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Abstract

Monuments that testify to the Islamicate past of the Iberian Peninsula dot the landscape of nearly all of modern-day Spain and Portugal. For the better part of fifty years, archaeologists have identified and excavated sites with Andalusi pasts in Spain —yet few of their efforts are recognized. This is particularly true in the modern-day Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha, located in the centre of the Iberian Peninsula. To date, many of the early medieval fortifications of the region, geographically defined as the Southern Meseta, are understood through a lens of conflict where Christian kingdoms and Islamic empires battled for control of the Iberian Peninsula. However, few sources from the time suggest this is an appropriate interpretation for the Umayyad period (711-976). Rather, this understanding is a result of an early modern nation-building project in which Spain embraced a Catholic triumphal history to the exclusion of others. This thesis challenges this understanding of Central Spain as a region with little Umayyad history using written, archaeological, and architectural evidence dating to the eighth through tenth centuries and then analyses cultural processes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that have led to the misremembering and occlusion of this Andalusi past.

The Arabic written sources of later centuries refer to the area under investigation as a border space, specifically the *thaghr al-awsat*. To date, scholarship has accepted this designation with little question as to whether late sources appropriately reflect dynamics born out of the Umayyad conquest of the Iberian Peninsula. Looking at the contemporaneous written sources suggests approaching the Umayyad fortifications of Castilla-La Mancha as border spaces loosely tied to the dynastic centre in Córdoba is a definition born out of later conflicts. This is upheld by archaeological evidence in which the fortresses of the Southern Meseta show strong material ties to early Umayyad architecture and material culture of the Iberian Peninsula.

The understanding of the Southern Meseta as a liminal space that was first portrayed in late medieval Arabic chronicles held sway over the historiography of the region, with real consequences for
the cultural patrimony of the region today. An interrogation of laws relating to cultural patrimony passed by the nation of Spain from 1844-1975, with a focus on those in the first third of the twentieth century, demonstrates how the historical understanding of Andalusi past as limited to the south of the Iberian Peninsula has affected how modern scholars approach the study of Umayyad history in Spain today.
Monuments that testify to the Islamicate past of the Iberian Peninsula dot the landscape of nearly all of modern-day Spain and Portugal. For the better part of fifty years, archaeologists have identified and excavated sites with Andalusi pasts in Spain —yet few of their efforts are recognized. This is particularly true in the modern-day Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha, located in the centre of the Iberian Peninsula. To date, many of the early medieval fortifications of the region, geographically defined as the Southern Meseta, are understood through a lens of conflict where Christian kingdoms and Islamic empires battled for control of the Iberian Peninsula. However, few sources from the time suggest this is an appropriate interpretation for the Umayyad period (711-976). Rather, this understanding is a result of an early modern nation-building project in which Spain embraced a Catholic triumphal history to the exclusion of others. This thesis challenges this understanding of Central Spain as a region with little Umayyad history using written, archaeological, and architectural evidence dating to the eighth through tenth centuries. The work then shifts to analyse Spanish laws from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that have led to the misremembering and occlusion of this Andalusi past from Spanish collective memory.

The Arabic written sources of later centuries refer to the area under investigation as a border space, specifically the thaghr al-awsat. To date, scholarship has accepted this designation with little question as to whether late sources are the best available resources to construct eighth century history. Both written and material evidence from earlier periods suggest not that the Southern Meseta was a border space but rather fully integrated into the Umayyad polity. The understanding of the Southern Meseta as a liminal space that was first portrayed in late medieval Arabic chronicles held sway over the historiography of the region, with real consequences for the cultural patrimony of the region today.

An interrogation of laws relating to cultural patrimony passed by the nation of Spain from 1844-1975, with a focus on those in the first third of the twentieth century, demonstrates how the historical
understanding of Andalusi past as limited to the south of the Iberian Peninsula has affected how modern scholars approach the study of Umayyad history in Spain today.
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Notes to the Reader

N.1 On Calendar Dates

When referring to events, I use only Gregorian dates, rather than a combination of Gregorian/Ḥijrī or solely Ḥijrī ones, for consistency and clarity. If we were strictly to follow the sources and their use of calendars, this discussion would start with Gregorian dates from Roman and Visigothic sources, shift to the Ḥijrī calendar for Andalusi ones, then return to Gregorian dates for medieval sources. In addition, this does not consider that in the eighth through tenth centuries, Western Europe, particularly the Iberian Peninsula, employed a variety of calendars meaning more dates would be in play. Such switching seems needlessly confusing and interferes with legibility. I opt not to use both calendars simultaneously for purposes of clarity. Anyone reading academic texts that do employ both can attest to the difficulty of keeping two calendars in mind at the same time. For experts, converting dates between one calendar and another should not pose a problem.

N.2 On Presentation of Sources in Original Languages, Transliteration, and Use of Diacritics

I choose to privilege original languages over English in my presentation of sources. This comes dually from the recognition that translation into any modern language results in an altering of authentic voices, as well as out of an awareness for the ways in which Anglophone scholars of al-Andalus often participate in a linguistic colonization of history through their treatment of other languages. As a result, all quotes are presented in the language of composition in the main body with translations (and transliterations) in the footnotes. This not only gives better access to voices from the past, with all their peculiarities and ambiguities, but also demands of Anglophone scholars an academic understanding of the languages of the sources relating to Andalusi history. Anglophone historians have not always engaged with the languages of both primary sources and secondary scholarship on al-Andalus, relying
instead on translations or works printed in English.¹ This work engages with Arabic primary sources and secondary scholarship in Spanish, French, and English. Admittedly, this work has not engaged robustly with the secondary scholarship in Arabic on the history of al-Andalus. Unless otherwise noted, all translations and errors within are my own. As medieval Spanish and Arabic can have different spellings and/or meanings than modern languages, readers must keep in mind that some of the sources quoted here do not adhere to rules of their modern counterparts. Some ‘errors’ in spelling are preserved to stay as close to the source material as possible.

I have chosen not to employ transliteration in in-text block quotations of Arabic sources since for readers of Arabic this puts more of a strain on the reader than the use of the original text. Thus, as with Spanish and French, the longer selections from sources are presented in the language of composition with translation and transliteration provided in footnotes. The use of single words or small phrases poses slightly more of a challenge as switching the direction of reading mid-line can be distracting. As a result, when referencing Arabic single words or phrases in-text, I transliterate. Quotations and terms are transliterated according to International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies (IJMES) guidelines. IJMES prioritizes English-language phonetics, and while this does imply a linguistic hierarchy, this choice has been made in recognition that the primary audience of this work is competent in both English and Arabic. I depart from IJMES guidelines which reject the use of diacritics except for the use of ‘ for ‘ayn and ’ for medial and final hamzas in relation to personal names, names of political parties and organizations, and titles of books and articles. Respectively, in these cases, I use all diacritics as those learning Arabic benefit from their inclusion to reconstruct the original Arabic text. For those unfamiliar with Arabic, diacritics neither help nor detract from legibility or meaning, and only point to

the reality that Arabic has different sounds. Following IJMES, concepts and titles are italicized; names and places are not. All choices have been made with the ease of reading in mind.

For consistency, when discussing current place names in the Iberian Peninsula, I opt for the respective Spanish, Catalan, Euskadi, or Portuguese spelling, and do not toggle between Anglicized versions of supposedly more well-known cities verses local names for less familiar sites. For Catalan, Euskadi, and Portuguese names, the first time I reference a site I will provide the Spanish equivalent in parentheses, as at times the spellings differ so greatly as to suggest different locations. I do not do this for terms in Spanish with English equivalents as no names differ so greatly in the two languages that slightly different spelling or the presence of diacritical marks makes the use of Spanish incomprehensible to the Anglophone reader. For Arabic, I use diacritics only when a place either no longer exists or we cannot place it (i.e., Tudmīr or Almāʿīda) to give the reader the most contextual evidence possible. This logic extends outside the Iberian Peninsula (i.e., Fusṭāṭ vs. Mecca).

N.3 Note on GIS Mapping

Though at times we have incredibly accurate and precise information as to the GIS-mapped location of a site (the castle-fortress of Zorita or data points derived from archaeological reports are an example of this), the datasets used to create the maps used in this work should not be understood as widely having archaeological accuracy and precision. Datasets were generated using cell phones and Google maps and inaccuracies may be a result of GPS errors in recording locations. In some cases, where Islamicate remains are not visible, I have had to estimate logical locations for sites. I have identified forts, churches, and bridges as least likely to have moved and data points in the maps reflect this hierarchy. In cases where named locations are unknown, or there is a debate as to the location in the scholarship, I have chosen not to map the location and have noted the omission in the footnote.
Prologue

The COVID pandemic that swept the world beginning in 2019 had implications for the work that follows. Originally, this work intended to act as a gazetteer, identifying written and archaeological sites in Castilla-La Mancha dating to the Umayyad period. The proposed research involved studying unpublished material from archaeological sites in the region, held in the provincial museums of Toledo, Cuenca, and Guadalajara. Suddenly cut off from sources that would allow me to answer the question ‘what happened in the Southern Meseta from the eighth to tenth centuries?’ the question became ‘how do we know what we know, or more frequently, why do we not know about the history of the Southern Meseta from the eighth to tenth centuries?’ This shifted the scope of inquiry from solely interrogating the materiality of the early medieval period to one that engaged with the field of cultural memory. As a result, this work engages with a time span far greater than what originally had been imagined. In cultural memory, two moments arise as key to understanding the eighth- to tenth-century history of this region: first, the eleventh century, during which Arabic chroniclers embraced a narrative trope about the Southern Meseta as a thaghr full of characters with dubious loyalties; second, the middle of the nineteenth century to the present, during which governments of the modern nation-state of Spain have classified and framed cultural heritage of the region. The result of this expansion into cultural memory has two effects. First, that linguistic stability, which can be challenging within a source, let alone within a time period, simply does not exist between the sources discussed in this work. Words are used very differently in the eighth century than they are in the twenty-first, and specifically terms relating to concepts of identity have such radically different meanings as to make them unintelligible across this temporal gap. Second, a host of myths related to nation-building in the early modern, colonial, and contemporary periods has created not only ahistorical understandings of the past, but also defined conversations and approaches within the field.2 To address some of these concerns, I offer this

---

2 For works attempting to identify and deconstruct foundational myths of the Spanish nation, see Henry Kamen, Imagining Spain: Historical Myth and National Identity (New Haven, 2008); José Ruiz Mata, Al Ándalus, La historia
This Prologue identifies terms that offer the most potential for confusion in the shifting between the eighth century to the present day and defines them here. This should be understood as concurring with both Marshall Hodgson who argued that the language scholars employ is important and speaks to wider prejudices and Michel Foucault who forewarned that ill-defined terms and concepts lead to situations where ‘one hardly knows what one is talking about.’ As Hodgson wrote,

not only the scholar’s cultural environment at large but their explicit precommitments, which brought the greater of the scholars to their inquiry in the first place, have determined the categories with which they have undertaken their studies. Only by a conscious and well-examined understanding of the limits of these precommitments and of what is possible within and beyond them can we hope to take advantage of our immediate humanness to reach any direct appreciations of major cultural traditions we do not share.

This choice to foreground positionality in a prologue serves first, to not distract the reader in later chapters with lengthy historiographies on vocabulary, and second, to identify common terms that appear across several chapters. These shared expressions I identify here are determined by the sources I use: Latin and Arabic writings from the eighth to tenth centuries detailed in Chapter Two; architectural and archaeological remains from the centre of the Iberian Peninsula dating from the same time period and discussed in Chapter Three; and finally, the language used in laws passed by the nation of Spain in the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries which is the focus of Chapter Four.

---

que no nos contaron (Spain: Almuzara, 2018); Arsenio Escolar and Ignacio Escolar, La nación inventada: Una historia diferente de Castilla (Spain: Booket, 2013); A quick, cogent summary of the prevalent myths affecting studies of al-Andalus can also be found in Ragnhild Johnsrud Zorgati, Pluralism in the Middle Ages: Hybrid Identities, Conversion, and Mixed Marriages in Medieval Iberia (New York: Routledge, 2012), 3.


P.1 The Challenges of Vocabulary I: Political Terms Related to Conceptions of Space and Place

The focus of this study is spatial in terms of ‘place’, by which I mean physical geographies, as well as ‘space’, which I use to signify socially-constructed conceptions of space, both individual and collective, as argued by Pierre Bourdieu, Henri Lefebvre, and Edward Soja. Place is a fixed spot on the earth quantifiable by Global Positioning Systems (GPS). It is a physical location where social actors create space and spaces. Since space(s) include physical locations, what follows is an attempted reconstruction of social networks and the ways these developed after the Umayyad conquest of the Iberian Peninsula. This work centres how, during the eighth through tenth centuries, North African peoples in relationships with the Umayyad dynasty interacted with the physical geography of the Southern Meseta and how this history became occluded in both premodern and modern retellings. As Soja states, definitions of space are iterative processes in which the human-landscape interaction forms both actors. Yet a temporal scope of thirteen centuries means that spaces (and sometimes places) change names over time. For clarity, before discussing the available evidence, I delineate how I use spatial terms often equated with ‘place’ including Hispania, al-Andalus, Spain, as well as more conceptual ones including empire, frontier, and conquest, which all have complicated historiographies in early Islamic and Andalusi studies.

P.1a Hispania, al-Andalus, and Spain

An obvious anachronism in terminology that arises when looking at sources spanning thirteen centuries is the reality that changing political formations means that locations that have not physically moved have been claimed by various historical actors and states throughout time. For both medieval and modern authors, identity is tied to place, though conceptions of place and their associated social

---


6 Soja, Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory, 37 and 58.

spaces have changed throughout the centuries. In medieval sources, individuals frequently are identified by their city of origin or residence (i.e. Leander of Seville or Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Qurṭubī), and less commonly with a larger geopolitical unit. This might be understood as growing out of the legal tradition of the Roman Empire in which peoples were identified with a city of origin, or orígio. In Arabic, this identification often came in the nisba, such as the above-mentioned al-Qurṭubī. In the modern period, the case is almost exactly the opposite. Individuals often are identified with a nation-state identity than a city (i.e., the ‘Spanish Arabists’). This creates an imbalance when attempting to talk across time periods. The names of locations including metropolises, towns, fortresses, palaces, and religious sites demonstrate remarkable stability over time and are comparatively free of broad political connotations. However, the socially-constructed political constellations that absorb and claim these localities shifted dramatically, meaning that any attempt to discuss broader polities implies a lessening degree of accuracy. The concept of a clearly defined ‘border’ that can be represented as a line on a map is a relatively new, and thus even when we do speak of medieval territories, attempts to assign them physical borders are somewhat suspect. In the time periods under review, the places of the Iberian

---

8 For a discussion on identity and place in the modern world, see Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (London: Verso, 2016); For a discussion on how boundaries were tied to individuals rather than to physical geographies, see Jan Assmann, Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 133.
10 In Spain, Hobsbawm argues this shift from a local understanding of patria to a national one occurred in the late nineteenth century. According to him, ‘in the late eighteenth century, it still meant the place or town where a person was born’. See The Age of Empire: 1875-1914 (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1987), 148.
11 This stability is noted by Pierre Guichard in Pierre Guichard, Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1995) and is what allows him to reconstruct the tribal geography of al-Andalus in Chapter 6.
Peninsula, various political actors have claimed the places of the Iberian Peninsula, yet the terms most engaged with here are the Hispania/Spania of the Visigoths, the al-Andalus of various Islamicate dynasties, and the modern nation-state of Spain. As a result of these changing socio-political constellations, when known, I attribute individuals to geographic places rather than to constructed political entities. When I do use a more socially-constructed spatial vocabulary, I employ terms informed by current scholars of geography and topography. I use ‘Iberian Peninsula,’ ‘North Africa,’ ‘Sicily,’ and the ‘Balearic Islands’ in referencing the lands in which Andalusi history occurred, not out of some malice for the country of Spain, as Dario Fernández-Morera has suggested, but rather as many have pointed out, that solely using ‘Spain’ ignores the fact that at times those who ruled the polities of al-Andalus also included governed in the nation-states of Portugal, France, Morocco, Algeria, Mauritania, and Italy.

The history of ‘Spain’ is more expansive than the territory governed by the modern nation-state.

---

13 This is true for my use of ‘North African’ as a descriptor. At no point do I mean this with any other meaning than as related to the geographies north of the Sahara Desert, which includes the modern countries of Egypt, Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco. I understand that in some ways this is simply trading one political vocabulary for another. Modern geographical terminology, despite giving the impression of objectivity, privileges the sciences of geography and topography over political designations. In my opinion, this is most appropriate for the following discussion, but I recognize that geographical and topographical terms are not devoid of power dynamics. I trust that future scholars will see the intent here is to write for a contemporary audience – and that should different, more appropriate, terms arise in the future, I would embrace those equally.


15 While useful in terms of laying out geographical references to mark the space that I discuss, the term ‘Spain’ is problematic regarding the ways that it has been imbued with nationalist connotations in eighteenth- to twenty-first-century historical positionings about identity. The notion of ‘Spain’ as a pre-Andalusi nation has generated much tense academic discussion, one that any scholar engaging in a study of the history of the Iberian Peninsula cannot avoid. While a more robust conversation on the term and its relation to cultural memory follows in the next chapter, for the purposes of identification, whenever I employ the term ‘Spain’ in the following pages I am referring only to the state brought into being in the early modern period that has continued, albeit with varying borders and political configurations, to the present. The authority of this nation-state has never been accepted by all who live within its purported borders, and as a result all uses of ‘Spain’ carry nationalist and political connotations as defined by a powerful centre. I therefore will not use the terms ‘Visigothic Spain’ or ‘Muslim Spain’ to avoid anachronisms, a position increasingly advocated by scholars working on medieval Iberia as seen in Thomas F. Glick, Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages, Second, Revised Edition, The Medieval and Early Modern Iberian World (Leiden: Brill, 2005); Jerrilynn D. Dodds, Architecture and Ideology in Early Medieval Spain (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990); Claire D. Anderson and Mariam Rosser-Owen, ‘Introduction,’ in Revisiting Al-Andalus: Perspectives on the Material Culture of Islamic Iberia and Beyond, The Medieval and Early Modern Iberian World (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 18.
When referring to historical polities, whenever possible, I employ the terms used by the chroniclers of that time. When speaking of the Visigothic state, I use ‘Hispania’ or ‘Spania’; when discussing Umayyad and North African rule, ‘al-Andalus’; and for the territories traditionally designated as the ‘Christian Kingdoms’, I use regional indicators including Navarra, Asturias, Galicia, the lands of the Basques, and Cantabria. To distinguish temporal shifts within these polities I follow dynastic chronology, basing designations on the familial self-identification of the ruling polity. Therefore, I employ the following periodization: for the Visigothic Kingdom (395-711 CE); for al-Andalus: Umayyad (661-976 CE), ‘Āmirid (976-1009 CE), Dhū al-Nūnid (1023-1092 CE), Tāʿifa (1031-1305 CE), Almoravid (al-

---


17 Scholars often embrace a periodization ending in 1031 which marks the ‘official’ beginning of the Tāʿifa kings. However, I argue for a periodization of the Umayyad dynasty ending with the death of Abū al-ʿĀṣ al-Mustansir bi-llāh al-Hakam ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān (al-Hakam II) in 976 following Abdurrahman Ali El-Hajji, Andalusian Diplomatic Relationships with Western Europe during the Umayyad Period (A.H. 138-366/A.D.755-976) (Beirut: Dar al-Irshad, 1970), 30; Although Abū al-Walīd Hishām al-Muʿayyad bi-llāh (Hisham II) ‘reigned’ from 976-1009 and 1010-1013, this was in name only. The consolidation of power by the ʿĀmirid ruler Abū JaʿfarʿAbd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Mansūr (al-Mansūr) during Hishām’s rule altered the ways in which traditional power relationships negotiated by the Umayyad family at the onset of al-Mansūr’s tenure. This is not to argue that there were no consistent features between the Umayyad and the ʿĀmirid period. As Mariam Rosser-Owen has argued, the ʿĀmirids consciously adopted and adapted aspects of Umayyad rule, especially their imperial visual culture to evoke continuity and legitimacy. The ʿĀmirids should be studied in their own right. See Rosser-Owen, Articulating the Hijāba: Cultural Patronage and Political Legitimacy in al-Andalus: The ʿĀmirid Regency c. 970-1010 AD; Pierre Guichard also argued for understanding the ʿĀmirids as a distinct dynasty in Esplendor y fragilidad de al-Andalus, Colección Historica (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2015), 124.

18 Given the nature of the Tāʿifa kingdoms, various small kingdoms existed around the Mediterranean claiming Tāʿifa status; the end date of 1305 is given for when the kingdom in Ceuta fell to the Mārnīṣids of Fes.
Murābiṭūn, 1040-1147 CE), and Almohad (al-Muwahhidūn, 1121-1269 CE); for the ‘Christian Kingdoms’, Asturian (718-924 CE); Leónese (910-1833 CE);19 and Navarese (824-1841 CE). When I employ the term ‘Umayyad’ to modify al-Andalus, I am referring only to the eighth through tenth centuries. When I use ‘Andalusi’, I intend to cover all polities which laid claim to the ruling of al-Andalus, from the eighth through the fifteenth centuries. While a detailed discussion of this follows in Chapters Two and Three, according to texts and archaeological evidence we should consider the modern Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha as integrated into the Umayyad state starting in the first quarter of the eighth century and continuing as such throughout Umayyad rule.

I refer to entities by the ways in which our written sources closest to the time employ, always with the understanding that this is the way an urban, elite, literate culture chose to identify people. However, as Lefebvre discussed generally and Oleg Grabar pointed out in his discussion of absolute versus relative time, very rarely does the periodization of the Arabic (or Latin) chronicles match those of cultural milieus, creating a tension in discussions of representations of the past.20 Despite the reality that shifts in material culture seldomly align with the changing of dynasties or that the lived experience of people often does not reflect the geographical divisions of chroniclers, there is value in having a common reference on which we can base conversations. Additionally, contemporaries would not have understood titles with ordinal numbers, such as “Abd al-Rahmān I” or ‘Alfonso I’. Finally, there is a tension in the ways in which Islamicate and Christianate polities in the Iberian Peninsula conceived of sovereignty. While Islamicate dynasties in the early medieval period tended to base political

---

19 The Kingdom of León traces its heritage through the Asturian line; in 910, the death of Alfonso (III) resulted in the splitting of Asturias into three kingdoms: León, Asturias, and Galicia. With the death of the last king of Asturias, Fruela (II) in 924, the three kingdoms reunited, this time reconstituted as León. The first half of the tenth century was one of significant turmoil for the León, as the kingdom dealt with internecine conflicts as well as threats from the Normans. León first achieved political stability under the rule of Ramiro (II, r. 931–951).

identification on familial, dynastic, designations, Christianate kingdoms more commonly identified themselves with the names of conquered lands. This can have problematic consequences when comparing the two – the use of titles like “Alfonso VI of Castile and León” not only is (at times) an anachronistic one, but one that suggests that the Christian king had a legitimate claim to a territory with a clearly defined border. It is a colonisation of sorts which obscures the dynamics of the medieval period, and one we must keep in mind. The first time I introduce a ruler I provide their family name found in the sources as well as the more familiar ordinal gloss in historiography. Particularly when discussing the Christian kingdoms, I try to emphasize their dynastic, familial history as well as their territorial claims.

P.1b Empire

These shifting political configurations from the eighth to the twenty-first century raise issues regarding the meaning and use of the term ‘empire’. While I do not assert that Umayyad al-Andalus was an empire, the region studied here was first settled as a result of the conquest of the Umayyad Empire and built heavily upon the substrate of the Visigothic Kingdom, which in turn relied upon political and administrative legacies of the Roman Empire.21 As a result, the ways in which this space was settled and used in the eighth through tenth centuries has implications for historians of premodern empire. This frame is important for understanding not only the initial Umayyad expansion into the Iberian Peninsula at the beginning of the eighth century but more crucially for the ways in which the process of expansion and clientage was viewed by those participating in this system. As Herfried Münkler, Karen Barkey, Robert Haug, and Asa Eger have argued, to understand the success and organization of empires, scholars should look to their edges rather than the imperial cores.22 This focus on the edges appears

---

particularly relevant given Eger’s assertion that the Umayyad Empire was mainly frontiers. The jump from ‘premodern’ to ‘colonial’ empire is significant and scholars of empire have grappled with the stability of the broader term. In general, researchers of the early modern and colonial periods pay more attention to these structuring terms than scholars of medieval history, which could be considered lacking in such theoretical discussions. In this regard, there is a benefit to the anachronisms caused by the temporal gap in this study, as it requires a more methodological approach to the concept. Early modern and colonial historians have dedicated much discussion to the difference of empire (and empires of difference) in the past few decades complicating traditional understandings of what makes an empire. As pointed out by Alan Mikhail and Christine Philliou

in empires past we are free to imagine a different kind of political belonging, off the grid of the national, neoliberal state that was often the ideal but rarely a reality in the twentieth century. In early modern empires in particular, diversity, flexibility, and indeterminacy of imperial subjecthood can be counterposed to the homogenizing, micro-managing modern nation-state and the reductionist, Manichean, and violent histories that have been generated in its service.

One might also apply this idea of a particular, diverse, flexible, and indeterminate empire to premodern as well as early modern constellations. For art historians, particularly those working in institutions that

---


26 Mikhail and Philliou, ‘The Ottoman Empire and the Imperial Turn,’ 722.
represent cultural heritage, taking note of the tension between premodern and modern empire/nationalism is particularly important as this is the exact space this thesis mediates. Modern political configurations claim total hegemony over their citizens over whom they take ever-increasing measures of surveillance and control, one of which includes performing a normative task in educating its citizens through cultural institutions and policies.\textsuperscript{27} One challenge faced by cultural historians today is to provide access to the past, which means we must present worldviews of the comparatively hands-off approach of premodern empires that exhibited none of these homogenizing tendencies. Chapter Four focuses on the ways twentieth-century Spanish historians’ understandings of empire and political control influenced their interpretation of the past, in particular, that of Umayyad al-Andalus, the history of which is presented in Chapters Two and Three. For the purposes of this discussion, I adhere to Frederick Cooper’s definition that empire is ‘a political unit that is large, expansionist (or with memories of an expansionist past) and which reproduces differentiation and inequality among people it incorporates.’\textsuperscript{28} I emphasize that presentist judgments that read ‘inequality’ as negative are unhelpful in approaching the premodern past.

\textit{P.1c Frontier}

One of the repercussions of rethinking ‘empire’ is the way in which this affects conceptions of what defines the space of premodern empires. The reconsideration of premodern space as networks rather than polities with borders that can be represented by lines on maps has ramifications for the area under investigation in this paper.\textsuperscript{29} The focus of the physical space delimited by the topography of the


\textsuperscript{28} Cooper, \textit{Colonialism in Question}, 27.

\textsuperscript{29} For discussion on empires and networks, see Cooper, 53 and 201; For a discussion of empires as based on nodes, see Barkey, \textit{Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective}; For discussions on European-conceived marking of territory using lines as borders, see Adelman, ‘Mimesis and Rivalry: European Empires and Global Regimes,’ 90; Bernard S. Cohn, \textit{Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India} (Princeton:
centre of the Iberian Peninsula often is referred to in secondary sources on Umayyad al-Andalus as a ‘frontier’, largely as a result of Arabic chronicles relating the history of the period which employ the term *thaghr* (pl. *thughūr*). Late medieval Arabic sources referred to the territory under scrutiny in this work as the *thaghr al-awsat*, although their definitions of the area are nebulous and vary by author. Much has been made of the term *thughūr* and its sister terms, *āfāq, hudūd*, and *tukhūm*, and their numerous translations. The terms ‘march’, ‘lime’, ‘border’, and ‘frontier’ all have been used at various times, and each has as specific connotation; the first two evoke the worldview of the Roman Empire, the latter European and American concepts of colonial and ideological space. I opt not to use ‘march’, ‘lime’, ‘border’, or ‘frontier’ due to these problematic connotations and the ways that applying these constructs as equivalent to Arabic terms further muddies our understanding of Arabic texts. Just as ‘frontier’ gained currency in an attempt to distance the concept of *thughūr* from Roman limes or marches, it is time to reconsider the appropriateness of translating *thughūr* as ‘frontier’ in discussions of medieval Iberian and perhaps more widely, medieval Middle Eastern and early Islamic history. Instead, I suggest that the substantial body of academic literature on *thughūr* means that it is a well-developed

---


31 See Chapter Three of Manzano Moreno, *La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas* for the most detailed conversation of the ways in which various Arabic chronicles define the *thaghr al-awsat* to date. A brief summary of this is provided in Chapter One.

term to be understood and used without translation. A delineation of this term in Andalusi studies in presented in Chapter One.

P.1d Fat/h Futūḥ and Conquest

Finally, discussions on empire and their spaces employ terms relating to how empires form and expand. In the case of the Umayyad Empire in al-Andalus, these include ‘invasion’, ‘fatḥ (pl. futūḥ)’, ‘migration’, ‘submission’, and ‘conquest’ to describe the military process that began in 711 CE.

Alejandro García-Sanjuán summarizes the challenges of using a ‘correct’ term, arguing that to date no term is without ideological baggage: ‘invasion’ is problematic due to its association with Spanish nationalism, in particular its use by Eduardo Saavedra who named the ‘Arab invasion’ ‘the national catastrophe’; the Arabic ‘fatḥ’ offers the challenge of being a preferred term for a triumphalist Islamic worldview in Arabic scholarship; ‘tribal migration’ almost entirely ignores the reality that this was a military operation; ‘submission’, as championed by Pedro Chalmeta, over-emphasizes the role of


34 The most recent conversation that discusses the inappropriateness invasion, fatḥ/futūḥ, conquest, submission, or tribal migration is in Alejandro García-Sanjuán, ‘El origen de al-Andalus: reflexiones para un nuevo marco conceptual,’ in Arabización, islamización y resistencias en al-Andalus y el Magreb, ed. Bilal Sarr and M. Angeles Navarro García (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2019), 51–76; For references of Francisco Franco’s use of ‘Reconquista’ and crusade narratives in the Spanish civil war, see Paul Preston, The Spanish Civil War: Reaction, Revolution & Revenge (London: Harper Perennial, 2006), 17, 76, 220, and 222.
capitulatory agreements; and ‘conquest’ plays into nationalist narratives about ‘reconquest’ that suggest a unified ‘Spain’ existed prior to the events of 711. García-Sanjuán sees ‘conquest’ as the lesser of all the evils, arguing that ‘conquest’ has less negative connotations than ‘fatḥ’. However, this argument has concerning implications that somehow Arab triumphalism is harsher than Spanish nationalism. While the use of ‘conquest’ emphasizes shared experiences of premodern empires, for al-Andalus it also plays into a narrative advanced by the ‘negationists’ who deny the presence of autochthonous Islamic communities in the Iberian Peninsula. A solution to this Gordian Knot might be a neologism, yet that also poses problems as it obscures similarities between the process of Umayyad expansion and that of other empires. Although an admittedly imperfect solution, I have chosen to use ‘fatḥ’ and ‘conquest’ interchangeably, in an attempt to suggest the parity of Umayyad empire-building across regions as well as to emphasize the weaknesses of both terms simultaneously. While at times the word ‘fatḥ’ reads awkwardly to Anglophone audience, I encourage this unease as it invites reflection.

P.2 The Challenges of Vocabulary II: Ethnolinguistic Terms that Mark Identity

The second category of terms affected by the vast temporal scope encompassed in this work deals with questions of identity. In 2005, Cooper noted that modern scholarship ‘often implies or asserts that nations, races, and identities exist, and that people have a nationality, a “race” and an identity.’ In the case of Andalusi history, we need to add that people are assumed to have a clear confessional affiliation as well. Postcolonial studies, much influenced by Cooper, have focused on deconstructing these categories, looking at the ways in which early medieval peoples made use of various identities

36 For a summary of initial polemics in the nineteenth century, see Chapter One in Pablo Bornstein, Reclaiming Al-Andalus: Orientalist Scholarship and Spanish Nationalism, 1875-1919 (Brighton: Sussex, 2021); For a discussion of the negationists, see Alejandro García-Sanjuán, ‘Rejecting Al-Andalus, Exalting the Reconquista: Historical Memory in Contemporary Spain,’ Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies 10, no. 1 (2018): 127–45.
37 Cooper, Colonialism in Question, 63.
depending on situations. The Latin sources under review speak of ‘Saracens (Saraceni)’, ‘Arabs (Arabes)’, ‘Moors (Mauri)’, ‘Goths (Goti)’, ‘Franks (Franci)’, ‘Chaldeans (Chaldaei)’, ‘Asturians (Astures)’, ‘Galicians (Gallaecae)’, ‘Basques (Vascones)’, ‘Northmen (Nordomani)’, ‘Gauls (Galli)’, ‘Ishmaelites (Ismaelitae)’, ‘Jews (Juda)’, ‘Christians (Christiani)’, and ‘Europeans (Europenses)’. The terms ‘Arab (‘Arab)’, ‘Berber (Barbar)’, ‘Goths (Qūṭiyūn)’, ‘Galicians (Ahl Jiliqiyya/Ghalijshkush),’ ‘Basques (Bashakas/Bashkūnas),’ ‘Franks (Franja/Fransī),’ and ‘Slavs (Ṣaqāliba)’ dominate the Arabic sources when identifying groups of people. Within the scope of the eighth to tenth centuries, these terms are problematic enough. Authors use vocabulary differently between texts and often within texts these categories defy consistent characterization. Many of these terms fell out of use over time. However, terms like ‘Moor’, ‘Arab’, and ‘Berber’ have not only remained, but accumulated more definitions and connotations in the interstices between the early medieval and modern periods. By the nineteenth-century, terms like ‘Mozarab’ and ‘Mudéjar’ had been created and employed, inventing ahistorical categories in which to place medieval peoples according to modern conceptions of identity. In defining ‘who’ I discuss in this work, I have chosen not to employ many of the terms one might expect to


39 See discussion in Kenneth Baxter Wolf, Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain, Second, Translated Texts for Historians 9 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011), 32 For the use of ‘Moor’ in Chronicle of 754, see page 85.


41 Spelling of ‘Basque’ is not consistent in the Arabic sources. In Ibn Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-Tārikh, 142 spelling is al-bashakas; In al-Iṣṭakhrī, ‘Kitāb al-masālik wa l-mamālik,’ 37; and in Ibn Hawqal al-Nusaybi, ‘Kitāb surat al-ard,’ 109 spelling is Bashkiṣnas.

encounter in Umayyad histories of al-Andalus. In addition to jettisoning ethno-linguistic categorizations of peoples (‘Moors’, ‘Arabs’, and ‘Berbers’), I shy away from religious identity markers (‘Islamic’ and ‘Christian’) and recently-created terms (‘Mozarab’ and ‘Mudéjar’). These choices are explained below. The order of the subsequent discussion starts with the first appearance of these problematic terms in the sources and discusses the historical development of each before turning to the next word.

**P.2a ‘Moors/Moros’ and Moorish’**

The primary actors of this study are peoples originally from North African who, under the leadership of Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād, settled in the Southern Meseta at the beginning of the eighth century. Frequently named as ‘Moors’ or ‘Berbers’ in scholarship, relatively few investigations have recognized that neither of these terms was used self-referentially by the peoples under study. Given that the sources often name the families that settled here, the choice of general terms over specific ones begs the question, why use exonyms? One of the more astonishing phenomena in the study and presentation of Andalusi history is the persistence of the terms ‘Moor’ and ‘Moorish’, despite Hodgson’s assertion in 1961 that ‘we have got rid almost together of “Moorish” and “Turanian” and “Saracen” amongst specialists because each of these terms had come to carry, as a category, implications too hopelessly confused for reform to seem worthwhile.’ In Anglophone scholarship, this vocabulary is particularly tenacious in the United Kingdom as evinced in recent publications and in museum displays, including the uncomfortably titled ‘Viva España’ article in the Winter 2022 issue of the Royal Academy of Arts Magazine, the 2022 display of Islamic ceramics at The Burrell Collection in Glasgow (Figure P.1), current labels in the National Museum of Scotland, identifying the only Andalusi item in the collection as a

---

43 Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, 1: The Classical Age of Islam:47. “Saracens” is a term which has an unclear etymology, though it was used in early Latin sources to refer to non-Roman peoples, likely nomadic and from the east. By the late medieval period it was widely used to refer to Muslims. “Turanian” came in fashion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries designating a linguistic family of Eurasia. It widely became used to refer to peoples and cultures from Iran, often synonymous with the exonym “Persian”.

37
'Hispano-Moorish' astrolabe (Figure P.2), and in the British Museum, where outside of the newly installed Islamic Galleries, the term is found in labels. There is a potency in seeing the term 'Moorish' compared to 'Turanian' and 'Saracen', both of which would seem radically out of place in twenty-first century works or displays. Particularly of import for Chapter Four, 'Moor' (del Moro) was used in the early nineteenth century in legislation, labels, and texts in cultural sites throughout Spain and is still a term employed regularly in Spain to denote places associated with the Islamicate past. Its long history of use has caused a slippery quality that can have dangerous connotations in the modern period. ‘Moor’ is not a term used by experts who study al-Andalus: what follows is an explanation of why the term is equally unhelpful for historians of modern Spain.

The confusion surrounding terms derived from ‘Moor/Moros’ to discuss Andalusi history stems from its varying use over the thirteen centuries that have elapsed since the Umayyad conquest of the Iberian Peninsula. While a more extended academic conversation on the topic is long overdue, I assert that a simple statement regarding its anachronism and denouncing the term is not enough. Many have expressed this before: in addition to Hodgson’s 1961 avowal, in 2005, Thomas Glick argued that it is never appropriate to use the term ‘Moor’/‘Moros’ due to its racial connotations, and in 2007 Glaire Anderson and Mariam Rosser-Owen wrote that they

---

44 Bray and Tremlett’s choice of title seem to evoke the pop song ‘Y Viva España’, yet without an explanation, this also evokes the Francoist slogan ‘Viva España y Viva Franco!’ which certainly would be known to Tremlett as a historian of the Spanish Civil War. For use of the term ‘Moor’ see Xavier Bray and Giles Tremlett, ‘Viva España,’ Royal Academy of Arts Magazine, 2022, 52–53. Bray and Tremlett do seem to understand that the term is contested, given it is in quotation marks, yet there is no explanation for this choice, nor do they provide any context for this term. For recent use of ‘Moorish’ in Islamic history and Islamic art history, see Robert Hillenbrand, Islamic Art and Architecture, Second (London: Thames and Hudson, 2021), 181; Brett and Fentress, The Berbers, 156; Escolar and Escolar, La nación inventada: Una historia diferente de Castilla, 108. 139. 302; Richard L. Kagan, The Spanish Craze: America’s Fascination with the Hispanic World, 1779-1939 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), 211; Javier Martínez Jiménez, ‘Crisis or Crises? The End of Roman Towns in Iberia, Between the Late Roman and the Early Umayyad Periods,’ in Tough Times: The Archaeology of Crisis and Recovery: Proceedings of the Graduate Archaeology at Oxford Conferences in 2010 and 2011, ed. Elsbeth M van der Wilt and Javier Martínez Jiménez, BAR International Series 2478 (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013), 85; For use of the term ‘Moor’ in recent historical work, see Buresi, La frontière entre chrétienté et Islam dans la péninsule Ibérique: Du Tage à la Sierra Morena (fin Xle-miieu Xlle siècle), 291; For a discussion on the presentation of Islamicate history in The Burrell Collection, see Mariam Rosser-Owen, ‘Burrell Collection- Pollok Park,’ Instagram Photo, August 21, 2022.
reject[ed] notions and terms such as ‘Reconquista’ and ‘Moor’/‘Moorish’, which imply an
historiographical model of the Arab invaders as ‘landlords’ of the Iberian Peninsula, who for seven
hundred years remained aloof from it, built monuments which then remained behind as the only traces
of their presence, when indigenous Christianity finally reasserted itself and drove them from its land.\textsuperscript{45}

In 2009, Ross Bran delineated the problematic instability of the term which historically has at times
signified race and at other times, religion.\textsuperscript{46} These enjoinders have slowed the use of the term, yet not
halted it. This quick review sheds light on some of the complicated dynamics that employing the term
comes with in relation to the research presented in this work.

As mentioned earlier, in the eighth through tenth centuries, only the Latin sources use a term
that translates to ‘Moor’ in English. ‘\textit{Mauri}’ is used to label the Umayyad and North African conquerors,
though these Latin textual sources more frequently employ ‘Saracen’, ‘Chaldean’, ‘Ishmaelite’, or ‘Arab’
in their descriptions.\textsuperscript{47} The use of ‘\textit{Mauri}’ to identify the Umayyad conquerors is somewhat confused.
Sixth-century authors local to the Iberian Peninsula writing before the conquest, like John of Biclaro (c.
540-c. 621) and Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636), understood the word as Lara Eggleton defines, as deriving
from ‘the Latin \textit{Maurus} . . . first used in Roman times to denote the inhabitants of the province of
Mauretania, which included large portions of modern-day Algeria and Morocco.’\textsuperscript{48} It is worth pointing
out that in his \textit{Chronicle}, John of Biclaro has a distinctly negative view of the ‘\textit{Mauri}’ who only are
identified as killers of Roman prefects and ravagers of Roman territory.\textsuperscript{49} Sixth-century writers of the
Iberian Peninsula defined ‘\textit{Mauri}’ as others. This is an interesting viewpoint considering the integration
of North Africa into the Roman Empire as evinced in intellectual networks as well as archaeological sites

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} See Glick, \textit{Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages}, xxii; and Anderson and Rosser-Owen,
‘Introduction.’
\item \textsuperscript{47} For use of ethnically-defined terms in the \textit{Chronicle of 741}, the \textit{Mozarab Chronicle of 754}, and the \textit{Chronicle of
\item \textsuperscript{48} For use of the term ‘\textit{Mauri}’ in John of Biclaro’s Chronicle, see Wolf, 53–54; 58; For Eggleston’s extended
\item \textsuperscript{49} See specifically entries 8, 11, 16, and 48 in Wolf, \textit{Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain}, 53–58.
\end{itemize}
which demonstrate the Romanization of the area. For these writers, the defining quality that made someone an ‘other’ was that she or he was from a different place, and othering of peoples within the same political system was possible. Belonging to the Empire did not create an all-inclusive sense of identity across participants.

It is this use of the term that the Latin chroniclers of the eighth through tenth centuries follow, though the preference for labels other than ‘Mauri’ to name the conquerors is clear. The first eighth-century use of ‘Mauri’ in Andalusi history comes in a convoluted entry in The Chronicle of 754 which confusingly refers to ‘the Mauri of Spania’, suggesting a new geographical home for the Mauri. This phenomenon is worthy of its own academic conversation, but the main point here is that by the middle of the eighth century, the term no longer indicates a clear geographical origin, suggesting a shift to a more ethnically- or religiously-defined significance. We can state that the eighth- through tenth-century Latin texts presented in this work appear to understand ‘Mauri’ as someone from North Africa, who may be living in North Africa or in the Iberian Peninsula. The greatest failing of Eggleton’s definition is her lack of engagement with the racialized nature of the term. She significantly fails to mention that


51 See Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain*, 85.
‘Maurus’ in itself arises from the ancient Greek μαυρός, meaning ‘dark’.52 There is a racial component to this label that medieval scholars often have avoided or ignored. It is hard to see if one chooses to use the term how this conversation can be overlooked.

As Bourdieu extolled scholars to recognize their own training and biases, in my case, and perhaps for others raised and trained in the United States, race, and the ways in which we speak of it play an important and sometimes overlooked role in the crafting of our arguments.53 This frame is especially important for the term ‘Moor’ which owes a great deal of its familiarity to Spanish- and English-speaking audiences to literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.54 While Bran delineated a shift from a geographical and ethnic understanding of the term to a racial one in the thirteenth century, his assumptions that readers are so familiar with the constructed ‘Moors’ of Cervantes and Shakespeare warranting a preclusion of a discussion on this is an oversight.55 While the meaning of the term shifted significantly in the late medieval period, the cultural dominance it achieved in Western vernaculars is not a result of the popularity of the medieval works the Poema de Fernán González or the Primera crónica. Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra (1547-1616) and William Shakespeare (1564-1616) contributed much to world literature not only in content but also in language formation.56 In their works, each offered descriptions of what defined a ‘Moor(s)’, adding distinguishing traits in their texts. Both Cervantes and Shakespeare understand the term as encompassing far more than an indication of geographic origin.

53 This responds to Bourdieu’s challenge for scholars to understand how ‘the social origins and coordinates of the researcher’ affect her framing of academic inquiry in An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology, 39–56.
54 Bran, ‘The Moors?’, 309.
56 This is largely a result of the print circulation of their works. For a discussion on print capitalism and its homogenizing effects on community, see Anderson, Imagined Communities.
The influence of Cervantes and Shakespeare on European literature and language meant that after the seventeenth century, the term ‘Moor’ carried additional connotations that would have been unrecognizable to eighth- through tenth-century Latin authors. Specifically, these characteristics moved from geographical or religious identifications to phenotypical and behavioural ones, wherein ‘Moors’ became identifiable by their physical traits and ways of living. These works of fiction inspired innumerable Orientalist paintings of ‘Moors’, increasing the inundation of the term with visualizations of ‘Moors’ as black and be-turbaned.57 By the time Spanish lawmakers employed the term ‘Moor’ in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the word brought far more connotations than it had in its eighth- through tenth-century use by Latin scholars. Although Chapter Four will discuss this in greater detail, an example of a protected Spanish site still employing the term is the ‘Taller del Moro’ found in Toledo, which has become a repository for the arts of al-Andalus in that city.58

Not only was the term ‘Moor’ applied in Spanish laws that identified protected sites, but it was heavily used (and remains in use) in secondary literature today.59 Historical studies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, coupled with nascent nationalisms and ways of defining group belonging gave rise to conceived identities, often along lines of supposedly shared genetic traits or religious beliefs.60 Eric Hobsbawm posited ‘we are now so used to an ethnic-linguistic definition of nations that we forget that this was, essentially, invented in the late nineteenth century.’61 This dynamic is reflected in the field

57 A google search performed for ‘paintings of Othello’ on March 17, 2022 returned 3,770,000 results. A google search performed for ‘nineteenth century Orientalist paintings of Moors’ on March 17, 2022 returned 446,000 results. A few more famous examples include Delacroix’s Death of Sardanapalus (1827) or Collision of Moorish Horsemen (1844), William Etty’s Study of a Black Boy (1827-38). For depictions of ‘Moors’ in the twentieth-century, see Claudia Hopkins, ‘Eternal Convivencia’: From Madrid’s Painters of Africa to the School of Tetouan,’ World Art 13, no. 1 (January 31, 2023): 41–42.
58 ‘Taller dl Moro’ translates to ‘Workshop of the Moor’. It is of note the use of the word taller is also problematic as it participates in hierarchies of Western art historical scholarship in which crafts are not considered ‘art’. As a result, the connotations of ‘Taller del Moro’ and its physical separation from the central art museum of Toledo, the Museo de Santa Cruz participates in these hierarchies of power in which ‘Moors’ made crafts while Christians made art.
59 See footnote 42.
60 Hobsbawm, The Age of Empire: 1875-1914, 146.
61 Hobsbawm, 146.
of Andalusi studies, which was founded at this time. As James Monroe details, the Spanish Arabists became embroiled in conversations that debated the role that al-Andalus played in the history and identity of Spain: a conversation which made use of the term ‘Moor’. At the same time, European and American visitors to Spain, enamoured with the architecture of al-Andalus, created an architectural idiom they called ‘Moorish/Moresque’. As a result, secondary scholarship became peppered with references to ‘Moor’ and ‘Moorish’, although the term ‘Moorish’ no longer had only one meaning. ‘Moorish’ was used as the adjectival form suggesting ‘belonging to a Moor’ but also could refer to a distinct stylistic term that had nothing to do with the historical use of the term ‘Moor’.

Finally, the experience of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) added another layer of meaning to the term, perhaps the most vitriolic in historiography as for some, General Francisco Franco’s Africanista regiments become synonymous with terror and violence. Franco’s creation of the Guardia Mora, his personal escort consisting of North African troops, which he used from his rise to power in the 1930s until 1956 when the regiment disbanded after the establishment of the Kingdom of Morocco, created an uneasy visual tie between the dictator and North African peoples. Concerningly, histories of the Spanish Civil War equate the Moroccan regiments with the eighth-century North African troops of Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād and Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr.

All of these meanings are in play if we employ the term today. At best using ‘Moor’ or ‘Moorish’ to discuss the history of al-Andalus muddies arguments, even if attempts are made to distance its use from an unwanted subtext. Once words have connotations they cannot be parsed. At worst, the use of

---

63 I refrain from repeating hateful terminology here due to the ways in which repetition of derogatory terms blunts us to the trauma of its continued use. For an example of the dangerous conflation of ‘Moor’ as both a term to describe those living in al-Andalus as well as Franco’s Africanista regiments, see Preston, *The Spanish Civil War: Reaction, Revolution & Revenge*. ‘Moor’ is used to refer to those from al-Andalus on pages 17, 76, 107, 129, and 222. For examples of the use of ‘Moors’ to refer to Franco’s troops, see 97, 106, 120, 123-4, 132-3, 170, 177, 193, 195, 204, and 233. For use of ‘Moor’ to refer to the Africanista regiments in Paul Preston, *The Spanish Holocaust: Inquisition and Extermination in Twentieth-Century Spain* (New York: W.W. Norton Company, 2012), 46, 47, 90, 306, 319, 354, 464.
‘Moor’ continues to participate in a racialization of Andalusi history that is without any firm support in the sources. The widespread intermarrying of Umayyad conquerors and autochthonous populations, combined with a long history of cultural exchange in the premodern Mediterranean world means that the question of ‘race’ in al-Andalus is largely unknowable. While DNA-based archaeological studies may shed more light on this in the future, for now, the extant sources that discuss what might be considered ‘racial’ characteristics are few.64

Academically the use of ‘Moor/Moros’ has excluded people from the history of Spain due to religiously and racially motivated prejudices. In the historiography of al-Andalus, scholars have used the terms ‘Moor/Moros’ to other people who descended from autochthonous communities in the Iberian Peninsula who converted to Islam.65 Labelling local peoples as ‘Moors’ jettisoned them from the history of Spain and allowed academics grappling with the question ‘what it meant to be Spanish’ to assert erroneously that Islam contributed nothing lasting to the history of the Iberian Peninsula.66 The image of Spain as a confessionally-Catholic state from the sixth century to present depended on a portrayal of ‘Moors/Moros’ as outsiders.67


65 For a glossing of Maure as Muslim, see Aillet, Les Mozarabes: Christianisme, islamisation et arabisation en Péninsule Ibérique (IX-XII siècle), 295–96.

66 The most prominent discussion of this is found in Chapter Four of Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz, España: Un enigma histórico, vol. 1 (Barcelona: Edhasa, 2000), 189–240 titled ‘No se arabiza la contextura vital hispana’ (trans. The Vital Hispanic Contexture is not Arabized).

This multiplicity of layers makes use of ‘Moor/Moros’ inappropriate. The adjectival form of ‘Moorish’ carries these same othering and racial overtones which makes use of the term unsuitable. As discussed, while ‘Moorish’ as an adjective can identify a style created in the nineteenth century by a culturally Christian, European, and American milieu to evoke al-Andalus, as this work does not engage with this subject, there is no appropriate use for this term in this work. While this is certainly not the focus of this work, a more detailed engagement explaining the dangers of continued use or turning a blind eye to the use of ‘Moor’ and ‘Moorish’ is needed in scholarship. I take the liberty of pointing to these issues here, recognizing that this is only a small step in the direction of reconciliation needed in Andalusi scholarship. Sadly, current scholarship and displays have shown that such a detailed explanation of a rejection of a term of othering is needed here.

P.2b Latin, Arabic, Arabized, and Arab

Identity terms related to language became problematic in nineteenth-century socio-linguistic studies which equated language with ethnicity. In alignment with my identification of the terms ‘Moor/Moros’ and ‘Moorish’ as historical constructs, I take care with ‘Latin’, ‘Arabic’, and ‘Arab’. The words ‘Arab’ or ‘Arabic’ are used in Arabic sources from the eighth through tenth centuries as well as in the Spanish laws passed in the nineteenth century related to cultural patrimony. Yet they have different meanings in these respective contexts. In Spanish, ‘árabe’ can translate to either ‘Arab’ or

Asturian regionalism as well as the reality that ‘certainly Christian Cordoban writings of the second half of the ninth century reflect no testimony that the restoration of the Gothic kingdom was a clear goal’ see Luis A. García Moreno, ‘Spanish Gothic Consciousness Among the Mozarabs in Al-Andalus (VIII-Xth Centuries),’ in The Visigoths: Studies in Culture and Society, ed. Alberto Ferreiro, vol. 20, The Medieval Mediterranean: Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400-1453 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 303–23.


69 In Arabic sources, the term ‘Arab’ is used self-referentially as well as to identify members of other groups. While modern scholars may not always understand what was implied by the term, it was an identity marker used and understood by writers of the eighth through tenth centuries. In Spanish laws of the nineteenth and twentieth century, the term is used only to identify baths (the ‘baños árabes’ of Córdoba, Murcia, Palma, Gerona, Granada, Zaragoza, Toledo, Jaén, Málaga), doors (as in the ‘Puerta árabe’ in Soria), and houses (as in the ‘Casa árabe’ in Málaga). These identifications are loosely related to Andalusi history- most of these sites do not date to the time of al-Andalus, but rather to later periods evoking the Andalusi past.
‘Arabic’ in English. This conflation of the terms in Spanish has had consequences for Anglophone scholarship, as in translation it becomes easy to lose track of what one is discussing. When I use the terms ‘Latin’ and ‘Arabic’, I refer only to the language and not to a broader cultural context. Thus ‘Latin authors’ means ‘those who wrote in Latin’ and ‘Arabic chroniclers’ means ‘those who wrote in Arabic’. This logic is also applied to modern authors writing in European languages. At no point do I use linguistic terms to refer to a broader ethnic identity that might be derived from either language or geographical location. The language in which people chose or choose to write reflects only their education or the language of their scholarly output, not their ethnicity nor their confessional alignment.

In the past scholars have devoted much time to asking and answering the question ‘to what degree and when was the society of the Iberian Peninsula Arabized’ i.e., ‘at what point in time was there a linguistic shift from Latin or Latinate vernaculars to Arabic’? As the sources accessed here provide no further insight on this topic, I do not engage with this concept nor use ‘Arabized’ or ‘Arabization’.

As Peter Webb argues, like ‘Moor’, the use of ‘Arab’ obscures rather than elucidates, due to its multifaceted use. In Arabic texts relating the history of al-Andalus, frequently authors use the term ‘Arab’ in opposition to ‘Berber.’ In these texts, ‘Arab’ can be synonymous with the ‘Baladiyyūn’ and/or

---

70 On December 14, 2022, Google Translate offered the following as translations for ‘árabe’: ‘Arab, Arabic, Arabian, Moorish, Moresque’.
71 This is in contrast to Hodgson who argues for Arab as a linguistic identity. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, 1: The Classical Age of Islam:150.
72 The ‘Arabization’ of the Iberian Peninsula is an area of the historiography of al-Andalus that has generated much discussion. At times ‘Arabization’ has been pitted against or confused with ‘Islamicization’, that is the point at which the majority of the inhabitants of al-Andalus embraced Islamic cultural norms. Though the work here may speak to some of these social post-conquest processes, this is not the focus. If the question we ask is to look at ‘Arabization’ or ‘Islamicization’ we might miss or misinterpret social processes that do not neatly fit these categories. For discussions on this, see Pedro Chalmeta, ‘Conquista y sumisión de Hispania,’ in *Arabización, islamización y resistencias en al-Andalus y el Magreb*, ed. Bilal Sarr and M. Ángeles Navarro García (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2019), 19–35; and Bilal Sarr and M. Ángeles Navarro García, eds., *Arabización, islamización y resistencias en al-Andalus y el Magreb* (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2019); For discussions on the ‘Arabization’ of the Berbers, see Brett and Fentress, *The Berbers*, Chapter 4; Manzano Moreno, *La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas*, 189 and 234.
the ‘Syrians/Shāmiyyūn’ and indicates close ties to Umayyad leadership. It should be understood that when Arabic writers use ‘Arab’, ‘Syrians/Shāmiyyūn’, or ‘Baladiyyūn’, this reflects political ties rather than ethnic identifications. In an Andalusi context, ‘Arabs’ would have been understood as coming from the Eastern Mediterranean. The primary sources always assert ‘Arabs’ as occupying a higher social position than ‘Berbers’. This social stratification of the Arabic texts has made its way into the historiography of al-Andalus with ‘Berbers’ or ‘Berber dynasties’ being blamed for the collapse of the Umayyad caliphate.

74 The term ‘Baladiyyūn’ refers to the so-called first settlers of al-Andalus sent by the Umayyads, though this tends to apply only to elite persons, and thus only the ‘Arab’ settlers. Notable ‘Baladiyyūn’ families include the Lakhmī, the Kalbī, and the Fihrī. The ‘Syrians’/’Shāmiyyūn’ refer to those who came to al-Andalus under the leadership of Balj ibn Bishr al-Qushayrī after 741. These ‘Syrians’/’Shāmiyyūn’ often came from the same families of the ‘Baladiyyūn’, i.e. the Kalbī and the Fihrī, and as a result the ‘Baladiyyūn’ versus ‘Syrians’/’Shāmiyyūn’ distinction is largely unhelpful. It is hard to say given our temporal distance from the sources what dynamic people would have understood as more binding: family or military units.

both the terms ‘Arab’ and ‘Berber’ in this work should be understood as challenging a binary that pits the discreet identities of each against one another, with the latter always subservient to the former.

**P.2c ‘Berber’**

Like ‘Arab’, ‘Berber’ is a deceiving word in the sense that the continued use of the term for over 1200 years has given an impression of unity of identity and experience for people from North Africa. Like ‘Arab’ and ‘Moor/Moros’, the term ‘Berber’ is an exonym.\(^76\) Michael Brett and Elizabeth Fentress have written on the heterogeneity of North African peoples, as has Amira Bennison who explains, ‘the so-called “Berbers” did not, however, consider themselves to be one people but several, all speaking their own related but distinct languages which shared characteristics with Ethiopic and other languages of the neo-Hamitic family.’\(^77\) In many cases using ‘Berber’ acts as a short-cut in which peoples whose tribal affiliation we often know is conflated into one broad identity. In addition, there are concerns about its continued use given its predominantly adverse connotation in historiography. As Ramzi Rouighi argues, the continual reproduction of a term that Arabic histories used negatively, particularly in describing the territory of al-Andalus, has marked scholarship.\(^78\) ‘Berber’ leaders and dynasties have been sidelined, and at times vilified, in early Islamic history, a dynamic that recent scholarship challenges. I thus avoid the term ‘Berber’ unless referencing its use in primary sources or past scholarship. However, this is the group around which my research focuses and therefore I reference them frequently. I prefer to speak in either geographic or dynastic and familial terms, not ethnic ones. The forces that conquered the Iberian Peninsula in 711 undoubtedly were ‘Umayyad-led,’ accountable to leaders in Qayrawān and Damascus. All sources agree that the majority of the conquering forces came from North Africa. In particular, the

---


\(^78\) See Chapter 3 Rouighi, *Inventing the Berbers: History and Ideology in the Maghrib*. 
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area of the Southern Meseta was conquered by the troops of the North African leader Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād whose path began in Gibraltar, and depending on the source, continued to Medinat Sidonia, Moror, Carmona, Éjica, and Jaén before arriving in Toledo, perhaps with stops in Alcalá de Henares and Guadalajara. This initial North African conquest led to settlement; in the Southern Meseta from the eighth through twelfth centuries the families identified by Arabic chroniclers as wielding power include the Hawwāra (ancestors of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn), Maknāsa, Madyūna, Kutāma, Zanāta, Maṣmūda, Malīla, Ṣanhāja, Nafza, Arān, Raṣīn, Maḍḍa, Ghamāra, and the Banū al-Aftas. I use familial designations when we can speak with relative certainty that a familial-group controlled certain territory, and North African for all other general uses.


80 While the correction Arabic transliteration of this is the Banū Dhī al-Nūn, I have chosen to keep the family name in the nominative, rather than genitive given the confusion that the switching between the two cases has caused in secondary scholarship for writers unfamiliar with Arabic. I maintain this throughout this thesis.

81 For identifications of those peoples in the thaghr al-awsat in the eighth through tenth centuries, see Chapter Two, particularly the section on al-İṣṭakhrî’. For other author’s identifications, see Ṭāhā, The Muslim Conquest and Settlement of North Africa and Spain, 175; Brian A. Catlos, Kingdoms of Faith: A New History of Islamic Spain (London: Hurst & Company, 2018), 43; Bosch Viā, ‘The Administrative History of Al-Andalus: An Approach,’ 84.

82 While I am aware that ‘North African’ is currently a contested term, I argue that the geographic scope of my work makes this the most appropriate for this discussion. I refer readers to footnote 15 for a similar methodology.
The final category of terms I discuss relating to challenges posed by the temporal span of this work consists of those terms relating to the Abrahamic faiths. What makes someone Christian, Muslim, or Jewish, how contemporaries can identify someone as adhering to one of these faiths, and how important this identity may be in an individual’s participation in society has changed drastically in 1300 years. In particular, a legacy of eighteenth and nineteenth-century scholarship on the field of Andalusi studies is the ‘religious turn’ that emphasized religion as an identity marker. This is evinced in the need of secondary scholarship to classify people as ‘Christian’, ‘Muslim’, or ‘Jewish’ in the medieval period. While undoubtedly faith was important in medieval Iberia, to what extent the average person identified with and practised certain traditions is largely unknown. Our reliance on elite written sources gives the impression that confessional creed was a major dividing line of the time. Yet studies on apostasy and conversion demonstrate that these so-called borders were quite permeable. As discussed earlier, of the various ways to identify peoples, the sources under review here opted more frequently for ethnolinguistic terms than religious ones. Neither the early medieval sources nor Spanish laws in the nineteenth and twentieth century consistently employ terms that clearly denote confessional affiliation. Although there are instances in which scholars can classify the faith of historical individuals given their self-professions, characterization by others, or identification by legal norms and social habits, largely assignations of religion to peoples occurs in secondary literature. This realization affects my use of terms related to faith systems, and in particular my embracing of the term ‘Islamicate’ over ‘Islamic’. What

83 Frederick Cooper warns against the idea of ‘intellectual turns’ in which scholars make coordinated moves together in Cooper, Colonialism in Question, 5; However, Ussama Makdisi’s argument for what he terms ‘the ecumenical frame’ and its growth in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is most in line with what I mean. See particularly Part I: Religious Difference in an Imperial Age in The Age of Coexistence: The Ecumenical Frame and the Making of the Modern Arab World (Oakland: University of California Press, 2019).

84 For monographs on shifting identities in al-Andalus, see Safran, Defining Boundaries in Al-Andalus: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Islamic Iberia, 5; Zorgati, Pluralism in the Middle Ages: Hybrid Identities, Conversion, and Mixed Marriages in Medieval Iberia; For reference to the ease of crossing religious boundaries in al-Andalus, see Aillet, Les Mozarabes: Christianisme, islamisation et arabisation en Péninsule Ibérique (IX-XII siècle), 65–71; For general discussions on the ways in which identity shifts, see Cooper, Colonialism in Question, 65–71.
follows is a brief explanation of how I use ‘Islam/Muslim’, ‘Christianity/Christian’, ‘Judaism/Jewish’ and a
definition of what I mean by ‘Islamicate’ and ‘Christianate’.

**P.3a ‘Islam/Muslim’, ‘Christianity/Christian’, ‘Judaism/Jewish**

Religious practice is something identifiable in archaeological strata and increasing attention to
this source base can help answer questions about communal life in the Iberian Peninsula.85 There are
also times in which our sources make clear the religious affiliation of an individual or group of people.

For clarity, I use ‘Islam’ only when talking about religious practice, ‘Islamic’ when talking about objects
or concepts related to religious practice, and ‘Muslim’, either in its noun or adjectival form, only when
referring to a person whose practice of the faith of Islam is known explicitly.86 I employ ‘Christianity’ and
‘Christian’, and ‘Judaism’ and ‘Jewish’ in the same way. I do not use the terms in cultural and social
ways, opting instead to use Hodgson’s word ‘Islamicate’. It is also important to note that when

---

85 See studies like Sénac, ‘Cuando fueron árabes: La présence musulmane en Narbonnaise (VIII siècle)’; Marcos
García García, ‘Lecturas arqueo(zoo)lógicas del proceso de Islamización en al-Andalus: Una mirada desde Qurṭuba,’
in *Arabización, islamización y resistencias en al-Andalus y el Magreb*, ed. Bilal Sarr and M. Ángeles Navarro García
(Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2019), 297–312; Marcos García García, ‘Exploitación consumo de los
animales en el sudeste de la Península Ibérica durante le alta edad media (siglos VII-XII): Perspecticas Históricas y
arqueozoológicas’ (Granada, Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2019); Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Espacios de poder en
Recópolis en las épocas visigoda y primitiva andalusi (S. VI-IX d. C.)’; Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Recópolis y su justificación
científica: la secuencia estratigráfica’; Antonio Reyes Martínez, ‘Resistencia a la Islamización en el suroeste de al-
Andalus: el caso de Guadix (Granada),’ in *Arabización, islamización y resistencias en al-Andalus y el Magreb*, ed.
Bilal Sarr and M. Ángeles Navarro García (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2019), 241–95; Retuerce and
Zozaya, ‘Variantes geográficas de la cerámica omeya andalusí: los temas decorativos’; Victoria Amorós Ruiz, *El
Tolmo de Minatada en la Alta Edad Media. Cerámica y contexto* (Alicante: Publications de la Universitat d’Alacant,
2018); For a more general summary of the ways in which religion can be detected in archaeology, see Introduction

86 The notable challenge to this conception of ‘Islam only as religion’ came in Shahab Ahmed, *What Is Islam?: The
is Islam? is the assumption that somehow the terms ‘religion’ and ‘faith’ adequately fit Islam. He bases this on the
idea that the English language expresses Western cultural ideas, that neatly fit Christianity but not Islam. This
seems both needlessly pedantic when discussing three faiths so intertwined in geographic origin, belief, practice,
history, and linguistics and also dangerously essentializing of the two other Abrahamic religions. Ahmed
distinguishes Islam from Christianity in structural terms and we should question the wisdom in this. Islam,
Christianity, and Judaism are all systems of difference. Just as Muslims all over the world disagree over what it
means to be Muslim, so do Christians disagree over what it means to be Christian, and Jewish communities
disagree over what it means to be Jewish. The problem is not with the terms ‘faith’ and ‘religion’ which equally
misfit Islam, Christianity, and Judaism. I use all terms as faith systems, recognizing that to label them as such does
not diminish the complexity of their experience.
discussing the Iberian Peninsula after the sixth century, my use of ‘Christian’ always refers to Catholicism. Largely due to the Inquisition, Protestantism did not take hold in the Iberian Peninsula and thus I use ‘Christian’ and ‘Catholic’ interchangeably.87

P.3b ‘Islamicate’ rather than ‘Islamic’

Beginning in the 1980s Spanish archaeologists made a concerted effort to move away from the use of terms like ‘Islamic Spain’ or ‘Muslim Spain’ in favour of ‘al-Andalus’ or ‘Andalusi’ to attempt to dissociate their study from anachronistic nationalisms and the imprecise attestations to the role of religion.88 ‘Islamic’ is rightly troubling to art historians and archaeologists and scholars have arrived at little consensus in either field as to its appropriateness or utility as an adjective. Long understood as a useful misnomer, ‘Islamic art’ as a title for a field seemingly pleases no one yet persists due to an inability to come to any consensus as to what might fit better.89 Hodgson warned of the problems of ‘Islamic’ in the broader context of Islamic history, stating:

the historian, like the philosopher, has a special obligation to be intelligible to the layman because of the human immediacy of the questions he is dealing with. Nevertheless, some special terms and usages are necessary. In many disciplines, scholars would not dream of taking their terminology from the street. Even if they do not fully succeed in agreeing upon a given set of terms, they recognize that it is essential for each writer to use his terms with precision, and that an attempt to accommodate oneself to popular usage as reflected in the dictionary must be disastrous. Too often, historians (especially in the field of Islamics) still try to avoid recognizing such a necessity and are satisfied to be guided by whatever is ‘common practice’. They note that often terminological discussion can descend into pettifogging, and that the nature of their field prevents historians from building up a single total body of terminology in which all cases are provided for. They hope, therefore, that terminology will take care of itself, but it does not. The responsibility remains for selecting minimally misleading terms and for defining them precisely.90

89 For a recognition of ‘Islamic art’ as a ‘convenient misnomer’ and a ‘poor name for an ill-defined subject’, see Blair and Bloom, The Mirage of Islamic Art: Reflections on the Study of an Unwieldy Field,’ 153 and 174; For an extended conversation on the ‘convenient misnomer’ of ‘Islamic art’, see Ahmed, What Is Islam?: The Importance of Being Islamic, 47.
90 Hodgson, The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization, 1: The Classical Age of Islam:45.
Hodgson’s answer to this for the larger field of ‘Islamic studies’ was to coin two neologisms, ‘Islamicate’ and ‘Islamdom’, crafted from popular understanding and dictionary definitions, to move away from ‘Islamic’ as a catch-all term.91 I return to these terms shortly, but first it is worth recounting some of the challenges posed to Islamic art historians in what ‘Islamic’ might mean as a descriptor of art and archaeology.

Scholars have noted the challenges of ‘Islamic art’ largely due to its ambiguity.92 Questions posed include: What exactly is ‘Islamic’ supposed to imply? Who must adhere to Islam to make an object (or a field) Islamic? The rulers? The craftspeople? The everyday people? Is an objects’ use in a liturgical setting enough to make it Islamic? What of the art and material culture of non-Muslims living under ‘Islamic’ rule, or Muslims living under non-Muslim rule? Is ‘Islamic’ cultural? Is ‘Muslim’ the adjective to retain to signify a religious connotation?93 What happens if we jettison the term ‘Islamic’? Would this, as Sheila Blair and Jonathan Bloom suggest, destroy the field, by embracing divisions that could foster

91 Hodgson, 1: The Classical Age of Islam:57.
nationalism and ethnicity, pulling ‘the field apart so that there will be nothing left at all?’

Wendy Shaw, in What is ‘Islamic’ Art? Between Religion and Perception, mounts a significant challenge to the borders of the field to date, arguing that the emphasis made by art history as a field on visuality obscures the art of other senses, namely aurality and ‘heart’ which she argues are key to understanding ‘Islamic art.’

While Shaw pushes scholars to interrogate what art historians have included in the field, she offers no alternative conception of it, meaning that we are left with the feeling that the term is even more inadequate than we had already realized: yet still we are to use it? ‘Islamic’ is misleading, to the extent that at times in academic scholarship we lose track of exactly what we are discussing. In the first place, as discussed earlier, the very idea that religion was a meaningful distinction in the medieval period is tenuous. As Olivia Remie Constable argued, ‘overall, within the Islamic milieu, there is not very strong evidence for segregation of patronage along religious lines or of separating Muslim clients from the dhimmi.’

