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CHAPTER VI

TRANSLATION OF MS. A OF

TĀRĪKH MĀYYĀFĀRĪQĪN WA ĀMID
It is reported that when Ibn Jahīr conquered Diyār Bakr, Amīr Artuq was with him. When Ibn Jahīr became established and no longer required the services of Artuq, Artuq broke away from him. When Malik-Shāh came, Amīr Artuq went to Syria and took possession of Jerusalem and the surrounding area. He lived on the Sahil and died there. His sons, the amīrs Sukmān and Najm al-Dīn Il-Ghāzī, ruled Jerusalem after him for a time.

Then Najm al-Dīn Il-Ghāzī went to Sultan Muḥammad and remained in his service. Muḥammad granted him the iqtā' of Hulwān for a while. Then Sultan Muḥammad made him shīhna in Iraq and Il-Ghāzī lived in Baghdad. After the Franks took the Sahil and Jerusalem, Sukmān came to this country and took possession of Hisn Kaifā. Amīr al-Yaqqūtī had (already) taken possession of Mārādīn. When Najm al-Dīn Il-Ghāzī came to this country al-Yaqqūtī had died. Il-Ghāzī had been there under the suzerainty of al-Yaqqūtī. (Thereafter) he became subordinate to Sukmān of Hisn Kaifā. Il-Ghāzī remained in Mārādīn and took possession of it. He remained there until 498 when it is reported that Amīr Sukmān died.

Sukmān's son, Amīr Ibrāhīm b. Sukmān, ruled after him. Ibrāhīm contacted Shams in Mārādīn and took as a hostage a son of his who
remained with him in Hisn Kaifa for a while. Then the news reached Shams that Ibrahîm had insulted his son and imprisoned him. So when Najm al-Dîn Îl-Ghâzî came (back again) Shams surrendered Mârdîn to Najm al-Dîn.

After a while Amir Ibrahîm died in Hisn Kaifa. His brother, Amir Dâ'ûd, took over his position after him. He remained for a while and Amir Shams and Mârdîn were in his hands. He did not surrender the city to anyone. Then Najm al-Dîn Îl-Ghâzî came and he surrendered it to him in the year 507. So it came to Îl-Ghâzî and his descendants from that day (f.161a) until now.

As for Amir Shams, he was the father of Amir Sonqur who was the father of Yûsuf who himself was the father of Rasûl. It is reported that Najm al-Dîn Îl-Ghâzî took possession of Mârdîn in the years 507 or 508 remaining there until the year 512.

Then he contacted the sultan saying that Mayyafâriqîn was going to rack and ruin and was in decline, whilst previously it had been a city without peer. The sultan got in touch with Ilduz Be, ordering him to hand over Mayyafâriqîn to Najm al-Dîn Îl-Ghâzî. So when Îl-Ghâzî arrived, Ilduz Beg handed it over to him. He entered the city on 14 Jumâda II 512. Ilduz Beg left and took up residence in al-Rawâbî where he stayed for three days. On the fourth day, a messenger came in haste to him from the sultan, ordering him not to surrender the city, but he found it was already too late. Najm al-Dîn became established in Mayyafâriqîn and he showed justice and kindness to the inhabitants. He removed from them the athgâl and the aqsaî and the anzâl for the people were
in great distress because of the nuzl.

Most of the city was ruined because of constant changes of régime and overlord. Those who conquered them treated them unjustly and tyrannised them and mulcted them because they knew that they themselves would not endure and their rule would not last. From the moment Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī took power, he became established, their hearts became calm and the people became secure in their homes.

It happened that the soldiers who had no homes came down into the city and set up tents in the ruins of the city because most of the city was ruined and the roads were terrorised by robbers and highwaymen, to such an extent that a caravan could go to Āmid only if it was escorted by a shīhna and cavalry. It was the same to Arzan, Hisn Kaifa, Ḥanī and Mārdīn, for an escort was needed to guard the caravan even for a short distance because of the devastation of the towns and villages. From the moment Najm al-Dīn assumed power, the roads and the countryside became safe. The robbers fled and the villages flourished. Mayyāfāriqīn began to prosper and he ruled the people very well.

He remained until the year 513 when he took possession of Aleppo and fought the Franks, inflicting a decisive defeat on them, plundering their possessions and taking a great number of them prisoner. This was the defeat at al-Balāt. As for Aleppo, he took it from Sultan-Shāh b. al-Malik Ridwān who had taken it from (another) son of Ridwān.

It is reported that in 513 the Friday mosque at Āmid was burned.
In 514 Najm al-Dīn took Nasībīn. Qādī Ḥaṣan al-Dīn b. Nubāta and a group of the inhabitants of Mayyāfārīqīn went and met him there and congratulated him on his conquest of the city. He put ceremonial garments on them and treated them well, and they returned to Mayyāfārīqīn.

It is reported that in 515, the population of Tiflīs got in touch with Najm al-Dīn ʿIl-Ghāzī asking him to come so that they might hand over Tiflīs to him. The inhabitants had run the administration by themselves for forty years. A family from amongst its inhabitants, called the Banū Jaʿfar, had ruled the city for about two hundred years. When their leaders finally died out, the administration of the city reverted (f.161b) to its citizens. Every month one of them would take over the administration. This situation had prevailed for forty years.

King Daʿūd, King of the Abkhāz and the Gurj, had oppressed the city sorely and it had declined, (so) they had got in contact with Sultan Toghrīl Beg, son of Sultan Muhammad, who was ruler of Ganja and Arrān and he sent a shihna to them. But the tyranny of the king of the Gurj towards them increased. They carried on in this way for a while and agreed to pay him 10,000 dīnārs every year. They also agreed to have a shihna with (only) ten horsemen. After continuing like that for a while, they approached Najm al-Dīn ʿIl-Ghāzī and asked him to come. He set out accompanied by a large number of troops and Dubais b. Ṣadaqa, lord of the Arabs. This man was the son-in-law of Najm al-Dīn, being married to his daughter Guhar Khatun, and had joined him that year. Najm al-Dīn
took troops with him, and having contacted Shams al-Daula Toghan Arslan, lord of Arzan and Bitlis, to whom the city of Dvin also belonged, he ordered the latter to enter Tiflis from the eastern side. When Najm al-Dīn left he (also) took with him Qadi c Alam al-Dīn b. Nubāta and his son, Qadi c Alam al-Dīn Abu 'l-Fath al-Kabīr, who is now qādi of Mardin; and the vizier Abū Tammām b. cAbdūn also went with him. When they arrived in Erzerum the qādi and the vizier stayed behind there.

Najm al-Dīn entered Georgia with his troops by way of the province of Kars and Tharyālīth. They had agreed that all the troops should assemble before Tiflis. Sultan Toghril Beg made his dispositions on the Ganja side and Toghan Arslan al-Ahdab marched from Dvin. Najm al-Dīn advanced until he was only a half-day's journey away from the mountain near Tiflis. King Dā'ūd, accompanied by his son Dīmitri, sallied forth from the western side with a large number of troops. He swooped down on them from the mountain while they were at the bottom of it. The troops of Sultan Toghril Beg had not come, nor had Shams al-Daula al-Ahdab with his men. They engaged in a mighty battle, and Najm al-Dīn was defeated. The infidels killed a large number of his men and seized much plunder from them. Only Najm al-Dīn and Dubais escaped with a small band of men, so that the Georgians have retained prisoners right up to our own time.

I saw the place of the battle when I entered Tiflis in the year 548. I stayed there, then I entered the service of the King of the Abkhāz with whom I remained (a while). I accompanied him on a visit round his territory for a period of over seventy days. He crossed over to al-Lān and the edge of Darband and the province
of the Abkhāz. One day in the province of the Abkhāz we came to a broad meadow in a forbidding citadel beneath a mountain. The malik (of Darband) was encamped here. The king of the Abkhāz said to me: "O so and so! In this citadel is a foreigner who has been a prisoner since the time of Il-Ghāzī. When morning comes, go up and see him and ask him where he comes from". So I decided to do so and I said (to myself): "I will ask the king to let him go." After I had slept that night and daybreak had come, the bugle (f.162a) for departure was sounded because the King had received the news that some of his territory had rebelled against him. When he heard the news he and his entourage left and God did not decree that we should meet that man.

It is reported that in 515 Malik Ridwān died in Aleppo, but the first date is more accurate. When Najm al-Dīn had been defeated and retreated with the men remaining, the king of the Abkhāz withdrew with the plunder and the prisoners. He camped before Tiflīs and besieged it for a while. Then he tore down its walls from the west and entered it by the sword, burning and plundering it. After three days he gave its inhabitants security, soothed their hearts and made them fair promises.

That year, he removed from them the athqāl, the mu'ān, the aqsāt and the kharāj. He laid down for the Muslims all the conditions they wanted; these are still valid in Tiflīs today. (He stipulated) that no pigs should be brought over to the area where the Muslims lived or to the city and that these animals should not be slaughtered there or in the market. He struck dirhams for them on one side of which was the name of the sultan and the
caliph, and on the (other) side was the name of God and the name of
the Prophet (on him be peace), while the king's name was on the
margin of the dirham. He proclaimed in the town that the blood of
anyone who harmed a Muslim might be shed with impunity. He granted
them the call to prayer, prayers, and the reading (of the Qur'an) in public. He also guaranteed that on Fridays sermons and public
prayers should take place, and that prayers should be said from the
minbar for the caliph and the sultan but for no-one else. He also
guaranteed that no Georgian, Armenian or Jew should enter the bath
of Isma'īl in Tiflis. He assessed the tax of a Georgian at a rate of
five dinārs per annum, that of a Jew at four dinārs and that of a
Muslim at three dinārs. He treated the Muslims extremely kindly,
whilst to the people of 'ilm and religion and the Sūfīs he
accorded a level of respect which they did not receive (even)
amongst the Muslims.

I witnessed all these privileges when I entered Tiflis in 548. I
saw the king of the Abkhaz, Dīmītrī, in whose service I was and who
had come to Tiflis. After he had stayed there a few days, he went
down one Friday to the mosque and sat down on a dikka opposite the
preacher. He stayed in his place until the preacher had preached
and he listened to the entire khutba. Then he went out and donated
two hundred gold dinārs to the mosque. I used to see him honour,
reward and respect the 'ulama', preachers, sharifs, Sūfīs and those
who came to him and (he would) show unparalleled reliance on them.
And from him I saw such esteem for the Muslims as they would not
enjoy even if they were in Baghdad.

It is reported that in the year 515, there was an earthquake in
the city of Janza, which is Ganja. Part of it fell to pieces and its walls collapsed. King Da'ūd went with his retinue, horsemen and infantry and attacked the city. He plundered their possessions and everything he found there, killing a large number of people and imprisoning innumerable crowds of them, so many of them that the prisoners entered Tiflis on carts, there being so many of them.

(f.162b) The Muslim prisoners were driven along like herds of sheep. When Da'ūd brought them into Tiflis, the citizens of Tiflis bought most of them and set them free. Some of the citizens of Tiflis said to me, "We were only in straitened circumstances from that year onwards."

It is reported that in the year 515, Maudūd was killed in the Friday mosque of Damascus and was buried in the burj.

It is reported that in the year 515, Najm al-Dīn returned to Mārdīn where he remained until 516. He went to Aushal al-Haina in the district of Mayyāfārīqīn and stayed there with his wife the khatun, the daughter of Togh-Tegin, the lord of Damascus. He became ill and died on Thursday 27 Ramadan. He was carried by night. His son, Amir Shams al-Daula Sulaimān, and the khatun rode and came to Mayyafariqin by night, arriving at the Huwa gate. They sat the amīr on his horse, held upright by a man behind him, moved forward and shouted. The wāli, whose name was Oghuzoglu, came down. A shaikh who had been a companion of Najm al-Din since his early days and to whom Shams al-Daula and the khatun had given instructions went inside. So when he (the wāli) opened the gate, they said that the amīr was ill. When they reached the grounds of the citadel, they shouted and yelled that the amīr had just
In the morning the population of the town and those soldiers who were there went up to the citadel. The amīr was washed, prayers were said over him and he was buried in the sidīlī for a while. Then he was removed and buried in the masjid al-amīr to the east of the qubbat al-sultan. He was buried there.

Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī had married Farkhunda Khatun, the daughter of Malik Ridān, when he had taken possession of Aleppo. He had contracted a marriage with her but did not consummate the union with her nor did he visit her; and he died without having met her.


It is reported that Shams al-Daula Sulaimān became established in Mayyafāriqīn and he appointed as vizier the vizier ‘Abd al-Malik b. Thābit and turned affairs over to him. He took Khartabīrīt from Amīr Balak and it remained in his possession until he died, whereupon Amīr Dā‘ūd took it. Sulaimān (also) took the town of Hāzā from Amīr Dā‘ūd and the villages in the district of Mayyafāriqīn which Husām al-Daula, lord of Arzān, had taken.

In the year (5)17, al-Afdal, amīr al-juyūsh in Egypt, was killed, murdered by the Batiniyya.

Sulaimān left as governor of Mayyafāriqīn in the burj al-mulk his mamlūk, Khutlug-Shāh and he made overtures for the hand in marriage of Sayyida Khatun, daughter of Sultan Qīlīch Arslan b.
Sulaimān b. Qutulmush. The ǧādi Tāj al-Dīn Abū Salīm b. Nubātā went to fetch her from Malatya for him. He consummated the marriage with her while he was staying in Mayyafāriqīn.

It turned out that when Najm al-Dīn died, al-SA‘Īd Husām al-Dīn Temūr-Tash, his son was in Mardin. Temūr-Tash therefore took over Mardin and assumed sole control there. He had with him al-Sāhib, the chamberlain, Shams al-Hujjāb Muhammad Ḥaḍarah, whom Najm al-Dīn Ḥaḍarah had married to the mother of Husam al-Dīn.

It is reported that on 26 Rabi‘ II, the ǧādi ‘Alam al-Dīn Abu’l-Hasan ‘Alī b. Yahya b. Nubātā died in Mayyafāriqīn. His son, the ǧādi Tāj al-Dīn, took over the office of ǧādi. He was also called Abū Salīm, may God have mercy on him. Shams al-Daula laid ceremonial garments on him, honoured him by giving him his father’s post, and he became established in the office of ǧādi. Shams al-Daula had a son (f.163a) whose name was Mahmūd. I saw him in Mardin. He was in the worst possible condition because of the evil life he led, his own shameful conduct in his personal life, his disobedience to his family and his depravity. I do not know what became of him. Shams al-Daula was an amīr who was just, virtuous, daring and courageous. He lived until the afternoon of Thursday, 6 Ramadan 518 and was buried with his father in the masjid al-amīr. The wālī Khutlugh-Shāh assumed sole control in Mayyafāriqīn and it came into his possession and under his sway.

The account of the rule of Husam al-Dīn

It is reported that when Shams al-Daula died, Khutlugh-Shāh
assumed sole control in Mayyafāriqīn with the vizier ‘Abd al-Malik. Husam al-Dīn came, approached the gate of the city, encamped outside the town and sent a message to Khutlugh-Shāh. The amīr Dā‘ūd b. Sukman, lord of Hīm Kaifa, was about to leave (for Mayyafāriqīn) but Husam al-Dīn arrived (there) first. He contacted Khutlugh-Shāh and he swore to meet his demands, swearing to him that he would make no changes which would put the people of the town at a disadvantage and that he would appoint ‘Abd al-Malik as vizier. He took an oath agreeing to their proposals and entered the town in Shawwāl 518. He appointed ‘Abd al-Malik as vizier. His position became established and he acquired everything that had belonged to his father Najm al-Dīn. He treated the people kindly and they liked him. He assumed sole control.

He married the wife of his brother, the amīr Ayaz b. Najm al-Dīn, who had had by her Shihāb al-Dīn Muhammad b. Ayaz. Temur-Tash had by her a daughter, Šafiyya Khatun, who was the eldest of his children. After a while he married the khatun, daughter of the amīr Ghazi from Erzerum. She came to Mayyafāriqīn and he had by her the lord Najm al-Dīn Alpī in 520. Then he had (by her) Amir Jamāl al-Dīn Tughrati (?) in 521. After Husam al-Dīn took possession of the country, he begat Hadiyya Khatun, and then Amir Samsām al-Dīn Bahrām in 5—.

Husam al-Dīn took possession of Aleppo which remained in his hands for a while. Then he exchanged it for (‘Azāz (?)) or he handed it over and it left his possession.

It is reported that Sultan Mahmūd set out for Iraq and wanted...
to enter (the country), but the caliph al-Mustarshid prevented him from doing so. Much fighting took place between them. Al-Mustarshid was defeated, his possessions were plundered, and Sultan Mahmūd entered Iraq without his permission. After a while they became well reconciled.

It is reported that in 519 or at the beginning of 520 al-Bursuqī was killed in the Friday mosque in Mosul by the Batiniyya. His son Masʿūd took over the land of Diyar Rabīʿa and other places. The qāḍī Bahaʾ al-Dīn al-Shahrūzūrī, Nasīr al-Dīn Jaqar and Salah al-Dīn Muhammad Yaghūqiyānī met together, collected money and taxes and went down to Baghdad to pay their respects to Sultan Mahmūd and to establish Amir Masʿūd b. al-Bursuqī in the land. When they arrived, they reconsidered and discussed the matter, saying: "He is a young boy, who won't rule (f.16b) effectively and who may well not administer the country wisely. We will be blamed for the wrong he does." So they agreed to meet Zangi b. Qasīm al-Daula Aq-Sonqur, who was the shihna of Baghdad that year. They established with him what offices they wanted and they exacted an oath from him promising that Bahaʾ al-Dīn should become qāḍī of Mosul and should exercise control over the posts of qāḍī in the whole country and over religious affairs. He (also) swore that the offices of ḥājib and of amīr al-ʿaskar should go to Salah al-Dīn and that Nasīr al-Dīn should govern Mosul and the whole country and appoint as his wālis whom he thought fit. So Zangi swore to them that he would do this and they settled the matter to their mutual satisfaction. Then they paid their respects to the sultan and his retinue and to the caliph and his retinue, handing over the money which they had brought with them. When they had sought
out Zangi, the sultan handed over to him his two sons Alp Arslan and al-Khafajī. Zangi became atābeg to them both and gained control of the country. He went and took possession of Mosul and the country at the beginning of 522.

It is reported that in 522 Nūr al-Daula was killed. While he was attempting to seize Manbij in Syria and was besieging it, he was struck by an arrow which killed him. Amir Dā'ūd took possession of his territories: Khartabīr, Bālū, Mīzgard and its neighbourhood. Amir Balak had taken this province from the sons of Jubuq. When Balak died, he left no successors other than a daughter whom Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan b. Dā'ūd married.

It is reported that in 523 Atabeg Tugh-Tegin died in Damascus and his son Tāj al-Mulūk Būrī assumed control over Damascus and its environs.

It is reported that on 5 Shawwāl 524 Sultan Mahmūd, lord of Iṣfahān, died. Also in that year the vizier al-Maḍaqānī, Bahrām, and all the Iṣmāʿīlīs in Damascus were killed. Sultan Mahmūd was buried in Iṣfahān. His brother, Sultan Toghril Beg, became sultan for a period of two years and then he died early in 527, whereupon his brother, Sultan Masʿūd, became sultan.

Sultan Muhammad left a number of sons, amongst whom was Sultan Mahmūd, who wielded exclusive power, Toghril Beg, Sultan Sulaymān-Shāh, Masʿūd, Saljuq-Shāh, and Bahrām-Shāh who is reported to have died (?). Sultan Mahmūd left Sultan Dāʿūd, who was the
eldest of his children and took possession of Āzarbāijān. He was killed in Tabrīz in 539 by the Bātiniyya in the centre of the bazaar and was buried in Tabrīz. Sultan Mahmūd also left Muhammad-Shāh who became sultan after his uncle Mas'ūd, whose daughter he married. Sultan Mahmūd (also) left Malik-Shāh, who during the lifetime of his uncle Mas'ūd was in the 'askar with him. (Thereafter) he took Khūzistān. Mahmūd (also) left Alp Arslan and al-Khafājī with Atabeg Zangī in Mosul where they were both killed. He also had a daughter, Guhar, by the daughter of Sultan Sanjar. Guhar lived until around the year 557.

As for Sulaimān-Shāh, he died and left no heirs. As for Saljuq, he had a son who is now in Mosul, having been with Mas'ūd Bilāl in the citadel of Takrit. When it was taken, he was brought to Mosul where he is now. He has some children. As for Sultan Toghrīl Beg, he sired Arslan-Shāh whose mother was the wife of the amīr Eldigūz. He is now sultan (f.164a) of the area from Iṣfahān, Hamadhān, Āzarbāijān and Arrān up to the city of Ganja and Shamkūr (?).

In 524, Husam al-Dīn and Dā'ūd were defeated at Sarja below Dārā. They were defeated by Atabeg Zangī.

It is reported that in 524, Sayyida Khatun, the daughter of al-Qālīch Arslan, died in Mayyāfarīqīn and was buried beside her father in the qubba. Her mother was the wife of the amīr Rukn al-Daula Dā'ūd. After a few days her brother, Sultan Toghrīl Beg, came from Hisn Kaifā to Mayyāfarīqīn. He was the son-in-law of Rukn al-Daula Dā'ūd, being married to his daughter. He stayed in the qubba
and took all her inheritance.

It is reported that in 525 al-Āmir bi-Akhām Allāh, caliph of Egypt, died. He left behind a pregnant wife, but no son. \(^{181}\)

It is reported that in this year Sultan Sanjar contacted Zangī, ordering him to release Dubais. So Zangī released Dubais who went to Sultan Mas'ūd. In 526 the Akhlāṭ ships were sunk in the sea at Constantinople with a group of people from Akhlāṭ travelling in them. \(^{183}\) In that year Nur al-Daula, lord of Pinik, died. His son, the amīr Abū Nasr, succeeded him. In that year Amir Da'ūd seized the citadel of Qatalbas and Bātāsā. \(^{185}\)

It is reported that the people of Egypt were in disagreement and disarray, saying: "Before he does, the imām of this family always leaves a male nominated to succeed him as imām. This man has left no son and has nominated no successor other than an unborn child." Before his death he had named the unborn child as his successor. The people said: "The nomination of an unborn child is permissible and it may be that a male child will be born." So they went on waiting for the unborn child to be born; but a girl was born. The people were (again) in disagreement and agitation. At the end of 525 they brought out from the castle a man who was one of the sons of al-Mustansir. His ism was 'Abd al-Majīd, his kunya was Abu 'l-Maimūn, and his laqab was al-Hāfiz li-Dīn Allāh. One report says that this man was 'Abd al-Majīd b. al-Mustansir. Another report says that he was 'Abd al-Majīd b. Abī 'l-Qāsim al-Musta'īlī b. al-Mustansir. Yet another report says that he was the son of another son of al-Mustansir — other than al-Musta'īlī. Al-Hāfiz took over the caliphate. The
people agreed on him, and the line of legitimate succession on behalf of al-Musta'li and his descendants was quashed. The Isma'ili believe the following: that the line of succession at that time is a continuous one from al-Mustansir through Nizar until now. This is their doctrine but they are all wrong. Al-Hafiz remained in the caliphate and became established and his power became strong. There is no caliphate except with the 'Abbasi family because the Prophet (may God have mercy upon him) said concerning al-'Abbas: "You are the father of kings of my umma until the Day of Resurrection." The people of Egypt and the Isma'ili are in error. Only prejudiced and biased people think these beliefs are right. There is no imam and no caliph except the one from the 'Abbasi family in Baghdad.

It is reported that in 525 Amir Dā'ūd took possession of Isfird, Bahmār and Batasa. In (f.164b) 524 Atabeg Zangi joined battle against Husam al-Dīn and Amir Dā'ūd. After they had been defeated outside Sarja they fled for safety to Dāra. Zangi went to Syria and took Hamā and its environs as well as Hims. He made for Damascus where he took Dubai and returned to Mosul, taking with him Dubai bound in fetters.

It is reported that in Ramadan 526 the caliph al-Mustarshid went to Mosul. He encamped before it and laid siege to it for a while. In command of the city was Nasīr al-Dīn Jaqar. The caliph engaged in fighting the inhabitants but Nasīr had fortified the city and had dug a ditch. Although the caliph pressed on hard with the siege, he was unsuccessful and he returned to Baghdad, entering the city on 29 Dhu'l-Qa'da.
It is reported that in 527 the vizier 'Abd al-Malik died in Mayyafarîqîn and al-Nāsih 'Alî b. Ahmad al-Āmidî took over the supervision of the diwān. When he was mutawallî in Āmid, Mu'ayyid al-Dīn b. Nīsān had seized him, mulcted him for 30,000 dinārs and taken over his position. Al-Nāsih came to Mayyafarîqîn and his son Abū Naṣr received the profit from the harvest while al-Nāsih was given the post of administering the waqfs. After the vizier died he took control of the diwān.

