

## The Establishment of Almohad Rule in Al-Maghrib al-Awsat̄ and Al-Maghrib al-Adnā and Almohad Policy Towards the Arab Tribes

Baadj Amar Salem♦

Relizane University

email: amarsalem.baadj@univ-relizane.dz

ملخص:

تأسيس الحكم الموحد في المغرب الأوسط والمغرب الأدنى وسياسة الموحدين تجاه القبائل العربية

نستهل المقال بدراسة التوسع الموحد نحو بلاد المغرب الأوسط وإفريقية في منتصف القرن السادس هجري (06 هـ) الموافق للثاني عشر ميلادي (12م)، وعملية ضمهما إلى الدولة الموحدية الناشئة، ثم قمنا بتحليل نقدي لمصادر معركة سطيف الحاسمة (548هـ/1153م)، وتقصي الأساليب المتنوعة التي استعملها الموحدون لتهدة والسيطرة على القبائل الهلالية والسليمية في المغربين الأوسط والأدنى ومنها عملية التهجير، والتجنيد، ودفع الرواتب، والقمع العسكري.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

الخلافة الموحدية؛ المغرب الأوسط؛ بنو هلال؛ بنو سليم؛ عبد المؤمن بن علي.

### Abstract:

This article begins with a study of the conquest of the Central and Eastern Maghrib by the Almohads during the middle of the 6<sup>th</sup> century A.H./12<sup>th</sup> century A.D. and the incorporation of both regions into the Almohad state. It includes a critical analysis of the sources for the decisive battle of Setif in 548 A.H./1153 A.D. leading to some new conclusions about the battle. It also discusses the various strategies employed by the Almohads to subdue and pacify the various Hilālī and Sulaymī tribes that inhabited the Central and Eastern Maghrib and which constituted the main source of resistance to the eastwards expansion of Almohad rule. These

---

♦ Corresponding Author

methods included resettlement, recruitment into the Almohad army, payment of stipends, and military repression.

**Keywords:**

Almohad Caliphate; Central Maghrib; Banū Hilāl; Banū Sulaym; ‘Abd al-Mu’min b. ‘Alī.

**Introduction:**

The Almohad Empire was a unique example of a state that succeeded in uniting the entire western Islamic World from al-Andalus and al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā in the far west to Ifrīqīya in the east. The absorption of the Central and Eastern Maghrib into the empire in the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century was a major success for the Almohads. By conquering these lands they succeeded in achieving a feat which had eluded their Almoravid predecessors. At the same time the conquests brought new challenges in their wake. The Almohads now had to contend with powerful, and potentially turbulent tribes that were not accustomed to accepting strong centralized rule: the Banū Sulaym in Tripolitania and Ifrīqīya, the Banū Hilāl in the eastern and central regions of al-Maghrib al-Awsaṭ, and the Zanāta in the western regions of al-Maghrib al-Awsaṭ. As we will see Almohad policies towards these tribes were varied, including the incorporation of some of them into the military and ruling elite of the empire along with the granting of iqtā‘ and salaries, large-scale resettlement of some tribal groups, and repression of others.

**The Distribution of the Arab Tribes in the Central Maghrib, Ifrīqīya, and Libya at the Commencement of the Almohad Period**

By the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century the Sulaymī tribes were present in the coastal plains of Cyrenaica and Tripolitania and throughout Ifrīqīya as far west as Annaba and the Awrās Mountains. Two of the Sulaymī tribes, Hayb and Labīd, were found mainly in Cyrenaica. The other major Sulaymī tribes were the Dabbāb, ‘Awf, Hayb, Zughb<sup>1</sup>, and Rawāḥa<sup>2</sup>. These tribes were concentrated in

---

<sup>1</sup>Not to be confused with the Hilālī Zughba who inhabited the Central Maghrib between Bijāya and Tlemcen during this period.

Tripolitania and Ifrīqiya, in other words from the Gulf of Sirt in Libya, across much of Tunisia, to Annaba and the Awrās mountains in eastern Algeria<sup>3</sup>. The Dabbāb were comprised of several lesser tribes including Jawārī, Maḥāmīd, Banū Salmān, Banū Sulaymān, and Banū Sālim. Broadly speaking it can be said that the Dabbāb were present along the coast from Tripoli in the east to Qābis in the west though some of their clans were found outside of this area in Jabal Nafusa, northern Fezzan, and occasionally east of Tripoli<sup>4</sup>. The ‘Awf were comprised of two continuously feuding sub-tribes, the ‘Allāq and Mirdās<sup>5</sup>. The ‘Allāq were themselves split into a number of tribes, most notably the Ka‘ūb who are mentioned in the context of Qarāqūsh’s expedition to the west<sup>6</sup>. The Hilālī tribes were mainly found west of Ifrīqiya in the Central Maghrib with the exception of the Riyāḥ who were present in northern Tunisia during this period<sup>7</sup>.

Intermixed with the Arabs in the coastal plain between Sirt and Qābis were the original Berber inhabitants, predominantly Hawwāra and Mazāta<sup>8</sup>. Al-Bakrī mentions the presence of people who spoke a strange, unidentifiable language in Sirt and he remarks that around Tripoli there were large numbers of « *aqbāt* (Egyptians) who dress like Berbers. »<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>For more on the Banū Sulaym and their sub-divisions see **IBN SA‘ĪD AL-MAGHRIBĪ AL-ANDALUSĪ** (‘Alī b. Mūsā) : *Nashwat al-Ṭarab fī Tārīkh Jāhiliyyat al-‘Arab*, ed. Nuṣrat ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Amman, Maktabat al-Aqṣā, 1982, vol. 2, pp. 519-523; **IBN KHALDŪN** (‘Abd al-Raḥmān) : *Al-‘Ibar wa Dīwān al-Mubtada’ wa al-Khabar*, 8 vols., ed. Khalīl Shahāda and Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut, Dār al-Fikr, 2001, vol. 6, pp. 94-105.

<sup>3</sup>**SHARQĪ (Nawwāra)** : « Al-Ḥayāt al-Ijtimā‘īya fī al-Gharb al-Islāmī fī ‘Ahd al-Muwahḥidīn: 524/1126-667/1268 », MA thesis, Algiers University, 2007-2008, p. 286.

<sup>4</sup>See **AL-BARGHŪTHĪ** (‘Abd al-Laṭīf Maḥmūd) : *Tārīkh Lībīyā al-Islāmī min al-Fath al-Islāmī ḥattā Bidāyat al-‘Aṣr al-‘Uthmānī*, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir, 1973, p. 266.

<sup>5</sup>**IBN SA‘ĪD** : *Nashwa*, part 2, p. 522.

