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SOME REMARKS ABOUT SECTARIAN MOVEMENTS IN AL-ANDALUS

The purpose of this paper is an evaluative study of the sectarian movements existing in the Iberian Peninsula during the Islamic period. Concerning the movements in themselves, I do not pretend to contribute new facts simply because there are none: the sources available are scarce and, in general, have been exhaustively studied by scholars specialized in the Islamic world of al-Andalus. My intention is, simply, to evaluate from a new angle the existence of sects in al-Andalus, a phenomenon which, to the present day, has been considered marginal and insignificant within an Andalusian Islamic environment commonly regarded as “monolithic” and rigidly “orthodox.” Before entering upon the subject matter, I should like to clarify two concepts—orthodoxy and sect—which frequently appear throughout this paper. As it has been repeatedly pointed out, the term “orthodoxy” is obviously inadequate and even ambiguous in reference to an Islamic context. (1) However, it will be used in the present paper as it is the term employed by the majority of modern scholars to whose works I shall have need to refer. As for the concept of sect, I am referring here to a movement of a religious nature, a minority within the ruling majority whose members feel they form part of an elite and throng around the figure of a charismatic leader upon whose death the movement usually either disappears or fragments into smaller groups. (2) As a general rule, sects appear when

(1) See, for example, W. M. Watt, Formative Period, p. 5f.
(2) Cf. Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, s.v. “Sekten”; cf. also G. Kehrer, Religionssoziologie, p. 63f.
the predominant religious organization is incapable of offering a rational explanation to various problems—often of a social nature—affecting a determinate group.\(^3\) Regarding the problems which a study of the Islamic sects presents, I need only refer to W. Montgomery Watt’s clear insight on the matter, expressed in his book “The Formative Period of Islamic Thought.”\(^4\)

The sectarian movements which took place in the Iberian Peninsula hardly find mention in the works on Andalusian Islam. The majority of scholars are of the common opinion that Andalusian Islam was characterized by extreme “orthodoxy” and an almost total monopoly of the Mālikites,\(^5\) a monopoly only interrupted by a few outstanding, independent thinkers, such as Ibn Hazm or Ibn Masarra. According to some of these scholars, Andalusian Islam was orthodox because the inhabitants of the Peninsula have always been characterized by an “innate” tendency towards “orthodoxy”, a tendency which in their opinion can be confirmed under Islam as well as under Christianity.\(^6\)

As an element forming an important part of the population of al-Andalus, the Berbers were also characterized by their marked religious sense which, in turn, stimulated “orthodoxy” in the Iberian Peninsula.\(^7\) Following this line of thought Andalusian Islamic “orthodoxy” would, therefore, be due to ethnical reasons. Another characteristic trait, within this same line, is the unquestionable predominance of the Mālikī school which, in al-Andalus, would have been

---

\(^3\) Kehrer, op. cit., p. 86f. In our times, we can confirm this in the so-called “youth-sects;” cf. F. W. Haack, Jugendreligionen, p. 76ff. and R. Hauth, Die nach der Seele greifen, p. 104ff.

\(^4\) P. 1ff.

\(^5\) See, for example, M. Asín Palacios, Ibn Masarra, p. 17; E. Lévi-Provençal, Historia, 4/98 and 5/293ff.; E. García Gómez (= introduction to Lévi-Provençal’s Historia) 4/25; M. Cruz Hernández, Spanien und der Islam, p. 361; A. Steiger, Función espiritual, p. 48; M. ‘A. Makki, Ensayo, p. 145 and 173. According to Lévi-Provençal, Umayyad Spain was a “citadel for orthodoxy” (op. cit., 5/305).

\(^6\) Lévi-Provençal, op. cit., 5/259; García Gómez, op. cit.; Makki, op. cit., p. 145.

\(^7\) Lévi-Provençal, op. cit., 5/295. It is interesting to compare this thesis with Gautier’s opinion (Les siècles obscurs, p. 260ff.) according to which the Berbers were characterized by a predisposition to Ḥārīṣīm, which had its origin in Pre-Islamic times (shortly after it was formulated, this hypothesis was severely criticized by R. Strothmann in his article Berber und Ḥibādilīn).
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specially "conservative" and "intolerant", (8) thereby impeding the development of other law schools. (9) As an example of said intolerance, authors often quote the difficulties imposed by the Mālikites on the 3rd/9th century traditionist, Baqī b. Maḥlād, when he returned from the East with new texts, (10) or the difficulties encountered by Ibn Ḥāzm. (11) Also quoted, in this same sense, is the testimony of the oriental al-Muqaddasi, according to which whoever dared to follow the Ḥanafi school in al-Andalus risked being expelled from the country. (12)

The "innate orthodoxy" of the inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula together with the "strict" and "intolerant" Mālikīsm that immediately predominated here—impeding the entrance of other schools or doctrines—would, then, be the reason why the sects did not find root in al-Andalus. (13)

Can we accept these conclusions? I do not think so. Let us see why not.

First of all, there are times when one is led to believe that those who defend such hypotheses, unconsciously fall into a vicious circle: Andalusian Islam was predominantly Mālikite because the inhabitants leaned towards "orthodoxy" and this "orthodoxy" is, in turn, explained by confirming that Mālikīsm prevented the entrance of other religious currents. Obviously, this line of reasoning takes us nowhere.