It is reported that in 528 al-Mu'ayyid Abu'l-Hasan b. Mukhtar arrived in Mayyafarîqîn from the Jazîra. He had been mulcted by the vizier 'Abd al-Malik who had tortured him and taken a lot of money from him. He had gone off to the Jazîra until the vizier 'Abd al-Malik died and had then returned to Mayyafarîqîn and taken over the diwān al-istīfa' with al-Nāsih.

(In) 528 Sharaf al-Dīn Hābashi Abū Tālib b. Hābashi left the people of Iraq for the service of al-Sa'īd Husām al-Dīn. He remained with him, receiving most generous hospitality. He had worked for Salāḥ al-Dīn Muhammad al-Yaghi-Siyânî in Hamā, who had seized him and tortured him by tying a dog to him inside a sack. While the dog struck and bit his body, he rolled around in the sack until the dog's head positioned itself between his thighs, whereupon he wrung its neck until it died in the sack and he was released. So Hābashi fled to Qal'at Ja'bar where he stayed with Najm al-Daulâ Malik b. Salîm b. Malik. Then he went to Mārdîn and stayed with Husām al-Dīn for a while, taking over as the vizier of al-Sa'īd Husām al-Dīn. He acquired an unprecedentedly comprehensive degree of power, ruling as a complete
In this year al-Maqqūn Abu’l-Barakāt b. Abī’l-Pahm al-Harrānī arrived in Mārdīn, having fled his uncle’s family in Harrān. He stayed with al-Sa’īd Husam al-Dīn as his guest.

One report states that al-Mustarshid left Baghdad in Sha’bān 529. Another report says it was in 528. He joined battle against Sultan Maṣ‘ūd outside Hamadhan at a place called Day Marg near the mountain Bihistūn and the camp (?) was plundered. The sultan had assembled a large number of men, (f.165a) together with the lord of Khartabirt with his army and troops. Moreover, his uncle, Sultan Sanjar, had sent him a large force. They joined battle and having defeated the caliph, they imprisoned him and all his state officials.

I asked al-Sa’īd Mu’ayyid al-Dīn Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Anbarī (may God have mercy on him) in 534 in Baghdad, when I stayed with him that year, about the affair of al-Mustarshid, about the battle and its outcome. He said: ‘May God be pleased with him. Hostilities had flared up between the sultan and the caliph in the time of Sultan Mahmūd who went out and defeated the caliph twice. When Maṣ‘ūd succeeded him, his deputies became over-ambitious in Iraq and they opposed the caliph in his own lands. Relations (between the sultan and caliph) became strained and al-Mustarshid collected troops, having seriously resolved to rebel. It happened that one day the vizier Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī ‘Alī b. Tirāḏ called on the caliph and the treasurer Kamāl al-Dīn Talha were with him. The caliph had driven the sultan’s representatives out of Iraq and he had appointed the treasurer to take charge of
the town and of the sultan's office of mazālim. When we went in
that day, the vizier Sharaf al-Dīn said to him: "O master! Your
slave has something on his mind. May he speak?" He said: "Go
ahead." The vizier said: "O master! Where are you going, and who
will give you help, refuge and support? We are strongest if we stay
in Baghdad. No-one can attack us and Iraq is our protection. When
al-Husain b. 'Alī (blessings be upon him) left for Iraq, he met his
fate. If he had stayed in Mecca no-one would have clashed with
him." The caliph said to me: "What do you advise, O scribe?" So
I said: "O master, the right course of action is to stay put. What
the vizier has suggested is right. No-one will attack us in Iraq.
Would God that Iraq remains ours!" So he said to the treasurer:
"O wakīl, what do you say?" He replied: "I think the same way as
my master." He was the one who egged the caliph on to rebel. Al-
Mustarshid said: "If death is inevitable, it is despicable to die
a coward."

Then he got ready and mobilised troops. A group of Turkish
amīrs had joined his service and he had given them a large amount
of money. Then we set out. When we came near to Hamadhān, Sultan
Masūd sallied forth and they joined battle at a place called Day
Marg near the mountain of Bihistūn near Hamadhān. When the troops
had lined up and were about to fight, all the amīrs and Turks
deserted from our camp to the sultan's side, whereupon the caliph
and his remaining followers fled. The camp was plundered and the
caliph and his officials of state were seized. The vizier, the
treasurer, the naqīb of the 'Alīds and I were taken to the castle of
Sar-i Jahān near Qazwīn and Rayy. When I (the author) went to Rayy
in 549, I saw the citadel looming into view at the top of a high hill.
The sultan took al-Mustarshid with him and went round Āzarbājīān with him until he brought him to Marāgha, where he made camp. Three heretics entered the caliph's tent and killed him (may God be pleased with him). A man (f.165b) called Ibn Sakīna, who was leading him in prayer, was killed with him. It was Thursday, 16 Dhu'l-Qa'ida 529. The caliphate of al-Mustarshid lasted seventeen years, seven months and two days.

He had appointed as heir his son, Abū Ja'far al-Mansūr al-Rashid bi'llāh, who had stayed behind in Baghdad. When the news that al-Mustarshid had been murdered reached Baghdad, the people pledged allegiance to al-Rashid as caliph. It is said that Sultan Sanjar sent the people who killed al-Mustarshid. But according to another report Sultan Mas'ūd applied to his uncle Sanjar for permission to kill him and Sanjar concurred. Mas'ūd therefore commissioned those men who accordingly went into his tent and killed him. He was buried in the city of Marāgha.

Dubais b. Sadaqa b. Mazyad was with the sultan in his camp. After a while the sultan departed and camped outside Tabrīz. One day after he had been riding, he dismounted and Saif al-Daula Dubais went in to see him. It was then that he executed him. After a few days, the sultan married the daughter of Dubais. Her mother was Sharaf Khatun, daughter of 'Amīd al-Daula b. Jahīr by Zubaida, daughter of Nizām al-Mulk. Dubais was taken to Mārdīn to his wife Guhar Khatun and was buried in the mašhad beside Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī, may God have mercy on them both. There had been a report that Dubais had incited the sultan to kill al-Mustarshid. The narrative of Mu'ayyid
al-Dīn continued thus: 'When al-Mustarshid was killed, Sultan Mas‘ūd summoned us to his presence, so the vizier Sharaf al-Dīn, the treasurer Jamāl al-Dīn and I went to see him. The nagīb of the ‘Alids had died in the citadel of Sar-i Jahān where he had been buried. When we went to see the sultan, he said: "What is your opinion? What should be done about the caliphate? Whom do you think suitable?" The vizier said: "O master, the caliphate belongs to the heir, for the people have already pledged allegiance to him; he has come to the throne and become established. Allegiance was pledged to him when he was made heir-apparent and now (yet again) after the murder of his father."

The sultan said: "That is completely impossible. I will not confirm him as caliph, for he is thinking of rebellion just like his father did. Al-Mustarshid constantly rebelled against us from the moment he assumed power; he rebelled against my brother Mahmūd twice, against me once before and now yet again this time. He got what was coming to him but it is we who will be saddled with disgrace and ignominy until the end of time. People are saying, 'They killed the caliph, even though it was they who caused the dignity of the caliphate to be restored to this family'. I want someone on the throne who will meddle in nothing but religious matters, who will not raise an army, take up arms or assemble men and who will not rebel against me and the members of my family. There are several members of the family, so choose a shaikh from amongst their number who possesses a good intellect, judgement and resourcefulness, who observes all that obedience to us requires and does not leave his house. Do not overlook Harūn b. al-Muqtadī, for he is a great shaikh, he will not provoke religious dissensions and he was recommended by my uncle Sanjar."
There were at that time in the palace seven brothers, the sons of al-Muqtadī; they too had sons and grandsons. Some of these seven lived until the 550's. There were (also) in the palace seven brothers, who were the sons of al-Mustazhir, amongst whom were the amīr Abū 'Abdallāh, Abū Tālib, Abū Nasr, Abu'l-Qāsim, Abū 'Alī, Ismā'īl and Yahyā. They (too) had a number of sons. Al-Mustarshid also had a number of sons. And then there was al-Rāshid, who had some twenty sons, the eldest of whom was the amīr al-jaish who had been born to his father when he was nine years old. This is an unprecedented phenomenon.

The following story was told to me by someone in Baghdad whom I trust, who heard it from a person who used to visit (f.166a) the caliph's palace regularly and knew what was going on. Al-Mustarshid bought five concubines for al-Rāshid when he was seven years old. He ordered them to woo him, to put themselves at his disposal and to initiate him sexually. The concubines remained thus engaged with him until he was nine years old and had reached puberty. Amongst the girls was a yellow-skinned Abyssinian slave-girl. One day he had sexual relations with her and she became pregnant by him. This information reached al-Mustarshid, who refused to believe it. He summoned the girl and threatened her. She said, "By God, he is the only person who has been near me. He is mature like all men." The other slave-girls were questioned and they told the same story. So the caliph gave orders that the slave-girl should bring a piece of cloth. Then al-Rāshid had intercourse with her. When he rose from her she removed the piece of cloth and there was semen on it. He did the same with
the other slave-girls and there was semen too. Al-Mustarshid rejoiced at that. When her confinement came to an end, the slave-girl gave birth to a son whom al-Mustarshid called amīr al-jaish and he was extremely happy about his birth. This is an unheard-of occurrence, except in the Hijāz. It is said that girls from Tihāma menstruate at nine and that their boys reach puberty at nine. The nearest parallel between father and son is the case of 'Amr b. al-'Ās and his son Abdallāh who had a son when he was twelve years old. There has been no similar case except that of al-Rāshid which we have already mentioned.

Al-Rāshid followed in his father's footsteps and the people pledged allegiance to him at the end of 529. Al-Rāshid was an astute and noble-minded man who possessed judgement and ambition. That is why the sultan was reluctant to appoint him as caliph.

It is reported that in Dhu’l-Hijja 529 Sultan Mas‘ūd had Sadaqa b. Dubais (sic) killed in his presence while he was his prisoner. I think this report is inaccurate because the people he killed were Qaracha and Mengū-Bars.

It is reported that Sultan Mas‘ūd approached his uncle Sanjar seeking his advice on whom he should appoint. Sanjar sent back the following reply: "Appoint only someone vouched for by the vizier, the treasurer and Ibn al-Anbārī". So the sultan had a meeting with them. He consulted them, referred to Harūn and told them what Sultan Sanjar had ordered them to do. The vizier said: "If that is going to be our responsibility, then we will appoint someone we think
suitable; the person I have in mind is ascetic and religious. There is no-one like him in the palace." The sultan asked, "Who is he?" The vizier replied: "He is the amīr Abū ‘Abdallāh b. al-Mustazhir." The sultan said: "Do you vouch for his good conduct?" The vizier said "Yes."  

The amīr Abū ‘Abdallāh was the son-in-law of the vizier Sharaf al-Dīn, being married to his daughter. When she went into the palace one day, in the reign of al-Mustazhir, the amīr Abū ‘Abdallāh saw her and asked for her hand in marriage from his father, who married him to her. At that time Sharaf al-Dīn was the nagīb al-nuqabā'ū. Ibn al-Mustazhir consummated the marriage with her and she remained with him until she died. The sultan said: "The decision is yours. Keep the matter hidden lest the affair be noised abroad and al-Muqtāfī be killed in Baghdad." Then the sultan and his retinue set off for Baghdad (f.166b) accompanied by the vizier and all of us.

It is reported that after the murder of his father, the people pledged allegiance to al-Rāshid. He took sole control and became established. He sent a message to the atābeg Zangi in Mosul, asking him to come and giving him a guarantee that al-Malik Alp Arslan b. Mahmud who was with the atābeg should become sultan and that Zangi would be in charge of the atabegate and the caliphate. Zangi therefore went down to Baghdad and took up residence on its eastern side in one of the houses belonging to the sultan. He stayed there until the news reached him that the sultan had set out for Baghdad, whereupon he encamped on the western side of Baghdad.
When the sultan approached Baghdad and camped near al-Nahrawān, al-Rashid found out what was happening and realised that it was inevitable that someone other than himself would be appointed as caliph. He shut in a cellar all the amīrs in the caliphal family who were living in the palace and he gave orders that the cellar should be closed up. I heard this story from Zain al-Daula Abu 'l-Qasim 'Alī b. al-Sāhib who was the ḥājib al-bāb like his father and grandfather before him and who was with al-Rashid. He said:

"When al-Rashid had put the amīrs in the cellar, he called me in and said, 'O 'Alī, take this sword.' He had a sword in his hand (and then) he said: 'Take care that your sword is as good as mine. I want to fetch out each person in the cellar and kill them all so that no-one remains who is eligible to become caliph. For these men may well come, change things and appoint somebody other than me.' Then he ordered the cellar to be opened. (Just then) the messenger came to al-Rashid who said, 'What is the news?' He replied, 'The atābeg Zangi plundered the Tahirid harīm and left for Mosul in Dhu'l-Qa'da. As for the sultan, he has arrived and crossed to al-Nahrawān. When the atābeg learned that the sultan had camped at al-Nahrawān he fled.' Thereupon al-Rashid threw away the sword from his hand and went into the palace. He grabbed for himself jewels of inestimable value, giving me some of them too, and then went away, taking with him the chief ǧādī al-Zainabī and having left as vizier Jalāl al-Dīn Abu'l-Rida (b.) Sadaqa. We left with him and he joined Zangi on the way to Mosul."

Al-Sa'īd Mu'ayyid al-Dīn, may God bless him, said: "The following
morning the sultan entered Baghdad and we were with him. He took up residence in his palace and we did the same in our houses. The day of our arrival was 10 Dhu’l-Qa‘da 530. The next day we and the vizier went to the sultan’s palace, and the vizier asked the sultan’s permission for what he was going to do. The sultan secured the vizier’s signature and ours on the guaranty and we then returned to our houses. On the morning of Monday 12 Dhu’l-Qa‘da 530 we went to see the amīr Abū ‘Abdallāh and we and the vizier had a talk with him. The vizier fixed the conditions on which he was to become caliph and stipulated that he should obey the sultan. We informed him that we had vouched to the sultan for all the conditions which the sultan had laid down for him. He was content with that and we left him, went to the sultan and told him what had happened and that Abū ‘Abdallāh had agreed to the conditions imposed on him. (f.167a) So the sultan said: ‘Tomorrow let the people pay allegiance to him.’ In the morning, we went up to the palace and removed from it musical instruments and improper things. Some of the people in the palace testified that al-Rashid had drunk wine. The ‘ulama’ duly gave a fatwā deposing him. The qādī ‘Imād al-Dīn Sharaf al-Qu’dāt Abū Tahir Ahmad b. al-Karkhī, the muhtasib, who was the qādī of the Shafi‘ites, may God bless him, took responsibility for this. The ‘ulama’ and notables met together and deposed al-Rashid.

The vizier, the treasurer and I went in to see Abū ‘Abdallāh. We talked together and I handed him a piece of paper with some laqabs on it: al-Muqtāfī li-Amr Allāh and al-Mustādi bi-Amr Allāh and al-Mustanjīd bi’llāh. The caliph said, ‘It is up to you to choose’, and asked me, ‘What do you think?’ So I said, ‘Al-Muqtāfī li-Amr Allāh’, whereupon he said, “Blessed be that name.” Then the caliph stretched
his hand and the vizier took it, kissed it and said, 'I have pledged allegiance to our lord and master, al-Muqtasdi li-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Faithful, on God's book and on the sunna and ijtihād of the Prophet of God.' Then the treasurer took his hand, kissed it and pledged allegiance in the same way. Then I took his hand and having kissed it, I said: 'I have pledged allegiance to our lord and master, the imām al-Muqtasdi li-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Faithful, on the same conditions as I pledged allegiance to his father, his brother, and his nephew at his heir-apparent ceremony.' I had pledged allegiance to the imām al-Mustazhir bi'llāh when I served as his wakīl al-dar in the year (4)92. I had remained (in that post) until the year 507 when I was given charge of the diwan al-insha'. I had (also) pledged allegiance to al-Mustarshid and al-Rāshid. Then we stood up and left him and he went into the palace. After the people had pledged allegiance to him, all the 'ulamā', fuqahā', qādis and notables went in and did likewise. Three days later, Sultan Mas'ūd arrived and pledged allegiance to him. Then all his retinue, the khwājas, the chamberlain and all his state officials pledged allegiance to al-Muqtasdi, who assumed sole command and became established in the caliphate."

It is reported that in 529 Najm al-Daula Malik died in Qal'at Ja'bar and was succeeded by his son. Also in that year the atābeg Zangi took al-Raqqā from Musayyib b. Malik.

A number of people had held office as vizier to al-Mustarshid in his time. Amongst them were Amin al-Dīn Khwaja Ahmad b. Nizām al-Mulk and Sharaf al-Dīn Anūšīrwan, each of whom held office twice: then Jalāl al-Dīn Abū 'Alī b. Sadaqa was vizier until he died. Then
Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī held office as vizier until the caliph was killed. Al-Zainabī had been taken prisoner with him as we have already mentioned.

To go back to what happened to al-Rāshid: he left for Mosul with the atābeg Zangī in Safar 531, accompanied by the chief qādī al-Zainabī and Jalāl al-Dīn Abu’l-Ridā b. Sadaqa, the nephew of the vizier Abū ‘Alī. Having stayed with Zangī for a while, al-Rāshid went with him as far as Nasībīn, where he stayed a few days. Thereafter he left the atābeg and went to Sultan Mas’ūd to ask if he might enter his territory and proceed to Sultan Sanjar.

It is reported that he sought out Sultan Dā’ūd and went to see him (to seek) his own reinstatement (f.167b) as caliph. When he was near Isfahān, a group of heretics rose against him, went into his tent and killed him in Ramadān 532. He was taken to Isfahān and buried there in the city of Shahristān, which is one farsakh from Isfahān. It is said that the city was built by Alexander on a bridge over a river known as the Zāyanda Rud. The caliphate of al-Rāshid, from the time allegiance was pledged to him after the murder of his father until the ceremony of allegiance to al-Muqtafī, was more or less 11 months. It is said that the sultan sent people to go in and kill al-Rāshid. He left in the palace some twenty sons, amongst whom the eldest was amīr al-jāshī, and it is said that he appointed him as his heir before he left Baghdad. As for the chief qādī, al-Zainabī, may God have mercy on him, he returned (from Mosul), went down to Baghdad and returned to his post. As for Jalāl al-Dīn Abu’l Rida b. Sadaqa, he became vizier to Atabeg Zangī for a while, before being
dismissed and returning to Baghdad. He had become vizier to Zangī after the death of Diyā' al-Dīn Abū Sa'īd al-Kafartūthī. Al-Muqtafī became established in the caliphate and his rule was secure.

It is reported that in (5)32 Sultan Saljuq-Shāh besieged Akhlāt for a while and then withdrew. In (5)33 Amīr Dā'ūd had the khutba said in the name of al-Muqtafī on Friday 23 Muharram.

In the year (5)3(3?) the Sanāsuna imprisoned the lord of Akhlāt; they were given Khūwīth and he was released through the mediation of Husām al-Dīn in Jumāda 1 (5)33.

It is reported that in 529 Malik Toghril Beg died outside Damascus and was taken to Iraq. He was murdered.

In 529 I travelled from Mayyafāriqīn to Mārdīn having not previously left Mayyafāriqīn, and I stayed in Mārdīn for a while. While I was in Mārdīn, Dubais' bier arrived and he was buried in the mashhad. In this year the wife of the amīr Shīhāb al-Dīn Muhammad b. Ayāz died. She had also been married to the amīr Husām al-Dīn and she had Safiyya Khatun by him. I was in Mārdīn this year when al-Sa'īd Husām al-Dīn married the princess, the khatun, daughter of al-Malik Ridwān. She had come that year from Aleppo. She had been wife of Badr al-Daula Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Jabbār b. Artuq and she died in Mārdīn. She came from Aleppo, accompanied by a son whose ism was Köpek and whose laqab was Majd al-Mulūk. After a time al-Sa'īd
Husam al-Din married her. In this year Taj al-Din Abu Salim b. Nubata, may God be pleased with him, came to Mardin.

It is reported that in 528 Atabeg Zangi and Husam al-Din attacked the citadel of al-Sur. After Zangi had taken it on 21 Rajab, he handed it over to al-Sa'Id Husam al-Din and Hamdan b. Aslam was killed. He was one of the courageous amirs in the suite of Amir Da'ud and had been governor of al-Sur on his behalf. In this year, (f.168a) Atabeg Zangi came to Tall Shaikh and joined up with Husam al-Din. They (then) encountered Da'ud outside Amid and defeated him. Zangi entered al-Sur and took it. In this year Atabeg Zangi took possession of Tanza and Tall Shaikh. Diya' al-Din Abu Sa'Id b. al-Kafartuthi became vizier to Atabeg Zangi and entered his service. In that year Shams al-Daula al-Ahdab died.

It is reported that in the year (5)30, Husam al-Din ordered the destruction of the rabad and the muhaddatha and they were (duly) destroyed. An argument had arisen between al-Sa'Id Husam al-Din and Amir Da'ud, with Zangi siding with Amir Husam al-Din. After they had defeated Amir Da'ud outside Amid, they went and seized Jabal Jur. Dhu'l-Qarnain and Siwan. These places were taken from Amir Arslan b. 'Abd al-Jabbar b. Artuq and were handed over by Zangi to al-Sa'Id Husam al-Din. Amir Arslan ran away and entered the service of Amir Da'ud.

It is reported that in (5)28 Amir Da'ud plundered the rabad of Tanza, taking its inhabitants captive, plundering their possessions and raping the women more disgracefully than even the Franks would have done. In (5)28, al-Sa'Id Husam al-Din took possession of

It is reported that in 531 Husam al-Din came to Mayyafariqin, accompanied by Habashi b. Habashi, who conducted an inspection of the 'ummal and the mutasarrifun. Habashi mulcted the inhabitants of the city, uprooted them (from their homes) and did them great harm. The people met at his hand abuse, injustice and oppression of an indescribable severity and he inflicted tyranny and extreme hardship on them. Habashi seized al-Nasih al-Amidi, who was the mutawalli of the diwan of Mayyafariqin, and his son Abu Nasr. Al-Mu'ayyid b. Mukhtar, who was (also) mutawalli, fled from Habashi and went to the Jazira, but the latter arrested his brother Abu Sa'id. Habashi released the 'amid Abü Tahir b. al-muhtasib from prison where he had incarcerated him for a while, and he appointed him muhtasib of the people. They encountered from him unspeakable severity and hardship.

In that year I was in the Jazira where I lived for a while before returning to Mayyafariqin. I went on to Nasibin where I saw Atabeg Zangi.

It is reported that in (5)29 Najm al-Daula Malik b. Salim died in Qal'at Ja'bar and Atabeg Zangi took al-Raqqa from Amir Musayyib. He went on to Damascus, besieged it for a while and then entered it. Malik's son Badran was in Qal'at Ja'bar for a while, remaining until the beginning of (5)30 when his brother Amir 'Ali b. Malik killed him and took over the citadel.
It is reported that in 528 'Abd al-Mu'min conquered the Maghrib. I will mention something about him and about the information which has reached me about him. The story goes as follows: Muhammad b. Tumart who was from the Mas'muda (tribe) went to the countries of the east. He was the shaikh of 'Abd al-Mu'min b. 'Ali al-Kūmī who came from the mountains of Sūs in the extreme west. Muḥammad b. Tumart al-Idrīsī al-Ḥusainī had gone (f.168b) to the east where he remained for a while before returning to the Maghrib in 519.

While he was staying in Marrākush, a group of fuqaha' met him. When he engaged in debate with them, he revealed that his opinions were unconventional and not the orthodox doctrines of the people of the Maghrib. So both parties disapproved of one another. Then the fuqaha' held a meeting with the āmil al-muslimīn 'Alī b. Yusuf b. Tashufin at which they said to him, "Send this man away from us. If you don't, he will corrupt and ruin people." 'Alī therefore ordered him to leave, which he did in 520. 'Alī banished him to the mountain area of the Mas'mūda, a group of Berbers who were his own tribe. After he had spent some time with them he incited them to disobey the āmil al-muslimīn. Thereupon the āmil al-muslimīn took the field against him and Ibn Tumart defeated him. The commander of the troops, 'Abdallāh b. Malwiya, was killed. The āmil al-muslimīn therefore went out in person and, having assembled his troops, he met Ibn Tumart on the battlefield and defeated him.

Ibn Tumart consolidated his position in the mountain area, which is a journey of a month or two. This mountain area is called Daran and is in the province of Marrākush and Sūs. A great many people...
rallied to him. When Muhammad b. Tūmart died in 523, his place was taken by ʿAlī al-Wansharishī who equipped troops and laid siege to Marrākush in 524. After the amīr al-muslimīn had defeated him and hounded him from Marrākush, he fled to the mountains and strengthened his position there. The situation between the two of them remained more or less unchanged until 528 when ʿAlī al-Wansharishī died.

