The Formation of the Civilian Elite in the Syrian Province: The Case of Ayyubid and Early Mamluk Ḥamāh

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades our knowledge of urban history in northern Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt during the post-formative period has continuously increased. Studies such as those by Douglas Patton on Zangid Mosul, Anne-Marie Eddé on Ayyubid Aleppo, Louis Pouzet on thirteenth-century Damascus, Michael Chamberlain on thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Damascus, Carl Petry on fifteenth-century Cairo, Bernadette Martel-Thoumian on the fifteenth-century Mamluk state, and others have added significantly to our knowledge of pre-modern Middle Eastern society. A particular concern of these studies has been the section of the population that Petry termed the “civilian elite,” i.e., the ulama and the non-military administrative personnel whom biographers regarded as notables.

The present article further extends this stream of research by discussing the
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example of the middle-sized north Syrian town of Ḥamāh during the period from the late sixth/twelfth to the eighth/fourteenth centuries. This urban settlement, situated on the banks of the Orontes River and with a population of some 7,000 during the period considered here, tended to stand in the shadow of neighboring Aleppo and Damascus. In the late fourth/tenth century it was included within the Aleppan realms of the Hamdanid ruler Sayf al-Dawlah (d. 356/967). In the following century this status of dependency continued with Hamāh either in the Fatimid sphere of influence or subject to Bedouin, especially Mirdasid, domination typical of this period in northern Syria. With the Saljuq conquest of Aleppo in 479/1086 Ḥamāh became a bone of contention in conflicts between the autonomous Saljuq rulers in the Syrian lands. It changed hands repeatedly until the founder of the Burid dynasty in Damascus, Ṭughtigin (d. 522/1128), incorporated it into his realm in 517/1123. This period ended with the conquest by the Zangids who in 530/1135 included the town in their emerging empire, which gradually extended into Syria and al-Jazirah. During the Ayyubid period the princes of Ḥamāh gained some degree of independence within the Ayyubid family confederation after Şalâh al-Din had handed over the town to his nephew al-Malik al-Muẓaffar I ʿUmar (r. 574–87/1178–91). Al-Muẓaffar’s descendants and other members of the Ayyubid family were able to rule the town, with short interruptions, well into the early Mamluk period when this last Syrian Ayyubid principality was finally absorbed into the Mamluk administrative system in the 730s/1330s.

From an economic perspective, Ḥamāh could draw on the fertile soil of the surrounding lands, ample water supplies, and its location on the main north-south trade axis linking Aleppo and Damascus. However, while Egypt experienced economic prosperity during the fifth/eleventh century, the northern Syrian towns, like their north Mesopotamian and Iraqi counterparts, experienced a period of urban stagnation or even decline. The weakening of fiscal institutions and the near-complete absence of building activities during this period was
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characteristic of this decline. The predominant Bedouin rulers of northern Syria did little to support the region’s urban network. With the establishment of Saljuq rule the towns of the region experienced a renaissance that continued during the Zangid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk periods. The Saljuqs’ measures, especially those of the regional Atabeg dynasties, aimed at supporting their urban basis, most importantly through a reorganization of the fiscal system, and were accompanied by increased building activities. 

The disastrous Syrian earthquake in the year 552/1157 was a setback in the case of Hamah’s ascendancy. The epicenter was close to the town and further seismic shocks followed in subsequent months. The destruction of the infrastructure must have been massive and the loss of human life considerable. The estimation of an Andalusian traveller who visited the town some fifteen years after the catastrophe, that of the purportedly 25,000 inhabitants of the town only 70 men survived, is certainly exaggerated. However, the chronicles show that this earthquake was estimated to be among the most disastrous catastrophes in the Syrian lands during the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth century. Anecdotes played, as is typical in premodern historiography, a crucial role in structuring the earthquake narrative. For instance, the Zangid chronicler Ibn al-Athîr included a report on a teacher leaving the teaching premises shortly before the earthquake. Not only did all of his students perish, but their relatives who might have inquired in the following days about the children’s fate also did not survive. In the same vein, later topographical descriptions of Hamah are centered on this event. The only diachronic passage in Ibn al-ʿAdîm’s seventh/thirteenth-century description of the town, for instance, sets the earthquake at center stage, and mentions the castle’s
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destruction and the following efforts at refortification. The consequences for the civilian elite are reflected in references to scholars who either perished in the earthquake or left the town in its aftermath. However, Ḥamāh soon recovered and continued to enjoy “[i]n the Ayyūbid period, and during the governorship of Abū ’l-Fidāʾ, . . . true prosperity.” This prosperity can be seen here, as elsewhere, in increased building activities, especially with regard to madrasahs, which will be discussed below.

The present article traces this urban renaissance in more detail by focusing on the civilian elite. The construction of a high number of endowed madrasahs provided the financial basis for a variety of civilian careers. However, the source material currently available precludes a systematic examination of career patterns based on endowments in the case of a middle-sized town such as Ḥamāh. Consequently, the following discussion will focus on holders of judgeships and will be subsequently supplemented by the fragmentary material available on khaṭībs, secretaries, and posts in madrasahs. This discussion will show the gradual formation of an indigenous civilian elite during this period that was increasingly able to monopolize the crucial civilian posts in the town.

The purpose of the present article in engaging with the case of the civilian elite in Ḥamāh is twofold. Firstly, it has a descriptive outlook, namely to give an overview of those names that appear repeatedly when studying the civilian elite of the town. In the course of the description it will become evident that the basic unit of the civilian elite organization was the elite household. In this sense the article describes how such families established themselves in a provincial town. Secondly, it puts forth the argument that the urban renaissance in northern Syria set the framework for the development of a strong civilian elite from the second half of the sixth/twelfth century onwards. Furthermore, this urban elite took on a

decisively local character during the seventh/thirteenth century and the first half of the eighth/fourteenth century. 

Owing to the historiographical nature of the available sources, the focus is on chronicles and biographical dictionaries. The rise of historical writing from the seventh/thirteenth century allows the formation of the civilian elite, even in considering the case of a middle-sized town such as Ḥamāh, to be traced in some detail. This is because the prosperity enjoyed by the town also encouraged the publication of a multitude of historical works. Not only two rulers of the town, al-Malik al-Manṣūr I Muhammad and Abū al-Fidāʾ, but also a number of scholars or administrators from the town, such as Ibn al-Naẓīf (d. after 634/1236–37), Ibn Abī al-Dam (d. 642/1244), the latter’s relative Ibn Wāṣil (d. 697/1298), and ʿAlī al-Muẓaffarī Ibn al-Mughayzil (d. 701/1302), composed chronicles. Despite the fact that the royal chronicles are of rather limited interest for any inquiry into a field beyond politics, Ibn al-Naẓīf’s work 16 is rather focused on the neighboring town of Homs, and most of Ibn Abī al-Dam’s chronicle is lost, 17 these works, especially the chronicle of Ibn Wāṣil and its supplement by Ibn al-Mughayzil, allow insights into the town’s development. Although these insights cannot be compared with those gained for major urban centers, such as Cairo, Damascus, and Aleppo, the focus on this middle-sized town is a crucial addition to our understanding of urban society in the Syrian lands during the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries.

ḤAMĀH’S GROWING PROSPERITY: MADRASAHS AND THE CIVILIAN ELITE

The considerable ascent of Ḥamāh after the earthquake setback in 552/1157 can be traced by turning to the building activities within the town, which are well illustrated by the number of endowed madrasahs. These testify to the dynamic development of the urban infrastructure during the late Zangid, Ayyubid, and early Mamluk periods. The starting point of this development in Ḥamāh was in the late Zangid period under the Sultan Nūr al-Dīn (d. 569/1174). Nūr al-Dīn initiated a considerable building project encompassing representative and functional buildings, not only in the major towns of his realms such as Damascus

and Aleppo but also in middle-sized towns such as Baalbek and Ḥamāh. In Ḥamāh he built two madrasahs, one Shafi‘i and one Hanafi, in addition to the mosque in the lower town with a hospital next to it. The Shafi‘i madrasah, the ‘Aṣrūnīyah, was built for Sharaf al-Dīn Ibn Abī ‘Aṣrūn (d. 585/1189), who indeed taught there at least once. It was situated, similarly to the Hanafi madrasah, in the market area of the lower town. Eminent scholars of the indigenous civilian elite, such as the town’s Shaykh al-shuyūkh Tāj al-Dīn Āḥmad Ibn al-Mughayzil (d. 687/1288) and the town’s judge ‘Īmād al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim (d. 652/1254), taught there. In the following century, members of the ruling Ayyubid family endowed additional madrasahs. Al-Malik al-Manṣūr I Muḥammad (d. 617/1221) founded the Shafi‘i Madrasah al-Manṣūriyah. This madrasah proved attractive even to a prominent scholar from outside the town, Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmīdī (d. 631/1233), its first teacher. In the later Ayyubid period Mu‘nisah Khāṭūn bint al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Māhmūd (d. 703/1303) endowed the Madrasah al-Khāṭūniyah. She was the paternal aunt of the town’s last Ayyubid ruler during the Mamluk period, Abū al-Fād (r. 710–32/1310–32). Having acted herself as attending authority (musmī‘ah) in scholarly readings she provided this school with a generous endowment. Abū al-Fād himself endowed the Madrasah al-Mu‘āyyadiyah (also known as al-Khaṭībiyah), in which members of grand Hamawian families such as Abū al-Lātīf Ibn al-Mughayzil (d. 690/1291) and Šadr al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn al-Bārizī (d. 875/1470) taught.


