown of the *Reḥla* and its proximity in time to the Ayyūbid period, as only modest changes may have occurred between the two periods.
and Medina he borrows from Ibn Jubayr's *Riḥla* and only provides a brief description of the instructional lectures in the Prophet's Mosque: 'People would gather in circles in the Mosque courtyard throughout the night, reading aloud the Qur'an and studying it together by candlelight'. He also restricts himself to mentioning certain sheikhs and teachers at the Mosque, such as Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Marzūq, Sa'īd al-Marākishi, Abū Muḥammad al-Shirwī and Abū al-'Abbās al-Fāsī, without referring to their specialisms or the subjects which they taught, and without indicating which of Medina's madrasas were in existence during his visit.

Here, also, it appears that the brevity of Ibn Battūta's stay in Medina lies behind the scarcity of information he provides on learned activity there.

7.1.6. **Ibn Farḥūn (693-769/1294-1368)** provides the most information about the state of learning in Medina in his book *Naṣiḥat al-Mushāwīr*, devoting a chapter to the lives of certain mujāwīrin, former sheikhs and 'ulamā' of Medina. He relates stories about them, some of their circumstances and the problems that certain of them experienced with the sharifs and the Shi'a. This book is used often as reference in the second part of this Chapter. It should be noted that, Ibn Farḥūn relates a passage later taken by some, such as al-Samḥūnī, Jamīl Ḥarb and 'Awātīf Nawwāb, to be referring to every Sunni 'ālim, as if they are unaware of the amount of information he provides which establishes the existence of Sunni 'ulamā' in Medina. These men well were known as lecturers in the Mosque to whom students came from both inside and outside the city in order to study. The passage is as follows:

> I was aware of a group of mujāwīrin and khuddām who recited their books and listened to their Prophet's ḥadīth only in secrecy until the arrival of al-Ṣāḥib b.

---


45 Here, al-Mudayris takes this description and comments on it: 'This confirms that the Prophet's Mosque was not locked at night during this period, and this conflicts with what Ibn Farḥūn reports, as he contradicts this more than once and on more than one occasion'. See al-Mudayris, p.247; Ibn Farḥūn, p.27.

Manna '47 who opposed the Sinān family and the al-Qayyashin [Shi'a]; and they were in awe of his standing with the Sultan, and yielded to him, practising taqiyya.48

One notes that in his passage Ibn Farhūn he only mentioned a group amongst the mujāwirūn, however, he did not say that all Sunni 'ulamā’ were experiencing the same situation. If he says so then he would have contradicted himself (for more details on the same passage see chapter 6 section 6.1.6.1).

7.1.7. Al-Sakhāwi (821-902/1418-1497) provides useful and abundant information on the state of learning in Medina in his book al-Tuhfa al-Laṭīfa, by recounting the biographies of many of the city's 'ulamā’ and sheikhs during this period. These biographies contain most of the information used in this study in order to demonstrate the blossoming of learned activity in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and the error of those who believed that learning at this time was at a low ebb. One notes from al-Sakhāwi's biographies that, throughout, he is concerned with reporting the scholar's dates of birth and death, his origin, birthplace, the doctrine to which he belonged, his sheikhs, his pupils, what others have said of him, his books and compilations, the branches of learning in which he specialised, the activities in which he was engaged, and something of his political, economic, social and cultural circumstances. This information is useful in explaining certain features of scholarly life in Medina, and it makes it possible to say that scholarly activity in the city during the Ayyūbid period was flourishing.49

7.1.8. Al-Fayrūz Abādī (729-817/1329-1414) visited Medina in 782/1380 and wrote a book on its history, called al-Maghānīm al-Muṭāba, which he divided into six chapters: the first concerns the merits of visiting the city, and its courtesies; the second is about its history and first inhabitants; the third is on its names; the fourth is on its good qualities, discussing the history of the Mosque's construction, the houses surrounding it and the most significant mosques in Medina; the fifth mentions the most important places in the city, and is the longest section of the book; and the sixth contains biographies of those 'ulamā’

—


48 Ibn Farhūn, p.22.

49 Al-Sakhawī's biographies are employed further in the second part of this chapter.
of whom he was aware. However, unfortunately, al-Fayrūz Abādī does not provide a great deal of information on learning in the city, nor does he say anything new beyond that which had already been given by al-Sakhāwī and Ibn Farḥūn. In spite of this, it is possible to glean, from the sparse information scattered throughout his book, confirmation of what has been reported by Ibn Farḥūn and al-Sakhāwī.

7.1.9. Al-Samḥūdī (844-911/1440-1505) does not devote any particular part of his Wafā’ al-Wafā’ to discussing learning in Medina, but, despite this, he cites a passage from Ibn Farḥūn, saying that not one of the Sunni ‘ulamā’ is able to recite Sunni books, for fear of the Shi’a. This generalisation by al-Samḥūdī is untrue, because Ibn Farḥūn’s passage does not say all Sunnis, but rather that he was aware of a group of Sunni mujāwirūn and khuddām who recite their books in secret. This also contradicts what is discussed, in the second part of this chapter, on the existence of teaching lectures for the Sunnis in the Prophet’s Mosque and many of the madrasas, ribāṭs and houses. The existence of many well-known Sunni ‘ulamā’, with students studying under them in an overt and public fashion, will also be demonstrated. In truth, it is not known exactly why al-Samḥūdī says this, but it is possible that he had read about an isolated incident in which the Shia tried to prevent one of the ‘ulamā’ from teaching or tried to harm him, and so assumed that this was the case generally for the ‘ulamā’ at that time. Both Jamīl Ḥarb and ‘Awāṭīf Nawwāb have adopted his statement.

7.1.10. ‘Awāṭīf Nawwāb, a modern historian, mentions in her book that:

The Prophet’s Mosque comes second among centres of learning in the Ḥijāz, even if its state of learning does not attain the scholarly rank of the Masjid al-Ḥarām in particular, and this is due to the persecution of the Sunnis, to the extent that it is said that it was not possible to recite the Sunni books in public.

51 Ibn Farḥūn, p.17.
52 Al-Samḥūdī, Wafā’ al-Wafā’, 2/600.
53 Jamīl Ḥarb, p.166; ‘Awāṭīf Nawwāb, p.258.
54 She cites al-Samḥūdī without referring back to Ibn Farḥūn to confirm this. See ‘Awāṭīf Nawwāb, p.258.
She says: 'The persecution of Medina's Sunni inhabitants explains the weakness of the scholarly role played by its 'ulamā' during that period'. It is not actually clear why she speaks of the weak role of the Sunni 'ulamā' in Medina, as she does not explain the reason for this statement nor she show how she knows that the role was weak. However, she found that most of the travellers who visited Medina and Mecca had written at some length about learning, instruction and the 'ulamā' in Mecca, whereas they had not done likewise for Medina, and, thus, she assumed that the state of learning in Medina was not flourishing as it was in Mecca, and so did not pay attention to the length of time spent by the travellers in these two cities. It is also possible that she was influenced by al-'Abdari's words on the imparting of learning in Medina. One also notices that she confirms the presence of 'ulamā', yet denies them scholarly activity; but how could they have become 'ulamā' if they had not engaged in any scholarly activity (a 'ālim cannot be called a 'ālim if he does not study, write and research)? Moreover, if the scholars of that era were not active in that way, why does she describe them as 'ulamā'? The purport of her statement is that there were no 'ulamā'; and this is clearly incorrect.

7.1.11. Jamil Ḥarb another modern historian, says the following of the Medinan 'ulamā': 'The Sunni inhabitants came to be in a weakened and degraded state, to the extent that they were unable to recite their books or listen to the Prophet's ḥadīth, unless in secret'. Although he does not mention the source of this information, it appears that he has derived it from al-Samhūdi, who related it from Ibn Farḥūn, who was talking about certain mujāwirūn and khuddām of whom he was aware during the Mamlūk era, and who were not, as Jamil Ḥarb states, from the Ayyūbid period. He also mentions that this led to the weakness of scholarly activity in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and that the 'ulamā' of Medina during this period were forced to leave the city due to their weakness and the degradation they were suffering at the hands of the Shi'a. This is an erroneous generalisation, since this occurrence only happened with the al-Majd and al-Nizām families, who appear to have been at odds with the sharifs over financial rather than doctrinal issues.

---

55 'Awāṭif Nawwāb, p.258.
56 Jamil Ḥarb, p.166.
57 ibid.
58 Ibn Farḥūn, p.66.
7.1.12. 'Ali al-Sayyid 'Ali also a modern historian, says, after citing the passage from Ibn Farhûn about his being aware of a group of mujâwirûn and khuddâm, who only recited their books in secrecy, that this passage is evidence that the role of the Prophet's Mosque served the interests of the Shi'a, and that the Sunni activity in the Mosque was very weak. It is strange that he states that the role of the Prophet's Mosque benefited the Shi'a, when he neither refers to a single text about instructional lectures conducted by the Shi'a, nor mentions the names of any of their 'ulamâ'. How does he form this judgement? One then notices that he has not researched the remaining historical sources which establish the presence of Sunni 'ulamâ' in Medina, giving instructional lectures in the Prophet's Mosque. From the discussion above it can be concluded that, in spite of those who describe the state of learning in Medina as stagnant and feeble, and also those who make no mention of learning there during that period, although they visited the city, certain travellers and historians have provided useful information about scholarly life in Medina, due to their contact with the city's 'ulamâ' and their reception of knowledge and stories from them.

One notices in the books of most of them their interest in describing the state of learning in the city, although they do not devote a particular section to learning, discuss it or research into it as a topic. They also concern themselves with mentioning the times set aside for teaching, the fields of study which were taught in the Prophet's Mosque, the most important libraries and the most celebrated 'ulamâ', their compilations, their specialisms, teaching methods, and so on.

These negative statements about the imparting of learning in Medina can be summed up as follows:

1- Accounts of the teaching lectures in the Prophet's Mosque are dispersed among statements scattered throughout histories and biographies, and rarely is there a separate account about them. It therefore appears that some people have neither read between the

---

60 Since the 'ulamâ' were careful to tell their students who their sheikhs and their teachers' sheikhs were, accordingly, the students knew the names of their 'ulamâ' predecessors as well as their specialist areas.
lines, nor thoroughly researched the books and texts, looking instead for an obvious or separate heading on the matter.

2- There is a dearth of information on daily life in Medina in the history books, due to their preoccupation with the major political events which were taking place in the Islamic world, and the lack of attention to those facets of ordinary life occurring in Islamic cities which were unconnected with politics.

3- One finds that certain historians who came later provide a description which is lacking or sometimes contrary to the truth, and this is because they have not found information about learning in some of the sources they have researched, or due to their thinking that the travellers who visited Medina during this period have not provided a description of learning in the city, as they have done in their description of learning in Mecca. Accordingly, they believe that this is due to the state of learning in Medina not being on the same level as that in Mecca. Or else it is because of their reliance on one or two sources, rather than attempting to research other books, such as biographies and siyar, or because of their having found a passage by one of the travellers who visited Medina for one day only, mentioning what is indicative of the weakness of learning in the city, and taking it up and being satisfied by it without ascertaining the truth of the account, the circumstances surrounding it and the reasons for such a statement, and without taking recourse to other sources which might provide evidence that is at variance with that passage, entirely different from it and demonstrating the opposite.

4- It is true that, after studying the learned activity in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, and after researching the abundance of books available, one can observe the paucity of 'ulamā' and their writings during this period, as compared with the Mamlük era which followed it. However, it is possible to affirm that this was not due to the Medinan inhabitants being ignorant or less scholarly than others, as al-'Abdārī asserted. Rather, it is possible to attribute the cause of this to several factors; prominent among these were the weakened economic situation and the scarcity of natural resources.

5- It can be said that the reason for the meagre information about learning in Medina offered by certain travellers who visited the city and wrote about what they saw there is
that they did not stay for a sufficient length of time to allow them to become acquainted with the various facets of scholarly life during this period. 62

6- It may be that one of the reasons for the lack of information about the teaching lectures at the Mosque and scholarly activity is that Tuesdays and Fridays were holidays for both teachers and students, as it has already been mentioned that certain travellers only stayed in Medina for a day or two. If such a traveller arrived in Medina on one of these two days and left there on the following day, it would not be feasible for him to witness these lectures or acquaint himself with the ‘ulamā’.

7- It could be that because most of the travellers who visited Medina were preoccupied with presenting a detailed description of the Mosque, taking its measurements in that short space of time, visiting the Qubā’ area and its mosque, and the tombs of the Uhud martyrs, visiting the Baqī’ cemetery and describing all that, they had insufficient time to follow the teaching lectures and meet the ‘ulamā’.