He was succeeded by ʿAbd al-Muʿmin b. ʿAlī al-Kūmī. He was one of the companions, disciples, friends and helpers of Muhammad b. Tūmart. Having mobilised troops, he met the amīr al-muslimīn in battle and defeated him. He took possession of the whole mountain area, seizing another province too before going down into the desert in 530, conquering most of the lands of the amīr al-muslimīn and acquiring (every) place. He conquered most of Ifriqiyya and the lands of Spain, taking most of the lands of the amīr al-muslimīn and conquering many places from the Franks. Then in 540 he met the amīr al-muslimīn, Tāshufīn b. ʿAlī b. Yūsuf, defeated him and killed many people. He imprisoned and killed the amīr al-muslimīn. He gained a strong hold of the country; he conquered most of the Maghrib and the people went in terror of him. Whenever he conquered a city he would kill all its inhabitants, and he used to say: "I am the Lord of the Age." In (5) 42 he took the city of Tunis which is one of the mightiest cities of the Maghrib. According to the Kitāb al-Masālik waʾl-Mamālik the circumference of its walls is 21 miles.

In the year (5) 31, on 4 Dhuʾl-Qaʿda, the amīr Dāʾūd took over control of Ḥanī from the amīr Shahrukh and granted it (back) to him as an ʿiṭāʿ. Shahrukh remained in (his) service in the rabād of
Hanî until he died. He was buried in Hanî.

It is reported that in 541 'Abd al-Mu'min seized the territory of the Banû Hammad, driving them out of that area. In 532 he conquered and took possession of al-Mahdiyya; there was no-one who opposed him, was hostile to him or resisted him. He built two great cities, one of which was a port which he called al-Mahdiyya (f.169a) and the other was inland (?). His sovereignty became established and he continued conquering the lands of the Franks bit by bit until his death in 540. His sons remained in power after him. It is said that he left some forty male children.

It is reported that in 532 the Byzantine emperor left Constantinople for Syria. He seized Buza'a, taking all its inhabitants away into captivity and plundering the property there. He (then) encamped before Aleppo and laid siege to it. Although Atabeg Zangî joined battle with him, he remained fixed on his goal; but when all the troops of Diyâr Bakr and Diyâr Rabî'a came and Amir Dâ'ûd sent his son with Turcoman troops, the Byzantine emperor left Aleppo and returned to his own country.

In this year Baha' al-Dîn Abu'l-Hasan b. 'Ali al-Shahrazûrî died in al-Raqqa, where he was buried. News of his death came to the Jazîra while I was staying there. That year I lived there for a while before returning to Mayyâfâriqîn. In (5)32 Zangî made peace terms with the ruler of Damascus whose mother he (then) married. In that year Zangî took Hims and killed Qir-Khan, its ruler. In that year Shihab al-Dîn, ruler of Damascus, was killed and was succeeded
by his son.

It is reported that in 533 Amir Da‘ūd looted Arzan, taking all its inhabitants into captivity and plundering their possessions — and he allowed his soldiers completely free rein. While he was there, atrocities worse than those at Tanza were committed on the population, and the people received indescribable treatment at his hands. When al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn arrived in Mayyāfāriqīn, Husām al-Daula Qurtī b. al-Ahdab, lord of Arzan, joined him.

It is reported that in Shawwāl (5)33, Sav-Tegin al-Karjī, lord of Harrān, died. Atabeg (Zangī) attacked and took possession of the city. In this year Husām al-Dīn defeated the Franks in Shabakhtān and captured the caravan outside Edessa. In that year I was in Amid. In that year al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn and Zangī made peace. Zangī took Dārā and married Safiyya Khatun, daughter of al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn. She was brought to Mosul in 534 while I was there.

I had stayed in Mayyāfāriqīn until the end of 5(3)3 before going down to Baghdad, where I met al-Sa‘īd Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn Abū ‘Abdāllah Muḥammad b. al-Anbārī, may God have mercy on him. I arrived in Baghdad (only) in Rabī‘I, 534 because I had spent some time in the Jazīra and Mosul. I lived in Baghdad for six months and I saw the caliph al-Muqtāfī when Khwaja ‘Izz al-Mulk took the oath of allegiance to him. (It was at that time that) the caliph al-Muqtāfī consummated his marriage with the sultan’s sister.

While I was in Baghdad, I was at the Bāb al-Hujra at the time of
the marriage of Sultan Mas'ūd to the daughter of the caliph al-
Muqtafi. The chief qādī al-Zainabī, may God have mercy on him,
preached a sermon. Sharaf al-Dīn 'Alī b. Tīrād al-Zainabī was
vizier and Kamāl al-Dīn was the treasurer.

I visited a group of the famous people of Iraq. I studied the
Fara'īd under Shaikh Abu'l-Muzaffar b. al-Shahrazūrī al-'Attār.
(f.169b) I studied the Fasīḥ and the 'Umda with Shaikh Abū Mansūr
al-Jawālīqī and I studied the Tanbīh with Shaikh Abū Hasan Abū'l-
Khall. I met Shaikh Abū Mansūr al-Razzāz and a group of the
fugahā', Shaikh 'Abd al-Qādir b. al-Narāwī and the sons of the chief
qādī al-Dāmghānī and Yusuf al-Dimishqī and a group of hadīth
scholars, amongst whom were the qādī Abū Bakr, who was the qādī
of the bimaristan, Ibn al-Samarqandī, 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Anmātī and
many others. I listened to them and I studied the Qur'ān with
Shaikh Abū Muhammad b. Nabt (?) and the Khifāf with Shaikh 'Abd
al-Wahhāb. I stayed in Baghdad and visited all the mashhads there.
I went down to al-Mada'in and visited the tomb of Salmān al-
Fārisī. I stayed in Baghdad until 5 Muharram 535.

At the end of 534, Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī, who was vizier,
became angry, went off in high dudgeon to the sultan's palace and
took up residence there. The caliph sent the sultan a slave whose
name was Najāh requesting the sultan's permission to dismiss the
vizier. The chief qādī al-Zainabī deputised as vizier for a while
and was succeeded as deputy by Mu'ayyid al-Dīn Sadīd al-Daula. The
order from the sultan dismissing Sharaf al-Dīn arrived in 535.
Nizām al-Dīn Abu'l-Muzaffar b. al-Za'īm b. Jahīr, who had been
Ustādh al-dār was appointed vizier and he became established in the post.\(^\text{417}\)

It is reported that in 534 Atabeg Zangi took the citadel of Baʿlabak. After he had camped before Damascus and besieged it for a while, the people handed over to him the citadel of Busra.\(^\text{419}\) It is reported that the treasurer Kamāl al-Dīn resigned from office and went to Mecca. His son, Qawām al-Dīn b. Sadaqa, was appointed to succeed him. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī did not leave his house. Safī al-Dīn b. al-Zuwān al-Ḥāshimi was the sāhib al-dīwan and Nizām al-Dīn became established as vizier.

Then I returned to Mayyafāriqīn early in Muharram 535, passing through Mosul and Hisn Kaifa, where I happened to meet Amir Dāʿūd. A quarrel had arisen between him and al-Saʿīd Husām al-Dīn, and having pillaged the district of Mayyafāriqīn in Muharram (5)36 Dāʿūd camped outside the city gate where he remained for eight days and then withdrew. He had raided the whole district and had gone to Tall Shaikh,taken it, and distributed the town as an iqṭāʿ. Al-Saʿīd Husām al-Dīn destroyed the citadel of Bushat although he had taken it and erected (new) buildings in it. So Dāʿūd seized all the iqṭāʿ of Jabal (Jūr). He spent each day raiding from the two places as far as the gate of the city, stealing people's clothes during the day. Habashī was in charge of the area with the ḥājib Yūsuf ʿīnal as wālī. He governed the people and protected the town. The situation remained like that until the end of 535. In 536 Amir Dāʿūd and al-Saʿīd Husām al-Dīn made peace and Amir Dāʿūd came to Mayyafāriqīn and
went into the citadel. An agreement was then established between them.

It is reported that half-way through Jumādā I in 536 Amir (f.170a) Saʿd al-Daulāʾīl-aldī b. ʿIbrāhīm, lord of Āmid, died whilst Muʿayyid al-Dīn was (still) mutawallī in Āmid. He put ʿIl-aldī’s son in power and the latter became established. His mother was Yumna Khatun, daughter of Nājm al-Dīn ʿIl-Ghāzī, and Ḥusām al-Dīn was his maternal uncle. I was in Āmid that year with my father, may God have mercy on him.

It is reported that in 536 Shams al-Mulūk was killed in Damascus.

It is reported that Sharaf al-Dīn al-Ḥabashi and the ʿamīd Abū Tāhir b. al-Muḥṭasib were (in power) when al-ʿIl-ayyid Abuʾl-Ḥasan b. al-Muḥṭār returned to the service of al-Saʿīd Ḥusām al-Dīn. Ḥabashi seized him in (5)34 and he remained under arrest. Ḥabashi killed his brother ʿAl-Raʿīs Abū Saʿīd under torture. Ḥabashi remained (in power) until the end of (5)36 when Atabeg Zangī got in touch with Ḥusām al-Dīn saying: "If we send messengers to one another, they do not behave honestly with you or me. If you want to come to an agreement, let Ḥabashi be sent to me." So Ḥusām al-Dīn sent Ḥabashi to him, accompanied by the ḥājīb Nāṣir and others. When they met Zangī, he asked them to stay. After three days he appointed Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥabashi to the dīwān al-istīfāʾ and laid upon him a satin jubba, a garment (studded) with ʿIrāqī gold and a horse with a (decorated) saddle. The envoys who had gone with Ḥabashi returned home. Then Ḥabashi assured Atabeg Zangī that he could take the country and swore an oath to him on that. So Zangī said: "I will have what has been sworn to me but when we reach the country I will hand it over to you."
In this year al-Sa'id Husam al-Din seized the most excellent Abu'l-Rijā b. Saratan and imprisoned him for a while. Then he tore out his eyes and threw him from the top of the citadel of Mārdīn into the maidān.

It is reported that in 537 Atabeg Zangī made his way to Diyār Bakr and entered the territory of Amir Ya'qūb b. Qizīl Arslan. He attacked Khīzan, al-Mādan, Irūn and Qatalbas and took the whole region. That year I was in Mosul.

In 538 Atabeg Zangī turned towards the country (Diyār Bakr), arrived in the district of Mārdīn and came to Tall Bashmi with the intention of going into the province of Āmid and Mayyāfārīqīn. He had already taken possession of Hānī, Is'īrd, Jabal Jūr, Dhu'l-Qarnain and the whole of that region after the conclusion of the peace-treaty with Amir Dā'ūd. Zangī made camp in the olive grove at Tall Bashmi. One night Mu'ammil al-Shaqisi and Muhammad b. Abī'l-Mukārim al-Muhalmī went into Habashi's tent and they struck him down with their swords. They took his head and brought it to al-Sa'id Husam al-Dīn. There was an outcry and the people and the 'askar were in uproar. The following morning Zangī withdrew and returned to Nasībīn.

It is reported that on Sunday 19 Muharram 539 Amir Dā'ūd died in Hānī and was taken to Hisn Kaifā. His bier went through (Mayyāfārīqīn) on the Monday and was placed in the Muhaddatha mosque where the citizens and Qur'ān readers went to visit it. The following morning (f.170b), Amir Dā'ūd was taken to Hisn Kaifā. His son,
Amir Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan, took possession of Hīsn Kaifā, Khartabirt and Bālū after him. His son Arslan Toghmīsh took the citadel of Mīzgard.

Atabeg Zangī attacked the territory of Amir Dāʾūd and captured Isʿīrād, Bahmārdu, Tānzī, Bātāsā and all the province adjoining the province of al-Maʿdān. He (then) crossed to the other province, i.e. Hānī, Jābal Jūr, Dhuʿl-Qarnain and al-Sīwān. He (then) went and took Arqānīn, al-Ḥalār, Tall Khūm, Charmūk and all that area, except for Khartabirt, Bālū and Mīzgard which remained in the hands of Dāʾūd's sons.

In this year Sultan Dāʾūd was killed in the bazaar at Tabrīz. In this year Arslan Toghmīsh b. Dāʾūd married Hadiyya Khatun, daughter of al-Saʿīd Ḥusām al-Dīn, and she was taken to Arslan Toghmīsh in Mīzgard. (Also in this year) Atabeg Zangī and Ḥusām al-Dīn quarreled.

Atabeg Zangī went down to Edessa and having laid siege to the city for a while, he conquered it by force on 25 Jumāda I 539, which was 23 December (1144). Edessa had been taken by the Franks after the death of Taj al-Daula in the year 492 and they had held it for forty-seven years. After he had put the affairs of the city in order, Zangī withdrew from it and camped outside al-Bīrā which he besieged. The Christians had been saying that Atabeg Zangī would be killed on Christmas night and they were expecting that to happen but Zangī took the city on Christmas night and did not die and the Christians were lying.
It is reported that he continued besieging al-Bīra for a while. A few days later, the news reached him that Nasīr al-Dīn Jaqar governor of Mosul, had been killed by his ghulāms on 8 Dhu'l-Qa'da 539. Atabeg Zangi withdrew from al-Bīra, went to Mosul and put its affairs in order, placing Zain al-Dīn ‘Alī Kücük in charge.

In 539 Amir Kurj Ghāzī, lord of al-Bāri'īa, died in Āmid.

The people of Mosul had suffered at the hand of Nasīr al-Dīn extreme injustice, tyranny, murder, mulcting and the imposition of illegal taxes. When Zain al-Dīn became governor, he did away with all that and he treated kindly both the citizens and the people of the whole area. The people received every kindness from him until he died in 564.

In Rajab 538 Ḥusām al-Dīn summoned ‘Alam al-Dīn Abu'l-Path Muhammad b. ‘Alī b. Nubāta to Mārdīn and made him qādi of Mārdīn, appointing his brother Bahā' al-Dīn as khatīb in Mayyafāriqīn. Majd al-Dīn Da'ūd, son of the qādi al-Sadīd, who had been qādi of Mārdīn, was dismissed in that year at the time that ‘Alam al-Dīn was appointed. Al-Mu'ayyid Abu'l-Ḥasan b. Mukhtar al-Mustaufl was responsible for this. Two days later Bahā' al-Dīn was appointed khatīb in Mārdīn, a job he already held in Mayyafāriqīn. After ‘Alam al-Dīn had been appointed qādi of Mārdīn, he established his position and took up residence in Mārdīn. He moved his family and children to Mārdīn and there he remains to this day.

Makin al-Daula (f.171a) Ibrāhīm b. Munqīdh had come to Mārdīn from the people of Egypt. He stayed for a while as the guest of Ḥusām
al-Dīn. Then, two days after the appointment of ‘Alam al-Dīn as qādi of Mārdīn, Husām al-Dīn made him vizier, appointing as his deputy al-Muḥaddhīb al-Baghdādī, who was a scribe in the mashhad of Mārdīn. His full name was Abu ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-‘Irāqī. He used to say:— "I am from the Mu‘wajj family in Baghdad." That year I was in Mārdīn.

At the beginning of his rule in Mayyafārīqīn, al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn had moved Najm al-Dīn ʿIl-Ghāzī and Shams al-Daula his brother from the Masjid al-Amīr to Mārdīn. Then he buried them in the citadel of Mārdīn in the Khīḍr mosque in the citadel. In that place there was a turba in which a group of people who had died at the time of ʿIl-Ghāzī were (buried). ʿIl-Ghāzī and Shams al-Daula were buried there for a while. Then al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn erected a beautiful mashhad below the rabad of Mārdīn at ‘Ain Baqrī in which he built a turba. He spent a lot of money on it, established a waqf on it and put the tombs there. There they buried all those people who had previously or subsequently been in the citadel. Husām al-Dīn furnished it with rugs, screens and ornaments. He put in it a library supplied with many books which are still there today.

It is reported that in 539 the structure of the Qaramān bridge collapsed. It dates from the year 48. In this year the curtain wall inside Mayyafārīqīn fell down and was rebuilt.

It is reported that in (5)40 the Egyptian vizier was arrested and imprisoned in the citadel of Mārdīn. While in prison he collected pieces of material and escaped from the prison, by tying
them round his waist, lowering himself from the citadel of Mardin and running away. In the morning the people looked for him but could not find him. (When) they saw the material tied in place, they looked for him and found him on the hill-side. They brought him to al-Sa'id Husam al-Din who let him go and sent him away without harming him.

It is reported that in 540 al-Sa'id Husam al-Din defeated Pakhr al-Din Qara Arslan at Baghin. It was a great and memorable day. The victory and conquest belong to Shihab al-Din Muhammad b. Ayaz b. Il-Ghazi since he was at the head of the troops with his uncle, Husam al-Din. In 540 Atabeg Zangi came to Mayyafariqin, took Tall Shaikh and harassed Mayyafariqin for a while before withdrawing.

It is reported that in 540 Shaikh Nur al-Huda Sulaiman b. 'Umar the 'Alid came from Is'ird to Mayyafariqin while Husam al-Din was staying in the town. The inhabitants of Mayyafariqin all went out to meet him about a farsakh outside the town, and then the amir went and met him at the Qubbat al-Sultan, for Sulaiman was distinguished and learned. He stayed with Taj al-Din, may God have mercy on him, in the house of 'Alam al-Din. After one day the amir went in to see him and Sulaiman did not stand up for him, but remained seated in the mosque. When he preached and spoke, the people were captivated by him, the amir was considerably affected by him and he acquired the highest possible position. His status became such that if the amir was in Mayyafariqin, Sulaiman was with him. If the amir went to Mardin, he would go with him; indeed, he lived wherever (f.171b) the amir lived. He became such a celebrity that during the whole time he stayed with the
amīr he did not stand up for him at all.

It seems that he acted in a way which was inappropriate for the likes of him. Having gone down in the people's estimation he went off to Syria, where he remained a while and took the citadel of Abū Qubais. He then had a disagreement with the Ismā'īlīs and returned to al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn with whom he remained for a time. He had encouraged al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn to become interested in alchemy but he achieved no results. He went to Isfīrd where he remained for a while until the month of Rabī' I 546. As he was going into the mosque one Friday, two Ismā'īlīs attacked him. One of them struck him with a dagger; the shaikh hit back at him with a sword which he had in his hand, and the other man leapt on him striking him with a knife. He fell down. The people were in uproar and his assailant and his companion were arrested. He had lived until his appointed day and then he died, may God have mercy on him. He was buried in the Khīḍr mosque in Isfīrd and his two murderers were killed.

It is reported that in 540 al-Maula Najm al-Dīn al-Mālik (Alpī) became joined in marriage to the khatun, daughter of Amir Ahmad b. Sukmān, lord of Akhlāt. She was the uterine sister of the Shah-i Arman and the daughter of his paternal uncle. Šafī al-Dīn b. Rashīq, Athīr al-Dīn 'Abbād b. Abī'l-Futūh, Sirāj al-Dīn b. Kāmil Ghāzī and a group of Sukmān's state officials came and stayed a few days in Mayyāfāriqīn, before going on to Mārdīn and then returning home. In 541 Qādī 'Alam al-Dīn Abu'l-Path Muhammad b. Nubātā went to Akhlāt with dignitaries of state and fetched the khatun. The wedding took place in Mārdīn and was attended by the state dignitaries from
It is reported that in 541 al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn, may God have mercy on him, began the building of the Qaraman bridge under the supervision of al-Zāhid b. al-Tawīl. After its piles had been firmly fixed on the eastern side, floods wrecked it completely because of his defective craftsmanship. Al-Zāhid was fined for his work and removed from the job. His place was taken by Amir Saif al-Dīn Shīrbarīk Maudūd b. 'Alī (b. Alp-Yaruq) b. Artuq. He began building it under the supervision of Abu'l-Khair al-Fasūl, who brought unusually large pieces of wood and began work. It is one of the marvels built in this age and work continued on it.

In 541 Atabeg Zangī attacked Qal'at Ja'bar where Saif al-Daula Abu'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Mālik was. He prosecuted the siege vigorously and it was on the verge of being taken. Jamāl al-Dīn Tughrati(?), the son of al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn, was in his service with an 'askar but he had seized Jamāl al-Dīn and imprisoned him in the church in the rabād of the citadel.

When I was in Mosul in 544 I asked the wāli al-Masdar al-Kāmil Qādī al-Quḍāt, Kamāl al-Dīn, Abu'l-Fadl Muhammad b. 'Abdallaḥ al-Shārazūrī, may God perpetuate his shadow, about the killing of the atābeg (f.172a) and what had happened. He said: 'After we had been besieging the citadel for a while, Amir Ḥasan al-Manbījī went out one day and shouted: "I want to speak to Amir 'Alī." When 'Alī appeared in front of him on the walls, he said to him: "You know what friendship exists between us and you know what sort of man Zangī is.'
You have no-one to protect you, no-one to defend you against Zangī. The best thing to do is to surrender; if not, he will take the citadel by the sword in a way which you will be powerless to resist. After such an eventuality what fate can you expect?"

'Alī replied: "Amir Hassan! I am expecting relief from God most high and what you were expecting at Manbij when Amir Balak was besieging it - and God took care of him for you." 497

Kamāl al-Dīn said: 'By God, hardly had half of that night passed (it was Wednesday, 5 Rabi‘ II or, according to another report, the 9th of that month,541) when the town-crier shouted from the citadel: "Atabeg Zangī has been killed. What good news for you, Ibn Husām al-Dīn!" People shouted and were in an uproar. It had come about because while Atabeg Zangī had been sleeping in his tent, a slave was with him but no-one else. When he was asleep that night in his tent, the slave killed him. Taking the knife covered in blood he left, went up to the rabad below the citadel and shouted to the people, "I have killed Atabeg Zangī." When they did not believe him, he showed them the knife and other effects which he had taken from Zangī's tent. So they let him come up to them, verified his story and called out the news. The people were in great confusion and at odds with each other. They went to the camp of Jamāl al-Dīn the vizier. It was pillaged and he fled to me. The amīrs and prominent people sought me out. When I rode up, they asked: "What does the malik think?" We made our way to the tent of Malik Alp Arslan b. Mahmūd and there I spoke as follows: "The people, the atabeg and I are your servants and the country belongs to you. We are all your servants and the slaves of the sultan." The people agreed on the malik and Jamāl
al-Dīn Tughrati(?) was released from the church and taken to Mardīn.

The people divided into two factions. Salāh al-Dīn Muhammad al-Yaghī-Siyanī took Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Atabeg (Zangī) and the Syrian 'askar, went to Syria and took Aleppo, Hamā, Manbij, Harran, Hims and all Zangī's possessions in Syria. Thus Nūr al-Dīn became established there. As for us, we took the malik and the 'askar of Diyar Rabī'a and made our way to Mosul.

When we arrived in Sinjār, the malik ran away, making for the Jazīra. My brother Tāj al-Dīn Abū Tahir Yahya, may God have mercy on him, and 'Izz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dubaisī caught up with him, made promises to him and brought him back to the camp, and then continued down to Mosul. Saif al-Dīn Ghāzi b. Zangī came from the town of Shahrazūr which had been given to him as an iqta' by the sultan and he took possession of the whole of Diyar Rabī'a. The malik was taken to the citadel of al-Thalū at Sinjār. Saif al-Dīn Ghāzi took Mosul and the whole country. He appointed as vizier Jamāl al-Dīn Muhammad b. al-Iṣfahānī who had been mustaufī of the diwan in his father's time and (f.172b) he granted the Jazīra as an iqta' to 'Izz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dubaisī. He became established in the land.

Salāh al-Dīn and Asad al-Dīn Shīrkūh assumed responsibility for Amir Nūr al-Dīn, whilst he appointed Majd al-Dīn Abū Bakr b. al-Dāya as ḥājib. The latter's mother had been the wet-nurse of Nūr al-Dīn, which was a post of some standing, whilst Majd al-Dīn had served him from his youth onwards. When Nūr al-Dīn took power, he handed command back to him and made him governor of Aleppo. He then
established his position in Syria.

A few days after the murder of Zangi, the Armenian population of Edessa attacked the Muslim inhabitants of the city, killing a number of them. 'Izz al-Din Dubaisi and Hassân, lord of Manbij, arrived with a group of Turcomans. They joined forces against the city, and plundered and conquered it, killing a great number of people. A group of the conquerers remained in the city.\[514\]

At the time of the murder of Zangi, al-Sa'id Husam al-Din was in Mayyafâriqin. The news reached him one afternoon when he was in the citadel garden, whereupon he left immediately. Before that day, he had received the news that his son Jamâl al-Din had been arrested and this had distressed him greatly. When he heard the news that Zangi had been murdered, he went to Hâni and laid siege to the town for a time and then took possession of it. Its ruler was Amir Ghâzi b. al-Mihri. Husam al-Din took Hâni on 23 Rabî' II 541. Thereafter he went and seized al-Sîwan, Jabal Jûr and Dhu'l-Qarnain before going down to take Shabakhtân, al-Muwazzar, Tall Mauzan, Jamalîn and 'Ain al-Khabûr. He then returned home. That year I was in Mâdîn.

