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The core of this thesis is the edition of ff.160b-178b of the Tarikh Mayyafarigan wa Amid by Ibn al-Azraq al-Fariqi. This text, hitherto largely unexploited, deals with the history of the Jazira from c.1100-c.1150, and contains a wealth of local detail - political, prosopographical and topographical. Despite its format of a city chronicle it also sheds much light on the major historical processes of this period, such as the revival of caliphal power, the growth of the atabegate and the rise of minor Turcoman dynasties at the expense of Saljuq power.

The prime aim of this thesis has been to render the text more accessible. This has been done firstly by preparing a critical edition based on the two known manuscripts. Since the text is known to be complex, however, it seemed best to try to solve its many problems by providing translations of both manuscripts and an extensive commentary on the edition itself. In this commentary the fullest possible use is made of other contemporary primary sources to control the information given by Ibn al-Azraq.

Individual chapters then explore some of the issues raised by the text. The chapters on ِIl-Ghâzi and his sons seek by careful selection to establish the significant landmarks of their careers and to assess them as military and civil rulers. The beginning of their transition from semi-nomadic amîrs to settled dynasts is thereby clarified. Chapter II shows how later writers exploited the text of Ibn al-Azraq and thereby examines certain typical
Islamic approaches to works of history, biography and topography. Chapter III analyses the text as an interesting source for the study of late medieval Arabic.

The edition itself, then, with its associated critical apparatus, addresses itself to the specific problems of language, history and topography presented by the text. The chapters which follow arise naturally out of the content of the text and demonstrate the wider horizons of this material.
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CHAPTER I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The value of the Tarikh Mayyafarigin wa Amid of Ibn al-Azraq as a source for the history of the Jazira has long been recognised. Amedroz, who first drew attention to this text, subsequently transcribed some relevant sections of it in the footnotes to his edition of Ibn al-Qalanisi. Minorsky translated and analysed Ibn al-Azraq's account of Il-Ghazi's campaign to Tiflis in 515/1121, whilst Cahen, in an early article, sketched the major political outlines of the part of the Tarikh Mayyafarigin wa Amid which

---

deals with Artuqid history.¹ The section of the text concerned with the Marwānids has been edited and published by ‘Āwad.²

It is not the intention in this thesis to edit the whole section of Ibn al-Azraq’s work which is concerned with the Artuqids. A conscious decision has been taken to restrict the material edited to those folios of Ibn al-Azraq’s text which deal with the activities of the first two Artuqid rulers, ʿIl-Ghāzī and Temūr-Tash, whose reigns cover a time-scale of roughly fifty years (1100-50), from the establishment of ʿIl-Ghāzī at Mārdīn to the death of his son Temūr-Tash. The reign of Najm al-Dīn Alpī which concludes the Tārīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa Âmid has been omitted.

Instead of a longer edition, translations of both manuscripts have been provided. Although a good portion of the chronicle is easy to read, certain sections remain obscure. Translating such passages will, it may be hoped, clarify them or at least stimulate discussion as to alternative meanings. Moreover, this text, although unreliable in its chronology and full of unexplained allusions, contains a wealth of material which deserves to be better known both to Islamic historians of the Jazīra and of the late Saljuq empire and to Western historians interested in the

---

Muslim world at the time of the First Crusade and the establishment of Frankish power in the Near East.

The translation is accompanied by a commentary which sets out to explain some of the detailed background to the text. This commentary has been placed separately after the translation because of its length. The Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid presents many unfamiliar place-names and numerous references to little-known people and the commentary attempts to clarify some of this problematic material. It also discusses the better-known episodes of the period by a comparison with other contemporary sources.

Description of the manuscripts

There are two extant copies of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid. Both are in the British Library.

Manuscript A (B.N. Or. 5803)

This is the longer and larger of the two manuscripts. The pages edited below usually have 23 lines\(^1\); the pages measure about 7" x 5". The manuscript is written in black ink on yellow paper. New sections of the text are marked by titles written in

---

1. Not 22, as stated by Amedroz (op. cit., 785). Although the number of lines in the earlier part of the manuscript varies, from f.120b onwards the pages contain 23 lines. The only exceptions are ff.173a - b which have 22 lines.
larger letters. The manuscript is written in a fine hand and is provided with vowels and diacritical points.

There is ample evidence that alterations were made to the manuscript after it was copied. It contains a large number of marginal additions or corrections, deletions in the text and intercalations.

In many places the text is illegible or difficult to decipher, as some words or even whole lines are now completely obliterated. A further problem is caused by the punctuation. The scribe often places the dots or vowel markings in the wrong place or where they are not needed at all.

The manuscript contains two hundred folios. Its first few folios are missing. It is highly probable that some of the last folios are lost too, since it comes to an abrupt end.

In Ms.A, the material is presented within a chronological framework. The missing folios at the beginning probably contained a history of the early Islamic period, since the work actually begins with an account of ‘Umar’s caliphate. This is followed by a description of the founding of the city of Mayyāfāriqīn.¹ The next folios deal with the successive periods in the history of Diyār Bakr and of the caliphate and include a detailed account of the Hamdānid dynasty.² The history of ‘Aḍud al-Daula and the

---

¹. Ff. 7b - 12b.
². Ff. 12b - 121b. The rise of the Hamdānids begins on f. 110a.
subsequent rule in Diyar Bakr of Bad the Kurd follows. Ibn al-
Azraq then gives an account of the Marwanid dynasty and of the
chaotic years between their downfall and the establishment of
Artuqid power.¹ The remainder of the text consists of a detailed
description of the history of the early Artuqids. The manuscript
ends around the death of Majm al-Din Alpi in 572/1176-7.

Folios 160b - 178b cover the reigns of Il-Ghazi and Temur-
Tash. It is these folios which are edited and translated in this
thesis.

The subject-matter of Ms.A is more detailed than Ms.B and
contains material which is restricted to the history of Diyar
Bakr. This non-local subject-matter usually consists of obituary
notices of Fatimid and other rulers and isolated snippets of
information which are inserted often in the wrong place chronologically
or in the middle of a totally unrelated episode. Sometimes such
non-local material is repeated, without comment, under different
dates.

For the period of Temur-Tash's rule, Ibn al-Azraq frequently
uses details from his own experience or has access to eye-witness
accounts of historical events. Hence, no doubt, the more extended
treatment which he accords to certain episodes in this period.²

---

1. This is the section of Ibn al-Azraq's work which was edited
by 'Awad (ff.121b - 160b).
2. The process can be noted at the end of the previous reign in
the Tiflis campaign of Il-Ghazi which occupies ff.161a-162b.
Falling within the reign of Temur-Tash are the accounts of
The uneasy juxtaposition of detailed anecdotes with a succession of short scraps of information which characterises the text edited below produces a very uneven, unco-ordinated narrative.

Ms. A contains interesting features of orthography, morphology and syntax which are discussed in some detail elsewhere in this thesis.

Amedroz states that the date of the composition of this manuscript is 572 A.H.¹ Unfortunately, he does not explain how he arrived at this conclusion. ‘Awad, on the contrary, is unnecessarily indecisive, asserting that "no definite clues have been found which would lead to a correct answer".²

In fact there are several clues in the text. On f.177a, Ibn al-Azraq mentions that Nur al-Din Muhammad "is now in power". This ruler succeeded his father Qara Arslan at Hisn Kaifa in 562/1166-7 and ruled until 581/1185-6. A little later, Ibn al-Azraq mentions the death of Shirbarik in 566/1170-1³ and Balak b. Arslan Toghmish b. Bektash who became an ascetic in 567/1171-2. On the evidence of these three references, it may be postulated that

the ‘Abbāsid caliphs, al-Mustarshid and al-Rāshid, which take up much of ff.164b-167b. This is followed by a long excursus into the history of the Maghrib (ff.168a-169a).

3. F. 177b.
the manuscript was written in the reign of Nur al-Din Muhammad, some time between 567 and 581.

But the date of composition can be narrowed down further than this. The latest date mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq in the Artuqid section of Ms.A is found under the account of the reign of Najm al-Din Alpî, where the author states that he was at Akhlât in 571/1175-6.1 In another part of the text edited here Ibn al-Azraq, speaking of Arslan-Shâh b. Toghril, states that "he is now sultan of the area from Isfahân ... up to the city of Ganja ...".2 Arslan-Shâh died in Jumâdâ II 571/December-January 1175-6.3 This evidence indicates that Ibn al-Azraq was well-advanced in the writing of the text by the early part of 571.

The work was still unfinished in 572, however, since almost at the very beginning of his whole text he inserts the rulers of Mayyâfârîqîn up to his own time, which he gives here as 572/1176-7.4

The final version of Ms.A was therefore probably composed in the years 571/1175-6 and 572/1176-7.

It is not certain when and where the manuscript was copied. Amedroz, again without supporting evidence, states that it was

1. F.200a.
2. Ff.163b - 164a.
4. F.7b.
probably copied at Damascus in the seventh century A.H. on the other hand, is justifiably unwilling to commit himself on a date for the copying but says that Mayyafariqin would have been the most likely place.

Certainly, some version of Ibn al-Azraq's longer manuscript was available to writers such as Ibn Khallikan, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzi, and Ibn Wasil who wrote in the second half of the seventh century A.H. But this whole question is discussed at length elsewhere in this thesis.

Manuscript B (B.M. Or. 6,310)

This manuscript is shorter than Ms.A. It consists of 138 folios. Each page has 10 lines. The manuscript is written in black ink on yellow paper. It is to a great extent devoid of diacritical points or vowel markings. The pages of the manuscript are about half the size of those in Ms.A.

Although deletions and corrections have been made to this manuscript, such features are not as frequent as in Ms.A.

The first 31 folios are no longer legible. From the remainder of the text it is clear that the scribe had a better grasp of Arabic orthography than his counterpart for Ms.A. Whilst Ms.B displays a number of unusual grammatical and orthographical features,

it is more carefully written than Ms. A.

Like Ms. A, this manuscript adheres to the format of an annalistic chronicle in which events are presented under a given year. As with Ms. A, this manuscript lacks a beginning or an end. It begins with material dating from the reign of the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Muhtadī (255/868-9) and ends with the first part of the description of the rule of Najm al-Dīn Alpī. There is no account of the years 549-60/1154-65.

Ms. B contains a limited amount of non-local material but its scope is less general than Ms. A.

Ms. B. was probably composed in 560/1164-5, since on folio 94b the author speaks of the year in which he was writing as 560. It is not possible to ascertain the date of the copying of this manuscript. One fact is certain; Ms. B was available in some form to Ibn Shaddād in the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century since he copied long sections from it for his historical geography of the Jazīra. This work is found in the Bodleian manuscript entitled Marsh 333, which was composed in 679/1280-1 and copied in 789/1387-8.  

The title of Ibn al-Azraq's work

As explained above, both manuscripts lack folios at the

---

1. It was Amedroz who first mentioned this fact and cited f.94b as proof (op. cit., 785).
beginning and end of the text, where the title of the work, the names of the author and the scribes and the dates of composition and copying would probably be found. Fortunately, Ibn Shaddād in Marsh 333 gives the full name of the author as Ahmad b. Yūsuf b. 'Alī b. al-Azraq and the title of the work as the Tārīkh Mayyafarīqīn wa Āmid.¹ Ibn Khallikān calls it the Tārīkh Mayyafarīqīn.²

The edition of the text

a) Preliminary comments

The most important decision for any editor of the Tārīkh Mayyafarīqīn wa Āmid is whether to present the two manuscripts as one text or to edit them separately. 'Awad adopted the former method. Minorsky, on the other hand, recommended that the two manuscripts should be edited separately; possibly in two parallel columns, since in his view the material they treat is so divergent.³

A close examination of the material covered by both manuscripts for the period under discussion in this thesis reveals that the shorter manuscript, Ms.B, does not contain information which is not included in the longer text, Ms.A. The detailed indices which are provided below for both manuscripts confirm this.

---

1. Marsh 333, ff.79b and 81b.
It is true that Ms. B sometimes presents episodes or individual facts in a different order from Ms. A and very occasionally adds the odd isolated detail, but with this very minor exception it remains true that all the information in Ms. B can be located somewhere in Ms. A. Ms. A, on the other hand, contains material which is not found in Ms. B.

Minorsky's suggestion of two separate editions in parallel columns would thus result in an unnecessarily cumbersome work and would make the text difficult to read. It is therefore not the method used here. The idea of editing the two manuscripts one after the other has also been rejected after some thought. This method would be justified only if Ms. B contained significant differences from Ms. A. A long, careful study and a separate translation of both manuscripts reveal that this is not the case.

The method adopted for this edition, therefore, is the one used by 'Awad for his edition of the earlier part of Ibn al-Azraq's text. Ms. A is taken as the main text. For whole areas of the work it is the only version available. Where Ms. B covers the same material, it is used for comparison and for the clarification of difficulties. Significant variants in the two manuscripts are mentioned in the footnotes to the edition.

The edition of the Tarikh Mayyafarigin wa Amīd presented in this thesis covers Ms. A, ff. 160b - 178b and Ms. B, ff. 100b - 138b. The unpublished work of the historical geographer Ibn Shaddād on the Jazīra, entitled al-A'laq al-Khatira fī dhikr umarā' al-Shām...
wa'l-Jazira is used in this edition to elucidate passages which are unclear in both Mss. A and B. The relevant part of this text is to be found in the Bodleian manuscript, Marsh 333\(^1\). It is a useful aid because a large portion of its contents are borrowed, often verbatim, from Ibn al-Azraq. Marsh 333 is based on Ms. B. It would have been of greater help in the preparation of this edition if it had taken material from Ms. A. Nevertheless, it is of value since it provides a third version of a limited number of incidents. Marsh 333 is cited in the edition only sparingly as it is so similar or identical to Ms. B. Ibn Shaddād has a better grasp of geographical names than Ibn al-Azraq or his copyists and his work is of value in this respect too.

Transliterations of both manuscripts and a detailed comparison between them has revealed a great wealth of minor textual differences. Not all of these have been recorded, since the footnotes to the edition are already lengthy. Variant readings from Ms. B are given only if they help to clarify Ms. A, for example by providing better readings of proper names.

The orthography and many of the morphological idiosyncrasies of the manuscripts have been standardised, except in certain specific situations mentioned below. As, however, the language of this chronicle is an important facet of its scholarly value, the syntactical peculiarities of the text have been left unchanged. The actual form used by the scribes is, however, indicated in the

---

footnotes. The aim has been to ensure that every word of the original text can be reconstituted either from the edition or the footnotes.

b) **Detailed comments on the edition**

1. Ms. A contains numerous marginal comments. These are recorded in the footnotes.¹

2. Ms. A has many instances of words or phrases intercalated in the text. Some of these are of no particular significance. Often they simply reveal the missing part of a name omitted in error by the scribe who inserts it on re-reading his text. Intercalations are mentioned in the footnotes only when they are of importance to the edition. Instances where an alternative word or phrase is provided above the line of text in addition to the version written on the line are also recorded in the footnotes.

3. Punctuation has been added but is limited to the introduction of paragraphs.

4. In both Ms.s, the definite article is usually omitted from dates which contain the elements of day and month, e.g.-

1. The marginal amendments in Ms. A are followed by صع and their placing in the text is indicated by an arrow.

The examples of this practice have been left unchanged in the text.

5. Place-names have been recorded in the edition in the form which they appear in Ms.A. The variants from Ms.B have been placed in the footnotes. Marsh 333 has been used for clarification. If a place-name occurs in the text in a strange form, it is given in its more usual version in the translation which accompanies the edition, e.g.:

Dhu'l-Qarnain = بالقرنين

6. Personal names are presented in the text in the form in which they appear in Ms.A. Any variants in Ms.B are placed in the footnotes. Often Ms.B contains the more usual form of a personal name but the unusual versions in Ms.A have been retained since they are of interest. Possibly they reflect the local pronunciation of such names. For example, the name Toghril Beg is rendered in Ms.B as طُغرِل بَک but it often appears in Ms.A as طغریک. The more usual forms of personal names, have, however, been adopted for the translation.

In the rendering of certain very common personal names such as Ibrāhīm and ʿUthmān, and above all Sulaimān, the manuscripts omit the notation of length of the alif altogether.¹ They have been left unchanged in the text.

A personal name is corrected in the edition only when there

---

1. Such names as Sulaimān often occur in written Arabic with the fatha replaced by a vertical stroke.
is a clear error either by the author or the scribes. For example, Zangi's son is called Qūtb al-Dīn Māmūd; this has been changed to Maudūd in the text.¹

7. If the reading of a word or phrase is doubtful, this is indicated in the footnotes with a question mark in brackets.

8. Illegible words or phrases and lacunae in the original text are mentioned in the footnotes.

9. Similarly, on the few occasions where a word has been added to the text, this is also noted.

Abbreviations used in this edition

Ms. = Ms.A, i.e., B.M. Or. 5803
Ms.B = B.M. Or. 6310
Marsh 333 = Bodleian Ms. Marsh 333
'A'wad = B.A.L. 'A'wad, ed., Tārīkh al-Fārīqī (Cairo, 1959)
Amedroz = Ibn al-Qalānisī, Dhail Tārīkh Dimashq, ed.
           H.F. Amedroz (Leyden, 1908)
Ibn Wāsil = Ibn Wāsil, Mufarrij al-Kurūb fī akhbar Banī Ayyūb
           ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl (Cairo, 1953), I.

¹ Ms.A, f.174b.
Introduction to the translation of the text

Preliminary comments

The translation of the edited text of Ibn al-Azraq has been kept as literal as possible. On the other hand, a wider range of words and sentence structures has been introduced, since the translation would have been virtually unreadable if the repetitiveness and the restricted vocabulary and syntactical form of the Arabic original had been transferred wholesale into English.

In spite of his protestations and profuse apologies for his "literal" translation, Gibb's achievement with *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*\(^1\) provides a polished model for any translator of an Arabic chronicle to try to emulate.

The shortcomings and limitations of Ibn al-Azraq's "literary" style are apparent from a reading of almost any page taken at random. To translate his work into readable English perhaps endows it with a certain elegance which is quite undeserved. The alternative, however, would be to produce a text as confusing and unco-ordinated in English as it is in the Arabic original. Even as distinguished an author as Ibn Khaldūn presents difficulties of this kind; Gibb himself condemned Rosenthal's translation of the *Mugaddima* as "moronic staccato". 

In the translation provided below, the simplistic style of

the Arabic has mostly been retained. From time to time, however, subordinate clauses introduced by temporal conjunctions have been used to vary the constant succession of short main clauses. On occasion, pronouns have been replaced by proper names in order to impose some clarity on obscure parts of the text. Similarly, words such as "then" have sometimes been added to render the sequence of events more understandable.

For the sake of completeness and comparison, a translation of the whole of the corresponding portion of Ms.B is also provided.

Points of detail

1. The paragraphs given in the translation correspond to those of the Arabic edition. In both cases they are purely arbitrary but they are added to make the text more readable.

2. Brackets are used to indicate explanatory words or phrases which are not found in the Arabic original.

3. Question-marks in brackets denote doubtful translations or readings of names. The use of this device has been kept to a minimum but its limited appearance has proved inevitable.

---

1. Above all, such a procedure is necessary for an understanding of the genealogical account (Ms.A, ff.177b - 178b) and the excursus into the history of the Maghrib (Ms.A, ff.168a - 169a).

2. Cf. Appendix C.
4. Well-known words such as vizier, caliph and sultan appear in their westernised forms. This also applies to famous cities such as Baghdad, Jerusalem, Edessa and Constantinople.

5. The transliteration of Turkish names written in Arabic script presents a major problem. In face of a wide divergence of treatments for such names, it has seemed best in this thesis to opt for the versions found in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. V. For names which do not occur there, the works of Sauvaget¹ and Houtsma² have been consulted. Reservations may be expressed about some of the versions of Turkish names found in *The Cambridge History of Iran* but at least in the face of continuing scholarly controversy, an attempt at consistency has been made here by the wholesale adoption of one system.

6. Although many personal and place-names occur in unusual forms in the edition of the text, which is based primarily on Ms. A, the more usual form of a name has been written in the translation.

   e.g. Togh-Tegin not Toghr-Tegin
        Toghril-Beg not Toghr-Beg
        Dhu’l-Qarnain not Bal-qarnain
        Bahmard not Bahmud

So many versions of the modern Harput are found in medieval sources

---

that its unusual form Knartabirt has been retained in the
translation.

The numbering in the translation refers to the detailed notes
in the commentary. Genealogical tables and a map are provided at
the end of the thesis.

It is only to be expected that a city chronicle should have
a predominantly local focus. The Tarikh Mayyafarqin wa Amid is
no exception in this respect. As a result the text abounds in
topographical detail: names of obscure towns, villages and
castles follow each other in quick succession. In order to
clarify the geographical framework of the text as much as
possible, a detailed map of Syria and the Jazîra has been prepared;
this map extends also to southern Iraq, westernmost Iran and the
fringes of the Caucasus. The aim of the map is that all the
places mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq in the text edited here (except
a few like Marâgha, Tiflîs, Isfahân and Hulwân which are outside
the area specified) should be located on it provided that their
identification can be regarded as established. There seems to
be no point in larding the map with names for which only
hypothetical locations can be proposed. Frequently the context
indicates the general area in which these castles and settlements
may be found.

In the preparation of the map the single most useful source
was M. Canard's monumental Histoire de la dynastie des Â'amdanides
de Jazîra et de Syrie (Paris, 1953). This was supplemented where
appropriate by E. Honigmann, Die Ostgrenzen des byzantinischen
Transliteration table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>fatha = a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>kasra = i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>damma = u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>fatha + alif = ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>kasra + yā = ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>damma + waw = ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fatha + ya = ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fatha + waw = au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In name-endings -iyya has been preferred to -īya/-iyyah/-īyah

Apart from "caliph", "sultan" and "vice" in which English terms, the word titles are transliterated as
are to the left of the line or defined as cited in all of
none of these terms are clipped or not strictly transliterate.
CHAPTER II

IBN AL-AZRAQ AS A SOURCE FOR

LATER MEDIEVAL AUTHORS
IBN AL-AZRAQ AS A SOURCE FOR LATER MEDIEVAL MUSLIM HISTORIANS

Introductory Comments

The Tarikh MayyafirigIn wa Amid appears to have been known to a number of seventh/thirteenth century Muslim historians in Syria and Egypt, who make extensive borrowings from it in their own works. It is not the intention here to discuss the debt owed to Ibn al-Azraq by all the Muslim authors who are known to have made use of his work. Attention will be focused on only four historians, who borrowed substantial material from the Tarikh MayyafirigIn wa Amid.

Among those who used some portion of the manuscripts Amedroz and ‘Awad cite Yaqut. But the information known to have been borrowed by this later author does not come from the section of the manuscript treated in detail in this thesis. It will, therefore, not be dealt with here. In the case of those authors who do borrow from the material edited in this thesis, no attempt has yet been made to establish, by means of a critical comparison and analysis, the exact relationship between Ibn al-Azraq's original and the later borrowing. In the case of Ibn Wasil, his dependence on Ibn al-Azraq has not hitherto been widely recognised.

It therefore seems worthwhile not merely to list the borrowings which can be identified but also to try to discover why later historians borrowed what they did and to discuss how and why they altered this material. In the process it might be
possible to glean some insights into the use which a medieval historian made of his sources.

A note of caution should, however, be sounded at this stage. It is clearly unrealistic to expect from these medieval authors a critical approach to their sources. For them the primary function of a historian was to chronicle events, not to impose a pattern upon them. They rarely display an awareness of the wider historical setting of the events which they set down, or of the implications of those events. They do not habitually sift, select and evaluate their material. Where accounts differ they are often content to place them side by side without comment. Borrowings are very rarely acknowledged. In the context of this approach to writing history it should be no surprise that interpretative comments are the exception, not the rule. Since the historian maintains so determined a neutrality, the only way of detecting his real attitude is by studying his selection of material and, equally important, his omissions. Even this method is fraught with difficulties, for it is quite possible that later historians were constrained to use Ibn al-Azraq because some of the information he provided was not to be found elsewhere.

Although the four authors to be studied in detail in this chapter have been termed "historians", the particular emphasis of their work varies. Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī and Ibn Wāsil qualify as genuine historians, as will be clear from the discussion below. Ibn Khallikān, however, was concerned with writing biographies and this naturally led him to ignore much that was of vital political interest. His borrowings from Ibn al-Azraq are dictated
by this somewhat narrow interest. Ibn Shaddād was a historical geographer whose approach was to write a concise history of each of the towns within his area of choice. Thus the same events are often repeated in several places in the text simply because they directly concern the town in question. Other events of much greater moment are omitted simply because they happened somewhere else. While each of the four authors under discussion quarried material from Ibn al-Azraq, their aims were not the same. But the very fact that they all used him, despite the differences in their approach, is ample testimony to the regard in which he was held in the century after his death.

Thus the evident lack of any literary merit in Ibn al-Azraq's work and indeed the wealth of grammatical errors and colloquial usages which occur on nearly every page do not apparently deter later writers from extracting significant portions of the text for incorporation into their own histories. The detailed subject matter clearly outweighs considerations of literary or linguistic merit in writers who themselves have lost contact with the literary standards much valued in the 'Abbāsid period. As Fück demonstrates, the advent of the Saljuq Turks brought fundamental linguistic as well as political changes.⁴ Even Usāma b. Munqidh (488/1095 – 584/1186), who is capable of writing correct classical Arabic in his poetry, used a simpler, more colloquial language in his biographical reminiscences.²

---

2. Ibid., 191.
The work of Sibt Ibn al-Jauzî\(^1\) entitled *Mir'aät al-Zaman*, belongs to the genre of universal history much favoured by Muslim writers. Like his grandfather, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzî writes biographies of the 'ulamâ' but blends these with historical accounts, culled either from other sources or - for the latter part of his work - from his own experience.

Cahen rightly comments on the derivative nature of the *Mir'aät al-Zaman* in the sections which deal with the sixth/twelfth century.\(^2\) Here, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzî draws heavily on the works of Ibn al-Qalanisî and Ibn al-Azraq and on the History of the Atabegs of Mosul\(^3\) by Ibn al-Athîr.

On the other hand, Gabrieli laments the fact that Sibt Ibn al-Jauzî has not been studied systematically, since his work is of primary value for the Ayyûbid and Mamlûk period.\(^4\) Whatever the merits of his history for the seventh/thirteenth century, the very fact that the *Mir'aät al-Zaman* copies other works so extensively for the period under discussion in this thesis is of value as one facet of a more detailed appraisal of the work of Ibn al-Azraq.

\(^1\) Born 582/1186-7; died 654/1256-7.


\(^3\) Cahen, *op. cit.*, 66.

In the *Mir'āt al-Zamān*, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī quotes several passages which appear to have been taken from Ibn al-Azraq. In the particular section of his history which deals with events between 500/1106-7 and 550/1155-6, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī does not, it is true, explicitly acknowledge that he has borrowed information from Ibn al-Azraq. Earlier, however, under the year 418 A.H. (1027-8), he says that his source for the details of the placing of a purse in the coffin of the vizier al-Maghribī is the *Tārīkh Mayyafarīgīn*, a fact noted by Amedroz.  

Amedroz also draws attention to a statement by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī to the effect that he used the *Tārīkh Mayyafarīgīn* as his source for his information that the vizier al-Maghribī wanted to be buried beneath the feet of al-Husain. Such details are, however, not to be found in either Ms.A or Ms.B of the *Tārīkh Mayyafarīgīn*. Similarly, the account given by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī of the defeat of Qilīk Arslan in 500/1106-7 is very different from the version of this event given in Awād's edition which is based on Ms.A and B. Yet here again Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī

2. *Op.cit.*, 799. Amedroz says that the information in Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī is to be found in Or.4619, f.216b.
3. Ibid.; Amedroz cites Or.4619, f.217a here.
5. 'Awād, *op.cit.*, 272-3.
expressly states that his source is the author of the *Ṭarīkh Mayyāfārīqīn*. It would therefore appear likely that the manuscripts of Ibn al-Azraq's work under discussion in this thesis were not the only ones known in the medieval period. This suggests that Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī used a third version of Ibn al-Azraq's text for the portions of his work mentioned above.

For the part of the *Ṭarīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa Āmid* which is discussed in this thesis, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī borrows small, isolated details taken from the period 500/1106-7 to 550/1155-6. More significant than these somewhat trivial borrowings, however, are several extended episodes in his narrative which trace their origin back to the work of Ibn al-Azraq.

The first example of this kind is the account by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī of İl-Ghāzī's campaign to Tiflīs. His version of this episode is an interesting mixture of summary, paraphrase and copying from the *Ṭarīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa Āmid*. His text runs as follows:

1. Recueil III, 533.
3. Ms. A, f.161a - b; Ms. B, f.102a - f.103a.
In both versions of the text in Ibn al-Azraq, on which this passage is based, Ibn al-Azraq uses the verb نُذَذُ three times. A close reading of his work lends credence to the theory that for him this verb has a meaning close to "send" or "contact". His vocabulary is extremely limited in general but he particularly over-uses this verb, which can be found throughout his work.

Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī clearly finds the verb نُذَذُ used in this way either incorrect, obscure or provincial, for he removes it completely from his version of this episode. Elsewhere he is not averse to borrowing from Ibn al-Azraq certain phrases which please him - the words "القرن كبارهم" (Ms. A) and "مثابهة شمسية" (Ms. A and B) are lifted intact into his own work1 - but in this section he replaces the verb نُذَذُ by three separate verbs. He changes نُذَذُ to "رسلوا نُذَذُوا" on the first occasion. When it appears again, he replaces نُذَذُ by "بعث". The third time

1. This is not the same as saying that Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī "quotes Ibn al-Azraq's words" (Awad, op. cit., 60). Such a statement is far from true as a generalisation.

2. Ms. A and B: نُذَذُوا إلى السلطان

3. Ms. A and B: نُذَذُلهم شحنة
he writes the verb بث instead of نفذوا.

The changes which Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī makes to Ibn al-Azraq's text confirm the meaning of نفذ as "send" or "contact". Moreover, they reveal the impoverishment and repetitiveness of Ibn al-Azraq's language. Whilst the style of Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī is not especially graceful or well-turned, it is the work of a writer who is better acquainted with Arabic and who is more lucid and subtle than Ibn al-Azraq.

Like Ibn al-Azraq, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī recognises the need to explain who the protagonists are in this unfamiliar historical episode. But he makes additions, omissions and summaries as he feels appropriate to the information about Toghril and Toghan Arslan which he derives from Ibn al-Azraq. Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī adds that they are border-lords (mulūk al-atrāf). He also eliminates the details of the route taken by ʿIl-Ghāzī into Georgia, probably realising that it would be only of peripheral interest to his readers. Moreover, he replaces Ibn al-Azraq's account of the troop movements of Toghril and Toghan Arslan by the succinct phrase "وكان الموعد بثقليس", "the rendez-vous was outside Tiflis". Although his account is appreciably shorter than that of Ibn al-Azraq, it has the virtue of clarity.

The second extended account which Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī borrows from Ibn al-Azraq is that concerned with the capture of Tiflis by King David the Restorer and his subsequent treatment of its inhabitants.¹

1. Ms. A and B: ينفدو الالهاء الدين

2. Mirʿāt al-Zaman, op.cit., 101-2. The original passages in Ibn al-Azraq occur on f.162a (Ms.A) and f.103b–104b (Ms.B).
This account by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī is not different in substance from the text of Ibn al-Azraq in either manuscript. The phraseology of Mss. A and B, however, has been drastically changed by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī, unless indeed his words are based on a version of Ibn al-Azraq's text which is now lost. But in view of the fundamental similarity in style between Mss. A and B, it is not very likely that any other version of Ibn al-Azraq's work would have been couched in the terms used by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī. Rather, the style of any missing manuscript would resemble closely that of Mss. A or B. Internal stylistic evidence in the passage above rules out the possibility that Ibn al-Azraq would use such phrases as 

The wording here is far more likely to be that of Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī himself who has taken the liberty of eliminating some of the more difficult parts of Ibn al-Azraq's narrative and using his own phraseology for that which remains. In particular, he removes such words as athgāl, aqāq and the specific reference
to the bath of Isma‘īl at Tiflis. On the question of King David's treatment of the religious élite in the city, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī seems to have had additional information, either from a missing copy of the Ṭārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn or from another source. He adds poets to the list of people helped by King David and mentions the detail that if the preachers, Sufīs and poets wanted to leave Tiflis the King allowed them to do so and supplied them with a lot of money.

Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī also takes liberties in his interpretation of parts of this passage. Ibn al-Azraq's phrase is taken literally by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī. He writes "He built ribāts for guests and houses for preachers and Sufīs and poets". Ibn al-Azraq's wording is certainly more susceptible to a metaphysical interpretation, indicating probably that the king accorded the 'ulamā' and Sufīs the highest status.

The third episode borrowed from Ibn al-Azraq in the Mirāt al-Zamān is the account of the earthquake at Ganja. This passage is modelled more closely on Ibn al-Azraq and retains much of his actual wording in Ms.A:-

وفيها زلزلت جزيرة ونبل كنجة وانخذ غرف منها وانهدم سورها فصار إليها مثل الأبخاز والكرخ فصار إليها بمساكره فدخلها وساق اهلها سيابا الى تلفيس حيث حملوا على الحبل وسق المسلمون مثل فضائع الغنم فأشترى اهل تلفيس منها خلقا كثيرا واعتفوا بمكان اهل تلفيس يقولون ما اتفقنا غير تلك السنة

Sibt Ibn Jauzī's version of this passage is of value in elucidating some of the problems of vocabulary presented by Ibn al-Azraq's text and indeed in solving some of the cruces of that text. Ibn al-Azraq writes دخلت الأسارى إلى تفلس على الحبل which can be interpreted either as "the prisoners entered Tiflīs on carts" or "the prisoners entered Tiflīs in a hurry". By replacing حملوا دخلت by حملوا Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī makes it clear that he at least interpreted the phrase as involving some form of transport. Furthermore, the statement made by the people of Tiflīs presents difficulties of decipherment in Ms.A. A tentative reading of افتقتنا (f.162b) is supported by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī's use of افتقتنا.

More important than the linguistic issues raised by a comparison of individual details in the accounts of these three episodes in the texts of Ibn al-Azraq and Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī are the broader questions of the choice of material and the emphasis used.

Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī is writing a general history. He is not viewing events from the specifically local vantage point of Ibn al-Azraq. Places and people that are familiar to Ibn al-Azraq's readers in the area of Mayyāfāriqīn are not necessarily known to Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī and his readership in Damascus. In his search

1. Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī mentions the manner in which Sulaimān and the Khatun entered Mayyāfāriqīn in 516/1122 after the death of İl-Ghāzī but he fails to extract the full flavour of the anecdote because he only recounts half of it (op.cit.,103; Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.162b and Ms.B, f.104b - 105a).
for relevant material in Ibn al-Azraq, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī must have had to skim through a great deal of text which held no interest for him. Particular value therefore attaches to the sections he did decide to reproduce in his own history. In fact his selection of material from Ibn al-Azraq proves to be sensible, indeed intelligent. He chooses three episodes, all connected with Georgia. Not only are they concerned with events and places with which Ibn al-Azraq was familiar personally but they are also one major section of the Tarikh Mayyāfārīqīn wa Āmid which contains unusual, even original, information not available in other Arabic chronicles accessible to Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī in the sixth/thirteenth century.

For Syrian matters, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī rightly concentrates on the work of Ibn al-Qalanīsī who handles this material with a firmer grasp and good chronology. Ibn al-Azraq's account of the ill-fated campaign into Georgia is much more convincing than the one given in Ibn al-Qalanīsī, whilst his description of King David's treatment of the Muslims must have interested Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī, who gives it extended treatment in an account which is otherwise terse narrative.

Other motives may have prompted Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī to concentrate on this Caucasian material. Conflict on their Georgian frontiers was a matter of urgent concern for the later Saljuq rulers. The Saljuq Toghrīl of Arrān was involved in this one unsuccessful attempt to repel the Georgians in 515/1121-2 and Sultan Mahmūd personally went out on campaign into Georgian territory soon afterwards in 517/1123-4.1 Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī is closely interested.

in the events of late Saljuq history. Just as he can manifest a
certain malicious satisfaction at the degrading fate of Sultan
Sanjar, seeing it as God's retribution for the humiliation and
death suffered by the caliph, al-Mustarshid, so too this historian's
horizons can extend to include material on the Caucasus connected
with the decline of Saljuq power.

One important question remains: which version of Ibn al-
Azraq's text was used by Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī? The work was probably
well-known in Syria since the writers who copied him in the century
after his death (some time in the 570s A.H./1174-84) lived in
that area. On the basis of the three long extracts discussed
above, it is clear that Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī did not copy from Ms.B.
Ms.B does not mention that the troops of Toghril and Toghan Arslan
had not arrived in Tīflīs when King David and his son attacked
Īl-Ghāzī. This detail is included in both Ms.A and Sibt Ibn
al-Jauzī. Moreover, Ms.B specifically mentions the year in which
King David entered Tīflīs (the end of 515 A.H./1122), which is in
neither Ms.A nor the Mir'āt al-Zaman.

There is a great similarity between the accounts in Ms.A
and Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī but the latter also contains details which
are not in Ms.A. As the rest of the Caucasian material in Sibt
Ibn al-Jauzī comes from Ibn al-Azraq's account, which is based
on his first-hand experience in Georgia and eye-witness accounts,
there is no pressing reason why it may not be assumed that the

---

additional sentences found in the *Mir'at al-Zaman* also originate from the same source. It may therefore be concluded that Sibt Ibn al-Jauzi used a version of the *Tārīkh Mayyafarīgīn wa Āmid* which is now lost but which resembled Ms.A more closely than Ms.B. An alternative but less likely hypothesis is that he used Ms.A and a missing version of the text of Ibn al-Azraq together.

Whatever version of the *Tārīkh Mayyafarīgīn wa Āmid* was used in the *Mir'at al-Zaman*, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzi selects material from Ibn al-Azraq which deals specifically with the Caucasus. In his treatment of the material, however, although he may change the actual wording, he does not in general alter the emphasis or attempt to give his own interpretation of the events.¹

Ibn Khallikān and Ibn al-Azraq

The great biographical work *Wafayāt al-a'yan wa anbā' abnā' al-zaman*,² written by Ibn Khallikān (608/1211-12 - 681/1282-3), covers a wide geographical area in its selection of great men, from Spain to Transoxiana. The author, therefore, needs a variety of sources to provide detailed information on the celebrities of

---

¹ Unlike Ibn al-Athīr, who, as Gibb has convincingly shown, was greatly influenced by his own beliefs and prejudices when borrowing material from Ibn al-Qalānisī (H.A.R.Gibb, "Notes on the History of the Early Crusades", *BSOAS* VII (1933-35), 745-754).

so many regions.\textsuperscript{1} For the lives of famous people from the Jazīra, Ibn Khallikān derives much information from the \textit{Tārīkh Mayyafāriqīn wa Āmīd}.

It is of no special value to list the numerous occasions when Ibn Khallikān borrows information from Ibn al-Azraq. The actual use Ibn Khallikān makes of the \textit{Tārīkh Mayyafāriqīn wa Āmīd} is in any case probably more extensive than the obvious borrowings cited by Amedroz\textsuperscript{2} and \textsuperscript{3} 'Awad. Since Ibn Khallikān does not employ a chronological approach for his vast undertaking and since he has a tendency to paraphrase rather than to quote his sources verbatim, it is difficult to trace all the details in his work which have Ibn al-Azraq as their source.

In the discussion which follows, a distinction will be drawn between trivial borrowings and the more extended episodes which Ibn Khallikān has taken from Ibn al-Azraq. Given the clear discrepancy between the literary merits of these two writers, it is not surprising that Ibn Khallikān, having extracted the subject-matter he needs from Ibn al-Azraq, should rephrase the information.

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{1}] M. de Slane, \textit{Ibn Khallikān's Biographical Dictionary} (Paris and London, 1843-1871), 4 vols. See also F. Wüstenfeld, \textit{Über die Quellen des Werkes Ibn Challikani vitae illustrium hominum} (Göttingen, 1837).
\item[\textsuperscript{2}] H.F. Amedroz, "Three Arabic MSS. on the History of the City of Mayyafāriqīn", \textit{JRAS} (1902), 799.
\item[\textsuperscript{3}] B.A.L. 'Awad, \textit{Tārīkh al-Fāriqī} (Cairo, 1959), 41-8.
\end{itemize}
rarely leaving the words of his source unchanged. Although Ibn Khallikān's literary style cannot be compared with that of such historians as Ibn al-Tiqtaqa\(^1\) and Miskawaih - he was admired more for the enormous wealth of his subject-matter - his style is manifestly superior to that of Ibn al-Azraq.

An example of Ibn Khallikān's borrowing of a small detailed area of information from Ibn al-Azraq is his account of the death of Dubais b. Sadaqa.\(^2\) Ibn Khallikān describes how after the murder of al-Mustarshid, Sultan Masūd was afraid of incurring widespread public disapproval for this deed. He therefore decided to fob off the blame onto Dubais. Having analysed the sultan's motives, Ibn Khallikān relates that Dubais came in to pay his respects to the sultan, who made a sign to one of his mamlūks. The latter crept up behind Dubais and beheaded him with a sword. After the death of Dubais, Masūd published it abroad that Dubais had been killed as an act of vengeance for the murder of al-Mustarshid which Dubais had instigated.

All this information does not come from Ibn al-Azraq who makes only a passing reference to the motive for Dubais' murder\(^3\)

---


3. He merely writes: "There had been a report that Dubais had incited the sultan to kill al-Mustarshid".
and in no way describes the mode of execution. However, for the less important account of Dubais' subsequent burial in Mayyafāriqīn in the mashhad beside Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī, Ibn Khallikān quotes straight from the Tārīkh Mayyafāriqīn wa Āmid:-1

It is natural that for specific details concerned with Mayyafāriqīn, where an important historical figure such as Dubais was buried, Ibn Khallikān should have recourse to the local historian, Ibn āl-Azraq. Thus in another part of his work he gleans information from Ibn āl-Azraq on libraries at Mayyafāriqīn and Āmid.2 Conversely, when Ibn āl-Azraq describes the burial of Īl-Ghāzī in 516/1122, it is Ibn Khallikān who provides an explanation for the buildings mentioned. Ibn al-

2. This appears to be based more on Ms.B than on Ms.A. The burial of Dubais in Ms.B is followed by the account of the sultan's marriage to the daughter of Dubais, whereas in Ms.A the order is reversed. But the dependence on Ms.B remains far from proven.
3. The vizier, al-Manazī, collected many books which he bequeathed as a waqf to the mosques of Mayyafāriqīn and Āmid (Ibn Khallikān, op.cit., I,55; Ibn āl-Azraq, Ms.A,ff.134b-135a, Ms.B,f.44a).
Azraq writes:-

"He (Ił-Ghażi) was buried in the sidillī (سديلا) for a while. Then he was removed and buried in the masjid al-amīr to the east of the qubbat al-sultan." ²

In his biography of Nasr al-Daula b. Marwan al-Kurdī (d.453/1061/2), Ibn Khallikan writes that this Marwānid ruler "was buried at the mosque of al-Muhdatha or at the castle of al-Sidillī whence his body was afterwards removed to the vault of the Banū Marwān adjoining the mosque of al-Muhdatha". He adds that al-Muhdatha is a ribāṭ outside the city of Mayyafārīqīn and that al-Sidillī is the name of a dome situated in the castle and built on three pillars. ³ Ibn al-Azraq feels no need to explain these facts, as in an earlier part of his text he describes these buildings in some detail. Ibn Khallikan must derive his information from there.

A more significant debt which Ibn Khallikan owes to Ibn al-Azraq is revealed in three extended episodes to which Ibn Khallikan accords some prominence and which are all derived from the Tarīkh Mayyafāriqīn wa-Āmid. An analysis of these passages is valuable both for the elucidation of difficult areas of Ibn al-Azraq's text and also as an illustration of the methods

---

1. "Three pillars".
employed by Ibn Khallikan in treating material from this source.