As mentioned earlier, Hodgson’s answer to the vagueness and ability to mislead inherent in using ‘Islamic’ to refer to wider societal and cultural practices tied to religion was to create two terms: ‘Islamdom’ and ‘Islamicate’. For Hodgson, ‘Islamdom’ meant

the society in which the Muslims and their faith are recognized as prevalent and socially dominant, in one sense or another – a society in which, of course, non-Muslims have always formed an integral, if subordinate, element . . . it does not refer to an area as such, but to a complex of social relations, which to be sure, is territorially more or less well-defined.

‘Islamicate’ signified ‘a culture centred on a lettered tradition, which has been historically distinctive of Islamdom the society, and which has been naturally shared in by both Muslims and non-Muslims who participate fully in the society of Islamdom.’ For Hodgson, the distinction is subtle, related to who

---

96 Olivia Remie Constable, Housing the Stranger in the Mediterranean World: Lodging, Trade, and Travel in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 105.
retains ‘dominance’. I argue that distinguishing between military power, political power, and socio-cultural power can be achieved within the framework of one term: ‘Islamicate’. This is made possible by two realizations. First, understandings of territorial identifications, borders, and mapping have shifted dramatically since the 1960s. Scholars no longer assert that a line on a map corresponds with a political, military, or socio-cultural reality. People express allegiance to political powers without living in the defined territory. This has repercussions for the space under investigation here: while undoubtedly ‘Islamicate’, whether or not the Southern Meseta was a part of ‘Islamdom’ is highly debatable (if unknowable). Peoples easily could have expressed political allegiance to a dominant Umayyad polity without being part of a society in which Islam was recognized as prevalent and socially dominant. Second, while ‘Islamdom’, a direct parallel with ‘Christendom’, may have made sense in the vernacular of the 1960s, in 2022 each are equally obscure and neither retains the power they had to clarify. I suggest, and like to think that given Hodgson’s emphasis on taking terminology from the street, we merge aspects of ‘Islamdom’ into ‘Islamicate’ since the line between the two was never very clear in the first place. I define ‘Islamicate’ as: a society in which Muslims and their faith are recognized as prevalent politically or socially, which can express itself, regardless of territorial boundaries, in a complex of social relations and cultural traditions practiced by Muslims and non-Muslims alike. This is admittedly an elision of Hodgson’s two terms.99

---

99 This does not address Ahmed’s primary objection to Hodgson’s ‘Islamicate’ which is the false separation between religion and culture, as though somehow religion and culture are not locked in a symbiotic relationship. However, this is not so much a reason to wholesale reject the term than it is an opportunity to nuance it— which is what I propose here. Although Shaw and Ahmed argue that the answer is to bring the cultural into the term ‘Islamic’, I argue this is not helpful for the audience with whom I am concerned. Bringing a wider cultural understanding to the term ‘Islamic’ is only useful if your intent is to push against a narrative one understands to be false about what constitutes practice and belief in Islam. I argue that for non-theological discussions, understanding Islam as a faith (in all its complexities) is different than wider socio-cultural practices informed by Islam. The distinction between theological debates and people’s every day experience is important when considering archaeological, artistic, and architectural evidence. I understand the term ‘Islamicate’ as a set of cultural practices which owe their provenance and expression to ‘Islam’. This also avoids a really problematic assertion that Ahmed makes that the professed faith of a person does not affect their worldview. Ahmed argued that we should understand Maimonedes as ‘Islamic’ and disregard his adherence to Judaism. The dismissal of both
P.4 Guiding Philosophy in Identifying People(s)

After rejecting the aforementioned identity terms, the logical question becomes, how do I refer to the peoples under study? The guiding factors I have employed in ‘identifying’ people are first to ask the question if we know the ways in which people understood themselves (i.e., would a person upon hearing a label that I have used plausibly have been able to recognize themselves in the term) and, second, when I cannot find any self-referring terminology, I opt to use geographic terms, a choice dictated by the spatial focus of this work. This decision does not free us from all theoretical problems as geography itself is an exercise of power, yet I believe this helps dismantle some problematic structural issues in the field of Andalusi studies: namely the idea that categories created in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which provide discreet identities for people should still be those to which we adhere.100 Despite recent research that emphasizes people would not have understood these identities as binding and evinces a remarkable fluidity and ease with which people crossed so-called religious boundaries, the continued use of ethno-linguistic, religious, and anachronistic categories demonstrates that we still divide our inquiries along these lines.101 Repetition of these terms implies their theoretical constructs are sound and as this work shows, these terms are superfluous; we have better options. Terminology is important as it forms the foundation on which all work stands. It is my hope that while at times the reader may find expressions like ‘North African peoples’ or ‘Islamicate’ more cumbersome than ‘Berber’ or ‘Islamic’, the use of these words points to the problematic natures of discussions that fail to engage with academic constructs that no longer serve the field.

Maimonedes’ Jewish faith as well as the wider culture in which he participated, claiming him as an Islamic individual is a bit colonial (and unnecessary). See Ahmed, What Is Islam?: The Importance of Being Islamic, 147.

100 For further references on geography as power, see footnote 29.

101 For notes on the fluidity of ethnic identities in the early medieval period, see Brett and Fentress, The Berbers, 99. For recent work on crossing identity boundaries in al-Andalus, see footnote 139.
Introduction

In 1990 excavations under the co-direction of Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez began at a site called Ronda del Cañillo 16 (Figure I.1) in Talavera de la Reina, a city located approximately fifty miles west of Toledo (Figure I.2). The city council of Talavera de la Reina, in conjunction with the Spanish Department of Education and Culture, approached Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez to oversee a salvage operation as the town was building a parking garage and in the course of this process had unearthed ancient material. Over the next year, Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez’s team raced to complete the excavation along the timeline dictated by the city of Talavera de la Reina, finding continuous habitation at the site from the Late Imperial Roman period to the fourteenth century CE, at which point the space became used as a garden. The site is a small part of a settlement known by many names throughout history: that of the Roman settlement of Caesarobriga, the Romano-Visigoth/Umayyad foundation named in Arabic sources as Ṭalabayra, and the late medieval town whose name persists today, Talavera de la Reina. Regrettably, both Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez’s focus on the Late Imperial Roman world, as well as the demands of their schedules has meant that since its original excavation, most of the material has remained unexamined, currently housed in storage rooms in the Museo de Cerámica Ruiz de Luna in the city of Talavera de la Reina. In addition, the appeals of Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez to postpone development of Ronda del Cañillo 16 in order to allow for continued excavation came to no avail, and as a result the potential to understand the ways in which peoples in the Iberian Peninsula built, used, and reused spaces throughout time diminished. In particular, Ronda del Cañillo 16 testifies both to a time and place little understood in the history of the Iberian Peninsula: the Andalusi past of the Southern Meseta.

---

102 Information as to the events of the Talavera de la Reina excavation comes from multiple conversations held with Urquijo Alvarez and Urbina Martínez from the summer of 2018 to the summer of 2021.

103 As of the spring of 2020, the Museo de Cerámica Ruiz de Luna was unable to locate these boxes.

104 I return to a geographical definition of the Southern Meseta in great detail in Chapter Three. For now, the area under study roughly aligns with the city of Madrid and the provinces of Cuenca, Guadalajara, and Toledo in the
The destruction of sites is by no means unusual in the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha, consisting of provinces of Albacete, Ciudad Real, Cuenca, Guadalajara, and Toledo (Figure I.3). In the eleventh century, chroniclers and geographers writing in Arabic identified this area as the \textit{al-thaghr al-awsat}.\textsuperscript{105} One cannot delineate precisely the geographic extent of the \textit{thaghr al-awsat}, a conversation that I return to later in Chapter One. The term has remarkable fluidity over time, including and excluding areas depending on the perceived strength of their ties to the Umayyad dynastic centre in Córdoba. As mentioned earlier, all sources available to us confirm North African presence in the region during Umayyad rule of al-Andalus: Arabic texts, linguistic studies of topography, as well as archaeological evidence.\textsuperscript{106} Though osteoarchaeological studies of Andalusi history in the region have yet to occur, those that have been conducted in the Iberian Peninsula and Southern France not only show the accuracy of Arabic chronicles in identifying spaces of North African settlement but also suggest that both the intensity and duration of these have been vastly underestimated.\textsuperscript{107} All evidence at hand demonstrates that the Umayyad and North African presence in the \textit{thaghr al-awsat} played an important role in the region’s history: one that deserves more attention. This investigation examines an example of visual culture of the Southern Meseta, the Umayyad fortress of Zorita located in Zorita de los Canes (Figure I.4), and analyses the ways in which the development of national cultural patrimony in Spain in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries occluded its Andalusi, North African past.

Perhaps surprisingly, the lack of scholarship on the Andalusi history of the Southern Meseta is not due to a lack of sources. To date, excavations in these Autonomous Communities, similar to the operation in Talavera de le Reina, have generated a wealth of Andalusi material though little of these

\textsuperscript{105} On a grammatical note, from here on out I will use ‘the \textit{thaghr al-awsat}’ instead of ‘the \textit{al-thaghr al-awsat}’ for ease of reading. The ‘the \textit{al-thaghr al-awsat}’ is repetitive and translates to ‘the the Middle Thaghr.’ ‘The \textit{thaghr al-awsat}’ is admittedly an ‘Arabi-glish’ construction. The Arabic is \textit{اﻟﻠﻐراﻻوﺳط}.

\textsuperscript{106} See footnote 136.

\textsuperscript{107} See footnote 108.
finds have been studied or included in publications. Andalusi finds largely are relegated to storerooms awaiting analysis by those with both the expertise and the time. The COVID 19 pandemic highlighted its inaccessibility. The lack of cataloguing and display of Islamicate finds in this region meant that accessing material sources from the Southern Meseta testifying to Umayyad al-Andalus was almost impossible for foreign researchers from March of 2020 to the summer of 2021. Not only are sources not available online, often they are inaccessible (or unknown to a general public) due to a lack of documentation and cataloguing. As a result, this lacuna in scholarship has much to do with funding for projects and national and regional interests which have not prioritized the study of the Andalusí past in central Spain.

Nationally-recognized sites of historical memory in Castilla-La Mancha largely ignore the history of the region that corresponds to the Andalusí period. Archaeological parks, protected areas, and museums in the region, all of which play a role in guarding or granting access to the archaeological material of the thaghr al-awsaf, tend to focus on Roman and Visigothic history, as evinced in the funding of cultural patrimony in the region. After the ratification of the Constitution of 1978, the newly re-established Kingdom of Spain devolved identification and management of cultural sites to the Autonomous Communities in a law passed in 1985. This legislation grandfathered in all sites that had previously been identified in Spanish legislation as ‘National Artistic Treasures’, albeit under a new designation called Bienes de Interés Cultural (BICs). In addition, pursuant to this legislation, the government of Spain provided national funding to locally-identified sites which could be added to the national register. This work cannot engage with all protected locations in the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha, so before moving to the exemplars I have chosen, I provide this summary of the nationally-funded sites that act as custodians and creators of history in the region. In this discussion I deal solely with the

108 See note on the lack of studies on existing museum collections of Islamicate finds in Retuerce and Zozaya, ‘Variantes geográficas de la cerámica omeya andalusí: los temas decorativos,’ 72.
category of ‘bienes inmuebles’ of the Bienes de Interés Cultural, that is ‘unmovable cultural heritage’ designation of protected cultural heritage in the province of Castilla-La Mancha. Each province of the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha identified the archaeological parks, \textit{yacimientos},\footnote{There is no great English translation for this term, which I have chosen to keep as it is used by both the national and regional governments of Spain. In this context, \textit{yacimiento} can be translated as ‘protected area’ and includes a variety of types of areas including parks protected as sites of caves or rock art, places and buildings of archaeological or architectural interest not designated as archaeological parks, and locations of mines.} and museums to receive national funding as BICs.

In terms of archaeological parks, the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha identifies and protects seven sites as of 2023.\footnote{Consejería de Cultura, ‘Parques Arqueológicos de Castilla-La Mancha,’ accessed February 2, 2023, \url{https://cultura.castillalamancha.es/patrimonio/parques-arqueologicos}.} Albacete selected the sites of Libisosa and Tolmo de Minateda, both Bronze Age sites with significant occupation in the Roman period; Cuenca selected Segóbriga, a Celtiberian\footnote{As we will see in Chapters Two and Three, the use and meaning of Celt-Iberian changes in meaning in written sources. For the purposes of this thesis, whenever I use the term I am in line with its use by Spanish archaeologists who define the Iberians as inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula from the eighth-century BCE to the first-century CE, in line with the identification by Arturo Ruiz and Manuel Molinos, \textit{The Archaeology of the Iberians}, trans. Mary Turton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). For a longer discussion on the ways in which the terms Iberian and Celt-Iberian have been used in Spanish (and German) political discourse, see Introduction and pages 1-12 of the same book.} hill-city with significant occupation in the Roman period; Toledo selected Carranque, a Roman villa; Guadalajara selected Recópolis, the Visigothic imperial city of the late sixth century; and Ciudad Real selected Alarcos and Calatrra la Vieja, both Bronze Age settlements with occupation through the late medieval period. Interestingly, many of these sites have significant Andalusi pasts: considerable material has been excavated by the teams of Sonia Gutiérrez Lloret at Tolmo de Minateda, Lauro Olmo Enciso at Recópolis, and Manuel Retuerce in Calatrra la Vieja, yet this history is not mentioned on the website of the Ministry of Culture and Sports of Castilla-La Mancha.\footnote{Consejería de Cultura; Although the website for the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha does not discuss the Andalusi history of Tolmo de Minateda, the printed material from the Autonomous Community does. See Castilla-La Mancha Turismo, \textit{Tolmo Parque Arqueológico: Una ciudad en el camino}, Parques Arqueológicos de Castilla-La Mancha 5 (Castilla-La Mancha: Castilla-La Mancha Turismo, 2022), 4 for the work of the University of Alicante and the Museum of Albacete in excavating finds from the ‘Islamic’ period.} These six locations receive the bulk of national funding allocated for the Community of Castilla-La Mancha.
The *yacimientos* are more numerous and more diverse: Albacete named six locations; Ciudad Real, twelve; Cuenca, ten; Guadalajara, eight; and Toledo, thirteen. Of the forty-nine protected areas in Castilla-La Mancha, only two, the fortress of Calatrava la Vieja in Ciudad Real and the city of Vascos in the province of Toledo, are protected because they are identified with an Andalusi past. The text written by the government of Castilla-La Mancha identifies an additional nine sites with vibrant life under Andalusi rule, though many other locations with significant attestations to this past remain unacknowledged. Perhaps the most extreme of these cases is the site of the Monastery of Uclés,

---

115 The six locations are identified as: four prehistoric sites (Arte rupestre en Nerpio/Rock art in Nerpio, Arte rupestre en Alpera/Rock art in Alpera, Arte rupestre de la Cueva del Niño en Ayna/Rock art of the Cueva del Niño in Ayna and Cueva de Montesinos/Cave of Montesinos), one Iberian hill-fort with continuous occupation through the late medieval period (Castillo de Chinchilla de Montearagón/Castle of Chinchilla de Montearagón); one Andalusi fortress with a late medieval history (Castillo de Almansa/Castle of Almansa).

116 The twelve locations include one prehistoric site (Arte rupestre de Fuencaliente/Rock art of Fuencaliente); three Bronze Age sites (Motilla del Azuer/Motilla of Azuer, Castillejo del Bonete/Palace of Bonete, and Cerro de las Cabezas); one Roman site (Parque Minero de Almadén/Mines of Almadén); four sites with Andalusi history (Calatrava de la Vieja, Canteras de Piédrola/Quarries of Piédrola, the Castillo de Peñarroya/Castle of Peñarroya, and the Castillo de Doña Berenguela/Castle of Doña Berenguela); one late medieval site (Calatrava la Nueva); and two mills from the early modern period (Molinos de Campo de Criptano/Mills of Campo de Criptano and Molino Grande de Manzanares/Great Mill of Manzanares).

117 The ten locations include two prehistoric sites (Arte rupestre en Villar del Huma/Rock art in Villar del Humo and Las Hoyas); five Roman sites (Valeria, Minas Romanas de Lapis Especularis/Roman mines of Lapis Especularis, Fuente de la Mota, Ercávica, and Villa Romana de Noheda/the Roman villa of Noheda); and three late medieval sites, one of which has an Andalusi history (Castillo de Garcimuñoz/Castle of Garcimuñoz; Castillo de Belmonte/Castle of Belmonte, and the Monasterio de Uclés/Monastery of Uclés).

118 For the ten sites, the following identifications apply: two prehistoric sites, both of which evince later Andalusi occupation (Conjunto de los Casares/the ensemble of los Casares and El Prao de los Judíos); one Iron Age site (El Ceremeño); two medieval Christianate sites (Monasterio de Monsalud/Monastery of Monsalud and the Monasterio de Bonoval/Monastery of Bonoval); and four late medieval/early modern sites (Fábrica de Paños de Brihuega/the Fábrica de Paños in Brihuega, Las Salinas de San Juan/the salt pans of San Juan, and the Castillo de Torija/Castle of Torija).

119 Of the thirteen sites, the following identifications apply: one is prehistoric (Arte rupestre de Casa del Oro/Rock art of Casa del Oro); one Iberian site (Cerro Calderico); two Visigothic sites (Santa María de Melque and Guarrazar); although it should be noted that in scholarship the provenance of Santa María de Melque is debated with no clear conclusion; two sites with Andalusi history (Vascos and Los Hitos); six late medieval Christianate sites (Castillo de Oropesa/Castle of Oropesa, Castillo de Orgaz/Castle of Orgaz, Castillo de Guadamir/Castle of Guadamir, Palacio de los Condes de Montalbán/Palace of the Counts of Montalbán, the Palacio de Fuensalida/the Palace of Fuensalida, and the Palacio de Pedro I de Torrijos/the Palace of Pedro I of Torrijos) and one early modern site (Casa-Museo de Cervantes/the house-museum of Cervantes).

120 The following sites are mentioned as having an Andalusi past: in Albacete, Castillo de Almansa and Castillo de Chinchilla de Montearagón; in Ciudad Real, Canteras de Piédrola, Castillo de Peñarroya, and Castillo de Doña Berenguela; in Cuenca, Castillo de Garcimuñoz; in Guadalajara, Conjunto de los Casares and El Prao de los Judíos, and in Toledo, Los Hitos. Sites whose Andalusi past is glossed over include Sacro Convento y Castillo de Calatrava la Nueva/Sacred Convent and Calatrava la Nueva and the Parque Minero de Almadén/Mines of Almadén,
which is built on top of and next to the still-extant eighth-century Dhū al-Nūnid fortress which the province of Cuenca neither acknowledges nor protects. As with the Archaeological Parks, excavations in and studies on the yacimientos in the past forty years have unearthed much that might change how sites are identified and defined to the public. In fact, many of the nine sites mentioned earlier that now are identified with an Andalusi past are identified as a result of research done post 2010. However, this research has had relatively low-impact in changing approaches to cultural heritage in the region. This is evinced in the lack of official acknowledgement and protection of Andalusi sites in Castilla-La Mancha.

Finally, each province has a state-funded museum that not only displays the cultural history of the region to the public, yet also acts as a repository for and guardian of excavated material. As per Law 16/1985, all excavations in a province must forward the entirety of the finds from a site to the designated provincial museum. The growth of archaeology as a field in the 1990s continued until the 2007-8 financial recession and as a result provincial museums have found themselves to be custodians of hundreds of thousands of artifacts, many of which are consigned to storage due to logistical concerns. Of the five provinces in Castilla-La Mancha, Toledo is the only one to have an affiliated museum structure. Each region excepting Toledo has one archaeological museum: the Museum of Albacete, the Museum of Ciudad Real in the Convento de la Merced, the Museum of Cuenca, and the Museum of Guadalajara. Toledo’s main museum is the Museum of Santa Cruz which oversees its affiliates, the Taller del Moro (Toledo), the Museum of the Councils and Visigothic Culture (Toledo), the House-museum of Dulcinea (Talavera de la Reina), and the Museum of Ruiz de Luna (Talavera de la Reina). Often, curation of the provincial museums prioritises Roman history over all others.121

121 The Archaeological Museum of Cuenca boasts six rooms dedicated to Roman history and one vitrine to that of al-Andalus, the Museo de Santa Cruz in Toledo, in recent years has consistent deaccessioned archaeological works in favour of more traditionally defined arts (like paintings), which has had real consequences for the Andalusi past. In 2020, visitors could access the excavation of Andalusi layers under the museum which were incorporated into the display of Islamicate material. After the museum reopened after the COVID-19 pandemic, this area was no
Taken together, these three categories of sites officially protect, preserve, and present the history of the region on behalf of the government of Spain. The devolution of power to Autonomous Communities in the 1980s effectively allowed regions to pick which past they conserved and projected. Nationally, this has led to a fragmented presentation of history which has both positive and negative consequences. On an encouraging note, the variety of local histories means that the pushing of one story to support a centrally-defined national narrative has become more difficult. On the downside, each region has the autonomy to curate its history with little oversight or accountability to authorities who might challenge biased presentations of the past. As a result, regionalism, which has always been particularly strong in the Iberian Peninsula, persists.\textsuperscript{122} While allowing regions to choose the histories they identify with allows for the elevation of local histories that might otherwise be obscured, we must be cognizant that this choice also allows regions to choose which histories to suppress, either intentionally or subconsciously. In Castilla-La Mancha, choices have been made that have led to the limited display and sometimes occlusion of information regarding the Umayyad \textit{fatḥ} and North African settlement from the eighth to twelfth centuries. This obfuscation gives the impression that Castilla-La Mancha’s history of inclusion in and exclusion from al-Andalus left little mark on the territory – a

\begin{quote}
Taller del Moro has become a repository for art objects often with little connection other than a perceived ‘Muslimness’ defined either as dating from the Andalusi period or identified as ‘mudéjar’. For historiographies of the field of archaeology in Spain and the tendency for the discipline to focus on the Roman past, see Magdalena Valor and J Avelino Gutiérrez, ‘The Study of Medieval Archaeology in Spain,’ in \textit{The Archaeology of Medieval Spain 1100-1500}, ed. Magdalena Valor and Avelino Gutiérrez, Studies in the Archaeology of Medieval Europe (Sheffield: Equinox, 2014), 6; and Margarita Díaz-Andreu, ‘Conflict and Innovation,’ in \textit{The Archaeology of Iberia: The Dynamics of Change}, ed. Simon Keay and Margarita Díaz-Andreu, Theoretical Archaeology Group (London: Routledge, 1997), 6–33.

\end{quote}
position that perhaps could find support if the toponomy and the archaeology of the area did not attest otherwise.

Attempting a reconstruction of the Umayyad and North African past of the entire Southern Meseta is not the goal, although one hopes that the information contained hereafter will provide future researchers with valuable tools and information to study the region further. Resources on the Southern Meseta have yet to be complied into a single piece of work which those interested in the *thaghr al-awsat* could reference. Though the region’s Andalusi past encompasses the eighth through twelfth centuries, I have chosen to focus on only the eighth through tenth centuries, as the changes wrought after the civil war that erupted in 1009 and lasted until 1031 radically altered ways of participating in and belonging to al-Andalus. This analysis starts with an examination of the way the Southern Meseta developed in the Umayyad period (711-976 CE). I have made the choice to investigate the history of the Southern Meseta using the Umayyad fortress of Zorita as a window to understand both the Umayyad history of the region as well as how the development of cultural patrimony laws in the nation of Spain in the twentieth century unintentionally obscured this past. The history of the castle-fortress of Zorita in the province of Guadalajara, provides a clear case study of how reuse of an Islamicate site in later Christianate periods and the ways in which later societies understood this past set government policy on a path that eventually led to an occlusion of the fortress’s Andalusi founding. This is demonstrated by a close analysis of the Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts on June 3, 1931, the law that had the largest impact on defining cultural sites in the nation of Spain from 1844 until 1974. I conclude with a brief discussion on a scapular bone inscribed with Arabic letters and a carved miniature both found at the Talavera de la Reina excavation now lost to us. I argue that there is much valuable information in the region that will be lost unless we take better care to preserve this unique history. It is

---

123 There is a small chance that these could be recovered. The Director of the Museo de Santa Cruz in Toledo related in March of 202 that the boxes from the excavation were lost, but that it was possible they were in unlabelled boxes in the storerooms.
the hope of this work that further understanding processes that led to the forgetting of Andalusi contributions to Spanish history will allow for greater context for those trying to make sense of the past of not only the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha, but also for other regions. This work provides some context as to how the Umayyad and North African past of Castilla-La Mancha became occluded in contemporary historical memory and, most importantly, argues for the need of scholarly advocacy for this forgotten history in hopes that increasing attention to this region might preserve sites that can tell us much about this disremembered Andalusi past.

I.1 Structure and Organization of Thesis

This study is at its heart an art historical inquiry, looking to interrogate visual culture to elucidate the past. As such, the story told here revolves around the architecture of the castle-fortress of Zorita demonstrating how careful examination can bring us to new and unexpected questions both about the building itself as well as the reason for its relative anonymity. However, before starting with visual analysis, I offer chapters to clarify the historiographical conversations I enter, the methodologies I use, and the current understanding of the history of the *thaghr al-awsaṭ*. I ultimately argue that the development of the legal history of cultural patrimony in Spain is as important as knowing the history of the fortress of Zorita in terms of understanding why and how the obfuscation of the Andalusi experience in the region occurred.

I.1a Chapter One: Historiography: Andalusi Studies, Cultural Memory, and the Thaghr al-Awsaṭ

Chapter One focuses on the three fields with which this work most directly engages: first, the field of English-language Andalusi art history; second, the theoretical body of literature on cultural memory and the disagreements over whose past counts as ‘Spanish’ in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Spain; and finally, on summarizing the state of the field of academic work on the *thaghr al-awsaṭ*. Though this work touches on several additional fields, it is these three with which this thesis converses most directly. Discussions, both historical and political, regarding al-Andalus and the ways in
which the Andalusi legacy contributes or does not contribute to identity in the modern nation of Spain have demonstrated the possible contentiousness and vitriol of historical investigation. As a result of this, I have chosen to limit my engagement with these conversations and I have touched on these discussions only briefly in the prologue. To a large extent further engagement with both polemical diatribes and neologisms contributes little to developing our understanding of the lived reality of al-Andalus, and often takes away attention from valuable historical investigations.

I.1b Chapter Two: ‘Between Rebellion and Obedience’: Conceptions of the Southern Meseta in Written Sources from the Eighth to Tenth Centuries

Chapter Two discusses the ways in which, from the eighth through tenth centuries, writers conceived of the space now identified as the Southern Meseta in the modern-day Autonomous Communities of Castilla-La Mancha and Madrid. This chapter looks at the ways in which Latin and Arabic chronicles written prior to the eleventh century conceived of this territory, occasionally referred to in the Arabic chronicles as the ṭaghr al-awsat. By limiting the sources under review to the eighth to tenth centuries, we see a different story emerge regarding the use of the term ṭaghr (pl. thughūr) than has been argued both in wider scholarship on thughūr as well as in its context of al-Andalus. This chapter points to an over-reliance on eleventh century authors like Ibn Ḥayyān (d. 1076) not only in understanding the term but also more generally in constructing Umayyad history, suggesting that in the future we must pay more attention to the anachronisms caused by using later sources to structure ideas of space and administration of earlier periods. Finally, this chapter uses QGIS mapping to demonstrate the literal hole formed when we map canonical written sources onto the geography of Iberian space. This is in contrast to the geographical dispersion of material culture in museums and in published works. This chapter argues that telling more complete and balanced histories requires closer investigation of overlooked sites like the fortresses of the Southern Meseta.
Chapter Three: Hidden in Plain Sites: Umayyad Fortresses of the Southern Meseta

Chapter Three focuses on the castle-fortress of Zorita, one of several archaeological sites in the Southern Meseta dating to the eighth to tenth centuries and testifying to Umayyad presence in the region. Though this work does not fully investigate possible sister sites, including but not limited to Talavera de la Reina, Calatalifa, Los Hitos, Calatrava la Vieja, Segóbriga, Ercávica, Vascos, Madrid, Guadalajara, Talamanca, Uclés, Huelamo, and Huete, each of these locations offers architectural and archaeological evidence testifying to the region’s robust North African settlement under Umayyad rule. The case study of Zorita offers tantalizing glimpses into this broader, oft occluded, past. This chapter begins with a review of the historiography of the site, familiarizing readers with the high points of its Christianate past which originally drew the attention of scholars, particularly the twentieth-century historian of the province of Guadalajara, Francisco Layna Serrano. The discussion then moves to recounting the few mentions of the site in Arabic chronicles, all of which come from sources dating after the tenth century. After discussing what historians have written about the site, I move to describe the fortress itself, paying specific attention to both its location in the landscape as well as the features that we can trace to the Umayyad period, including the walls of the fortress, its ninth-century entrance, the church–cámara del alcaide structure, the cistern, and a later Andalusi feline decoration in the ‘Sala del Moro’. The chapter concludes with questions as to what occluded this past, paving way for a discussion on its inclusion as a national monument in the Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts on June 3, 1931, and the way this initial identification affected its trajectory as a historical monument.

Chapter Four: A Monumental Year: Occluding the Islamicate Past in National Heritage Sites in the Decree of June 3, 1931

Chapter Four focuses on the piece of legislation that initially identified Zorita as a site worth preserving: the June 3, 1931 Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts passed by the provisional government of the Second Republic (April 14, 1931- April 1, 1939). This order remained the most significant piece of legislation in terms of the sheer number of locations claimed by the Spanish
government, in its various iterations, as protected national monuments from the initial inclusion of the Cathedral of León in 1844 under the reign of Isabel II (r. 1833-1868) to the addition of the villa of Fermoselle in Zamora under the Francoist government in October of 1974. It was not until the reimagining of the Kingdom of Spain following the death of Francisco Franco in 1975 and its passing of the Spanish Historical Heritage Law of 1985 that a process was initiated under which a larger number of sites gained protected status. This chapter focuses not only on the laws passed between 1844 and 1974 that designated various locations as protected monuments, but also provides an overview of legal approaches to cultural patrimony during this time span. Chapter Four begins with a conversation on the market for Spanish antiquities in the first quarter of the twentieth century that led to a culture of legal protectionism by the governments of Spain, particularly focusing on the development of the relationship between the art historian Mildred Stapley Byne and the architect Julia Morgan. This connection led to a partnership between Stapley Byne, her husband, Arthur Byne, and American media mogul William Randolph Hearst – a joint venture which effected the pillaging and exportation of huge quantities of Spanish artifacts by both legal and illegal, but always coercive, means. It is within this predatory cultural context that Layna Serrano acted to save his region’s heritage and advocated for the inclusion of the castle-fortress of Zorita as a protected site of Guadalajara in the June 3, 1931 Decree. The chapter continues with a close reading of this piece of legislation and a discussion that situates this law within the broader legal context of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Spain. Ultimately, a careful look at this legislation allows us to see how this single law played a foundational role in establishing cultural sites that still enjoy governmental protection today. Given this law’s importance to the legacy of Spanish cultural patrimony, I then unpack the ways in which this legislation provides a window onto some of the national insecurities in the early 1930s and demonstrate the ways in which the choice of regions to name and preserve locations as sites of Catholic heritage have had long-lasting implications for perceptions of the national identity of Spain.
I.1e  Chapter Five: Conclusion

The final chapter, Chapter Five, returns us to Chapters Two, Three, and Four not only to summarize the arguments presented but also to highlight potential avenues for future research that were not pursued given the structuring approach of space as a centre. Overall, this thesis stresses that the devaluing of non-elite excavated material and its lack of display has contributed to perceptions that there is no way to reconstruct the history of the *thaghr al-awsat* from the eighth to tenth centuries. Yet as the fortress of Zorita proves, there is evidence that attests to this period. Above all, this thesis argues for the immediacy of involving scholars of al-Andalus in discussions on the history and archaeology of the Southern Meseta. I turn now to the historiographic discussions with which I intentionally engage. This next chapter serves to highlight the conversations I consider relevant to my work, identifies those beyond the scope of this investigation, and grounds the reader in the scholarship to date on this region. In particular, Chapter One serves to ground the discussion that follows in conceptions of the Andalusi *thughûr* that have consequences for the rest of this work.
Chapter One: Historiography: Andalusi Studies, Cultural Memory, and the Thaghr al-Awsat

‘Tras esto, para mostrarnos hombre erudito en letras humanas y cosmógrafo, haced de modo como en vuestra historia se nombre el río Tajo, y vereis luego con otra famosa anotación, poniendo: ‘El río Tajo fue así dicho por un rey de las Españas; tiene su nacimiento en tal lugar y muere en el mar Océano, besando los muros de la famosa ciudad de Lisboa, y es opinión que tiene las arenas do oro’’.124

— Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra

‘Memory lives and survives through communication, and if this is broken off, or if the referential frames of the communicated reality disappear or change, then the consequence is forgetting.’125 — Jan Assman

As Cervantes noted in Don Quijote de la Mancha, the river Tajo has occupied a prized place in the history of the nation of Spain. One of five major rivers that cross the Iberian Peninsula, the Tajo has long supplied settlements with water for agriculture and transportation. From its start in the Sierra de Albarracín to its mouth in Lisboa (Lisbon), the river boasts several major settlements including Aranjuez, Toledo, Talavera de la Reina, Abrantes, Almā‘ida, and Santarém. The area under investigation here is what might be termed the ‘Upper Tajo’, extending north and east of Toledo, with a temporal focus on the Umayyad period. At its simplest, the question, What happened in the centre of the Iberian Peninsula from the eighth to tenth centuries? animates the investigation that follows. The original intent of this contribution was to provide an answer to the above questions using archaeological sources to shed light on social processes in this understudied region.126 However, the course of recovering this past generated several questions as to why this past was so inaccessible, or as Assman suggests, how the processes of social memory broke down. As a result, this work speaks to three main bodies of historiography: first, the broader field of English-language Andalusi studies; second, the body of work on

124 Translation: ‘And then, to show your learning in the humanities and in heavenly cosmography, make sure somehow or other, you get the name of the River Tagus into your history, and you’ve immediately got yourself another fantastic annotation, like this: ‘The River Tagus was named for a Spanish King: it originates in such-and-such a place and flows down to the ocean, kissing the walls of the famous city of Lisbon, which is said to be lined with gold . . .’ as in Miguel de Cervantes, Don Quijote de La Mancha (Spain: Real Academia Española Asociación de Academia de la Lengua Española, 2004), 11–12; de Cervantes, Don Quijote, act 10.

125 Assmann, Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination, 23.

126 As of the time of writing I could not locate a single work that has focused solely on the region of Southern Meseta in this particular time period. Scholarship on the Andalusi history of the region tends to focus either on specific sites in the Southern Meseta or treats it as part of a larger frontier area.
cultural memory, specifically in relation to early Islamic history and the place of the Islamicate dynasties of al-Andalus in the history of Spain; and third, the corpus of scholarship on the Andalusi history of the Southern Meseta (thaghr al-awsat).

1.1 Anglophone Scholarship on al-Andalus Engaged with in this Work

The first conversation that this work engages with and is informed by is what might be termed Anglophone arabitas. An important aspect of the training of these academics is the emphasis on engagement with Arabic language sources to investigate the eighth to fifteenth centuries during which the polity of al-Andalus existed in the Iberian Peninsula. This cohort of scholars includes art historians, archaeologists, and historians, as this definition aligns closely with the concept of the ‘arabista’ which is how the field is conceived of in Spanish academic institutions. The foundations of the broader field of Andalusi history, art history, and archaeology have been related by a host of scholars and I seek not to repeat this conversation here. Rather, I point the reader to the works mentioned in the footnote for summaries of the histories of the major Spanish- and French-language institutions and scholars dedicated to Andalusi studies. We can conceive of Western scholarship on al-Andalus as three silos.

127 Although this runs the risk of further separating the field into ‘arabists’ versus ‘medievalists’, I find the elucidation of who comprises the community of scholars engaging with Arabic-language sources important. To date ‘Arabists’ have largely been seen as outside of the community of ‘medievalists’. What I argue here is that ‘Arabists’ belong within the community of ‘medievalists’, though their methodological approach to sources should be recognized. Glick acknowledged the nature of the two fields of what he termed ‘Hispanist’ and ‘Islamicist’ in Glick, Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages, xii.

Spanish, French, and English, though those of Spanish and French scholarship share a bridge, or perhaps as Emilio García Gómez argued a common ‘trunk’ from which the two schools draw, as a result of the work of Evariste Lévi-Provençal. While scholars writing in Spanish have frequently published in English, and scholars in French have written in Spanish, Anglophone scholars tend not to write in Spanish or French, and at times do not read the relevant scholarship published in other languages or in the adjacent fields of history, art history, and archaeology.

The discussion here seeks to continue a conversation highlighted in the 2007 ‘Introduction’ of Revisiting al-Andalus by Glaire Anderson and Mariam Rosser-Owen. In the past fifty years, English-language scholarship on al-Andalus slowly has become more substantial, and while a true physical ‘centre’ for those interested in studying this history in English has yet to emerge, thankfully the field has responded to Rosser-Owen’s observations that it would benefit from more geographically and chronologically specific studies. What is perhaps surprising, is how precarious the future of this field remains twenty years after the 2002 meeting of the Middle Eastern Studies Association of North America (MESA) in Washington, DC, in which Anderson and Rosser-Owen moderated a panel titled ‘Al-Andalus: A Decade of New Research on the Art and Archaeology of Islamic Spain.’ The objective of this
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129 García Gómez, ‘E. Lévi Provençal,’ ix.
130 This was recently highlighted in Abigail Krasner Balbale, The Wolf King: Ibn Mardanīsh and the Construction of Power in al-Andalus, Medieval Societies, Religions, and Cultures (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2022), 6.
131 By Anglophone scholarship, I mean the scholarship coming out of institutions in English-speaking countries, written in English. Of course, Spanish and French institutions and scholars publish in English, yet here I am most concerned with training, rather than solely language. As mentioned earlier, the gap seems not to be that French and Spanish scholars do not engage with or publish in English, but rather the other way around.
session was to take stock of the development of the field of Andalusi art history since the landmark year of 1992, when scholars from all over the world participated in efforts to mark the 500th anniversary of the fall of Granada, which marked the end of a political al-Andalus. In 1992, not only did the Patronato de la Alhambra y Generalife in conjunction with the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York stage the exhibition ‘Al-Andalus: the Art of Islamic Spain’ which generated a catalogue of the same name edited by Jerrilynn Dodds, but 1992 also witnessed the publication of The Legacy of Muslim Spain, an enormous collaboration edited by Salma Khadra Jayyusi made possible by the support of the Aga Khan Foundation.¹³³ Both of these publications remain important foundational texts for Anglophone Andalusi scholars. However, scholars studying in English are indebted to a wider community in Islamicate art history, archaeology, and history. It is unlikely, given the geographical dispersal of Anglophone Andalusi academics, that any student wishing to train in the field will have access to more than one expert in the region, let alone the time period. As a result, individuals must identify their own networks and conversations, much as they had to in 2002. What follows is an elucidation of how I have thought of my engagement with various Anglophone scholars.

While reliant on a host of scholars who have contributed to larger volumes like The Legacy of Muslim Spain and the 2018 publication The Aghlabids and their Neighbors, edited by Anderson, Corisande Fenwick, and Rosser-Owen, the thesis that follows specifically engages with the art historical work of Anderson, Abigail Balbale, Rosser-Owen, and Anna McSweeney. Each of the aforementioned scholars’ recent focus on the material culture of the Umayyads, the Almohads and Ibn Mardanîsh, the ‘Āmirids, and the Nasrids, respectively, have provided valuable comparands from which to establish chronologies as well as methodological and theoretical frameworks to approach medieval material culture of the Iberian Peninsula. To date, Anglophone art historical scholarship on al-Andalus almost

¹³³ In conversation, Glaire Anderson credits the Dodd’s catalogue as being ‘a catalyst for our panel and volume’. Jerrilynn D. Dodds, ed., Al-Andalus: The Art of Islamic Spain (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992).
exclusively has focused on elite culture in urban centres and frequently prioritizes the late medieval period over an earlier one.

In terms of archaeology, this work primarily relies on the research and reports of Spanish and French archaeologists. Anglophone scholars who have investigated non-elite, rural spaces in al-Andalus are few; this thesis engages with the work of Thomas Glick and Javier Martínez Jiménez.\textsuperscript{134} Glick’s scholarship on rural areas concentrates on the south and east, while Martínez Jiménez has a broader geographical focus that encompasses the entire Iberian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{135} Given the strong connections of the peoples of the \textit{thaghhr al-awsat} to North Africa, there is also a heavy reliance on the works of Elizabeth Fentress and Corisande Fenwick. Finally, Anglophone interest in Andalusi numismatics has been strong, and this thesis makes use of the scholarship of George Miles and Michael Bates.

The field of history is a little more robust for Andalusi history, though as Rosser-Owen noted for art historians, the field has had a tendency to produce generalist scholarship often geared towards a non-specialist audience.\textsuperscript{136} Recent works that have focused on more precise chronologies and topics

\textsuperscript{134} Admittedly including Martínez Jiménez as an Anglophone ‘arabista’ is a bit of a stretch. While he completed his studies at the University of Oxford, his expertise falls more in late antiquity and archaeological sources rather than Islamicate history or Arabic language sources. However, his book remains the only Anglophone contribution to review some archaeological sites in the Southern Meseta.


\textsuperscript{136} In recent years Brian Catlos’ book serves as an example of this tendency. See \textit{Kingdoms of Faith}. 74
include those of David James, Janina Safran, and the late María Rosa Menocal, whose works closely analyse textual sources on al-Andalus. This approach to written sources brings this work into conversation with scholarship in the wider Islamicate world, specifically that of Hugh Kennedy, Edward Zychowicz-Coghill, and Tobias Andersson. Olivia Remie Constable and Hannah Barker’s approaches to a connected medieval Mediterranean have encouraged me to think beyond the Iberian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{137} As with art historical and archaeological studies, historians of North Africa have been key to the work that follows; I point to the works of Amira Bennison and Adam Gaiser as particularly relevant to the study at hand.

As this thesis shows, there is much work to be done away from the cities of Córdoba, Toledo, and Granada in what Amira Bennison termed ‘the huge silent majority’.\textsuperscript{138} While the broader intention here is to challenge scholars writing in English to diversify their scope and source base in line with work done by European peers, there is a value in sketching what a community of scholars interested in the eighth through tenth centuries, trained and publishing in English looks like. No English-language monograph has tackled the rural space of the Southern Meseta, a region roughly aligned with the modern Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha. The third largest Autonomous Community in Spain, Castilla-La Mancha consists of nearly 80,000 square kilometres (a little over 30,000 square miles).\textsuperscript{139} Given the lack of studies on this region, I pause here to explain to explain its geography, before moving to a discussion on the ways in which the history of the Southern Meseta has been presented.

\textsuperscript{137} While not specifically engaged with here, it is important to note that both Remie Constable and Barker’s work is informed by the Annales school’s emphasis on social and economic histories, especially in Fernand Braudel, \textit{The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II: Volume One}, trans. Siân Reynolds (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); This in turn has inspired a generation of Anglophone scholars on the connected Mediterranean. The research here is heavily influenced by theoretical approaches pioneered in Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell, \textit{The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History} (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

\textsuperscript{138} Bennison, \textit{The Almoravid and Almohad Empires}, 139.

\textsuperscript{139} The largest Autonomous Community in terms of area is Castilla y León which occupies approximately 94,000 km\textsuperscript{2} (around 36,000 m\textsuperscript{2}) followed by Andalucía which occupies approximately 87,000 km\textsuperscript{2} (almost 34,000 m\textsuperscript{2}).
1.2 Defining the Geographical Bounds of the Southern Meseta

Maps detailing the extent of the territory of al-Andalus frequently depict the borders of the Umayyad polity with little reference to the physical environment (Figure 1.1). However, for the area under investigation, the Southern Meseta, the landscape, with its mountainous peaks, proximity to the Tajo River, arid summers, and abundant vegetation played a particularly important role both in the development of the region and in the history of al-Andalus.140 Over time, the area came to be thought of as a liminal space marking the division between the so-called Islamicate and Christianate worlds.141 The landforms of the Southern Meseta, located between the fortieth and forty-first parallels, has played important roles in the history of the Iberian Peninsula.

The Southern Meseta, by definition, is bounded to the north and northwest by the Sierra de Guadarrama and the Sierra de Gredos mountains, respectively, two of the ranges that make up the Sistema Central (Figure 1.2). The Sierra de Guadarrama divide the Central Meseta of Spain into a Northern and Southern Meseta. While not as imposing as the Pyrenees, which has average heights around 1,060 metres (around 3,500 feet) and whose tallest peak, Aneto, logs in at 3,404 metres (11,168 feet) these ranges, while generally of lower elevation, are by no means insubstantial: the Sierra de Guadarrama and the Sierra de Gredos range from 900-1,200 metres (around 3,000-4,000 feet) in elevation: the former’s highest peak of Peñalara, with a recorded height of 2,428 metres (7,966 feet); the latter’s apex at Pico Almanzor with a recorded height of 2,592 metres (8,504 feet). Indeed, any force interested in unifying the territories of the Iberian Peninsula had to contend with this range, which in addition to posing a challenge to Andalusi and Asturian hegemony in the eighth through thirteenth

---

140 For a discussion on the fertility of the plains of Castilla-La Mancha in the medieval period, see Valor and Gutiérrez, ‘The Study of Medieval Archaeology in Spain,’ 1.
141 For monographs that consistently portray this area as a border space, see Catlos, Kingdoms of Faith; Calderwood, Colonial Al-Andalus: Spain and the Making of Modern Moroccan Culture; Manzano Moreno, La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas; Buresi argues for the perception (and reality?) of the region as a border territory beginning in the twelfth century in La frontière entre chrétienté et Islam dans la péninsule Ibérique: Du Tage à la Sierra Morena (fin Xle-milieu Xlle siècle); Andrew C. Hess, The Forgotten Frontier: A History of the Sixteenth-Century Ibero-African Frontier (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978).
centuries, also played important roles in both the Peninsular War (1807-1814) and the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939).142

To the northeast, the Southern Meseta is bounded by the Serranía de Cuenca, a more modest range of the Sistema Ibérico, whose highest peak is in the Moncaya mountains, reaching 2,313 metres (7,589 feet). While the Serranía de Cuenca did not act as a decisive barrier between the northeast and central areas of the Iberian Peninsula, it was formidable, and perhaps most importantly for this study, delineated drainage basins and watersheds. The Southern Meseta is an area featuring numerous rivers, most notably the Tajo, the longest river in the Iberian Peninsula and one second only to the Duero in terms of size of watershed. The major tributaries of the Tajo drain from the aforementioned mountain ranges of the Sistema Ibérico, where the Tajo finds its source, and the Sistema Central, which lead to mouth of the river at the city of Lisbon on the Atlantic Ocean. Rivers of all sizes crisscross the Southern Meseta, including the Cuervo and Escabas of the Serranía de Cuenca, the Henares, Tajuña, Jarama, and Guadarrama of the Sierra de Guadarrama, and the Alto Tormes, Alto Alberche, Tiétar Oriental, Tiétar Occidental y la vera, and the Valle del Ambroz of the Sierra de Gredos. In addition, the Southern Meseta is a space of regular precipitation and high water tables on the Iberian Peninsula, meaning that historically the fluvial networks of the region acted to support not only local subsistence but larger pastorage that supported the urban populations of the Peninsula throughout history.143 In particular, the area has a long tradition of supporting sheep and cow raising.144 Water and access to it is a defining factor in site location, from ancient to modern times. In addition to providing sustenance, water, and the control of it acted as an important expression of power in the pre-modern world.145 The readily

---

142 For more reading on the strategic importance of the Sierra Guadarrama in the Spanish Civil War, see Ch 19 in Hugh Thomas, *The Spanish Civil War* (New York: The Modern Library, 2012) especially pages 300-301.
143 Bishko, ‘The Castillian as Plainsman: The Medieval Ranching Frontier in La Mancha and Extremadura,’ 49.
144 Glick, *From Muslim Fortress to Christian Castle: Social and Cultural Change in Medieval Spain*, 105; Bishko, ‘The Castillian as Plainsman: The Medieval Ranching Frontier in La Mancha and Extremadura,’ 49.
145 For the importance of water for defence, see Pavón Maldonado, *Arte Toledano: Islámico y mudéjar*, 48; and Eduardo Jiménez Rayado, ‘Water Culture in Madrid: An Islamic Heritage under the Christian Rule,’ in *Water in the
available water sources could maintain relatively dense populations if harnessed accordingly.

Importantly, the region under study is that south of the Tajo River and makes no attempt to account for the history of the Northern Meseta, which is bordered by the Duero River to the north and the Tajo to the south. Rivers act as both limiting features and as routes of communication. For the purpose of this study, I use the Tajo as a physical border delimiting two distinct spaces in the broader Meseta. I have chosen this approach as it is one that seems to most accurately reflect the socio-political dynamics of the period in which the Northern Meseta functions differently than the Southern Meseta.

Politically, this region spans three of the five provinces in the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha (Cuenca, Guadalajara, and Toledo) and the Autonomous Community of Madrid. In the past, this region was claimed as the home of the Carpetanians (in the south) and Celtiberians (in the northeast), the thaghr al-awsat of Umayyad al-Andalus, the heartlands of the Dhū al-Nūnīd Tā'īfa rulers, and the Castillian territory New Castille, before acquiring its current designation. As one of the largest political regions in modern Spain, Castilla-La Mancha has come to play an important role in the imagination of the nation. An example of this is seen in literature for tourists that seeks to present the

---

region as foundational to modern Spanish identity, or as in Patricia Harris and David Lyon’s word in which they named the territory ‘The Crucible of Spanish Identity.’\textsuperscript{146} Though written in an English-language tourist book, the following description of Castilla-La Mancha eerily mirrors present trends in academic historiography of the region. Harris and Lyon encourage the reader to envisage the following:

As you approach the cities of Central Spain, imagine that you are leading an invading army. After a long march across a flat plain with no place to hide, you finally reach the outskirts of Toledo, Cuenca, Segovia, or Avila. You crane your neck to look up at the walled fortress city on the hill. Its defenders have watched you approach for days, and their swords are ready. . . It is the story of central Spain written over and over- only the names of the invaders and the defenders constantly changed.

And whoever seized the plains of La Mancha or the hilltop aeries of the cities, they always acted audaciously. Roman engineers channeled water from distant mountains to make Segovia bloom. Centuries later, a string of rulers named Alfonso and Sancho and Ferdinand (Fernando) plotted power in the name of a Christian god and fortified the heights, giving the region its enduring name, Castilla, or land of castles. They carried the battle of the reconquista from castle to castle across the searing centre of the peninsula, mustering the military might, religious fervor, and brilliant scholarship that made them the most powerful rulers in Iberia- and ultimately kings of Spain.

But Castilla is more than just battles and castles. It’s hard to think of a region without envisioning Don Quixote tilting at the windmills of La Mancha and nursing his impossible dream of nobility, so eloquently articulated (and skewered) by Castilian native son Miguel Cervantes. This region is a dreamer’s world where Santa Teresa sought the ecstatic embrace of Christ in her hometown of Avila and ended up revitalizing the Catholic Church as a moral force. The painter El Greco conjured up fantastic images- swirling, elongated figure rising to the heavens like animate thunderheads- from the hilltop citadel of Toledo, a city of both prayers and swords. And in Salamanca, Christopher Columbus lectured to the young students (Hernan Cortes possibly among them), recounting his adventures in a new world. There may be more impressive fortresses, more richly decorated churches, and even more picturesquely sited cities in other areas of Spain, but none boast so many touchstones of Spanish identity in such close proximity.\textsuperscript{147}

As suggested in this passage, the accepted history of Castilla-La Mancha is Roman and Christian.

According to this narrative, the many fortresses in the region owe their foundation to the Christianate Kingdoms; the heroes of the region date to the height of Spanish colonial empire.\textsuperscript{148} Nowhere is the

\textsuperscript{146} Patricia Harris, David Lyon, and Peter Stone, \textit{Spain: Spend Less See More} (Hoboken: Wiley, 2009), 79.
\textsuperscript{147} Harris, Lyon, and Stone, 79.
\textsuperscript{148} It is perhaps surprising to note that this guidebook was written in 2009 yet has little qualms about elevating controversial historical figures including Columbus and Cortes.
history of al-Andalus represented; peoples of the region living under Umayyad, Dhū al-Nūnid, Almoravid, and Almohad rule have been erased as if their presence never mattered.

1.3 Cultural Memory of Umayyad al-Andalus in the Southern Meseta

How did we arrive at a place where the Andalusi past of the Southern Meseta is so poorly known that the peoples who built the fortresses for which the region is named no longer feature in the narrative of Castilla-La Mancha? At what point in time did this memory become lost? To investigate these questions, this work actively engages with a second body of literature on cultural memory, both in terms of early Islamic history and conceptions of belonging in the modern nation of Spain. The theoretical approach to this complete work, despite the temporal gap, is this question of cultural memory which interrogates how we know what we think we know about the history of al-Andalus.149

Two critical moments, or as Jan Assman termed them, ‘decisive changes within the connective structure’ of cultural memory, arise when looking at the ways in which Andalusi history has come down to present generations.150 These cultural ‘turns’ occurred first, in the eleventh century with the codification of Arabic narratives regarding the early Islamicate history of the Southern Meseta as the thaghr al-awsat, and second, from the middle of the nineteenth century to present during which the creation and identification of state-protected monuments have privileged Christianate history over the Islamicate past.


150 Assmann, Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination, 10.
1.3a Creating the thaghr al-awsat

Beginning in the eleventh century, sources including Ibn Ḥayyān (d. 1076)’s Muqtabis and the anonymous writings Fath al-Andalus and Akhbār Majmū’a related histories of the thaghr al-awsat, almost always portraying it as a border space full of disloyal Berbers.151 Chapter Two addresses the dominance of eleventh century voices in narrating a canonical history of the Southern Meseta in Umayyad al-Andalus and argues that the richness of these texts should not overshadow the plethora of contemporary sources from the eighth to tenth centuries that provide valuable, though oft overlooked, information on the Umayyad state. In terms of cultural memory, the initial classification of the Southern Meseta as one of the thughūr that occurred in the eleventh century, followed by the subsequent translation of the term as ‘frontier’ have had significant repercussions for approaches to narrating the history of the territory. This understanding of the Southern Meseta as a ‘frontier’ dovetailed with nineteenth-century discussions on Spanish character, the second moment of cultural memory with which this work engages. The initial eleventh century portrayal of the territory as frontier, combined with modern understandings of ‘Spain as unified and Catholic’ which solidified in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, resulted in narrations of the Southern Meseta’s past as embroiled territory.152 It seemingly never occurred to scholars to investigate the questions, ‘was the Southern Meseta a frontier in the eighth through tenth centuries?’ or ‘Is the history of the fortresses of Castilla-La Mancha Catholic?’

1.3b The Development of Frontier Theory and ‘Spain as Unified and Catholic’ in the Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

Intellectual discussions of the nineteenth and twentieth century that led to the identification of sites in Castilla-La Mancha worthy of state-sponsored cultural protection were affected by two trends in

---

151 A further conversation regarding the ways in which these eleventh century sources refer to the space of the Southern Meseta follows in Chapter Two.
152 For delineations of nineteenth century conversations which to to establish a ‘Spanish national character’ as Christian, see Bornstein, Reclaiming Al-Andalus: Orientalist Scholarship and Spanish Nationalism, 1875-1919, xi,1,77, and 167.
historiography: first, assertions that the Spanish character was forged in the unique frontier experience which pitted Christianity against Islam and second, the assertion that a primordial Spanish identity could be traced through an unbroken line which featured the Catholic Monarchs, the Kingdom of Asturias, and the Visigoths.153 Both of these have long been rejected by scholars, yet it is important to understand these ‘filters’ through which the cultural memory of al-Andalus passed. The first filter is a legacy of frontier theory that has resulted in ahistorical conceptions of the \textit{thaghr al-awsat} as a no-man’s land reserved for the resolution of an ongoing conflict between Islamic and Christian societies. The second filter is one which argued that the history of al-Andalus left no mark on Spanish character. While perhaps not consciously, these nineteenth- and twentieth-century representations of the history of the Southern Meseta resulted in the occlusion of places from lists to preserve cultural heritage in the region. Buildings that did not neatly fit these conceptions of the past were either misinterpreted and misunderstood and thus classified as Christian, or passed over in favour of sites that represented a more acceptable and more ‘Spanish’ past.

153 I deal with the issues that arise from classifying the Southern Meseta as a frontier in the main text. I will not engage with the issues of a primordial Spanish identity, other than to point the reader to the following works which address its erroneousness. The most substantial argument delineating the appropriation of Isidore of Seville’s writings by Asturian monarchs in the ninth century can be found in Jamie Wood, \textit{The Politics of Identity in Visigothic Spain: Religion and Power in the Histories of Isidore of Seville}, Brill’s Series on the Early Middle Ages (Leiden: Brill, 2012); For scholarship that rejects claims of the continuity of Visigothic Spain to the Catholic Monarchs, see Glick, \textit{From Muslim Fortress to Christian Castle: Social and Cultural Change in Medieval Spain}, xvii; Catlos, \textit{Kingdoms of Faith}, 3; Martínez Jiménez, Sastre de Diego, and Tejerizo García, \textit{The Iberian Peninsula between 300 and 850: An Archaeological Perspective}, 144; Guichard, \textit{Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente}, 7; Jerrilynn Denise Dodds, Maria Rosa Menocal, and Abigail Krasner Balbale, \textit{The Arts of Intimacy: Christians, Jews, and Muslims in the Making of Castilian Culture} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 2; Bornstein provides a good summary of the Real Academia de Historia’s ‘staunch defence of the Catholic essence of the Spanish nation’ and its favouring of Visigothic history for the origin of Spanish national identity in the nineteenth century. See the Introduction and \textit{Reclaiming Al-Andalus: Orientalist Scholarship and Spanish Nationalism, 1875-1919}, 77; Joseph F. O’Callaghan discusses the role José Ortega y Gasset (1883-1955) played in advancing the assertion that ‘Visigoths provide the determining elements of Spanish character’ which include austerity, desire for fame, stoicism, individualism, and bravery to the point of rashness in \textit{A History of Medieval Spain} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), 17.
1.3b.i The Frontier Theory, Depopulation, and Frontier Unity Filters

As mentioned in the Prologue, there are substantial challenges to using the term ‘frontier’ in medieval contexts in the Iberian Peninsula largely because of the ways in which both scholars in this field and politicians in Spain have used the term in reference to an ideological division between Christianity and Islam. Under the influence of frontier theory, this border became viewed as a unique space for the forging of national character.154 Frontier theory has evolved substantially from a term to a field since its naming by Frederick Jackson Turner in 1893. In his talk, ‘The Significance of the Frontier in American History’, given at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, Turner suggested frontier as space of clashing between societies of different civilizational status and argued that this struggle contributed to the formation of national identity. As scholars like Eduardo Manzano Moreno and Pascual Buresi have noted, Turner’s conception of frontier is particularly strong in Spanish historiography and in the academic debate over who and what is ‘Spanish’.155 Scholars, notably Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz, mimicked Turner’s thesis that the character and institutions of the United States were formed in the winning of the American frontier and argued that the contentious ‘frontier experience’ in which ‘Christians’ first defended their territory then advanced against ‘Muslims’ solidified a Spanish Catholic identity; in other words, Sánchez-Albornoz argued that the so-called ‘Reconquista’ created the Spanish character.156 Despite Manzano Moreno’s argument that Turner and like-minded theorists have no place in medieval Iberian history,157 Turner’s hypothesis continues to pop up in medieval accounts perhaps because historians of medieval Iberia have yet to embrace a theoretical framework that would allow a break with frontier models.158

154 For the perceived role that frontier played in the formation of Christian identity, see Aillet, Les Mozarabes: Christianisme, islamisation et arabisation en Péninsule Ibérique (IX-XII siècles), 5.
155 Manzano Moreno, La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas, 28–29; Buresi, La frontière entre chrétienté et Islam dans la péninsule Ibérique: Du Tage à la Sierra Morena (fin Xe-milieu XIIe siècle), 14.
156 Sánchez-Albornoz, España: Un enigma histórico.
157 Manzano Moreno, La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas, 28.
158 One possible model for new approaches to territories designated as liminal can be found in Finbarr Barry Flood, Objects of Translation: Material Culture and Medieval ‘Hindu-Muslim’ Encounter (Princeton: Princeton University
The nineteenth century emphasis on religion as a marker of identity emerged as key to the dynamic of the Southern Meseta as an oppositional space. This trend remains strong in historiography of al-Andalus and affects the field today. As Asa Eger wrote, ‘what is at stake is the continuous simplification of Muslim-Christian encounters throughout history and the appropriation of an assumed or envisioned past that has been grafted on to modern interactions.’\textsuperscript{159} One would hope that by now academic discussions could have shaken the contentiousness that in 1991 caused Manzano Moreno to argue that the ideological frontier of the Catholic monarchs still existed, albeit in the form of academics identifying either as ‘Medievalists (i.e. Christian)’ or ‘Arabists (i.e. Islamic)’\textsuperscript{160} or that in 2005 led Thomas Glick to conclude the challenge of recreating the past seems compounded in the case of Spain, as he stated that

\begin{quote}
the Spanish school of historiography seems less able than other [schools] to disentangle present myths from past ones or to deal effectively and realistically with those aspects of the past which have been particularly productive of conflict or anxiety.\textsuperscript{161}
\end{quote}

Sadly, these summaries of the state of the field remain current.\textsuperscript{162} As Alejandro García-Sanjuán argued in a 2018 article, the traditional conservative viewpoint retains remarkable life today.\textsuperscript{163} García-Sanjuán points to the influence of several members of the Real Academia de la Historia (Royal Academy of History) who advocate for the exclusion of al-Andalus in the construction of both Spanish history and identity, including Cardinal Antonio Cañizares, Luis Suárez Fernández, and Serafín Fanjul. Susan Martin-Márquez echoes concerns about the exclusionary ideological tilt of Spanish scholarship supported by the

\begin{thebibliography}
\item Eger, The Islamic Byzantine Frontier: Interaction and Exchange Among Muslim and Christian Communities, 2.
\item See Manzano Moreno’s discussion in \textit{La Frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas}, 1991.
\item Glick, \textit{Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages}, 3.
\item For an assertion of the polemical nature of the field in 2021, see Bornstein, \textit{Reclaiming Al-Andalus: Orientalist Scholarship and Spanish Nationalism}, 1875-1919, 2.
\item García-Sanjuán, ‘Rejecting Al-Andalus, Exalting the Reconquista: Historical Memory in Contemporary Spain.’
\end{thebibliography}
Royal Academy, pointing to the publication of the volume *Las Tres Culturas* that ‘implicitly affirms the identification of Spain with Christianity by excluding consideration of religious plurality in the Muslim-dominated areas of the Iberian Peninsula.’¹⁶₄ This problem is not confined to Spanish scholarship. One might look to works like that of Darió Fernández-Morera, who in 2016 published *The Myth of the Andalusian Paradise* which attacks ‘Western scholarship,’ both academics and publishers, as exercising an anti-Catholic bias in their failure to read and cite Spanish historians.¹⁶⁵

One cannot escape the religious connotations of the ‘frontier’ in Spain. As Janina Safran argues ‘the line across the Iberian Peninsula represents, or rather, asserts, a divide that has an immediate rhetorical impact. The delineation of a border between the domains of Islam and the domains of Christendom is a way of structuring the past that identifies religion with land and identity.’¹⁶₆ Yet aside from late medieval testimonies that the frontier was a space of religious confrontation, there is little contemporary evidence from the early medieval period when Christian and Islamic polities abutted one another in the Iberian Peninsula to support this assertion. At most this position is an argument from absence – it is assumed that the North African troops who conquered the Southern Meseta in the eighth century practiced Islam and had contentious relationships with their Christian neighbours.¹⁶⁷ However none of this is attested in either written or material sources. Too little research has been done on the

---

¹⁶₄ Susan Martin-Márquez, *Disorientations: Spanish Colonialism in Africa and the Performance of Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 320 For a more detailed discussion on scholars advancing projects that ‘condemn or erase the Andalusi legacy’ see the works of RosaMariá Rodriguez Magda, Fernando García de Contázar Ruiz de Aguirre, Quintín Aldea Vaquero, as well as the journalism of Cesár Vidal. .

¹⁶⁵ Fernández-Morera, *The Myth of the Andalusian Paradise: Muslims, Christians, and Jews under Islamic Rule in Medieval Spain*, 51 Aside from the bifurcation of ‘Western scholars’ and ‘Spanish scholars’ in which Fernández-Morera has orientalized Spain, removing it from ‘the West’, the assertion that ‘Western scholars’ do not read Spanish scholarship is almost impossible to prove. He seems to be referring to a specific set of scholars he would like Western scholars to cite. It seems not to have occurred to him that perhaps ‘Western scholars’ have read and rejected some Spanish scholarship, particularly those that either exalt the ‘Reconquista’ and/or ahistorically persist in denying the role of Islamicate dynasties in the Iberian Peninsula.


¹⁶⁷ In fact, as argued in Martínez Jiménez, ‘The Rural Hinterland of the Visigothic Capitals of Toledo and Recopolis, between the Years 400-800 CE,’ 114 it might make more sense to see the lack of archaeological evidence for the disruption of the Umayyad conquests as a result of the similarity of North African culture to that of the peoples of the Iberian Peninsula which meant little disruption in day-to-day modes of being.
spaces that might suggest what the dynamics might have been, and as discussed further in Chapter Three, those late medieval sources that do remain speak to an ongoing *convivencia* in the region well into the sixteenth century.168

In addition to being as referenced earlier, ‘a crucible of Spanish identity’, the construct of ‘Southern Meseta as frontier’ depends on assertions of this space as unoccupied or sparsely populated. Prominent in discussions of frontier is the concept of frontier as an edge, a limit, or a periphery, tied up with conceptions of *terra nullis* and the rectitude of private land ownership.169 In the Spanish historiography, historians adopted the conception of *terra nullis* especially as it related to the supposed intentional depopulation of the frontier, Sánchez-Albornoz’s *despoblación*.170 Typically this depopulation is used to describe occurrences in the Duero Valley, in which Christians withdrew from their homes to the safety of the Christianate Kingdoms to create a so-called strategic wilderness in the face of the Umayyad advance. According to this myth, people fled the area, fearing the advance of the ‘Muslims’ and responding to calls from the Asturian monarchs for people from the Duero Valley to settle in cities

---

168 For discussions of *fueros* that speak of Muslim, Christian, and Jewish communities present in Zorita de los Canes in the early modern period, see Francisco Fernández Izquierdo, Ángeles Yuste Martínez, and Porfiro Sanz Camañes, *La provincia de Almonacid de Zorita en el siglo XVI: Recuperación de una historia viva de la administración local en la edad moderna*, Biblioteca de Historia 46 (Madrid: Instituto de Historia Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Comasur, 2001), 54; and Plácido Ballesteros San-José, ‘El castillo de Zorita en época cristiana,’ in *El Castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología*, ed. Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez (Madrid: El Tercer Sello, 2022), 42; For discussions of fueros that speak of Muslim, Christian, and Jewish communities present in Uclés in the early modern period, see Gómez Anuarbe, *Uclés: Historia, paisajes, patios y jardines*, 54; For discussions of these region as a space of acculturation Aillet, *Les Mozarabes: Christianisme, islamisation et arabisation en Péninsule Ibérique (IX-XII siècle)*, 264; For discussions on social pluralism and cohabitation in this region, see Hess, *The Forgotten Frontier: A History of the Sixteenth-Century Ibero-African Frontier*, 5; For the histories of convivenica in Uclés and Huete in the late medieval period, see Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision*, 4–5; For a more general assertion of the role of Christians in the *thughūr*, see Eduardo Manzano Moreno, ‘Christian-Muslim Frontier in Al-Andalus: Idea and Reality,’ in *The Arab Influence in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dionisio A. Agius and Richard Hitchcock (Ithaca: Ithaca Press, 1994), 92.


in Asturias. This intentional depopulation supposedly created a ‘no-man’s land’ that lasted from the eighth to the tenth centuries, only to end with a purported repopulation that accompanied the ‘Reconquista.’ According to this narrative, as the Asturian monarchs expanded southwards, they secured their newly conquered territory by settling Christians in the region. Yet archaeology does not support this interpretation and the continued account of the ‘Islamic/Christian’ frontier as an empty space is not supported by research.\textsuperscript{171} The archaeology of the region shows continuous settlement through these apparently turbulent times. There is no evidence for either a massive, elite-led intentional de- or repopulation of people in border areas, and people living in this space would not have understood themselves to be living in a frontier space, let alone an empty space.\textsuperscript{172} As argued by María Asenjo González, the propagation of the myth of the ‘depopulation of the Duero’ makes further research more difficult.\textsuperscript{173}

Conceptions of frontiers as empty spaces have had negative consequences for the study of the central Iberian Peninsula. The Southern Meseta had for years prior to the Umayyad futūh served as the political and religious centre of the Visigothic polity and played a major role in the agricultural output of the Peninsula. Any attempt to control the area must account for the sizeable autochthonous population living there. The Southern Meseta, in addition to consisting of several Roman settlements including the financially dominant sites of Complutum, Ercavica, and Segóbriga, was also the home to the Visigothic

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{171} For scholarship contesting the idea of a depopulation followed by a repopulation based on the lack of archaeological evidence, see Asenjo González, 425; Manzano Moreno, La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas, 172 and 389; Manzano Moreno, Conquistadores, emires, y califas: Los omeyas y la formación de al-Andalus, 247; Glick, From Muslim Fortress to Christian Castle: Social and Cultural Change in Medieval Spain, 113–14; Aillet, Les Mozarabes: Christianisme, islamisation et arabisation en Péninsule Ibérique (IX-XII siècle), 250; Eger, The Islamic Byzantine Frontier: Interaction and Exchange Among Muslim and Christian Communities, 193; Roger Collins, The Arab Conquest of Spain, 710-797, History of Spain (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 158; Fierro, ‘Abd Al-Rahman III, 69; Safran, Defining Boundaries in Al-Andalus: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Islamic Iberia, 171; For an example of a recent publication continuing to assert the idea of a depopulation followed by a repopulation, see Escolar and Escolar, La nación inventada: Una historia diferente de Castilla, 47–48; Collins, Caliphs and Kings: Spain, 796-1031, 139–40.

\textsuperscript{172} See Glick, Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages, 34–35; 50.

\textsuperscript{173} Asenjo González, ‘La organización de los espacios, técnicas y cultura material en la Castilla medieval. Un estado de la cuestión.’
\end{footnotesize}
palatial city of Recópolis, and the Romano-Visigoth episcopal see and city of Toledo. In the eighth through tenth centuries there was an established administrative substrate in this territory – and investigation into it must account for broader networks of power in the Meseta including the cities of Guadalajara and Medinacelli. It seems reasonable to suggest that one possible consequence of seeing the *thughūr* as unpopulated has been the lack of sustained scholarly interest in the area. After all, if nobody lived there, what history is there to study?