22 Ibn al-ʿAdim, Bugyat, 10:4581.
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24 Al-Dhahabi, Mufarrij, 4:78, 80.
a freedman of al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd, set up the Hanafī Madrasah al-Ṭawāshiyah. Finally, members of the civilian elite endowed a number of madrasahs, which illustrates the wealth of these families of notables. Among these civilian founders were Najm al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ghuffār Ibn al-Mughayzil (d. 688/1289–90), Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Rahmān (d. 659/1261), khaṭīb of the Great/Upper Mosque, and Mukhlīṣ al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Ibn Qarnās (d. 648/1248).

This rise of the madrasah as an urban institution from the mid-sixth/twelfth century onwards was paralleled by the formation of an urban elite that was firmly entrenched within the town itself. In contrast, the sources are almost completely silent, typically for northern Syria, with regard to the civilian elite in Ḥamāh in the preceding period. This might be explained as a result of chronological distance in the case of the works composed during the seventh/thirteenth century, such as the chronicle Mirāṭ al-Zamān by Sībī al-Jawzī (d. 654/1256) or the biographical dictionaries Wafayāt al-ʿA’yān by Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1281–82), Muḥjam al-ʿUdabāʾ by Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī (d. 626/1229), and Bughayt al-Ṭalab by Ibn al-ʿAdīm (d. 660/1262), which rendered the events or persons linked to minor towns of limited significance. However, even a contemporary work such as Ibn ʿĀsāʾir’s (d. 571/1176) Tārīkh Madīnāt Dimashq, which covers the Syrian scholars well beyond the borders of the town of Damascus, has little to say about scholars originating from or being active in Ḥamāh—in contrast to those linked, for example, to neighboring Homs. Even appointments to the most eminent position, the chief judgeship, can only be traced systematically starting with the late sixth/twelfth century. This picture is not altered when taking into account
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32 In Ibn al-ʿAdīm’s biographical dictionary of Aleppo (Bughayt al-Ṭalab), for instance, nineteen entries refer to individuals linked to Ḥamāh, of which five persons are only superficially connected to the town. Of the remaining fourteen, eight lived partly or mostly in the seventh/thirteenth century and only four in the sixth/twelfth century.
33 In the only complete edition of the work (the commercial Dār al-Fikr edition) Ḥamāh is referred to 17 times, while neighboring Homs has some 700 entries. These numbers match my impression gained from the published volumes of the scholarly Majmāʾ al-Lughah edition.
34 Similar to the case of al-Raqqaḥ, where the names of the chief judges are only known from the mid-sixth/twelfth century onwards (Heidemann, Renaissance, 284–85).

the works produced in Ḥamāh: while chronicles such as those by Abū al-Fidāʾ or Ibn Wāṣil are indispensable in order to trace the civilian elite starting with the second half of the sixth/twelfth century, they have little to say about earlier periods.

Considering the civilian elite, a striking feature becomes apparent that parallels the rise of the madrasah and which hints again at the mid-late sixth/twelfth century as a decisive turning point in the urban history of the Syrian lands: the first relevant persons, in a sense the “founding fathers,” of those families that came to dominate the civilian elite in the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods in Ḥamāh were active during this period (Banū Rawāḥah, Banū al-Bahrānī, Banū Qarnāṣ) or in the following decades of the early seventh/thirteenth century (Banū al-Bārizī, Banū al-Mughayzil). The formation of this civilian elite, particularly the indigenous civilian elite, will be discussed in the following in three sections: First, appointments to the Shafiʿi judgeship, the crucial position in the town, are considered. This is followed by an analysis of the khaṭībs, secretaries, and non-Shafiʿi judges. Finally, those grand scholarly families of the town that did not hold a large number of civilian posts will be discussed.

THE SHAFIʿI JUDGESHIP: LOCALS AND COSMOPOLITANS
Ḥamāh became, as was typical for the region, dominated by the Shafiʿi school of law and affiliation with it became one of the prerequisites for attaining prestigious religious posts during the Zangid and subsequent periods. All the grand local households discussed below were Shafiʿi. This madhhab was sponsored by the political elite, which furthered its dominant role. For instance, the town’s last Ayyubid ruler, Abū al-Fidāʾ, and its Mamluk governor Sanjar were both themselves Shafiʿi jurisprudents35 who supported the madhhab. This dominance is evident in the appointments to the town’s judgeship during the early phase of the period considered here. The judgeship of Ḥamāh had initially not been explicitly restricted to any specific school of law. It was only with the introduction of the other madhhab’s judgeships in the late seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries that this judgeship became to be nominally attached to the Shafiʿi community. However, despite the theoretical possibility that a non-Shafiʿi scholar might be appointed before this introduction of madhhab-affiliated posts, the Shafiʿis were able, owing to their dominance, to monopolise the post entirely.

Appointments to the Shafiʿi judgeship (cf. fig. 1) followed, with regard to the geographical origin of the post holders, distinctively different patterns during the period considered here. While individuals from outside the town prevailed in the first stage until the early seventh/thirteenth century, the local elite dominated

this post in the following 150 years until the mid-eighth/fourteenth century. Thereupon, the post holders’ provenance became significantly more varied and the dominance of the local elite started to vanish. These different patterns indicate two alternative career patterns—that changed in importance over time—which led to the post.

In the first and third phase, a “cosmopolitan” profile was decisive for the candidate’s appointment. It was crucial to belong to trans-regional networks of learning and/or political power. Many of the post holders, especially during the first phase, were distinguished scholars who had the prestige of having studied with the grand scholars of their time. In the third phase candidates belonged more often to the trans-regional Mamluk civilian elite. Owing to the integration of trans-regional networks, judges who left the post voluntarily or involuntarily during both phases frequently moved on to take up positions in other towns and regions.

In the second phase, in contrast, post holders typically had a “local” profile, i.e., they were closely integrated into the local network of influential families. Generally, they were born into one of the grand families and followed a career centered on the town, especially holding other (minor) posts before attaining the judgeship. In contrast to the preceding and following phases, judges often held the post until an advanced age or death. Those who left the post voluntarily or involuntarily tended to remain within the town, as it was here that they had networks that had been—and often continued to be—crucial for their career.

The Shafīʿi Judgeship from 559/1164 to 616/1219: The Cosmopolitans’ Period

During the first sixty years of the period under discussion cosmopolitan scholars from outside the town played an important role in appointments to the judgeship. Initially these scholars originated in particular from the eastern lands, more specifically Mosul, the Zangid dynasty’s first stronghold. In a sense the Zangids “imported” prestigious scholars from their possessions in the East to newly conquered towns such as Ḥamāh. These scholars tended to hold the post—typical for the cosmopolitan career pattern—only for a limited period and soon moved on to other urban centers.

The first judge, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Anṣārī (d. 600/1203), came from Mosul under the Zangid Nūr al-Dīn. He stayed in the post for eight years, but then moved on further west in order to settle in Egypt, where he was appointed
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36 The differentiation between “cosmopolitans” and “locals” is based on Merton’s terminology; cf. his “Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials,” in Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, 3rd ed. (New York, 1968), 441–74.
to the judgementship of the Upper Egyptian town of Asyūt. The second judge, Diyāʿ al-Dīn al-Qāsim Ibn al-Shahrāzūrī (d. 599/1203), held the judgementship twice: he had left Ḥamāh after his first appointment in order to move to Baghdad, where he was also appointed judge. However, after his deposition in Baghdad he had to return to Ḥamāh, where he filled the post again for some months until his death. Ibn al-Shahrāzūrī belonged to a family which held high offices throughout the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries in Syria and Iraq. His paternal uncle, Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 576/1176), like al-Anṣārī, came from Mosul and had been appointed by Nūr al-Dīn to the judgementship of Damascus and Aleppo simultaneously.