It is of some interest that whilst for trivial borrowings Ibn Khallikan acknowledges his debt to Ibn al-Azraq, in the following extracts - where he has borrowed substantially more - he remains silent.

In his biography of Sultan Mas'ūd, Ibn Khallikan borrows the following passage from Ibn al-Azraq without acknowledgement:

Apart from the removal of the conjunction which is over-used by Ibn al-Azraq, Ibn Khallikan takes this passage from verbatim from Ibn al-Azraq. For the remaining lines quoted above, instead of the long list of amīrs cited by Ibn al-Azraq as having been killed by Mas'ūd, Ibn Khallikan says simply that "he killed a good number of the great amīrs". Ibn Khallikan probably considers that the individual names of such amīrs are either insignificant or that Ibn al-Azraq's information may be inaccurate. The fact that Mas'ūd was responsible for the murders of al-Mustarshid and al-Rāshid is, however, deemed worthy of explicit emphasis by Ibn Khallikan.

2. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.175b; Ms.B, f.133b.
Thus by judicious selection Ibn Khallikān manages to highlight the crucial information. Ibn al-Azraq, by contrast, fails to do so and indeed contradicts himself.

The next part of the biography of Sultan Mas'ūd given in the Wafayāt al-A‘yān is also culled from Ibn al-Azraq but from another part of his history where he describes the relationship between Mas'ūd and the caliph al-Mustarshid. This extract is again borrowed without acknowledgement by Ibn Khallikān, who writes:

The sentence is quoted verbatim from the Tārīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa Āmid whilst the remainder of the above passage is a paraphrase of Ibn al-Azraq.

In this episode, Ibn Khallikān collects relevant information about Sultan Mas'ūd from various parts of Ibn al-Azraq's work, strips it of extraneous detail and incorporates it into his own text. If Ibn al-Azraq's wording meets with his approval (and this occurs only rarely) it remains unchanged. But Ibn Khallikān habitually uses his own words. It casts an interesting sidelight on Ibn al-Azraq as a historian that the information which he gives is most tellingly presented by someone else. It seems that Ibn al-Azraq did not regard himself as having a duty to assemble his material coherently.

---

In the particular case of the deaths of the caliphs al-Mustarshid and al-Rashid, he states in one part of his text that the Isma'ili were responsible and elsewhere that Sultan Mas'ud was responsible. He does not adjudicate between these two accounts and may even have failed to notice that they contradict each other. Thus, his chronological approach has left inconsistencies which Ibn Khallikan, applying a more critical and selective eye to the material, has been able to iron out.

A second interesting narrative which originates in Ibn al-Azraq is to be found in Ibn Khallikan's biography of Kamal al-Dīn al-Shahrazūri. It runs as follows:

ولا فت عماد الدين على فلحة جعبر كما ذكرنا ن في ترجمته كان كمال الدين المذكور نافذرا في الحصر هو اخوه تاج الدين أبو ناهير يحيى والد الفاضي ضياء الدين فلما رجع الحصر إلى الموصل كانا في صحته ولما تولى سيف الدين غازى ولد عماد الدين فوض الأمور كلها إلى الفاضي كمال الدين وأخه بالموصل وجميع مملكته ثم أنه فجر عليهما في سنة اثنتين وأربعين واعتقلهما بفلحة الموصل وأسر نجم الدين أبا علي الحسن بن بهاء الدين أبي الحسن علي وهو ابن عم كمال الدين وكان فاضي الرحمة وولاد القضاء بالموصل وديار ربيعة عوضا عن كمال الدين ثم ان الخصبة المفتوح مير سولا وشمع في كمال الدين أخه وأخرى من الاعتقالي ونفادا في بيوتهما وعليهما الترسيم وحبس بالأبلة خالد الدين أبو أحمد ولد كمال الدين وفباء الدين أبو المفائل الناصب بن تاج الدين ولما مات سيف الدين غازى في التاريخ المذكور في ترجمته رفع الترسيم عنها وحضرنا إلى نطق الدين مودود بن زنكي وقف تولى السلطة بعد أخه سيف الدين وكان راكا في ميدان الموصل فلما فروا منه ترجل وعليهما شباب الخزع يغير غرحات فلما رسب اله ترجل لحا أيضا وعزيهم عن أخه وحَّاته بالولاية ثم ركبوا ووفقا كل واحد منهما إلى جانبه ثم عادا إلى بيوتهما بغير ترسيم وصارا يركبان في الخدمة

In the first part of this passage Ibn Khallikān states that Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī and his brother Tāj al-Dīn were with the 'askar of Mosul at the time of Zangī's assassination and that Saif al-Dīn b. Zangī handed over all affairs to the two of them after his establishment in Mosul. Ibn Khallikān is here summarising a long narrative from Ibn al-Azraq. Ibn Khallikān covers some of the same material under his biography of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī.² From the intervention of the caliph al-Muqtadī who sends messengers to try to intercede on behalf of the two brothers who have been imprisoned, this section of Ibn Khallikān's text is modelled more closely on Ibn al-Azraq.³ The details of the meeting between Qutb al-Dīn Maudūd and the two brothers in the maidan at Mosul are taken from the Tarīkh Mayyafarīqīn wa-Àmid. Whole phrases, such as بغير طريحة and عزيز عن أخيه have been left unchanged. For the rest, the main lines of the narrative of Ibn al-Azraq are followed in sequence but the wording used by Ibn Khallikān is his own. The obscure نفذ ـ جماعةـ سبأ ـ رسلاً gives way to the simpler حصلوا صاروا. The ubiquitous المرسم and الاعتقال which do not appear to have formed part of Ibn al-Azraq's stock vocabulary. The confusion created by Ibn al-Azraq over the names in this passage is removed by Ibn Khallikān. ⁴

2. Cf. infra, p.45.
4. Instead of "the son of Kamāl al-Dīn Abū Ahmad al-Jalāl" (Ms.A, f.173b [sic]), Ibn Khallikān has "Jalāl al-Dīn Abū
One major change of interpretation made by Ibn Khallikān occurs in his handling of a phrase from Ibn al-Azraq which seems to read: "وقد غيروا أنهم" "they had changed their clothes". According to this reading, they entered the maidān wearing different clothes, since their original ones would have been dirty from riding on the donkeys and they would wish to appear properly dressed to meet the new ruler of Mosul. An alternative reading might be "وقد غيروا أنهم" "their clothes were covered with dust", which would fit in well with the story.

Ibn Khallikān, however, interprets this phrase quite differently: "وعليهم تأيب العزاء" "They were clad in clothes of mourning" - presumably in response to the recent death of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī. Neither Ms.A nor Ms.B would support the reading العزاء. Ibn Khallikān may base his phrase on another, now lost, version of Ibn al-Azraq's text, which supports his interpretation. Alternatively, and more probably, he finds justifiable difficulty in making sense of the sentence as given by Ibn al-Azraq and takes the liberty of emending it on his own initiative so as to make it accord with the subject matter of the narrative.

In his treatment of the story of the two brothers al-Shahrazūrī, Ahmad, son of Kamāl al-Dīn" (op. cit., I, 598). For Tāj al-Dīn Abu 'l-Faḍā'il al-Ḍiyā (Ms.A., f.173b [sic ] ), Ibn Khallikān writes "Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Abu 'l-Faḍā'il al-Qāsim, son of Tāj al-Dīn" (ibid.).
Ibn Khallikan gives his narrative greater clarity and unity. Ibn al-Azraq records that the initial imprisonment of these men took place in 542/1147-8 and that they remained under house arrest until the death of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī in 544/1149-50. In Ibn al-Azraq’s account, however, the various parts of the story are interrupted, as the author, true to the chronological framework of his work, breaks off to discuss other events which have no bearing on the imprisonment of Kamāl al-Dīn and Tāj al-Dīn. Two folios later, their story is resumed. Ibn Khallikan is not bound by the same restrictions of genre and again groups together all relevant parts of the narrative.

A third account which Ibn Khallikan borrows from Ibn al-Azraq is the description of the events which immediately followed the death of Zangī. Ibn Khallikan uses this material from Ibn al-Azraq in his biography of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Zangī. Some of the details of Zangī’s assassination according to the version of Ibn al-Azraq are given elsewhere in the Wafayāt al-A‘yān, in the biography of Zangī. But this is a very abbreviated treatment by Ibn Khallikan, who shows much greater interest in the power struggle which ensued on Zangī’s death.

His account reads as follows:

From the beginning of this extract until the mention of Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī, Ibn Khallikān is summarising the disturbed events which ensued after the death of Zangī outside Qal‘at Ja‘bar in 541/1146-7. Neither he nor Ibn al-Azraq explain that the events they then describe are part of a plan conceived by Kamāl al-Dīn and his associates to take the young Saljuq malik back to Mosul only as a stalling measure until Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī can reach Mosul and assume power.

The conversation between Zangī's officials and Alp Arslan closely echoes the one recorded by Ibn al-Azraq. Similarly, the information about the two groups which were formed, the one heading for Syria and the other for Mosul, comes from the same source, although the wording is somewhat different. But then Ibn Khallikān adds a statement of his own to the effect that the reason why the malik fled after his arrival in Mosul was that he imagined himself to be the object of some treacherous plot.
Thus Ibn Khallikān rounds off the bald narrative of events by an interpretative comment, whereas Ibn al-Azraq is here content simply to record what happened without looking for the motivation of the protagonists. The rest of Ibn Khallikān's account follows closely that of Ibn al-Azraq, whose words are paraphrased.

It will be clear from the discussion so far that Ibn Khallikān utilises only that information from Ibn al-Azraq which is relevant to the biographies he writes. The material he borrows is usually in the form of anecdotes about the famous person under discussion. The extracts analysed above are concerned with the Zangids, about whom Ibn al-Azraq possessed much first-hand information culled from eye-witnesses or from his own experience.

Ibn Khallikān clearly recognised the value of the probably original material contained in the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid. It is significant, and indicative of Ibn Khallikān's selective technique, that he leaves unused Ibn al-Azraq's garbled account of Ibn Tūmart and 'Abd al-Mu'min in which certain sections are obscure and the chronology wildly inaccurate, although he himself writes an extended biography of Ibn Tūmart.

Stylistically, Ibn Khallikān displays the same sensitivity. He does not automatically reproduce the Arabic of his model. Instead, he prefers to paraphrase or summarise Ibn al-Azraq's text, only occasionally leaving unchanged phrases from the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid. Perhaps Ibn Khallikān was actuated by a desire to stamp his book with his own personal style.
Alternatively, the Arabic style of Ibn al-Azraq was too unpleasing for him to reproduce - though he himself is not the greatest of stylists. Whatever his motive, he is the only one of the four authors discussed in this chapter who can be critical of the matter as well as the wording of Ibn al-Azraq's work.

In short, then, Ibn Khallikan shows good judgement in his choice of large-scale borrowings from Ibn al-Azraq, on whose work he also draws for a wealth of minor topographical details concerned with the Jazîra.

It is extremely difficult to assess which version of the Tarîkh Mayyafarîqîn wa Âmid is used by Ibn Khallikan. Most of the details he chooses to incorporate in his work appear to come from Ms.A rather than Ms.B, but he may well have had access to a version of Ibn al-Azraq's text now lost. Since he so often changes the wording of Ibn al-Azraq, it is rarely possible to employ stylistic criteria to judge which manuscript of the text Ibn Khallikan used. But the cumulative evidence provided by Ibn Khallikan, Sibt Ibn al-Jauzî and Ibn Wâsil does point to their use of a now lost text which approximates fairly closely to Ms.A.

Ibn Shaddâd and Ibn al-Azraq

It is well known that the author of the historical geography entitled al-Afla' al-Khatîra fî dhikr umarâ' al-Shâm
wa'1-Jazīra makes extensive use of the Tarīkh Mayyafārīqīn wa-Āmid in the part of his work which deals with the Jazīra. Amedroz drew attention to this fact and also identified the author as Ibn Shaddād of Aleppo (613/1216-7 - 684/1285-6).

The work was probably written between 671/1272-3 and 680/1281-2. More recently, Cahen analysed the geographical information on the Jazīra provided by Ibn Shaddād and discussed briefly the sources used by this author.

Cahen states that in the part of Ibn Shaddād's work which is found in Ms. Marsh 333 some geographical data and almost all the historical facts concerned with events before 622/1231-2 are made

---

1. The section of this work which deals with the Jazīra is unpublished. The part which describes Damascus has been edited (Ibn Shaddād, La Description de Damas d'Ibn Šaddād, ed. S. Dahān [Damascus, 1956]).


3. Cf. a note written by Amedroz at the front of the Bodleian manuscript, Marsh 333, where he states that the work is the "second volume of al-A'laq al-Khatīra fī dhikr umarā' al-Shām wa'1 Jazīra of Ibn Shaddād of Aleppo".

up of quotations from other authors. For the period under
discussion in this thesis, Ibn Shaddād's sources are Ibn al-Azraq
and Ibn al-Athīr.

Whilst Cahen is generally accurate as to the extent of the
debt owed to Ibn al-Azraq by Ibn Shaddād, it would not be correct
to say that the quotations from Ibn al-Azraq in Marsh 333 are an
exact replica of his wording. These sections of Ibn Shaddād's
text do therefore have some linguistic interest. In any case,
the very selection of information by Ibn Shaddād, and even his
omissions, quite apart from his changes of Ibn al-Azraq's wording,
may be of some historical value. Ibn Shaddād only mentions the
name of Ibn al-Azraq twice but there is convincing evidence that
he borrows from this author throughout Marsh 333.

Ibn Shaddād's aim is to write a historical geography. He
begins his description of the Jazīra by dividing the area into
three parts, Diyar Rabī'a, Diyar Mudar and Diyar Bakr. For each
of these three regions he lists the principal towns. When he deals
with an individual town, he provides certain relevant geographical
and topographical information about it. Thereafter he gives a
summary of the history of the town according to the information
available to him, which varies considerably from one town to the
next.

The inevitable drawback of this method of writing is the

1. Cahen, "La Djazira", 110
2. Marsh 333, ff.79b and 81b.
continual repetition of basic historical facts. In a sense this is inevitable, especially as in the area under discussion neighbouring towns were often under the same ruler or at least had their fortunes closely linked. On the other hand, the presentation of dynastic history in Ibn al-Azraq is given a new focus if viewed, according to Ibn Shaddād's method, from the successive vantage points of individual cities other than Mayyafārīqīn. Generally, however, Ibn Shaddād's approach is cumbersome and in the context of this thesis it is interesting principally because it affords a valuable comparison with Ibn al-Azraq's work.

When Ibn Shaddād borrows from Ibn al-Azraq, his phraseology adheres more closely to that of his source than does the wording of Ibn Wāsil, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī or Ibn Khallikān. When the wording in both texts is identical, Marsh 333 is of great help as a third version of the Tārīkh Mayyafārīqīn wa Āmid, to supplement Mss. A and B and to clarify obscure parts of the text, especially difficult place-names. On some occasions, moreover, when Ibn Shaddād slightly changes the language of his source, he gives an indication of what the meaning of a particular word or phrase might be. In the commentary which accompanies the translation presented in this thesis, frequent reference has been made to individual points of comparison between Marsh 333 and Mss. A and B.

1. The account of Yaqūtī's acquisition of Mārdīn is given twice: once under Mārdīn (Ms.B, ff.132b - 133a) and again under Raṣ al-'Ain (Ms.B, f.42b). On both occasions it is a long narrative based on the same passage from Ibn al-Athīr (ed. Tornberg, X, 269).
The same ground will not be covered here. Instead, it seems preferable to make a few more general observations.

The major passages which Ibn Shaddād has taken from Ibn al-Azraq's work in the period c.500-c.550/c.1106-c.1156 are the accounts of the reigns of Īl-Ghāzī and Temūr-Tash in Mayyāfāriqīn.¹ The treatment of these passages in Ibn Shaddād's work is unusually long. No doubt he profits from the detailed historical descriptions given by Ibn al-Azraq for the town of Mayyāfāriqīn whilst the dearth of information available to him about other places in Diyar Bakr restricts him to brief historical résumés or a bare list of the names of the people who ruled there.² Where Ibn Shaddād's sources expatiate on the subject in hand, he himself does likewise. For example, Ibn al-Athīr's description of Yaqūtī's seizure of Mārdīn is reproduced at length in Marsh 333.

No special inference, therefore, may be drawn from the extended treatment given by Ibn Shaddād to the activities of Īl-Ghāzī and Temūr-Tash at Mayyāfāriqīn. He employs no rigorously selective technique and omits very little from his source. For his accounts of this Artuqid material he follows closely the version of Ibn al-Azraq's text found in Ms. B. The order and nature of the information given by Ibn Shaddād exactly mirrors that in Ms.B and the form of wording used is very similar. Ibn Shaddād's dependence on Ms.B is apparent in his account of the

---

2. Cf. for example, Ibn Shaddād's rapid historical surveys of the towns of Sinjār (f.45a) and Sarūj (f.31b).
reigns of both ʿIl-Ghazi and Temūr-Tash. He adds very few comments of his own and there appear to be no details which come from Ms.A or from another version of the Tarīkh Mayyafarīqīn wa Amid. In this respect the text of Ibn Shaddād differs from that of Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī.

For the information about ʿIl-Ghazi which he finds in Ms.B, Ibn Shaddād keeps the facts he gives, and their interpretation, exactly as he finds them. Some rudimentary process of selection is adopted. He eliminates the reference to the burning of the Friday mosque at Amid in 513/1119-20, which is in Ms.B,1 and moves straight from Balat to the acquisition of Nasībīn by ʿIl-Ghazi in 514/1120-1.2 While it is understandable that in an account of Mayyafarīqīn he should omit a reference to a mosque in Amid, it is also not entirely relevant that he should then deal with ʿIl-Ghazi's activities at Balat and Nasībīn. Moreover, he soon strays even further from Mayyafarīqīn. The first part of the account of ʿIl-Ghazi's campaign to Tiflis in 515/1121-2 which is given in Ms.B3 is repeated by Ibn Shaddād,4 but after his account of ʿIl-Ghazi's defeat he omits any reference to King David's treatment of the inhabitants of Tiflis or to the earthquake at Ganja, describing only ʿIl-Ghazi's humiliating return to Mardin and subsequent death.5 The omission by Ibn Shaddād of material

5. Marsh 333, f.102b.
so patently unconnected with Diyār Bakr is understandable but he lacks consistency since he still mentions in some detail İl-Ghāzī's campaign to Tiflis. His somewhat blinkered use of his source has led him to incorporate some of its rather different emphases into his own work. As a result his section on Mayyafāriqīn is abnormally long and too frequently strays from its ostensible subject.

A more sensible policy has been adopted by Ibn Shaddād for his treatment of the reign of Tamūr-Tash. Once again, the order in which he gives his information is exactly that of the parallel information given by Ibn al-Azraq in Ms.B, but material irrelevant to the history of Diyār Bakr has now been removed. Thus, Ibn Shaddād relates the taking of Mayyafāriqīn by Tamūr-Tash in 518/1124-5, the death of Sayyida Khatun, daughter of Qūlīch Arslan of Malatya, in 524/1129-30, and the arrival of certain officials in Mayyafāriqīn in 528/1133-4 and the important struggle in the area between Zangī, Tamūr-Tash and Dā'ūd of Hisn Kaifā in the years 520-541/1126-47. Ibn Shaddād mentions the killing of Ḥabashī in Zangī's camp in 538/1143-4, the death of Dā'ūd in 539/1144-5 and that of Tamūr-Tash in 548/1153-4. His narrative ends with an

5. Marsh 333, f.103a - b; Ms.B, f.109a.
account of the officials who held office at Mayyafāriqīn.\textsuperscript{1}

It is significant that material on the Maghrib, Baghdad, Syria, and on the important struggle between the caliph al-Mustarshid and Sultan Mas'ūd, all of which is interpolated in almost random fashion by Ibn al-Azraq in his mainly local chronicle, has been omitted by Ibn Shaddād. It is difficult to understand, however, why Ibn Shaddād should be more alert to the discontinuities of his source for the period 516/1122 - 548/1154 than for the equally obvious discontinuities in the period c.500/1106 - 516/1122. Perhaps he was becoming aware of the inordinate length of his entry on Mayyafāriqīn, and felt the need to abbreviate it. In any case, Ibn al-Azraq himself provides such a wealth of information on Temür-Tash that some cutting by Ibn Shaddād was obviously imperative. By contrast, Ibn al-Azraq's account of İl-Ghāzī is much sparser and this dearth of information may have prompted Ibn Shaddād even to incorporate material which did not properly belong with the local history of Mayyafāriqīn.

In general it may be concluded that his selection of material, especially that which deals with the reign of Temür-Tash, is imposed on him by the geographical limitations of his work and not by any more subtle motives such as a desire to interpret his source or to suppress unsuitable information.

For the specifically local material which he finds in Ms.B of the Tarikh Mayyafāriqīn wa Āmid, Ibn Shaddād restricts his

\begin{itemize}
  \item Marsh 333, ff. 104b - 105a; Ms.B, ff. 136b - 137b.
\end{itemize}
choice of information still further. Here he again shows good sense. He concentrates on those events specifically connected with the history of the Artuqids. Thus he reveals a certain ability to sift the available information and to highlight the significant items. Even the accounts about the Artuqids which Ibn Shaddād does choose to include in his own work are often much shortened from their original form in Ibn al-Azraq, as for example his brief reference to the death of Temūr-Tash, an event which inspires Ibn al-Azraq to launch into a lengthy panegyric of his former master.¹

Ironically, the assassination of Zangī in 541/1146, which was the most significant event in the reign of Temūr-Tash and assured the continued existence of the Artuqid dynasty as a separate political entity in Diyar Bakr, is not mentioned here by Ibn Shaddād, since Zangī was killed at Qalʿat Jaʿbar. Ibn Shaddād's account of the event is closely modelled on that of Ibn al-Azraq in Ms.B, but is written in a different part of his narrative under his description of that place. It is thus completely divorced from some of the political events which preceded it.² Its particular location in Ibn Shaddād's text is enough to deprive it of its crucial political significance. This is an apt illustration of the limitations imposed on Ibn Shaddād by the genre he has chosen and his inability to break free from its constraints.

---

2. Marsh 333, f.34a - b; Ms.B, ff.126b - 127b.
Further confirmation of Ibn Shaddād's dependence on the Ms.B version of Ibn al-Azraq is provided by internal stylistic evidence. In his account of the reign of İl-Ghāzī, Ibn Shaddād calls Dubais "Saif al-Daula Dubais b. Sadaqa al-Mazyadi". The title "al-Mazyadi" occurs only in Ms.B. İl-Ghāzī is written in Marsh as in Ms.B, whereas in Ms.A it appears as الهازي. The word "tents" which is written so strangely in Ms.A as appears in both Marsh and Ms.B as هذهنات. These are merely a few of the numerous occasions when Ibn Shaddād uses the exact wording of Ms.B.

The abilities of Ibn al-Azraq and Ibn Shaddād as historians are closely matched. Both writers invite severe criticisms as to their methods, lack of clarity and inaccuracies. However, Ibn Shaddād fails even more signally than Ibn al-Azraq in general respects. His grasp of genealogy is unusually defective. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this weakness, which pervades his work. Toghan Arslan al-Ahdab, the ruler of Arzan and Bitlīs, is called Toghan Arslan ibn al-Ahdab, and the key figure of İl-Ghāzī b. Artuq is given the appellations İl-Ghāzī b. Sukmān and on another occasion "the son of Sukmān's brother". There is some justification for Ibn Shaddād's confusion over the identity of Toghan Arslan al-Ahdab, the ruler of Arzan and Bitlīs, is called Toghan Arslan ibn al-Ahdab, and the key figure of İl-Ghāzī b. Artuq is given the appellations İl-Ghāzī b. Sukmān and on another occasion "the son of Sukmān's brother".

1. Marsh 333, f.102a.
5. Ibid., f.101b and f.133b.
6. Ibid., f.43b.
of the Artuqid al-Yaqūtī, since his bewilderment is shared by Ibn al-Azraq himself in his genealogical accounts. But Ibn Shaddād labels al-Yaqūtī as "the son of the sister of Sukmān" and elsewhere "the son of Artuq", whilst in another place it is Sukmān whom he calls "the son of Artuq".

More serious, however, than a poor grasp of family history is his lack of original information. He seems content to provide somewhat inadequate digests of, or practically verbatim quotations from, extant sources without putting his own stamp on the material. Even the promising scheme of arranging the material under the rubric of the relevant town degenerates into a tedious chronology of the people who took the town or fought over it. The presence of unusual, if not entirely original, material in the work of Ibn al-Azraq, who draws it from eye-witness accounts or from his own experience, immediately increases the value of his badly-written, unco-ordinated narrative. Ibn Shaddād shares these last two failings but cannot compensate for them in the historical part of his work on the Jazīra by the presence of any interesting new material. Moreover, although he makes some selection of the material he takes from Ibn al-Azraq, he does not attempt to analyse or slant the borrowed information. Whilst it is possible to agree with Elisséeff when he declares that Ibn Shaddād "affords the reader a general view", it is hard to accept his praise of

---

2. F.132b.
3. F.43a.
4. F.127b.
Ibn Shaddād for "the clarity of his exposition".¹ The framework of Marsh 333 is clear enough but too often the historical facts contained in it are garbled and imperfectly grasped. This is the inevitable outcome of the unhappy marriage of two sources, Ibn al-Azraq and Ibn al-Athīr, without the overall focus and unity which could have been provided by an author in command of his material.

Whilst Ibn Shaddād borrows extensively from Ibn al-Azraq, the geographical descriptions given by Ibn Shaddād have an independent value² and shed some light on places and buildings mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq. Indeed, Marsh 333 is a valuable complement to the Taʾrīkh Mayṣafarīqīn wa Āmid since it concentrates on the exact locality of Ibn al-Azraq's work. Marsh 333 is written in a clear, legible hand and Ibn Shaddād's long list of fortresses which date from pre-Islamic and Islamic times³ helps with the decipherment of some of the difficult names mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq. Unfortunately, Ibn Shaddād does not specify the exact location in Diyar Bakr of the many citadels mentioned but the fact that he places them in the vicinity of Āmid, Mayṣafarīqīn,

---

3. Marsh 333, ff.65a - b.
Arzan and Mardin helps to narrow the field of choice and is therefore of some value.

Ibn Shaddad's description of Mayyafāriqīn, however, is much more precise. He identifies buildings such as the burj al-mulk, the burj al-Rawābi and the bab al-huwa, often mentioned cursorily by Ibn al-Azraq, who assumes that his reader is acquainted with them. He mentions the suburb known as al-Muhaddatha and the citadel and a wealth of other details.

Ibn ʿWasil and Ibn al-Azraq

The work entitled Mufarrij al-Kurūb fī akhbar Banī Ayyūb by Ibn ʿWasil (604/1207 - 697/1298) is well known as a principal source for the history of the Ayyūbids. Cahen lavishes high praise on this author, saying that it is scandalous that this work of his is virtually never used. Elisséeff also mentions Ibn ʿWasil, emphasising the alertness with which the Mufarrij al-Kurūb is written. Neither of these scholars, however, have recognised the debt owed by Ibn ʿWasil to Ibn al-Azraq. They both list the written sources used by Ibn ʿWasil, mentioning the works of Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn al-ʿAdīm. Elisséeff adds that for the period of

1. Pf.67a - 69a cover the complete description of Mayyafāriqīn.
2. C. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche (Paris, 1940), 70.
Nūr al-Dīn Ibn Wāsīl also drew on Sībṭ Ibn al-Jauzī, ‘Imād al-Dīn and Baha‘ al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād. It was the editor of Ibn Wāsīl, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl, who pinpointed the dependence of the Mufarrij al-Kurūb on the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Ṭāmīd, although he did not explore this topic in any detail. The value of a comparison between Ibn Wāsīl and Ibn al-Azraq is both linguistic and historical, as with the other three authors discussed in this chapter.

The dependence of Ibn Wāsīl on Ibn al-Azraq takes the form of substantial borrowings from one particular section of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Ṭāmīd when the author describes in detail the murder of the caliph al-Mustarshīd, the subsequent accession and deposition of his son al-Rāshid and the circumstances of the appointment of a new caliph, al-Muqtāfī. Of less significance is Ibn Wāsīl’s inclusion of the scabrous episode about al-Rāshid’s sexual precocity which he probably found too outré or amusing to omit. The selection by Ibn Wāsīl of the area of Ibn al-Azraq’s work which deals with these three caliphs and their relationship with the Saljuq sultan, Mas‘ūd, is significant and intelligent. For this part of his text, Ibn al-Azraq’s information, as he himself admits, is culled from some of the principal protagonists in the events themselves and does not appear to be in any other extant source contemporary with Ibn al-Azraq’s work. Not only does Ibn Wāsīl choose original material from Ibn al-Azraq but he...

1. Ibid.
also selects a key historical issue, namely the relationship between the 'Abbāsid caliphs in the sixth/twelfth century and the Saljuq sultans. Ibn Wāsīl concentrates his borrowings from Ibn al-Azraq on this topic, leaving aside the rest of the author's work and opting to follow the more lucid account of the Tarīkh al-Daula al-Atābakiyya by Ibn al-Athīr for the general lines of his narrative elsewhere in the Mufarrij al-Kurūb.

The first important episode which Ibn Wāsīl borrows without acknowledgement from Ibn al-Azraq is the account of the decision of al-Mustarshid to leave Baghdad and his subsequent murder outside Marāgha in 529/1134-5. Ibn Wāsīl's description is modelled extremely closely on that of Ibn al-Azraq in the version contained in Ms.A. Indeed, the wording is virtually identical. Ibn Wāsīl adds a few explanatory comments, such as genealogical details about the Sultans Mahmūd and Masʿūd, and he omits the odd phrase. He amends the wording of the line from al-Mutanabbī which is quoted wrongly in Ms.A but written correctly in Ms.B, and changes من الغبن to من العجب. He also adds the statement that the line which the caliph was reciting was a quotation from al-Mutanabbī.

A more significant modification to the text is Ibn Wāsīl's omission of Ibn al-Azraq's own description of the castle of

Sar-i Jahān which he says he visited in 549/1154-5. 1 Perhaps Ibn Wāsil wished to conceal this obvious reference to the source of his information or he may have felt that his own text could dispense with such a description.

As regards the subject matter of this anecdote, Ibn Wāsil is generally content to keep to both the details and the main sweep of events as recorded in Ibn al-Azraq. But he cannot let the murder of the caliph pass without some kind of amendment to Ibn al-Azraq's version. Even Ibn al-Azraq makes a rare departure from his bald recital of events to record two conflicting reports on those responsible for the murder of the caliph. He writes that according to one source, Sanjar sent the murderers, whilst another attributes the blame to Mas'ūd. 2 Ibn Wāsil rejects Ibn al-Azraq's statements and breaks off the narrative of Ibn al-Azraq's informant, Ibn al-Anbārī, to write the following lines: 3

Whatever the source of this account, by its inclusion Ibn Wāsil places the blame for the death of al-Mustarshid firmly on Sanjar. The details of Mas'ūd's ostentatious display of false grief, however, clearly implicate him too.

The second extract from Ibn al-Azraq to which Ibn Wāsil accords extended treatment in his history is the very interesting account of Sultan Mas'ūd's meeting with officials in which he explained his

views on the future role of the caliphate.\footnote{Ms.A, f.165b; Ibn Wāsil, \textit{op. cit.}, 61-2.} Here the subject-matter is of such value that Ibn Wāsil quotes Ibn al-Azraq almost entirely \textit{verbatim}.\footnote{It is interesting to note that Ibn al-Furat also borrows a substantial portion of this material. Indeed, Ibn al-Furat (734/1334 - 808/1405) borrows extensively from Ibn Wāsil and it is clear that Ibn al-Azraq's text is reproduced by Ibn al-Furat from the version made by Ibn Wāsil. All the minor changes of wording made by Ibn Wāsil also occur in the text of Ibn al-Furat (Ibn al-Furat, \textit{Tārīkh al-Duwal wa'l-Mulūk}, Vienna Ms.A.F. 118, II, ff.68b - 69a). On other occasions Ibn al-Furat admits his dependence on Ibn al-Azraq's text itself, as for example in his account of the death of Sultan Mahmūd in 525/1130-1 where he acknowledges his source (f. 29b).} He again adds short explanatory comments on the identities of the uncles of Rāshid who are potential claimants to the caliphate and removes two grammatical infelicities of Ibn al-Azraq. For Ibn al-Azraq's phrase \textit{السلطان سعور لفظنا حضننا}, Ibn Wāsil writes simply \textit{حضنا}, whilst instead of Ibn al-Azraq's version \textit{اريبصليس الأمن} Ibn Wāsil prefers \textit{ولأريبصليس الأمن}. Other than these minor linguistic changes, however, Ibn Wāsil retains this valuable portion of his source virtually intact.

He then moves on to the episode of al-Rāshid and the slave-girls.\footnote{Ibn Wāsil, \textit{op. cit.}, 62.} In the \textit{Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn} \textit{wa} \textit{Āmid} the flow of Ibn
al-Azraq's important political narrative is interrupted by this obtrusive and irrelevant anecdote which he places between Mas'ūd's statement on the qualities he is seeking from any future caliph and the next major passage which deals with the circumstances of the selection of al-Muqtadī. The inclusion of this scandalous titbit of court gossip introduces a completely inappropriate tone to one of the most interesting parts of Ibn al-Azraq's text. Ibn Wāsil is also unable to resist the temptation to include the Rāshid episode, although it detracts greatly from the unity of his narrative. He could easily have included it elsewhere, for example when dealing with al-Rāshid's death. Although he chooses to retain the Rāshid anecdote, Ibn Wāsil removes some of the more explicit statements, no doubt from motives of propriety.

The remainder of the material which Ibn Wāsil has borrowed from Ibn al-Azraq deals with the latter's extremely detailed account of events from the second meeting of Mas'ūd with the Baghdad officials until the oath of allegiance sworn to al-Muqtadī. These pages of Ibn Wāsil's history are copied very closely from Ibn al-Azraq. His dependence on his source is, however, not total, since he adds several minor explanatory comments of his own, and when other information is available to him he incorporates it into his text. For example, Ibn al-Azraq mentions that al-Rāshid

4. Ibn al-Furūt also borrows parts of Ibn Wāsil's text here (op. cit., ff.144b - 145a).
got in touch with Zangi in 529/1134-5 asking him to come and give him support in Baghdad. From his reading of other historians, especially Ibn al-Athir, Ibn Wasil can explain at this point exactly what Zangi was doing and outlines his subsequent actions before reaching Baghdad. Once in Baghdad, Zangi encountered a number of border lords who had assembled to fight Sultan Mas'ud.

This information is not found in the *Tarikh Mayyafāriqin wa Amid*. Ibn Wasil resumes his borrowing from Ibn al-Azraq with the account of how al-Rashid imprisoned the members of the caliphal family in a cellar, his escape to Mosul and his deposition.

In this long narrative modelled closely on the *Tarikh Mayyafāriqin wa Amid*, Ibn Wasil makes few changes of wording. This is not too surprising. This part of Ibn al-Azraq's text is much more lucid than the unexplained, staccato scraps of information about the history of Diyār Bakr which punctuate his work. There is an unexpected unity about these stories of the three 'Abbāsid caliphs and their relations with the Saljuq sultan, Mas'ūd, which suggests that Ibn al-Azraq must have written detailed notes of his conversations with his principal informant, Ibn al-Anbarī. His account is clear and better expressed than usual.

Ibn Wasil, then, selects only a limited area of Ibn al-Azraq's work for inclusion in his text. He well recognises the value of

the material he chooses. Cahen praises the intelligent, coherent presentation of facts which characterises the *Mufarrij al-Kurub* and comments on its precise if not elegant language. Certainly, Ibn Wāsil manifests such qualities in his treatment of Ibn al-Azraq as a source, since he rejects other areas of the *Tarikh Mayyafarigīn wa Āmid* from which he might also have borrowed material. For such crucial topics as the career of Zangī he obviously prefers the clear account of Ibn al-Athīr to the incomplete and garbled version of Ibn al-Azraq with its chaotic chronology. It could therefore be said that he has recourse to Ibn al-Azraq only as a last resort, when the material he needs is not available elsewhere.

The manner in which Ibn Wāsil welds into a continuous narrative the sections from Ibn al-Azraq dealing with the 'Abbāsid caliphate between 529-532/1134-7 is an object lesson on the use of a muddled source by a lucid historian. He enhances their importance and thereby highlights at once the wealth of information contained in the *Tarikh Mayyafarigīn wa Āmid* and the very unsatisfactory way in which such information is presented.

**Conclusions**

Since Ibn al-Azraq was writing a town chronicle he naturally included a large amount of local material about Mayyafarigīn and its surrounding area. Nevertheless, despite the limitations of the subject-matter and the archaic language used in the text, Ibn

al-Azraq's work appears to have been well known to later Muslim historians over a wide geographical area, from Iraq to Egypt. Whether their frequent use of his text was due to the wide dispersal of copies of the *Tārīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa ʿĀmid*, or whether the text was accessible to them through other works now lost, is not clear.

These writers draw on the *Tārīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa ʿĀmid* in various different ways, with or without acknowledgement to its author. Sometimes they paraphrase Ibn al-Azraq's words; on other occasions they borrow portions of the text unchanged. The joins between their own material and that which they have borrowed are rarely advertised. It is a commonplace that Arab writers saw no shame in plagiarism. A great part of their work was quotation and a writer often neglected to mention the source of his material, viewing this as of little interest to himself, or his readers. Only in the case of Ibn Khallīkān are there some grounds for speculating that he deliberately suppressed a reference to his source in certain important passages.

This chapter has considered only four writers who copy Ibn al-Azraq: Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī, Ibn Khallīkān, Ibn Shaddād and Ibn Wāsil. The value of a comparison between their borrowings and the original passages from Ibn al-Azraq is two-fold. By making a detailed comparison between the same passage in two different texts it is possible to gain useful insights into the meaning of obscure vocabulary and unconventional syntax. It is, however, of greater significance to analyse and discuss the choice of material selected by later Muslim historians since it

1. A minor exception is Ibn Wāsil's omission of the reference to
is a valuable indication of the areas of the *Tarīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa Ṭīmīd* which they considered interesting. Their selection provides a possible pointer to which parts of Ibn al-Azraq's account display originality or special information.

Ibn Khallīkān's borrowings may be excluded here since he is interested in specific details about individual personalities. Moreover, Ibn Shaddād borrows from Ibn al-Azraq in such a wholesale, indiscriminate fashion that he too is of little value in assessing the relative merits of the various sections of Ibn al-Azraq's work. However, the other two authors - Sībṭ Ibn al-Jauzī with his interest in the Georgian material and Ibn Wāsil who concentrates on material which clarifies the relationship between caliph and sultan in the sixth/twelfth century - successfully highlight the wider interest of the *Tarīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa Ṭīmīd*, outside its more obvious role as the principal source for the history of the Jazīra in the period 1100-1150.

A few tentative conclusions may now be drawn. The study of these four authors and their use of Ibn al-Azraq's text has revealed that writers composing in several different genres and therefore with varying aims drew on this work. Clearly it was more common for Ibn al-Azraq's history to be used uncritically than selectively. Moreover, later writers applied their critical faculties principally to the task of selection rather than to the task of evaluating Ibn al-Azraq's information. It is probable that the *Tarīkh Mayyāfārīqīn wa Ṭīmīd* was considered sufficiently useful to be available in several copies and that a version of
the text existed which was similar to Ms.A although not identical. The existence of a third manuscript of substantially similar content to one of the two which survives, and of no later than 13th century date, provides a modicum of evidence in favour of the theory that much of Ibn al-Azraq's text - at least for the period 1100-1150 - has survived in Ms.A. At all events, the borrowings of the four writers discussed in this chapter afford no grounds for believing that Ms.A is lacunary. It is apparent that authors who were not themselves noted as great stylists felt, not surprisingly, the need to change, to a varying extent, the infelicitous, provincial Arabic of their source. Finally, the popularity of his text among writers of the next four generations strongly suggests that Ibn al-Azraq was probably the major source available for the area of the Jazīra in the period 1100-1150.
CHAPTER III

THE LANGUAGE OF IBN AL-AZRAQ
THE LANGUAGE OF IBN AL-AZRAQ

Introduction

It is not the intention here to give a comprehensive analysis of the language of the Tarikh Mayyafariqin wa 'Amid. Instead, a description of some of the salient features of the text will be provided, followed by a few tentative general remarks. As there is such a dearth of studies which treat either the literary or the colloquial Arabic of the Saljuq period, it would be a pity to leave completely undiscussed certain very interesting linguistic features, especially of syntax, which appear on many pages of Ibn al-Azraq's text.

Scholars such as Fück have shown that the decline of classical Arabic, the language which had united Islam for barely two centuries, was accelerated by the advent of the Saljuqs. Al-Tabrizi (420-502/1030-1109) needed to give an elementary explanation of classical Arabic poetry in his teaching at the Nizamiyya madrasa in Baghdad and al-Hariri devoted a work to the grammatical mistakes made in Arabic by the educated classes. Especially revealing were the mistakes of al-Hariri's contemporaries.

2. Ibid., 177.
3. Ibid., 180-5.
when they tried to express themselves "correctly". Their errors showed that in al-Hariri's time (he died in 516/1122) the sense of a living tradition of classical Arabic was fast receding.

If the educated classes in the cultural centre of Islam were no longer able to grasp the essential difference between 'Arabiyya and Middle Arabic, it is scarcely surprising that an author such as Ibn al-Azraq who lived in such a linguistically mixed area as Diyar Bakr, and who had such a piecemeal grasp of any Arabic other than the colloquial dialects current in the regions where he lived and travelled, should have failed to reproduce fine classical Arabic.

The language of Ibn al-Azraq, then, should be assessed not so much against a norm of classical Arabic - a norm which already in his day had lost much of its prescriptive force - as against contemporary works of comparable character. In the

1. The term Middle Arabic is used here according to the definition of Fück. It denotes the vernacular dialects spoken by the lower and middle classes in the first centuries of Islam. Middle Arabic first received literary expression in the works of Christians and Jews who spoke a colloquial form of Arabic but who were divorced from the culture which produced classical Arabic literature. When they wrote, they used the spoken language. By the Saljuq period, Middle Arabic characteristics had infiltrated the works of Muslim writers on a large scale (Fück, op. cit., 87-8).
tradition of Arabic historical chronicles and biographical writings of the sixth and seventh centuries A.H., the emphasis is more on subject-matter than on style and the vernacular increasingly infiltrates the would-be classical Arabic. Even the cultivated Usama b. Munqidh, who is capable of writing correct classical Arabic poetry, adopts a more colloquial style for his memoirs.

Any analysis of the language of Ibn al-Azraq's text is complicated by the fact that the manuscripts reflect the linguistic background not only of the author himself but also of the scribe. Indeed, it is difficult to disentangle the author's own language from that of his copyists. The dating of the manuscripts is uncertain. It seems highly probable that Ms.B or an earlier version of it was available to Ibn Shaddād in the second half of the seventh/twelfth century, since he drew so heavily on it for his historical geography of the Jazīra.¹ Ms.A probably dates from around the same time.

The two manuscripts reproduce Ibn al-Azraq's Arabic text written in the second half of the sixth/twelfth century. Superimposed on it are the amendments of two scribes working a hundred years or so later. The fact that the seventh/thirteenth century writers² who borrowed large sections of Ibn al-Azraq's work were based in Syria lends support to the theory that the

---

1. Cf. Chapter II of this thesis for a longer discussion.
scribes also came from that area.¹

In the description which follows, it seems reasonable to assume that the orthographical and many of the morphological features of the text should be attributed to the scribes.² Its vocabulary and general wording, however, belong to Ibn al-Azraq, who is probably also responsible for at least some of the interesting syntactical features. Although a linguistic study of any section of the Tarikh Mayyafarīqīn wa Amid would produce interesting results, the part which is under scrutiny in this thesis is of special value since Ibn al-Azraq is writing more independently than usual of borrowed sources. His history of the Artuqids is therefore likely to be a more accurate reflection of his own prose style.