Finally, approaches that have embraced frontier theory as useful to the study of the border regions of al-Andalus imply an experiential unity that given the paucity of studies of the region cannot be confirmed or denied. As Kerwin Lee Klein summarized the field in *Frontiers of Historical Imagination*, whether scholars have defined frontiers as binary spaces that juxtapose savagery and civilization or freeland and settlement, or as spaces defined by the marginality of civilization, political borders, or spaces of community building, all definitions of the word ‘frontier’ imply some type of ‘overarching unity.’ In the case of scholarship on the Andalusi frontiers or ‘*thughūr*’, this has led to studies on the *al-thaghr al-a’lā*, the ‘Upper Frontier’, as being seen as representative of all *thughūr*. Located in the northeast of the Iberian Peninsula and frequently mentioned in conjunction with the city of Zaragoza, the *thaghr al-a’lā* was often a space of rebellion against Umayyad authority. Compared to the extant testimony from other ‘frontiers’, there is a wealth of information, both written and material, that attest to the *thaghr al-a’lā* as a contested one. Yet to assume that processes that occurred in the *thaghr al-a’lā*, can be transmuted to the *thaghr al-’awsat* with no supporting evidence is unconvincing. While further research might suggest similar processes in both regions and thus allow for conclusions like this, suggesting that the use of the term *thaghr* implies unity of experience puts the cart before the horse.

---

Understandings of a ‘frontier’ as a unique space to forge national identity, a sparsely populated region, and approaches that treat North Africans in the region as a monolithic entity are legacies of nineteenth- and twentieth-century embracing of frontier theory. Reconstructing what happened in the eighth through tenth centuries in the Southern Meseta requires challenging these crucial moments in which culture became codified. We must rethink what we think we know about the *thaghr al-awsat*.

1.3b.ii ‘Long Live Catholic Spain’

In addition to the filter of frontier theory which became dominant in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the need to portray Spain as a unified nation in the nineteenth century had repercussions for scholarship on the history of the Iberian Peninsula. Long a confederate society, the peoples of the Iberian Peninsula found themselves subject to the centralizing initiatives of the Spanish governments which aimed to consolidate political power in Madrid. Pinning down a date for the start of ‘Spain’ is a murky undertaking. While conventional histories point to the Catholic Monarchs as founders of modern Spain and certainly other countries in the early modern period understood Spain as a rival nation, it was not until the nineteenth century, with the signing of the Constitution of 1837, that the ruling monarch, Isabel II, took the title ‘Queen of Spain.’ Prior to this, all kings and queens, including those of the *Siglo de Oro* (Spain’s Golden Age in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries), notably Charles I/Charles V (r. 1516-1556) and Philip II (r. 1556-1598), continued to self-represent as rulers of a confederation of regions. Though the War of Spanish Succession (1701-1714) led to the official merging


179 For a discussion on the notion of the concept of ‘patria’ in Spain and its coterminality with ‘nation’ rather than ‘region’ starting in the 19th century, see Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire: 1875-1914*, 148.
of the crowns of Castilla and Aragon under the first Bourbon king, Philip V (r. 1700-1746) and paved the way for a more centralized ‘Spanish’ citizenship which shifted rights traditionally held by regions to the increasingly centralized state, monarchs continued to use regional titles until the nineteenth century. Regionalism strongly influenced and continues to influence the development of the modern nation-state of Spain, and particularly affects the understanding of its Umayyad past. As Pierre Guichard recognizes,

> en España, el carácter encarnizado de las controversias sobre la época árabe de la historia nacional hay que vincularla a las tensiones políticas nacidas de la contrastada estructura de un país formado por regiones con historias largo tiempo diferenciadas, donde se mantienen fuertes culturas regionales o cuasi nacionales, y donde se han desarrollado en el transcurso de los dos siglos pasados luchas ideológica-políticas de gran violencia. \(^{180}\)

Catholicism became a way to unite people across regional differences and in the nineteenth and twentieth century played a key role in the political platforms of the Carlists, Monarchists, Falange, JONS (Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista), and Francoists as well as that of many Spanish liberals. \(^{181}\) The worldview of political parties played a key role in cultural history, as the monarch and Cortes identified and legislated what history to protect. It is unsurprising that in a bid for unity, governments safeguarded monuments that could speak to a broad historical moment.

Chapter Four discusses how dominant conceptions of ‘Spain as Catholic’ in the twentieth century led to the identification and preservation of cultural heritage with a clear relation to Christian history to the detriment of sites or histories representative of al-Andalus. However, as Chapter Four shows, a Catholic past was not the only historical choice available to peoples looking for a national identity. Despite the potential of portraying al-Andalus as shared national history, this discourse ‘lost’

---

\(^{180}\) Guichard, *Esplendor y fragilidad de al-Andalus*, 15. Translation: ‘In Spain, the fierce nature of the controversies over the Arab period of its national history must be linked to the political tensions arising from the contrasting structure of a country made up of regions with long-differentiated histories, where strong regional or quasi-national cultures are maintained, and where ideological-political struggles of great violence have developed over the past two centuries.’

the bid for national identity and in the twentieth century became identified as a foreign experience.182

These two filters, that of Castilla-La Mancha as a frontier space and the creation of a general conception of Spain verses a regional one, led to a prioritization of Catholic sites as national heritage. These choices had particular consequences for remembering the Umayyad history of the Southern Meseta and need to be grappled with in order to deconstruct canonical understandings of the region.

1.4 Historians and Art Historians of the thaghr al-awsat

Scholarship on the history of the Southern Meseta from the eighth through tenth centuries, during which the Umayyads exercised a significant presence in the region, has largely been divided along source base, with historians Évariste Levi-Provencal, Francisco Layna Serrano, Jacinto Bosch Vilá, Eduardo Manzano Moreno, Pierre Guichard, and Pascual Buresi concentrating on written sources, and art historians and archaeologists including Leopoldo Torres Balbás, Basilio Pavón Maldonado, Manuel Retuerce Velasco, Lauro Olmo Enciso, Dionisio Urbina Martínez, and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez investigating sites found in Zorita de los Canes, Cuenca, Uclés, Huete, Madrid, Vascos, Calatalifa, and Talavera de la Reina. Despite the stress of Manzano Moreno and Buresi on the importance of bringing the source bases together to better understand the region, this work has yet to be done.

1.4a Historiography of the Southern Meseta in Written Sources

There is surprisingly little scholarship on al-Andalus that centres spatial concerns. Though designations of space have clear consequences for taxation and administration, the relative lack of investigations that speak to this topic when compared to the rich bodies of work in fields including legal

182 For the most comprehensive discussion of this history, see Bornstein, Reclaiming Al-Andalus: Orientalist Scholarship and Spanish Nationalism, 1875-1919; For additional identifications of Andalusí history as foreign, see Ruiz Mata, Al Ándalus, La historia que no nos contaron, 19; Guichard, Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente, 24; For attempts by church and state to ‘excise Spain’s layered and diverse history’, see Dodds, Menocal, and Balbale, The Arts of Intimacy, 2; As Rosie Bsheer noted, ‘modern state formation necessitates the erasure of some pasts at the expense of others’ in Archive Wars: The Politics of History in Saudi Arabia, Stanford Studies in Middle Eastern and Islamic Societies and Cultures (Stanford: Stanford University Press, n.d.), 64–65 The Andalusí past, while potent in certain regions, did not become the shared cultural experience on which Spain crafted a national identity in the twentieth century.
studies, linguistics and poetry, music, biographical studies, gender, and general histories means that often we have little idea of how the Umayyad rulers, armies, and local peoples understood belonging to an Umayyad polity in the eighth through tenth centuries. As has been made clear by now, the Southern Meseta generally has been identified as belonging to the *thughūr*, a term much discussed in scholarship on early Islamicate empires, in what Robert Haug suggested could be termed *thughurology*. For the Iberian Peninsula, several scholars make assertions about the *thughūr*, but few grapple with the original sources and their use of the term. In al-Andalus, the *thughūr* are often described as spaces of questionable loyalty, as evinced in this summary by Brian Catlos: ‘in the Marches, the military and civil authority was not separated and there was a tendency for local military dynasties to coalesce and take control, a state of affairs the amirs tolerated as long as these governors remained loyal’, or as spaces of chaos, as Arsenio and Ignacio Escolar offer: ‘la frontera, un mar de caos con algunas pequeñas islas de civilización tras las murallas de las fortalezas’. Janina Safran offers perhaps the most cogent distillation of the scholarship, stating

The borderland territories are described by the Arabic chronicles as *thughūr* (s. *thaghr*) marches (literally, front teeth), a term used to refer to the Umayyad borderland with Byzantium in the East. The term commonly characterized a different administrative status than the districts (*kuwar*) centered on the major cities of Muslim settlement and economy in the southern and eastern regions of the peninsula. In the ninth and tenth centuries the borderlands were a place for raids, and control of fortresses might pass back and forth between Muslims and Christians according to the successes of military adventures and campaigns. The Arabic geographies and chronicles refer to the *thughūr* broadly, and in the tenth-century accounts some geographic (and perhaps administrative) distinctions emerge, but the terms are imprecise. Texts refer to three frontier zones in the tenth century as the upper, middle, and lower marches, but the middle and lower (western) *thughūr* are not always differentiated, and sometimes the easternmost part of the upper march is referred to as the eastern *thaghr*. The upper march comprised the territory around the farthest towns under Islamic jurisdiction in the northeast, centered on Zaragoza and

---

184 Catlos, Kingdoms of Faith, 65–66.
185 Escolar and Escolar, La nación inventada: Una historia diferente de Castilla, 47 Trans. ‘the frontier, a sea of chaos with some small islands of civilization within the walls of the fortresses.’
the Ebro River valley, including Tudela, Huesca, Lerida, and Balaguer; the middle march was centered on Toledo (and after 946) Medinaceli and included a line of fortresses along the Tajo River; the lower (western) march included the open plains around Merida, situated on the Guadiana.186  

These descriptions draw almost exclusively on work done by Levi-Provencal, Bosch Vilá, and Manzano Moreno. In 1938, Lévi-Provençal, referencing William Marçais’ conceptualization of diffusion, defined a thaghr as “un país abierto a las incursiones del enemigo donde se libran combates de detención”.187 Lévi-Provençal argued that the most distinguishing feature of a thaghr was its military character.188 In his 1962 work, Bosch Vilá proposed a slightly more comprehensive notion of thaghr, as the entire band of territory, or buffer zone with its cities, fortresses and castles, its barren, desert regions as well as fertile, populated lowlands, organised along both military and civil lines, which protected, above all, the lines of communication and acted as a support area for the armies of Córdoba and the frontier troops.189  

Bosch Vilá’s works ‘Algunas consideraciones sobre «al-Ṭaḡr en al-Andalus» y la división político-administrativa de la España musulmana’ and ‘The Administrative History of al-Andalus: An Approach’ remain the most authoritative scholarship that has grappled with the stability and theoretical meaning of the term across sources.190 An important contribution of Bosch Vilá’s, oft overlooked in generalist scholarship, is the idea that while the thughūr were spaces controlled by powerful families, it is by no means certain that these families should be classified as rebellious or disloyal.191 As John Haldon, Hugh Kennedy, and Michael Bonner argue for the eastern ‘Islamic-Byzantine frontier’, Bosch Vilá suggests that the major distinguishing feature of the thughūr was the role they played in fiscal administration; while some have posited that in the eastern Mediterranean thughūr and ‘awāṣim signalled different

---

187 Manzano Moreno, La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas, 59 Trans. ‘a land open to enemy incursions in which fighting is arrested.’.  
188 Manzano Moreno, 380.  
190 Safran’s aforementioned description draws heavily from Bosch Vilá’s work.  
approaches to tax collection and imperial expenditure, so too have scholars advanced an economically-based *thughūr/kuwar* distinction in al-Andalus.\(^{192}\)

To date the most detailed work delineating what places actually entailed the *thughūr* under Umayyad rule remains Manzano Moreno’s discussion in *La frontera de al-Andalus*.\(^{193}\) Manzano Moreno, in his first chapter, collates the references of the various *thughūr* into what remains the most succinct and capable delineation of the oft-referred to three zones of *thughūr* employed by Arabic chroniclers: the ‘*al-thaghr al-a’lā*’, the ‘*al-thaghr al-awsāt*’, and the ‘*al-thaghr al-gharbī*’.\(^{194}\) One is hard pressed to find any type of consistency across the Arabic chronicles discussing the *thaghr* in al-Andalus, either in name or in demarcation of territory, giving the impression that early medieval authors did not share common understandings of this space.\(^{195}\) Manzano Moreno’s conversation on the *thughūr* focuses mainly on what is said in later texts, as he rightly notes that prior to the tenth century authors made few mentions of the *thughūr*.\(^{196}\) Manzano Moreno’s research employs information gleaned from Ibn Qūṭiyya’s (d. 977, Córdoba) *Tarīkh ʿiftitāḥ al-Andalus*, Ibn al-Faraḍī’s (d. 1003, Córdoba) *Tarīkh ulama al-Andalus*, Ibn Ḥayyān’s (d. 1076, Córdoba) *Muqtabis*, al-Udri’s (d. 1085, Zaragoza) *Tarsi al-akhbār*, Ibn al-Abbār’s (d. 1260, Valencia) *Kitāb al-Takmila li-Kitāb al-ṣila*, al-Himyarī’s (d. 1300s, Ifriqiya) *Kitāb al-Rawḍ al-miʿṭār fī khabar al-aqṭār*, Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s (d. 1374, Granada) *al-Ihata fī akhbār Gharnāṭa*, Ibn Khaldūn’s (d. 1406, Tunisia, Fes, Granada) *Kitāb al-ʿIbar*, and al-Maqṣari’s (d. 1632, Fes) *Naft al-Ṭīb*.\(^{197}\) His discussion thus focuses on how either Andalusi writers or those writing on the history of al-Andalus (Ibn


\(^{193}\) Manzano Moreno, *La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas*, 50–60.

\(^{194}\) Manzano Moreno, 50–60.

\(^{195}\) More details on this follow in Chapter Two.

\(^{196}\) Manzano Moreno, *La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas*, 50.

\(^{197}\) It should be noted here that the city included in the parentheses is taken from either the author’s nisba or the city in which he was employed at the time of writing rather than the place of his death.
Khalδunu, al-Maqqari) from the middle of the tenth century to the beginning of the seventeenth treated
the spaces and concept of thughur.

According to Manzano Moreno’s collation, the first thaghr, variously referred to as ‘al-thaghr al-
a’lā’, ‘al-thaghr al-akhbār’, ‘al-thaghr al-aqṣā’, or at times ‘al-thaghr al-sharqi’, betrays the most
consistency among the sources and generally refers to the Ebro Valley, whose dominant city was
Zaragoza. Of the three Andalusi thughur, this one has received the most scholarly attention, largely due
to the abundance of written sources that detail the rebellions of the Banū Qasī (ca. ninth century), a
powerful family that was based in the region of what is now Logroño and the south of Navarra. The
second, the focus of this study, goes by the names of ‘al-thaghr al-awsat’ and sometimes ‘al-thaghr al-
adnā’ and its delineated area constantly shifts, there being only mild agreement that it is around Toledo,
which sometimes is at times the capital city, loosely included in the thaghr, or portrayed as its own
administrative area.\(^{198}\) The thaghr al-awsat generally lies south of the Tajo river but north of the
Guadiana river and includes the territory between Atienza, to the northwest of Madrid, and Talavera, to
the southwest of Madrid. The third thaghr, that of ‘al-thaghr al-gharbī ‘al-thaghr al-yawf’ and
confusingly also ‘al-thaghr al-adnā’, includes the region between the Tajo and the Guadiana, only

\(^{198}\) In Maqqari, The History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain, 1:48“the cities depending on Toledo are
Guadalajara, Calatrava, and others”. In Kennedy, Muslim Spain and Portugal: A Political History of al-Andalus, 52–
53 the Middle March is dependent on Toledo; In Hodgson, The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World
Civilization, 1: The Classical Age of Islam:310 the marches are “normally (but often insecurely) under Muslim
control but organized on a war footing” with the Upper, Middle, and Lower Marches focused on Zaragoza, Toledo,
and Mérida, respectively; In Pavón Maldonado, Arte Toledano: Islámico y mudéjar, 21 the Middle March is “from
Toledo to Medinaceli” and includes Talamanca, which was founded by Muḥammad I; In Bosch Vilá, “The
Administrative History of Al-Andalus: An Approach,” 94 the capital of the Upper March is Zaragoza, the capital
of the Central March is Toledo and Medinaceli, the capital of the Lower March is Mérida; David James, Early Islamic
additional description of the thughur comes in footnote ten in David James, Early Islamic Spain: The History of Ibn
al-Qutiya, Culture and Civilization in the Middle East (London: Routledge, 2009), 92 James writes “The Marches,
around 740 CE, consisted of three fronts or frontiers between al-Andalus and the non-Muslim northern part of the
peninsula: The Lower March: Merida-Coria-Leon-Lugo; the Middle March: Toledo-Guadalajara-Medinaceli-Soria-
Pamplona; the Upper March: Tudela-Zaragoza-Huesca-Barbastro-Geron. The latter remained more-or-less intact
until the beginning of the 7th/13th century.” However, it is unclear where this definition comes from (it is not in
the text of the Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus and no text prior to this history has offered an explanation of the term
thughur. This is perhaps an example of scholars taking something for granted without proper investigation.
further to the west extending into modern-day Portugal. The predominant city of the thaghr al-gharbī is Mérida. There are even fewer mentions of this third thaghr and one wonders if this designation had any meaning in the eighth to tenth centuries.

Despite the wealth of questions Manzano Moreno posed, including whether we can rightly understand these as unified, stable territories, it seems the work has been understood more as an authoritative discussion on the frontier rather than the catalyst for conversation envisioned by the author.\(^{199}\) Guichard dedicated some time in *Al-Andalus: Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en Occidente* to tracing the families who peopled the thughūr.\(^{200}\) Specifically, he points to the presence of the Madyūnī and Dhū al-Nūnid families in the thaghr al-awsat.\(^{201}\) Finally, Buresi touches upon the region in *La frontière entre chrétienté et islam dans la Péninsule Ibérique: Du Tage à la Sierra Morena* (fin XIe-milieu XIIIe siècle), yet both his temporal scope and his interest in the conversion of the territory from Almoravid and Almohad control to Asturian rule means he asks questions irrelevant to the investigation here.\(^{202}\)

The present investigation should be understood as a prequel to Manzano Moreno’s work and further bolsters his assertion that conceptions of these areas as ‘frontiers’ coalesced only after the rule of ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (r. 912-961).\(^{203}\) The purpose of Chapter Two is to look at if and when authors writing in the eighth through tenth centuries talked about the space of the Southern Meseta. Generally, studies encompassing the territory of the Southern Meseta under Islamicate rule arise from discussions of the thughūr, and thus the area under question is often defined, as noted earlier, by Arabic chroniclers writing after the middle of the tenth century. Few, if any, studies focus

\(^{199}\) Manzano Moreno, *La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas*.

\(^{200}\) See Chapter 6 in Guichard, *Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente*.

\(^{201}\) Guichard, 366 and 395.

\(^{202}\) Buresi, *La frontière entre chrétienté et Islam dans la péninsule Ibérique: Du Tage à la Sierra Morena* (fin Xlle-milieu Xlle siècle).

\(^{203}\) Manzano Moreno, *La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas*, 49.
solely on this territory (in any time period) and as a result the histories of the region find themselves subsumed into larger discussions on ‘frontier’ experiences under the Umayyads. The assertion here is that a careful reading of eighth- through tenth-century sources on the Southern Meseta reveals two key points: one, that in general written sources offer poor recompense for those looking to study this history, and that material sources are far more promising for future avenues of research; and two, the scant information we do have suggests that in this period, the Southern Meseta did not function as a border territory, but rather a well-integrated region loyal to the Umayyad ruling polity through the first quarter of the tenth century.

1.4b Historiography of the Southern Meseta in Material Sources

In recent decades, there have been an abundance of studies that have stated unabashedly the goal of studying the frontier as a way to challenge traditional core-periphery models of empire. Yet a major issue with models and analyses which seek to use the frontier as a way to better understand the imperial centre, and thus the structure of empire as whole, is that they are, despite their stated goals, still defined and oriented to the core. Both of the terms frontier and thughūr are defined by political and administrative centres. This core-periphery dynamic is impossible to avoid; and I do not advocate that we should ignore it. Imperial centres exist and when we learn about the interactions of the thughūr with them, we learn more about the structure of pre-modern empires. However, what should be avoided, and what largely has not been in the past, is studying the periphery with the intention of learning about the core. To study a space in its own right, as an end in itself, shifts the discussion to centre upon the lived experience of the people there and leads us to different conclusions about local agency than teleological studies that aim to justify imperial control.

Studies grounded in material culture tend to take a different approach, as they start with where the material is located and use it to define the area under study. This ground-up approach clashes with the

---

204 See footnote 21.
top-down model of using designations in written sources to define the physical scope of inquiry. As a result, there is a tension between what the written sources suggest, i.e., the *thaghr al-awsat* as a dependency on the city of Toledo, and how the material sources relate to one another, in which Toledo emerges as a space of distinct materiality differing greatly from its surrounding region. The work done by Leopoldo Torres Balbás, Basilio Pavón Maldonado, Juan Zozaya, Manuel Retuerce Velasco, Lauro Olmo Enciso, Dionisio Urbina Martínez, and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez have pointed to distinct material culture emerging from the Southern Meseta.\(^{205}\) The map below provides a summary of the archaeological sites with Andalusi finds (Figure 1.3). This dataset was generated from publications dealing specifically with material culture in the Southern Meseta, yet because of their comparative nature, often mention sites throughout the Iberian Peninsula, France, and the Balearic Islands.\(^{206}\) What this visualization demonstrates is that there is significant material evidence of Andalusi habitation in the Southern Meseta that demands the attention of historians of al-Andalus.

The nature of the material evidence is fragmentary, though several publications in the past ten years have sought to bring finds from various times and locations into the same conversation. Excavations of material that date to the early Umayyad conquest of Spain have occurred at Recópolis, Segóbriga,

\(^{205}\) See Retuerce and Zozaya, ‘Variantes geográficas de la cerámica omeya andalusí: los temas decorativos,’ 72.

Calatalifa, Calatrava la Vieja, Vascos, El Tolmo de Minateda, Talavera de la Reina, and Vega Baja (outside of Toledo). In terms of numismatic evidence, Rubén-Lot García Lerga has written on the numerous finds of Islamicate coins in the region. In addition to the aforementioned sites, García Lerga points to monies found in more informal contexts from Guarrazar.

Another source base which will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Two is that of lead seals dating to the conquest of the Iberian Peninsula. Philippe Senac, Tawfiq Ibrahim, Sébastian Gasc, Sebastián Gaspariño, and Felipe Agüerra Cachinero have published extensively on this. Only one lead seal with an inscription that testifies to a location in the Southern Meseta (Talavera) has been found. It is currently held in a private collection. In their publication on it, Gaspariño and Ibrahim argue for its importance, stating that though singular, it argues for a more comprehensive settlement in the centre of the Iberian Peninsula than has been understood previously.

Both the numismatics and the seals pose challenges for researchers, as many are not held in publicly accessible collections nor published online. In addition, though coins often carry information as to dating, place of manufacture, and under whom it was struck, we often do not know how they came to be in current collections. While much can be done with coins, particularly using die cast studies to determine circulation, and comparing their weights to infer administrative regulation

---

208 For an image of this seal, see Sebastián Gaspariño and Tawfiq Ibrahim, “Importante adición a los precinto de la conquista: Talavera,” Manquso 14 (September 2021): 23–27.
210 This has repercussions for this thesis, as I have only been able to examine and collate this material culture through publications. While these reviews have informed my analysis, I am limited in what images I can reproduce. Though the material culture is largely in the public domain, the reality is that when the only images of it are in publications that I cannot reproduce without permission. None of the archaeological museums of the provinces under review have their collections online. When possible I have sought to include comparative sources that show to what I refer. When not possible, I include page references in my footnotes so that people interested in further research can access them.
of coinage, the lack of coins with identifiable stratigraphic contexts poses challenges when seeking to learn information about a specific space, as this study prioritizes.

In terms of material evidence, scholars have a longer history of investigating ceramics of the Southern Meseta. One of the earliest catalogues published on medieval ceramics from al-Andalus is that of Retuerce Velasco and Zozaya published in 1986.\textsuperscript{211} In this publication, the authors argued that the great variety of publications on Umayyad Andalusi ceramics required synthesis in order to recognise similarities and differences that would allow for more specific typologies. Prior to this article, Andalusi ceramics had been understood in five typologies: painted/common wares; glazed, honeydew ceramics; green and manganese ceramics with a white underglaze; dry rope ceramics; and stamped ceramics.\textsuperscript{212} Instead Retuerce Velasco and Zozaya argued for eighteen typologies that would allow for greater differentiation in both period and location.\textsuperscript{213} While this study had larger implications for the field, it also identified particular characteristics of ceramics of the ‘Middle March’, which included unglazed ceramics with red paint on brown backgrounds, often with a petal-like floral decoration around its edge, found in significant numbers around the river basins of the Manzanares, Guadarrama, Jarama (high), and Henares (low);\textsuperscript{214} unglazed ceramics with red paint on brown backgrounds featuring an ‘eternity cord’, flowers, and zoomorphs from the Tajo River basin;\textsuperscript{215} bichrome glazed ceramics with a dominant central theme which was also particular to the ‘Middle March’;\textsuperscript{216} Retuerce and Zozaya also identified that ceramics from the Southern Meseta were more likely to be glazed on only one side, unlike those from the rest of al-Andalus which were typically glazed on both sides.\textsuperscript{217}

\textsuperscript{211} Manuel Retuerce and Juan Zozaya, “Variantes geográficas de la cerámica omeya andalusí: los temas decorativos,” 69–128.
\textsuperscript{212} Retuerce and Zozaya, 70.
\textsuperscript{213} Retuerce and Zozaya, 70.
\textsuperscript{214} Retuerce and Zozaya, 76.
\textsuperscript{215} Retuerce and Zozaya, 80.
\textsuperscript{216} Retuerce and Zozaya, 97.
\textsuperscript{217} Retuerce and Zozaya, 91.
ceramics, more research has been done into Andalusi forms, including jars, storage containers, candles/lamps, and bowls. In 2018, Antonio de Juan García and Retuerce Velasco published a catalogue featuring the ceramics of the medieval period which is helpful in determining dating of typologies and forms.218

As none of the provincial archaeological museums in Castilla-La Mancha have online catalogues, I offer an example of display of Andalusi material culture in the Southern Meseta in the Archaeological Museum of Cuenca (Figure 1.5). Visible in the bottom left of the photograph are examples of some of the glazes discussed by Retuerce Velasco and Zozaya (also in Figures 1.6 and 1.7); in the bottom centre are examples of Andalusi ceramic forms of jars and storage containers (also in Figure 1.8), while the top offers archaeological drawings of typical Andalusi forms in the region; the bottom right of the photograph shows forms of lamps and candles (also in Figure 1.9); and the top right presents a hoard of Andalusi coins found outside the city of Valeria (also in Figure 1.10). A major hindrance to studies of the material culture of the Southern Meseta in the Andalusi period is the lack of access to the sources themselves. Most finds are kept in storage and those that are displayed can only be seen in person.

Conclusion

The review of the fields with which I intentionally engage serves not only to direct the reader as to the conversations I continue, but also to provide summaries of both approaches to cultural memory and concepts like *thughūr*, which are referenced in the following chapters. This first section, like the Prologue on terminology, addresses ideas that run throughout the rest of the work. While Chapter Two discusses in greater detail the incongruity of the written and material sources regarding conceptions of what makes up the *thaghr al-awsat*, Chapter Three tackles the question of creating a corpus of fortresses of the Southern Meseta.

---

Chapter Two: ‘Between Rebellion and Obedience’: Conceptions of the Southern Meseta in Written Sources from the Eighth to Tenth Centuries

‘By the late eighth century three frontier districts, or Marches (Thughūr), had been created along a diagonal extending from the mouth of the Tagus to that of the Ebro, with Mérida, Toledo, and Zaragoza normally serving as their administrative centres. They were usually known respectively as al-Ṭagr al-Adna (Lower March), al-Ṭagr al-Awsat (Central March), and al-Ṭagr al-A’lā (Upper March) and all three played a vital role in the Umayyad state.’

‘the inclusion of a theoretically meaningful spatial dimension may not be possible without shattering many well-established interpretive assumptions and approaches, especially those associated with the deeply engrained primacy of historical versus geographical modes of explanation’

The above juxtaposed excerpts, one from the historian Roger Collins and one from the spatial theorist Edward W. Soja, exemplify the tensions addressed in this chapter. Different sources lead to different conclusions, and while written sources from the eleventh century and onwards inform Collins’ argument, an investigation into sources from the eighth to tenth centuries suggest quite a dissimilar picture. While providing less detail, texts composed between 711 and 976 offer a different picture of the division and establishment of the thughūr. Presented below is evidence that challenges not only the timing of the delineation of three thughūr, but also the administrative centres of each thaghr purported to be of import in the Umayyad period. This argument has consequences for Chapter Three as it alters the historical foundation with which archaeologists approach material sources. In particular, the written sources from the eighth to tenth centuries present a vastly different portrayal of North Africans in the Umayyad state than that which was detailed in the Introduction. Rather than understanding the North Africans of the Southern Meseta as fickle partisans keen to rebel against the Umayyad centre in Córdoba, an image popular in the eleventh century, the sources presented here suggest a dependable contingent of North Africans settled in the region, whose loyalty to the Umayyad dynasty helped keep

219 For a discussion on the expression ‘between rebellion and obedience’ in Ibn Ḥāyyān and Ibn Iḍhārī, see Manzano Moreno, La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas, 297.
220 Collins, Caliphs and Kings: Spain, 796-1031, 27.
221 Soja, Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory, 44–45.
the city of Toledo (often under Fihri governance), the rebels in the northeast of the Peninsula, and the Christianate Kingdoms of the north in check.

2.1 Prioritizing Place, Deconstructing Space

This chapter is about a specific geographical place and how this place and the spaces within and around it have been defined over time in written sources. The place in question here is the Southern Meseta, as it is the constant with which all our evidence interacts. This approach relies heavily on the work of Pierre Bourdieu, Henri Lefebvre, Anthony Giddens, and Soja and their discussions on social space. Following Soja who argued ‘space in itself may be primordially given, but the organization and meaning of space is a product of social translation, transformation, and experience’, this investigation examines the ways in which chroniclers conceived of space in the centre of the Iberian Peninsula in the eighth through tenth centuries as attested in their written production. Foregrounding place leads us to ask different questions of our written sources as authors more frequently emphasize the people and events of the past. Often locations are the background upon which all action occurs, rather than the centre around which a text is constructed. In written sources the space of action thus shifts, as narratives follow their protagonists. In each of the accounts below there is a temptation to wander from place and follow these various storylines. Yet ultimately these are bypaths that lead away from this work’s selected centre. As Anna McSweeney notes regarding object biographies, it ‘requires a certain stamina and discipline to stick with the object as far as possible, claiming it as the centre of the story despite political changes, movements, and seismic cultural shifts that went on around it.’ This is the

---

222 For a review of how social agents construct social realities in Bourdieu, see Bourdieu and Wacquant, An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology, 10; For a discussion of differences between ideal space and the ways space is used in social practice, see Lefebvre, The Production of Space especially pages 7, 14, 17, and 32. Specifically the theoretical structure of the conversation that follows rely on the following works: Soja, Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory; Giddens, The Constitution of Society.
approach applied here, though instead of an object, we have a geographical place – we might consider this a biography of a location. This conversation stays with the Southern Meseta, which can leave the reader with a sense of fragmentation. The following investigation examines how people have conceived of and lived in this geographical place and how the dissonance between these two experiences brings to light the ways in which we need to integrate the available evidence to tell more accurate histories.

Material sources can offer an upper hand in one sense, as buildings constructed in places rarely move.\(^\text{225}\) Thus when we stand in a place, we can observe its original environs selected by its patrons, the ways in which its designers took advantage of or solved challenges of the natural environment, and the ways in which those who worked on its construction built.\(^\text{226}\) Physically observing a place often means we develop a different relationship with that location than that which the written sources portray.\(^\text{227}\)

Chapter Three discusses a building in the Southern Meseta that testifies to Umayyad presence and priorities in the eighth through tenth centuries and as such analyses constructions in space. Yet before we can move to that, it is important to understand the constructions of this space – that is how peoples imagined areas and networks. This chapter has two foci: first, it delineates places named in the sources to establish how chroniclers portrayed locations in the Southern Meseta; second, it focuses on the ways in which space was socially constructed by the same authors. As made clear in Chapter One, in Arabic texts, by the eleventh century, the Southern Meseta was referred to confidently as the \textit{thaghr al-awsat}.

The question this investigation seeks to answer is, when did this designation come into use, and what, if anything, can we say it meant?

\(^{225}\) Examples of buildings that have been relocated follow in Chapter 4, A Monumental Year.

\(^{226}\) Although topography can change over time, there are ways to account for these changes in various sciences. We have tools at hand (paleoarchaeology, geology) to reconstruct environments as they would have been in the past.

\(^{227}\) Soja argued that to understand a monument, one ‘must view [the monument] in its surrounding and context, populated area, and networks’ in Soja, \textit{Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory}, 118.
2.2 Note on the Choice and Organization of the Sources

This investigation presents eighteen Latin and Arabic sources that discuss the Umayyad fath and subsequent rule in the Iberian Peninsula, traditionally divided into genres of ‘geographies’ and ‘histories’, in chronological order. This is a loose chronology, organized by death date of the author. Given that few works give the specific date of their composition, as time passes the numbers of extant texts renders it increasingly difficult to place them in chronological order as often we cannot be sure when in someone’s lifetime the text was composed. This method of delimiting texts by date of composition, across genres and language, is borrowed from Antoine Borrut’s approach in Entre mémoire et pouvoir and gives a rough sense of the milieu in which writers composed their pieces. This organization allows for an examination of developments over time and interrogates traditional historical narratives. As Jacob Lassner wrote: ‘rather than start with recorded events as if they represented actual states of the past, scholars would do better to reconstruct the intricate process by which events were perceived and then recorded for political purposes.’ By creating a stratigraphy of texts, we can pinpoint the moments in which shifts in the corpus occurred, much like we can with material culture. It might be termed a ‘seriated approach’ and one that for eighth- through tenth-century al-Andalus, if undertaken, no scholar to date has published.

---

228 One should note that I have not engaged with astrological texts, another rich source base which offer insight into geographical knowledge in the eighth through tenth periods. I point to this as a future area of research to compliment the arguments presented here.

229 As I will discuss in the historical context that I provide for each source, the chronologies are established by century of composition, rather than by dating of extant manuscripts. Many of the manuscripts of these sources date to the twelfth century or after, meaning that interpolation between the time of composition and the dating of extant manuscripts is possible. The texts that I treat in this chapter are those for which we can be reasonably certain the text passed down to us was established in a written form in the eighth through tenth centuries.


231 Lassner, Islamic Revolution and Historical Memory: An Inquiry into the Art of ‘Abbāsid Apologetics, 66:xv.

232 This remains true not only for studies interested in the space and geography of the Iberian Peninsula under Andalusi rule. As of the time of writing, scholars have not employed this methodology to investigate the history of al-Andalus. As a result, the field rarely discusses many of the sources presented here, giving the impression that historians of al-Andalus are unaware of these texts’ value in narrating Umayyad history. This discussion serves not only to highlight the ways in which chroniclers and geographers conceived of space, but also to highlight the relevance of authors not frequently consulted in the field.
I treat the geographical and historical texts from the eighth to tenth centuries holistically. I have read the accounts detailed below in their entirety, mapped the locations they name, and only then looked to see what locations in the Southern Meseta are mentioned, if any. This approach provides context for the references to places in the centre of the Peninsula. I make no distinction between those sources that originate within al-Andalus and those that do not in this presentation of sources, though when discussing each work, I provide information about its origin and what we know about its author’s relationship to al-Andalus. I also mix ‘genres’ as mentioned earlier. Medieval authors wrote across so-called genres, which are largely constructs of modern scholarship. While limiting research into ‘geographies’ does allow for a manageable corpus of materials with which to grapple, it by no means represents the only way space was understood in the eighth through tenth centuries. I thus have included histories and chronographies. Though for some this is an unorthodox way of approaching sources, it helps to escape polarizing histories of the Iberian Peninsula, touched upon the Introduction.

Likewise, I see little logic in dividing sources by language or by geographical origin of author. Holding to linguistic borders suggests that Latin sources and Arabic ones tell different histories, when they often relate the same events and show awareness of the same information; dividing sources by place of origin (Asturian and Andalusi vs. non-Iberian) suggests that geographic proximity implies more familiarity with one another than people within the Islamicate cultural sphere, when in reality the North African, Iraqi, and Persian writers often show more awareness of individuals and cultural norms in al-Andalus than those writers from Asturias. Unsurprisingly, those who are from or who travelled to the

---

233 In the treatment of each source I identify what has been read. The majority of the texts have been read in their entirety, in the original language whenever possible. However, given the size of al-Ṭabarī’s Tārīkh al-Rusul w’al-Mulūk, I have only looked at the sections dedicated to al-Andalus. Likewise the exclusion of al-Balādhuri’s Kitāb Futūḥ al-Buldān is based on reading its index.

234 For a discussion on the history genre in early Islamic historiography, see Franz Rozenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography (Leiden: Brill, 1968), particularly pages 66-98. For a delineation of biographies, prosopographies, and chronographies, see Chase F. Robinson, Islamic Historiography, Themes in Islamic History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), particularly 55-82.
Iberian Peninsula relate more about al-Andalus and make fewer inaccurate statements about geography than those who write from afar. The Arabic Andalusi sources discuss more about the south of the Peninsula, while the Latin Asturian sources relate more about the north. The purpose of this discussion is not to argue that we should trust Andalusi authors more than the Asturian or non-Iberian writers, but rather to provide an overview of who said what and when. The juxtaposition of all sources also allows us to draw conclusions about what was theoretically possible for writers to know. If a work was composed at a certain date and refers to a specific place, we know that if this work had been in circulation, people could have known about locations without traveling there. Thus, the discussion here sets the terminus post quem for geographic knowledge.\textsuperscript{235} The discussion that follows seeks to trace what was said about al-Andalus and when it was said. I have chosen to map these locations using QGIS software to illustrate networks highlighted in each text. This approach provides something often missing in scholarship—tying accounts to the physical geography in which events played out. Yet geographies and topographies are key in understanding why people lived in and moved across places. Without understanding the ‘where’, we often misinterpret the ‘why’ and ‘how’.

This approach also provides a starting point for future scholars working on al-Andalus to know which sources from the eighth to tenth century discuss space and place in the Iberian Peninsula, something currently lacking in scholarship.\textsuperscript{236} As will be discussed below, past approaches to telling the history of the Southern Meseta and al-Andalus more generally have not distinguished between date of composition, creating anachronistic conceptions of space (i.e., the idea that there was always a thaghr

\textsuperscript{235} We know that the orality of Mediterranean culture means that geographic knowledge could have been circulating for quite some time. This must be kept in mind in reading texts.

\textsuperscript{236} Providing a complete list of who has accessed what would be cumbersome. To date, Eduardo Manzano Moreno should be understood as the scholar most interested in the conversation at hand who has made use of a similar source base. The most expansive references occur in his work Manzano Moreno, Conquistadores, emires, y califas: Los omeyas y la formación de al-Andalus in which he used the Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741, The Chronicle of 754, ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Habīb’s Kitāb al-Tārikh, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s Futūḥ Ifriqiyya wa l-Andalus, the Chronicle of Alfonso III, the Chronicle of Albelda, the Prophetic Chronicle, al-Ṭabarī’s Tārīkh al-Rusul wa l-Mulūk, Ibn al-Qūṭiyya’s Tārikh iftitāḥ al-Andalus, and Ibn Ḥawqal’s Kitāb Ṣūrat al-Ard.
and that this was a meaningful designation of space in the eighth century). After mapping the locations mentioned in each source, I reflect on the ways sources describe places in the Southern Meseta (if any). This allows for a delineation of the ways in which writers constructed social space in this region at this time. The sources discussed below are as follows: the Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741, The Chronicle of 754, ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Ḥabīb’s Kitāb al-Tārīkh, Khalīfa ibn Khayyāt’s Tārīkh, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s Futūḥ Ifriqiyya wa l-Andalus, the Chronicle of Alfonso III, the Chronicle of Albelda, the Prophetic Chronicle, Ibn Rusta’s Kitāb al-Aʾlāq al-Nafīsa, al-Hamadhānī’s Mukhtasar Kitāb al-Buldān, al-Yaʾqūbī’s Kitāb al-Buldān, Ibn Khurdādhbih’s Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik, al-Ṭabarī’s Tārīkh al-Rusul wa l-Mulūk, al-Iṣṭakhri’s Masālik al-Mamālik, Ibn al-Qūṭiyya’s Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus, and Ibn Hawqal’s Kitāb Sūrat al-ʿArḍ.237 For each source, I provide skeletal information regarding the biography of the author and history and location of the manuscript(s) examined.

2.3 Previous Methodological Approaches to Space in the Iberian Peninsula

In many ways scholarship on al-Andalus suffers from an overdependence on the wealth of sources that date to the eleventh century and after. In this chapter I intentionally have focused on sources from the eighth to tenth centuries to escape what might be termed the tyranny of Ibn Ḥayyān (d. 1076), whose prolific writing dominates histories of Umayyad al-Andalus.238 This is a major departure

---

237 For ease of reading here, I use the names by which these writers are commonly referred. The sections dedicated to each writer below give their full names. I have chosen not to analyse al-Muqaddasi’s Aḥsan al-taqāṣīm fi maʿrīfat al-aqālim here, not because I have not read it, but rather that both its composition date and its content seem to reflect a different understanding of al-Andalus in world politics. I suggest that al-Muqaddasi (d. 991) is best understood as reflecting the ‘Āmirid period. In addition, while this delineation of sources might seem elementary, nothing like this exists in scholarship. Those writing on the Umayyad dynasty in al-Andalus frequently make use of the Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741, The Chronicle of 754, the Chronicle of Alfonso III, the Chronicle of Albelda, the Prophetic Chronicle, and Ibn al-Qūṭiyya’s Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus. Recent publications have made increasing use of ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Ḥabīb’s Kitāb al-Tārīkh, Khalīfa ibn Khayyāt’s Tārīkh, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s Futūḥ Ifriqiyya wa l-Andalus, as discussed in greater detail in the sections on each work. Using Ibn Rusta’s Kitāb al-Aʾlāq al-Nafīsa, al-Hamadhānī’s Mukhtasar Kitāb al-Buldān, al-Yaʾqūbī’s Kitāb al-Buldān, Ibn Khurdādbhī’s Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik, al-Ṭabarī’s Tārīkh al-Rusul wa l-Mulūk, al-Iṣṭakhri’s Masālik al-Mamālik, and Ibn Hawqal’s Kitāb Sūrat al-ʿArḍ is almost unheard of in the field and it is unclear if scholars are aware of their writings on al-Andalus.

238 Pierre Guichard made note of the importance of Ibn Ḥayyān’s Muqtabis starting in the 1970s in Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente, xvii.
from all works that touch on the history of the Southern Meseta detailed in Chapter One. Ibn Hayyân’s *Muqtabis* provides valuable information –indeed Chapter Three makes use of his work to provide context for how later writers conceived of locations in the Southern Meseta. Hitherto, there has been little evaluation of the soundness in using an eleventh-century source to construct supposed social spaces and administrative divisions of a political system from three hundred years earlier.\(^\text{239}\) This overlooking of eighth to tenth century accounts is perhaps due to perceptions that earlier writings did not have much to offer and that scholars would do better to stick with later texts that provided more detail.\(^\text{240}\) While I argue that the periodization here proves valuable for understanding the developments of socially defined space in the Southern Meseta; this approach could yield interesting results for any scholar looking to trace change over time without the teleological assertions of eleventh-century writers who know the Umayyad dynasty will collapse.

This seriated approach is particularly suited to writing ‘meso-histories’ of al-Andalus that balance macro-historical narratives which tell the story of the Islamicate empires and micro-historical studies that focus on specific people, events, or sites. Most commonly, studies that focus on narrating the history of the Umayyad polity in al-Andalus, be it the so-called ‘Amīral (756-929) or Caliphal (929-1031) periods, have approached the task by collating information from all available sources to create an aggregate account.\(^\text{241}\) It might be termed a ‘composite approach’. In many cases, this has meant that

\[^{239}\text{While Guichard warned of this in his Introduction of xxxiii this has not stemmed the tide of scholars who rely on this work to conceive of Umayyad social spaces and administrative practices.}\]

\[^{240}\text{For discussions on nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars’ negative opinions of earlier texts, see discussions in Ibn Habib, *Kitāb al-Tārīkh*, 77–78; and endnote 30 in David James, *A History of Early Al-Andalus: The Akhbar Majmū‘a: A Study of the Unique Arabic Manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, with a Translation, Notes and Comments* (Milton Park: Routledge, 2012), 155; For a dismissal of Ibn Habib’s work as ‘eschatological’, see Aillet, *Les Mozarabes: Christianisme, islamisation et arabisation en Péninsule Ibérique (IX-XII siècle)*, 22; For a plea to reconsider the importance of Ibn Habib and Ibn ‘Abd al Ibn Ḥakam, see Manzano Moreno, *Conquistadores, emires, y califas: Los omeyas y la formación de al-Andalus*, 36.}\]

\[^{241}\text{A comprehensive list of works that use this approach is beyond the scope of this work. However, one will find this approach in the following works as examples: Mahmoud Makki, ’The Political History of Al-Andalus (92/711-897/1492),’ in *The Legacy of Muslim Spain*, ed. Salma Khadra Jayyusi (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 3–87; Pedro Chalmeta, ’An Approximate Picture of the Economy of Al-Andalus,’ in *The Legacy of Muslim Spain*, ed. Salma Khadra Jayyusi (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 741–58; Chalmeta, ’Conquista y sumisión de Hispania’; Pedro Chalmeta, *Historia*}\]
chroniclers of later periods have a greater voice in these histories, simply because they offer more material with which to work. This composite approach is useful for creating macro-histories of the Iberian Peninsula. However, such a methodology means that conversations about conceptions of space develop only as a secondary product of research: after all, the driving forces for narratives of this kind are the reports of events, people, and dates. In research that privileges what?, who?, and when?, method for the treatment of where? is largely missing.

Micro-historical studies, particularly those focused on places and questions of what happened here?, come predominantly from the work of art historians and archaeologists who rely on indexes of primary source texts to allow for quick reference regarding particular places. In these studies, authors provide textual references across time and genre that match architectural or archaeological sites.242 It might be termed a ‘gazetteer model’.243 This method is particularly useful when writing about specific places in great detail. This index-driven approach is also one used when trying to create a composite picture of a larger historical period in a given place, which is the method employed by Manzano Moreno and Buresi in their aforementioned works on the thughūr.244 While combining all accounts, regardless of author,

---


243 This terminology is borrowed from Eger, The Spaces Between the Teeth: A Gazetteer of Towns on the Islamic-Byzantine Frontier.

244 Other works which employ this methodology include: Hugh Kennedy, Caliphate: The History of an Idea (New York: Basic Books, 2016); Kennedy, Muslim Spain and Portugal: A Political History of al-Andalus; Catlos, Kingdoms of Faith; Glick, Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages; Glick, From Muslim Fortress to Christian Castle: Social and Cultural Change in Medieval Spain; Collins, Caliphs and Kings: Spain, 796-1031; María Jesús Viguera
date, genre, or location written does give us a much-needed guide to what sources mention certain
locations (and this really is a great service given the enormity of the written and material corpus
available to historians of al-Andalus), a gazetteer approach leaves little room for scholars to understand
the ways conceptions of space in the Iberian Peninsula developed.

Finally, I have chosen not to examine texts that come to us in later recensions, the most notable
being that of Al-Layth ibn Sa‘d ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Fahmī al-Qalqashandī (d. 791) whose works come
to us via Abū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn ʿAbd Allah ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (d. 871) or Aḥmad ibn
Muḥammad ibn Mūsā al-Rāzī (d. 955) and his son ʿĪsā ibn Aḥmad al-Rāzī (d. 980) whose works are
related in Ibn Ḥayyān (d. 1075). I also chose not to deal with the Akhbār Majmūʿa, for which both
authorship and dating remains problematic, a choice I review after I conclude with my discussion on
teninth-century texts. These decisions should not be understood as an evaluation of the overall worth of
these sources, but rather a recognition that for the type of work done here, it becomes difficult to assess
the likelihood of later interpolations by authors. It is relatively easy to add a specific name to a place in
relating a history and in situations where students were likely reconstructing chronicles from written
notes rather than relating what they heard verbatim or by duplicating earlier copies it is nearly
impossible to ascertain if this occurred.245 While the al-Rāzīs are indispensable for conversations
reconstructing tenth-century Umayyad court life, in a study concerned with vocabulary, tracing
interpolations which might exchange a location unknown to an early author in favour of a known
location by a later author is difficult if not impossible.246

Molins, ‘Madrid En Al-Andalus,’ in III Jarique de Numismática Hispano-Árabe (Spain: Museo Arqueológico Nacional,
1992), 11–35; Guichard, Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente.
245 For a discussion on the likelihood of paraphrasing al-Layth by al-Kindi, see Edward Zychowicz-Coghill, The First
Arabic Annals: Fragments of Umayyad Culture, vol. 41, Studies in the History and Culture of the Middle East (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 24. The inability to parse this for the al-Rāzīs in the eleventh-century works of Ibn Ḥayyān is what has led me to exclude them here.
246 A possible methodology for testing whether or not a corpus is transmitted verbatim (suggesting a written copy)
or more loosely (suggesting an oral/aural tradition) has been proposed in Zychowicz-Coghill, The First Arabic
Annals: Fragments of Umayyad History However, this is not the focus of study nor the methodology here.
2.4 The Eighth-Century Written Sources

As Roger Collins argues, we cannot ignore that the only sources dating to the eighth century that give descriptions of the Umayyad conquest of the Iberian Peninsula are those written in Latin: the first being the Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741; the second The Chronicle of 754.²⁴⁷ Both have been attributed to authors writing from the Iberian Peninsula, though further specification regarding locations of origin cannot be made.²⁴⁸ As we will see, eighth-century written attestations of place remain general and tend to be more interested in the people who inhabit the Peninsula rather than in the locales in which people live. This is an important distinction and a common one in the premodern world: while individuals have places to which they claim belonging, groups tend not to be discussed in relation to the places they occupy. While individual associations to places remain more fixed, group belonging can be quite fluid in terms of territory.

2.4a Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741

The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741²⁴⁹ is extant in two manuscripts, one from the thirteenth century and one from the sixteenth century.²⁵⁰ Composed in the Iberian Peninsula, the narration espouses a history of Visigothic rule of Hispania and the Umayyad fath of 711 with a history of the East Roman Empire. Collins and Robert Hoyland have argued that the similarities of the narrations of eastern Mediterranean history in this work and The Chronicle of 754 when compared to disparate accounts of the history of the Iberian Peninsula suggest that the respective authors had access to a common source

---

²⁴⁹ The text is also referred to as Continuatio Byzantina Arabica DCCXI.
²⁵⁰ For more detailed discussions on the manuscripts, see Collins, The Arab Conquest of Spain, 710-797, 52–54.
for Byzantine history.\textsuperscript{251} The differences in the ways in which each author approaches the history of the Iberian Peninsula are evident in several ways, one of which is the naming of places in their narrations. The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741 in general devotes little attention to events in the Iberian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{252} Of the forty-three entries, only seven deal with events in the region.\textsuperscript{253} Of these seven, only one makes any reference to a geographical entity:

In the western regions, through a general of his army by the name of Musa, \{Walīd\}\textsuperscript{254} attacked and conquered the kingdom of the Goths established at [Spania]\textsuperscript{255} with ancient solidity, and having cast out their rule he imposed tribute.\textsuperscript{256}

While the identification of ‘the kingdom of the Goths established at [Spania]’ clearly indicates that at this time the Visigothic court was identified with the Iberian Peninsula rather than with Toulouse from where the Visigoths had first launched excursions into the Peninsula in the fifth century, it is of note that no cities in the Iberian Peninsula are mentioned. While the author of the chronicle relates a detailed knowledge of geography of the eastern Mediterranean, relating provinces and cities of Byzantium, Iran, and North Africa, no such information is available for Spania.\textsuperscript{257} The remaining six entries that discuss events in the Iberian Peninsula deal sparsely with changes in the rulers of the Goths; leadership of a people is never tied to a corresponding geographical location.


\textsuperscript{252} In Hoyland’s analysis, only 9\% of the text is dedicated to events in the Iberian Peninsula, 29\% concerns ‘Byzantine affairs’, and ‘Arab affairs’ make up 62\% of the content. See \textit{Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam}, 477-494, 331.


\textsuperscript{254} This refers to the Umayyad caliph al-Walid ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān (r. 705-715).

\textsuperscript{255} While Hoyland translates this as ‘Spain’ it is best to read this in its original Latin, Spania, to avoid anachronistic attributions of modern nation-state terminology. Hoyland, \textit{Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam}, 477-494, 447.

\textsuperscript{256} See §36 in Hoyland, 487.

\textsuperscript{257} There is some disagreement about whether the author may have been from, with both Syria and the Iberian Peninsula floated as possibilities. For a discussion of this, see Cardelle de Hartmann, ‘The Textual Transmission of the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754,’ 13.
Thus, the geographic knowledge of the Iberian Peninsula that one can glean from *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741* is minimal. However, the detailing of places in the Eastern Roman Empire shows that the text is interested in relating some geographic information. This divergence within the text is worth noting: it could reflect either 1) that the author would have expected his audience to be familiar with the history of Spania and thus there was no need to include geographical information, while it would have been important to include geographical information for locations further away 2) that including geographical information was more common in eastern sources like the one the author accessed to write *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741* than it was in an Iberian written tradition at the time, or 3) it is equally possible this reflects a disinterest in or ignorance of geographies of the Iberian Peninsula. Regardless, the first written account of the Umayyad fatḥ of the Iberian Peninsula gives little sense of the places in which this history played out and provides no information as to the region that is the focus of this study. However, we do see a hint that people who conquer or command, such as Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr or Walīd, are important. This is a trend throughout the eighth-century sources on the Umayyad conquest.

2.4b The Chronicle of 754

In contrast to *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741*, the author of *The Chronicle of 754* offers more information about the Iberian Peninsula, shifting the balance of narration from the eastern Mediterranean to the west. *The Chronicle of 754* survives in several manuscripts. However, many date to after the sixteenth century and as a result are regarded as adding little new information as they remain copies or versions of earlier ones. The earliest extant copy dates to the ninth century and is

258 This of course must remain heavily conditional as it is hard to draw conclusions about a source base when the extant corpus numbers only two.
currently split between the Biblioteca de la Real Academia and the British Library.\textsuperscript{261} The Chronicle of 754 is a lengthier work than its predecessor: not only has the total number of passages jumped from forty-three to ninety-five, but the latter work also offers more detailed entries. A robust conversation about the specific geographical provenance of the work exists, though there is general agreement that the author wrote from the Iberian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{262} The action of The Chronicle of 754 is split between three arenas: Byzantium; the areas of the Umayyad futūḥ, starting in the Arabian Peninsula and extending into Southwest Asia, North Africa, and Europe prior to 711; and finally, the post-fath Iberian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{263} The specificity of Iberian locations in this work support the idea of a peninsular author or at least someone familiar with the geography of the Iberian Peninsula. The Chronicle of 754 mentions the polity Hispania/Spania over fifty times and additionally discusses six cities, with Toledo leading with nineteen entries.\textsuperscript{264} The next most frequently highlighted city is Córdoba, with eight references, followed by Sevilla with five. The map below shows the locations mentioned and the colour of the dot for each location indicates how frequently the location is mentioned in the text (Figure 2.1). Temporally, there is a gradual move of action from Toledo to Córdoba in the text, with mentions of the former coming early in the text and references to the latter towards the end.

Generally speaking, the author of The Chronicle of 754 writes of space as it relates to a Christian ecumene centring around Toledo. Within the Iberian Peninsula, the action takes place almost entirely within cities, and most cities are only mentioned in conjunction with a church officer, frequently

\textsuperscript{261} For detailed discussion on the manuscripts, see Cardelle de Hartmann, ‘The Textual Transmission of the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754’ in particular the discussion on pages 19-25.

\textsuperscript{262} For more details on this discussion, see Cardelle de Hartmann, 17–18.

\textsuperscript{263} Wolf, Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain, 23–37; Cardelle de Hartmann, ‘The Textual Transmission of the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754,’ 17.

\textsuperscript{264} Mentions of Hispania/Spania can be found as follows: (§§13-14, 16-17, 23, 27, 36-37, 41, 47, 50-51, 54-57, 59, 62, 64-65, 69, 74-75, 77-79, 81-82, 84-88, 91, 99-95). The cities include Toledo (§§14, 17-18, 23, 26, 35-36, 38, 41, 45, 48, 54, 70, 85, 88, 93), Sevilla (§§14, 17, 23, 59, 93), Zaragoza (§§17-18, 23, 54, 82), Córdoba (§§55, 64, 78, 81-82, 85-6, 88, 92), Guadix (§70), and Algeciras (§85) in Wolf, Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain.
bishops. What becomes clear is that while the author is familiar with ecclesiastical networks, as he can relate precise titles of bishops as well as designations of sees, he is less familiar with or interested in political ones. Only Toledo is pointed out with a political purpose being named an ‘urbs regis’. Recópolis, the other Visigothic royal seat in Castilla-La Mancha founded in 578 CE, is not mentioned at all. The discussions about cities provide little information other than the knowledge that the author knew of these places. Cities rarely come with accompanying descriptions – the most we learn about any urban space relates to Toledo which was renovated by Wamba (r. 672-680) ‘with wonderful and elegant workmanship. Versifying on the sculpted work, he completed it by inscribing epigrams on the bright and shining marble . . . and in memory of the martyrs, whose names he set over the turrets on the gates’ (§35) and that the city had ‘strong walls’ (§85). It is of some note that the author calls out an epigraphic tradition in the Iberian Peninsula, specifically the use of personal names on gates.

In addition to mentioning cities, The Chronicle of 754 indicates some knowledge of earlier Roman administration of the region: the author includes references to Gallia Narbonensis and Hispania Citerior and Ulterior, suggesting a continuity with previous chronicles written under Roman rule. Some topographical features appear, including mountains: the Transductine and the Pyrenees; rivers:

---

265 Bishops are mentioned for the metropolitan sees of Toledo (§§14, 26, 38, 41, 45, 48, 70), Sevilla (§§14, 17, 23), Zaragoza (§§17, 18, 23), Guadix (§70), as well as the regions of ‘Spain and Gallia Narbonensis’ (§§36, 41). The text names only one deacon, ‘Deacon Peter of the see of Toledo’ in §93. There is a clear distinction between ecclesiastical power and political power in the Chronicle of 754, as the kings and lords of the Goths, despite their conversion from Arianism to Catholicism under Reccared in 586. See Wolf.

266 In José Eduardo López Pereira, Crónica Mozarabe de 754: Edición critica y traducción, vol. 58, Textos Medievales (Zaragoza: Anúbar, 1980), 32-33,46-47, 64–67, 70–71 this translated as ‘la ciudad regia’; And in Wolf, Conquerors and Chronicles of Early Medieval Spain, 95, 99, 105, 107 this is translated as ‘the royal city.’

267 For English translation, see Wolf, Conquerors and Chronicles of Early Medieval Spain, 91–128.

268 See Richardson, The Romans in Spain, 2; For a longer discussion of how later centuries used Latin chronicles from the Visigothic period, see Chapter Three: Reception and Reuse: History, Historians and Historiography in the Writings of Isidore of Seville in Wood, The Politics of Identity in Visigothic Spain: Religion and Power in the Histories of Isidore of Seville.

269 According to Baxter Wolf this is thought to be near Medina Sidonia. See Conquerors and Chronicles of Early Medieval Spain, 106, footnote 98.
the Garonne and Dordogne located in southern France; and finally, a sole mention of the Straits of Cádiz. The discussion of cities and geographical features are nothing but passing references. The most information we receive about the landscape of the Iberian Peninsula in any eighth-century text comes from The Chronicle of 754 in an account of the reign of the governor ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Qaṭan al-Fihrī (r. 732-734 and 740-742):

In the era 772 (734), in the fourteenth year of the emperor Leo, the one hundred sixteenth of the Arabs and the twelfth of Hisham, Abd al-Malik, from a noble family, was sent by order of the prince to be the governor of [Spania]. He found it, despite all it had been through, to be abundant in every good thing and, even after all its suffering, to be filled with beauty, so that you could say that it was like a pomegranate in August. But he treated it so harshly for almost four years that little by little it was ruined, cut off from its neighbours . . . When the prince [Hisham] rebuked him for having won no military victories in the land of the Franks, Abd al-Malik immediately left Córdoba with the entire army and tried to subdue the inhabitants of the Pyrenean mountains. But leading the expedition through the narrow passes, he won no victories. After launching occasional attacks here and there in these remote places and losing many of his soldiers, he was convinced of the power of God, from whom the small band of Christians holding the pinnacles awaited mercy. He retreated to the plains and returned home through unfamiliar territory.

The author references the Iberian Peninsula as a place of great abundance and beauty and offers some sense of topography: specifically, mountain passes and plains. Yet the focus of the text and the relation of spaces remains with the peoples, be they individual or groups. When we compare the information in The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741 and The Chronicle of 754 we can make few conclusions regarding the differences in approaches to relating places on the Iberian Peninsula: the discrepancies in describing geography could be a result of the idiosyncrasies of the composers; equally it could be that we are seeing the beginnings of a shift in expectations that chroniclers of the Umayyad conquest provide more information as to the places involved in the fatḥ or a wider trend in the eighth century to write of space as related to the people more than geography. The current extant sources are so few as to allow for any

270 Gallia Narbonensis in §§ 17, 36, 41 and Hispania Citerior and Ulterior in §§ 54, 62, 69; the Transductine §§ 52, 82 and the in Pyrenees §81; the Garonne and Dordogne in §80; mention of the Straits of Cádiz in §54 Wolf, Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain.
271 For original Latin text, see López Pereira, Crónica Mozarabe de 754: Edición critica y traducción, 58:102.
272 Wolf, Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain, 118.
definitive conclusions regarding the treatment of space and place in the Iberian Peninsula in the eighth century.

2.4c Summary: Eighth-Century Views of the Southern Meseta in Comparison to the Archaeological Record

Neither extant eighth-century source relates information regarding the history of the Southern Meseta. This region is not alone in its invisibility in the written sources. If we were to follow only written sources, we might think that only six cities in the Iberian Peninsula were of import at the time of the Umayyad conquest. Material culture hints at a slightly different picture. Investigations into the material culture of the eighth century historically has not been the focus of Andalusi studies, but recent research has increasingly sought to address this gap. While in some regions studies of Islamicate coins can provide much information as to powerful political centres indicated by the mints in which dinars and dirhams were struck, the corpus of numismatic evidence from al-Andalus from 711-976 cannot be used in this way. This is because during this interval Umayyad dirhams coined in the Iberian Peninsula carry the name of only two mints: al-Andalus and Madīnat al-Zahrā’. The first extant Andalusi coins in gold and silver to be struck in the Iberian Peninsula not carrying the name al-Andalus were those minted at Madīnat al-Zahrā’ beginning in 947/8 during the reign of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Nāšir li-Dīn Allāh and extending through 976, the end of the reign of al-Ḥakam ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. While Sébastien Gasc

---


274 The correct Arabic plurals of monies are danānīr, darāhim and fulūs, respectively. For consistency in English (which often speaks of dirhams and fulūs) and to avoid the confusion of the term fulūs in Arabic, I use ‘dinars’, ‘dirhams’ and ‘fals’.

275 George C. Miles, The Coinage of the Umayyads of Spain (New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1950); Antonio Delgado y Hernández, Estudios de numismática arábigo-hispana considerada como comprobante histórico.
and Tawfiq Ibrahim’s recent study on the coinage of the Umayyad governors (r. 711-756) have shown that the dates of the striking of coins from 711 to 715 correspond to the presences of Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr in the Iberian Peninsula proving a centrally regulated fiscal structure of a peripatetic governmental mint, the coins themselves do not testify to specific places in the peninsula. Unlike other regions in early Islamicate empires, notably al-Shām and Iraq, numismatics offer little in terms of reconstructing spatial networks from the eighth to tenth centuries in al-Andalus. In the Iberian Peninsula, Umayyad coins are most useful when found in archaeological contexts to provide dating, to signify the presence of the central state, and/or to contribute to estimations of circulation and production through die-cast studies.

Some dirhams dating to the eighth century have been found in the Southern Meseta at the sites of Vega Baja dating to the years 713, 717, and 735/6; Navalvillar, dating to the year 716; and several at Recópolis from the reign of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dākhil (r. 756-788) with a chronology between 772/3 and 785. Fals, the copper coinage of Islamicate empires, have been found in far greater numbers, though not always in stratigraphies with reliable dating, indeed sometimes we do not even have data on where they were originally found. However, comparative studies that look at both weight and typology show a robust use of Umayyad copper money in the Southern Meseta in the eighth and ninth centuries.

---


Significant numbers of fals have been found at sites including Navalvillar, Zama, Calatrava la Vieja, El Tolmo de Minateda, Segóbriga, Recópolis, Talavera de la Reina, Vega Baja, Calatalifa, and Vascos.\textsuperscript{278}

While coins discovered at Recópolis allow us to conclude the region was a space integrated into the Umayyad sphere as early as 772, other finds from Olmo Enciso’s archaeological investigations of the city of Recópolis testify to a continued habitation in the region from the Visigothic to Umayyad period. Though much of the material evidence of early Islamic occupation at Recópolis awaits publication, Olmo Enciso has written extensively about a commercial zone located to the south of the monumental gate (Figure 2.2). Notably, the zone shows no disruption at the time of the Umayyad conquest, as evinced by the continuous production of glass. Olmo Enciso’s team found that one Visigothic glass workshop remained in operation throughout the eighth century, well after the Islamicate occupation.\textsuperscript{279} In addition, new material forms as well as new subdivisions of homes attest to a different use of the site. Excavations in this same zone found new walls, largely constructed without mortar, built to divide larger living spaces.\textsuperscript{280} In addition, excavations at Recópolis found evidence of circular pits consistent with forms of the North African \textit{tannur}, or oven, in these living spaces.\textsuperscript{281} Olmo Enciso suggested that the increased number of hearths and ovens perhaps intimated as a new way of living based around family groups, though this seems hard to conclude without more evidence.\textsuperscript{282} Finally, reports on finds at Recópolis speak to new pottery forms, including pots, pitchers, lamps, and lathe-turned wares though

\textsuperscript{278} For images of these, see pages 1120, 1122, and 1124 in Rubén-Lot García Lerga, ‘La moneda emiral en la Meseta Sur. Un estado de la cuestión’.
\textsuperscript{280} Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Recópolis y su justificación científica: la secuencia estratigráfica.’ 72.
\textsuperscript{281} Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Recópolis y su justificación científica: la secuencia estratigráfica.’ 72.
\textsuperscript{282} Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Espacios de poder en Recópolis en las épocas visigoda y primitiva andalusí (S. VI-IX d. C.); Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Recópolis y su justificación científica: la secuencia estratigráfica.’ 87.
publications do not include pictures of these finds, nor do they have archaeological drawings. However, Olmo Enciso asserts that these forms correspond to other cities in al-Andalus. 283

Olmo Enciso concludes that not only did Recópolis maintain its status as a substantial settlement throughout the eighth century, but that there was a demographic shift in the site. Aside from suggesting that the arrival of North African Umayyad troops did not significantly alter ways of living at the site, it may be impossible to pinpoint exactly who lived here. As related in Chapter One, the knowledge that Umayyad conquerors frequently intermarried and treated with local elites might suggest that those troops that settled at Recópolis did just that. 284 While the archaeology shows new ways of subdividing houses, the introduction of new technologies like the tannur, and new ceramics forms, without further investigation, it is impossible to say who exactly lived in these houses and used these ovens. Two scenarios are possible: one, the Umayyad partisans brought their families with them and displaced those people living at Recópolis, or two, North Africans intermarried and developed cultural norms with local peoples already living in the city. More research into both the material already unearthed as well as future excavations could shed more light on this question. In any case, it is clear that written sources from the eighth century are not particularly useful in telling this history, though this does not mean that the Southern Meseta has no Andalusi history.

Another material source base does testify to spatial networks in the eighth century: the seals of the Umayyad governors. The research of Gasc and Ibrahim, as well as that of Sebastián Gaspariño and Felipe Agüerra Cachinero, into Andalusi sigillography reveal locations that speak to the Umayyad administrative networks in the early eighth century. Seals are an interesting source base, because in general, they tend to be completely divorced from their original archaeological context and are often


284 Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Espacios de poder en Recópolis en las épocas visigoda y primitiva andalusí (S. VI-IX d. C.)’; Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Recópolis y su justificación científica: la secuencia estratigráfica.’
held in private collections. The recent work of Ibrahim and Gaspariño in establishing online open-access scholarship, such as that of *Manquso*, has done much for the field in the past ten years. That being said, without knowing where or when such finds date to, there are limited conclusions that one can draw.

Though there is some debate as to how they were used, Ibrahim has outlined several typologies of seals: those with the names of amirs or governors; those that attest to pacts of peace (*ṣulḥ/muṣalaḥa*); seals that attest to the “fifth” (*khams/fay Allāh*); those that attest to the practices of *jizya* (the capitulation of *dhimmi* communities and use the term *ahl*); distributive seals (*qasm*); those that attest to the distribution of booty (*ghanima*); a grouping that are named with the *jund of Ḥumṣ*; those that might attest to the division of human booty, particularly women (*ḥarāʾid*); and finally those which state that something is legal in al-Andalus (*jāz/jāʿiz*). Thus, individual seals, even removed from archaeological contexts, can provide much information about what people administered and area and how it came to be a part of al-Andalus.