That this family originated from Mosul and subsequently gained a great reputation within Syria parallels the shift of the Zangids’ power base from the East westwards. This shift also became apparent in the nominations to the judgementship in Ḥamāh: after the first decades of Zangid rule, post holders were increasingly recruited from the Syrian lands. The early seventh/thirteenth-century judge Najm al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Ibn Abī ‘Aṣrūn (d. 622/1225), for instance, was the son of the aforementioned Sharaf al-Dīn Ibn Abī ‘Aṣrūn, for whom Nūr al-Dīn had built the Shafi‘i madrasah of the town. Sharaf al-Dīn had succeeded Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrāzūrī in the position of the most eminent Shafi‘i scholar in the Syrian lands and more specifically he had taken over the judgementship in Damascus. It was the family’s cosmopolitan prestige that allowed his son to hold office in Aleppo and Ḥamāh, where he was twice judge and also vizier. Najm al-Dīn is in this sense representative of a transition period: his family still had hardly any connections to the local elite of Ḥamāh, but it was already well-placed within the civilian elite of the Syrian lands.

In this early period there are already three cases which hint at the developing local elite, most importantly two judges belonging to the al-Bahrānī family (cf. fig. 2 with sources), Amin al-Dawlah/Dīn al-Ḥusayn (d. 587/1191) and Aḥmad Ibn Mudrak (d. 590/1194 or 591/1195). This family also continued to play a remarkable role in the following seventh/thirteenth century. Two additional members of the family, Muḥyī al-Dīn Hamzah (d. 663/1264–65) and Muwaffaq al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 699/1300), were appointed judges in 642/1244–45 and


697/1298 respectively. Other members of the family focused on scholarship without attaining formal positions of importance, such as Muḥy al-Dīn’s wife Ṣafiyat (d. 646/1248), one of the grand female hadith scholars of her time; Muwaffaq al-Dīn Nabā’/Muḥammad (d. 665/1267), a hadith scholar who was at least appointed repetitor (muʾīd) in Cairo; as well as ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad (d. 654/1256) and Muḥy al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (d. 688/1289), son and grandson of Ṣafiyat respectively.

The third relevant case—although he only briefly held office—is Zayn al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn al-Raʾfāʾ (d. 617/1220), who originated from Kafartāb (some 40 km to the north of the town). He moved on to take the judgeship of neighboring Bārīn (some 40 km southwest of the town). His son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (d. 662/1263) was to become the shaykh al-shuyūkh of Ḥamāh and entered the networks of the Hamawian civilian elite by marrying his daughters to members of the influential al-Mughayzil family. However, it is significant that neither the indigenous al-Bahrānī family nor Ibn al-Raʾfāʾ were yet able to control the post more tightly. Both lost it to Ibn Abī ʿAṣrūn, the outsider who was twice appointed to the post.

Tellingly, Ibn Abī ʿAṣrūn’s second office—the last of the cosmopolitan period—came to an end owing to his involvement in an event that had implications well beyond the confines of the town: the Ibn al-Mashṭūb revolt of 616–17/1219–20. ʿImād al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn al-Mashṭūb (d. 619/1225), a high-ranking Kurdish amir and son of the aforementioned madrasah founder Sayf al-Dīn Ibn al-Mashṭūb, had been exiled from Egypt after an attempted revolt against the sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil (r. 615–35/1218–38). He found refuge in Ḥamāh and subsequently entered the service of the strongman in northern Syria, al-Malik al-Ashraf Mūsā (r. 607–17/1210–20 in Diyarbakr), whom he challenged soon after. Al-Malik al-Manṣūr I Muḥammad of Ḥamāh supported him financially and provided armed men. Furthermore, he authorised Ibn Abī ʿAṣrūn, to whom Ibn al-Mashṭūb had promised an appointment as judge in the lands that were to be brought under his control, to resign and to participate in the endeavour. ʿImād al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn al-Mashṭūb revolt of 616–17/1219–20.

Ibn Abī ʿAṣrūn was arrested after Ibn al-Mashṭūb’s defeat and the entire correspondence with rulers of the region as well as copies of the oath of allegiance to be sworn by those allied with Ibn al-Mashṭūb were found in his possession. Nevertheless, in contrast to Ibn al-Mashṭūb, who perished in al-Ashraf’s captivity, Ibn Abī ʿAṣrūn was liberated owing to his family connections, which went well

beyond Ḥamāh. It was Fakhr al-Din ibn Shaykh al-Shuyūkh (d. 647/1250), the influential member of the Damascene Ḥamawayh family, which had intermarried with the Banū Abī ʿAṣrūn, who came as Egyptian envoy to al-Ashraf’s court. He convinced al-Ashraf to release Ibn Abī ʿAṣrūn, who returned to Ḥamāh without regaining a formal position of influence. 44

The Shafī‘ Judgeship from 616/1219 to 764/1363: The Domination of the Locals

With Ibn Abī ʿAṣrūn’s resignation in the early seventh/thirteenth century the second period in the recruitment pattern for the judgeship began. For some 150 years the judgeship was entirely monopolized by local scholars while cosmopolitan outsiders, be they from the neighboring large towns of Aleppo and Damascus or from Mosul, ceased to play an important role in Ḥamāh. In this period the urban renaissance began to bear fruit and a strong local civilian elite was able to gain complete control over the post. Particularly notable with regard to the judgeship were three of the town’s grand families, the Banū Wāṣīl, the Banū al-Bahrānī discussed above, and the Banū al-Bārizī.

The al-Bārizī family (cf. fig. 3) 45 was at the very core of the Hamawian civilian elite. It was able to monopolise the judgeship for some 120 years during the late seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries with only one interruption. The first notable individual of this family, Shams al-Dīn Ibrāhīm I (d. 669/1270), 46 specialised in jurisprudence, and taught and studied in various Syrian towns until he settled in his hometown. Here he taught, composed works, issued fatwas, and was finally appointed as the town’s judge. He bequeathed this position upon his death to his deputy and son Najm al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm I (d. 683/1284), 47 a multidisciplinary scholar. Najm al-Dīn was deposed after some ten years of holding office in favour of Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Wāṣīl (see below), but this did not loosen the grip of the Banū al-Bārizī on the post. A member of the clan
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44 Ibn Wāṣīl, Mufarrij, 4:76–77.


was reappointed two years after Ibn Wāṣil’s death and a short interlude by one of the Banū al-Bahramī, Muwaffaq al-Dīn Muhammad (d. 699/1300).

This member was Sharaf al-Dīn Hibat Allāh I (d. 738/1338), 48 Najm al-Dīn’s son, who was the most famous member of his family. He not only held the judgeship for forty years, but was also wealthy enough to dispense with the salary. Although he was offered the judgeship in Egypt, he preferred to stay within the confines of his hometown where he was embedded via his family into a tight network with members of the civilian elite. He passed the post on to his grandson and deputy Najm al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm II (d. 764/1363), 49 whose death marked the end of the Banū al-Bārizī’s grip on the judgeship. However, the influence of the family extended beyond the judgeship to other posts so that it was able to retain crucial influence in the town despite having lost control of the judgeship. Further civilian posts held by this family in Ḥamāh included the deputyship of the judge, 50 teaching positions, 51 and administrative positions (kāṭīb al-sīr, 52 wakīl bayt al-māl, 53 and vizier 54).

Members of the family were still appointed in the following decades to the judgeship. Now it was the second main line of al-Bārizīs in Ḥamāh—going back to Sharaf al-Dīn’s brother Kamāl al-Dīn Muhammad I (d. 698/1299)—that started to play a more prominent role. 55 However, the careers of Kamāl al-Dīn’s descendants show that the al-Bārizīs had been transformed from a typical local family of Ḥamāh into one with a cosmopolitan outlook. Nāṣir al-Dīn Muhammad II (d. 823/1420), 56 Kamāl al-Dīn’s great-grandson, quickly abandoned the judgeship in

51 Besides several judges of the family who obviously taught in addition to their juridical tasks, mention can be made of Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad I.
52 Cf. Sharaf al-Dīn Hībat Allāh II (mentioned in the biography of his son Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad III: al-Sakhāwī, Al-Dawʾ, 10:69) and the aforementioned Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Umar.
54 Cf. Shīhāb al-Dīn Ahmad II.
order to become secretary of the chancellery in Ḥamāh, judge in Aleppo, and finally secretary of the chancellery in Egypt. Here, his descendants attained positions in the Mamluk military and administrative elite.⁵⁷ His son Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad I (d. 822/1419),⁵⁸ who opted for a military career, rose to such high rank that the sultan al-Malik al-Muʿayyad (815–24/1412–21) attended his funeral. The other son, Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad III (d. 856/1452), succeeded his father in the post of kātib al-sīr in Egypt, which he held alternately with the same post in Damascus where he was also appointed chief judge for a while. He married into the sultan’s family and the reigning sultan, al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Jaqmaq (842–57/1438–53), was present at his funeral.⁵⁹