Orthography

It is necessary here to draw a distinction between the idiosyncratic mistakes of the scribe, wrong spellings caused by phonetic confusion and non-classical spellings which were fairly widespread at the time the manuscripts were copied.

There may well be a fourth category of orthographical error in the two versions of Ibn al-Azraq's text: mistakes caused by

---

1. It is of course possible that the manuscripts were copied in Mayyafarīqīn itself.
2. The scribe of Ms.B had a markedly better grasp of classical Arabic than the scribe of Ms.A.
a similarity in form between certain Arabic letters. This kind of mistake is difficult to detect in Ms.A, since, as already noted in the description of the manuscripts, the scribe places dots and diacritical points freely over words which do not require them or sometimes omits such markings altogether. Such irregularities forbid any generalisations on the scribe's use of dotted and undotted consonants. With Ms.B, which is totally devoid of diacritical marks, this category of orthographical mistake must also remain undetected.

1) Mistakes made by the scribe

The scribe of Ms.A makes numerous spelling mistakes, amongst which are some caused by haplology, e.g. 

Others arise from metathesis, e.g.

An unfamiliarity with words of foreign origin causes him to give both 

1. Brinner notes a number of mistakes of this kind where  is written for , , , , , , , , , , , (W.M. Brinner, A Chronicle of Damascus [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963], xx).

whilst he offers حركات ١ as the plural of the Persian بلالوا ٢ instead of بلال. The rendering of the place-name فلœ as بلالوا ٢ instead of the usual بلال may well have been prompted by a desire to make the form the same as the third person plural of the perfect indicative verb.

The scribe of Ms.A has several spellings for the number خمسة٣ خمسية٤ خمسية٥ "five hundred". As well as the usual spelling, he writes خمسية٤ خمسية٥.

The scribe of Ms.B also writes خواجه٦ instead of خواجه but otherwise makes fewer spelling mistakes than the scribe of Ms.A.

ii) **Spelling mistakes probably caused by phonetic confusion**

As Brinner points out, there is the greatest uncertainty and confusion in later medieval Arabic in the treatment of emphatic or velarised dental stops and spirants, the consonantal group where the Arabic colloquial dialects show the most divergence.٧

---

3. This occurs on numerous occasions, e.g. f.161a.
4. Ff. 162a, 164a and b, 168a, 169a and b, 170a, 171a and b, 172b, 173b, 175a.
5. Ff. 164b, 167b, 168b.
This uncertainty is mirrored in Ms. A of Ibn al-Azraq's text.

Ms. A uses مساء صور for صور (wall), which is written صور \(^1\), whilst Saljuq is rendered mostly by صاحبوق \(^2\), but on one occasion by صاحبوق.

The consonant ل is confused with ص. Ms. A gives ص

ووحت صفة الكرم في السنة خمسة وثلاثين

On another occasion, the scribe writes نظر for نظر in the phrase:

كولى نظر الدیوان \(^4\).

Ms. A also blurs the distinction between ذ and ز writing زمام for ذمام in the phrase:

الی دیوان الدمام والاستیقا

The error of writing الا for الی must be an aural one:

ولی مفتورين ... جماعة من الوالدة ومنهم الحاجب الی البوکر وبیبرم و

عثمان كل منهم مرة الی الحاجب بیبرم فولی مرتين

There is also confusion over the name Sayyida Khatun which is rendered mostly as سیدة but appears once as سیدة.

1. F.172a.
2. F.163b.
3. F.162a.
4. F.164b.
iii) **Non-classical spellings**

The **hamza** is usually omitted in hamzated verbs where the **hamza** is the second or third radical. Ms.A gives ١ for بُدِّت هَنَاوَةٌ and ٢ for اسْلَمٌ. Ms.A gives ٣ for ٢٧٢ and ٤ for امْرَاء.

The **hamza** is rarely written after alif mamdūda. For example, Ms.A has ٤ for امْرَاء.

The spellings هَاوَالٍ هَاوَالٍ are given for the classical هَوَالٍ.

The two months of Jumādā are often written in both manuscripts without showing that the first "a" is long. The notation of length is almost always omitted for the numeral thalāth and in some proper names such as Sulaimān.

The scribe of Ms.A has a marked preference for a dotted ٤٤٠ instead of a final alif in ٤٠٤٠ which he writes as ٤٠٤٠.

The letter ئََ is consistently written inside words like ارَاء.

where would normally be expected. As Vitestam points out in the case of Sibt Ibn al-Jauzi, this may well have been typical of the orthography of that period.

On some occasions, the first person plural of the perfect tense is written without a terminal alif, e.g., قضرنا قضرن.

Morphology and syntax

Pronouns

i) Personal pronouns

There is confusion about the dual personal pronouns, used either independently or as pronominal suffixes. On occasion, the dual is used in accordance with correct classical usage, e.g.: 4

وخلف ابني هما نورالدين .... وعماد الدين

More often, however, it is replaced by the third person masculine plural pronoun hum, e.g.: 5

نقل خم الدهن الغازى وشمس الدولة إفهان من مسجد الأمير إلى مارةين ثم وفنههم (for دفنهم)

   خضائل for (Ms.A, f.173b).
   اوابيل for (Ms.A, f.169b).


Hum also replaces the third person feminine plural pronoun hunna when used as a suffix. The best example of this usage is the passage which is found in both manuscripts and which deals with Rashid and the slave-girls. A small part of it will suffice to illustrate this linguistic feature:

Not once in this part of the text is the pronominal suffix hunna used, although it is crystal clear from the context that the persons concerned are female.

ii) Demonstrative pronouns

Unusual forms have already been noted in the section on orthography. It should be added here that the dual is not used but is replaced by the plural forms. For example, Ms.A expresses "those two men attacked him" as

(for داينك الرجلاج.

iii) Relative pronouns

is often found instead of التي, e.g.,-

 وهوم من العجيب الذي بيني هم هذا النزام

1. Ms.B, ff.112b-113a. The equivalent passage in Ms.A also demonstrates this point (f.166a).
2. F.176a.
although on other occasions, the ηος is used correctly. 1
also replace the ηος, e.g.: 2

but there are other instances where a classically correct usage of the ηος is found. 5

The dual relative pronoun does not occur and is replaced by the plural ηος. The sentence ηος is intended to express the idea "They killed the two men who killed them", which should read ηος Another example is ηος 7; "one of the two maliks who were with him".

There is often an absence of the referential pronoun:

"all the territory which the atabeg had taken".

Generally, the ηος is by far the most common relative pronoun,

8. Ms.A, f.172b. This tendency is, however, found in good classical writers such as Tabari and Ibn Hishām. I am grateful to Professor A.F.L. Beeston for pointing this out.
replacing on occasion either الـذين الـتي or الـذى and thus breaking classical rules of agreement in gender or number. The text demonstrates that while the referential pronoun was often used it was sometimes forgotten.¹ Both Fück² and Blau³ discuss the widespread use of الـذى in Middle Arabic and state that it is equivalent to the vernacular ـىٰلّى، which is invariable in gender, number and case.

General remarks on the use of pronouns

Beeston's statement that "Arabic use of pronouns borders sometimes on the irresponsible"⁴ is triply valid here since Ibn al-Azraq adds to the ambiguity inherent in the Arabic use of pronouns his own erratic grasp of classical grammar and his

1. For an analysis of relative sentences in Middle Arabic, cf. G. Graf, Der Sprachgebrauch der ältesten christlich-arabischen Literatur (Leipzig, 1905), 69-70. Ibn al-Azraq's text shares some but not all of the characteristics listed by Graf. For example, in this text الـذى does not introduce a relative clause which follows an indeterminate antecedent.


confusion over borrowed historical data.¹

**Nouns**

1) **The declension of the noun**

The short-vowel endings which are added to a noun in accordance with its syntactical role in the sentence are not visible in an unvocalised text. As already mentioned, Ms.B is unvocalised and Ms.A is badly pointed. Irregularities in all three cases of noun declension are best perceived, therefore, in such words as *ab* and *akh* which have certain special case-endings if followed by a genitive or an affixed pronoun.

There would appear to be a certain preference for the radical **waw** in these nouns for all three cases. As well as numerous examples, correctly written in the nominative, where the

¹. The best example of Ibn al-Azraq's confusing use of pronouns is found in his one excursion into the history of the Maghrib. Here he discusses, obviously from a borrowed source, the rise of 'Abd al-Mu'min. Unfortunately, in his account of the various military encounters between Ibn Tūmart and the **amīr al-muslimīn**, it is rarely clear who has defeated whom. Perhaps Ibn al-Azraq did not understand the facts before him (Ms.A, f.168b). Fortunately, clearer accounts are available elsewhere.

There is also considerable confusion with pronouns in Ibn al-Azraq's genealogical accounts, especially those in Ms.A (ff.177a - 178b).
ending waw is of course to be expected, the following instances illustrate this feature of the text:

إقطع عزالدين الوبكر الجزيرة

لقد سألت الوالي كمال الدين الباي الفضل

Here the nominative form of the noun is used in a position which demands the accusative.

Other examples illustrate these nouns in the genitive or prepositional case, where again the nominative is used:

حضرنا عبد الامير الباي عبد الله

إلى الدين الباي

من خدمة جمال الدين اموال الملك فتح الدين

The situation is by no means clear-cut, however. Individual examples may be cited which testify only to great confusion about case endings:

لقد قصدنا الامير الباي

وصل حشي الباي طالب

4. Ibid.
One characteristic which emerges from these examples is an apparent dislike for the correct accusative form, e.g. akhā or abā.

ii) The loss of the alif of tanwīn

A more widespread sign of i'rab in unvocalised texts is the alif of tanwīn which marks the accusative of many nouns and adjectives when the noun is undefined.

The absence of the alif of tanwīn in the indeterminate accusative singular and the accusative of broken plurals is a feature of Middle Arabic. It is present to a limited extent in Ibn al-Azraq's text.

أولئك القوم (for لج) "Its rulers were a group..."²

An interesting example is:-

ٍ بناء لي مشهد مليي ³ "He built a fine mashhad".

Here nunation is omitted for the noun but added to its dependent adjective.

iii) The use of the accusative in place of the nominative

This feature is noted both by Graf ⁴ who treats material from as early as the second/eighth century and by Brinner ⁵ who

---

2. Ms.B, f.102a. The removal of the alif makes it unclear whether the noun is intended to be in the nominative or accusative.
4. Op. cit., 23. One example he cites is لا يربطون احدا
points out examples from Ibn Sasra in the eighth/fourteenth century. In the following examples the accusative is used where the nominative would be correct:

1. وخرج عن يد السعيد حسام الدين مالاعطليا
   "A lot of money left the possession of al-Sa‘īd Husam al-Dīn".

2. ليس أحدا منهم على الصحيح
   "Not one of them is right".

3. ولم يبق بعداتابكزكي إبريل
   "Not one amīr remained after Atabeg Zangī".

There are also a few examples of the masculine sound plural in the oblique rather than the nominative case, e.g.:

4. سيفقوا المسلمين
   "The Muslims were driven along".

iv) Lack of differentiation between diptotes and triptotes

Whilst the alif of tanwīn is sometimes incorrectly omitted, it is also added in error to diptotes, e.g.:

6. موضع (for فتح من الاحتراج مواضع كثيرة)
7. خمسة دنانير (for رنانير)
8. نهب مماليكجماعة (for ماهاليك)

5. Perhaps this may be categorised as a scribal hyper-correction.
v) Gender

There are few mistakes of gender in Ibn al-Azraq's text. The Jumādā months are occasionally treated as masculine,⁴ as is the word dār once²:

although this mistake may well be attributable to the fact that a numeral is involved.

vi) Plurals

The noun in the dual is used correctly in several phrases, e.g.:- "Ibn Nisān despatched two men". On other occasions, the dual of the noun is written correctly but its dependent adjective is in the plural:-

Another example illustrates the lack of accord between the dual noun and its adjective, as well as a possible preference for the accusative case, where correct classical Arabic would require the nominative.⁵

---

1. E.g. Ms.A, f.175b:-
5. Graf pinpoints the Middle Arabic preference, especially in the dual and the plural, for the accusative rather than the nominative. This is due to the predominance of the endings in and aini in the vulgar language (op.cit.,23). Cf. also Blau, op.cit.,214.
Although an opposite example also exists:

 Generally, however, Ibn al-Azraq's text is careful in its retention and renderings of the dual form of the noun. Its treatment of sound plurals is also accurate.

Sound plurals are generally accurate too.

vii) Numerals

Blau points out that it was in the sphere of numerals that the most far-reaching changes occurred in Middle Arabic. Although the treatment of numerals in Ibn al-Azraq's text is careless, no consistent pattern of mistakes emerges. Certain features, however, may be noted.

The use of numerals in contexts unconnected with dates is generally quite correct. The following kinds of mistake, however, may be cited. The rules for agreement between the numeral and the noun which follows it are apparently not known:—

1. Ms.A, f.177b
2. Ms.A, f.165b
4. Ms.A, f.161b; Ms.B, f.102b
5. Ms.A, f.162a
The correct case for a noun which follows a numeral between one and ten is not known. Some form of the singular is given instead of the genitive plural:

العشرين ألف
الاثنان عشر ألف

"ten thousand dinārs".
"five thousand dinārs".

Dates involving the numerals one to ten are generally correct. Those containing the numerals eleven to nineteen are almost always incorrect according to classical Arabic usage, e.g.

الخمسة عشرة سنة
الفترة الخمسة عشرة وخمسة

A certain consistency is revealed here in that the form of the numeral used with a masculine noun has been taken in place of the form needed for a feminine noun.

1. Ms.B, f.105b
2. Ms.A, f.161b; Ms.B, f.102b
3. Ms.A, f.174a. Graf also notes mistakes with
   where the singular is used for the plural, e.g.
   (op. cit., 28).
4. Ms.A, f.161a
5. Ms.A, ff.162a - b
6. Perhaps because of the superficial similarity of form between the ending of the word sanat and the ending of the first element of the compound numeral.
eighteen, however, is idiosyncratic:

تمناً عشرة

Between 20 and 100 most mistakes are concerned with the use of the form of the numeral employed with a masculine noun in place of the form needed for a feminine noun:

من سنة اثنتين وخمسة
من سنة اربعة وأربعين وخمسة
من سنة اثنين وعشرين واربع
من سنة اثنتين وتسعين واربع

Verbs

i) Hamzated verbs

The way in which hamzated verbs are treated in this text has already been mentioned in the section on orthography. As noted there, in writing verbs whose middle radical is alif, the alif is omitted, e.g.

اسْلَمَ (for

The alif is also not written in a verb whose final radical is alif, e.g.

بَدَأَ (for

1. Ms.A, f.163a; Ms.B, f.107a
2. Ms.A, f.167a
3. Ms.A, f.176a
4. Ms.A, f.170b
5. Ms.A, f.161b; Ms.B, f.103b
6. Ms.A, f.161a; Ms.B, f.101b
ii) **Defective Verbs**

Verbs whose last radical is \( \text{ya} \) are often written with a terminal alif, e.g.

\[
\text{sab}^1 \quad \text{bna}^2
\]

This is also true of derived forms of defective verbs, e.g.

\[
\text{man azamaslama}^3
\]

Verbs whose last radical is \( \text{waw} \) often have an otiose alif added to the third person masculine singular of the imperfect, e.g.

\[
\text{yizn}^5 \quad \text{hislal}^6
\]

"He conducted raids against the Franks".

"There began to appear".

iii) **Doubly weak verbs**

The jussive of \( \text{rai} \) is not known:

\[
\text{wilm yir}^7
\]

The derived forms of the verb \( \text{rai} \) are imperfectly known.

4. This feature is noted by Vitestam and Brinner.
The sixth form is given as "he came into view" instead of the classically correct 'ارتأوا' whilst the eighth form is rendered by in place of the correct "they took thought".

iv) The dual

Dual forms of the verb appear in the text quite frequently and are written correctly, e.g.

alternatively a dual subject is given a third person masculine plural ending, e.g.

One example shows that the writer remembers the dual ending twice but thereafter lapses into the third person masculine plural:

The dual is also used erroneously, probably as a result of scribal tampering, in a passage where clearly three people are involved:

5. Ms.B, f.120a.
General comments on syntax

1) The role of the imperfect

Classical Arabic rules on the moods of the imperfect are sometimes broken. The indicative takes over the functions performed by the subjunctive in classical Arabic and the difference between an governing a subjunctive and anna followed by an accusative noun is blurred.

Ms.B مهبل، f.107b.

"It was agreed that they should take 10,000 dinars".

Ms.B مهبل، f.102b.

"It was their firm resolve to appoint someone other than him".

In the above examples the imperfect indicative has assumed the role of the subjunctive after an.

ii) Agreement

One striking syntactical feature of the text is the widespread abandonment of the classical Arabic rules for agreement of number.\(^1\) It is quite common in this text, therefore, to find a plural verb preceding its subject in a verbal sentence.\(^2\) A collective noun is often preceded by a masculine plural verb, e.g.

\[\text{لغذوا أهل تقليس (for لنذو هنقاء)}\] \(^3\)

\[\text{خرج وخردوا الأمدمية (for خرج ذو خروبة)}\] \(^4\)

Tribes are also given a plural verb:-

A broken plural is also given a masculine plural verb, e.g.

\[\text{فاختلعوا الناس (for اختلت الناس)}\] \(^6\)

\[\text{واقموا الأولاد (for أقاموا الأولاد)}\] \(^7\)

A broken plural is also found with a masculine singular verb:-

\[\text{استقرت (for تقترع)}\] \(^8\)

1. The use of the dual has already been mentioned.
2. The term "verbal sentence" is interpreted here according to the definition given by Arab grammarians who call it الجملة العملية. In such a sentence, the verb is put first and is followed by its noun-subject. Such a verb is always in the singular but is congruous in gender.

Less frequent but noteworthy are examples of a feminine subject immediately following a masculine verb. Graf cites the example:

\[
\text{وكان امهاشرون تحالون} \quad 1
\]

Ibn al-Azraq's text has:

\[
\text{كانت } \\
\text{واننلاها} \quad 2
\]

(for كان)

In Graf's example, the feminine subject is separated from the verb, which is masculine, by the word لها. No such excuse can be adduced for Ibn al-Azraq's usage here.

In compound tenses, agreement is confused but the following examples may be noted:

\[
\text{وكان نونيت} \quad 3 \\
\text{وكان اعذرتها الاضرط} \quad 4 \\
\text{وكان يخرجون الناس} \quad 5
\]

A rigid kana form has been used here, even in the first example where the subject is feminine. In the second example, the Franks are given first a masculine singular and then a feminine singular verb. The third example places a singular and plural verb before the subject.

An interesting feature of Ibn al-Azraq's language is his predilection for conjunctions such as من حيث and من حيث. In his analysis of Middle Arabic, Pück mentions new conjunctions, amongst which he cites which is translated as "comme, attendu que".¹ Dozy, on the other hand, gives its meaning as "comme, dès que".²

The following examples illustrate Ibn al-Azraq's use of this conjunction:

3
من حيث الملكُ الخُمُرُ الدين استقرروا فِي دُورهم
"While (or from the moment that) Najm al-Dīn ruled, they were secure in their homes".

4
وَكَانَ خَالَافِهِ مِن حيثُ لَبِيعَ لهُ لِعَدّ قَتْلَ أَبِيهِ الْيَلِدُ
"The caliphate, from the time allegiance was pledged to him after the murder of his father until the ceremony of allegiance to al-Muqtafī, lasted eleven months".

5
وَكُانَ اِسْرَاءِ الدُّولَةِ مِن حيثُ قَتْلَ زَنْجِي إِلَيْه
"The running of the state had been in his possession since the murder of Zangi".

These examples seem to indicate that in this text من حيث means "as soon as" or "from the moment when". They are, therefore, in partial agreement with Dozy's definition.

Another conjunction favoured by Ibn al-Azraq is بحيث which occurs frequently. Dozy translates it as "puisque",¹ which has a causal, not temporal, meaning in French. A few examples of its use by Ibn al-Azraq are given below:-

"The sultan was so generous that he shared out all his territory amongst his followers" (A possible alternative to this might be to translate بحيث as "seeing that, inasmuch as").

"The women were violated in such a way that if the Christians had attacked they would not have gone to such extremes as that with the Muslims".

Vocabulary

In many respects, the vocabulary of the تَارِیخ مَوَیْفَّاریقین wa Ṭāmid is broadly similar to that used in other Arabic chronicles of the period 500-700 A.H. Ibn al-Azraq employs the standard phraseology for military and dynastic history. His range of

expressions is extremely limited and his style is repetitive and virtually incapable of subtlety or nuance. Even within the obvious limitations of his genre, his vocabulary, when compared with that of Ibn al-Qalānīsī or Ibn al-‘Adīm, for example, seems bald and impoverished in range.

1) **Foreign borrowings**

Ibn al-Azraq rarely borrows foreign words. There are a few Persian words in his works but they are not unusual and are attested much earlier than the sixth/twelfth century. In this category are sardab¹ and isfahsalār².

There is little evidence that individual Turkish words have been borrowed, other than the obvious plethora of personal names. The usual problem of rendering Turkish names in Arabic remains unresolved in this text too. The Turkish names in Ms.A have a very idiosyncratic form, e.g. Temür-tash is written تموراش and Toghrül is rendered in Ms.A as تغر. These versions of well-known names probably reflect local pronunciation.

Most of these idiosyncratic versions of Turkish names are absent from Ms.B.

Several place-names in the form presented in Ibn al-Azraq's

3. F. 162b.
text may have a possible Syriac origin. The forms خَرَطَةُ (for Kharpūt) and مَيْدِين (for Mārdīn) are especially noteworthy. Ibn al-Azraq also on occasion uses the names of Syriac months such as كَانَانٌ الْآوَّلِ. 2

ii) Unusual vocabulary

Ibn al-Azraq uses certain words and expressions which may tentatively be attributed to some dialectal usage with which he was familiar. These are the words which are often paraphrased by other writers when they borrow from his work. Writers such as Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī and Ibn Wāsil are not noted for the excellence of their Arabic style but they clearly find some of Ibn al-Azraq's usages too obscure or regional to be retained. A few examples will suffice to support this statement. 3

Ibn al-Azraq uses the verb نَفْذ throughout his text. In his account of ِIl-Ghāzī's campaign to Tiflīs in 515/1121 5

1. The widely accepted view that the form مِيْدَيْن (for مَيْدِين) comes from the Syriac is systematically demolished by Markwart in seven pages of detailed discussion (J. Markwart, Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen [Vienna 1930], 163-70).


3. For a much longer discussion on the writers who used Ibn al-Azraq's text, cf. Chapter II.

4. In the second form. Only once, in Ms. B, does the fourth form نَفْذ appear (f. 113b).

5. Ms. A, f. 161a-b; Ms. B, ff. 102a - 103a.
this verb is employed three times in quick succession. Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī, who borrows Ibn al-Azraq's account almost verbatim, removes each time it appears, replacing it by لفظ نذ. Ibn Khallikān, who also borrows from the Tarikh Mayyāfīriqīn wa Āmid in his biography of Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī, replaces Ibn al-Azraq's phrase (sic) سير رسلاً نفذ جماعة رسلاً by نفذ.

The ubiquitous لفظ نذ is not a unique case. Ibn al-Azraq also over-uses the verb حصل. In one short sentence, he writes حصل three times, in each case with a different meaning implied:-

وحصل إذا كان الأمير ميفرفيين كان معه وأذل سار معه وكان يقيم حيث اقام الامير وحصل له الناموس العظيم (sic) حيثان مدة مقدمة عند يا أردا وبيق وميا يحق حصل عليه ليل يلي بله

"It turned out that if the amīr was in Mayyāfīriqīn, he (Sulaimān) was with him. If he (the amīr) went to Mārdīn, he would go with him. (Indeed) he lived wherever the amīr lived. He enjoyed such a high status that the whole time he stayed with the amīr he did not stand up in his presence on any occasion. Then it seems that he acted in a way which was inappropriate for the likes of him."

In this passage, the verbs صار and حرفت صار would be more usual.5

---

In an earlier part of the text, Ibn al-Azraq writes, "when they arrived in the area of the citadel". Verbs with various meanings are not unusual but the fact that in one short anecdote Ibn al-Azraq chooses to use حصل in this way is an indication of his limited ability to express himself in Arabic. 2

In Ms. B, which is the earlier version of his text, Ibn al-Azraq writes that Zangi "took Edessa by force in which was 23 Kanun al-awwal." By the time he writes Ms. A, the date of Zangi's capture of Edessa has been altered to read 25 Jumada II or 23 Kanun al-awwal. According to Lane, al-asabb is a dialectal variant of al-asamm, which is one of the epithets of the month of Rajab. 3

The use of the verb is also worthy of note. On the occasion of the deposition of the caliph al-Rashid, Ibn al-Azraq records that the 'ulama' gave a fatwa to that effect. He then writes and in the equivalent account in Ms. B a participle is used instead:

2. Cf. also Ms.A, f.176a: "They became his followers and under his command."
whilst is perfectly acceptable for expressing the concept of the adoption of a belief or a doctrine, it is not the usual verb to employ for a judge pronouncing a verdict or taking responsibility for a decision. Significantly, Ibn Wāsil, who copies Ibn al-Azraq's accounts of this incident, replaces حكم in this context. \(^1\) It is difficult to assess whether Ibn al-Azraq's use of was caused by the influence of a provincial usage or whether he was consciously trying to use the correct judicial term but chose the wrong one through ignorance. Possibly also in this category of unusual vocabulary is Ibn al-Azraq's usage in the sentence:\(^2\) The phrase may mean since the person concerned was a qādi.

The verb أُولِد is used consistently in Ibn al-Azraq's text ("to give birth to"). أُولِد is followed by a direct object.\(^3\) The preposition من is added if the mother is mentioned, e.g.

أُولِد عنها الصاحب نجم الدين ألبی

"He begat by her the lord Najm al-Dīn Alpī."

---

3. E.g. أُولِد أربعة بنين "he sired four sons" (Ms.A, f.177a).
Alternatively,ـ ولد may be used of a woman bearing a child:
وـ كانت زوجة الامير جاسم الدين وـ ولدت منه صفية كالعوت
"She was the wife of Husām al-Dīn and she had by him Safiyya Khatun."
This usage may also be provincial in origin.

iii) Colloquial vocabulary

There are traces of colloquial words and phrases in the Arabic of Ibn al-Azraq, especially in the snatches of conversation which he records. Colloquial words such as the interrogative word "الش" and the verb "جاب" occur occasionally and the colloquial verb "ظه" is used in preference for the classical "حتن".

The dialogue between Hassān al-Manbijī and 'Alī at the siege of Qal'at Ja'bar just before the assassination of Zangī contains colloquial phrases in both of Ibn al-Azraq's accounts. Ms.A has the phrase:-

تعلم ما بيني وبينك وتابت لعون الله هو

whilst the version in Ms.B runs as follows:-

تعلم ما بيني وبينك من صداقة وانت لـ تروف اتكاب و ما هواعليه

5. F.172a.
"You know the friendship (that exists) between us and you (also) know the atabeg and what he is like."

In the account of the Tiflis campaign, the phraseology is colloquial in parts:

"The people of Tiflis got in touch with Najm al-Dīn ʿIl-Ghāzī asking him to come so that they might hand over Tiflis to him. The inhabitants had run (the administration) by themselves for forty years."

General remarks on the language and style of the text

It is difficult to ascertain the linguistic background of Ibn al-Azraq. A wide variety of languages were spoken in Diyār Bakr in the sixth/twelfth century. The military governors and their soldiers in the citadels belonged to the Turkish-speaking minority, whilst the indigenous inhabitants of the area spoke Arabic, Syriac and Armenian. There were also important groups of Kurdish speakers in the countryside. Socin drew attention to the importance of other languages, especially Syriac and Kurdish, in any study of the lexicography and grammar of the Arabic dialects spoken in the region of Mosul and Mardin. 2

It seems unlikely that Ibn al-Azraq was of Syriac origin since he mentions that he needed a Syriac text translated for him before he could include it in his history. It is also improbable that he was a Christian. He relates that a Syriac book, the Tash‘ith, was translated for him into Arabic by "one of the Christians". The author also gives prominence in his text to his own personal discussions in Baghdad with the most famous Shafi‘ite ‘ulama‘ of his day. It seems logical therefore to assume that he was a Sunni Muslim, although he may conceivably have begun life as a Christian. His ethnic origin becomes narrowed therefore to Kurdish, Armenian or Arab. Even if he was an Arab, his grounding in classical Arabic was poor. But the evidence is not strong enough to permit a definite conclusion about his ethnic origin.

If the text of the Tarikh Mayyafarisin wa Amid is read through as a continuous narrative, it becomes clear that there are certain variations of style. It is true that a number of general linguistic features are perceptible throughout but the work contains passages which deviate more sharply from classical usages and which stand out because of syntax which is unconventional even by the standards of the rest of the text. The flavour of these parts of the text is almost that of a translation from another language. This phenomenon could well be attributable to the influence of Diyar Bakr with its mixed linguistic traditions.

1. ‘Awad, op. cit., 35; Ms.A, f.7b.
Significantly, these passages in Ibn al-Azraq's text are lengthy anecdotes, culled from his own personal experience or based on eye-witness accounts which he himself recorded. There is little doubt therefore that these passages were written by Ibn al-Azraq himself and not borrowed from other written sources, which would have been couched in an Arabic different or better than his own. It is important to note that these are sections of the text which were written early since they are found in Ms.B, composed in 560/1164-5, as well as in the later Ms.A.

Side by side with the passages which mirror Ibn al-Azraq's own particular style are others where the phraseology seems less alien. His material which deals with the caliphate, for example, is written in a much clearer style and the syntax deviates less dramatically from that used in other roughly contemporary historical chronicles.

It is difficult to account for the uneven quality of the Arabic, except to postulate that the slightly more correct language may be due to greater scribal tampering in the actual

1. E.g. the account of the Tiflis campaign (Ms.A, ff.161a - 162b; Ms.B, ff.102a - 104b) or the anecdote about al-Rashid and the slave-girls (Ms.A, ff.165b - 166a; Ms.B, ff.112b - 113a).
2. E.g. the borrowed accounts of the rise of 'Abd al-Mu'min (Ms.A, ff.168a - 169a; Ms.B, ff.118b - 119a) or the short excursus into Fatimid history.
3. E.g. Ibn al-Qalānīsī or Ibn al-Athīr.
The text of Ms. A presents two clearly distinct strands: one is a series of disjointed scraps of information which resemble terse diary entries and are linked only by the framework of chronology, while the other consists of disproportionately long, detailed accounts of a few isolated episodes which Ibn al-Azraq had the opportunity to record from eye-witnesses or his own experience.

In general, Blau's analysis of the stylistic weakness of Middle Arabic writing may be extended to apply to Ibn al-Azraq's work, for which the following description seems tailor-made:—

"The accurate fixed style of Classical Arabic is largely replaced by careless language. Many authors of Middle Arabic texts seem not to bother to arrange their thoughts before writing. Instead, they directly write down the first idea that occurs to the, fitting it afterwards, as well as possible, into the frame of the sentence." ¹

Quite apart from the outright instances of colloquial words, Ibn al-Azraq's text is permeated with a conversational, almost gossipy flavour. Its phrasing is extremely loose and its ordering of material chaotic. One memory awakens another, which is immediately recorded, regardless of its inappropriate

Conclusions

The language briefly discussed in this chapter is by no means an isolated phenomenon. It should be set against the standards of written Arabic prevalent in the sixth and seventh centuries A.H. and assessed within the genre of Arabic historical chronicles. Like similar works of the period, Ibn al-Azraq's text is written in an Arabic which displays a number of non-classical features.

Although the language in this text falls short of the ideal of 'Arabiyya, it is the result of an attempt, at least, to conform to some of the standards of classical Arabic. Because of an inadequate grasp of grammar on the part of both the author and the scribes, elements of the vernacular language have crept in. The grammatical mistakes, especially those of morphology, and the non-classical spellings give some indication of the state of the literary language in the seventh/thirteenth century when the scribes copied the two manuscripts. Some of the syntactical features of the text, as well as its style, vocabulary and colloquial flavour, probably reflect the spoken Arabic of Diyar Bakr at the time of Ibn al-Azraq, a hundred years or so earlier. Generally, however, the restraining framework of classical Arabic just manages to hold this text in check and to prevent a flood of non-classical features from pouring in.

Ibn al-Azraq's language shares certain similarities with Middle Arabic texts written long before it in Christian and
Jewish milieux. It also resembles in some characteristics the language of Ibn Sasrā some two centuries later. The text of Ibn al-Azraq, like those studied by Graf and Brinner, reveals a partial disintegration of grammatical rules, especially those concerned with case endings and moods. In place of a highly inflected Arabic, there are signs of the emergence in the written language of the simplifying tendencies of the vernacular. The system of case-endings is simplified, the differentiation between the imperfect indicative and subjunctive is blurred and the rules for the concord of verb and subject in verbal sentences are ignored. These linguistic features, then, make the work of Ibn al-Azraq a fertile field for grammatical analysis, while at the same time providing glimpses of linguistic developments in the vernacular.
CHAPTER IV

THE CAREER OF NAJM AL-DIN IL-GHAZI
THE CAREER OF NAJM AL-DIN ĪL-GHĀZĪ

Introduction

Īl-Ghāzī has received scant treatment by Islamic and Western historians alike. Historians of Islam have concentrated inevitably and justifiably on the vital task of establishing a basic chronology from the tangled information provided by the medieval chroniclers.¹ Scholars of European history, on the other hand, have treated Īl-Ghāzī merely as an incidental figure in the wider sweep of Crusader history which spanned so much more than the career of this one Turkish amīr, active at a time of Muslim disunity and Crusader conquest.² Had Īl-Ghāzī lived half a century later, he might conceivably have been accorded more systematic scholarly study, such as the impressive corpus of work


that has appeared on Nūr al-Dīn\(^1\) and especially Saladin\(^2\).

It is perhaps premature to attempt to analyse the career of İl-Ghāzī in a way which deviates from the standard approach of outlining the various stages of his career in chronological sequence and providing documentary support for the information given. Yet many good studies of the chronological kind have already been made, notably the article by Claude Cahen\(^3\) in which from a wide array of sources he gives in broad outline the complex political history of the period covered by the Artuqid section of Ibn al-Azraq's Ṭārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Ṭāmid. This deals with the period from the establishment of İl-Ghāzī in Diyar Bakr to the reign of the third Artuqid ruler of Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn, Najm al-Dīn Alpī. More recently, the Turkish scholar, Ali Sevim,

---


3. C. Cahen, "Le Diyar Bakr au temps des premiers Urtukides", Journal Asiatique CCXXVII (1935), 227-40. These pages deal specifically with İl-Ghāzī's political career. Cf. also M.F. Köprülü's "critique" of the above article in Belleten, Cilt 1, sayı 1 (1937) 283-8. Köprülü raises few major objections to Cahen's article, contenting himself with criticisms of Cahen's renderings of Turkish names.
has written at some length about "the political deeds" of Artuq, İl-Ghazi's father, Sukman, his brother, and İl-Ghazi himself;¹ and Osman Turan devotes six pages to İl-Ghazi in his recent history of Eastern Turkey.² He adds nothing new, however. More summary and general still are the articles on the Artuqids, and more especially on İl-Ghazi, in the Encyclopedia of Islam³ and the Türk Ansiklopedesi.⁴ Although of varying standard, these provide a skeletal chronological framework for the career of İl-Ghazi. The various works listed in this paragraph may differ in points of detail but their basic concerns remain similar; to establish a chronology which includes the major political events of İl-Ghazi's life and not to analyse the implications of the various facts cited.

If a new primary source came to light, there would be justification for a fresh analysis of the detailed facts year by year. In the absence of such a bonus, there is a need, as Gibb indicated many years ago, for monographs on the important figures of the First Crusade, such as Togh-Tegin, Zangi and İl-Ghazi.⁵

---

In this chapter, therefore, the career and personality of Il-Ghazi will be considered under certain broad themes, in the hope that new light may be shed on this little-known but significant ruler.

The sources used are those concerned with the First Crusade, which are too well-known to be described yet again and which in any case are cited throughout the commentary on the Tarikh Mayyafarīqīn wa Āmid contained in this thesis. The work of Ibn al-Azraq will also be used as a source, but principally for Il-Ghazi's activities in Diyār Bakr and above all for the author's account of Il-Ghazi's campaign into Georgia in 515/1121-2.

Historians of the Crusades have discussed what they take to be the flamboyantly barbaric personality of Il-Ghazi and despite the somewhat lacunary information available have pronounced strong judgements upon him. Rohricht, as a creature of his times, condemns Il-Ghazi as a brute given over to drunkenness and excess, whilst the same opinion is expressed with greater restraint by Grousset, who labels him a coarse old trooper. Runciman has more level-headed criticisms of Il-Ghazi, but even he judges him to a great extent, though not entirely, from the viewpoint of Crusader history. Such an attitude is entirely justified in a

1. Cf. the bibliography in Runciman (op. cit., 480-5) and in the individual chapters on the First Crusade in Setton and Baldwin (op. cit., 135-76, 368-403, 410-48).
scholar who is writing about the Crusades but it presents a rather one-sided view of İl-Ghazi, leaving undiscussed many vital facets of his career. From the Muslim standpoint his dealings with the Franks were of secondary importance in comparison with his crucial role in the Jazîra.

It is indeed a commonplace of Islamic history that the advent of the Franks in the last decade of the eleventh century and their territorial expansion in Northern Syria thereafter exercised no dominant influence in the internecine political struggles of the Islamic heartland.¹ Furthermore, İl-Ghazi, throughout his career, was orientated eastwards towards the Jazîra and Baghdad, even to Western Iran - that is, to the territory of his overlord the sultan - and his ambitions and activities were inextricably linked with developments in the Saljuq empire. It is especially against the background of late Saljuq history, therefore, that İl-Ghazi's achievements should be evaluated.

In the discussion which follows, therefore, İl-Ghazi's career will be assessed primarily in the context of Saljuq decline. His role as a semi-nomadic chief will also be considered. His relations with the Franks cannot of course be ignored, but the Franks will be accorded subsidiary status as a small but significant political entity operative only in Northern Syria in

¹ Cf. especially the analysis of the Muslim attitude to the Franks in E. Sivan, L'Islam et la Croisade, Idéologie et Propagande dans les Réactions Musulmanes aux Croisades (Paris, 1968), 24-35.

² For the list of abbreviations used for the cited primary sources in this chapter, see infra, p.187.
the early twelfth century. They will not take over the foreground
of the discussion, as is standard practice in works on the Crusades.

The career of İl-Ghazi - first phase

The decline of the Saljuq empire did not manifest itself
markedly until the deaths in quick succession of Nizām al-Mulk and
Sultan Malik-Shāh in 485/1092-3, although the seeds of its decay
had been sown long before. During the early part of his career,
that is before 485/1092-3, İl-Ghazi's role was most probably
identical with that of many prominent leaders of the Turcoman
tribes who had helped to bring the Saljuqs to power in the Islamic
world. He fought in the service of the Saljuq sultans wherever
they might send him and was presumably rewarded. At this stage
there would have been little opportunity for him to gain independence
or to acquire territory on his own account. Sultan Malik-Shāh
and Nizām al-Mulk seem to have exercised a tight control and
commanded loyalty from their military commanders, who were ordered
to take cities and subjugate enemies but in the name of Malik-Shāh.²

---

1. For an analysis of Saljuq history after the death of Malik-Shāh,
cf. C.E. Bosworth, "The Political and Dynastic History of the
Iranian World", in The Cambridge History of Iran, ed.J.A. Boyle
(Cambridge, 1968), especially 102-18, and M.F. Sanaullah,
The Decline of the Saljuqid Empire (Calcutta, 1938).

2. For example, the campaign conducted by Ibn Jahīr against the
Marwānids in Diyar Bakr in 477/1084-5. The purpose of this
campaign was to quell the Marwānids and secure Diyar Bakr for
the Saljuqs (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 86-8, 93-4; Ibn al-Azraq, ed.
'Awād, 208-12; Ibn al-Athīr, Atāb., 5).
Before 485/1092-3 İl-Ghazi probably fought with his father, Artuq, on his various military campaigns to Diyar Bakr and Jerusalem, and while Artuq was alive, İl-Ghazi was under his controlling influence.

The career of İl-Ghazi - second phase

The death of Malik-Shāh in 485/1092-3 and that of Artuq shortly afterwards afforded İl-Ghazi the beginning of a freedom from constraint, both personal and governmental, which was further aided by the death of his elder brother Sukmān in 498/1104-5, whereupon İl-Ghazi became head of the Artuqid family. Between the death of Malik-Shāh and İl-Ghazi's acquisition of the fortress of Mārdīn some time around 502/1108-9, İl-Ghazi played an important part in the bitter and protracted conflict between the successors of Malik-Shāh. He also participated in the equally dangerous struggle for power amongst the Saljuq military commanders themselves, of whom he was one. All of them were eager to emancipate themselves from centralised control and acquire territory of their own. İl-Ghazi's brother, Sukmān, as well as Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī, Chūkermish and others all played the same game. They aligned themselves according to political expediency with one or other of

2. Tutush gave Jerusalem to Artuq as an iqṭā' in 478/1085-6 (Ibn al-Athīr, Atāb, 7); Ibn Khallikan, III, 171-2.
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 268; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 147; Matthew of Edessa, 256.
the Saljuq contenders. According to the caprice of fortune they could gain wealth and power if they had backed the winning side, but they found death or imprisonment if they lost. In the last decades of the eleventh century, then, İl-Ghāzī sought advancement in the same way as the other Turcoman chiefs in the Saljuq empire by attaching himself to a powerful scion of the Saljuq family. He was active in Northern Syria in the struggle between Duqaq and Ridwān and he held power briefly in Jerusalem.

Artuq, İl-Ghāzī's father, had been given Jerusalem as an iqtā’ by Tutush in 478/1085-6. When Artuq died, Sukmān and İl-Ghāzī succeeded him there. It is not altogether clear which of the two brothers was in charge or whether they ruled jointly. Whatever the arrangement in Jerusalem, it was short-lived, since the Fatimids, profiting from Saljuq weakness, attacked the city.

1. Before he died in 488/1095, Tutush asked his supporters to pledge their allegiance to his son Ridwān. Amongst the amīrs who were in Tutush's service was İl-Ghāzī whom Tutush had left to fight alongside his son Ridwān (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 167).

2. It would appear that at one stage İl-Ghāzī was governor in Jerusalem, and not Sukmān, since after Duqaq had detained İl-Ghāzī in Damascus, as a move in his struggle against his brother Ridwān, Sukmān went to take over from his brother's deputies in Jerusalem (Ibn al-‘Adīm, Bughyat, 139; idem, Zubda , 124). On the other hand, Ibn al-Athīr says that Jerusalem had been given to Sukmān by Tutush (X, 193).
in 489/1095-6 and took it from the Artuqid family.¹ At that point both Sukmān and ʿIl-Ǧāzī were there, with their cousin Sevinch and their nephew Yaqtī. The presence of this cluster of Artuqid princes may be interpreted as an attempt by the family to carve out an appanage for themselves in the Jerusalem area. After al-Afdāl had granted them safe conduct out of Jerusalem, the two brothers parted company, Sukmān staying in Edessa whilst ʿIl-Ǧāzī went to Iraq.²

The Jerusalem interlude is not of great significance in ʿIl-Ǧāzī's career but it is an interesting foretaste of the geographical distance he was time and again to cover in his search for profit.