The following cities are attested in the seals: Beja, Osconoba, Sevilla, Córdoba, Medina Sidonia, Jaén, Ibíra (Elvira, near Granada), Rayya, Narbonne, and Talavera. Only one of these locations is included in the Southern Meseta: Talavera. In 2021, Gaspariño and Ibrahim published a seal attesting to the city from a private collection (Figure 2.3). Though there is no available information about where this

---

286 In the earliest sources, Rayya refers to the city of Archidona. Later sources use Málaga as the location of Rayya. What can be said for sure is that Rayya referred to a province or region rather than a specific city. For the purposes of the map showing the seals of Gasc and Ibrahim, I have mapped Rayya as Archidona. For more information on Rayya, see É Lévi-Provençal and J. -P. Molénat, ‘Rayya,’ in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, ed. P. Bearman (Brill Reference Online, 2012), http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_6266.
seal was found nor names or dates on the seal, there are some conclusions that can be drawn. As can be seen in Figure 2.3, the name of Talavera is clearly visible on one side, and on the other, Gaspariño and Ibrahim have read ‘ahl’. This means that the seal is likely to date to the conquest of Talavera in the years immediately after 711, and that at this time Talavera was likely home to Christian an/or Jewish dhimmī communities that were assessed a jizya tax. While little more can be said about Talavera, there is more to glean when approaching the cohort of cities attested to in the seals. When we map these locations onto the map previously generated with the cities mentioned in The Chronicle of 754, we have a striking realization of what different stories each of these bodies of evidence is telling (Figure 2.4). Comparing these two source bases demonstrates first, the relative lack of interest or knowledge that the authors of The Chronicle of 754 and the Byzantine-Arab Chronicle of 741 had in the administrative details of the Umayyad fath. The eighth-century sources suggest it was not of import for these texts to record how the conquest occurred in terms of places and geographies. As we will see, this is a marked difference from the ninth century in which chroniclers in both Latin and Arabic show increasing interest in representing place and space when narrating both historical and current events. Secondly, reviewing the eighth-century sources – be they written or material – demonstrates the problematic picture with which studying elite sources leaves us. Neither the extant written sources nor the seals attest to an Umayyad presence in the Southern Meseta in the eighth century, yet archaeological investigations in the region demonstrate it was a space of cultural negotiation with distinct material culture recognizable in the ninth century. As this investigation moves to later centuries, it is worth keeping in mind a few questions: why have previous writers, from the eighth century to the present, chosen not to tell the history of the Southern Meseta under Umayyad rule? Is disinterest or ignorance of this region a constant feature of the sources as we move through time? When do the first mentions of locations in the Southern Meseta occur, and in what context?
2.5 The Ninth-Century Written Sources

The ninth century is the first time we have an idea of how an author living in Umayyad al-Andalus conceived of Andalusi space in the work of ʿAbd al-Malik Ibn Ḥabīb (d. 853/4). In addition to this Andalusi source, the ninth century boasts other Iberian sources in Latin, that of the Chronicle of Alfonso III (880s), the Chronicle of Albelda (881), and the Prophetic Chronicle (883). These four sources are the only sources ‘local’ to the Iberian Peninsula; yet given the interconnectedness of the Mediterranean in this time period, there is no particular reason to privilege Asturian histories over non-Andalusi Arabic sources. Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ (d. 850s) wrote from Basra and Ibn Ṭabī ḫakam (b. 803-d. 871) from Fusṭāṭ, locales significantly removed from al-Andalus, yet both sources provide interesting information about the Umayyad conquest of the Iberian Peninsula. The textual sources discussed in this section include ʿAbd al-Malik Ibn Ḥabīb’s Kitāb al-Tārīkh, Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ’s Tārīkh, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa l-Andalus, the Chronicle of Alfonso III, the Chronicle of Albelda, and the Prophetic Chronicle. Strict chronology is difficult, as the first Arabic chronicles relating the fath of 711 were penned by authors living contemporaneously to one another. I have chosen to start with Ibn Ḥabīb as he is the only author to write from al-Andalus in the ninth century. I then move to works of Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ and Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, although one could easily choose to order these three Arabic chronicles differently. The order of the remaining Latin sources is a bit clearer to parse, as both the Chronicle of Albelda and the Prophetic Chronicle are dated. While we know the Chronicle of Alfonso III was written in the 880s, further specificity is impossible at this time. I have chosen to discuss the Chronicle of Alfonso III first. This following section looks at the ways in which all of these authors wrote about space in al-Andalus, looking not only at specific towns and cities reported in these texts, but also paying attention to the ways in which authors conceive of space and its ties to peoples. I keep an especially close eye on the ways Arabic authors employ the terms ‘thaghhr (pl. thughūr)’ and ‘kūra (pl. kuwar)’.
The earliest surviving Andalusi sources written in Arabic that we know of date to the ninth century and were penned by ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Ḥabīb (d. 853/4). Ibn Ḥabīb was born outside of Granada, in a place called Ḥiṣn Wāṭ, and through his extant works we know he travelled throughout al-Andalus as well as the Eastern Mediterranean. Ibn Ḥabīb’s writing remains the sole Andalusi voice we have access to until the tenth century, at which point we encounter the works of Ibn al-Qūṭīyya and Ibn Ḥawqal. Though scholars, most notably Reinhart Dozy, dismissed Ibn Ḥabīb’s works as offering little useful information for the historian, as Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz, Jorge Aguadé, and David James have pointed out, it is necessary to rethink this assessment. A prolific writer, Ibn Ḥabīb’s surviving corpus includes nine works ranging from evaluations of agricultural techniques, meteorological treatises, history, to commentaries on religious issues. Here I look at the ways in which Ibn Ḥabīb represents Andalusi space in his *Kitāb al-Tārīkh*. Currently only one manuscript of the *Kitāb al-Tārīkh* is known to us: a copy in the Bodleian Library dating to 1295-6. As Mahmud Makki first argued, this text likely has interpolations from Ibn Ḥabīb’s student, Yusuf ibn Yaḥyā al-Majāmī (d. 900). However, given the nature of the investigation and the fact that al-Majāmī is also a ninth-century scholar, we can assert the knowledge passed along in the text belongs to this century.

The *Kitāb al-Tārīkh* is a universal history of which one section focuses on events in al-Andalus. It is of some note that no precise locations in al-Andalus feature in any of the other six sections, and

---

288 For the purposes of this discussion, I have read the entirety of the work.
289 As discussed by Aguadé, to date scholars have identified thirty-nine books attributed to Ibn Ḥabīb, nine of which are extant. See *Kitāb al-Tārīkh*, 17–20, 67.
290 For a discussion on Ibn Ḥabīb’s background and training, see pages 23-30 in Aguadé in *Kitāb al-Tārīkh*.
293 For more information on the manuscript, see Ibn Ḥabīb, 107–8.
294 Ibn Ḥabīb, 83.
295 Aguadé has categorized the sections as those including the creation of the world and the pre-Islamic prophets, a biography of Muhammad, a history of the caliphs from Abū Bakr to Hishām (d. 743), the history of al-Andalus, a ṭabaqāt, and a final miscellany, which notable includes our first written list of Andalusi governors from an Andalusi
indeed the term ‘al-Andalus’ only shows up twice outside of the portion on its history – once early on when Ibn Ḥabīb discusses the organization of his text; and once in introducing a ṭabaqāt entry of the figures of al-Andalus. The section that focuses on al-Andalus can be divided into three subsections: the first, a biography of Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr; the second, a list of rulers that includes information as to both their ascension to rule as well as their death; and finally, a segment that deals with questions of law, with a particular emphasis on the positions of Mālik ibn Anās. These sections have decidedly different tones, yet the treatment of space does not vary greatly between the three.

References to the broader polity of al-Andalus are more common than discussions of specific locations: al-Andalus is mentioned twenty-seven times; Córdoba, ten; Toledo, four; Tudmīr (Murcia), three; Sevilla and Algeciras, twice each; and Almā‘ida, Carmona, Écija, and Zaragoza once each, as mapped below (Figure 2.5). When we compare the cities mentioned in the Kitāb al-Tārīkh with those identified in The Chronicle of 754 there is substantial overlap. All of the cities identified in the Latin text source in Ibn Ḥabīb, Introduction; For a discussion on the structure of the text and the combination of tārīkh and ṭabaqāt in early Islamic historical writing, see Tobias Andersson, Early Sunnī Historiography: A Study of the Tārīkh of Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, vol. 157, Islamic History and Civilization (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 93–96.

296 In Ibn Ḥabīb, Kitāb Al-Tārīkh, §39, 26. The Arabic ‘thummā arji‘a ilā iftitāḥ al-Andalus wa-ghalabat Ṭāriq mawlā Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr ‘alayhā’ seems to be missing an ‘f’ in the edition and so I have transliterated and translated it as ‘‘affāta’ ‘‘تتاحة’. Translation: ‘And then I return to the conquest of al-Andalus and the victory of Ṭāriq, client of Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr, over it.’

297 كا أهل الأندلس بعد التابعين رجال أهل فقه و علم و حكم و مروة صالحة in Ibn Ḥabīb, §§567, 178. Transliteration: ‘kāna ahl al-Andalus ba‘ada l-tābi‘īn rījāl ahl fiqḥ wa-‘ilm wa-ḥiilm wa-murū‘a sāliḥa’. Translation: And the people of al-Andalus were, after the tābi‘īn, men of jurisprudence, learning, clemency and pious virtue’

298 Almā‘ida. It should be noted that the name, translating as ‘table’, might also be understood as the origin for the mythical ‘Table of Solomon’ that appears. It is unclear to what this refers here, a place or an object. This is not the focus of the investigation here, but would be worthy of further study as there is some confusion both within and across texts as to how to translate this term. It makes some sense that a particularly rich location, from which Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād took significant booty, could transform in time to a transportable object. Ibn Ḥabīb uses it seemingly both as a location and an object (following al-Layth ibn Sa‘d), although once again, further investigation into this usage would be welcome.

299 Cities in Europe that are mentioned include: Algeciras two times (§§ 415, 422), Almā‘ida (§ 422), Carmona (§ 443), Córdoba ten times (§§422, 435, 441, 442, 443, 450, 452), Écija (§446), Sevilla two times (§§ 444, 452), Toledo five times (§§403, 406, 408, 445), Tudmīr (Murcia) three times (§ 396), and Zaragoza once (§ 408). Of these locations, all are mapped except for Almā‘ida, as this location remains debated. All in Ibn Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-Tārīkh; The identification of Tudmīr with Murcia follows Guichard in Guichard, Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente, 192.
are attested to apart from Guadix. For the first time, in Ibn Ḥabīb, we have references to Almā’ida, Carmona, Écija, and Tudmīr. However, it is striking that neither the eighth-century Latin nor ninth-century Andalusi written sources reflect the locations attested to in the seals. This text of Ibn Ḥabīb’s does not map with the present corpus of administrative artifacts dating to the Umayyad fath and subsequent rule.

The Kitāb al-Tārīkh is less interested in physical space than in what we might term prophetic space, both in the past and in the future.300 Events are rarely situated in the real world and throughout his work Ibn Ḥabīb shows an interest in the stories of Jewish prophets whose qualities frequently are grafted upon historical figures like caliphs and governors.301 The text reads most like a biography of Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr, as it is he who Ibn Ḥabīb follows throughout the first subsection. In this part, more than half of the section takes place outside of the Iberian Peninsula, either in Ifrīqiyya or al-Shām. While many of the locations in al-Andalus (Algeciras, Almā’ida, Carmona, Écija) are mentioned only as stops along the way to other places, there are glimpses of ways in which Ibn Ḥabīb identifies some centres. Tudmīr (Murcia) is a space conquered by Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād; Toledo is one of great wealth and a seat of the Visigothic royalty, home to both the infamous Table of Solomon and the polytheists (mushrikūn);302

300 For an extended discussion of the ninth-century tendency for chroniclers to associate Arabs with Biblical prophets, see Chapter Four in Chase F. Robinson, ‘Abd al-Malik, Makers of the Muslim World (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005).
301 Some examples include Mūsa ibn Nuṣayr being addressed as ‘a Prophet of God’; his role in confronting and destroying idols, specifically calves, in §416-419, his ability to call on God to end a drought for his followers in §423, and his death on hajj before reaching Mecca in §426, all of which recall his namesake; and his sending out of eagles to look for safe land is reminiscent of Noah in §421 in ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Ḥabīb, Kitāb Al-Tārīkh, ed. Jorge Aguadé (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas Instituto de Cooperación con el Mundo Árabe, 1991).
302 The Table of Solomon has fascinated scholars for a long time and there is much debate on what it is or what it means. For an extended discussion on this, see Julia Hernández Juberias, La península imaginaria: Mitos y leyendas sobre Al-Andalus (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1996), 208-248. However, there is little need to engage with this here. Of the eighteen sources examined here, Ibn Ḥabīb is the only author to provide more than one line of information about the Table of Solomon. There is no doubt that this is a very early story. Most texts attribute this to an account of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ’Amr ibn al-Āṣ (d. 684), a companion of the Prophet (of course how he is supposed to know of events that occur after 711 is a bit of a mystery). Ibn Ḥabīb’s treatment of the Table is brief. The first mention of it describes it as covered in gold, pearls and rubies and that states that it is taken by Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād (on page 406). The next time we encounter it, the Table of Solomon plays an essential role
Sevilla is a place of power to which people repair when Córdoba falls; Zaragoza has a ḥiṣn, and Córdoba has a qaṣr. Unsurprisingly, given the likelihood that Ibn Ḥabīb wrote from Córdoba, that city features prominently in his narrative, first as home to people who recognize 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dakhil (r. 756-788) as rightful ruler, then to those who ignominiously revolt against their ruler, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muhammad (‘Abd Allāh I, r. 888-912).

As in the eighth-century sources, space and territories are amorphous as they are tied to groups of people, not physical locations. Thus, fighting occurs not in Galicia or in the Basque country, but rather against Galicians (Jillīqīya), the Basques (Bashāksah), or the Franks (al-Ifranj). There is no mention of Asturias or cities in Asturias, which suggests that later accounts or histories that point to the importance of the Asturian monarchy in the early ninth century exaggerate the reality. No evidence suggests that Ibn Ḥabīb found Asturians to be notable or powerful enemies, unlike the Galicians, Basques, and Franks.

The text also identifies the Goths (qūṭ) and makes distinctions between Arabs and Berbers (al-Barbar), suggesting that places held by these groups were understood as distinct from one another. Finally, in the Kitāb al-Tārīkh, there is no discussion of locations in the Southern Meseta, though the narration of Mūsā moving against Zaragoza from Toledo suggests that the Umayyad forces followed roads that crossed through the area. Neither thaghr al-awsaṭ, nor the more general term thughūr, is used. The Kitāb al-Tārīkh should be considered a text interested in the wider Mediterranean, particularly emphasizing the Umayyad control of North Africa and al-Andalus. Yet as we will see, of the ninth-

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{in a disagreement between Tāriq ibn Ziyād and Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr. Both have been recalled by the caliph, al- Walid. Tāriq, expecting some trickery from Mūsā, replaces one of the legs of the table with a fake. Upon arriving to Damascus, Mūsā asserts that the booty of the Table is his, and that the entire table is real. Tāriq accuses him of lying and is proven right when the new caliph (Sulaymān, who had acceded to rule after the death of al-Walid) finds that Mūsā has lied (422-427). While this story attests much to the relationship between Tāriq, Mūsā, and the caliph, and thus can speak to administrative tensions and perhaps we can extrapolate ideas regarding ‘Arabs’ and ‘Berbers’ in the division of booty, this story has little relevance for the investigation at hand.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{303 Although not the focus of this investigation, it is important to point out that in referring to fortifications, Ibn Ḥabīb uses only three Arabic words: qaṣr, pl. qaṣūr; ḥiṣn, pl. ḥuṣūn; or qa'l'a, pl. qa'l'āt/qilā. The term ribāṭ, frequently used to discuss frontiers, is not a term used by Ibn Ḥabīb.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{304 Ibn Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-Tārīkh, 29–30.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{305 Ibn Ḥabīb, (408)142.}}\]
century sources to which we are privy, this is the only account which privileges Andalusi space. In Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ’s Tārīkh, al-Andalus is only a place that is conquered, not a space to be governed; in Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam’s Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa I-Andalus, the section on al-Andalus is rooted in North Africa; the Asturian chronicles emphasize the lands of Asturias.

2.5b Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ (d. 854/5) and the Tārīkh306

Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ (d. 854/5) was born in the city of Basra and trained as a muḥaddith. The only known extant manuscript (and only one known to date) of his Tārīkh is a copy of Baqī ibn Makhlad al-Qurṭubī’s (d. 889) recension of Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ, provisionally dated to 1084 or 1085 and currently held in the General Library of Rabat in Morocco.307 Another recension, that of Mūsā ibn Zakariyyā al-Tustarī (d. 912), can be found in fragments and is quoted extensively in Ibn ‘Asākir’s (d. c. 1176) Tārīkh Dimashq. As Tobias Andersson has argued, both recensions were likely created from written notes taken from Khalīfa’s lectures and as such must be understood as approximations.308 The Rabat manuscript of Baqī ibn Makhlad al-Qurṭubī’s is less problematic for the discussion here – not only is the copy complete but as Baqī ibn Makhlad is a ninth-century writer, any interpolations belong to the century under scrutiny. Given Baqī ibn Makhlad’s Andalusi origin and his presumed familiarity with the geographic space of the Iberian Peninsula, the lack of specificity in relating the fath of al-Andalus suggests both that the narration of this section is Khalīfa’s and that there was nothing particularly controversial in what he relates in terms of this subject.309

307 Andersson offers the dating of 1084 in Early Sunnī Historiography: A Study of the Tārīkh of Khalīfa b. Khayyyāṭ, 157:13; Wurtzel and Hoyland tentatively accept 1085. This dating is not universally accepted and some have suggested a much later date in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. For more information on the manuscript, see footnote 190 in Khalīfa Ibn Khayyat’s History on the Umayyad Dynasty (660-750), 47.
309 For approaches to controversial material in Khalīfa ibn Khayyyāṭ, see Andersson, 157:161–62.
As with Ibn Ḥabīb, Khalīfa composed works across several ‘genres’. Like the Kitāb al-Tārīkh of Ibn Ḥabīb, the Tārīkh of Khalīfa is a universal history, however it differs in its structure as it is annalistic. All mentions of locations in the Iberian Peninsula come after the year 707/8 and are contextualized against events occurring broadly in the Umayyad empire. The Tārīkh mentions the polity of al-Andalus only five times, and Córdoba, Beja, and a place called al-Bayḍā’, which remains unidentified, once. Córdoba, Beja, and al-Bayḍā’ are mentioned in the same sentence that details Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr’s campaign through al-Andalus in 712. It is worth noting that here we have the first mention of Beja, which is the first alignment with information provided on seals dating to the early years of the Umayyad conquest. In addition to the mentions of locations in the Iberian Peninsula, both Mallorca and Menorca are mentioned in relation to raiding in the Mediterranean in 708/9 when Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr sends his son ‘Abd Allāh to raid the ‘two islands between Sicily and al-Andalus’. References to locations in the Iberian Peninsula and the Balearics thus occur in years 707/8, 711-713, and 741-2 at which time ‘the Berbers revolted in al-Andalus’, shown in the map below (Figure 2.6). Little detail regarding any of these locations is given. Unlike in Ibn Ḥabīb’s text, no ethnographic information is given for peoples in the Iberian Peninsula, an approach common throughout Khalīfa’s Kitāb al-Tārīkh. Andersson suggested that the silence regarding conquered peoples is the author’s way of expressing the hegemony of the early Islamicate state. We do learn that Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr conquers and treats with the Ṣanhāja and attacks the ‘Awraba in North Africa, and we know that there are ‘Berbers’ in al-Andalus. However, there

---

310 For more information on texts of Khalīfa, see ibn Khayyat, Khalīfa Ibn Khayyat’s History on the Umayyad Dynasty (660-750), 14–15.
311 Al-Andalus (pp.400, 404, 408); Córdoba (pp. 3, 406), and Beja (406) in ibn Khayyat, Tārīkh of Khalīfa ibn Khayyat; See pages 173,176, 179, and 244 for mentions of al-Andalus; and 177 for mentions of Córdoba, Beja, and al-Bayḍā’ in ibn Khayyat, Khalīfa Ibn Khayyat’s History on the Umayyad Dynasty (660-750).
312 Both mentions are on the same page in ibn Khayyat, Tārīkh of Khalīfa ibn Khayyat, 400; In ibn Khayyat, Khalīfa Ibn Khayyat’s History on the Umayyad Dynasty (660-750), 173.
313 Ibni Khayyat, Khalīfa Ibn Khayyat’s History on the Umayyad Dynasty (660-750), 244.
is no indication of tribal or family affiliation for those troops who cross the strait into al-Andalus after 711 nor does Khalīfa relate anything about the peoples of the Iberian Peninsula.

Of more interest to scholars of al-Andalus in the text of Khalīfa is the ways in which he employs terms regarding fortifications, administrative divisions of land, and borders. Like the Kitāb al-Tārīkh of Ibn Habīb, military strongholds are either qūṣūr, ḥuṣūn, or qala’āt/qilā. As discussed earlier, in looking at the ways various Arabic authors use kūra and thaghr, it is important to note that Khalīfa uses both, though neither in relation to al-Andalus. Thaghr is used when referring to the thaghr al-Hind, the thaghr al-Jund, the thaghr al-Qandabīl. The first two are general, contested areas, the latter is where ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Ziyād al-Mundhir ibn al-Jārūd is given governorship (and where he dies of starvation). For Khalīfa, thaghr is not something applied to al-Andalus as of 750 and is a term little used in other regions. However, it is important to see that in the Tārīkh, the thughūr have governors, suggesting they are integrated into the administrative map of the empire. In the relation of the death of al-Mundhir in Qandabīl and the narration of his successors, it becomes clear that in this thaghr, Umayyad power is contested. Similarly, kūra is used only a few times, and never in conjunction with space in al-Andalus. The first mention of a kūra comes when describing a provision of a treaty (sulh) and another comes when discussing the kūra of Sanbīl, ‘a province in Khuzestan bordering Persia.’ In both cases it is a term to designate regions, though we would be hard pressed to say more than this.

315 For examples of qūṣūr, see pages 165, 182, 201, and 203. For examples of ḥuṣūn, see pages 178, 402-3, 406, and 423. For examples of qala’āt, see pages 141 and 163 in ibn Khayyāṭ, Tārīkh of Khalīfa ibn Khayyāṭ.
316 ibn Khayyāṭ, 240, 249, and 358.
317 ibn Khayyāṭ, 229.
318 ibn Khayyāṭ, 287 Qandabīl currently goes by the name Gandava, or Ganjaba, and is located in the district of Baluchistan in modern day Pakistan.
319 ibn Khayyāṭ, 287.
320 Ibn Khayyāṭ, 133 Transliteration: ‘wa-yuqālu: ‘Abū Maryam wali sulḥ al-kūratayn . . .’ Translation: ‘and he said: ‘Abū Maryam is the guarantor (wali) of the peace (sulḥ) of the two kūras’; For information on the location of the kūra of Sanbīl, see footnote 2 on page 135 in ibn Khayyāṭ, 135.
However, it is important to see that *kūra* was in use in Arabic chronicles to designate space in the ninth century and it is not unique to al-Andalus.321

2.5c Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (d. 871) and the Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa l-Andalus 322

Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (d. 871), known as Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, was a scholar trained in Maliki *fiqh* from Fustāṭ. He penned his *Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa l-Andalus* in the first half of the ninth century. The text survives in four manuscripts: one in the British Library, two in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and one at the University of Leiden.323 Much work remains to be done on the *Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa l-Andalus*, which Charles Torrey estimated accounts for approximately one-tenth of ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s *Futūḥ Miṣr*, a text that includes not only the ancient history of Egypt but also concludes with a ṭabaqāt.324

Despite being divided into sections on Ifrīqiyya and al-Andalus, the section purportedly dedicated to al-Andalus constantly is pulled to North Africa. Robert Brunschvig suggested that the text might best be understood as ‘the conquest of North Africa – and something of an excursus into Spain.’325 The narrative of Andalusi history starts in North Africa with the administration of the Umayyad governor, Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr, and his expansion into the Maghrib. Immediately after the introduction of Mūsā’s *mawlā*, Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād, the space of action moves to the Iberian Peninsula. Though the narrative

321 Andalusi scholarship on the *kūra* generally treats the term in a vacuum and has not historically compared to other regions. For a detailed discussion of the division in Andalusi history, see Bosch Vilá, ‘Algunas consideraciones sobre «al-Ṭāqr en al-Andalus» y la división político-administrativa de la España musulmana.’
does include information about the fabled Table of Solomon similar to Ibn Ḥabīb’s Kitāb al-Tārīkh, this account, unlike the Kitāb al-Tārīkh, is grounded in physical spaces in the Iberian Peninsula. In general, when comparing Ibn Ḥabīb’s account and Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s, the space of action has moved from the prophetic to the tangible. Of note as well is a shift in the perspective regarding the protagonists. While the Kitāb al-Tārīkh lauds Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr, the Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa l-Andalus portrays him as a far more shadowy figure: Mūsā mistreats Ṭāriq ibn Ziyād and cheats his own troops and the caliph out of war spoils, although he still maintains enough status to accompany the Umayyad caliph Sulaymān ibn ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 715-717) on ḥajj, perhaps a reflection on Sulaymān’s generous nature. After the conquest narrative detailing the years 711-713, relatively little of the account deals with the physical space of the Iberian Peninsula. Instead, the section returns to North Africa and details the administrative changes affected in al-Andalus by order of the governors of Ifrīqiyya. The last third of the portion dedicated to the fath of al-Andalus focuses on the so-called ‘Berber revolt’ of the 740s, which ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam shows is far more complicated than such a name implies. 326

Of the twenty cities mentioned in the section, nine are in Europe – a division which might not seem stark unless one considers that these nine locations together tally only thirty mentions, when compared with the seventy-five references to North African cities. Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam most frequently refers to events happening in the Iberian Peninsula as occurring in ‘al-Andalus’ – the balance between the mention of the region to Ifrīqiyya fares better at a ratio of forty-two to thirty-eight. Unsurprisingly given his base in Fustāṭ, when Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam is speaking about al-Andalus, he is far more likely to use general, regional terminology, and when speaking of Ifrīqiyya, he more frequently uses specific place names.

326 I will return to this discussion when reviewing ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s treatment of peoples.
In al-Andalus, Córdoba is referenced the most with twelve mentions, followed by Toledo with six; Algeciras with five; and Narbonne with three; Gibraltar, Cartagena, Medina Sidonia and Firās are all mentioned once, mapped below (Figure 2.7). There is almost no overlap between the work of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and Khalīfa’s Kitāb al-Tārīkh when discussing locales: the only location in al-Andalus that both mention is Córdoba, meaning the two texts share 1/14 places, and have a similarity score of roughly seven percent. There are only slightly more correspondences between the Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa l-Andalus and Ibn Habīb’s Kitāb al-Tārīkh (both reference Córdoba, Toledo, and Algeciras, meaning they share 3/18 places, a similarity score of approximately seventeen percent). It is interesting to note that both Khalīfa and Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s work align with the presence of extant seals, though each show awareness of different locations (Khalīfa discusses Córdoba and Beja; Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam references Córdoba, Narbonne, and Medina Sidonia). In Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, little information accompanies the mentions of cities. Most often the naming of a location has no accompanying description. Narbonne, however, is of some note as not only is it mentioned twice and aligns with material culture, but it is one of the few locations described in the text. Narbonne is ‘the furthest border of the country’ and its description as such is the first use of the term thaghr to identify Andalusi space. Given Philippe Sénac’s recent work that shows the Islamicate presence in Narbonne was both more substantial and lasted far longer than previously understood, these early references to Narbonne and its identification of it as thughūr should perhaps be revisited. The naming of Narbonne in parallel to administrative centres including Córdoba and Toledo, combined with seals and substantial archaeological finds, suggest a location of importance.

---

327 Later texts also refer to this location as Firāsh (فزاش).
328 Algeciras, five mentions (pp. 88, 90, 96, 130); Toledo, six mentions (pp. 90, 92, 94, 96); Jabal Ṭāriq (p. 90); Cartagena (p. 90); Córdoba (90, 92, 94, 96, 130, 132); Alcantara (p. 90), Medina Sidonia (p. 94), Firās (location unknown, p.94), Narbonne, two mentions (p. 96) in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Conquête de l’Afrique du nord et de l’Espagne (Futūḥ Ifrīqiya wa l-Andalus).
330 Sénac, ‘Cuando fueron árabes: La présence musulmane en Narbonnaise (VIII siècle).’
It is not common for Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam to use the term *thaghur/thughūr* to discuss space in the Iberian Peninsula; however, its application here shows the concept of *thughūr* being applied outside of an Eastern context for the first time (in an extant manuscript). What is interesting is that this notice is attributed to al-Layth ibn al-Sa’d (b. 713-d. 791), which might suggest that the term itself was in common usage from the very earliest of Arabic chroniclers. However, the application of the term to Narbonne is substantially geographically removed from the space of the Southern Meseta. If the Southern Meseta had been considered a border space in the ninth century, one would assume it would be identified in this text as such. In terms of the physical buildings that fill the spaces referenced, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam refers to *qala’āt/qilā* and *quṣūr*.\(^{331}\) However, the sparsity of the use of these terms means that the text reads as less interested in fortifications and military manoeuvres than in the people that traversed, conquered, and administered these spaces and places.

The *Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa l-Andalus* is a text deeply concerned with people, both individually and collectively. Individually, the text offers the most comprehensive portrait to date of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥabīb al-Fihrī, the governor of al-Andalus from 745-755. If Ibn Ḥabīb’s *Kitāb al-Tārīkh* might be considered a biography of Mūsā ibn Ṯuṣayr, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s section detailing the *fatḥ* of the Iberian Peninsula might be considered a biography of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥabīb: one third of the text revolves around his actions in the ‘Berber revolt.’ This perhaps fits into a larger narrative in the text of the Fihrī family in the *Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa l-Andalus*. As Brunschvig argued, ‘Uqba ibn Ṯāfi’ al-Fihrī, an ancestor of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥabīb, ‘is the hero of the conquest of Barbary, outclassing even Mūsā ibn Ṯuṣayr and Ṭaṭrīq.’\(^{332}\) This suggests that either the Fihrīs played a larger role in establishing, securing, and administering Ifrīqiyya and al-Andalus than is typically attributed to them or that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam had an interest in relating the history of the family (or perhaps both).

\(^{331}\) See pages 88 and 94 for references to the former; page 106 for references to the latter Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, *Conquête de l’Afrique du nord et de l’Espagne (Futūḥ’ Ifrīqiyya wa’l-Andalus)*.

\(^{332}\) ‘Ibn AbdelḤakam and the Conquest of North Africa,’ 212.
The detailing of collectives, specifically tribal affiliations, is markedly different in the *Futūḥ Ifrīqiyya wa I-Andalus* than in any other chronicle to date (in this investigation). In his narration of the so-called ‘Berber Revolt of the 740s’, Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam includes references to the Butr, Barānī, Sādif, Zanāta, Maghīla, Luwāta, Hawwāra, Nafza, Ghifarī, Fazara, Zubayd, Juhayna, Mudlij, Lakhm, Judhām, Tujībī, Qaysī, Fihrī, Kalbī, and Quraysh. The challenge of the text is identifying who is fighting whom, as tribal affiliations do not always align with military alliances. The only references to tribes in al-Andalus is one mention of the Goths (*qūṭ*). In addition, there are several formulas including the term ‘ahl’, although what to make of these remain puzzling. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam refers to the *ahl al-Andalus, ahl al-Kitāb, ahl al-Shirk, ahl Mīṣr, ahl Ifrīqiyya, ahl Qayrawān, ahl al-Shām*, and *ahl al-dhimma*. Edward Zychowicz-Coghill suggested that the term should be understood as referring to those people enrolled in the army or those owing taxes. This is a new way of referring to broader collective identities.

2.5d *Chronicle of Alfonso III (880s)*

The *Chronicle of Alfonso III*, dated to the 880s, survives in two versions, one named in the historiography as the *Oviedo version* (910-914) and the other as the *Roda version* (914-924). The text is one of three Asturian texts composed in the 880s, the others being the *Chronicle of Albelda* (after 881) and the *Prophetic Chronicle* (883). Though each recounts similar periods in history, the structure and content of each source suggests slightly different motivations, though all act to legitimize the nascent kingdom of Asturias. As Wolf has noted, the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* is quite different from either the *Chronicle of Albelda* or the *Prophetic Chronicle* in tone: the aim of the author seems to have been to

---

333 These refer to mentions of collectives, not prosopographical information that can be gleaned from names.
334 Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, *Kitāb Futūḥ Mīṣr wa-Akbārihā*, 208 While the Goths were identifiable as a tribe at the time of their conquest of the Iberian Peninsula, by the ninth century if this would have been understood as a tribal identity or a broader ethnic identity.
336 For more information on the texts, particularly its dating, see Yves Bonnaz, *Chroniques Asturiennes (Fin IX Siècle)*, Sources d’Histoire Médiévale (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1987), viii–xxix; and Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain*, 38–40.
create an addendum to Isidore’s *History of the Kings of the Goths* in his *Etymologies.* 337 Unsurprisingly, in content this text gives us the most information to date about locations in the northern part of the Peninsula. Of the sixty-three places mentioned and mapped below (Figure 2.8), the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* names only three locations south of the Tajo: Toledo, Córdoba, and Sevilla. 338 These mentions rarely focus on the people or rulers of al-Andalus. Of the eleven times Toledo is mentioned in the text, only twice does it refer to events post-711. 339 The author discusses Córdoba eight times: twice as the home of Roderic, six times as home to the ‘Chaldean’ seat of power. 340 Sevilla garners two mentions, both relating to the defeat of the ‘Chaldeans’ who lived there at the hands of the ‘Northmen,’ in a description of the Viking raids on al-Andalus in the middle of the ninth century. 341 It is this conception of space as people that dominates the *Chronicle of Alfonso III.* According to the author, ‘Chaldeans’, ‘Ishmaelites’, ‘Saracens’, and ‘Arabs’ constitute the Umayyad armies with little differentiation as the terms are used interchangeably. However, it is important to note that the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* is the first written account to provide great detail about northern geographies. This text also bears witness to the extent of the Umayyad military presence along the northern coast. 342

### 2.5e *Chronicle of Albelda (after 881)*

The *Chronicle of Albelda* is found in six partial manuscripts. 343 Itself a miscellany of Latin sources, of these three Asturian texts from the 880s, it gives the most information about locations and the geography of the Iberian Peninsula to date. Unlike the author of the *Chronicle of Alfonso III,* whose text highlights the continuity of the Asturian monarchs with that of the old Visigothic elite, the creator of the

338 Toledo (§§ 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 25, 26); Córdoba (§§ 6, 8, 25); and Sevilla (§ 23).
339 The text refers to the fall of the city to the Ishmaelites (§ 8) and once when Mūsā appoints his son Lupe prefect of the city (§ 25).
340 §§ 6,8,16,25.
341 § 23.
342 See §§ 8-10, 11, 13-14, 16, 18-9, and 21-28 in Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain*, 133–43, respectively.
343 For more information on the surviving texts, see discussion in Bonnaz, *Chroniques Asturiennes (Fin IX Siècle)*, xxix–xxxvii.
Chronicle of Albelda writes in what might be termed a more universal style, concerned with not only annalistic history but also with geographical, administrative, characteristic traits of races, and what in Arabic would be termed ‘ajā‘ib, or ‘wonders of the world’.

The structure of the text begins with an accounting of known data on the earth: its’ size and the physical features (i.e. seas, rivers, mountains, islands) and fortifications of the regions in the North, East, South, and West. The chronicle continues to a conversation on Hispania, specifically focusing on the episcopal sees of the various regions of the Iberian Peninsula. This section is followed by descriptions of the four rivers of Hispania, the seven wonders of the world, the ‘traits of the nations’, the ‘famous items of Hispania’, a brief account of world history from Adam to the ‘sixth age of Christ’, and a list of cities in Hispania and the distances between them before starting what might be more recognizable as a ‘history’ which details the times of the Romans, Visigoths, and coming of the ‘Arabs’.

Because this text discusses world geographies, I have limited the discussion that follows to locations mentioned that are found in either the Iberian Peninsula or the modern nation-state of France.

The Chronicle of Albelda refers to ninety-six locations in the Iberian Peninsula and France, mapped below (Figure 2.9). To detail the new locations mentioned would be tedious and belabour the point that for the first time in the ninth century, a text provides a more comprehensive overview of

---


345 Due to the difficulties of parsing whether to include ‘border’ locales like Toulouse versus those further afield like Poitiers, it seemed more prudent to include all mentions and allow the reader to distinguish what may be relevant for their studies.

346 Due to challenges in clearly identifying these locations, I have not mapped the following: Arepla, Tucci, Caliabria, Nafza, Velegia, Sollanzo, Coyanca, and Balatcomalti. Guichard argued that Nafza is identifiable as Vascos in Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente, 38; For an argument that Nafza remains unidentified in texts, see Buresi, La frontière entre chrétienté et Islam dans la péninsule Ibérique: Du Tage à la Sierra Morena (fin Xe-mi Multiple XIIIe siècle), 68; While Velegia has been identified as Velegia Alabense the location remains unidentified as of Juan A. Quirós Castillo and Alfonso Vigil-Escalera Guirado, ‘Networks of Peasant Villages between Toledo and Velegia Alabense, Northwestern Spain (V-Xth Centuries),’ Archeologia Medievale XXXIII (June 2006): 37.
places in the Iberian Peninsula. The various sections of the text mean that the compiler, though writing history with the intent of legitimizing a Christian, Asturian Kingdom, locates places in the Peninsula not necessarily related to this aim. The author does show more familiarity with Christian settlements in the south of the Peninsula, yet his knowledge is not exclusive to this community.

Of most interest for the conversation here is the detailing of places in the Southern Meseta. The first core of locations come in a description of what the author terms the first of the episcopal sees, that of Carthage. The author states that Carthage and Carpetania have Toledo as its metropolis, which includes the sees of Oreto (Grantula), Baeza, Mentesa, Acci (Guadix), Basti (Baza), Urci, Bigastro, Elche, Jativa (Xátiva), Denia, Cazlona, Valence (Valencia), Veleria (Valeria), Segorbe (Segóbriga), Arcabica (Cabeza del Griego/Ercavica), Complutum (Alcala de Henares), Sigüenza, Osma, Segovia, and Palencia, which between them have nine to ten bishops. This text for the first time hints at the demographic density and the Catholic administrative apparatus in the Southern Meseta with the references to Valeria, Segóbriga, Ercavica, Complutum, and Toledo, mapped below (Figure 2.8). Each of these locations has been excavated and has found evidence of Islamicate occupation.

Interestingly, Recópolis, which is located between Valeria, Segóbriga, Ercavica, and Complutum is not listed. Rather, it is identified in the section dedicated to history. The author writes ‘[Leovigild] constructed a city in Celtiberia and named it Recópolis’. This suggests that in the Umayyad period, Recópolis either no longer served as an episcopal seat or that the city’s history as an ecclesiastical centre was no longer a part of cultural memory or import. Another curious fact to highlight is the shifting geography of Carpetania and Celtiberia. For the first time in the eighth- or ninth-century sources, we have an identification of the region in which Recópolis is located as Celtiberia. Traditionally Recópolis

---

347 Bonnaz, *Chroniques Asturienes (Fin IX Siècle)*, 10.
348 See Figure 1.8 at the end of Chapter One for details as to where Islamicate finds in the Iberian Peninsula have occurred.
349 Latin: *urben in Celtiberia fecit et Reccopolim nominavit* in Bonnaz, *Chroniques Asturienes (Fin IX Siècle)*, 19.
would have been understood as a city of Carpetania (in which Valeria, Segóbriga, Ercavica, Complutum, and Toledo were all located by the author of *Chronicle of Albelda*), which was understood to be in the western part of the Southern Meseta.\(^{350}\) Celtiberia was understood to be in the north-east of the Meseta.\(^{351}\) This is illustrated in Figure 2.11. It is hard to make sense of these attributions. Are Carthage and Carpetania administrative designations while Celtiberia is historical one? Is this a mistake due to a confusion of the author as to how geographic space aligns with ecclesiastical space? Or rather might this text hint at the ways in which different networks of power identified space? Have some people of Celtiberian heritage moved to Recópolis? Whatever the case (and we might never know), to date, this identification of Recópolis (and subsequently Zorita) as Celtiberian is first attested in *Chronicle of Albelda* by an author not from the region. As we will see, in the eleventh century, the Arabic chronicles begin to identify the entire Southern Meseta as Celtiberian with the place name *Santabariyya*. It is worth bearing in mind in both this chapter and the one that follows that despite assertions that the Southern Meseta is Celtiberian, it is entirely possible that later authors are working from an understanding (or misunderstanding) perpetuated in written sources that might have little to do with the lived reality of the peoples in this space from the eighth through tenth centuries.

Another point of note is that in the *Chronicle of Albelda*, the city of Talavera is grouped in with the third of the episcopal sees, Lusitania, in an identification that is a bit hard to parse in terms of origin.\(^{352}\) This suggests that the pairing of Talavera with Toledo that comes in later Arabic sources is a result of the Umayyad conquest in which relationships between cities of the Iberian Peninsula changed.

\(^{350}\) Richardson argued that the Southern Meseta including Toledo, Segóbriga, and Complutum was reshaped during the reign of Diocletian (r. 284-305) and as such would have been understood as culturally distinct from the developments in the Northern Meseta (i.e., Celtiberia). See *The Romans in Spain*, 142.

\(^{351}\) For discussions of Celtiberians in the Northwest Meseta near Numantia, see Richardson, 12,66,116, and 153; For a detailed map of all of tribes of the Iberian Peninsula in the Roman period in the same book, see page 265.

\(^{352}\) Bonnaz, *Chroniques Asturriennes (Fin IX Siècle)*, 10.
Finally, Guadalajara, though not geographically in the Southern Meseta given its position north of the Tajo but often identified as part of the *thaghr al-awsat*, is mentioned as a ‘stronghold.’

**2.5f Prophetic Chronicle (883)**

The *Prophetic Chronicle*, dated to 883, is found in seven partial manuscripts. Unlike the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* or the *Chronicle of Albelda*, the *Prophetic Chronicle* devotes little attention to physical space, talking rather about eschatological spaces, particularly of Gog and Magog. In terms of physical locations, only Sevilla and Toledo are mentioned, mapped below (Figure 2.12). Sevilla is only mentioned as the *origio* of Isidore (‘Isidore of Seville’) and Toledo, which garners only three mentions, is referred to alternately as a space of royal power, the location of the tomb of Saint Leocadia (‘an admirable work’), and a city (*urbs*).

While it might be tempting to exclude this source as relatively unhelpful in the task at hand, what the *Prophetic Chronicle* demonstrates is that into the ninth century, it is still important to think about spaces in the Iberian Peninsula as ecclesiastical spaces.

**2.5g Summary: Ninth-Century Sources**

We cannot talk about the extant ninth-century sources as though they comprise an intentional corpus. What remains today is a result of accidental preservation and discovery and we must bound any conversation that seeks to bring these sources together by this realization. To reflect on what changed in these ninth-century texts, it is perhaps useful to review what could be gleaned from eighth-century sources. The surviving eighth-century written sources spoke little to what occurred in the Southern Meseta and point to the importance of looking to material culture for information. However, the ninth century gives sources that for the first time speak to both the geographical space of the Southern Meseta as well as the socially-constructed space of the *thughūr*. In summarizing ideas presented by

---

353 Bonnaz, 26.
354 For more information on the surviving texts, see discussion in Bonnaz, xxxvii–xliv.
355 Sevilla (§4), Toledo (§§ 4 and 5).
these texts there do seem to be some common threads: both Latin and Arabic sources testify to an interest in prophetic space, identifying space as tied to people rather than to geography, and an interest in relating administrative substrates. In this last case the Arabic chroniclers are most interested in issues of military sites, while the Latin writers prioritize religious networks.

The geographical information of the Arabic texts, though thin, aligns with the extant material evidence and thus suggests an accuracy in information. In addition, as they all relate different information, we can make some assertions that they drew from varying source bases. This argues for the necessity of reading these chronicles together. This might be particularly important for reevaluating the history of the Umayyads in Narbonne and France more generally. In addition, the Arabic sources suggest that thaghr was a designation used for spaces integrated into the Umayyad Empire though ones in which control was contested. Only one ninth-century source uses ‘thaghr’ in discussing a place in al-Andalus, and while we should be hesitant about drawing conclusions from a singular data point, it is of some note that the thaghr was located in France, not in the Iberian Peninsula. There are no discussions of kuwar in al-Andalus which leaves us unable to draw any substantive conclusions other than these likely were not widely-understood or employed, if indeed this was how the Umayyad administration conceived of this space at this time.

Given both the temporal and geographical proximity of the composition of the Latin texts, it might be more accurate to state that the chronicles of the 880s allow only for conclusions about what was important in the Kingdom of Asturias at the end of the ninth century. Wolf and Collins have written extensively on these priorities. What perhaps is new to this conversation is the assertion that the Chronicle of Albelda is an important text to understand both the ecclesiastical networks active in the Southern Meseta, but also how the concept of the Southern Meseta as ‘Celtiberia’ evolved (if not began). The identification of Recópolis as Celtiberian when its surrounding sees are all included as

357 See Collins, The Arab Conquest of Spain, 710-797; Wolf, Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain.
Carpetania speaks to a dynamic that is hard to make sense of over a thousand years later: Did the peoples who settled Recópolis uniquely identify as Celtiberian while their neighbours did not? Did the author of the Chronicle of Albelda have a different understanding of history and geography than we do now? Regardless, this is a theme that will be picked up on in later Arabic sources, particularly when describing the rise of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn. It is interesting to note that the earliest extant source that identifies a location in the Southern Meseta as Celtiberian is in Latin. In moving to tenth-century sources, the question remains: how do authors talk about the Southern Meseta in written sources and does this reflect the material reality?

2.6 The Tenth-Century Sources

The works covered here include Abū ‘Alī Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar ibn Rusta Iṣfahānī’s Kitāb al-Aʿlāq al-Nafīsā, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī’s Mukhtāṣar Kitāb al-Buldān, Ibn Wāḍiḥ al-Ya‘qūbī’s Kitāb al-Buldān, Ibn Khurḍādhbih’s Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Jarīr ibn al-Ṭabarī’s Tārīkh al-Rusul wa l-Mulūk, Abū Ishāq al-Īṣṭakhrī’s Masālik al-Mamālik, Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Rusta’s Tārīkh Iḥtiyāk al-Andalus, and Abū al-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Nāṣibī (Ibn Ḥawqal)’s Kitāb Ṣūrat al-ʿArḍ. As discussed, this organisation of works by death date is somewhat artificial given that Ibn Rusta’s, Ibn al-Faqīh’s, al-Yaʿqūbī’s, Ibn Khurḍādhbih, and al-Ṭabarī’s lives straddled the ninth and tenth centuries. Ordering this cohort of texts is also difficult: Ibn Khurḍādhbih is generally understood to have been the earliest Arabic geographer and is cited by Ibn Rusta (despite dying after him), creating a confusing web regarding the exchange of information in the beginning of the tenth century. For consistency I have ordered the texts following the same principles in the earlier sections on the eighth and ninth centuries. However, readers should understand these authors as creating in a rich sphere of knowledge exchange and as a result the authors writing at the turn of the tenth century are perhaps best understood as a cohort. Given the number of sources in this section, I change my approach to the sources here. While I still provide a
summary of the geographical knowledge of the Iberian Peninsula and the uses of terms like qala‘āt/qilā‘, quṣūr, ḥuṣūn, thughūr, and kuwar when used in conjunction with al-Andalus, in each source, I save reflections on the larger corpus for the end.

2.6a Abū ‘Alī Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar ibn Rusta Isfahānī (d, after 903) and the Kitāb al-A’lāq al-Nafīsa

Abū ‘Alī Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar ibn Rusta Isfahānī wrote from Isfahan and likely did not travel much outside of Iran excepting Mecca. The Kitāb al-A’lāq al-Nafīsa is extant in two manuscripts, one in the British Library and one at the University of Cambridge, though these comprise only a small part of the original work by Ibn Rusta. The extant text has a decidedly eastern bent, but does reference al-Andalus five times: twice when discussing the wonders of the world (‘ajā‘īb), twice when discussing the geographies of western seas, and once when locating al-Andalus in the fifth aqālīm. No mentions of specific locations in the Iberian Peninsula are recorded. There is, however, an unclear reference to a ‘Narbūna’ which is mentioned in a broad discussion on the seas. The text reads:

و ﯾﺧرج ﻣﻧﮫ ﺧﻠﯾﺞ آﺧر اﻟﻰ ارض ﻧَرﺑُوﻧﺔ ﯾﻛﻮن طوﻠﮫ ﻣﺎﺋﺗﻰ ﻣﯿ ل

Like the ninth-century sources, this suggests Narbonne played a larger role in the history of al-Andalus than has been ascribed previously. The most detailed entry is that on the ‘copper horseman of al-Andalus’, which Ibn Rusta reported as one of the four wonders of the world.

359 The manuscripts are British Library, Add. 23,378, and Cambridge, Or. 920, no 1006.. Bosworth.
361 Ibn Rusta, 7:91.
362 Ibn Rusta, 7:98.
363 Ibn Rusta, 7:85 Transliteration: ‘wa-yakhruju minhu khalīj ākhar ilā arḍ Narbūna yakūnu ṭūluhu mi’atayn mi’il’. Translation: and leaving from ['Adhrīs] there is a great bay near to the land of Narbonne which is around two hundred miles’. This line is footnoted that the original manuscript read 'Barbariya’. As this section includes mentions to Sardinia, Sicily, and Corsica, Narbonne is a better read.
364 This account is attributed to the companion of the Prophet, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ. See Ibn Rusta, 7:78.
2.6b Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Faqīḥ al-Hamadhānī (fl. 902) and the Mukhtaṣar Kitāb al-Buldān

Little is known about Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Faqīḥ al-Hamadhānī other than his association with the city of Hamadhān in Iran. The Mukhtaṣar Kitāb al-Buldān of Ibn al-Faqīḥ survives in several manuscripts, the earliest tentatively dated to 1022. The text examined here, in its entirety, is that originally edited by M. de Goeje in 1885, for which he accessed the then-known three surviving manuscripts. Although more manuscripts have been located, none date prior to the eleventh century. The work in itself is hard to categorize both according to the logic of earlier texts discussed here and in a modern sense. While, like other works like Ibn Ḥabīb or Ibn Rusta, Ibn al-Faqīḥ starts with the creation of the world, but in the following narration, subjects of geographical location, Prophetic history, tax collection, and the history of events are mixed together, making this both a treasure trove of information as well as a frustrating piece to conceptualize. Mentions of al-Andalus occur throughout the work, nestled in descriptions of the seas, its relation to North Africa and the Maghrib, the wonders of the world in which the copper horseman of al-Andalus makes another appearance, descriptions of Christians in al-Andalus, and most extensively in a section detailing who and what makes up the Maghrib. Perhaps most interestingly al-Andalus is not given a separate section as in other works, but rather is treated as part of a coherent Maghrib ruled by several peoples in various locations. There are mentions of the Aghlabids, Rustamids, Idrisids, and more generally the Ṣufī Kharajites, in addition to the Umayyads, all of whom are understood to operate outside the ‘Abbāsid orbit. Thus, discussions on al-Andalus are not separate from those on North Africa, and this is perhaps a nod that modern historians who try to divide the two are not conceiving of spaces the ways people in the tenth century would have.

368 This tradition is also attributed to `Abd Allāh ibn `Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ in ibn al-Faqīḥ al-Hamadhānī, 5:72.
‘Berbers’ live throughout al-Andalus with no mention of the rebellious or destructive behaviour that characterizes depictions of ‘the Berber Revolt’ of the 740s or the later Almohad and Almoravid Empires. In addition to the twenty-four references to al-Andalus, the territory of al-Franja is discussed three times.371 ‘Ghalijshkush’ is referred to once as a place of unbelief (al-shirk).372 The cities mentioned include Córdoba twelve times;373 Toledo twice;374 and Narbonne, Tudmīr, Jaén, Faḥṣ al-Ballūṭ once, all mapped below (Figure 2.13).375 An unidentified location named Jabal Shulayr is also referenced.376 In terms of locations, the information related by Ibn al-Faqīh is interested in two primary subjects: first, the geography of sites conceived of in terms of the length of journey between two points, and second, the products for which a place is known. Tudmīr is known for its mines of silver and gold; Jaén for its silver; and Faḥṣ al-Ballūṭ for its mercury mines, probably a reference to the mines of Almadén which were known both during the Roman period and afterwards for the vast quantities of mercury extracted.377

2.6c Ibn Wādīḥ al-Ya’qūbī (d. ca. 908 CE)378 and the Kitāb al-Buldān

Ibn Wādīḥ al-Ya’qūbī (d. ca. 908 CE), active in the ninth century and early tenth century, composed several works, though the only one which refers to the geography of al-Andalus is his Kitāb al-Buldān. To date, we know of three extant copies of the Kitāb al-Buldān, the oldest is that held in

371 ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī, 5:82.
374 ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī, 5:82.
375 Narbonne is mentioned on page 82. All other references to locations occur on page 87 in ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī, Kitāb al-Buldān; The Identification of Faḥṣ al-Ballūṭ with Los Pedroches follows Miranda A. Huici, ‘Faḥṣ Al-Ballūṭ,’ in Encyclopaedia of Islam, ed. P. Bearman et al., 2012, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_2240.
377 Cinnabar is extracted from the mines which can be used both in a refined state to produce mercury and in an unrefined state to create a red pigment for dyeing. In 2012 the site was recognized as a UNESCO World Heritage Site in the assemblage ‘Heritage of Mercury. Almadén and Idrija’ and in 2022, the International Union of Geological Sciences recognized Almadén as a geological heritage site due to its history as the largest known mercury deposit which has been continually mined since the third century CE.
Munich, dated to 1211 CE. Like other scholars of his age, we know little of his life, and as Sean Anthony and Matthew S. Gordon point out, from his texts, his ‘comments suggest a figure who was curious, highly literate, and well-travelled, but offer little else.’ However, it has been generally understood that al-Ya’qūbī was an Iraqi noble, who held the position of a kātib in the ‘Abbāsid court, worked under the Tāhirids in Khurāsān, and later for the Tūlūnids, perhaps living in Barqa. This gave him an opportunity to observe many places. There is no evidence that al-Ya’qūbī travelled to al-Andalus and there is nothing in his short description of the Iberian Peninsula to suggest he had first-hand knowledge of the territory; if anything, his mistaken attribution of Toledo as being located on the Duero implies he compiled his entry from second-hand accounts. The notice reads:

و من جبٰن ذات الشمال الى مدينة طلبتة وهي مدينة منيعة جليلة ليس في الجزيرة مدينة امنع منها واهلها يحافون على

A-Ya’qūbī’s section on al-Andalus, Jazīrat al-Andalus wa-mudunuhā, is brief, extending a little over two folios. Twenty-one cities in the Iberian Peninsula are mentioned, the majority being in the south as mapped below (Figure 2.14). Córdoba is mentioned the most (seven times); followed by Zaragoza (four times); Toledo (three times); Rayya, Medina Sidonia, Algeciras, Sevilla, Niebla, Beja, Osconoba, Mérida, Tudmīr, and Jaén (twice); and finally Lorca, Ibīra, Lisbon, Guadalajara, Tudela,

381 Anthony and Gordon, 14, 16.
382 f. 79 of Ibn Wādīh al-Ya’qūbī, Kitāb al-Buldān, ed. T.G. J Juynboll (Leiden: Brill, 1861), 123.
383 Transliteration: ‘wa min Jayyān dhāt al-shamāl ilā madīnat Tulaytula wa hiya madīna mani’a jalila laysa fi l-jazira madīna ‘amna’ minhā wa ‘ahluh āyahāūna ‘alā Banī ‘Umayya wa-hum ‘akhlāt min al-arab wa l-barbar wa l-mawālī wa lahā nahr ‘azīm yuqālū lahu duwayru’ in al-Ya’qūbi, 20; Translation by Paul Cobb: ‘From Jaén one goes north to the city of Toledo. Toledo is a majestic and well-protected city- there is no better-protected city in the peninsula. Its people, who are a mixture of Arabs, Berbers, and non-Arab clients, are opposed to the Banū Umayya. It has a great river called the Duero’ in Matthew S Gordon et al., eds., The Works of Ibn Wādīh Al-Ya’qūbi: An English Translation, vol. 1, Islamic History and Civilization Studies and Texts 152 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 193.
Huesca, Tortosa, and Valencia (once). The \textit{Kitāb al-Buldān} mentions only one city sometimes included in the \textit{thaghr al-awsat}, that of Guadalajara. The entry on the city reads:

وَمِنْ طَليَّةَلُهْ نُمَّ أَخْذَ مِنْهَا مُشْرَقًَّا إِلَا مُدِينةٍ يُقَالُ لَهَا وَادٍ الحَجَّارَةُ كَانَ عَلَيْهَا رَجُلٌ مِنَ الْبَرَبِيرِ يُقَالُ لَهُ: بِن فِرْجِ الصَّنَاحِجِ يَتُولَّاهَا يَدُوُّ إِلَيْنِيّ مَيْتَيْةً ثُمَّ صَارَ وَلَدَهُ وَذَرَّيْنِهِ بَعْدَهُ إِلَى هَذِهِ الْغَائِبَةِ فِي الْبَلْدَ٢٨٥

Though this brief entry gives us little information as to who might govern Guadalajara at the time that al-Ya’qūbī writes (are we supposed to believe that Ibn Faraj al-Ṣanhāja no longer is in power? who governs Guadalajara at the moment of al-Ya’qūbī’s writing?), it is of import that at one point in time Guadalajara was understood to be ruled by the Ṣanhāja who backed the Umayyads.

\textbf{2.6d Ibn Khurdādhbih (d. 913) and the \textit{Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik}}

Like Ibn al-Faqīh, little is known about Ibn Khurdādhbih, other than he wrote from Iran and was in the employ of the ‘Abbāsid administration. The \textit{Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik} is itself only a portion of his larger work, the \textit{Kitāb al-Kharāj}, which is one of eight known titles attributed to Ibn Khurdādhbih. Two recensions of this texts were known to de Goeje, who edited the text examined here: one held in the Österreischische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna and one in the Bodleian Library at Oxford University. Similarly to other texts of this time, the information recorded about al-Andalus

\footnote{384 Given the brevity of the section of al-Andalus, all references to these locations occur in Gordon et al., \textit{The Works of Ibn Wāḍiḥ Al-Ya’qūbī: An English Translation}, 1:191–94.}

\footnote{385 Transliteration: ‘wa min Ṭulayṭula li-man akhadha musharriqan ilā madina yuqālu lahā Wādī al-ḥijāra kāna ‘alayhā rajūl min al-barbar yuqālu lahu ? Ibn Faraj al-Ṣanhāji yatawallāhā yadʾū li-bani umayya thumma šāra waladuhu wa dhurriyyatu bu da ḍahu ilā hādhahi l-ghāya fi l-balad’ in al-Ya’qūbī, \textit{Kitāb Al-Buldān}, 20; As translated by Paul Cobb, the entry on the city reads ‘from Toledo, heading east, one arrives at a city called Guadalajara, which used to be governed by a Berber called [...] b. Faraj al-Ṣanhāji, a supporter of the Banū Umayya. His descendants and offspring live in this region to this day.’ in Gordon et al., \textit{The Works of Ibn Wāḍiḥ Al-Ya’qūbī: An English Translation}, 1:193. The ‘?’ in the text is how the editors have chosen to indicate that this portion of the manuscript is missing/ illegible.}

\footnote{386 For notes on the multiple possibilities of his full name and his career in the ‘Abbāsid administration, see Travis Zadeh, ‘Ibn Khurdādhbih,’ in \textit{Encyclopaedia of Islam}, ed. Kate Fleet et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 92–93, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_30869.}

\footnote{387 This is attested in the last line of the \textit{Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik} which reads that this concludes the sixth part of the \textit{Kitāb al-Kharāj} in Ibn Khurdādhbih, \textit{Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik}, ed. M.J. de Goeje, vol. 6, Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum (Leiden: Brill, 1889), 266 (Arabic); 208 (French).}

\footnote{388 MSMixt. 783, fol. 2b and MS Huntington 433, fols. 1a-b, respectively.}
tends to fall into three categories: first, measures of distance from places in the Mediterranean, typically North Africa, to cities in the Iberian Peninsula;\textsuperscript{389} second, notices of the riches or marvels of the territory;\textsuperscript{390} and finally, information about the seas.\textsuperscript{391} By and large, the text refers to al-Andalus in a general sense, mentioning the polity nineteen times. The stories told about al-Andalus are familiar: there is a recounting of the story of the Table of Solomon and mystical elements that trace to Ibn Ḥabīb and the copper horseman of al-Andalus makes another appearance.\textsuperscript{392}

Information on locations in al-Andalus is often given in lists with little accompanying detail. While Ibn Khurdādhbih states that al-Andalus has over forty cities, he names only eight. As mapped below, Córdoba is mentioned six times;\textsuperscript{393} Narbonne, three;\textsuperscript{394} Granada and Toledo, twice;\textsuperscript{395} Zaragoza, Gironda, al-Baydā’, and Mérida, once (Figure 2.15).\textsuperscript{396} Of these eight cities, it is worth noting the first mention of the city of Gironda, something mentioned by no other Arabic chronicler in this late ninth- to tenth-century cohort. The distance between cities is recorded, and the only place about which more information is given is Toledo, which is identified as the seat of the king (\textit{al-malik}).\textsuperscript{397} To the north of al-Andalus is Franja, which is also the home of the Ṣaqālib and is a place of unbelief (\textit{al-shirk}).\textsuperscript{398}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{389} Ibn Khurdādhbih, \textit{Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik}, 6:87, 89, 154, and 231 (Arabic); 63–65, 116–18, and 175 (French).
\bibitem{390} Discussions include mentions of the fertility and fruits of al-Andalus on page 89 (Arabic) and 65 (French). The discussion on page 116 (Arabic) and 88 (French) on the copper horseman of al-Andalus is attributed to ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ as in ibn Rusta and ibn al-Faqīh. Ibn Khurdādhbih, \textit{Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik}.
\bibitem{391} Ibn Khurdādhbih, 6:92 (Arabic) and 66 (French).
\bibitem{392} For the Table of Solomon, see Ibn Khurdādhbih, 6:155-6 (Arabic); 116-8 (French).
\bibitem{393} The city is mentioned in Ibn Khurdādhbih, 6:87, 89, 90, 156, and 22 (Arabic); 63, 65, 117, 208 (French).
\bibitem{394} Narbonne is mentioned in Ibn Khurdādhbih, 6:89-90 (Arabic); and 65 (French).
\bibitem{395} All mentions of Granada and Toledo occur on Ibn Khurdādhbih, 6:89 (Arabic); 65 (French).
\bibitem{396} All mentions of Zaragoza, Gironda, al-Baydā’, and Mérida occur on Ibn Khurdādhbih, 6:89 (Arabic); 65 (French).
\bibitem{397} As before, due to a disagreement about the location of al-Bayda, it is not mapped here.
\bibitem{398} Ibn Khurdādhbih, 6:89 (Arabic); 65 (French).
\bibitem{389} Ibn Khurdādhbih, 6:89 and 92 (Arabic); 63 and 65 (French).
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Abū Ja’far Muḥammad ibn Jarīr ibn Yazīd al-Ṭabarī (d. 915), known as al-Ṭabarī, straddles the ninth and tenth centuries in his production like Ibn Rusta, Ibn al-Faqīh, al-Ya’qūbī, and Ibn Khurdādhbih. Little is known about him and it is likely that his fame as a scholar resulted in the early medieval period affected the ways in which Arabic authors of this period wrote about him; thus parsing biographical fictions from reality becomes complicated in his case. Born in the town of Āmul in Ṭabaristān under Ṭāhirid governance, al-Ṭabarī travelled in Iraq, the Arabian Peninsula, Egypt, al-Shām, and India. The *Tari̔kh al-rusul wa l-mulūk* exists in too many manuscripts to enumerate here. The text consulted here is the multi-year translation project *The History of al-Ṭabarī* edited by Ehsan Yar-shater on which several scholars worked from 1979-1999.

Though the *Taʾrīkh al-rusul wa l-mulūk* does not dedicate much time to al-Andalus, narrations do exist in Volumes 2 and 3. Al-Ṭabarī references al-Andalus or cities within it twenty-six times in his work. The only cities referred to are Toledo, mentioned twice, and Córdoba, mentioned once, mapped below (Figure 2.16). Both cities are discussed in the same passage relating the story of Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr’s reconciliation with Ţāriq ibn Ziyād and the acquisition of the Table of Solomon. In this narration, Córdoba is referred to only as a geographical reference point for Toledo, which is a twenty-
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399 Given the size of the text, this is the only text I discuss that I have not read in its entirety. I used the index to look for mentions of al-Andalus and then read those sections in their entirety.


401 Daniel.

402 Daniel.


404 All mentions of cities occur in Volume 23 of al-Ṭabarī, 201.
days journey away. Toledo is named ‘a great city’ and as home to the Table of Solomon ‘containing God knows how much [by way of] gold and jewels.’

2.6f Abū Ishāq al-Fārisī al-Iṣṭakhrī (writing post 951) and the Masālik al-Mamālik

Abū Ishāq al-Fārisī al-Iṣṭakhrī’s Masālik al-Mamālik represents a major turning point in the representation of Andalusi spaces in Arabic geographical writings. Like other authors, little is known about his life, but his nisba suggests he was from Fars and his works suggest that he spent some time living in Baghdad. In his works he also mentions traveling through Yanbū’, Wādī l-Qūrā, ‘Aydāb, and Zughar near the Dead Sea, Mecca, Kufa, Basra, Khūzistān, Ray, Bukhara, and Samarqand. There are several editions of the manuscript of the Masālik al-Mamālik, though the one examined here is that of de Goeje, who used three manuscripts in his compilation. Despite his apparent lack of travels in al-Andalus, this text is a rich source for those interested in geographic knowledge of the Iberian Peninsula. This might be a result of his meeting with Ibn Ḥawqal in or around 951.

Although the broader text does mention the polity of al-Andalus in other sections, given the richness of the account on the Maghrib I have limited this discussion to this section. It is of note, that like in Ibn al-Faqīh, the section on the Maghrib flows freely between North Africa and the Iberian Peninsula, suggesting al-Iṣṭakhrī sees the region as a coherent space. The section dedicated to the Maghrib mentions al-Andalus over twenty times and names forty-one locations, some of which remain unknown. Though some have been tentatively identified by other authors, given the speculative nature of the identifications I have chosen not to map the following locations: Ghafiq (which is known to be near Córdoba), Nafza, Hawwāra, Maknāsa (all of which refer to peoples and places in the text), Mawrūr,

---

405 See Volume 23 al-Ṭabarī, 201.
406 See Volume 23 in al-Ṭabarī, 201.
408 Bolshakov.
409 For a discussion on the known manuscripts, translations, and recensions, see Bolshakov.
Shantabariyya, Kurtash, and Qūrya. All other locations are mapped below (Figure 2.17). Most locations are referenced once or twice; those that stand out with more references are Gibraltar and Santarém with six, Córdoba with five, and Toledo with four. Most of these places appear in lists of distances between locations on the Iberian Peninsula and are referred to as great (‘azīma). There is some detail related locations of gold and silver mines near Ilbīra, Murcia, and Córdoba; Arabs live in Málaga which is known for making the hilts of swords (minhu maqābīḍ al-suyūf); Toledo is referred to as a city in high mountains built of stones (madīna fi-jabalīn ’ālin ban’uhā min hijāra) and is located accurately along the Tajo River. As the map shows, al-Iṣṭakhri’s geography of al-Andalus is heavily coastal. This suggests a familiarity with Mediterranean sea-trading routes. When the text of the Masālik al-Mamālik moves to the interior and north of al-Andalus, there are more generalizations: both ‘Berbers’ and Christians are painted with broad brushes that refer to Galicians, Basque, and North African peoples (Ghalijsks, Jalāliqa and Baskūnas, and Maknāsa, Hawwāra, Madyūna, Kutāma, Zanāta, Maṣmūda, Malīla, Şanhāja) as both people and place. There is substantially more information about North Africans in al-Andalus than in any other source since Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam. However, it should be noted that the information related is different, and it is unlikely that Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam served as a source for al-Iṣṭakhri. Together, the Futūḥ Ifriqiyya wa l-Andalus and the Masālik al-Mamālik provide valuable information about North African settlement in the Iberian Peninsula—and to date scholarship has not made significant use of either. Unlike in al-Ya'qūbī, the Şanhāja are no longer recognized as residing in Guadalajara which is now, in addition to its surroundings, in the hands of the Banū Sālim.

410 The case of ‘Qūrya’ is similar to that of Almā’ida as it is unclear if this is a name of a specific place (some have suggested Coria) or if it is simply a reference to a village. I err on the side of caution and do not map it.
411 The section on the Maghrib is between pages 36 and 48 and thus all references to locations occur within this span in al-Iṣṭakhri, ‘Kitāb al-masālik wa l-mamālik.’
412 al-Iṣṭakhri, 44.
413 al-Iṣṭakhri, 42.
414 al-Iṣṭakhri, 42.
members of the Maṣmūda tribe.\textsuperscript{415} The Nafza, and Maknāsa are reported to be in al-Andalus between Jalāliqa and Córdoba, while the Hawwāra and Madyūna reside in Santabariyya (the Arabic interpretation of Celtiberia).\textsuperscript{416} In light of these details, the most interesting passage comes in what appears as a rather mundane entry listing itineraries:

\begin{quote}
\textquoteright wa min Ṭulayṭula ilā Wādī al-ḥijāra yawmān wa min Qurṭuba ilā Maknāsa 4 ayām thumma ilā Hawwāra mithlahum thumma ilā Nafza 10 ayām wa min Nafza ilā madīnat Samūra 4 ayām.\textsuperscript{417}
\end{quote}

It is of note that only the city of Guadalajara is seen to have a direct relationship with Toledo. The other \textquoteleft locations\textquoteright{} (or peoples) have a relationship with Córdoba. This is an important distinction between groups of North Africans living in the centre of al-Andalus. There seems to be an axis from Toledo to Guadalajara and one from Córdoba to Santabariyya, the latter of which more closely aligns with the focus of this investigation. This is an important distinction largely because later chroniclers seem to lump the two together in a conflation that potentially obscures the ways in which people communicated and interacted.

Al-Iṣṭakhrī is also the first author to introduce concepts that later scholars take for granted: he is the first Arabic chronicler consistently to identify the enemies of al-Andalus as Christian; the first to use the concept of \textquoteleft ḥarb\textquoteright{} to describe foreigners in relation to al-Andalus (though interestingly the construction is \textquoteleft bilād al-ḥarb\textquoteright{} not the juridical \textquoteleft dār al-ḥarb\textquoteright{}); the first to assign al-Andalus kuwar; and there is an increased use of the term thaghr/thughūr, though these observations require more context.

\textsuperscript{415} al-Iṣṭakhrī, 42; For identifications of the Banū Sālim as Masmuda, see Pavón Maldonado, Guadalajara medieval arte y arqueología árabe y mudejar, 13; and Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Espacios de poder en Recópolis en las épocas visigoda y primitiva andalusí (S. VI-IX d. C.),’ 92.

\textsuperscript{416} al-Iṣṭakhrī, ‘Kitāb al-masālik wa l-mamālīk,’ 44.