Apart from this, the "ethnic" oriented hypotheses lead us to other problems. It is not a logical assumption that the Berbers' supposed "religiousness" was a contributory factor in promoting "orthodoxy" in al-Andalus when we all know that the North African Berbers were open to all types of religious

(9) Makki, op. cit., p. 144f.
(10) See, for example, I. Goldziher, Ibn Toumert, p. 25f.; J. Ribera, La enseñanza, p. 25f.; Asín Palacios, Abenhdzam, 1/24; id., Ibn Masarra, p. 18; J. López Ortiz, Recepción, p. 103f.; Lévi-Provençal, Historia, 5/308; Makki, op. cit., p. 142.
(13) Lévi-Provençal, Historia, 4/98; Makki, op. cit., p. 145. Lévi-Provençal is of the opinion that the Ḥarīgīte movement did not find favourable ground in the Peninsula, not even among the large number of Berbers who were living here (op. cit., 4/27).
movements. (14) On the other hand, the question of an "innate tendency" towards "orthodoxy" on the part of the inhabitants of the Peninsula, leads us into a much more controversial field: that of the ethnical make-up of al-Andalus. Those who attribute the "orthodoxy" of the Andalusians to a supposed idiosyncrasy characteristic of the inhabitants of the Peninsula, base their theory on the assumption that the contribution of Arab and Berber elements, resulting from the Islamic conquest, was minimal in comparison with the indigenous population living here prior to the arrival of the Muslims. (15)

Nevertheless, P. Guichard has convincingly proved that the number of Arabs and Berbers established in the Peninsula as a result of the conquest as well as their capacity to resist being assimilated into the indigenous population, were much greater than what has generally been accepted. (16) Moreover, it must be taken into account that the conversion of the Hispanic population to Islam was not immediate but rather a slow process. If we accept the figures given by R. W. Bulliet, by the year 300/912—date by which the Mālikī school was already firmly established in al-Andalus—only one-third of the indigenous population had converted to Islam. (17) Apart from the fact that the theories which attempt to explain certain phenomena by attributing them to supposed racial characteristics of a people, hardly prove to be convincing, it is not logical to assume that the native converts exerted such great influence on the Arabs and Berbers so as to "immunize" them against possible heretical whims.

Nor can we affirm that Andalusian Mālikism was specially "conservative" and "intolerant." Both these adjectives are ambiguous and their meaning when applied to law schools is not all clear. Moreover, such an affirmation fails to allow for the fact that the law schools are no immutable and can, depend-

(14) See for this Rebstock, Ibāḍīten.
(15) See for this P. Guichard, al-Andalus, p. 15ff. and 23ff.
(17) Cf. R. W. Bulliet, Conversion to Islam, p. 114ff.; cf. also Glick, Islamic and Christian Spain, p. 33ff. Even if Bulliet's figures are not accepted, it is difficult to believe that at the beginning of the 3rd century (when the Mālikī school took root in Spain), the native converts could have formed an important percentage of the population, that is, when hardly a century had passed since the arrival of the first Muslims in the Peninsula.
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ing on the time and circumstances, adopt different postures when confronted with certain problems. In his study on the Andalusian 'ulamā', D. Urvoy points out that the Andalusian Mālikī school is more complex and less "monolithic" than what has been affirmed in the past.\(^\text{(18)}\) And M. Kh. Masud's study of aḥ-Sāḥībī clearly shows the Mālikī school in al-Andalus was not incapable of evolving and adapting itself to the changes experimented by society.\(^\text{(19)}\) Besides by defining Andalusian Mālikism as specially "conservative" and "intolerant", a comparison is being made—perhaps unconsciously—with other law schools in other Islamic areas. I do not believe it is possible to affirm that in the East, for example, the law schools have been characterized by a particularly "tolerant" nature that would distinguish them from the Mālikī school in al-Andalus.\(^\text{(20)}\) Numerous were the Ḥanafītes that took part in the famous Ṣiḥna carried out by al-Ma'mūn and his successors.\(^\text{(21)}\) In Bagdad, in the 5th/11th century, continuous conflicts ensued between Ḥanbalites on the one hand, and Šāfi‘ītes-As‘arītes on the other, often degenerating into street brawls.\(^\text{(22)}\)

The problems encountered by Baqī b. Maḥlād with the jurisconsults of his country—problems which, as we have already mentioned, are often quoted as an example of the "intolerance" of the Andalusian Mālikī school—were due mainly to personal reasons and to envy: relations between colleagues are, at times, conflictive.\(^\text{(23)}\) Something similar can be said of

\(^{\text{(18)}}\) Cf. D. Urvoy, Le monde.

\(^{\text{(19)}}\) M. Kh. Masud, Islamic Legal Philosophy (specially p. 317); the fact that aḥ-Sāḥībī was severely attacked by other Mālikites does not invalidate our affirmation.

\(^{\text{(20)}}\) Curiously enough, the Ḥanbalīites have also been accused—and without reasons to justify it—of being specially intolerant and conservative; see for this H. Laoust's article on Ḥādhār b. Ḥanbal in EJ.

\(^{\text{(21)}}\) Cf. Watt, Formative Period, p. 286.

\(^{\text{(22)}}\) See, for example, Makdisī, Ibn 'Aqīl, p. 350ff.; Laoust, Les agitations, p. 178; id., La politique, p. 48ff.; Haim, Al-Kundurt.

\(^{\text{(23)}}\) See for this M. Marīn, Baqī, p. 167-9 and Makki, op. cit., p. 196. Ar-Rāzī (apud Ibn Ḥalawān, ed. Makki, p. 248) makes explicit mention of the envy Baqī's knowledge (specially in the field of ḥadīth) provoked among his colleagues. Precisely one of the leaders of this opposition against Baqī, the jurisconsult Aṣbaḥ b. Ḥalil, became famous for his ignorance regarding tradition. On one occasion, he quoted the following isnād: "... 'an† n-Nabī 'an Ġibrīl 'an† ilāh" (Ibn al-Farāḍi, Ta'rīḥ, 1/78,1; Ibn al-Farāḍi cites other examples of his ignorance in this field).
Ibn Ḥazm whose polemical nature was mainly the cause of the difficulties he encountered with the Mālikites. (24)

There is no doubt that the Mālikī school predominated in al-Andalus: however, it is also a known fact that this was not the only school to which the Andalusians adhered. The Shāfi‘ites were rather numerous and, at certain periods, occupied important posts. (25) There were also Zāhirites (26) but, however, a very insignificant representation of Ḥanbalites or Ḥanafites is to be found. (27)

Various reasons have been given to explain the preponderance of the Mālikī school. As early as the Middle Ages, Ibn Ḥazm was affirming that this school had attained a majority following due to the influence that Yahyā b. Yaḥyā al-Laḥīḍī, one of Mālik’s disciples, exerted over the Emirs governing during his lifetime. (28) In this case, it is obvious that Ibn Ḥazm—whose anti-Mālikī sentiments are widely known—attempted to defame this school by attributing its success in al-Andalus to ordinary Court intrigues. (29) The contrary would be a more