Of paramount importance, however, to an understanding of ʿIl-Ǧāzī's motivation and later career is the move he made from Jerusalem to the service of the future Sultan Muhammad at a time when the latter was struggling for the supremacy in the western part of the Saljuq empire, namely Western Iran and Iraq. Sanjar,

1. It is hard to share the enthusiasm for Artuqid rule expressed by Ibn Khallikān in his biography of the Fātimid caliph, al-Mustaʿī. Describing the capture of Jerusalem by al-Afdal, he writes that al-Afdal "then appointed a governor to rule it in his name, but this person, being unable to resist the Franks, yielded the city up to them; had it been in the possession of the Ortuk family, it would have been better for the Muslim people" (tr. de Slane, I, 160).

Muhammad’s full brother, was already ruler of Khurāsān. The move to Iraq by Īl-Ghāzī was not necessarily an obvious one, for he could have thrown in his lot with Rīdwan who was operating just north of the Jerusalem area. Sukmān, it will be noted, decided to remain in Syria, and this decision may have influenced Īl-Ghāzī. It is also possible that representatives of the Artuqid family were still at Hulwān, his father’s old iqṭāʾ.¹

Īl-Ghāzī’s relationship with Sultan Muhammad overshadowed his whole career and henceforth he was never free of the spectre of Muhammad at his shoulder until the latter’s death at the end of 511/1118. The presence was not always a malevolent one. When Īl-Ghāzī went to Iraq, some time after 489/1095-6, he probably went to Hulwān, and thereafter gave military service to Muhammad. In 494/1100-1, Sultan Muhammad and Sanjar made their way to Baghdad and were joined at Hulwān by Īl-Ghāzī whom Ibn al-Athīr praises, saying that he served the sultan well.² No doubt as a reward for his services, Sultan Muhammad appointed him shīhna of Baghdad in the following year.³

The post of shīhna in Baghdad was powerful and prestigious. The shīhna was the main representative of the sultan in Baghdad, charged with maintenance of law and order and with the task of restraining any attempt by the caliph to interfere in the sultan’s

1. Ibn Khallikān, op. cit., III, 171.
sphere of influence. The evidence given by Ibn al-Athīr reveals that Īl-Ghāzī became attached to this office, although the people of Baghdad did not share this enthusiasm. The presence in and around Baghdad of Īl-Ghāzī’s Turcoman groups engendered civil unrest and riots. On one occasion, in Rajab 495/April-May 1102, Īl-Ghāzī, instead of using diplomacy and his power as their leader to subdue his men, set about looting the city in retaliation for the seizure of one of his followers. Only the efforts of the caliph, al-Mustazhir, prevented Īl-Ghāzī from extending the pillaging elsewhere in the city. There is no record that Muhammad exacted retribution for this gross misrule.

Perhaps the enjoyment he found in controlling Baghdad and his lack of any territory apart from Hulwān contributed to a disastrous political mistake which Īl-Ghāzī made in 497/1103-4 when he changed his allegiance from Muhammad to Berk-Yaruq. Under the terms of the uneasy peace-treaty made between Muhammad, Berk-Yaruq and Sanjar in that year, Berk-Yaruq was to be overlord of Baghdad. Instead of removing himself from that city to seek service elsewhere with Muhammad, who had been given the territories of Armenia, Āzarbāijān, the Jazīra, Mosul and Syria - territories which lay

1. For an analysis of the role of the shihna, see C.L. Klausner, The Seljuk Vezirate, A Study of Civil Administration, 1055-1194 (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), 20, 28 and 123.
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 231-2. The caliph sent the chief qādī and a professor from the Nizāmiyya madrasa to intercede (ibid.).
more within ʿIl-Ghāzlī's sphere of operations than south-western Iran and southern Iraq - ʿIl-Ghāzlī remained in Baghdad and inserted Berk-Yaruq's name in the khutba in Jumādā I 497/February 1104.¹

It is not hard to guess ʿIl-Ghāzlī's motivation in changing sides. He explained his reasons to Sadaqa who announced his intention of driving ʿIl-Ghāzlī out of Baghdad. He told Sadaqa that his only possession until he became shihna of Baghdad had been Hulwan, and that it was because of Baghdad that he had recognised Berk-Yaruq as his sultan. Sadaqa apparently understood these arguments and returned to Hilla.²

Nor was ʿIl-Ghāzlī's new-found loyalty likely to ingratiate him with Sultan Berk-Yaruq, who, if Ibn al-Athīr's chronology is to be trusted,³ had already sent his own shihna, Gūmush-Tegin, to Baghdad in Rabiʿ I 496/December 1102, in an attempt to oust ʿIl-Ghāzlī, his brother's candidate. ʿIl-Ghāzlī had allied himself with Sadaqa, the lord of Hilla, who had recently shifted his allegiance from Berk-Yaruq to Muhammad,⁴ with his brother Sukmān, whom he had summoned

---


2. Ibid.

3. Gibb has shown that Ibn al-Athīr frequently changes the dates given by Ibn al-Qalānīsī "and always does so wrongly" (op. cit., 747).

from Hisn Kaifa, and together they had succeeded in driving Gumush-Tegin out of Baghdad. It seems unlikely that their joint action was instigated by Sultan Muhammad although he was no doubt glad of the discomfiture of Gumush-Tegin.

But Il-Ghazi had now rendered himself unacceptable to Sultan Muhammad and was at best reluctantly allowed by Berk-Yaruq to continue as shihna. Il-Ghazi's visit to Isfahan in 498/1104-5 to see Berk-Yaruq may well have been motivated by a desire to persuade the sultan of his loyalty, as well as to press him to come to Baghdad to strengthen his precarious hold over the city. It was en route to Baghdad that Berk-Yaruq died.

Instead of attempting at this point to make amends to Muhammad by mentioning his name in the khutba at Baghdad, a move which might conceivably have reinstated Il-Ghazi in Muhammad's favour, Il-Ghazi proceeded with Berk-Yaruq's infant son, Malik-Shah, and his atabeg Ayaz, as far as Baghdad. There they proclaimed Malik-Shah sultan. This move was of course prompted by a desire to acquire more power for themselves since they could rule through the small boy. Il-Ghazi's attachment to his post in Baghdad had induced him to make another egregious error of judgement.

Soon after, Muhammad marched on Baghdad and assumed control of

1. Ibid., 244-6.
2. Ibid., 262; Bundarî, 90.
his brother Berk-Yaruq's territories, ¹ thereby putting an end to Īl-Ghāzī's ambitions in Iraq. Sultan Muhammad's coolness towards him was understandable; so too was the sultan's next move, which was to replace Īl-Ghāzī² at Baghdad in 498/1105 by Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī.³

With the establishment of Sultan Muhammad as sole Saljuq ruler in the west in that year, in view of Īl-Ghāzī's record of insubordination and unpredictability, a rift between the two was inevitable. In the years that followed, Sultan Muhammad's attitude was to harden from probable coolness to anger and hostility, whilst Īl-Ghāzī's personal animosity towards the sultan provided a bitter spur for many of his subsequent acts of insubordination.

By a strange coincidence, Īl-Ghāzī found himself deprived of position and prestige at the same time as his elder brother Sukmān,

---

2. There seems to be no record of a quarrel between Muhammad and Īl-Ghāzī although Süsheim justifiably infers that one did take place (EI¹ art. "Īl-Ghāzī"). The chronology of Īl-Ghāzī's departure from Baghdad and the death of his brother Sukmān is not clear. Perhaps he left Baghdad of his own accord, out of fear of possible reprisals from Muhammad and with the aim of taking over his brother's lands. Alternatively, Muhammad may have sent him away on his own arrival in Baghdad.
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 268; Ibn al-'Adīm, Bughyat, 204 (he gives no date).
who had possession of Hisn Kaifa and Mardin, died on his way to
answer an appeal from Togh-Tegin in Damascus. 1 I1-Ghāzī's decision
to go to Diyār Bakr and assume the leadership of those members of
his family who were already there was to pave the way for his
eventual acquisition of his own territory.

The career of I1-Ghāzī - third phase

After the struggle for power between Berk-Yaruq and Muhammad
had ended and the latter had become ruler of western Iran and Iraq,
the Saljuq empire gained a sovereign who recognised the need to
impose his control over the dissident factions within his
territories and to restore unity. 2 His removal of I1-Ghāzī from
the post of shihna of Baghdad indicated clearly his determination
to tolerate no amīr of doubtful loyalty in such a key post.

After his departure from Baghdad, I1-Ghāzī stayed in Diyār
Bakr, far from the new sultan's capital. His deliberate policy
appears to have been to ally himself with the enemies of the
sultan, whilst initially, at least, maintaining a semblance of
obedience. In 501/1107-8, the caliph attempted to mediate in a
quarrel between Sadaqa and the sultan. In his reply, Sadaqa
informed the caliph that Chavlı Saqao and I1-Ghāzī had agreed to
make common cause with him in any war that he might have with the

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 268; Ibn Khallikān, op. cit., III, 171-2;
Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 147.
2. Cf. Sanaullah, op. cit., 114. Whether Muhammad was stronger
than his brother, as the sources imply, is discussed later
in this chapter.
sultan or any other person. He had only to call and they would come with their troops. This is one explicit indication of İl-Ghazi's declared willingness to lend support to powerful enemies of the sultan.

Once secure in the fortress of Mardin, well-known to be virtually impregnable and situated far from Muhammad's centre of government - a fortress which he took in 502/1108-9 - İl-Ghazi gradually became bolder in his hostility to the sultan. Muhammad appointed Maudūd to the post of governor of Mosul, dismissing Chavlı Saqao in 501/1107-8. This position was of key importance in consolidating the sultan's authority over the Jazīra and carried with it great prestige. Opinions vary as to the extent to which the successive armies which were sent out from Mosul between 500/1106-7 and 509/1115-6 acted on the direct orders of the sultan. Some scholars have seen these campaigns as expressing the ambitions of successive governors of Mosul; others regard them as inspired at least in part by the sultan, who called on his amirs to participate in a joint enterprise against rebel amirs (İl-Ghazi and Togh-Tegin) and the Franks, in order to restore his direct control over Syria and Diyar Bakr. Whatever the exact motivation

---

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 308.
3. Gibb thinks that Grousset was wrong to regard every offensive against the Franks as a "counter-Crusade" ("Notes on the Arabic Materials for the History of the Early Crusades", BSOAS VII [1933-5], 741). Gibb regards as misleading the idea that the expeditions sent out under the governors of Mosul were the
of such campaigns, a series of armies were sent out from Mosul, under Maudūd, Aq-Sonqr al-Bursuqī and Bursuq b. Bursuq, within the space of five years. Their activities directly affected Il-Ghāzī, already incensed by the appointment of Maudūd as governor of Mosul. Two of these armies were sent via Mārdīn so that efforts could be made to bring Il-Ghāzī to heel. These efforts were invariably unsuccessful. In the event, the latter two armies also experienced humiliating reverses.

At first, Il-Ghāzī's own actions betrayed indecision. He may well still have cherished hopes of the sultan's favour, especially if after a period in disgrace he had shown his behaviour to be exemplary. This is a plausible explanation for his inconsistency with Chavli, the dispossessed ruler of Mosul, who wanted to enlist Il-Ghāzī's help in 502/1108-9. Il-Ghāzī was too weak at that time to resist Chavli's threats, especially when the latter actually came to Mārdīn, and so he unwillingly accompanied him. But he grasped the first possible opportunity to escape back to Mārdīn. ¹

¹ - - - - - - - - -

result of Saljuq intervention. The one exception to this was the expedition of Bursuq in 509/1115-6 which was directed against the Muslim princes, not the Franks (ibid., 742).

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 321. This retreat by Il-Ghāzī was not prompted by loyalty to Muḥammad, as Turan implies when he says that Il-Ghāzī, in spite of the fact that Muḥammad had dismissed him from the post of shīhna of Baghdad, would not help and returned to Mārdīn (op.cit., 146). Turan also confuses Chokermish (who died in 500/1106-7) and Chavli. Il-Ghāzī did not reveal himself to be loyal to Muḥammad either
A similar inconsistency marked İl-Ghāzī's conduct in 503/1109-10, when he went to Syria with his Turcoman groups in answer to the sultan's appeal to take part in a joint campaign with other amīrs under the leadership of Maudūd, lord of Mosul. Although he participated in the fighting, İl-Ghāzī quarrelled with Sukmān al-Qutbī during the campaign. Sukmān was a close territorial rival of his and his career, in contrast to İl-Ghāzī's, had advanced smoothly through his calculated loyalty to the sultan. After the quarrel, İl-Ghāzī withdrew to Mārdīn. There he shortly before or after this incident. His refusal to co-operate with Chavī was probably caused by an awareness of his own lack of strength at that point and perhaps by a feeling that he might still be restored to Muḥammad's favour eventually. He may also have had doubts about the particular suitability of Chavī as an ally.


According to Ibn al-Qalānisī, İl-Ghāzī and his Turcomans joined up with the troops of Maudūd and Sukmān al-Qutbī at Jazīra Banī Numair. During the campaign İl-Ghāzī and Sukmān quarrelled; İl-Ghāzī went off to Mārdīn whilst Sukmān seized Balak, İl-Ghāzī's nephew, and took him back to his own city (Akhlāṭ) in chains.

This campaign is not mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr.

2. Ibn al-Qalānisī, 170. Cahen's article on the Artuqids (E12) is misleading in its analysis of İl-Ghāzī's relationship with Sultan Muḥammad. Cahen dates the cooling of relations between them to the rupture in mid-campaign between İl-Ghāzī and Sukmān al-Qutbī. A more likely moment for the beginning of
remained, refusing to fight. When the campaign was renewed the following year (504/1110-11) a vast army assembled under the leadership of Maudūd. As Īl-Ghāzī did not dare at this early stage to refuse the sultan altogether nor to oppose his army, he did send troops, but under the leadership of his son Ayaz, not himself. He was the only amīr summoned to fight who did not appear in person. ¹

The murder of Maudūd in 507/1113-4² removed one powerful animosity between Muhammad and Īl-Ghāzī would be in 498/1104-5 when Muhammad dismissed Īl-Ghāzī from the office of shihna of Baghdad after he had shifted his allegiance to his brother Berk-Yaruq.

1. For an account of this campaign, see Ibn al-Qalānisī, who gives the date as 504/1110-1 (op.cit.,174-5) and Ibn al-Athīr, who has two versions (X, 340-1 and Atab.18). In the Kāmil he records the episode under the year 505/1111-2.

It was on this campaign that Sukmān al-Qutbī died. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Īl-Ghāzī made a surprise attack on his men who were taking his body back to Akhlāt (ibid.; see also Ibn al-Furat, f.54b.)

2. Ibn al-Qalānisī, 187; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 347-8; Michael the Syrian, 216; Matthew of Edessa, 285-6; al-ʿAzīmī, 382; Anon. Syr.Chron., 85. According to Fink, Maudūd of Mosul was motivated by religious idealism in his offensives against the Franks (H.S. Fink, "Mawdud of Mosul, Precursor of Saladin," The Muslim World, XLIII (1953), 18-27. Sivan refutes his claims saying that Fink does not give convincing
rival from îl-Ghāzī's path but in the event its consequences were to fan still further his resentment against Muhammad. îl-Ghāzī had already been ignored once by the sultan when the latter had appointed Maudūd as governor of Mosul. Now, in 508/1114-5, the sultan replaced Maudūd with Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī, the man who had taken over îl-Ghāzī's position as shihna in Baghdad. ¹ îl-Ghāzī's short-lived attempt at conformity with the sultan's wishes had proved fruitless, and he refused to answer the next call to arms from the sultan.

In 508/1114-5 Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī went to Mārdīn and forced the reluctant amīr to submit to the sultan's authority. The most îl-Ghāzī would concede was to hand over a body of troops under his son, Ayaz. Aq-Sonqur did not accept this insult lightly. He subsequently arrested Ayaz and plundered the countryside around Mārdīn. ² îl-Ghāzī enlisted help from his nephew, Dā'ūd of Hisn Kaifā, fought and defeated Aq-Sonqur and freed Ayaz. ³ By this defeat of Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī, îl-Ghāzī's transparently half-hearted support of the sultan had given way to open defiance.

At this juncture, îl-Ghāzī apparently began to fear the wrath of the sultan, even in the security of his fortress at Mārdīn, evidence that Maudūd attempted to give his campaigns a religious character (op. cit., 56, n.8).

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 350-1; Sibt b. al-Jauzī, 52.
especially after he received threatening letters from Muhammad. Seeking an ally with a similar outlook, he fled to Togh-Tegin in Damascus and joined forces with him. Togh-Tegin had just cause to believe that he had incurred the sultan's displeasure after Maudūd had been murdered in the previous year whilst in his company at Damascus. Although the blame for the assassination had been placed as usual on the Isma'īlis, some of the chroniclers suggest Togh-Tegin's own complicity in the deed.

The alliance formed by İl-Ghāzī and Togh-Tegin in 508/1114-5 was of long duration and mutually beneficial. Together they made a treaty that same year with Roger of Antioch and awaited the arrival of the combined forces of the sultan sent out under a new general, Bursuq. The twin objectives of this campaign were to quell the pride of İl-Ghāzī and to prosecute the jihad against the Franks. The order of priorities is significant here. After İl-Ghāzī, Togh-Tegin and Roger of Antioch had assembled their troops and Bursuq's army had arrived near Aleppo, no battle actually took place. After eight days, Bursuq retreated, fell

into an ambush set by Roger at a place called Dānīth, and was defeated. The battle took place in Rabī' II 509/September 1115.¹

This serious defeat of an army sent out under the auspices of the sultan appears to have aroused feelings of guilt and fear in Tugh-Tegin and perhaps in Il-Ghāzi too. Tugh-Tegin in Damascus was closer to Frankish territories and had more to lose from a complete break with the Saljuqs. He therefore broke off his alliance with Roger and made his peace with Sultan Muhammad.² It seems that Tugh-Tegin was not asked to break off relations with Il-Ghāzi as the price of peace; he may even have spoken up for Il-Ghāzi at Baghdad. Il-Ghāzi did not feel the same pressures as his ally, although he did not fight again on the same side as the Franks. He apparently saw no need to seek pardon from the sultan since he had no cause to fear any more reprisals.³ Nevertheless he did not provoke the sultan further by continued defiance. He waited until the sultan's death at the end of 511 and then sent his son, Temur-Tash, to Muhammad's successor.

3. Runciman mentions only Tugh-Tegin's reconciliation with Sultan Muhammad (op. cit., 133). Stevenson, on the other hand, states that "Ilgazi and Tugtakin both effected their reconciliation with the sultan" (op. cit., 100). There would appear to be no evidence of this rapprochement in the chronicles. Indeed, it would be more consistent if Il-Ghāzi made no move towards the sultan.
Mahmūd, with whom no doubt he hoped to have more friendly but indirect relations. ¹

For his part, after Dānīth Sultan Muhammad made no other serious attempts to quell the ambition of Il-Ghāzī not did he send out another large army into Syria. Il-Ghāzī's rebellious stance had prevented direct interference by the Saljuq sultan in his affairs, if somewhat belatedly (the sultan died in 511/1118 and Il-Ghāzī himself in 516/1122), and had permitted him to establish his own small but independent territory in the Jazīra. After Muhammad's death, and the succession problems that ensued, Il-Ghāzī wielded genuine power in his own right. From the viewpoint of the external enemies of Saljuq power in the Near East, especially the Franks, and the Georgians, who had begun harassing the northern borders of Muhammad's territories, ² the sultan's struggles to impose order within his empire by disciplining amīrs like Il-Ghāzī successfully diverted Muhammad's attention away from their own activities, wasted his valuable time and energy and prevented him from undertaking serious military action against them.

These reflections prompt a somewhat critical assessment of the role of Sultan Muhammad. Muḥammad has been praised by Muslim chroniclers who see him as a strong ruler who brought order and

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 418.
unity to a decaying state, torn apart by internal strife. Whilst fortune favoured him by the absence of any strong rival claimants to the throne, his efforts to establish his authority over his amirs, especially İl-Ghazi and Tugh-Tegin, were remarkably unsuccessful. Fear of reprisals by Muhammad may have dogged the steps of these two rebels but it did not generally deter them from continuing to pursue their own independent policies. Once Maudūd had been killed, and two successive armies from Mosul had been defeated, one by İl-Ghazi himself and one by the Franks at Dānīth, Sultan Muhammad's hold on affairs in Syria and Jazīra became seriously enfeebled. His death provided the opportunity for even more independent actions by the amirs of the Jazīra and Syria.  

Although his turbulent relationship with Muhammad looms large in İl-Ghazi's career from the fall of Jerusalem onwards, that career may also be viewed as a continual effort by İl-Ghazi to establish himself in the area of Diyār Bakr and to extend his sphere of influence in the surrounding area. The process by which

1. Bundārī, 134; al-Ḥusainī, 82; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayat al-ʿĀ<yān>, (Cairo, 1310) II, 47. The latter two writers praise Muhammad's efforts against the Ismāʿīlīs.

2. It is difficult to agree with Turan's view that "Sultan Maḥmūd inherited a strong state from his father, Sultan Muhammad" (O. Turan, Selçuklular Tarihi ve Turk Islam Medeniyeti, 182). A closer analysis of the period would indicate that at least in the west Sultan Muhammad's authority had been seriously undermined by İl-Ghazi and
he acquired territory must have been arduous and complex. The difficulty of holding onto any city or citadel in a land where the central government barely controlled the contending local warlords was a perennial one in the medieval period. But at this time it was exacerbated by the presence in Diyar Bakr of the nomadic or semi-nomadic Turcoman groups from whose ranks Īl-Ghāzī had come. The two major exigencies of nomadic existence had to be satisfied: one was grazing lands for their flocks, the other was booty. The inherent mobility of nomadic life, and the raids necessary to make a livelihood, explain on the one hand the vast geographical area, extending from Jerusalem to Tiflis, from Aleppo to Isfahān, which was covered by Īl-Ghāzī and his Turcomans, and on the other highlight some of the difficulties they must have experienced in becoming entrenched in one specific geographical area.

The area which Īl-Ghāzī had selected for his territory was Diyar Bakr. He had probably visited it with his father, Artuq, who took part in Ibn Jahīr's campaign to seize Mayyāfāriqīn in the name of Malik-Shāh, stamp out the Marwānids and take their treasures. 1 The territory of Diyar Bakr was eminently suitable for Īl-Ghāzī's purposes. His brother had possession of Hisn Kaifā and Mārdīn and other members of the Artuqid family were Togh-Tegin. At best, he left a state strong in the central area of his empire only. For a balanced assessment of Sultan Muhammad, cf. C.E. Bosworth, "The Iranian World", 113-4.

1. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awād, 208.
there too. 1 Diyār Bakr had good grazing lands as well as a chain of citadels which had existed since early Islamic times to man the frontier against Byzantium. 2 Moreover the area was conveniently far from the heartland of Saljuq power and this made it fairly safe from interference on the part of the central government.

The interplay between the settled areas - the cities of Mārdēn, Mayyāfārīqīn and other smaller Artuqīd possessions - and ʿIl-Ghāzī's Turcomans must have been violent and disruptive, although the custom of the times demanded that a city should be protected by its citadel, held by some armed force. The sources abound with examples of cities such as Tiflīs, 3 Aleppo 4 and Mayyāfārīqīn desperately seeking military protection from various Turcoman and other leaders, since to be defenceless was even more of a disaster than to be ruled despotically. 5

---

2. These are listed by Ibn Shaddād (Marsh 333, ff.65a-b).
3. According to Ibn al-Azraq, the people of Tiflīs had already sought the protection of the Saljuq malik, Toghrūl, in Arrān, but in 515/1121-2, as his help had proved inadequate, they asked ʿIl-Ghāzī to come (Ms.A, f.161a).
4. Aleppo had a succession of rulers after the death of Rīdwān in 507/1113-4. The initiative for their taking command frequently came from influential citizens, especially Ibn al-Khashshāb.
5. This attitude was shown by the people of Aleppo who finally asked ʿIl-Ghāzī to take over control of their city in 511/1117-8. He was clearly their last resort (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 185).
Ibn al-Azraq is an unreliable source for any assessment of the effect of İl-Ghazi and his Turcomans on the cities he owned. His testimony is blatantly pro-Artuqid, since he worked for İl-Ghazi's son, Temür-Tash, who incidentally receives far more eulogies than his father. The changes which Ibn al-Azraq claims that İl-Ghazi made are therefore intrinsically suspect but they are nonetheless revealing. İl-Ghazi is said to have abolished billeting in the houses of Mayyafāriqīn, most of which was in ruins, and to have made the countryside safe from robbers who plundered the caravans in the immediate area of the town.¹

There is, however, no reason to assume that in the years 502-516/1108-1122, when İl-Ghazi's centre of operations was Diyar Bakr, there was any improvement in the uneasy relationship between his Turcoman troops and the local inhabitants. The detailed description given by Ibn al-Athīr of one turbulent incident at Baghdad during İl-Ghazi's time as shihna² is probably a more accurate picture of the impact of the Turcomans on Mardīn, Mayyafāriqīn and Aleppo than that implied by Ibn al-Azraq's bland eulogies. The real beginnings of a fruitful relationship

2. In Rajab 495/April-May 1102, whilst İl-Ghazi was away from Baghdad, some of his men wanted to cross the Tigris. A sailor who took a long time to answer their request for a boat was promptly killed. The murderer, who was seized by the populace, was then rescued by İl-Ghazi's son, whilst the townspeople threw stones at the Turcomans. Although the ḥājib al-bāb seized those people who were involved in the incident, İl-Ghazi was not satisfied. He went over to
between the Turcomans and the people of the cities ruled by the Artuqid family must have been made in the reign of Temur-Tash, who held on to Mayyafārīqīn and Mārdīn for thirty years. Genuine sedentarisation of course took very much longer than a single generation.¹

After acquiring Mārdīn around 502/1108-9, Īl-Ghāzī must have wielded power unofficially in Mayyafārīqīn too² and his grip on the sailors’ quarter and pillaged it.

The story did not end there. Some of Īl-Ghāzī’s men were killed; still more were drowned crossing the river. Only the efforts of the caliph, who sent the chief ǧādī, with a professor from the Niẓāmiyya madrasa, prevented Īl-Ghāzī from taking more retaliatory measures on the western side of Baghdad (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 231-2.)


2. The fate of Mayyafārīqīn need not necessarily, of course, have been linked to that of Mārdīn. Mayyafārīqīn had been the centre of Marwānid power, whereas under Qīlīch Arslan b. Sulaimān b. Qutlumush the town had been ruled from Malatya. It was subsequently taken over by Sukmān al-Qutbī, who ruled it from Akhlāt. It was therefore no novelty for the fortunes of Mayyafārīqīn to be linked with those of a neighbouring city ruled by a dominant power.
the city must have tightened after the death of its overlord, Sukmān al-Qutbī, in 504/1110-1. The official date given by Ibn al-Azraq for his acquisition of the city is 512/1118-9.¹ The vulnerability of the hinterland of this city after Sukmān al-Qutbī’s death was soon revealed, as "despotic hands reached out" to snatch whatever territory they could.² Prominent amongst the claimants for this temporarily ungoverned territory was Īl-Ghāzī himself, who by that time had probably established himself as the overlord of the other amīrs in that area. These included Toghan Arslan of Arzan and Bitlīs, who answered his call to arms on the Tiflis campaign,³ and Amīr Ibrāhīm, the lord of Āmid.⁴ The more recent rulers of Mayyāfāriqīn had been local amīrs and it must have seemed natural for the pattern to continue. Thus in 498/1104-5 Qīlīch Arslan of Malatya had entered Mayyāfāriqīn and received oaths of allegiance from the local amīrs already

¹. Ibn al-Azraq is very specific on the date of Īl-Ghāzī’s acquisition of Mayyāfāriqīn: 14 Jumādā II, 512 (Ms.A, f.161a). According to Ibn al-Athīr, however, Īl-Ghāzī received Mayyāfāriqīn in 515/1121-22 (X, 418). This may well have been only the formalisation of his de facto rule over the city.


⁴. Ibn al-Azraq lists the local princelings of Diyar Bakr (ed. ‘Awad, 272). They include Qūzīl Arslan of Is‘īrd, Shāhrūkh of Hānī and Ibrāhīm of Āmid.
established in the area.\(^1\) After Qilîçh Arslan had drowned in the Khâbûr in 500/1105-6 Sukmân al-Quţbî had assumed overall control of Diyar Bakr from his centre at Akhlût.\(^2\) With his death the most likely choice was Īl-Ghâzî.

Īl-Ghâzî's centre of power was clearly Mârdîn. The sources refer to him constantly as lord of Mârdîn and it was a key city for him to hold in view of his predominant political interests in Diyar Bakr and the Jazîra. The area of Diyar Bakr seems to have held considerable appeal to Artuq and his sons and Mârdîn, in particular, became the principal base for Īl-Ghâzî, the place to which he always returned, no matter how far afield he campaigned. Sukmân, the brother of Īl-Ghâzî, had already in 490/1096-7 specified the future Artuqid connection with the area. Declaring his intention to march first on Diyar Bakr and take it from the rebels who had seized it, he announced: - "Once strengthened in that country, I will leave my family there".\(^3\) Mârdîn was the key to the continuance of Artuqid power after his death. If he had chosen Aleppo instead, his family name would probably have sunk without trace.

Īl-Ghâzî at Aleppo

Īl-Ghâzî showed an unfortunate lack of judgement in his two major attempts to secure territory outside Diyar Bakr. His first

---

1. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 272.
2. Ibid., 275.
blunder was his involvement in the affairs of the city of Aleppo. After the Crusaders had gained possession of Tripoli in 502/1108-9, a rough equilibrium had been established in Northern Syria. This uneasy balance was liable to be disturbed at any moment if Aleppo acquired a new ruler, Muslim or Frank. This city therefore became the focal point for the ultimate hegemony in Northern Syria. At first, ʿIl-Ghāzī was only one of many chiefs interested in possessing Aleppo but by a series of complicated events, described in detail in Ibn al-ʿAdīm, he became master of the city in 511/1117-8. According to Ibn al-ʿAdīm, the townspeople sent for his help only very reluctantly, as a desperate measure.

Aleppo was a vital strategic point but, as indicated above, it was dangerous to own, especially as the Franks, now masters of Antioch and Edessa, became increasingly aggressive; and its economy was in a lamentable state. Although the other cities owned by ʿIl-Ghāzī—Mārdīn and Mayyafārīqīn—had been subjected to constant changes of government and their surrounding countryside had been ravaged, the plight of Aleppo seems to have been especially pitiful. It had fallen prey to the depredations of the Turcomans some thirty or forty years earlier and had been continually harassed thereafter. According to Ibn al-ʿAdīm,

2. "The inhabitants, despairing of finding support from any Muslim prince, decided to send deputations ... to ʿIl-Ghāzī" (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, ibid., 185).
I1-Ghāzī was not the Aleppans' first choice of protector though they desperately needed someone to guarantee the security of the city. Nor was his first attempt at gaining possession of the city successful. He departed, leaving his son Temūr-Tash behind, according to some sources as a hostage. On his second entry into Aleppo, however, I1-Ghāzī gained access to the citadel and managed to make himself acceptable as the new ruler of the city.

Reference has already been made to the numerous vicissitudes experienced by the once prosperous city of Aleppo in the previous two decades. A succession of rulers - Tutush, Ridwān, Alp Arslan al-Akhras, Sultan-Shāh (the two latter controlled by the eunuch Lu'lu') had taken the city ever further from centralised control by the Saljuq government and by gross misrule had brought it to a lamentable state. Thus the Aleppo which greeted I1-Ghāzī and his Turcomans was not destined to exert a permanent appeal to

1. Nor was he the only ruler interested in acquiring Aleppo (Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 180).
2. In 511/117-8, I1-Ghāzī was invited to come from Mārādīn and rid the city of Aq-Sonqur. On this first occasion, I1-Ghāzī was not able to gain access to the big citadel and had to make do with the gal'at al-sharīf (ibid., 179-80).
4. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 185. Sivan says that the personal intervention of Ibn al-Khashshāb was needed before power in Aleppo could be transferred to I1-Ghāzī (op. cit., 41, citing Ibn Abī Tayyī in Ibn al-Furat, I, ff.121b - 122b).
them. Above all, İl-Ghazi found the treasury empty.¹ There was nothing with which to satisfy his Turcoman supporters who had come with him from Mārdīn. He stayed long enough to put the affairs of the city in order, placed his son Temür-Tash in charge as his deputy there and hastened back to Mārdīn.²

In the period between his taking of Aleppo and his death in 516/1122, İl-Ghazi seems to have visited the city regularly but never to have held it in particular esteem.³ His choice of Mārdīn rather than Aleppo as the centre of his power was astute. It would have been understandable had he opted for Aleppo, since it was a large and prestigious city, far more significant than Mārdīn on all counts. But it was much nearer the Franks' sphere of operations, and the Ismā'īlīs were very strong there. These factors would quickly have made his tenure of the city precarious and would have required a greater commitment on his part. As a result his descendants would probably not have entrenched themselves so firmly in their chosen area.

---

1. According to Ibn al-Athīr, the treasury in Aleppo was empty because the eunuchs had shared out its contents amongst themselves (op. cit., X, 372).

2. According to Ibn al-'Adīm, the revenues of Aleppo were not adequate for the needs of İl-Ghazi and his Turcomans. He became estranged from the people of Aleppo and left for Mārdīn (Zubda, 180).

3. İl-Ghazi's attitude to Aleppo is summed up by Ibn al-'Adīm who says that the city was too weakened to be a suitable place in which İl-Ghazi might live (ibid., 193).
 İl-Ghāzī, after the revolt of his son Sulaimān, whom he had left as his deputy in Aleppo during the Tiflis campaign, seems to have made in 515/1121-2 a final bid for strong rule in Aleppo. He allied himself with Ridwān’s family by marrying his daughter and removed his own son from the role of deputy there, appointing his nephew Sulaimān b. ‘Abd al-Jabār in his stead. He tried to give himself and the city a respite by concluding a truce with the Franks for a whole year. But it was too late for the Artuqids to keep a firm foothold in Aleppo. Temūr-Tash, who was to succeed his father at Aleppo, lacked the grandiose territorial ambitions of his father and was indifferent to the fate of the city after İl-Ghāzī’s death. This indifference culminated in his probably deliberate move of letting the city slip from his hands. This was in fact a logical extension of the policy of İl-Ghāzī, who considered the city unsuitable to serve as his base. The account which relates how on the way to Tiflis İl-Ghāzī offered Aleppo to Dubais, his son-in-law, on condition that he helped him on their return in a plan which İl-Ghāzī had to take Antioch, is an indication of the little value which İl-Ghāzī placed on his possession of the city.1

Becoming involved in the affairs of Aleppo was exhausting and unprofitable. Answering the appeals for help from the people of Tiflis,2 however, was an egregious error. Sultan Toghrīl,

1. The report that Dubais joined in an attack on Aleppo after İl-Ghāzī’s death reveals his continuing interest in the city (Ibn al-‘Adīm, Bughyat, 205).
2. Such is the version of Ibn al-Azraq (Ms.A, f.161a). Ibn
who ruled in Arrān, and who was therefore the nearest person to whom the people of Tiflis might turn in trouble, had been unsuccessful in curbing the incursions of King David the Restorer into the area. ʾIl-Ghāzī, whose reputation was at its height at the time of the request for assistance from Tiflis, must have been flattered by this appeal. Besides, Georgia was a frontier area, well suited for someone who wanted - as ʾIl-Ghāzī had consistently done - to rule independently of the central power. He had the requisite military strength, but an analysis of the exhausting schedule of activities which preceded his departure for Georgia reveals that he was foolhardy to undertake such a long journey into unfamiliar terrain. He had campaigned early in his career into parts of Armenia but it is very unlikely that he had penetrated Georgia itself. The resounding defeat which David and his son Dimitri inflicted on ʾIl-Ghāzī and his army (the battle is analysed in detail below) was a bitter humiliation from which

al-Qalānisī, on the other hand, relates that ʾIl-Ghāzī embarked on the campaign to Tiflis in answer to a call from Sultan Toghril (op.cit., 204-5). Cf. also Matthew of Edessa, 304.

1. Toghril was the brother of Sultan Mahmūd. He had first ruled in the area of Zanjān (Bundārī, 134; al-Husainī, 90). In 514/1120-1 he rebelled against Mahmūd and took Ganja (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 383-5).

2. Minorsky, citing Vardan, states: "In 1092 famine visited Armenia, and then the country was invaded by Al-Khazi (ʾEl-Ghāzī b. Artuq). The latter, with 7,000 men, reached Ani but the Pahlavīd Grigor slew his giant brother and the aggressors were beaten off" (Studies in Caucasian History [London, 1953], 82).
 İl-Ghāzī's pride did not recover. Most of his men were killed or taken prisoner and he escaped with Dubais and a small band of followers to Mārdīn.¹

Ibn al-Azraq's account of the Tiflīs campaign is the most detailed one by a Muslim author. Ibn al-Qalānīsī attempts to soften this defeat by the assertion that the Muslim troops were victorious initially but were then routed by the Georgians.² Other writers have based their accounts on Ibn al-Azraq.³ In fact, the description of the battle between David and İl-Ghāzī is one of the few sections of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa-Āmid where greater credence may be placed on Ibn al-Azraq than on other more reliable historians of the time.

It was typical of İl-Ghāzī's unco-ordinated, almost frenetic, military activity in the last years of his life that he should have allowed himself to be tempted to undertake the journey to Tiflīs. Instead of acquiring the abundant booty and other material gain which no doubt to a great extent motivated the campaign, İl-Ghāzī sustained considerable losses of men and possessions. Whether İl-Ghāzī seriously contemplated a government of his own in Tiflīs is difficult to say. The Tiflīs episode may well have been regarded as a mere military operation, with the lure of booty for his men and the chance of another glorious victory for İl-Ghāzī, whose swollen pride is mentioned by the

hostile Christian sources. This same sentiment may well have inspired İl-Ghazi briefly with a vision of his rule over a principality extending from Aleppo to Tiflis. If so, the dream was soon shattered.

İl-Ghazi's military ability

(a) His relationship with the Turcomans

İl-Ghazi depended for his military strength on his bands of Turcomans who, according to the sources, were based in the area around Mardin. İl-Ghazi would embark on a campaign in the spring and would return with his Turcomans in the autumn to Mardin.

The Turcomans were known to be fierce fighters and presented a spectacle which excited and fascinated the onlooker. Ibn al-Athir describes them thus:-

"Each of them would come with a bag containing flour and mutton". Ibn al-Qalanisi likens them to birds and beasts of prey:-

"He (Tagh-Tegin) found the Turkmens already assembled thither from every quarter and every direction in vast numbers and manifest strength, as lions seeking

Their prey and gerfalcons hovering over their victims.\(^*\)\(^1\)

While they were renowned for their undoubted fighting powers, the Turcomans were also known to be unruly and wayward. They were motivated only by lust for plunder.\(^2\) Any leader who depended on Turcoman troops therefore had to have the funds to pay them promptly; at the very least he had to be assured of ample booty in the campaign undertaken.

Il-Ghāzī's relationship with his Turcomans moulded his career, to his advantage and detriment alike. The chronicles agree that he possessed an unusual power over them and that he inspired loyalty and devotion from them. Michael the Syrian says that the Turcomans "were very docile to Il-Ghāzī".\(^3\) Already in 499/1105-6 when Il-Ghāzī was shihna of Baghdad, Ibn al-Athīr describes him as strengthened by the large number of Turcomans who had joined his service.\(^4\) In Ramadān of that year Il-Ghāzī, accompanied by 10,000 horsemen, went with Malik Rīdwan of Aleppo on his campaign to take Nāṣībin. Through the machinations of Chōkermish, Rīdwan turned against Il-Ghāzī and placed him in chains. When the news of the capture of Il-Ghāzī reached his Turcomans they were so enraged at the treatment meted out to their leader that they attacked Rīdwan's men, plundering and

---

1. Ibn al-Qalānīsī, tr. Gibb, 159.
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 400.
pillaging livestock and other possessions.  

The behaviour of the Turcoman troops after a victory in battle could be disciplined and restrained under İl-Ghāzi's command. There was not always a wild rush for booty. After the victory over Roger of Antioch at Balat, for example, the Turcoman chiefs came bearing their spoils to İl-Ghāzi, who had taken over Roger's tent. He allowed the chiefs to retain what booty they had taken, reserving for himself only a few items, to present as gifts to other rulers.  

If such calculated generosity was typical of his dealings with his Turcomans, their loyalty to him would not be surprising.

On the other hand, İl-Ghāzi's operations were also seriously curtailed by his use of Turcoman troops. Since the Turcomans could be persuaded to participate in a campaign only if there was the prospect of booty, İl-Ghāzi was unable to consolidate his gains in a given area. Once a battle was finished, the Turcomans were unwilling to linger. They wished to return to Mardin straight after the battle with their spoils. According to Ibn al-Athîr, İl-Ghāzi never embarked on long campaigns against the Franks. Every hour mattered, since the Turcomans were anxious to return as quickly as possible. In fact, if the campaign became prolonged, they would disperse as he had no money to give them.

---

1. Ibn al-Athîr, X, 280.
2. Ibn al-ʿAdîm, Zubda, 190.
It is clear from such comments, and from the evidence implicit in the sources, that even on campaign the aims of İl-Ghażî and his Turcomans were not always very compatible. But in times of peace the Turcomans were apt to be a much greater obstacle. They would never be able to share in the ambition of İl-Ghażî (or any other like-minded amîr) to establish a permanent principality somewhere. Settling in a given area would mean that the interests of its inhabitants would, economically speaking, coincide broadly with those of their ruler. They could not be plundered like the enemy. In time the Turcomans would therefore have to travel increasingly further afield in search of booty, for after a comparatively short period they would systematically have laid waste the border areas. Alternatively, they would have had to settle on the land, a process which might take generations to be accomplished.

The Turcoman response to the empty treasury at Aleppo exercised a great influence on İl-Ghażî's attitude to that city and made him leave for Mârdîn, earlier perhaps than he had intended. Furthermore, the blame for İl-Ghażî's failure to take Antioch after his victory at Balât may be attributed at least in part to the Turcomans. They refused to stay on after the battle and thus rendered İl-Ghażî incapable of moving on to Antioch, which as Ibn al-Qalânîsî stresses lay defenceless after the death of Roger at Balât. Their short-term tactics thus foiled any possible long-term strategy which İl-Ghażî may have

1. Ibn al-ʿAdîm, Zubda, 180.
2. Ibn al-Qalânîsî, 201. This point is also made by Ibn al-ʿAdîm (Zubda, 191).
planned.

Despite İl-Ghāzī's much-vaunted power over his Turcoman bands and their crucial role in his one major victory at Balāt, there are signs that a rift was developing between him and them. As early as the period before Balāt, when Togh-Tegin and İl-Ghāzī were planning joint operations against the Franks, they discussed the unreliability of the Turcomans and they both went personally to Mārdīn to attempt to persuade the Turcomans to take part in the forthcoming campaign:-

"It was agreed between them that the amīr Najm al-Dīn İl-Ghāzī b. Ortuq, for the better executing of his undertaking, should proceed to Mārdīn in order to assemble the Turkmens from his provinces, and urge them to destroy the factions of infidelity and error. It was considered desirable that the amīr Zahīr al-Dīn [Togh-Tegin] should go with him to reinforce their purpose and facilitate the realization of their hopes."

A widening gulf between the Saljuqs of Iran and the Turcomans had long been perceptible and had led to friction and misunderstanding. Such a gulf was inevitable as the Saljuqs assumed the trappings of Islamic rulers in the Persian style, thus divorcing themselves from the Turcomans on whose military support they had depended and to whose ranks they had initially belonged. The same development may well have occurred gradually with İl-

Ghazi and his Turcomans, as their interests diverged and İl-Ghazi developed a taste for wider political power.