8- When the length of time most travellers stayed in Mecca is compared with the period they spent in Medina, one finds that they stayed in Mecca for far longer, and therefore had sufficient time to get to know its ‘ulamā’, attend teaching lectures there, see many things having a connection with learning, and then write about them, whereas this time was not available to them in Medina. 63

However, in spite of the reasons noted above to avoid or leave Medina, one finds - as will be seen in the second part of this chapter - that Medina during the Ayyūbid period did attract certain Muslim ‘ulamā’, and famous scholars came there to stay for a few years or for the rest of their lives. One notices that most of them continued in their scholarly pursuits, be it in teaching at the Prophet’s Mosque or compiling literary works, writing books or studying under those ‘ulamā’ who came to Medina for ziyāra. A number of scholars and travellers also came to perform the hajj and ziyāra, and took advantage of the opportunity to visit Medina and meet with the ‘ulamā’ who were there, whether they were from the place itself, or mujāwirūn, or those who, like them, had come for ziyāra. There were also certain ‘ulamā’ who came there to take up religious or administrative positions,

62 Most of them stayed there for between one and five days only: see, for example, the period of Ibn Jubayr’s stay in Medina: Ibn Jubayr, p. 181.
63 The reason for certain travellers remaining longer in Mecca than Medina was stated previously in footnote number 15, p.216.
such as: Aḥmad b. ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Jamāl al-Qastalānī (d. 636/1239),\textsuperscript{64} who was a teacher at the Prophet's Mosque; ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Sajastānī (d. 658/1260),\textsuperscript{65} an imam and teacher at the Prophet's Mosque; Bilāl al-Ḥabashī al-Sālihi (d. 699/1300),\textsuperscript{66} who assumed the office of head attendant at the Prophet's Mosque; ‘Abd al-Mun‘im al-Wāṣiṭi (d. 624/1227),\textsuperscript{67} a teacher in the city; and others.

7.2. The state of learning in Medina

This part of the chapter will refute the aforementioned statements of certain historians and travellers who have described the state of learning in Medina as being poor (and the reader will emerge with a picture very different from that presented by these historians and travellers). This will be achieved by presenting a more accurate picture of the state of learning in Medina at that time, after consulting many of the sources and references, the most significant of which are the biographies and siyar, and which, through the biographies of Medinan ‘ulamā‘, provide clear evidence of the existence of learning activity during the Ayyūbid period. This will be achieved by means of the following: there will be a discussion of the state of learning in the Prophet's Mosque, the madrasas, the katāṭīb, arba‘a and houses, and the syllabuses, then the role of the ‘ulamā‘ and their influence over learning in Medina. All of this is intended to clarify matters relating to the state of learning in Medina during that period, and to establish facts that were not evident to some of those who visited the city or to certain historians. The following contains a discussion and analysis of previous research on the texts about learning in Medina during that period.

7.2.1. Learning in lectures at the Prophet's Mosque

The Prophet's Mosque was the first centre of learning in Islamic civilisation, started by the Prophet (PBUH), when he would sit surrounded by the Companions and recite to them parts of the Qur’ān that had been revealed to him, talking to them, teaching them and preaching to them.\textsuperscript{68} After his death, the Companions sat in the mosque, teaching the Qur’ān to each other and relating to others what they had witnessed or heard from the

\textsuperscript{64} al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, 1/205.
\textsuperscript{65} ibid., 2/410.
\textsuperscript{66} ibid., 1/384.
\textsuperscript{67} ibid., 3/96.
\textsuperscript{68} Sāmī al-Ṣaqqār, Lāmahār ‘an Nushū‘ al-Ḥarkār al-‘Ilmiyya fī al-Ḥijāz, 2/54; al-Mudayris, al-Madīna, p.245.
Prophet. Things continued in this manner over the ensuing periods, and the Prophet's Mosque became a place for reciters, ḥadith scholars, jurists, and other 'ulamā', surrounded by their seated students from Medina and those who came from other places, listening, writing, questioning, and learning the sharī'a (the Islamic law) and literary sciences. During the Ayyūbid period, the situation did not differ greatly, though it was influenced by certain internal and external factors, such as the economic and security aspects of the city.\(^69\)

The reports on teaching lectures at the Prophet's Mosque are dispersed among scattered references in the history books and biographies, and there is rarely a separate account of them. What follows will be an exposition and analysis of some examples of this, after dividing the 'ulamā' who gave teaching lectures in the Prophet's Mosque into groups according to the branches of learning in which they specialised, in order to present a picture of scholarly activity in the Mosque and the variety of the lectures, and record the presence of more than one learned science in its various branches.

**The Qur'ānic sciences:** these are the first and oldest of the sciences linked to the Prophet's Mosque, and were considered to be amongst the fundamental sciences that 'ulamā', regardless of their specialisms or race, were eager to study, such as tafsīr (commentary), tajwid (the art of reciting the Qurān) and 'ilm al-qirā‘āt (the science of recitation), and which have continued from the time of the Prophet to the present day.\(^70\) In the biography and sīra books are biographies of the famous reciters of the Ayyūbid period, and one notices from these accounts that most of them knew the Qurān by heart, having learnt the qirā‘āt in Medina, and that some of them had spent some time at the Prophet's Mosque studying under certain sheikhs who knew the Qurān by heart and had learnt recitation passed down from sheikh to sheikh going back to the Prophet. The biography of Mūḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Ghadir al-Wāṣiṭi al-Muqrī (born 607/1210) tells how he learnt qirā‘āt in Medina from al-Firā‘ al-Fārūthi, then went to Damascus where he studied recitation science (tajwid) under al-Fāḍilī, but without concluding his studies, which he did under al-Shams al-Dumyātī, al-Iskandarānī, al-Ḥāḍirī and others. He was a master of
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\(^{69}\) 'Abd al-Bāṣīt Badr, *al-Madīna*, p.239.

One finds in the biographies of most of the luminaries and 'ulamā' of Medina that they learnt to read and recite the Qur'ān from sheikhs at the Prophet's Mosque and in some of the madrasas and arba'ī. Among the most famous of these scholars were al-Nizām Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Masʿūdī (d. 658/1260) and al-Bahlāwī Abū Muḥammad al-Ṭabarī (d. 691/1292). Al-Ḥasan b. Ya' ḥā al-ʿUmari al-Ḥanafī (d. 706/1306) was likewise renowned for recitation science during this period. He was a Medinan native of the al-ʿUmari family, and his biography states that he was a scholar of 'ilm al-qirāʿāt, having learnt to recite the Qur'ān as handed down from sheikh to sheikh going back to the Prophet Muḥammad. Many became his pupils and he left behind him a fine body of successors, all of them reciters, declaimers, students and teachers of the Qur'ān.

The science of ḥadīth: it was one of the leading sciences in terms of the number of those specialising in it, as there were approximately nineteen 'ulamā' according to al-Sakhāwī alone. It appears that this period is characterised by interest in the ḥadīth and the large number of 'ulamā' specialising in it. Some of the most famous ḥadīth scholars in Medina during this period were:

- Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Tamīmī al-Finjārī (d.627/1230), a muğāwil in Medina of Sufi persuasion who transmitted ḥadīth from many 'ulamā', such as Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥajari, Muḥammad b. Maflih, Abū al-Ṭabbār, al-Mayānshī and al-Hāshimi, and was made licentiate by Abū al-Ṭāhir b. 'Awf in Alexandria.

- Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Ṭabarī al-Shafīʿī (615-714/1218-1314), described by al-Barzalī and al-Dhahabi as the sheikh of the Hijāz; a muḥadith who has amongst his corpus of writings the book al-Nukhba al-Madaniyya. He took a class in the Rawḍa at the Prophet's Mosque in 647/1249, and amongst those who attended his lessons were the muḥadith Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd Al'azīz al-Mahdi, al-Quṭb al-Qaṣṭalānī and al-Jamāl al-Ṭabarī al-Qāḍī.
Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid al-Zāhidi al-Maqdasi al-Ḥawrāṇī al-Shāfīʿī (583-667/1187-1269); al-Sakhāwī mentions a group of his sheikhs and pupils and statements of ʿulamāʿ about him.⁷⁶

Abū al-Fadl Rabīʿ b. ʿAbd Allah al-Mardini al-Ilanafi (d. 602/1206), from whose biography al-Sakhāwī provides information on the economic, social and cultural situation of this scholar, his relationships with politicians and others, as well as his travels in the pursuit of knowledge. He mentions a group of his sheikhs and pupils, in addition to the activities in which he was involved. Al-Sakhāwī observes:

He founded the famous ribāṭ in Mecca with help from al-Malik al-Afdal al-Ayyūbi in 554/1159, a benefactor well known for his acts of magnanimity. He was told hadīth by al-Ḥāfiz b. ʿAsākir, and transmitted from him and from Ibn Abū al-Ṣayf al-Yamanī; and Abū al-Fadl Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allah b. Qimas, Abū Ghanīm Muḥammad b. Abū Jirāzah and others transmitted from him. He wandered the land, going to Baghdad, Mosul, Kufa, Alexandria, Damascus and Aleppo, living often as a mujāwir in the two Holy Cities. He resided in Medina for twelve years and worked as a labourer, drinking from waterskins, and what he earned in the day he put towards food for the poor. He would neither put aside from his daytime meal food for his evening meal, nor from his evening meal for his daytime meal, and would only break his fast on one or two days each month, influencing his friends to do the same. Neither would he partake of the wealth of the sultan, or his soldiers or those who endowed awqāʿ.⁷⁷

Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. Yūsuf al-Anṣārī al-Andalusi al-Qurtubi, later al-Madani (557-631/1162-1234), about whom al-Sakhāwī provides the accounts of certain ʿulamāʿ; touching on a group of his sheikhs and pupils, and the sciences which he taught, such as ʿilm al-qirāʿāt, ḥadīth, tafsīr, and adab (belles-lettres). Al-Sakhāwī says that, for a long time, he was a mujāwir in Medina, and also mentions some of his attributes, the years of his birth and death and some of his poetry, saying of him that he respected the sharifs and exalted them.⁷⁸

The science of fiqh: this discipline drew the attention of the Medinan ʿulamāʿ and the scholars who came to the city, and many of them excelled in it, so much so that many of

⁷⁶ ibid., 1/195-197.
⁷⁷ ibid., 2/61.
those who came to the city for ziyāra were eager to meet with the fuqahā' of Medina and obtain certificates from them. From the biographies provided by al-Sakhāwi, one often notices that most of the fiqh scholars were encyclopaedists who studied and taught other disciplines, such as Qur'ānic sciences, ḥadīth, tafsīr, rhetoric and adab. It seems that the nature of this science required from the scholars who wished to specialise in it that they be versed in other disciplines so that they could issue legal opinions and teach the science of fiqh, because it was linked to those disciplines.

Among the most well-known scholars in this field whose lives al-Sakhāwi has chronicled, are:

- ʿAbd al-Rāḥim b. Ibrāhīm al-Juhaynī al-Ḥamawī al-Shāfi`i (d. 683/1284): al-Sakhāwi mentions the positions he held before going to the Hijāz where he was a qādi and a teacher. He then mentions what al-Dhahabi says about him, that he was an outstanding imam, a faqih learned in the principles of the law, a man of letters and a poet, well-versed in psychology, commended for his judgements, imbued with piety, and one who loved the poor and the virtuous. Al-Sakhāwi also conveys from al-Kutubi the report that he inherited many books from the time of his father and grandfather, it being said that he had over fifty thousand volumes. 79

- Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid al-Hawrāni, who has already been mentioned amongst the ḥadīth scholars: al-Sakhawī mentions the statements about him by certain `ulamā'. Al-Dumyātī described him as the austere scholar of religious duties, and al-Dhahabi said that he taught and acted beneficially, combining both science and work. Al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī called him the peacock of the Ilāramayn, the mufti of the two denominations, the imam and jurist of the divine, and matchless scholar of hadith, and Ibn Rāfi said he was a Shāfi`i and an expert in fiqh and religious duties. 80

- Aḥmad b. ʿAli al-Jamāl al-Maṣrī al-Mālikī (559-636/1164-1239): al-Sakhāwī talks of his origins, his growing-up, his studies, the offices he held, his journey in pursuit of knowledge, his sheikhs, his students and the opinions of some scholars about him. He also mentions a story about him concerning a prayer for rain in Medina, and his love for the poor. 81

79 ibid., 2/557-558.
80 ibid., 1/195-197.
81 ibid., 1/204-206.
Al-Sakhāwi also relates the names of several *fugahā*, such as ‘Abd al-Muḥsin b. Abū al-‘Amid al-Abhari (d. 624/1227); 82 ‘Abd al-Munaim b. Yūsuf al-Wāsiti (who was in Medina in 624/1227), saying that `he was a faqih and a teacher at the Prophet's Mosque'; 83 the qaḍī Sirāj al-Damanḥūri (born in 636/1239), 84 of whom al-Sakhāwi provides a lengthy biography, some of which will be cited in the next section.

One notices from the aforesaid that most of the teachers at these lectures during the Ayyūbid period were among the sheikhs who came to Medina, and the dozens of students who graduated from there, most of them becoming sheikhs in Medina or in the cities from which they came. As the individuals who were lecturing sheikhs and their countries increased in number, so also did the subjects and sciences which they taught, and the scholars would give those who excelled in understanding these sciences certificates authorising them to relate what they had learnt from them.