<sup>6</sup>**IBN KHALDŪN** (‘Abd al-Raḥmān) : *op. cit.*, vol. 6, pp. 95-96.

<sup>7</sup>**SHARQĪ (Nawwāra)** : *op. cit.*, p. 286.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 267-273.

<sup>9</sup>Al-Bakrī quoted in ‘**ABBĀS (Iḥsān)** and **NAJM (Muḥammad Yūsuf)** : *Lībīyā fī Kutub al-Jughrāfiyya wa al-Riḥlāt*, Benghazi, Dār Lībīyā li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī’, 1968, pp. 30-31.

The inhabitants of Jabal Nafūsa were largely Berber-speaking and they followed the Ibādī sect. During the medieval period the dominant Berber tribe in this area was the Nafūsa which gave its name to the region. This tribe was comprised of several major clans including the Banū Zammūr, Banū Tadamīt, Banū Māt̄wasa, and the Banū Maskūra. Alongside the Nafūsa there were members of other tribes inhabiting the mountain range including some Hawwāra, Lawāta, Mazāta, Zawāgha, Sadrāta and Zanāta<sup>10</sup>.

The Hilālī tribes were found primarily in the Central Maghrib; they appear to have been driven westward and out of Ifrīqīya by the Banū Sulaym. The westernmost Hilālī tribe was the Zughba who inhabited an area stretching from Tlemcen in the west to Algiers in the east. The Athbaj inhabited areas to the south and east of the Zughba. The Riyāḥ were found in the vicinity of Constantine and Masīla in eastern Algeria as well as in northern Tunisia. The Ma‘qil, a Yemenite tribe which claimed Hilālī ancestry, were also found in pockets along the Algerian coast and in the interior<sup>11</sup>. According to ‘Azzāwī, the Hilālī tribes would normally spend their winters in the Zāb or in southern Ifrīqīya, moving to more northerly pastures such as the countryside around Bijāya and Constantine in the summer<sup>12</sup>.

Of these tribes the Zughba alone were consistently loyal to the Almohads. They had close relations with a Zanaī Berber tribe from Tlemcen called Banū Badīn. Ibn Khaldūn remarks that the Zughba and Banū Badīn cooperated to defend the Almohad Empire during its long wars with the Banū Ghāniya<sup>13</sup>. As for the other Hilālī tribes, they were always looking for an opportunity to shake off Almohad rule and the Banū Ghāniya could count on their support as long as there was the prospect of booty. The same could be said of the Banū Sulaym in Ifrīqīya.

---

<sup>10</sup>**MAZHŪDĪ (Mas‘ūd)** : *Jabal Nafūsa mundhu Intishār al-Islām ḥattā Hijrat Banī Hilāl ilā bilād al-Maghrib: 642-1053, 21-442*, Rabat [?], Mu‘assasat Tāwālt, 2003, pp. 26-34.

<sup>11</sup>See **IBN KHALDŪN (‘Abd al-Rahmān)** : *op. cit.*, vol. 6, pp. 30-92; **SHARQĪ (Nawwāra)** : *op. cit.*, pp. 41-52, p. 286 map.

<sup>12</sup>**AZZĀWĪ (Aḥmad)** : *Qadāyā Tārīkhīya khilāl al-‘Aşrayn al-Muwaḥḥidī wa al-Marīnī*, Rabat, Rabā Nīt, Diyūr al-Jāmi‘, 2010, p. 51.

<sup>13</sup>**IBN KHALDŪN (‘Abd al-Rahmān)** : *op. cit.*, vol. 6, p. 54.

### The Conquest of the Central Maghrib

During the Almohad period al-Andalus and al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā contained a total of 14 provinces of medium or small size<sup>14</sup>. In contrast, the eastern possessions of the Almohads consisted of only three very large provinces: Tlemcen, Bijāya, and Ifrīqīya. Tlemcen province was a creation of the Almoravids and its conquest was connected to the process of overthrowing Almoravid rule in North Africa. Bijāya province corresponded to the territory of the Hammadid state and Ifrīqīya to what had once been the Zirid state though the latter had already completely disintegrated by the time the Almohads reached Ifrīqīya.

Unable to decisively defeat the Almoravids in their core territory of al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā, ‘Abd al-Mu’min decided to open a new front against them in the province of Tlemcen, which comprised the western part of al-Maghrib al-Awsaṭ. His goal was twofold -to outflank the Almoravids from the east and also to detach the powerful Zanātī tribes of the region (including his ancestral tribe, the Kūmīya) from their allegiance to the Almoravids and add their manpower to his army. In 537/1143 an Almohad force entered the Central Maghrib and defeated the governor of Tlemcen, Ibn Fānnū, who was killed in the battle. Meanwhile ‘Abd al-Mu’min himself had appeared in the Central Maghrib and rallied the Kūmīya and other Zanātī tribes to his cause. The new Almoravid ruler, Tāshfīn b. ‘Alī, sent his best general, the Catalanian commander known as Reverter, to salvage the situation in the Central Maghrib. Unfortunately for the Almoravids, Reverter’s force was ambushed by the Almohads while returning heavily encumbered with loot in the aftermath of a raid on some Zanātī tribes, and he was killed in the fighting<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup>On the Almohad provinces see **BURESI (Pascal)** and **EL AALLAOUI (Hicham)**: *Governing the Empire: Provincial Administration in the Almohad Empire (1224-1269)*, trans. Travis Bruce, Leiden, Brill, 2013, especially pp. 61-62.

<sup>15</sup>**IBN KHALDŪN (‘Abd al-Rahmān)**: *op. cit.*, vol. 6, pp. 307-309; **AL-BAYDHAQ (Abū Bakr b. ‘Alī al-Ṣanhājī)**: *Akhbār al-Mahdī Ibn Tūmart wa Bidāyat al-Dawlat al-Muwaḥḥidīya*, Rabat, Dār al-Manṣūr, 1971, pp. 56-60; **BOSCH VILÁ (Jacinto)**: *Los Almorávides*, Granada, Editorial Universidad de Granada, 1998, pp. 256-265.

Tāshfīn summoned reinforcements from across the Almoravid empire and personally took command in Tlemcen. He was joined there by a force led by a Hammadid prince from Bijāya. The Hammadids were defeated and fled. Tāshfīn then decided to move to Oran with the bulk of his forces even though Tlemcen continued to resist the Almohads. Perhaps the Almoravid amir hoped to receive reinforcements by sea from al-Andalus or to escape there by ship as Bosch Vilá suggests<sup>16</sup>. Oran was subjected to a brutal siege by the Almohad commander Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar and the Almoravid position was weakened by desertions. In 539/1145 Tāshfīn died in an accident while attempting to escape from the Almohads who had set fire to the fort that he had sought refuge in, located in the mountains overlooking Oran. Oran fell to the Almohads a few days later. Tlemcen surrendered in the same year<sup>17</sup>.