Such a development is impossible to prove. But certain evidence which dates from İl-Ghazi's involvement in Aleppan affairs deserves discussion at greater length in this context. As has already been mentioned, the Turcomans found Aleppo wanting in funds and urged İl-Ghazi to return home to the area around Mardin. Aleppo was not an attractive territory to the Turcomans. It had been much more the arena of war than Diyar Bakr and was still the focus for great military activity. İl-Ghazi, on the other hand, returned to Aleppo the following year and, as Ibn al-Qalanisi states, spent some time with Togh-Tegin persuading the Turcomans to come with them. ¹ İl-Ghazi's political aspirations in Aleppo, where he had been invited to come after many factions had been struggling for supremacy there, were clearly in conflict with the Turcomans' desire to remain in Diyar Bakr.

It is at this point that, according to Sivan's interpretation, İl-Ghazi made the first conscious use of jihad propaganda to impose his authority over his Turcoman forces. The particular occasion - before Balat in 513/1119-20² - made such an appeal well-timed. İl-Ghazi is accorded an important role in Sivan's analysis of the gradual reawakening of the concept of jihad amongst the Muslims in the early twelfth century.³ After

1. Ibn al-Qalanisi, 200.
2. Sivan, op. cit., 41.
3. Ibid., 32-43.
explaining the factors which contributed to the absence of an awareness of *jihād* amongst the Muslims of Northern Syria at the time of Frankish expansion and consolidation in the area in the period 491-512/1097-1118, Sivan analyses the beginnings of a change of attitude in the face of increasing aggression on the part of the Franks who were threatening to take Aleppo around 1118.

Sivan asserts that in 1118, when ʿIl-Ghāzī came back to Aleppo for the second time after the city had been under siege from the Franks, and when he finally assumed control there, he seems to have been in no way imbued with the zeal of a "warrior of the faith". He had been an ally of the Franks in the past and had been enticed into Aleppo only after the promise of considerable financial rewards. The following year, with increasing pressure on Aleppo from Roger of Antioch, however, ʿIl-Ghāzī found himself in a city in a ferment with the idea of *jihād*. He now realised full well the use he could make of this "galvanising" idea to boost the morale of his troops in this dangerous enterprise. The appearance of the ṣādiq Ibn Khashšāb before the assembled Turcoman troops is seen by Sivan as the first instance of the use of an official *jihād* propaganda in the Muslims' fight against the Crusaders. ʿIl-Ghāzī made his amirs swear an oath "to do their duty courageously, to fight heroically, and not to retreat, even if they had to shed all their blood for the holy war".

After encountering initial indifference and even contempt, Ibn al-Khashshāb brought "tears of ecstasy" to the eyes of the Turcomans, who then went into battle and won a glorious victory over the Franks.

Sivan's evidence is certainly persuasive. It may well be that ʾIl-Ghāzī had perceived the benefits of ḥijād propaganda and used it to strengthen his flagging hold over his troops.

The events of the following year are also significant. In that year, 514/1120-1, ʾIl-Ghāzī crossed the Euphrates with his men on a new campaign, having made the unusual prohibition that they were not to pillage during the campaign. When some of his men disobeyed, he punished them by shaving and hamstringing them. At this point, his troops disbanded and deserted him, leaving him with only a small handful of men. It was very fortunate for him that Tugh-Tegin came in time to save him from Frankish attacks. The sequel showed, then, that ʾIl-Ghāzī was ill-advised to decree that his soldiers were not to pillage during the campaign. His motives for taking this unusual step are not clear. Perhaps he thought it would be wasteful to pillage territory that would soon be his. Or perhaps he was

---

1. One Turcoman soldier is reported to have cried out, "Was it to obey this man with a turban that we left our country?" (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 189).
2. This whole issue is discussed at greater length in this chapter on pages 173-5.
determined that his men would concentrate their energies only on fighting. Presumably he was confident that he could control them with the promise of battle plunder, in place of the casual pillaging of fields and livestock which was their normal practice. But what most probably motivated his rash decree was a misplaced confidence in his own abilities as a general, a confidence greatly strengthened by his recent victory at Balat.

During the years 513/1119-20 and 514/1120-1, therefore, Il-Ghazi's control over the Turcomans seems to have been slackening. His troops were subsequently decimated in the Tiflis campaign and it may well be that if the casualty figures were as high as the chroniclers suggest, Il-Ghazi's forces were irretrievably depleted. He engaged in no major offensive after Tiflis in 513/1121-22, nor is there evidence that he was planning one, and he died a year later.

Il-Ghazi - a military strategist?

It would be false to attribute to Il-Ghazi a consistent, well-planned military strategy, even in the period of his success from 502-516/1108-1122. He took as allies known enemies of the

1. Ibn al-Azraq says that Il-Ghazi escaped with only twenty horsemen (Ms.B, f.103b).
Saljuq sultan Muhammad, such as Dubais. He also allied himself with rulers who were near at hand, such as Tugh-Tegin and Roger of Antioch. But he played the same game of making and breaking alliances as the other local chieftains in the struggle for power in Northern Syria. Il-Ghazi's military abilities may be highlighted by a detailed analysis of his two major battles, Balat in 513/1119 and Tiflis in 515/1121. These are well-documented. They also represent victory and defeat and thus present a certain balance.

In 513/1119 Aleppo stood in great danger of being taken by the Franks after Roger of Antioch had harassed the area around the city and captured Buza'a. The people of Aleppo summoned Il-Ghazi who came from Mardin in Safar 513/June 1119.1 Roger of Antioch, ceding to pressure from the lords of Frankish castles in the area around Aleppo - their territories were being ravaged by Il-Ghazi - decided to fight alone. He positioned himself in a valley at Balat. Despite a marked numerical superiority2 Il-Ghazi seems to have been unsure whether to attack or not, since he was awaiting the arrival of Tugh-Tegin with re-inforcements. Once again the pressing demands of his Turcoman troops forced his hand and he attacked. His victory was inevitable, for Roger had placed himself in an extremely vulnerable position and did not expect Il-Ghazi to attack. The Turcomans rushed into the valley from three sides at the same time and the Franks

1. Ibn al-'Adim, Zubda, 187.
2. The sources vary widely as to the quantities of troops on both sides but it would appear that Il-Ghazi's men greatly outnumbered Roger's.
were powerless to resist. Roger was killed and the flower of the Norman cavalry was cut down. Ibn al-Qalānisi writes that the Turcomans swooped down like a flight of falcons wanting to protect their nests and even the anonymous Christian writer of the Syriac chronicle is moved to an unusual descriptive detail, saying that the Turcomans showered arrows on the camp like clouds of hail.

It was a victory calculated to delight the Turcomans. It had not taken long and afforded booty and prisoners. Yet ʿIl-Ghāzī had been lucky that Roger had made a fatal blunder in sallying forth too soon and in positioning himself so unwisely. ʿIl-Ghāzī was fortunate too that he had allowed himself, against his better judgement, to be swept along by the demands of his troops for an early engagement with the enemy. Moreover, he had enjoyed a considerable advantage in numbers. Lastly, the battle had suited Turcoman military tactics and had not required the talents of a gifted general.

It did require strategic ability, however, to plan the next move in the territorial game and ʿIl-Ghāzī lacked the military acumen to make it. The accession of Roger of Antioch had united the Franks in Northern Syria. With his death, the Franks were in disarray and Antioch lay defenceless. It is clear that the people of Antioch were afraid that ʿIl-Ghāzī was coming to attack.


They made what preparations they could but İl-Ghazi did not follow up the great opportunity that presented itself.

Instead his troops, following the time-honoured practices of nomadic life, dispersed with their booty and according to western sources perpetrated a full-scale massacre of Frankish prisoners. The Turcomans would not contemplate further battles and thus Antioch slipped from İl-Ghazi's hands. But it is not even entirely clear that İl-Ghazi himself had intended to exploit this rare opportunity. The sources say that he was unable to fight for three weeks after the battle. According to some writers, including Usāma, the illness was caused by excessive bouts of drinking in celebration of his victory. Such a report would accord ill with the image of a great strategist but it tallies with earlier accounts of Muslim historians stressing the drunken habits of İl-Ghazi. At all events, by the time he fought the Franks again, in August, the outcome was indecisive; Baldwin had had time to restore the morale of the Franks and forestall any immediate threat to Antioch.

İl-Ghazi has incurred much opprobrium from modern historians

1. Runciman, op. cit., 151, citing Walter the Chancellor.
2. Ibid. Ibn al-'Adîm gives no indication that there was a particularly barbarous massacre of Frankish prisoners. He simply states that İl-Ghazi took ransom money from rich captives, killing the rest (Ibn al-'Adîm, Zubde, 193).
3. Usāma, tr. Hitti, 149.
for his failure to follow up his victory at Balāt by an attack on
Antioch. As Runciman expresses it:—

"The great Artuqid campaign fizzled out. It had
achieved nothing material for the Muslims, except
for a few frontier-posts and the easing of Frankish
pressure on Aleppo."¹

This kind of criticism is inappropriate to an analysis of ʿIl-
Ghazi, since it seems to endow him with an overall strategy, a
master plan, which extended beyond the immediate campaign with
which he was concerned at any time. This was manifestly not the
case with him or his contemporaries. They shifted their allegiance
to meet the demands of the moment. ʿIl-Ghazi would have needed
exceptional gifts of imagination, decisiveness and leadership to
have been able to exploit his sudden victory to the full. Zangī
and Nūr al-Dīn may well have been endowed with such qualities but
they did not fall to the lot of ʿIl-Ghazi.

The irony was that this unexpected triumph of his, achieved
by a fortunate concatenation of circumstances, should have been
the first major Muslim victory against the Franks, who called it
the ager sanguinis. With his Turcomans, this rebellious enemy
of the sultan had achieved a feat that had been denied to more
official campaigns mounted with the blessing of the sultan himself.
Some lines of al-ʿAzīmī express the extent of ʿIl-Ghazi's prestige

"Say what you want, your wish will be granted. After the Creator, our reliance is on you."¹

It is all the more ironic, therefore, to reflect that after Balat İl-Ghazl's career petered out dramatically.

İl-Ghazl did not, however, entirely lose sight of a possible attack on Antioch. In 514/1120-1, he made for the city but it was too late for him to recapture the victorious mood of the previous year. He forbade his troops to pillage and had to withdraw from the neighbourhood of Antioch, and it was at this stage, as mentioned above, that his Turcomans, disgruntled at the lack of plunder and money, left him in the lurch.² It is conceivable that İl-Ghazl still had his eye on Antioch during the Tiflîs campaign in the following year, since he is reported by one source (as noted above) to have sworn an oath with Dubais that he would give him Aleppo, if Dubais would bring money and troops to help him attack Antioch.³

When he returned from Tiflîs in 515/1121, he was occupied for some time with affairs at Aleppo, where his son, Sulaimân, had risen up against him.⁴ The Franks could, therefore, continue

¹ These lines are quoted in Ibn al-Athîr, X, 390.
² Ibn al-‘Adîm, Zubda, 195.
³ Ibid., 200.
⁴ This event is discussed in Chapter VIII of this thesis.
to consolidate their position in Northern Syria unhampered by their principal opponent.

One source describes ʾIl-Ghāzī before the Tiflíš campaign as "uplifted".¹ Certainly the immediate consequence of his victory at Balāt was a complacency expressed in an orgy of festivities and this held him back from a sustained effort at Antioch. Soon the news of Balāt was resounding throughout the Near East, and it brought him glory. Robes of honour came from the caliph and verses were penned in his honour. This new-found fame and sense of his own achievement, coupled with the recent arrival of Dubais—who brought great wealth and more troops—and with the promise of future plunder in Georgia must have all contributed to ʾIl-Ghāzī's decision to answer the appeal from Tiflíš.

Several accounts of the Tiflíš campaign survive.² Ibn al-Qalānīsī is anxious to soften the humiliation of the Muslim defeat. He relates that the Muslims were initially victorious but that the Georgians subsequently routed them, inflicting great losses.³ Ibn al-Athīr's short but factual account mistakenly puts the campaign in 514/1120-1 but the protagonists are the same; Toghrūl, Dubais and ʾIl-Ghāzī. Greater credence than usual may be placed on Ibn al-Azraq's account. He himself visited Georgia some thirty years after the battle and probably discussed it with

---

3. Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 204-5.
who only the year before had brought such glory to the Muslim cause, was now lucky to escape with Dubais and a handful of men and return in disgrace to Mardin. His men he could not save.

In defeat as in victory, then, İl-Ghazi showed little of the military panache and resourcefulness of Zangi or Saladin. His victory at Balat had restored Muslim morale for a while but it did not mark the beginning of a counter-Crusade, and it was quickly balanced by an equally spectacular defeat, significantly enough at Christian hands. İl-Ghazi lacked the qualities of a general, though he was on the whole a good leader of Turcoman nomads. Sultan Muhammad may have been influenced by his awareness of İl-Ghazi's rash nature and military limitations, as well as by their mutual animosity, when he systematically refused to appoint İl-Ghazi as overall leader of his military campaigns, naming instead Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqi and then Bursuq b. Bursuq. Subsequent events proved that his judgement was sound.

İl-Ghazi's political ability

İl-Ghazi was fortunate in the period from 502-513/1108-1120 in that his potential rivals were gradually eliminated. In 507/1113-14 the murder of Maudūd, the energetic governor of Mosul, probably instigated by Tagh-Tegin, who was tired of Maudūd's interference in Syrian affairs and jealous of his military successes, removed a skilful military commander from Sultan Muhammad, and one who might conceivably have quelled İl-Ghazi.

In the immediate area of Mardin, Qılıç Arslan, to whom the
amīrs of Diyār Bakr had declared their allegiance in 498/1104-5, 1 had been defeated in battle and drowned. 2 The career of Sukmān al-Qutbī, which, as noted above, had advanced smoothly thanks to a policy of strict adherence to the sultan's commands, reached its apogee when he took Mayyāfāriqīn, now without an overlord, in 502/1108-9. 3 He had already ruled the area around Akhlāt and the local princelings thought it prudent to declare suzerainty to him. 4 It is significant that Sukmān took possession of Mayyāfāriqīn in the same year as Il-Ghażl gained Mārdīn, already in the hands of his family. It seems likely that both had their eyes on Mayyāfāriqīn and that by seizing it first Sukmān was underlining his dominance in Diyār Bakr. Their peaceful co-existence was virtually impossible. Fortunately for Il-Ghażl, Sukmān died soon afterwards, 5 and thereby vacated the overlordship of Diyār Bakr for his rival. Ibn al-Athīr describes the raid which Il-Ghażl led on Sukmān's men as they returned to Akhlāt with their master's coffin. 6 This was not merely an attempt to obtain plunder but was a deliberate move to destroy Sukmān's

1. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 272.
4. Ibid.
6. Ibid. Cf. also Ibn al-Furāt, f.54b (apud Cahen, "Le Diyār Bakr", 233).
troops and thereby weaken the power of the principality nearest his own. Although the attack on Sukmān al-Qutbī's troops was unsuccessful, Sukmān's son, Ibrāhīm, never offered a serious threat to Īl-Ghāzī's growing power in Diyār Bakr. The struggle for power within the Artuqid family itself, and especially between Īl-Ghāzī and his brother's son, Ibrāhīm b. Sukmān, seems to have been resolved with the death of Ibrāhīm around 502/1108-9.\(^1\)

For a short time Sukmān had ruled Mārdīn and Hisn Kaifa jointly. Ibrāhīm had wished to do likewise after his father's death in 498/1104-5, when he inherited Mārdīn and ruled it from Hisn Kaifa. Thereafter, when Īl-Ghāzī came to Diyār Bakr, dismissed from his post as shīhna and without obvious territorial possessions, there must have been a struggle for control of Mārdīn between him and Ibrāhīm, culminating in Ibrāhīm's death. Ibrāhīm's brother, Dā'ūd, then took Hisn Kaifa,\(^3\) whilst Īl-Ghāzī ruled at Mārdīn. Thus these two cities, the cornerstones of Artuqid power, began to be ruled separately, a pattern which was to continue for a long time. After the death of Ibrāhīm, Īl-Ghāzī wielded supremacy

---

1. Ibn al-Azraq writes that Ibrāhīm succeeded Sukmān, his father, but he does not give a date for Ibrāhīm's death (ed. 'Awad, 269; Ms.A, f.160b).

2. Sukmān had acquired Hisn Kaifa after he had helped Musā in a campaign against Chōkermish in 495/1101-2 (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 235). He gained possession of Mārdīn sometime between this date and his own death, after 'Alī, the wāli of its citadel, had invited him to take the town (ibid., 270).

over the Artuqid family. The amir whose power most nearly approached his own was his nephew Da'ūd, whose subordinate status may be inferred from the fact that he sent troops to Il-Ghazi when he was called upon to do so.  

Il-Ghazi's relationship with his two most prominent sons, Temur-Tash and Sulaimān, will be discussed in Chapter VIII. His nephew, Da'ūd of Hisn Kaifā, seems to have maintained good relations with Il-Ghazi and not to have interfered with his uncle's territorial ambitions. Such deference and restraint were not evident once Il-Ghazi had died, for the two cousins, Da'ūd and Temur-Tash, were destined to clash on several occasions in their power struggle in Diyār Bakr. Another of Il-Ghazi's nephews, Balak, is mentioned as his constant companion in arms in the last year of Il-Ghazi's life and seems to have possessed greater force.

1. The struggle between Il-Ghazi and his brother's son, Sukmān, epitomises a major problem of succession amongst the ruling Turcoman families; namely whether a brother of the eldest son should inherit territories. After the death of Alp Arslān in 465/1072, Qavurt, his brother, claimed the greater right to the inheritance whereas Kalik-Shāh adduced the argument "A brother does not inherit where there is a son" (Bosworth, op.cit., 88). In this unresolved inheritance problem the outcome usually depended on a trial of strength.

2. Il-Ghazi called on his nephew to help him fight Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī in 508/1114-15 (Michael the Syrian, 216-7; Matthew of Edessa, 287; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 352).
of personality and energy than either the wayward, frivolous Sulaimān or the more docile Temūr-Tash. Certainly, from the viewpoint of the continuation of jihād against the Franks, Balak was ʿIl-Ghāzī's heir, not his sons. Balak's qualities as a warrior were recognised by more than one medieval historian. He died, however, soon after his uncle in 518/1124.

Between 502/1108-9 and 511/1117-8, ʿIl-Ghāzī managed to entrench himself at Mardin and extend his sphere of influence over the amirs in the surrounding area. After the death of Sultan Muhammad in 511/1118 and the succession quarrels that ensued, the Jazīra was at last freed from the interference of the Saljuq sultans. ʿIl-Ghāzī now wielded genuine power in his own right. Even a hostile source such as the Anonymous Syriac Chronicle cannot deny the extent of ʿIl-Ghāzī's prestige and power just before his death:—

"Ghāzī had become powerful and was uplifted because he ruled his own land, that of his brother Suqman's sons, and that of his uncle's son Daud, as far as Assyria, Armenia, and the land of the Iberians."1

ʿIl-Ghāzī and administration

In his long article on the Artuqids, which spans the political careers of ʿIl-Ghāzī, Temūr-Tash and Najm al-Dīn Alpī, Cahen discusses briefly the nature of the state which ʿIl-Ghāzī

1. Sic.
built up in Mayyāfārīqīn and Mārdīn. Although he emphasises that Īl-Ghāzī was still a nomadic leader who spent his time in wide-ranging expeditions, he adds that while other Turkish chiefs were mere pillagers Īl-Ghāzī busied himself with administration and religious matters. This statement is self-contradictory and is not supported by evidence. The events of the last years of Īl-Ghāzī's life and the vast geographical areas he covered left him little time for administration, even if he had possessed the inclination or ability for it. The two cities for which documentary evidence is available, namely Aleppo and Mayyāfārīqīn, seem to have been governed under Īl-Ghāzī in the manner customary during the period. Local families, such as the Banū Nabata in Mayyāfārīqīn, would be handed the task of the day-to-day administration of the city. Whether in the winter months Īl-Ghāzī took a direct part in the affairs of Mārdīn, a city which he seems to have preferred to Mayyāfārīqīn, is impossible to say. But it is unlikely that his interests went further than the initial removal of burdensome taxation to ingratiate himself with the inhabitants, as in Mayyāfārīqīn, followed by the use of customary methods to raise funds for his men and for his military activities.

2. Ibid.
3. Members of this family consistently held high office in Mayyāfārīqīn in the Marwānid period and also under the Artuqids.
5. In 511/1117-8 Īl-Ghāzī mulcted Aleppo officials of large sums of money with which to buy a truce with the Franks. This move was intended to give him time to fetch reinforcements from Mārdīn (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 373).
It is hard to join in Cahen's eulogy of İl-Ghazi, when, basing his enthusiasm upon the naively pro-Artuqid statements of Ibn al-Azraq, he writes:

"Par sa force même, il redonne aux chemins une relative sécurité profitable au commerce, et peut alléger les impôts qui écrasaient les populations ruinées."¹

The same sweeping praise is lavished on İl-Ghazi by Sevim who labels him "not only a shrewd soldier but also a politician and a good administrator".² This is hard to reconcile with the description by Ibn al-'Adîm of events at Aleppo when İl-Ghazi and his Turcomans arrived to take command of the city. Rapacity was then the key motivation and it was not mitigated by the slightest interest in the well-being of the urban populace.³

Ibn al-Athîr's account of İl-Ghazi at Aleppo agrees in spirit with that of Ibn al-'Adîm, whilst adding more details.⁴ Descriptions of a conquering military chief entering a city and removing burdensome taxation from its inhabitants abound in the sources and are couched in stereotyped phrases.⁵ There is no justification for attaching particular significance to the actions

---

2. Sevim, op. cit., 690.
5. Cf. the phrases used by Ibn al-'Adîm to describe how Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqî removed the burden of taxation from the people of Aleppo (Bughyat, 204).
of İl-Ghazi when he in turn conquered a city.

It may, however, be conceded that by the time İl-Ghazi had become a significant power in the political struggle in Northern Syria around 511/1117-8 he seems to have acquired confidence and some rudimentary political skills. His alliance with Togh-Tegin of Damascus in 508/1114-5 and his earlier experience as a military leader for Tutush and Ridwan had given him a knowledge of Syrian politics. The support of Togh-Tegin proved invaluable. Alone, İl-Ghazi might not have withstood the pressure exerted on him by Sultan Muhammad. But the relationship between İl-Ghazi and Togh-Tegin was not always harmonious. Whilst, according to obviously biased sources, they had both been guilty of savagery after Balat, especially at Aleppo where the Frankish prisoners were massacred for the enjoyment of the population, the death of the Frankish leader, Robert, at the hands of Togh-Tegin himself seems to have angered even İl-Ghazi. İl-Ghazi had sent Robert to Togh-Tegin in an attempt to extort a higher ransom from him but Togh-Tegin rashly beheaded him with his own sword.

In general, İl-Ghazi's attitude to Frankish prisoners seems to have been level-headed. He saw his most prominent captives as a source of ransom money, especially as he was often short of the funds needed to pay his troops.

1. Runciman, op. cit., 151.
2. Usama, tr. Hitti, 149.
3. "İl-Ghazi sent a messenger, reproaching the atabek, saying, "We are in need of even one dinar to pay our Turkoman soldiers. Here was a man who had fixed his own ransom at ten thousand
By a fortuitous set of circumstances, İl-Ghazi did not wait for Tugh-Tegin to arrive with his troops before Balat. Since he attacked alone, the glory of the first major Muslim victory against the infidel fell exclusively to İl-Ghazi.

In the years between his taking Mardin and his establishment in Aleppo, İl-Ghazi's relations with the Franks were characterised by flexibility and pragmatism. Contacts on the personal level between Frankish and Muslim rulers at this time are well-documented. İl-Ghazi was impressed on occasion by individual Frankish leaders, one of whom he allowed to live because of "his proud bearing". Since the Franks were a significant power-group in Northern Syria, İl-Ghazi inevitably came into conflict with them on occasions, sometimes emerging triumphant, sometimes not. When Bursuq was sent out at the head of a large army in Dhu'l-Hijja 508/May 1115, to take reprisals against İl-Ghazi and Tugh-Tegin, the two rebellious amirs were in abject fear of the sultan and did not feel strong enough to face the forthcoming attack alone. They therefore made an alliance with Roger of Antioch. Thus, when Bursuq's army arrived, the local princes of Northern Syria, Muslim and Frankish alike, joined forces against the outside aggressor. The defence of territory clearly

... dinars ... and thou hast killed him!" (ibid., 149-50).

1. Cf. especially the memoirs of Usama.
2. Runciman, op. cit., 150. İl-Ghazi sent this leader, Reynald Mazoir, his ring as a guarantee of safety (Rohricht, op. cit., 135).
counted for more than the defence of the faith. But it would appear even then that the two rebel amīrs were reluctant to actually engage with the army of Bursuq, which fell into an ambush set by Roger alone.

After Roger's victory over Bursuq's forces at Tall Dānīth on 22 Rabī‘ II, 509/14 September 1115, Syria was indeed rid of the Saljuq army. Tugh-Tegin understood (possibly more clearly than Ḥal-Ghāzī) the wider implications of this defeat of Bursuq and immediately went to Baghdad to seek a reconciliation with Sultan Muḥammad. No doubt he feared the ever-growing power of the Franks in Syria and felt isolated. He might also have experienced a certain guilt at fighting with Christians against fellow Muslims and he can scarcely have been unaware how his behaviour might be construed in Iraq, where the Franks offered no threat. As for Ḥal-Ghāzī, he reaped one tremendous benefit from the defeat of Dānīth: no longer were his projects thwarted by the sultan. But he too never again allied himself with the Franks. Indeed, after the battle at Dānīth there were some signs of a hardening of Ḥal-Ghāzī's attitude towards the Franks. Various reasons may be adduced for this change.

The accession of Roger of Antioch had united the Franks in Northern Syria and their firm establishment in that area had been helped by increasing dissensions amongst the Muslim amīrs after the deaths of Maudūd and Rīḍwān in 507/1113-4. By the year 511/1117-8, Roger of Antioch was harassing the area around
Aleppo and was threatening the city itself.

Combined with a heightened awareness of the danger of his new foe was İl-Ghazi's new-found freedom from direct Saljuq interference and from opposition from within his own territory of Diyār Bakr. Sultan Muhammad died in 511/1118. Sanjar was still preoccupied with affairs further east. Mahmud, the new sultan, was embroiled with the problem of rival contenders for his throne. In his own territory of Diyār Bakr, İl-Ghazi could at last feel secure. The new sultan had asked him to take over Mayyafāriqīn in 512 probably in response to a request from İl-Ghazi. Indeed, Mahmud was scarcely in a position to refuse such a request from a senior amīr whose lands were distant and whose loyalty was suspect. İl-Ghazi also ruled Harrān, Rā's al-'Ain and Nasībīn. Armed with a new confidence and the ability to act independently, İl-Ghazi and Togh-Tegin planned a joint campaign against the Franks in 512/1118-9. According to Ibn al-Athīr, İl-Ghazi could muster 20,000 men at Mārdīn before embarking on


2. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161a. The date of 515/1121-2 given by Ibn al-Athīr is less trustworthy than that of Ibn al-Azraq who gives the exact day, month and year of the entry of İl-Ghazi into the city. According to Ibn al-Athīr, İl-Ghazi sent Temūr-Tash to Sultan Mahmud in 515/1121-2 to plead for mercy for Dubais. It was at this point that the sultan added Mayyafāriqīn to the iqtā' s already held by İl-Ghazi (X, 418).

3. Ibn Shaddād (Marsh 333, ff.17b, 43b and 39b).

the undertaking which culminated in Balāṭ (513/1119-20). Although Il-Ghazi sent a perfunctory message to the new sultan asking for help against the Franks,¹ he appears to have received no answer. This request was probably nothing more than a formality in any case.

It is difficult to assess the extent to which Sivan's arguments may be accepted when he suggests that in the short period between Il-Ghazi's entry into Aleppo in 512/1118-9 and the battle against Roger of Antioch in 513/1119 Il-Ghazi changed from someone in no way imbued with the zeal of a mujāhid to a leader who was fully aware of the benefits of using jihad propaganda.² If such a theory could be proved it would show that Il-Ghazi possessed a certain awareness of political realities.

It is perfectly possible that brief contact with pietist circles in Aleppo, where the idea of jihad was re-awakening, could have given an extra edge to Il-Ghazi's attitude towards the Franks. Yet it is well known that he stayed in Aleppo for only very short periods at a time. Certainly the presence before the troops at Balāṭ of Ibn al-Khashshāb, the qādī who had played an important role in establishing Il-Ghazi at Aleppo and who is shown by Sivan to have made a major contribution to the re-awakening in Aleppo of an awareness of jihad, is very significant. Further support for Sivan's theory is provided by the oath of allegiance which Il-Ghazi made his amirs swear before going into battle against Roger. Ibn al-Khashshāb may

¹. Ibid., X, 383.
². This was mentioned briefly supra, 151-3.
well have suggested that the taking of such an oath, backed up by his own eloquence to the Turcoman troops, would be a possible means of holding their loyalty a little longer.

There is, however, a major flaw in Sivan's argument. His theory would be persuasive if it could be demonstrated that Iīl-Ghāzī continued to use jihad propaganda in his subsequent campaigns. After his victory at Balāṭ, the caliph sent him robes of honour and adulatory verses were penned in his honour. The efficacy of the formula had been proved, Iīl-Ghāzī's own reputation had been enhanced, and the Turcomans had fought like lions, after being moved to tears by the eloquence of the qādī.

Yet it was patently not the case that Iīl-Ghāzī continued to inspire his troops with the spirit of jihad in his subsequent undertakings against the Franks. Sivan states rather lamely that it is not certain that in the less spectacular battles which ensued Iīl-Ghāzī continued to use these propaganda themes. The truth of the matter was that Iīl-Ghāzī in no sense built on his victory over Roger at Balāṭ. He failed signally to follow up either the politico-military or the psychological advantages which he had gained. Instead, he basked in a haze of glory and then dissipated his energies in a series of minor military operations.¹ He may deliberately have invited Ibn al-Khashshāb to speak to his troops and, like his own Turcomans, he may even have been swayed momentarily by an atmosphere of religious fervour;

¹ After Balāṭ, Iīl-Ghāzī took only Athārib and Zardana (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 390).
but his deliberate adoption of a *jihād* propaganda seems unlikely. It would have been more in character with the opportunistic *Realpolitik* which ʿIl-Ghāzī and his ilk habitually practised for the adoption of *jihād* propaganda to have been a ploy. If so, such propaganda would have been lightly adopted for reasons of expedience - after all, it could do no harm - and as lightly discarded when it had served its turn.

After their victory at Balāt, the Turcomans quickly began to disperse with their booty and could not be persuaded to linger for any motive, material or religious. Presumably after so devastating a victory, with its correspondingly rich booty, it would have been obvious that no further major opportunities for plunder would present themselves. The ardour of the Turcomans to engage in battle with Roger of Antioch is not very likely to have been of a religious nature and could more realistically be attributed to their desire to acquire more booty for themselves rather than await the arrival of Tugh-Tegin with his troops who would be as rapacious as they were. In fact, ʿIl-Ghāzī was very reluctant to begin fighting until his ally came but was pushed into action by the urgent demands of his Turcoman *amīrs*.¹

In spite of the Tiflīs fiasco ʿIl-Ghāzī's reputation in Northern Syria remained prestigious enough, possibly because of the very remoteness of Tiflīs. In his general discussion about Georgian affairs at this time, Osman Turan says that ʿIl-Ghāzī

¹. This is certainly the interpretation given by Sibt b. al-Jauzī *(op. cit.*, 79).
died and could not undertake another campaign into Georgia.¹
He then mentions a letter which, according to Bar Hebraeus (and
apparently only him) the Byzantine emperor wrote to İl-Ghāzī in
which he informed İl-Ghāzī that a large Crusader force was coming
to the coasts of Syria. He then added:

"Prepare to fight them. If you need it, I will
help you with an army of 30,000 men."²

This anecdote, although it has an apocryphal flavour, is testimony
to the prestige which İl-Ghāzī had gained at Balāṭ. It was to
him, not Tugh-Tegin, that the Byzantine emperor wrote making
this offer of military support.

Relations with the Ismā‘īlis

İl-Ghāzī was aware of the political necessity of establishing
some kind of rapport or at any rate modus vivendi with the
Ismā‘īlis, especially while he was master of Aleppo, a city which
had been bolstered by their military strength in the area. They
had in fact provided military support for Aleppo for several
years and Riqwān had indeed shown them outright favour. According
to Ibn al-Furat³, İl-Ghāzī seems to have engaged in a wily game
of diplomacy from which he emerged the victor. He was approached
on one occasion in Mārdīn by a messenger from the leading

---

1. O. Turan, Selçuklu Zamanında Türkiye, 166.
2. Ibid., citing Bar Hebraeus, tr. Budge, 249-50.
3. Quoted by E. Quatremère in "Notice historique sur les Ismaëliens"
in Fundgruben des Orients, ed. Graf W. Rzewusky (Vienna, 1818) IV, 346.
Ismā'īlī in Aleppo who asked him to hand over the citadel of al-Sharīf to the Ismā'īlīs.  İl-Ghāzī coolly announced that he had just given orders for the demolition of that fortress and added that he would hand it over if the work of destruction had not already begun. Whilst his secretary occupied the envoy,  İl-Ghāzī despatched a message by pigeon ordering the immediate demolition of the citadel of al-Sharīf and ordering that some prominent citizens of Aleppo should occupy the ground where it had previously stood. The messenger from the Ismā'īlīs arrived back in Aleppo to find the building no longer standing.  İl-Ghāzī later informed the Ismā'īlīs that he would gladly have given it to them if they had come to him secretly and not announced their intentions publicly.¹ The citadel had been an important strategic point in Aleppo and clearly  İl-Ghāzī had at once realised the danger of ceding it to the Ismā'īlīs.

Relations with the Caliphate

İl-Ghāzī's relationship with the 'Abbāsid caliph was one of indifference or at times hostility. This was a characteristic which was shared by later Saljuq sultans and many of their amīrs.² Dubais b. Sadaqa, for example, who was a thorn in the side of the

---

1. This incident from Ibn al-Furāt is quoted in full by Quatremère (ibid.). Cf. also Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 199.

2. Cf. the stormy relationship between the caliph al-Mustarshid and Sultan Maṣ'ūd which culminated in the caliph's murder in 529/1135.
caliph al-Mustarshid and had ravaged the countryside around Baghdad, sought refuge first at Qal'at Ja'bar with the Arab ruler\(^1\) there and then with İl-Ghāzī, who became so absorbed with his guest and accorded him such lavish hospitality that he neglected his administrative duties. Dubais, as a further mark of their mutual bond, married İl-Ghāzī's daughter, Parkhundā Khātūn.\(^2\)

When al-Mustarshid wrote to İl-Ghāzī, sending him robes of honour, he requested him at the same time to break off relations with Dubais. Whilst İl-Ghāzī agreed to participate in the \(\text{jihād}\), he refused to sever his links with Dubais.\(^3\)

**Religion**

If actions are a clue to inner convictions it is unlikely that İl-Ghāzī's commitment to Islam was profound. His drinking orgies must have exceeded the norms of his time for they are described with evident relish by the chroniclers.\(^4\) Whilst other military and religious leaders, including apparently the caliph al-Rāshid,\(^5\) also enjoyed this activity forbidden by Islam, they are not recorded as indulging to the same extent as İl-Ghāzī.

---

It is not appropriate here to discuss in detail the exact nature of the form of Islam practised by the Turcomans in the early twelfth century. What is probable, however, is that their commitment to Islam was only superficial. İl-Ghazi, as leader of the Turcomans in Diyār Bakr, was essentially flexible in his approach to the established religious groups with which he had to deal. Towards the Saljuq sultan Muhammad, the champion of Sunnī orthodoxy, and towards the 'Abbāsid caliphs, he was generally hostile and unco-operative. This sprang from his desire for territorial independence, not from his championing of any heterodox creed. He actively supported enemies of both the sultan and the caliph. Yet he made gestures of reconciliation towards Sultan Mahmūd, and the caliph, al-Mustarshid, as mentioned above, sent him robes of honour to mark his victory at Balāt, according him the honorific title Najm al-Dīn. İl-Ghazi is also said by Ibn Shaddād to have founded a Sunnī madrasa in Mārdīn.¹ In this he was following a widespread practice of his times.

On the other hand, İl-Ghazi is likely to have been familiar with Shī'ite Islam during his time in Syria, both when he was in the service of Malik Ridwān whose Shī'ite sympathies were well-known,² and in his own rule in the latter years of his life at

---

1. Ibn Shaddād, Marsh 333, f.130b.
2. R.W. Crawford views Ridwān's attitude to the Ismā'īlīs as prompted by an awareness of political realities rather than personal or doctrinal motives ("Ridwān the Maligned" in
Aleppo. Moreover, the Ismaʿīlīs were powerful at this time both in Northern Syria and in Diyar Bakr itself, as the slaughter of several hundred of their number at Amid in 519/1125\(^1\) and the deep influence exerted by one Ismaʿīlī shaikh over Īl-Ghāzī's son, Temūr-Tash, testify.\(^2\) Īl-Ghāzī is known to have established contact with the Ismaʿīlīs in Northern Syria whilst he governed Aleppo though it is evident that he distrusted them.

**Personality**

Īl-Ghāzī was, in short, an energetic military leader and at times an astute politician. He was wayward and independent, uncontrolled on occasions in his personal and political life and erratic in his judgements. Only in the later part of his life did he acquire Mārdīn and Mayyāfārīqīn, but he clung to them tenaciously in difficult times and thus assured the continuation of his family in that area through the agency of his cautious and peaceable son, Temūr-Tash. Indeed, the Artuqids maintained themselves in their area of choice for three centuries, an achievement unmatched by any other minor Turkish dynasty in Anatolia. Īl-Ghāzī's own career was characterised by tremendous, indefatigable military endeavours over far too wide a geographical area, which extended from Tiflis to Aleppo and from Hulwān to Mārdīn. He did not possess the political maturity to concentrate

---
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1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 441; Sibt b. al-Jauzī, 69.

his efforts in a smaller area, but the lesson of his life was not lost on his less ambitious son Temür-Tash, who consolidated his hold on the heartland of Artuqid power and deliberately rejected the unreal aspirations of his father.¹

Conclusions

Against the background of the disintegration of the Saljuq empire after the death of Malik-Shāh, İl-Ghāzī, as chief of a large group of Turcomans in the Jazīra, succeeded in establishing himself in the area of Mardin and Mayyāfāriqīn and paving the way for his successors to remain there.

The process of his emancipation from Saljuq control was gradual. After serving the minor Saljuq princes of Syria, he seized Mardin, the key to his future successes. By alliances with the enemies of Sultan Muḥammad, above all Togh-Tegin, İl-Ghāzī managed to ruin the attempts of the sultan to impose his authority on the western reaches of Saljuq territory.

 İl-Ghāzī's political approach was pragmatic and flexible, motivated by territorial and personal ambition. The basis of

¹ After his extremely detailed article, Sevim can only pass a favourable judgement on İl-Ghāzī in his concluding two pages. He labels him a shrewd soldier, a politician and a good administrator (op. cit., 690). He ignores other less positive interpretations which the evidence provokes.
his power was his Turcoman forces but by the end of his long career there are signs that a rift was developing between them.

Until the last few years of his life, Īl-Ghāzī's political fate was linked with that of the Jazīra and orientated eastwards towards the centre of Saljuq power. He did not look westwards to Byzantium nor were his efforts directed primarily against the Franks. Only after the death of Sultan Muhammad, when he began to enjoy true independence and was freed from the spectre of Muhammad's retaliation, did Īl-Ghāzī attempt positively to curb Frankish power in the area of Aleppo.