Of the Sunni schools, the Shafīʿi school was the prevalent school in Medina, as has been stated already, yet the open approach to teaching at the Prophet's Mosque allowed ‘ulamā’ of other Islamic schools to hold lectures in their own tradition. When Ibn Farḥūn came to Medina, there was no one teaching Mālikī *fiqh*, so he set about teaching it at the Prophet's Mosque and did not encounter any problems as a result. 85 When Sheikh Shams al-Dīn b. al-ʿAjām came, he found no one teaching or studying Ḥanafī *fiqh* at the Prophet's Mosque, and it was not widely known amongst the inhabitants of Medina, so he directed a group of his students to study it. 86

In addition to the religious sciences which were taught in the Prophet's Mosque, there were other sciences which held the interest of ‘ulamā’ who specialised in them or were encyclopaedists who gathered together great quantities of all kinds of learning, and began teaching them to the students who came to them. At the forefront of these disciplines were Arabic language sciences, such as grammar and syntax, *adab* and rhetoric. These were basic disciplines which all students had to study, but differed in terms of how much they acquired of them and how far they took them. One finds in the biographies of certain luminaries among the Medinans and the *mujāwirūn* that they were proficient in other

---

82 ibid., 3/75.
83 ibid., 3/96.
84 ibid., 3/312-317.
85 Ibn Farḥūn, p.88.
86 ibid., p.82.
sciences considered to be specialist disciplines of lesser importance than religious learning and the Arabic language. The biography of al-Shihāb al-Abashiṭi states that he taught algebra and equations as well as grammar and syntax. Likewise, al-Taqi al-Ḥuṣānī taught logic and semantics in addition to the science of usūl, and Arabic, and many attended his classes. Some scholars of this period had more than one lecture group in different disciplines, and even those ‘ulamā’ who held official offices were eager to teach at the Prophet’s Mosque in their spare time, particularly the qāṭī, most of whom taught at the mosque prior to assuming the office of qāṭi, such as the Qāṭi of Mecca ‘Abd Allāh b. Yahyā al-Ṭabārī (605/1208), who held lectures in Shāfi’ī fiqh and ḥadīth in the Prophet’s Mosque, as well as ‘Abd al-Raḥīm b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-Ḥamawī (d. 557/1162) and others. Most lectures at the Mosque were voluntary, with the sheikh receiving no payment for them, and the visiting ‘ulamā’ found teaching at the Mosque to be a good opportunity to augment their curricula vitae and increase their scholarly knowledge and experience. Statements in several sources reveal that some of the office-holders allocated sums of money to the teaching of some particular discipline at the Prophet’s Mosque, creating for this work a permanent waqf, the revenue of which was paid to those who taught, according to the conditions stipulated in the waqf deed.

7.2.2. Learning in the madrasas of Medina

Madrasas were the second most important places for learning in Medina, after the Prophet’s Mosque, and differed from the Mosque in that they were created purely for the purpose of education. They had salaried instructors, and a limited number of students

88 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, 2/434.
89 ibid., 2/557.
90 Such classes included those which Emir Sulār established, with the efforts of the qāṭi Fakhr al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī (d. 739/1338); he endowed properties, the revenue from which was paid to a scholar giving regular lessons in Māliki fiqh, another giving classes in Shāfi’ī fiqh, and a third teaching Ḥanafi fiqh. Ibn Farḥūn mentions other lessons which were funded by Fakhr al-Dīn Nāẓir al-Jaysh, the superintendent of the army, and others financed by a man called Shu’ayb b. Abū Madyan. Undoubtedly, these lessons which were endowed by awqāf would become a sustained activity as long as the waqf and its proceeds continued (although occurring in the Mamlūk period, it is possible that these were longstanding and had taken place before this, as Ibn Farḥūn does not mention that these were a novel concept or that that emir had been the first to do this, but reports the information as if it is something to which people had become accustomed. All of this is hypothetical and could be true or false. See Ibn Farḥūn, p.149; ‘Abd al-Bāṣīt Badr, al-Madīna, p.241-243.
normally resided there, who were given a certain amount of money. Some historians have attributed the building of the first madrasas in Mecca and Medina to Šalāḥ al-Dīn, yet the available sources neither mention the names of the madrasas which he built, nor attribute to him any of the known madrasas of the Ayyūbid period. It could be that the madrasa which Šalāḥ al-Dīn built in Medina was one of those which bore the name of its subsequent supervisor or had become disused or had been closed after a while.

The madrasas in the Ayyūbid period were characterised by being detached buildings housing a section for student accommodation, with a separate room for single or paire of students, and so the number of students was limited to thirty. They had a kitchen where food was prepared for the students and teachers living there and one or more large halls for teaching, and were usually built around the Prophet's Mosque or close by. Most of them had been houses or arbita which the founders had purchased and then converted to suit their new function.

Each madrasa had a sheikh who was in the position of director responsible for it and was also one of the ‘ulamā’ known in his time. This sheikh would teach the science for which he was renowned, and participating with him in the teaching were other sheikhs whom he had selected from the residents of Medina or the newcomers to the city. Each madrasa had dedicated to it awqāf, which could be invested in, such as shops, houses and plantations, which were leased out to whoever invested in them, and the revenue was spent on the teachers’ salaries, the students and their subsistence, and the upkeep of the building and seeing to its needs. When the revenue was scant, so were the numbers of the students, and the madrasa could eventually be shut down, particularly when the benefactor died and the overseer neglected it or someone gained control over it.

7.2.2.1. Inception of the madrasas in Medina

Certain sources point to the existence of a number of madrasas appearing during the sixth and seventh Hijri centuries:

1- Madrasas which were built in the time of Šalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī: al-Nu‘aymī (d. 927/1521) refers to the building of madrasas in the time of Šalāḥ al-Dīn in 577/1181, in
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92 Abd al-Bāṣīt Badr, al-Madīna, p.244.
93 Ibid.
both Medina and Mecca. *Arbiţa* were also built with them, and were supported by *awqaf*. However, al-Nu‘aymî does not specify whether it was Şalâh al-Dîn who built them or ordered the building of them, or whether they were built during his time by other people; nor does al-Nu‘aymî state the names of these madrasas or their locations. The reason for this may lie in Ibn Farḫūn, since he mentions that most of Şalâh al-Dîn’s *awqaf* and madrasas were known by names other than his, from amongst the people who lived there, their supervisor or those who were in charge of the building, and that his wish was that the donors should be anonymous. Some historians relate that madrasas were first built in Medina during the Ayyûbid period. What is meant by ‘madrasa’ here was a place set aside for study and teaching. These madrasas were simply built and furnished, and expenditure on them, and the payment of the salaries of the teachers and students, was through the *awqaf* with which they were endowed. It seems that the survival and continuity of these madrasas was affected by the city’s security and stability at that time, and, therefore, the names are not known of those madrasas which may have been taken over or usurped by other individuals due to the absence of security. It is possible that some of the sheikhs and teachers at these madrasas, and certain wealthy persons, emirs and sultans, participated in building these madrasas and spending money on them, particularly if the income from the *waqf* with which the madrasa was endowed was insufficient to meet its needs.

2- Al-Shirāziyya Madrasa: from the name it would seem that it was built by a person or group of persons from Shirāz in Iran. According to Ibn Farḫūn, one of the most celebrated of its sheikhs was Sheikh Ibrâhîm al-Rûmî (d.730/1330), who lived in Medina for more than fifty years, having settled in the al-Shirāziyya Madrasa. It appears, from the date of this sheikh’s death and the length of his stay at the madrasa, that it was founded prior to 680/1281, according to Ibn Farḫūn’s account, and this is supported by al-Sakhāwī when he says:

Sheikh Ibrâhîm al-Rûmî resided in Medina for more than fifty years, and stayed at the al-Shirāziyya Madrasa, building it and repairing its roofs and windows. In his days, the
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madrasa was held in great regard and enjoyed high standing. He purchased for it a
date garden with which he endowed it as a waqf. 100

3. Al-Shihābiyya Madrasa: it was built by al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Shihāb al-Dīn Ghāzī al-
Ayyūbī b. al-Malik al-ʿĀdīl (d. 646/1248),101 and was given this name as an attributive of
his. Al-Samhūdī mentions that al-Malik al-Muẓaffar purchased the house of Abū Ayyūb
al-Anṣārī in which the Prophet Muhammad had lodged when he migrated to Medina, and
built the madrasa on its site.102 It is likely that he did this when he was making the
pilgrimage and visited Medina in 624/1227.103 The madrasa is distinctive in that it houses
the four legal schools, and is therefore a large building with two halls, one large and one
small, and a valuable library. Al-Malik Shihāb al-Dīn endowed it with many awqāf in
Damascus, Diyār Bakr and Medina.104 The purpose of these awqāf was for the madrasa to
have a constant revenue stream from which to pay for teachers, students and repairs, and
to provide it with what it needed by way of equipment and requisites.105 The madrasa was
also endowed by waqf with many books. Among those who endowed it with books was
Yaḥya b. Zakariyya al-Ḥawrānī (d. 721/1321).106 Indicative of the importance and repute
of the madrasa is the fact that the appointment of teachers there required the consent of
the sultan, as happened with Ibn Farḥūn, who tried to obtain from the Chief Justice in
Egypt a decision appointing him as a teacher at the al-Shihābiyya Madrasa, but no assent
was forthcoming until he had established his credentials for that position, and then a
decree from Sultan Muhammad b. Qalaūwn was issued in his favour.107

7.2.3. The imparting of learning in katāṭīb

Katāṭīb were the first stage of learning, in which children took their initial steps. In
Medina, they are longstanding, dating back to the time of ‘Umar b. al-Khattāb, who

100 al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfâ, 1/154-155. Nāji al-Anṣārī mentions in his book al-Ta’llīm (p.287) that
Sheikh Ibrāhīm al-Rūmī was the founder of the al-Shirāziyya Madrasa. I find no reference in the
sources he mentions which points to this. Instead, the passages in Ibn Farḥūn and al-Sakhāwī
indicate that the madrasa had existed for some time before Sheikh Ibrāhīm al-Rūmī came there
and that he restored it to prevent it from falling down. See Ibn Farḥūn, p.47; al-Fayrūz Abādī, al-
102 al-Samḥūdī, Wafāʾ al-Wafāʾ, 1/265.
104 al-Samḥūdī, Wafāʾ al-Wafāʾ, 1/265; Nāji al-Anṣārī, al-Ta’llīm, p.287; ‘Abd al-Bāṣīṭ Badr, al-
Madīnā, p.245.
106 al-Samḥūdī, Wafāʾ al-Wafāʾ, 1/265.
gathered together the children of the Companions who were absent on jihad, allocating to them a man in each quarter to teach them the Qur'ān. He wrote to the emirs of the great cities urging them to do likewise, and they financed this with money from the treasury. Thus, Katātib were the first educational establishments in Islamic society for the teaching of the young, and spread throughout most Islamic cities, with the teaching in them becoming a profession for a group of people. The term 'teacher of young boys' emerged, and the syllabus taught in these schools broadened to include learning qirā‘āt, writing and a little arithmetic. During the Ayyūbid period, there was an unknown number of katātib in Medina, associated with the teachers who taught in them, and it was common practice that some of these were at the Prophet's Mosque, but the majority were in the homes of the teachers or in a few of the arbiṭa. There is no detailed information available about the katātib in Medina at this time, yet it is possible to deduce that they were widespread from statements which occur in the biographies of certain of the city's inhabitants and the mujāwirūn, a number of whom worked in them. A mujāwir without adequate means would easily find an opportunity to teach young boys, such as Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Maymūn al-Jaza‘iri, who came to Medina and stayed there for five years educating children; Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Siyānī, who had one hundred pupils in his kuttāb, and Aḥmad b. Abū Bakr al-Anṣārī, who earned his living teaching children. Some of the kuttāb sheikhs possessed a high level of knowledge of the qirā‘āt, and even al-Sakhāwī himself studied the Qur'ān under one of them.

7.2.4. Learning in the houses and arbiṭa of Medina

7.2.4.1. Houses
Houses were important centres in the search for learning in Medina during the Ayyūbid period. Some students would acquire their learning in the houses of the ūlamā’, such as the traveller Ibn Rashid, who was taught by Sheikh Abū Ishāq al-Fāṣī at his home in
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Medina in 684/1285. It can be said that certain ‘ulamā’ would prefer to hold their classes in their homes, because of their age and inability to leave the house, as was the case with the sheikh and faqih Abū Ishāq al-Fāsi. Furthermore, some of the madrasas only gave a limited number of individuals the opportunity to teach in them, and only on the terms laid down by the owner of the madrasa or its supervisor, as with the al-Shihābiyya Madrasa, to which no one could be appointed without the sultan’s approval.

7.2.4.2. Arbita

A ribāt was a secure Islamic ḥāmiya, or a location where the cavalry gathered in preparation for a campaign. However, the most accurate definition of a ribāt comes in the Qur’ān: ‘Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war’ (4:1). In the Lisān al-‘Arab dictionary, ‘ribāt’ means diligence in applying oneself to something. Yet, in Medina, the term ribāt was applied to shelters for the poor, for those dedicated to worship, and for students and mujāhirūn of the Prophet’s Mosque.

Activity in building arbita in Medina began at the beginning of the fifth Hijri century, and the basic purpose of building them was to house the Sufis among the mujāhirūn and religious devotees, foreigners, widowers and students. Some were made awqāf to house visitors to the city, and, with the passage of time, these arbita became educational centres for various reasons, one of the most significant being that many ‘ulamā’ and students coming to Medina did not have enough money to purchase or rent a house, and so would stay in these arbita free of charge and, sometimes, undertake teaching in them. Also, the sheikhs who assumed the office of sheikh or leader of a ribāt were among the most senior-ranking and learned ‘ulamā’.