(24) See, for example, R. Arnaldez’s article on Ibn Ḥazm in EI² and A. Turki, Polémiques, p. 50. Moreover, we know that Ibn Ḥazm also enjoyed the authorities’ support in his day. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Ḥuṣaynī (see for him note 412, p. 567 of Makki’s edition of Ibn Ḥayyān’s Muqtabas) who, on returning from a studies trip to the East, introduced in al-Andalus the Kitāb an-Nāṣīḥ wa-l-mansūḥ by Abū ‘Ubaid al-Qaṣīm b. Sallām, also fell victim to the envy of his colleagues. Some of them accused him before the sāḥib as-sūq of being a dangerous heretic who spoke of nāṣīḥ wa-l-mansūḥ in the hadīth. The sāḥib as-sūq, who obviously was not versed in theological subtleties, summoned him and proceeded to interrogate him. During the interrogatory, when Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh tried to explain that the technique of the nāṣīḥ wa-l-mansūḥ was also applied to the Coran, the sāḥib as-sūq no longer doubted that he was dealing with a dangerous heretic and he imprisoned him. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh remained in prison for three days until his case was brought to the attention of the Emir, who laughed at the sāḥib as-sūq’s lack of culture and ordered them to set Muḥammad free (Ibn Ḥayyān, op. cit., p. 252,1ff. and 254,6ff.).


(27) Cf. Makki, op. cit., p. 183ff.; Urvoys, op. cit., p. 105. Nevertheless, Ibn Ḥanbal’s works were known in al-Andalus: see Ibn Ḥa’ir, Fahrasa, p. 139; 262; 269 and 301.


(29) Ibn Ḥazm did not even give the name of the Emir over whom Yahyā
logical supposition, that is, if the Mālikī school found official support, it was due to its already being influential and enjoying a majority following. (30) Moreover, Ibn Ḥazm’s argument fails to explain why this school continued to predominate in the following years.

Ibn Ḥaldūn also concerned himself with the question and decided upon two different motives. The first is geographical: when they made the Pilgrimage, the Andalusians came into contact with the Medinese Mālikites which resulted in the predominance of the Mālikī school in the Peninsula. (31) The second motive is based on sociocultural reasons: the Andalusians felt a propensity towards the Mālikī school because its doctrine was simple and adapted perfectly to their poorly developed spirit which he considered similar of that of the Bedouins. (32) Some modern scholars seem to accept this second reason proffered by Ibn Ḥaldūn, although with some slight modifications. (33) M. ʿA. Makki has already pointed out the inconsistency of this argument: even allowing that the inhabitants of al-Andalus—Arabs, Berbers as well as Hispanics—were really much less spiritually cultivated than those of others Islamic regions (assumption requiring demonstration), it is not possible to affirm that the Mālikī school is “simpler” than the other schools. (34)

Another motive frequently given to explain the predominance of the Mālikī school in al-Andalus is the conflict following the rebellion of Muhammad b. ʿAbdallah in Medina in the year 145/762, that caused the confrontation between Malik and the ʿAbbāsid government, winning for the former the sympathy of the Spanish Umayyads. (35) However, it is highly doubtful exerted so much influence. As we shall have opportunity to see further on, Yaḥyā’s relations with one of the rulers of his time (Emir al-Ḥakam) were conflictive. Concerning the rulers’ supposed influence in the introduction of the Mālikite school in al-Andalus, see also Urvoy’s remarks in Une étude, p. 235f.

(30) Makki, Ensayo, p. 92f.
(31) Muqaddima, 3/12. See also Turki, Vénération, p. 48.
(32) Muqaddima, 3/12-3.
(33) See, for example, Idris, Réflexions, p. 411f. and Watt, History, p. 65.
(34) Op. cit., p. 91. However, I do not agree with Makki when he continues, saying: “...las razones [for Mālikite predominance] hay que buscarlas en otros factores raciales y psicológicos del pueblo español.”
that this small, isolated event in Mālik’s life was of such signi-
ficance as to have a decisive influence in al-Andalus, (36) besides,
yany sympathy felt by the Andalusian Emirs for Mālik would
ot be a sufficient explanation for the wide acceptance of his
school in al-Andalus.

Moreover, the first Mālikites and the governing authorities
were not always on the best of terms. In Córdoba in the year
189/805, there was an abortive conspiracy to dethrone the Emir
al-Ḥakam; the jurisconsult Yaḥyā b. Muḍar, one of Mālik’s
disciples, (37) was among the conspirators. Some time later,
in the year 202/818, the same Emir had to confront another
serious rebellion in Córdoba, the so-called “revuella del arrabal”,
in which the Mālikite jurists also played an important role. (38)
Precisely Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Laiṭī and ʻĪsā b. Dīnār, usually
considered the principal initiators of the Mālikī school in al-
Andalus, (39) participated in the rebellion. (40) Aware of the
jurists’ influence over the people, the Emir understood the
danger of their opposition so, to maintain peace, he granted an
amnesty to the majority of them. (41) If, from this moment on,
the Emirs showed more respect for the opinion of the Mālikī
jurisconsults, (42) it was due to the latter’s having demonstrated
that the power they represented was not to be taken lightly.

Another motive given to explain the predominance of the
Mālikism in al-Andalus is based on this school’s having been

(36) The information relating that Mālik highly praised one of the Andalusian
Umayyads (cf. Makki, op. cit., p. 92) seems very suspect and gives the impression
of being apocryphal.

(37) Following this attempt, Yaḥyā was executed. For the conspiracy cf.
Lévi-Provengal, Historia, 4/107f. For Yaḥyā b. Muḍar see al-Ḥumaidi, Ġagwa,
p. 378 (=nr. 903); al-Qāḍī ʻIyāḍ, Tarḥib, 3/126ff.; al-Maqqari, Naḥḥ, 1/344,5ff.;
Makki, op. cit., p. 97, note 1.

(38) See for this revolt Lévi-Provengal, op. cit., 4/108f. A large number of
jurists took part in it.

(39) See, for example, Makki, op. cit., p. 134f.