\textsuperscript{417} Transliteration: \textquoteleft wa-min Tulaytula ilā Wādi al-ḥijāra yawmān wa-min Qurṭuba ilā Maknāsa 4 ayām thumma ilā Hawwāra mithlahum thumma ilā Nafza 10 ayām wa-min Nafza ilā madīnat Samūra 4 ayām\textquoteleft. Translation: \textquoteleft And from Toledo to Guadalajara two days and from Córdoba to Maknāsa four days then to Hawwāra the same, then to Nafza ten days and from Nafza to the city of Zamora, 4 days\textquoteright in Abū Ishāq Ibrahīm ibn Muḥammad al-Fārisī al-Iṣṭakhrī, \textquoteleft Kitāb al-masālik wa-al-mamālīk\textquoteright in Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, ed. M.J. de Goeje, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1927), 47.
Al-Iṣṭakhrī offers the earliest account of the rebellion of Ibn Hafṣūn in an Arabic chronicle. Active in the late ninth and early tenth centuries, Ibn Hafṣūn repeatedly challenged Umayyad power in the Iberian Peninsula, ultimately serving as the foil to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir. While Ibn Hafṣūn’s ancestry varies across texts, there is consensus that he used conversion to Christianity to tap Christian communities for political and military support. Given that Ibn Hafṣūn framed his rebellion as a religious conflict, this might have affected the ways in which other Christian enemies of the Umayyad dynasty in al-Andalus were portrayed (and perhaps perceived). While previous accounts had identified those living in the north of the peninsula as mushrikūn, now the Ghalijsks, Jalāliqa and Baskūnas are al-naṣārā, who live in the bilād al-ḥarb or bilād al-Īslām. It seems not coincidental that all identifications of northern peoples as Christians in a state of war occur in the passage about Ibn Hafṣūn. Secondly, the Masālik al-Mamālik mentions four kuwar: Santarém, Rayya, Faḥṣ al-Ballūṭ, and Ilbīra. All of these locations had previously been administered as Iberian Byzantine territories and were never fully under the control of the Visigoths. It is worth positing that kuwar might have been used intentionally by al-Iṣṭakhrī (or in common parlance) to signify a type of administration division of al-Andalus with roots in the late antique world. Though al-Iṣṭakhrī uses the term thaghr, it is hard to see this usage as anything other than a term for ‘border’. The term is used twice: once in the construction ‘thaghr al-Jalāliqa’ which is said to consist of the cities of Mérida, Nafza, Guadalajara, Toledo, and Zamora; once in passing as ‘thaghr al-Andalus’ which has the great city of Zamora. In comparison, the term ḥadd is used ten times in the section on the Maghrib: ḥadd balad al-Jalāliqa once; ḥadd Tāhārt once; ḥadd al-Maghrib once; ḥadd al-
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418 al-Iṣṭakhrī, 43.
419 al-Iṣṭakhrī, 41.
420 For Santarem, see pages 37 and 47; for Rayya see page 42; for Faḥṣ al-Ballūṭ see page 43; and for Ilbīra see page 44 in al-Iṣṭakhrī, ‘Kitāb al-masālik wa l-mamālik.’
422 al-Iṣṭakhrī, 43.
Given the direct comparison between *thaghr al-Jalāliqa* and *ḥadd balad al-Jalāliqa*, it seems likely that the choice of the term *thaghr* is merely that of a synonym, not of an administrative unit to be understood as separate from the *kuwar*. Finally, it is worth noting that at no point does this text give any information in relation to the *thaghr* that might be used to ascertain loyalty. The naming of the cities including Mérida, Nafza, Guadalajara, Toledo, and Zamora does suggest that the *thughūr* are firmly within the imagined boundaries of al-Andalus, not without.

### 2.6g Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn al-Qūṭiyya (d. 977) and the *Ṭārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus*

Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn al-Qūṭiyya is the second Andalusi author reviewed so far. Comparatively, much is known about his family background and how he was raised. Born in Córdoba, Ibn al-Qūṭiyya descended from a local *mawlā* family that had served the Umayyads for four generations. It is also important to note that he is the author whose death most firmly aligns with the shift in power in al-Andalus from the Umayyad to the ‘Āmirid family and that his histories likely do not reflect the growing anti-North African sentiment that becomes popular in eleventh-century sources.

David James argued that he likely related his histories orally and it was unlikely that a written version of his history existed while he lived. The one known surviving manuscript of the *Ṭārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus* is currently held in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and carbon-dating of the paper suggests that it was not copied before 1300. James has argued that the level of corruption in the text suggests that this version was copied from an earlier one. The text is itself interesting as it is written as a chronicle yet is not in strict chronological order; sections are grouped according to Umayyad rulers.

---

423 For *ḥadd balad al-Jalāliqa* see page 37; *ḥadd Tāḥārt* see page 39; *ḥadd al-Maghrib* see page 40; *ḥadd al-bahr* see page 37; *ḥadd Miṣr* see pages 36-7; *ḥadd balad al-Andalus* see page 42; *min al-Andalus haddān* see page 42 in *al-Iṣṭakhrī, ‘Kitāb al-maṣāliḥ wa-al-mamālik.’*


425 James, 29.

426 The manuscript number is MS 1867. For more information on the dating of the manuscript, see James, x.

427 James, 18.
In the *Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus*, Ibn al-Qūṭiyyya references fifty-nine locations in the Iberian Peninsula, mapped below (Figure 2.18). There is a drastic increase in the frequency in which specific places are named: Córdoba is mentioned over seventy times; Sevilla, over forty; Toledo twenty; followed by Medina Sidonia at thirteen; Bobastro at twelve; and Rayya at ten. This text is heavily biased towards the areas in the south, specifically surrounding Córdoba and Sevilla (Figure 2.19). In almost exact opposition to al-Iṣṭakhrī, Ibn al-Qūṭiyyya’s work shows greater familiarity with the interior of the Iberian Peninsula, excluding mentions of major ports like Almeria, Pechina, Santarém, and Valencia. It is important to note that both texts are limited in scope and the differences between the two points to not only different stores of knowledge but also varying interests. Together al-Iṣṭakhrī’s *Masālik al-Mamālik* and Ibn al-Qūṭiyyya’s *Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus* show that providing a robust overview of locales in the Peninsula requires access to sources that are interested in various topics. The absence of mentions of spaces in the Southern Meseta is not necessarily due to an absence of action in the area, but rather a lack of interest on the behalf of chroniclers whose works survive in relating this history. Al-Iṣṭakhrī’s discussion of North Africans in the centre of the Peninsula prove they were there – it just seems that neither al-Iṣṭakhrī nor Ibn al-Qūṭiyyya were interested in relating more detailed histories.

Once again, the only information about a location sometimes included in the *thaghr al-awsat* are the references to Guadalajara, which is located in the Northern Meseta, north of the Tajo River, but south of the Duero. The stories regarding Guadalajara are as follows: one in which in the year 839-840 “ʿAbd al-Raḥman had a nocturnal emission in the city of Wādī al-hijāra [Guadalajara], while on a
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428 For mentions of Córdoba see pages 49-52, 59, 61-3, 67-75, 82-3, 87-9, 91, 98-101, 103, 109-11, 117-122, 124, 130-1, 133, 135-7, 140-1; for Sevilla see pages 50-53, 63, 68-70, 100-102, 111, 116, 119, 133-4, 137; for Toledo see pages 49-52, 72, 86-8,140; for Medina Sidonia see pages 51-2, 63, 68-70, 123, 133-4; for Bobastro see pages 119-121, 136, 140; and for Rayya see pages 59, 69, 115, 120 in James, *Early Islamic Spain: The History of Ibn al-Qutiya*. Not mapped are the following: Aqua Portora (Aqwāh Burṭūrah) which is known to be a battle site near Córdoba; Nafdura which is known simply as a battle site; Niba, a fort near Sevilla; Tacarona located near Bobastro; and Peña, out of an inability to determine to which one the text refers.

campaign’;430 another in which the ṣāḥib of Guadalajara and the thughūr, Izrāq ibn Muntīl, ‘who was a loyal subject of the emirs of Cordova, and the handsomest of men’ faces off against the rebel Mūsā ibn Mūsā (d. 862) of the Banū Qasī.431 It is hard to make much of these entries: both have a military character and for the first time in a source Guadalajara is clearly paired with the thughūr. There is a ṣāḥib of Guadalajara, suggesting that the area is incorporated into the Umayyad polity. The last reference to any administration in the city of Guadalajara occurred in al-Ya'qūbī’s Kitāb al-Buldān, in which ‘a man’ (rajūl), Ibn Faraj al-Ṣanhāja, was in charge of the city. It is important to emphasize that as Ibn Faraj al-Ṣanhāja was described as loyal to the Umayyads, and that in al-Iṣṭakhrī the city was in the hands of a family whose relatives held appointments in the dynastic capital, the use of the term ṣāḥib seems to indicate that over time the city developed a closer relationship with the Córdoban authorities, not that a rebellious force was overthrown in order to bring the city into the Umayyad orbit. Every reference to the city to this point has emphasized its loyalty to the Banū Umayya. The Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus is also the first text to consistently use the term thughūr in the plural when referring to spaces in al-Andalus, though the meaning of the term is still unclear. It is most often used without any accompanying description: in a general sense to indicate the last places in al-Andalus before crossing into non-Andalusi space.432 The most concentrated use of the term comes in the section relating to the rule of Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (r. 852-886) suggesting this was a time of import for the development of the region.433 For the first time in any written source, the use of thughūr in relation to al-Andalus demonstrates a conscious delineation of border regions, perhaps relating to administration, that include the territory of the Northern Meseta.

431 James, 124. Another mention of the position ṣāḥib al-thaghr is made on page 116.
432 James, 72, 100, 118, 120, 122–25.
433 James, 116, 118–20, 122–25.
There are some entries with more detail. The first mention of a *thaghr* comes in the section relating the history of the period of the Umayyad governors (711-756). During the conflict between ‘Abd al-Malik al-Fihrī and Balj ibn Bishr al-Quyshayrī in the 740s, the Umayyad governor of Narbonne, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Alqama al-Lakhmī, ‘gathers his troops at the frontiers’ and marches to support ‘Abd al-Malik al-Fihrī with an army that consisted of both Arabs and Berbers. As seen in other texts, the *thaghr* is tied to Narbonne. The first use of the terms *thaghr al-‘alā*, *thaghr al-awsat*, and *thaghr al-adnā* occur in Ibn al-Qūṭiyya’s text when Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān approaches the aforementioned Izrāq ibn Muntūl to subdue the Banū Qasī. Later in the text, Aḥmad ibn al-Barā’ ibn Mālik al-Qurayshī is identified as ‘the governor of Saragossa and the Upper March in opposition to the Banū Qasī’ and in 924/5 there is a note that the Banū Qasī were removed from the *thaghr al-a’lā*. Interestingly, when the Banū Qasī rebel against Córdoban authority, it is the leaders of the *thaghr al-awsat* who bring them to heel. This is an important dynamic to note; rather than portray all of the *thughūr* as peoples of questionable allegiance, the *Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus* narrates how the leaders of the *thaghr al-awsat* are used to bring the *thaghr al-a’lā* back into relationship with Córdoba. It seems the first distinction among *thughūr* thus occurred as a result of an internecine conflict in which authors needed to clarify the loyal *thughūr* from the disloyal ones. According to al-Qūṭiyya, multiple *thughūr* exist by the 920s, on the eve of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir’s claiming of the caliphate. While it may be unclear to modern readers what al-Qūṭiyya means by the term, his writing suggests that his contemporaries would have understood his usage and needed no definition. This gives us some indication that the development of the *thughūr* as a rebellious, liminal space had in some sense codified by the end of Umayyad rule in al-Andalus (976).

434 James, 61.
435 James, 138–40.
Though we have little information about the thughūr in terms of geographical information, the Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus is a text concerned with peoples and as such we can draw some generalizations about both groups and families of the thughūr. Starting under the reign of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad (r. 822-852), the thaghr al-a’lā is associated in the text with the Banū Qasī and the thaghr al-awsat with the Banū Salīm. Each family has members loyal to the Umayyads (Mūsā ibn Qasī, Muḥammad ibn Salīm, Sa’īd ibn Muḥammad ibn Salīm) each has rebels (Mūsā ibn Mūsā Qasī, men of the Banū Salīm who get drunk and attack a Córdoban tax collector). Excepting the revolts of the Banū Qasī from Zaragoza in the tenth century, the peoples of the thughūr are always portrayed as loyal to Córdoba in the text. In 844, ‘the volunteers from the Marches’ (under Mūsā ibn Qasī) help repel the Viking threat to Lisbon, Sevilla, and Carmona. This text narrates in the greatest detail to date the role that ‘Berbers’ played in the history of al-Andalus. While previous chroniclers discussed the ‘Berber Revolt’ in terms of North African dynamics, Ibn al-Qūṭiyā narrates the dynamics internal to the Iberian Peninsula. Building on al-Iṣṭakhrī’s identification of the areas of the centre of the Peninsula being in North African control (Maknāsa, Hawwāra, Madyūna, Kutāma, Zanāta, Maṣmūda, Malīla, Ṣanhāja) and the presence of the Ṣanhāja in Guadalajara, there are some conclusions we can draw about North Africans in al-Andalus. Generally, of note in the Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus is that once ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dākhil enters al-Andalus in 755, North African tribes consistently fight against the Fihrī family and for the Umayyads. The last battle against the enemies of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dākhil is won because the North African Banū al-Khalī and the Banū Wānsūs offer their support to him. This is a crucial dynamic to keep in mind: not
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436 Generally, the Banū Salīm are presented as loyal, honest, and dependable. Not only do they fight for the Umayyads against Ibn Hafsūn, in one anecdote, when ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥakam (‘Abd al-Raḥmān II, r. 822-852), faced with the corruption of Córdoban civil governors (wulāt al-madīna) he searches the inhabitants of all the provinces for an honest man, eventually settling on Muḥammad ibn Salīm. For the story about the Banū Salīm fighting against Ibn Hafsūn see page 79; for the account of the recruiting of Muḥammad ibn Salīm see page 103; for the story of the young men of the Banū Salīm attacking the tax collector, see 123 in James, Early Islamic Spain: The History of Ibn al-Qutiya.

437 James, 100.

438 James, 72–73.
only was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dākhil the son of the Nafza woman, Rāḥ, but he owed his kingdom in large part to North African military support. Similarly, when Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān launched his attacks into Christianate lands across the *thughūr*, he appeals to the people of the *thughūr* who join him and with whose help he defeats his enemies. At no point in the *Ṭārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus* do North Africans act against the Umayyad family (which differs drastically from the actions of Arab tribes and Christian *mawāli*).

Like al-Iṣṭakhrī, Ibn al-Qūṭyiyya makes use of the term *kūra*. The *kuwar* are named as Algeciras, Rayya, Huelva, Sevilla, and Medina Sidonia and all correspond to territory that was once incorporated as Byzantine Iberia. However, it is hard to argue that they are clearly administered differently from the *thughūr* as both have governors. There seems to be a difference and it is notable that at no point does Toledo or any other major city of Visigothic Hispania (like Mérida or Córdoba) become identified as a *kūra*. It is worth considering that the divide between *kūra* and *thaghr* had more to do with pre-existing administrative structures in the Iberian Peninsula than with ways in which the Umayyads approached division of territory. As a final observation, all fortifications are referred to as either *quṣūr*, *ḥuṣūn*, or *qala‘āt/qilā*.

### 2.6h Abū l-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Naṣībī, aka Ibn Ḥawqal (d. after 978)

Attaching a location to Abū l-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Naṣībī (d. after 978), known as Ibn Ḥawqal, is difficult to place due to his itinerant lifestyle, though for the purposes of this discussion we shall classify Ibn Ḥawqal’s *Kitāb Šūrat al-Arḍ* as an Andalusi source. It is likely that Ibn Ḥawqal came to al-Andalus between 947 and 951 and as such provides us the first extant ‘eye-witness’ geography of al-Andalus. Ibn Ḥawqal met with al-Iṣṭakhrī circa 951 and both the *Kitāb Šūrat al-Arḍ* and the *Masālik al-

---

439 James, 123.
440 For Algeciras, see page 52; for Rayya, see pages 59, 69, and 119; for Huelva, see page 61; for Sevilla, see page 70; for Medina Sidonia, see pages 51, 123 in James, *Early Islamic Spain: The History of Ibn al-Qutiya*.
Mamālik show evidence of this meeting. The structure of the Kitāb Sūrat al-Arḍ mirrors that of al-Iṣṭakhrī and as such I have treated the text the same. Though Ibn Ḥawqal’s work mentions the polity of al-Andalus in other sections, given the richness of detail on the Iberian Peninsula in the section dedicated to al-Andalus, only this part has been examined for the discussion that follows.

An innovation in the Kitāb Sūrat al-Arḍ is that information on al-Andalus is separated from that of the Maghrib. Ibn Ḥawqal identifies fifty-eight locations throughout the Peninsula, as shown on the map here (Figure 2.20). The most frequently mentioned location is Córdoba with twelve followed by Cintra and Toledo with six.\(^{442}\) Of the fifty-eight, I have not mapped ten.\(^{443}\) The text appears to be most concerned with relating distances between cities as well as merchandise that can be found in each locale, giving it an economic bent. Though the text identifies no locations in the Southern Meseta, Ibn Ḥawqal names two locations of the thaghr al-awsat: Guadalajara and Talavera de la Reina, both in the Northern Meseta. Guadalajara is referenced a total of three times. In addition to being listed as one of the celebrated old cities (along with Jaén and Toledo),\(^{444}\) Guadalajara garners two additional mentions:

\[
\text{و} \text{من} \text{هن} \text{ا} \text{الي} \text{وادي} \text{الحجارة} \text{مدينة} \text{ كبيرة} \text{ و} \text{ثغور مشغور} \text{الحال} \text{مشوّر} \text{بحجارة} \text{دات} \text{أسواق} \text{ و} \text{فندق} \text{ و} \text{حمامات} \text{ و} \text{حاكم} \text{ و} \text{مخلف} \text{ و} \text{ها}
\]

\[
\text{يسكن} \text{ولا} \text{ة} \text{ثغور} \text{أحمد} \text{بن} \text{على} \text{و} \text{غالب} \text{ و} \text{عليها} \text{أكثر} \text{جهاد} \text{جليبية} \text{،} \text{و} \text{من} \text{هن} \text{ا} \text{الي} \text{شعراء} \text{القوارير} \text{و} \text{فيها} \text{منهل} \text{تنزله} \text{الرافق} \text{مرحلة}
\]

\(^{442}\) For mentions of Córdoba see pages 111-113 and 115-116; for discussions of Cintra see 109, 115, and 117; for references to Toledo see pages 110-111 and 116 in Ibn Hawqal al-Nusaybi, ‘Kitāb surat al-ard.’

\(^{443}\) These include three that have been mentioned before: Ghafiq (which is known to be near Córdoba), Nafza, and Maknása (all of which refer to peoples and places in the text); the others are Yūna, Gharghīra, Baiza, Mkhāḍa, Abnsh, Mughām, and al-Gharra’, places that have yet to be identified.


\(^{445}\) Transliteration: ‘wa-minhā Wādī al-hijāra madīna kabīra wa-thughūr mashghūr al-hāl musawwarran bi-hijāra dhāt aswāq wa-fanādiq wa-hammāmā wa-hākim wa-mukhlaf wa-bihā yaskunu wulāt al-thughūr ka-Ahmad ibn Y’alī wa Ghalīb wa-’alayhā aktbar jihād Jaliqiyya wa-minhā lā Shā’rā’ al-Qawārīr wa-fīhā manhal tanziluhu l-rīfāqa marhala’ in Ibn Hawqal al-Nusaybi, 117. Translation: ‘and from al-Gharra to Guadalajara, a large city which is in the well-known thughūr; Guadalajara is walled with stones- and Guadalajara has markets, hostels, bathhouses, a ḥākim and a mukhlaf - and in Guadalajara lives the governor of the thughūr, like Ahmed ibn Y’ala and Ghalib, and on them is the greatest jihād against Galicia; and from Guadalajara to Sha’rā al-Qawārīr, which is a place for the military companies to settle, is one stage.’ I have left ḥākim and a mukhlaf untranslated as both refer to specific positions. Though I have chosen to translate it as ‘place for the military companies to settle’ given the previous reference to jiḥād, it is also possible that manhal refers to a watering place.
The two mentions of Talavera de la Reina come in the same entry which states that Talavera is five days from *M. khāda* and three days from Toledo.\(^{447}\) While the notices on Talavera give little information other than in the middle of the tenth century it is a location of some note, the references to Guadalajara provide the clearest conception of an Andalusi *thughūr* of all the sources examined here (although even this is not that clear). As in Ibn al-Qūṭiyya’s text, the governor of the *thughūr* resides in Guadalajara. As this is the last source examined here, it is of note that at no point in any of the aforementioned texts is a governor of any *thughūr* said to live in Toledo. This suggests that in the tenth century, Umayyad al-Andalus did not significantly involve Toledo in administering the *thughūr*, and certainly to refer to it as a capital is without precedent at this time. Guadalajara is firmly associated with the *thughūr* and it is from here that troops loyal to al-Andalus fight against the Galicians. In general, the term *thughūr* is not used frequently: the entire section on al-Andalus employs it five times in the following constructions: once against the *al-Ifranja* and the *Ghalijshksh*; once against the *Jalāliqa*; once to describe the *al-Rūm* in the eastern Mediterranean; and twice as seen above to discuss Guadalajara

\(^{446}\) Transliteration: ‘*wa-Mārida wa-Ṭulaytula min ‘azam mudun al-Andalus wa-ashaddihā man’atan wa-thughūr al-Jalāliqiyya Mārida wa-Nafza wa-Wādī al-hijāra wa-Ṭulaytula tali madīnatayn al-Jalāliqiyya allatī tu’arafu bi-Samūra wa-liyūn maskan sultānihim wa-‘uddatihim ba’da-Samūra wa-‘Ubayda min kibār mudunihim wa-hijā ba’īda ‘an balad al-islām’ in Ibn Hawqal al-Nusaybi, 111. Translation: ‘Mérida and Toledo are amongst the greatest cities of al-Andalus in terms of strength and resilience [to attack], the *thughūr* of Galicia, Mérida, Guadalajara and Toledo face the two cities of Galicia known as Zamora and León, which is the place of their authority [where the Christian King rules from] and is considered the greatest cities [of that region] after Zamora and Ubeda and are far from the Land of Islam’.

\(^{447}\) Ibn Hawqal al-Nusaybi, 116.
and the governors of the *thughūr*. The term *ḥudūd* is used as well, though not as frequently. As in all the previous sources, all fortifications are referred to as either *qusūr*, *ḥusūn*, or *qala’āt/qilā*.

2.6i The Problem of the *Fatḥ al-Andalus* and the *Akhbār Majmū’a*

It will not have escaped notice that in my discussion of space in the eighth through tenth centuries that I have not discussed two sources that one might expect to see in this conversation: the *Fatḥ al-Andalus* and the *Akhbār Majmū’a*. While the *Fatḥ al-Andalus* is firmly dated to after the tenth century, and thus is excluded from sources discussed in Chapter Two based on temporal reasons, there is no consensus in the field as to when the *Akhbār Majmū’a* was compiled. The only copy of the *Akhbār Majmū’a* is in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, bound in the same colophon as Ibn al-Qūṭiyya’s *Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus*. As with Ibn al-Qūṭiyya’s text, the paper of the manuscript allows for a confident dating of the copy no earlier than fourteenth century. The best discussion of the controversy and opinions surrounding its dating are in David James’ *A History of Early al-Andalus: The Akhbār Majmū’a*. All those who work with the text agree to it being a collection of sources gathered by a member of the Córdoban elite. There is a near consensus in the field that parts of the collection date back to the tenth century. The only scholar to suggest a dating of the *Akhbār Majmū’a* as late as the twelfth century was Luis Molina, though in later publications he qualified this assertion. I have read and mapped the locations in the entire text and believe it clearly reflects a context from the eleventh century or beyond.

---

448 For its use in reference to the Ghaliṣkhsh see page 109; for the Jalāliqa see page 111; for the al-Rūm see page 113; for Guadalajara see page 117 in Ibn Hawqal al-Nusaybi, ‘Kitāb Surat Al-Ard.’
449 Ibn Hawqal al-Nusaybi, 110.
Although previous scholars had tried to parse authorship according to subject matter, James suggested it might be worth considering that the copyist’s use of coloured headings (red, blue, and black) in the physical manuscript may have been used to reference the fact that the scribe was using a different source when switching to a new colour. Thus, I collated the data according to what colour heading each of the information falls under. By treating the Akhbār Majmū’a as three different sources I opted to err on the side of caution. After mapping each coloured section separately, I also collated them together into one map to see what information the entire text is relating about places in the Iberian Peninsula (Figures 2.21-2.24).

By looking at the locations mentioned in the texts separated by coloured heading, it seems unlikely that headings were used to delineate different sources for the simple reason that there is no discernible difference in the ways in which each section discusses space. If we were dealing with different sources spread throughout the eighth through eleventh century as argued by James, we would expect the data to generate different maps based on different understandings of space. However, the maps are almost identical. It could be argued that those sections that fall under blue headings talk more about locations in North Africa, those under black headings are interested in the north of the Iberian Peninsula, and those under red headings seem to have a clearer understanding of the geography of al-Andalus, yet my investigation suggests these are unconvincing conclusions. I argue the divisions according to colour are not likely to indicate different source bases.

The first reason it seems unlikely that we are dealing with unedited texts dating to the eighth and ninth centuries has to do with language relating to place. None of the other extant sources examined in Chapter Two speak with the specificity that all sections of the Akhbār Majmū’a do. If different sources were used to generate the variously coloured headings, we would expect that some of

---

the maps generated from a separation according to source base would reflect the geographies of at least some of the eighth- through tenth-century sources mapped in this chapter. They do not. It seems unlikely that any of these sources were written before the last half of the ninth century. In particular, there are some remote locations unnamed in pre-eleventh-century sources that are referenced in all sections. Torrox and Almodóvar del Rio can be found in the red, blue, and black headings; Colomera, Laqant, and Almazara under the blue and red headings; Qal’at Za’wāq and Lajdāniya under blue and black headings; and Cazlona in the black and red headings. This crossing of sections to mention common locations, combined with the fact that there is no discernible pattern across sections (for instance, all other duplicates only occur across red-blue or blue-black sections) suggests that these are not independent traditions. It seems a stretch to believe that no sources dating prior to the eleventh century refer to these locations, yet within the same work, sections attributed to different authors from earlier time periods somehow all know of the same obscure places. If headings do refer to separate sources, we must concede a heavy editorial hand in the compilation of the Akhbār Majmū’a, which had a vested interest in creating a coherent spatial narrative across the work.

The second reason this division by sources by the scribe or copyist seems unlikely has to do with the narrative. By far, the blue sections deal the most with North Africa, thus it is surprising that the only mentions to the island of Umm Hakim, a location only referenced in Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s Futūḥ Ifriqiyya wa al-Andalus in the eighth- to tenth-century sources, appear under black headings when the narrative material of the blue section shows the most similarities to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s work. It is unclear how most of the information from Futūḥ Ifriqiyya wa al-Andalus would end up in one section, with only a small part of it showing up in another. In a similar situation, as divided by the scribe, the black section seems to have the most familiarity with locations in the north, mirroring the information in the Chronicle of Albelda. It is thus extremely surprising to find the only reference to Pelayo, appear in the blue North African/Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam section. While we certainly could come up with theories to justify why this
swapping of narratives occurred, sometimes the simple answer is the correct one. It seems far more likely that the scribe who compiled the *Akhbār Majmū’a* had a reason to colour-code his sections that did not have to do with the source of the material, or that the compiler of these traditions exercised a heavy editing hand (which perhaps explains an absence of *isnād*) rather than as James suggests, this distinction in colour could help us with dating portions of the text. Another problematic treatment in the text is the use of the term *thughūr* throughout all sections. We can state that clearly the compiler of the *Akhbār Majmū’a* is working with a late tenth century understanding of the term in which the *thughūr*, of which there were two, were places of rebellion.

As a result, I have decided to treat the *Akhbār Majmū’a* as an eleventh century text, even though it clearly makes use of earlier material. The nature of this study requires a precision of language that the *Akhbār Majmū’a* is without. Unfortunately, we cannot delineate where the compiler may have added specificity or concepts.

### 2.7 Summation

While at times the listing of sources in chronological order can be laborious for the reader, such a methodology allows for us to see more clearly the developments and changes in which some authors socially conceive of space between the eighth and tenth centuries. This ordering leads to several conclusions: first, the importance of non-Andalusi, non-Iberian, and material sources; second, a confusion over what constitutes Celtiberia/Santabariyya; third, the importance of Narbonne as an Umayyad settlement of the *thughūr*; fourth, the lack of importance of Toledo as a city of the *thughūr*; fifth, the emergence of Guadalajara as significant to the *thaghhr al-awsat*; sixth, the likelihood that the term *thughūr* as a concept meaningful in al-Andalus occurred relatively late in the Umayyad dynasty’s control of the Iberian Peninsula, perhaps under the rule of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir; and finally, negative conceptions of North Africans are likely a result of an eleventh-century lens, perhaps related to the fall of the Umayyad dynasty and the rise of the Ṭā’ifa Kingdoms. Each of these is elaborated below.
2.7a The Importance of non-Andalusi sources

The first conclusion to be drawn after reviewing the extant written sources from the eighth to tenth century is that non-Andalusi sources are vital to reconstructing not only conceptions of space, but also aspects of the history of the Umayyad dynasty. Specifically, written sources such as the Chronicle of Albelda and al-Iṣṭakhrī’s Masālik al-Mamālik offer vast amounts of information regarding the geographical networks of the Iberian Peninsula for this time period. While neither would be considered to have insider knowledge of Umayyad al-Andalus, there is much information to be gleaned from each. The Chronicle of Albelda is particularly important for discussions on the Southern Meseta. As reviewed earlier, the naming of locations in the Southern Meseta testifies to the rich Christianate heritage of the region, a fact confirmed by archaeological evidence. Though al-Iṣṭakhrī likely never travelled to the Iberian Peninsula, the Masālik al-Mamālik offer comparatively extensive information on not only the ports of al-Andalus but also on the North African peoples of al-Andalus. Al-Iṣṭakhrī is the closest we can come to accessing what was thought of North African peoples prior to the decline of the Umayyads and the eleventh-century pivot characterized by Ibn Ḥawqal which began to portray North Africans in distinctly negative ways. The information provided in the Masālik al-Mamālik points to a differentiation between the Toledo-Guadalajara axis (confirmed in Ibn Ḥawqal) and another one from Córdoba to Santabariyya. When investigating the former, the tribes of the Banū Sāim, Nafza, and Maknāsa are key figures, while for the latter, the Hawwāra and the Madyūna played significant roles. As traveling between Toledo and Guadalajara also would require traversing different roads than one would use moving from Córdoba to Santabariyya, we are likely looking at different political and social dynamics. Those with North African heritage likely controlled both areas, but to group them together simply

455 This makes sense in terms of the fact that ‘most Islamic states through the tenth/eleventh centuries governed large (and frequently majority) non-Muslim populations’ in Robinson, ‘Abd al-Malik, 12.
because they came from North Africa likely obscures the complex dynamics of the period.456 More detailed studies must be done to ascertain these relationships, and what follows in Chapter Two is an investigation of the second axis and thus can only speak to the histories of the Hawwāra and Madyūna within the context of Umayyad rule. Finally, the reality that written sources do not reflect the history testified to by surviving buildings in the Southern Meseta argues for the importance of archaeology to understand this area’s past. The unvaried source-base to date goes some way to explaining why all histories of al-Andalus seem to treat the Southern Meseta in the same way. To tell a different story we must use different sources.

2.7b Where in the world is Santabariyya?

Another important conclusion made evident in this seriation of sources is that the confusion over where Celtiberia/Santabariyya is starts in the ninth century in a Latin source. The identification of Recópolis as a city of Celtiberia when all of the surrounding locations mentioned are placed in Carpetania by the author of the Chronicle of Albelda testifies to an uncertainty as to where Celtiberia is. This confusion intensifies as time goes on. Al-Iṣṭakhrī locates the Hawwāra and the Madyūna as residing in Santabariyya, but we should by no means assume that this means Recópolis. While later texts in the eleventh century assert that Santabariyya is in the hands of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn (whose ancestors were the Hawwāra) at no point should we understand this as having a clear conception of exactly where they

456 There is more work to do here. Both the Nafza and the Hawwāra had strong ties to Tunisia, where robust Khārijite communities from each tribe were active. The super-confederation of Zanata became major power players in the ninth through thirteenth centuries as members of the tribe founded the Idrisid, Rustimid, and later Marinid dynasties. For general histories that have much to contribute to such a study, see Bennison, The Almoravid and Almohad Empires; Blair and Bloom, The Art and Architecture of Islam: 1250-1800; Maribel Fierro, ‘El proceso de Islamización en el Occidente Islámico visto a través de los ulemas (ss. II/VIII-X),’ in Arabización, islamización y resistencias en al-Andalus y el Magreb, ed. Bilal Sarr and M. Ángeles Navarro García (Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2019), 85; Kennedy, Muslim Spain and Portugal: A Political History of al-Andalus; For strong Andalusi connections to Tahart, see Bloom, Architecture of the Islamic West: North Africa and the Iberian Peninsula, 700-1800, 68; For similarities between the tenth-century material culture of Fes (under the Zanata) and in Algeria and Andalusi goblets in Guadalajara, see Kaoutar El Baljani, Ahmed S. Ettahiri, and Abdallah Fili, ‘La céramique des niveaux Idrisside et zénète de la mosquée al-Qarawiyyin de Fès (IX-X siècles),’ in The Aghlabids and Their Neighbors: Art and Material Culture in Ninth-Century North Africa, ed. Claire D. Anderson, Corisande Fenwick, and Mariam Rosser-Owen, vol. 122, Handbook of Oriental Studies (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 421.
lived and what comprised this region in the eighth through tenth centuries. As time passes the sources give the impression of certainty; however, we would be wise to keep Jan Assman and Antoine Borrut’s caution that once a story achieves a fixed status we are likely dealing with less accurate information. The closing of the corpus and the textual agreement on who and where constitutes Santabariyya might speak more to the need for a clear origin story for the Dhū al-Nūnīd Ṭā’ifa rulers than any reality under Umayyad rule.

2.7c The Importance of Narbonne

A third point of interest is that throughout the eighth to tenth centuries, the authors, across language, time, and place of origin, are unanimous in pointing to Narbonne as a significant location in relation to al-Andalus. As discussed earlier, studies have shown that there was a far more substantial Islamicate presence in the region than previously understood, and an analysis of the written sources from the time period suggests that this should not be a surprising conclusion. The past two decades have witnessed a wealth of finds relating to the Umayyad fath of Narbonne, including ceramics (though rare), coins (dirhams and fals), seals, and funerary contexts.

As one would expect, there are more fals than dirhams, which corresponds to the availability of their respective metals, copper and silver. Fals have been found in several locations north of the Pyrenees and in the environs of Narbonne, including Ruscino, Salses, Ville-longue-dels-Monts, Sigean, Argelès-sur-Mer, Fitou, Roquefort-des-Corbières, Portel-des-Corbières, Pomas d’Aude, Perpignan, Lapalme, and Narbonne itself (Figure 2.25). Though fals do not typically bear information that directly attest to dating, comparative studies with Umayyad currency in the Eastern Mediterranean suggests the

457 For attributions of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn as Hawwāra, see Brett and Fentress, The Berbers, 98; Guichard, Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente, 40, 250–51; Olmo Enciso et al., ‘Espacios de poder en Recópolis en las épocas visigoda y primitiva andalusí (S. VI-IX d. C.),’ 92.


bulk of this corpus dates between 711 and 756.\textsuperscript{460} The dirhams that have been found offer direct testimony to dates. A fractional one found in Fitou, which unfortunately due to its cleaving does not give us the date nor the mint, is consistent with either those issued from Wāsīṭ or those of ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Dākhil, which firmly dates to the eighth century. Another dirham, found in Pomas d’Aude, dates to 781/2.\textsuperscript{461} The monies that have been found align with locations along Roman roads, particularly the Via Domitia, which may testify to the routes that the Umayyad army followed.\textsuperscript{462} As with the lead seals, current discussions on the numismatics of the Umayyad conquest are additionally published in \textit{Manquso}.

According to Gaspariño and Ibrahim, the lead seals of Narbonne are numerous in comparison to other seals, numbering forty-five of one type.\textsuperscript{463} These seals, all excavated from the site of Ruscino, read:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>قسم</th>
<th>مغنوم</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طيب</td>
<td>[بارونة]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

These seals, with the reference to \textit{ghanima}, attest that Narbonne was taken by force after acts of war. Another piece of evidence that may attest to an Umayyad presence in Narbonne is the fals struck in the name of the governor ‘Anbasa ibn Suḥaym al-Kalbī (r. 721-726) (Figure 2.26). The written texts tell us this was a time of increasing Umayyad presence in the region.\textsuperscript{464} It reads:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}

بسم الله

\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{460} Philippe Sénac et al., “Note sur quelques fulūs de Narbonnaise (première moitié du VIII° siècle),” \textit{al-Qantara} XXXI, no. I (2010): 228.
\item \textsuperscript{461} Philippe Sénac et al., “Nouveaux vestiges de la présence musulmane en Narbonnaise au VIII° siècle,” 66.
\item \textsuperscript{462} Philippe Sénac et al., “Nouveaux vestiges de la présence musulmane en Narbonnaise au VIII° siècle,” 68.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Additionally, in Narbonne, ninety-three Islamic burials have been excavated. All have been carbon-dated to the first half of the eighth century and DNA testing has confirmed that most are of North African origin and were of an age between 20 and 29. The most detailed study on funerary contexts is that from Nîmes, which is located approximately 142 kilometres (88 miles) to the northeast of Narbonne. In 2006, preventative excavations conducted by the French National Institute for Preventative Archaeology uncovered around twenty graves from mixed contexts. Of these twenty, three were identified as particularly interesting: SP7080, SP7089, and SP9269 (Figure 2.27). The positioning of both the burial pits, which faced the direction of Mecca, and the bodies within the pits, which were on their right side with upper and lower limbs extended and occasionally crossed, suggested an Islamic socio-religious context. In 2016, further studies were published that confirmed the likelihood that these individuals participated in (or arrived after) and settled in the region as a result of the Umayyad conquest of southern France. Investigations found: first, that burial pits were dug in the al-lahd shape consistent with Islamic burials in Spain and Portugal from the period; second, the radiometric dating confirmed that the skeletons dated to the seventh through ninth centuries; and third, palaeogenomic

466 Sénac, ‘Cuando fueron árabes: La présence musulmane en Narbonnaise (VIII siècle)’, 153.
testing confirmed North African patrilineal heritage for all individuals.\textsuperscript{468} It is of note that none of these three individuals bear evidence of a death caused by fighting suggesting a natural death.\textsuperscript{469}

Sénac argued that the wealth of finds attesting to Umayyad settlement in Narbonne and southern France demand more attention than has traditionally been given to this city which Sénac dubbed a ‘no man’s land of scholarship’.\textsuperscript{470} All sources, written and material, suggest that Narbonne was a settlement important to the administration and functioning of the Umayyads in al-Andalus. The likelihood that the Umayyad conquest of Narbonne increased the settlement’s status as argued by Sénac is high.\textsuperscript{471} Throughout the eighth to tenth centuries texts name Narbonne as significant for understanding the political geography of al-Andalus and perhaps of significant import for scholars of early Islamic history.

\textbf{2.7d The Umayyad Thaghr al-Awsat: What and where was it?}

Another significant takeaway for this discussion is that we have no evidence to suggest that during the eighth through tenth centuries anybody conceived of the Southern Meseta as part of any \textit{thughûr} and certainly there is nothing to support that Toledo should be considered as a capital of the \textit{thaghr al-awsat}. The only named \textit{thughûr} in this time period are 1) the area around Narbonne, located over 900 kilometres (550 miles) and divided from the Southern Meseta by two substantial mountain ranges, the Sierra de Guadarrama and the Pyrenees 2) that of Zaragoza, located over 300 kilometres (180 miles) and across a mountain range, the Serranía de Cuenca, and 3) the city of Guadalajara, which is only 70 kilometres (40 miles) away, yet still a location that requires crossing the Tajo and making one’s way through the Sierra de Guadarrama. In the eighth to tenth centuries, the written sources offer so

\textsuperscript{468} Yves Gleize et al., “Early Medieval Muslim Graves in France: First Archaeological, Anthropological, and Palaeogenomic Evidence,”\textsuperscript{4}
\textsuperscript{469} Yves Gleize et al., “Early Medieval Muslim Graves in France: First Archaeological, Anthropological, and Palaeogenomic Evidence,”\textsuperscript{4}
\textsuperscript{470} For discussion on finds, see pages 151-153 in Sénac, ‘Cuando fueron árabes: La présence musulmane en Narbonnaise (VIII siècle).’ For quotation, see page 147.
\textsuperscript{471} Sénac, 158–59.
little information as to what constitutes the *thaghr* we should exercise caution in suggesting anything other than cities specifically named as belonging to the *thughūr*. Rather than see Toledo as important, historians should emphasize Guadalajara which was always associated with North African leaders, as the most significant city of the *thaghr al-awsat* in the Umayyad period. In addition, during the eighth to tenth centuries, there is nothing to suggest that the dynamics of the Southern Meseta and the Northern Meseta were the same. This is not to say that the Southern Meseta was not included in the *thaghr*, rather that we should not assume this *a priori* when approaching archaeological evidence from the region. According to the written sources, Umayyad investment in the *thughūr* in al-Andalus seems to have grown in the middle of the ninth century, perhaps under the rule of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (r. 852-886). This is of note as it aligns with the material culture of the region. In Rubén-Lot García Lerga’s cataloguing of amiral coinage found in the Southern Meseta evinces, several sites across the region which show an increase of finds dating to the reign of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān: that of Vega Baja, Recópolis, Calatrava la Vieja, Vascos, Guarrazar, and Ercavica. The richness of finds at Calatrava la Vieja led García Lerga to conclude that ‘el periodo de gobierno de Muḥammad I, [fue] momento en el que comienza a adquirir protagonismo esta importante qal’at de la Meseta Sur’. The archaeology of the region suggests that this reflection applies to several sites in the Southern Meseta.

In addition, while the only information given in these sources about the people who live in the *thaghr al-awsat* identifies them as North African (Ṣanhāja, Nafza, Maknāsa, Hawwāra, and Madyūna), at no point are they disloyal. In fact, the only mentions of them specifically state their close ties and allegiance to the Umayyad rulers. While I am not suggesting that the Southern Meseta was populated only by North African peoples loyal to the Umayyads, I am contending that to identify this area as one
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472 Discussions on the first five sites can be found in García Lerga, ‘La moneda emiral en la Meseta Sur. Un estado de la cuestión’; For a discussion on dirhams found at Ercavica dating between 866 and 876, see Aillet, *Les Mozarabes: Christianisme, islamisation et arabisation en Péninsule Ibérique (IX-XIIe siècle)*, 50.

473 García Lerga, 1123. Translation: ‘the period of government of Muhammad I, was the moment in which this important qalʿat of the Southern Meseta [Calatrava la Vieja] began to acquire importance.’
full of disloyal ‘Berbers’ is an argument from absence. The only sources to state such were penned after
the fall of the Umayyads, at which point the ‘Berbers’ of the Southern Meseta become treacherous and
rebellious. This has repercussions for both historians and archaeologists interested in this place and
time. What, if instead of approaching the history and material culture from a perspective of ‘this is the
home of North Africans who were constantly in rebellion against a centre’ or as Eduardo Manzano
Moreno wrote, a ‘space that had for centuries rejected the Umayyads’ which might lead to interpreting
material evidence like fortresses as having primarily defensive military purposes, historians and
archaeologists understood the buildings constructed in the ninth century as in line with a post-Roman
worldview?474

The Roman Empire constructed fortresses along routes to ensure speedy communications, to
safeguard trade routes, to respond quickly with military forces to foreign threats, and to ensure the
effective administration (and tax collection) of fully-integrated territories under their rule. Borrut has
argued that from the start of their reign in Damascus, the Umayyads defined their ability to exercise
power by securing routes that allowed for mobility.475 Manzano Moreno and Martínez Jiménez have
separately pointed out that the main Umayyad fortresses were always located by Roman roads.476 I
suggest we might need to think of rivers in this way as well. It would be wise to consider what other
strategic benefits constructing along roads and rivers would bring, other than assuming military need. As
Peter Sarris pointed out regarding the Roman world, the Roman frontier zone was heavily tied to the
imperial capital with roles akin to ‘sub-capitals.’477 In addition, recent research by Abigail Balbale into

474 For Manzano Moreno quote, see Conquistadores, emires, y califas: Los omeyas y la formación de al-Andalus,
431.
475 Borrut, Entre mémoire et pouvoir: L’espace syrien sous les derniers Omeyyades et les premiers Abbassides (72-
476 Manzano Moreno, La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los omeyas, 153; Martínez Jiménez, ‘Crisis or Crises?
The End of Roman Towns in Iberia, Between the Late Roman and the Early Umayyad Periods,’ 86; For an
observation that North Africans built near the cities of Complutum and Recópolis (and thus near Roman roads), see
Pavón Maldonado, Guadalajara medieval arte y arqueología árabe y mudejar, 18.
477 Sarris, Empires of Faith: The Fall of Rome to the Rise of Islam, 500-700, 15.
the eleventh-century fortresses of Ibn Mardanîsh (r. 1147-1172) argues that his construction of forts regularly placed along roads served the administrative purpose of securing communication, following the model of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣîr. Might this not be a better model for approaching and interpreting the Islamicate archaeology of the Southern Meseta? To assume these buildings served a primarily defensive military function goes against the written sources of the time.

There has been surprisingly little (if anything) written on the economic ties of the ṭaghr al-awsat to Mediterranean trade in the eighth through tenth centuries. However, this is what the written sources most suggest. Recent research by Adam Gaiser has identified the Iberian Peninsula as providing wheat, sugar, raw cotton, silk, processed cotton fabrics, pottery, gold and silver jewellery, armour, helmets, and swords to North Africa. Another major export of the Iberian Peninsula was people. According to Gaiser, enslaved women from al-Andalus might have cost three to ten times the going rate of their Egyptian counterparts. To date, there has been little sustained attention to the question of where these goods and peoples sold into slavery originated. Gaiser’s identification of the Ibâdi Khârijîtes aligning with the Hawwâra, Nafza, and Zanâta in the middle of the eighth century might have established relationships that continued throughout the Umayyad period. Gaiser speaks to the close relationships of the Umayyad amirs and the North African Khârijîtes, specifically the Rustimids and the Midrârids, after the advent of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dâkhlî’s rule. As Gaiser posits, the Ibâdi dominance of the slave trade and the presence of North African silver in Andalusi dirhams suggests that al-Andalus provided the people to be enslaved in the ‘Abbâsid empire mediated through the Rustimids and the
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While it is well known that the Umayyads provided *Saqāliba* to the Mediterranean slave market, little is known about the networks that transported people from territories north of al-Andalus to the east. It might be that looking into what the *thaghr al-awsat* contributed to the economy of the Umayyad polity might provide insight into the trans-Mediterranean trade in peoples.

The term ‘*thaghr al-awsat*’ likely came into use in the second half of the tenth century. Unknown in sources prior to 950, the conception of Andalusi *thughūr* with respective geographic centres is introduced in al-Qūṭiyya (d. 977). Neither Al-Iṣṭakhrī (d. 957) nor Ibn Ḥawqal (d. after 978) use the term, though it is hard to assert if this is a result of the term not being widely understood and in circulation, or rather, due to the two authors’ unfamiliarity with dynamics in al-Andalus. For both al-Iṣṭakhrī, who likely learned much of his knowledge from Ibn Ḥawqal, we can assert that if the term ‘*thaghr al-awsat*’ had been used in al-Andalus by the 950s, this usage was not of import to geographers writing from outside of the Iberian Peninsula. Both al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal relate information about the Andalusi *thughūr*, suggesting they are aware of a general conception of these territories.

Perhaps it is of some note that al-Qūṭiyya’s family background and his familiarity with Córdoba allowed for him to be intimately associated with details of administration in a way that neither al-Iṣṭakhrī nor Ibn Ḥawqal were likely to be, given their different personal histories as well as their purpose in composing their respective texts. However, it is likely that the concept of the ‘*thaghr al-awsat*’ dates to the very end of Umayyad rule of al-Andalus. This suggests that a named *thaghr al-awsat* developed as a result of Córdoban administrative practices which needed to grapple with an ever more populous and substantial number of settlements in the Meseta. As mentioned above, the written and material sources demonstrate the importance of the region during the reign of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān in the
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middle to late ninth century; Al-Qūṭiyya’s Tārīkh iftitāḥ al-Andalus clearly states that the thaghr al-awsat has a sāhib, a position that would be appointed from Córdoba. Throughout the text, the peoples of the thaghr al-awsat are loyal to the Umayyad rulers. This lens must be kept in mind when approaching later texts, that while relate important information as to the names of people who held positions in the thaghr al-awsat, often portray the peoples of this region as disloyal. If anything, the contemporaneous sources from the time suggest a region in which the Umayyad polity invested heavily, both in terms of physical fortifications as well as in people. Future studies might look at the ways in which eleventh-century sources portray social dynamics in the thughūr, particularly during the final years of the reign of ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Nāṣir and his son, al-Ḥakam. However, any analysis of eleventh-century texts relating developments in the thughūr need to be caveated with the recognition that any text composed after 976, and certainly those written after 1013, likely project anachronistic dynamics born out of the politics of the rise and fall of the ‘Amīrids and Ṭā’ifa rulers.

This leads to the final point: that it is worth considering that the constructions of thughūr and its meaning to eleventh century (and later) Arabic chroniclers occurred as a result of needing a ‘backstory’ for the Ṭā’ifa kings. Certainly, this would explain the deceptive mislabelling of Carpetania as Celtiberia and the assertions that the Dhū al-Nūnids who were to reign over Toledo’s ‘golden age’ of astronomy and science had a primordial presence in the region. Ibn Hayyān’s poor opinion of North Africans seems to become inseparable from the region and descriptions of it after the eleventh century –yet this does not mean that this particular representation of the past is true. For example, the motivation for reports that suggest that ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Nāṣir acknowledged he could not achieve control over Dhū al-Nūnid lands might be to show the power of the dynasty that would come to control the region, rather than to
speak to the weakness of the Umayyad state.484 This recalls a statement made by Emilio García Gómez that the marches as frontiers eerily prefigure the Ṭā’ifa kingdoms.485

Certainly the grouping of Toledo and Santabariyya together seems to be a rewriting of history to extend the influence of the Dhū al-Nūnid family over time and space.486 In secondary literature the *thaghur al-awsat* is frequently described as being a frontier zone focused around Toledo, which is often referred to as its capital.487 One question this close investigation of sources sought to answer was, is this understanding representative of the way the space of the Southern Meseta functioned in the eighth through tenth centuries? Is it correct to see this space as Toledo-facing, rather than Córdoba-facing? In 1991 Manzano Moreno argued, agreeing with Bosch Vilá, that Toledo cannot be considered the capital of the *thaghur al-awsat*, though this assertion has not been popularly adhered to in subsequent scholarship.488 At no point in any text reviewed is Toledo referred to as loyal or fully integrated into the Umayyad polity. The city has to be repeatedly conquered, because it is constantly in rebellion.489 As Robert Haug argued in relation to the Syrian-Anatolian *thughūr*, ‘one cannot rebel if there was not first an honest conquest.’490 It seems more likely that Toledo was never thoroughly conquered (and thus not in a constant state of rebellion) until the middle of the tenth century. The entire concept of an Umayyad Toledo may need to be revisited. The continued conflation of Toledo and the *thaghur al-awsat*, which

484 Kennedy, *Muslim Spain and Portugal: A Political History of al-Andalus*, 93; Manzano Moreno, *Conquistadores, emires, y califas: Los omeyas y la formación de al-Andalus*, 349.
486 For an assertion that the two should be treated as one unit, see Guichard, *Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente*, 409.
487 For a review of this argument, see Section 1.4.
490 Haug, *The Eastern Frontier: Limits of Empire in Late Antique and Early Medieval Central Asia*, 73.
may be historically inaccurate for the Umayyad period, might explain why the _thughūr_ retain a reputation as a space of questionable loyalty. Nothing in the sources here suggest this to be the case (neither that Toledo is in the _thughūr_ nor that the _thughūr_ is disloyal). Those interested in the history of Umayyad al-Andalus and its administration must appreciate that the historiographic filter of the eleventh century might have altered our perceptions of what the history of the region is. As the extant written sources which engage with the history of the region are tinged by bias, it is only with more archaeological investigations that we can hope to ascertain the relationship of sites founded by the Umayyads in the Southern Meseta to the wider polity.

A major contribution of this work is to emphasize the need to prioritize contemporary sources in constructions of geographic space in al-Andalus, an approach currently lacking in scholarship. While later sources can inform certain historical aspects of a society, we should rethink whether or not these are the appropriate sources to use in all situations. The next chapter engages with the Umayyad fortress of Zorita, founded before 813. As we will see, a major hindrance to interpreting the Islamicate history of the site is the reality that no contemporary written source mentions the fortification. Every medieval Arabic source therefore reflects eleventh-century (and after) sensibilities, which can only be confirmed or countered by material evidence.
Chapter Three: Hidden in Plain Sites: Umayyad Fortresses of the Southern Meseta

‘Cuánto castillo hemos visto, morada de poderosos procurada, para acabar viéndole luego en ruinas y sin vida!’ —al-Ghazāl, Muqtabis 2.1

‘pero mejor cosa sería que percatándose el Ministerio de Educación Nacional de la importancia tuvo Zorita, del tesoro emocional y evocador que encierra, de su pintoresca situación y la belleza indudable de esas ruinas, se ocupara de su conservación, de adecentarlas un poco, estimulando de paso a los amantes del pasado, a los enamorados de la Naturaleza y de la Tradición, para que los visiten y admiren; el Patronato de Turismo realizaría una obra meritoria preocupándose del castilla de Zorita, divulgando su existencia, su importancia y sus bellezas, con lo que poco a poco se irían allegando recursos para consolidar tan interesantes ruinas. Si algo de esto no hace, pasados muy pocos años, a la vista del cerro desmochado cubierto de escombros informes, podría algún poeta lamentarse, como Rodrigo Caro ante las ruinas de Itálica: ‘Estos Fabio ¡ay gué dolor! Que ves ahora campos de soledad, mustio collado fueron un tiempo Zorita la famosa . . .’ —Francisco Layna Serrano

‘It is never easy to get back from the object (product or work) to the activity that produced and/or created it. It is the only way, however, to illuminate the object’s nature, and reconstitute the process of its genesis and the development of its meaning.’ —Henri Lefebvre

Humans have long mourned the deterioration of their built environment. From the ninth-century Andalusi poet al-Ghazāl to the twentieth-century historian Francisco Layna Serrano, people in the Iberian Peninsula have elegized past architectural splendour. In El castillo de Zorita de los Canes, first published in 1934, Layna Serrano closed his book with the above quote, modifying lines from a popular sixteenth-century poem, ‘Canción a las Ruinas de Itálica.’ In doing so, Layna Serrano joined the author of the poem, Rodrigo Caro, in lamentation for a lost site. Though Caro mourned the lost Roman past of

491 Translation: ‘How many a castle have we seen, a residence of the powerful, procured, later to end up seeing it in ruin and without life’ in Ibn Hayyān, Crónica de los emires alḥakam I y ‘Abd al-Rahmān II entre los años 796 y 847 (Almuqtabis II-I), 157.

492 Translation: ‘But it would be better if the National Ministry of Education realized the importance of Zorita, the emotional and evocative treasure it contains, of its picturesque situation and the undoubted beauty of these ruins, to take care to conserve it, to clean it up a little, appealing to lovers of the past and those enamoured with nature and tradition, so they can visit and admire it; the Board of Tourism would realize a meritorious cause in their concern for the castle of Zorita, divulging its existence, its importance, and its beauties, with which a small amount of resources would consolidate such interesting ruins. If some of this is not done, with the passing of a few years, a view of this promontory will be covered in shapeless rubble, and a poet may lament, like Rodrigo Caro before the ruins of Itálica, ‘oh how painful! What you see now on this plain of solitude, once stood for a time the famous Zorita’ in Layna Serrano, El Castillo de Zorita de Los Canes, 83.

493 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 113.
Scipio and Trajan, Layna Serrano grieved a medieval past, and in replacing the location Itálica with Zorita, powerfully employed popular culture to emphasize the threat to one of his beloved castles of the province of Guadalajara. This chapter introduces the fortress of Zorita, one of many ex novo sites founded by North Africans in service of the Umayyad dynasty in the centre of the Iberian Peninsula from the eighth to tenth centuries. Although sources from the Umayyad period do not mention Zorita, the combination of material evidence and late-medieval written sources testify to its history at this time. The intent of this chapter is not to lay forth the history of Zorita – other scholars have already done so. Rather, this discussion highlights the substantial potential that sites like Zorita, where archaeological projects have either not focused on an Islamicate past, have been a result of rescue operations, or in some cases have never been initiated, have to not only testify to the Umayyad presence in the region but also to challenge written tropes that insist on the rebellious character of North African tribes in the thughūr.

About ninety-six kilometres (sixty miles) to the east of Madrid, as the crow flies, lies the town of Zorita de los Canes in the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha. Visitors interested in driving from Spain’s capital to the village, and indeed the larger province of Guadalajara in which Zorita de los Canes is located, would likely opt to take either the A-3 or the R-3, before moving onto smaller local
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494 ‘Canción a las ruinas de Itálica’ (1595), l. 4,37, www.uma.es.
495 In the Arabic chronicles, سریتah (Surūṭah) both spellings can be found in Ibn Hayyān’s Muqtabis depending on the manuscript; in medieval Spanish fueros Çorita.
496 We do not have written attestations to the founding of Zorita. As will be discussed later, the earliest mention of the fortress in the written sources dates to 813, in which al-Hakam ibn Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān sends ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Mughith to Zorita to negotiate between the ‘Berbers’, implying the settlement already exists. See Ibn Hayyān, Muqtabis II: Anales de los emires de Córdoba Alhaquém I (180-206 H. / 796-822 J.C.) y Aberrerahmán II (206-232 / 822-847), 28.
497 For works on the history and archaeology of the fortress, see Leopoldo Torres Campas y Balbás, ‘El castillo de Zorita de los Canes (Guadalajara),’ Boletín de la Sociedad Española de Excursiones 27, no. 2 (1919): 90–106; Layna Serrano, El Castillo de Zorita de Los Canes; Pavón Maldonado, Guadalajara medieval arte y arqueología árabe y mudejar; Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez, El castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología.
498 For a general assertion that ‘rescue archaeology is now the most productive source of archaeological discoveries in Spain, but frequently more research is required [as] findings remain unpublished or briefly published as technical reports at a regional level’, see Valor and Gutiérrez, ‘The Study of Medieval Archaeology in Spain,’ 8.
roads. Regardless of this choice, travellers from the west end up on the CM-2029, which follows not only the bends of the Tajo River, but also the path of the Roman road, which according to the chronicles, the Arabic-speakers who settled in the region in the eighth century referred to as *al-balāṭ*,⁴⁹⁹ or ‘the pavement/the paved.’⁵⁰⁰ This name has shown remarkable durability as attested in the toponymic evidence of the region, not least of which is the location of a smaller village on the outskirts of Zorita de los Canes named Albalate de Zorita. Those visitors coming from the east, be that northeast or southeast, eventually find themselves on the CM-200 approaching the town, so to speak, from its back. Regardless of how one arrives to Zorita de los Canes, the structure to catch the visitors’ eyes is an imposing castle that sits on the top of the hill of the village –equally impressive and striking no matter the approach a traveller might choose.

The chronology of Zorita is complex, and a brief sketch of the fortresses’ history is useful to situate the discussion that follows. Initially founded under the Umayyads, the first written attestation of the fortress occurs in the *Muqtabis* of Ibn Ḥayyān (d. 1076) who mentions it as an established location in 813. By the beginning of the eleventh century (if not earlier), the family of the Banū Dhū al-_ROUTE_NAME_ had expanded their reach and the fortress was associated with their holdings in the region of Santaver (Figure 3.1).⁵⁰¹ When the Dhū al-_ROUTE_NAME_ids had established themselves in the city of Toledo under the aegis of Ismaīl ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Dhū al-_ROUTE_NAME_ (r.1032-1043), Zorita, as a part of Santaver, was included in the dynasty’s territory, along with the fortresses and land surrounding Uclés, Huete, and Cuenca. The death of the Dhū al-_ROUTE_NAME_id ruler, Yaḥyā ibn Ismaīl al-Ma’mūn (r. 1043-1075; from here on, al-Ma’mūn) in 1075
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and the subsequent chaos the city of Toledo plunged into on the assumption of power by his under his grandson, al-Qadir (r. 1075-1085), had repercussions for Zorita. 1080 is the most-probable date for the fortress leaving Dhū al-Nūnid control. 502 For most of al-Maʿmūn’s rule, the city of Toledo had paid tribute, in the form of a paria, to Alfonso the Brave [Alfonso VI, r. León (1065–1109), Galicia (1071–1109), and Castilla (1072–1109)]. In 1080, Alfonso supported the return of al-Qadir to the city of Toledo (he had fled to Cuenca, and the city had temporarily been under the control of the al-Mutawakkil ibn al-Aftas, ruler of Badajoz). Alfonso exacted fortresses as payment from al-Qadir, and it was likely that Zorita (along with Brihuega and Canales) left the Andalusi sphere of influence for the first time. Thus, from its founding at the beginning of the ninth century to its handing over to the Castilian rulers at the end of the eleventh, the history of Zorita is entirely Islamicate.

The eleventh- through thirteenth-century history of the fortress is one of possession and repossession. In 1086, Alfonso the Brave (from the Asturian line of monarchs) appointed one of his strongmen, Álvar Fañez, as governor of Zorita. Fañez maintained control over the fortress until 1114. The twelfth century witnessed the toggling of control of the fortress between the Asturian kingdom (which variously controlled constellations in Castilla, León, Galicia, and Basque territory) and their strongmen (notably the Castro family) and the Almoravids, and later between the Asturians, Ibn Mardanīsh (d. 1172), and the Almohads. By the end of the twelfth century, the Umayyad-founded fortress had passed to Asturian/Castillian control for good, and it would remain a dispensation of the monarchs of Spain until the twentieth century. 503 In 1174, the fortress became the seat of the Order of Calatrava, which maintained control of it until the end of the fifteenth century, though after the

502 Fletcher, The Quest for El Cid, 128.
503 Generally the complex is understood to be abandoned at the end of the seventeenth century. On November 23, 1821 there is a record of stones falling from the wall of the fortress and killing three residents of Zorita de los Canes. See Gonzalo López-Muñiz Moragas, ‘Abandono, ruina y restauración del castillo de Zorita de los Canes (1559-1973),’ in El Castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología, ed. Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez (Madrid: El Tercer Sello, 2022), 63.
fourteenth century it increasingly fell into disrepair. In 1565, Philip II included the castle in a donation to the Duke of Pastrana. By the seventeenth century, the fortress largely was abandoned. Throughout its Christianate history, the castle-fortress was used by monarchs to reward loyal vassals: to Álvar Fañez at the end of the eleventh century by Alfonso the Brave; to the Order of Calatrava in 1174 by Alfonso the Noble of Castilla (Alfonso VIII); and to the Duke of Pastrana in the sixteenth century by Philip II. In cultural memory, the fortress is most known for its Calatravan period, as a home to a Catholic, crusading military order. What is so surprising is that given its rich Islamicate history, so little of this is known or told, resulting in an ignorance amongst scholars of al-Andalus not only of Zorita, but of the various sites in the Autonomous Communities of Madrid and Castilla-La Mancha that testify to the Umayyad history of the region.\footnote{Notable exceptions are the scholars discussed in Chapter One.} Much of this is due to twentieth-century understandings of the area’s history that interpreted the space as Christianate.

This Christian history is the past that Layna Serrano mourned: a time during which the fate of Zorita was tied to the military order of the Knights of Calatrava and the Asturian, Trastámaran, and Hapsburg dynasties. Yet Layna Serrano’s identification of and advocacy for Zorita as a late medieval Christianate site, while consistent with the interest in late medieval history, particularly that of Catholic military orders, in the early twentieth century, has had ramifications for the ways in which we ‘see’ the monument today. In the excerpt quoted at the beginning of this chapter, Layna Serrano identified Zorita as a ‘castle,’ although this description holds true only for its last period of occupation. From its ‘gifting’ by Philip II (r. 1556-1598) in 1565 to Ruy Gómez de Silva, Duke of Pastrana and Prince of Éboli (1516-1573), until its abandonment in the seventeenth century, the space functioned mainly as living quarters for Spanish nobility.\footnote{For a primary source reporting the deserted and ruined site, see José Arturo Salgado Pantoja, ‘La iglesia prioral de San Benito de Zorita: arquitectura y mobiliario litúrgico,’ in \textit{El Castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología}, ed. Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo (Madrid: El Tercer Sello, 2022), 111.} Thus, its life as a ‘castle’ was relatively short – only a century or so. In
comparison, from its foundation prior to 813 until the aforementioned sixteenth-century transaction, Zorita was primarily a fortress. The Andalusi history that has been told of the fortification is a story of strategic importance for both the Umayyad rulers of Córdoba and those resisting their hegemony in the ninth and tenth centuries—a role intensified in the tumultuous eleventh through thirteenth centuries as various forces fought for control of the Iberian Peninsula. Yet as discussed in the previous chapter, this military focus may be a result of historiographic filters, discussed in Chapter Two, that understood the Southern Meseta as a space of rebellion in the Umayyad period. This chapter and the one that follows suggest that its seat as home to a Catholic crusading order and the emphasis on the Christianate history of the castle-fortress also affect the ways in which Zorita’s founding and function in the eighth through tenth centuries are interpreted.

This chapter provides an overview of the Islamicate features of Zorita that, while long identified by Spanish scholars, are not well-represented in Anglophone studies of Islamic architecture and history in the Iberian Peninsula. The rich tradition of local advocacy to document and preserve the fortress by the people of Zorita de los Canes and more broadly speaking, the people of the province of Guadalajara, means that recovering the Umayyad history of Zorita is an easier task than in similar sites in the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha. While this chapter concludes by pointing to other sites that hint at substantial central investment by Córdoba in the eighth through tenth centuries in the

---

506 The term ‘castle-fortress’ reflects both the designation of the site by the Patrimonio Cultural de Castilla-La Mancha as well as the mixed history of the ways in which various peoples used this space. As discussed, at its establishment at the turn of the ninth century, the space functioned as a fortress; by the sixteenth century, the space functioned as a castle evinced in architectural additions that allowed for a different social use. My employing of ‘fortress’, ‘castle’, or ‘castle-fortress’ reflects the use at the time to which I refer—thus ‘fortress’ for the eighth through sixteenth centuries in which the space was used as a space of administration with a military function; ‘castle’ to refer to the sixteenth through twenty-first centuries, which reflects both its actual use and its perceived function in the landscape, as living quarters for elite families, particularly the Mendoza family and the Duke of Pastrana; and ‘castle-fortress’ to reflect the way that it is referred to by the Patrimonio Cultural de Castilla-La Mancha in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. For a discussion on the ways in which using the term ‘castle’ brings a feudalizing dynamic inappropriate to the cultural context of the early medieval al-Andalus, see Bazzana, Cressier, and Guichard, Les châteaux ruraux d’al-Andalus: Histoire et archéologie des ḥusūn de sud-est de l’Espagne, 22–35.
Southern Meseta, no other place offers as much evidence as Zorita. The fortress is unique in this sense: the history of the building since the eleventh century has resulted in a higher level of documentation and preservation than any of its possible ‘sister sites’. At Zorita, a constellation of factors have come together: first, the stability of its name in the written sources from the eleventh century to the present means that unlike places like Vascos (perhaps the Nafza of Chapter Two), we know exactly where to look and that descriptions have a continuity over time;507 second, the decline of Zorita de los Canes as an economic centre in the late medieval period has meant the site has not suffered from constant urban development, unlike settlements like Madrid or Cuenca; and finally, the long history of local advocacy (dating to at least 1844) has resulted in substantive documentation on desired interventions while the failure to obtain funding has minimized poorly-recorded excavations.508 It is the hope that by the end of this chapter we understand the importance of Zorita as a site, see how it is representative of a wealth of archaeological sites in the Southern Meseta that can teach us about Umayyad and Dhū al-Nūnid history, and question why and how this history became obscured.

3.1 Organization of the Chapter

This chapter starts with a brief summary of the historiography of Zorita in the secondary scholarship from the twentieth- and twenty-first centuries. As none of this literature addresses the history of the site told in Arabic chronicles, the conversation moves to cover this before continuing. This is a new contribution to scholarship. After reviewing the history of Zorita, the discussion moves to a formal analysis of the castle-fortress, paying specific attention to the features attesting to its Umayyad past. This is the first attempt in scholarship to include Zorita in current discussions on Umayyad archaeology in the Iberian Peninsula. In the past fifty years, no archaeological scholarship on Zorita has

507 For an identification of Nafza as Vascos, see Ibn Ḥayyān, Cronica del califa ‘Abdarrāḥmān III al-Nāṣir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V), 436.
been conducted by ‘arabistas’; rather those trying to make sense of the Andalusi past are doing so from outside the field. The chapter concludes with an initial attempt to define a cohort of the Umayyad fortresses in the Southern Meseta that might lend insight into the socially-constructed concept of the thaghr al-awsat.

3.2 The Historiography of the Fortress-Castle of Zorita in Academic Scholarship

The historiography of Zorita straddles two fields: history and archaeology. In terms of studies that make use of written sources, those that relate the Christianate period are more substantial than those that narrate the Islamicate period, perhaps as a result of the accessibility of the sources, not only in archives but also in terms of language. No thorough study exists on Arabic sources that focus on Zorita; the most comprehensive are the aforementioned works of Eduardo Manzano Moreno and Pascual Buresi on the thaghr al-awsat in which the fortress and the neighbouring settlement of Recópolis are treated cursorily.

Conversely, histories on the Christianate period (defined as post-twelfth century) at Zorita are fairly robust.509 In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the fame of Zorita rested on previously mentioned history as the seat of the Order of the Knights of Calatrava, one of the dominant military orders of Spain in the medieval period. Given as a royal bequest to the Calatravan knights by Alfonso the Noble of Castilla (Alfonso VIII, r. 1158-1214) in 1174, the fortress of Zorita acted as a strategic centre crucial to the expansion of Castillian rule and thus is known for its contribution to crusading history.510


510 For a note on the investment that the Francoist government made in sites related to crusading Military Orders, see López-Muñiz Moragas, ‘Abandono, ruina y restauración del castillo de Zorita de los Canes (1559-1973),’ 68.
Most of the historiography of Zorita emphasizes its role in this later period. Thus, we have detailed accounts of the role Zorita played as a home to one of the more powerful twelfth-century military orders and the careers of individual warrior-knights or Grand Masters of the Order like Ruy Días de Yanguas (r. 1207 to 1212). It is important to note that this is likely a result of the relatively sizeable corpus of primary sources that relate this particular era in the history of the fortress.

The history of Zorita in the early modern period, by which point the fortress functioned as a castle, is equally well-attested, largely due to histories on dynamic individuals circulating in the court of Philip II. In the middle of the sixteenth century, Philip II sold the fortress to his close advisor Ruy Gómez de Silva, the First Prince of Éboli, though today he is less-well known today than his intrepid wife, the Princess of Éboli, Ana de Mendoza de la Cerda y de Silva Cifuentes (1540-1592). The Princess of Éboli was a staple in Philip’s court and a good friend of his third wife, Elisabeth of Valois (1545-1568, m. 1559). A portrait of the Princess, for a time incorrectly attributed to one of Philip II’s court painters, Alonso Sanchez Coello, depicts her wearing an eyepatch due to her blindness in one eye (Figure 3.2). She has caught the imagination of artists from the sixteenth century to the present, most recently evinced in the 2010 popular Netflix series, La Princesa de Éboli. This role in popular culture might mean today she is the most recognizable historical figure associated with Zorita Castle.

The figure that looms largest in the crafting of history and advocacy for the site of Zorita is Francisco Layna Serrano (1893-1971). As Chapter Four details, Layna Serrano’s career as an advocate for the architectural history of the province of Guadalajara started as a result of the removal of the Monastery of Santa María de Óvila by William Randolph Hearst’s antiquity dealers, Mildred Stapley Byne.