In the wider sweep of Islamic history, Īl-Ghāzī played a significant role in the slow undermining of the central Saljuq authority and in the gradual establishment of independent emirates in the Jazīra and Northern Syria. His victory at Balāṭ was an early indication of the source of the future Muslim counter-Crusade against the Franks. That revanche was destined to come not from the efforts of Saljuq sultans far away in Western Iran but from small dynasties established locally at Aleppo and other cities in Syria and at Mosul. Yet it is ironic that before Balāṭ Īl-Ghāzī's actions positively helped the Franks. The attention of Sultan Muḥammad was often occupied in trying to curb his rebellious stance, whilst in the meantime the Franks were able to consolidate their position and expand their territories in Northern Syria. The armies from Mosul, even under the command of the energetic Maudūd, directed their efforts towards the subjugation of Īl-Ghāzī and Tugh-Tegin instead of attacking the Franks. Yet even if Īl-Ghāzī had joined the
armies sent from Mosul in campaigns against the infidels, it is unlikely that the Muslims would have achieved the successes of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin. The religious climate of the early decades of the twelfth century was only beginning to betray a consciousness that the Franks might be different from other factions fighting for hegemony in Syria. Il-Ghazi was too inconsistent and unpredictable, too bound to his semi-nomadic heritage, to have achieved the successes of Zangī, whilst he lacked the religious motivation shown by Nūr al-Dīn in his later years.
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CHAPTER V

Tārīkh Māyyāfāriqīn wa Āmid

ARABIC TEXT
تاریخ میان عصر قره و آکرم

افسه‌ای

احمد بنephوس بن علی بن الازرق الفاروقی

کیارال محبیانه
ذكر مجلة نجم الدين الغازى وملكه في مفردين

قبل لما فتح ابن جهير ديار بكر كان الأمير ارنق معه ولم يبق له موضع نفعل عنه وسّف لما جاء ملكشاه إلى
النام وملك بيت المقدس وما حوله واقام بالساحل وات هناك
وملك بيت المقدس بعده ولده 4 الأمير سكمان والامير نجم الدين
الغازي مدة

وسار نجم الدين الغازى إلى السلطان محمد وبغي في خدمته
وإقلبه حلوان مدة تم إعلان هيئة العراق ناقم ببغداد وملك
الابن وتولى وولى الأمير سكمان إلى هذه البلاد
وملك حصن كيفا وكان ملك الأمير الباقوني ماردين من نجم الدين
الغازي إلى هذه البلاد ومات الباقوني وكان فيها من قبل
الباقوني مدخل تحت ناقة سكمان من حصن كيفا وبغي بها وملكها
قبل في سنة عمان وثمانين واربعمئة مات الأمير سكمان وبي في
مما إلى ان مات الأمير سكمان

وملك بعده ولده الأمير ابراهيم بن سكمان فنذى إلى
شمس بماردين 8 وات أبا له رهينة وبغي فتح فتح حصن كيفا مدة
تم بلغه إنه اما 9 إلى ولده ووجسه فلما وحل نجم الدين

1. MS.B. ذلك إبتداء مجلة.
2. MS.B uses the form ابن غازي throughout.
3. MS. في is written above the line.
4. MS. ولده.
5. MS. شحنكة;
6. MS. الباقوني
7. MS. مات is illegible.
8. MS. in the margin بماردين صح
9. MS. اما
10. MS. إلى is written above the line.
النارئي سلمها اليه
وبقي الأمير إبراهيم مدة ثم مات بحسن كفاءة وولي
موقعه اخوه الأمير داوود بعد اختي سكبان وبقى مدة وكان
الأمير شمس ومارتين بيده لم يسلمها إلى أحد وحضر نجم الدين
 وسلمها اليه فيما سنة سبع وخمسمائة حملت للنارئي وأولاده من ذلك
اليوم إلى الآن
وأما الأمير شمس فاولد الأديسونفر وولدستغربيوس وولدبوس
رسول وقيل ملك ماردين في سنة سبع أو عesan وخمسمائة على أن
يتي بها إلى سنة اثنتي عشرة وخمسمائة
تم تنبذ إلى السultan يقول له أن ميافارقين خرمت
واضحليت وهي بلد لا يرى منها تنبذ السيط إلى الدزليك رسولا
أمره ان يسلم مصرفين إلى نجم الدين النارئي نحضر وسلمها
اليه تدخل بها في ربع عشر حصاد الأخرى سنة اثنتي عشرة
وخمسمائة وملكها خج الديزليك ونزل على الروابي واقام ثلاثة أيام
لمسا كان في اليوم الرابع ومه رسول مجد من السلطان يقول له
لا نسلم موجود الامير قد فات واستنقر نجم الدين بمصرفين واظهر

1. MS. sic.
2. MS. سي
3. MS. و
4. إلى added.
6. MS. إلى on the line, على above it.
العدل والأخلاق إلى الناس وإزال عنهم الأنفل والاتصال والانزل من دورها وكان الناس من النزل في دورهم في شدة شديدة وكان أكثر خرابا لاختلاف الدول وتغير الاحصاب كل تعلم ومن بعدهم بجد عليهم، وظف بهم وعادتهم لعلمه أنه لا يفهم، ولا بدوم ملكه ومن حب ملك نعم الدين الغازى استقر وطابت فلوهم واستقر الناس في دورهم وعلل الأحاد الذي ما لهم دور منزلون بها يعبرون لهم في خرابات المدينة خركاهات لأن أكثر المدينة كانت خرابا وكانت الشرك من خرابا وقواع الطرق العربية حيث كان لا تنفرد الفاعلة بمضى إلى آمد إلا ومعها الناقة والخلع وكذلك إلى ارزق وحسن كيفا وحاجي وماردين محتجرون من يختوم في الصرف القريب لخرب البلاد والغبادف من حيث ملك نعم الدين امت الشرك والبلاد وانهزمت الحرامة وانتفرت الغبادف وبدأت صغرى في العمارة وسوس الناس احسن ساقية وبعض إلى اسم ست عشرة وختمانة ملك حلفي الالبقر وكرهم كسرة عظيمة وغنم اموالهم وامر منهم خلقا عظاما وهي كسرة البلاد، أما حلائها انها من ملايين شاه بن الملك رضوان وكان اخذهما من الاسراءين مثل

1. MS.B. العدل والأخلاق والأخلاق
2. Marsh البزال 333 (f.102a).
3. MS. خرباء
4. Marsh مساكن 333 (f.102a)
5. MS خركاهات; Marsh 333 خركاهات (f.102a).
6. MS سدته
7. MS. ستة عشرة but MS.B. سدة عشرة
8. MS. كسرة is written above the line.
9. MS. (Sic)
فَعَلَ وَقِيلَ لَسْتَ عَشَرَةً وَخَمسَانَةً احْتَرَقَ جَامِعٌ آَمَد
وفِي سَنَةٍ أَرْبَعَ عَشَرَةً وَخَمسَانَةَ مَلَكَ نَحْجَ الدَّيْنِ مَعْبِينَ وَسَارَ
النَّافِعِ عَلَى الدِّينِ بِنَبِيَةٍ وَجَلَّةٍ مِنْ أَهْلِ مَدْفُونِ فَلَقَوْهُ بَا.
وَهَتَوَّهُ يَنْتَفِعُهُ وَخُلْقُهُ وَأَحْصُهُ الْبَيْنَمُ وَعَادُوا لَلْمَدْفُونِ
فَعَلَ وَقِيلَ فِي سَنَةٍ خَمْسَ عَشَرَةً وَخَمسَانَةَ نَفَذَ أَهْلُ تَعْلِمَهُ إِلَى
نَحْجَ الدَّيْنِ النَّافِعِ بِبِنَبِيَةٍ وَلَسْتُمْ إِلَى الْبَيْنَمُ وَكَانَ لَهَا بِدَ
أَهْلُهَا مَدْفُونَ أَرْبَعَ عَشَرَةَ سَنَةٍ وَكَانَ مَالِكُهَا قُوَّةٌ مِنْ أَهْلِهَا شَمُونَ بِيْ
حَجَرَ مِنْ مَدْفُونٍ مَّأَيِّنَتُهُ إِمَّا انْفَرَضَ كَبَارُهُ وَأَضْحَلُوا فَعَادُ امْرَهَا
إِلَى أَهْلِهَا وَكَانَ كَلِّ شَهْرٍ بَيْنِ امْرُهُ وَأَحْدِمِ مَنْهُ وَبَغْوا
(۱۶۱b) كَذُلْكَ مَدْتُ أَرْبَعَ عَشَرَةَ سَنَةَ
وَكَانَ الْمُلِكُ دَاوُدُ مَلِكُ الْإِبْنَاتِ وَالْكَرَجُ قَدْ فَيَقَبَ مَغَاثَةً
شَدَّةٍ وَأَضْحَلُوا وَكَانُوا نَفَذُوا إِلَى السَّلَطَانِ طَغَرِيكَ بِنَ السَّلَطَانِ
مُحَمَّدٌ وَكَانَ مَلِكٌ حَنْزَى وَآَرَانَ نَفَذُوا لِهِمْ شَحَةً وَزَادَتْ مَغَاثَةَ مَلِكَ
الْكَرَجِ لَهُمْ وَبَغْوا عَلَى هَذِهِ مَدْتَ ثَانِيَةَ أَن يَحْلُوْنَ عِلْهُ في
1. MS. ثَلَاثَ عَشَرَةٌ
2. MS. أَرْبَعَ عَشَرَةٌ
3. MS.B. عَلَى الدِّينِ بِالْحَسَنِ بِنَاءً
4. MS. هَوَّاءٌ
5. Marsh ۳۳۳ (۱۰۲a).
6. MS. خَمْسَ عَشَرَةٌ
7. MS. نَفَذُوا
8. MS. مَدْفُونٌ
9. MS. قُوَّةٌ
10. MS. بِنَاءٌ
11. MS. مَدْفُونٌ
12. MS. إِلَى أَهْلَهَا is repeated.
13. MS. امْرُهُ منْهُ
14. MS.B. دَاوُدُ
15. MS. نَفَذُوا لِهِمْ شَحَةً ذَاتٌ مَّغَاثَةً In the right margin is زادت.
16. MS. يَحْلُوْنَ
Amedroz omits ذَاتٌ too (op.cit., 205). MS.B. ما زالت...
كل سنة عشة آل mát دنار ويكون عندهم شحنة معه عشة ٢ نوارس
فسوا على ذلك مدة ونغوا إلى نجم الدين الغازى ستعونه
نمار ومعه عساكر عظيمة ومعه دبيبين مقدة ٤ ملك العرب وكان
مهر نجم الدين على استله كهار خاتون وكان قد وصل إليه
في تلك السنة نمار بالعساكر ونغوا إلى شمس الدولة غزنو آرسلان
صاحب ارزون وبدليس وكان له مدينة دوين وأمره ان يدخل من شرقية
تفليس وسرار واحد معه الفاضي علم الدين بن شنان ومعه ولده
الفاضي علم الدين إبن الفتتح الكبير هو الآن فاضي ماردین
والوزير ابي تمام بن عبدون وسار معه فصولوا إلى ارزون الروم
وتخلف الفاضي والوزير مازن الروم.
ودخل بالعساكر من ولاية الغرسم طريق ترباليت
وتفقوا أن تجمع العساكر اجمع على باب تفليس وتجهز الطلمان
لفرك بن من ناحية جنزي وسار غزنو آرسلان الأدبي من دوين

1. MS. الف
2. MS. عشر
3. MS.B. adds لا غير
4. MS.B. المزيدي
5. MS. إبر
6. MS. وسي; MS.B. طغرل
و وخلد نجم الدين إلى أن بقي سنه وست تقليص الجبل مقدار
نعف يوم وخرج الملك داود ومعه ولده ديمباري من جانب الغرب
في عماكر عظيمة وكان بحذر عليهم من الجبل وهم في لحنه
ولم تكن وصلت عماكر السلطان طغرليك ولا شمس الدولة الأحذ
بمن معه وتفائلوا نتائجًا عظيمة وكسر نجم الدين وقتل منه
خلفاً كثيرة وعمم الكفار منهم عماكر عظيمة وخرج نجم الدين
و دبع في نفس بصره بحيث أن بقي عندهم من الأسرى إلى زمننا
ولقد رأيت موضع الوقعة حين دخلت إلى تقليص في
سنة ثمان واربعين وخمسة فاقتها بها ثم وصلت إلى خدمة
ملك الاحجاز ونفقت عنه وخرجت معه وسرت في ولائه معه
مقدار نبي وسبيتين بوما واجتاح إلى الآن ولم يدرسه والي
ولاية الاحجاز ولقد وصلنا بعض الأيام في ولاية الاحجاز إلى مرح
واسع تحت جبل في قلعة شامخة نزل الملك هناك وقال لي ملك

1. MS. مقدر
2. MS. يكن
3. MS. ودبع صح is written in the margin.
4. MS. مقدر
5. MS. sic
6. MS. الاحجاز لقد وصلنا. MS.B. ولقد وصلنا
7. MS. مرح or برج
8. The phrase نزل الملك is barely legible. MS.B.
الإخبار بالفَلَان ان في هذه القلعة رجلا اسرا مستعربا من نوبة
الخازى ناصعد إليه من الغد وابعره و اماله م ان هو نصبه
على ذلك وقت اغلبه من الملك لطلقه في تلك الليلة فلما
كان من وقت السحر ضرب بوق (162a.4) الرجَل لأنه وصل الله
الخبر ان بعض ولايته قد توشته عليه نحن وصله الخبر رحل
ورحل الناس ولم يقدر الله الاجتماع بذلك الرجل
وفبل في سنة خمس عشرة وخمسة مات وانه ي مع
الملك رغوا ان يحل ولما كسر نجم الدين وعاد بسن بغي مه
رجل ملك الإخبار بالخانات والأمر ونزل على تغليس وحاملها
마다 ثم هدم سورها من قبل الغرب ودخلها بينها واحرفها ونهبها
بعد ثلاثة ايام من اهلها وطيب فلوهم ووعدهم بالجمال
و فناد عليهم تلك السنة الانتقال والعون والانسات

1. MS. رجل اسیر مستعرب. MS.B. مستعرب.
2. MS. ناصعد إليه is repeated.
3. MS. اسمه
4. MS.B. من وقته
5. MS.B. بعض الوليات.
6. This word is not clear in MS.A. MS.B. has الله. Amedroz reads على (op. cit., 206).
7. MS. خمسة عشر.
9. MS.B. has في عشرين فارسا after.
والخروج وشرط للمسلمين كما ارادوه من الشرط الذي هو الآن
بأن بما لا يعبر إلى جانب المسلمين والمدينة الخنجر
ولا يذبح بها ولا في سوتها وضرب لهم الدرهم ١ وعلى اسم الملك
والخليفة في الوجه الواحد وفي الوجه اسم الله واسم النبي
عليه السلام واسمه على جانب الدرهم ونادي في البلد انه من
آذى مسما فقد اهدره دمه وشرط له الآذان والعلاة والقراءة
ظاهراً وان يخط يوم الجمعة ويلى ويدعى للخليفة
والسلطان ولا يدعى لغيرهما على المنبر وشرط ان حمام
إسماعيل بتغليس لا يدخله كرهي ولا ارمني ولا يهودي ووظف
خدمة الكرهي في السنة خمسة دنانير ٩ وخدمة اليهودي اربعة
دنانير وخدمة المسلم ثلاثة دنانير ١١ واهمن الى المسلمين
غاية الأحسان وجعل لاهل العلم والدين والصوفية أكرم المنازل

١. Ms. has a lacuna here. Ms. B.
٢. الدارهم
٣. Ms. sic.
٤. إذا
٥. Ms. يدعا
٦. والسلطان ولا يدعى لغيرهما مع is written in the left margin.
٧. يدخلها
٨. وظف
٩. دنانير
١٠. Dنانير
١١. Ms. تلت
١٢. Ms. Dنانير
١٣. Ms. اكرام
ولا بسر لهم عند المسلمين

ولقد رأيت هذه الشروط كلها 1 لما دخلت إلى تفليس

في سنة ثمان وأربعين وخمسمائة ولقد رآيت ملك الإخاز

 نفسها الذي كنت في خدمته وقد قدم 2 إلى تفليس وأقام بها

اباما ونزل ذات يوم جمعة إلى 3 الجامع وجلس على دقة مقابل

الخلب فوقف موضعه حتى خلب الخليل 4 سمع الخلبة

جميعها ثم خرج واتلقى برسم الجامع مائتي دينار احمر 5 وكتبت

اري العلماء والوعاظ والأشراف الذين يقودونه 6 والعوناء

والذين حلون الده فكرهم وعملهم وحترمهم ويعتمد معهم

ما ليس بمثله 7 ولقد كنت اري لاحترامه للمسلمين ما لو انهم

سباد ما احترمو تلك الحرم أ

قبل وفي سنة سته عشرة وخمسمائة تزلزلت مدينة جنزة

وهي كنجه وانصح غرف منها وانهدم سورها وسار الملك داود

بصاحبه وخلبه ورجاله 8 وتعدها ونهب أموالهم وما كان فيها

1. MS. كليهما

2. MS. is damaged here. MS.B. has 206.

3. The MS. is damaged here. MS.B. has (op.cit.,

4. The MS. is damaged here. Amedroz has

206). The subject matter in MS.B. is ordered differently here

but mentions that the people prayed. A possible reading here

might therefore be على الناس

5. MS. احمر 3

6. The MS. is illegible here. MS.B.

7. MS. مثله

8. MS. رجله
وقتٌ منهم خلفاً عظاء بماً وسبيًّا ومنهم خلفاً عظاء لا يخص بحبٍ
دخل الإداري إلى تفليس على العجل من كُرَّتهم (f.162b) سيقوا
المسلمون 2 مثل نظم الاعتدام اساري ودخل بهم إلى تفليس
فانشترى اهل تفليس أكثرهم ولحقهم وقال لي جماعة من اهل
تغليس اننا ما اتفقنا الا من تلك السنة
فقل وفي سنة خمس عشرة وخمسائة قتل مودود 4 بجامع
دمشق ودفن بالبرج
قبل وفي سنة خمس عشرة وخمسائة عاد نجم الدين إلى
مادين 6 واتم بها إلى سنة ست عشرة وخمسائة خرج الى
اوصل 9 الهيئة من بلد مبترفين واتم هناك ومعه زوجته الخاتون
بست تغرتين حاص دمشق فمرض وتوبي يوم الخمس سابع عشر
رمضان تحمل لبلا وركب ولده الأمير شمس الدولة سليمان والخاتون
ووصلوا مبترفين لبلا ووصلوا إلى باب الهوة واجملوا الامر
على فرسه ومن وراءه رجل يمشي وتقدموا وصاحوا منزل الوالي
وكان اسمه كزافي 7 ندخل شيخ ممن صحب الامير نجم الدين من اول

1. MS
2. MS
3. MS
4. MS
5. MS
6. MS.B
7. MS.B
8. MS
9. MS.B
10. MS. sic ; MS.B
11. MS. sic ; MS.B sic
زمانه وكلبه يومن الدولة و الخاتم ففتح الباب فقالوا ان
الامير مرجع فلاحصلوا في ارض الفجر صاحوا وفجرا وقالوا مات
الامير في هذه الساعة
واصيح الناس وصد اهل البلد ومن كان بها من الجن إلى
الفصر وغلب الامير وعلي عليه ودفن بالسدي مدة ثم اخرج ودفن
في مسجد الامير شرف قبة السلطان ندفن هناك
وكان نجم الدين الغازى قد تزوج بفرندان خاتون بنت
الملك رفوان لما ملك حلب وعقد عليها ولم يدخل بها ولا رآها
ومات ولم يرها تزوجها بعده الامير بلك بن بيرام بن ارتن
قبل واستقر شمس الدولة سليم بمشرفين واستوزر عبد
الملك بن 5 عبیت ورد الامور الهو اخذ خربى من الامير بلك
وصحت معه إلى ان مات واخذها الامير داود واخذ بلد حزة من
الامير داود واخذ الديابات التي 6 اخذها حسام الدولة 7 صاحب ارزن
من بلد مشرفين
وفي سنة سبع عشرة قتله الانخل امير الجيوش بمصر فنتقله

الباغية

1. Ms. B adds after 2
2. Ms.
3. Ms.
4. Ms.
5. Ms.
6. Ms.
7. Ms.
8. Ms.
ورك والي مغرفين في برج الملك محله خلع شاه
ونبذ خلب سيدة خاتون بنت السلطان قلجم آرسلان بن سليم بن قنئش وميخ الهاشمي ناج الدين أبو سالم بن نباتة احترها
اله من محلية ودخل بها وكان مقامه بمغرفين
وكان لما مات نجم الدين ابن السعيد حسام الدين تمرداً
ولده بماردين نملك ماردين واستبد بها وكان مع الحايل
الحاجب شمس الحجاب محمد أكديش وكان زوجه نجم الدين النازري
عام السعيد حسام الدين
فقتل وفي سادس عشرين ربيع الآخر مات القاضي علم الدين
ابو الحسن علي بن بحبي بن نباتة بمغرفين وولي القاضي ولده
تاج الدين القفاض وهو أبو سالم رحمه الله وخلع عليه شمس
الدولة وأكرمه وولاه ووضع ابه واستقر في القضاء وكان ولد
شمس الدولة (f. 163b) ابنا اسمه محمود ولقد رأته بماردين وهو
في اسو حال من سو طرفته 1 وقيح سرته في حق نفسه وخروجه
عن طاعة اهلائه ورذالة نفسه وما اعلم ما كان منه وكان

1. MS. sic.
2. MS. ولاله
3. MS. ابن
4. MS. ابن
5. MS.A سو حال من سو طرفته; MS.B. ين اسو حال من سو طرفته (f. 106b).
6. MS.B. adds وقفة هنها after بينه.
ذكر ولاية حسام الدين قبل لما مات في شمس الدولة استشهد خلائشة بتعيينين والوزير عبد الملك فوصل حسام الدين وحضر بباب المدينة ونزل في خيم ظاهر البلد ورسل خلائشة وكان الأمير داود بن سكمان صاحب حسن كنيا هم بالخروج فسبق السيد حسام الدين وراسل خلائشة وحرف له على الذي اراد وحرف ان لا يغير على اهل البلد شيئاً وان يسوزر عبد الملك وحرف على ما اقترحوا ودخل البلد في شوال سنة عشان عشراً وخمسمائة واستنفر عبد الملك واستنتر حاله وحصل له جميع ما كان لا يبي نجم الدين واحسن إلى الناس واحبوه وانشد بالملك وتزوّج بزوجة اخوه الأمير ياس لحجم الدين وكان له منهما الأمير

نجد الدين محمد بن ياس وولد منها بنتاً هي صبي خاتون وهي

---

1. Ms. السيرة
2. Ms. (؟) سادس عادس
3. Ms. وانت
4. The Ms. has an initial لdeleted and a second سplaced between the لا and the
5. Ms. نعم عشر
6. Ms.B. الياس
اوّل ولاده وغيّر مدة وتزوج بالخاتون بعث الأمر غازى من ارزان الروم ووصل إلى مشرفين وولد منها الحاج نجم الدين

ألي في سنة عشرين وخمسة تم أولد الأمر حمل الدين

سربى في سنة إحدى عشرين وخمسة وملك حسام الدين البلد

تم أولد هذة ² خاتون تم أولد الأمر جميع الدين بهرام في

سنة ٣٠٠٠ وخمسة

وملك حسام الدين حلب وبقيت معه مدة ثم انه عاوض

بها ٤٠٠٠ أو سلم حلب وخرجت عن يده

قبل وخرج السلطان محمود إلى العراق واراد الدخول

فمنعه الخليفة المسترشد وجرى بينهما نتائج كثيرة وكسر

المشرشد ونهب ما كان معه ودخل العراق بغير إذن معه وبقي مدة

واستلحا حيث

قبل وفي سنة تسع عشرة ⁶ أو في أول سنة عشرين

وخمسة ⁷ قتل البرغقي جامع الموصل قتلته ⁸ الباغية وولى

ولده مسعود البلد من دار رحبة وغروها واجتمع بهاء الدين

1. MS.B. adds after this name.

2. MS.B.

3. MS. has a lacuna.

4. MS. is illegible here.

5. MS.

6. MS.

7. MS.B. has after قبل في سنة إحدى عشرين

8. MS.
القاعي النوروزى ونصر الدين جفر وصلاح الدين محمد السفياني
وحملوا خزانة وخدمة ونزلوا الى بغداد لخدموا الملك
محمود وبغروا� الامير معود ولد البرسفي في البلاد لما وصلوا
ارتوا وقالوا ان هذا مي ولد يقسم (163ب) بالملك وربما
لا يدير البلاد و يكون الحف عليه فاقتضى، رأى انهم
اجتمعوا بنفسم الدولة زنكي بن آن سنقر و كان شحنة بغداد في
تلك السنة وقرروا معه ما ارادوا من معالجهم و استحلفو ان
يكون ليهاء الدين نفاه الموصل وجميع البلاد و ما فيها من
القضاء و الأمور الدينية له تحلد ان تكون الحجية و امارة
العسكر الصلح الدين وان تكون ولاية الموصل وجميع البلاد
الي نصر الدين وبولى فيها من يراه فعلى لمهم على ذلك وقرر
الامير بهم بينهم ثم اتهم خدموا الملك وصاحب و الخلفة
صاحب والمال الذي وصل معهم وطلبوا زنكي فسلم الهم
السلطان ابنه آل رسال والخناجي و حمل اتاكهما ووضع
له بالبلاد ونار الى الموصل وملك الموصل و البلاد اول سنة
الانتهتين وعشرين و خمسينة
1. MS.B. الأخشياني
2. MS. ليخدم
3. MS. يرفر
4. MS. ارتوا
5. MS.B. adds ولا حمل بالملك ولا حمل
6. MS.B. has وطلبوا اتاكهما وان يكون زنكي
انبه الب ارسلان
7. MS. sic ; MS.B. الب ارسلان
8. The MS. is very damaged here. MS.B. has
9. MS.B. اولاث
قبل وفي سنة اثنين وعشرين وخمسمائة فتولى داود
الدولة وملك على منصب بالشام وكان محاصرا لها نجاه، سمع
فذبحه وملك لاده خبرت وبالو، و ميزكرد و ما حوله الأمير
داود وكان الأمير بكل قد اخذ هذه الولاية من أولاً عق، و مات
و لم يحفظ غير سنة وتوجها فخر الدين نورا رسول الله
فقبل وفي سنة ثلاث وعشرين وخمسمائة مات آتابك
طلتكين بدمشق وولي ولده تاج الملوك بورى دمشق وما حولها
قبل وفي يوم خامس شوال سنة اربع وعشرين وخمسمائة
مات الصليان محمود صاحب اصفهان وفاء قتل الوزير المزدغاني
وهرام (و) البادية اجمع بدمشق ودفر بها و الأول الصليان
أخوه سرك سلطنة مدة سنتين ثم مات في اواخر سبع
وعشرين وخمسمائة وولي مات الصلاين مصور الصلاين
فقبل وكان خلف الصليان أولاً جماعة منهم الصلاين

1. MS. كالوا
2. In the MS. there is no sign of ا، and the لا
   is written above the 
3. MS. sic. ز MS. B. sic.
4. MS. سنة
5. MS. اربعة
6. MS. sic. Usually known as المزدغاني
7. MS. و has been added.
8. MS. sic.
9. MS; i.e. Muhammad.
محمود ولي الأمير وحده غريبه 1 وسلطان سليمان شاه وسعود وسلجوك 2 شاه وحريمان شاه فقيل وافد وخلف السلطان محمود السلطان داود وكان أكبر ولاده وملك أذربيجان وتقتل في تمرير في ستة نعم وثلاثين وخمسة قاتله 3 الباذنية في وسط السوق ودفن بتمرير وخلف محمد شاه وملك السلطنة بعد غم مسعود ونروج ابنه وخلف ملك شاه وكان في حياة 4 غم مسعود معه في العسكر وملك خوزستان وخلف آل آريلان والخنافي مع آتبيك زنكي بالموصل وقتل بالموصل وخلف بنشة من بنت السلطان سنجر كهار ملك 4 وعاشت إلى ما يقارب ستة سبع وخمسين وخمسة واما سليمان شاه نمات ولم يعقب واما ملعون 5 فله ابن هو الآن بالموصل كان على مسعود بلال بغلة تكيرت فلما اخذت نفسها اذهب إلى الموصل وهو الآن بها وله أولاد واما السلطان غريبه 6 فانه خلف آريلان شاه امه زوجة الأمير

1. Ms. sic
2. Ms. sic
3. Ms. فتله
4. Ms. حيوه
5. Ms. sic
6. Ms. sic
7. Ms. sic
MS. sic. Possibly 1. 

2. MS. sic. Possibly 2.

3. MS. sic. Possibly 3.

4. MS. B. after 4.

5. MS. sic. Possibly 5.

6. MS. B. has instead of 6.

7. This word is illegible in the MS. 7.

8. This word is illegible. 8.
الدولة صاحبنا وولي ولده الأمير أبو نصر وفها تسلم
الامير داود قلعة فلليس وناتاسا
فناو اختفى اهل مصر وجماع وقالوا هذا البيت
لا تموت الامام منهم الا وقد خلف ولدا ذكرا منعما علمه
بالامام و هذا لم يخلع ولدا ولا نع الا حمل وكان قبل موته
نُر على الحمل فقالوا بحوز النصر على الحمل و يمكن ان يكون
ذكرا نصفوا ينظرون الحمل إلى ان وضع فوضعت بنتا فاختلها
الناس و جما و اخرجوا رجل امن الغفر من اولاد المستنعر
امام عبد المجيد وكان ممومون في لقب بالحافظ لدى
الله في آخر ستة خمس وعشرين و خمسينإة وقيل هو عبد المجيد
المستنعر وقيل هو عبد المجيد بن باي الفقم المستعالي بن
المستنعر وقبل ولد غير المستعالي لمستنعر نوالي الخلافة
وما عليه و انقطع النصر من قبل المستعالي و اولاده وهو قول
العامة فإن النصر في الامام متعلق من المستنعر الى نزار الى
الان وهو مذهبه وليس احد منهم على الصبح وباقي الحافظ في

1. MS. وقالوا هذا is repeated.
2. MS. فانفصلوا
3. MS. ابن
4. MS. ابن
5. MS. ابن
6. MS. احرا
الخليفة واستغر وتتوعد ملكه ولم يست خلافة إلا في بنى العباس لقول
النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في حق العباس 2 أت أبو الاملاك 3 من امتي إلى يوم
القانية واهل معر واصحابة على الباطل وانما اهل
الاعيروه والاهواء يقولون ذلك ولا امام ولا خليفة الا بغداد من آل
العباس
قيل وفي سنة خمس وعشرين وخمسانة ملك الامير داود
امرد وباهمود وباتاسا وفي (1645) سنة اربع وعشر
وخمسانة لقي أسامة بن زعيم جموع الدين والامير داود وكسروا على
سرقة والنجوا إلى دارا وسار زعيم إلى الغام وممل حماة وما
حولها وحمور فعدد دمشق واخذ دبس من دمشق وعاد إلى الموصل
و معه دبس مفيدا
قيل وفي سنة ست وعشرين وخمسانة قعد الخليفة
المسترذ في شهر رمضان الموصل ونزل عليها وحارها مدة وكان
بها نعبر الدين حفر وابنا فقاثم الخليفة وكان حنمها وحفر
الخندق وفتق عليها الخليفة ولم يبطل منها متحودا وعاد الى
بغداد ودخل بن ناسح عشرة ذى الفعدة
قيل وفي سنة سبع وعشرين وخمسانة مات الوزير عبد
الملك بمصرفين وولي نظر الديوان الناصح علي بن أحمد الأموي
و كان مولعا بآمذ نفخه مولع الدين بن نيسان وصادره بختين

1. MS.
2. In the margin of the MS. is written
3. MS. sic. i.e.,
4. MS.
5. MS. adds
6. MS. adds
7. MS. B.
8. MS. B.
الدinar و ولى موضعه و وصل إلى مصرفين نجم ولده أبو نصر
الشمّرة، و على الناحية الوقفية إلى أن مات الوزير (و) تولى
نظر الدبان
قيل في سنة عمان و عشرين و خمسمائة و وصل المؤيد
ابو الحسن بن مخلت إلى مصرفين من الجزيرة و كان صادره
الوزير عبد الملك و عانقه و أخذ منه مالا كثيرا و انتقل
إلى الجزيرة فلما مات الوزير عبد الملك عاد إلى مصرفين
و ولي الاستفاء مع الناحية
وفي سنة عمان و عشرين و خمسمائة و وصل سهوب الدين
حبشي أبو غالب بن حبشي 7 من أهل العراق إلى خدمة السعد
حسام الدين و أقام عنه على أحسن سبيل الضافة و كان في
خدمة ملاح الدين محمد البغدادي 8 بحماة و كان نفظه و عاقبه
و عده معه كلبا في غرارة و كان نفر الكلب و نبه به دنه
و استدار في الغرارة حتى وقع رأس الكلب بين فخذيه و عصر
على حلفه حتى مات في الغرارة و أطلق فانهزم إلى قلعة حمیر
و أقام عند نجم الدولة 9 مالك من ماله 10 و لم ينتقل

1. The reading شمرة is very tentative. MS. B has
   the same word فاعتي ابنته ابا نصر الشمرة.
2. is added from MS. B.
3. has been added. MS. B.
4. MS. نضر.
5. has been supplied from MS. B., which has
6. MS. ابي.
7. MS. B حبشي بن محمد بن حبشي.
8. MS. البغدادي.
9. MS. B. SHAB AL-DIN.
10. MS. Malak bin Salam. is not legible.
الى ماردين و بقي عند حسام الدين مدة و ولي الوزارة 1 مع السعد حسام الدين و بلغ من الدولة ما لم يبلغه احد 2 و تحكم اونى تحكم
و في هذه السنة وصل الى ماردين المكين 4 أبو اليرقات بن أبي الفهم 5 الحرامي محبزا من بني عمه من حران و اقام عند السعد حسام الدين على سبيل الغ篇章ة و قبل خراج في شعبان سنة ثم و عشرين و خمسينه قبل في سنة عشرين و خمسانه و خراج الخليفة المسترشد من بغداد و لقي السلطان مسعود سماح هذان الى موقع لندي دأى مرك فرب من جبل سيهون و نهب العسكر و كان حرم السلطن خلفا عظما (765ه) و معه صاحب خربرتيت 7 جيشه و عسكره وكان نفذ له عم السلطان سنجر عسكرا عظما فألقوا و كروا الخليفة و امر و امراء ارباب المناصب كلها ولقد سألت السعد مؤيد الدين 9 ابا عبد الله محمد بن عبد الكريم الانباري رحمه الله في سنة اربع و خمسين و خمسانه بسجدة حين نزلت اليه في هذه السنة عن حال المسترشد

الوزارة
1. MS.

2. MS. B. وبلغ مرتبة لم يبلغها غيره 333 ؛ Marsh غيره 333
3. MS. B. وفي هذه السنة وصل
4. MS. المكين ؛ MS. B. الملكين
5. MS. المكين ؛ MS. B. الفهر
6. MS. B. mentions only 528.
7. MS. 5ic.
8. MS. وكسر
9. MS. B. adds سيد الدولة after مؤيد الدين
و وقعة وما جرى 1 نقال رضي الله عنه كان قد وقع 2 بين السلطان والخليفة في أيام السلطان محمود وخرج وكسره مرتين فلما ولي محمود استقال نوابه على العراق وأغراه الخليفة في إملاكه فوحت الوحدة وتجوز المسترشد وعزم على الخروج وجد في ذلك 3 وافق ان بعض الأيام دخل الوزير شرف الدين الزنبي على بن عراد على الخليفة وانا معه وجمال الدين ظلحة صاحب المخزن وكان الخليفة قد طرد أصحاب السلطان عن العراق ورغب صاحب المخزن على دار السلطان للمظلوم والبلد فلما دخلنا ذلك اليوم فقال له الوزير شرف الدين بالموالا في نفس الملكوك شيء فهله بأذن له في النقال نقال قال بن مواليما إلى ابن تمضى وسمن تحتفل وألي من تلتحم وسمن تنتحر ومثنا بسنداد امكننا ولا يبتعذنا أحد والعراق نبنا الكتابة أن الحسن بن علي عليه السلام لما خرج إلى العراق جرى عليه ما جرى ولو اقام بعكة 4 ما اختلف عليه أحد من الناس 5 فقال لي الخليفة ما تقول يا كاتب فقلت يا مولانا العواب المعان وما رآه الوزير فهو الرأي فلا بدعنا 6 علينا أحد وليت يبني علينا 7 العراق نقال لصاحب المخزن يا وكيل ما

1. After وما جرى MS. B. adds وسبب ولاية المختنق وكيف ولي دون غيره
2. MS. Wقع is written in the margin.
3. After ووافقه جمال الدين بن MS. B. adds طلحة
4. MS. 8يا written above the line.
5. MS. نفه is written on the line and لنا above it.
6. MS. B. adds بالمدينة after بعكة
7. After أحد من الناس MS. B. adds وكان سابعه جميع الناس
8. MS. له
9. MS. and MS. B. يقدم لنا
10. MS. B. لنا
تقول نائلي نفسها ما في نفس موانان و كان هو حمله على الخروج
قال المسترشد
و لام يكن من الموت برف من الغين ان تموت جبانا
ثم أنه جهذ و جمع و كان قد حصل في خدمته جماعة من امراء
الآثراك و اعلاعهم ما عظما تم خرج و خرجنا فلما نارتنا
هذان خرج السلاطين مصعود فالتفقوا في موقع يسمى دامرك
 قريب من جبل بهعون قريب من هذان فلما اصطفت المساكر
وهما بالقاتلف نفر من معركتا جميع الأمراء و الآثراك إلى
جانب السلاطين فانهزم الخليفة و من بقي معه و نهب العسكر
وبرت الخليفة و ارباب المناصب و حمل الوزير صاحب المخزن
و كان و قب العلوين إلى قلعة صريحان بالقرب من قزوين
و الري و لقد رثبتها في تمام و اربعين و خمسمئة لما دافرت إلى
الري و رابتها وهي تتوج على رأس جيل عال و اخذ السلاطين
المسترشد معه و غامبه في اذربيجان إلى ان وصل به الى مراغة
فنزل هناك دخل عليه ثلاثة نفر من الملاحدة فقتلوه فرضي
الله عنه و قتله(1654) معه رجل كان يفلي به يسري ابن سكينة
سوم الخمس سادس عشر زيد القعدة سنة ثمان و عشر و خمسمئة
و كانت خلاته سبعة عشر سنة و سبعة أشهر و يومان

1. MS. حك ; MS. B. has الحجر
2. MS. B.
واد الم يكن من الموت برف من العجز ان يكون جبانا
3. The MS. is damaged here. MS. B.
4. MS.
5. MS. سادس عشر MS. B. سادس عشر
6. MS. بومان
كان ولي عبده ولده ابا جعفر المنصور الرائد بالله
وكان تخفيف سبداد فلما وصل الخبر إلى بغداد بقتله بابعوا
الرائد بالخلالة وقيل ان السلطان سحى نغذ اله من قتله وقيل
ان السلطان مسعود نفذ استاؤن عمه سنجر قائد له في قتله
نرتب اولوا فدخلوا عليه نكتلوه ودفن في مدينة المراغة
وكان مع السلطان في مسكونه دبس بن صدة بن مزيد 5
ورحل السلطان بعد مدتا الى باب تبريزة وركب بعض الأيام ونزل
ودخل الى سيف الدولة دبس فضرب عنقه ونفي السلطان اماما
وتزوجت دبس وكانت امه شرف خاتون بنت عبيد الدولة
بن حنجر من زيد ابنة نظام الملك وحمل دبس الى ماردين
إلى زوجته كبار حاكون نفذن بالمشهد عند نجم الدين الغازى
رحمهما الله وكان قد قبل ان دبس حمل السلطان على نقل
المشرشة قال موعد الدين لما قتله المشرشة نفذ السلطان
مسعود احضروا عنه نحفر الوزير شرف الدين وجمال الدين

---

1. Ms. بل
2. Ms. اوايک
3. Ms. B adds سيف الدولة in front of دبس
4. Ms. اب
5. Ms. B adds حين فبخ الخليفة وينال أنه حمل السلطان على قتله
6. Ms. B adds ت written below the line
7. Ms. B adds الدین is written on the line, ملك above it. Ms. B
addsالحن من احق
8. Ms. B adds حمل من باي تبريزة after دبس
9. Ms. B دفن في مشهد نجم الدين B
10. Ms. B نفذ is best placed here, as in Ms. B. In Ms. A
is written above مسعود
ماحط المخزن وانا وكان نقيب العلويين قد مات بقلعة سرحان
ودنن هناكم نلما حضرنا عنده قال ما الرأي وما الفيديب
في أمر الخلافة من ترون فقال الوزير يا مولانا الخلافة لولي
العهد وفد ساية الناس وجلس واستقر وقد بوبع له بولاية العهد
والان بعد قليل ابنه فقال ما الى هذا سبيل ابدا ولا أقدر
عليها فانه يحدث نفسه بالخروج مثل ابنه فنحن كل يوم من حبت
ولي المسترشد لم يزل بخرج علينا وكان خرج على اخي محمود
مرتين وعلى مرة ولهذا 5 اخرى تم عن عه ما تام وبقت علينا
شغامة عظيمة ومسة الى آخر الدهر ويقولون قتلوا الخليفة
وهم كانوا يفسي في عود الخلافة الى هذا البيت ارد لا ليس
الا من لا يدخل نفسه في غير امور الدين ولا بذل ولا تخذ ولا
يجمع ولا يخرج على ولا على اهل بيته وفي الدار جماعة فاعتمدوا
على شغفهم ماحط عقل ورأي وفديب يلزم نفسه لما جدد من
طاعتنا لا يخرج من داره ولا تخرجوا على هرون من المتهدى فهو
شيخ كبير ولا يرى الفتحة وقد اثار به عمى سنجر 6

1. MS. B. النقيب الظاهر
2. MS. B. احضرنا عندنا نجرون
3. MS. من ترون فقال الوزير يا مولانا الخلافة مع is written in
the right margin.
4. After الرائد MS. B. adds الرائد
5. MS. favours this form.
6. لا is provided from MS. B.
7. After MS. B. has في غير أمر الخلافة
8. MS. B. وامر الدين
9. MS. B. السلطان العالم سنجر عمى
وكان في الدار في ذلك الوقت سمعة أخوة من أولاد المغندى وليم أولاد أَوْلاد أُبُو اولاد أُبُو وليم من السنة إلى سنة نيفية
وخمسين وخمسنائة وكان في الدار من أولاد المستظهر سمعة أخوة منهم الأرض أبو عبد الله أبو طالب وابن نصر وابن القاسم وأبو علي وابن عيسى وابن اولي لمحمد وكان للمسرحد وابن اشياء وابن الرائد وله مقدار نيف وعشرين ولدا أكبرهم امبر الجشو وكأن ولد لابه وهو ابن تسع سنين
ولم برم مثل ذلك قد ولد حدوثي بعض من اثنا اثنين سبعمائة ممن كان بدخل
وقد حذفني بعض من اثنا اثنين سبعمائة ممن كان بدخل
(166a) إلى دار الخلافة وبلع عليهم أن المستظهر اشترى للرائد لما كان عمره سبع سنين خمسة سنوات وأمرهم أن يلازموه وحكمته
من أنفسهم وحملوه على ذلك فانهم "تع" على ذلك إلى أن مارس

1. MS. B. نفت
2. MS. B. اعمل
3. MS. مقدر
4. MS. B. اخذ
5. MS. B. جوار
6. MS. امرهم
7. MS. يحكموه
8. MS. أنفسهم
9. MS. يحملونه
10. MS. فكانوا
11. After معه MS. B. has

وكان ذلك إلى أن سلم
لآ بدل مبلغ الرجال وكانت فيهن جارية

فمه حديثا نواحها ذات يوم فحملت منه مبلغ المستمرد ذلك فأدركوا واحضرها وهديها فقالت والله ما تقدم أي سوء وانه بالغ مثل جميع الرجال فجعل بباقي الجوار فقلن مثل ذلك فأمر

ان تحمل الجارية قلنا ثم وظفتها فلما قام عنها اخرجت الدين والماني عليه وكذلك فعل بباقي الجوار فخرج الماني ففر المستمرد بذلك فلما تم حملها وضعت ابنا فسماء المستمرد

امرأ الجيش وسره ضرورا شديدا وهذا ما لم بسمع بمتنه الا في الحجاز بقال ان نساء نهامة باض لنسى ويتيف صبيانهم

لتحم أقرب ما رأى ابن اب وابنه ما رأى بين عمر بن العاص وبين ابنه عبد الله وكان ولد له وعمر اجتاعرة سنة ولم

بطرق الا ما ذكرناه من امر الراشد

والراشد على طريقه ابنه وكان نابه الناس في آخر

سنة تحص وعشرين وخمسين وكان شيا من الرجال شريف النفس

ذا رأى وهمة فلهذا انحرف السلطان عن توليه الخلافة

1. is added.
2. MS. وكان فيهم
3. MS. سبيل
4. MS. فقالوا
5. MS. B. نوقف
6. After وبم بباقي MS. B. has واعترموا مكان الماني مع كل الجوار
7. MS. B. واحدة
8. MS. عشر
قبل وفي ذي الحجة سنة نعم وعشرين وخمسينة قتل
السلطان مسعود سنة من دبعين بده مبر وأوانه وهم لا إن
الذي قتله كان فراغاً (و) ملكورس 2
فبل ونذل السلطان مسعود만 عليه مسخر أخذ أنذه فينم
ولي تنذل الله يقول لا تول الا من يغمه الوزير وصاحب
المخزن والابن الإباري ناجم السلطان به وعاورهم وأثر
هرون وهزهم ما امرهم السلطان مسخر وقال الوزير إذا كان
هذا الأمر بلزمنا فنحن نولي من نراء وهو الزائد العابد
الدين الذي ليس في الدار مثله قال السلطان من هو قال
الامير عبد الله بن المستنصر نقال ونضمنون ما يجري منه
غلال الوزير نعم
وكان الأمير ابو عبد الله مهر الوزير شرف الدين على
ابنه فانها دخلت ذات يوم في الدار في زمن المستنصر فراها
الامير ابو عبد الله فطلبها من ابيه فزوجه اباها وكان شرف
الدين إذ ذاك نقيب النفياء 7 ودخل بها وبقيت عنده مدة وما ت
عهد نقال السلطان ذاك الحكم واكتمنا الحال لئلا نحم الامر
1. has been added.
2. MS. sic.
3. MS. B. has made the gowab instead of
4. MS. لا تول
5. After MS. B. has لا تول إلا من يقع عليه رأي الوزير وصاحب
المخزن وكاتب الأنساء وضمون ما جرى منه ويكون الجواب عليهم
6. MS. B. B. B.
7. MS. B. adds ثم انتقل الى الوزارة
    نقيب النفياء
After the four occasions this word is used, it is spelt سرزاب

8. MS. B. سيفا

9. MS. B.
بعض سيفك، فانى اريد اخرج كل من في السراداب واقتل الجميع حتى لا يبقى من يحلل للخلابة فانه Operational 2، ربما دخلوا وغيروا وولوا وغيرهم امر بفتح السراداب فالنحار جاهز، فقال ما الخبر فقال أن آتاك ولعب الحريم الطاهر وطلب الموصل في الدهادة واما السلطان فوقع وغير النهروان ولما حقق آتاك نزول السلطان بالنهران انجزم فرضي السيف من يده ودخل إلى الدار واخذ معه من الجواهر ما لا تنكره لها قيمة واطعاني منها مثل ذلك، وخرج وأخرج معه ناقت القفاة الزمنية وكان قد استور جلال الدين ابن الرضا (ت 546هـ) في قمة نخرج وخرجنا وحق آتاك ولعب على طريق الموصل قال السيد موسى الدين رحمه الله فلما كان بكرة ذلك اليوم دخل السلطان بهداد ودخلنا معه ونزل في داره ونزلنا نحن في دورنا وكان دخلنا عاشر ذى الفعدة سنة ثلاثين وخمسين فلم كأن من الغد مضى الوزير إلى دار السلطنة ونحن معه واستذاذنا فيما فعل نأخذ خظه وخلوتنا بالضمان ثم عدننا إلى