Some of the most important arbita were:

1. ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān Ribāt: in 423/1032, a group of Moroccan merchants purchased the smallest house belonging to Caliph ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān, and made it into a ribāt
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for students from the countries of the Maghrib who lived in Medina, but the ribāṭ became lodging for pilgrims during the hajj season.\textsuperscript{121} This ribāṭ later became renowned as the Dūkāla Ribāṭ.\textsuperscript{122} It contained a library rich in books on Māliki fiqh, which indicates that some arbita contained libraries with books that some mujāwirūn brought with them and then endowed them by waqf to the arbita.\textsuperscript{123}

2. Al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh Ribāṭ: in 570/1175, the ‘Abbāsid Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh ordered the building of a ribāṭ in Medina to house students and foreigners staying in the city. This ribāṭ is situated by the Bāb al-Nisā’, near to the Prophet’s Mosque.\textsuperscript{124}

3. Al-Marāghi Ribāṭ: in 571/1176, the Chief Justice Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Marāghi endowed by waqf a ribāṭ situated close to Bāb al-Salām. One of the conditions of his endowment was that it was to house Sufi zuhhād residing in Medina, and also accommodate Arab and Persian pilgrims during the time of hajj.\textsuperscript{125} In the ribāṭ lies the tomb of the gādī Abū Bakr al-Marāghi.\textsuperscript{126}

4. Al-Bukhāriyya Ribāṭ: some merchants from the city of Bukhāra built several arbita in Medina, the most famous of which is situated in front of the Bāb al-Rahmā, and is known as the al-Bukhāriyya Ribāṭ.\textsuperscript{127}

5. Al-Zanjīli Ribāṭ: ‘Uthmān b. ‘Ali al-Zanjīli, deputy to the Emir of ‘Adan, ordered the building of this ribāṭ in 579/1183. It is situated adjacent to the Prophet’s Mosque on the Bāb al-Nisā’ side. He endowed it by waqf for the Ḥanafis and pilgrims and visitors arriving from ‘Adan.\textsuperscript{128}

6. Wālidat al-Calīh al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh Ribāṭ: in 599/1203, the mother of the ‘Abbāsid Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh endowed her well-known ribāṭ in Medina, near to the Bāb Jibril of the Prophet’s Mosque, as a waqf for the city’s poor.\textsuperscript{129}
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7. Al-Isfahānī Ribāt: Jamāl al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, the Zengid vizier, purchased at the end of the sixth hijrī century the largest house belonging to ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān, and endowed it by waqf as accommodation for poor Persians arriving from Iran. According to al-Samhūdī, this ribāt housed a tomb in which Jamāl al-Dīn was buried in accordance with his request, which shows that certain of these arbaṭa sometimes contained graves of deceased persons.

8. Khālid b. al-Walid Ribāt: This ribāt is situated in the respective houses of Khālid b. al-Walid and ʿAmru b. al-ʿĀṣ, as they were adjoining. Some merchants from Ghazni in India purchased both houses in 620/1223 and built them into a ribāt to house Indian mujāwirūn in Medina. It was later called the al-Sabil Ribāt.

One notices that some ribāṭa were once the houses of certain Companions, such as the house of ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān, that of Khālid b. al-Walid, that of ʿAmru b. al-ʿĀṣ, and others, which indicates that people wished to preserve the places where the Companions had lived, and inhabit them because of their merit and blessedness. Many arbaṭa are also characterised by their proximity to the Prophet's Mosque, due to the majority of those living in them being students or religious devotees, such as the Sufis and mujāwirūn who came to Medina to seek Allāh's reward through study, and prayer and worship at the Prophet's Mosque.

The influence of the Shiʿa in ribāt construction is apparent during the Ayyūbīd period, since one finds that some of them contain tombs, such as the al-Asfahānī Ribāt and the al-Marāḡhī Ribāt. This was commonplace among the Shiʿa, particularly in the days of the Fatimid state, as was the placing of cupolas on some of the ribāṭa, such as was widespread with arbaṭa and zawāyā in Cairo during the Fatimid period.

7.3. Syllabuses at the Prophet's Mosque and certain madrasas

Lectures at the Prophet's Mosque and the madrasas dispersed around it taught similar syllabuses. The syllabus usually started with learning the Qurʾān by heart and studying its disciplines, such as tajwīd, tafsīr and qirāʿāt. Then the student went on to study the ḥadīth, grammar and syntax. Once these were mastered, the student read books in greater depth
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and attended lessons in other sciences. The method of instruction was based on the system of lectures, and it was the sheikh who decided on the subjects that he wished to teach and also the appropriate method of teaching. The student would choose which sheikh he wanted, and may have moved from one lecture to another depending on his wishes and what suited his propensities and tastes. The sheikhs would read to their students from a variety of books (either their own, their sheikhs', or those of prominent 'ulamā'), which would contain copious material on the science in which they were specialising. The sheikh would expatiate upon the subject-matter of the book, perhaps adding to it, and the students would listen to their sheikh, who, once he had finished talking, would begin a discussion between himself and the students. Dictation and recitation were the study methods used.

It is apparent, from the biographies which mention the syllabuses which were taught by the 'ulamā' at this time, that the syllabuses were broad: students would learn various sciences before specialising in a single discipline. If a student were a resident of a madrasa, he learnt first of all the syllabus taught by his madrasa. These syllabuses generally began after the stage of memorising the Qurān and learning qirāt, writing and the basic religious sciences.

The cultural syllabuses at that time were concerned with learning by heart bodies of texts or mutān (sing. matn) on a number of sciences, and it was deemed necessary that the student should do this after having memorised the Qurān. Mutān were texts which the students learnt word-for-word, and they might be set in verse to facilitate memorising, with the exception of the Prophet's hadith which was memorised as it appeared in the books of hadith. Memorising the forty hadith, which had been chosen and expounded by al-Nawawi had become widespread, and they were known as 'al-Arba`in al-Nawawiyya'. For example, one finds in the biography of Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Madani that he had memorised 'al-Arba`in al-Nawawiyya', his syllabus and the alfiyyat al-Hadith wa al-Nahw (a one thousand item repertoire of the hadith and grammar). After the mutān came the shurūḥ (commentaries; sing. sharḥ), and these were studied, not memorised. The sixth century and those that followed were characterised as being the age of shurūḥ, since many
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were written during this time, from commentaries on the *ḥadīth* to commentaries on poems.\(^{137}\)
The cultural syllabus in some lectures and madrasas included the study of certain Sufi books which were well known at that time.\(^{138}\) Sufism was already widespread, and was a matter of conduct rather than culture,\(^{139}\) but some students and persons knowledgeable about the principles of the Sufi way of life were interested in reading books on this subject, some of whom perhaps memorised the *mutūn* contained in them. In the biography of Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd al-Murshidī in al-Sakhāwī, it is stated that he memorised the Qurān, Nawawi's Forty and then the poem *Manzūmat al-Ṭayr* (the Conference of the Birds)\(^{140}\) on the Sufi way of life.\(^{141}\)

In addition to this cultural syllabus, in some madrasas, certain other sciences were studied, such as algebra, arithmetic, equations and logic.\(^{142}\) Naturally, madrasas were interested in these sciences to varying degrees, and included them in their syllabuses. This knowledge was available in Medina through those of its native inhabitants who had attained a high level of learning in these disciplines, or through *mujāhir* `ulamā' who were at the forefront of teaching in lectures at the Prophet's Mosque and the madrasas.\(^{143}\) Some students were, however, dissatisfied with the learning on offer in Medina, and so travelled to different countries in the pursuit of knowledge, meeting with *ulamā* prominent in particular sciences and studying under them. One finds in the biographies the names of many Medinan luminaries who travelled to countries far and wide in order to study under certain sheikhs. Thus, the Medinan Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Kazārūnī journeyed to Cairo in order to study the *Tusā'iyāt* of Ibn Jamā'a under al-ʿIzz b. al-Furāt. He also travelled to Damascus to learn Qurānic recitation from Ibn al-Jazari, and accompanied his master on his travels, even going with him to the Yemen.\(^{144}\)

A sheikh would give a student who diligently attended his class an academic *ijāza*, after the sheikh had ascertained that the student had grasped what he had learnt and possessed the

\(^{140}\) The author of *Manzūmat al-Ṭayr* is Fārīd al-Dīn al-ʿAṭṭār (545-627/1150-1230).
ability to teach it. By this Ijāza, the teacher certified that his pupil had mastered and understood what he had learnt from his teacher and that he was authorised to teach it to others.

The earliest text of an academic Ijāza which has come down to us was the Ijāza which one of the Medinan 'ulamā', Muḥammad al-Tūnisī, known as al-Wāniighī, gave to a Meccan 'ālim, Taqī al-Dīn al-Fāsī, in the year 813/1411. Al-Fāsī tells how al-Wāniighī gave him a Ijāza, authorising him to give legal opinions and teach the Mālikī doctrine. An abridged text of the Ijāza is as follows:

He, Taqī al-Dīn al-Fāsī the qādi, was one of those with whom I met, deliberated and had discussions on numerous occasions. He came to us in Medina, attended our lessons in fiqh and usūl, and in so doing demonstrated beneficial qualities and scholarly inquiry worthy of his learning and merit. In all this, I considered him a fit person to teach, to issue legal opinions and to instruct students, by virtue of his natural talent for understanding and the capaciousness of his mind for research and the use of authorities. All this requires that he be granted permission to teach, to issue legal opinions and to instruct students and that he be enjoined to occupy himself with this and practise it unremittingly, in order to benefit people in general and his compatriots in particular. By the hand of Muhammad al-Wāniighī the Mālikī, the humble servant first mentioned above, resident in the Two Holy Cities, on the second of Dhu al-Hijja in the year eight hundred and thirteen.

7.4. Medinan ‘ulamā’ and their writings

By means of the biographies, it is possible to divide the ‘ulamā’ living in Medina, whether they were born there or came from other countries and stayed there, into two categories. One category is content to accumulate learning, master it and then expatiate upon it to students in classes and lectures, but is not interested in writing and does not produce any
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books. This is a category which focuses its efforts on accumulating and then transmitting to others. Often, the 'ulamā' in this category were creative, but they channelled their creativity into their oral classes and discussions, and the instructing of the students who attended their sessions. These 'ulamā' were not destined to have pupils who wrote about them and conveyed what they wrote in independent writings, and mention of them is restricted to their status as 'ulamā' (i.e. saying of him that he was an 'ālim). As for the second category, it did concern itself with authoring and writing books, whether they were new in subject-matter, or were commentaries and annotations containing additions and amendments to what other 'ulamā' had already written. They may have written their works themselves, or dictated them for their students to write down, then they would review and approve them, and others might read them as their students.\(^\text{147}\)

These two categories of 'ulamā' existed in Medina. Perhaps the first category was the larger in number, due to the considerable number of lectures at the Prophet's Mosque and surrounding madrasas, and certainly al-Sakhāwī reports a great many of them in his book, al-Tuhfa al-Latifà. Among the most famous of these were 'Abd al-Salām b. Mazrū', Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Qurtubi and Abū al-Fadl al-Hanafi.

With regard to the 'ulamā' who were interested in writing, there were those among them who had been born and raised in Medina, while others had come there to live and be mujāwirūn. Some of the mujāwirūn had written their books prior to coming to the city, but preferred to present them for a second time to those who attended their lectures in Medina. When al-Muḥibb al-Maṭari, the famous Meccan 'ālim, came to Medina in 647/1249, he stayed there for some time, giving lectures at the Prophet's Mosque. Among those who attended his classes were al-Qutub al-Qastalāni, 'Abd Allāh al-Mahdawi, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Matari and others.\(^\text{148}\) Naturally, they would seize the opportunity of this sheikh's presence to hear what he had to say, ask him about what he had written, and perhaps discuss and debate with him.

Matters may have gone further than attendance at lectures or classes, to the extent that sheikhs would become each other's students in spite of their high rank. This points to the humility of the 'ulamā', and their wish to strive further in the pursuit of knowledge. An example of this is that when the great tafsir scholar, al-Qurtubi (d. 631/1234), came to
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Medina, he was met by Abu Shama al-Maqadasi, author of the book *al-Rawdatayn*, who was also in Medina at the time, and whose accounts he heard, and he asked al-Qurtubi to give him *ijaza*, which he did.\(^{149}\)

Ibrahim b. Muhammad al-Dimashqi was also a mujawir in Medina, an imam of *isnad* (ascription of *hadith*) and given the appellation of ‘*musnad al- Haramayn*’, and a number of sheikhs studied under him.\(^{150}\) There was also Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Sabti al-Sufi, about whom al-Sakhawi mentions that he wrote on Sufism.\(^{151}\)

Certain ‘ulama’ owned sizable libraries whose volumes assembled a large quantity of the legacy of learning from different parts of the Islamic World. Ibn Farhun reports that Sheikh ‘Abd Allah b. Hajjaj al-Mughrabi (d. 701/1301), famed as makshif al-Ra’s (‘the bareheaded one’), had a vast library which he had brought from his own country, containing basic works, and original copies and collections of Qur’anic *tafsir*, books on *fiqh*, *hadith*, history, medicine, logic, wisdom and other sciences. According to Ibn Farhun:

When his books were sold following his death and the emigration of his children to Egypt, they flooded Medina until every house in it possessed a store of learning unfamiliar to anyone of that time and incomprehensible to anyone who had not applied himself to its principles and had access to its sheikhs.\(^{152}\)

Sheikh ‘Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Nakazawi (614-683/1217-1284) was one of the most prominent Medinan ‘ulama’ at that time. He was born in the city, and studied at the Prophet’s Mosque under a number of sheikhs, immersing himself in *qirā‘at* until he attained an advanced level. He wrote several works, among them *al-Shamil fi al-Qirā‘at al-Saba‘* and *al-Igtidā‘ fi Ma‘rifat al-Waqt wa al-Ibtidā‘*:\(^{153}\)

Among the great ‘ulama’ was Sheikh Saar al-Din ‘Abd al-Latif b. Muhammad al-Khajandi al-Isfahani, the senior *ālim* in Isfahan, revered by kings and sultans and the general public. Ibn Jubayr described him as a jurist, a man of letters and a poet, and said that he was taught by him, referring to him as the head of the Shafi‘i in Isfahan and remarking on his proficiency in the *hadith* in Arabic. About his class, which he attended at the Prophet’s
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Mosque, he says that he had never before attended one like it, in terms of the number of those present, their submissiveness and their attachment to their sheikh. Also among the `ulamā' was Sheikh Ruzayn b. Mu'awiyah b. Ammar (d. 525/1131), imam of the Mālikis, who wrote a book on Medinan akhbār and another on Meccan akhbār. He wrote a third book on the ḥadith which brought together those in the al-Ṣiḥḥ al-Khamsa (the Five Truths) and the Muwatta'. He was one of those who taught the ḥadith in Mecca and then in Medina. Accounts of him were given by the Qādi of Mecca, Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Shaybānī, al-Ḥāfiẓ b. 'Asākir and Abū Mūsā al-Ḥadīthī, and he gave al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Salāfī ijāza. The 'ālim 'Afif al-Din 'Abd al-Samā' b. Muhammad al-Hanbali (625-696 A.H.) was a mujawirin Medina for over fifty years, studying and teaching in the city.