(40) Al-Qāḍī ʻIyāḍ, op. cit., 3/113-3f.; 127,6; 392,4ff.; 4/107,9ff. Cf. also Ibn
al-Faradī, Ta’rīḥ, 1/331. Yaḥyā had to flee to Toledo; ha was later pardoned
by the Emir. For Yaḥyā see al-Qāḍī ʻIyāḍ, op. cit., 3/379ff.; Makki, op. cit.,
p. 128ff. and 135. For ʻĪsā cf. Makki, op. cit., p. 135f.; the Emir later pardoned
him.


(42) The institution of the mukāwārūn, a group of jurists whose decisions the
Emir regularly consulted, was apparently introduced immediately following this
revolt (cf. Monèş, Le rôle, p. 57ff.).
adopted by the middle class who concerned themselves with religious studies that lent them authority and prestige in the eyes of the upper and lower classes. The objection here is that, in general, all the law schools were supported by the middle classes and that this hypothesis does not bring to light the reason why the middle class in al-Andalus preferre the Mālikī school over the others.

Why, then, did the Mālikī school hold the majority following in al-Andalus?

I think Ibn Ḥaldūn ascertained the right answer when he asserted that this was mainly due to geographical reasons. The Iberian Peninsula is a great distance from Irak where the Ḥanafītes, as well as the Ḥanbalītes, had their most important centers. On the other hand, the main center of the Mālikī school was to be found in the Ḥiḡāz, specially in Medina, on the route followed by the Andalusians making the Pilgrimage. When this school extended to Egypt and Ifrīqiya, obligatory stages for those travelling to Mecca from the Iberian Peninsula, the Andalusians making the Pilgrimage came into almost constant contact with the Mālikī school which, evidently, influenced their juridical formation. Moreover, it is only natural that the Ṣāfīʿī school, with its base in Egypt, would also find followers among the Andalusians.

Other factors also existed that did not favour the development of the remaining schools. Regarding the Ḥanafītes, I think that the diffusion of this school in al-Andalus was also seriously hampered by the collaboration of some Ḥanafītes in the pro-Muʿtazilite policy of al-Maʿmūn and his successors during the Miḥna. This collaboration precisely led them to persecute a good number of Mālikītes and Šāfīʿītes in Egypt and Ifrīqiya and this persecution was the cause of the unfavourable sentiments towards Abū Ḥanīfa’s school among those Andalusians who were eye-witnesses to the event, just at a time when the religious and intellectual life of al-Andalus was being formed. Concerning the Ḥanbalīte school, the fact that it was, chronologically speaking, the latest of the four main schools, must have been a very influential factor; however, in the East it did

---

(43) Idris, Réflexions, p. 398ff.
(45) Makki also accepts this.
(46) Aguadé, Eine Schrift.
not enjoy a great diffusion either. The same can be said about the Zāhiri school which was always characterized both in East and West by a minority following.

The predominance of the Māliki school in al-Andalus, then, has a single explanation and is neither due to a presumed "innate orthodoxy" of the inhabitants nor to a special "conservatism" and "intolerance" of the Andalusian Mālikites.

Therefore, the apparent failure of the sectarian movements in the Iberian Peninsula cannot be attributed to either one of these two motives. Those who are of the opinion that influence of the Māliki school "immunized" the inhabitants of al-Andalus, forget that the law schools were an eminently urban phenomenon: the tribes, whether formed by Arabs or Berbers, that did not reside in urban areas, were governed by their own common law and, therefore, escaped the influence of the law schools. (47) The success of the Ḥārīgite doctrines among the North African Berbers clearly demonstrates that the degree of influence the law schools could have exerted in this matter was minimal.

Now the question arises as to whether the sectarian movements in al-Andalus were really so insignificant, having such a minority following as has generally been accepted in the past. Before going into this question, some remarks are required.

First of all, those who consider the sectarian movements in al-Andalus an extremely irrelevant phenomenon, having a minority following, are obviously making a comparison with other Islamic regions. But when making such a comparison, one must keep in mind the boundaries of Muslim Spain which, at the end of the 9th century, enclosed no more than approximately two thirds of the total area of the Peninsula, due to the advance of the Reconquest. One must also keep in mind that, during the first centuries, a large part of the population had still not converted to Islam, thereby remaining generally beyond the

(47) See, for example, N. J. Coulson, History, p. 135ff., and J. Chelhod, Le droit. The sedentary Arab tribes continued making frequently use of common law; cf. Chelhod, Droit intertribal. For the Arab and Berber tribes that settled in al-Andalus cf. Guicherd, al-Andalus. According to Watt (History, p. 52), the Ḥārīgite movement did not take root in Spain because the Berbers required the solidarity of the other Muslims against the Christians. This is not a valid explanation either, because the rebellions of the Berbers in al-Andalus are frequent, which does not indicate they felt the need to rely on the solidarity of the other Muslims.
influence of the Islamic sectarian movements. Taking all this into account, we obviously cannot compare the sectarian movements in al-Andalus with those existing, for example, in Iran whose area and population were far superior. For the very same reason, we cannot compare the Andalusian Ḥārīgīte movements with the North African ones since the latter appeared in a large area, extending from Tripolitania to Morocco and inland to the edge of the Sahara.

Secondly, the geography of the country must be considered. In North Africa, a region like Siğilmâsa, for example, situated beyond the Atlas mountains and bordered by the desert, offered a safe enough refuge for those Ḥārīgites that settled in that city. The same can be said of Tâhirt, the Rustamid capital. The fortress of the Assassins in Alamūt is specially famous for its impregnability. The geography of the Iberian Peninsula was not so favourable for the sectarian movements. As a result, and due also to its being a smaller extension of land, the central power was always stronger than that of North Africa, for example, and could more easily suppress any kind of rebellion. Let us not forget either that the whole northern part of al-Andalus, bordering with the Christian kingdoms, was a very unsafe area for sectarian movements as they would run the risk of having to defend themselves on two fronts. The Christians were precisely the ones who put an end to a Messianic movement (which we shall mention further on) that would surely have created problems for the Emir of Córdoba, had it not been for its rapid extinction.