Even as he was overseeing the completion of the conquest of al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā in the 1140’s, ‘Abd al-Mu’min also began intervening in al-Andalus which he hoped to wrest from the Almoravids while at the same time fending off the threat of the Christian kingdoms. In 540/1145-6 the first Almohad expedition across the straits of Gibraltar was launched and in 541/1147 Seville was captured followed by Cordoba<sup>18</sup>. In 545/1150 ‘Abd al-Mu’min was in Salā where he received most of the remaining independent Andalusian amirs who now pledged allegiance to him<sup>19</sup>. The next likely step would have been for the caliph to cross the straits in person with the bulk of his forces in order to consolidate his gains in the peninsula and perhaps to campaign against the Christians. Contrary to public expectations, ‘Abd al-Mu’min resolved to first turn his attention against the east, specifically against the Hammadids.

Various reasons have been given for this move. Sa‘īdī suggests that ‘Abd al-Mu’min had dreams of unifying the Maghrib in its

---

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 262.

<sup>17</sup>**IBN KHALDŪN** (‘Abd al-Rahmān): *op. cit.*, vol. 6, pp. 307-309; **AL-BAYDHAQ** (Abū Bakr b. ‘Alī al-Ṣanhājī): *op. cit.*, pp. 56-60; **BOSCH VILÁ (Jacinto)**: *op. cit.*, pp. 256-265.

<sup>18</sup>**IBN KHALDŪN** (‘Abd al-Rahmān): *op. cit.*, vol. 6, pp. 312-313.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 315.

entirety<sup>20</sup>. Huici Miranda suggests that he wanted to avenge the poor treatment of the Maḥdī by the Hammadids, to expel the Normans from their coastal strongholds in Ifrīqiya, and to restore order in the east after the chaos caused by the Hilālī invasion<sup>21</sup>. Less probable is his suggestion that the caliph wanted to attack the Hammadids because they were Ṣanhāja Berbers like the Almoravids. Apart from the great difference in culture and lifestyle between the Ṣanhāja of the Mauritanian desert from whom the Almoravids were derived and the mountain-dwelling Ṣanhāja of the eastern Algerian coast who had founded the Zirid and Hammadid states, the Almoravids and the Hammadids had a history of bloody conflict. Perhaps ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s interest in the Central Maghrib stemmed from personal reasons. He was descended from the Zanātī Kūmīya of Nadrūma and thus he may have wanted to secure the eastern flank of his Zanātī kinsmen and further bind them to his cause by campaigning against their old rivals the Hammadids.

After two years of preparations the caliph led his army out of Salā. It was announced that he intended to cross the straits to al-Andalus and the army marched in the greatest secrecy. He had the route of march from Salā to Miknās, Miknās to Fez, and Fez to Tlemcen monitored by officials who forbade civilians from traveling along these roads. Soldiers were forbidden by threat of execution from mentioning the true destination of the army<sup>22</sup>. The army arrived before Algiers unexpectedly and took the town without resistance. It was in Algiers that ‘Abd al-Mu’min encountered the last Zirid amir, al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī. Al-Ḥasan had abandoned al-Maḥdīya in the face of the Norman assault on that city and after wandering around Ifrīqiya in search of a refuge for himself and his family he was treacherously imprisoned in Algiers by his cousin, the Hammadid sultan Yaḥyā. ‘Abd al-Mu’min set al-Ḥasan free and showed him great favor. Al-Tijānī says that al-Ḥasan encouraged the Almohad caliph to attack Bijāya in order to take revenge on the relative who had been responsible for his

---

<sup>20</sup>SA‘ĪDĪ (A.) : « Tawḥīd al-Maghrib fī ‘Ahd al-Muwaḥḥidīn », in *Tārīkh Ifrīqīyā al-‘Āmm*, vol. 4, pp. 35-73, ed. J.T. Nīyānī, Beirut, UNESCO, 1988, p. 56.

<sup>21</sup>HUICI MIRANDA (Ambrosio) : *al-Tārīkh al-Sīyāsī li-al-Imbrāṭūrīya al-Muwaḥḥidīya*, trans. ‘Abd al-Wāḥid Akmūr, Rabat, al-Zamān, 2004, p. 151.

<sup>22</sup>AL-BAYDHAQ (Abū Bakr b. ‘Alī al-Ṣanhājī) : *op. cit.*, pp. 73-74.

misery though 'Abd al-Mu'min hardly needed such encouragement<sup>23</sup>.

The Hammadid ruler Yaḥyā was a careless and pleasure-loving individual who left the business of governing in the hands of his wazīr Maymūn b. Ḥamdūn. The exact course of events leading up to the fall of Bijāya is difficult to determine because of the contradictions in our sources. Ibn al-Athīr says that Maymūn led an army out of Bijāya that was defeated by the Almohad advance guard<sup>24</sup>. Ibn Khaldūn claims that there was a clash between the two sides at a location a day's journey from Bijāya called Umm al-'Ulū<sup>25</sup>. On the other hand, al-Nuwayrī says that Maymūn deliberately avoided giving combat<sup>26</sup>. There are some additional sources which claim that Maymūn himself surrendered Bijāya to the Almohads without a fight. Among these is an official letter from the caliph praising Maymūn and his brother, a prominent jurist, for their role in peacefully delivering Bijāya to him<sup>27</sup>. This makes it unlikely that there was any serious fighting before the fall of Bijāya since Maymūn, the wazīr and commander of the Hammadid army, seems to have had a secret agreement with the caliph. The Almohads entered the city unopposed. The sultan Yaḥyā had already fled from Bijāya to Constantine in eastern Algeria while most of his family took refuge in Sicily. The Almohads proceeded to besiege Constantine until Yaḥyā finally surrendered. He was well-received by 'Abd al-Mu'min who sent Yaḥyā and his relatives to al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā where they lived in great splendor and luxury<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>23</sup>AL-TIJĀNĪ (Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad) : *Rihla*, ed. Ḥasan Ḥusnī 'Abd al-Wahhāb, Tunis, al-Maṭba'a al-Rasmīya, 1958, p. 343.

<sup>24</sup>IBN AL-ATHĪR ('Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan) : *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, 11 vols., ed. Abū al-Fidā' 'Abdallāh al-Qādī, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīya, 1987, vol. 9, pp. 372-373.