Back in Ḥamāh, Sharaf al-Dīn’s great grandson Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad I (d. 812/1409–10)⁶⁰ reinstated the pivotal role of his family in the town’s judgship. Although the family was no longer able to monopolize the post, two more al-Bārizī judges in the ninth/fifteenth century, Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 875/1470)⁶¹ and Sirāj al-Dīn ʿUmar (b. 844/1440),⁶² are evidence of continuing influence. However, these appointments hint again at the transformation of the al-Bārizīs from a local to a cosmopolitan family. Appointments of family members in Ḥamāh now depended less on a local network than on the influence of the developing Egyptian al-Bārizī branch. For instance, it was Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad III who interceded with Sultan Jaqmaq in Egypt for the appointment of Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad to the judgeship of Ḥamāh.⁶³

Another family, besides the Banū al-Bārizī and the Banū al-Bahrānī, that was of some importance for the judgeship was the Banū Wāṣil. This clan played a role in the civilian elite of Ḥamāh throughout the seventh/thirteenth century. Three members of the family were appointed judges: Sālim (d. 629/1232),⁶⁴ the


⁵⁷ Their integration into the Egyptian civilian and military elite is also evident in marriage patterns: such relations were established with the crucial civilian and military households. In the mid-ninth/fifteenth century the al-Bārizīs were one of the families with whom such alliances were regularly sought (cf. Martel-Thoumian, Civils, 258–60).

⁵⁸ Ibn Taḥḥībīdī, Al-Nūjūm, 14:159.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 16:13–18.

⁶⁰ Al-Sakhāwī, Al-Ḍaw’, 8:236.

⁶¹ Ibid., 10:24–25. Sadr al-Dīn taught also in the Madrasah al-Mukhlīṣiyah that had been endowed by Mukhlīṣ al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Ibn Qārnāṣ (d. 648/1248).

⁶² Ibid., 6:131.

⁶³ Ibid., 10:24–25.

⁶⁴ On the dates of Sālim’s judgship cf. Ibn Wāṣil, Mufarrīj, 4:118.
historian Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad (deputized by his brother), and Shihāb al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Ibn Abī al-Dam, who was linked to the Banū Wāṣil clan via Sālim’s wife. Another son of Sālim was an intimate of the Hamawian ruler al-Malik al-Manṣūr Il Muḥammad (d. 683/1284) and one of his nephews was physician at the Hamawian court. Jamāl al-Dīn’s appointment shows that even during the period of local recruitment trans-regional networks were of benefit. The reasons for the deposition of his predecessor Najm al-Dīn al-Bārizī are not known, but one might assume that Jamāl al-Dīn’s tight network within the military and civilian elite of late Ayyubid and early Mamluk society was instrumental in his appointment. However, the influence of this family was in sum rather limited, as it was not able to monopolize specific posts and only rose to some prominence for two generations.

During the period of local recruitment to the judgeship in Ḥamāh some individuals who did not belong to the grand families of the town were appointed. These individuals were nevertheless part of the civilian networks of the town and had the local background that was typical of this period of recruitment. ʿImād al-Dīn Abū al-Qāṣīm (d. 652/1254) held the judgeship twice but had to flee owing to the conflicts of his brother, Shihāb al-Dīn ibn al-Quṭub, with the town’s ruler. Shihāb al-Dīn had initially embarked on a civilian career, acting for example as Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī’s repetitor (muʿīd) in the Madrasah al-Manṣūriyyah. However, he turned later to a military career and became an amir. Although their family

---

65 This brother was ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 692/1293) (al-Dhahabi, Tārīkh, vol. 691–700:158).
67 On Ibn Wāṣil’s network and the Banū Wāṣil in general cf. Konrad Hirschler, Medieval Arabic Historiography: Authors as Actors (London, 2006), 18–28. The exact date of Ibn Wāṣil’s appointment is curiously not identifiable as his nomination and Ibn al-Bārizī’s deposition are not exactly dated. It is on al-Yūnīnī’s statement (Dhayl Mirʾāt al-Zamān, 4:218–23) that the latter was deposed “a few years” before his death, that my estimation “late 670s” is based.
69 This change from a civilian to a military career pattern was a consequence of Shihāb al-Dīn’s close alliance with the younger son of Ḥamāh’s ruler, al-Malik al-Nāṣir Qilīj Arslan (r. 617–26/1221–29), who was to be installed on the throne against the explicit will of his father. Qilīj Arslan granted Shihāb al-Dīn a considerable iqṭāʿ, so that he “took off the turban from his head, put on the sharbūṣ, and wore the soldiers’ garments. Al-Malik al-Nāṣir appointed him as governor of al-Maʿarrāh [Maʿarrat al-Nuʾmān]. He acted there just as the kings act in their lands.” (Ibn Wāṣil, Mufarrij, 4:87–88) (The sharbūṣ was the distinct headgear of the amirs; cf. R. Dozy, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes [Leiden, 1881], 1:742.)
was of no great importance within the civilian elite, their marriage connections secured them the necessary local backing. ‘Imād al-Dīn’s wife, for instance, was the daughter of a prominent member of the Banū Qarnās, Mukhliṣ al-Dīn Ibrāhīm (d. 648/1248), discussed below.

‘Imād al-Dīn’s predecessor, Ḫūjjat al-Dīn Ibn Marājīl (d. 617/1220), also did not belong to one of the grand families. Nevertheless, his family, which was at least described as “a renowned household in Ḥamāh,” had a somewhat prominent standing, particularly due to its holding of administrative positions. Ḫūjjat al-Dīn’s nephew, Afīf al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh, acted as envoy for the Ayyubid rulers of the town. Isḥāq ibn ‘Ali Ibn Marājīl (d. after 658/1260) was secretary of the chancellery under al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd, before moving on to Cairo where he held the same position. Members of the family also held administrative posts in other Syrian towns, such as Damascus and Aleppo.

The dwindling grip of the indigenous elite on the Shafī‘i judgeship in the third period, that is from the death of Najm al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm II in 764/1363 onwards, is evident in the much more varied background of those appointed to the post. Most importantly, judges tended to be recruited from cosmopolitan individuals who had, just like the judges in the first period of the judgeship, hardly any connections to the town. A case in point is Najm al-Dīn ‘Umar ibn al-Ḥījji (d. 830/1427). During his career Najm al-Dīn was secretary of the chancellery in Egypt and judge in Damascus, Tripoli, and Ḥamāh without being linked to the local elite of the town. This trend of cosmopolitan candidates

---

70 Their father was a rather minor jurisprudent. Although Ibn Wāṣil describes him as “eminent in scholarship and fatwas” (Ibn Wāṣil, Muḥarrīj, 4:87), biographical dictionaries refer to him only briefly (e.g., al-Dhahabi, Tārīkh, vol. 611–20:98).
71 Ibn Wāṣil, Muḥarrīj, 4:118–19, who refers to him as “Ibn Marāhīl.”
73 Ibn Wāṣil, Muḥarrīj, 4:128 and 141.
74 Ibn al-ʿAdim, Bughyat, 3:1489.
75 ‘Ali ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Ibn Marājīl (d. 703/1304) was secretary (in Ḥamāh?) and held further unspecified administrative posts (al-Ṣafādi, Al-Wāfī, 21:234–35; Ibn Hajar, Al-Durar, 3:131). His father Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm had been secretary in different functions in Aleppo and Damascus (al-Ṣafādi, Al-Wāfī, 21:234–35). His son Taqī al-Dīn Sulaymān ibn ‘Ali (d. 764/1363) was employed in several diwâns, held the trusteeship in the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus, and moved on to Egypt to become vizier (Ibn Hajar, Al-Durar, 2:254–55; Ibn Taghibirdi, Al-Nujūm, 11:18).
76 On him cf. al-Sakhāwī, Al-Ḍaw‘, 6:78; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah, Ṭabaqāt, 4:122–27; Martel-Thoumian, Civīls, 61, 88, 96, 452. On his judgeship in Ḥamāh: Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah, Tārīkh, 2:23; 4:258, 269, and 311. The only traceable connections are marriage alliances that this family concluded with the Egyptian al-Bārizi branch (Martel-Thoumian, Civīls, 367).
was accompanied by a significantly enhanced turnover. The average length for holding the judgeship now halved to under seven years, compared with more than thirteen years in the preceding period of local dominance. There were still some local scholars appointed to the post, such as Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Ḥamawī (d. 776/1374–75). However, the example of the Bārizī family—which could retain some influence over the judgeship only because it became a cosmopolitan family—shows that the period of the local scholars had definitely come to an end by the mid-eighth/fourteenth century.