---

511 Historians, including Francisco Rades y Andrada, Rafael de Ureña y Smenjaud, D. Tomás López de Vargas Machuca, Francisco Layna Serrano, Leopoldo Torres Balbás, Basilio Pavón Maldonado, Antonio Herrera Casado, Francisco Fernández Izquierdo, and Paula Ballesteros-Arias, Dionisio Urbina have discussed the role the fortress played in the region, often focusing on its experience from the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries.

512 For a list of relevant sources, see Francisco Fernández Izquierdo, ‘Documentación existente en Zorita de los Canes hasta el siglo XVIII, relativa a la Villa y a su provincia,’ Wad al-Hayara 10 (1983): 329–58.
and Arthur Byne, in the first half of the twentieth century. From 1932, with the publishing of his first work, *El monasterio de Óvila*, Layna Serrano advocated for protections for several buildings in Guadalajara, including Zorita. The fortress featured in *Castillos de Guadalajara* (1933), the aforementioned book dedicated to the site, *El castillo de Zorita de los Canes* (1934), as well as in his monograph, *La provincia de Guadalajara* (1948). In addition to writing books for public consumption, Layna Serrano backed repeated applications to both the central and provincial government to secure not only recognition but financial support to restore and preserve the site throughout his lifetime.

Layna Serrano understood the building as a Christianate achievement: his first chapter in his book dedicated to the fortress starts in the late medieval period and emphasizes its ownership by the Prince and Princess of Éboli. Though more recent scholars have challenged many of these interpretations, it is important to understand the advocacy for the site has most often revolved around its Christianate past.

Archaeologists have also written extensively on Zorita, producing more balanced studies on the history of the location. Of note are those who have either worked on restoration projects or excavated at the location: José Manuel González-Valcára in 1961; José Miguel Merino de Cáceres in 1973; Lauro Olmo Enciso in 1985; and Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez starting in 2014. However, the lack of historical investigations making use of Arabic sources and the dated nature of scholarship of the *thaghr al-awsat* has meant that those who specialize in material culture are without valuable tools that help to make accurate interpretations for the earliest period of occupation at Zorita. More work must be done on the nature of the *thughūr*, the role of North Africans in the Southern

---

513 For a note on Layna Serrano’s appointment as historian of Guadalajara as a result of his advocacy in response to Hearst’s buying of Santa María de Óvila, see Layna Serrano, *El Castillo de Zorita de Los Canes*, 10.
515 For a summary of archaeological interventions at the site, see López-Muñiz Moragas, ‘Abandono, ruina y restauración del castillo de Zorita de los Canes (1559-1973).’
Meseta, non-elite Umayyad archaeology, and the relationships between North Africans, the Umayyads, and Mediterranean trade networks in order to support archaeological interpretation.

Perhaps surprising to art historians of al-Andalus, Zorita has been researched by those with a high profile in the field. Leopoldo Torres Balbás and Basilio Pavón Maldonado both wrote on the fortress: the former a short article in 1919 titled ‘El castillo de Zorita de los Canes (Guadalajara)’; the latter in detail in Guadalajara medieval: Arte y arqueología árabe y mudéjar in 1984. Thanks to these studies we have photographic documentation of many of the features of the fortress that are no longer extant. However, neither of these works attempts to connect the material culture of Zorita outside of the province of Guadalajara. This is particularly important because modern boundaries do not reflect medieval ones. As a result, there is a lack of studies on Zorita (and the architecture of the Southern Meseta in general) as an integral part of the architecture of Umayyad al-Andalus.

In recent years there has been increasing interest, both popular and academic, in the castle, evinced in the re-release of Layna Serrano’s El castillo y fortaleza de Zorita de los Canes in 2015 by the Tourist Board of Castilla-La Mancha, the discussions of Olmo Enciso on the importance of looking to Zorita as a new Umayyad settlement in the ninth century, the recent article in El País, published on September 21, 2020, ‘Treinta monjes guerreros y un bebé’, which discusses the latest excavation of the necropolis, and Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez’s edited volume, El castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología, dedicated to the castle-fortress of Zorita published in January 2022. As Olmo Enciso argues in his recent article, ‘Espacios de poder en Recópolis en las épocas visigoda y primitiva andalusí (S. VI-IX d. C.’, Zorita castle demands attention as its founding at the beginning of the ninth century makes it one of a handful of new settlements in the Southern Meseta which can speak to the Umayyad conquest of the area. To date, however, no study mentioned above has undertaken any source-critical work regarding the Arabic chronicles in which Zorita is mentioned. Thus, before moving on to the modern historiography of the fortress, I pause to highlight the mentions of Zorita in Ibn
Ḥayyān (987-1076) and al-Idrīsī (1100-1165) and point to some of the problems that occur when considering these entries outside of the larger context of their works. This discussion demonstrates how much work textual historians must do to support the archaeological work being done.

3.3 References to Zorita in the Arabic Chronicles

To date, no account of the history of the fortress of Zorita has made appropriate use of the Arabic textual sources. At best, accounts are uncritical, at worst, contain factual errors. Any work hoping to relate a more accurate history must account for the triangular relations of the Dhū al-Nūn with both the centralized powers in Córdoba and the near-constant rebellious city of Toledo, a study whose size might mandate its own monograph. As discussed in the previous chapter, no contemporary sources relate the fortification’s founding or its Umayyad history. The earliest mentions of the fortress come in the eleventh century in Ibn Ḥayyān’s Muqtabis, of which sections of four volumes are extant. However, the notes on Zorita come in such confusing circumstances that it is hard to accept almost anything except the dates and people involved. Future studies must refrain from judgement on the motivations, loyalty, and relationships of actors until thorough source-critical examinations of extant texts can reconstruct the larger historical and biographical context for the places and peoples featured. Ibn Ḥayyān presents Zorita in a context of rebellion, mainly because for him it is tied to the family of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn, of whom he maintains a decidedly low opinion for a family that he regularly reports acts in interests that align with those of the Umayyads.

516 For an extensive list of primary sources relating to Zorita, see Fernández Izquierdo, ‘Documentación existente en Zorita de los Canes hasta el siglo XVIII, relativa a la Villa y a su provincia.’ This only references Latin sources and with the exception of mention of a lost source dating to maybe the eighth century, the documentation begins in the thirteenth century.

517 For incorrect dating of Arabic sources, see Daza Pardo, ‘Apuntos para una propuesta de evolución constructivo del castillo de Zorita de los Canes,’ 83.
3.3a Zorita in Ibn Ḥayyān’s Muqtabis

Presented here are the few mentions in Ibn Ḥayyān’s Muqtabis, which demonstrate that by the eleventh century the history of the tenth century in the Southern Meseta is convoluted. Zorita is discussed four times in the Muqtabis, once in Volume II and three times in Volume V. The first mention comes in a passage in the second volume of Ibn Ḥayyān which, as edited by Makki, reports that in the year 813:

و فيها خرج الحالج(ب) عبد الكريم بن عبد الواحد بن مغيث إلى سرية للإصلاح بين البربر فراسله اهل طليطلة داعين إلى الطاعة فأمنهم وقبض رهنهم و ولا عليهم أختهم(م) احمد بن عبد الواحد بن مغيث فدخلوه إليهم وأظهروا الا نابة إلى الطاعة من غير صحة عقد استروحا

It is of note that the Arabic manuscript contains several errors in these few lines and it is clear that the copyist either has no idea how this passage should be in Arabic or has not realized how many careless errors were made (Figure 3.3). This makes the work of both asserting the original Arabic, editing, and translating it difficult. While for following passages I do not provide Spanish translations in-text, I do here largely because of the ways in which the Spanish translation (not the Arabic) has been interpreted by scholars working on the thughūr. María Jesús Viguera Molins and Federico Corriente translated this as follows:


518 This has been prepared from 101 verso of the facsimile of the manuscript. See Ibn Ḥayyān, Muqtabis II: Anales de los emires de Córdoba Alhaquém I (180-206 H. / 796-822 J.C.) y Aberrahmán II (206-232 / 822-847), 28. I have preserved words that may not be spelt the same way to stay as close as possible to the copy. My interpolations to make the words legible in Arabic are in parentheses. I keep the errors to show the poor copy from which all scholars are working. Ibn Hayyān, Muqtabis II: Anales de los emires de Córdoba Alhaquém I (180-206 H. / 796-822 J.C.) y Aberrahmán II (206-232 / 822-847), 28; For a particularly tricky last line, I have consulted Ibn Ḥayyān, Al-Sifr Al-Thānī Min Kitāb Al-Muqtabas, ed. Maḥmūd ‘Alī Makkī, al-Ṭabʻah: 1 (al-Ｒiyāḍ: Markaz al-Malik Fayṣal lil-Buhūth wa-al-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyah, 2003), 135. Transliteration: ‘wa fīhā kharaja al-ḥājib ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Mughīth ilā Surīta l-islām bayna al-barābar farāsahahu ahl Ṭulaỳtula dā in ilā al-tā’a fa-amanahum wa qabiḍ rahnahum walā ‘alayhum akhāhu Ahmad ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Mughīth fa-adhkalāhu līayhum wa azharū al-ināba ilā al-tā’a min ghayr saḥa ‘aqada istirwahan minhum ‘alā yaktasibuna bihā qawā’. 519 I am indebted to Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila and Umberto Bongianino for their kindness in reviewing this convoluted passage with me.
propuestas de sumisión: él les dio el amán y puso a su frente a su hermano Aḥmad b. 'Abdalwāḥid b. Muğīṯ, a quien recibieron, manifestando su retorno a la obediencia sin la firmeza de un pacto, confiados en una mansedumbre (por parte del poder central) que les daba fuerza (para nuevas rebeliones).520

Of note is that in 813, no centralized position in the Córdoban administration oversees Zorita. Rather, the Umayyad ruler, al-Ḥakam ibn Hishām (r. 796-822) sends his ḥājib to deal with the matter on his behalf. While it was common for an Umayyad ḥājib to have an army at his disposal, it is of note that this selection does not have an overtly military characteristic. This passage emphasizes the nature of treaties rather than military force. As seen in Chapter Two, Ibn al-Qūṭiyya details the presence of a ṣāḥib of the thughūr by 862. With so little sources it is difficult to make something of this information, though there seem to be three likely deductions: first, that the administrative overhaul completed under the rule of 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥakam (r. 822-852) resulted in the creation of official administrative unit(s) of thaghr/thughūr with a titled position of ṣāḥib; second, that the need for the position of ṣāḥib of the thughūr suggests that a substantial number of people lived in this region and that these populations had a formal relationship with Córdoba; and third, 813, in which an Umayyad amir sends his ḥājib to treat with (not to fight) the peoples of the Southern Meseta, might represent the beginning of this territory’s more formal incorporation into the Umayyad administration of the Iberian Peninsula. This last point challenges traditional interpretations that assume that a full ‘conquest’ happened immediately in the aftermath of the arrival of Umayyad troops in 711 and that everything that ensued was the Umayyads trying to stem rebellions from previously conquered territory. This passage, in conjunction with the information from Ibn al-Qūṭiyya, suggests that the ninth century was one not of rebellion and contraction for the Umayyad state, but rather one of expansion and consolidation.

520 Ibn Hayyān, Cronica del califa ‘Abdarrāḥmān III al-Nāṣir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V), 51
Translation: ‘According to Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Rāzī: In the year 813, the chamberlain, ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Mughīth left for Zorita to reconcile the Berbers. The Toledans wrote to him with submission proposals: he gave them the amān and put his brother Ahmad ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Mughīth in charge of them. He received them, manifesting their return to obedience without the firmness of a pact, confident in their meekness (on the part of the central power) that gave them strength (for new rebellions)’. This translation makes use of the Spanish as well, given the illegibility of the Arabic manuscript. This last portion is quite unclear.
The Arabic clearly states that ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Mughīth is sent to ‘reconcile the Berbers’. However, in using the Spanish translation, both Torres Balbás and Pavón Maldonado asserted this was a rebellion of the people of Zorita against Córdoba.\textsuperscript{521} It is important to note that in the original Arabic, the treaty negotiated by ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Mughīth is clearly \textit{between} the ‘Berbers’ \textit{(bayna al-barābar)}, not between the people of Zorita, the affiliation of which is unknown, though the contemporary sources reviewed in Chapter Two suggest it was settled by members of the Hawwāra and Madyūna, and Córdoba, which was undoubtedly ‘Arab’. Thus, the Spanish translation allows for a wider reading not possible in the Arabic. A rebellion of the people of Zorita against Córdoban rule would not be framed as an ‘inter-Berber’ conflict. Any interpretation of this passage as evidence of a ‘Berber’ rebellion against Córdoba presupposes a cultural context in which Córdoba demanded peace between ‘Berbers’ and in breaking a truce, ‘Berbers’ became disloyal. While possible, this interpretation brings unstated assumptions that are extraneous to the text. It is best to stick as close as possible to the source.

What this passage shows is that Zorita is a site of arbitration. The phrase ‘\textit{bayna al-barābar}’ suggests that one conflict is an ‘inter-Berber’ dispute (there is not enough information to suggest that this is intertribal) and this conflict is one that Córdoba has an interest in resolving. Zorita is also the place in which ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Mughīth receives supplications from the city of Toledo, which is in rebellion (something we know because they ‘return to obedience’ implying they were disobedient). Thus, Zorita is a site in which the \textit{ḥājib} (like with his army) uses as an administrative base to mediate conflict in the region. This passage refers to treaties and negotiation more than military force. The text suggests that Zorita is the place that everyone gathers to resolve conflict, not a place that itself is in rebellion against the Umayyad ruler.

\textsuperscript{521} Torres Balbás asserts it is this passage that shows Zorita is in rebellion in ‘El castillo de Zorita de los Canes (Guadalajara),’ 97; Pavón Maldonado assert that Zorita is a seat of rebels against Córdoba in \textit{Guadalajara medieval arte y arqueología árabe y mudejar}, 185. Though it is unclear from where he generates this assertion, given the available texts it seems this description is the most likely candidate.
In these lines, the only clear rebellion against Córdoba is from the people of Toledo. It is important to note that in the written sources, Toledo was never a ‘Berber’ stronghold. Rather the population was Christian, and rebellions were led by members of the Arab elite, notably the Fihrī family in the last half of the eighth century. It seems extremely unlikely then that the ‘inter-Berber’ dispute was one between the North Africans of the region and Toledo. Thus, the relationship between Zorita and Toledo is unclear. Zorita could either be an impartial seat that is involved first in negotiating an arrangement between the North Africans of the area, then charged with a separate task of bringing the peoples of Toledo back into submission, or Zorita could be the place from which peoples were attacking Toledo, bringing about the need for a negotiated truce with the city. In addition, asserting that Zorita is in the hands of North Africans is speculative (this information is not in the text; it is only in Ibn Qūṭiyya that demographic information in the region is provided). Rather, the text shows only that Zorita is recognized as representative of or tied to Umayyad administration in a way that several groups recognize it as a place of arbitration, not a place featured in a dispute. However, unlike in past scholarship, we cannot interpret this to mean that the peoples of Zorita are in rebellion against Córdoba without making assumptions not present in the text; to do so changes the dynamics that Ibn Ḥayyān is reporting. All that can be said is that Zorita hosts a negotiation, and as a result either could be involved in the dispute or could be a third party. Zorita, while in an entry that later mentions Toledo, does not seem to have a direct relationship with the city, other than being in proximity to it.

The second time Ibn Ḥayyān discusses Zorita is in a longer episode in 926 in which he relates ‘The Campaign of Zorita’. The entire text of the entry is related here, as edited by Chalmeta:

فيها ألغى التناصر لدين الله فرّوا به الصوانف، ولم يغن له فيها بنفسه حركة، لمحل كان فيها، وفخّش شديد، فألغى الوزير القادع الحميد بن يبيل إلى النفر الأعلى الذي فيه بنو ذي اللون، وهم منصورون على الخلاف، مستنصرون في الفساد في الأرض والاستطالة على من جاورهم من المسلمين وأهل النضمة، فوقع بيني ذي اللون، وقتل منهم من استحق القتل، وقتل كبيرهم محمد بن محمد ذي اللون، وعده من رجالهم، وأداخ بلدهم شتة بريدة، وفتح منه مدينة سرية، فدخلها وولاؤها عاملاً للسلطان، ففرق أهلها ما كانوا عليه من الخلفان، فذرت جلابة شتة بريدة من لذ ذلك الوقت، وسارت بسيب سائر الكور الفتحاحية إلى الطاعة.
y los castigó, quedando la región enderezada con su acción' in Ibn Hayyán, al-Muqtabis, ed. Pedro Chalmeta, Federico Corriente, and M. Subh (Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Arabe de Cultura, 1979), 203–4. English Translation: 'In this year [314/926] al-Nāṣir li-dīn Allāh sent his army with 'Abdal Ḥamīd ibn Basīl against the Banū Dhī l-Nūn and took Zorita, and after the capture of this place the Banū Dhī l-Nūn were; and they persisted in their disagreement, clear in their disobedience. They multiplied the corruption in the land and oppressed both their Muslims allies and those who were protected (dhimma). So al-Hamīd ibn Basīl attacked the Banū Dhī l-Nūn and he killed those of them who deserved to be killed, including their leader, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Dhī l-Nūn and several of his men. And he subjugated their country of Santabariyya and he conquered the city of Zorita, and entered it and put in charge a governor (āmil) of the Umayyads (al-sulṭān) separating its people from their disloyalty. From then on the collection (jibāya) of Santabariyya was abundant and Santabariyya followed the other provinces (kuwar) in their obedience. The incident between 'Abd al-Hamīd ibn Basīl and the Banū Dhī l-Nūn was in muḥarram of this year [314/926]. The Banū Dhī l-Nūn had schemed against Khalaf ibn 'Abdūs, known as Ibn Qaṭīn, commander (ṣāḥib) of Zorita, and they took him prisoner, hoping to take possession of the fortress. Then they killed him while he was in their custody. So his sister took the fortress and defended it against the Banū Dhī l-Nūn. And she addressed al-Nāṣir li-dīn Allāh and asked him to come there. So he sent the army with Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Basīl against the Banū Dhī l-Nūn. Abd al-Hamīd ibn Basīl attacked the Banū Dhī l-Nūn and took Zorita, and after the castigation of the Banū Dhī l-Nūn through him, all things remained right.'; Spanish translation: ‘En este año, an-Nāṣir mandó con las acefas a sus caídos, sin moverse él personalmente, a causa de la escasez y gran sequía que hubo; así pues, envió al visir y caíd 'Abdalhamiđ b. Basīl a la Marca Superior, donde los Banū Dī n-Nūn se obstinaban en la disidencia y clara desobediencia, multiplicando su maldad y atreviéndose contra los musulmanes y jímmites vecinos, de modo que hubo de derrotarlos y matar a quien lo merecía, como fue el caso de su jefe, Muhammad b. Muhammad Dī n-Nūn y algunos de sus hombres. En país de Santaver fue castigado, y tomada la ciudad de Zorita, donde 'Abdalhamiđ entró y nombró un gobernador del sultán, dejando la población su anterior rebeldía, pues desde entonces se percibió regularmente el tributo de Santaver, comportándose como las demás coras sometidas a la obediencia. El combate de 'Abdalhamiđ b. Basīl con los Banū Dī n-Nūn tuvo lugar en muḥarram (19 marzo – 17 abril 926), tras haber engañado éstos al gobernador de Zorita, Jalaf b. 'Abdūs, conocido por Ibn Qaṭin, cogiéndole prisionero con la esperanza de apoderarse de la fortaleza y matándole en prisión, pero su hermano se hizo con está y se defendió de ellos, dirigiéndose a an-Nāṣir en petición de ayuda: fue entonces cuando mandó el ejército con 'Abdalhamiđ b. Basīl contra los Banū Dī n-Nūn, el cual los derrotó, se hizo con Zorita, y los castigó, quedando la región enderezada con su acción’ in Ibn Hayyán, Cronica del califa 'Abdarrahmān III al-Nāṣir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V), 157.
This is the longest passage that exists on Zorita in Arabic chronicles, yet few have taken the time to critically engage with it. Leaving aside the relationship with the Dhū al-Nūnids for a moment, there is valuable information in this text. First of all, we learn that Zorita is in the hands of a governor (sāhib), implying a relationship with a power who could appoint this position. Secondly, when challenged, the sister of the governor writes to Córdoba, implying she had some expectation of receiving help. This is of note given the discussion in Chapter Two that in the tenth century it seemed the peoples of the Southern Meseta had a stronger relationship with the dynastic capital than with geographically closer cities, like Toledo. It is also important to note that Zorita is not considered part of Dhū al-Nūnid territory, but rather a location conquered by them. The relationship to Santaver is unclear. It is possible that Zorita is a city in Santaver; it is also possible that the battle between Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Dhī al-Nūn and the Córdoban army took place in Santaver, then upon the former’s defeat, the forces of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Basīl proceeded to Zorita. Finally, it is of note that the term used to describe Zorita is madīna, not qal’a, qaṣr or ḥiṣn. Zorita is said to contain a ḥiṣn, yet its primary identification is not as a military fortification. Like before, in this passage Zorita is portrayed primarily as a city of administration (which in the early medieval period would have included a fortified area).

This text unequivocally states that the Dhū al-Nūnids are disobedient. However, interpreting the Dhū al-Nūnids as rebels in conjunction with Zorita might be an effect of past approaches that used indexes to find isolated mentions of locations. Context is everything. It is important that in the Muqtabis V, this story comes on the heels of a substantial number of members of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn being caught and imprisoned by Sancho (Sancho I, r. 905-925), King of Pamplona, after the Battle of Viguera. Recounted in the Muqtabis, in 923 the forces of the Navarese monarch clashed with the Dhū al-Nūnids, who were allied with the Banū Qasī, resulting in not only a defeat for the Umayyad forces, but also the

---

523 It is important to note that in the Muqtabis it is common to refer to the sāhib al-thaghr or sāhib al-thughūr which is typically translated as governor.
capturing and imprisonment of Muṭarrif ibn Mūsā ibn Dhī al-Nūn, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Dhī al-Nūn, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Dhī al-Nūn, and Yaḥyā ibn Faṭḥ ibn Dhī al-Nūn in Pamplona. In this battle, it was the Navarese who attacked the Banū Qasī’s stronghold at Viguera and the Dhū al-Nūnids responded to support the Banū Qasī. With this context, the Dhū al-Nūnids look less like uncontrolled rebels, and more like the loyal Umayyad retainers of Chapter Two who repeatedly fought against Christianate forces in the thaghr al-ʿaʿlā. The loss at Viguera stirs ʿAbd al- Raḥmān al-Nāṣir to action: 924 finds the amir campaigning in Pamplona.

There is no immediate resolution to the story of the Dhū al-Nūnids held captive in Pamplona (other than we know at some point Muṭarrif ibn Mūsā ibn Dhī al-Nūn escapes)—the reader must wait until notices in the year 933 to find out that after ten years, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir negotiates with his aunt, Queen Tota (r. 931-934), for their release.525 It is important to consider that perhaps there are more complex dynamics at work between the Dhū al-Nūnids and the central authorities in Córdoba than what might appear if we only sample quotes about Zorita. After all, it is reasonable to think that during the period Córdoba did not act to ransom Dhū al-Nūnid hostages, that those members of the family still in power might not feel keenly about cooperating with Córdoba. Additionally, there is confusion as to where Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Dhī al-Nūn actually is. According to Ibn Ḥayyān, in the year 926/7 he is equally a hostage of Sancho of Pamplona and while simultaneously campaigning against the peoples of Santaver.

The focus of this study is Zorita, and not the family of the Dhū al-Nūn, and while much more work remains to be done on the rise of the family and their relationships with Córdoba and Toledo, collating the available sources we might summarize them as a rising power that generally supports

524 For the account of the the campaign of Viguera, see Ibn Ḥayyān, Cronica del califa ʿAbdarraḥmān III al-Nāṣir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V), 145–5.
525 See Ibn Ḥayyān, 252; For more on the complex relationship between Navarre and Córdoba, especially the powerful Queen Tota, see Claire Anderson, ‘Sign of the Cross: Contexts for the Ivory Cross of San Millán de La Cogolla,’ Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies 6, no. 1 (2014): 15–41.
Umayyad interests. At times it appears they are too successful in bringing enemies to heel, and as a result pose a threat to what Ibn Hayyān sees as Umayyad hegemony in the region. It is possible to read Ibn Hayyān and see the Dhū al-Nūnids as loyal Umayyad partisans who are treated particularly poorly by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir. Whatever the reality, the reign of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir marks a break in the relationship between the peoples of the Southern Meseta and the central government in Córdoba. It is only after the relations between the Umayyads and the Dhū al-Nūnids turn sour that there are mentions of a rebellious thaghr al-awsat.\textsuperscript{526} If the previous passage in Ibn Hayyān suggested that the ninth century was one of Umayyad growth in the region, this second passage gives the impression that the tenth century, specifically the advent of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir’s rule, initiates a breakdown in the relationship between Córdoba and the peoples of the Southern Meseta. It is important to keep these dynamics in mind when reading in isolation the passage on Zorita related above.

Finally, the mention of the dhimmi community in the region who are subject to the ‘oppression’ of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn is curious. A few readings are possible. First, the emphasis on financial considerations and the collection of the jibāya immediately after the line about the oppression of the dhimmi might suggest that the Banū Dhū al-Nūn were disobedient because they were not forwarding the appropriate taxes to the central government in Córdoba. Situationally, this would make sense as the passage starts discussing the widespread drought and famine at the time, in which local actors would likely have more motivation to keep tax-in-kind. Secondly, it is possible that given the Navarese still held members of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn hostage, the family may have been consolidating both money and

\textsuperscript{526} The first use of the term ‘thaghr al-awsat’ in any Arabic chronicle appears in an entry in the year 936. It is important to note that earlier in the year, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir had replaced al-Fath ibn Yahya ibn Fath ibn Dhū al-Nūn as governor of Santaver with Salama ibn Ahmad. It is worth considering that the creation of a rebellious thaghr al-awsat is a direct result of poor politics on the part of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir. In trying to unseat a regional power whom his predecessors had depended on to act as support troops in the fight against the Christianate Kingdoms in the north of the Peninsula, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir may have created political dynamics that ultimately led to the region’s distancing from Córdoba. See Ibn Hayyān, \textit{Cronica del califa ‘Abdarrahmān III al-Nāṣir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V)}, 293–95.
goods to try and ransom captives on their own. Dealing directly with the Navarese would have been seen as treasonous. Second, the passage could suggest that the family of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn (Hawwāra) were not the original conquerors of Zorita or the region, as in this passage they are seen as interlopers. This might suggest that the original tribal affiliation of those who conquered Recópolis and then founded Zorita were the Madyūna, rather than the Hawwāra. Regardless, this brief reference to an existing dhimmi community implies that at the time of its fatḥ, the peoples of the region came into a contractual relationship with Córdoba. The fact that at no point before 926 do we have any mention of the peoples of Zorita not paying their taxes, in a historical genre in which such facts are often recorded, suggests that up until this point there had been no problem of this sort. The third notice about Zorita occurs in the year 930/1 and reports:

Transliteration: ‘. . . min hawlihā aqṣā balad kūrat Shantabariyya, al-mujāwira li-‘amal al-sahla, madīnat Shant Mariyya, bilād Bani Razīn, ‘alā masāfat mi‘a wa-thalāthīn mi‘lān min madīnat Ṭulaṭyula, wa-fīmā bayna mashāriq al-i‘tīdāl wa l-sayf minhā, thumma yaqrub min ḥuṣūn Surīta, ‘alā nahw sittīn mi‘lān min Ṭulaṭyula, fatadghaṭṭuhu hunālik jibāl ilā madīq yusammā Q. lār.q bayna jaba layn fa-taṣīr sa‘atuḥu hunālik nahwa sab‘at adhrū, wa-‘umquhu mā lā ya‘lamuhu illā Allāh . . .’ in Ibn Ḥayyān, al-Muqtabis, 278-9. English Translation: ‘. . . around it the furthest part of the province (kūra) of Santaver, neighbouring the area ruled of the Sahla, the city of Santa María, the country of the Banū Razīn, at a distance of 130 miles from the city of Toledo, and it (the Tajo), between the east of the equinox and the summer (?). Then it (the Tajo) passes close to the fortresses (ḥuṣūn) of Zorita, and continuing on sixty miles from Toledo, there it (the Tajo) is squeezed by mountains into a narrow gorge called Q. lār.q, which is between two mountains; its width there is about seven cubits across, and its depth only God knows.’ The phrase ‘between the east of the equinox and the summer’ is admittedly confusing and an alternate reading would be welcome. It is important to see, however, that in the Spanish translation offered below, this phrase is skipped; Spanish Translation: Así . . . a su alrededor la parte más extrema de la cora de Santaver, vecina al distrito de as-Sahla, la ciudad de Santa María en el país de los Banū Razīn, a ciento treinta millas de Toledo, y luego sigue acercándose a las fortalezas de Zorita, a unas sesenta millas de Toledo, encarajándolo allí los montes en una garganta llamada Q. lār.q, donde su anchura es sólo 7 brazas y la profundidad sólo Dios sabe, arrojándose entre aquellos dos montes a impresionante profundidad y produciendo su descenso tremendo ruido que se oye desde lejos.’ Ibn Ḥayyān, Cronica del califa ‘Abdarrāḥmān III al-Nāṣir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V), 211.

---

527 Transliteration: ‘. . . min hawlihā aqṣā balad kūrat Shantabariyya, al-mujāwira li-‘amal al-sahla, madīnat Shant Mariyya, bilād Bani Razīn, ‘alā masāfat mi‘a wa-thalāthīn mi‘lān min madīnat Ṭulaṭyula, wa-fīmā bayna mashāriq al-i‘tīdāl wa l-sayf minhā, thumma yaqrub min ḥuṣūn Surīta, ‘alā nahw sittīn mi‘lān min Ṭulaṭyula, fatadghaṭṭuhu hunālik jibāl ilā madīq yusammā Q. lār.q bayna jaba layn fa-taṣīr sa‘atuḥu hunālik nahwa sab‘at adhrū, wa-‘umquhu mā lā ya‘lamuhu illā Allāh . . .’
Though the information related to Zorita is mainly geographic (we know it is approximately halfway between the source of the Tajo and Toledo), it is curious that in this description Zorita is not only a fortress (ḥiṣn), but it has fortresses (ḥuṣūn). None of the other written sources suggest any comparanda and the use of the plural instead of the dual in Arabic suggests the author means more than just a fortress at Zorita and one at Recópolis. If we interpret the passage this way, the question becomes: what are these other sister forts of Zorita? Another possible reading of ḥuṣūn might suggest the multiple towers of Zorita itself.\(^{528}\) This explanation would suggest that Zorita was a substantial fortified location in the region. However, without more information it is difficult to assert what Ibn Ḥayyān might mean here.

The fourth and final notice in Ibn Ḥayyān’s *Muqtabis* about Zorita comes in the year 936. At the end of most years in his annalistic chronicle, Ibn Ḥayyān reports on the administrative changes in the government. This last notice is brief, it reads:

إِبْرَاهِیْمُ بِن إِسْحَاقَ عَن مَدِینَةٍ سُرتَةٍ بِیَحْیَیٍ بِنْ أَصْبَقْ

Nothing concrete can be said other than the people and the dates, although it is interesting to consider that we might be looking at the appointment of a governor of Jewish descent to the city given his name, Ibrāhīm ibn Isḥāq. Once again it is of note that we have Zorita the city (*madīna*), which is the seat of an administrative position.

Taken together, these notices in Ibn Hayyān show that while Zorita served as a site of interest for the Dhū al-Ḥuṣnids around the first quarter of the tenth century, at no point in the text did they administer it. It seems to be a site of negotiation which is primarily used to advance the interests of

\(^{528}\) I am indebted to Mariam Rosser-Owen for suggesting this interpretation.

Córdoba. Indeed, the relationship with Córdoba may have made it a good target for any force wishing to negotiate with the Umayyads. The city seems to hold a liminal position between an undefined area and Santaver, which is located immediately to its east. Finally, it is curious that in two of the four entries in Ibn Ḥayyān Zorita seems to have a relationship to dhimmi. As discussed earlier, this description of Zorita as a place of convivencia is common in the late medieval sources, and it is significant to note that this reputation may have long preceded later mentions.

3.3b Zorita in al-Idrīsī’s Kitāb nuzhat al-mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-āfāq

al-Idrīsī lived in the twelfth century and as such his text, the Kitāb nuzhat al-mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-āfāq, reflects a very different understanding of al-Andalus from those writers from the Umayyad period. Not only did al-Idrīsī live in a time of stronger written polemics, but the twelfth century witnessed dramatic changes in the role of the Southern Meseta in the Iberian Peninsula. The Kitāb nuzhat al-mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-āfāq refers to Zorita twice. Neither reference should be understood as historically relating to the Umayyad period but rather as representative of Zorita in the twelfth century as the Asturians, Almoravids, and Almohads contested the region.

The first time al-Idrīsī writes on Zorita he informs the reader that it is located in the province of Walaja along with the sites of Fita and Calatrava. The second reference states that

و من شقرة إلى مدينة سرتة مرحلتان كبيرة و هي مدينة متوسطة القدر حسنة البقعة كثيرة الخصب و بالمقربة منها حصن

530 This challenges the assertion that the Dhū al-Nūn are ‘established in Zorita of Santaver’ as argued by Manuel Acién Almansa and Eduardo Manzano Moreno, ‘Organización social y administración política en Al-Ándalus bajo el emirato,’ Territorio, Sociedad y Poder, Anejo 2 (2009): 338.


532 Transliteration: ‘wa-min shaqūra ilā madīnat Surita marhalatān kabiratān wa hiya madīna mutawassīṭat al-qadr ḥasanat al-bu’qa kathirat al-khisb wa bi-l-maqruba minhā hiṣn ... wa min hiṣn ... ilā Tulaytula marhalatān’ in al-Idrīsī, Kitāb nuzhat al-mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-āfāq (Description de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne), trans. Reinhard Dozy and M.J. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1866), 239. English Translation: ‘and from Segura to Zorita, two long stages, and Zorita is a medium-sized city of beautiful location with great fertility, and close to it is hiṣn ... and from hiṣn ... to Toledo, two stages’; French Translation in text, ‘de Segura à Sorita, ville de moyenne grandeur, dont le territoire est beau et fertile, 2 journées. Dans le voisinage se trouve le fort de Fita’. It is of note that the original Arabic manuscript is inscrutable where the word ‘Fita’ has been ascribed by Dozy and de Goeje. The annotation to the
These are the first mentions we have of named sites specifically related to Zorita. Again, however, the Arabic sources attest to the size and productivity of the site, suggesting that this was well-established prior to the Christianate period. Aside from Ibn Ḥayyān’s description of the site as a city, this is the first economic information related about Zorita. However, al-Idrīsī’s account mainly demonstrates that texts often relate circumstances relevant to the times and cultural circumstances relevant to the author. al-Idrīsī should not be used to reconstruct administrative divisions or establish cohorts of sites from the Umayyad period. Calatrava la Vieja is another site that was founded in the Umayyad period and known to Arabic chroniclers in the tenth and eleventh centuries. At no point in these centuries was Calatrava mentioned as being a part of the thaghr al-awsat or in conjunction with any location in the Southern Meseta. The Kitāb nuzhat al-mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-ʾāfāq demonstrates how space was conceived of and configured in the Almoravid and Almohad period, not earlier. This cautions that any references in later Arabic sources to the region (and certainly references that suggest Calatrava la Vieja and Fita might act in constellation with Zorita) likely reflect post-Umayyad realities.

The history of the castle-fortress of Zorita is rich, especially between the ninth and thirteenth centuries in which the site served as a major site of contestation of power in the Iberian Peninsula. Established by the beginning of the ninth century, Zorita is one of the few, ex-novo locations constructed under Umayyad rule. As such the site has much to tell us about life in the centre of the Iberian Peninsula, especially in the Islamicate period, yet to date has been little explored. Yet given the testimony of structures visible to the naked eye that demonstrates the Islamicate presence in the area, coupled with the rich findings of excavations at the nearby Visigothic site of Recópolis (f. 578 CE) dating

---

original Arabic text gives several options: qīta, qīta, and qīna have all been suggested as alternative readings. We are best not to assume, as the French translation does, that there is a definitive place named ‘Fita’.
to Islamicate rule in the eighth and ninth centuries, one would expect more scholarly attention, especially from historians of early Islam. 533

3.4 Situating the Castle-Fortress of Zorita in the Landscape: The Role of Water

No conclusive evidence explains why at the turn of the ninth century, the people of Recópolis largely abandoned the site in favour of a new foundation at Zorita. A bird’s-eye view of the landscape situates Zorita in relation to the surrounding topographical features, specifically the fluvial and mountainous networks of the space (Figure 3.4). Although difficult to observe due to the tree canopy, the Tajo River lies approximately 90 metres (300 feet) from Zorita, lapping the bottom of the hill on which the fortification stands. The green vegetation shown in Figure 3.4, borders the banks of the river, traced in dark blue, and a smaller tributary, the Badujo, outlined by the thinner light blue line. As seen on the map, Recópolis is still located quite close to the river, though its slightly further distance from a water source might speak to one reason why, at the turn of the ninth century, the fortress of Zorita was established. Though it is tempting to think that perhaps changing environmental conditions such as erosion or flooding meant that originally Recópolis’ location lay closer to water, the presence of the Roman and Visigothic road which runs along the south bank of the river and is outlined in red, the foundation of the Roman bridge, and the walls that surround Zorita de los Canes that date to the Andalusi period, show that the course of the Tajo has not changed drastically since the Visigothic period (Figures 3.5, 3.6). 534 Therefore, while Recópolis lay close to the Tajo, in choosing places to build, both on

533 Martínez Jiménez, Sastre de Diego, and Tejerizo García, The Iberian Peninsula between 300 and 850: An Archaeological Perspective, 144.

534 For discussions on the location and dating of the bridge, see Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo, eds., El castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología (Madrid: El Tercer Sello, 2022); Basilio Pavón Maldonado, Guadalajara medieval arte y arqueología árabe y mudejar (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas Instituto Miguel Asín, 1984), 188–89; Dionisio Urbina Martínez, Proyecto de Actuación Arqueológica En Las Murallas y Castillo de Zorita de Los Canes (Guadalajara). 2014,’ Solicitud Permiso de Actuación Arqueológica (Zorita de Los Canes, Guadalajara, December 23, 2014); Francisco Fernández Izquierdo, Ángeles Yuste Martínez, and Porfiro Sanz Camañas, La provincia de Almonacid de Zorita en el siglo XVI: Recuperación de una historia viva de la administración local en la edad moderna, Biblioteca de Historia 46 (Madrid: Instituto de Historia Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Comarsur, 2001), I. 245. This page details a description of the bridge of Zorita de los Canes in a sixteenth century text from a ‘visita,’ or report offered to the monarchs.
the northern slope adjacent to the walls of Recópolis and at the village of Zorita de los Canes, the inhabitants in the Umayyad period prioritized a move towards water, specifically towards running water.535

Such a move would be in keeping with other archaeological sites in the Iberian Peninsula in which North African settlers under Umayyad rule prioritized proximity to water. In choosing to construct the fortress of Zorita on top of this particular rocky outcrop, the builders moved substantially closer not only to the Tajo, but also to the previously mentioned smaller, yet additional, water source, the Badujo, that borders the fortress to the north and east. As Magdalena Valor and J. Avelino Gutiérrez point out, this corresponds to an Andalusi pattern of locating sites on high plateaus surrounded by water, as evinced in the cities of Albarracín, Ronda, Cuenca, and Toledo.536 It is perhaps not coincidental that of the four cities identified by Valor and Gutiérrez, two are located in the province of Castilla-La Mancha. In addition to the sites studied by Valor and Gutiérrez, Eduardo Jiménez Rayado discusses the initial choice of North African settlers in the ninth century to establish Mayrit, the ex novo site that became Madrid, on ‘two hills positioned in a north-south access, separated by a creek which formed a valley of at least four natural springs.’537 It seems there was a clear preference for multiple water sources over one.

regarding the previous holdings of the Military Orders. The document relates ‘el puente que cruzaba el río desde la conquista en el siglo XI, mantenido por el Común, y sobre el que el comendador de Zorita cobraba pontaje, se conservaba todavía en buen estado en 1541.’ Translation: The bridge that crosses the river, since the conquest [of Zorita de los Canes] in the 11th century, has been maintained by the Commune, and for which the Commander of Zorita charged a bridge tax, was in good condition in 1541.’ From this text, we can tell that the bridge existed prior to the Asturian conquest of the region; For the assertion that ‘walls in medieval Islamic cities were generally fixed and not removed when the population expanded beyond their perimeters’, see D. Fairchild Ruggles, Gardens, Landscape, and Vision in the Palaces of Islamic Spain (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 49.

535 It is possible that running water played an important part in relocating due to Islamic law. For discussions on the seven types of water permissible to drink in Islamic law, see Hillenbrand, ‘Gardens beneath Which Rivers Flow: The Significance of Water in Classical Islamic Culture,’ 39.


Not only do the other North African settlements in the region suggest a propensity for high places with access to numerous water sources, but all show logical decision-making for a society that historically relied on water carriers to bring water from creeks and springs to sites rather than more monumental constructions.\textsuperscript{538} Seen from North African eyes, Recópolis’s distance from the Tajo was an inconvenience, even if the aqueduct that had been built with the founding of the city was still in operation when the Umayyad troops arrived. The decision of North Africans to settle on the steep northern slope outside the city walls of Recópolis prior to the founding of Zorita makes sense in this light.\textsuperscript{539} It is difficult to see what the physical advantage of a rocky hill outside the city walls of Recópolis would be if not for the proximity to the water source.

In her study on water systems in rural Granada, María Aurora Molina Fajardo highlighted the importance of considering geography, ecosystems, and the socio-cultural environment to underscore choices that people made in planning settlements.\textsuperscript{540} In particular, Molina Fajardo points to the importance of familial links of an agnatic society whose relationships became important in water management, which required a high degree of cooperation.\textsuperscript{541} In this socio-cultural sphere, access to water simultaneously acted as a space for cooperation and conflict.\textsuperscript{542} It thus merits consideration that in settling at Recópolis the Umayyad troops would be forced into negotiation with the populace that already lived at the site. Access to water could have become a flashpoint for conflict at the established site. By moving locations to Zorita, not only did the Umayyad troops gain access to an increased number

\textsuperscript{538} For a discussion on the propensity of ‘Berbers’ to prefer inaccessible summits that dominate valleys, see Brett and Fentress, \textit{The Berbers}, 245; For a discussion on transporting water in the medieval period, see Jiménez Rayado, ‘Water Culture in Madrid: An Islamic Heritage under the Christian Rule,’ 148.

\textsuperscript{539} This area was excavated by Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvaro as part of Olmo Enciso’s work at Recópolis, yet none of these findings have been published. I am indebted to conversations with Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvaro for this information.


\textsuperscript{541} Molina Fajardo, 121.

\textsuperscript{542} Molina Fajardo, 128.
of water sources, but they also moved upstream, a relocation that gave them more legal rights should a conflict over water arise. In *From Muslim Fortress to Christian Castle: Social and Cultural Change in Medieval Spain*, Thomas Glick argues that ‘the most salient feature of Berber irrigation is the absolute priority of upstream irrigators over those downstream.’ In addition, in Roman water law, navigable waterways, like the Tajo, were considered communally owned while springs and small rivers were considered as privately owned. It would thus be in keeping that a move closer to the Badujo would put the builders and residents of the fortress in a more coveted position than the population that remained at Recópolis. We must consider that one possible motivation or factor contributing to the site selection of this new fortress lay in its proximity to multiple, upstream water sources. Finally, in the medieval world, controlling water meant power. Not only would a move upstream put settlers in a better legal situation than staying at Recópolis, but it communicated authority.

3.5 *Situating the Castle-Fortress of Zorita in the Landscape: A Typology of ḥuṣūn*

As Luca Mattei argued, in Umayyad al-Andalus there was a propensity to settle in high defences built principally on natural forms that offered good visibility and a capacity to control the principal roads of communication. In addition to its prized location near multiple upstream water sources, the location of Zorita atop a rocky outcrop rather than the wider plateau-like hill of Recópolis meant an increase in altitude and visibility, specifically over both the Roman road that hugged the Tajo, as well as the Tajo itself, which could be used for transportation and communication. Seen from above, Zorita

---

543 Glick, *From Muslim Fortress to Christian Castle: Social and Cultural Change in Medieval Spain*, 81.
544 For an elucidation on Roman water law, see Martínez Jiménez, *Aqueducts and Urbanism in Post-Roman Hispania*, 29.
546 Mattei, ‘Los mozárabes del mundo rural y sus asentamientos: el caso de Tózar y los Montes Occidentales de Granada,’ 213.

---
looks like many of the ḥuṣūn in the southeast of the Iberian Peninsula studied by André Bazzana, Patrice Cressier, and Pierre Guichard in Les châteaux ruraux d’al-Andalus: Histoire et archéologie des ḥuṣūn de sud-est de l’Espagne. The lack of architectural and archaeological studies on Islamicate fortresses in Castilla-La Mancha means that finding appropriate comparanda requires looking outside the region. Both the richness of studies on Andalusi fortresses in the southeast of the Peninsula as well as the identification of this territory as a space of North African settlement make this the closest region both geographically and culturally.

While the next section looks at features and structures within Zorita that suggest Andalusi, if not Umayyad, origins, this discussion looks at the form of the fortification as a whole (Figure 3.7). Bazzana, Cressier, and Guichard studied over one hundred sites in southeastern Spain to generate seven typologies of edifices dating to the Islamicate period: the urban citadel; the frontier zone fortress located on trade routes with administrative, military, and commercial functions; the ‘chateau-barracks’ or surveillance forts serving a solely military purpose; the fortress with permanent rural settlement; the ‘chateau-refuge’; the hamlet; and finally, the lookout tower (aṭālaya).547 While more research needs to be done at Zorita, currently the two typologies that align most closely with it are those of the fortress with permanent rural settlement or the ‘chateau-refuge’ due to the presence of a large cistern, the construction on natural cliffs, and the position overlooking water in which ‘cette position leur permet de commander tout à la fois les zones agricoles irriguées, voire, comme à Dalías et Laujar de Andarax, le point de captage de réseau d’acequias de ce terroir’.548 In addition to Dalías (Almera) and Laujar de Andarax (Almería), the sites of Chulilla (Los Serranos), Puigpunyent (Perpunchent, Mallorca), Marchena/Marshāna (Sevilla), Uixó (Uxó, in Castilló), and Castillo de Feli (Lorca) might prove valuable

548 Bazzana, Cressier, and Guichard, 126 Translation: ‘this position allows them to control both the irrigated agricultural areas, as in Dalías and Laujar de Andarax, the point of collection of the irrigation networks of this region.’
sites of comparison. Interestingly, Zorita’s features dating to the Andalusi period detailed below do not reflect typologies of the frontier zone fortress or the ‘chateau-barracks’ which has typically how the building has been described in the historiography. Locating the fortress in the local topography clearly demonstrates that water was a priority for those who founded it. While water has many uses, the typologies to which Zorita most closely relate suggest that perhaps the main motivation for this choice of location was not for daily use or communication, but rather agricultural or pastoral.

3.6 Structures Attesting to the Islamicate Inhabitation of the Fortress of Zorita

Certain Islamicate aspects of Zorita have been studied in detail and the section that follows does not attempt to explain the intricacies of every feature dating to Andalusi habitation. For those interested in further information on the features discussed, I direct readers to the 2022 publication El Castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara) edited by Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez. This book details the most current state of archaeological knowledge of the fortress. To date, the majority of excavations at the site have not yet reached Islamicate layers and thus what can be known about this period at the site largely is gathered from surface finds, above-ground structures, and old photographs of the fortress. A few exploratory trenches have been dug, notably near the southeast tower. It is from this area that evidence regarding the ceramic stratification of the fortress, which will be discussed later in this chapter, has been uncovered. The levels of occupation from which Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez have recuperated the most information date to the late medieval period (late twelfth century). The existing finds suggest that future work at Zorita might unearth more Islamicate material which could speak to the Umayyad history of the site. Rather than offering an analysis of each feature, this presents a summary of the features that, when taken together as a grouping, suggest that scholars of the Umayyads and in general of early Islam should pay more attention to this site. This approach to

the constellation of Islamicate characteristics is new in scholarship. It also serves as a preliminary sketch of what a typology of an Umayyad site in the Iberian Peninsula might look like and include. However, the primary purpose of what follows is to show what material evidence still remains of a ninth-century site of which no contemporary written accounts exist. Zorita is a microcosm of the wealth of material culture testifying to the Umayyad period in the Southern Meseta waiting to be either interpreted or to be excavated. Discussed below are five features that together comprise the constellation of Islamicate history of Zorita, spanning the Umayyad to Almohad periods: the walls; the Puerta del Hierro; the pairing of the church-cámara del alcaide reminiscent of the mosque-dār al-imāra twinning; the cistern; and finally, the feline feature on the ceiling of the ‘Sala del Moro/Sala de Felino.’

3.6a The Original Walls

When viewing Zorita today visitors see a medieval castle patched together reflecting several layers of use and restoration campaigns from 1961 to the present (Figure 3.8). Figure 3.9 shows the plan sketched by Layna Serrano in 1932, one of the earliest drawings of the layout of the fortification. The fortress of Zorita is built into the natural features of a rocky outcrop which is, as mentioned previously, surrounded on two sides by water. As a result of the natural topography, the fortification is long and skinny with an oval shape. Substantial walls run along the eastern and western sides, while shorter walls contain the northern and southern sides. The fortress technically has two entrances, one on the eastern side and one on the west. However, the main portico on the eastern side runs along the eastern side to the north, bends, and follows the northern edge of the fortification which has a second entrance point.

The walls of Zorita are without a doubt the most-studied Andalusi feature of the castle: the Islamicate sections were identified at least as early as 1919 by Torres Balbás who pointed out the characteristic soga y tizón (alternating faces of bricks) of Andalusi architecture visible in the eastern wall
Figure 3.10 shows a close-up of the base of the wall to the south of the turret which is the section that Torres Balbás first recognized. In this section of wall there is a clear distinction of layers: from bottom to top we see first the rock on which the Umayyad elite built the first fortification; on top of that we have a layer of rocks positioned vertically, highlighted in the pink box below in Figure 3.11; on top of this vertically constructed wall, we see the largest section of the wall, consisting of several feet of horizontally-laid stone which date to the Christianate period. Research into the phases of the wall has progressed substantially, with the most detailed study published in 2022 by Enrique Daza Pardo (Figures 3.12, 3.13). Pardo’s study into the historical interventions made to the walls of the fortress of Zorita add context for future excavations – archaeologists are in a better position to understand the places that correspond to the earliest phases of inhabitation of the site. Though the walls testify to the foundation of Zorita in the Umayyad period, comparative studies on the form, site selection, and perhaps techniques of building on the rocky outcrops in Castilla-La Mancha are needed to make any more conclusions about this earliest phase of habitation.

The walls of the town of Zorita de los Canes have also been studied and documented. Figure 3.14 is a picture from the Cortijo-Ballester archives. This husband-and-wife team documented many of the cultural sites of Castilla-La Mancha in the 1960s. The photograph referenced here likely was taken in 1963. As with the walls of the fortress, the walls of the city demonstrate the *soga y tizón* technique. This suggests that the walls of the town were built in the same period as the walls of the fortress. Thus,
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550 Torres Balbás, ‘El castillo de Zorita de los Canes (Guadalajara),’ 99; For other studies discussing the walls of Zorita, see Pavón Maldonado, *Guadalajara medieval arte y arqueología árabe y mudéjar*, 185–87 and 191–92; Daza Pardo, ‘Apuntos para una propuesta de evolución constructivo del castillo de Zorita de los Canes’; For extended discussions of *soga y tizón* see Arnold, Canto García, and Vallejo Triano, *La Almunia de Al-Rummâniyya (Córdoba)*, 58, 61, 75, 84–85, 91, 95, 124, 199, 229, 251, 262, 265 and Laminas 20 and 22.

551 See section on walls in Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Álvarez, *El castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología*.

552 Daza Pardo, ‘Apuntos para una propuesta de evolución constructivo del castillo de Zorita de los Canes.’

553 For further information on the Cortijo-Ballester Archive, see https://cefihgu.es/archivos-y-colecciones/archivo-fotografico-cortijo-ballester/.
typologies of Umayyad settlements in the region might include a central, fortified location, as well as a ring-wall which provided for the security of inhabitants in a surrounding neighbourhood.

The majority of extant walls that date to the Umayyad period at Zorita are on the eastern side of the fortress. While little can be said about this, the reality that the Umayyad walls encompass nearly the entire rocky outcrop from south to north demonstrate that the fortress was always large. While further renovations and additions to the fortress may have substantially altered the use of the site, the initial footprint of the Umayyad fort remained largely unaltered. This suggests that future archaeological work on the site, particularly near the eastern wall, might yield material culture from the Umayyad period. Investigations on the western side of the fortress should look to the slopes and base of the outcrop as the lack of extant Umayyad walls suggests material culture from the period would have fallen there.

3.6b Entering Zorita: The Puerta del Hierro

While the grander of the two entrances to Zorita is located on the eastern side furthest from the Tajo and marked by a massive medieval gate added under Pero Díaz in 1290, to enter the original fortification one would have approached from the west—crossing the Tajo River across the aforementioned bridge. The bridge is situated directly west of the second entrance gate, referred to as the Puerta del Hierro, likely a derivative from the Arabic bāb al-ḥadīd. I pause here for a brief note about methodology. While to this point, I have relied primarily on investigations of written or material evidence that speak to what Paul Connerton, in How Societies Remember, termed ‘personal memory’ and ‘cognitive memory’, the discussions that follow on the Puerta del Hierro, the mosque-Dār al-‘Imāra, and the aljibe all engage with the literature and approaches of ‘habit-memory’ of social groups. Substantial discussions of this framework can be found in the scholarship of cultural anthropology and social memory. The work of Maurice Halbwachs, specifically Les cadres sociaux de le mémoire and La

554 The inscription above the gate reads ‘DON PERO DIAZ ME FECIT ERA DE MIL ET CCC ET XVIII ANO’. See Layna Serrano, El Castillo de Zorita de Los Canes, 63.
mémoire collective, and Connerton undergird assertions that I make in the following sections. Briefly summarized, the concept of social memory asserts that while individual memory can be fragile and short-lived, especially without the presence of written material traces, the processes of collective reinforcement in social norms visible in commemorative ceremonies and bodily practices survives much longer. Both ‘commemorative ceremonies’ and ‘bodily practices’ can be characterised as ‘habit-memories’, which encompass a broad set of practices, including but not limited to linguistics and use of technologies. The main thrust of Connerton’s argument is that, traditionally, scholars of history give little to no value of ‘the accumulative practice of the same’. However, Connerton argues, continuity and disruption are key indicators of social change. In this section, and the sections dealing with the mosque-Dâr al-'Imâra and the aljibe, highlight both continuous use of language and moments of redirection of use in the site. What I present here should not be read as though they are the complete picture. I have minimal training in linguistic and anthropological approaches. However, I do highlight the historical evidence that exists in the hope that future investigations might be able to make use of the material and written traces I present. I assert that continuity in language and disruption in use are significant historical indicators, and that recovering the history of sites like Zorita requires collaborative scholarship from several fields, notably anthropology.

The Puerto del Hierro, which currently has two levels, is the tallest and most visible feature of Zorita from a distance (Figure 3.15). The location of this gate hints at the Umayyad-era due to its horseshoe shape but also datable by its position in the foundational wall of the fortress, an identification originally made by Pavón Maldonado (Figures 3.16, 3.17). It is important to note that

556 Connerton, How Societies Remember, 7-40.
558 Connerton, How Societies Remember, 34.
559 Pavón Maldonado, Guadalajara medieval arte y arqueología árabe y mudejar, 194.
most of what we see today as part of the horseshoe-arch door is a restoration completed in 2009.\textsuperscript{560} However, enough of the original stone springer and voussoirs remained to reconstruct the whole (Figure 3.18). When standing at the threshold of this door and looking out, one can see the unique vantage of this location. The view from the door affords a view not only of the Tajo River, the mountains of the Sierra Ministra, and all of the surrounding lands in between, but also of the old Roman bridge (Figures 3.5, 3.19, 3.20). The ability to keep a close eye on the bridge would have allowed for the collection of a bridge tax, which had the potential to generate significant income in the early medieval and medieval periods.\textsuperscript{561} The question of economic incentive remains a supposition, but one worth considering. Like the walls, this gate has been studied intensely, yet without local sites of comparison, it is hard to make any new conclusions about this feature. It is perhaps important to observe that as the apex of the horseshoe arch is rounded rather than pointed it is more likely to have been constructed prior to the eleventh century at which point keyhole arches commonly were poly-lobed or pointed. However, this stylistic reading needs confirmation from nearby exemplars.

\textbf{3.6c The Mosque/Dār al-‘Imāra of Zorita?}

No excavations have suggested that the site of Zorita had a mosque. However, if there was a mosque inside the walls of Zorita, the most likely location for this would be where the church stands today, given the long tradition of reuse of sacred space in the Iberian Peninsula (Figure 3.21).\textsuperscript{562} Although no longer extant, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, both photographs and sketches show portions of a covered passageway that connected the church to the commandant’s rooms (Figures 3.22, 3.23). In the most recent drawings of the footprint of the fortress, the space that was

\textsuperscript{560} This reconstruction, completed by the firm Carpetania without the assistance of archaeologists, collapsed in the fall of 2021.


\textsuperscript{562} Examples of this are too abundant to enumerate here, but some of the most well-known examples in the Iberian Peninsula include the Great Mosque of Córdoba, the Great Mosque of Sevilla, Bāb Mardum/Cristo de la Luz in Toledo, the Cathedral of Toledo, and the Cathedral of Granada.
originally connected by the covered passageway, is named the cámara del alcaide, or the chambers of the commander (Figure 3.21). Alcaide (or in the case of the medieval sources, Alcayde), is derived from the Arabic, al-qā‘id, and refers to the commander of the fortress. It is important to caution that translating this as ‘commander’ connotes a military function while in Arabic the position of qā‘id also implies a role in the administration (with military responsibilities), and was a position that reported directly to the amir or caliph. In the sixteenth century, the historical chronicler of the Order of Calatrava, Francisco de Rades y Andrada (d.1599), wrote about Zorita in 1169. In the section leading up to the following moment, two counts in the service of the king, Don Nuño Pérez de Lara and Don Ponce, had sought an audience with Lope de Arenas, the commander of the castle. Lope de Arenas had thrown them in prison, when Rades y Andrada reports: de allí a pocos días, un criado del Alcayde, que se decía Dominguejo, el qual servía en cosas baxas, fue al Real con una maça en la mano y dixo al Rey: ‘Señor Rey, yo soy Dominguejo, criado de Lope de Arenas, y vengo a daros auiso como ganeys este Castillo.’

This passage speaks to the leadership of Zorita immediately before its bequest by Alfonso the Noble to the Knights of Calatrava. Not much is known about the commander, or alcayde, of the fortress, Lope de Arenas. In an earlier passage, he is described as ‘petty’. Regardless, the passage quoted above shows that the alcayde of Zorita had a relationship with Alfonso the Noble that is reminiscent of the organization of the al-qā‘id to the Umayyad amir or caliph. This continuity of social practice is of note because consistently in the late medieval sources, when referring to those in leadership roles in the Order of Calatrava, the term of the leader is always ‘maestre’. The position of the ‘alcayde’ suggests that the ways in which Zorita was administered before the Calatravan period has roots in the Islamicate

563 Plácido Ballesteros San-José, “El castillo de Zorita en época cristiana,” in El Castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología, ed. Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez (Madrid: El Tercer Sello, 2022), 34. Translation: ‘After a few days, a servant of the Alcayde, named Dominguejo, who was a man of base things, went to the Royal [person], and said to the King, with a mace in his hand, and said to the king: ‘Señor King, I am Dominguejo, servant of Lope de Arenas, and I come to give you advice as you protect this castle.’

564 Plácido Ballesteros San-José, “El castillo de Zorita en época cristiana,” 34.
world. The change from the Arabic-derived ‘alcayde’ to the Latin-derived ‘maestre’ indicates that passing of control of the fortress to the Order of Calatrava was a moment of disruption in social practice, something that had ramifications for the discussion on the *aljibe* that follows.

The positioning of the church next to the *cámara del alcaide* is reminiscent of not only Andalusi architecture, but specifically Marwānid Umayyad forms present in al-Andalus from the eighth century to the middle of the ninth century. What is most interesting about this possible pairing is that if this is the case, this references a specific Andalusi Umayyad preference for the positioning of the *dār al-ʿimāra* in relation to the mosque attested to in the Iberian Peninsula in the eighth and ninth centuries. Originally identified as an Umayyad layout by Jere Bacharach, the mosque-*dār al-ʿimāra* typology is a distinctly elite form. While Bacharach posited that in Umayyad constructions, the *dār al-ʿimāra* was located on the qibla side of the mosque, Amira Bennison pointed out that in Umayyad Córdoba the *dār al-ʿimāra* was constructed to the west of the mosque to make use of preexisting structures of power in the city. The fact that at Zorita this is the plan that exists is curious, especially as the two were connected by a covered walkway as in Córdoba. In the dynastic capital, this form would have been dateable to the reign of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muhammad (r. 888–912). The written sources show that at the end of the ninth century, the *thaghr al-awsat* had a particularly strong relationship with the Umayyad power centre. Though this is far from conclusive, the development of this pairing of the mosque and the *dār al-ʿimāra*, particularly on an east-west axis, as an expression of power in Umayyad al-Andalus is worth researching. The argument here is not that this is definitely a mosque-*dār al-ʿimāra* structure. However, the appearance of this layout in a location with a demonstrated political and temporal tie to

567 Bennison, ‘Power and the City in the Islamic West from the Umayyads to the Almohads,’ 67.
Córdoba suggests that more research in the area is needed to determine if this is an aberration, a continuation of an early Umayyad practice (or perhaps another more local form that happened to coincide with Umayyad expressions of power), or if perhaps forms like this could be used as diagnostic tool in distinguishing between Andalusi phases of building, as suggested by Bennison.

3.6d The Aljibe

Another aspect of the fortress of Zorita that points to the shared technology and visual culture in which the peoples of medieval Iberia participated can be found in the cistern that is located at the centre of the site (Figure 3.24, 3.25, 3.26). Measuring approximately 14.4 metres (47 feet) north to south and 5.85 metres (19 feet) east to west on the inside, this cistern could hold approximately 180,000 litres (47,500 gallons). The inside is lined in almagra, the red coating introduced to the Iberian Peninsula in the Umayyad period. As Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez have argued, no evidence allows for a firm dating of the cistern; however, I suggest here that this likely belongs to the Umayyad period for several reasons.

In the first place, as with the cámara del alcaide, the persistence of the Arabic name as an identifier suggests an older structure within the fortification. In the documentation of the 1491 ‘visita’, a type of inspection of sites undertaken by the Knights of Calatrava, the report details rooms including ‘. . ., la bodega del algibe, el pozo . . .’. The pairing of the Arabic-derived ‘algibe’ next to the Latin-derived ‘pozo’ is curious. Namely, the visitas were written in a Latinate language, so it is curious that instead of documenting a ‘cisterna’ and a ‘pozo’, there is an ‘algibe’. Secondly, the fact that the ‘algibe’ is not being

---

568 Estimates on population are difficult due to the number of unknown factors (how hot is it? how often do people drink? are animals drinking from this? is this being used for anything other than drinking?), but Urbina and Urquijo suggest a conservative estimate that this could support around 100 people. ‘Excavaciones arqueológicas en el área del aljibe,’ in El Castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología, ed. Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez (Madrid: El Tercer Sello, 2022), 163.

569 For the assertion that nothing can be firmly dated to the Islamicate period, see Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez, ‘Conclusiones,’ 363.

570 Plácido Ballesteros San-José, “El castillo de Zorita en época cristiana,” in El Castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología, 45.
used for water collection, but rather as a storehouse (for wine), speaks to a change in social practice. As demonstrated with the alcayde to maestre transition, it seems reasonable to suggest that this change in commemorative ceremony would occur at the same time as the linguistic shift. The study of the aljibe of Zorita has confirmed that the technology of the well dates to the Calatravan period. Contextual evidence suggests that it is likely that the shift from use of the cistern (algibe) as a method of water collection to that of a well (pozo) occurred at this time.

Secondly, all the Andalusi typologies identified by Bazzana, Cressier, and Guichard feature walls, cisterns, and towers. Therefore, a North African Andalusi construction with walls and towers on the top of a natural cliff bordered by two water sources without a cistern would be an exception, not the rule. While it is possible the original cistern at the site was not the almagro cistern seen today, the compressed timeline related below, combined with strong evidence of ninth-century almagro cisterns in al-Andalus make this unlikely to have been renovated in the post-Umayyad period.

Third, the disruption of use (Connerton’s ‘commemorative ceremony’) is worth considering. Given the testimony of visitors to Zorita in 1494 who attested the strange feature of a well built inside the cistern, which was also being used as a wine cellar, demonstrates that at some point prior to 1494 the space had been altered. The construction of the cistern must fall between Zorita’s founding and the end of the fifteenth century. Given that the textual description offered in 1494 did not suggest that this use as a storeroom was a new feature, that ceramic finds of vessels used to store wine were stamped with the cross of the Order of Calatrava, and that the well within the cistern had already been constructed, it is likely that the cistern had been functioning as wine cellar for some time.

---

571 Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez, “Excavaciones arqueológicas en el área del aljibe”.
573 The description of the space as a ‘bodega del aljibe’ or ‘storeroom of the cistern’ in the Relaciones de Felipe II Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez, ‘Excavaciones arqueológicas en el área del aljibe,’ 167.
574 For details of the stamped ceramics of the wine storage containers, see Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez, 168–69.
Knights of Calatrava did maintain control of Zorita from 1174 to 1487, the declining power of the Knights of Calatrava and the rising importance of the adjoining settlement of Albalate de Zorita at the end of the fourteenth century suggests that an investment like the building of a cistern was not likely in this later period.575 Thus, if constructed in the Calatravan period, the more likely period of construction of the aljibe would date between 1174 and the 1380s. Given this short time frame, it seems unlikely that had they had the knowledge to construct it, the ability to repair it would have been lost so quickly. This draws on the reality that social memory of a community lasts longer than individual memory. Presumably had the cistern stopped functioning within the same generation that it was built, people with the skills to fix it would still be in the community. Additionally, had the foundation of the cistern been a part of the contribution of the Order to the built environment, one would assume that had the craft of cistern-building once existed in the community, this would have been taught to future generations. Safeguarding the water supply would have been a priority for all peoples and thus as a form of social memory is one likely to have a long lifespan. The aging of eleven adult males buried in the late medieval cemetery in the fortress yields a range between twenty and fifty-five years old.576 Using these ages as a rough guide, the time period between 1174 and 1380 is between four and ten generations. It is notable that several of the individuals who were aged are fifty or over (T1, T13, T15, T18) and that individuals between fifty and fifty-nine represented the highest distribution of ages of those examined.577 This suggests that the generational span of the inhabitants at Zorita is likely closer to


577 See Tables 1 (p. 268-9) and 2 (p. 274) and Figure 12 (p. 275) in Rissech, Creo, and Revuelta, “Estudio preliminar de los restos humanos encontrados en el yacimiento Castillo de Zorita’.
four than to ten. It seems unlikely that the social memory of a craft related to survival would be lost in this span of time. So far, however, this dating is an argument from absence.

If we accept a dating of the *terminus ante quem* for the cistern to have functioned in a water-providing capacity under the Knights of Calatrava (1174-1487), then the cistern would have been constructed either during the near three hundred years of the Andalusi period (ca. 800-1086) or in the thirty years in which Álvar Fañez administered the castle from 1086-1114. There are three factors that suggest the cistern does not date to the Asturian period. First, the only direct comparands for the cistern come from the south of the Peninsula, making it unlikely that the Asturians brought the technology that built this cistern. In addition to arched cisterns in the province of Córdoba discussed by Ricardo Córdoba and Faustino Rider Porras, the research of Bazzana, Cressier, and Guichard discuss the *aljibes* of Uxó, Puigpunyent, Merchana, and Castillo de Feli. The cistern at Uxó provides the most compelling comparison (Figures 3.27, 3.28). Measuring 7 and 7.2 metres (23 and 23.6 feet) long and 2.3 and 3.14 metres (7.5 and 10.3 feet) and sealed in *almagro*, its measurements are almost exactly half that of Zorita, maintaining the same proportion. Though Bazzana, Cressier, and Guichard did not study it in the same detail, of the comparable structures discussed in their text, the cistern at Castillo de Feli bears the most physical resemblance to that of Zorita (Figure 3.29). The fact that the cistern they did study and provide detail on is proportional to the one at Zorita suggests there might have been commonly-accepted proportions for cisterns in the Umayyad sphere of influence in the tenth century.

Other characteristics for dating the cistern to the Umayyad period include several features of the cistern that all have strongest precedents in the ninth and tenth centuries: the use of *almagro*, the existence of stairs into the cistern, and its complex downspout system used for water collection.

---


579 For discussion on cistern at Uxó, see Bazzana, Cressier, and Guichard, *Les châteaux ruraux d'al-Andalus: Histoire et archéologie des ḥuṣūn de sud-est de l'Espagne*, 182–84.
Climbing down into the cistern to observe its features from the inside allows the visitor to develop a better understanding both how water would have entered the reservoir, but also how those who constructed the cistern at Zorita minimized seepage and how they would have accessed the water. Assisted by a rope handrail added for visitor safety, one can access the inner cistern by descending fourteen stairs located at the southern end of the structure (Figure 3.25). These stairs are supported by three semi-circular arches, that decrease in height as the stairs approach the bottom of the cistern. Stairs descending into reservoirs were a feature of Andalusi water basins, as excavations in the western suburbs of Córdoba have demonstrated. An enclosed downspout that brings water from the surface to the cistern is located next to the tallest arch, visible only when one looks up the shaft from the base of the cistern. Though most of the compound has long since eroded away, traces of almagro, the red waterproof clay paint used to seal the cistern and reduce seepage, cover the entire southern wall, and extend approximately two-thirds of the way (2.5 metres, 8.2 feet) up the remaining three walls (Figure 3.30). The use of almagro to line cisterns was regarded as a revolutionary technology in the Iberian Peninsula in the Umayyad period. Dated to as early as the eighth century, almagro-lined pools, cisterns, and decantation chambers appear regularly in North African and Andalusi construction through the eleventh century. While the use of red clay paint was pervasive in the Mediterranean, it is not until after the Umayyad fath in the eighth century that structures on the Iberian Peninsula employ this

---

580 Vázquez Navajas, ‘Some Notes on the Hydraulics of the Western Suburbs of Umayyad Cordoba,’ 24.
581 I am indebted to conversations with Javier Martínez Jiménez as well as Martínez Jiménez, Aqueducts and Urbanism in Post-Roman Hispania, 166.
technology used for both waterproofing and sanitation reasons. Its use in water systems including qanāt and cisterns is relatively common throughout the Andalusi period: it is a regular feature in cisterns like those at Uxó studied by Bazzana, Cressier and Guichard; Carmen González Gutiérrez and Manuel Cobo Aguilera discuss the traces of almagrao found in the ablution rooms attached to the Great Mosque of Córdoba constructed on the orders of Hishām ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (r. 788-796); Guadalupe Pizarro Berengena documents its use in the qanāt constructed under the orders of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥakam (r. 822-852). This early use of almagrao means that it is entirely plausible to suggest that those who built Zorita had access to the knowledge, skill, and craftspeople to make this cistern as early as the eighth century. The construction of cisterns coated with almagrao continued into the Almoravid and Almohad periods. María Marcos Cobaleda has pointed to the cistern in the Tabbānīn Arrabal in Málaga dated to the end of the eleventh century or beginning of the twelfth century, with coated floors and walls. Thus throughout the Andalusi control of Zorita, from its founding in the ninth century to the last dated Islamicate occupation in the eleventh century, almagrao cisterns were continually constructed. This feature demonstrates how integrated this supposed liminal space which housed the fortress of Zorita was in the wider technological advancements of the Iberian Peninsula. The intellectual spread of technology to Zorita suggests that skilled craftsmen trained in current techniques permeated all of al-Andalus.