Thirdly, the fact that the majority of the sectarian movements in al-Andalus were persecuted and, usually, suppressed, does not at all mean they did not find acceptance from some part of the population. Such failures mean primarily that the central power was stronger. In this respect, Andalusian Islam was not an exception. In the East, the Shi'a has suffered a long line of unsuccessful rebellions. In northeastern Iran, a considerable number of sectarian movements existed during the period extending from the 'Abbāsid triumph to the first half of the 3rd/9th century; however, all of them were defeated and, finally, disappeared without leaving the slightest trace. Nonetheless, the fact that a sectarian movement is defeated, militarily speaking, does not imply its automatic extinction. For example, the Shi'a has not disappeared, despite its many un-
successful revolts. Moreover, it must not be overlooked that the sects, with the sole exception of the Shi'a, did not triumph, in the end, in the Islamic world. In this respect, as well, al-Andalus is not an exception to the rule. The Fatimids were not successful in Ifriqiya nor in Egypt, in spite of their enjoying self-rule for almost three centuries. And there are only isolated remains of the Hārīgītes in remote areas, such as Oman, Jerba or the Mzab.

Finally, there are not many sources available for the history of al-Andalus, and those extant are rather laconic. When the orientals speak of a region as distant as al-Andalus, they only offer us brief information: for example, this is the case of Ibn al-Atîr who, in spite of his brevity, is one of our main sources for the subject matter in question. The same can be said for the treatises on heresiography: oriental writers completely overlook al-Andalus and, within the Peninsula, we can only resort to the "Fiṣal" by Ibn Ḥāzm who, unfortunately, was more concerned with oriental sects than with those existing in his own country.

Let us now examine the sectarian movements found in al-Andalus. This study will basically englobe the period extending from the Muslim conquest of the Peninsula to the fall of the Caliphate of Córdoba, a period coinciding, more or less, with the centuries in which the sectarian movements enjoyed greater importance in the Islamic world. Here, only those movements leaving no doubt as to their sectarian nature will be mentioned. (48)

The first sectarian movement in al-Andalus occurred in the year 122/740. When the Hārīgīte Berbers, under the direction of Maisara, revolted in the Maghreb and occupied Tangiers, the Berbers of the Iberian Peninsula also rebelled and ousted

(48) Makki ('Tašaiyu', p. 97) considers 'Abdallāh b. Sa'd b. 'Ammār's rebellion against 'Abdarrāḥmān I the first Shi'i movement in Spain. However, the sources do not seem to confirm this interpretation: the rebel's action was influenced by a desire for vengeance. It seems that 'Abdallāh b. Sa'd's grandfather died at Șīffin fighting on 'All's side and, for this reason, his grandson did not feel well-disposed towards the arrival of 'Abdarrāḥmān I (see, for example, Ibn Sa'id, Muğrib, 2/161; al-Maqqari, op. cit., 2/330 and 3/61). The same can be said about al-Ḥusain b. Yaḥyā's and Sulaimān b. al-A'rābī's rebellion in Zaragoza in the year 165/782 which Makki (op. cit., p. 97) also considers a Shi'i movement; the sources do not corroborate this interpretation (see Aḥbār mağmū'a, p. 112ff.; Ibn 'Idārī, Bayān, 2/56-7; see also Lévi-Provençal, Historia, 4/77ff.).
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the governor, appointing one of their own as Imām: the rebellion was later suppressed by Balğ b. Biṣr. (49)

Shortly thereafter, in the year 136/753-4, the Yemenite Arabs headed by al-Ḥubāb b. Rawāḥa revolted. (50) There are few data available concerning this event; but the fact that Ibn al-
Aṭīr—usually a well informed, precise source—says that al-
Ḥubāb “da’ā ilā nafsihi” (51) seems to indicate the sectarian nature of the revolt.

Some fifteen years later, towards the year 151/768, the rebellion of Ṣaqyā took place in the eastern part of al-Andalus; this rebellion was the most important sectarian movement in Andalusian Islam. (52) His name was Ṣaqyā (53) b. ‘Abdulwahid, a Berber from the Miknāsa tribe and residing in Santaver as a school teacher. He claimed to be a descendant of Ḥusain b. ‘Alī; (54) this would suggest its being a Šī‘ite movement. Unfortunately, the sources give no information concerning his doctrine. Ṣaqyā enjoyed great success among the Berbers and had a large following; the strength of the movement is clear from the fact, that the revolt spread quickly and the Emir ‘Abdarrahmān took nine years to suppress it. Ṣaqyā was assassinated in the year 160/776-7 and the revolt ceased shortly thereafter.

Between the years 181/797 and 202/818, there was a Ḥāriğite

(49) See, for this rebellion, Ṣabīr maqmu’a, p. 38ff. (=Spanish trans. p. 48ff.); Ibn al-

(50) For this movement cf. Lévi-Provençal, Historia, 4/33-4.

(51) Kāmil, 5/462-5ff. Ibn al-
Aṭīr is apparently the only source that records this aspect; unfortunately, he does not offer more information which could help us learn what kind of movement it was. Ibn ‘Iḍārī (Bayân 2/41ff.) says the rebellion took place in the year 137; according to this author the Berbers participated in it also. Ibn al-
Aṭīr always uses the expression “da’ā ilā nafsihi” when referring to sectarian movements.

(52) For this movement see Ṣabīr maqmu’a, p. 107ff. (=transl., p. 99ff.) Ibn al-

(53) In Ibn al-
Aṭīr’s Kāmil he is erroneously named Ṣaqnā, which seems to be an incorrect reading of Ṣaqyā. According to the author of the Ṣabīr maqmu’a (p. 107,4), he was called Sufyān.

(54) Kāmil, 5/605,5ff.; Ibn ‘Iḍārī, 2/54,9; cf. also Ṣabīr maqmu’a, p. 107,6.

(55) Asin Palacios, Ibn Masarra, p. 17, note 4; Lévi-Provençal, Historia 4/106 and 126, note 80; Makki, Ensayo, p. 175; Guichard, op. cit., p. 372.
revolt in Algeciras (55) that the Emir al-Ḥakam personally suppressed.

Another Ḥārīgīte rebellion broke out in Morón in the year 200/815-6 and was crushed by the local governor; (56) the leader was Berber.