The Non-Shafi’ī Judgeships, Khaṭīb, and Other Posts
The case of the Shafi’ī judgeship exemplifies the rise of the local civilian elite during the Ayyubid period and its continuing influence well into the Mamluk Sultanate until it lost its monopoly to candidates with a more cosmopolitan background. A consideration of appointments to other judgeships presents nevertheless a more complex picture. The Hanafi judgeship was established in Ḥamāḥ during the rule of the Mamluk sultan al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Baybars (r. 658–76/1260–77). In the 660s/1260s Baybars introduced the ruling according to which—at least theoretically—each madhhab was to be represented by a judge in the empire’s major centers. With regard to the judgeships for the other two madhabs, Ḥamāḥ followed the normal course of affairs in provincial Syrian towns that only introduced them hesitantly; both the first Maliki judge and the first Hanbali judge in Ḥamāḥ would be appointed only about a century after Baybars’ decree.

The Hanafi, Maliki, and Hanbali Judgeships
The Hanafi judgeship (cf. fig. 4) was monopolized after its introduction for

---

78 Sources for those judges in figure 1 who are not discussed in the present section are as follows: no. 19: Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbāh, Ṭārīkh, 1:244; no. 20: Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbāh, Ṭārīkh, 1:216, Ibn Ḥajar, Al-Durar, 3:417–18 (d. 764/1363 [sic]); no. 21: Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbāh, Ṭārīkh, 1:473 and 504; no. 23: Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbāh, Ṭārīkh, 1:613 and 4:258; no. 26: Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbāh, Ṭabaqāt, 4:141–42; al-Sakhāwī, Al-Dawʾ, 10:129–31; no. 27: al-Sakhāwī, Al-Dawʾ, 10:129–31 (biography of no. 26); no. 28: al-Nuʿaymy, Al-Dāris fī Ṭārīkh al-Madāris (Beirut, 1990), 1:249 (al-Madrasah al-Ṣārimiyah); no. 29: al-Sakhāwī, Al-Dawʾ, 10:24–25 (biography of no. 30).
79 Cf. Huda Lutfi, Al-Quds al-Mamlūkīyya: A History of Mamlūk Jerusalem Based on the Haram Documents (Berlin, 1985), 192, for the case of Jerusalem where even the Hanafi judgeship was introduced only in 784/1382. Al-Qalqashandi describes for his time the status quo that had developed in the preceding periods: in Ḥamāḥ judges for each madhhab, in addition to a Hanafi qāḍī ‘askar, were nominated (al-Qalqashandi, Ṣūḥ qāḍī ‘askar fi Ṣināʿat al-Inshāʾ [Cairo, 1913–19], 4:238).
80 Halm, Ausbreitung, 227, mentions Najm al-Dīn al-Khalīl ibn ‘Ali al-Ḥanāfī (d. 641/1243) as an
some eighty years by the Banū al-ʿAdīm. The Hamawian Banū al-ʿAdīm branch retained its close links to Aleppo, where the Banū al-ʿAdīm were one of the most influential families within the civilian elite. For example, the deputy of the Hanafi judge Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh was sent to Ḥamāh from Aleppo by order of the Aleppan Hanafi judge, Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar ibn al-ʿAdīm (fl. 738/1337–38). However, the period of the Banū al-ʿAdīm in the Hamawian office had, parallel to the development of the Shafiʿi judgeship, a distinctive local character. The first Hanafi judge in Ḥamāh, Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn al-ʿAdīm (d. 694/1295), not only settled in the town but became part of the local elite. He was buried in his turbah in the cemetery in ʿAqabah Naqīrīn, a village close to Ḥamāh where other Hamawian notables such as the Shafiʿi judge Jamāl al-Dīn Ibn Wāṣil had their turbahs built. Furthermore, he was able to establish a kind of indigenous Hamawian line of succession as his son and grandson, Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar (d. 734/1333) and Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh, held the post too. ʿĪzz al-Dīn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Ibn al-ʿAdīm (d. 711/1311), the second Hanafi judge of the town, was appointed as an outsider, but remained in the office for some forty years and died in Ḥamāh. The local tradition established by the Banū al-ʿAdīm was continued by Taqi al-Dīn Maḥmūd Ibn al-Hakīm (d. 760/1359), who belonged to a Hamawian family that had a zāwiyyah in the town and a muhtasib among its members. With Taqi al-Dīn’s death in 760/1359 this local tradition came to an earlier judge, but I was not able to find evidence for a judgeship for this individual in Ḥamāh.


85 Al-Dhahabī, Dhayl Tārīkh al-Islām, 111; al-Qurashī, Al-Jawāhir, vol. 1, no. 857; Ibn Ḥajar, Al-Durar, 2:492.
end. For instance, Amin al-Din ‘Abd al-Wahhāb ibn Ahmad (d. 768/1367), one of the subsequent judges, had no background in the town.\(^8\) Thus, the role of the local background in appointments to the Hanafi judgeship started to disappear, similar to the Shaf’i case, in the second half of the eighth/fourteenth century.

In this same period both the Maliki and the Hanbali judgeships were introduced. It is striking that in both cases local scholars from the outset played hardly any role, but that individuals with a cosmopolitan background dominated the list of post holders. The first Maliki judge in Hamah (cf. fig. 5), Sharaf al-Din Ismā’īl al-Gharnāṭi (d. 771/1369),\(^8\) originated—as was typical for this madhhab—from the western Islamic lands. This predominance of post holders originating from the Maghrib or al-Andalus remained unchanged in the following decades: among them were Jamāl al-Din Muḥammad al-Maghribī (d. 795/1392),\(^9\) Shams al-Din Muḥammad al-Maghribī (d. 840/1437),\(^1\) and, indirectly, Sharaf al-Din’s son Nāṣir al-Din Muḥammad (d. 828/1424).\(^2\) Equally important was Damascus, with which the Maliki community of Hamah entertained close links, as illustrated by Shihāb al-Din Ahmad al-Dimashqī (d. 796/1394)\(^3\) and ‘Alam al-Din Muḥammad ibn Nāṣir al-Din (d. 805/1402).\(^4\) The latter was deposed and reappointed some ten times as judge in Damascus and filled some of the resulting intervals with appointments to the judgeship of Hamah.

The same is valid for the Hanbali judgeship, which was introduced roughly in the same period as the Maliki post. Its first holder, Ahmad ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Mardāwī (d. 787/1385–86),\(^5\) was born in Mardā, a village close to Nablus which produced a number of Hanbali scholars active in Syria and Egypt.\(^6\) He moved first to Damascus and then to Hamah, where he was appointed to the judgeship and


\(^{16}\) Ibn Ḥajar, *Al-Durar*, 1:179.

\(^{17}\) In Damascus the Mardāwiyūn cemetery was favored by the Hanafi milieu of the town (Pouzet, *Damas*, 235).
taught. 97 He was followed by his brother Taqī al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh, 98 and among the post holders of the following decades, such as ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlī Ibn al-Maghālī (d. 828/1424–25), 99 Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Rassām (d. 844/1441), 100 Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Qādir, 101 and ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn al-Kāzarūnī (d. 895/1489–90), 103 rarely can any specific link to Ḥamāh be detected.

This salience of outsiders in the case of the Maliki and the Hanbali judgeships cannot be directly linked to the shift from local to cosmopolitan post holders that was evident in the Shafiʿī case and to some degree also in the Hanafi case. Certainly, the introduction of the two former judgeships coincided with the period when the local elite also lost control over the Shafiʿī and the Hanafi judgeships to the benefit of individuals with a cosmopolitan background. However, the weak role of local families in appointments to the Maliki and the Hanbali judgeships can to a large degree be explained, as was the case in other towns, 104 by the quantitative weakness of these madhhab in Ḥamāh. Arguably a similar quantitative weakness also explains the “importation” of the Hanafi Banū al-ʿAdīm judges from Aleppo. These madhhab’ weaknesses are apparent in the source material. The biographical dictionary by al-Dhāhabī, Tārikh al-Islām, for instance, shows hardly any entries for Hanafi, Maliki, and Hanbali scholars linked to Ḥamāh until the end of the seventh/thirteenth century. Similarly, madhhab-focused works, such as al-Qurashi’s (d. 775/1373) biographical dictionary of Hanafi scholars Al-Jawāhir al-Muḍīyah and Ibn Rajab’s (d. 795/1392) biographical dictionary of Hanbali scholars Al-Dhayl ʿalā Ṭabaqāt al-Hanābilah, 105 are rather silent on Ḥamāh.