<sup>25</sup>IBN KHALDŪN ('Abd al-Rahmān) : *op. cit.*, vol. 6, p. 315.

<sup>26</sup>AL-NUWAYRĪ (Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb) : *Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab*, 31 vols, Cairo, al-Hay'a al-Miṣrīya al-'Āmma li al-Kitāb, 1933-, vol. 24, p. 166.

<sup>27</sup>IBN ABI ZAR 'AL-FĀSĪ : *Rawḍ al-Qirṭās*, Rabat, Dār al-Manṣūr, 1972, p.194; ANONYMOUS : *al-Ḥulal al-Mawshīya fī Dhikr al-Akhhār al-Marrākushīya*, eds. Suhayl Zakkār and 'Abd al-Qādir Zammām, Casablanca, Dār al-Rashād al-Ḥadītha, 1979, pp. 149-150; LEVI-PROVENÇAL (Èvariste) : *Majmū' Rāsā'il Muwahhidīya*, Rabat, al-Maṭba'a al-Iqtiṣādīya, 1941, Letter 7, p. 20.

<sup>28</sup>LEVI-PROVENÇAL (Èvariste) : *op. cit.*, Letter 8, pp. 24-25;



**The Establishment of Almohad Rule in Al-Maghrib al-Awsaṭ and Al-Maghrib al-Adnā and Almohad Policy Towards the Arab Tribes**

After the fall of Constantine, the caliph sent a detachment which marched to the Qal‘a of the Banū Ḥammād<sup>29</sup>. A large force of Ṣanhāja, partisans of the Hammadids, as well as some Lawāta and Kutāma Berbers had gathered to oppose the Almohads. According to Ibn Khaldūn they were led by Yaḥyā’s brother, one Jūshan, while Ibn al-Athīr says that their commander was named Abū Qaṣaba. A fierce battle took place outside the city between the two sides resulting in the defeat of the Hammadids. The Almohads then stormed the Qal‘a which they thoroughly looted and burned while its inhabitants fled to the surrounding hills<sup>30</sup>.

The Hilālī Arabs who occupied a large swath of territory south of Bijāya felt threatened by the Almohad presence. They had been treated well by the Hammadid sultans who permitted them to keep half of the harvest in the lands where they had settled in return for guarding the frontier<sup>31</sup>. They feared that the Almohads would expel them from the Central Maghrib altogether. As a consequence the Hilālī tribes of Riyāḥ, Zughba, Athbaj, Qurra, and ‘Adī banded together to face the Almohad army. The Normans offered to send 5,000 men from Sicily to assist the Arab confederation but the Arab chiefs turned down the offer claiming that they did not need the assistance and that in any case they could not ally with a Christian power against fellow Muslims<sup>32</sup>.

The most likely account of the battle is given by Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Khaldūn with only minor variations. According to them ‘Abd al-Mu‘min had already started his return march to Marrakech when he received word of the Arab uprising and he sent against them a force of 30,000 horsemen under his son ‘Abdallāh. They met the more numerous Arab army at Setif in 548/1153. The Almohads won

---

**ANONYMOUS** : *op. cit.*, pp. 149-150.

<sup>29</sup>Ibn Khaldūn says that this force was led by the Caliph’s son ‘Abdallāh while Ibn al-Athīr and al-Nuwayrī say that the commander was one Abū Sa‘d Yakhluf. See **IBN KHALDŪN** (‘**Abd al-Rahmān**): *op. cit.*, vol. 6, p. 316; **AL-NUWAYRĪ** (Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘**Abd al-Wahhāb**): *op. cit.*, vol. 24, p. 167; **IBN AL-ATHĪR** (‘**Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan**): *op. cit.*, vol. 9, p. 373

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup>**HUICI MIRANDA** (Ambrosio) : *op. cit.*, p. 153.

<sup>32</sup>**IBN AL-ATHĪR** (‘**Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan**): *op. cit.*, vol. 9, pp. 390-391; **AL-NUWAYRĪ** (Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘**Abd al-Wahhāb**): *op. cit.*, vol. 24, pp. 167-168; **IBN KHALDŪN** (‘**Abd al-Rahmān**): *op. cit.*, vol. 6, p. 316.

a crushing victory; the goods, animals, and families of the Arabs fell into their possession and were brought back to al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā. The caliph treated the captured women and children honorably and he wrote to the Arabs to come to Marrakech to take back their family members. When the Arabs arrived not only were they reunited with their wives and children but they also received generous presents<sup>33</sup>. According to Ibn al-Athīr the caliph sought their support in securing the appointment of his son as crown prince; no doubt he also wanted to appease them so that they would not cause further headache for him in the Central Maghrib and to make use of them as auxiliaries in his army.

The account of the battle of Setif in al-Baydhaq's chronicle presents a number of problems. According to this account 'Abd al-Mu'min was still in Bijāya when the battle of Setif had occurred. He had sent the bulk of the Almohad army off under two commanders: his son-in-law Ibn Wannūdīn and Yiṣlāsīn b. al-Mu'izz. These two quarreled and separated with their respective contingents. The Arabs took advantage of this rift by attacking Ibn Wannūdīn's column which they defeated and Ibn Wannūdīn himself was captured and later executed by them. The caliph was angered by this and he sent all available men except for his own personal bodyguard to fight the Arabs whom they defeated at Setif. Meanwhile the caliph was attacked in Bijāya by Ibn Qaṣaba at the head of a tribe called Banū Zaldaway. The caliph and his retinue fought them off and Ibn Qaṣaba was killed<sup>34</sup>.

There is no mention in the other chronicles of a fight between the Almohad commanders and the capture of one by the Arabs or of any Almohad setback before the battle of Setif. Furthermore, the other sources imply that the caliph was on his return march at the time of the battle if he had not reached Marrakech already. The mention of Ibn Qaṣaba further complicates the narrative. This person is clearly referred to by the other chroniclers as the leader of the Ṣanhāja in the battle for the Qal'a, which they insist preceded the battle of Setif. Al-Baydhaq does not refer to the battle for the Qal'a; he simply inserts the improbable account of Ibn Qaṣaba's assault on the caliph within the narrative of the battle of Setif which

---

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> **AL-BAYDHAQ** (Abū Bakr b. 'Alī al-Ṣanhājī) : *op. cit.*, pp. 74-75.

suggests that he has confused the two events. This would not be surprising since al-Baydhaq makes no pretense of being an historian. His work is a panegyric on Ibn Tūmart and ‘Abd al-Mu’min.