In the year 237/850-1, a strange movement appeared in eastern Spain; (57) it was headed by a man, a school teacher it appears, (58) who, according to the sources, claimed to be a prophet and gave his own exegesis of the Coran. Concerning his doctrine, we only know that he forbade his followers to cut their hairs and nails, affirming that what God had created must not be altered. (59) His preaching apparently found sufficient support among the lowliest strata of the population. In spite of the movement’s pacific nature, the governing authority quickly stepped in and sentenced the leader to be crucified when he refused to retract his beliefs. The sources do not offer more information about his doctrine or his adherents, so it is difficult to formulate an opinion about the nature of this movement which could possibly have been a syncretic doctrine similar to those found in North Africa. (60)

The well-known movement headed by Ibn al-Qīṭṭ and Abū ‘Alī as-Sarrāğ took place in the year 288/901. (61) The latter appeared on the scene around the year 285/898 in the frontier region, preaching the Holy War and the “amr bi-l-ma‘rūf.” At the same time he tried to form an alliance between Ibn Ḥāfsūn and the Banū Qasī of Aragon, according to Ibn Ḥāiyān. (62)

(57) Ibn al-Atīr, Kāmil, 7/66,1ff.; Ibn ʿĪḍārī, 2/90,6ff.; Asín Palacios, Ibn Masarra, p. 22; Makki, Taṣāiyū’, p. 100. According to Ibn ʿĪḍārī, this happened in the eastern part of al-Andalus; on the other hand, Ibn al-Atīr is less precise (cf. 7/66,1) and only refer to the “frontier region”.
(58) This information is only found in Ibn ʿĪḍārī (2/90,6).
(59) Asín Palacios (Ibn Masarra, p. 23, note 16) assumes that this prohibition was due to a supposed Pythagorian influence, but this has been refuted by Stern, Ibn Masarra.
(60) See, for example, T. Lewicki, Prophètes and R. Le Tournneau’s article on the Bargawāṭa in EP.
Shortly thereafter, he succeeded in convincing a descendent of the Emir Hišām I, nicknamed Ibn al-Qiṭṭ, to join him and he presented him to his followers as the expected Mahdī. The two of them preached the Holy War and were enormously successful, specially among the Berbers who had come from far and wide to join their cause. They then set out to conquer Zamora that was already in Christian hands. Following their initial success here, they were totally defeated by Alfonso III and Ibn al-Qiṭṭ lost his life in the battle. According to some modern scholars, Abū ʿAlī as-Sarrāḡ was a Fāṭimid daʿī; nevertheless the fact that Abū ʿAlī presented precisely an Umayyad as Mahdī contradicts this assertion. It was, in reality, a messianic movement. In the year 333/944-5, a man appeared in Uṣbūna claiming to be a descendent of ʿAbdal-muṭṭalib, the Prophet’s grandfather. He affirmed he was a prophet and that he had been inspired by Gibril. Concerning his doctrine we only know that he obliged his followers to shave their heads.

The Ismāʿīlīte doctrines also found some followers in al-Andalus, although the authorities quickly suppressed all attempts to spread these doctrines. We also know there were some Andalusians who allowed themselves to be seduced by the Ismāʿīlīte creed and emigrated to the Fāṭimids. The best known of these emigrants was Ibn Hāni’, the poet. The Fāṭimid Caliph al-Muʿizz reproached ʿAbdarrahmān III, the Andalusian Caliph for the large number of Andalusians who, according to him, had abandoned their country for religious reasons, seeking refuge in Ifrīqiya; however, this does not necessarily means they were Ismāʿīlites. We can also find Andalusian Ḥāriqītes outside the Peninsula. There were two Andalusians among the six members of the counsel (ṣūrā) that had to elect a new Imām in Tāhert after the death of ʿAbdar-
raḥmān b. Rustam in the year 168/783-4. (69) Towards the middle of the 3rd/9th century, an Andalusian Ḥāriğite led a revolt near Salé, in Morocco, and was recognized as Imām. (70)

Among the Andalusians who headed religious movements outside their country, we must mention Abū Rakwa, a curious figure who succeeded in posing as the Messiah of the Umayyads and rebelled against the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Ḥākim, in Barqa towards the year 395/1004. (71)

At a later date, after the fall of the Caliphate of Córdoba, some sectarian movements can still be found. The most famous one is, probably the revolt lead by the Sūfī Ibn Qasī who, at the end of the Almoravid period, between 537/1142 and 546/1151, appeared in southern Portugal where he succeeded in having himself recognized as Madhī and preached a syncretic doctrine, comprising Islamic and Christian beliefs. (72)

Ibn Ḥazm has contributed additional information on the existence of sects in al-Andalus. According to him, the majority of the Ḥāriğites living in the Peninsula belonged to a faction of the Ibāḍiya, known as Nukkāriya; (73) he also mentions some of their precepts. (74) Unfortunately, this is all the information Ibn Ḥazm offers us regarding the Andalusian Ḥāriğites, a movement about which we would like to be better informed. Nevertheless, this brief allusion confirms the fact that, during Ibn Ḥazm’s period, the Ḥāriğte movement still existed in the Peninsula, in spite of previous unsuccessful revolts. Moreover, his affirmation that the majority of them

(69) See article Ibāḍiyya (T. Lewicki) in EP (3/675).

(70) Cf. Makki, Ensaya, p. 177.

(71) See for him Águade, Abū Rakwa.

(72) For Ibn al-Qasī see Ibn al-Ḥāṭib, A‘māl, p. 248ff. (=German tran. p. 448ff.); article Ibn al-Ḵasī (A. Faure) in EP. I have not been able to consult D. R. Goodrich’s dissertation (A Sūfī Revolt in Portugal: Ibn Qasī and his Kitāb khal’ al-na‘lāyn. Ph. D. dissertation. Columbia University 1978). Apparently, his contemporary Ibn Barraǧān also succeeded in having himself proclaimed Imām; see article Ibn Barrajān in EP (A. Fauré). The jurist, aš-Šāṭībī (died in 790/ 1388) speaks of a “false prophet” called al-Fāzāzī, who preached in Málaga and was later executed; however, no precise date is given for his preaching activity. His teachings apparently produced response among the simple people (cf. al-Itīṣām, 2/97,-7ff.).