The most celebrated poets whose lives al-Sakhāwī documents are Khalāff b. 'Abd al-Azīz al-Qabātī (born in 615/1218), 'Abd al-Ṣamad b. 'Abd al-Wahhab al-Dimashqī (614-686/1217-1287) and Ja'far b. Aḥmad al-Mawṣūli al-Adīb (693/1294).

There were also a number of female scholars present in Medina, among whom was Umm al-Khayr Fatima b. Ibrahim al-Bata'ibl. Ibn al-Rashid al-Fahri mentions, in his account of the events of his journey to Medina, that he met Umm al-Khayr at the Prophet's Mosque and studied under her with her son present, and that she lowered her jilbāb over her face out of modesty and respectability. She gave him ijāza regarding all she narrated. Ibn Ḥajar says of her that she was a muḥadditha of piety, righteousness and correct observance. She was born in 625/1228 and was taught by a number of the sheikhs of her era, such as Ibn al-Zubaydi and Ibn al-Ḥusayrī, the sheikh of the Ḥanafis. She narrated aḥadīth, and Muḥammad al-Wānī studied under her from the Book of Tawḥīd in the Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī, and other things, as well as selected rubā'iyyat ḥadith from Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim as heard by her from Mūhammad b. Aḥmad al-Ḥusayrī. Muḥammad al-Shāfī‘i wrote about her with her permission, and al-Subkī borrowed from her. She died in Damascus in 711/1311.
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There is no doubt that the existence of women who were scholars and educated in Medina is significant in many ways; for instance, the Medinans' concern for the education of women to the extent that some families allowed their daughters to attain a high level of learning. A woman could become a muhadditha or a scholar of qirāʿāt. It is possible that there existed another category of women who did not attain the rank of scholar and, therefore, are not mentioned in the biographies but no record of them has come down to us. In spite of the lack of detailed information on the education and cultural attainment of ordinary women during this period, one can gather from the existence of female muhaddithāt, reciters and faqihāt that there were classes specifically for women. It is also possible that these women scholars gave lessons to women, which would lead to there being good educational activity among women.161

There was a further variety of 'ulamā' who were solely interested in waʿẓ, particularly in the Prophet's Mosque, where there were numerous lectures on waʿẓ during the festivals, in which 'ulamā', waʿẓ preachers and non-Medinan incomers participated, and which were attended by people of different social backgrounds, sexes and age groups. In 553/1158 Ibn al-Jawzi came to Medina and held lectures on waʿẓ at the Prophet's Mosque.162 Ibn Jubayr describes a waʿẓ lecture that he attended during his visit to the city, during which the head of the 'ulamā' of Khurasān spoke in Arabic and Farsi.163

From what has been mentioned above, one notices that learned activity in Medina was above all focused around the Islamic sciences, such as the Qurʾān, the hadith, tafsīr, fiqh, qirāʿāt, and then came the disciplines of the Arabic language, such as grammar, syntax and poetical metrics. It is natural that interest in these sciences should predominate, as Medina is the repository of Islamic heritage, in which lies the Prophet's Mosque, the destination of incomers seeking to worship and obtain recompense. All of this places religious sciences at the forefront of the sciences in which those in the city were interested, followed by the Arabic language sciences which were considered supplementary to the religious sciences.164

Among the 'ulamā' who had a role in academic activity in Medina were the copyists or nussākh, who copied books, whether previously written, or those written by authors from amongst the native Medinans and mujāwirūn. In the biographies of the luminaries of the
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Ayyūbid period there is repeated mention of those who were skilled in calligraphy and copied books and literary works and worked in transcription, such as Aḥmad b. al-Farajj b. Rāskid al-Madānī (d. 551/1156), Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Anṣārī and Ṭabd al-Wāḥid al-Jazūli. This allowed students and ‘ulamā’ to augment their knowledge from, and to study wider aspects of, the heritage and works by ‘ulamā’ and writers from all over the Islamic World, whom they had no chance of meeting.

Lastly, one can describe the ‘ulamā’ of Medina during the Ayyūbid period as being characterised by two things. The first was the knowledge and understanding of sciences and an awareness of their latest developments. The inhabitants of Medina were, thus, at an advanced level: many of them knew the Qurān by heart, studied fiqh, the ḥadīth, tafsīr and language. The Prophet’s Mosque was the site of constant lectures attended by students and men who felt that, by attending, they were preserving the link between learning and the ‘ulamā’, and performing in full measure their religious duties. Among them were merchants, artisans, and service workers, as well as mujāwirūn and visitors. The second thing was academic innovation; that is, adding to what had been achieved by those who came before.

7.5. Mujāwir ‘ulamā’ and their role in the academic activity in Medina

Before discussing the role of these mujāwir ‘ulamā’ in the academic activity in the city, it is perhaps useful to explain the reasons for the migration of ‘ulamā’ from the various Islamic lands to Medina and not elsewhere, and their singling it out as a place in which to live, study and teach.

Among the most significant reasons for the migration of ‘ulamā’ to Medina is what is contained in the Prophetic hadith on the merit of Medina, the urging to take up residence there, the merit of studying there and the urging to do so, and the merit of its scholars over other ‘ulamā’. Abū Hurayra reported the Prophet as saying:

A time will come for the people [of Medina] when a man will invite his cousin and any other near relation: Come [and settle] at [a place] where living is cheap, come to where there is plenty, but Medina will be better for them;
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would that they know it! By Him in Whose Hand is my life, none amongst
them would go out [of the city] with a dislike for it, but Allāh would make his
successor in it someone better than he. Behold, Medina is like a furnace
which eliminates from it the impurities. And the Last Hour will not come until
Medina banishes its evils just as a furnace eliminates the impurities of iron.\(^{168}\)

Abū Hurayra also reported the Prophet as saying:

Men will all but beat the livers of their camels [riding hard] in pursuit of knowledge,
but they will find no one more knowledgeable than an 'ālīm of Medina.\(^{169}\)

Among the merits of Medina is that whoever goes to its Mosque to teach or to learn is like
a mujāhid in the way of Allāh. Abū Hurayra narrated:

I heard the Messenger of Allah say: whosoever comes to this my Mosque and comes to
it only for the goodness which he teaches or learns, then he ranks as a mujāhid in the
way of Allāh, but he who comes otherwise ranks as a man who looks to the property of
others.\(^{170}\)

Among the merits of the Prophet's Mosque is that it is described by Allāh in the Qur'ān as
being a mosque which is founded on taqwa or piety. He said: 'there is a mosque whose foundation was laid from the first day on piety:
it is more worthy of the standing forth (for prayer) therein'.\(^{171}\) When the Messenger was
asked which of the two mosques was founded on piety, he said: This Mosque of yours
(referring to the Mosque of Medina).\(^{172}\)

Another of its merits is that its Mosque was made one of the only three mosques to which
a journey should be made. Abū Hurayra reported of the Prophet that he said: 'Do not
undertake a journey but to three mosques: the Mosque of al-Ḥaram and the Mosque of al-
Aqṣā and this mosque of mine'.\(^{173}\)

The Messenger enjoined his Companions to deal kindly with those who came to Medina
seeking knowledge, and to instruct them in the knowledge they had. The Messenger said to
his Companions: 'People will come to you from all over the world asking you about the

\(^{168}\) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, with al-Nawawi's commentary, 9/153, Bāb al-Madīna Tanfi Shirāriha.
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\(^{172}\) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, with al-Nawawi's commentary, 9/169.
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religion, so, if they come to you, be accommodating to them, be gentle with them and instruct them. These are some of the Prophetic hadith regarding the merits of Medina, which encourage residence and study there, and, therefore, there were a great many mujāhirūn in the city and students who visited it throughout the ages, to learn something new there, obtain recompense and the honour of teaching in its Mosque. One thing which perhaps increased the numbers of mujāhirūn in the city was that some ‘ulamā’ preferred not to be mujāhirūn in Mecca for fear of committing a sin there, because the degree of fault there was not the same as in other countries, but was doubled. This is possibly indicative of a healthy academic activity in Medina, perhaps on a par with that in Mecca. However, the lack of reports about this has led to the belief that it was less; in fact, extremely weak.

The influence of the mujāhir ‘ulamā’ in the flourishing of academic activity in Medina can be summed up by the following points:

1- There were many mujāhirūn from amongst the ‘ulamā’ who played an important role in the academic activity and the encouraging of it in Medina.

2- The presence of certain of these mujāhir ‘ulamā’ in Medina, and especially those who were well known, led to an increase in the numbers of students coming to be taught by them and learn from them, which had an effect on academic life in the city.

3- They came from countries which differed from Medina in terms of the teaching methods used, and thus brought with them from their countries new approaches to education and different ways of teaching.

4- Some of them combined the teaching methods of their country with those prevalent in Medina. Nowadays, this is what we would call an exchange of teaching and educational expertise.

5- The migration of mujāhir ‘ulamā’ to Medina led to an exchange of learning and knowledge between them and those living in the city.

6- Many mujāhirūn sought to teach at the Prophet’s Mosque or at one of the madrasas or arbita, which lent force to academic activity there.

---


7. Many mujāwir 'ulamā' took with them to Medina books, their own or those of others, which enriched the city's libraries and resulted in a wealth of different books being contained in them. However, their role was not confined to bringing to Medina books on the Islamic sciences and Islamic thought, but went beyond this, to include Greek science, medicine, astronomy, engineering, philosophy, chemistry and other subjects. An example of this can be found in the biography of Sheikh ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥajjāj (d. 701/1302), known as ‘the bareheaded one’. Al-Sakhāwī said of him, citing Ibn Farḥūn:

He was among those acquainted with the learning of the ancients on wisdom, logic, engineering and philosophy. He collected books as no other had done, and brought them from his country, including basic works, and original copies and collections of tafsīr, fiqh, hadith, history, medicine, logic, wisdom, and other sciences unknown to the people of our time.176

8. The mujāwir ‘ulamā’ in Medina influenced resistance to Shi'a innovation.

From the aforementioned, I have sought to demonstrate, with evidence, the presence of many Sunni ‘ulamā’, who played a role in the academic activity in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, which has been described by some as an age in which the academic activity in the city stagnated, and the Sunni ‘ulamā’ played a weakened role. Naturally, the students of these ‘ulamā’ would be Sunnis also, which points to the existence of a significant number of Sunnis in Medina. In the light of what has been demonstrated previously regarding the existence of the substantial groupings of Sunnis in Medina, composed of mujāwirūn, khuddām, and those related to the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār, it would appear that the Sunnis were the majority rather than the minority, contrary to what some would believe, and that there were many ‘ulamā’ who were active in learned circles both within Medina and outside it, who had studying under them many ‘ulamā’ from Medina and elsewhere.

7.6. Shi'a influence on learning in Medina

The Imami Shi'a in Medina had no clear influence on the continuing vitality of learned activity in the city. On the contrary, more than one historian has said that they played a role in its being weak and stagnant. In reality, and from what this study has concluded regarding the existence of vibrant learned activity in the city during the Ayyūbid period, it

can be said that the Shi'a played no part in the weakening state of education, because the learned activity was not weak initially. Instead, it would appear from the above discussion that a few isolated incidents occurred involving certain Shi'a against certain Sunnis, which caused these historians to exaggerate, and believe that this was how the Shi'a behaved towards all Sunni 'ulamā'. Ibn Farhūn mentions one such incident:

I was aware of a group of mujāwirūn and khuddām who recited their books and listened to their Prophet's hadith only in secrecy until the arrival of al-Ṣāhib b. Ḥannā, who opposed the Sinān family and the al-Qayyāshin [Shi'a]; and they were in awe of his standing with the Sultan, and yielded to him, practising taqiyya. Although Ibn Farhūn reports that he 'was aware of a group of mujāwirūn and khuddām' and does not say Sunni 'ulamā', there are those who have later relied on this wording in order to claim that the Shi'a prevented Sunni 'ulamā' from reciting their books and teaching them during the Ayyūbid and early Mamlük periods, which led to the enfeebling of learned activity in Medina. These statements have been discussed and refuted, but it is impossible to discount entirely the Shi'a influence on learned activity. Indeed, Ibn Farhūn mentions how some of the Shi'a were antagonistic towards certain of the Sunni 'ulamā' and would do them harm, such as when one of the Shi'a sharifs heard Sheikh Muhammad b. Sa'id (d. 699/1300), a reciter at the Prophet's Mosque, reciting from the Qur'ān: "and there are those among the Medinan folk obstinate in their hypocrisy", and kicked him, crying, 'O enemy of Allāh, how you lie about Allāh' and threatened him with death. Another example of the actions of the Shi'a was when one of the Sunni 'ulamā' was in disputation with one of the Shi'a, and bettered him in argument: the Shi'a man complained to the Emir of Medina, who ordered the arrest of the Sunni sheikh and fined him.