Unfortunately the two greatest modern historians of the Almohad Empire, the Spaniard Ambrosio Huici Miranda and the Egyptian Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh ‘Inān, have obscured and distorted the events surrounding the battle of Setif through their attempts to accommodate the version of this campaign that is presented by al-Baydhaq. Huici Miranda mentions two major battles against the Arabs, a position that is not supported by any of the primary sources. For the first battle he gives no name or location. He works the story of the dispute between Ibn Wannūdīn and Yiṣlāsīn b. al-Mu‘izz into the narrative of this battle as well as the attack on the caliph by Ibn Qaṣaba. According to him the main Almohad army was victorious against the Arabs and the caliph defeated Ibn Qaṣaba. ‘Abd al-Mu’min commenced his return march to al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā leaving behind him a sizeable contingent to occupy the former Hammadid territories. When the caliph reached Mitīja (south of Algiers), word reached him that the Arabs had gathered near the town of Setif. He sent the bulk of the troops who were with him to reinforce the local Almohad force and together they won a second victory over the Arabs at Setif, capturing the families and flocks of the Arabs<sup>35</sup>.

‘Inān implies that ‘Abd al-Mu’min was present in the Central Maghrib during the battle of Setif. According to him Ibn Qaṣaba led the Ṣanhāja, Kutāma and Lawāta against the Almohads following the battle of Setif while the caliph was in Bijāya. This means that according to ‘Inān there were two battles with the Berbers: the first was the battle at the Qal‘a which occurred before Setif, and a second battle which occurred after Setif<sup>36</sup>.

This is a needless complication of events. Our fullest and most reliable sources, Ibn al-Athīr, al-Nuwayrī, and Ibn Khaldūn, make it clear that there was one battle at the Qal‘a with the assembled

---

<sup>35</sup> **HUICI MIRANDA (Ambrosio)** : *op. cit.*, pp. 152-157.

<sup>36</sup> **INĀN (Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh)** : *Dawlat al-Islām fī al-Andalus: ‘Aṣr al-Murābiṭīn wa al-Muwaḥḥidīn fī al-Maghrib wa al-Andalus*, 2 vols, Cairo, Lajnat al-Ta’ālīf, 1964, Vol. 1, pp. 284-285.

Berber tribes under Ibn Qaṣaba which occurred after the fall of Bijāya and shortly before or at the same time as the fall of Constantine. This was followed by a single decisive battle against the Arabs at Setif which occurred when the caliph was on his way back to Marrakech. If an attack was made on ‘Abd al-Mu’min when most of the Almohad forces were away then it must have happened during the campaign against the Qal‘a when the caliph was still in Bijāya and Almohad forces were divided between the Qal‘a and Constantine. Al-Baydhaq is the only author who mentions the attack on the person of the caliph. It appears that ‘Inān has been misled by the fact that al-Baydhaq inserted his account of the attack on the caliph by Ibn Qaṣaba after his mention of the battle of Setif but this means little since al-Baydhaq appears to be careless with chronology<sup>37</sup>.

### **The Conquest of Ifrīqiya**

The campaign against the Central Maghrib concluded in approximately 548/1153. It resulted in the fall of the Hammadid state and its absorption into the expanding Almohad Empire. ‘Abd al-Mu’min spent the next five years consolidating his hold on power. He suppressed a number of revolts and conspiracies in al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā and he forced the senior Almohad chiefs to accept the succession of the caliphate in his own line. During this time he had received numerous delegations from the Muslims of Ifrīqiya pleading for assistance against the Normans. It should also be remembered that the last Zirid sultan, al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī, was present in Marrakech at this time. He was a close friend and advisor to the caliph and he also strongly urged him to wage war on the Normans who had deposed him from the throne of al-Mahdīya.

In the winter of 554/1159 the caliph left Salā at the head of a large army whose number is given by Ibn al-Athīr as 100,000<sup>38</sup>. He was accompanied by al-Ḥasan the Zirid. They marched to Tunis,

---

<sup>37</sup> Another interpretation of the battle of Setif is offered by ‘Azzāwī who suggests that ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s withdrawal to the west prior to the battle was a feint intended to test the loyalty of the Arabs and to lure them further west so that they would be between the Almohad garrison in Constantine and the main Almohad force that was with the caliph in the western part of al-Maghrib al-Awsaṭ. See ‘AZZĀWĪ (Aḥmad) : *op. cit.*, pp. 50-52.

<sup>38</sup> IBN AL-ATHĪR (‘Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan) : *op. cit.*, vol. 9, p. 428.

which was then governed by the Banū Khurāsān, and they reached it in less than five months. A fleet of seventy galleys sailed along the coast parallel to the Almohad army commanded by the admiral Abū ‘Abdallāh b. Maymūn<sup>39</sup>. There are conflicting accounts of what happened next; some sources say that the city surrendered peacefully while others insist that there was a siege.

The fullest account is given by al-Tijānī<sup>40</sup>. He says that the caliph’s son, ‘Abdallāh, had besieged Tunis in 552/1157 but the defenders had annihilated his army. As a result they were overconfident in the face of ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s forces and rejected his offer of a peaceful surrender. After three days of siege the city leaders sent a delegation to negotiate with ‘Abd al-Mu’min. Perhaps the Tunisians realized that this time they would face the entire might of the Almohad Empire. They begged the caliph’s pardon which he granted under stringent conditions, confiscating half of the property and money of the citizens of Tunis and the inhabitants of the surrounding villages and expelling the Banū Khurāsān from the city<sup>41</sup>.

He appointed an Almohad governor for Tunis and advanced to al-Mahdīya. The Christian defenders, who numbered 3,000, had abandoned the suburb of Zawīla and they were concentrated in the nearly impregnable peninsula. ‘Abd al-Mu’min commenced the siege in Rajab 554/August 1159 and it lasted until Muḥarram 555/21 January 1160. All attempts to storm the citadel ended in failure; the Almohads had no recourse but to wait until the supplies of the defenders ran low. A Sicilian fleet of 150 vessels attempted to break the siege but it was defeated by the Almohad navy outside of the harbor of al-Mahdīya. After this event the defenders lost hope and entered into negotiations with ‘Abd al-Mu’min. He agreed to allow the defenders to return to Sicily unmolested with all of their possessions since the new Norman king, William, had threatened to massacre the Muslims on that island if any of his knights were

---

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> **AL-TIJĀNĪ** (Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad) : *op. cit.*, pp. 344-346.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

harmful. With this treaty twelve years of Christian rule in al-Mahdiyya came to an end<sup>42</sup>.