1. MS. B. يرى ويدك
2. MS. هآلاء
3. MS. ظاهر; MS. B. الطاهر
4. MS. يعرف
5. MS. أبو
6. MS. B. has been added.
7. MS. B. hasinstead of لحن اتاك وسار سعي اتاك
8. MS. السلالة is illegible.
دورنا وأصبحنا يوم الاثنين سابع عشر ذي الفعدة سنة ثلثين وخمسمئة وخمسة وأربعين عن الله وتحت الوزير معه وتحتنا معه هم وشرت عليه القيام بأمر الخلافة وطاعة السلطان واعلمناه اننا قد ضمنا ذلك من السلطان جميع ما اقترحه عليه فرشى بذلك وانعاملنا عنه ومضينا الى السلطان واعلمناه ما جرى وانه رضي بما شرط عليه (1675هـ) فقال السلطان إذا كان من الندى فاضموا فلما أصبحنا معدنا إلى الدار وانهرا من الدار اشباه من الآتى التي تعلل للغناه واشعارها لا تلبق وشهد جماعة من أهل الدار انه شرب الخمر فانتهى العلماء بخلعه واعتقى ذلك القاضي عماد الدين شرف الغضاة أبو طاهر أحمد بن الكرخي المحتم وكان فاضل أصحاب التذكير الله واجتمع العلماء والآتى شعر به ودخل إليه الوزير وصاحب المخزن وانهرا وتحتنا وناولته راحة فيها ما يسمى به من اللقب وكان فيها المنتفي لأمر الله والمنتفى بأمر الله والمستنجد بالله فقال ذلك اليمين فقال لي الخليفة ما ترى فنقلت المنتفي لأمر الله فقال مبارك

1. Ms. أبو
2. Ms.B والOCR بالأكرام وطاعة السلطان
3. Ms.B من عذوبة
4. Ms. شرطت
5. Ms.B إذا كان من غد وهو الثلاثاء ثالث عشر ذي الفعدة سنة ثلثين وخمسمئة
6. Ms.B دار الرائد
7. Ms. الإن
8. Ms. يليق
9. Ms. B فتى الفقهاء بخلعه وانه لا يسأل لذلك وكأن المنتفي لذلك شرف الغضاة ابن الكرخي
10. Ms. يرم
11. Ms.B بسور الله
12. Ms.B مغال له (sic) الوزير لي
تم مّد بهدّة ناذرًا الوزير وقبلها وقال بابتها سدنا ومولانا
المُقتفي لأمر الله أمير المؤمنين على كتاب الله وسنة رسول
الله ﷺ واجتهاده ثم اتخذها صاحب الخزن وقبلها وبايعه على مثل
ذلك ثم اتخذيه وقلت بعد ان قبّلتها بابتها سدنا ومولانا
الأمام المقتفي لأمر الله أمير المؤمنين على ما بابتها عليه
اباه واخاه وابن اخه في ولاية عده وكرت بابتها الأمام
المتشرف بالله لما خدمته في وكالة الدار سنة 1120
وتسعين
وبقيت إلى سنة سبع وخمسمائة لما لبثت ديوان الأنشاء وبايعت
المتشرف والراشد ثم قاما من عده ودخل إلى الدار وبايعه
الناس ودخل العلماء والفنّهاء والقُناة وأكابر الناس 4
نبيعوه وحفر السلطان مسعود بعد ثلاثة اباه وبايعه وبايعه
جميع أصحابه من خواجة 5 والأمير حجاب 6 وجميع أرباب الدوله
وادين له الأمر واستنفر في الخلافة
قبل وفي سنة سبع وعشرين وخمسمائة مات نجم الدولة

---

1. Ms.B adds وقام
2. Ms. has a lacuna here
3. الناس is supplied from Ms.B.
4. Ms.B والمقدمون
5. Ms. أخواجة
6. Ms.B adds تشار
ابن مالك بالقلمة وولي ولده وفيها أخذ أتابك زنكي الرقة
من مسبب بن مالك
وكان وزير للممتد في إبامه جماعة منهم ابن الدين
خواجة أحمد بن نظام الملك مرتين ومرة الدين انوشوان
مرتين وحلا din Abu علي بن صدقة الى أن مات ووزر له
شرف الدين الزينبي الى ان نقل والد ما ذكرنهاء
اما ما كان من الراعد فانه خرج مع أتابك زنكي في منفر
سنة احده ونائبين وخمسة الى الموصل ومعه نغي الغضا
الزينبي وحلا din Abu الرضا بن صدقة ابن اخي الوزير ابي
علي وغاي عندم فصول معه الى باب تعبيد وقام اباما
ثم انفعله ومنه الى السلطان مصعود لبدي خليه وبه الى
السلطان ملجر
وقبل نع الذل الان الذي داود ودخل عليه حتى برده الى
الخلابة فلما قارب اصفان خرج عليه قوم من الملاحده

1. Ms. آخواج
2. Ms. B نظام الدين ابو تمر أحمد
3. Ms. B adds نقيب النيابة
4. Ms. B adds علي بن طراد
5. Ms. احد
6. Ms. اخ
7. Ms. B وكان نع الوزير خلال الدين ابا الرضا بن صدقة ببغداد
8. Ms. B وعاد الى الموصل
9. Ms. B وسار بطلب السلطان حتى يستأذه ودخل الى خراسان
10. Ms. sic
11. Ms. has with ف written above the line.
ودخلوا عليه فقتلوه في شهر رمضان سنة اثنينين وثلثين وخمسين وخمسمائة
وحمل إلى امدهان قد بنى في مدينة شيرستان من امدهان على
فرعم وبلغ انها من ابنة ذي القرنين على ما يعرف بجزراؤد 2 على
القنطرة وكانت خلفته من حيث بوبع له بعد قتل ابيه إلى ان
بوبع للمقتفي 3 احد عشر شهرا زائدا فانعما وقبل ان السلطان
بوقذ من دخل عليه وقتله وخلفه في الدار نيفا وعشرين ولدا
منهم الكبير امير الجيش ونجال انه ولا الهام قبل خروجه من
بنداد 5 واما فاضي القصاة الزمني رحمه الله نامه عاد ونزل
الي بنداد وعاد الى منبه واما جلال الدين ابو الرضا بن
مدفنة فانه وزر آتابك زدي مدة ونزل عاد الى بنداد وكان
وزر آتابك بعد موت حياة الدين ابو سعيد الكفرنوني واستقر
المقتفي في الخلافة وتوعد امره
قبل وفي سنة اثنينين وثلثين حامر السلطان ملحوش شاه
خلال مدة ورحل عنها 7 وفي سنة ثلت وثلاثين خط الامير
داود للمقتفي الجمعة عايل عشرين المحرم

1. Ms. B 
2. Ms. sic; Ms. B 
3. Ms. المقتفي 
4. Ms. B adds وجعل الاسم الملاحدة 
5. Ms. B adds ومغيبان القصاة وجمال الدين بالموصى بعد انتمائه 
6. Ms. ابن 
7. Ms. has a lacuna here. Perhaps it should read
1. A number has been omitted here.
2. Ms. اسروا
3. Ms. اخويت
4. Ms. has added in the margin.
5. Ms. sic
6. Ms. sic
7. Has been added.
8. Ms. ابن
9. Ms. has a lacuna here.
10. Ms. مجد
فيقبت مدة وتزوجها السعيد حسام الدين وكان وصل هذه السنة
تاج الدين أبو سالم بن نباتة رضي الله عنه إلى ماردين
قبل وكان في سنة ثمان وعشرين وخمسين وأ длًا نازل آتاك
زنكي وحمام الدين نُلّة العور فاخذها حادي عشرين رجب وسلماً
إلى السعيد حسام الدين ونقل جندال بن اسلم وكان امبرا
مقدامًا من اصحاب الامير داود وكان امير العور للامير داود
وفيها (168هـ) وصل آتاك زنكي إلى نل شيخ (و) إجتماع بحمام
الدين ولقوا داود بباب آدم وكسروه ودخل إلى العور واخذها
وفيها ملك آتاك زنكي طنزي ومن نل الشيخ (و) وزار ضياء
الدين أبو سعيد بن الكنَّريوش آتاك زنكي وحمل في خدمته وفي
تلك السنة مات شمس الدولة الاحداب
وفيل وفي سنة ثلثين امير حسام الدين بنزاق الربيع
والحدثة نحنذاً و كان قد وقع الخلاف بين السعيد حسام الدين
والامير داود (و) آتاك مع الامير حسام الدين فكروا الامير

1. Ms. B حمدان (f.103a) مصان
Ms. sic.
2. Ms. مقدام
3. و is added.
4. Ms. حسام
5. و is added.
6. Ms. ضياء
7. Ms.B نابدت في نفعه في الجمعة ناسع المحرم
8. و is added.
داود على باب آنده وساروا فملكونا جبل جور وباقيين والسيوان
اختت من الأمير آرسلان بن عبد الجبار بن ارنين وستها أتاك
إلى السعيد حسان الدين وانهزم الأمير آرسلان إلى خدمة الأمير
داود
قبل في سنة ثمان وعشرين نهب الأمير داوود رفح طنزي
وسي كل من فيها ونجب اموالهم وهكنت النساء بسبت لو غزت
الاترجمه ما فعلت أكثر من ذلك وفي سنة ثمان وعشرين ملك السعيد
حمان الدين الهناغ على ما ذكرناه وىذها من الأمير شمس الدولة
عيسى بن أحمد بن نظام الدين بن مروان
قبل في سنة احدي وعشرين وخمسة وحل السعيد حسان
الدين إلى مغرفين ومعه حبيبي بن حبيش وعمل حساب العمال
والзыва وتعارف ومعاه ولعله يه تما واجله وحنني الناس
من شدة لا توصف من الشحم والجور والظلم وسلك بسهم ا ين بطق
من الحبد والفهر وتفغ الناحي الأدمى وكان مثولبا بديوان
مغرفين وقى ابنه ابنه ابا نصر وكان المؤدي بن مختر مشolia

1. Ms. sic
2. Ms. B
3. Ms.
4. Ms. B
5. Ms. B
6. Ms. B
7. Ms.
8. ابن
نارى نرم من يد حبي ومنى إلى الجزيرة وقى فيها ابا سعيد
واخز العميد ابا طاهر بن المحسن من الحس و كان له مدة
محبوسا وولا 6 الناس ولقي الناس منه شدة وفعئة لا توص
و كنت في هذه السنة بالجزيرة واغتت بها مدة وعدت الى
ميسرين وأخذت بتنصيب ورايت آناهبك زنكي بثنين
قبل وفي سنة عشرين مات نجم الدولة مالك بن
مالك بالقلعة واخذ آناهبك زنكي الروقة من الأمير مسيب وسار الى
دمشق وحارة مدة ثم دخل فيها وفي القلعة ولده بدران مدة
و بقيق (الي) 2 ان دخل سنة ثلثين وقتله اخوه الأمير علي بن
مالك وولي القلعة
قبل وفي سنة ثمان وعشرين وخمسة ظهر عبد المؤمن
بالمغرب وانا انكر من حاله وما وصل الي من امره وهو ان
محمد بن تومرت كان من المعامدة وخرج الى بلاد المشرق وهو
شيخ عبد المؤمن بن علي الكوصي من جبال الاموس المأوى بالمغرب
وكان محمد بن تومرت الاعريعي الحسيني خرج(168) الى المشرق
3
وبغي مدة ثم عاد إلى المغرب في سنة عشرة وخمسة
و اقام بمروكش واجتمع اليه جمعة من الفقهاء انظرهم نجرى
بينهم ابباء غير ما جرت به عادة المفاربة وخارجا عن طريقهم
نانكر عليهم وانكروا عليه ثم انهم اجتمعوا الى امير المسلمين

1. The Ms. is damaged here. The terminal ساب is visible.
2. احتساب (?)
3. إلى has been added.
4. Ms. sic ; Ms.B sic
5. Ms.B
علي ابن يوسف بن تاشفين وقالوا له نخرج هذا من بيننا والأئمة الناس واهلهم فتقدم الله بالخروج فخرج في سنة عشرين
وخمسة ونها إلى الجبل إلى المعاملة وهم جنرمن البربر.
وكذبوا عبده وناقشهم بينهم وحملهم على ترك طاعة أمير
المسلمين نخرج الله ابن المسلمين فلقبه نكره وقتل رأس
العسكر عبد الله بن ماوية فخرج أمير المسلمين بنفسه وجمع
الجماع فلقبه وكسره وتمكن في الجبل وهو مسيرة شهير في شهر وهو
جبل درن بولاية مركوش والسوس واجتمع الله خلق كثير عليهم.
وبقيت الى سنة ثلاث وعشرين وخمسة وماه محمد بن تومرت وولي
موضعه علي الورنشي وجيز الحساكر وحاصر مركوش في سنة أربع
وعشرين وخمسة وقبله أمير المسلمين وأزاحهم من مركوش.
نائيهم الى الجبل وتحتله وليي الامر بينه وبين أمير
المسلمين يزيد وبنفنش الى سنة عشرين وعشرين وخمسة وماه
علي الورنشي
وتولى موضعه عبد المؤمن بن علي الكوعي وكان من جملة
أصحاب محمد بن تومرت وتلامذته وأصحابه ومعاشه نجوم ولي
امير المسلمين وكره وملك الجبل باسره وملك ولاية أخرى ونزل

1. Ms.
2. Ms.B adds
3. Ms. ارن ; Ms.B
4. Ms. sic.
5. Ms. sic.
6. Ms.
7. Ms. sic.
8. Ms.B adds (عند)
9. Ms.B adds وهو برر المنس

ملاحظة: ملاحظات لم تتم الترجمة في الأصل.
في سنة تمتين١ خمسمائة العجرة وفتح أكثر بلاد أمير المسلمين
وأقيمت له البعثة وفتح أكثر أفريقية وبلاداً من الأندلس وفتح
أكثر بلاد أمير المسلمين وفتح من الأفريقي موافقة كبيرية وباقي
القرن إلى سنة اربعين وخمسينًَا ولفظ أمير المسلمين تاغين بن
علي بن يوسف وكره وقتل خلفا كشيرا وامر وقتله وتوفدت له
البلاد وفتح أكثر المغرب وهابه الناس وكان لا يفتح مدينة الا
قتل كل من فيها وكان يقلل إنا صاحب الزمان وملك في سنة
انتين واربعين مدينة تونس وهي من أعظم مدن المغرب وقد
ذكرت في كتاب المسالك والممالك ان دور سورة احد وعشرين
ميلا
وفي سنة احدى وثلاثين في رابع ذي القعدة تسلم الأمير
دأود هاني من الأمير شارع واشعاع انقطاعًا واقام في خدمته
(في) ربيع هاني الى ان مات ودفن في حاني
قبل وفي سنة احدى وأربعين وخمسين ملك عبد المؤمن
من ولاية بني حماد وأجتاه عنها وفي سنة انتين وثلاثين
---

1. Ms.
2. Ms.
3. Ms.
4. Ms.
5. Ms.B adds
6. Ms. written in left margin.
7. in has been added.
8. Ms.B adds

وقت١ من أكابرهم جماعة
وخسامة فتح المهدية وملكها ولم يبق له منازع ولا من بنايه ولا من بقاومه وبنى مدينة عظيمة احدهما بريني 1 وسماها المهدية (1696) والآخر بريني 2 واستقر في ملكه وبنى بفتح
من بلاد الأفregon طرفنا فطرنا إلى إن مات في سنة أربعين وخمسة ومن بقي اولاده من بعده في الملك وقال انه خلف نيفا واربعين 5 ولدا ذكروا فبل وفي سنة اثنين وثلاثين وخمسة خرج ملك الروم من النمسطنة إلى الغام وملك زعامة وانه جمل اهلها باسرهم وسبل كل من فيها ونبه ما كان بها وحذ على حلب وحاصروه ولقيه آتانكه زنكي وبنى في وجه وصارت إليه عساكر دصار بكر وديار ربيعة احده ونفد الأمير داود ولده معه عساكر التركمان فرحل من حلب وعاد إلى بلاده وفي هذه السنة مات بهاء الدين أبو الحسن بن علي ابن الشهيرزوري بالرقة ودفن بها وعثر نقطة إلى الجزيرة وكتب بالجزيرة وفي هذه السنة اقتبس بها مدة وعدت إلى مبرقين وفي

1. Ms. أحدثها
2. Ms. sic ; Ms.B في بريني
3. Ms.B والآخر في بريني وسماها ...
4. Ms.B وهو إلى الآن في يد الأفregon من المغرب يفتح
5. Ms. اربعون
6. Ms. سا
7. Ms.B ولكل ولده نم الدين نفس الشاة
سنة انتهى وغلبتن اصلح زنكي مع صاحب دمشق وتزوج بآله
وفيها اتصل زنكي حمص وقتل شركنه صاحبها وفيها قتل شباب
الدين صاحب دمشق وولي اخنه
فهل وفي سنة تلت وغلبتن وخمسائة نحب الأمير داود
ارزن وسي أهلها ونحب أموالهم وأباح الجند كلما وكان بها
وجرى عليهم أكثر مما جرى على أهل طنزي ولقي الناس منه ما
لا يوجد ووصل السيد حسام الدين إلى مينفرتين ووصل اليه
حمام الدولة قرني من الأحده ماحب ارزن
فهل وفي شوال سنة تلت وغلبتن نوفي ملكين المجري
صاحب حران وقعدها آتابك وتسلمها وفي هذه السنة كسر حمام
الدين الأمير في شيخان واحذ القافلة من باب الرها وكتب في
هذه السنة بالحص ومثل هذه السنة اصلح السيد حسام الدين
وآتابك زنكي وأخذ دارا 4 وتزوج بهذه خاتم بيت السيد حسام
الدين وحملت في سنة أربع وغلبتين وخمسائة الى الموصل وكتب
بها
واقت بعفارتين الى آخر سنة تلت (وغلبتين) وخمسائة
واحترث الى بغداد واجتمعت باعبيد معاذ الدين ابن عبد الله
محمد بن الإباري رحمه الله ووصلت في شهر ربيع الأول سنة
أربع وغلبتين وخمسائة لانني كنت اقتمت بالجزيرة والموصل مدة

1. Ms. ب
2. Ms. ب
3. Ms. ب
4. Ms. B
5. has been added.
وانتت ببغداد مدة سنة أشه ورأيت الخليفة العباسي لما
بابه خواجة عز الملك ودخل الخليفة العباسي يأخذ السلطان
فكتب ببغداد وحضرت باب الحجارة وأملال السلطان مسعود باپتة
الخليفة العباسي وخطب قاضي القضاة الزينبي رحمه الله وكان
الوزير شرف الدين علي بن طراد الزينبي وكمال الدين صاحب
المخزن
ورأيت جماعة من كبار أهل العراق وقرأت على الشيخ أبي
المظفر بن الشهيروزري العطار (١٦٩١)
والفرائض وقرأت الفصيح
والعمدة على الشيخ ٢ أبى منصور الجواليتي وقرأت التنبيه على
الشيخ أبي حسن ٣aben الخليل وقته الشيخ أبى منصور الرزاز
وجماعة من الفقهاء منهم ٤ الشيخ عبد القادر ابن النراوي
وأولاد قاضي القضاة المسماني ويوسف الدمشقي وجماعة من
اصحاب الحديث منهم القاضي أبو بكر قاضي اليمامة وابن
السرئيدي وعبد الوهاب الأندلسي وجماعة كثيرة وسمعت عليهم
وفرات على الشيخ أبى محمد بن نبات الشيخ البأر وعلي الشيخ عبد
الوهاب الخناف وانتت ببغداد وزرت جميع المشاهد بها ونزلت

1. Ms. اخواجة
2. Ms. حرير
3. Ms. الفريض
4. Ms. للشيخ
5. Ms. الشيخ أبى حسن صح written in the right margin.
6. Ms. وجماعة الفقهاء من الشيخ منهم The is misplaced.
7. Ms. has been added.
الى المدائين وزرت تبر سلمان الفارسي واقتت بسنداد إلى خمس
محرم سنة خمس وثلاثين وخمسينة
وكان شرف الدين الزينبي في الوزارة فغضب في اخر
سنة اربع وثلاثين وخمسينية ومغى إلى دار السلطان منغبها
واتم بها 2 وغذ الخليفة إلى السلطان خادما اسمه نجاح
وستأذن في عزله وناب في الوزارة فاضي القناة الزينبي مدة
نوعه بعدم ميدي الدين مديد الدولة وحل امر السلطان بعزله
في سنة خمس وثلاثين وخمسينية وولي الوزارة 4 نظام الدين
ابا المظفر بن الزعيم بن جهير وكان استاذ الدار واستجر بها
فب وفي سنة اربع وثلاثين وخمسينية ملك آتاهه زنكي
قلة بحلبه ونزن على دمشق وحامرها مدة ثم سلموا البه قلبة
بعرف بحله واستقل ماح المخزن كمال الدين ومغى إلى مكة وولي
5 موضع نوام الدين بن مدبقة ولزوم شرف الدين الزينبي داره
وكان ماح الدين مفي الدين بن النوازي القاشع واستطر نظام
الدين في الوزارة ثم عدت إلى مغرفين في اوائل 7 محرم سنة
خمس وثلاثين وخمسينية وعبرت بالمولى وحص كيفة فساقت الامير

1. Ms.
2. Ms.B
3. Ms.
4. Ms.
5. Ms.
6. Ms.
7. Ms.

اربعة
ونزن بدار نحم الدين رشيد الجامدال
داود قد وقع بينه وبين السعيد حمام الدين ونهب بلد ميفرقين
في محرم سنة ست وثلاثين ونزل على باب المدينة وأقام بها
ثمانية أيام ثم رحل وكان قد اغبار على جميع البلد ورحل إلى تل
سيح واخذها وانقطع البلد وكان السعيد حمام الدين قد خرج
قلعة بنانة واتخذها وبني بها وانقطع الجبل جميعها وبقي كل
يوم يغير من الموضعين إلى باب المدينة وتؤخذ شباب الناس
في النهار وكان حشي في البلاد والحاجب بوصف بنال في الولاية
وواس الناس وحظم...وبقي الأمر كذلك إلى آخر سنة خمس وثلاثين
وخمسمائة وفي سنة ست وثلاثين اصلح الأمر داوود والمصيدة
الدين ووصل الأمر داوود إلى ميفرقين ودخل باب القصر وانقض
ان وقع الأثنان بينهما
قيل وفي منتصف جمادي الأول سنة ست وثلاثين وخمسمائة
مات الأمير سعد الدولة بالبلد 8 ابن إبراهيم صاحب آدم
وكان مؤبد الدين منولي آدم نزلي ولده شمس الملكي محمود في

1. Ms. illegible.
2. Ms. فقط.
3. Ms. بناء
4. Ms.B المهر (f. 170a) ; Marsh 333 (f. 103b) النهر
5. Ms.B adds شرف الدين
6. The Ms. is damaged here. It appears to read الك... It's likely word would be الرعاية
7. Ms.B مدير نظري أمر العسكر والبلد
8. Ms. The usual form in this Ms. is
9. Ms.B ابن نيسان
الأمرة وفررها وكانت امه بمثني خاتون سنت نجم الدين الغازى
وكان حسام الدين خاله وكانت في هذه السنة سالماً وكانت في صحة
والذي رحمة الله وقيل في سنة ست وثلاثين وخمسمائة قتل 1 شمس
الملوك بدمشق
قبل وكان شرف الدين الحبشي والمعبد أبو طاهر ابن
المحتسب (في الولاية) لما عاد المؤبد أبو الحسن بن المخلص
إلى خدمة السيد حسام الدين فبه حبشي في سنة اربع وثلاثين
وبقي في القبض وقتل اخاه الرئيس ابا سعيد تحت العقوبة وبقي
 الى آخر سنة ست وثلاثين وفنف آناباه زنكي الى حسام الدين يقول
أن كان رسول يعطي منك او يعلك مني لا ينحوك ولا ينحومي
فان اردت انفانتا فنفز الي حبشي فنفزته إليه ومعه الحاجب
نام ومعه جماعة فلما لقى انزيلم وبقي ثلاثة أيام ثم ولي
شرف الدين حبشي الاستيفاء وخلع عليه الجبة الاطلس والبركان
بالذهب العربي والفرس بالمركب وعاد الرسل الذين مغوا معه
ثم ابن ضمن آناباه زنكي اخذ البلاد وقاتله في ذلك فقال لي
من قد حلف لي ومنى ووصلنا الى البلاد سلمتها الى

1. Ms. قبل followed by قتل which is deleted.
2. في الولاية has been added.
3. عادت الرسل الذي
4. Ms.B مغى شرف الدين حبشي الى الموصل برسالة الى آناباه وعادت الإدارة الذين مغوا معه
5. Ms.B قبل ان حبشي رتب في نفس آناباه و
وني هذه السنة نبغر الصعيد حسام الدين على الأجل epoxy
الوثا من seratan و حسب مدة ثم قلع عنئه ورمى به من رأس
قلعة ماردين إلى السيدان
فنين في سنة سبع وثلاثين وخمسون سنة صعد آتاباك زنكي إلى
diar بكير ودخل إلى ولاية الأمير بعقوب بن السبع الاصفر ففقد
خيران والمعدن وابرون وفطليس واخذ جميع الولاية وكتب بالمومل
في هذه السنة
وفي سنة ثمان وثلاثين وخمسون سنة صعد آتاباك زنكي
البلاد ووصل إلى بلد ماردين ودخل إلى تل بشمال على انه بدخل
الي ولاية آدم ومييغنين وكان قد ملك حاني واسعد وجبل حور
والفرنين 6 وجمع تلك الولاية اخذها بعد صلح الأمير داود ونزل
في النزيل الذي في تل بشم 7 فلم كان بعض البابلي 8 دخل على
حبي في الخيمة مؤمل الشافعي ومحمد بن أبي المكار والمجلسي

1. Ms. ابو
2. Ms. ابن
3. Ms.B رطان، بن السرطان ; Ms. رطان
4. Ms.B إلى ريض ميردين
5. Ms. ابن
6. Ms. sic.
7. Ms.B ووصل إلى تل بشم وحل بها العسكر
8. Marsh 333 (f.104a)
9. The Ms. is illegible here; Ms.B and Marsh 333 (f.104a) مؤمل
وضربو حسام الدين، رأساً وساراً إلى 서울، حسام الدين، ونعت الصبية، اختبى الناس والعسكر وأصبح آتائه من غدوة
فرحل وعاد إلى نصيبين
فخل وغلام الآداب تسع عشر محرم سنة تتخلع وقيل:
وعندما مات الأمير داود بحاني وحمل إلى حصن كيفاً وعبر
تابته بوم الآداب وحل بجامع المحدثة وخرج في الناص
والفرار، وحمل من غدوة إلى (ب1701) حصن كيفاً وملك بعده ولد
الأمير فخر الدين فرآ آرسلان حصن كيفاً وخرتيبت وباولاءً وملك
ولدآرسلان تضم فلقة مزكرد وقعد آتائه ولاية الأمير داود
فملك اسمدة ياهوم ولنزي وباناسا وجمع الولاية المتعلقة
بولاية المعدن وعبر إلى الولاية الأخرى وذلك حاني وجبيل جور
وابالفراتين والسوان فنزل وملك ارقين والماء لوتل خوم
وجرح ملك وجمع ذلك غير خرتيبت وباولاء ومزكرد وسفنت بيد
اولاد الأمير داود
وفي هذه السنة قتل السلطان داود بسوت تبريز وفي هذه
السنة تزوج آرسلان تشم ين داود بهدية خاتون بنت السعيد

1. Ms. B 
2. Ms. B 
3. Ms. B 
4. Ms. sic
5. Ms. sic
6. Ms. sic
7. Ms. B
حمام الدين وحملت إليه الى ميزكرد ووقع الخلف بين آتابة وحمام الدين.

ومض آتابة ونزل الى الرها وحاصرها مدة ثم فتحها عنوة في خمس والعشرين من جمادي الآخرة وكان ثلاث عشرين كانوا الأول سنة تسع وثلاثين وخمسمائة وكانت اختحتها الأتمم بعد موثة الدولة في سنة اثنين وتسعين واربعمئة وكان لها بابهم سبعة واربعين سنة ثم رحل عنها بعدها رتب امرها ونزل الى البيرة حاصرها مدة وكانت النصارى يقولون ان آتابة بقتل ليلة البلاد وكانوا مبطنين 2 ذلك وكان فتحها ليلة البلاد وسلم آتابة وذكروا قبل وحي حاصر البيرة مدة نوشه الخبر بعد امام بقتل نصير الدين حفر والي الموصل وكان فتحه علمائه في ناس من المقدمة سنة تسع وثلاثين وخمسمائة فرحل آتابة عن البيرة ونزل الى الموصل وفرر حالها ورتب فيها زين الدين على كوشة وكان في سنة تسع وثلاثين مات الأمير كريح غازى صاحب البارعية بآدم وكان لقي الناس من نصير الدين شدة من الجوار والظلم والقتل والمصادرة والانساد فلما ولي زين الدين ازال ذلك جميعه واحسن الى الناس والرعية في جميع البلاد ورأى الناس منه كل خير الى (زان) مات في سنة اربع وستين وخمسمائة.

---

1. Ms. B. The more coherent version is in Ms. B.
2. مشروطون.
3. ان نصير الدين جنروا وصل الى الموصل ونقلت.
5. ان has been added.
وكان في شهر رجب سنة ثمانية وثلاثين وخمسة استدعى
علم الدين مه مدسن علي بن نباتة إلى ماردين
و ولي الامير حسام الدين قضاء ماردين ونائبه بها الدين
خطابة ميشرفين وكان فاضي ماردين مجد الدين داود بن القاضي
السديم فنزل في تلك السنة وولي علم الدين وكان المؤيد أبو
الحسن بن مختار المستوفي الموثوقي لذلك وبعد يومين ولي الخطابة
بماردين وكان ميشرفين له الخدمة فولى قضاء ماردين واستقر
واقام بها ونقل أهله وأولاده إلى ماردين وهو بها إلى الآن
وكان وصل إلى ماردين مكين الدولة (1512هـ) إبراهيم
بن منذر من اهل مصر ناقام في ضيقة السعيد حسام الدين مدة
ثم انه بعد بومين من ولاية علم الدين قضاء ماردين وله حسام
الدين الوزارة وسناب المشاهب البغدادى وكان ناسخا بإلهام
ماردين وهو مصطفى بن محمد بن محمد العراقي وكان يقول
وانا من بيت المعوج من اهل بغداد كنت في هذه السنة
بماردين

---

1. Ms. إيسى
2. Ms. من ميشرفين
3. Ms. اخيب
4. Ms. إبا
5. Ms. الوزارة
6. Ms. ز ياسان
7. Ms. بمدرسان
وكان السيد حسام الدين في أول ولايته بمجرد نقل
نجم الدين الغازى وشمس الدولة اخفاء من مسجد الأمير الى
ماردين ثم دفنهما 2 بقلعة ماردين في مسجد الخدر بالقلعة وكان
في ذلك الموضع تربة 3 فيها جماعة من من مات في اعمال الغازى
فدتند الغازى وشمس الدولة هناك مدة ثم ان السيد حسام الدين
بنى تحت ضغ ماردين عند عين بالفري مشدا ميلحا وبنى 7
فنه تربة وغروم عليها ما عظيم ووقد عليها الوقوف وخط
المقابر بها ودفنهما فيها جميع الذين 8 كانوا بالقلعة اولا
فأخيرا ونذ البدا البال والسو ووالآت وجمع فيها خزانة
كتب وجعل فيها كتب كثيرة 9 وهي الى الآن بها
قبل وفي سنة تسعمائتين وخمسين اندمت عماره حسر

---
1. Ms. نمض
2. Ms. دفنهما
3. Ms. B وكان لهم تربة بالقلعة
4. Ms. بنا
5. Ms. sic; Ms. B بالفري
6. Ms. مشد
7. Ms. بنا
8. Ms. الذي
9. Ms. الات
10. Ms. كتب كثيرة
قدامى ومن سنة عمان وأربعين وفيها اندممت البدنة داخل
مغرفين وبنيت
قبل وفي سنة أربعين فبغض الوزير المعري وحبسه
فلع دي ماردين نحل عنه في الحبس نحاب خام وخرج من الحبس
وعده في وسط وندلى من فلعة ماردين وانهزم فلما أصبحوا
ظلموه فلم يعذروه ورأوا الخام مخدود فظلموه فوجدوه
في طرف الجبل نحلوه إلى السعيد حسام الدين فاطته وعرفه ولم
يعرف البي
قبل وفي سنة أربعين وخمسمائة كسر المعبد حسام الدين
فخر الدين فرا آرسلان على باغين وكان بوما عظيمًا مشهودا
وكانت الكرة والفتح لشجاع الدين محمد بن الباس بن الغازى
فانه كان رأس الحسكة مع عمه حسام الدين وفي سنة أربعين وصل
آتاك بن زيكي إلى مغرفين واخذ كل شيخ وهايم مغرفين مدة عام
قبل وفي سنة أربعين وخمسمائة وعلم الشيخ نور البدى
سلمون بن عمر العلوى من اسمه إلى مغرفين وكان حسام الدين
بالبلد فخرج أهل مغرفين يسرون ولفغو مقدار فرسخ وخرج
المير قاب الله عند قبة السلطان وكان فاضلا عالما ونزل عدد فتح
الدين رحمه الله في دار علم الدين وبعد يوم نزل الأمير البدي
لم يقم له وجلس في الجامع ووعظ وتكلم وانتقن الناس به وبلغ
-- -- -- -- --
1. مس. B
2. مس. B
3. مس.
4. مس. B
ولنهر الأمير والجماعة
الأمير مباغطهما وكان في اونى منزلة، وحل إذا كان الأمير
بمغرفة كان معه وإذا سار إلى ماردبن سار معه وكان يقيم
فجأة اقام(ف717م) الأمير وحل له الناسوت العظيم، حيث أنه
مدة مقامه عند الأمير ما يتم له بوما فقط وحله 3 منه ما
لا يلبي ممثله فتعلق في اعين الناس سار إلى الشام وبقي مدة
واخذ فلعة أبي فبي وقع بينه وبين الأسماعية وعاد إلى
اشعيب حسام الدين وإقام مدة وكان اشعيب حسام الدين
في عمل الكيميا 4 ولم يع منه شيء ومنى إلى اسمعد وإقام بها
مدة إلى شهر ربيع الأول سنة ست وأربعين وخمسين فدخل إلى
الجامع 5 وكان يوم الجمعة نود عليه رجلان من الأسماعية 6
فغريبه انذن بخْنجر غريبه بسبب كأنه رجاء فوتب عليه رجل
غريبه بسكين نفوق واختبئ الناس وتبغ الذي ضربه ورقبه
وبغي إلى يوجه ومات رحمه الله ودفن باسرد في مسجد الخضر
عليه السلام وقتلوا اللذين قتلاه 9

1. Ms.B وحل له من الناسوت الحرة ما ليس بالقليل ويحكم على
الأمير اوني تحكم.


3. Ms. يبدوا

4. Ms. الكيميا

5. Ms.B adds ليصل

6. Ms. الاسماعية

7. Ms.B مونبه أخر

8. Ms.B adds وكان من الاسماعية (تين)

9. Ms. الذين قتلوه
قبل وفي سنة أربعين وخمسين اتولى العلّي نجم الدين
المالك إلى خاتون بنت الأمير أحمد بن سكمان صاحب خلافة وكانت
اختتامه أرمن لاه ونست عمه ونجل صف الدين بن رشيد وأشير
الدين عبد بن أبي الفتح وسراج الدين بن كامل غازى وجماعة
من أكابر دولة سكمان وأقاموا أياماً في حبرين وساروا إلى
ماردين وعادوا ومنه الفاضي علم الدين أبو الفتح محمد ابن
لباطنة ومعه أكابر الدولة إلى خلافة في سنة اثنتي وأربعين
وخمسين واحضروا خاتون وكان العرس بماردين وحضر أكابر
دولة خلافة

قبل وفي سنة اثنتي وأربعين وخمسين شرع السيد حسام
الدين رحمه الله في بناء جمر أفرامان على النقطة بتوالي
الزاهد ابن الدويل واستقر تؤاودة من الجانب الشرقي وتمه
المد و أخربه لضعف عمله وأخربه والزاهد الغمارة ناخر

---

1. Ms. B adds
2. Ms. B
3. Ms. B written on the line, above it.
4. Ms. B خلاف
5. Ms. B وساروا إلى ماردین ولفوا الصاحب وتقرر الحال
6. Ms. B المید
7. Ms. B بالفيضوم
8. Ms. B اسم
9. Ms. B من الجانبين (sic); Marsh 333
10. Ms. B وضع
11. Ms. B وبممارته; Ms. B and Marsh 333

النرامة
عليه ثم وليه الأمير صيف الدين شير باریک محدود بن علي بن
ارتق و شرع في عمارته بتعلي ابي الخبر الفاسول واحضر
اخشابا لم بر مثلها وابتدأ في عمارته وهو من الحجاب التي
ننست في هذا الزمان وننعمل فيه
وفي سنة احدى واربعين وخمسائنا نازل آتاكك زنكي قلعة
جمير ونها سيف الدولة أبو الحسن علي بن مالك وضافة
مغابنة ندينة واشترت على الأخذ وكان جمال الدين مربي ولد
المعبد حسام الدين في خدمته ومعه عسكر وكان فقهه وحبسه في
بيعة ربع القلعة
ولقد سألت الوالي المصدر الكامل فاجي الفضيلة كمال
الدين ابا الفضل محمد بن عبد الله الشهروزي ادام الله ف手机号
في سنة اربع واربعين وخمسائنا بالموصل عن قتل (172هـ) آتاكك
وما جرى فقال كنا نازلنا القلعة مدة فلما كان بعض الآيام خرج
الامير حسان المنبري وصاح اريد اكلم الأمير علي فتراءى له
من على السور وقال له تعلم ما ببني وبنيك واتاكك تعرف
ابن أب ومالك من تلتنؤ البه ولا من يعرفه عفك ولا رأي أت

1. Ms. sic. It should read
2. Ms. B بان علي بن الب يارق بن ارتق
3. Ms. B ابي الخبر بن الحكم الفاسول
4. Ms. B عمله إلى سنة تمان واربعين وخمسائنا
5. Ms. B الذي بنى
6. Ms. B وبجي يسير
7. Ms. B حسان المنبري; Ms. B حسام الدين المنبري
8. Ms. B اريد اكلم الأمير علي
9. Ms. B تفرايا
10. Ms. B السور; Ms. B الصور
11. Ms. B من الصداقة
12. Ms. B وانت تعرف اتاكك وما هو عليه
13. Ms. B لما لك ظهر مستند إليه

الواجب
تسلم، وانها، يا أمير حسان انطور الفرج من الله تعالى، وما انثرت على منبج لما حاصرها الأمير بك، وكما الله امره فقال، كمال الدين واللله، ما كان الا تلك الليلة نحو الليل، وكان ذلك اليوم الأربعاء خامس شهر ربيع الآخر، وقيل تاسعة سنة اخري، واربعين وخمسين، والصباح من القلعة، يصبح قتل آنابك بن حسام الدين، لك البشري، واختص الناس وماحو، وكان سب ذلك أن الأمير آنابك كان يبيت في الخيمة، وعنده خادم، فما كان يبيت عند، غيره، فلا نام تلك الليلة، فن 된 الخادم في الخيمة، فأخذ السكين بالدم، وخرج وطع إلى الرب إلى تحت القلعة، وصاحبهم قتلت آنابك، فلم يردوه فأراهم السكين، وعلة أخرى كان اخذه من عند، فأصدره، البيت، وحققوا الحال منه، وصاحبوا، واختص الناس، واختلفوا، وقعد الناس مشيت، جمال الدين، الوزير، فنحب وانهزم، وجاه اليه، وقعدن، 7، الأمراء، والكبراء، وركب، وقالوا، ما رأى الملك،

---

1. Ms.B لا تريد.
4. Ms. نصوا.
7. Ms. وقصدوني.
فعدوا وقصد خيمة الملك آل عثمان بن محمود وقالت انا والناس وآتاك عبان الملك والبلاد له والكل خدم ومالاه الملك فاجتمع الناس على الملك وأطلق جمال الدين سري من البعجة وسبرو الى ماردين

وتفرق الناس فئتين فأخذ صالح الدين محمد ابن مسعود الغساني دور الدين محمود بن آتاك وعسكر الشام ومضوا الى الغام فملك حلب وحماة ومنج وهران وخمس وجميع ما بيد آتاك من الشام واستمر به وسرنا نحن مع الملك وعساكر ديار ربيعة فظلنا الموصل نومنا الى سنجار فانكسر الملك وطلب الجزيرة فلحقه اخي ناج الدين أبو طاهر يحيى رحمة الله وعز الدين أبو بكر الدبيسي وحلفا له وردنا الى المعسكر ونزلنا الى الموصل ووصل سيد الدين غازى بن آتاك من بلد شبه زور وكانت اقطاعه من السلطان فملك ديار ربيعة باسرها وحمل الملك الى قلعة التنلو عند سنجر وملك الموصل وجميع

---

1. Ms. sic ; Ms. B
2. Ms. B
3. Ms. B
4. Ms. B
5. Ms. B
6. Ms. B
7. Ms. B
البلد، وسيف الدين غازى استور حمال الدين محمد بن الأصبهاني
وكان محتفظاً ديوان أبيه (527هـ) وانقطع الجزيرة لعز الدين
ابي بكر الديبيسي 3 واستقر في البلاد
وتولى امير نور الدين صالح الدين 4 واسد الدين شيركوه
واحتفل مجد الدين ابا بكر بن 5 الدابة وكانت امه دابة نور
الدين وهي رتيبة وكان مجد الدين يخمه من صباه فلم يولي الأمير
رد الامه الامر وولاها حلب واستقر في النام
وبعد اساب من نقل آتامه وتب اهل الرها من الأردن على
من كان بها من المسلمين وقعتها جمعة 6، ووصل عز الدين الديبيسي
وحسان صاحب منبج وجماعة من التركان وتكانوا عليها ونبهوها
ومنحوا وقعت منها خلق كبير 7 وقام بها جمعة
وكان عند نقل آتامه السعيد حسام الدين بسغريين فوصله الخبر
العصر وهو في مبانى المحوط فصار من وقته 8، وكان قبل ذلك اليوم
وصله الخبر ببغداد، ولد جمال الدين فضاقت مدره ثم وصله الخبر

1. Ms. وقطع
2. Ms. أبو
3. Ms. B adds وولي سيف الدين غازى زين الدين علي بن يكين
   وعز الدين الديبيسي
4. Ms. B adds ولده الأكبر
5. Ms. ابن
6. Ms. B adds وملكوها ونعدوا يستدعون الامرين فاجتمع عليها خلق
   من المسلمين
7. Ms. خلفا كثيرا
8. Ms. B من لبلته
بፍتله وصار الى حاني فنزلها وقي عليها مدة ثم أخذها وكان
فيها الأمير غازي ابن المهرى فتحها نالت عشرين شهر ربيع
الآخر سنة احدى واربعين وخمسائة وصار فاخد السبان وجلب جور
والقرنين ومنزل ثم أخذ ششطن (و) الموزر وتل موزن
وجملين ورأس عين الخابور وعاد وسكن في هذه السنة بماردين
و سائر فخر الدين قراطرل 4 وملك ارفتين وجرموك وتل
خوم 5 والبالت وجميع الحمون التي كان اخذها 6 آتاكه من ابنه
الامير داود وملك جنوب اسرعد الشرقي 7 وبهود 8 وباشا وطنى
والروق وقصلة وملد صاف والفهم التي في جبل طورعيدين
ونزل صاحب اختلاف شاء ارمن نملك خيزان و المعدن واشرون وجميع
الولاية التي اخذها 9 آتاكه من الأمير بعقوب
وفي هذه السنة وهي سنة اثنين واربعين وخمسائة غرب
السعود حسام الدين الفلس المنفر ومضى الى المعدن واشترى
صفر برسم الفلس
وفي سنة ثمان واربعين مت عملان "تخصيص بين الأمير داود
و نازل السعيد حسام الدين اسعد اباما واخذها