Fakhr al-Din Qara Arslan went and took Arqanîn, Charmûk, Tall Khûm, al-Halâr and all the fortresses which Zangî had taken from his father, Amir Dâ'ûd. He took the eastern side of Is'ird as well as Bahmard, Bêtûsâ, Tanzî, al-Rûq, Qatalbas, the town of Sâf and the citadel of al-Haithum which is in the mountainous area of the Tür 'Abdîn.
The lord of Akhlat, the Shāh-i Arman, went down and took Khīzān, al-Ma‘dan, Irūn and the whole area which Zangī had taken from Amir Ya‘qūb.

In this year, which was 542, al-Sa‘īd Husam al-Dīn struck copper coins, after I had gone to al-Ma‘dan and bought copper for the coins.

In (5)43 Arslan Toghmīsh b. Dā’ūd died. Al-Sa‘īd Husam al-Dīn laid siege to Is‘īrād for several days and took possession of it. He also took Batasa. Jamal al-Dīn Mahmūd, lord of Amid, and Jamal al-Dīn Abu‘l-Qāsim b. Nīsān, who was with him at Is‘īrād, had joined his service. After Husam al-Dīn had taken Is‘īrād, he returned to Mayyāfārīqīn. After a while he handed Is‘īrād back to Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan who during this period had taken Mīzgārd. Hadiyya Khatun returned to Mayyāfārīqīn.

In this year al-Sa‘īd Husam al-Dīn and Zangī’s son, Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī, quarrelled and Saif al-Dīn plundered the town of Mārādīn and (took) a number of the mamluks of Husam al-Dīn.

In this year the khatun, daughter of ‘Izz al-Dīn Saltuq, lady of Akhlat, came to Hisn Kaifā on her way to the Hijāz. Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan gave her hospitality (f.173a) and spared no effort in his kind treatment of her. (Then) the vizier Bahā’ al-Dīn and Athīr al-Dīn ‘Abbād and ‘Alam al-Dīn b. Tabar, the qādī of Arjīsh, arrived and stayed in the house of al-Mu‘ayyid b. Mukhtar in Mayyāfārīqīn, remaining several days. Al-Sa‘īd Husam al-Dīn got in touch with Fakhr al-Dīn, they stopped the khatun from going to the
Hijāz, which was what the Shāh-i Arman had asked them to do, and they put pressure on the khatun, as a result of which they all went back to Akhlāt.

In this year al-Mu’ayyid al-Mustaufī Abu’l-Hasan al-Mubārak b. Mukhtar died. He was the mutawalli of the diwan, with al-Muhadhdhib al-‘Irāqī as mushrif for him. Ibn Mukhtar was buried in Mārādīn in the church which he had built and he was succeeded by his son, al-Ajall Karīm al-Daula Abū Mansūr Khālid, who adopted as a laqab the laqab of his father, Mu’ayyid al-Daula Karīm al-Mulk. He remained within his conditions of service and followed what was incumbent upon him to do. (Then) he took sole command and went beyond what people expected of him, with all administrative matters coming under his control.

It is reported that in 542 the caliph al-Hāfīz died in Egypt and was succeeded by his son al-Mansūr Ismā‘īl, whose laqab was al-Zafir, but the ruler was the amīr al-juyūsh, al-‘Adil (b.) al-

Sallār from (Ms. illegible), who stabilised the state and put the army in order. Al-Zafir became established as caliph.

It is reported that in 542 Atabeg Ghāzī seized the qādī Kamāl al-Dīn and Taj al-Dīn, the sons of ‘Abdallāh al-Sharazūrī. He(Kamāl al-Dīn) had kept control of the state since the murder of Zangī. The vizier, Jamāl al-Dīn and Zain al-Dīn(al) had a hand in their arrest. After Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī had seized them, they were taken to the citadel of Mosul. He summoned from al-Rahba the qādī Najm al-Dīn Abū ‘Alī b. Bahā’ al-Dīn b. al-Hasan b.‘Alī b.al-Qāsim al-Sharzūrī, who administered the law there. When Bahā’ al-Dīn al-Sharzūrī had died in 532 in
al-Raqqa as we have already mentioned, his son the qādī Najm al-Dīn Abu‘l-Hasan b. ‘Alī took over as qādī of the whole of the atabeg’s territories. The nephew of Bahā’ al-Dīn, Shams al-Dīn Abū Ahmad, succeeding at Mosul. Kamāl al-Dīn became qādī of Nasībīn and qādī al-‘askar. Tāj al-Dīn Abū Ṭahir took over as qādī of the Jazīra and Sharaf al-Dīn, the brother of Bahā’ al-Dīn, became qādī of Sinjār. All these people exercised independent control, without deputies. (This came about) because they had all been in these posts as deputies for Bahā’ al-Dīn and when Bahā’ al-Dīn died, these men took over the places in question (in their own right).

Najm al-Dīn, the son of Bahā’ al-Dīn, ruled all the remaining territories with the qādīs as his deputies. He remained (in power) until 533, when Shams al-Dīn Abū Ahmad took over in Mosul as chief qādī. Having paid money to Najm al-Dīn he took the post of qādī of Mosul in addition to what he already had.

The situation remained like that until 535 when Najm al-Dīn, (who was now) mutawalli of Nasībīn, was seized. He was mulcted, imprisoned and severely tortured. (f.173b) About 130,000 Amīrī dīnārs were extorted from him. Kamāl al-Dīn Abu‘l-Fadl Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Shawrazūrī took control of the whole area, and seizing power independently, administered the law, the country and the troops. Everything was handed back to Kamāl al-Dīn until the death of Zangī, as we have already mentioned.

Najm al-Dīn remained in prison for four years until the qādī Kamāl al-Dīn obtained his release and appointed him qādī of al-Rahba,
(an office which he had held) in the days of his father Bahāʾ al-Dīn. He remained in the post until Kamāl al-Dīn was arrested, as we have already mentioned. (Then) Najm al-Dīn came and took over Mosul, appointing his eldest son Bahāʾ al-Dīn in al-Rahba, as we have already said. Najm al-Dīn established himself in Mosul and Kamāl al-Dīn and Tāj al-Dīn stayed imprisoned for a time in the citadel at Mosul.

The īmām, the caliph al-Nuqtāfī, may God's mercy be upon him, sent messengers to Mosul and obtained permission for the two of them to be sent back to their homes. Najm al-Dīn put two Khurāsānī guards at each of the two men's doors so that no-one could go in or out and he took the son of Kamāl al-Dīn Abū Ahmad al-Jalāl, and the son of Tāj al-Dīn Abū l-qualification\'il al-Diyāʾ, and they were imprisoned in the citadel at Mosul. Najm al-Dīn acquired sole power as qādī of Mosul. He gave ‘Īzz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dubāsī the Jazīra as an iqtā' and appointed a qādī there whose name was Ibn Hamza and who came from Daqūqā.

It is reported that in 536 the vizier Nizām al-Dīn Abū Ja'far, whom another report calls al-Muẓaffar Muḥammad b. al-Za'im b. Jahīr, was appointed as vizier to the caliph, after the sultan's permission to dismiss Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī had been obtained. Qawām al-Dīn b. Sadaqa was made treasurer as we have already mentioned. The vizier remained in office until 541, when he went to Mecca, performed the pilgrimage and then returned to Baghdad.

In this year Bahāʾ al-Dīn Abū Tāhir b. ‘Aqīl b. Tāhir b. Nubata set out on the pilgrimage. When he arrived in Baghdad, he
pronounced a judicial decision in the presence of the vizier Nizām al-Dīn and Sadīd al-Daula b. al-Anbārī, may God have mercy on them both. He made another visit after the state officials of the caliph had assembled and the caliph put a robe of honour on him. He was attended by the qādīs and Abu’l-Fath b. al-‘Umrānī. After the vizier had returned to Baghdad, he remained (in power) for a while before being dismissed from the vizierate. Qawām al-Dīn b. Sādaqa succeeded him as vizier and Za’īm al-Dīn b. Ja’far took over as treasurer, whilst al-Ajall Jamāl al-Dīn Abu’l-Muzaffar b. Hiba inherited the diwān.

It is reported that in 543 the khatun, Fātimā, wife of the caliph al-Muqtafl, died in Baghdad. In 543 Shaikh Sharaf al-Dīn b. Sa’d b. ‘Aṣrūn came from Mosul and concluded the marriage between Zumurrud Khatun, daughter of al-Sa’īd Ḥusām al-Dīn, (f.174a) and Atabeg Ghāzī. The engagement had been in the citadel of Mayyāfārīqīn for (a dowry of) 20,000 dīnārs, with Shaikh ‘Izz al-Shuyukh Abu’l-Qāsim b. Ḥabashi as wāli.

In Sha’bān 543 ‘Izz al-Daula Abū Naṣr b. Nisān came to Mayyāfārīqīn and concluded the marriage between Safiyya Khatun, daughter of al-Sa’īd Ḥusām al-Dīn, and Jamāl al-Dīn Shams al-Mulūk Maḥmūd b. il-aldī, lord of Amid, for (a dowry of) 5,000 dīnārs with the khatib Taj al-‘Ulama’ al-Khaslaqi (?) as the wāli. He took her to Amid in the last few days of Sha’bān.

In 543 Amir Bahā’ al-Dīn Sevinch b. Kuhmūsh (?) and the vizier Diyā’ al-Dīn came on behalf of Amir Pakhr al-Dīn Daulat-Shāh b. Toghan Arslan, lord of Arzan and Bitlīs, and drew up a marriage
contract between (him and) Naura Khatun, daughter of al-Sa‘īd Ḥusām al-Dīn, for 50,000 dinārs and the wāli was present and the marriage (contract was drawn up) in Mayyafāriqīn.

In 538 Ḥusām al-Daula Qurtī had died in Arzan and was succeeded by his brother Shams al-Dīn Yāqūt Arslan who held power until 540. He sent his brother Daulat-Shāh to work for Atabeg Zangī when he passed on his way to take the territory of Amir Dā‘ūd after Dā‘ūd died. Then Yāqūt Arslan died on a Saturday at the beginning of Ramaḍān 540. Diya‘ al-Dīn Ayyūb went to Zangī's camp and Amir Daulat-Shāh whose laqab was Fakhr al-Dīn, came and, having passed through Mayyafāriqīn with Diya‘ al-Dīn, went to Arzan and took possession of the area. He assumed sole command and conquered all the territory of his father and his brothers. Diya‘ al-Dīn Ayyūb had married Daulat-Shāh's mother. Daulat-Shāh joined up with al-Sa‘īd Ḥusām al-Dīn and in Dhu‘l-Hijja they (Daulat-Shāh's officials) came to Mayyafāriqīn and fetched Naura Khatun and took her to Arzan, the wedding having taken place in Mayyafāriqīn.

In 543 Tāj al-Dīn Abū Sālim Tāhir b. Nubāta went to the Hijāz. When he arrived in Baghdad he went to the dīwān of the caliph. In 543 the vizier Makīn al-Dīn al-Misrī returned to Mayyafāriqīn where al-Sa‘īd Ḥusām al-Dīn appointed him vizier. That year I was mutawallī ishrāf outside the town of Mayyafāriqīn. After a few days, Makīn al-Dīn seized al-Mu‘ayyid and al-Muhadhīb and tortured them in the citadel for a few days. Then he appointed al-‘Amīd b. Abī Tāhir b. al-Muhtasib to inspect the dīwān. He held office for only two days before al-Sa‘īd Ḥusām al-Dīn gave orders that he should be dismissed,
slapping him, shaving off his beard, putting him on a donkey and leading him round the town. He was (then) banished and driven from the town. After a few days, the vizier left one afternoon with his ghulām in attendance, went round the town and then made for the Hisn Kaifā road and cleared off. When al-Saʿīd Husām al-Dīn was told that the vizier had fled, he said "He has taken nothing from us, so do not go out looking for him." So he got away and the following morning al-Muʿayyid and al-Muhadhdhab were reinstated in the diwān, their position became established and they regained the highest office.

It is reported that in 544 Zangī's son Ghāzī went (f.174b) as far as Nasībīn and sent Amir Julduk (?) al-Khalīfatī to Mārdīn, whence he brought Zumurrud Khatun as far as Nasībīn, accompanied by Samsām al-Dīn. (Then) Zangī's son Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī fell ill and she was taken to Mosul where she stayed in Darb Durrāj in the house of the khatun, the daughter of Sukmān and wife of Atabeg Zangī. Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī, who was seriously ill, came and stayed in Mosul. He had sent people to Baghdad who brought back the doctor Abuʾl-Barakāt. Although this man arrived and treated him for several days, he died in Safar 544.

His brother, Qutb al-Dīn Maudūd b. Zangī, took command and stabilised his position. The state was administered by the vizier Jamal al-Dīn, Zain al-Dīn and 'Īzz al-Dīn. Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī was buried in the 'Imādiyya madrasa.

After the death of Saif al-Dīn, the qādī Kamāl al-Dīn and his brother were released from their homes and summoned to the maidān.
That year I was in Mosul working for al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn by selling iron, and I was in the maidān (that day). The vizier Jamāl al-Dīn had sent them two donkeys, so they came riding into the maidān in Mosul itself. When they came through the gate of the maidān—having changed their clothes and riding without tarhās—they dismounted. When Atabeg Qutb al-Dīn saw them, he went towards them and dismounted to (speak to) them. They greeted him, complained to him about his brother and congratulated him on his assumption of power. Then they re-mounted and stood near him, remaining (there) an hour, before returning home. They removed the soldiers from their doors. The two brothers began riding out every week in the service of Qutb al-Dīn, Zain al-Dīn and Jamāl al-Dīn. After a while they approached al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn and arranged matters so that Atabeg Qutb al-Dīn was married to Zumurrud Khatun after the completion of her period of widowhood. Qutb al-Dīn consummated the marriage with her in Mosul.

At the end of (5)44 al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn attacked the city of Dārā but the wālī refused to surrender it. After he had laid siege to it for a while, the wālī surrendered it to him on Wednesday, 12 Dhu‘l-Hijja. After he had taken possession of the city he appointed the ḥājīb Ibn Buqsh (?) al-Dunaisirī as governor there. I was in the camp, working for al-Sa‘īd Husam al-Dīn, until he conquered the city.

In this year, that is (5)44, the domed bazaar in Mayyafāriqīn was burned. (Also) in this year, in Dhu‘l-Hijja, there was disagreement between the sons of the ‘amīd Tāj al-Dīn Abū Sālim b. Nubāta. Diyā’
al-Dīn went to Dārā, met Ḥusām al-Dīn, paid his respects and took the post of ʿādī before returning to Mayyāfārīqīn.

On 12 Muharram 544 Qutb al-Dīn Ḥāzī, son of al-Mālik Najm al-Dīn, was born. May both their shadows be preserved.

In 544 the Christians took Almeria (f.175a) from the Muslims. The city was plundered and the loot was taken and sold in the lands of Egypt, the Sāhil and Syria.

In 545 Samsām al-Dīn Bahram b. al-Saʿīd Ḥusām al-Dīn was married to Zangi's daughter, the sister of Qutb al-Dīn, and I was in Mosul at the time of the marriage.

In 545 the Bedouin, the Banū Zaʿb and others, Zubāb and Batrān, plundered the last caravan of the pilgrimage, taking all their possessions between Mecca and Medina at a place called Sadd, and a great number of people perished. This is an occurrence which is unheard of except in the distant past. Only a very small number of people escaped alive. That year I was living in Mosul.

Ḥusām al-Dīn with his sons conquered all the ṣāḥibs of Diyar Bakr, Diyar Rabiʿa and Armenia and attached them to himself.

After Atabeg Zangi (had been killed) no ʿādī other than Ḥusām al-Dīn remained independent, unopposed, unchallenged and governing alone.

In 545 Muʿīn al-Dīn Unur died in Damascus. Also in that year Nūr al-Dīn Mahmūd b. Zangi, ruler of Syria, met the Franks and
defeated them roundly. Joscelin's son, the lord of Edessa and its
surrounding area, was taken prisoner and all his lands were seized.
(Then) Nūr al-Dīn took Tall Bāshir and its environs and Tall Khālid
and its neighbourhood. Ḥusām al-Dīn seized Sumaisāt and on 6
Rabī'ā I 545 took al-Bīra.

In the defeat in (5)46 the hājib 'Umar al-Khāss, who was in
the employ of Nūr al-Dīn, was killed. Pakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan
took Hisn Mānsūr and Bābalū, both in the territory of Joscelin's
son, and seized the citadel of Gargar from the Armenians. Sultan
Qīlīch Arslan took Mafrash and Kaisūn and its neighbourhood.
Joscelin's son had no territory left except Qal'at al-Rūm which
Husām al-Dīn would have taken if he had lived.

In 545 Mu'īn al-Dīn Unur died in Damascus.

In 546 I travelled to Akhlāt and went to Baghdad again, where
I arrived on 27 Ramadān, and I stayed there (for a while). In 546
al-Sā'īd Ḥusām al-Dīn circumcised the sons of Amir Jamāl al-Dīn
Tughrati (?) in Mayyafāriqīn.

In (5)47 an edict came to al-Sā'īd Ḥusām al-Dīn from the
sultan and the caliph, which was read from the minbar throughout
the land. Robes of honour arrived (too). Two nights later, that
is to say, the night of Monday, 22 Rabī'ā I 547, the minbar area and
the arcades of the mosque in Mayyafāriqīn collapsed.

(In this year) I was in Baghdad where I met Qutb al-Dīn al-
'Abbadī the preacher. I was in his company for a time and I wrote down a lot of his discourses.

At the end of (5)44 'Aun al-Dīn al-Muzaffar Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Hubaira became the caliph's vizier after the dismissal of Qawām al-Dīn b. Sadaqa. 'Aun al-Dīn became established in the post. He had (previously) been in charge of the ǧīwān al-zimām wa'l-istīfā. Jalāl al-Dīn (f.175b) b. Ja'far, the brother of the treasurer, took over the ǧīwān al-zimām. Their father (Ja'far) had come from the small town of Ba'qūbā and had served as vizier to Muḥāhid al-Dīn Bihrūz until he died. The caliph remained in control of affairs.

In (5)46 Sultan Maš'ūd arrived in Baghdad, where he stayed all winter. I saw him that year in Baghdad when I (also) saw the elephant, the parrot and the monkey. The sultan moved on to Hamadhān, where he fell ill in Jumādā I (5)47. He hung on until 11 Jumādā II when he died outside Hamadhān. He was (then) taken to Isfahān. I remained in Baghdad until 1 Rajab that year before I went to Mayyāfārīqīn. When we reached Takrit the news broke that the sultan had died and the people were in turmoil. We moved on to Mosul.

The caliph rose up in rebellion, occupied the sultan’s palace and seized control of Baghdad. Maš'ūd Bilāl, who was shihāna in Baghdad, fled to Takrit. He had organised the hajj for some years and had treated the people with great kindness and leniency. The caliph mobilised the jūnūd and the 'asḵars and he removed the mu'ān and the a'shar which the sultan's officials had taken. He was kind to the people and treated his subjects justly. He acquired Iraq and appropriated all its revenues. The sultan, the royal ladies and the
sultan's officials in Iraq had possessed an income (sufficient to support) 20,000 horsemen. So all that reverted to the caliph.

When Sultan Mas'ūd died outside Hamadān, Sultan Muhammad-Shāh b. Mahmūd, who was his son-in-law - being married to his daughter - was in Khūzistān. The brother of Muhammad-Shāh, Malik-Shāh b. Mahmūd, was in the camp, so Khās Beg b. Palang-Eri made him sultan for a while. When Muhammad-Shāh heard (about that) he left Khūzistān, went to Hamadān and seized the sultanate, whereupon his brother Malik-Shāh went and took Khūzistān, Ahwāz and part of Basra. After a while Muhammad-Shāh killed Khās Beg b. Palang-Eri and ruled independently as sultan.

Sultan Mas'ūd, may God have mercy on him, was a just sultan, of mild disposition and so generous that he divided out all his territory amongst his associates, leaving for himself only the name of sultan. In spite of his mildness, he never fought anyone without defeating them. Amongst the great awrās he killed those whom no-one else could have slain: Mengū-Bars, Qaracha al-Saqī, lord of Fārs and Shīrāz, and 'Abbās, lord of Rayy. He (also) killed al-Rashid, al-Mustarshid, Dubais, Boz-Aba, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Toghan Yūrek and a group of great awrās and generals. Mas'ūd led a very happy life. When he died, he left three young sons; Muhammad-Shāh became established as sultan and took Hamadān and Isfahān and its environs without being mentioned in the khutba in Iraq.

It is reported that in (5)47 Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan took the fortress of Gargar from the Armenians. In 547 Jalāl al-Mulūk Köpek
b. Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Jabbār (f. 176a) b. Artuq married Hadiyya Khatun, daughter of al-Sa'īd Husām al-Dīn, through the good offices of his mother the princess, daughter of Riḍwān and wife of Husām al-Dīn.

In (5)45 the vizier Zain al-Dīn As'ad b. 'Abd al-Khāliq, the brother of al-Mu'ayyid Zain al-Dīn, the sultan's vizier, had come to Mārdīn and stayed with Husām al-Dīn who appointed him vizier. He remained in the diwān, assisted by al-Mu'ayyid the mūsāwī and al-Muḥaddhib, and appointing as his deputy a scribe whose lāqab was al-Shihāb. Zain al-Dīn became established as vizier until 546.

In the year 544, Ṣafīyya Khatun had died in Āmīd. At the beginning of (5)46 al-Sa'īd Husām al-Dīn went and camped before Āmīd and demanded from the inhabitants the marriage settlement of Ṣafīyya Khatun. He remained (there) for a while and then left Āmīd and went back to Mārdīn. After a few days Ibn Nīsān sent two men who stayed in the citadel at Mārdīn for a few days (secretly) searching for the thief. Then the vizier Zain al-Dīn went riding one day and on his way up to the citadel, he passed through a narrow place where he was attacked by these two men, one of whom hit him on the head with an axe so that he fell (to the ground). A group of people who were with the vizier went looking for the two men, who said to them: "What do you want? We will go up with you to the amīr." So they went up with the group to the gate of the citadel, with the citizens behind them. When they had gone into the citadel to see the amīr, they said: "We have killed the vizier." He said: "Why?" to which they replied "We were ordered to do so."

The majority of people said that Ibn Nīsān had plotted and killed...
him. Amir Husam al-Din ordered that the two men should be executed on the vizier's grave. He was buried in Mardin. The two men were Isma'Ilis.

Husam al-Din attacked Amid with renewed vigour. Bahau al-Din Aus, the vizier of Akhlat, came and met al-Sa'id Husam al-Din outside Amid, talked to him and interceded on behalf of the people of Amid. Then Bahau al-Din went into Amid, met Mu'ayyid al-Din b. Nisan and arranged the matter with him, (whereupon) Mu'ayyid al-Din went out to the amir and they made peace. The people of Amid went out to al-Sa'id Husam al-Din and they became his subjects and under his command. (Then) he left them.

In the last ten days of Rajab 546, Naura Khatun, daughter of Husam al-Din, died at the house of the lord of Arzan, leaving a son who outlived her by a few days before he (too) died. She was buried in Arzan. Al-Sa'id Husam al-Din grieved at her death.

After the murder of the vizier Zain al-Din, Husam al-Din remained without a vizier, making do with al-Ajall Mu'ayyid al-Daula Abu Mansur Khalid b. al-Mubarak b. Mukhtar until he (Husam al-Din) died. Mu'ayyid al-Daula performed his task most admirably.

Al-Sa'id Husam al-Din remained in power until Thursday 2 Dhu'l-Qa'da 548 when he died in Mardin. His illness lasted from Saturday until Thursday 2 Dhu'l-Qa'da. He was buried in the mashhad below Mardin. He ruled Mayyafariqin for 30 years and Mardin for 32 years. (f.176b) May God be pleased with him. Husam al-Din was a knowledgeable amir, well-versed in all the branches of religious
knowledge. He liked the ‘ulamā’, maintaining close contact with them, and he honoured skilled craftsmen in every trade. He was generous, munificent and bountiful. He only contemplated killing when it was a necessity and he provided protection and security from oppression to an extent which was unknown (even) amongst the pure-blooded Arabs. Amir Abū Bakr, lord of Nasībīn, had come to him when he fled from Atabeg Zangī. Husām al-Dīn gave him refuge and when Zangī asked him to hand him over, he would not do so. A serious disagreement between them ensued and Zangī took Dārā and plundered the country. Although al-Sa‘īd Husam al-Dīn lost a lot of money, he still would not hand Abū Bakr over and that man was the reason for the estrangement between al-Sa‘īd and Zangī. When Abū Bakr left Husam al-Dīn, he went to Sultan Mas‘ūd who seized him and sent him to Zangī. Zangī (then) killed him.