During the four years preceding the siege of al-Mahdiyya revolts had flared up in most of the other coastal cities of Ifrīqiya. Tripoli, Şfāqus, Jirba and Qābis threw off the Norman yoke, no doubt in anticipation of the arrival of the Almohads<sup>43</sup>. When ‘Abd al-Mu’min reached Tunisia the new rulers of Şfāqus and Tripoli hastened to submit to him as did many of the towns in Jabal Nafusa and the Jarīd. Qābis refused to submit and as a result it was conquered by a contingent under the command of the caliph’s son. The rulers of Qafşa heeded the example of the other cities and recognized Almohad authority<sup>44</sup>.

Ibn al-Athīr and al-Nuwayrī relate that as ‘Abd al-Mu’min was preparing to leave Ifrīqiya in 555/1160 he summoned the amirs of the Banū Riyāh, a Hilālī tribe that was then settled in that province, and asked them to provide him with 10,000 horsemen to help the Almohads defend al-Andalus from the Christians. The amirs agreed and sent the troops that had been requested of them. In private the Arabs resented ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s orders as they believed that his real intention was to remove their tribes from Ifrīqiya and resettle them in the west. After only two days of marching the Arab fighters slipped away from the caliph’s army near Jabal Zaghwān between Tunis and Qayrawān. The caliph continued his march to the vicinity of Constantine where he set up camp in a remote valley for twenty days taking care that the army’s whereabouts were kept secret. The Arabs assumed that ‘Abd al-Mu’min had been compelled to hurry back to al-Andalus and they let their guard down. When the moment was ripe the caliph sent out his sons Abū ‘Abdallāh and Abū Muḥammad at the head of a picked force. They surprised the Arabs at Jabal al-Qarn near Qayrawān while ‘Abd al-Mu’min followed closely behind with the main body. Together they inflicted a devastating defeat on the Arabs. The chief of the Banū Riyāh was killed and their families and possessions fell into the hands of the

---

<sup>42</sup>AL-NUWAYRĪ (Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb) : *op. cit.*, vol. 24, pp. 171-173; IBN AL-ATHĪR, *op. cit.*, vol. 9, pp. 428-431; ‘INĀN, *‘Aṣr al-Muwahhidīn*, vol. 1, pp. 293-297.

<sup>43</sup>IBN AL-ATHĪR (‘Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan) : *op. cit.*, vol. 9, p. 403.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 429-430.

enemy. ‘Abd al-Mu’min protected the dignity of the captured womenfolk and he returned them safely to the Riyāhī emissaries who came to Marrakech, just as he had done after the battle of Setif. After Jabal al-Qarn all of the Arab tribes in Ifrīqiya submitted to the caliph and their contingents joined him on his next campaign in al-Andalus. For the time being Ifrīqiya was quiet and pacified according to our chroniclers<sup>45</sup>.

### **Almohad Policy Towards the Arab Tribes and its Consequences**

The above account may be somewhat exaggerated as Huici Miranda suggests but it is nonetheless of considerable importance in that it sheds light on the Almohad policy towards the Hilālī and Sulaymī Arab tribes which had come to occupy significant territory in Ifrīqiya and the Central Maghrib in the previous century<sup>46</sup>. The Almohad caliphs, beginning with ‘Abd al-Mu’min, moved entire Arab tribes from their abodes in Ifrīqiya to al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā where they resettled them. This strategy of forced resettlement was connected to both the internal and external politics of the Almohad state.

One motive for this policy was ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s desire to counterbalance the influence of the original Almohad (Maṣmūda and Zanāta) tribes in the army<sup>47</sup>. ‘Abd al-Mu’min intended to create a hereditary caliphate that would be restricted to his descendants alone. Such a move was bound to create tension in Almohad ranks as it meant that Ibn Tūmart’s descendants would be excluded from the office of caliph. To further complicate matters the caliph had agreed early in his reign that he would be succeeded by Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar al-Hintātī who was one of the most influential companions of the *mahdī* Ibn Tūmart. In order to pave the way for his son’s accession the caliph went to great lengths to woo the Arabs. He treated the defeated Arab chiefs with great leniency after the battle of Setif (548/1153), showered them with gifts, and even proclaimed

---

<sup>45</sup>IBN AL-ATHĪR (‘Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan) : *op. cit.*, vol. 9, pp. 431-432; AL-NUWAYRĪ (Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb) : *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 173-175.

<sup>46</sup>HUICI MIRANDA (Ambrosio) : *op. cit.*, p. 184.

<sup>47</sup>AGUILAR SEBASTIÁN (Victoria) : « Aportación de los Arabes nómadas a la organización militar del ejército almohade », *Al Qantara*, 14, no. 2, 1993, p. 396-397.

that he shared a common Northern Arab (‘Adnānī and Muḍarī) ancestry with the Banū Hilāl and Banū Sulaym<sup>48</sup>. Since the Arabs were outsiders with no previous involvement in internal Almohad disputes ‘Abd al-Mu’min could count on their continued loyalty to his family alone. In 551/1156 ‘Abd al-Mu’min met in private with the Hilālī chiefs and told them to raise a great outcry and ask him to designate an heir from among his sons. While the Arabs created a public uproar and let it be known that they could only accept a son of ‘Abd al-Mu’min as the heir-apparent, ‘Abd al-Mu’min feigned innocence by protesting that Abū Ḥafṣ was the right person to succeed him. Abū Ḥafṣ understood very well what had transpired behind the scenes. He prudently withdrew his claim to the succession and hastened to give the *bay‘a* to Muḥammad, the eldest son of ‘Abd al-Mu’min<sup>49</sup>. This incident clearly demonstrates the importance of the Arab element in the internal policies of the Almohad caliphs<sup>50</sup>.

A second motive behind the forced resettlement of the Arabs was the pacification of Ifrīqīya and the Central Maghrib. It was hoped that the power of the Arabs in the eastern provinces could be diluted by removing some tribes to al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā where they would be surrounded by loyal Berber tribes and under the close watch of the caliph in Marrākush.

The third reason for the transfer of Arab tribes to the west was the need for their military services on the Andalusian front. The Arab tribesmen had a formidable reputation as soldiers in the western Islamic lands at this time<sup>51</sup>. They were particularly prized

---

<sup>48</sup>See **FIERRO (Maribel)** : « The Genealogies of ‘Abd al-Mu’min, the First Almohad Caliph », trans. Jeremy Rogers in Maribel Fierro, *The Almohad Revolution: Politics and Religion in the Islamic West during the Twelfth-Thirteenth Centuries*, Burlington, U.S.A., Ashgate, 2012, (non-continuous pagination).

<sup>49</sup>**LEVI-PROVENÇAL (Èvariste)** : *op. cit.*, no. 13, pp. 55-61; **IBN AL-ATHĪR (‘Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan)** : *op. cit.*, vol. 9, pp. 407-408; **AL-NUWAYRĪ (Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb)** : *op. cit.*, vol. 24, p. 169.