1. Ms. sic
2. has been added.
3. Ms.B
4. Ms. sic
5. Ms. تل خرم
6. Ms. اخذ
7. Ms. جانب الشرقي اسعد
8. Ms. B
9. Ms. اخذ
10. Ms.B
11. Ms. sic
12. Ms.B adds

وحلف ابنا من ابن الأمير عاش بعده امامقلائل ومات
وصل إلى خدمته جمال الدين محمود صاحب آمد وجمال الدين
ابن القاسم بن نيسان وكان معه على اسرد فلم يذهبا عاد
إلى ميعرفين وبعد مدة ردوا إلى فخر الدين وفي هذه المدة
ملك فخر الدين فرا آرسلان ميكر وعادت هبة خاتون إلى
ميعرفين وفي هذه السنة وقع الخلف بين السعيد حسام الدين
وابن آتابك سيف الدين غازى ونهب بلد ماردين ونهب مماليك
جماعة
وفي هذه السنة وصلت الخاتون بنت عز الدين سلطان
صاحبة الخلاف إلى حصن كيفا طلبت الحجاز فانزلها فخر الدين
فر آرسلان واصحاب في إكرامها ووصل بهاء الدين الوزير
واخير الدين عباس وعلم الدين بن طيب فاضي ارجيش ونزلوا في
دار الموئد بن ميعرفين واقاموا امساء ونفى السعيد
حسام الدين إلى فخر الدين ومنعوا الخاتون من العصر إلى

1. Ms. ابن
2. Ms. سيان
3. Ms. omits a verb ; Ms.B ملك
4. Ms. مماليك
5. Ms. غالب
6. Ms. (sic) أكرادها
8. Ms. B المستوفي
الحجاز وكان شاهارهم سائلحهم ذلك فلمعوا الخائون حتى عادوا جميعًا إلى خلاف
وفي هذه السنة مات الموئد المستوفي أبو الحسن
المبارك بن مختار وكان منولي الديوان وكان معيج 들어ب العراقي
مشرفاً ودفنا في ماردين في البيعة التي بناها و ولي موضعه
ولده الأجل كريم الدولة أبو منصور خالد و بلقب بلقب
ابنه مؤيد الدولة كريم الملك و اقام بشرف الخدمة و نابه ما فوض
الله واستقل وزاد على ما يرجو منه و حصل الأمر كلها يحكمه
قبل وفي سنة اثنتين واربعين وخمسائة مات الخليفة
الحافظ بمعر و ولي موضعه ولده المنصور اسحاق و بلقب
بالطافر وكان السلطان امير الجيوش الحاد السائل من الملكي
وقرر امر الدولة و رتب الجساكر و اشترر الطافر بالخلافة
قبل في سنة اثنتين واربعين وخمسائة فشيّع انابك
غازي على الفاضي كمال الدين و ناج الدين ابني عبد الله
الشهورى و كان امر الدولة من حي حت قتل انابك زنكي اليه
فسيت جمال الدين الوزير وزين الدين في ذلك و قبض عليهم و ورثوا
الي قلعة الموصل و استحفر القاضي نجم الدين ابا علي بن بهاء
ورد فخر الدين الى خلاف ولم يمكنها من المسير الى
الحجاز

1. Ms. B
2. Ms. لقب
3. Ms. ب ذك ص寫ten in left margin.
4. Ms. وقبها
5. Ms. استحضروا
الدين ابن الحسن بن علي بن النجم الشهيروري من الراحلة وكان
بها ملولي الفضاء فانه لما مات بها الدين الشهيروري في سنة
إنتتين وثلاثين وخمسين والسنة بالرقة على ما ذكرناه ولي نجاء بلاد
آتانيه اجتمع ولده الفاضي نجم الدين ابن الحسن بن علي وولي
ابن اخيه شمس الدين ابن احمد الموصل وولي كمال الدين
فضاء نصيبين والعكر وولي ناج الدين ابن طاهر قضاء
الجزيرة وولي شرف الدين اخر بها الدين سنجر وكل منهم ولي
مستغل من غير نيابة فانه كانا جميعهم في هذين الموافق
نيابة عن بها الدين فلما مات تولى هؤلاء هذه البلاد
وولي نجم الدين ولد بها الدين باقي البلاد اجتمع فيها
الفضاء نوابه وباقي الى سنة ثلاثي وثلاثين وخمسين وتولى شمس
الدين ابن احمد موضع ناضم الفضاء بالموصل وخمد نجم الدين
فأخذ فضاء الموصل مفاجا الى ما كان بهده وباقي الى سنة خمس
وثلاثين وخمسين والسنة وفي نجم الدين مستوي نصيبين وبدر وحبص
وعقوبه عقوبة (5173) عظيمة و اخذ منه معادرة ما بنارب مائة
الف وثلاثين الفدينار أميرة وولي كمال الدين ابن الفضل
محمد بن عبد الله الشهيروري البلاد جميعها واستقل بالامر
وحصلت الولادة من الفضاء والبلاد والعساكر وجميع الأمور مرودة

---

1. Ms. sic The scribe often prefers this form.
2. Ms. هاولاء
إلى كمال الدين إلى أن قتل آتائه على ما ذكرناه وبقي نجم الدين في الحبس مرة أربع سنوات ثم ان الفاضي
كمال الدين توصل في اخراجه ولا فضي الرحمة فانه كان في ابام ابنه بيه الدين وبيت فيه إلى أن توفي كمال الدين على ما ذكرناه وحضر ولي الموصل ورتب ولده الأكبر بيه الدين على ما ذكرناه بالرحمة ويشتر هو بالموصل وبيت كمال الدين وتباع
الدين في حبس الموصل بالقلعة مدة فندق الامام المقتني الخليفة رحمة الله عليه جماعة ١٠٠٠٠٠٠ رسالات الموصلفاتوها في اخراجهما إلى دورهما ورتب على باب كل واحد منهما رجلي
خراسانيين حيث لا يدخلون ولا يخرجون وأخ وله كمال الدين ابو أحمد الجلال ولد) ٢ ناج الدين ابوالففضل ٣ الغياء وحصا في قلعة الموصل فاستبد نجم الدين بغضب الموصل واقطع
عز الدين ابا ٤ بكر الديني الخزيرة ورتب فيها نعيا يعرف بابن حمزه من اهل دوقا مدة ٥
قبل وكان في سنة ست وثلاثين وخمسين ولي الوزير نظام
الدين ابو جعفر وقبل المظفر محمد بن الزعيم بن جبير وزارة
الخليفة بعد ما عاد الآن من السلطان مسعود بحجز شرف الدين
الزينبي وولي فوام الدين من خدمة المخزن على ما ذكرناه وبيت

---
1. Ms. There is a lacuna here.
2. Ms. خراسانية
3. ولد has been added.
4. Ms. العفائل
5. Ms. ابو
6. Ms.8 ولي الجزيرة الدقوقٍ
الوزير إلى السنة احدي واربعين وخمسينات في الوزارة ومغى إلى مكة وحج وعاد إلى بغداد. وفي هذه السنة جمع بهاء الدين أبو طاهر بن عقيل بن طاهر بن نيابة من مكفارم ودخل إلى بغداد. وحضر دار الخلافة وارضف نعولا بحضور الوزير نظام الدين ورشيد الدولة ابن الأنباء رحمهما الله وجمع ارباب دولة الخليفة.

وعاد وخلع عليه الخليفة وكان صحبه غلب الفتاح ابن العماراني، وبعد عبد الوزير إلى بغداد بفترة مدة ونزل من الوزارة وولي قراء الدين من مقدمات الوزارة وولي المخزن.

زعيم الدين بن جعفر وولي الديوان الأجل، جمال الدين أبو المظفر بن هبة.

قبل و في سنة ثلاث واربعين وخمسينات مائتين الخاتون فاطمة زوجة الخليفة المقفي، في بغداد وفي سنة ثلاث واربعين وخمسينات حضر الشيخ شرف الدين بن سعد بن عصرون من الموصل.

وعقد على زمرد خاتون بنت السعيد حسام الدين (من) لاكاب، غازي وكان الاملاك بخصر ميافارقين على عشرين ألف دينار، وكان الوالي الشيخ شروق أبو القاسم بن حبي.

وفي شعبان سنة ثلاث واربعين وخمسينات وصل غلب الدولة أبو نصر بن نمام إلى مكفارم وعقد على مفية ذات بنت...

1. Ms. صحبه
2. Ms. الوزارة
3. Ms. ابن
4. Ms. اتاك
5. Ms. sic
6. Ms. الولي
7. Ms. written above the line, ملك
8. Ms. ابن
السيّد حسام الدين لجمال الدين شمس الملك محمود بن ابلدی،
صاحب آدم على خمسة أدنار، وكان الوالي الخلب تاج
العلماء الحصني، وحملها في الخمس الأوّل من شعبان إلى آدم
وفي سنة سنت واربعين وخمسين هجرة خضر الأمير بهاء الدين
سويج بن كهيمخ (و) الوزير فياء الدين، من عند الأمير نفر
الدين دولت شاه بن طنان آرسلام صاحب ارزع وبدليّس وعقدا على
نورة خاتون بنت السيّد حسام الدين على خمسين الف دينار وكان
الوالي، وكان العقد بمغفرتين
وكان في سنة شماني وثمانين وخمسين هجرة مات حسام الدولة
فرتي وولي الإمارة اخوه شمس الدين باقوت آرسلام إلى
سنة اربعين وخمسين هجرة ونفذ اخاه دولت شاه إلى خدمة آتاباك زئكي

1. Ms. sic
2. Ms. خمس
3. Ms. الف
4. Ms.B خمسين الف دينار
5. Ms. sic (؟) الوالي
6. Ms. sic (؟)
7. و has been added.
8. Ms.B adds ابوب
9. Ms.B adds لفخر الدين دولت شاه بن طنان آرسلام
10. Ms. sic (؟) الوالي
11. Ms. فوتي
لمَّا عبر واخذ بلاد الأمير داود بعد موته ثم مات بالفوت آرسلان
بُوم السبب مستهل شهر رمضان سنة اربعين وخمسمئة و سار ضياء
الدين ابوب به على معركة انباكة فجابوا الأمير دولت شاه وبلقب
بفخر الدين وغير به على نبابة مفرقيين وسُر إلى ارزان وملك
البلد واستبد بالامارة وملك جميع ولاية ابيه واخوته 4 وكان
ضياء الدين ابوب تزوج امه وانقل إلى السعيد حسام الدين وفي
ذى الحجة وصلوا إلى مفرقيين واخذوا الخاتون وساروا بها
إلى ارزان وعمل العرس بمفرقيين 6
وفي سنة شتاء وأربعين وخمسمئة سار تاج الدين ابوب
سالم ظاهر بن نباتة إلى الحجاز ودخل بغداد وحضر ديوان الخلافة
وفي سنة ثالث وأربعين وخمسمئة عاد الوزير مكين الدين المغري
إلى مفرقيين وأработ السعيد حسام الدين الوزارة وبي إباما
وكانت في هذه السنة منولي اشراف ظاهر بلد مفرقيين وباقي مدة ثم

---

1. Ms. B adds وكان زوج امه
2. Ms. sic ; Ms. B عاد به إلى ارزان
3. Ms. فخر
4. Ms. B اخيه
5. Ms. B انقلت Ms. B
6. Ms. B ووصل بهاء الدين سونج من 0000 واخذها وسار إلى ارزان وبيعت عنه مدة
انه نبغ المؤيد والمهذب وعابهما بالقصر إمام ثم انه رتب العميد بن أبي طاهر بن المحترم في عمل حساب الدوائر. فجلس يومين لا غير وتم السعيد حمام الدين بعزله وصنفه وحلق لحيته ورك حمارها ودروبا به في البلد ونفى واصفا عن البلد. وتم السريع إمام ثم خرج بعد الحصر وغلابه خلفه وسر حول البلد ثم طلب طريق حسن كيفا ومضى فقيل للسريع حمام الدين قد هرب فقال ما أخذ مالا شيئا فلا تطلبوه لمضى وفي بكرة الأجد عبد المؤيد والمهذب إلى الدوائر واقتصر أمرهما وعادا إلى فتى منزلة قبلا في سنة أربع وأربعين وخمسين خرج ابن آتابك غازى (ت. 745هـ) إلى باب نعمين ونذر الاستير جلوك الخليلي إلى ماردز وخطمز خاتون إلى باب نعمين ونزل معها صمام الدين ومرض ابن آتابك سيف الدين غازي فحملته إلى الموصل ونزلته في درب دراج وفي دار الخاتون بنت مكمان زوجة آتابك زنكي ودخل سيف الدين غازى وهو مريض على شدة وانام بالموصول وقد نذر إلى بغداد فاحضروا الحكم ابا البركات نجاح وأرجله إماما ونافذ في سنة أربع وأربعين وخمسين وولي الأمارة انور قطب الدين مودود بن آتابك واستغر في الأمارة ورتب الدولة جمال الدين الوزراء وزين الدين وعزا

1. Ms. Ibn
2. Ms. بن written above the line.
3. Ms. أربعة
4. Ms. B محدد مدود
5. Ms. ابن
الدين، و دفن سيف الدين غازى في المدرسة العمادية.

و بعد موت سيف الدين، اطلق القاضي جمال الدين واتبه
من دورهما، و استديعا إلى الميدان، و كنت في هذه السنة
بالموصل في خدمة السيد حسام الدين في بع الحديث، و كنت في حالا
الميدان وكان نفذ الوزير جمال الدين لبما خلفه نركبا وحضر
الميدان داخل الموصل فلما دخل باب الميدان و قد غيرا شبابهما
وركبا بغير طرحته ترجلا لبما رأهما آتاك قطب الدين طلبهما
و ترجل لبما ولقباه 6 و عزباه عن أخاه، و هناء 7 بالامارة وركن
و وقفنا من ناحيتنا و بقيا ساعة و عادا إلى مقرهما، و أزالوا
الاجداد من على أبوابهما و حصلا نركبان وبسطا في كل اسبوع
إلى خدمة آتاك وزين الدين وجمال الدين، و بعد مدة نفذوا
و و قرروا الحال مع السيد حسام الدين، و عقد آتاك قطب الدين
على زمرد خاتون بع انفضا مدة الوفاء، و دخل بها بالموصل

1. Ms. B، استمر بوساطة زين الدين، والديسي، وجمال الدين الوزير

2. Ms. B، بالموصل

3. Ms. B، بارعное أيام

4. Ms. B، دورهم

5. Ms. B، بباب الدار الإثابية

6. Ms. B، و عانهم

7. Ms. B، هناء

8. Ms. B، وركب وركبا

9. Ms. B، و بتوا

10. Ms. B، يميينان مع in left margin.

11. Ms. B، متقرر ذلك على أن مدينة دار

12. Ms. B، الوفاة
وفي آخر سنة اربع، واربعين نازل الحماد حسام الدين
مدينة دارا وامتنع الوالي من تسلمها. ثم
سلمها اليه يوم الأربعاء ثاني عشر ذي الحجة وملكها وترتب
فيها واليا الحاج ابن بنش الدين مورِ وتلك بالمعسكر 4 حتى نتجها
في خدمة السعيد حسام الدين. وفي هذه السنة سنة اربع واربعين
احترق سوق القبة بميا مارفين وفي هذه السنة في ذي الحجة ونع
الخلف بين أولاد العميد ناج الدين ابن سالم بن نباتة وسار
ضياء الدين إلى دارا فلقي السعيد حسام الدين وخدم واخذ القضاء
وعاد الى ميافعين وفي ثاني عشر محرم سنة اربع واربعين
وخمسين وثلاطتين أبل غازي ولد الملك نجم الدين
دام ظلما
وفي سنة اربع، واربعين وخمسين أخذت الأورنج أربعة
(1275هـ) من المسلمين ونهب وحمل نهبها وبيع 0 بدار مصر والساحل

1. Ms. أربعة
2. The Ms. has a lacuna here (؟) اليه
3. Ms. ذو
4. Ms. B adds وكنت اذناك بالمعسكر

5. Ms. ابن
6. Ms. في سنة ثاني
7. Ms. أربعة
8. Ms. ابن ابل غازي
9. Ms. أربعة
10. Ms. بيع ; ابيع Ms. B
وفي سنة خمس وأربعين وخمسمائة املك صعما الدين
بهرام بن السعيد حمام الدين بنيت آتاكاب اخت نقب الدين وكت
وقت الاملاك في الموصل
وفي سنة خمس وأربعين وخمسمائة نب الحرم بنو زعاب وغيرهم 3 وذبيب وبطران آخر الحاج واخذوا جميع ما كان
معهم بين مكة والمدينة عند موضوع بسم الله وئلف خلق كبير
عظم 4 ولم يسمع بذلك الا من مشين بعيدة ولم بسلم الا الأقل
من الناس وكتبي في هذه السنة بالموصل مغيبما
وملك حام الدين بالواده جميع امراء ديار بك وديار
ريبة وارمنية واتصاله بهم 6 ولم ببق بعد آتاكاب زنكي امير
مستغل بنشه من غير محارض ولا منازع ولا من يحكم عليه غير
السعيد حام الدين 7
وفي سنة خمس وأربعين وخمسمائة مات مشين الدين اثر
بدمشق وفيها 8 لقي نور الدين محمود بن زنكي املك الشام الانتر

1. Ms. 
2. Ms. B adds في المحرم
3. Ms. B نب الحرم الحاج
4. Ms. written above the line; Ms.B نلف خلق عظم
5. Ms. B ملك
6. Ms. B امروها باتصاله لهم
7. After Ms. B has اتتكاب زنكي اميرا
8. Ms. B في المحرم
وسئهم اقبح كسره وامرأة بن جوسلين صاحب الرها وما حولها وملكت بلاده جميعها وملك نور الدين تل باشر وما حولها وتب خالد وما بليها 1 وملك السعيد حسام الدين سريسي وكان في السادس شهر ربيع الأول سنة خمس واربعين وخمسمائة ملك البيرة وفي سنة ست واربعين فتح في هذه الكسرة الحاجب عمر الخالص وكان في خدمة نور الدين وملك فخر الدين فر 2 آرسلان من ولاية ابن جوسلين حسن منصور وبابو واخذ من الأرض فلعة كرك وملك السلطان فلخ آرسلان مرعش وكيسوم وما جاورها ولم يبق لابن جوسلين من الولادة غير فلعة الروم 3 ولو عاش السعيد حسام الدين كان ملكها 4

وفي سنة خمس واربعين وخمسمائة مات مبعين الدين انور بدمشق

وفي سنة ست واربعين سافرت إلى خلاف وعهد انتهرت إلى بنداد نوختها سابع عشرين شهر رمضان واقمت بها وفي سنة ست واربعين طهر السعيد حسام الدين أود أمير جمال الدين سرمي بعيفرتين

وفي سبع واربعين وصل إلى السعيد حسام الدين منشور من السلطان والخليفة وترعر على المنبر بالبلد ووصل الخلع

1. Ms. B has instead of ما بليها 1
2. Ms. sic ; Ms. آرسلان 2
3. Ms. B has ولم يبق على الفرائض موضع ليس هوللمسلمين غير فلعة الروم

4. Ms. كان قد ملكها 3
5. Ms. B adds واجتمع الناس
6. Ms. B is supplied from Ms. B 4
وبعد ليلتين وهي ليلة الاثنين ثاني عشر من شهر ربيع الأول سنة
سمع واربعين انغمض الجامع بب.Manفرين محل المنبر والزينة
وكنت ببغداد واجتمعت ببغداد بقطع الدين العبادي الواعظ
وصبحت مدة وكتبت عنه شيئاً كثيراً من مجالس
وكان سنة اربع واربعين في آخرين ولي الوزارة عون
الدين الموظف محمد بن بحتم بن هبة وعزل قوم الدين بن
صدفة من الوزارة واستغفر عون الدين فيها وكان اليه ديوان
الزمام والامتناء وولي ديوان الزمام 4 جل الدين
ابن جعفر آخر صاحب المأنه وكان أوهما من عهقدة بالقوى
وكان وزراً لمجاهد الدين مهروز مدة حياته وفتح الخلية مستمر
الإحوال
وفي سنة ست واربعين وصل السلطان مصعود الى بغداد
واقام بها جميع الشروة 6 وازداد في هذه السنة ببغداد وازداد
الفيل والبطينة والقرد وسار السلطان الى باب همذان فمرض في
جمادي 7 الأولى سنة سبع واربعين وفني الى حادي عشر جمادي

---
1. Ms. B
2. Ms.
3. Ms. بن provided from Ms. B.
4. Ms. الزمام
5. Ms. بايعتها
6. Ms. B adds
7. Ms. جمادي
8. Ms.
تلقيت 3 وات من باب همذان وحمل إلى عثمان فاقمت بغداد إلى اول رجب من السنة وسرت إلى مبغضين فلم وتلنا إلى تكريب ملك الخليفة ونزل في دار السلطان ومملكة بغداد وهرب مصعود بلال إلى تكريب وكان تلنا إلى بغداد وكان قد عمل امارة الحج سنين ولقي الناس منه كل شراب وحاول الخليفة الجند والمساك ناطق الموت والاعتناق التي كان بإذنها أصحاب السلطان واحسن إلى الناس وعمل في الرعاية وحمل العراق واستغل ارتفاع العراق جميعا فانه كان للسلطان والخواتين وأصحاب السلطان بالعراق مبقة عشرين الف نار فحمل الجميع للخليفة ولما مات السلطان مصعود باب همذان كان السلطان محمد شاه بن محمود وكان صهره على ابنه في خوزستان وكان معه في المعسكر، 7 أخوه ملك شاه بن محمود نرفه خاصيبه بن البلنكر في السلطة عدة 8، فلما سمع محمد شاه سار عن خوزستان

---

1. Ms. 
2. Ms. 
3. Ms.B adds
4. Ms.B adds 
5. Ms.B 
6. Ms.B ملدابن محسن 
7. Ms. في المعسكر 
8. Ms.B مملك وترتب في السلطة وفي مدة
إلى هذان واحدهما السلطان اسار انه ملك ناه تملك خوزستان والاهوار وطرفا من البحر ولي مدة وقتل خاصيك بن البلكري وامتد بالسلطة محمد ناه وكان السلطان مصعود رحمه الله وابلضا لين الجانب كبير النفس بتاعة فرق ولائه اجمع على اصحابه وما كان له غير الاسم من السلطة وكان مع لين جانبه ما حارب احدا الا ظهر به وقتل من الامراء الكبار ما لا قتل غيره منهم منصور وك喇 والفاجا السافي صاحب فرس 3 وقبر وقتل عباس صاحب الزولى وقتل الرائد والمشردونبيس 5 ووزبه 4 عبد الرحمن بن طغر بك وجماعة من الامراء 6 الاقتصاد الكبار وسع سهادة عظيمة ومات وخلف ثلاثة بين صنار واستمر محمد ناه في السلطنة وملك هذان واصبه وما حولها من غير خيبة بالعراق فيل وفي سنة سبع واربعين ملك فخر الدين قرا آرسلان حسن كركر من الأرمن 9 في سنة سبع واربعين وخمسية تزوج جلال الملك كيك بن سليمان بن عبد الجبار 8(176 م) بن ارتق بهديا خاتون بنت المبعدي حسام الدين سفارة امه الملكة بنت 1.

1. Ms. B has اسم
2. Ms.
3. Ms.
4. Ms. sic
5. Ms. sic
6. و is provided from Ms. B
7. Ms.
8. Ms. B has ماهولا لان الجانب instead of
9. Ms. is provided from Ms. B
10. Ms.

ابن
برس

رضوان زوجة حسام الدين
وفي سنة خمس واربعين كان وصل إلى مراديين الوزير زين الدين سعدي بن عبد الخالق الإمراء المولى زين الدين وزير السلطان واقام عند حسام الدين واستمر في الديوان ومعه المؤيد المستوفي والمجهذ واستناد رجل زاهد حبان بلقب الشهاب واستقر فيوزارة إلى سنة ست واربعين وخمسة وكان في سنة اربع واربعين وخمسة ماتت صفتية خاتون بآدم
وفي أول سنة ست واربعين خرج السعيد حسام الدين ونزل
آدم وطلاهم بصداق صفتية خاتون ونفي مدة ورحل عن آدم إلى مراديين ونفي إماما ونذير ان نسوان رجلي فاناما ملفعة مراديين يعملان بالفاعل إماما ثم ان الوزير زين الدين ركب ذات يوم وصعد إلى الفلعة فنجاز في موضع ضيق فخرج عليه ذاك الرجل فضربه احدهما فنام في رأسه فوقع نطق جماعة كانوا بين بيد الوزير الرجلين فقالوا لم ما تريدون نحن نصعد اخي المؤيد الذي كان وزير البرنسفي وحصل وزير السلطان
ورتب المؤيدو المجهذ بالديوان على حالهما
3. Ms.B adds وهو الآن في ديوان صاحب ارزن
4. Ms.
5. Ms.B adds ونابلها وغابتها واقتلع البلد
6. Ms.B adds على جسر الحور
7. Ms.B تم رحل إلى تل الحورية وجرى بينهم خلاف عظيم واخذ الغلة تلك السنة تم ابن نيسان دب امره ورحل الأمير عنه
8. Ms. (sic) أولك
9. Ms.B الرجل ورميه
10. Ms. فقال; فقال Ms.B
حكم إلى الأمير 1 تعزنا بالقوم إلى باب الفتحة 2 والناس خلفهما 3 ودخل الفتحة إلى حين بدى الأمير وقالنا فئتننا الوزير فقال ولما فئتنا امرنا بذلك وأكثر الناس فلنوا ان ابن نسبان دم عليه 4 وقال فامر الأمير حسام الدين بضرب رفافهما على فبره وكان دفن بماردين وكان الرجلان من الملاحة وعاد حسام الدين نزل على آدم وضايقها فحضر بهاء الدين اوس وزير اخلاق فأجتمع بالصعيد حسام الدين على باب آدم وحدث معه وقال فيه ثم دخل إلى آدم واجتمع بموعد الدين ابن نسبان وقرر معه الحال فخرج موعد الدين إلى الأمير واستغر العلح وخرج 7 الامدية إلى الصعيد حسام الدين وحصلوا من جملته وتحت امره 8 ورحل عليهم في العصر الواحد 9 من شهر رجب سنة ست واربعين وخمسشانة مائة فئة خاتون إلى حسام الدين عند صاحب ارزن

1. Ms. B adds وناصره انا فئتنا
2. Ms. B adds وقال للسفيحاء اعلام الأمير اننا قد فئتنا الوزير
3. Ms. خلفهم
4. Ms. B من فتله
5. Ms. B نزل

6. Ms. B على ولاية آدم
7. Ms. خرجوا
8. Ms. B وخرجوا الامدية إلى خدمته وحصلوا في خدمته وخرج إليه موعد الدين في النوبة الأولى وعد رده إلى آدم وخرج من بكره الأمير والخاتون وأولاد الأمير وأولاد الرئيس واستغر فاعدهم

9. Ms. الاخر; Ms. B
و خلفت ابنا عاش بعدها اباما و مات و دفنت بارزان وضاح صدر
السيد حسام الدين لمرتها 1 وبني حسام الدين بعد قتل الوزير
زين الدين بيخر وزير و اكتفى باللجل مؤيد الدولة 2 ابي منصور
خالد بن 3 المبارك بن مختار إلى ان مات نفام بما فوض إليه
الحسن القيم
و بني السيد حسام الدين في الولاية إلى يوم الخميس
كاني ذي القعدة سنة ثمان واربعين وخمسمائة و توفي بماردین
و كان مرضه من يوم السبت إلى يوم الخميس كاني ذي القعدة ودفن
بالمشهد تحت ماردین و كانت ولابته مغرفين تلتين سنة
و ماردین انتشین تلتين سنة (1170 ه) نهض الله عنه و كان
امبرا عالما مطلعا على جميع العلوم يجب اهل العلم ويخالطهم
وبكر ارباب الفناد من كل مناعة و كان كربنا جوادا منفذا لا
يرى الفناد الا عند الغرورة وكان له من الذمة والجوار ما لا
كان للعربياء 6 ولقد قعده الامیر ابو 7 بكر صاحب نصيبين
منمزما من آتابكي زنكي نذم له وطلبه آتاباك ولم يسلمه اليه
وجري بينهما امر عظيم واخذ آتاباك دارا ونهب البلاد وخرج عن

1. Ms.B
2. Ms.B adds
3. Ms.
4. Ms.
5. Ms.B
6. Ms.
7. Ms.
8. Ms. adds
 seri محمد الدين مال زعيم ولم يسلم وهو كان سبب
الوحة بين السعيد وبين آتابك ثم انفعل عنه ومنى الى
السنان مسعود نفسه السلطان ونفذه الى آتابك فقتله
وكان السعيد حمام الدين رحمة الله يراضي أرباب البيت
وينظر في احوالهم ولا يرى قلهم البوعة الكبار وكان إذا قعده
رجل من أصحاب العلماء والعلماء انزله وأكرمه وحسن الهمة
وانفظ البوعة جميع ما يحتاج إليه وكان إذا تحقق في رجل شبا
من أي العلماء كان قريبه وادناء واعطاه وسأله عما يعلمه من
علم وصناعة
وكانت لما مات بولاة الكرج في خدمة ملاك البختر
بين داود ملك الولجة باسرها فانتُقبا في سنة ثمان
واربعين إلى نفليس ورخت الى خدمته وسرت معه الى ولادة
الان و البختر و الدراز و كنا ذات يوم قربا من بلد الدراز
و كان ذلك اليوم الرابع المحرم سنة سبع واربعين وخمساثة
فاستدعاني وقال ان صاحب جمام الدين قد مات وقد وصلني
الخبر في هذا اليوم

1. Ms. مالا عظيمًا
2. Ms.B سيده آتابك في ظلته فتمسلمه اليد فحمله الى آتابك
3. Ms. فصلته written in the left margin.
4. Ms.B قلع بيت قديم
5. Ms.B وكان يقصده جماعة من أرباب البيوتات من جميع البلاد
6. Ms.B وضعهم ويخيف عليهم الانقامة والراحة مدة مقامهم في
خدمته
7. Ms. سله
8. Ms. sic
9. Ms.B وقال وصلني الخبر بموت صاحبكم
و كان ولي ميغرفين في إبادة جماعة من الولاء منهم
الحاج أبو بكر وبرم و عثمان بن خرشاش الحاج كل منهم مرة
الأغاج بيرم فولي مرتين ثم ولي الحاج عبد الكريم ثم
عزل وولي الحاج يوسف بنال ثم عزل و اعطيت تحت دار اختار
واخذها منه التي لابن زنكي و ولي ميغرفين مملوكا كان للأمير اسمه
فزعلي مدة ومات وجلس في النصر الأمير فيماز الخادم والحاج
مدة ثم ولي الحاج برنشدة و عاد الحاج يوسف بنال مرة
ثانية و في الوالدة إلى ثلاث رجب سنة تمع و لنين و متات
ودفن ميغرفين ثم ولي ناصر الدولة صند في ذي القعدة سنة
تمع و لنين و مني إلى شهر ربيع الأول سنة غلى و اربعين و متات
وبقي ولده غريدة الدولة بنال بن رشحل الملك وجلس الحاج بيرم
في القصر مدة و استقل بنال بالولاية و في والدا إلى أن
مات السيد حسام الدين رحمه الله على ما ذكرناه ان ناع الله
 تعالى

---

1. Ms. sic ; Ms. B
2. Ms. B بنو
3. Ms. B إلى Ms. B
4. Ms. B فلعة سرجة
5. Ms. B بنش الحامي
6. Ms. B adds الجمعة
7. Ms. B adds إلى الخميس في
و أنا أذكر نسب الأرنفين

و ما و صل إلى من احتواءهم ومن بغي من نسل (672م). الإمبر
ارتق رحمه الله قبل لما مات الأمير ارتق خلف أولاها جماعة منهم
الامبر سكمان وحم الدين غازى و سهراج و عاد الجبار و سماوين
و آبة بارق و ابنا آخر ذكر اسمه 1 بكشان و ابنا آخر اسمه
آلاباش و هولاء 2 الذين اغتموا و حي نسلهم الى الآن بدير بكر
دبل خبر هولاء 3 وما سميت بان 7 لهم الآن عتبة 8 فاهلهم ذكرهم
فنا سكمان فانه ملك حصن كبير و مية مدة ومات سنة
ست و خمسمائة و خلف الأمير ركن الدولة داوود والأمبر إبراهيم
و ملك حصن كبيرا بعد ابنه مدة و ملكها بعده ركن الدولة
داود و امر خاتون و ملك ركن الدولة 9 حصن كبيرا بعده و ملكا خيرها
بعد ذلك واولد أربعة 10 بدينهم " آرسلان نخشي و فرآرسلان

1. Ms.B
2. Ms.B
3. Ms.B
4. Ms is written as an alternative above
5. Ms. هاولا
6. Ms. هاولا
7. Ms. ان
8. Ms. عنب
9. Ms. وملك حصن كبيرا بعد ابنه مدة و ملكها بعده ركن الدولة
والوجه وارز خاتون وملك ركن الدولة

This lengthy omission is written along most of the left margin.

10. Ms. أربع
11. Ms. هما
و سليمان ومحمد و اما آرمانس نظم نمات وكان ملك ميزكيد
و كان ملكها بعد اباه وخلف ابنا من ابنه المعيد حام الدين
ومات بعد اباه بعدة يسيرة واما سليمان فانه مات وخلف ابنا

ا

 اسمه يعقوب هو الآن في خدمة المالك نجم الدين وابنا آخر
هو في خدمة جمال الدين في حاني واما محمود فملك

الفرخة و مات وخلف ابنا يمسى داوود وهو في خدمة اولاد عمه

نخر الدين بهمن كيما و اما داوود الدين فنر آرمانس فانه ملك

البلاد جميعها التي كانت جباهه بعد موهه على ما ذكرناه ومات

و خلف ابتين هما نور الدين محمد وعماد الدين ابو بكر وولي

الأمر بعده نور الدين وهو الآن في الملك وخلف بناه جامعه

و اما الأمير ببرام بن 6 ارتق فانه خلف الأمير داور

الدولة بكاء وملك خرتيت ومالوا 7 وما حولها واخذها منه شمس

الدولة سليمان بن الغازى واخذها بعد ذلك الأمير داور بعد

1. Ms. الملك
2. Ms. ملك
3. Ms. غز
4. Ms. محمود
5. Ms. الأمير
6. Ms. ابن
7. Ms. sic Ms. B بالود
8. Ms. ابن
موت سليم، وكان تزوج بالملكة فرعّندا خانون بنت الملك
رضوان بعد نجم الدين الغازى وهو دخل بها وملك طفلاً من قرب
الفرات وكان يغزو الأئمء وقتله على منج على ما ذكرناه وخلف
بنته تزوجها فخر الدين فراصلان ومات عنها
واما شيواي بن ارتن فانه خلف الأمير بونس الحرامي
ورابته في خدمة السيد حسام الدين رحمه الله وولد اولاداً
منهم في خدمة اولاد فخر الدين بحن كيما والامير سبونج وهو
في خدمة جمال الدين اخي الملك 4 ينام الدين وغزو
بنته الأمير شيرباريك وولد منها ابنا اسمه شاه ملك وماتت
وتزوج باختلافها أخرى
واما آل بارق بن ارتن فانه خلف اولاداً منهم الأمير
على ملك جبل جور وولد الأمير ممدوح وهو شيرباريك و ابنا
آخر مات اسمه محمود وولد ابنا اسمه 5 هو في خرتيت
وتزوج شاه ملك بنت شيرباريك في سنة سبع وخمسين وولد
شيرباريك سبونج و اسمه وطريق 6 وباتنا جماعة وولد ابنا

1. Ms. يغزوا
2. Ms.B adds ومات في خدمته
3. Ms. اخر
4. Ms. الملك
5. Ms. has a lacuna here
6. Ms. sic
من جاربة اسمه زكى، وبقي في خدمة ابها مدة ومضي
إلى معر و توبي بها في ابام شاور واما طبريك ممات بحصن كفها
وجمل الى مبركي و اما سومه وكان أكبرهم فنزوج
خاتون باب الملك رضوان موما ولم يعقل واما اسمبل فله
ولدان ذكران، وهو في خدمة المالك ۴ نجم الدين وبغي شيربارك
في خدمة المالك حمام الدين الى اباه مات وانتقل الى خدمة فخر
الدين قرا آلسلان وبغي عندب مدة وعاد الى خدمة المالك نجم
الدين و ممات في طلا سنة ست وستين وخمساتة ودنب في فترة
لهم في استن المقابر
وأما عبد الجبار بن أرتق فانه خلف تلثة بنين
اغبان وآرسلان وسبعين فاما اغبان ۹ فانه انتقل وخدم

1. Ms. sic
2. Ms. وزوج
3. Ms. ولدين ذكور
4. Ms. الملك
5. Ms. الملك
6. Ms. ابن
7. Ms. لثن
8. Ms. آرسلان
9. Ms. اغبان
ولاية اخلاء مع بنت سكمان وأولاد هناك ولدين الأمير أحمد والآخر
بلقب عز الدين وانغلف إلى خدمة فخر الدين فر آرسلان بحصن
ببنا وحمل عنه في اوثق درجة وزوجه بنت اخوه آرسلان تغيش
ومات بالمراع وخليف ابنه هو في خدمة اولاد فخر الدين
واما آلناش فانه خلف الأمير علي الحرامي ومام
في خدمة حسام الدين وخلف ولدين احدهما أبو 3 بكر وقد ليس
العروف وهو نفيس وعمر وهو في خدمة اولاد فخر الدين بصح كيغا
واما الأمير آرسلان بن 4 عبد الجبار فانه ملك جبل
جور وبالفرن وانسفان وبي مدة وانهف عنده السيد حسام
الدين وانغلف إلى حصن كيغا إلى خدمة ركن الدولة داود ومات
في خدمته وخلف اولادا منهم بلان ومحمود وباشا وكان رجوب المثا
في حماته من الأمير زعيم الدولة مصيب بن 6 مالك صاحب الرقة
وافاق 7 الأولاد في خدمة فخر الدين وانغلف الأمير بلان إلى خدمة

---

1. Ms. عز
2. Ms. آرسلان
3. Ms. أبي
4. Ms. ابن
5. Ms. سـت
6. Ms. ابن
7. Ms. افاقوا
الملك نجم الدين ومات

وأما سليمان كان يلقب بـ "بدر" 1 الدولة فانه ملك حلب وتزوج بالخاتون الملكة بنت رضوان التي كانت زوجة الأمير بلك وأولاد منها ابنا سماه كيك ويلقب بجلال الملوك واخذت منه حلب ووصل إلى خدمة السعيد حسام الدين وافطعه بلد قلب وحصنه وبغي في خدمته إلى ان مات ووصلت الملكة إلى ماردين بعد موته ومعها ولده فان célibت بماردين وزوجها السعيد حسام الدين على ما ذكرناه وزوج ولدها جلال الملوك من ابنة هدية خاتون في سنة سبع واربعين وبغي الى سنة اربع وخمسين وخمسين وخمسين وتوفي بباب نصيبين على ما سذكره ان شاء الله تعالى

وأما الابن الآخر وهو بكدان فانه اولد رسلان ظل مش وانشل الى خدمة آتابك لفلكين صاحب دمشق فانه كان عليه في اولي منزلة وتزوج ابائته خاتون ابنة بضي الوزير (أ. 1784) محمد الدوسي واقام بدمشق الى سنة ثلاث وأربعين وخمسين وخمسين في خدمة اولاد فلكين وتعد الموصل ناقام في خدمة صاحبها مدة سيرة

---

1. Ms. بدر
2. Ms. السعيد
3. Ms. sic
4. Ms. فلكين
ن انتقل الى خدمة السيد حسام الدين وآكرمه وافتتحه اقناعاً

كتمة في آخر عشرة اربع واربعين عندما ملك دارا وبغي مدة

لا بسيطة ومات وخلفه ثلاثة بنين احدهم كان يلقب بخمس الدولة عاش

في خدمة السيد بعد ابيه مدة سنتين ومات وبقي الآبان مصعود

وبلك وبغي مصعود في خدمة المالك نجم الدين مدة وانتقل الى

خدمة نخر الدين فرا آرسلان واما بل كناء بغي في خدمة المالك

نجم الدين الى سنة سبع وسبعين وتزهد وانتقل وجلس في مصر

باقوًا قريبًا من باب البوابة في رأس الريش وهو الى الآن

معيش بـ

واما نجم الدين الغازى فانه اولد اولادا جماعة احدهم

البلاس والبزم قفلاً في حباه وكحاز خانو واما الباس فانه

اولد الأمير شهب الدين محمد بن الباس وبنثا من خاتون

تزوجها سعد الدولة ايلودي صاحب امها ولده منها ولد في آمد

واما شهب الدين محمد نانه كثيري خدمة عنده السعيد حسام

الدين وافتتحه تل بشي وكان عنده مكرماً الى ان مات وبقي مدة

بعد موتنه وانتقل الى الباب الى خدمة دار الدين افتتحه اقناعاً

كثيرة وغي في خدمته الى الآن وله ثلاثة بنين وهم الآن في خدمة

1. Ms.

2. Ms. has a lacuna here

3. Ms. ايلودي

4. Ms. كبيراً
نور الدين وولد نجم الدين ابناً من حاربة اسمه عمر زوجها
بالامير اسمعالى ومت ولد ولم يعقب وولد ابناً اسمه
نور من حاربة زوجها بالحاج عمر الخاكم ولد ولم يعقب وزوج
كبير خاتون من سيف الدولة ديبا وولدته منه الأمير إيز الدين
محمد وبنى عنه عدداً بمارددين إلى أن قتل ديبا ومضى إلى الحلة
ولملك به مدة وعاد إلى خدمة الملكة نجم الدين
وقد قام وتوت في سنة تسع وخمسين
وخدمته ودمت بدكرابه وخلف عن الدولة ابناً هو الآن في خدمة
شهاب الدين محمد بن الاياس وولد نجم الدين بنتاً صانتها عينا
خاتون تزوجها الأمير ابلد صاحب آدم وولد منها جمال الدين
شمس الملك محمود وهو الآن صاحب آدم ورست وعمره بعدها بابت
شهاب الدين على ما ذكرناه وولد بنتاً اسمها سفري خاتون
تزوجها حسام الدولة فرطى بن 3 فنان آرسلان صاحب ارزون ودبلاس
ومات 4 وخلفه ابناً اسمه باقي بسان (878هـ) وهو في خدمة فخر
الدين دخلت عمة وولد شمس الدولة سليم وملك مغربيين
بعد ابنه وتوفي وخلفه ابناً اسمه محمود ورأبه في مارددين وهو
في السواحال وما أعلم ما كان منه وولد السعيد حسام الدين

1. Ms. illegible or امرها 
2. Ms. كان
3. Ms. ابن
4. Ms. مات
5. Ms. وحال ; أسو حال
نمرنعاش وكان عين البيت وسيد الأولاد فملك ماردين على ماذكرناه
بعد أبيه وملك ميغريين بعد أفيه ومسي إلى ان مات وخلف من
الأولاد المالك نجم الدين آلبي وملك الملك بعد أبيه وجمال
الدين مربي اغواء اخوه حاني والسيوان وحسن قلب وصمام الدين
بهرام ملك دارا وهديه خاتون هي عيناخيها جمال الدين حاني
وزمرد خاتون بالمحور مات عنها في الدين مودود بن زنكي وخلف
منها اربعة اولاد ملك الملك سيف غازي بن مودود على ماستذكروه
إن شاء الله وصاع في حياته صفية خاتون زوجه صاحب آدم ونورة
خاتون زوجه صاحب ارزون على ما ذكرناه فرحة الله عليه ورضوته
لديه فهذا ما وصل الي من نصيب من الارثية والله اعلم
بالصرف