Al-Sa‘īd Husam al-Dīn, may God have mercy on him, used to show deference to the members of important families and to look after their affairs. He did not contemplate the uprooting of the big families. If a member of the turbaned class and the ‘ulamā’ came to him, he would give him hospitality, honour him, treat him kindly and minister to all his needs. If he detected any knowledge of the religious sciences in a man he would bid him approach, present gifts to him and ask him about what he knew of his science or craft.

When Husam al-Dīn died, I was in the province of the Gurj in the service of the king of the Abkhaz, Dimītrī b. Dā‘ūd, the king of the whole area, for I had come to Tiflis in (5)48 and entered his employ. I accompanied him to the province of al-Lān and of the
Abkhaz and to Darband. One day we were near the town of Darband—
it was 4 Muharram 549—when the king summoned me and said: "Your
master Husām al-Dīn has died. I received the news today."

A number of people held the office of governor of Mayyafāriqīn
during the lifetime of Husām al-Dīn. Amongst them were al-Ḥājib
Abū Bakr, Bairam and 'Uthmān b. Khumar-Tash al-Ḥajj, each of whom
was governor once, except for al-Ḥājib Bairam who held office twice.
Thereafter al-Ḥājib 'Abd al-Karīm became governor, and was then
dismissed. (He was succeeded by) al-Ḥājib Yūsuf Īnāl, who was
subsequently dismissed and given an iqṭā' below Dārā which Atabeg
Zangī took from him. Then a mamlūk belonging to Husām al-Dīn whose
name was Oghuzoghlu became governor of Mayyafāriqīn for a while
and he died (in office). Then Amir Qaimāz, the eunuch, occupied
the citadel with al-Ḥājib Bairam for a while and was succeeded by
al-Ḥājib Yūsuf Īnāl who held office a second time and remained in
the governorship until 3 Rajab (5)39 when he died and was buried
in Mayyafāriqīn. Then Nāṣir al-Daula Sandal became governor in
Dhu'l-Qa'da (5)39 and he remained (in office) until Rabī' I (5)43,
when he died. (Then) his son Ghars al-Daula Īnāl remained in the
būrī al-mulk and al-Ḥājib Bairam held the citadel for a while.
(Then) Īnāl assumed sole control as governor and he remained in
office until the late al-Sa'īd Husām al-Dīn died, as we have
related, God willing (!).

I will relate the genealogy of the Artuqids and what information
has come to me about them and what descendants remain of (f.177a)
Amir Artuq, may God have mercy on him.
It is reported that when Amir Artuq died he left a number of children; amongst them were Amir Sukmān, Najm al-Dīn ʿIl-Ghāzī, Bahrām, ʿAbd al-Jabbār, Siyāwush, Alp-Yaruq, another son called Bektash and another whose name was Alp-Tash. These sons are the ones who had children whose descendants have remained until now in Diyār Bakr. Artuq left other children besides these, but as I have not heard that they have descendants alive I have omitted to mention them.

As for Sukmān, he took Hisn Kaifa (and he) remained (there) for a while; then he died in 506. He left Amir Rukn al-Daula Daʿūd, and Amir Ibrahim, who ruled Hisn Kaifa after his father for a while and (then) died. Rukn al-Daula Daʿūd and Azar Khatun took the city after Ibrahim and Rukn al-Daula ruled Hisn Kaifa, subsequently conquering other places too. Daʿūd left four sons; Arslan Toghmīsh, Qara Arslan, Sulaimān and Mahmūd. As for Arslan Toghmīsh, he died, having taken possession of Mīzdard after his father. Arslan Toghmīsh left a son by the daughter of al-Sāʿīd Husam al-Dīn but the son died shortly after his father. As for Sulaimān, he died leaving a son called Yaʿqūb, who is now in the service of al-Malik Najm al-Dīn, and another son who is in the service of Jamāl al-Dīn in Ḥanī. As for Mahmūd, he took Tanzīl and al-Qarshiyya. When he died, he left a son called Daʿūd who is now in the service of the sons of his uncle Fakhr al-Dīn in Hisn Kaifa. As for Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan, he took over the whole of his father's territory after the latter had died, as we have already mentioned.

When he died, he left two sons; Nur al-Dīn Muhammād and ʿImād al-Dīn Abū Bakr. It was Nur al-Dīn who succeeded him and who is
now in power. Fakhr al-Dīn (also) left a number of daughters.

As for Bahrām b. Artuq, he left Amir Nūr al-Daula Balak who took Khartabirt, Bālū and its surrounding area until Shams al-Daula Sulaimān b. Īl-Ghāzī seized these possessions from him. When Sulaimān died, Amir Dā'ūd took them. Balak had married Princess Parkhunda Khatun, daughter of Malik Ridwān, after Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī, and it was Balak who (actually) consummated his marriage with her. He seized territory near the Euphrates and waged war against the Franks until he was killed below Manbij as we have already mentioned. He left a daughter whom Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan married and he died before her.

As for Siyāwush b. Artuq, he left Amir Yūnus al-Ḥarāmī whom I saw in the service of the late al-Saʿīd Husām al-Dīn. Yūnus al-Ḥarāmī left sons, some of whom are in the service of Fakhr al-Dīn in Hisn Kaifa. Siyāwush also left Sevinch who is in Hānī in the service of Jamāl al-Dīn, the brother of al-Mālik Najm al-Dīn. Sevinch married the daughter of Amir Shīrbārīk by whom he had a son whose name was Shāh Malik. After she died he married one of her sisters.

As for Alp-Yaruq b. Artuq, he left sons, amongst whom was Amir 'Alī, the malik of Jabal Jūr, who begat Amir Maudūd - who was (also) called Shīrbārīk - and another son who died, whose name was Mahmūd. 'Alī also had a son whose name was (Ms.lacuna) who is in Khartabirt. Shāh Malik married the daughter of Shīrbārīk in 507 (sic). Shīrbārīk sired Sevinch and Ismāʿīl and Toghrīl Beg and a number of daughters. He (also) had a son, whose name was Zangī, from a slave girl. (f.177b)
Zangī remained in the service of his father for a while, and (then) went to Egypt where he died in the reign of Shawar. As for Toghrīl Beg, he died in Hisn Kaifā and was brought to Mayyafāriqīn. As for Sevinch, who was the eldest of them, he married Safiyya Khatun, daughter of Malik Ridwan, and he died leaving no issue. As for Iṣmā‘īl, he had two sons and he is in the service of al-Malik Najm al-Dīn. Shīrbārīk remained in the service of Malik Husam al-Dīn until the latter died. (Then) he transferred to the service of Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan and remained with him for a time. (Thereafter) he returned to the service of Malik Najm al-Dīn and he died in Rajab of the year 566. He was buried in a village belonging to them in the lowest of graves.

As for ‘Abd al-Jabba:r b. Artuq, he left three sons; Yagḥī- Siyan Arslan, and Sulaimān. As for Yagḥī-Sīyan, he moved on and served in the province of Akhlaṭ with the daughter of Sukmān. Whilst he was there, he had two sons, Amir Ahmad and another who had the ḥaqab ‘Izz al-Dīn. He moved to the service of Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan in Hisn Kaifā with whom he attained a most powerful position. Fakhr al-Dīn married him to the daughter of his brother Arslan Toghmīš. Yagḥī-Sīyan died of epilepsy, leaving a son who is now in the service of the sons of Fakhr al-Dīn.

As for Alp-Tash, he left Amir ‘Alī al-Harāmī who died in the service of Husam al-Dīn. He left two sons, one of whom was Abū Bakr who became a Sūfī and was a faqīr. He had a long life and he is in the service of the descendants of Fakhr al-Dīn in Hisn Kaifā.

As for Amir Arslan b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār, he took Jabal Jūr, Dhu’l-
Qarnain and al-Sīwān. After a while al-Saʿīd Husam al-Dīn took them from him. He moved to the service of Rukn al-Daula Dāʿūd in Hīṣn Kaifā where he died. He left sons, amongst whom were Bulāq and Mahmūd and daughters. He gave one daughter in marriage in his lifetime to Zaʿīm al-Daula Musayyib b. Mālik, lord of al-Raqqā, and their descendants remained in the service of Fakhr al-Dīn. Amir Bulāq moved to the service of al-Malik Najm al-Dīn where he died.

As for Sulaimān, whose ḥaqāʾiq was Badr al-Daula, he conquered Aleppo and married the ḥatūn, the princess, daughter of Rūdwan, who was (also) the wife of Amir Balak. He had a son by her whose name was Köpek and whose ḥaqāʾiq was Jalāl al-Mulūk. When Aleppo was taken from him, he went into the service of al-Saʿīd Husam al-Dīn who gave him the town of Qalb as an ḥaqāʾiq. He fortified the town and it remained in his service until he died. The princess came to Mārdīn after Sulaimān's death accompanied by his son. She settled in Mārdīn and al-Saʿīd Husam al-Dīn married her as we have related. He gave her son Jalāl al-Mulūk in marriage to his daughter, Hadiyya Ḥatūn, in (5)47. Jalāl al-Mulūk lived until 554 when he died outside Nasībīn as we shall relate, if God wills.

As for the other son called Bektash, he sired Arslan Toğhmīsh who moved to the service of Atabeg Tugh-Tegin, lord of Damascus, for he had a most powerful position with him. He married ʿĀʾisha Ḥatūn, daughter of the brother of the vizier (f.178a) Muhammad al-Dvīnī, and lived in Damascus until 543 in the service of the descendants of Tugh-Tegin. He went to Mosul and lived in the service of its lord for a short time; then he moved to the service of al-Saʿīd
Husam al-Din who honoured him and gave him many iqtas at the end of (5)44 when he took Darā. He remained for a short time and then died, leaving three sons. One of them, who had the lagab Shams al-Daula, remained for a period of two years in the service of al-Sa'īd after (the death of) his father and then died.

The other two sons, Mas'ūd and Balak, remained. Mas'ūd remained in the service of al-Malik Najm al-Dīn for a while before transferring to the service of Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan. As for Balak, he remained in the service of al-Malik Najm al-Dīn until (5)67. (Then) he became an ascetic, breaking away from worldly things, and he ensconced himself in the Masjid Yagūt near the Huwa gate at the top of the rabad where he is living to this day.

As for Najm al-Dīn İl-Chāzī, he had a number of children, including Ayaz and al-Bazm, both killed in his life-time, and Guhar Khatun.

As for Ayaz, he sired Amir Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ayaz and a daughter from the khatun whom Sa'īd al-Daula İl-aldī lord of Āmid, married. İl-aldī has a son from her in Āmid. As for Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad, he grew up in the service of his uncle al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn who gave him Tall Bashmi as an iqtā. He was honoured by Husam al-Dīn until the latter died. He remained a while after his death and then went to Syria, to the service of Nūr al-Dīn. Nūr al-Dīn gave him many iqtā's and he has remained in his service until now. Shihāb al-Dīn has three sons who are now in the service of Nūr al-Dīn.
Najm al-Dīn had a son from a concubine. His name was ‘Umar. He married her to Amīr the general. His son (‘Umar) died leaving no issue. Najm al-Dīn had a son whose name was Nāṣr from a slave-girl whom he married to the hājib ‘Umar al-Khāṣṣ. He died and left no issue.

Najm al-Dīn married Gūhar Khatun to Saif al-Daula Dubais. She had by him Amir ‘Izz al-Dīn Muḥammad who remained with her in Mārdīn until Dubais was killed. (Thereafter) he went to al-Hilla where he ruled with his brothers. After a while he returned to the service of al-Mālik Najm al-Dīn. He went to and fro several times and died after his mother. She had died in the year 559 and she was buried in Mārdīn. ‘Izz al-Dīn left a son who is now in the service of Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ayāz.

Najm al-Dīn had a daughter whom he called ‘Aina Khatun and whom Amir Īl-aldī, lord of Āmid, married. He had by her Jamāl al-Dīn Shams al-Mulūk Maḥmūd who is now lord of Āmid. When ‘Aina Khatun died, he married the sister of Shihāb al-Dīn as we have related.

Najm al-Dīn had a daughter whose name was Safra Khatun whom Husām al-Daula Qurtī b. Toghan Arslan, lord of Arzan and Bitlis, married. She died leaving a son whose name is Yaghī-Basan (f.178b) who is now in the service of Fakhr al-Dīn Daulat-Shah, his uncle.

Najm al-Dīn (also) sired Shams al-Daula Sulaimān, who ruled Mayyāfārīqīn after his father until he (Sulaimān) died. He left
a son called Mahmūd whom I saw in Mardin. He was in a very bad way and I don't know what has become of him.

Najm al-Dīn (also) had al-Saʿīd Husam al-Dīn who was the pride of the house and the head of the family. He took possession of Mardin, as we have related, after his father and he took Mayyafāriqīn after his brother. He remained (there) until he died, leaving children: al-Mālik Najm al-Dīn Alpī who ruled after his father; Jamāl al-Dīn Tughrati (?) to whom his brother gave Hanī, al-Sīwān and Hisn Qalb; Samsām al-Dīn Bahram, lord of Dārā; Hadiyya Khatun who is with her brother Jamāl al-Dīn in Hanī; Zumurrud Khatun in Mosul - (whose husband) Qutb al-Dīn Maudūd b. Zangi died after her, leaving four children by her, including Malik al-Mulūk Saif Ghāzī b. Maudūd, whom we will mention later, God willing - Ṣafiyya Khatun, wife of the lord of Āmid, and Naura Khatun, wife of the lord of Arzan, who died in his lifetime, as we have already related. May God have mercy on him and be pleased with him. This is what has reached me of the genealogy of those Artuqids that have remained. God knows best what is true.
CHAPTER VII

COMMENTARY ON TRANSLATION OF MS.A OF

TĀRĪKH MAYYĀPĀRIQĪN WA ĀMĪD
INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMENTARY

General Comments

The commentary on the edition and translation of Ibn al-Azraq's text is inevitably long. The linguistic problems raised by a translation of the text require discussion. Moreover, the author's chaotic chronology and unexplained allusions necessitate constant reference to other primary sources which deal with the historical period under discussion.¹

Place-names present a major problem for an understanding of this text. Explanations or references to geographical works have been given wherever possible. It must be admitted, however, that the exact location of some of the places mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq remains unknown, as Cahen pointed out in his pioneer article on the Artuqids in 1935.

In this commentary, frequent reference has been made to the unpublished section of the historical geography of Ibn Shaddād, which deals with the Jazira and which concentrates, therefore, on the same areas as Ibn al-Azraq.² It is true that Ibn Shaddād does

¹ The commentary has been kept separate from the translation to which it refers in order to facilitate the reading of the actual narrative.

² Claude Cahen summarised the contents of Ibn Shaddād's work on the Jazira in his article, "La Djazira au milieu du treizième siècle d'après ‘Izz ad-din Ibn Chaddād", Revue des Études Islamiques (1934), VII, 109-116. He did not, however, make full use of the information nor did he link it to the text of Ibn al-Azraq.
not offer precise information on the location of many of the places which both he and Ibn al-Azraq mention, but since Ibn Shaddād's work is a virtually unexploited source it seemed appropriate to record his comments in some detail.

It is unfortunate that so many explanatory notes should be necessary in the first few pages of the commentary - i.e. those which deal with Ibn al-Azraq's account of the reign of ʿIl-Ghāzī. It is quite apparent that the information on this period available to Ibn al-Azraq is far from complete and that he himself only partially understands it. In an attempt to reduce the number of footnotes in this section of the commentary, references to the extended discussion of this period in the chapter on ʿIl-Ghāzī have been inserted wherever possible. Similarly, the commentary on the genealogical section (ff. 177a-178b) is deliberately brief in order to avoid duplication of the discussion in the notes to the genealogical table.

Another difficulty inherent in Ibn al-Azraq's text is its administrative terminology. With increasing political fragmentation at the beginning of the sixth/twelfth century and the rise of semi-independent dynasties centred in a major city, e.g. the Artuqids at Mārdīn and the Zangids at Mosul, it is difficult to determine the exact meaning of the administrative terms used in connection with these rulers in the chronicles. The actual titles are inherited from the administrative system of the Great Saljuqs but often offices are merged. Ibn al-Azraq uses administrative terms freely but does not see the need to define them. The offices he mentions are discussed wherever possible in the commentary.
List of abbreviations used in the commentary

For full details of these titles, see the bibliography.

Abū'1-Fīḍā', Mukhtasar = Al-mukhtasar fī akhbār al-bashar III
‘Awāq = Ibn al-Azraq, Tārikh al-Fārīsī, ed. ‘Awāq
al-‘Azīmī, "Chronique" = Cahen (ed.), "La chronique abrégée d'al-‘Azīmī" (sic),
JA 1935
Bar Hebraeus, Chronicle = The Chronography of Gregory Abū'1 Fārat,
tr. Budge
Bosworth, "Iranian World" = Bosworth, "The political and dynastic
history of the Iranian world (A.D. 1000-1217)", Cambridge History
of Iran V
al-Bundārī, Zubdat = Zubdat al-nuṣra, ed. Houtsma
Cahen, "Diyār Bakr" = Cahen, "Le Diyar Bakr au temps des premiers
Urtuqides", JA 1935
Cahen, Syrie = Cahen, La Syrie du Nord, 1940
Canard, H’amānides = Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des H’amānides, 1953
Dozy, Supplément = Dozy, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes, 1881
Honigmann, Ostgrenze = Honigmann, Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen
Reiches, 1935
Horst, Staatsverwaltung = Horst, Die Staatsverwaltung der Grosselijtjen, 1954
al-Ḥusainī, Akhbār = al-Ḥusainī, Akhbār al-daula al-Saljuqīyya, ed.
Iqābī, 1933
Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmil = Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl fi l-târîkh, ed. Tornberg, 1851-76
Ibn al-Furatî, Duval = Ibn al-Furatî, Târîkh al-Duwal, Vienna 1851-76
Ibn al-Jauzî, Kutnâzam = Ibn al-Jauzî, al-Kutnâzam fi târîkh al-mulûk wa l-umam X, 1940
Ibn Khallikân, Sâyât = Ibn Khallikân, Sâyât al-a'vân, tr. de Slane, 1843-71
Ibn al-Qâlânîsî, Dhail = Ibn al-Qâlânîsî, Dhail târîkh Dimishq, ed. Amedroz, 1908
Ibn Shaddâd, Jazîra = Ibn Shaddâd, al-A'laq al-khatîra, Bodleian Ms Marsh 333
Le Strange, Bagdad = Le Strange, Bagdad during the Abbasid Caliphate, 1900
Le Strange, Lands = Le Strange, Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 1905
Markwart, Südarmenien = Markwart, Südarmenien und die Trieriscuellen, 1930
Matthew of Edessa, Chronique = Matthew of Edessa, Chronique, tr. Dulaurier, 1858
Michael the Syrian, Chronique = Michael the Syrian, Chronique, tr. Chabot, 1899-1914
Minorsky, "Caucasica I" = Minorsky, "Caucasica in the History of Mayyâfârîqîn", BSOAS 1949
Minorsky, Studies = Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History, 1953
Mustafrî, Gûzîda = Hâmâlî Muhammad Mustafrî al-Îamînî, Târîkh-i Gûzîda, tr. Defrömery, Jâ 1846
Mansī, Rāżīṭ = Mansī, Rāżīṭ al-ṣudūr, et. Iqbal, 1921
Turan, Doğu Anadolu = Turan, Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi, 1973
Ulūma, Memoire = Ulūma, Memoire, tr. Kitti, repr. 1964
Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devleti = Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devleti teshkilatı
medhal, 1941
Yāqūt, "Reisen" = Wustenfeld, "Jācuṭ's Reisen", ZDMG 1864
1. Ibn Shaddād names the author of the work from which he borrows his information on Mayyafāriqīn as Ahmad b. Yūsuf b. ʿAlī b. al-Azraq. He gives the title of the work as the Tarīkh Mayyafāriqīn wa Āmid (Ibn Shaddād, Jazīra, f.71b).

Although Āmid is included in the title, Ibn al-Azraq's work concentrates for its local history almost exclusively on Mayyafāriqīn. Information about Āmid occurs only occasionally. On the other hand, as Ibn Shaddād points out:

"Most of the time, Āmid, Mayyafāriqīn, Mārdīn and the fortresses attached to them were ruled as an entity from Mayyafāriqīn, and Āmid" (ibid.)

The history of these cities was inextricably linked. In the period treated below, it was Mārdīn which dominated Mayyafāriqīn and Āmid. In his position as town chronicler of Mayyafāriqīn, Ibn al-Azraq never explicitly states this important fact.

2. The name Il-Ghaṣī is written إلغازى in Ms.Α and إلغازي in Ms.Β. A dotted i has been used in the transliteration of this name to remove any erroneous impression that ُال has any connection with the Arabic definite article. The etymology of the word ُل is discussed by Sir G.L.M. Clauson (An Etymological Dictionary of pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish [Oxford, 1972], 121).

3. The forms ميافرظين and ميافرظين are both found in both manuscripts, although the latter is used more frequently. For a discussion of the form ميافرظين, cf. Chapter III, p.99, n.2.

4. Fakhr al-Daula Abū Nasr Muhammad b. Jahīr held office with the Marwānid ruler of Mayyafāriqīn until 453/1061-2. In the

5. Artuq was one of the military commanders of the Saljuq sultans, Alp Arslan and Malik-Shāh. Malik-Shāh gave him Hulwān as an iqṭā, and employed him on military missions in Anatolia, Bahrain and upper Mesopotamia. For his career in more detail, cf. A. Sevim, "Artukluların soyu ve Artuk Bey'in siyasî faaliyetleri", Belleten, cilt XXVI, sayı 101 (1962), 121-47; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, I, 17/-2.

6. Artuq had good reason to flee, since he had incurred Malik-Shāh's displeasure by intriguing in Diyār Bakr with Muslim, the Arab prince of Mosul and Aleppo, who was not on friendly terms with Malik-Shāh (G. Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen [Mannheim, 1851], III, 130, n.2).

8. The term Şahil has not been translated. It is used by Arab historians of Egypt and Syria to denote the Mediterranean coast which roughly corresponds to Phoenicia.

9. After Artuq's death, his two sons, Sukman and İl-Ghazı, ruled Jerusalem for a short time, until the Fatimids, under the leadership of al-Afdal, took the city from them in 491/1098. For a longer discussion, with references, cf. Chapter IV, pp. 117-8.


12. Ms.A: شم اعطاه سخرا العراق  
Ms.B: شم اعطاه شمكية بغداد  

Whilst there is ample evidence from other sources that İl-Ghazı was appointed shihna of Baghdad by Sultan Muhammad in 495/1101-2, there would appear to be no corroboration for his being given Sinjar, as Ms.A would appear to suggest.

What probably occurred was that the scribe of Ms.A was unfamiliar with the word شخبة, which bears a certain superficial similarity to سخبر, and he therefore wrote سخبر. The form شخبة is an Arabicisation of a Persian word (cf. M.E. Quatremère, Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks de l'Égypte, II, Paris, 1845, pt.1, 195, n.2; the work is a translation of al-Maqrîzî, Al-Sulûk fî Ma'rifat Duwal al-Mulûk).

The shihna was an important official of the Saljuq sultan, charged with the task of keeping him informed of events in
Baghdad and with restraining the power of the caliph.

According to Guspynov, the first shihna was appointed in the 1050's and the last one in 1135. The caliph could not prevent the existence of the shihna but he had the right to declare the candidature of shihna persona non grata, whereupon the sultan would suggest someone else (R. A. Guspynov, "Sultan i Khalif (Izistorii suuzereniteta i vassaliteta na Blizhnem Vostoke XI-XII vv.), Palestinsky Sbornik 19 [82, 1969], 133).

13. Ibn al-Azraq omits the whole interlude of Fatimid rule in Jerusalem and mentions only its subsequent passing into the hands of the Crusaders. On other occasions, especially on the matter of the succession of Fatimid caliphs, he shows a greater interest in Egyptian affairs (cf. pp. 287-288, 164a).


16. There is considerable divergence of opinion about the identity of (al)-Yaqūtī.

Ibrāhīm Artuk calls him "the son of Artuk" (I.Artuk, Mardin Artukoğulları Tarihi [Istanbul, 1944], 34-6).

Minorsky is uncertain if Yaqūtī was the son or grandson of Artuq ( "Mardin", 81, 274).

Dolapönđ calls him the grandson of Artuq (H. Dolapönđ, Tarihte Mardin [Istanbul, 1972], 41).

Cahen says Yaqūtī is Sukmān's brother - i.e. the son of Artuq (La Syrie du Nord, 237).
Ibn Shaddād, whose genealogical grasp is poor, describes Yāqūtī as "the son of the sister of Sukmān" (Jazīra, f.132b), "the son of Artuq" (ibid., f.43a) and "the brother of Sukmān" (ibid.).