177 Ahmad b. Muḥammad Za'īn al-Dīn b. al-Ṣāhib became a mujāwir in Medina in 701/1302. He was a faqih and put a stop to much of the Shi'a innovation (ibida). He died in Egypt. See Ibn Farhūn, p.24; al-Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, 2/141; Ibn Ḥajar, al-Durar, 1/283.
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A further example is what befell one of the Sunni `ulama`, al-Nizam by name: he had children and property in Medina, and they were rendered miserable by the wrongs done to them by the Shi'a sharifs, so they moved away, leaving their property behind.184

It has been understood from certain texts, which have reported on the state of learning among the Shi'a in Medina, that their `ulama` and dā'is were not interested in learning, such as al-'Abdari's account in which he describes the Shi'a imam at the Mosque as being ignorant.185 Also, the lack of prominent Shi'a `ulama` or books by Shi'a authors written during this period - according to the findings of my research186 - has reinforced this belief. Nevertheless, from an account by Ibn Farhūn, it is possible to confirm the existence of Shi'a `ulama` lecturing and teaching in the Prophet's Mosque. As Ibn Farhūn observes:

Those who came before us were indulgent and so they added to the noble chamber a great magṣūra as protection from the sun, and it was innovation and error in which the Imāmi Shi'a prayed, and took as the places where they taught and their `ulama` secluded themselves.187

However, Ibn Farhūn does not elaborate on this, nor does he reveal which sciences they were teaching, or the names of their scholars or teachers.

In another account, he says:

When the month of Ramadan set in, the Imāmi reciters and their imams would take from the shrine a candle for each of their number, and, placing them in their majlis gatherings after the `Ishā` prayer, they would recite from their books and raise their voices around the Rawḍa.188

Here, also, he does not explain what learning they were reciting.

Ibn Farhūn does mention the name of one of the Imāmi sheikhs and their mufti, Ibn Abi al-Naṣr al-Quwaydi,189 but says nothing further about him, such as whether or not he held classes at the Mosque, or had written any books, and in which branches of learning he specialised.

Lastly, as has already been stated, Medina's qādis and most of the imams and khutabā' at the Prophet's Mosque during the Ayyūbid period were Shi'a, and it is widely known that
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these are religious positions which require those who hold them to be religious scholars and fuqahā'. In spite of this, not one historian or traveller has given a single account of any of them being scholars or holding lectures at the Mosque. Where they are mentioned by travellers or historians, all that is said is that they were qudāt or imams and khufabā' at the Mosque, with occasional references to their actions and their relations with the Sunnis.  

7.7. Conclusion

In spite of the lack of information, it is possible to conclude from the existing texts that the state of learning in Medina during that period was good, contrary to what some believe. This is can be shown by the following:

1- Medina was an important cultural centre in the Hijāz, due to its religious status, and so most 'ulamā', when they had written a book in the Mashriq or the Maghrib, India, Iraq, Syria or any another region, would send a copy to Medina to procure a blessing, and in the hope that their book would be well received.  

2- The Prophet's Mosque was the venue for lectures in the various sciences, and each had set locations and times.  

3- Travelling to Medina in pursuit of knowledge was an important matter for scholars of that period.  

4- Lectures at the Prophet's Mosque were open to anyone wishing to gain knowledge and were not tied to specific hours, nor was the study of any particular subject compulsory. Students would move around from one lecture to another, until they settled in the discipline that was to their taste.  

5- The specialist 'ulamā' would have numerous books which were kept in their own libraries; often, others would have access to them, and were allowed to take excerpts from them. There would be debates over learned questions in these libraries.

---
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6- A sheikh or 'ālim would preside over a lecture at the Prophet’s Mosque, surrounded by his students, who would listen to him, and he would debate with them. The teaching methods in these lectures were dictation, recitation, the study of the narrations, empirical knowledge and disputation.\(^{196}\)

7- There was a public library in the Prophet’s Mosque which contained a great number of books and copies of the Qur'ān, which students could borrow with the permission of the library supervisor.\(^{197}\)

8- Tuesdays and Fridays were holidays for teachers and students.\(^{198}\)

9- There was no regular income for teachers. Some would receive money from the parents or guardians of their students, or from copying books,\(^{199}\) and some might receive trust funds from the awqāf endowed for Medina and its ‘ulamā’ and mujāhirūn, although these funds were not recurrent.\(^{200}\)

10- ‘Ulamā’ would give their students Ijāza in the various branches of knowledge, this Ijāza being a certificate from the ‘ālim to the student to the effect that he was able to teach the sciences which he had learned from his sheikh. The Ijāza would usually contain the name of the ‘ālim and his sheikhs, the name of the student, and the discipline in which he was licensed, as well as the signature of the ‘ālim and the date.\(^{201}\)

11- The descriptions given by certain historians and travellers of the state of learning in Medina during the Ayyūbid period are inaccurate. Some have made their judgements in general terms, without confirming or verifying the facts but simply through witnessing some individual case, or because they failed to meet a well-known ‘ālim. One finds some, for example, stating there were no ‘ulamā’ in Medina whatsoever, and even describing the imam at the Mosque as ignorant. This could be due to the brevity of their stay in Medina, as some of them would arrive in Medina in the evening and depart the following morning. This length of time is insufficient to make a judgement on a case or a general situation or to apply this to all of the city’s inhabitants. It is also misguided to accept everything that these travellers say, and to deduce from their accounts alone the history of Medina during that period.
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period. What has also happened with certain subsequent historians who have written about the history of Medina is that one finds them applying what a traveller saw during his short visit to the city to the entire history of Medina and its inhabitants, which seems to have occurred frequently during that time. This is an error on the part of those who do not take the trouble to research and check their information and are content with the first piece of information that they come across.

12- The fact that travellers and historians have omitted to mention the state of learning in Medina, or define who were the ‘ulamā’ in the city at that time, has led to those who followed believing that there were no ‘ulamā’ in Medina, since they provide long lists of names in their description of learned activity in Mecca and the names of ‘ulamā’ whom they met, whereas they have not done so in their description of Medina.

13- It is true that a person studying the learned activity in Medina during the Ayyūbid period will notice the paucity of ‘ulamā’ and their writings during that period, especially compared with the Mamlūk era which follows. However, the reason for this was not due to the Medinan inhabitants’ ignorance or lower educational level than others - as one traveller described it - but can, rather, be attributed to several factors, including the weak economic situation and lack of natural resources. It is natural for people to migrate to prosperous places in search of a better standard of living, and it appears that the ‘ulamā’ like others - preferred to go to the great Islamic cities such as Baghdad, Damascus and Cairo, in order that they might more easily make a living, study, teach and write. Amongst the reasons also was the security situation in Medina at that time: the warring between the emirs of Medina and Mecca, the wars amongst the Medinan emirs themselves over the emirate, and the constant attacks on the city by the neighbouring Bedouin tribes all contributed to the weak security situation in Medina, which resulted in ‘ulamā’ not going there, and, indeed, in more of the ‘ulamā’ who lived there migrating elsewhere, fearing for themselves and seeking a better life.

It might also be that some of the Sunni Muslim ‘ulamā’ in Medina, when they saw that the Shi’a were in charge there, preferred to emigrate from there, after some met with a certain amount of hostility from them, as stated earlier. This may also have had an effect on Muslim ‘ulamā’ wishing to migrate to the city.

---
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Chapter Eight

The Conclusion

There were two main reasons for choosing this subject: first, the lack of a single book specific to the study and portrayal of Medina's history during the Ayyūbid period; second, the significance of this period in the history of the city and its being characterised by important events such as the emergence of the Shi'a in Medina. These events are reported in some scattered and brief accounts which mention the presence of certain Imāmi Shi'a in the city during that time in whose hands lay the emirate, power and influence as well as the key religious positions (without the authors giving any details or saying how the Shi'a came to be there, the reasons for their presence or the effects it had).

Therefore, the basic idea behind the study was to look into and portray the history of Medina during the Ayyūbid period (and to clarify its ambiguities and uncover what is missing); to research the issue of the Shi'a presence there (to get to know the details, how it came about and the reasons for this); and to identify its influence on various facets of political, social, economic and scholarly life in the city.

The methodology pursued in this study focused on locating accounts dispersed and scattered amongst the historical sources, travelogues, sīra, biographies and other authoritative sources which are concerned with the history of Medina during the Ayyūbid period (or a century before or after it), and correlating and comparing these so as to determine a timeline of events, to dispel the misapprehensions surrounding them, to fill in information which is lacking, to interpret and comment on key events which are mentioned in certain accounts without the causes and outcomes of these being explained or revealed, and to rectify some of the erroneous information about Medina's history.

The main difficulty the author encountered during this research was the scarcity of information available on this subject, not to mention the difficulty in obtaining it. Most of the information written about Medina during the Ayyūbid period is either scattered among huge volumes under different titles, and is difficult to locate except by reading the entire volume, or it is scattered among sīra and biography books, which can provide vital information about Medina during that period through the biographies of individuals. This information is hard to extract as the majority of these books do not have indexes which would facilitate locating the names and dates of these individuals, as well as the names of
the cities in which they lived. Some of this information is contained in particular manuscripts, and requires extraordinary effort to extract. The author spent a great deal of time and effort searching for a piece of news or for an event, the name of a scholar or information about a personality, or for a commentary on an incident that might elucidate its causes and results.

Despite the various obstacles confronted during its preparation the study found that the most important points about this subject are mentioned by the `ulamā' of that period (and has established that they are untrue), namely what Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhūn report concerning the majority of Medina's inhabitants at that time: that they converted from Sunnism to Imāmi Shi‘ism due to the arrival in Medina of certain Imāmi du‘ār from Qāshān who set about using financial incentives to induce the city's inhabitants to abandon their doctrine and embrace Imāmi Shi‘ism.

By examining the extant accounts of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhūn and all of the accounts found in the rest of the available historical sources on this period which touch on this subject, the study has found that these reports contain much exaggeration, as there is not a single account which mentions the name of even one person who converted from the Sunni doctrine to that of the Imāmi Shi‘a. Moreover, Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhūn themselves neither provide any details about the subject, nor determine a specific date for the arrival of the Qāshānī Shi‘a du‘ār in Medina; nor do they mention anything about these du‘ār, such as the names of their sheikhs, leaders and prominent individuals, or even the name of a single individual from amongst them. Likewise, they do not put forward any evidence to substantiate what they say or support this view of theirs, nor do they mention the source of their information. Sīra, biographies and the writings of travellers who visited Medina during that period have been searched for anything that might support what they say, yet no evidence has been discovered to substantiate these reports. Furthermore, the study's investigation of scholarly life in Medina has shown conclusively that the Shi‘a in the city had no educational centres and that all madrasas, arba‘a, and lectures held in the Prophet's Mosque were teaching the Sunni madhāhib (schools of law), in particular the Shāfī‘i and Mālikī schools. Also, the way in which Imāmi Shi‘a control in Medina came to an end confirms that they were not very numerous, and as soon as they were dismissed from the key positions which they held, their role and influence in the city ended. In addition, this
study has uncovered further evidence and indications running contrary to what Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Farhūn recount on this point.

In Chapter 1 the study paid particular attention to the peculiar history of Medina providing a brief historical background of the city prior to Islam, and identifying its historical and religious status among Muslims.

Chapter 2 then commenced by presenting a concise account of the significance of Medina in the Islamic sources (the Qur‘ān and the hadīth), and discussing the role of the city and its inhabitants in the support for and propagation of Islam, by examining the major battles which took place in Medina or close by, notably the Battle of Badr, the Battle of Uḥūd and the Battle of the Trench. The chapter also gave a brief account of the key historical events occurring in Medina after the death of the Prophet (PBUH) up until just before the Ayyūbid period.

Chapter 3 then gave an account of the state of the Islamic World prior to and during the Ayyūbid era, in the course of which the major powers and political events which bore a connection to Medina during that period were identified. The key historical events occurring in the city were also discussed, and these were then related to what was going on in the Islamic World. This chapter showed that Medina was influenced both negatively and positively by political events in the Islamic World, including the struggle between the ‘Abbāsid and Fātimid caliphates to secure Medina’s allegiance, a struggle that reflected the city’s importance to all Muslims. The chapter also revealed that the material factor had the most effect, for when the caliphs sought to obtain Medina’s subordination they would try to outdo one another in offering money to the city’s emirs and carrying out various charitable works for its inhabitants, which resulted in a degree of economic stimulation. It was noted that the preoccupation of the caliphs, sultans and governors with their own problems, wars and conflicts impacted negatively on the city; the best example of this is that they did not post a permanent force to protect it from external attacks. The Crusader raid on the city and the countering of this by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s army was also discussed.

In chapter 4 a historical background to the Shī‘a in Medina prior to the Ayyūbid period was presented, through discussion of the reports of ‘ulamā’ and historians about their history in the city, from the start of their emergence in Islam up to the years immediately preceding the Ayyūbid period. It was then demonstrated that Shi‘ism as a doctrine and with all of its sects did not exist in the time of the Prophet. The chapter explained that the
historical sources differ in determining at what time Shi'ism emerged in Medina, but considered it likely that Shi'ism did not emerge at any time in the first five Hijri centuries. Indeed, the 'amal of its people was authoritative for others, and they held fast to Sunnism and belonged to the school of Imām Mālik b. Anas throughout that period.