<sup>50</sup>Shortly before his death ‘Abd al-Mu’min decided that Muḥammad was unfit for the caliphate and he instead designated another son, Yūsuf, as his successor. Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar continued to serve the Almohads loyally in the capacity of vizier. His family (the Hafsids) remained very influential in the Almohad state as we shall see.

<sup>51</sup>**AGUILAR SEBASTIÁN (Victoria)** : *op. cit.*, p. 409.



as cavalry, much like their Turkic counterparts in the Mashriq during the same period. In contrast to the Turks, the Arab horsemen typically fought as lancers rather than mounted archers<sup>52</sup>. Their signature tactic was the *karr wa farr* (attack and retreat) which consisted of a series of fast, furious charges punctuated by abrupt withdrawals. These moves were calculated to confuse the enemy and draw him out of formation<sup>53</sup>.

The military value of the Arabs was reflected in their salaries which were considerably higher than those of other troops in the Almohad army. According to a passage from Ibn Ṣāhib al-Ṣalāt's *al-Mann bi al-Imāma*, the caliph Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf (558-580/1163-1184) commanded that ordinary fully-equipped infantrymen be paid eight dinars, unequipped infantry three dinars; fully equipped horsemen ten dinars, unequipped horsemen eight dinars. For the Arab troops a separate pay scale was applied: fully-equipped horsemen were to be paid twenty-five dinars each, unequipped horsemen fifteen dinars; and foot soldiers were to be paid seven dinars. Each minor Arab chief was to receive fifty dinars, and the major chiefs were to be paid two hundred<sup>54</sup>.

The resettlement of Hilālī and Sulaymī Arab tribes in al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā occurred on a large-scale during 'Abd al-Mu'min's reign following his conquest of the Central Maghrib (548/1153) and Ifriqīya (555/1160). This policy continued during the reigns of his successors Yūsuf (558/1163-580/1184) and Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr (580/1184-595/1199)<sup>55</sup>. In his *Kitāb al-'Ibar* Ibn Khaldūn recorded the distribution of the resettled tribes in al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā<sup>56</sup>. The Banū Riyāḥ (a major Hilālī tribe) were settled in northwestern Morocco in the coastal plain between Tangiers and Salā. The Jusham (a large Hilālī tribe with three important branches in al-

---

<sup>52</sup>GARCÍA FITZ (Francisco) : *Las Navas de Tolosa*, Barcelona, Ariel, 2005, pp. 327-328; LEV (Yaacov) : *Saladin in Egypt*, Leiden, Brill, 1999, pp. 145, 147.

<sup>53</sup>GARCÍA FITZ (Francisco) : *op. cit.*, pp. 326-329.

<sup>54</sup>IBN ṢĀḤIB AL-ṢĀLĀT : *Al-Mann bi al-Imāma*, ed. A.H. Tāzī, Beirut, 1964, p. 348, quoted in SEBASTIAN, *Aportación*, p. 407.

<sup>55</sup>See ḤASAN (Ḥasan 'Alī) : *Al-Ḥadāra al-Islāmīya fī al-Andalus wa al-Maghrib: 'Aṣr al-Murābiṭīn wa al-Muwahḥidīn*, Cairo, Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1980, pp. 310-312.

<sup>56</sup>IBN KHALDŪN ('Abd al-Rahmān) : *op. cit.*, vol. 6, pp. 37-53, 77-93; HASAN (Ḥasan 'Alī) : *op. cit.*, p. 315 (map).

Maghrib al-Aqṣā: Khulṭ, Banū Jābir, and Sufyān) and some clans of the Hilālī Athbaj were settled in the fertile plain of Tāmasnā (the region bounded by Wādī Abū Raḡraq to its north, Wādī Tansīft in the south, the Atlas mountains in the east, and the Atlantic in the west). According to Ibn Khaldūn the Jusham maintained their traditional nomadic lifestyle in Tāmasnā for a while but eventually they settled down and took up agriculture during the Marinid period<sup>57</sup>.

The Banū Maʿqil (a tribe of Qaḥṭānī origin that took part in the great Hilālī migration of the eleventh century) had three major sub-tribes: the Dhawū ʿUbaydallāh, Dhawū Maṣṣūr, and the Dhawū Ḥassān. These tribes roamed the deserts to the east and south of al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā and together their abodes formed a rough crescent. The Dhawū ʿUbaydallāh were the northernmost tribe. They controlled an area south of Tlemcen that extended westwards as far as Tāwṛīrt (a northern Moroccan city just over 100 kilometers west of the modern Algerian-Moroccan border). The Dhawū Maṣṣūr in the center of the crescent controlled Wādī Mulūya and Wādī Tāfilalt. The Dhawū Ḥassān controlled a swath of territory extending from Wādī Darʿa to the Atlantic coastline, including the region around Wādī Sūs<sup>58</sup>.

Fitz and Nawwāra present evidence which suggests that the Almohads resettled many Hilālī Arabs in al-Andalus as well as al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā<sup>59</sup>. It is important to note that a considerable number of the Jusham and Riyāḥ remained in the Central Maghrib and Ifrīqīya since they took part in the wars between the Almohads and the Banū Ghāniya in both regions during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

The impact of the resettled Arab tribes on the Almohad state was considerable. We have already seen that they played a role in converting the state into a hereditary caliphate ruled by the family of ʿAbd al-Muʿmin. When the Almohad Empire began to decline in the 1220s these same tribes played an important part in the civil wars and succession disputes which sapped its strength. A notable

---

<sup>57</sup>IBN KHALDŪN (ʿAbd al-Rahmān) : *op. cit.*, vol. 6, pp. 37-38.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*, vol. 6, p. 77.

<sup>59</sup>GARCÍA FITZ (Francisco) : *op. cit.*, pp. 331-332; SHARQĪ (Nawwāra) : *op. cit.*, p. 54.

example of such intervention by the Arab tribes was the civil war between the caliph al-Ma'mūn (626/1229-630/1232), who was supported primarily by the Khulṭ, and Yaḥyā al-Mu'taṣim (624/1227-626/1229) who drew support from the Banū Sufyān. The Khulṭ were a major source of instability during the reign of al-Rashīd (630/1232-640/1242). When the Almohad caliph al-Sa'īd (640/1242-646/1248) undertook an expedition against the Ziyānids (Banū 'Abd al-Wād) of Tlemcen, factional fighting between the Arab contingents in his army indirectly caused his defeat and death at the hands of the enemy<sup>60</sup>.