Ibn al-Athīr writes "the son of Sukmān's brother, Yāqūtī b. Artuq" (sio) (Kāmil, X, 269).

It would appear likely from the genealogical information provided by Ibn al-Azraq (cf. Appendix B) that Yāqūtī was the son of Alp-Yaruq b. Artuq.

A detailed account of Yāqūtī's acquisition of Mārdīn is given by Ibn al-Athīr (Kāmil, X, 268-70) and is copied twice almost verbatim by Ibn Shaddād (Jazīra, ff.43a-b; ff.133a-b).

Yāqūtī was imprisoned in the citadel at Mārdīn which was governed by Berk-Yaruq's bard (ٌٓ). The town pleased Yāqūtī and he was determined to acquire it upon his release, which was effected through the intercession of Artuq's widow. He persuaded the governor of Mārdīn to hand over some soldiers to help him rid the countryside of Kurdish raiders. Yāqūtī eventually gained control of the citadel by threatening outside the gate to kill the soldiers one by one. Thus the town fell into his hands.

Yāqūtī died soon afterwards in a battle with Chūkermish in 498/1104-5, whereupon his brother, 'Alī, took the town under the suzerainty of Chūkermish. 'Alī left a governor in Mārdīn who was also called 'Alī. This second 'Alī summoned Sukmān b. Artuq and asked him to come and take Mārdīn. The Artuqid 'Alī asked Sukmān to give him back Mārdīn but Sukmān only gave him the iqṭa' of Jabal Jūr.
Unfortunately, the dating of all this is very imprecise. Ibn Shaddād says that Yaqūtī took Mārdīn some time in 487 or 488/1094-5 (Jazīra, f.134a) but Ibn al-Athīr mentions no date at all for the whole episode.

18. Ms.A: ـلاـباتاـت الباقون

The word ـلاـباتاـت الباقون has been changed here to ـلاـباتاـت الباقون. This emendation may be regarded as rather bold but these lines are the most obscure in the whole edited text and a certain temerity is needed to make any sense of them at all. The absence of dates and names is especially noticeable here. If Ms.A is translated literally, as "the others died", an apparently insuperable problem of identification arises, for these "others" are not mentioned earlier in Ibn al-Azraq's text.

19. It is difficult to ascertain with any degree of precision the role of ـلاـبـعـل الباقون in the last decade of the fifth century A.H.. It is clear that with two major citadels in Diyār Bakr - Hisn Kaifā and Mārdīn - in Artuqid hands, there was a concentration of other members of the Artuqid family in that area. It was inevitable that there should be conflict and shifting alliances between them. The date of Yaqūtī's acquisition of Mārdīn is known (487 or 488/1094/5) but the date when ـلاـبـعـل الباقون took it is uncertain.

Ibn al-Azraq does not clarify the situation. He mentions few dates and makes no distinctions between the various separate occasions when ـلاـبـعـل الباقون must have visited Mārdīn. He also omits any reference to the latter's absences on campaign. The only precise date is ـلاـبـعـل الباقون's dismissal from the office of shīhna in 498/1104-5 (cf. Chapter IV, p.123), after which he returned
to Diyar Bakr to participate in the power struggle amongst the members of his own family. From this struggle he ultimately emerged victorious.


23. Cahen reads the name of this ُامير as Shamtar (?) ("Diyar Bakr", 232). He is right to be diffident about this reading. The name occurs three times in Ms.A and on only one occasion (f.161a, 1.21), can the name possibly be read as Shamtar. The three radicals seem to be ُس م ش .

24. The form ُمیرین is often used in Ms.B in place of the usual ُمیرین.

25. Ms.A ُوولی موضعه اخوه ُالامیر واو لبناکیه ُکان This is a very confused genealogy. Ibrâhîm and Da'ûd were brothers; so too were Sukmân and Il-Ghâzî. In order to make sense historically, the phrase ُلبداخیهسکان has been translated simply as ُبعده .

26. In his chapter on the Innsbruck dish, which he attributes to Da'ûd b. Sukmân, van Berchem discusses some of the problems connected with the Artuqids at Mârnîn and Hisn Kaîfâ at the beginning of the sixth/twelfth century. He rightly pinpoints the difficulty of establishing the sequence of events at Mârnîn at a time when places constantly changed hands and he criticizes Lane-Poole for linking Il-Ghâzî's acquisition of Mârnîn with the death of Ibrâhîm (M. van Berchem and J.Strzygowski, Amida.
According to Ibn al-Furat, Il-Ghazl took Mardin in 502/1108-9 after using a trick to gain access to the citadel (I, f.21a apud Cahen, "Diyar Bakr", 232).

Cahen erroneously cites the date given by Ibn al-Azraq on this folio (f.160b) as 509/1115-6 (ibid.).

27. Ms.A consistently uses the verb ولد where the form ولد would be more usual.

28. For a good description of Mardin, cf. Yaqut, who writes:-

"(Mardin) is a citadel at the top of a mountain which overlooks Dumaizir, Darar, Nasibin and that broad plain. In front of the citadel extends a large suburb with market places, Muslim and Christian inns.....It is built like an amphitheatre.... There is no doubt that there is no more beautiful, more solidly built and firm castle in the whole world than this" ("Reisen",436).

29. The sultan was now Sultan Mahmud. Sultan Muhammad had died at the end of 511/1118 (Mustaufi, Guzida, 278; Ibn Khalilikân, Wafayat,139; Ibn al-Qalânisî, Dha'il, 198-9).

30. Lehmann-Haupt mentions Nasiir-i Khusrau's visit to Mayyafarqin in 438/1046-7. It was a very prosperous city before the advent of the Turks. The rabah had caravanserais, bazaars, baths and a large mosque, whilst the Friday mosque was abundantly supplied with water and other amenities (Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien einst und jetzt, Reisen und Forschungen [Berlin,1910], 424).

For a scholarly and detailed study of the history of the city of Mayyafarqin from Sasanian times onwards, cf. M.E. Quatremère, Histoire des Mongols de la Perse écrite en persan par Rashid-eddin (Paris, 1836)

Finally, Ibn Shaddād writes of Mayyūfarīqīn:-

"Until our own time it has never been taken by the sword forcibly. Beside it, Āmid is stronger and better fortified and (yet) it has been taken several times by the sword" (Jazīra, f.68b).

31. Ms.A: اـرئـيك and اـرئـيكی
Awad: رئیک
Ibn Shaddād:

The reading of this name as Ilduz Beg is very uncertain. Cahen gives Ruzbākī (Diyār Bakr, 234). A more likely reading is Ildiz Bey (M.H.Yinanc, "Diyarbekir", I.A., 614). Ibn Shaddād gives Zangī (Jazīra, f.101b). Whilst this is not totally impossible, Ibn Shaddād is, as noted elsewhere in this thesis, very inaccurate with names and genealogies.

Whatever the reading of this name, the amīr Ilduz Beg was appointed as wāli of Mayyūfarīqīn in 508/1114-5 by Qaracha, the governor of Mosul (Awad, 283).  

32. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Sultan Mahmūd gave Mayyūfarīqīn as an iqṭāʿ to il-Ghāzī as late as 515/1121-2 (Kāmil, X, 418).

33. The burj al-Rawābī is mentioned by Ibn Shaddād in his description of the buildings of Mayyūfarīqīn (Jazīra, f.68b).

34. The reasons for this change of decision are not clear.

35. This is stock panegyrical.

36. For  لغٌ (plural لغٌ) of Dozy, Supplément, I, 161. Dozy defines this term as "ce dont on a besoin dans la guerre". This was one of the many kinds of extra tax which a ruler could levy.
37. For 

(اقطاط) , cf. Dozy, Supplément, II, 344. Dozy defines this term as "contribution, impôt, tribut". It would appear to imply the payment of a debt in instalments. A parallel account is found in Ibn Shaddād, who glosses athqāl and asāt by kalaf and mu‘an (f.101b).

A similar list of taxes were abolished by Sukman al-Qutbī at Mayyāfāriqīn in 502/1108-9 (‘Awad, 275).

38. Ms.A: 

(eznāl) (plural 

(eznāl) "provisions que les sujets sont tenus de fournir au souverain quand il est en voyage et à son armée" (Dozy, Supplément , II, 661).

ii) "l'obligation de loger des soldats" (ibid.).

Of these two suggestions, the second one, which means billeting, is more appropriate to the context. Although Ms.A has the form 

Ibn Shaddād reads 

(Jazīra, f.101b).

Ibn al-Athīr records that in 519/1125-6 the soldiers of Sultan Mahmūd's army entered Baghādād and installed themselves in the houses of the inhabitants (Atabeg, 29).

39. Cf. the use of the term مصارعات by Bundārī (Zubdat, 132).


41. This use of the term shihna probably implies some kind of military officer in charge of the garrison of a city. Minorsky translates this word in a similar context as "protector" ("Caucasica I", 32).

42. Arzan was situated at a distance of one day's journey from Mayyāfāriqīn. According to Ibn Hauqal, it was as important
as Mayyafarqin, Bitlis, Manzikert and other cities in Armenia (Canard, Hkdanides, 84). According to Ibn Shaddād, Arzan had a round citadel on a high hill. The town had an abundance of wines (Jazīra, f.129b). It stands on a tributary of the Tigris called the Arzan-Su (Lehmann-Haupt, op.cit., 385).

43. This apparently lavish praise should be treated with caution. Ibn al-Azraq was for a time in the service of Il-Ghāzī's son Temūr-Tash and his sympathies are with the Artuqids. These are in any case conventional phrases applied indiscriminately by Ibn al-Azraq to other rulers of Mayyafarqin. This description should be weighed against that of Ibn al-‘Adîm who emphasises the rapacity of Il-Ghāzī and his soldiery when they entered Aleppo in 511/1117-8 (Zubda, II, 180).

44. Ms.A has 516/1122-3 which is the year Il-Ghāzī died. Ms.B has 513/1119-20. Neither of these two dates tally with the other chronicles, except for Michael the Syrian who also puts the date of the surrender of Aleppo to Il-Ghāzī in 513 (Chronique, 217). The other chronicles say that Il-Ghāzī took Aleppo in 511/1117-8 (Ibn al-‘Adîm, Zubda, 180; Ibn al-Qalanîsî, Dhail, 146; Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmil, X, 372).

45. The victory at Balāt marked the apogee of Il-Ghāzī's military career. Ibn al-Qalanîsî gives the most graphic account of the battle which took place in Rabī’ I 513/June 1119 (Dhail, 200-1). Michael the Syrian relates that in this battle Roger of Antioch was "hacked to pieces" (Chronique, 217). For a further discussion of Balāt, cf. Chapter IV, p.56.

46. Ms.A

Ibn al-Azraq is unsure of the name of one of the two young sons
of Malik Ridwan of Aleppo. When Ridwan died in 507/1113-4, he was first succeeded by his son Alp Arslan al-Akras, who ruled in collaboration with a mamluk, Lu'lū'. Alp Arslan was murdered a year later by Lu'lū' and his associates and was replaced by his brother, Sultan-Shah, whom Ibn al-Azraq identifies correctly. For these events at Aleppo, cf. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 167-172; Bughyat, 152-7.

47. Matthew of Edessa places this event in the years 508-9/1115-6 (Chronique, 291). As the local historian, Ibn al-Azraq would normally be the more trustworthy source, were it not for the fact that an inscription in the name of Sultan Muhammad, datable c.510 and in any case before 511, the date of the sultan's death, is found on the west facade of this mosque, which was built at that time. The fire would provide the most natural motive for such a substantial rebuilding. For the text of this inscription, with commentary, see M. van Berchem and J. Strzygowski, Amida (Heidelberg, 1910), 55-9; see also M. van Berchem, "Arabische Inschriften", in Max Freiherr von Oppenheim, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien (Leipzig, 1909), 97.

48. Nasībīn lay in Diyār Rabi‘a, on the caravan route from Mosul to Syria, six days' journey from Mosul and nine farsakhs from Sinjār (Yāqūt, "Reisen", 435). Already in the fourth century A.H. it had fallen from its former elevated status as the intellectual centre of the Nestorians (E. Honigmann, "Nasībīn", EI').

Ibn Shaddād (Jazīra, f.37a) lists the rulers of this town as follows:
It would appear that Il-Ghāzī had held Naṣībīn on an earlier occasion, during the years 500-2/1106-8. His rule in the town was ended by the appointment of Maudūd. After Maudūd's murder in 507/1113-4, another rival of Il-Ghāzī, Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī, who had ousted him as shihna of Baghdad, became governor of Mosul and ruled Naṣībīn.

Perhaps Il-Ghāzī's victory at Balāṭ in 513/1119-20 gave him the confidence to seize Naṣībīn the following year.

49. Elsewhere, Ibn al-Azraq gives his full name as ʿAlām al-Dīn Abu'l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Yāhūd b. Nubāta. He belonged to an illustrious family whose members had held the post of ʿāḍī in Mayyāfārīqīn. He was born in 464/1071-2 (ʿAwād, 267).

50. The following passage about Georgia has been translated by Minorsky ("Caucasica I", 31-5). The Arabic text has been transcribed by Amedroz in a footnote to his edition of Ibn al-Qalānīsī (op.cit., 205). Part of this account and other subsequent passages in Ibn al-Azraq which refer to Georgia are also published in an Arabic reader for Georgian students (Arabuli Krest'omathia, ed. G.V. T'seret'heli (Tiflis, 1949), 68-72). T'seret'heli prefers to follow Ms.B, which is
generally a more lucid account than Ms.A.

51. The reputation of Il-Chāzī was never so high as after his resounding victory at the battle of Balāt. He was thus considered the most appropriate leader for this expedition to Georgia.

52. There is no textual justification for T'seret'heili's reading (op.cit.,58).


54. This period must have been between the end of the rule of the Shaddādid, Fadlūn (some time after 461-2/1068) and the occupation of King David the Restorer (515-6/1122). For further information, cf. M.F.Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au commencement du XIXe siècle (St.Petersburg, 1849) I/1,334 and Minorsky, Studies, 64.

55. King David the Restorer ruled Georgia from 1089-1125. By the end of his reign he had extended the frontiers of Georgia substantially, taking in much of Armenia including Ānī, Shīrvān, and the foothills of Dāghistān as far as Darband (Lang, op.cit., 112; Minorsky, Studies, 84). David had come to the throne after the death of his father, Giorgi, in 1089. After the death of Malik-Shāh, David dared to adopt a more aggressive policy. He stopped paying kharāj to the sultan and prevented the Turks from wintering in Georgia (Brosset, op.cit., I,352).

56. Minorsky defines the territory of the Abkhāz as western Georgia. The energetic kings of Tiflis were first of all kings of eastern Georgia (Kh'art'li) (V.F.Minorsky, review of H.Hasan,

58. The form used in this text is جنزى.

59. Arran is the area south-east of Tiflis between the Kur and the Araxes rivers. Yaqút says it is a vast province whose main towns are Barda’a, Shamkûr and Bailaqañ ("Reisen", 17).

60. Ms.A: وزارت
Ms.B: مزالت

In his transcription of this part of Ibn al-Azraq's text, Amedroz prefers the reading in Ms.A (Ibn al-Qalanisi, Dhail, 205). Minorsky, who translates the passage about Tiflis, and Tisseret'heli, who transcribes it, prefer to use the version in Ms.B.


63. Toghan Arslan is usually given the title al-ahdab ("the hunchback") (cf. Minorsky, Studies, 83,85). For details on his descendants, cf. n. 565.

64. Minorsky states that Toghan Arslan acquired Dvîn as a kind of "Transaraxian colony" (ibid.,83). Here he clearly refers to the well-known Dvîn which lies north of the Araxes. In his earlier article, however, Minorsky very properly suggests that there is confusion between the well-known Dvîn and "the Duvin belonging to Arzan (i.e. to the valley situated between the river of Bitlis and that of Mayyafariqîn)"("Caucasica I",32).
The suggestion about the "Transaraxian colony" is made without any explanation and in complete contradiction to his earlier hypothesis, which he merely states "needs correction".

In the Marwānid section of Ibn al-Azraq's text, Ibn al-Azraq appears to clarify the matter when he writes:

ومک تقز ارسلان السج الاهمرا سروع وطنز وباهمور
وكان مک مدينة دوين من بلد ارزون

(Awad, 269). It is certainly more logical to assume that a minor ruler like Toghan Arslan held a small place in Diyar Bakr rather than an important city so far away from his other possessions.

65. تخلع "to stay behind".

Minorsky wrongly translates this sentence as: "They arrived in Arzan al-Rūm (Erzerum) where the ḍādī and the vazir quarrelled" ("Caucasica I", 32).

66. Ms.Α: الفرس

Minorsky says Juvainī also spelt the name thus (ibid.). Amedroz is obviously wrong to read فرس (Ibn al-Qalānī, Dha'il, 205). T'seret'heli writes ترس (op.cit., 59).

67. Thrialetghi is a district to the south of Kūr, upstream from Gori. Minorsky says that the route of the invaders must have been Kars-Ardahan-Akhalcalaki (ibid., 32, n.10).

68. Dimitri I ruled 1125-54.

69. Amedroz reads كسر (op.cit., 205); Minorsky has اسر (op.cit., 33). Amedroz' reading makes better sense.

70. Ibn Shaddād writes that they escaped with twenty horsemen (Jazīra, f.102b). Cf. also Ms.Β, f.103b.

71. Ibn al-Azraq refers to one such prisoner on f.161b.
72. Minorsky draws attention to an earlier passage in Ibn al-Azraq's text (Ms.A, f. 64a) where the author describes a visit he made around the provinces with his master, King Dimitri. This may well be the same visit mentioned here. The details of the locality seem similar (V.F. Minorsky, *A History of Sharvan and Darband* [Cambridge, 1958], Annex V, 170-1).

73. Ms.A: 
الآن

Al-Lân were an Iranian people from the northern Caucasus (cf. V.F. Minorsky, *"Alân", EI2*).

74. Ms.A: 
وصلنا ...... إلى مرج واسع

There are several occasions in this text where it is difficult to distinguish between مرج and مرج. This is one such instance. A meadow inside the area of a citadel is attested at Hîsn Kaîfâ where crops were grown inside the citadel (Ibn Shaddâd, *Jâzîra*, f. 127a). On the other hand, the translation of مرج واسع as "broad tower" is also possible.

75. Ms.A: 
فنزل الملك وناك وتقال له ملك الإبحار

This rather strange repetition of the word *malik* is probably prompted by the fact that two separate rulers are involved.

In the earlier description of this visit (Ms.A, f. 64a), the *malik* of Darband, Amîr Abu 'l-Muzaffar, came to pay his respects to Dimitri, the King of the Abkhâz (Minorsky, *A History of Sharvan*, 170).

76. Two readings are possible here:-

i) مَستَعِرب an Arabic speaker

ii) مَستَعِرب a foreigner

‘Awad, who describes this anecdote in his introduction, opts for مَستَعِرب (op.cit., 2). The other hypothesis of مَستَعِرب seems preferable here.
In an earlier passage, Ibn al-Azraq states that Malik Ridwan died in 505/1111-2 (‘Awad, 278). Here he gives the date as 515/1121-2. Unusually for him, he expresses an opinion on their relative accuracy, opting for the earlier date. In fact, both the dates he gives are wrong, since Malik Ridwan died in 507/1113-4 (Ibn al-‘Adîm, Zubda, 164; Ibn al-Qalânisî, Dhail, 189).

Minorsky has made an error here by confusing وعده and وعده وعده. He translates this phrase as "he left them alone in all goodness" ("Caucasica I", 33).

(µu‘an) probably means "maintenance costs". It came under the category of illegal taxes (Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 80). Cf. also Dozy, Supplément II, 566.

Cf. the article "Kharâj", EI²; Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 78-9.

Copper coins which correspond to this description and which have the Georgian king's name or monogram on the obverse and the caliph's name on the reverse were minted in large numbers under King Dimitri (D.M. Lang, Studies in the Numismatic History of Georgia in Transcaucasia [New York, 1955], 17). Lang interprets the presence of the caliph's name on the coin not as a sign of political dependence on the part of the Georgian king, but as a conciliatory gesture towards the Muslim inhabitants of the Georgian capital (ibid.).

The exact meaning of خدمة is unclear. As King David is evidently treating the Muslims more favourably than the Georgians, Armenians or Jews, some kind of taxation is probably
involved.

83. King David is praised here for his kind treatment of his Muslim subjects, just as Malik-Shāh is mentioned in laudatory terms by Georgian sources. Giorgi, the father of King David, went in person to Malik-Shāh in Isfahān to complain about the ravages of the Turks into his territory. Malik-Shāh stopped these incursions into Georgia, on condition that Giorgi paid kharāj (M.F. Brosset, Georgie I, 349).

84. For the dikka, cf. J. Pedersen, "Masjdīd", EI.

85. Sibt b. al-Jauzī interprets this passage more literally (cf. Chapter II, p. 31).


87. Cf. Sibt b. al-Jauzī, Mirāt, 102. An earlier attack on Ganja by the Georgians in 503/1109-10 had been repelled (Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dhail, 167; al-Husainī, Akhbar, 81). King David obviously saw the devastated city as a prime source of plunder.

88. Ms.A: دخلت الاشاري الى تفليس على الحجل من كثرتهم. Three possible meanings may be adduced for the phrase على الحجل.

The first would appear to be the most satisfactory.

i) "on carts".

The meaning "cart" is attested by Sauvaget (J. Sauvaget, Les Trésors d'Or de Sibt b. al-'Ajami [Beirut, 1950], II, 76).

King David would use carts in order to prevent the enormous number of prisoners mentioned from escaping and to speed up his departure from Ganja where he was vulnerable to attack.

ii) "hurriedly"

King David would be anxious to get back to Tiflis with
the greatest possible haste.

iii) "sheep-fold"

This is a rather unlikely possibility. It might be an Arabicisation of the Turkish word *agil*, "enclosure for livestock, sheep-fold" (Clauson, *op.cit.*, 83a).

89. Ibn al-Azraq has already given the date of Maudūd's death as 508/1114-5, (‘Awad, 280). There he writes that Maudūd was buried in the "Green Tower" (*ibid.*). Maudūd was in fact assassinated in 507/1113-4. According to Ibn al-Qalānīšī, he was buried in the *mašhād* inside the *Bāb al-Farādis* (Dhail, 187-8).

90. Mārđīn was clearly the centre of Il-Ghāżī’s power, the place to which he always returned for rest and reinforcements.

Ibn Shaddād gives a long description of the town. He mentions a *madṛasa* which was founded by Il-Ghāżī. Outside the town to the east was an open square around which the Artuqids built a wall (*Jazīra*, ff.130a-b).

Ms.B points out that Temūr-Tash had stayed behind in Mārđīn, while the *khātun* and Sulaimān accompanied Il-Ghāżī to Mayyāfārīqīn (f.105a).

91. The exact locality of this place remains obscure. Honigmann mentions a place called Ausal/Oal "before the gates of Amīd" (Ostgrenze, 98). Matthew of Edessa writes about a place called "Aucal, à deux portées de flèche d'Amid" (*Chronique*, 13).

Ibn al-Qalānīšī states that Il-Ghāżī died at a village called al-Fuhūl in Diyār Bakr (Dhail, 208). For this kind of information, however, Ibn al-Azraq as the chronicler of the Artuqids is more likely to be correct.
92. The dates given by the chroniclers for the death of Il-Ghāzī may be tabulated as follows:

Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A: 27 Ramadān 516
Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.B: 17 Ramadān 516
Sibt b. al-Jazī (Mir'āt, 103)
Ibn al-Qalānisī 6 Ramadān 516 (Dhail, 208)
Ibn al-'Adīm 1 Ramadān 516 (Zubda, 206)

Again, in spite of Ibn al-Azraq's unreliable chronology, one of the dates in his history is more likely to be correct here. He should know best when a major political figure from his own area died. However, it must be admitted that neither 17 nor 27 Ramadān 516 fell on a Thursday.

93. The Huwa gate is mentioned by Ibn Shaddād who recounts an anecdote to explain how it acquired its name (Jazīra, f.69b).

94. The term wālī presents problems of precise definitions. Its meaning under the Saljuqs is well-known. The wālī was the representative of the ruler, responsible for all aspects of the administration of a province (Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 46). In outlying districts such as Diyār Bakr in the early sixth/twelfth century a new overlord of a town would leave behind a wālī to ensure his master's continued tenure there.

95. This name presents great problems. Ibn Shaddād renders it in three different ways:

(ībīd., f.102b) (ībīd., f.104b) and (ībīd., f.58b)
Koprülü rightly criticises Cahen for his reading of this name as Kuzugli (see his review of "Diyar Bakr" in Belleten, Cilt 1, Sayı 1 [1937], 287). Similarly, Artuk's version of Köngli is very unsatisfactory (op.cit., 60). Turan's reading would appear to be the most sensible: Oğuzoğlu (Doğu Anadolu, 89).