The chapter also showed that the doctrinal closeness between the Fātimids and the emirs of Medina did not influence the emergence of Shi'ism in the city, or increase its authority therein, and that was because the Fātimid doctrine was Ismā'ili whereas that of the Medinan emirs was Twelver. It likewise demonstrated that the Fātimids were unable to propagate their doctrine in Medina throughout the period of its nominal allegiance to them.

The chapter then considered the reasons for Twelver Shi'ism's emergence in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, which entailed detailed study and analysis. How they came to assume authority and control in the city in Ayyūbid times, the length of time they spent spreading their influence in Medina and their relationships with other Shi'a sects, namely the Ismā'ili, the Zaydis, and the Kaysānīs were discussed, and Shi'ism in Medina was compared with that in Mecca. How their control there was extinguished and their power came to an end was also discussed.

The chapter also determined the period during which the Shi'a were able to gain control of the key religious positions in Medina; this period began in the mid-sixth Hijri century with the arrival of certain Shi'a families from the east led by the Qāshānīs. They set about winning over Medina's Shi'a emirs and worked towards expanding their influence and property, bringing in young slaves to whom they taught the Imāmi doctrine, so as to increase their numbers. At the start of the seventh century the authority and influence of the Shi'a Imāmīs grew when they assumed control of the judgeship and the offices of khaṭīb and imām. However, their power then began gradually to wane over the last third of the seventh century, when the office of imam was passed back to the Sunnis. During the last quarter of the seventh century the office of khaṭīb also passed from the Imāmī Shi'a into the hands of the Sunnis; then, in the first decade of the eighth century the Shi'a Imāmīs' sole possession of the judgeship came to an end, and a Sunni qāḍī was appointed to adjudicate between the Sunni inhabitants. Thus their power in Medina was abolished in the middle of the eighth Hijri century, when Emir Sa'ad b. Thābit b. Jammāz excluded them from the judgeship and entrusted the office to the Sunni qāḍī only. As a result the
period in which control and influence in Medina remained in the hands of the Shi'a lasted around 150 years, from about 600/1203 to 754/1353, the date Imam judgeship was brought to an end.

Regarding political life in Medina during the Ayyubid era, the available accounts about this period were discussed, analysed, compared and contrasted in chapter 5. The chapter was able to determine the names of sharifian emirs of Medina during this time, and the periods of their rule, and to identify their political and doctrinal allegiance, dispelling the misapprehensions and confusion into which some historians have fallen concerning the emirs' names and the sequence of the years of their rule.

It was also concluded in the chapter that the Medinan emirs' relationship with the 'Abbāsids and the Fāṭimids was based on material considerations; they would transfer their allegiance and subordination between the caliphs depending on which sent money and assistance to the city. These two caliphates strove to obtain Medina's allegiance because the legitimate caliph in the eyes of Muslims was whoever was the guardian of the Two Holy Mosques (haramayn) in Mecca and Medina, and therefore both the 'Abbāsids and the Fāṭimids were eager to extend their influence to this sacred region so as to gain the support and favour of the Muslims in their capacity as Guardians of the Holy Places.

During the Ayyubid period, no power competed with the Ayyūbid sultans for the subordination and allegiance of Medina. It was also demonstrated that none of the Ayyūbid sultans tried to change the emirs from being Ḥusaynī sharifs or to send any of their own governors to the city. We noted that the Ayyūbid sultans were concerned about Medina and what went on there with regard to the transition of power and influence in the interests of the Imamī Shi'a, yet they did not prevent them from assuming the key offices in the city. Furthermore, the Sunni population of Medina were not minded to oppose the Shi'a Imamīs' grip on the key positions there, or request the assistance of the Ayyūbids preoccupied with their wars, due to the status the city's emirs held amongst them, and because the emirs were not fanatical about the Shi'a doctrine or racist towards the Sunnis. Rather, their policy was one based on benevolence towards the Sunni inhabitants of Medina and their fuqahā.

Regarding the internal events under the sharifs' rule, it was shown that they did not do anything to benefit Medina, since there is no evidence that they undertook any restoration of old buildings or construction of new ones. They were not able to achieve security for Medina's inhabitants, or for visitors coming to see the Prophet's Mosque, or for pilgrims.
passing through the city. Indeed, they imposed taxes on pilgrims and visitors wishing to enter Medina or pass through it on route to Mecca. In addition to this, there was the ongoing conflict amongst the sharifs for the emirate.

Chapter 5 also showed that the emirs' policy of benevolence influenced the removal of enmity and hatred between the Sunnis and the Shi'a, as evidenced by the fact that during the Ayyubid era there were no disputes between the emirs of Medina, who were Imami Shi'a, and the Ayyubids. The Imamis believed that imama must lie with a member of the Ahl al-Bayt, and that they refused to recognize any caliph from outside the family of the Prophet, and yet one finds that the Imami emirs of Medina acknowledged the 'Abbasi caliphs and Ayyubid sultans, invoking them in the sermon at Friday prayers. The chapter again demonstrated that the ties of kinship and the closeness of doctrine which bound the Husayni emirs of Medina and the Hasani emirs of Mecca had no effect on their rivalry and did nothing to prevent the wars which raged between them.

The reason behind the Ayyubids' support for the Medinan emirs of the Muhanna family, and the Banu Rasul's backing of the Qatada family of Mecca, was the Ayyubids' desire to exact revenge on the Rasulids who were ruling the Yemen independently, and the fear that their opponents would gain control of the Hijaz - since it was easy for whoever controlled Mecca to control the rest of the Hijaz - thus the Rasulids might threaten the Ayyubids and their interests and vice versa. This conflict cost both sides much money and effort which the Islamic front was in the acutest need of to fight its real enemies, most importantly the Crusaders and the Tatars.

In chapter 6 the study examined and analysed Medinan society through a study of the groupings that emerged during the Ayyubid period, their distinguishing features and their respective economic states, as well as the social relations between them and the influence of doctrinal differences (between the Sunnis and Shi'a among them) on these relations.

The main social customs prevalent during that period were identified, as well as the Shi'a influence over the emergence of certain customs in Medina.

One of the most significant conclusions reached in this chapter in this regard is that, due to Medina's religious status in the hearts of Muslims, many people of varying nationalities came to the city to visit or reside there, which led to the proliferation of the groupings and races that lived in the city, and their respective doctrines, as well as the emergence of new customs therein.
We also showed that despite the spread of Shi`ism among the emirs of Medina in Ayyūbid times, most of them followed a policy of benevolence towards the city’s Sunnis in order to create equilibrium of sorts in the internal polity, so that the Sunnis did not feel oppressed. Moreover, the Imāmi Shi`a ṭurāt were keen to bring in juvenile slaves from India and Abyssinia to work in their plantations and properties, as it was easy to indoctrinate them with the fundamentals of Shi`ism and they became Shi`a when they were older, thus increasing Shi`a numbers in Medina.

The tipping of the scales in favour of the Shi`a in Medina led to a change in social relations between some of the Sunnis and Shi`a. Some negative incidents occurred which were brought about by intolerant individuals on all sides; conversely, positives also emerged which helped to maintain good relations among the parties concerned. We find that in spite of the minor negative occurrences related in some of the biographies and historiographies, in which an individual offended another or one party caused some harm to another, the issue stopped there - which shows the speed at which the problem was controlled and kept within the bounds of the personal, and prevented from escalating into a sectarian dispute or civil strife. It also proves that peaceableness and coexistence were firm principles in Medinan society at that time.

The chapter also demonstrated that the attitude of the emirs had a significant bearing on the maintaining of good social relations among the population’s groupings; they handled matters well and dealt with any problems swiftly and fairly, preventing them from developing and reaching critical proportions. The absence of major events and civil conflicts from the histories and biographies indicates that the clashes were too few and too insignificant to be mentioned and that their consequences were important only in psychological terms.

It can also be concluded from certain customs which were practised in Medina during the Ayyūbid period that Sufism was widespread in the city at that time. Moreover, certain Shi`a customs, which had not existed previously, became widespread during this period, such as various religious celebrations and the building of cupolas over graves. Thus it can be said confidently that the influence of the Shi`a on social life in Medina was greater than in other areas.

The chapter also presented important information about the major economic activities practised by the Medinan population, such as agriculture, crafts, and commerce, and
showed that agriculture was one of the most important, as many citizens made their living from it, the Shi'a in particular. But there was no developed artisanal industry in the city, like that in Egypt and Syria; instead there were a small number of elementary simple crafts. Moreover, it is clear that Medina's geographical location had a bearing on economic life in the city, as it was situated on the trade route between Syria and Yemen, and that of the hajj caravans coming from Iraq, Egypt, Syria and Iran. The presence of the Prophet's Mosque in particular influenced commercial traffic in Medina, due to the large influx of visitors to it every year; and the Imami Shi'a had a positive effect on economic life in Medina, in that they formed the majority of those proficient in the cultivation of date palms. The chapter's critical examination of certain accounts concerning the currencies used in Medina during that period established that there was a mint in the city producing coins bearing the name of the emir.

In chapter 7 we discussed the state of learning in the city during the Ayyubiid period and the Shi'a influence upon it, which included an analysis of the accounts relayed by certain historians and travellers which mention the state of learning in Medina as being poor, and some have attributed this to the Shi'a presence in the city. These accounts were refuted using what documentary evidence exists and what it is possible to conclude from subject areas on which there is no conclusive text, through comparison with what occurred subsequently in the city and was chronicled in the history books. They were also refuted through the presentation of a thorough and extensive description of the state of learning in Medina, which was supported by evidence with regard to the teaching lectures current in the Prophet's Mosque and the madrasas at that time, the katârib (Qur'an schools), the syllabuses, the teaching methods, the most notable 'ulama' and their key works, the role of the Sunni 'ulama' in the blossoming of learned activity and the reality of the Shi'a influence upon it. The reasons for the failure of some of Medina's visitors to provide a thorough and extensive description of the various facets of scholarly life in the city, and the failure of some of those who came later (and documented the city during that period) to study meticulously and research the subject in a better way, were considered.

The chapter established that the descriptions given by certain historians and travellers of the state of learning in Medina during the Ayyubiid period were not accurate. Some made their judgements in general terms, without confirming or verifying. This was probably due to the brevity of their stay in Medina, as some of them would arrive in Medina during the
night and leave the following morning. This brief visit was surely not sufficient to make a judgement on the state of learning in the city. It is also unfortunate that certain subsequent historians who have written about the history of Medina merely recounted what certain travellers saw during their short visits to the city and generalised it to apply to the entire history of Medina, believing that this was the prevailing situation at that time. Thus a misleading picture was built on the errors of those who appear not to have taken the trouble to research and check their information but were content with the first account they came across. Chapter 7 also showed that some travellers and historians omitted to mention the state of learning in Medina, and who were the ‘ulama’ in the city at that time, which led those who came after them to believe that there were no ‘ulama’ in Medina, since they provide long lists of names in their description of learned activity in Mecca and the names of ‘ulama’ whom they met, whereas they have not done so in their description of Medina.

A study of learning and scholarly activity in Medina during the Ayyubid period does reveal a surprising paucity of ‘ulama’ and their writings, as compared with the Mamluk era which followed, or the learning in Mecca. However, the reason for this was not that the Medinans were ignorant or on a lower educational level than others, as one traveller (al-Abdari) asserted; rather, this scarcity can be attributed to several factors, including the weak economic situation and lack of natural resources. It was natural that people would migrate to more prosperous places in search of a better standard of living, and it appears that the ‘ulama’ - like others - preferred to go to the great Islamic cities such as Baghdad, Damascus and Cairo, where it would be easier to make a living, study, teach and write. Another factor was the alarming security situation in Medina at that time: the warring between the emirs of Medina and Mecca, the wars amongst the Medinan emirs themselves over the emirate, and the constant attacks on the city by the neighbouring Bedouin tribes. It would not be surprising if ‘ulama’ were unwilling to visit the city, and indeed many of the ‘ulama’ who lived there migrated elsewhere, fearing for themselves and seeking a better life. It might also be that some of the Sunni Muslim ‘ulama’ in Medina, when they saw that the Shi’a were in charge, they preferred to emigrate from the city, after some had met with a certain amount of hostility from them, as stated earlier. Their experience with certain Shi’a may also have discouraged Sunni Muslim ‘ulama’ from migrating back to the city.
To conclude, we can summarise the study main findings as follows:

The study's first important conclusion is that the significance of the Imāmi Shi'a presence in Medina during the Ayyūbid period and the significance of their influence was not due to the majority of the city's inhabitants abandoning the Sunni doctrine and converting to Shi'ism, or because of their large number (as this is untrue). Instead, this was due to a solitary reason: their assumption of the key political and religious positions in Medina, and in spite of this, it has been demonstrated that their influence over various facets of life within the city was not significant.

The study's second important conclusion was reached in chapter 4, namely that the emergence of Shi'ism in Medina occurred in stages, the first of which was the arrival of certain Shi'a sharifs from Egypt (such as Muslim b. 'Ubaydullāh and his son Ṭāhir). However, they did not think to propagate the Shi'a doctrine in the city, for one or more reasons: they (and those who came after them) were preoccupied in competing for the emirate; they were moderate Shi'a who preferred to keep good relations with the Sunnis; they feared that the caliphs and sultans would punish them for this; not all of them were Shi'a. The second stage was the arrival in Medina of certain Imāmi Shi'a du'āt intent on propagating their doctrine and da'wa there; among them was the Qāshāni family. The third stage was their assumption of the offices of qādi, imām and khatib. It was noted that among the most important reasons for the transfer of power and influence to the Imāmis in Medina were: the sharifs' assistance and support for them; the preoccupation of Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn with the jihad against the Crusaders; the sultan's friendship with Emir Abū Falīta Qāsim b. al-Muhanna, who was Imāmī and who accompanied Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn on his campaigns; and also, no one spoke out against Shi'ism or opposed its influence during that time.