Even more important than their role in the decline of the Almohad state was the long-term impact that the Arabs had on the population of al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā. There was a high degree of intermarriage between the Arab newcomers and the Berbers in the Atlantic coastal plains of Morocco which resulted in the rapid spread of the Arabic language and the realignment of old tribal structures<sup>61</sup>.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- 'ABBĀS (Iḥsān) and NAJM (Muḥammad Yūsuf) : *Lībīyā fī Kutub al-Jughrāfiya wa al-Riḥlāt*, Benghazi, Dār Lībīyā li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī', 1968.

-AL-BAYDHAQ (Abū Bakr b. 'Alī al-Ṣanhājī) : *Akhbār al-Mahdī Ibn Tūmart wa Bidāyat al-Dawlat al-Muwaḥḥidīya*, Rabat, Dār al-Manṣūr, 1971.

-AL-NUWAYRĪ (Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb) : *Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab*, 31 vols, Cairo, al-Hay'a al-Miṣrīya al-'Āmma li al-Kitāb, 1933-.

-AL-TIJĀNĪ (Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad) : *Riḥla*, ed. Ḥasan Ḥusnī 'Abd al-Wahhāb, Tunis, al-Maṭba'a al-Rasmīya, 1958.

-ANONYMOUS : *al-Ḥulal al-Mawshīya fī Dhikr al-Akhbār al-Marrākushīya*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār and 'Abd al-Qādir Zammām, Casablanca, Dār al-Rashād al-Ḥadītha, 1979.

<sup>60</sup> See IBN KHALDŪN ('Abd al-Rahmān) : *op. cit.*, vol. 6, pp. 37-43.

<sup>61</sup> SHARQĪ (Nawwāra) : *op. cit.*, p. 59; HASAN (Ḥasan 'Alī) : *op. cit.*, pp. 319-20.

- IBN ABĪ ZAR‘AL-FĀSĪ** : *Rawḍ al-Qirṭās*, Rabat, Dār al-Manṣūr, 1972.
- IBN AL-ATHĪR** (‘**Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan**) : *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, 11 vols., ed. Abū al-Fidā’ ‘Abdallāh al-Qāḍī, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmīya, 1987.
- IBN KHALDŪN** (‘**Abd al-Rahmān**) : *Al-‘Ibar wa Dīwān al-Mubtada’ wa al-Khabar*, 8 vols., ed. Khalīl Shahāda and Suhayl Zakkār, Beirut, Dār al-Fikr, 2001.
- IBN ṢĀḤIB AL-ṢALĀT** : *Al-Mann bi al-Imāma*, ed. A.H. Tāzī, Beirut, 1964.
- IBN SA‘ĪD AL-MAGHRIBĪ AL-ANDALUSĪ** (‘**Alī b. Mūsā**) : *Nashwat al-Ṭarab fī Tārīkh Jāhilīyat al-‘Arab*, Part 2, ed. Nuṣrat ‘Abd al-Rahmān, Amman, Maktabat al-Aqṣā, 1982.
- LEVI-PROVENÇAL (Évariste)** : *Majmū‘ Rāsā’il Muwaḥḥidīya*, Rabat, al-Maṭba‘a al-Iqtiṣādīya, 1941.

### Studies

- AGUILAR SEBASTIÁN (Victoria)** : « Aportación de los Arabes nómadas a la organización militar del ejército almohade », *Al Qantara*, 14, no. 2, 1993, 393-417.
- AL-BARGHŪTHĪ** (‘**Abd al-Laṭīf Maḥmūd**) : *Tārīkh Lībīyā al-Islāmī min al-Fatḥ al-Islāmī ḥattā Bidāyat al-‘Aṣr al-‘Uthmānī*, Beirut, Dār Ṣādir, 1973.
- ‘**AZZĀWĪ (Aḥmad)** : *Qadāyā Tārīkhīya khilāl al-‘Aṣrayn al-Muwaḥḥidī wa al-Marīnī*, Rabat, Rabā Nīt, Diyūr al-Jāmi’, 2010.
- BOSCH VILÁ (Jacinto)** : *Los Almorávides*, Granada, Editorial Universidad de Granada, 1998.
- BURESI (Pascal) and EL AALLAOUI (Hicham)** : *Governing the Empire: Provincial Administration in the Almohad Empire (1224-1269)*, trans. Travis Bruce, Leiden, Brill, 2013.
- FIERRO (Maribel)** : « The Genealogies of ‘Abd al-Mu’min, the First Almohad Caliph », trans. Jeremy Rogers in Maribel Fierro, *The Almohad Revolution: Politics and Religion in the Islamic West during the Twelfth-Thirteenth Centuries*, Burlington, U.S.A., Ashgate, 2012, (non-continuous pagination).
- GARCÍA FITZ (Francisco)** : *Las Navas de Tolosa*, Barcelona, Ariel, 2005.

-**ḤASAN (Ḥasan ‘Alī)** : *Al-Ḥaḍara al-Islāmīya fī al-Andalus wa al-Maghrib: ‘Aṣr al-Murābiṭīn wa al-Muwaḥḥidīn*, Cairo, Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1980.

-**HUICI MIRANDA (Ambrosio)** : *al-Tārīkh al-Sīyāsī li-al-Imbrāṭūrīya al-Muwaḥḥidīya*, trans. ‘Abd al-Wāḥid Akmīr, Rabat, al-Zamān, 2004.

-**‘INĀN (Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh)** : *Dawlat al-Islām fī al-Andalus: ‘Aṣr al-Murābiṭīn wa al-Muwaḥḥidīn fī al-Maghrib wa al-Andalus*, 2 vols, Cairo, Lajnat al-Ta’ālīf, 1964.

-**LEV (Yaacov)** : *Saladin in Egypt*, Leiden, Brill, 1999.

-**MAZHŪDĪ (Mas‘ūd)** : *Jabal Nafūsa mundhu Intishār al-Islām ḥattā Hijrat Banī Hilāl ilā bilād al-Maghrib: 642-1053, 21-442*, Rabat [?], Mu’assasat Tāwālt, 2003.

-**SA‘ĪDĪ (A.)** : « Tawḥīd al-Maghrib fī ‘Ahd al-Muwaḥḥidīn », in *Tārīkh Ifrīqīyā al-‘Amm*, vol. 4, pp. 35-73, ed. J.T. Nīyānī, Beirut, UNESCO, 1988.

-**SHARQĪ (Nawwāra)** : « Al-Ḥayāt al-Ijtimā‘īya fī al-Gharb al-Islāmī fī ‘Ahd al-Muwaḥḥidīn: 524/1126-667/1268 », MA thesis, Algiers University, 2007-2008.