There is a possibility that the name might be Közoğlu but it is less satisfactory.

Whatever the reading of the name, this man was the mamlük of Sukmân al-Qutbî who appointed him wâli of Mayyâfârîqîn in 502/1108-9, where he remained until 506/1112-3 (Ibn Shaddâd, Janîra, f.101a; 'Awaç, 274-5, 279).

96. Ms.A: وكلمة شمس الدولة والخيلوان
"to whom Shams al-Daula and the khâtûn had given instructions".
This passage is very obscure. The sequence of events is not clear. Another possible translation might be:-
"A shaikh who had been a companion of Najm al-Dîn since his early days went inside and told him (the wâli) that Shams al-Daula and the khâtûn were there".

97. This subterfuge was necessitated by their desire to enter Mayyâfârîqîn at all costs and gain possession of the citadel before news of Il-Ghazi's death leaked out. Hence they travelled by night. Once in control of the citadel, they could announce officially that Il-Ghazi was dead and thus secure the city for Sulaimân. For a fuller discussion of this episode, cf. Chapter VIII.

98. Ibn Khallikân, in his biography of Nasr al-Daula b. Marwân al-Kurdî, quotes Ibn al-Azraq to the effect that this ruler was buried in the castle of al-Sidîlî, whence his body was
afterwards removed to the vault of the Banū Marwān adjoining the Muḥaddatha mosque. Ibn Khallikān notes that al-Siddīlī is the name of a dome situated in the castle of Mayyāfārīqīn, that this dome is built upon three pillars and that sīdīlī is a Persian word, signifying "three props" (Wafayāt, I, 157-9).

99. The gubbat al-sultan was built by Khumar-Tash, the mamlūk of Qilīch Arslān b. Sulaimān b. Qutlumush. Qilīch Arslān was buried there after his body had been retrieved from the Khābūr and brought to Mayyāfārīqīn (ʿAwad, 273).

100. ʿIl-Ghāzī settled Sultan-Shāh b. Rūdān and the daughters of Rūdān in a house at Aleppo after he had taken the city (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 185). He later married one of Rūdān's daughters to consolidate his possession in Aleppo, after his son, Sulaimān, had rebelled there in 515/1121-2 (ibid., 202-3).

101. This assertion is contradicted by Ibn al-ʿAdīm who writes that the union was consummated in Aleppo (ibid., 203).

102. For Khartābīr, cf. Canard, H'anđanides, 260; Markwart, Südarmenien, 69, 95.

103. For the career of Balak, cf. C.Cahen, "Balak", EJ 2; O.Turan, Doğu Anadolu, 151-5.

104. For an analysis of Daʿūd b. Sukmān of Hisn Kaifā, cf. Chapter VIII.

105. Sulaimān was attempting to restore to the territory of Mayyāfārīqīn its old boundaries, by taking Haza from his cousin, Daʿūd of Hisn Kaifā, and by reconquering the lands taken by Ḥusām al-Daula of Arzan.

106. Cahen rightly amends the name Ḥusām al-Dīn to Ḥusām al-Daula ("Diyār Bakr", 241). This ruler is in fact Qurtī, the son of
Toghan Arslan al-Ahdab, who inherited the family territories of Bitlis and Arzan (Minorsky, Studies, 85).

107. Al-Afdal b. Badr al-Jamali, the famous Fatimid vizier, was assassinated in 515/1121. Ibn al-Qalânisî strongly refutes the suggestion that the Batinis were responsible for his death. He claims that the real cause was an estrangement between al-Afdal and the caliph (Dhaîl, 203). For the death of al-Afdal, cf. also Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmîl, X, 416; Ibn Khallikân, Wafayât, I, 614; F. Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Fatimiden - Chalifen (Göttingen, 1881), 289-90).

108. Ibn Shaddâd describes the building of this tower at Mayyâfarîqîn (Jazîra, f.68a).

109. Ms.A: This name has been read as Khutlugh-Shâh.

110. This marriage of Sulaimân b. Il-Ghazi with the daughter of Sultan Qîlîch Arslan of Malâtya may well represent an attempt by Sulaimân to emulate his successful cousin Balâq, who had allied himself to the Saljuqs of Rûm and wielded power thereby.


111. The name Temûr-Tash only rarely occurs in Ibn al-Azraq's text. Usually this ruler is known under the title al-Sâ'îd Husam al-Dîn. When the name Temûr-Tash appears, it has the form تمرهتش. For the etymology of this name, cf. J. Sauvaget, "Noms et Surnoms de Mamelouks", Journal Asiatique, Tome CCXXXVIII (1950), 47.
In the edition, the underlined ... has been removed. Whilst it is possible that "Husam al-Din and his son were in Mardin", the most likely reading is "When Najm al-Din died, it happened that his son Husam al-Din Temur-Tash was in Mardin." On f. 163a (page 283 of the translation) Ibn al-Azraq lists the children of Temur-Tash. The only one of them born before 520/1126-7 was Safiya Khatun whom he described as the eldest of Temur-Tash's children. His sons whose names are known were born in 520 and thereafter.

There is general agreement in the sources that Temur-Tash succeeded his father at Mardin (cf. Anon. Syr. Chron., 89; Ibn al-Qalani, 208; Ibn al-Athir, Kamal, X, 426; Ibn al-'Adim, Zubda, 209).

Cahen gives this name as Akdish (Diyar Bakr", 240). One possible reading of this word might be Ldish ("eunuch") (cf. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devleti, 115).

A more attractive alternative is the word transcribed as Houtsma as "Agdish" which he translates as "Pferd von gemischter Rasse" (M.T. Houtsma, Ein Türkisch-Arabisches Glossar (Leiden, 1894, 51).

In a later work, Cahen defines the word ikdish as a "gelding or cross-bred animal". From this meaning, it came to mean a human being of mixed race. In Asia Minor, it referred mainly to the offspring of unions between Turks and the indigenous inhabitants (C. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, tr. J. Jones-Williams, [London, 1968], 192).
115. It was the common practice at this time amongst the Saljuqs and other Turkish rulers for an atābeg to marry the mother of his young ward.


117. Cahen mentions in a footnote to his genealogical table of the Artuqids that Mahmūd was governor of Mārdīn and then exiled ("Diyār Bakr", 168) but he does not cite his source.

118. For the death of Sulaimān, cf. also Sibt b. al-Jawzī (Miḥrāt, 117); Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 220).

119. The bodies of Il-Ghāzī and his son, Sulaimān, were later transferred to Mārdīn by Temür-Tash (cf. p. 344/f. 171a).

120. ختلشام This is probably an attempt to reproduce the name Khutlugh-Shāh.

121. The acquisition of the citadels of Mayyafārīqīn and Mārdīn presented great difficulties to any would-be conqueror. They could be taken either by negotiation, usually after a protracted siege (e.g. the conquest of Mayyafārīqīn by Ibn Jahīr in 478/1085-6) or by subterfuge (e.g. Yaqtī's acquisition of Mārdīn, cf. supra, n. 17).

Typically, Temür-Tash preferred to negotiate with the wāli of his late brother. Sulaimān, of course, had opted for a trick to enter the citadel. Temür-Tash was not the only ruler interested in Mayyafārīqīn and his succession there after his brother's death was by no means a foregone conclusion.

122. The death of the senior member of the family, Il-Ghāzī, shortly
followed by that of his son Sulaimān, left a power vacuum in Diyār Bakr. Both Da'ūd and Temūr-Tash possessed a strong base in the area, at Hisn Kaifa and Mārdīn respectively, but Mayyaḡāriqīn lay without a protector.

The history of the period 518-538/1124-44 in Diyār Bakr is dominated by the rivalry of these two cousins and by their relationship with Zangā.

123. Ibn Shaddād gives a detailed description of Hisn Kaifa. He stresses the impregnability of its citadel and lists the town's monuments. The citadel had within its enclosure a green maidān and fields where enough wheat, barley and grains were grown to feed its inhabitants from year to year. In the rabad to the north were bazaars, khāns, madrasas, hammāms, tombs and the turbas of the Banū Marwān and the Banū Artuq (Jazīra, f.127a).

124. Temūr-Tash had hurried to Mārdīn from Aleppo on 25 Rajab 518 to ask for help from his brother against the Franks at Aleppo and to collect troops (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 223). While Temūr-Tash was at Mārdīn, Sulaimān died and Temūr-Tash went quickly to Mayyaḡāriqīn. He was preoccupied with the acquisition of his brother's territories to the exclusion of thinking about Aleppo (ibid.,225).

125. The negotiations must have lasted several weeks since Sulaimān had died at the beginning of the previous month, Ramadān, and it is to be assumed that Temūr-Tash acted quickly.

126. According to Sauvaget, there were two versions of this name: ایاز and ایاس (op.cit., 39). Ms.A has the form ایاس whilst Ms.B prefers ایاس for the death of Ayāz, cf. Chapter VIII.
127. This is a reference to the third Saltuqid ruler of Erzerum (cf. O. Turan, Doğu Anadolu, 8 and 241). His full title was Alp Toghril Beg Abu'l-Muzaffar Ghazi (cf. R. H. Unal, Les Monuments Islamiques Anciens de la Ville d'Erzurum et de sa Région [Paris, 1968], 26).

128. This name is unclear in the manuscripts. The disposition of the letters appears to be . Cahen read Tafratı (Diyar Bakr, 268). Artuk prefers Tughrati (I. Artuk, Mardin Artukoğullari Tarihi [Istanbul, 1944]). Artuk's genealogical table is on the last unnumbered page of his book.

129. The order of events is confused here. According to Ibn al-Cadi, Temur-Tash took possession of Aleppo on Wednesday 20 Rabi' I 518, after the death of Balak two days before. He then left for Mardin on 25 Rajab 518 and acquired Mayyafariqin after the death of his brother, Sulaiman (Zubda, 220-5).

A striking characteristic of Ibn al-Azraq's history is his lack of interest and information about Aleppan affairs. This elliptical reference to Temur-Tash's acquisition and loss of Aleppo may be the result of a genuine lack of information about these events. A more probable motive, in this instance at least, is a desire on the part of Ibn al-Azraq to suppress the facts about Temur-Tash's role in Aleppan affairs which did not redound to his credit.

130. Once in power at Aleppo, Temur-Tash's first important step was to release Baldwin, on Friday 17 Rajab 518. Baldwin had agreed to hand over a number of citadels and a large ransom but immediately after his release he violated his agreement with Temur-Tash. Baldwin allied with Dubais and other parties
interested in Aleppo and Temür-Tash went to Mardīn to seek help from his brother. Messengers were sent to Temür-Tash from the people of Aleppo. He ignored their entreaties, temporised with them and finally imprisoned them. The messengers, one of whom was an ancestor of Ibn al-ʿAdīm, escaped and sought help instead from Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī, who went and took Aleppo in Dhu’l-Hijja 518/January 1125 (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 223-30; Bughyat, 204-7).

The illegible part of this passage in Ms.A is not found in Ms.B. The text seems to read:

شتم أنه عاوض بها... خذكى وأسلم حلب

131. This incident is recorded in detail by Ibn al-Athīr. The shihna of Baghdad came into conflict with the caliph, al-Mustarshid, in 519/1125-6. The shihna left Baghdad that same year and complained to the sultan of his treatment at the hands of the caliph. He informed the sultan that the caliph was raising troops to prevent him from entering Iraq. Sultan Mahmūd left for Iraq and although the caliph asked him not to come to Baghdad, the sultan persisted. He arrived in Baghdad on 20 Dhu’l-Hijja 519 and stayed until 10 Rabi‘ II 520. There were skirmishes between the troops of the sultan and caliph and finally the caliph sought peace. Mahmūd appointed a new shihna of Baghdad, Zangī (Atabegs, 28-31; Kamīl, X, 447-450). Cf. also Mustauffī, Guzīdā, 345.

Ibn al-Azraq's dates are wrong, since the sources seem agreed that the murder of Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī took place at the end of 520 in Dhu'l-Qāda. Ibn al-"Adīm and Ibn Khallikān agree that the exact date was Friday 9 Dhu'l-Qāda 520. Ibn al-Athīr has 8 Dhu'l-Qāda.

133. 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd succeeded his father at Mosul and was confirmed in his post by Sultan Mahmūd. Mas'ūd took his main adviser, Chavli, who had been one of his father's mamlūks. The following year, however - 521/1127 - Mas'ūd died (Ibn al-Athīr, Atabegs, 32). Cf. also Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, 252-3.

134. Bahā' al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī belonged to the eminent Shahrazūrī family which furnished the Zanjīd dynasty with many of its qādīs (cf. infra, nn. 45 and 380).

135. Nasīr al-Dīn Jaqar was an important adviser and associate of Zanjī (cf. infra, n. 204).

136. Ms. B writes the name الأغساني اليهسياني. According to Usāma, Salāh al-Dīn possessed unusual ferocity and cruelty. This man, who had held the office of ḥājib in the time of Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī, is mentioned frequently by Usāma (Memoirs, 187-9).

137. Ibn al-Athīr also mentions that Chavli's envoys took a large sum of money with them (Atabegs, 32).

138. خدمة is used here in accordance with Dozy's definition: "témoigner son respect à quelqu'un, en lui offrant quelque chose" (Supplément I, 354).

139. Ibn al-Azraq's account differs from that of Ibn al-Athīr in a number of important details. Ibn al-Athīr puts the date
of the visit to Baghdad of officials from Mosul in 521/1127-8. Jaqar was not in Mosul, as Ibn al-Azraq suggests, but in Baghdad with Zangī. Chavli, who had taken control in Mosul, sent Bahāʾ al-Dīn al-Shahrazurī and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Yaghī- Siyānī to Baghdad to ask the sultan to confirm the young brother of ʿIzz al-Dīn Masʿūd as ruler of Mosul. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Masʿūd himself had died in 521/1127 (Atabegs, 32). This date is confirmed by Ibn al-Qalānīsī (Dhail, 217) and Ibn Khallikān, who gives the exact day as 22 Jumādā II 521 (Wafayāt, I, 228).

140. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Bahāʾ al-Dīn and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn were worried by Chavli's power at Mosul. When they arrived in Baghdad, therefore, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn met Nasīr al-Dīn Jaqar who was a relation of his by marriage. Jaqar suggested that Zangī should assume power at Mosul. Jaqar and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn then returned to Bahāʾ al-Dīn and tried to persuade him to give Zangī his support. After the promise of iqṭaʿs, Bahāʾ al-Dīn agreed to the plan. The two envoys from Mosul then had a meeting with the sultan's vizier, Anūshīrvān b. Khālid. They said that the son of al-Bursuqī was a mere child and that Mosul needed a determined, courageous man to defend it (Atabegs, 34-5). Cf. also Bar Hebraeus' account (Chronography, 253).

141. Ms. A has the name Qasīm al-Daula Zangī b. Aq-Sonqr (sic). This has been corrected in the translation to read "Zangī b. Qasīm al-Daula Aq-Sonqr".

The father of Zangī was called Qasīm al-Daula Aq-Sonqr, whilst Zangī himself was known as "Atābeg b. Qasīm al-Daula" (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Rughyat, 97 and 251).
142. Ibn al-Athir mentions no meeting with Zangi to discuss the distribution of offices.

143. According to Ibn al-Athir, Bahā' al-Dīn was made chief qādi of all Zangi's existing territories and any other places which might be conquered subsequently. Of all the officials, he was the closest to Zangi and the most powerful (Atabegs, 35).

144. For a description of the office of ājjab in Saljuq times, cf. Usuncarsili, op. cit., 35-6. The ājjab acted as an intermediary between the ruler and his government (cf. also El, s.v. ājjab; Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 18-9).

145. The head of the ruler's own personal troops. For a definition of the term cāskar, cf. infra, n. 615.

146. According to Ibn al-Athir, Salah al-Dīn received the office of amīr ājjab (Atabegs, 35).

147. Nasīr al-Dīn Jaqar was made governor of Mosul and was given overall responsibility for the administration of the province and its citadels (ibid.).

148. The account given by Ibn al-Azraq broadly agrees with that of Michael the Syrian (Chronique, 229).

Ibn al-Athir has another account of Zangi's acquisition of Mosul (Kāmil, X, 453-4). Cf. also Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, 253-4; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, I, 540.

149. Mahmūd had two small sons, Alp Arslan and Farrukh-Shāh. There is, however, confusion in the sources on the question of which of them had the title al-Khafajī. Ibn al-Azraq clearly does not give the title to Alp Arslan but he does not know the names of Mahmūd's other son. Ibn al-Athir speaks of Alp Arslan al-Khafajī (Atabegs, 71), whilst Bundārī mentions Farrukh-Shāh al-Khafajī (Zubdat, 205).
150. For a definition of the term atābeg, cf. M.F. Sanaullah, The 
Decline of the Saljuqid Empire (Calcutta, 1938), 5-7.

151. Ms. B has: "They asked for one of his sons and that Zangī should 
be his atābeg".

It is significant to note that it was regarded as necessary 
to preserve the fiction that by the use of the two maliks the 
sultan's line was still in power. By the same token, Chavli 
had wanted the stamp of the sultan's official approval for the 
government at Mosul to be invested in the son of Aq-Sonqur al-
Bursuqī. The de facto ruler would of course have been Chavli, 
if his plan had succeeded.

152. The sources are generally agreed that Zangī took possession of 
Mosul in 521/1121. This year is given by Ibn al-Athīr (Atābeg, 
34; Kāmil, X, 454) and Ibn Shaddād (Jazīra, f. 45a). Ibn 
Khallīkān records the exact date as 10 Muharram 521/27 January 
1127 (Wafayāt I, 540).

153. Once again, Ibn al-Azraq's chronology is inaccurate. The date 
of Balak's death is discussed by J. Sauvaget ("La tombe de 
l'Ortokide Balak", Ars Islamica V, 207-15). The inscription on 
his tomb records the date of Balak's death as Rabī' I 518 (April-
May 1124).

Amongst the chroniclers, Ibn al-'Ādīm gives the most 
detailed account of Balak's death. He notes the date as 19 
Rabī' I 518 (Zubda, 219). Cf. also Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, X, 436; 
al-'Āzīmī, "Chronique", 394; Ibn al-Furāt, Duval, I, f. 196a 
(apud Cahen, notes to al-'Āzīmī, "Chronique", 440).

For an account of Balak's career, cf. O. Turan, Doğu Anadolu, 
151-5.
154. Ms.A: كاوكو (sic). Bālū was variously called Falu and Bālūnos (cf. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 30-2; Markwart describes Bālū as lying west of Khartabirt (خمرت) and east of Sumaisāt (Südarmenien, 242).


156. Jubuq was in the service of Ibn Jahīr when the latter took Mayyāfārīqīn. Ibn Jahīr gave him Khartabirt which remained in the possession of Jubuq and his descendants until Balak took it from them. After losing Khartabirt, Jubuq's descendants served the Artuqids at Hisn Kaifa (‘Awad, 212-3). Ibn Shaddād relates that after Ibn Jahīr had taken Diyar Bakr, Amīr Jubuq stayed behind with 300 horsemen. After he died, his sons took his territory (Jazīra, f.94a).


Michael the Syrian relates that since Dā‘ūd had stolen a march on Gümüş-Tegin Ghaṣī at Khartabirt, the latter pillaged the area of Khanzīt and took Mazara (Chronique, 220).

158. Tugh-Tegin died on Saturday 8 Safar 522 (Ibn al-Qalānisī, Dhail, 219).

159. Ibn al-Furāt gives the date of Sultan Mahmūd's death as Thursday 5 Shawwāl 525. He then adds without comment that "Ibn al-Asraq al-Fārizī gave the date as 15 (sic) Shawwāl 524 and mentioned that he died outside Isfahān, where he was buried" (Duwal, f.29b).
Ibn Khallikān gives the date as Thursday 15 Shawwāl 525. He also cites the date given by Ibn al-Azraq but he too makes no comment in its accuracy (Wafayāt III, pt. 1, 346).

This has been translated as "Also in that year the vizier al-Mazdaqānī, Bahrām and all the Ismāʿīlīs were killed".

This passage reveals a complete confusion on the part of Ibn al-Azraq or his scribe or both. In order to make sense of the historical facts, a ' has been added between "Bahrām" and "all the Bātinīs".

This incident is covered in detail by Ibn al-Qalānīsī (Dhail, 220-5). Bahrām, the propagandist of the Bātinīs at Damascus, was aided in the advancement of his aims by the vizier Abu'l-Tāhir al-Mazdaqānī. The latter was killed at Damascus at the instigation of Būrī b. Togh-Tegin on 17 Ramadan 523 (1129). Thereafter the townspeople seized known Ismāʿīlīs and killed them.

Bahrām was not killed at Damascus but in the valley of Tayyim during the previous year. He had been given the frontier fortress of Bāniyās by Togh-Tegin to hold against the Franks. Whilst Il-Ghāzī was in charge of Aleppo, Bahrām had persuaded him to recommend him to Togh-Tegin. At Damascus he had preached openly (M.G.S.Hodgson, The Order of Assassins [The Hague, 1955], 104-5).

161. Ibn al-Azraq is probably unaware of the complicated power-struggle which followed the death of Sultan Mahmūd. Toghril was Sanjar's candidate. He acceded to the throne after Sanjar had defeated Mas'ūd and Dā'ūd, who also aspired to the sultanate in the western part of the Saljuq empire.


Toghril finally came to the throne in Jumādā II 526 (Bundārī, Zubdat, 160). As for his death, whilst Ibn al-Qalānisī puts it in 528, most sources give Muharram 529 (e.g. Kāmil, XI, 11; Atabegs, 49; Rawandi, Rahāt, 208; Mustaufī, Gūzīda, 346). Ibn al-Jauzī gives an exact date of Wednesday 3 Muharram 529 (Muntazam, X, 53). Once again, Ibn al-Azraq's dates are chaotic.

162. The text of Ms. A mentions no name for this sultan but the context makes it clear that Sultan Muhammad is meant. For a genealogical table of the late Saljuqs and especially of those mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq on these pages, cf. Appendix B, infra, p. 517.


164. Ms. A

This part of the text is almost certainly incomplete. Ms. B
offers no help. Either a place-name such as Jīrīf should be inserted or if translated as it stands جَنَبٌ might mean the same as جَنَبٌ. This latter suggestion is far from satisfactory.

165. There is general agreement in the sources that Daʿūd died in 538/1143-4, not in 539/1144-5, as Ibn al-Azraq suggests. Bundarī says that Daʿūd married a daughter of Sultan Masʿūd and that he died in Tabrīz in 538. Bundarī also hints that Zangī had instigated his murder (Zubdat, 195). Al-ʿAzīmī gives a more precise date, Rabīʾ I 538, and states that he was killed in Tabrīz by three men (Chronique, 423). Cf. also Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dhall, 277; al-Husainī, Akhbār, 114.

Daʿūd was a claimant to the sultanate after the death of Mahmūd, his father, but Sanjar opted for Toghrīl. Daʿūd's power base was Āzarbāiǰān. After Masʿūd's accession, Daʿūd was finally mollified by Masʿūd's appointing him his heir (cf. Bosworth, "Iranian World", 124-5).

166. Muhammad b. Mahmūd is discussed in greater detail by Ibn al-Azraq on p. 332/175b.

167. Malik-Shah b. Mahmūd is also discussed by Ibn al-Azraq on p. 332/175b.

168. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Alp Arslan was still alive in 539/1144-5 and it was he who was responsible for the death of Nasīr al-Dīn Jaqar in that year. Zangī was waiting for Masʿūd to die so that he could make Alp Arslan sultan in his place (Atabegs, 71-2).

Alp Arslan was a significant protagonist in the events which followed the assassination of Zangī in 541/1146. He was misled into the belief that he would rule at Mosul but was in
fact taken prisoner (Ibn al-Azraq, p. 319/ f. 72a).


For a detailed analysis of the short reign of Sulaimān-Shāh, cf. ibid., 114-128. The important events in the career of Sulaimān-Shāh before he became sultan are discussed by Bosworth, "Iranian World", especially 144, 155 and 169. He ruled 555-6/1160-1 and was murdered in 556/1161 (Rāwandī, Rāhat, 279; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, XI, 175; Bundarī, Zubdat, 296; al-Husainī, Akhbār, 144).

170. Saljuq-Shāh was the only one of Muhammad's five sons who did not eventually rule as sultan (Bosworth "Iranian World", 119). On the death of Mahmūd, he had made a bid for authority from his power base in Fārs and Khūzistān, supported by his atābeg, Qaracha. He was also involved in the events of the caliphal crisis of 529-30/1134-6 and thereafter (ibid., 128-9). In 532/1137-8 Saljuq-Shāh made peace with his brother Masʿūd who gave him the territories which had belonged to the Shāh-ʿArman whose centre of power was Akhlāt (Bundarī, Zubdat, 185; al-Husainī, Akhbār, 111). It is significant to note Ibn al-Azraq's isolated comment on Ms. A, f. 167b where he writes that Saljuq-Shāh laid siege to Akhlāt in 532 but then withdrew.