The study's third important conclusion is that in spite of the significance of the transition of power to the Shi'a in Medina during the Ayyūbid period, one notices that most writings about the city's history neglect to discuss this subject. The study concludes that this shortcoming is mainly due to the preoccupation of the historians writing during that period with the major political events which were taking place in the Islamic World, among the
most important being the Crusader wars, Salāḥ al-Dīn's conquests, and the political struggles between the Islamic statelets. As for historians of the modern era, it appears that the reason for their not writing about the history of Medina during the Ayyūbid period is the scarcity of available information on the subject, not to mention the difficulty of obtaining it.

The study's fourth important conclusion is that the state of learning in Medina during that period was good, contrary to what some believe, since we have been able to establish this from a body of evidence, including the fact that the religious status of Medina in the hearts of Muslims made them aspire to migrating there. Scholars were among the most significant migrants to the city during that period, and therefore Medina was an important cultural centre in the countries of the Hijaz, and so, when most 'ulamā' had written a book in the Mashriq or the Maghreb, they would most likely send a copy to Medina to procure a blessing and in the hope that their book would be well received. The Prophet's Mosque was the venue for lectures in the various sciences, and each of these had a set place and time. There were also a large number of madrasas, arba'īta and houses in Medina where teaching of the various sciences took place. In addition, travelling to Medina in pursuit of knowledge was an important matter for scholars of that period. There was a public library in the Prophet's Mosque which contained a great number of books and copies of the Qur'ān, which students could borrow with permission from the library supervisor. Many of the students who visited Medina were eager to obtain an academic licence from the city's 'ulamā', who would appoint their students licentiates in the various branches of knowledge, this licence being a certificate, presented by the 'alim to the student, to the effect that he was competent to teach the sciences which he had learned from his sheikh.

Finally, we acknowledge that this research has some limitations. The present study can be viewed as a preliminary step towards the building of a much more detailed and nuanced history of Medina. The study has been done in such a way as to facilitate such building, which will be possible as more information is discovered by researchers. There are many possibilities of extending the study of Medina's legacy. Some recommendations for future research are as follows. There is a need to give attention to the existing manuscripts on the history of Medina; to give importance to its heritage; to search for that heritage and
endeavour to extract it from the pages of ancient books; to benefit from it; and produce more studies on the history of Medina after the first Hijri century. Attention should also be given to the civilisational history of the city, in particular the social, economic and cultural aspects; and also to Medina's ancient remains; these should be searched for and excavated, and what remains should be preserved. The historiography of Medina would benefit from more studies on the history of the sharifs there and their rule of the city.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Emirs of Medina

Emirs of Medina Prior to the Ayyūbids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emir</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ṭāhir b. Muslim</td>
<td>366-381/976-991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥasan b. Ṭāhir</td>
<td>381-390/991-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū al-Futūḥ al-Ḥasan b. Ja'far</td>
<td>390-401/1000-1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū 'Ali Dāwūd b. al-Qāsim b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ṭāhir</td>
<td>401/1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥānī b. Dāwūd</td>
<td>401/1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū 'Umārah Ḥamzah al-Muhanna b. Dāwūd</td>
<td>401-408/1010-1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. al-Muhanna al-Akbar b. Dāwūd</td>
<td>428-469/1036-1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shukr b. Abī al-Futūḥ</td>
<td>nd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāwūd b. al-Ḥasan b. Dāwūd b. al-Qāsim</td>
<td>nd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. Ja'far</td>
<td>454-487/1062-1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad al-Jawād b. al-Ḥusayn b. Dāwūd b. al-Qāsim</td>
<td>469/1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālik b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥanna b. Dāwūd</td>
<td>470/1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥanna b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥanna b. Dāwūd</td>
<td>up to 495/1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manṣūr (or Manẓūr) b. 'Umārah</td>
<td>495/1102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emirs of Medina during the Ayyūbid Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emir</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥanna</td>
<td>557-558/1161-1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Īzz al-Dīn Abī Falīta al-Qāsim b. Muḥanna</td>
<td>558-583/1163-1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jammāz b. al-Qāsim</td>
<td>583-612/1187-1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sālim b. al-Qāsim</td>
<td>583-612/1187-1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Qāsim b. Jammāz</td>
<td>612-624/1215-1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiḥa b. Ḥāshim</td>
<td>624-647/1129-1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Īsā b. Shiḥa</td>
<td>647-656/1249-1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munīf b. Shiḥa</td>
<td>656-657/1258-1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jammāz b. Shiḥa</td>
<td>657-700/1259-1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manṣūr b. Jammāz</td>
<td>700-726/1300/1326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: The important events related to Medina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/622</td>
<td>The Prophet's hijra from Mecca to Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/624</td>
<td>The Battle of Badr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/625</td>
<td>The Battle of Uhud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/627</td>
<td>The Battle of the Trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/632</td>
<td>The death of the Prophet Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13/632-634</td>
<td>The caliphate of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24/634-644</td>
<td>The caliphate of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35/644-656</td>
<td>The caliphate of ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40/656-661</td>
<td>The caliphate of ʿAli b. Abī Ṭālib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358/969</td>
<td>The governor of Medina declared his allegiance to the Fāṭimids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366/976</td>
<td>The Fāṭimids sent a large military force against Ṭāhir b. Muslim the prince of Medina, and caused him to shift his loyalty to them once again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436/1044</td>
<td>The subordination of Medina to the Fāṭimids ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488/1095</td>
<td>The Christians were mobilised by the Pope to fight the Muslims in order to free the Eastern Church from the Muslim yoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489/1096</td>
<td>The first Crusade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490/1097</td>
<td>The Crusaders conquered Nicaea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491/1098</td>
<td>The Crusaders captured Antioch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491/1098</td>
<td>The Crusaders captured the town of Edessa (al-Raha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492/1099</td>
<td>The Crusaders captured Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521/1127</td>
<td>ʿImād al-Dīn Zangi was decorated by the ʿAbbāsid caliph, ruler of Mosul and al-Jazirā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539/1144</td>
<td>ʿImād al-Dīn captured al-Rahā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540/1145</td>
<td>The Zangid's minister, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Īṣfahānī, sent money to renovate the wall of Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541/1146</td>
<td>ʿImād al-Dīn Zangi was killed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549/1154</td>
<td>Nūr al-Dīn Zangi rescued Damascus from the Crusaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557/1162</td>
<td>An attempt was made to steal the body of the Prophet by two Christian men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558/1163</td>
<td>Nūr al-Dīn Zangi visited Medina after performing a pilgrimage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558/1163</td>
<td>Nūr al-Dīn sent money to build a new wall around Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564/1169</td>
<td>Nūr al-Dīn sent an army to Egypt under the leadership of Asad al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564/1169</td>
<td>Shirkūh and his nephew Şalāḥ al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567/1171</td>
<td>Şalāḥ al-Dīn put an end to Fāṭimid rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569/1173</td>
<td>Şalāḥ al-Dīn sent a military expedition to Ḥijāz and then to Yemen, led by his brother, Turān Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572/1176</td>
<td>Şalāḥ al-Dīn ordered the emirs of Medina to stop levying the pilgrims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577/1181</td>
<td>The first attempt to invade Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578/1182</td>
<td>The second attempt to invade Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583/1187</td>
<td>The battle of Ḥaṭṭīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583/1187</td>
<td>Şalāḥ al-Dīn liberated Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589/1193</td>
<td>Şalāḥ al-Dīn's death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590/1194</td>
<td>The Zu'bb tribe's raid on Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601/1204</td>
<td>The Battle of al-Maṣārī between the emir of Medina Sālim b. al-Qāsim al-Husaynī and the emir of Mecca, Qatāda b. Idrīs al-Ḥasanī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611/1214</td>
<td>The Battle of Wādī al-Ṣafra' between Sālim and Qatāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613/1217</td>
<td>The Battle of al-Ḥumayma Village between al-Qāsim b. Jammāz and Qatāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654/1256</td>
<td>The volcanic eruption in Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750/1349</td>
<td>The end of Shī'a authority and power in Medina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: The Battle of Badr, Uḥud and the Trench

### The Battle of Badr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>17 of Ramadan, 2 AH/ March 17, 624 AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Badr, 90 miles (150km) southwest of Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Decisive Muslim victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belligerents</td>
<td>Muslims of Medina / Quraysh of Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Muslims: 314/ Quraysh 900-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualties and losses</td>
<td>Muslims: 14 killed/ Quraysh: 70 killed &amp; 43-60 captured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Battle of Uḥud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>7 Shawwal 3 AH/ 23 March 625 AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>In Medina near Jabal Uḥud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Stalemate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belligerents</td>
<td>Muslims of Medina / Quraysh of Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Muslims: 700-1000/ Quraysh 3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualties and losses</td>
<td>Muslims: 70 killed/ Quraysh: 54 killed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Battle of the Trench

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>5 AH/ 627 AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>North of Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Failure of siege &amp; Demise of the Banu Qurayza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belligerents</td>
<td>Muslims of Medina and others Confederates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Muslims: 3000/ Quraysh 10700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualties and losses</td>
<td>Muslims: 6 killed/ Quraysh: 3-10 killed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Ayyûbids of Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salâh al-Din al-Ayyûbi</td>
<td>1171-1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-‘Azîz</td>
<td>1193-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mansûr</td>
<td>1198-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-‘Adîl I</td>
<td>1200-1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Kamîl</td>
<td>1218-1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-‘Adîl II</td>
<td>1238-1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Šâlih Ayyûb</td>
<td>1240-1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mu‘azzam Turanîshah</td>
<td>1249-1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ashraf II</td>
<td>1250-1252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ayyûbids of Damascus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salâh al-Din al-Ayyûbi</td>
<td>1174-1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Afdal</td>
<td>1193-1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-‘Adîl I</td>
<td>1196-1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mu‘azzam</td>
<td>1218-1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Nasîr Dawud</td>
<td>1227-1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ashraf</td>
<td>1229-1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Šâlih Isma‘îl</td>
<td>1237-1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Kamîl</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-‘Adîl II</td>
<td>1238-1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Šâlih Ayyûb</td>
<td>1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Šâlih Ismaîl (2nd time)</td>
<td>1239-1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Šâlih Ayyûb (2nd time)</td>
<td>1245-1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turanîshah</td>
<td>1249-1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Nasîr Yusuf</td>
<td>1250-1260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ayyûbids of Aleppo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salâh al-Din</td>
<td>1193-1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Zahir</td>
<td>1216-1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-‘Azîz</td>
<td>1236-1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Nasîr Yusuf</td>
<td>1260-1236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ayyûbids of Yemen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mu‘azzam Turanîshah</td>
<td>1173-1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-‘Azîz Tughtegein</td>
<td>1181-1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘izz ud-Din Isma‘îl</td>
<td>1197-1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Nasîr Ayyûb</td>
<td>1202-1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Muzaffar Sulaiman</td>
<td>1214-1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mas‘ûd Yusuf</td>
<td>1215-1229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: The Fātimid Caliphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mahdi</td>
<td>909-934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Qā’im</td>
<td>934-946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Manṣūr</td>
<td>946-953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mu’izz</td>
<td>953-975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-ʿAzīz</td>
<td>975-996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ḥākim</td>
<td>996-1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Zāhir</td>
<td>1021-1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mustansir</td>
<td>1036-1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Mustaʿli</td>
<td>1094-1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-ʿAmir</td>
<td>1101-1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ḥāfiz</td>
<td>1130-1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ẓāfir</td>
<td>1149-1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Fāʾiz</td>
<td>1154-1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-ʿAdīd</td>
<td>1160-1171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Picture 5: A map of the Abbasid Caliphate at its greatest extent. 
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abbasid

Picture 6: A map of the Ayyubid Empire in its Greatest Extent
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Fatimid gold *dinar* of al-Mustansir, with three circular inscription bands. Tarabulus (Tripoli), AH 444 (AD 1052–3).
Fatimid gold dinar of al-Amir bi-Ahkam Allah, with the Shi'a kalima on the obverse. Misr (Cairo), AH 503 (AD 1109–10).

Ayyubid silver dirham of Salah al-Din (Saladin), star-in-circle type. Halab (Aleppo), AH 579 (AD 1183–4).

Ayyubid silver dirham of Salah al-Din (Saladin), square-in-circle type. Damascus, AH 579 (AD 1183–4).

Anatolian Seljuk silver dirham struck in the name of the Abbasid caliph al-Nasir li-Din Allah and the Anatolian Seljuk Sultan Suleyman Shah II, with a figure on horseback on the obverse. Konya, AH 579 (AD 1183–4).
Anatolian Seljuk silver dirham struck in the name of the Abbasid caliph al-Mustansir and the Anatolian Seljuk Sultan Kay Khusraw II, with a lion and sun on the obverse. Konya, AH 639.

Zangid copper dirham of Nasir al-Din Mahmud and the Abbasid caliph al-Mustansir, with a crowned figure holding the crescent moon on the reverse. Mosul, AH 627 (AD 1229–30).

Two pictures showing the domes built above the *Ahl al-Bayt*’s graves in al-Baqir in Medina. Available from: http://images.google.com