Finally, excavations have revealed an above-ground downspout, likely located at the corner of a surrounding colonnade, which would have filled the cistern with rainwater channelled from the various

---

roofs (Figure 3.31). Given the detailed research on water management in al-Andalus and the Mediterranean world, it is not unreasonable to suggest that this would have been part of a complex and broad network of roof channels and downspouts involved in water collection like those at the Great Mosque of Córdoba and Madīnat al-Zahra’.586 While collecting water from the roof was a widespread practice in the Mediterranean world, the pairing of the downspout system into an almagro cistern might be a typology worth studying.

3.6e Feline Head

The final and one of the most puzzling features present at Zorita hinting at Andalusi connections is the presence of a feline head adorning the interior of a domed space located on the southern end of the fortification (Figure 3.32-34). Little is known about the space or its adornment, although suggested purposes and uses have included a prison space or as a homage tower.587 What I offer here is not a definitive interpretation or conclusion, but rather an argument for the need of historians of the material culture of al-Andalus to be involved in any discussion regarding this feature. Described by Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez, in the centre of the dome is

la cabeza chata de un feline, sin melena y con pequeñas orejas. Lleva un tocado de tela sobre la parte alta de la cabeza, rematado en una medalla o disco en el centro de la frente y otra sobre cada oreja. Los ojos son grandes y bien marcados con las pupilas en hueco. La nariz es corta con dos agujeros bien pronunciados y de ella salen dos filetes que pudieran ser un nuevo adorno sobre la boca o el remate de la misma sobre la nariz, propio de felinos como el leopardo. Sendas


587 Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez, 201.
Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez offer one interpretation of the feline as a panther and suggest this might bear resemblance to panther door-knockers common in the medieval period in which employed this iconography to represent Christ. However, this imagery of Christ-as-panther comes from French and English medieval bestiaries, like that of Marie de Savoie (1411-1469), or Books of Hours dating to the fifteenth century (Figure 3.35). Instead, I argue that the naming of the space in which this cat’s head is found, the ‘Sala del Moro’, might again point to Andalusi ties which are both geographically and temporally closer to the material culture of the feline’s head than an interpretation which privileges the iconography of late medieval northern Europe. The naming of this space has no clear explanation in the documentation, and it is possible that it speaks to a forgotten socio-cultural memory that tied the designation of this room as ‘del Moro’ to an Andalusi feature in it.

More can be said about the feline head mounted in the dome. While, as Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez pointed out, interpreting the bottom half of the face is difficult, by looking at the feline face of Zorita in profile (Figure 3.34), one can see the remnants of a small pipe sticking out of its mouth. Additionally, the profile clearly shows that the head is mounted on a circular disc, which is then mounted on the dome. This is important as the head and the disc were not carved together, meaning they should be understood as separate parts.

---

588 Translation: ‘the flat head of a feline, with no mane and small ears. He wears a cloth headdress on the top of his head, finished with a medallion or disk in the centre of his forehead and another on each ear. The eyes are large and well-marked with hollow pupils. The nose is short with two well-defined holes and two impressions that could be the new decoration around the mouth or the end of the nose, typical of felines like the leopard. Both impressions seem to widen the mouth on both sides, but in this lower third the entire piece is broken and its interpretation is difficult’ in Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez, ‘Intervenciones arqueológicas en el Corral de los Condes y anexos,’ in El Castillo de Zorita (Guadalajara): Historia y arqueología, ed. Dionisio Urbina Martínez and Catalina Urquijo Alvarez (Madrid: El Tercer Sello, 2022), 202-3.

I deal first with interpretations of the iconography of the feline face as described by Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez, then I turn to examine the observations about the mouth and its mounting. Representations of felines are fairly common from the late Umayyad, ‘Āmirid, and Ṭā’ifa periods, across several types of media. Andalusi examples to which this cat bears a certain resemblance include depictions of lions found on fragments at al-Rummāniyya, al-Madinat al-Zāhira’, and the Alhambra (Figures 3.36-3.39). All of these examples are carved from stone and date to the tenth and eleventh centuries. In addition, all of these depictions of lions share the general shape of the face; short, skinny noses; and deep-set eyes with well-marked pupils, though not all are hollow. The treatment of the eyes recalls the popularity of inlaid metal eyes in depictions of both humans and animals from the tenth to thirteenth centuries in Andalusi material culture. The treatment of the mouth of the lion on the volute from al-Rummāniyya is suggestive—the tapering of the chin, the angle of the decoration that protrudes from the nose and moves across the cheeks, and the pursed lips around a circular hole are possible models for how the face of the feline at Zorita may have looked. Although the bottom third of the face is destroyed (a point to which I return in a moment), the shape of the extant face of the Zorita feline mirror this tapering, the marked depressions extending from the nose downwards echo the angle of the al-Rummāniyya fragment, and the presence of a small hole in both forms at approximately the same place suggest that in the Zorita fragment, the protruding pipe would have come from the mouth of the feline.

Though not of the same material, several bronze pieces dating to the tenth and eleventh centuries share stylistic features of the Zorita lion. In miniature, a bronze weight dating to the Umayyad caliphate in al-Andalus has been studied by Tawfiq Ibrahim (Figure 3.40). On one side of the weight there is a carving of a lion with small ears, no mane, deeply engraved eyes, and a short snout. Though

---

the size of the weight means that there is not much detail in the face, the value of this image lies in its absolute dating to the Umayyad period. Ibrahim comes to this conclusion by comparing weight systems (in this case the *daḥl*) to the metallurgical content and weight of money issued in al-Andalus.\textsuperscript{592} This firm dating of the iconography of lions with these stylistic features to the Umayyad period provides a tenth-century Andalusi comparison for the feline at Zorita. In addition to this bronze seal, other examples include a bronze ewer with a lion head for a spout held in the Museo Arqueológico Nacional in Madrid, the Monzón Lion in the Louvre, and the Monumental Lion held in the Louvre, Abu Dhabi (Figures 3.41-3.43). All of these examples date to the tenth or eleventh century. Anna Contadini discusses these three examples in detail in her work on the Monumental Lion, also known as the New York Lion or the Mari-Cha Lion in scholarship.\textsuperscript{593} Of all the examples mentioned above in stone or bronze, the Monumental Lion bears the most resemblance to the feline in Zorita.

Though the exact place of manufacture is still debated, scholarship on the Monumental Lion has increasingly agreed that it was likely made in the Iberian Peninsula between the end of the tenth century and the beginning of the twelfth, with a more likely date range being the tenth and eleventh centuries, perhaps even as specific as between 1085 and 1115.\textsuperscript{594} The Monumental Lion has far more detail than the feline head at Zorita, yet this is natural given the different materials each was made with and the likely different purposes each served. Fashioned from bronze, the Louvre’s Monumental Lion stares intently at the viewer with hollowed-out pupils set under deeply-chiselled eyebrows. While the entire surface of the face is adorned with patterns, the decoration from the bridge of the nose

\textsuperscript{592} Ibrahim, “Figurative Images on two Caliphate weights from al-Andalus,” 38.
\textsuperscript{594} For early scholarship on the Monumental Lion, see Richard Camber and Anna Contadini, “Presenting the Pisa Griffin and the Mari-Cha Lion,” in *The Pisa Griffin and the Mari-Cha Lion: Metalwork, Art, and Technology in the Medieval Islamicate Mediterranean* (Pisa: Pacini, 2018), 18–34. For most recent dating of the lion, based on metallurgical analysis and stylistic comparisons, see Contadini, “The Pisa Griffin and the Mari-Cha Lion: History, Art, and Technology,” 208, 237-8, and 243.
extending up until the space between the eyes is the deepest, including two circular forms between the eyes. When looking at the lion head-on, the top of the right ear features an adorning depression. These treatments on bronze, if transferred into the different medium of stone, could come out looking like a headband with a jewel centred between the eyes. A comparison of the profiles of the Monumental Lion and the feline of Zorita shows the short, squat nature of the face with similar lines from the forehead to the eyebrow and the eyebrow to the nose. The treatment of the mouth of the Monumental Lion echoes both that of the al-Rummāniyya volute, with decorative detail proceeding from the bottom of the nose across the cheeks of the face. Though not as pursed as those on the al-Rummāniyya fragment, the lips of the Monumental Lion are delicate and centre around a small, oval hole. From investigations undertaken by Contadini, we know that this mouth served a functional as well as decorative purpose. Camber and Contadini have argued that the Monumental Lion, and its sister sculpture, the Pisa Griffin, likely served as sound amplifiers, creating sounds of ‘beasts that roared’ as air moved through the internal systems of the statues. Thus the facial features, particularly the tapered shape of the chin, may have been more than stylistic choices; the function of the sculpture may have informed artistic choices.

As pointed out earlier, in the profile of the feline of Zorita there appears to be a small pipe jutting out from its mouth, something that is suggestive of animal fountains popular in al-Andalus from the Umayyad caliphate through Nasrid rule. The most well-known examples in stone of this are likely the lion fountains of the ‘Patio de los Leones’ in the Alhambra (Figures 3.44 and 3.45). While stylistically the lions from the Alhambra do not share many similarities, the function as fountain is suggestive. It is possible that what we are looking at in Zorita is a head of a zoomorphic stone fountain from al-Andalus. This is confirmed by the fact that the Zorita feline missing the bottom third of its face is strange in itself.

If this feline was produced locally, one would expect to find not only comparable forms in the area or at least water systems which would have had fountains, but also, we would expect for either the entire face to have remained intact or for the entire face to have fallen from the ceiling. After all, this is a form that is not only out of the way but is also difficult to physically approach. One must use ladders to take pictures of this form, let alone make contact with it. It is unlikely then that the damage to this feline head was done as a result of human contact with the form after it was installed. Gravity of course is always an option, especially if this head was part of a fountain spout which would have meant that the stone would have been heavily worked in the process of its making and thus the entire mouth area would have been structurally weaker than the rest of the face. Otherwise, unless the stone had a weak crack in it when the head was originally carved, it is hard to see how the face would have split how it did. It seems likely that the form was damaged either before it was installed or as it was installed. If it had been produced locally, one wonders why a broken lion’s head would be mounted to the ceiling (or if it broke during construction, why not carve a new one?). What seems more plausible that this is an example of spolia perhaps brought back by Asturian or Calatravan forces after successful raids in the south of the Iberian Peninsula.

This mounting of a zoomorphic form on the top of a building also has a curious parallel in the Pisa Griffin, which in the twelfth century was mounted on top of the Pisa Cathedral.596 Perched atop the cathedral, the Griffin, and perhaps the noise it produced as the wind travelled through its body, over time became emblematic of the city. While the feline of Zorita is inside of the dome, looking down on whoever walks in the room, this reuse of booty raises interesting questions relating to meaning, which at the current moment we are unable to answer. There are few local comparanda, though this may speak more to a lack of research, preservation, or interpretation than anything else. There is a curious
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example of a zoomorphic head which sits atop a column in the basement of the monastery of Uclés (Figure 3.46-3.48). The wolf-head is roughly hewn, yet also has small ears, deeply-cut eyes, and a tapered mouth which seems to wrap around a round form inside the mouth. As this is not in a space that allows for public access, I am indebted to Manuel Gómez Anuarbe for sharing his photographs with me. Given the fortress’s history with Ibn Mardanīsh, the ‘wolf-king’ and the increasing use of animals in carved stone during the ‘Āmirid period, the carved animals of the Southern Meseta might add additional context to visual expressions of power in the medieval Iberian Peninsula.597

Given the constancy of the fortress of Zorita as either part of the Andalusi polity or at odds with Andalusi rulers, it makes sense that scholars of both fields should participate in a future discussion to investigate these carvings of animal heads found in the Southern Meseta. One could see possibilities that the form belonged to the Almoravid or Almohad occupation of the castle, its use as triumphal spolia in which crusading knights brought pieces of al-Andalus back to adorn this space (especially if this space was used as a jail), its creation by artisans used to creating feline forms as expressions of power for a variety of patrons in either the Christian Kingdoms or al-Andalus, or its commissioning by a local Christianate noble as having equal validity as interpretations. The point is that accurate scholarship on this (and forms like it) will likely require the participation of art historians of both al-Andalus and the Christianate Kingdoms of Spain to determine what this means in a late medieval context.

3.6f Ceramics

Finally, a material that testifies to the use of Zorita in the Umayyad period is the ceramic evidence. At the moment, most of the excavations of the site have not penetrated layers that date to 597

For a discussion of the treaty in which Ibn Mardanīsh swapped his fortress at Uclés for Alfonso II’s fortress at Alcun, see Balbale, The Wolf King: Ibn Mardanish and the Construction of Power in al-Andalus, 209; For mentions of Ibn Mardanish in the region, see Ballesteros San-José et al., Guía histórica de la diputación provincial de Guadalajara (1813-2001), 31; For a conversation on ‘Āmirid use of animalistic imagery to express authority, see Chapter 7 in Rosser-Owen, Articulating the Hijāba: Cultural Patronage and Political Legitimacy in al-Andalus: The ‘Āmirid Regency c. 970-1010 AD.
the Umayyad founding of the fortress. However, in the exploratory trench dug in the southeast corner of the site, some ceramics were recovered that date to the ninth century (Figure 3.49).598 Few are diagnostic, although those that have been recovered do attest to jugs, storage vessels, and perhaps wider serving platters. The glazes are in line with those presented earlier: black paint on red forms (pained with almagro) and green and manganese on white glazes. It is hard to say anything about the decoration of the ceramics, other than they were decorated, often with vertical bands common to the centre of the Iberian Peninsula, meaning there was a need or desire for forms that were aesthetically pleasing, not just utilitarian. In his examination of the ceramics, Miguel Ángel Cuadrado Prieto found that there was a marked increase in the number of ceramic forms dating to the tenth century in addition to the presence of Almohad forms dating to the twelfth.599 Little can be ascertained from these finds at present, especially since the contexts in which they were found are only a limited part of the site. However, the ceramics from the Umayyad period confirm that the fortress was inhabited in the ninth century and suggest that there was a period of expansion in the tenth century. The presence of the Almohad forms allow us to assert that tastes in material culture did not adhere to religious or political boundaries. While the presence of ceramics confirms a substantial habitation at Zorita prior to the twelfth century, most of these finds have come out of surface finds or mixed contexts difficult to date.600

**Conclusion: Defining the Cohort**

Presented above are five structural features and one body of material evidence in the ceramics that together attest to the Andalusí history of the fortress of Zorita. In this brief presentation of Islamicate material culture of the fortification, I have highlighted features that might best be understood

---

as characteristics to look for when defining typologies of Andalusi fortifications of the Southern Meseta. In addition to physical features, investigations should look to linguistic clues and shifts in habit-memory that might shed light on social dynamics that cannot be found in written or material evidence. The continued use of identifiers based in the Arabic language (aljibe, alcaide, Puerta del Hierro, Sala del Moro) throughout the fortress of Zorita may provide clues as to features original to the fortification. There is a lot, not only at Zorita, but in Castilla-La Mancha for the historian of al-Andalus to study.

It is difficult to determine what sites should be included as ‘sister’ sites to Zorita due to both the changing conceptions of space in the written sources as well as a lack of archaeological work with clear stratigraphies that might allow for the assembling of a cohort. Various authors have defined groupings of fortresses in the thaghr al-awsat, though it is not always clear what criteria they are following. Layna Serrano argued for looking into the history of Atienza, Brihuega, Alcocer, Cifuentes, Cogolludo, Pastrana, Molina, Tendilla, Almonacid, Jadraque/Mondéjar, and Zorita; however, his reasoning is not related to what is important as contemporary groupings, rather he is listing important historical sites in twentieth-century Guadalajara. Torres Balbás pointed out that twenty-two settlements are identified as founded by the ‘Arabs’ in the written sources and argued that these should be examined in conjunction with one another. These cities span the Iberian Peninsula and include Catalayud (Qal’at Ayyūb), Calatrava la Vieja (Qal’at Rabāḥ), Qanāt ‘Āmir, Ilbīra, Uclés (Uqlīsh), Tudela (Tuṭīla), Murcia (Mursiyya), Úbeda (Ubbadat al-Arab), Talamanca (Talamanika), Madrid (Majrīt), Lérida (Lārida), Badajoz (Baṭalyaws), Chalencas (Madīnat al-Fath), Madinat al-Zahra’, Sektān, Medinaceli (Madinat Salīm), Almería (al-Marīya), an unnamed city built by Aḥmad al-Naṣr in 964, al-Madīna al-Zāhira, Jabal al- Ṭāriq, Aznalfarache (Hisn al-Faraj), and Algecira la Nueva (al-Bunīyya). Guichard suggested Nafza, Talavera, and Toledo; Bosch Vilá for Talavera, Madrid, Castejón de Henares, Uclés, Huete, Cuenca, and
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602 Torres Balbás, ‘Cities Founded by the Muslims in Al-Andalus,’ 266–85.
603 Guichard, Al-Andalus. Estructura antropológica de una sociedad islámica en occidente, 271.
These last two sets appear to be derived from the written sources. Aillet suggested that ‘the strongest Berber settlement was between the Duero, the Tajo, and the Ebro’ and named Vascos, Madrid, Guadalajara, Medinaceli, and Santaver as a grouping, seemingly based on this geographical outline. Buresi argued for a cohort including Recópolis, Zorita, Guadalajara, Medinaceli, Talavera, Madrid, Castejón de Henares, Uclés, Huete, Cuenca, and Huélamo, but provides no explanation as to why these should be grouped together (and this grouping does not appear in any primary source). Archaeologically, Olmo Enciso suggested comparing Occilis/Medinacelli, Complutum/Guadalajara, Recópolis/Zorita, Segóbriga/Uclés, Arcavica/Huete, Madrid, and Talamanca/Peña Fora. However, because of a lack of more detailed studies on the Arabic sources, this cohort has the disadvantage of blending all Islamicate history together and is unlikely to yield sites with similar chronologies. While many of these circle around the same sites and occasionally overlap, there is no clear answer to what the sister sites of Zorita may be.

A good starting point would be first to recognize that the Andalusi past cannot be lumped together in a conglomerate of ‘the Islamic past’. The written sources do indicate a chronology for both the site and the region. Zorita’s Andalusi past can be divided into three stages: Umayyad (ca. 800-970s); Dhū al-Nūnid (970s-1085); and Almoravid/Almohad (ca. 1114-1150). Until now, history has conflated the first two, if not all, of these stages. Identifying a cohort of Umayyad sites will depend on future archaeology. At the moment, the only statement the evidence reviewed here supports is that in this first phase, Zorita looked more to Córdoba than to Toledo, and comparisons in material culture need to be based in the south of the Iberian Peninsula. In reality, it is more likely that the Islamicate material...
culture of the Southern Meseta informed that of Toledo under the rule of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn than the other way around. This is a major departure from the approach advocated by Pavón Maldonado in *Guadalajara medieval arte y arqueología árabe y mudéjar* and in *Arte Toledano: islámico y mudéjar*. The written evidence suggests that at no point prior to the eleventh century does Toledo as a comparand for Zorita make sense.

Though the work presented here argues for more research into the Banū Dhū al-Nūn before interpreting the material culture of Santaver, in *Muqtabis III*, Ibn Hayyān does list the sites associated with the family as including Huete, Huélamo, Uclés, and Cuenca.608 This offers a potential cohort to investigate both the Umayyad and Ṭā’ifa periods in the Southern Meseta. In eleventh- through thirteenth-century sources, these fortresses appear in various constellations: Huete, Uclés, and Zorita appear as part of the territory of the Almohad ruler Abū Ya’qūb Yūsuf (Yūsuf I, r. 1135-1184),609 and in al-Idrīsī, Zorita is compared to Fita and Calatrava (la Vieja) for the first time, suggesting this is a good grouping to study the Almoravid and Almohad periods. The only research corpus on material evidence to suggest comparative studies is that of ceramics. For the Almohad period, the work of Miguel Ángel Cuadrado Prieto has suggested that the production of Calatrava la Vieja and Jerez de la Frontera reflects similarities to that of Zorita.610 Any identification of ‘sister sites’ in the future will require building a data set from both written and material sources. What I have undertaken here is to propose a cohort of characteristics at Zorita that might be found in other locations in the Southern Meseta.

A case-study of the castle-fortress of Zorita sheds light not only on this particular Umayyad-era fortification, but also begs questions as to why other sites of the ninth- and tenth-century Islamicate past, including the fortresses of Atienza, Guadalajara, Uclés, Huete, Huélamo, Cuenca, Madrid, Nafza

---


609 Fernández Izquierdo, Yuste Martínez, and Sanz Camañes, *La provincia de Almonacid de Zorita en el siglo XVI: Recuperación de una historia viva de la administración local en la edad moderna*, 7.

(Vascos), and Talavera currently are underrepresented in the protected sites of the Autonomous Communities of Madrid and Castilla-La Mancha. The history of Zorita and other sites like it are split almost equally between Islamicate and Christianate occupation. Why then, do we not identify Zorita as an Islamicate fortress rather than a Christianate medieval castle? The next chapter interrogates why investigations like the one presented here are so rare in Andalusi history.
Chapter Four: A Monumental Year: Occluding the Islamicate Past in National Heritage Sites in the Decree of June 3, 1931

‘Dear Mr. Hearst:
Mr. Byne encloses this chipping and says there have been several like articles lately and to ask you to please to keep impressing on Mr. McGregor the necessity of keeping the transaction as secret as possible until all the stones are out of Spain.
Yours very truly,
JM’April 11, 1926

‘Dear Mr. Hearst:
Mildred Byne wrote last fall that they had crossed and recrossed Spain in the quest for a cloister or palace for you. – This is just out and I suppose is in the nature of an answer to cloisters.
The blue slips are put in where the cloister is ‘abandoned’.
What a wealth of suggestive material this little book contains.
Yours very truly,
JM’March 31, 1927

‘Byne has bought renfacade and is shipping it we can use it somewhere 2 Byne writes that Spanish government has prevented exportation of Alcantara monastery
W.R. Hearst’December 20, 1930 (to Julia Morgan)

The telegrams above represent only a few of the thousands exchanged between William Randolph Hearst and his architect Julia Morgan in the course of the media mogul’s construction of his architectural magnum opus, San Simeon. Located on the California coast about halfway between San Francisco and Los Angeles, the twentieth-century castle is halfway around the world from the town of Zorita de los Canes, Spain, yet remains a testament to the convoluted relationship of 500 years of Spanish and American imperialism in which both nations played the role of the colonizer and the

611 I am thankful for the comments of the History of Art Reading group at The University of Edinburgh, College of Art, the Early Islamic Reading Group at the University of Edinburgh, Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies Department, as well as the Middle East and North African Reading group at Georgetown University for comments on this chapter.
colonized. Hearst, Morgan, and his dealers in Spain, Mildred Stapley Byne and her husband Arthur Byne, played a role in the fate of the castle-fortress of Zorita. The rampant mercenary transactions of Spanish and international antiquities dealers in the early twentieth century denuded Spain of artistic and architectural treasures, at times with the complicity of the Spanish government, the Catholic Church in Spain, and Spanish citizens. The 1920s and 1930s attest to the power-struggle between the aforementioned parties as Spain’s government identified and defined priorities in protecting national culture. Various administrations enacted legislation that attempted to stem the tide of the exportation of cultural heritage, with varied success. Simply put, the government attempted to prevent the situation in which ‘all the stones were out of Spain.’ This context of international pressure, local mercenary activity, national protectionism, and local advocacy collide in the history of the cultural heritage of the castle-fortress of Zorita. Since 1844, when the government first named and protected National Artistic Treasures, the people of Zorita de los Canes had advocated for its inclusion in the registry of national monuments. Their applications were without success until 1931: both Francisco Layna Serrano, the official historian for the province of Guadalajara in the middle of the twentieth century, as well as the cultural environment in Spain were directly affected by the Byne’s mediation which led to the exportation of the Monastery of Santa María de Óvila from the province. It is not an exaggeration to say that the protection of the fortress of Zorita came about directly as a result of the Byne’s predatory dealings in the province of Guadalajara. This chapter analyses the Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts passed on June 3, 1931, the law that protected the castle-fortress of Zorita, with the aim of understanding the development of the legal history of cultural patrimony in the nation-state of Spain. In tracing both the development of the Spanish legal framework for a national cultural

615 For a discussion detailing the removal of the Alhambra’s Partal Palace ceiling to Germany, see McSweeney, *From Granada to Berlin: The Alhambra Cupola*. For discussions on architecture and artwork that was sold, as well as information on many prominent dealers of Spanish antiquities, see Chapters Two and Three in José Miguel Merino de Cáceres y María José Martínez Ruiz, *La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W. R. Hearst: «El gran acaparador»* (Madrid, Catedra, 2022).
heritage, as well as examining the monuments that the government chose to recognize and protect between 1844 and 1975, I highlight how the Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts of June 3, 1931 unintentionally began an occlusion of the Islamicate history of Castilla-La Mancha which still affects the way we interpret the history of the region today. This discussion highlights the second major moment in cultural memory and the historiographic filter, referred to in the Introduction, through which Islamicate sites, like the fortress of Zorita, passes.

The discussion that follows starts in 1844 with the first legal designation of a National Artistic Treasure which referred to the protected national monuments of Spain, and terminates in 1975, at which point the nation-state of Spain shifted its approach to cultural heritage. The terminology of this protected category has changed over time: what were once National Artistic Treasures are now referred to as Bien(es) de Interés Cultural, or BIC(s). This temporal span starts in the reign of Isabel II (r. 1833-1868) and concludes with the end of the Francoist state after the dictator’s death in 1975. While the story of cultural patrimony in Spain continues, the object of this study is to provide insight into historical processes which contributed to the current situation. The transition back to a constitutional monarchy in the 1970s marked a disruption in the approach to the management of national cultural patrimony and as such deserves a study in its own right. Despite varying forms of government which included constitutional monarchies and dictatorships and periods of war including the sporadic outbreaks of the Carlist Wars in the nineteenth century (1833-1876), the Spanish-American War (1898), the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), not to mention international conflicts including World War I (1914-1918), World War II (1939-1945), and the Cold War (1947-1991), the approach to national cultural heritage from 1844-1974 remained stable—a potent modern testament to the ways in which cultural periodisations do not always match political and military ones. During this time period the basic process of designating National Artistic Treasures remained the same: the central government encouraged provinces to
nominate potential sites worthy of national protection yet the ultimate authority to grant this lay with the central government in Madrid.\footnote{This process is almost the opposite post 1978 in which the Constitution of the modern nation of Spain devolved this responsibilities to the seventeen Autonomous Communities.}

\subsection{Organization of the Chapter}

This chapter starts with a discussion on the advent and development of constitutionally-protected places of national cultural heritage in the nation-state of Spain.\footnote{Various scholars have written monographs on the development of national cultural heritage in Spain, for example Afinoguénova, \textit{The Prado: Spanish Culture and Leisure, 1819-1939}. However, the difference here is the history I relate here is the development of public protectionism that while in conversation and cooperation with the Crown and the Catholic Church, the laws passed from the middle of the nineteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century mark the development of the idea that a constitutional body, i.e. the Cortes, has a right to participate in this conversation.} This conversation seeks to situate the Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts, passed on June 3, 1931, in the larger framework of Spanish cultural heritage at the beginning of the twentieth century. This background demonstrates the June 3 Decree’s revolutionary approach to the identification of National Artistic Treasures/BICs in the nation. After providing this context, the discussion moves to the structure of this Decree and explores what the document itself demonstrates. I then move to narrate the story of Zorita’s identification as a National Artistic Treasure in the Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts on June 3, 1931: one that elucidates broader themes in Spain’s cultural history including the role of foreign dealers in exporting Spanish antiquities and the development of national, governmental protectionism and oversight of this trade; the ways in which cultural looting of Spain attests to the history of this European nation as a simultaneous colonizer and victim of cultural colonization; and an examination of the internal dynamics in Spain that led the June 3, 1931 law to add more sites perceived as Catholic or related to the history of the Asturian monarchy to the register of National Artistic Treasures –identifications which have had long term consequences for contemporary cultural memory in Spain.
4.2 Towards a National Cultural Heritage: The Laws

1931 served as a landmark year for the castle-fortress of Zorita, literally. Abandoned since the end of the sixteenth century, Zorita’s lamentable condition elegized by Layna Serrano at the beginning of Chapter Three may have persisted until the present, resembling that of other Islamicate sites in Castilla-La Mancha, had it not been for local, provincial, and national responses to the exportation of Spanish antiquities to international buyers at the turn of the twentieth century. As a result of both the real and perceived threat to Spanish cultural heritage, on June 3, 1931, the government of the Second Republic (1931-1939) under the leadership of the Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts, Marcelino Domingo y Sanjuán, and the provisional President of the Second Republic, Niceto Alcalá-Zamora y Torres, passed a law I will refer to from here on as the Decree of June 3, 1931. A close consideration of what this law said and why ‘Zorita Castle’ was included as a National Artistic Treasure leads us to discoveries about the contestation of Spanish cultural heritage in the first half of the twentieth century, the state of looting of Spanish antiquities in the 1920s, the development of Mildred Stapley Byne and Arthur Byne as major dealers involved in the illicit antiquities trade, the importance of local advocates like Francisco Layna Serrano, and how the way in which a monument entered the list of BICs impacted the way that future generations saw, defined, protected, and investigated a site. However, before moving to this discussion I provide a summary of what ‘national cultural heritage’ in Spain looked like prior to this point. The Decree of June 3, 1931 marked a major turning point in the national approach to cultural heritage, but to appreciate that requires understanding what the situation was prior to this law.

618 For a general history of collecting in Spain (and international collecting of Spanish heritage), see Afinoguénova. Afinoguénova discusses the role of the Peninsular Wars on the international taste for the development of Spanish art on page 49. For an assertion that there were no private art dealers in Spain until the end of the nineteenth century, see page 88. ; For a history on the development of the American taste for Spanish art at the turn of the century, see Kagan, The Spanish Craze: America’s Fascination with the Hispanic World, 1779-1939.
619 For a discussion of the passing of this law in response to predatory international buying, see Los cielos españoles (Aragón Cultura, 2020), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xxZxzw1pdk.
4.2a Setting the Stage: Cultural Patrimony in Spain prior to June 3, 1931

In ratifying the Decree of June 3, 1931, the government of the Second Republic expanded the number of protected national monuments overnight from 362 to 1,117, a dramatic increase of 209%. From the passing of the first law to safeguard a National Artistic Treasure on August 28, 1844, which identified the Cathedral of León as a protected monument, until the end of 1975, no year saw as many sites added as 1931 (Figure 4.1).\textsuperscript{620} Though the Provincial Commissions of Historical and Artistic Monuments and the Central Commission was established in 1844 and provides a possible starting point for the desire to curate a national heritage, this charge should be understood more as a evidence of \textit{interest} rather than evidence of \textit{protection}. There were several steps involved in achieving protected status including identification, advocacy, application, and approval. What is related below is a summary of legislation passed by the governments of Spain (in whatever form) that speak to larger trends in managing national cultural heritage. It is difficult to speak of a coherent national policy regarding historic monuments in Spain prior to 1931. Though the \textit{Gaceta de Madrid},\textsuperscript{621} the public bulletin summarizing laws passed by the Spanish government, published several orders relating to cultural patrimony between 1910 and 1920, this never resulted in a clear national plan or strategy for the identification, preservation, or restoration of monuments.\textsuperscript{622} In addition, it is important to keep in mind that understandings of what constitutes protection, preservation, and restoration have fluctuated drastically in the past century. There is a marked tendency in scholarship on the period to retroactively apply presentist conceptions of what constitutes acceptable protective practices to the past, something

\textsuperscript{620} When we take into account all of the Decrees of 1931, not just that of June 3, 1931, the total number of sites protected is 763.

\textsuperscript{621} From now on I will refer to the \textit{Gaceta de Madrid} simply as the \textit{Gaceta}.

\textsuperscript{622} Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, 189 Gaceta de Madrid § (1911); Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, 64 Gaceta de Madrid § (1915); See especially Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, ‘Reglamento provisional para la aplicación de la ley de 7 de Julio de 1911, que estableció las reglas a que han de someterse las excavaciones artísticas y científicas y la conservación de las ruinas y antigüedades,’ 65 Gaceta § (1912).
I seek to avoid. This section summarizes seven laws that speak to the state of cultural heritage in the 1920s prior to the Decree of June 3, 1931. The first three laws, passed on July 7, 1911, March 1, 1912, and March 4, 1915, respectively, are discussed primarily because of references to these pieces of legislation made in later decrees. Together they lay the foundation for policy relating to the treatment of antiquities in the nation of Spain. The next four acts discussed, the Royal Orders/Decrees of December 13, 1912, December 21, 1921, July 6, 1922, and April 25, 1924, demonstrate different approaches towards identifying and protecting national monuments. I have chosen to group these seven laws thematically rather than strictly chronologically to highlight the work these groupings do in approaches to cultural heritage.

4.2ai July 7, 1911: What makes a site and who has the right to compensation?

The first piece of legislation relating to excavations and antiquities in Spain was passed on July 7, 1911, and published in the Gaceta on July 8, 1911, and consists of thirteen articles. Articles 1-2 define terms like ‘excavation’ and ‘antiquities’; Article 3 states that the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts are ordered to create an inventory of ‘monumental ruins and antiquities used in modern buildings’; Article 4 details the state’s right to eminent domain; Articles 5-13 focus mainly on monetary valuation and compensation for antiquities including outlining the ways in which the state can partner with external organizations, be they Spanish or foreign-owned. While the law does provide a

623 An example of this can be found in José Miguel Merino de Caceres y Maria Jose Martinez Ruiz, La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W. R. Hearst: «El gran acaparador», 31, who state ‘no solo fueron las medidas gubernamentales, ni el más o menos discutible ejercicio de los emisarios del Estado para proceder a dichas expropiaciones, recogida de obras, etc., los que propiciaron el desastre, sino la actitud de una Sociedad que dio rienda suelta a gestos absolutamente airados, a codicias malsanas y a un ánimo general de abuso sobre los restos históricos . . .”/ Translation: “It was not only government measures, nor the more or less questionable activities of state emissaries that led to said expropriations, collecting of works, etc., that led to the disaster, but also the attitude of a society that gave free rein to absolutely angry gestures, unhealthy greed, and a general spirit of abuse regarding historical remains.” While in 2024 Western-European societal norms see the actions of peoples from the late nineteenth- and twentieth-centuries as problematic, historical approaches must understand that, despite voices from the time who lamented approaches to cultural history, this was no means a widely-accepted cultural norm. This discussion traces the development of modern cultural norms, looking to elucidate the history of how Spanish society (and others) came to a culture of protectionism that is more pervasive today.

624 Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, ‘Real Decreto,’ 189 Gaceta § (1911).
framework for archaeological work to be conducted, documented, and for a financial value to be placed upon it, it offers little information as to what will be protected, how it is to be identified, or who is to do the identifying.\(^{625}\) The law does state that both buildings and objects dating to Prehistory, Antiquity, and the Middle Ages are protected, there is little information as to what defines these categories. The vagaries of this law seem to have caused issues, as stated in a Royal Decree passed on March 1, 1912 published in the March 5, 1912 Gaceta.

4.2aii  March 1, 1912: Defining Archaeological Sites and Antiquities in Spain

The March 1 Decree has two chapters subdivided into forty-six articles, many of which aim at clarifying what qualified as an antiquity or archaeological site. This was the most comprehensive and dominant law relating to the identification and protection of sites: a sort of handbook to ‘what counts.’ The first significant difference between the March 1, 1912 law and that of July 7, 1911, is that while the earlier decree only counted sites relating to ‘Prehistory, Antiquity, and the Middle Ages,’\(^{626}\) the 1912 law included all sites up until the time of Carlos I, increasing eligible sites and objects.\(^{627}\) The majority of the first chapter of this ruling focuses on issues of compensation, ownership, and rights to sell. It is clear that the fronting of financial issues in both the 1911 and 1912 laws speak to cultural heritage as a business enterprise. It is not until Chapter Two, Article 27, which focuses on administration, that some procedures are enumerated. Compliance regulation is assigned to the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts and a Board of Excavations and Antiquities, whose membership is defined in Article 28, headed by the Inspector General of Fine Arts. The most specific clauses are those in Articles 41 through 45 which

---

\(^{625}\) See text of Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, 1911. A particularly confusing passage in Article 3 states that those responsible for forming an inventory of antiquities (loosely defined) will consist of persons from ‘the faculties of the Academies, the Libraries, Archivists, Archaeologists, staff from Universities, and Professors’ with no other reference to how these people will be selected, organized, managed, or compensated.

\(^{626}\) See Article 2 in Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes.

\(^{627}\) See Article 2 in Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, Reglamento provisional para la aplicación de la ley de 7 de Julio de 1911, que estableció las reglas á que han de someterse las excavaciones artísticas y científicas y la conservación de las ruinas y antigüedades, 671.
give some idea about the types of sites that the government is interested in protecting. Between Article 41 and 42, the following sites are specified: caves, mines, modern buildings that reused ancient material, deposits of natural minerals, abandoned mines, caverns, roads, and monuments, though no further explanation is given as to what might qualify as a monument. One walks away from reading the text of this law with the impression that this has relatively little to do with preserving heritage so much as it has to do with locating precious metals and materials that the state can extract monetary gain from its land. Articles 44 and 45 devolve the identification and location of sites to the provinces, which are to be supported by local officials and the Civil Guard in their work. However, almost nothing is said about after locations are identified how they will be protected or managed. No provisions are made explaining what achieving monumental status entitles a site to, be it monetary or nominal protection. This is interesting for a document so thoroughly concerned with finances. At this point in time National Artistic Treasures were viewed primarily as money-makers, specifically related to prices they might fetch if sold. The biggest question related to the financial administration of sites seems to be: once sold, who is entitled to profit from the sale – the person who found the ‘treasure’? the government? the firms or people who do the work of excavation? local communities? Almost nothing is said about the potential expense that a BIC might incur. Together, the cultural patrimony laws of 1911 and 1912 are about establishing ownership and the right to oversight and financial remuneration.

4.2.iii March 4, 1915: What Makes a National Monument?

As if to redress the lack of guidance regarding what makes a monument promulgated in the March 1, 1912 law, on March 4, 1915, the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts under the leadership of Saturnino Esteban Miquel y Collantes passed a law published in the March 5, 1915 Gaceta.

---

628 Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, Reglamento provisional para la aplicación de la ley de 7 de Julio de 1911, que estableció las reglas a que han de someterse las excavaciones artísticas y científicas y la conservación de las ruinas y antigüedades.
629 This is especially highlighted in Article 7 which specifically details how discoveries of precious metals and stones are to be handled. Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes.
This decree gives immense latitude to provinces, declaring that preferences as to artistic or historical style of potential monuments to be added to national register established by the June 7, 1911 law is up to them. This law also states that any person wishing to disassemble or destroy (presumably in the course of new construction) a protected site needs to obtain permission from the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts. Municipalities, provinces, and the State are given the right of refusal regarding sale of elements from dismantled sites, unless the building in question is destined to be rebuilt within the nation of Spain.\textsuperscript{630} Interestingly though, if no protest was made, the owner, be that an individual or an entity like the Catholic church, is awarded the right to sell after a waiting period of three months (Article 2-3). This decree deals largely with financing regarding the right to sell, the right to remuneration, and corporate incentives for engaging in relocation or restoration.

For the first time, this law provides information regarding funding for conservation, restoration, and/or reconstruction, which amounts to twenty-five to one hundred percent of an approved budget for the work, to be coordinated and approved by the Academies of Fine Arts, History, and the Council for Civil Construction of the Ministry.\textsuperscript{631} The right to apply for these funds backdate to all monuments previously added to this list, and this legislation adds that any reforms or construction on these sites must be approved. Rights of communities to use sites would remain unimpeded as long as they did not partake in activities that contributed to the destruction of the site. These provisions seem to speak to questions created by the laws of 1911 and 1912: if communities or the government decided to admit a monument into a protected category, what then did that mean for who would pay for the upkeep and repairs on the accessioned monument? And if a community was paying for a public site, what did that mean in terms of access? By 1915 the discussion on national culture included concerns of upkeep, restoration, and financial management of National Artistic Treasures.

\textsuperscript{630} See Article 2 in Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, 1915.
\textsuperscript{631} See Article 4, Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes.
Taken together, these laws passed between 1911 and 1915 show the concern with the financial aspects of cultural heritage. In Spain, this coincides with a rampant market in antiquities in which both objects and buildings were being sold at exorbitant prices to the highest bidder with little regulation.\textsuperscript{632} It appears that the goal of the Spanish government in these years was to police a financial market, especially one in which the Catholic church participated with little regulation.\textsuperscript{633} In many ways these laws make sense – before moving to managing property one has to identify what property there is to manage. Thus, in the aforementioned laws, protection is defined as not letting a site be sold or destroyed, rather than conceived of in terms of management, guardianship, or the custodial role that adding a site to a list might imply in 2024. However, analysing the history of laws passed in relation to cultural patrimony when compared to the official identification and designation of National Artistic Treasures by law or royal decree shows the disjuncture between intention and reality. While many commissions were ordered and laws were passed to investigate cultural patrimony, few resulted in systematic identification of sites, let alone any type of national criteria or top-down plan to preserve Spanish monumental heritage. The commissions devolved these powers to the provinces of Spain and comparing the results of the Provincial Commissions demonstrates how differently regions thought about their cultural heritage. While others have studied the Provincial Commissions, the intent of this paper is to look at the actionable results: that is what ‘made the list’ and when. Only a few laws demand attention prior to the June 3, 1931 Decree: the Royal Orders/Decrees of December 13, 1912; December 21, 1921; July 6, 1922; and April 25, 1924.

\textsuperscript{632} For a summary of how the lack of protection led to huge numbers of interiors move out of Spain in the early twentieth century, see McSweeney, \textit{From Granada to Berlin: The Alhambra Cupola}, 5:161–62; For a discussion of buildings (including the castle of Tamarit which was sold to Charles Deering in 1916), patios, and monasteries exported by the Bynes, see Victoria Rodriguez Thiessen, ‘Byne and Stapley: Scholars, Dealers, and Collectors of Spanish Decorative Arts’ (New York, Cooper-Hewitt Museum and Parsons School of Design, 1998), Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{633} For assertions that the Catholic church was immune to laws passed on the selling of cultural heritage, see Rodriguez Thiessen, ‘Byne and Stapley: Scholars, Dealers, and Collectors of Spanish Decorative Arts,’ 299.
4.2aiv Royal Order of December 13, 1912: Protecting Mérida

The format of the Royal Order of December 13, 1912, published in the *Gaceta* on January 3, 1913, is the first law to evince a coordinated approach regarding the identification of a group of sites in the nation of Spain. Though by December 1912, the state had identified one hundred and seven sites as protected by the national government, at no point had more than three sites been added to the list at the same time. Only four times prior had multiple sites been identified. One can describe the approach of cultural heritage until December of 1912 as piecemeal. However, the province of Badajoz first changed this by advocating for nineteen sites to be added to the list of BICs, in a grouping titled ‘the Antiquities of Mérida’. This list included one Prehistoric site of a dolmen; sixteen Roman sites: a theatre, an amphitheatre, the Roman circus, two bridges, two aqueducts, two reservoirs (*pantanos*), a network of Roman *cloacas*, a Roman triumphal arch, two temples, a columbarium, remains of a bath, and a basilica; and two Medieval sites: a basilica and the ‘Alcazaba-Conventual’, an Umayyad fortress that was reused in the late medieval and early modern periods as a convent. These aforementioned locations were not enumerated in the Decree; rather, from the language of the law it seems as though a list was turned into the Royal Academy of History and the Royal Academy of the Fine Arts of San Fernando who then bore the responsibility of overseeing the legal management of the sites. In addition to being a new approach to adding to the list of National Artistic Treasures, this law demonstrates the categories in which people advocated for sites. Striking for the conversation that follows is the shared identification of the Islamicate and Christianate pasts as equally ‘Medieval’ and equally Spanish.

4.2av The Royal Order of December 21, 1921: A Systematic Approach to Protecting Sites in Toledo

Nine years later, Toledo joined Badajoz as a province adding multiple monuments to the national registry when sixteen sites in the city came under the protection of the state. The format of this decree differs substantially from its predecessor, and we see for the first time an enumeration of sites...
based on their historical time period as a result of a Provincial Commission of Historic and Artistic
Monuments. This is the first decree that has a structuring aesthetic to it. While up until this point laws
had been presented in paragraph form, the physical organization of the document shows a different
approach at work. Sites are delineated first by type (walls, towers, gates, or bridges) and then within
each category classified by era (Roman, Visigothic, ‘Arab’, or belonging to the ‘Reconquista’). Each type
of monument has its own section physically separated in the Decree by paragraphs and capitalized titles,
and each subsection is indicated by italics. Not only does the Royal Order of December 21, 1921 show
the first typological approach to identifying and protecting sites in a location, but like the Royal Order of
December 13, 1912, shines a light on the ways in which the Provincial Commission saw and divided
historical epochs at the time. 1921 is the first delineation in a law related to cultural heritage that
suggests that medieval history cannot be understood holistically but rather should be divided into
epochs including ‘Arab’ and related to the so-called ‘Reconquista’. This is distinct from the approach of
the province of Badajoz in which both the Islamicate and Christianate history of a site were recognized.
In the crafting of this decree recognizing the history of the province of Toledo, the language suggests
that history has to belong to one epoch or another – that identifications cannot be shared.

4.2avi Royal Order of July 6, 1922: Identifying Protected Sites in Granada

The third law to include a substantial number of sites to be protected as National Artistic
Treasures prior to June 3, 1931 is the Royal Order of July 6, 1922, in which thirteen sites in the province
of Granada were added to the national registry. Like the law of December 21, 1921, this order makes
direct mention of the Provincial Commission’s report to the Royal Academies of History and Fine Arts of
San Fernando. In form, this decree falls somewhere between the laws enacted to protect sites in
Badajoz and Toledo. Sites are specifically named, yet not categorized. Instead, the Royal Order of July 6,
1922 states that the Provisional Commission has selected these sites in accordance with the laws

635 Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, Real Decreto.
previously delineated regarding historical sites: that of July 7, 1911; March 1, 1912, and March 4, 1915. This law is short and ‘matter-of-fact’. What emerges in this law is that Granada seems to be following a bureaucratic process in which Provincial Commissions identified sites.

4.2avii Decree of April 25, 1924

The final law that protected more than a handful of sites prior to the passing of the Decree of June 3, 1931 is that of April 25, 1924, published in the Gaceta on May 7. This Decree differs from the others not only because it protected forty-seven sites, the greatest number in any legislation to date, but also because it was the only law passed prior to 1931 that enumerated locations across provinces. The commonality is that all sites included in this list are identified ‘arte rupestre’ sites with cave paintings.

4.2aviii Prior to June 3, 1931: A Snapshot

Numerically speaking, these four laws protected ninety-five of the three hundred and sixty-two sites recognized as National Artistic Treasures between 1844 and June 3, 1931, approximately 26%. However, it is important to emphasize that while each law highlights a different approach that provinces or commissions took to identifying sites to be added to the list of BICs, none of these decrees further elaborated on what protected status meant, nor provide funding or directions to create an infrastructure to manage these locales. Rather each decree simply listed that certain places now fell under the protection of the Spanish government, to be managed jointly by the Royal Academy of History and the Royal Academy of Fine Arts of San Fernando.

The sudden doubling of National Artistic Treasures in 1931 Spain spoke to a nation-wide dynamic: that of a perceived menace to national heritage. While I will return to this issue of which national heritage seemed to be endangered, the action by the provisional government of the Second Republic which had only recently come to power on April 14, 1931, speaks to the sense that legal action was needed to staunch both the internal threat to sites from the Spanish people, as well as the external
threat of the removal of Spanish cultural objects from the country to foreign buyers. While the dynamics of this threat are complex, we can assert confidently that a contributing factor to this need to protect sites in Spain lay in stopping the looting of the country: a goal in which the law was often ineffective.\textsuperscript{636} Passed in direct response to the increased pillaging of the country by both Spanish and international dealers, the June 3, 1931 decree aimed at discouraging the destruction and exportation of architectural antiquities. However, without the backing of international law, decrees naming protected sites could affect little change.\textsuperscript{637} The speed at which the Second Republic passed this law is remarkable. While this legislation draws on work done by commissions, individuals, and the members of the Royal Academies of History and Fine Arts of San Fernando, the achievement is staggering in itself. Less than two months after being elected to power, the Second Republic delivered a sweeping reform and vision for a nation whose cultural heritage was under siege.

4.2b The Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction of Fine Arts on June 3, 1931: Its Form

The Decree of the Ministry of Public Instruction of Fine Arts of June 3, 1931 was published in the \textit{Gaceta} on June 4, 1931. Its form, language, and format tell us something about the priorities of the Second Republic. The Decree opens with a small paragraph that states:

De conformidad con los informes emitidos por la Junta Superior de Excavaciones y el Comité ejecutivo de la Junta de Patronato para protección, conservación y acrecentamientos del Tesoro Artístico Nacional, y en virtud de lo dispuesto en el Decreto de 9 de Agosto de 1926, el Gobierno provisional de la República, a propuesta del Ministro de Instrucción pública y Bellas Artes, decreta lo siguiente.\textsuperscript{638}


\textsuperscript{637} The first international law forbidding the trafficking of antiquities was passed in 1970.

\textsuperscript{638} Translation: ‘In accordance with the reports issued by the Superior Board of Excavations and the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for the protection, conservation, and enhancement of National Artistic Treasures, and by virtue of the provisions in the Decree of August 9, 1926, the provisional government of the Republic, at the proposal of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts, decrees the following:’ Niceto Alcalá-Zamora y Torres and Marcelino Domingo y Sanjuán, ‘Decreto de 3 de junio de 1931,’ 155 \textit{Gaceta de Madrid} § Ministro de Instrucción pública y Bellas Artes (1931), 1181.
Two items are of particular notice: first, this act is intended as a continuation of work completed under the Primo de Rivera government; and second, that this process was a thoroughly bureaucratic one, dependent not only upon reports from the Superior Board of Excavations and the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for the protection, conservation, and enhancement of National Artistic Treasures but also on the recommendation of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts.

The Decree itself only has two articles, though the first is quite lengthy. Article One lists art-historical monuments considered National Artistic Treasures. Following this statement, a list of over 750 sites is provided, organized alphabetically by province/city. Forty-eight provinces/cities are named, starting with Álava and concluding with Zaragoza. However, trying to figure out a structuring logic to the document is challenging. Provinces vary widely in the number of sites they protect, ranging from one (Ibiza) to thirty-eight (Zaragoza). While many provinces start by listing the major Cathedrals of the region, others do not. Regionally, priorities seem quite different, most notably in the way that some locations prioritize Catholic sites while others mention few, as shown in the table below. Of the 755 sites protected in this law, 422 can be identified as Catholic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Autonomous Community</th>
<th>Total Number of Sites Protected in June 3, 1931 Decree</th>
<th>Number of Sites identifiable as Catholic</th>
<th>Percentage of Sites in June 3, 1931 Decree Identified as Catholic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

639 I have tallied this at 755, though other sources might number this differently. The *Inventario Del Patrimonio Artístico y Arqueológico de España*, Second (Madrid: Centro Nacional de Información Artística, Arqueológica y Etnológica, 1975), 66–95 offers a count of 798. The discrepancy lies in the issue of duplicates and separation between sites. I have chosen to count a site only once, despite the fact that it may show up on the list twice, as different provinces occasionally claimed the same site. In addition, I have chosen to divide sites only if they are located at substantially different locations according to the GIS data. For example, the Decree may list three or four sites in one entry (thus the number of entries in the Decree is smaller than both my 755 and the 798 of the report of the Inventario. However, I have not separated sites where a chapel within a church is counted as two different sites - while the Inventario has, no doubt for legal reasons. My count is based on what provides serviceable data for the mapping of cultural patrimony, not for the legal protection, which has different considerations.

640 I have chosen to use the modern Autonomous Communities as during the period under discussion in this investigation (nineteenth and twentieth centuries) provincial boundaries change. The use of Autonomous Communities allows for useful comparisons in later chapters. In addition, though there are seventeen Autonomous Communities, this chart only has sixteen. The omitted Autonomous Community, the Canary Islands, as this territory did not protect any monuments.
### Table: Catholic Monuments by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>1931 Decree</th>
<th>in June 3, 1931 Decree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusia</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragon</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asturias</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baleares</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque Country</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantabria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilla-La Mancha</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilla y León</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>64.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremadura</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galicia</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rioja</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murcia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarra</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Sites</strong></td>
<td><strong>755</strong></td>
<td><strong>422</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no doubt that Catholic monuments were important to all provinces—the question was how important. The fact that the mean of 55.89 percent is also the median—we see this when we look at the distribution, eight Autonomous Communities fall above this (purple), and eight below (blue)—demonstrates that we are dealing with a normal distribution across areas. Though some percentages are skewed by the low number of sites protected by a region, it is clear that different priorities are at work in different locations, a discussion I return to later.

---

641 The following sites have been included (as they are named in the Decree): Cathedrals (Catedrales); Monasteries (Monasterios); Convent (Conventos); Seminaries (Seminario); Hermitages (Ermitas); Pilgrimage sites (Santuarios); Churches (Iglesias); and Chapels (Capillas). Though other sites (like Colegiatas) are often associated with the Catholic church, I have chosen to exclude them from this county due to the mixed nature of the sites and their respective relationship with the Catholic church over the centuries.

642 It may be of some discussion as to why I chose to insert a chart with Catholic identity, as this might seem teleologically driven by the aforementioned issues regarding the issue of confessional identity and nationhood. The reason for this choice is simply that no other easily definable identity resulting in a data set this large can be extrapolated from the names chosen for sites in the Decree. The next closest category, ‘Castles and Fortresses’ (identified by Castillo or Alcázar) had 91 sites (12.10%), followed by ‘Roman sites,’ (identified as romano/a) had 61 sites (8.08%); followed by Prehistoric (Despoblado or Cuevas) at 45 sites (5.96%). In terms of other sites named with reference to the terms I covered in my introduction, Arab sites (árabe) number 11 (1.47%); ‘Moorish,’ 3 (0.40%); Morisco, 1 (0.13%). Finally, several sites defied classification by association with peoples: those include doors, gates, walls, areas of cities, streets, fountains, prisons, towers, hospitals, and houses all of which can be dated to different periods and peoples. The largest statistical sample of the aforementioned is towers, numbering 14 (1.85%).
There are several irregularities in the Decree: duplicates abound, and while some seem to have plausible explanations—as in how various provinces claim sites located in border zones—one genuinely is confused as to how a site like Cuevas de Cales-Coves located on the island of Menorca was listed as a protected site for the neighbouring island of Mallorca. There are several types of duplicates that appear in the Decree, easily broken-down into three categories: first, sites that are named twice in the Decree yet are claimed by two different provinces; second, sites that are claimed by one province in 1931 only to be ‘course-corrected’ by later decrees which affirm them to be in another territory; and finally, sites that had been previously protected by Spanish laws that make a reappearance in the Decree of 1931, thus officially being protected at least twice by the government. Another common irregularity includes instances of misspelling that cannot be attributed to a difference in language. As we will see, one of these misspellings has significance for the cultural patrimony of Zorita: that of the Monastery of Óvila.

4.2bi Sites Mentioned Twice

One of the most glaring inconsistencies in the Decree of June 3, 1931 is the repetition of sites within the Decree itself. The distinguishing factor between this category and the one that follows is that places listed here were contested by various provinces at the time of their inclusion into national heritage whereas in the grouping that follows, sites became contested in later decades. Within the text of the law, six sites are claimed by multiple provinces: the church of San Jaime of Fontanyá, identified by Barcelona and Gerona; the Castle de Aínsa identified by Huesca and Navarra; the Monastery/Church of San Pedro de las Dueñas identified by León (monasterio) and Segovia (iglesia); the Monastery of Ovarra, identified by Lerida and Huesca; the Monastery of Vallbona, identified by Barcelona and Lérida;

---

643 Many sites evince this dual-protection over the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Those mentioned here already had official status as a National Artistic Treasure prior to inclusion on the Decree of June 3, 1931.

644 This is also a site that is misspelled. The correct identification should read: San Jaime of Frontanyá.
and finally, the Roman ruins in Monreal de Ariza, identified by both Soria and Zaragoza. Reconstructing what happened here would require more archival work: it is possible that the compilers of the law did not notice the repetition of sites; that they consciously left the duplicates in, perhaps a nod to equal claims of both provinces to a contested site; or perhaps some combination of both. One piece of evidence that suggests that this law was simply compiled from provincial reports rather than written and edited in some centralized process is that in two situations, sites within provinces are listed twice. The province of Granada protected the main church of Our Lady of the Incarnation in two separate entries and the province of Murcia listed the ruins of the palaces (alcázares) in San Javier twice as well. It is hard to think of a legal reason for doing so— after all a province would not be contesting its own claim – rather it appears this situation arose from a lack of editing both on a local and national level. This might speak to the process as well. It is reasonable to suggest that multiple lists may have been submitted. If we should regard duplicate mentions as errors, this speaks to the role that provinces had in identifying their own sites. A location showing up on a list twice suggests that this was not a coordinated effort where a central authority made one list, which would reduce the likelihood of duplicates, but rather shows that provinces identified their own sites, and sent their list forward to a compiler, not an author with an editorial purview. This hints at the regional nature of this law, which may also explain the vast disparities in number and type of sites mentioned earlier.

4.2bii Sites Later Attributed to Different Locations

Another curiosity of this list is the number of sites whose location is contested, largely due to their presence on borders of provinces.645 Although provincial borders changed in the twentieth

645 These twenty sites are attributed to one location, and then claimed by another in subsequent years: the Cathedrals of the Savior and Saint Mary, the Convent of Saint Dominic, and the Castle (castillo) of Orihuela (claimed by Murcia, in Alicante); the Roman temple of Vich (claimed by Gerona, in Barcelona); the monastery of Saint Mary in Gualter (claimed by Gerona, in Lerida); the bridge in Monistrol (claimed by Tarragona, in Barcelona); the ruins of Peña Amaya (claimed by Santander, in Burgos); the Chapel of the Tabernacle (sagrario) of the parochial church (claimed by Jaén, in Córdoba); the Castle (castillo) and walls of Molina de Aragón (claimed by Guadalajara, in Cuenca); the ‘Altar of the Moors’ and the ruins of los Bañales (claimed by Navarra, in Zaragoza); the Western
century, this redrawing of boundaries did not affect all the sites concerned. Sites that originally entered the national registry in one province only to have this designation changed later are labelled as ‘erroneously included’ in the report of the National Centre of Artistic, Archaeological, and Ethnological Information issued in 1975.\textsuperscript{646} Either as a result of changing boundaries or as locations identified by multiple claimants, this second grouping of sites all feature again in laws that dated to after June 3, 1931. This legal contestation of sites might lead to questions around popular understandings of physical borders, spaces that share importance for several provinces, and ways that peoples conceive of belonging. This reinforces ideas discussed in Chapter One that maps with lines rarely reflect the way in which people understand space. Regional conceptions of identity might have little to do with geographically contiguous space.

4.2biii Previously Protected Sites

Finally, fifteen sites designated as National Artistic Treasures prior to 1931 make the June 3, 1931 list which in theory means that sites are legally protected twice. Two subsets exist within these fifteen locations: first, the group of sites that are included exactly as they had previously been, and second, those whose inclusion in the Decree is accompanied by language that further specifies and clarifies aspects of the original site that are to be protected. This first group, consisting of eight sites, evince no difference in the language of their original designation as a protected monument to that of their inclusion in the June 3, 1931 law.\textsuperscript{647} There are few commonalities between these locations. They

\begin{itemize}
  \item Towers (claimed by La Coruña, in Pontevedra); Puente de la Alcantarilla, the ruins of Peña de la Sal, in Alcolea del Río, and the Castillo de Mulva, in Villanueva de Río (claimed by Seville, in Cordoba); the walls and doors of las Eras, in Montequago de las Vicarias, and the Ciclopéan ruins, in Santa María de Huerta (claimed by Soria, in Teruel); the ruins of Cabello de Alcalá (claimed by Teruel, in Zaragoza); the Hermitage of the Consolation in Chiprana (claimed by Teruel, in Zaragoza).
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{646} \textit{Inventario del Patrimonio Artístico y Arqueológico de España}, 66–95.
\textsuperscript{647} The eight sites are: the Church of Saint Peter de los Francos, in Calatayud (added August 4, 1875); the Royal Hospital of Santiago, in La Coruña (added December 30, 1912); the church of Saint Nicholas, in Burgos (added January 26, 1917); the bridge of Alcántara, in Toledo (added December 21, 1921); the Church of the Holy Cross and the church of Santa Eulalia, both in Barcelona (added November 2, 1929); the Roman Necropolis of Carmona, in Seville (added July 2, 1930); and the ruins of the towers of Goumés, in Alayor, Menorca (added July 16, 1930).
are situated in different provinces (Catalayud, La Coruña, Burgos, Toledo, Barcelona, Seville, and Menorca) and they are different types of sites (four churches, one royal hospital, one bridge, one ruins of towers, one necropolis). The randomness of places and forms suggests that their inclusion most was related either to a confusion in process (did provinces receive instructions about submitting a cumulative list or only sites to be added?) or to an ignorance by those creating the list that these places already held a status as National Artistic Treasures. Again, the fact that these appear in the final law suggest either that there was no attempt to edit what the provinces put forward or that the accelerated time frame in which the Second Republic pushed this decree through meant that comparing this list to legal precedent was not part of this process.

The second group is more interesting for the purposes of this discussion: those monuments that are protected again, yet the language in which they are identified in the June 3, 1931 Decree shows that their previous inclusion did not protect enough of the site: without exception all seven of these monuments expand the conception of what constitutes the protected site. For the purposes of legibility, I have provided information relevant to these sites in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Site (Language of June 3, 1931 Decree)</th>
<th>Date of Initial Inclusion</th>
<th>Language of Original Entry</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convento de la Concepción Francisca</td>
<td>May 19, 1884</td>
<td>‘la capilla de San Jerónimo en el convento’/the chapel of San Jerónimo in the Convent</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La iglesia de Santa María de Caspe</td>
<td>July 28, 1908</td>
<td>‘atria de la colegiata de Santa María la Mayor/atrium of the Collegiate Church of Saint Mary</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catedral de Santa María de Mediavilla de Teruel</td>
<td>March 1, 1911</td>
<td>‘la techumbre mudéjar de la Catedral de Teruel’/the mudéjar ceiling of the Cathedral of Teruel</td>
<td>Teruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palacio Arzobispal de Alcalá de Henares</td>
<td>July 20, 1922</td>
<td>‘Portada del Torreón del Archivo General Central del Reino’/the entranceway of the tower of the Central General Archive of the Kingdom</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puente, de Martorell  
May 8, 1925  
‘arco romano que da acceso al puente de la villa de Martorell’/Roman arch from which one accesses the bridge of the town of Martorell  
Barcelona

Ruinas del Cabezo de Alcála  
November 28, 1924  
‘Acrópolis sita en el Cabezo de Alcála y demás ruinas en Dehesa de Pedriñales’/ the acropolis on Cabezo de Alcála and the surrounding ruins in Dehesa de Pedriñales  
Zaragoza/Teruel

La catedral de Santa Maria  
March 28, 1928  
‘La Capilla de los Vélez, de la iglesia catedral de Murcia’/the chapel of Los Vélez in the Cathedral-church of Murcia  
Murcia

In each of the aforementioned cases, the Decree of June 3, 1931 expands the coverage of a previously identified site. This suggests that in some way, either the original identification was unknown (as in the sites discussed in the previous paragraph), or that the previous identification was known, but somehow deemed insufficient. I argue that this latter possibility must be considered, given the ways in which the nature of the demand for Spanish antiquities changed in the 1920s and the reality that in each of the aforementioned cases the new wording of the law expanded the protection of the designated location.

4.2biv **Spelling Errors/Misidentifications**

To conclude the summary of Article One, there are six sites that have spelling mistakes that cannot be attributed to a difference in language (a point I discuss later) but rather divulge either an error in the spelling of the location or a misidentification: the Castle of Alarcon (correct: Alaró) in Mallorca; the church of San Jaime de Fontanyà (correct: Frontanyà) in Barcelona; the monastery of Benifarà (correct: Benifasar) in Castellón; the rock church and its ruins in las Mesas de Villaverde in Alora (correct: Ardales); the ‘calle’ named for El Greco (correct: casa) in Toledo; and finally, the Monastery of

---

648 In the original list, this site was claimed by Zaragoza; this identification was later labelled erroneous by the Centro Nacional de Información Artística, Arqueológica, y Etnológica which placed the site in Teruel.
Oliva (correct: Óvila) in Guadalajara. One other repeated misspelling has less to do with knowledge of a place name rather than a confusion, perhaps in penmanship. Three times ‘fuente’ is substituted for ‘puente’ (Córdoba, twice; Salamanca, once). This confusion between the initial ‘f’ and the ‘p’ suggests either a mistake at the level of compilation or at the state of printing. After all, for a compiler or a printer, protecting a fountain had as much merit as protecting a bridge. These errors however suggest that once the list was forwarded from the province to Madrid there was no editing step in which local advocates reviewed the final law. Once in Madrid, the list appears to have been final. The most curious spelling mistake in this list is that of the Monastery of Óvila which as a location has a history intertwined with that of Zorita. Although we cannot be sure of the events that led to this misspelling, it is possible that as a result of the fact that a mythical Monastery of Oliva in Guadalajara was listed as a protected monument, not the real Monastery of Óvila in Guadalajara, this monument was allowed to be exported from Spain in the 1930s.

4.2bv Article Two

The Decree ends with Article Two, a brief statement which reads: ‘Se declaran igualmente como comprendidos en esta relación los Palacios y Jardines que pertenecieron al Patrimonio de la Corona, hayan sido o no entregados a los Ayuntamientos respectivas.’ Though vague, after all one has to go through previous laws to collate the nine sites this protects, this statement leaves no question over the issue of authorship of the lists of each province. This statement also speaks to some confusion as to what to do with the properties owned by the Crown. After forcing Alfonso XIII’s removal to Paris on April 14, 1931, the Second Republic was faced with the question of what to do with the royal properties.

---

649 I return to this as this has important for the discussion that follows.

650 Translation: Also included in this list are the Palaces and Gardens belonging to the Crown, whether or not they have been submitted by the respective Councils.’ Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes, ‘Decretos,’ Gaceta de Madrid Número 155 § (1931).
Though these would be confiscated in 1932, for the moment this law shows that at the very least, everyone could agree that these properties should be protected—whatever that might mean.

4.2bvi The Importance of Language

Finally, it is important that the language of the entire Decree is Spanish. Not only is this a highly centralized effort to bring oversight of ‘Spanish’ monuments to Madrid, but the language of the Decree emphasizes that despite its deceivingly provincial focus, this is at best an attempt to consolidate power in Madrid, at worst a piece of planned internal colonization. The absence of Euskara, Gallego, and Catalan names suggest that, despite its birth as a result of the success of the municipal referenda throughout Spain which resulted in a Catalan declaration of independence on April 14, 1931, the Second Republic firmly saw Madrid as capital, and Spain as a united nation that denied regional independence movements of the Basque country, Galicia, and Catalonia. It seems that there was an expectation that despite being generated by provinces, the language of the law needed to be Spanish. As this next discussion suggests, word choice had legal and cultural implications for national heritage.

4.2c Changes the Decree Affected in Castilla-La Mancha

In Castilla-La Mancha, the passing of the Decree of June 3, 1931 increased the number of protected sites from forty-five to one hundred and six (Figures 4.2 and 4.3). The rate of increase of 136% in Castilla-La Mancha was lower than the national average of 209%, mainly as a result of the pre-1931 advocacy of the province of Toledo in protecting sites in the December 21, 1921 law. However, two out of the five provinces of the Autonomous Community showed particularly large increases greater than the national average: those of Cuenca and Guadalajara. While Cuenca increased its number of BICs from two to seven, Guadalajara’s rose from five to twenty. The 300% increase in protected sites in

---

651 In Albacete, the number of protected sites increased from three to six, an increase of 100%; in Ciudad Real the number of sites increase from three to eight, an increase of 160%; in Cuenca, the number of sites increased from two to seven, an increase of 250%; in Guadalajara, the number of sites increase from five to twenty, an increase of 300%; in Toledo, the number of sites increased from thirty-two to sixty-five, an increase of 103%.
Guadalajara is of particular note, as it demonstrates the leading role this province had in cultural patrimony in 1931. In investigating what accounts for this dramatic increase we see the intertwining of the history of the Monastery of Óvila and that of Zorita Castle. Without understanding the story of the former, we cannot situate the protection of the latter.

The story of cultural patrimony in Guadalajara, and thus the story of Zorita, developed largely from the responses of one man, Francisco Layna Serrano, to the purchase by William Randolph Hearst of the monastery of Santa Maria de Óvila in December of 1930. Born on June 27, 1893, in the city of Luzón, Guadalajara, Layna Serrano trained in otolaryngology and maintained a successful career at the Hospital de Niño Jesus in Madrid. He may have continued in this career, known only to us as a doctor, had it not been for the American media mogul’s interest in Spanish architecture which resulted in the looting and removal of hundreds of Spanish antiquities, including two monasteries.