(73) Fiṣal, 4/191,8ff. For the Nukkāriya see article Ibāḍiyya in EP, as well as Lewicki, Subdivisions, p. 78ff.

(74) Fiṣal, 4/189,6ff.
belonged to the Nukkārīya, implies that other factions must also have been represented.

Ibn Ḥazm relates, as well, that a Ẓā'īite community lived in Velefique (Almeria)\(^{(75)}\) and that the inhabitants of an unidentified valley, which he calls Wāḍī Bānī Tauba, were Muṭāzilites.\(^{(76)}\)

As we have been able to observe, the number of sectarian movements found in al-Andalus is considerable, above all, if we take into account that these movements, as previously stated, appear within a reduced area which the central authority could control more easily than in other Islamic countries and where many of the inhabitants were not Muslims for several centuries. Moreover, we have seen that some of these sects, for example, those led by Ṣaqyā and Ibn al-Qīṭṭ, were not minority movements but, rather, had succeeded in attracting the support of important sectors of the population. These movements did not disappear without leaving any traces, since we know that some of them still existed at the time of Ibn Ḥazm. Therefore, I do not believe it possible to continue speaking of a “monolithic” Andalusian Islam that is totally “impermeable” to sectarian movements. It is objectively false to say the Berbers of al-Andalus were not within the reach of this kind of movement, when we know they were precisely the ones who participated, as we have just seen, in almost all the sectarian movements known to us: in this respect, they in no way differed from their North African fellow-tribesmen. There is nothing strange about the fact that these movements and beliefs did not triumph and, finally, disappeared: the same thing happened in the greater part of the Islamic world where Sunnism, professed by the majority, has been the only one to prevail. In this

\(^{(75)}\) Naqṭ, p. 247,3 (=Spanish transl., p. 142); see also Lévi-Provençal, Historia, 5/310.

\(^{(76)}\) Naqṭ, p. 247,2 (=p. 142). Lévi-Provençal doubts that a Muṭāzilite population actually lived in this valley (Historia, 4/126 note 81 and 5/311; Le mālikisme, p. 167). However, we know that there were some tribes living in North Africa, who were Muṭāzilites (cf. J. van Ess, Untersuchungen, p. 50, note 48); therefore, I can find no reason to doubt Ibn Ḥazm’s words. Obviously, the Muṭāzilism cannot be considered a sect in the strict sense of the word. Nevertheless, I have included it in this paper because the existence of Muṭāzilites in Spain proves that Andalusian Islam was not so “monolithic” nor so “orthodox”. Here, we can also include Ibn Masarra and his followers who did not constitute a sect either, but whose existence confirms what we have just asserted (for Ibn Masarra see Asín Palacios, Ibn Masarra, and article Ibn Masarra, in EP).
aspect, Andalusian Islamic history, evolved in a way very similar to that of Islam in other regions. Actually, the conclusions I have reached in this paper are not, in any way, exceptional and, perhaps, the scholar who is familiar with Oriental Islam, will be surprised precisely for their being so obvious; however, we should recall now that many scholars who have engaged in the study of al-Andalus, have often committed a fundamental error: that of considering certain phenomena which are also found in North African as well as Oriental Islam as distinctive, characteristic traits of Islamic culture in the Iberian Peninsula. (77)

Unfortunately, not many conclusions can be drawn due to the scarcity of information on sectarian movements in al-Andalus. Nevertheless, there is one fact that attracts our attention; the indigenous population of the Peninsula does not seem to have played an important role in any of the movements that took place during the first centuries. It is true that this may be due, in part, to the fact that the information available is scant; we know practically nothing about the movement that took place in the year 237/850-1. The sources do not mention the names of the leader or his followers; therefore, we cannot exclude the possibility that many of them were native converts. Nor do we know exactly the identity of Abū'Alī as-Sarrāġ. Obviously, such laconic sources prevent our excluding a priori the possible participation of native elements in the sectarian movements of the first centuries. Nevertheless, the few data available seem to indicate that the main protagonists of these movements were the Berbers. They were the ones who participated in the Ḥāriḡite rebellions in the years 122/740 and 200/815-6, as well in the Algeciras rebellion. Šaqyā was also a Berber as were the majority of his followers, as far as we know. On the other hand, there is no explicit mention as to the native element having a relevant participation in these events. This proves to be even more surprising when we observe that, during the same period, the native converts to Islam do, however, take part in numerous rebellions of a

(77) The most representative example of this tendency is, perhaps, C. Sánchez Albornoz; see, for example, the interpretation he gives for the consumption of wine in Muslim Spain (cf. Ensayos, p. 32ff.). Here we can cite as well the interpretations that have been given regarding the role played by women in Muslim Spain (see, for this, Guichard, al-Andalus, p. 147ff.).
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On the other hand, the native population of Iran at once played the main role in numerous sectarian movements. Unfortunately, we are also lacking information that would allow us to observe any posterior development in this respect in al-Andalus; we know nothing about the Ḥāriḵites, the Šīʿites and the Muʿtazilites mentioned by Ibn Ḥazm. However, it is difficult to think that with the enormous increase of Andalusians of Hispanic origin converted to Islam—which, in turn, meant a greater mixture of the different ethnic groups living in al-Andalus—these converts did not play a more important role in such movements. Concerning the rebellion led by the Ṣūfī, Ibn al-Qāṣī, I think, we can affirm that the majority of his followers were of Hispanic origin.