Similarly, no Maliki or Hanbali madrasah is mentioned with regard to Ḥamāh, while the Hanafis were represented by two madrasahs, one founded by Nūr al-Dīn and the Madrasah al-Ṭawāshīyah. However, the teaching staff in Nūr al-Dīn’s madrasah was to a large extent comprised of scholars from outside the town. Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn al-Abyaḍ (d. 614/1217), for example, descended—

97 Ibn Ḥajar, Al-Durār, 1:179.
100 Ibn Ḥajar, Inbāʾ, 8:86–88; Ibn Ḥajar al-Shuḥbah, Tārikh, 4:262; al-Sakhāwī, Al-Dawʾ, 1:249.
101 Ibn al-ʿImād, Shadharāt al-Dhahab fi Akhbār Man Dhahab (Cairo, 1931–33), 7:309.
102 Ibid.
103 Ibid., 357.
104 Cf. Petry, Civilian Elite, 315, for the example of Cairo, where many judges of the three “minority” madhhab (Hanafi, Maliki, and Hanbali), possibly most of them, were outsiders to the town.
just like the Banū al-ʿAdim—from an Aleppan Hanafi family. He had left Aleppo owing to conflicts with the central figure of the town’s madhhab, Iftikhar al-Din al-Hāshimi, and taught in Ḫammā in 609/1212–13 but then returned to his teaching post in Aleppo. Another teacher in this school was ʿAlam al-Din Qayṣar (d. 649/1251), who had to leave Egypt owing to misconduct in his administrative post. The relatively weak stature of the madhhab in the town certainly contributed to al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd’s (r. 626–42/1229–44) decision to have this madrasah destroyed in 630/1232–33 during fortification works.

KHAṬĪBS AND OTHER POSTS: THE RISE OF THE BANŪ AL-MUGHAYZIL

Turning to those positions that are less well-documented in the sources, i.e., khaṭībships and other civilian posts, a development similar to that illustrated above for the Shaфиʿi and the Hanafi judgeships emerges: from the mid-sixth/late twelfth century onwards the number of post holders rose distinctively; these post holders were generally Shaфиʿiis and the majority belonged to the indigenous civilian elite. The khaṭībship especially, throughout the various locations (see fig. 6 with sources), was dominated by members of grand Hamawian families. Among these were names of families introduced previously such as the Banū al-Bahrānī and the Banū al-Bārizī.

Another name emerging from the list are the Banū al-Mughayzil (cf. fig. 7), a “grand household” of the town whose members reappear frequently as khaṭībs, especially in the central mosque of the upper town, the Great or Upper Mosque (al-jāmiʿ al-kabīr/al-ʿalā). The origins of this family are not clear, as they did not attract the interest of the authors of contemporary chronicles or biographical dictionaries. However, it is obvious that it was—or had recently become—an indigenous Hamawian family by the mid-seventh/thirteenth century. Family members rarely rose to prominence in other Syrian towns and focused their career patterns typically on Ḫammā. The family’s head, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Naṣr Allāh, was seemingly the muṭasib of the town, although he is only mentioned in the biographies of his sons. His sons started to rise to prominence in the late Ayyubid and early Mamluk period and Badr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Latīf (d. 690/1291),

107 Ibn Wāṣil, Mufarrij, 5:343.
109 Ibn Nazīf, Al-Manṣūrī, 80.
110 Al-Dhahabi, Dhayl Tārikh al-Islām, 229.
111 Cf. the entry on his son ʿAbd al-Ghufrān in al-Ṣafadī, Al-Wāfi, 19:27.
for instance, was nominated *khaṭīb* in the Upper Mosque. His two sons Muʿīn al-Dīn Abū Bakr113 (d. 724/1324) and Bahāʾ al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ṣamad114 (d. 725/1325) followed respectively. Further *khaṭībs* emanating from this family are Badr al-Dīn’s grandson Šalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf115 (d. 719/1319), who was attached to a place that is not specified, and his nephew Zayn al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 699/1299)116 in the Lower Mosque (*al-jāmiʿ al-asfal*), the central mosque of the lower town. Together with Badr al-Dīn’s three brothers, the family was able to fill religious posts and offices in different branches of the town’s civil administration to an impressive extent.

Tāj al-Dīn Ahmad (d. 687/1288),117 the eldest of the four brothers, became the town’s *shaykh al-shuyūkh*, i.e., the head of the mystical milieu of the town who represented its interests vis-à-vis the political elite. In general the *shaykh al-shuyūkh* was chosen from the grand families of a town (in Aleppo, for instance, the Banū ʿAjamī and in Damascus the Banū Ḥamawayh)118 because his influence transcended the mystical milieu considerably. Tāj al-Dīn was able to pass the post on to his sons, which reflected also the active marriage policy of the al-Mughayzil family: his son Nāṣir al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm119 (d. 707/1307) had been married to a daughter of Tāj al-Dīn’s predecessor in this post, Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Anṣārī (d. 662/1263),120 the son of Ibn al-Raḥīf, the town’s previous Shafiʿi judge, who is mentioned above.

Two other brothers of Badr al-Dīn chose careers in the town’s civil administration. Najm al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ghuffār121 (d. 688/1289–90) became *kāṭīb al-darj*, working for both al-Malik al-Manṣūr II Muḥammad and his son al-Malik al-Muẓaffar III Maḥmūd (d. 698/1299), and acquired sufficient wealth to set up

---

several endowments. Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Karīm122 (d. 697/1297) was appointed assistant to the treasurer (wakil bayt al-māl). The administrative role of the family was continued by two individuals mentioned above: Badr al-Dīn’s son Bahāʾ al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad, who was the vizier of the town and Nāṣir al-Dīn’s son Nūr al-Dīn ‘Ali al-Muẓaffarī (d. 701/1301),123 the author of the supplement to Ibn Wāṣil’s Mufarrij al-Kurūb fi Akhbār Banī Ayyūb, who was appointed as kātib al-dīwān in 682/1283–4. After the early eighth/fourteenth century no member of the Banū al-Mughayzil held any further positions of importance in Ḥamāh and this local family ceased to play a prominent role.

LOCAL ELITE FAMILIES BEYOND FORMAL POSITIONS

Not all the grand families that emerged in Ḥamāh during the late sixth/twelfth century and flourished from the early seventh/thirteenth century onwards necessarily occupied civilian posts in great number. However, the rise of these families was also a consequence of the urban renaissance that provided a framework for alternative ways to acquire a standing in the town. These alternatives were based on the usage of cultural and/or economic capital. In comparison to the families discussed hitherto, social capital in the sense of activating the networks of the town’s civilian elite in order to acquire posts played only a secondary role.124 A typical example of this are the Shafī’ī Banū Qarnāṣ (cf. fig. 8 with sources), a “renowned family,”125 which possessed its zāwiyyah126 and whose members are called “grandee”127 or “notable”128 of the town. A number of them were renowned scholars, especially in the field of hadith, who never took any formal positions, such as Ṣafī al-Dīn Ahmad (b. 510/1117), Muḥammad ibn Hibat Allāh (d. 637/1239), Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Abd al-‘Aziz (d. 654/1256–57), Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 662/1264), Muwaqqaf al-Dīn Muḥammad (fl. 678/1279–80), and Shihāb al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm (d. 700/1300–1). Only a few members held religious/civilian posts, such as Mukhliṣ al-Dīn Ismā‘īl (d. 659/1261), a teacher

123 For details on his career cf. his Dhayl Mufarrij al-Kurūb, passim. Fig. 7 includes also Sayf al-Dīn ‘Ali ibn ‘Abd al-Laṭīf (d. 690/1291), who died at a young age (al-Dhahabi, Tārikh, vol. 681–90:427).

both in the “Jāmiʿ Ḥamāh” and the Madrasah al-Mukhliṣiyah, and Fath al-Din (d. 730/1329–30), who held the trusteeship (naẓr) in the central mosque of Ḥamāh.