4.3 Stealing Spanish Stones: Julia Morgan, Mildred Stapley-Byne, Arthur Byne and William Randolph Hearst

Thanks to the long-standing relationship of Hearst’s preferred architect, Julia Morgan, and art historian, Mildred Stapley Byne, a partnership featuring Hearst, Morgan, Stapley Byne, and her husband, Arthur Byne, developed that resulted in the transfer of vast amounts of Spanish heritage objects from the country. In the past five years several studies have looked to investigate the Bynes, though many are limited in scope. Until recently, scholarship on the Bynes tended to concentrate on individual archives; José Miguel Merino de Cáceres and María José Martínez Ruiz were the first to collate data from the archives at the Hispanic Society of America, California Polytechnic State University, the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, the University of Pennsylvania, the Byne House in Madrid (now the residence of the United States’ Deputy Chief of Mission to Spain), and the Real Academia de Bellas
Artes de San Fernando, into a comprehensive story on their role in the exportation of Spanish antiquities in the early twentieth century.652

Stapley Byne and her husband Arthur first came to Spain in 1910 drawn by a shared scholarly interest in the arts of the country. After a 1913 trip to New York City where the pair met with the founding director of the Hispanic Society of America (HSA), Archer Huntingdon, the Bynes eventually returned to Spain in 1914, in the employ of the aforementioned organization.653 The HSA originally contracted with the Bynes to undertake historical research, and as a pair, with the support of Huntingdon, they published several books, including *Rejería of the Spanish Renaissance* (1914), *Spanish Ironwork* (1915), *Spanish Architecture of the Sixteenth Century* (1917), *Decorated Wooden Ceilings in Spain* (1920), and *Spanish Interiors and Furniture* (1921 and 1922). This last book was a particular favourite of Hearst, who used it as a shopping catalogue after being inspired by Spanish and ‘Moorish’ architecture featured in the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego (Figure 4.4).654 By this point

---

652 Several small studies exist on the Bynes, yet these are heavily dependent on local archives and none brings all source bases together. Examples include See Gkozgkou, Dimitra. «El matrimonio Byne: dos hispanistas al servicio de Huntington». *Cuadernos de arte e iconografía*, Tomo 24, Num. 47 (2015). 123-138; María José Martínez Ruiz, “Mildred Stapley: «Esta mujer trabajadora, que tiene un experto conocimiento de la arquitectura española, ¿es acaso una feminista inaguantable?»,” in *Ellas siempre han estado ahí. Coleccionismo y mujeres*, ed. Patricia Andrés González and Miguel Ángel Zalama (Doce Calles, 2020), 189–210; José Miguel Merino de Cáceres, *En el cincuentario de la muerte de Arthur Byne*, vol. 61, Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando Separata de ACADEMIA (Madrid: Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, 1985) and; Rodriguez Thiessen, ‘Byne and Stapley: Scholars, Dealers, and Collectors of Spanish Decorative Arts.’ The work by Merino de Cáceres consults the most archives, yet strangely omits research at the Hispanic Society of America. In comparison, Rodriguez Thiessen relies disproportionately on that of the Hispanic Society of America. Despite the compelling work done by Rodriguez Thiessen, this master’s dissertation leaves much work to be done and should not be referenced as authoritative (as happens in Jody G Brotherston, *Arthur Byne’s Diplomatic Legacy: The Architect Author and Entrepreneur in Spain* [USA: The Lope De Vega Press, 2014]). ; Other recent discussions of the Bynes can be found in *Los cielos españoles*; *The Women of the Hispanic Society: Mildred Stapley Byne*, Video (New York: Hispanic Society of America), accessed June 13, 2023, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eNTHcwg7otc. The most comprehensive account to date is José Miguel Merino de Cáceres and María José Martínez Ruiz, *La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador»*.

653 This dating is unclear. 1914 is given in Rodriguez Thiessen, ‘Byne and Stapley: Scholars, Dealers, and Collectors of Spanish Decorative Arts’; and Brotherston, *Arthur Byne’s Diplomatic Legacy: The Architect Author and Entrepreneur in Spain*.

in time the media mogul had hired Morgan to build San Simeon, also known today as Hearst Castle, a site that stands on 250,000 acres in central California once owned by Hearst. In searching for inspiration for San Simeon, Hearst sent Morgan telegrams instructing her to look at certain pages in *Spanish Interiors and Furniture* and design his castle accordingly.655 Hearst’s taste was in line with wealthy American collectors of his era, and he was particularly keen to collect Spanish items after visits to the country in 1905 and 1911.656

Though Morgan and Stapley Byne had corresponded since 1914, the first mention of establishing a transactional relationship in which the Bynes, as a wife and husband team, would act as Hearst’s agents in Spain likely occurred in the fall of 1921 after severing their relationship with Huntingdon and the HSA in January of that year.657 In a correspondence that Morgan sent to Stapley Byne on November 16, 1921 (Figure 4.5). Morgan relayed that Hearst instructed:

Inasmuch as this lady says that she and her husband have gone into the antique business, maybe she could trace this cornice and if found try to buy it for us. Also, please correspond with the lady and ask her to act as agent for us. We will want a tremendous lot of stuff for the big house, bath house, etc. and probably we could do much better from her than from the average antiquary.658

By 1923, the relationship between the Bynes, Morgan, and Hearst had morphed from that of a dealer in small antiquities to larger, architectural objects. In his pursuit of authenticity for San Simeon, Hearst spared no expense. In a communication on August 6, 1923, Hearst wrote to Morgan regarding Byne, ‘I

---

Polytechnic State University; Julia Morgan to W.R. Hearst, ‘Letter from Julia Morgan to William Randolph Hearst, December 22, 1921,’ December 22, 1921, Morgan Papers, California Polytechnic State University.


656 For a general summary of American collectors of Spanish art at the beginning of the twentieth century, see Introduction in Kagan, *The Spanish Craze: America’s Fascination with the Hispanic World, 1779-1939*; For Hearst’s visits to Spain, see Rodriguez Thiessen, ‘Byne and Stapley: Scholars, Dealers, and Collectors of Spanish Decorative Arts,’ 288.

657 Merino de Cáceres and Rodriguez Thiessen date the first telegram was exchanged on October 1, 1921 Merino de Caceres, *En el cincuentario de la muerte de Arthur Byne*, 61:176; Rodriguez Thiessen, ‘Byne and Stapley: Scholars, Dealers, and Collectors of Spanish Decorative Arts,’ 30.

658 Julia Morgan to Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Stapley-Byne, Letter, November 16, 1921, Morgan Papers, California Polytechnic State University.
am also asking him to send a list and photographs of available ceilings, window and door trims, etc.
rather than lists and photographs of furniture and minor objects. The relationship would result in the
exportation of what Jody Brotherston tallied at ‘two dismantled monasteries, more than seventy
antique ceilings, countless doors, windows, and architectural artifacts all destined for inclusion in San
Simeon.’ This is to say nothing of the textiles.

Indeed, the move from art historians to entrepreneurs in antiquities, or given the illegality of
their transactions, dealers in contraband, seemed quite the shift from their early careers, in which
Arthur Byne had complained that ‘the finest examples of art and furniture had already left the country
in the hands of French and English antique dealers’ and in his article Old Spanish Furniture published in
March of 1915 he grumbled how a

long list of political disturbances caused the looting and destroying of many a
fine mansion; French and English antique dealers invaded the land and took
innumerable works of art back to Paris and London with them; then Spanish
antique dealers, called into being by the former, scoured the country and were
able to stock their shops in such tourist centres as Madrid, Granada, and
Sevilla.

However, by 1923, the Bynes had done an about-face, and fast would become some of the greatest
American looters of Spanish antiquities. It was in this context that the Byne’s attention to the cultural
monuments of the province of Guadalajara galvanized local people to advocate for the national
protection of sites, including the castle of Zorita, in the region. For the most part, the Bynes offered

659 Julia Morgan to W.R. Hearst, ‘Letter from Julia Morgan to William Randolph Hearst, August 6, 1923,’ August 6,
661 Brotherston, Arthur Byne’s Diplomatic Legacy: The Architect Author and Entrepreneur in Spain, 4 and108.
662 For a discussion on a similar about-face of Richard Ford from ‘protector’ to looter, see McSweeney, From
Granada to Berlin: The Alhambra Cupola, 5:113–15. For claims regarding the extent of the Byne’s role in the
exportation of Spanish antiquities, see Merino de Cáceres, José Miguel and María José Martínez Ruiz, La
destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador», 333-348 and Brotherston, Arthur
Byne’s Diplomatic Legacy: The Architect Author and Entrepreneur in Spain.
pieces of houses, such as windows, iron grills, ceilings, columns, or materials like silks to Hearst.\textsuperscript{663} Many of these sales were legal and would only have been illegal had the owners not wished to sell.

By 1925, two years into the dictatorship of Miguel Primo de Rivera which lasted until April 1931, the Bynes were thinking bigger, literally. Starting in September of 1925, the Bynes offered Hearst the choice of entire buildings, including monasteries, palaces, and houses. In 1925 Hearst bought his first monastery, Santa María la Real de Sacramenia, the cloister of which was dismantled, shipped to New York where, due to Hearst’s lack of motivation and the subsequent world financial crisis that significantly impacted his finances, it sat in crates in that city until 1954.\textsuperscript{664} Though some may protest that the Bynes simply were products of their time, participating in a world dynamic, the telegram from Morgan to Hearst on April 11, 1926, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, speaks to the Bynes’ knowledge that this exchange was unusual and likely to draw unwanted attention regarding questions of the legality of the sale. Morgan writes, ‘Mr. Byne includes this chipping and says that there have been several like articles lately and to ask you to please keep impressing on Mr. McGregor [Hearst’s banker in New York] the necessity of keeping the transaction as secret as possible until the stones are all out of Spain’.\textsuperscript{665} The Bynes acted as Hearst’s architectural mercenaries, as their correspondence shows. Of the near 1,300 documents in the Morgan Papers relating to the construction of San Simeon, over a hundred reference the Bynes, specific sites in Spain, and Hearst’s dealing with them. This is far more than others: combined the extant correspondence relating to other dealers totals less than ten. Hearst’s fabulous wealth, his insatiable appetite for Spanish stones, and his connections with the Bynes led to what would become a

\textsuperscript{663} See list of telegrams exchanged between the Bynes, Morgan, and Hearst in Merino de Cáceres, \textit{En el cincuentario de la muerte de Arthur Byne}, 61:173–98.

\textsuperscript{664} It is of note that the sale of Hearst’s objects resulted in the accession of several objects into American museums. This is little known detail about the sale, and many museums who acquired artifacts in this transaction might benefit from greater provenance investigations as to the collection. For more on the history of the removal of Monastery of Santa María la Real de Sacramenia, see Merino de Cáceres, José Miguel and María José Martínez Ruiz, \textit{La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador»}, 421-4.

\textsuperscript{665} Morgan to Hearst, ‘Letter from Julia Morgan to William Randolph Hearst, April 11, 1926,’ April 11, 1926.
pivotal moment in the cultural patrimony of Guadalajara: the purchase of the monastery of Santa María de Óvila in December of 1930. Looking at a map of the sites shows how close Santa María la Real de Sacramenia is to not only Santa María de Óvila, as well as the proximity of the latter to the fortress of Zorita (Figure 4.6)

Commissioned in 1167 by Alfonso VIII (r. 1158-1215), the monastery of Santa María de Óvila maintained a religious community until 1835, when the Spanish government closed it under the controversial decree to shut down and confiscate all convents and monasteries in towns whose population was less than 450 people. Only four monks remained in the monastery at the time. This was one of three laws passed in 1835 which affected the confiscation of church property. The site was largely ignored until, nearly a century later, in 1928 the Primo de Rivera government sold Santa María de Óvila to the director of the Spanish Credit Bank, Fernando Beloso, who desired the land around the monastery. Two years later, Beloso sold the monastery buildings to Hearst, in a transaction mediated by Byne. Few documents survive detailing the process by which Byne and Beloso came to this agreement, however in a telegram to Hearst dated December 20, 1930, Byne writes that he had spent the night in Guadalajara, as he was spending time in the region looking at the ruins of monasteries (in a search for another cloister). The initial demolition of the Monastery of Santa María de Óvila commenced on January 21, 1931; on March 9, 1931, Hearst’s assistant, Walter Steilberg, arrived at Óvila to help out, labelling stones so that they could be reconstructed according to his drawings. Photographs show the state of the monastery after the removal of its cloister (Figure 4.7-4.12). Though the legality of selling

667 For more on these laws, see Merino de Cáceres, José Miguel and María José Martínez Ruiz, La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador», 430.
668 Merino de Cáceres, José Miguel and María José Martínez Ruiz, La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador», 395.
669 Merino de Cáceres, José Miguel and María José Martínez Ruiz, La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador», 460.

264
Santa María de Óvila to Hearst was questionable in December of 1930, it was theoretically forbidden with the passing of the Decree of June 3, 1931 in which the province of Guadalajara protected the ‘Monasterio de Oliva’.\(^{670}\) It is interesting to consider that the difference in names, ‘Óvila’ and ‘Oliva’, may have acted as a legal loophole in which Byne, acting on behalf of Hearst, was able to continue to work to export the monastery. However, this was not without challenges. On July 19, 1931, Arthur Byne telegrammed Hearst lamenting the difficulties in removing the monastery ‘now that the Spanish government is prohibiting the transmission of antique stone.’\(^{671}\) Thus, the Decree came into effect while Steilberg actively was dismantling the monastery.

The Bynes were able to work with Beloso, local workers, local leaders, and national politicians in Primo de Rivera’s Ministry of Labor, arguing that the paid labour would benefit the people of Castilla-La Mancha far more than the presence of the monastery.\(^{672}\) After the purchase and the smoothing of legal challenges, the Monastery of Santa María de Óvila was dismantled and shipped to California, ostensibly to be reconstructed as a part of San Simeon for Hearst.\(^{673}\) While Hearst never realized this ambition, the shock of losing an entire monastic compound to an American newspaper mogul spurred many, including Layna Serrano to action.\(^{674}\) However, his advocacy was too late to save the Monastery of Santa María de Óvila, which became one of the few BICs no longer physically located in Spain. Of sites listed as

\(^{670}\) It is interesting that the entry immediately before the ‘Monasterio de Oliva’ is the ‘Castillos de Atienza, Torija, y Zorita de los Canes’ in Alcalá-Zamora y Torres and Domingo y Sanjuán, Decreto de 3 de junio de 1931. It is also confusing that Byne in his telegrams refers to the Monastery of Santa María de Óvila as ‘Mount Olive’. For more on this, see Merino de Cáceres, José Miguel and María José Martínez Ruiz, *La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador»*, 396. The authors suggest this is because he is writing in code, however this seems speculative. It seems there was genuine confusion over the name of the monastery and it is hard to state whether the


\(^{673}\) For a telegram from Byne stating that the owner of the monastery is fortunately a friend of the current military, see Merino de Cáceres, *En el cincuentario de la muerte de Arthur Byne*, 61:161.

\(^{674}\) For more on the fate of the monastery of Santa María de Óvila, see Onishi, ‘Monks in California Breathe Life into Monastery from Spain’; For a summary of Layna Serrano’s advocacy, see López-Muñiz Moragas, ‘Abandono, ruina y restauración del castillo de Zorita de los Canes (1559-1973),’ 64–69.
protected by June 3, 1931, five are no longer located in Spain, all having made their way to the United States of America. It is perhaps of note that the misspelling of the entry in the June 3, 1931 Decree might have been to allow its legal export from the country. Given the relationships that Byne had developed within Spain and his uncanny ability to strike deals with government officials to affect the removal of the Monastery of Santa María de Óvila, it was perhaps of use in customs law that no such site was protected. After all, he did not export the Monastery of Santa María de Oliva from Guadalajara.

Layna Serrano dedicated his first monograph to this relocated monument, publishing *El monasterio de Óvila* in 1932 with the support of the provincial government. This text would be the first of many in which Layna Serrano raised the profile of several local monuments; titles that follow *El monasterio de Óvila* include *Castillos de Guadalajara* (1933), *El Castillo de Zorita de los Canes* (1934), *La arquitectura románica en la provincia de Guadalajara* (1935), *El Palacio del Infantado* (1941), *Historia de Guadalajara y sus Mendozas en los s. XV y XVI* (1942), *Los conventos antiguos de Guadalajara* (1943), *Historia de la Villa de Atienza* (1945), *La provincia de Guadalajara* (1948), and *Historia de la villa de Cifuentes* (1955). It was largely due to his advocacy that the fortress of Zorita, located only 45 miles (74 kilometres) from Santa Maria de Óvila, was identified as a site of National Artistic Treasure as declared

---

675 In the first case, building material from the 12th century abbey, San Miguel de Fluvia of Gerona, was sold from the collection of George Grey Barnard and installed at its current location in The Cloisters Museum in New York City in 1914; the second case is the Monastery of Santa Maria de la Vega in Palencia which was sold in 1925 to the Hispanic Society of America; the third is that of San Miguel de Uncastillo in Zaragoza, which has quite a convoluted provenance. It is now in the Museum of Fine Arts (MFA) in Boston. In 1915, the Church of San Miguel de Uncastillo was sold by Manuel de Castro Alonso, Bishop of Jaca, to an unidentified private owner. In 1925, the portal of the church was removed and sold to Barcelona-based dealer Salvador Babra. In 1928, it was sold by Salvador Babra to the MFA for $42,782.; the fourth site is the monastery of Santa Maria de Óvila; the fifth is San Martin de Fuentidueña of Segovia, sold in 1957 with the approval of the Franco government to The Cloisters Museum in New York City.

676 It is also of note that this misspelling continues to cause confusion for scholars dealing with cultural sites in Spain. Most notably, in Kagan, *The Spanish Craze: America’s Fascination with the Hispanic World, 1779-1939* Kagan mentions this story of Hearst and the Bynes, though confuses the actual building taken from Spain, which asserts is the Monastery of Santa María de Oliva, in Navarre (which is still located at its original site).
by the Decree of June 3, 1931. In the middle of (and perhaps a result of) this vast academic output, in 1934 Layna Serrano was appointed Provincial Chronicler of Guadalajara, forever shifting his career path away from otolaryngology. From then on Layna Serrano dedicated much time to writing the history of Guadalajara in attempt to raise public awareness as to the cultural treasures of the region. His book, *El Castillo de Zorita de los Canes*, originally penned in 1934, remains relevant enjoying four reprints. His arguments for the need to protect the monumental history of Guadalajara continue to be current, and it is with some sadness and frustration to see the ways in which pleas to preserve Zorita have remained largely unheeded for almost a century.

4.4 Unpacking the Decree of June 3, 1931

Both Layna Serrano’s story and the Decree of June 3, 1931 give us access to a particular moment in Spanish cultural history – the international market for Spanish antiquities at the beginning of the twentieth century created a predatory environment in which advocates for cultural sites developed legal ways to protect places under the government of the Second Republic. Thus, tracing the first national legal measure that protected the fortress of Zorita highlights a specific mindset about cultural heritage in the nation-state of Spain in the twentieth century. It is worth pausing to discuss how Zorita’s history elucidates broader cultural themes at this time: first, an inquiry into the Decree of June 3, 1931 speaks to the position of Spain in the international community in the 1930s – how the sale of a Spanish monastery to a wealthy American illustrates shifting power dynamics of the times; second, how a close-look at the sites chosen as National Artistic Treasures illustrates the priorities of local communities and the Second Republic in terms of cultural patrimony; and third, how the preservation of a Christianate,
Catholic past simultaneously preserved an Islamicate one, testifying to the pervasive *convivencia* of the medieval period in the Iberian Peninsula.

### 4.4a Violation, Volition, and the Rise of Protectionism

The first broader theme that this moment gives us access to is the ways in which in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Spain simultaneously occupied a position of both colonizing and colonized nation—and speaks to a time in the nation’s history in which it could equally be perceived as dominant and dominated in international power relationships. Considering the galvanization of Layna Serrano in defence of the cultural heritage of his home province, Aviel Roshwald’s framework of violation and volition, which posits that an attack on a community will lead it to rally around a shared identity to combat and take initiatives on behalf of this newly-defined identity, is interesting. Though no blood was shed with the sale of the monastery of Óvila, much sweat was expended. In addition, the psychological violence and trauma of ripping a building from its land has consequences—and in this case not only shifted the fate of an otolaryngologist from Luzón but also the history of Zorita castle.

Much has been written on the effect of 1898 on Spain’s national consciousness from the men and women of the *regenerista* movement. Yet despite the nation’s decline in prestige (the perceived ‘national catastrophe’) after the loss of the colonies of Puerto Rico, Cuba, Guam, and the Philippines through war against the United States of America, and the sale of Palau, and the Caroline and Mariana islands to Germany in 1898, Spain largely has retained an identity as a colonizing, European nation in the historiography of early Islam and the Middle East. Though, like the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires,

---

680 For a detailed discussion of Spain as a world power at the turn of the nineteenth century, see Moradiellos, ‘Spain in the World: From Great Empire to Minor European Power.’
the country had once laid claim to huge swathes of territory, by the turn of the twentieth century, Spain had lost almost all of its colonies as a result of a near-constant assault on its hegemony by the United States and other European powers coupled with nascent nationalisms in the Americas. The country was, in the words of Spanish nationalists ‘sick’ and, as José Ortega y Gasset famously put it, ‘a patient in need of an Iron Surgeon’, a comparison which reminds us of assertions that the Ottoman Empire was ‘the sick man of Europe’.\textsuperscript{681} This ‘orientalising’ continues today: surveys of European art often do not include Spain and despite recent work by Eugenia Afinoguénova on the Prado, scholars, like Stephen Vernoit, still assert ideas that ‘Spain was somewhat isolated from developments in Europe.’\textsuperscript{682} However, Spain had maintained control of its borders in the Iberian Peninsula, no mean feat given the rise of regionalist independence parties throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Although many antiquities were stolen from the country in this century, many, like Óvila, were sold. However we might look at the coercion, dubious legalities, and power dynamics in play, especially in terms of economic buying power, the transactional nature of the removals makes issues of restitution and return complicated.\textsuperscript{683} As Byne himself commented in his 1915 article, dealers sold Spanish history, and he would capitalize on both the demand and the ease of selling antiquities to foreign buyers.\textsuperscript{684} McSweeney has argued that the narrative that foreign tourists, writers, artists, and dealers actively created and cultivated ‘the widespread framing of the resident population as ignorant and careless of

\textsuperscript{681} Although the exact start of this phrase is still debated, the most common attribution is that in the lead-up to the Crimean War, Tsar Nicholas I remarked to the British Ambassador Sir Hamilton Seymour, that as the Ottoman Empire was ‘the sick man of Europe’, the Russians and the British should pre-emptively discuss the partition of the empire in the ‘near future’. See M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, \textit{A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 79.

\textsuperscript{682} For a recent history on the development of museums and collecting in Spain, see Afinoguénova, \textit{The Prado: Spanish Culture and Leisure, 1819-1939}; For histories of European museums that do not address Spain nor collectors of Spanish art, see Carol Duncan, \textit{Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums} (London: Routledge, 1995); For quote, see Vernoit, ‘Islamic Art and Architecture: An Overview of Scholarship and Collecting, c. 1850- c. 1950,’ 24.

\textsuperscript{683} See Conclusion: The Cupola between Granada and Berlin in McSweeney, \textit{From Granada to Berlin: The Alhambra Cupola} for more discussion on this topic.

these globally significant buildings allowed others to justify their actions.\textsuperscript{685} Though Spain was not colonized by other nations, its cultural heritage suffered similar pillaging as buyers from economically stronger nations financed the dismantling of its monuments.

The sale of an entire building, its disassembly and relocation to another country, particularly the United States of America to which Spain had suffered its most recent international loss, was particularly galling. Layna Serrano’s defence of his province – and on a larger scale, the Second Republic’s passing of such sizeable legislation as the Decree of June 3, 1931 – should be seen as a reaction to cultural colonialism—highlighting the ways in which other European countries and the United States exploited Spain. It is somewhat interesting that while Spain is too ‘oriental’ for Europe, it also seem to be too ‘occidental’ for historians of the Middle East and North Africa.\textsuperscript{686} While this is not the focus of this work, an important lesson gleaned from the experience of accessioning Zorita as a National Artistic Treasure is to recognize that research that seeks to look into colonizer and colonizing dynamics around the Mediterranean Basin in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries should include Spain. Comparative histories between the Hapsburg and Ottoman Empires as well as the nations of Italy and Portugal might shed light on shared experiences in the modern period.

4.4b Motivations and Legacy of the Second Republic: Anticlericalism or Catholic Protectionism?

The second thread that the investigation into how monuments like Zorita became protected is that of the development of a Catholic cultural patrimony in Spain in the twentieth centuries and begs the question of the role this played in the policies of the Second Republic. Histories of the Second Republic often engage with the question of clericalism and anti-clericalism and the history of the development of the Decree of June 3, 1931 provides an alternative narrative to a persistent assertion

\textsuperscript{685} McSweeney, \textit{From Granada to Berlin: The Alhambra Cupola}, 5:115.
\textsuperscript{686} For discussions on this dynamic, see Kagan, \textit{The Spanish Craze: America’s Fascination with the Hispanic World, 1779-1939}, 87 and 136; For exclusion of Andalucía, see Said, \textit{Orientalism}, 303; For the exoticism of al-Andalus ‘outside the fundamental constructs of Westernness’, see Maria Rosa Menocal, ‘Al-Andalus and 1492,’ in \textit{The Legacy of Muslim Spain}, ed. Salma Khadra Jayyusi (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 483.
that the Second Republic followed an anti-Catholic agenda. Though much has been written on the Second Republic, almost all histories start from the teleological endpoint of the loss of the democratically elected government to the fascist government of Francisco Franco in 1939. Even those sections that purport to deal with cultural history in this time period spend most of the time looking at either the reforms in education or the anti-clericalism present in policies that stripped the Catholic church of its landholdings. A look at the legal history of the Second Republic with regards to cultural heritage suggests a more nuanced approach to this history is needed. Was the Decree of June 3, 1931 a measure of anticlericalism or Catholic protectionism? In Spanish history, the Second Republic, which came to power on April 14, 1931, and lost power at the conclusion of the Spanish Civil War on April 1, 1939, often is identified as a period of cultural persecution of the Catholic church and its legacy. This is in large part due to the anticlerical language of the Constitution ratified on December 9, 1931, and the strong of anticlerical measures that were passed at the beginning of 1932. It is important to read the


689 González Calleja et al., La segunda república española, 1019–21.


691 For a discussion on how ‘anticlericalism became a pillar of the regime,’ see Capítulo 6: El bienio reformista (1): las realizaciones. Specific anticlerical laws include those of January 23, 1932 which dissolved the Jesuit Order and nationalized their property; January 30, 1932 which secularized cemeteries; February 2, 1932 which legalized divorce; and Jun 2, 1933 under which all religious orders and their property came under State control. Pechorro, Historia de la segunda república Española (1931-1936); For another summary of anticlerical measures in the early years of the Second Republic see González Calleja et al., La segunda república española, 196–253.
Decree of June 3, 1931 against this background. Given the historical precedence that cultural patrimony was a matter of money rather than preservation in twentieth-century Spain, the removal of sites from the control of the Catholic church effectively meant a reduction in their assets to sell and thus profits to make. In addition, with the benefit of hindsight, it is significant that the Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts was Marcelino Domingo Sanjuán. A firm supporter of Catalan autonomy and later the Republican Left, Domingo Sanjuán occupied this position only briefly – by December 1931 he left the post for an appointment as the Minister of Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce.\textsuperscript{692} He remained in that post from December of 1931 until December of 1933. As Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts, Domingo Sanjuán oversaw the conversion of schools from religious to secular and reforms that allowed for bilingual education in Catalan and in Spanish, while as Minister of Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce he sponsored agrarian reform that pushed for the redistribution of land and wealth.

Undoubtedly, the passing of the Decree of June 3, 1931 in relation to Domingo Sanjuán’s other measures could be understood as taking aim at Catholic wealth, power, and influence. With this anticlerical frame one can understand how contemporaries could have seen this centralizing measure as threatening. Given the confiscation of Jesuit property, viewing the Decree of June 3, 1931 as an attempt to seize more Catholic real estate could explain why so many Catholic sites were protected in this legislation. Provinces could reasonably have seen Catholic cultural history as the most threatened at this time.

The legislation passed in the early part of the twentieth century meant that while adding a site theoretically guaranteed its safety in terms of predatory buying, it also had a side effect of redistributing power, specifically in relation to how the Catholic church could raise money. For example, in a

\textsuperscript{692} He returned to the position of Minister of Public Instruction briefly from February to May 1936 at the waning of the Second Republic. For more on the role of Domingo Sanjuán in the governance of the Second Republic, see González Calleja et al., \textit{La segunda república española}, 322.
correspondence between Morgan and Hearst, sent March 21, 1931, in reference to choir stalls offered by Byne for Hearst’s consideration to purchase, Morgan detailed,

As regards choir stalls, the first lot offered by Mr. Byne were uninteresting and plain, and you did not order.

The second were $65,000.00 and were later made a ‘National Monument.’ You did not order.

The third were a set of painted XIV Century stalls of inferior material and workmanship, but interesting on account of the painted Gothic decorations. You did not order these.

The fourth was the beautiful set of stalls with ‘perpendicular’ Gothic crestings and huge Bishop’s escutcheons. These you ordered at $25,000.00, but before Mr. Byne could get them out the Bishop died and his successor has not been able to deliver them in face of politics in and out of the church. Mr Byne says it would not be good judgment to push the matter at this critical period.

This correspondence is particularly revealing not only as it shows that Morgan and Hearst were aware that they were taking contested pieces, as well as the exorbitant prices Hearst paid for items, but also because this sheds light on how the Bynes understood the complex political dynamics in Spain at the time. It is clear that certain bishops willingly sold Church property, often to support their parishes, while other bishops understood selling Spanish antiquities to be a crime. Any history of the cultural policy of the Second Republic must account for the wide scope of responses that clergy had to the rampant domestic and international markets for Spanish antiquities.

This dynamic speaks to the relative financial straits of some parishes in Spain at the beginnings of the twentieth century. In the nineteenth century, the abolishment of the Inquisition, confiscation of land owned by the Church and its orders, outlawing of male orders, and the ending of royal control of Spanish Catholic churches had drastically reduced the material wealth and influence of the Catholic church. At the time, the inclusion of a site on a national register, especially by a Ministry led by

694 This point is also echoed in Los cielos españoles.
695 Thomas, The Spanish Civil War; Callahan, ‘Church and State, 1808-1874.’
Domingo Sanjuán, could have been understood as yet another attempt by the government to seize the assets of the Catholic church.

Yet to classify the Second Republic as anticlerical is a mistake. Rather it was a government in which some people and groups who advanced anticlerical ideas held power. The period from 1931-1936, and especially from April of 1931 until the resignation of Prime Minister Niceto Alcalá-Zamora and Minister of the Interior Miguel Maura in October of 1931, must also be seen as a time in which people firmly committed to Catholicism and Spain as a Catholic state held tremendous power. The Decree of June 3, 1931 can also be understood as a measure that emphasizes the priorities of the Second Republic’s provisional government under the leadership of Alcalá-Zamora to keep Spain Catholic.696 The reality was that all of Spain, including many leaders of the Second Republic, was popularly, confessionally, Catholic, and there was little debate about this. As Julio Gil Pechorro román has written, in 1930, Spain had the highest proportion of people in Catholic life in the world except for Italy (1 out of every 493 people); the Catholic church had a declared value of 244 million pesetas and owned 12,000 fincas and 8,000 urban buildings.697 Any substantive and meaningful reform in Spain had to address this dynamic. It is thus also possible to understand the protection of sites in this legislation as an attempt by the Second Republic to safeguard the common Catholic heritage of the state which was being pillaged by international and local antiquities dealers, often with the cooperation of Catholic clergy.

A fact that gives credence to this latter interpretation is the fact that this was not a centrally directed measure. Though coordinated by the central government, regions and provinces were given a free hand in selecting the sites to be protected. It comes as no surprise to see that if we look at the

696 Alcalá-Zamora’s tenure as Prime Minister of the Second Republic was brief. He served from April 14, 1931 until his resignation on October 15, 1931 along with that of Miguel Maura who both felt that that anticlerical language and the dissolution of religious orders called for in Articles 24 (which became Article 26 in the ratified document), and 27 of the proposed Constitution were inappropriate and potentially dangerous.

697 By the ‘proportion of people in Catholic life’, Pechorro román means those who have taken orders or who are ordained as clergy in Historia de la segunda república Española (1931-1936), 52.
categorization of sites protected, different regions chose to save different histories. As discussed in section 4.2b, nationally, 55.89% of all sites added in 1931 are specifically identified as Catholic monuments by their name: cathedrals (catedrales); Monasteries (monasterios); Convent (conventos); Seminaries (seminarios); Hermitages (ermitas); Pilgrimage sites (santuarios); Churches (iglesias); and Chapels (capillas). The regions that protected the largest number of Catholic sites were in the north of the country, which is not surprising given the strength of Catholic history in the north, from the churches and pilgrimage sites along the Camino de Santiago and the strength of Cistercian, Benedictine, and Cluniac orders along the northern coast of Spain. The autonomy given to regions in selecting sites means that even though it may be tempting to see the passing of the Decree of June 3, 1931 as an anticlerical measure, this is unlikely. Certainly, particular regions emphasized Catholic heritage more, yet no region excluded Catholic sites entirely. The threat to Catholic sites across the nation resulted in widespread embracing of Catholic heritage, perhaps a reflection of the social, educational, and religious backgrounds of those in governmental roles in the Second Republic. A close look at the sites designated by the Decree of June 3, 1931 shows that in many ways, and ironically, the Second Republic under the leadership of Alcalá-Zamora did more than any other prior administration or that of Franco in terms of affording legal protection for preserving the Catholic heritage of Spain in the twentieth century.

It is hard to avoid a teleological reading of the data given we know that shortly after the passing of this law the nation of Spain became engulfed in a fight for its survival in which who and what was ‘Spanish’ occupied a central role in national discourse. While speculating on this too much might have dangers, it is at least interesting to point out that when we look at a map of sites, we clearly see a clash of which histories were chosen by local communities to be preserved. Despite a wealth of histories to embrace, regions in the centre and north of the Peninsula were far more likely to embrace a Catholic history over all others (Figure 4.7). As I will discuss in a moment, many of these sites identified as Catholic in reality have shared histories given the reuse of sites in the Iberian Peninsula. Mapping the
sites protected up until June 3, 1931 shows an emerging sense of ‘what counted’ in national history – and we can see this clash of how various areas envisioned national memory.

4.4c ‘What’s in a Name’: How Castillos replaced Alcázar and Erased Islamicate History in the Southern Meseta

The cultural context of 1931 and the Second Republic created a situation in which advocating for a site’s Catholic past could result in its protection. This is an important shift from the dynamic that existed in the middle of the nineteenth century to perhaps the 1920s given the legal history reviewed earlier. In the history of Zorita, it is telling that in December of 1844 the mayor of Zorita de los Canes, in a failed attempt to have the fortress added to the catalogue of protected monuments suggested that one reason the site was worth preserving because it had ‘Islamic inscriptions’. Though these inscriptions never materialized (perhaps this was referring to the Latin inscription above the eastern gate?) the fact that in the middle of the 1800s a site in the Southern Meseta not only recognized its Islamicate past but also advocated on behalf of it is telling. While the situation at Zorita cannot be extrapolated to other locations, it is telling that the nineteenth-century national cultural heritage was more expansive than the middle of the twentieth century. By the 1930s, protecting Catholic sites was en vogue, possibly due to some of the reasons delineated above.

While peoples may have initially advocated for a location’s Catholic heritage in order to protect a specific cultural heritage perceived to be under threat in the 1930s, the naming of these sites based on 1931 affected another moment in the historiography of Islamicate sites in the Southern Meseta: the singular identification of sites as Catholic necessarily occluded alternate past uses. It is worth taking the time to consider what might be gained if we more accurately referred to sites based on all of their historic uses, rather than privileging their most recent use. One way to understand the enormity of the
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698 This phrase is lifted from Nasser Rabbat’s review ‘What’s in a Name,’ Artforum International 50 (January 2012): 75–78.
effect of embracing a Catholic name over an alternative identification is to consider how the map of sites might change if we elevate other search criteria. For historians working on the Islamicate history of the Iberian Peninsula, looking for sites named prior to and in the Decree of June 3, 1931 clearly relating to an Islamicate past would suggest there were thirty-eight places worth their scholarly attention, all of which were located in either the cities of Toledo, Córdoba, Granada, or Mérida (Figure 4.13). These sites have names including terms like alcázar (from the Arabic al-qaṣr), mezquita (from the Arabic masjid), or places identified as ‘árabe’ or ‘del Moro’. However, if we approach the National Artistic Treasures looking not at their names, but at their history, and use this history to develop a list of sites where archaeological investigation might yield important information regarding the Islamicate past of the Iberian Peninsula, we come up with an entirely different conception of the cultural history of the nation of Spain (Figure 4.14). Rather than looking at thirty-eight sites, we find two hundred and sixty-nine locations of interest, and these sites are widely spread throughout the peninsula, not just the southern region of Andalusia.700 Thus scholars of al-Andalus depending on names of BICs to guide investigation are at a distinct disadvantage to those working on a Catholic past.701 It is perhaps time to name civic tourist sites with shared pasts more accurately, to portray to both scholars and the general public the enormity of Islamicate contributions to the lived daily landscape throughout the Iberian Peninsula. It is clear that the answer to ‘what’s in a name?’ is the Catholic past. We are choosing what history to tell.

700 It is important to emphasize that this is only using archaeological criteria. If we were to use art historical criteria including sites built in the ‘mudejar’ style, this number would be far greater.

701 This is perhaps a contributing factor to assertions like Grabar’s that al-Andalus corresponds to the ‘southern section of the Iberian Peninsula which has become the contemporary province of Andalusia’ in Oleg Grabar, ‘Two Paradoxes in the Islamic Art of the Spanish Peninsula,’ in The Legacy of Muslim Spain, ed. Salma Khadra Jayyusi (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 583; or Diana Darke’s assertion that the only significant Islamic architecture in Spain is in Córdoba, Sevilla, Toledo, and Granada Diana Darke, Stealing from the Saracens: How Islamic Architecture Shaped EuropeHu (London: Hurst & Company, 2021), 192.
Conclusion: The Fortress-Castles of Castilla-La Mancha

While this chapter focused on Zorita as an exemplar of a site with an Andalusi past that became occluded as a result of the language with which it became accessioned as a National Artistic Treasure in 1931, it is important to recognize how unremarkable this history is in Castilla-La Mancha. Zorita Castle is one amongst many castle-fortresses of the Southern Meseta whose Umayyad past have yet to make their way into the cultural memory of the region: notable others with similar stories to Zorita include Atienza, whose story is dominated by its history in relation to Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar, more commonly known as El Cid; and Uclés, whose story is literally and figuratively dominated by the impressive monastery, construction of which began in 1529 for the monks of the Order of Santiago under the orders of Carlos V (r. 1519-1566), another architectural testimony to the legacy of the Holy Roman Emperor (Figure 4.15). As these castle-fortresses of Castilla-La Mancha demonstrate, the buildings of the Southern Meseta speak to a rich, shared cultural history, one that was occluded when sites became identified as only castles. Sites like Zorita, Atienza, and Uclés testify not only to the convivencia of the medieval period in which peoples of difference lived together without the homogenizing pressures of modern nation-states, but also to the multiple experiences that shaped the history of the Autonomous Community of Castilla- La Mancha. In addition, the buildings of Castilla-La Mancha demonstrate what might be termed the horizontal convivencia of certain periods (that is between peoples of the same time), their patchwork features of adaptive reuse show a vertical convivencia, in which peoples from successive generations creatively engaged with the past, rather than destroyed it. Embracing the multiplicities of these historical monuments could challenge current understandings of early modern Spain.
Conclusion: The Roads not Taken

‘the shape of the foreseeable future depends on how the past is portrayed and how its relations to the present are predicted’702 – Tony Bennett

As discussed at the onset of this work, the challenge was to centre a space (rather than a narrative) and discuss the ways in which an examination of a place or places within it can contest widely-accepted histories. In this case the place was the Southern Meseta of the Iberian Peninsula, a space which became socially constructed by Arabic chroniclers from the eleventh century and after as the thagr al-awsaṭ. Further narrowing the argument to focus on Zorita, one of the fortresses founded in the Umayyad period and within this space, elucidated how not only did eleventh-century writers but also how twentieth-century legislators, in identifying the fortification as a castle, affect the perception of this place. However, this is only one of the potential stories that can be narrated with this evidence – both exciting and overwhelming in their breadth, depth, and possibility to challenge the view from the centre. I offer this conclusion not only to emphasize what was argued here, but also to point out the various paths this research could have taken.

The evidence, both written and material, presented here sought to answer the question: ‘how do we know what we know, or more frequently, why do we not know about the history of the Southern Meseta from the eighth to tenth centuries?’ I argue for two crucial moments in the historiography that changed the trajectory of how we understand the history of this place and time: first, the eleventh century in which writers, like Ibn Ḥayyān, described a rebellious thagr al-awsaṭ full of actors with questionable loyalties to the Umayyad state; second, the twentieth century in which a nation which perceived its Catholic heritage to be under threat as a result embraced that history over other options. By making the choice to highlight the Southern Meseta and the ways sources attest to these two moments in time, I consciously chose not to discuss other issues highlighted in the presentation of this

material. To conclude, I offer a chapter-by-chapter review not only of the arguments made, but also to pause and highlight possibilities for future research. Like its physical counterpart, the medieval Southern Meseta is far more fertile ground than previous scholars have imagined.

**Prologue and Introduction**

This work began with an admittedly long prologue on terminology, though one necessary given the temporal scope of this work. Scholars of the medieval and modern periods do not use words or concepts the same way and the discussion of how I use terms undergirds and clarifies the points I make in later chapters. Medievalists could benefit from more careful consideration of identity theory and methodological approaches common in studies of early modern and modern empire, while scholars concentrating on more recent periods could profit from a deeper understanding of the nuances and deep roots of historical processes in the medieval world. Many of the tensions I highlight between medieval and modern uses of terms (and those periods in between) point to the need for more comprehensive historical investigations into the development and use of words with meanings we might take for granted. This is particularly true for terms of identity.

In addition to laying out the trajectory for the thesis, the Introduction served to situate the reader to the current management of cultural sites in the Autonomous Community of Castilla-La Mancha, paying particular attention to the ways in which sites are currently identified. This initial discussion also highlighted the ways in which challenges posed by the Covid-19 pandemic changed the scope of work initially imagined. While the driving question that animates the work presented here still remains (*what happened in the Southern Meseta from the eighth to tenth centuries?*), the investigation undertaken here does important groundwork, laying a much-needed foundation of historical context for the Umayyad period in Castilla-La Mancha. This shows the importance of source-critical studies of both written texts and Andalusi material culture in the region.
Chapter One: A Need for New Approaches

Chapter One provides a review of this historiographies with which this work engages, emphasizing three areas of scholarship: Anglophone Andalusi studies, cultural memory, and the history of the thaghr al-awsat. Like the Prologue and Introduction, Chapter One situates the work that follows, though the emphasis here is on theoretical and methodological approaches. The frameworks I chose to use were informed by the focus of this work: space and place. Centring another concern would have affected the approaches chosen. This emphasis on space had consequences for the work. What was presented here is an investigation into cultural history, which straddles traditional temporal, geographic, historiographic borders of academic fields. This is perhaps an unusual lens through which to examine the history of Umayyad al-Andalus, however one that is fruitful. More studies with unconventional approaches may illuminate new and different dynamics of the Umayyad rule in the Iberian Peninsula. Moving away from the geographic centre of Córdoba, both in material and written sources, allows for different understandings of how life outside the city progressed. However, such work, given the comparative lack of sources and/or studies on non-elite and rural spaces in the eighth and ninth centuries, means that any investigations into this time and place must clearly delineate the theories and methodologies the author chooses to approach this material. It is the clarity and rigor of the approaches which allows for clear conclusions. As we will see, there are many lenses through which this same material base might be filtered in the future.

Chapter Two: Towards Contemporary Sources

Chapter Two presented eighteen sources that related the Umayyad fath and subsequent rule of the Iberian Peninsula. This is in itself an argument to change the ways in which scholars approach the history of Umayyad al-Andalus. Long beholden to the richness of Ibn Hayyân and the anonymous works of Fath al-Andalus and the Akhbār Majmū’a, the field has not always understood that there are better sources available to historians of the early Umayyad period. The focus of the argument presented here
was space and sought to answer: what places were known? how did writers conceive of spaces in the period? and how did this develop over time? The resulting answers challenge ideas common in scholarship about the location of the thughūr, the idea of multiple thughūr with clear capitals, and the identification of where to look for an Umayyad past.

Contemporary written sources show that the thughūr of the eighth and ninth centuries were not in the middle of the Iberian Peninsula. Rather there seemed to be one important thaghr, located in the northwest of the Peninsula and the southeast of the modern nation-state of France with Narbonne as the main node. The tenth century saw the rise of stronger Christianate Kingdoms extending the area of the thughūr along the Duero, but notably not the Tajo. As a result, the important cities of the thughūr from the eighth through the first quarter of the tenth century included Narbonne, Barcelona, Talavera, and Guadalajara, notably not Toledo or Mérida. The sources show that we should not expect to find a robust Umayyad presence in Toledo. While Barcelona has a high profile in Andalusi studies, more attention should be paid to Umayyad Narbonne and Guadalajara. Secondly, these sources show that North Africans are noted for their service in contemporary sources. Though eighth- to tenth-century chronicles rarely relate information about North Africans, the few references that do exist suggest they are loyal to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dākhil, which should not be surprising given his mother’s Nafza roots. What emerges from this corpus is a picture of state-building that is reliant upon not only local peoples, but on the cooperation of the conquering elite, regardless of their ‘Arab’ or ‘Berber’ affiliation. While not directly stating the relationship between the Umayyad amirs and the North African tribes of the Southern Meseta, the fact that chroniclers consistently report them as fighting for Umayyad rulers suggest closer ties than have previously been imagined. At the very least, these sources challenge the idea of the eternally unreliable and treacherous ‘Berber’. Finally, this collection of written sources suggests that we might have imagined the function of Umayyad fortresses in the Southern Meseta through a completely inappropriate lens. The contemporary sources show that this region was not a
border area during which time these forts were constructed, and we have little evidence to suggest these buildings played primarily militaristic roles. Chapter Two argues it would be prudent to consider other late antique models of fortresses which had economic and social functions as well as military ones.

Focusing on conceptions of space and place in these histories meant that there was little reason to look at the ways in which contemporary sources related information about peoples and events, which are two roads not taken. My approach, while helping to avoid polemical discussions, admittedly has a sterilizing effect on the sources and treats this rich body of material flatly, obscuring some interesting dynamics. By limiting the sources under review to the eighth through tenth centuries, a more nuanced picture emerges about several people and events that by the eleventh century had coalesced into more cohesive narratives aimed at exalting the Banū Umayya, particularly regarding the history of the events leading up to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir’s declaration and solidification of the Córdoban-based Umayyad caliphate. However, this earlier corpus not only presents interesting and conflicting information about events like the conquest of North Africa and the Iberian Peninsula and the ‘Berber revolt’ of the 740s, but also depicts figures like Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr, ‘Uqba ibn Nāfi’ al-Fihrī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥabīb al-Fihrī, and Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Fihrī in far more complicated lights than later sources portray. These chronicles speak to the possibility of a detailed history of the Fihrīs and suggest that the family played a substantive role in Andalusi history in both the eighth and ninth centuries. While this discussion highlighted some of the complex dynamics between North African tribes and Umayyad rulers, be they governors or amirs, far more remains to be done. The presentation of the eighteen sources discussing al-Andalus dating from the eighth to tenth century should be seen as a starting point for further research that does not rely upon generations of chroniclers either dependent on Umayyad caliphal patronage or those with a vested, nostalgic interest in portraying the apex of a lost al-Andalus. The
sources here, though still elite, touch on a variety of viewpoints that give us a way to challenge the view from the centre for a plethora of research questions.

**Chapter Three: What Does a Corpus of Andalusi Buildings and Their Material Culture in the Southern Meseta look like?**

Chapter Three uses Zorita as a case study to elucidate two main points: one, how the failure to not only use but to interrogate Arabic sources could lead to misinterpreting material evidence, and two, how structures at the fortress that attest to Islamicate periods demonstrate the potential the Southern Meseta has in terms of enriching Andalusi studies. The existing discussions on Zorita’s Islamicate past demonstrate the ways in which this four-hundred-year period have been condensed into one ahistorical narrative. A result of mistranslation, misunderstanding, and a lack of contextual studies and source criticism has created an anachronistic picture of the fortress as a seat of rebellion belonging to the Banū Dhū al-Nūn who controlled a clearly-defined and stable region called Santaver. The written sources simply cannot support this conclusion. Though scarcely mentioned in Ibn Ḥayyān’s *Muqtabis*, Zorita, when discussed, evinces ties to the Umayyad centre at Córdoba. We cannot extrapolate from this analysis of Zorita conclusions about neighbouring sites, however, this study shows that further investigations into places in the Southern Meseta might paint a different picture of the region in the Umayyad period than what has previously been argued. Investigations into the architecture of the region might allow for diagnostic typologies that could identify chronological markers. The examination of Zorita presented in Chapter Three argues for a chronology for the Islamicate period in the Southern Meseta which follows: Umayyad (ca. 800-970s); Dhū al-Nūnid (970s-1085); and Almoravid/Almohad (ca. 1090-1150). In addition, the chapter shows the inappropriateness of using Toledo as a ‘centre’ or comparand for the art and architecture of the early Umayyad period. Finally, this research might lead to a re-envisioning of the reign of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (r. 852-886), which has been portrayed in eleventh-century sources as a time of great instability. Both the material and written sources suggest the opposite, that the solidity of ties in the Southern Meseta resulted in substantial investment in the
development of the region by the Umayyad rulers. A history of the Southern Meseta might challenge canonical presentations of several Umayyad amirs.

In many ways this chapter had the most possible opportunities to branch into different investigations. The scrutiny of Ibn Ḥayyān (and its translations) in the short passages on Zorita shows not only that we must return to original sources to avoid the errors created when scholars make use of secondary sources or translations to interpret primary ones but demonstrated the need for source criticism when using the Muqtabis especially to construct histories so geographically and temporally removed from Ibn Ḥayyān. The idiosyncrasies of the written passages presented here leave us with perhaps more questions than when we first started, for example: What was the actual relationship of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn to Córdoba? why are they fighting in support of Umayyad troops against Pamplona? what happened to the Dhū al-Nūnid captives and why did ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir wait ten years to ransom family members of clients who fought for him? did ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir’s policies in regard to the Southern Meseta create a rebellious thaghr al-awsat? If so, does this mean we should rethink the success of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir’s caliphate? Did his ‘firing’ of al-Fāṭih ibn Yaḥyā ibn Fath ibn Dhū al-Nūn in 935 set in motion dynamics that fractured the relationship between the North African tribes of the Southern Meseta and Córdoba? was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir as able an administrator as written sources depict? might a view from the Southern Meseta see the thirty year reign of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and the twenty year reign of ‘Abd Allah ibn Muḥammad as high points in the region’s history? how might patronage concerns and the fall of the Umayyad caliphate at the beginning of the eleventh century affect the ways in which the al-Rāzīs and Ibn Ḥayyān relate history, and how are we to puzzle this out? Might depictions of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn as ‘loyal and rebellious’ have something to do with legitimizing their later rule?

Another fascinating question not pursued is that the role that elite women play in the few mentions of Zorita and the history of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn suggest that women in al-Andalus exercised
power not only in urban centres like Córdoba. What reads in the twentieth-first century as aberration (when the sister of Khalaf ibn ‘Abdūs directs the defence of Zorita against the siege of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn) might testify to different social norms in the medieval period than are typically assumed. This is supported by Anderson’s study on the role Queen Tota (d. 958) played in Navarre. More studies about the role women played outside of cities might prompt re-evaluations of figures like Zaida of Seville (c. 1070–1093/1107), the concubine of Alfonso the Brave and mother of his only heir, Sancho; Queen Constance of Burgundy (r. 1079-1093); and Queen Urraca (r. 1109-1126) of León, Castilla, and Galicia. Zaida, who is attested to in contemporary written sources as bringing several fortresses as part of her agreement to join Alfonso’s court (the chronicles suggest as daughter-in-law of Al-Mu’tamid Muḥammad ibn Abbād she owned the rights to these lands) is largely dismissed and her story is regarded with incredulity by many scholars. Although there has been scholarly interest in the Christian queens of Castilla and León, future research might look at a cohort or powerful women rulers in the Iberian Peninsula from the eighth to twelfth centuries. The juxtaposition of four entries in the Muqtabis elucidate how much we do not know. However, this lacuna shows the work to be done and how switching the geographic centre of an argument can lead to fruitful questions.

The material sources are no clearer. While several structures at Zorita attest to Andalusi forms, the near complete lack of studies in the region by experts in al-Andalus means we are without local comparanda. This is not to say that individual studies have not been completed. Though piecemeal, there are a substantial number of archaeological studies in the Southern Meseta that have excavated material from Andalusi periods, spanning from the Umayyads to the Almohads. Work has been
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703 Anderson, ‘Sign of the Cross: Contexts for the Ivory Cross of San Millán de La Cogolla.’
704 For an example of a dismissal of this story as an ‘ahistorical legend’, see Dimas Pérez Ramírez, Uclés, Cabeza de la Orden de Santiago (Tarancón: Artes Gráficas Antona, 1997), 5; or the most agressive suggestion that this was ‘unheard of nonsense that would mean accepting as a historical truth that a concubine provided a dowry’ in Placido Ballesteros San-José et al., Guía histórica de la diputación provincial de Guadalajara (1813-2001) (Diputación de Guadalajara, 2001), 26.
completed and published on sites including Recópolis, Los Hitos, Vascos, Segóbriga, Huete, Ercávica, and Talavera de la Reina. Places like Uclés and Cuenca largely remain to be studied. However, Andalusi finds in these contexts are rarely studied by experts in al-Andalus. The lack of comparative studies between these sites means that scholars are largely without the diagnostic tools that would allow for conclusions about dating. This presented the largest challenge here and explains to some extent why the research I completed on sites, specifically Huete, Uclés, Cuenca, and Talavera de la Reina are not presented here. One possible way forward would be to start with a material history of the Banū Dhū al-Nūn, for which we are relatively well-positioned as a field. Not only is there written evidence that clearly identifies a cohort of sites (Zorita, Huete, Huélamo, Uclés, Cuenca, and Toledo) but archaeological studies exist to support a presentation of evidence. It is entirely possible that more attention to the Banū Dhū al-Nūn could provide typological and stylistic seriation for the tenth and eleventh centuries in al-Andalus. This theoretically is feasible for the Almoravid and Almohad period, though the only identification of a cohort in a written source is that from al-Idrīsī. At the very least, comparative studies between Zorita, Los Hitos, and Calatrava la Vieja might yield results for this later era. However, for the Umayyad period we are relatively at a loss. No extant written sources identify a cohort; no material studies in the region suggest clear comparands either. Though in general the increasingly specific seriations of Andalusi ceramics might allow for solid comparisons in the future, at the moment the excavated ceramics of the Southern Meseta are little studied.705

This brings us to the scapular bone of Talavera de la Reina first mentioned in the Introduction. As discussed, the original research plan was to look at the excavated material from this site, with the intent of cataloguing the finds that dated to the Andalusi period. However, COVID-19 and the museum’s
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705 The most detailed studies are those of Manuel Retuerce, such as Retuerce and Zozaya, ‘Variantes geográficas de la cerámica omeya andalusí: los temas decorativos’; Retuerce Velasco, de Juan García, and Garrido Amorós, ‘Ocho siglos de cerámica Medieval en Castilla-La Mancha’; Retuerce Velasco, ‘La cerámica islámica de Calatalifa: Apuntes sobre los grupos cerámicos de la Marca Media.’
inability to locate the boxes in storage that held this material (which are theoretically still lost) meant that research into the Andalusi past of Talavera, a site in the Southern Meseta that is identified by contemporary sources, could not be undertaken at this time. And yet in 2020 I saw photographs of an ovicaprid scapula covered in Arabic writing and a small carved figurine excavated from Ronda de Cañillo 16 from Andalusi layers. While currently lost, if found, this material could provide another window into studies on scapulimancy or perhaps the use of shoulder bones for writing, like that found at Los Bañales near Zaragoza (Figure 5.1), and provide information on the political and social hierarchies of al-Andalus. There is promising material for research throughout the Southern Meseta, but the lack of demand for studies on the Andalusi period has resulted in a lack of focus on the storage, labelling, care, and display of this material culture. The situation is more dire in many places. At Uclés, the conglomerate Carpetania was awarded a contract to ‘restore’ the fortress dating to the Umayyad period, a process during which they used excavators to dump material into trucks to be hauled away with no attempt to determine if archaeological material was present in what they threw away. The slopes of the fortress of Uclés likely held the most information on period dating to its founding in the Umayyad period –a history now totally lost to us. The company is known for their shoddy restorative work in the region: a look at the ‘restoration’ of the Almohad tower of San Miguel in Palomares provides

706 This photograph also seems to be missing although there is a clearer idea where to find it. Urbina and Urquijo suspect it is in their files on Talavera de la Reina. Both the situations regarding the missing boxes in the museum and the missing photograph would have been relatively small hurdles for a non-Covid thesis. However, the bans on travel and the difficulties in accessing archives after-Covid have made this relatively small challenge a disproportionately larger one.


708 This information came from several conversations with townspeople in Uclés, Manuel Añuarbe, and archaeologists Dionisio Urbina, Catalina Urquijo, Victor Barrera Alarcón, and Jose Luis Córdoba de la Cruz. By law, Carpetania must deposit any archaeological material, documented and catalogued in the provincial museum. While Urbina and Urquijo alerted the province as to what had happened at Uclés, theoretically increasing oversight at the site, the reality is that much of the material that could have spoken to this earliest period is forever lost.
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a particularly horrifying example (Figures 5.2-5.4). As one can see from the photograph, there has been little effort made to preserve the standing tower. Careful restoration would have left the stones from the original fortification, strengthened them, and then any additions (to build the tower up) would have been marked by a line of ‘modern’ material so that future researcher could identify what was original and what was new. Rather, in this the ‘restoration’, Carpetania plastered over the entire building with a yellowish concrete mortar. No attempt was made to carefully lay the stones, nor was any attempt made to only include stones from the original tower. In the image one can see not only an abundance of chicken wire but also modern hunks of concrete that would have never been a part of the original tower. There is no way to assess the state of the foundational wall as it is covered in the yellowish mortar and as a result, even identifying the original footprint of the fortification is difficult. The time is now. If scholars of al-Andalus do not start researching this time and place, the lack of demand and the perceived lack of interest in oversight could erase the material evidence that speaks not only to the Umayyad Andalusi state, but also to empire in the pre-modern world.

Finally, one path not taken is the fascinating conundrum of the feline head of Zorita de los Canes and other sculptural animalistic forms in the region, particularly in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Given the increased use of animal imagery in the ʿĀmirid period, the carved animals of the Southern Meseta might add additional context to visual expressions of power in the medieval Iberian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{709} The feline head in the fortress of Zorita and the wolf-head in the fortress of Uclés should be studied in conjunction with the visual culture of Christianate rule, particularly that of Alfonso the Noble and the military orders including the Order of Calatrava and the Order of Santiago.

\textsuperscript{709} For a discussion of the treaty in which Ibn Mardanīsh swapped his fortress at Uclés for Alfonso II’s fortress at Aicun, see Balbale, The Wolf King: Ibn Mardanish and the Construction of Power in al-Andalus, 209; For mentions of Ibn Mardanish in the region, see Ballesteros San-José et al., Guía histórica de la diputación provincial de Guadalajara (1813-2001), 31; For a discussion on ʿĀmirid use of animalistic imagery to express authority, see Chapter 7 in Rosser-Owen, Articulating the Hijāba: Cultural Patronage and Political Legitimacy in al-Andalus: The ʿĀmirid Regency c. 970-1010 AD.
Each of the above are studies that the evidence presented in Chapter Three speak to, and I would argue necessary for scholars interested in the Umayyad period to conduct in the future. However, my choice not to discuss these is due to my belief that while they potently express the Islamicate presence in the Southern Meseta, these investigations do not help to answer the question: ‘how do we know what we know, or more frequently, why do we not know about the history of the Southern Meseta from the eighth to tenth centuries?’

Chapter Four: The Twentieth Century Legacy of the International Art Market, the Regenerista Movement, and the Second Republic

Of all the chapters presented here, Chapter Four is the one that makes the greatest leap, not only in time but also in source base. Though the twelve-century span between the first source material presented to the interrogation of twentieth-century laws is quite a jump, the consistent methodology of mapping space brings these sources into the same conversation. Chapter Four shows the importance of the development of a national cultural heritage to the perceived past. The unique socio-cultural and political context of Spain in the 1920s and the 1930s led to the identification and official protection of sites that largely remembered a Catholic past. This is the second historiographical moment that occluded the history of the Southern Meseta. While eighth- through tenth-century sources rarely discussed the space, eleventh-century writers who did discuss the region portrayed it as a space of ‘others’ – not entirely Andalusi. The passing of the Decree of June 3, 1931 similarly suggested that Andalusi history only existed in the southern part of the Peninsula. Paired together, these two moments speak to the power of words to shape current perceptions. However, when these historical narratives are juxtaposed with material culture, we see the disjuncture.

In investigating how the castle-fortress of Zorita came to be a Bienes de Interé Cultural (BIC), Chapter Four details the development of legal protectionism of cultural heritage in the early twentieth century. This history is largely overlooked in art historical studies on both Spain and al-Andalus perhaps
a result of political turbulence that overshadowed the 1920s and 1930s. However, the legislation passed and its wording point to the issues that politicians grappled with at this time. One cannot understand the ways in which monuments were selected to be National Artistic Treasures in the largest piece of protectionist legislation passed from 1844 to 1974 without the context of predatory buying of Spanish antiquities on the international art market.

However, like the previous chapters, the analysis of the sources here, the Decree of June 3, 1931 and the correspondence between Julia Morgan, Mildred Stapley Byne, Arthur Byne, and W.R. Hearst points to other avenues of research. The discussion presented on the Decree of June 3, 1931 highlights how much is unknown about the process of the Provincial Commissions of Historical and Artistic Monuments and the Central Commissions, the people involved in identifying and advocating for sites, and the ways in which the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts, the Board of Excavations and Antiquities, and the Royal Academies of History and Fine Arts of San Fernando developed, maintained, and administered the national registry of BICs. Research at the aforementioned institutions as well as provincial archives would shed much light on this topic. Likewise, this discussion serves as a call to historians of modern Spain, specifically the Second Republic, to pay attention to a significant achievement of the administration of Niceto Alcalá-Zamora. The Decree of June 3, 1931 show it is a significant piece of legislation that must be contextualized within larger political developments of the time.

Secondly, more work must be done on dealers including but not limited to the Bynes. Though studies have been dedicated to Arthur Byne, the historical record remains strangely silent on the roles of Julia Morgan and Mildred Stapley, the latter of whom we know shockingly little about for a figure who wrote so prodigiously. Mildred Stapley played a significant role as what might be termed an early

710 For a discussion on the development of the taste for Spanish antiquities in the international art market, specifically in the United States, see Kagan, *The Spanish Craze: America’s Fascination with the Hispanic World, 1779-1939*. 
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twentieth-century influencer, yet her role in the Spanish antiquities market seems always to be to support her husband. While Martínez Ruiz has written on her background, employment with the Hispanic Society of America, and social life in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s, little time has been spent on her scholarship (other than to list her publications). There is remarkably little research into the role Stapley played in the partnership – and often her role in the business is downplayed. Even when we have correspondence in her own name, historians have somewhat bizarrely asserted that these were actually written by Byne as part of an attempt to cover up his dealings rather than attribute Mildred Stapley agency. A comprehensive look at Stapley’s role in their business is overdue, not only to understand her personal history but also to review the ways in which her scholarly perceptions of Spanish art objects and buildings and social connections affected the holdings of American collections as a whole.

Additionally, this chapter highlights the need for cultural historians of the modern Middle East, especially those concerned with the dynamics of colonization and imperialism, to include the history of heritage and collection in Spain in their purview. In this field, Spain tends to be known only as a

---


712 This is asserted in both Merino de Cáceres and Martínez Ruiz, La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador», 395 and Martínez Ruiz, “Mildred Stapley: «Esta mujer trabajadora, que tiene un experto conocimiento de la arquitectura española, ¿es acaso una feminista inaguantable?»,” 201-203. Martínez Ruiz states that the reason Byne used “Stapley” to sign a large number of telegrams is that he did not want to damage his standing as a scholar in Spain. As Stapley enjoyed a more scholarly reputation (as proven by Martínez Ruiz), this seems rather to argue the opposite. Nothing in the telegram correspondence suggests that either Stapley or Byne were ashamed of what they were doing nor trying to operate in secret. Rather this seems an anachronistic reading of contemporary evidence. As we have telegrams addressed to both Stapley and Byne, it makes sense that those on the receiving end of their correspondence expected that either could answer the telegram. Given Stapley’s specialty and historical knowledge, it seems more likely that Stapley was intimately involved in the couple’s dealings. Byne writes in telegrams that he must consult with Mildred before making decisions (see page 402 of La destrucción del patrimonio artístico español: W.R. Hearst: «el gran acaparador»). It is likely that Stapley wrote the telegrams that are signed with her name and that she played a more substantial role in the dealings of the couple than typically allowed. A reexamination of the sources with her in mind would be welcome. To date, the most comprehensive investigation of Stapley is that of María José Martínez Ruiz, “Mildred Stapley: «Esta mujer trabajadora, que tiene un experto conocimiento de la arquitectura española, ¿es acaso una feminista inaguantable?»,” in Ellas siempre han estado ahí. Coleccionismo y mujeres, ed. Patricia Andrés González and Miguel Ángel Zalama (Doce Calles, 2020), 189–210.
colonizing nation-state, specifically in Morocco.\textsuperscript{713} The research here does not negate that role, however, more research into how the threat to Spain’s Andalusi past by other European nations and the United States of America show its role as ‘colonised’ is needed. Comparative studies of European empires like the Habsburg, Ottoman, and Spanish Empires as well as Italy and the North African states on self-orientalisation might pinpoint the networks of predatory buying that resulted in the exportation of Islamicate material culture from their homes.\textsuperscript{714} This has repercussions for museums participating in decolonial work and for investigations of provenance.

Finally, Chapter Four shows the need for Anglophone historians of al-Andalus trained outside of Spain to make use not only of Spanish sources, something the field has become better at, but specifically to make use of the work that local historians and archaeologists have done. In many ways this final chapter is an ode to the peoples who have continually researched and advocated for local sites only to have their scholarship remain unread by historians of other countries. The cultural history of Zorita is a story of local advocacy, by peoples of the town and the scholarly community of Castilla-La Mancha. Centuries of predatory behaviours by scholars and artists from other European nations, particularly France, Germany, and Great Britain, and the United States of America, have created a distrust and a reticence for Spanish scholars to partner with academics outside of the nation.\textsuperscript{715} I hope that what has come through is that nothing presented here could be done without the current research that Dionisio Urbina Martínez, Catalina Urquijo Alvarez, Lauro Olmo Enciso, and Manuel Retuerce are doing on sites in

\textsuperscript{713} For examples, see Jonathan Wyrtzen, \textit{Making Morocco: Colonial Intervention and the Politics of Identity} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015); Calderwood, \textit{Colonial Al-Andalus: Spain and the Making of Modern Moroccan Culture}.


\textsuperscript{715} For examples of predatory buying by European nations, see McSweeney, \textit{From Granada to Berlin: The Alhambra Cupola}; Kagan, \textit{The Spanish Craze: America’s Fascination with the Hispanic World, 1779-1939}. Scholars who work on al-Andalus who do not conduct research in Spain, cannot read Arabic, and/or do not develop relationships with local experts abound. These dynamics needs to stop and at the very least those of us working in the field need to reconsider the ways we approach and use the research of our Spanish colleagues.
Castilla-La Mancha, or the past research of scholars including Leopoldo Torres Balbás, Francisco Layna Serrano and Basilio Pavón Maldonado.

**Conclusion: Better Together**

I close with a final example that demonstrates the need for historians of al-Andalus to engage with the work done by local scholars. Visitors to Zorita must check-in at the Interpretation Centre of Recópolis. A tourist has choices in learning about Zorita in the Interpretation Centre: there is a film that presents both the history of Recópolis and the fortress of Zorita; a self-guided exhibit split almost equally between the sites; and finally until 2020, those wishing to tour the location could request a guided tour by checking in with staff. The twinning of the presentation of the history of Recópolis and Zorita is a result of the successful advocacy of the people of Zorita de los Canes to include of the castle-fortress in the regional Archaeological Park of Recópolis in 2004. As a result of this, Zorita nominally became eligible to receive regional funding, though little changed regarding public access to the castle-fortress. When archaeologists Urbina Martínez and Urquijo Alvarez secured financing and started excavations at Zorita in 2014, despite being a part of the Archaeological Park of Recópolis for ten years, the site, as Urquijo Alvarez relates, ‘was a total mess. It had no physical entrance, it was open for anyone to go in and it was covered in trash, plants and paintings on the castle walls . . . one of the many things we did with this money was to close the castle, and from then on, visitors had an entrance for Recópolis and for the castle, a guide and a schedule for visits.’ The physical infrastructure to support public access to Zorita, while improving, still lags behind its neighbour.

It is clear that a lot of effort has been made to balance the histories of the sites of Recópolis and Zorita at the Interpretation Centre. The space dedicated to each site is about half and there has been a concerted effort to challenge traditional narratives which advanced the destructive nature of the

---

716 Tours of the site Zorita are now closed to the public due to another collapse of a section of the western wall of the castle.

Umayyad *fath*. Rather, the displays emphasize the archaeological continuity of the site until the early ninth century. In addition, there is time dedicated to all phases of habitation of the fortress, from its founding in the Umayyad period to its role in the late medieval period. The crusading history of the castle and its seat for the Order of Calatrava is part of the story of Zorita, not the whole picture. However, there are still some concerns with the displays. It is likely that whoever was involved in designing the displays could not read Arabic. The displays of the Umayyad dirhams found at Recópolis mislabel the sides of the coin, and thus a visitor is informed that the *shahāda* reads and vice versa (Figure 5.5). This is likely due to a confusion as to what ‘obverse’ and ‘reverse’ refers to in numismatics. In addition, the only depiction of the ‘Arabs’ is one taken from the *Māqamāt* of al-Ḥarīrī, and thus the illustration of the conquering North African tribes of Ṭāriq Ibn Ziyād have the characteristics of individuals imagined by Yaḥyā ibn Maḥmūd al-Wasiti, a thirteenth-century artist from Iraq (Figure 5.6). It is a curious curatorial choice to make, given both the *Māqamāt*’s temporal and geographical distance from eighth century al-Andalus as well as its illustrations, which has nothing to do with the conquering of the Iberian Peninsula but rather depicts a caravan on the way to Mecca. In terms of illustrations, the extant manuscripts do not speak to the eighth-century Umayyad *fath*. However, one wonders what experience a visitor might take away from the display if instead of showing an Iraqi manuscript, the image was one from the only extant illustrated Andalusi manuscript: the *Bayāḍ wa Riyāḍ*.

Might visitors form another impression if instead of being presented with a group of men on horses, they saw Andalusis in conversation (Figure 5.7), a depiction of the waterwheels which dotted the landscape of al-Andalus (Figure 5.8), or of Riyāḍ throwing herself down before her lady (Figure 5.9)? One should note this is not a problem unique to the Interpretation Centre at Recópolis. The Army Museum of Toledo displays an artifact with an Arabic inscription upside down, and the Archaeological Museum at Cuenca,

---

718 While this manuscript also dates to the thirteenth century, at least this is an example of Andalusi artists engaging in self-representation.
while generally having the most accurate displays on the Islamicate period in the museums of Castilla-La Mancha, misreads the Arabic and insists the town was referred to as ‘Qunka or Kunka’ (instead of Qwanka). While attempting to portray Andalusi history is an improvement for many sites, the lack of involvement of art historians means that in the public sphere, outdated understandings of the past live on. Above all, this work is a plea for attention for art and architectural historians of al-Andalus to engage with the Southern Meseta. This area has a rich and largely unexplored Islamicate past.
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