Why, then, did the native converts display such a passivity regarding the sectarian movements during the first centuries? It is not easy to find an answer to this question. It is logical to assume that part of the reason is due to the fact that the majority of the native population, at that time, was still not Muslim. However, this does not explain everything: in the 2nd/8th-9th century in Iran, an important part of the population had not yet been converted either; nevertheless, there were numerous sectarian movements. Here, I feel we must take into consideration that the social conditions in al-Andalus seem to have been very different from those existing in Iran. In this country, even long after the conquest, large estates still belonged to the traditional, landowning aristocracy who, in many cases, continued as Zoroastrians but who, at the same time, formed one of the main supports of the new Islamic regime whose taxes they were in charge of collecting; this situation was a cause for discontent among the peasants as well as the middle class. This explains the fact that some sectarian movements stemmed from the population that had not yet been converted to Islam and were directed mainly

(78) See for the rebellions of the indigenous population of al-Andalus Guichard, op. cit., p. 276ff.
(79) Cf. B. Scarcia Amoretti in The Cambridge History of Iran, p. 481. See also B. Spuler, Iran, p. 167ff. and E. L. Daniel, The political.
(80) Cf. Bulliet, Conversion, p. 44.
(81) Cf. Scarcia Amoretti, op. cit., p. 483 s.
against traditional Zoroastrianism. (82) The discontent of part of the population was also fomented by the existence of sects such as Maniqueism and Mazdakism which had traditionally been opposed to Zoroastrianism. (83) In Horasan, this situation, which had also provoked discontent among the Iranian converts as well as the Arabs who had settled there, was effectively exploited by Abū Muslim to overthrow the Umaiyyad regime; however, his anti-Umaiyyad propaganda caused the apparition of sectarian movements, often of a syncretic nature, that were directed, this time, against the 'Abbāsids. (84)

We know very little regarding the social conditions existing in al-Andalus after the conquest. (85) However, the absence of peasant rebellions seems to indicate that the conditions here were more tolerable for the native population. The problems that existed in Irak and Iran because the government continued exacting the payment of the ḥarāġ and the ǧizya from the converts, (86) do not seem to have been present in al-Andalus or, at least, they were not so important as in the East. (87) It is also possible that their conversion to Islam meant a certain social improvement for the natives: this would explain the fact that we have no word about conflicts connected with the payment of taxes by converts. Nor have we found any indications of conflicts that arose between the Church and part of the Christian population, nor of serious conflicts between Christians and the Muslim authorities. The existence of Christian kingdoms in the North of the Peninsula also meant for those Christians who were discontent with Islamic rule, the possibility to emigrate, a possibility that did not exist for the Zoroastrians in Iran.

Moreover, the indigenous population of al-Andalus gives the impression of having been very divided without any kind of

(82) Id., p. 490.
(83) Id., p. 484.
(84) See for this Scarcia Amoretti, op. cit., p. 490ff. and Daniel, op. cit.
(86) See, for instance, 'A. Zarrinkūb in The Cambridge History of Iran, p. 43ff.; Spuler, op. cit., p. 449ff.
(87) The author of the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754, which is in no way favourable to the Arab conquerors, complains at times of excessiv taxes which some governors exacted; however, in general, he does not seem to have had too negative an opinion of Muslim administration in the Peninsula (see, for example, Chronica Mozarabica, p. 36 and 38). I cannot accept Abel's opinion that the Muslim conquerors of al-Andalus treated the indigenous converts worse than in other countries (cf. Spain, p. 213f.).
"national" awareness, to use a modern term, which seems to have prevented them from effectively resisting stronger societies, such as the Arabs or the Berbers.\(^{(88)}\) The Andalusians of Hispanic origin do not seem to have been very aware of their Preislamic past, as we can observe in the texts known to us.\(^{(89)}\) The fact that al-Andalus did not bequeath any prominent figure from its Preislamic past, as did Iran, is significant. Also significant is the fact that, in Iran, Firdausi wrote a work like the Šāhnāme, while in al-Andalus absolutely nothing comparable can be found, written in the vernacular.

The absence of serious social and religious conflicts, as well as the non-existence of a clear sentiment of a "national" and cultural identity among the Andalusians of Hispanic origin\(^{(90)}\) must also have contributed to the sectarian movements of the first centuries having little success among them. These same factors can also help to explain the absence of sectarian movements of a syncretic nature during this same period. In this respect, the situation in al-Andalus was very similar to that of Syria-Palestine or Egypt.

We have also been able to observe that the Arabs do not seem to have played an important role in these movements either. Obviously, here again we must also emphasize the scanty information existing in the sources. Nevertheless, this absence of the Arab element is much more comprehensible. The Arabs had few motives to be discontent in the Peninsula where they had arrived as conquerors and constituted a minority. In other regions, far from the center of the Islamic world, and where they enjoyed a similar situation, as for example in North

\(^{(88)}\) For this see Guichard, op. cit., p. 284.

\(^{(89)}\) It is sufficient to compare, for example, what a later compiler like al-Maqṣūrī (in his Naḥf) knew about the Preislamic past of al-Andalus, with what Ibn al-Ājīr (in his Kāmil) could compile about the history of Preislamic Iran. See also for this M. Arkoun, Manifestations, p. 121f. See also Levi Della Vida's remarks concerning the use of Latin sources by Andalusian Muslims (I mozabābi, p. 673=Note, p. 69; 682f.=Note, p. 67 and 694=Note, p. 75). It is instructive to compare this lack of interest in the preislamic culture of al-Andalus with the remarks made by al-Gāhīz concerning the predilection of Oriental kutṭāb of his time for the Persian preislamic heritage (cf. Rasāʾil, 2/191ff.).

\(^{(90)}\) The fact that we find works, such as the well-known Risāla by aṣ-Ṣaqundī, that exalt the merits of al-Andalus, in no way contradict our assertion. The genre of the faḍḍāʾil is found throughout the entire Islamic world. In this case, aṣ-Ṣaqundī directs his Risāla only against the Berbers (cf. García Gómez, Andalucia contra Berberia, pp. 45ff.).
Africa, they did not usually play an outstanding role in this type of movements either.

The Berbers, then, were the main protagonists of these sectarian movements during the first centuries. This was chiefly due to the influence of their North African fellow-tribemen among whom Ḥāriǧism had found favourable ground: where we can best appreciate this influence is in the Ḥāriǧite rebellion of the year 122/740 which coincides with Maisara’s revolt in northern Morocco. The fact that the islamization of the Berbers who entered the Peninsula continued being very superficial, if not purely nominal, was obviously another influential factor in this respect. For the Berber tribes of al-Andalus who were, frequently, at odds with the Arabs as well as with the natives, and fully aware of their own strength, having an internal cohesion which was very superior to that of the indigenous population, these movement provided them with an ideology that justified their attempts at autonomy directed against the central authority. (91)

Jorge Aguadé
(Madrid)

(91) See Watt’s comments (Formative Period, p. 34) regarding the reasons why Ḥariǧism was attractive to Iranians and Berbers.
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