The main exception to the family’s focus on scholarly activities was Mukhliṣ al-Din Ibrāhīm (d. 648/1248), the founder of the Madrasah al-Mukhliṣiyah. He later played an active political role in Homs, which started in a somewhat unfortunate manner as he was imprisoned by the town’s ruler al-Malik al-Mujāhid Asad al-Dīn (r. 581–637/1186–1240). The imprisonment of both him and other members of the Banū Qarnāṣ was a consequence of the aborted ruse by Sayf al-Dīn ʿAli al-Hadhabānī, the strongman of Ḥamāh under al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd. Al-Hadhabānī undertook with a number of Hamawian notables a feigned flight from Ḥamāh to Homs on the pretence of seeking the support of Asad al-Dīn. Asad al-Dīn saw through the stratagem and imprisoned al-Hadhabānī and his companions on the spot.129 Nevertheless, Mukhliṣ al-Dīn was more fortunate than al-Hadhabānī and a number of notables who perished in captivity. Released by Asad al-Dīn’s successor, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Ibrāhīm (r. 637–44/1240–46), he made a career in the town’s administration. He became vizier and de facto regent of al-Manṣūr’s son, al-Malik al-Ashraf Mūsā (r. 644–62/1246–63).130

The Banū Qarnāṣ did not base their role within the civilian elite exclusively on intensive scholarly activities, i.e., the activation of cultural capital, and occasional political involvement. Rather, they are a typical example of the families who also profited from the economic development of the town from the late sixth/twelfth century onwards. Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 673/1274), for instance, was only described as a “notable of his town” because he had an outstanding fortune at his disposal.131 Owing to this wealth of the family, Zayn al-Dīn Ismāʿīl (d. between 635/1238 and 642/1244), one of the town’s grand estate owners, played a central role in the conflict between the town’s landed elite and its ruler al-Malik al-Nāṣir Qilīj Arslān. When the latter came to power in 617/1221 he obliged the inhabitants of Ḥamāh to buy overpriced wheat. Zayn al-Dīn refused and fled to Egypt and al-Nāṣir had his house destroyed and his estates confiscated. Seemingly his family had, owing to weak integration into the town’s administration, insufficient standing to settle the affair through local mechanisms of conflict resolution. Zayn al-Dīn was only able to recover his estates when al-Malik al-Kāmil of Egypt enthroned his candidate in the town, al-Nāṣir’s brother al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd. However, after al-Kāmil’s death in 635/1238 Zayn al-Dīn

129 Ibn Wāsīl, Mufarrij, 5:222–27.
131 Al-Dhahabī, Ṭārikh, vol. 671–80:133.
was imprisoned, where he died.\textsuperscript{132}

A second example of a grand family of the town that did not hold civilian posts in considerable number is the Banū Rawāḥah (cf. fig. 9),\textsuperscript{133} who gained in strength starting in the mid-sixth/twelfth century. This family originated from Ḥamāh, but its members appear in a number of different Syrian and Egyptian towns. They display a focus on scholarship mixed with some commercial activities and involvement in administrative posts comparable to the profile of the Banū Qarnās. The family started to rise to prominence with ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Husayn ibn Rawāḥah (d. 561/1165), the renowned khaṭīb of Ḥamāh.\textsuperscript{134} His son Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn (d. 585/1189–90) left the town for Damascus and Egypt where he studied hadith, was imprisoned for an extended period in Sicily, and finally died a martyr below the walls of Frankish Acre.\textsuperscript{135} Jamāl al-Dīn’s sons, ʿIzz al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh (d. 646/1248)\textsuperscript{136} and Nafīs al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 642/1245), both dwelled in Ḥamāh and were hadith scholars who were renowned well beyond the confines of their hometown. Nafīs al-Dīn’s daughter Fīṭimah (d. 716/1316–17), who played a crucial role among the town’s hadith scholars, subsequently continued this tradition of hadith scholarship,\textsuperscript{137} Jamāl al-Dīn’s brother Muḥammad (d. 631/1233)\textsuperscript{138} and their nephew Zaki al-Dīn Hibat Allāh (d. 622/1225) exemplify the trading activities of the family.\textsuperscript{140} Both seem to have left Ḥamāh and were active in Aleppo and Damascus where Zaki al-Dīn endowed madrasahs.\textsuperscript{141} Mainly remembered for holding civil posts are Nūr al-Dīn Ahmad (d. 712/1312), kāṭīb al-inshāʾ in Tripoli, who only returned to Ḥamāh shortly before his death,\textsuperscript{142} and Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 722/1322–3), secretary in the Upper Egyptian


\textsuperscript{133} Not mentioned in this section on the family is Sharaf al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 729/1329 in Cairo) (al-Maqrizī, \textit{Al-Muqaffā}, 6:523).


\textsuperscript{138} Al-Dhahabi, \textit{Dhayl Ṭārīkh al-Islām}, 145.

\textsuperscript{139} Al-Dhahabi, \textit{Tārīkh}, vol. 631–40:77.


\textsuperscript{142} Al-Ṣafādī, \textit{Al-Wāfī}, 6:56–57; Ibn Ḥajar, \textit{Al-Durar}, 1:176.
From the sixth/twelfth century onwards, the Banū Qarnāṣ and especially the Banū Rawāḥah rose beyond the confines of the town to a considerably larger extent than the families discussed above. Focusing on scholarly and trading activities they had to seek contacts in the Egyptian and Syrian lands. A middle-sized town such as Ḥamāh did not offer the family members sufficient opportunity to pursue their careers. As these families did not seek civilian posts—or were not able to attain them—they chose the more promising cosmopolitan outlook. Nevertheless, they were firmly grounded in the town that offered, owing to its cultural and economic development, ample resources from which they could draw. In this sense they complete the picture of the town’s local elite during the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods.

CONCLUSION

Two principal points emerge from the analysis of the Hamawian civilian elite in comparison with the development of the civilian elite in other towns during the period: the importance of the household in structuring the civilian elite and the ability of the Hamawian families to close their social universe to outsiders until the mid-eighth/fourteenth century.

Starting with Lapidus, the household has been increasingly defined as the basic unit for exercising power during the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods. Chamberlain in particular has stressed the household’s role in the post-Saljuq states, which were characterized by a low number of state agencies and autonomous corporate or religious bodies in both rural regions and urban centers. Military and civilian households alike took charge of most of the administrative functions that were still hardly specialized and often applied on an ad-hoc basis. The Hamawian civilian elite discussed in this article was, similar to that in the region’s large cities, structured according to such households. Only those functions that were at the very core of political power, such as the vizierate, were generally beyond the reach of these households. The Hamawian families tended to some kind of...
division of labor: the judgeship was largely the domain of the Banū al-Bahrānī, Wāsil, and al-Bārizī; the Banū al-Mughayzil played a salient role in the khaṭībship; administrative posts that went to the grand families were dominated by the Banū al-Mughayzil and al-Bārizī; and finally the Banū Qarnāṣ and Rawāḥah were main actors in the transmission of knowledge.

It is not evident how these families put this division of labor into practice or, in other words, in which ways or by what means they conducted the struggle over posts and influence. The only indicators available to us are appointments to the judgeship. It has been shown above that the turnover in the post was relatively low during the period of the local elite. Also of relevance is whether new judges were appointed upon the death of the previous post holder or whether their predecessor was deposed. Between 617/1220 and 764/1363, i.e., the period of the local elite, the large majority of judges died in office and deposition was a rather rare occurrence. These two characteristics of appointments to the judgeship indicate that, compared with a town such as Damascus, the division of labor among the grand households secured a larger degree of social stability within the civilian elite. Thus, we encounter in Ḥamāh the household as the typical basic unit of social organization, but the tight networks of this middle-sized town seem to have prevented social strife to a considerable extent.

The second point emerging from the comparison of Ḥamāh with other cities was the ability of the Hamawian families to close their social universe to outsiders during the period of the local elite. Studies of Cairo and Damascus have shown that scholars from outside the respective town played a considerable role within the civilian elites. Yet in Ḥamāh cosmopolitans ceased to take a prominent position within the social fabric during the hegemony of the town’s households in the local period. One explanation for the salience of local scholars is that a post in such a minor town was simply not prestigious enough for cosmopolitan scholars, especially those of greater standing. The case of the aforementioned judge Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Anṣārī, who later moved on to Egypt, shows that the judgeship of Ḥamāh was not necessarily perceived as the climax of one’s

---

147 On the fitnah among the civilian households in Damascus cf. Chamberlain, Knowledge. In Ḥamāh in the above-mentioned period Shafiʿi judges died in office on eight occasions (nos. 7a, 9a, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17 in fig. 1) and were deposed on three occasions (nos. 9, 11, and 13 in fig. 1).
148 Joan E. Gilbert, “The ‘Ulama’ of Medieval Damascus and the International World of Islamic Scholarship” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1977), 40–42, estimates that about 50% of the senior religious scholars up to 1260 were outsiders. Petry, Civilian Elite, 313, shows for the case of Cairo that especially the jurist scholars were recruited from a wide variety of regional backgrounds.

---

career. His successor al-Qāsim Ibn al-Shahrazūrī was even criticized for “lack
of ambition” for taking up a post in such a minor town. 149 Like the renowned
Damascene scholar Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām (d. 660/1262), who refused the invitation
of al-Malik al-Nāṣir (d. 656/1258) of al-Karak to join him at his court somewhat
indignantly with the words “Your lands are too small for my knowledge” and
moved on to Egypt, 150 many scholars from inside and outside the town preferred
not to continue their careers in the province. 151 Whenever scholars of greater
standing came to reside in the town for a longer period, they were mostly scholars
of the rational sciences. These scholars found a particularly receptive climate for
pursuing their careers in the town during the seventh/thirteenth century. 152

However, while the comparatively low reputation of Ḥamāh might have
facilitated the control of the town’s posts by the local elite, this did not entirely
exclude outside scholars, who played a role before and after this local period.
In order to understand the local elite’s capacity to dominate the distribution
of the town’s positions a further characteristic of Ḥamāh is of relevance: its
prolonged status as a semi-autonomous principality, first within the Ayyubid
family confederation and subsequently within the Mamluk Empire. The local elite
flourished some decades after the town’s first Ayyubid ruler al-Malik al-Muẓaffar
I ‘Umar came to power in 574/1178. The economic ascent of the region, which
was a prerequisite for the development of the local elite, took a decisively local
turn with the consolidation of the town’s autonomy. It was the following period of
some 150 years of nearly uninterrupted autonomy that offered the local elite the
political framework necessary for its development. The end of this local period
followed the political development again with some delay: after the absorption
of the Hamawian principality within the Mamluk Empire in the 730s/1330s, it
took further decades until the dominance of the local elite on the town’s posts
was weakened. The local families either changed their profile to a cosmopolitan

149 Al-Dhahabī, Tārīkh, vol. 591–600:408.
150 Al-Subkī, Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyah al-Kubrá, ed. Muḥammad al-Ṭanāḥī and ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Ḥilw
(Cairo, 1964–76), 8:210.
151 A typical example of this is Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad al-ʿĀmirī al-Ḥamawī (d. 680/1281) who
excelled in his hometown at the age of 18 years, was appointed professor in the Ashrafiyah in
Damascus, and finally as chief judge in Cairo (al-Dhahabi, Tārīkh, vol. 671–80:365–67; al-Ṣafadī,
Al-Wāfi, 3:18–19).
152 On rational scholars in Ḥamāh (and al-Karak) cf. Hirschler, Historiography, 59–60. Typical
examples of such scholars are ‘Ali ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Andalusi (d. 637/1239–40), an
Andalusian scholar of rational sciences who, although criticized for his beliefs, stayed in Ḥamāh
and the above-mentioned Sayf al-Dīn al-ʿĀmidī, the first teacher in the Madrasah al-Mansūrīyah.
Al-ʿĀmidī was a theologian with a brilliant reputation in the rational sciences who had to flee
Egypt due to accusations of heresy (Ibn Wāṣīl, Mufarrīj, 4:78 and 80).

outlook during this gradual weakening of their position or they disappeared from the social fabric of the town, which came to be dominated by the trans-regional Mamluk civilian elite.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year/Decade</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>559–67</td>
<td>Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Anşārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>550s/60s</td>
<td>Ibn al-Shahrazūrī, Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn al-Qāsim (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>571–?</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bahrānī, Aḥmad ibn Mudrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>?–587</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bahrānī, Amin al-Dawlaḥ/Dīn al-Ḥusayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>?–598</td>
<td>Ibn Abī ‘Arṣūn, Najm al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥākim (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>Ibn al-Shahrazūrī, Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn al-Qāsim (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>599–ca. 600</td>
<td>Ibn al-Raflāʾ, Zayn al-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>ca. 600–16</td>
<td>Ibn Abī ‘Arṣūn, Najm al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥākim (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>Ibn Marājīl Ḥuṣayn al-Dīn (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>Ibn Wāṣil, Sālim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>616–17</td>
<td>Ibn Marājīl Ḥuṣayn al-Dīn (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>617–22</td>
<td>‘Ismāʿl al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>622–42</td>
<td>Ibn Abī al-Dam, Shihād al-Dīn Ibrāhim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>642–52</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bahrānī, Muḥīy al-Dīn Ḥamzah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>‘Ismāʿl al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>652–69</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Shams al-Dīn Ibrāhim I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>669–late 670s</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Najm al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥākim I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>late 670s–697</td>
<td>Ibn Wāṣil, Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>697–99</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bahrānī, Muwaffaq al-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>699–738</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Sharaf al-Dīn Hibat Allāh I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>738–64</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Najm al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥākim II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>760s/770s</td>
<td>Shihād al-Dīn Ahmad al-Ḥamāwī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>780s</td>
<td>Nāṣir al-Dīn, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a/22b</td>
<td>?–789</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad I or II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>789–?</td>
<td>Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad, Ibn Muḥājir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>795–96</td>
<td>‘Alāʾ al-Dīn ibn Makki al-Ḥamāwī (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>796–99</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad II (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>Badr al-Dīn ibn al-Maʿarrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a</td>
<td>799–?</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad II (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>?–804</td>
<td>‘Alāʾ al-Dīn ibn Makki al-Ḥamāwī (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>804–5</td>
<td>Ibn al-Ḥijjī, Najm al-Dīn ‘Umar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>?–842</td>
<td>al-Shihāb al-Zuhrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>842–ca. 857</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27a</td>
<td>ca. 857–?</td>
<td>al-Zayn ibn al-Kharazī (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>late 9th c.</td>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Umar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Shafi’i Judges in Ḥamāh
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>Main Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fig. 2. Banū al-Bahrānī
* No entry in biographical dictionaries; known only from nasab or short references in other entries.
Further members of the al-Bārizī family active in Ḥamāh who cannot be placed in this genealogy: Şadr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-ʿRahmān ʿAlī ibn Yahyā ibn Ismāʿil (d. 733/1333); Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad II ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm (d. 755/1354)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after 658</td>
<td>Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 671–711</td>
<td>Ibn al-ʿAdīm, ʿĪzz al-Dīn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711–21</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721–34</td>
<td>Ibn al-Ḥakīm, Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?–738</td>
<td>Ibn al-Ḥakīm, Taqī al-Dīn Maḥmūd (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738–42</td>
<td>Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742–60</td>
<td>Ibn al-Ḥakīm, Taqī al-Dīn Maḥmūd (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760–62</td>
<td>Amīn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb ibn Aḥmad (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762–63</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763–68</td>
<td>Amīn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb ibn Aḥmad (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 9th century</td>
<td>Ibīn ʿArab Shāh, Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-9th century</td>
<td>Badr al-Dīn Hasan ibn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 4. Hanafi Judges in Ḥamāh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>760s–ca. 770</td>
<td>Sharaf al-Dīn Ismāʿīl al-Gharnāṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 770–76</td>
<td>Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Gharnāṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776–84</td>
<td>Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Maghribī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784–89</td>
<td>Shīhāb al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Dīmashqī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790s</td>
<td>ʿAlam al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Nāṣir al-Dīn (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>ʿAlam al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Nāṣir al-Dīn (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 9th century</td>
<td>Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Maghribī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 5. Maliki Judges in Ḥamāh**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place/Date</th>
<th>Further Posts in Hamah</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Further Posts</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Bahrānī, Ahmad (d. 590/1194 or 591/1195)</td>
<td>Hamah</td>
<td>judge</td>
<td>see fig. 2</td>
<td>see article</td>
<td>see article</td>
<td>see article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Bahrānī, Muwaffaq al-Dīn</td>
<td>Hamah</td>
<td>judge</td>
<td>see fig. 2</td>
<td>see article</td>
<td>see article</td>
<td>see article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Bārzī, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Uhmān</td>
<td>Hamah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Mughayzil, Yaḥyā al-Dīn Yūsuf (d. 790/1391)</td>
<td>Hamah</td>
<td>mudarris</td>
<td>see article</td>
<td>see article</td>
<td>see article</td>
<td>see article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rawāḥah, ʿAbd Allah ibn al-Husayn (d. 561/1165)</td>
<td>Hamah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Muhammad (d. 699/1299)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great/Upper Mosque (699–724)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Mughayzil, Bayār al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ṣamad (d. 725/1325)</td>
<td>Great/Upper Mosque (724–25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 6. Khāṭīb in Hamah**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Bārizī, Sādr al-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
<td>Great/Upper Mosque</td>
<td>Shafī‘i</td>
<td>see article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Ḥamāh” is given as place when no further specification is given in the sources.
Fig. 7. Banū al-Mughayzil

Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Naṣr Allāh*

- Najm al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ghuffār
d. 688/1289–90
- Badr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Laṭīf
d. 690/1291
- Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Karīm
d. 697/1297
- Tāj al-Dīn Ahmad
d. 687/1288

- Muḥammad*  
  - Bahāʾ al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ṣamad
d. 725/1325
  - Sayf al-Dīn ʿAlī
d. 690/1291
  - Muʿīn al-Dīn Abū Bakr
d. 724/1324

- Śalāḥ al-Dīn Yusuf
d. 719/1319

- Zayn al-Dīn Muḥammad
d. 699/1299
- Nāṣir al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Rahīm
d. 707/1307
  - Nūr al-Dīn ʿAlī
d. 701/1301

* No entry in biographical dictionaries; known only from nasab or short references in other entries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>Main Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hibat Allāh ibn Aḥmad</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>mentioned in Ibn al-ʿAdim, Bughyat, 3:1205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. Banū Qarnāṣ
* No entry in biographical dictionaries; known only from *nasab* or short references in other entries.