Qara-Sonqur put Saljuq-Shāh in power in Fārs in 533/1138-9 but the following year he was deposed by Boz-Aba. He probably died in captivity (Bosworth, "Iranian World", 129-30).
171. Mas'ūd Bilāl was shīhna of Baghdad until al-Muqtasī drove him out on the death of Sultan Mas'ūd. Cf. p. 381 /f. 175b.

172. Arslan-Shāh's mother married Eldgiūz after the death of Toghril (Mustaflī, Cuzīda, 352 and 358). Arslan Shāh came to the throne in Dhu‘l-Qa‘da 555/1160 at Hamadhān (Ḥusainī, Akhbār, 145). Eldgiūz was proclaimed atābeg al-ʿazam and was to play the key role in the new régime (ibid.; Bundari, Zubdat, 297). Arslan-Shāh died in Jumādā II 571/December-January 1175-6 (Rawandi, Rāḥat, 301).

173. Ms.A: 

Under Arslan-Shāh and the de facto ruler, his step-father Eldgiūz, Arrān and Āzarbājān were again closely united with al-Jībāl (Luther, op.cit., 141).

According to Le Strange, Shamkūr was one of the major cities of Arrān; it lay to the north-west of Bardinā, on the road to Tiflīs (Lands, 178-9).

174. Sarja was a fortress some fifteen kilometres west of Nasībīn (cf. Canard, Ḥ’madanides, 100, n.54; Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 20). According to Yaqtūt, the fortress lay between Nasībīn, Dunaisir and Dārā ("Reisen", 436).

175. Dārā lay to the south-east of Mārdīn, five farsakhs from Nasībīn (Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 20-4). It received its name from Darius (Yaqtūt, "Reisen", 436).

Sibt b. al-Jawzī says that Zangī took Dārā in 524 (Mir'āt, 189).

176. This incident is repeated on f.164b (cf. p.288 n. 99).

Here, as on several other occasions, Ibn al-Azraq is apparently
unaware that he repeats his material. Such lack of care adds confusion to his already generally inaccurate dates.

177. Sayyida Khatun had married Sulaimān b. ʿIl-Chāzī when he had assumed power at Mayyāfārīqīn in 516/1122.

(cf. also Ibn Shaddād, Jazīra, f.103a).


179. Ms.B: "Amir Daʿūd had married her mother, ʿĀlsha Khatun".

180. Ms.B calls him Malik Toghrīl. This must be a reference to the son of ʿQilīch Arslān whom Justi calls Toghrīl Arslān. Justi says he was driven out in 1109 and died around 1128 (op.cit., 453).

He states no source for this information.

After ʿQilīch Arslān died in 500/1106-7, his widow sought out Balak, who married her and gave her his protection (Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 200). Amongst the sons whom ʿQilīch Arslān left were Masʿūd, Malik-Shāh, ʿArab and Toghrīl Arslān (Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, 298-9).

Chabot (Chronique de Michael le Syrien, 204, n.4) and Turan are in no doubt that the sultan of Malatya was Toghrīl Arslān (O.Turan, Selçuklular Zamaninda Türkiye [İstanbul, 1971], 153). Dulaurier, on the other hand, is more tentative but nevertheless opts for Toghrīl Arslān as the most likely person (Matthew of Edessa, 466 n.3).

181. Al-ʿĀmir was caliph of the Fātimids from 495/1101 - 524/1130. Ibn al-Qalānisī records the date of his death as Tuesday 2 Dhuʾl-Qaʿda 524/November 1130 (Dhail, 228). The year 524 is also attested by al-ʿAzīzī (Chronique, 403), whilst Ibn al-Jauzī confirms the exact date given by Ibn al-Qalānisī (Muntazam, X, 16).
182. For various explanations of how and why Zangī came to have Dubais with him, cf. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 248-9; Bughyat, 231-2; Ibn al-Athīr, Atabeg, 46-7; Kamīl, X, 470-1; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 241; Ibn al-Qalānisī, Dhail, 230-1.

Ibn al-ʿAdīm stresses that Dubais was surprised to be well treated by Zangī. After the caliph al-Mustarshid had tried unsuccessfully to persuade Zangī to surrender Dubais, the caliph defeated the joint forces of Zangī and Dubais in Shaʿbān 526. Zangī returned to Mosul, whilst Dubais fled to Sanjar (Zubda, 251).

183. Turan reads this passage as:-

"Gurikat Merākib al-ahlatiyye biʾl - bahr Konstantiniyye fetagarrakta fiḥā cemaʿatun min el- Ahlatiyye" (sic) (Doğu Anadolu, 90, n.21). Ms.A clearly has whilst the word transcribed by Turan as "fe-tagarrakta" is illegible in the manuscript. The arrangement of the letters seems to be تصل (f.164a, 1.9). Possibly the verb تصل or is used here. The translation given is only tentative but is derived from the context.

Turan accepts the date 506 given by Ibn al-Azraq as correct, although this piece of information is placed in a group of events which occurred in 525 and 526. Even Ibn al-Azraq keeps to a rough chronological framework, although many individual dates are inaccurate.

One perplexing aspect of Turan's book is the way in which he cites references from Ibn al-Azraq. He states in his bibliography that he has used B.M.Or. 5803 (ibid.,249), yet his individual folio references to that manuscript (Ms.A) do
not tally remotely with the information he cites. The above passage which has been quoted in full from Turan is found on f.163a. Turan says it comes from f.172a. His book abounds with similar instances.

184. Finik was formerly called Phoenica and Fanak. It was situated twelve kilometres from Jazīra b.‘Umar (V.F.Minorsky, "Kurds", E1). Turan says it comes from f.172a. His book abounds with similar instances.

185. The exact location of Qatalbas is not clear. Cahen places it between Isʿīr and Khīzān ("Diyār Bakr", 223). The place is mentioned without details by Ibn Shaddād (Jazīra, f.65a).

186. Bātāsā is listed by Ibn Shaddād amongst the fortresses of Diyār Bakr (ibid.) The name is spelt in Marsh 333 as باتاسا. Cahen places it in the region of Isʿīr ("Diyār Bakr", 221).

187. This is a continuation of the discussion of Fātimid history which was cut short above.

188. In the earlier part of Ibn al-Azraq's history which deals with the Marwānids, the author discusses in some detail the question of the nass and the circumstances of the Nizārī schism (ʿAwad, op.cit., 276). There the phraseology is virtually identical:

189. For the confused events surrounding the succession of al-Āmīr see S.M.Stern, "The succession to the Fātimid caliph al-Āmīr", Orients 4 (1951), 193-255. According to some sources, an heir, al-Tayyib, was born to al-Āmīr in 524/1130 but his fate was shrouded in mystery (ibid., 195-202).

On the other hand, Wüstefeld, who follows a similar account to that of Ibn al-Azraq's source, relates that as
al-Amir left no male successor, his cousin, 'Abd al-Majīd, was next in line of succession. The populace, however, demanded a delay until the pregnancy of al-Amir's wife reached its term. If a son should be born, 'Abd al-Majīd was only to act as regent. The wife had a daughter, however (F. Wüstefeld, Geschichte der Fatimiden - Chalifen [Göttingen, 1881], 300).

In his biography of al-Hāfiz, Ibn Khallikān adheres to a narrative similar to that of Ibn al-Azraq (Wafayāt, II, 179-181).

What is more certain is that 'Abd al-Majīd at first acted only as regent but he later proclaimed himself caliph (ibid., 202-7).

190. The following genealogy of the Fatimids is relevant here:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>al-Mustansir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nizar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hāfiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Āmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Tayyib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Musta'lı</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

(Hodgson, op. cit., 160-1).

From the above table, it is clear that neither of the first two reports of al-Hāfiz's genealogy are correct, since al-Hāfiz was neither the son of al-Mustansir nor of al-Musta'lı.

If the phrase تقلب ولد غير رفيق المتصر is translated as:

"Another report says that he was the son of another son of al-Mustansir other than al-Musta'lı" it would make correct sense historically. The Arabic sentence might, however, also be translated simply as "Another report says that sons other than
al-Musta‘lī were born to al-Mustansir".

191. ‘Abd al-Majīd was proclaimed imām under the title al-Hāfiz li-Dīn Allāh on 3 Rabī‘ II 525 (Stern, op. cit., 207).

192. Ibn al-Azraq is interested in Fatimid history. This unusually long excursus is a continuation of a series of discussions on the Fatimids and Isma‘īlīs which occur at intervals in Ms.A.

In an earlier passage, Ibn al-Azraq relates how at al-Mustansir’s death, Fatimid Egypt was divided; one faction supported an elder son of al-Mustansir, Nizār, whilst the other gave allegiance to al-Musta‘lī, a younger son of al-Mustansir. Al-Musta‘lī’s mother was the sister of the powerful vizier al-Afdal who was responsible for by-passing Nizār in favour of his nephew (‘Awad, 267).

Ibn al-Azraq then relates how Nizār went away, thus creating the rift between the Fatimids in Cairo and the supporters of Nizār which is mentioned in this passage. Viewing events from his own time (572/1176-7) Ibn al-Azraq says that Nizār’s grandson, Nizār b. Muhammad b. Nizār "is now caliph of the Isma‘īlīs .... and is now in Egypt." (ibid., 276-7).

193. For the development of pro-Abbasid hadīths cf. I. Goldziher, Muslim Studies ed. S.M. Stern, tr. C.M. Barber and S.M. Stern (London, 1971), II, 97-101. Goldziher cites the example of a court poet of al-Mahdī who quoted the Qur’ān to prove that ‘Abbās was the rightful heir to the prophet (op. cit., 100).

Here the legitimacy of ‘Abbās and his line is put into the mouth of Muhammad himself. The pronouncement is very reminiscent of the caliph al-Qā’im’s statement quoted by Bundārī, on the occasion of Toghrīl’s request to marry his
daughter:-

(4bdat, 20).

194. The word *mlak*, which is most commonly the plural of *milk*
("property, possession"), is occasionally found as the plural of
*malik* ("king").

195. At the time of the Saljuq conquests, the religious authority
of the ’Abbasid caliphate had been deliberately strengthened by
the Saljuqs. Saljuq power had persuaded independent rulers to
reject Fatimid authority in favour of recognition of the

196. Yaqūt places Ḫird in the Jazīra, whilst other authors put it
in Armenia (Canard, Ṣamdanides, 85).

197. Bahmard is also referred to as Bahmūd in Ms.A.

198. These acquisitions were made by Da‘ūd after his defeat at
Zangī’s hands in the previous year. Other sources say that it
was Zangī who took Bahmard in 525/1131-2 (al-‘Azīmī, "Chronique",
405; Ibn Purāt, Duwal, f.29b). At any rate, Da‘ūd was not
destined to hold Bahmard for long, if he held it at all. Ibn
al-Athīr says that Zangī took the citadel in 526/1131-2
(Atabegs, 47).

199. This incident has already been mentioned in f.164a.

200. According to Ibn al-Athīr, the two Artuqid cousins had already
joined forces in 521/1127-8 against Zangī who had marched
against Nasībīn, a possession of Temūr-Tash. Zangī had
intercepted a pigeon carrying a message to the garrison at
Nasībīn. The message which came from the Artuqids promised to bring help and urged them to hold out for three more days. Zangī changed the message to a period of twenty days and thereby caused the people of Nasībīn to hand over the citadel to him (Atabega, 36-7).

On his campaign into Artuqid territory in 524/1129-30, Zangī met Dā‘ūd and Temūr-Tash outside Dāra, defeating them and taking Sarja and Dāra. He was reluctant, however, to pursue Dā‘ūd further into Diyār Bakr because of the difficulty of the terrain (ibid., 38-9; Kāmil, X, 497).

This incident is also described by Michael the Syrian, who says that Zangī knew he would be defeated but that he managed to hold out for one day. Then the two Artuqid cousins quarrelled and Dā‘ūd withdrew. Zangī pursued Temūr-Tash and then made peace with him (Chronique, 240-1).


202. Other sources state that Zangī did not succeed in his attempt to capture Hims that year (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda 246; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, X, 464; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 228).

203. Once again, Ibn al-Azraq has a different date from other sources. Ibn al-Athír and Ibn Khallikán put this event in 527/1133 (Ibn al-Athír, Atabegs, 47; Kámil, XI, 2-3; Ibn Khallikán, Wafayáth, I, 330).

204. His full name was Abú Saíd Jaqar b. Ya‘qub al-Hamadhaní; his laqab was Nasír al-Dín. He had been made governor of Mosul by Zangí and was "tyrannical, unjust, a shedder of blood and a violator of property" (Ibn Khallikán, Wafayáth, I, 329).

205. When Zangí heard that the caliph al-Mustarshid was approaching Mosul with 30,000 men, he left the city at once with some of his troops. Whilst Jaqar defended Mosul vigorously against the caliph, Zangí cut off al-Mustarshid’s food supplies. After three months, the caliph returned to Baghdad (Ibn al-Athír, Atabegs, 47).

According to Ibn Khallikán, Jaqar had already fortified and entrenched the city and he resisted the attacks of the caliph, forcing him to retire. This episode occurred in Ramadán 527/ July 1133 (Wafayáth, I, 330).

206. For a description of the duties of the mutawallí, cf. Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 70.

207. The influence of the powerful Nísanid family in Āmid is discussed in some detail by Van Berchem (M. van Berchem and J. Strzygowski, Amida, [Heidelberg, 1910], 55).

208. الثمرة "rapport de la terre" (Dozy, Suplement I, 164).

209. Cahen suggests that al-Násíh ‘Alí b. Ahmad incited his new master, Temür-Tash, against his old lord, the ruler of Āmid ("Diyār Bakr", 244-5).

211. Ibn Shaddād says that Ibn Mukhtar and al-Nāsih were brothers (Jazīra, f.103a).


213. This 'Uqailid ruler of Qal'at Jābar was the son of Shams al-Daula Sālim b. Mālik who died in 519/1125 (cf. Zambaur, op.cit., 135). Sālim b. Mālik had received this citadel and al-Raqqa from Malik-Shāh when the latter had removed him from Aleppo. When Sālim grew old, he entrusted these two citadels to his son, Mālik (Ibn Shaddād, Jazīra, f.24a).


214. The post of vizier at Mārdīn was clearly more important than that at Mayyāfārīqīn. Ibn al-Azraq never explicitly states that Temār-Tash’s main residence was at Mārdīn, although other sources refer to him as the "lord of Mārdīn". Habashī was empowered the following year (531/1136-7) to conduct an inspection of the officials at Mayyāfārīqīn. This rapidly degenerated into a purge (cf. p.303 n.330).

215. These anecdotes about the fluctuating fortunes of officials in these chaotic times reveal the frequency with which posts
changed hands and the ease with which officials could move
around seeking positions with different rulers within a limited
geographical area. It was clearly a regular practice for
officials to be tortured so that they would divulge the
whereabouts of their ill-gotten gains. Such money was often
hidden in the citadel.

It is interesting to note that Zangī never kept all his
money in one place, preferring to spread it over several
citadels in case he should lose all his wealth at once (Atabegā,
80).

216. Ms. A appears to have this name as al-Malikīn Abu’l-Barakāt b.
Abu’l-Fahr al-Harrānī. Ms. B and Ibn Shaddād make much better
sense with al-Makīn ... Abu’l-Fahr (Ms. B., f. 109 a.; Ibn
Shaddād, Jazīra, f. 103 a).

The reading of Ms. B is confirmed by Ibn al-Qalanisī, Dhail,
275) and by al-‘Āzīmī who writes that this man was arrested in
Aleppo in 535/1140-1 ("Chronique", 419).

217. Ibn al-Azraq’s accounts of the conflicts between the caliphs al-
Mustarshīd ad-dal-Rashīd and Sultan Mas’ūd are probably the most
valuable parts of his work. They are treated summarily here,
since they form the basis of a forthcoming article of mine on
the relationship between caliph and sultan in the twelfth century,
an article which developed naturally from the unusually detailed
anecdotes found in Ibn al-Azraq’s text.

218. Ms. A:

This is probably a scribal error. The sentence is misplace
d here.

It is repeated later on f. 165 a, where it is more appropriate to
the context. In both cases, it would read better as:


Ibn Wāsīl has taken this passage and uses it with certain changes in his work, Mufarrij al-Kurūb fi Akhbar Banī Ayyūb, 58-68. Comparisons will be made from time to time between his text and that of Ibn al-Azraq.

For a biography of this important official, cf. Ibn al-Jauzī, Muntazam, X, 206. There his name is given as Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm ..... Abū ʿAbdallāh b. al-Anbārī and his laqab as Sadīd al-Daula. Ms. B also has Sadīd al-Daula.

Ibn al-Anbārī held the office of Kātib al-inshāʾ for a long time, went as ambassador to Sanjar and held a correspondence with al-Harīrī (ibid.). He lived from 469-558/1076-1163.

In his transcription of this passage, Amedroz misreads and writes ٍعَارَضُ وَالكِبَرَةُ فِي إِسْلَامِيَّة and writes ٍعَارَضُ وَالكِبَرَةُ F(Ibn al-Qalānisī, Dhail, 250, n.1).

Ms. A:

These words are copied verbatim by Ibn Khallikan in his biography of Sultan Mas'ūd (cf. Chapter II, p.41). Ibn Wāsīl changes this phrase to read: "The caliph resisted in his territory" (op. cit., 58).

According to the biography given by Ibn al-Jauzī, ʿAlī b. Tirād al-Zainabī was born in 462/1069-70 and died in 538/1143-4.
He is often mentioned by Ibn Khallikan (Wafayat, III, pt.1, 156-7, 239, 287). He served as vizier both to al-Mustarshid and to al-Muqtadir in whose appointment he played a key role (Ibn al-Jauzi, Muntazam, X, 106; Ibn al-
Tiqtaqa al-Fakhr, 525-6).

224. Ibn Wāsil changes the name Jamāl al-Dīn Talha to Kamāl al-Dīn. The person mentioned here is most probably Kamāl al-Dīn Muhammad al-Khāzin who held office as vizier to Mas'ūd for a short time in 533/1138-9 (Klausner, op.cit., 39-40).

Ibn al-Athīr calls him Ibn Talha (Kāmil, XI, 15). Ibn al-
Fūrāt speaks of a madrasa built by Ibn Talha the treasurer (Duwal, f.129b).

225. Baghdad and its surrounding area proved to be the region where the sultan's authority was most vulnerable and where his representative, the shihna, was often at loggerheads with the caliph. For a detailed analysis of this question, cf. A.H. Siddiqi, Caliphate and Kingship in Medieval Persia (Lahore, 1942).

226. Ms.A: "وَرَتَب صاحب المخزن على دار السلطان للمظلوم والبلد"

This phrasing is rather obscure. Ibn Wāsil solves the problem by removing the words "والبلد" and writes:

"He appointed the treasurer to administer the mazālim (court)"
(op.cit., 59).


Cf. also Uzuncarsılı, Osmanlı devleti, 9-10.
227. An equally acceptable reading of Ms.A would be

أَلْيَنْ نَمْضَى وَلَبِنَنْ نَمْضَتَى وَالىَ مِنْ النَّجِيَّى


228. Ms.B, f.110b: "No two people would have disagreed with him"
(i.e. nobody at all).

229. "I think the same way as my master". The treasurer had
divined the intention of the caliph and complied with it.

230. Here Ibn Wāsil adds the explanatory comment that the caliph
was quoting from al-Mutenabbī (op.cit., 59).

231. Ms.B من الغبن من الغبن
Ms.9 من الغبن
As is more often the case, the wording of Ms.B is correct.

232. Ibn al-Qalānīṣī attributes the blame for al-Mustarshid's
rebellion and subsequent defeat to these Turkish amīrs
(Dhail, 249).


The battle took place on 10 Ramadān 529/24 June 1135 (Ibn al-
Aṭhīr, Kāmil, XI, 14).


235. The office of naqīb al-nuqābā was also known as naqīb al-
"alawiyyīn".

Klausner cites this office as an instance of the
combination of religious and administrative functions in
Saljuq times. 'Alī b. Tirād, who had previously been naqīb
al-nuqābā (chief of the 'Alids), served as vizier to two
caliphs (op.cit., 26-7).

For a description of how the office of naqīb came into
236. "Serdjihan est un château dans les montagnes du côté du Deilem; il domine la plaine de Qazwin ainsi que Zendjan et Ābhar .... C'est une des citadelles les plus belles et les mieux fortifiées que j'aie vues" (C.A.C. Barbier de Meynard, *Dictionnaire géographique de la Perse*, extrait du *Moudjem oul bouldan* [Paris, 1861], 307).

Rāwandī also mentions this citadel (Rāhat, 338 and 366). Mustaufī says it was five farsakhs from Sultāniyya and was destroyed by the Mongols (Barbier de Meynard, *op.cit.*, 307, n.1).

237. An even more humiliating fate awaited Sultan Sanjar after his capture by the Ghuzz.

238. Ibn Wāsil: تلاَّثْ نَفْسُنِ المَلاَهَة البَاطُوَنَة •

(op.cit., 60). Cf. also Ibn al-Furat (Duwal, f.133b).

239. Both Ibn al-Jauzī and Sibt b. al-Jauzī mention that Ibn Sakīna was killed too (Ibn al-Jauzī, *Muntazam*, X, 49; Sibt b. al-Jauzī, 156).

240. The dates given by the sources for al-Mustarshid's death may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Day and Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A</td>
<td>Thursday, 16 Dhu'l-Qāda</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.B</td>
<td>Thursday, 26 Dhu'l-Qāda</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Khallikān</td>
<td>14 or 28 Dhu'l-Qāda</td>
<td>529 (Wafayāt, I, 506)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Jauzī</td>
<td>Thursday, 17 Dhu'l-Qāda</td>
<td>529 (Muntazam, X, 49* and 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sunday 29 August 1135)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Athīr</td>
<td>Sunday, 17 Dhu'l-Qāda</td>
<td>529 (Kāmil, X, 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Qalānisī</td>
<td>Thursday, 28 Dhu'l-Qāda</td>
<td>529 (Dhail, 250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundārī</td>
<td>Thursday 28 Dhu'l-Qāda</td>
<td>529 (Zubdat, 178)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only version which fits the day of the week with the correct
date of the month is that given by Ibn al-Jauzī.


The dates for the beginning of his caliphate may be tabulated as follows:

Abu'l-Fida': Monday, 27 Dhu'l-Qa'da 529 (Mukhtasar, III, 10).
Sibt b. al-Jauzī: Monday, 17 Dhu'1-Qa'da 529 (Mir'āt, 158).
Ibn al-Athīr: Monday, 26 Dhu'1-Qa'da 529 (Atabeges, 50).

242. Ibn Wāsīl implicates both Sanjar and Mas'ūd in the caliph's death. He describes how on the day that the caliph was killed, a messenger brought a letter to Mas'ūd from Sanjar. Its overt contents were an order that Mas'ūd should honour the caliph and restore him to his throne. Its hidden message was that he should get rid of him. When the caliph had been murdered, Sultan Mas'ūd made an elaborate show of grief (op. cit., 61).

A similar account is given by Bar Hebraeus who says that two letters were sent; in the secret one, Sanjar rebuked Mas'ūd, saying: "Why didst thou not kill the khalīfah during the confusion of war?" (Chronography, 259).

243. By virtue of his long tenure of office and the support which he enjoyed in Iraq, al-Mustarshīd was a difficult opponent to eliminate or to mollify. Perhaps this was the reason that Mas'ūd felt the need to apply to Sanjar for permission to kill al-Mustarshīd. Since Sanjar was based at Merv, a courier would
need time to make the return journey to Mas'ūd. Perhaps this was why he delayed the killing of al-Mustarshid until he reached Marāgha.

244. Here Ibn al-Azraq does not lay the blame for al-Mustarshid's murder either on Sanjar or Mas'ūd but simply presents the evidence before him. He is apparently unaware of this when he later describes Mas'ūd as the murderer of both al-Mustarshid and al-Nāshid (Ms.A, f.175b).


247. The daughter of Nizām al-Mulk who married ʿAmīd al-Daula b. Jahīr was called Safiyya, not Zubaidā (Bosworth, "Iranian World", 60). The marriage is recorded by Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, X, 41. Cf. also Sibt b. al-Jauzī, Mirzāt, 155.

248. Ms.B gives this name as Nizām al-Mulk al-Hasan b. ʿIṣḥāq (f.1116). This title is the wrong way round and is incomplete. It should read Abū ʿAlī al-Hasan b. ʿAlī b. ʿIṣḥāq (E.E.Herzfeld, "Eine Bauinschrift von Nizām al-Mulk", Der Islam XII (1921), 98).

249. Guhar Khatun, the daughter of Il-Ghāzī, had escaped falling into the hands of al-Bursuqī in 517/1123-4 when all the wives and concubines of Dubais, except herself and one other, had been taken prisoner (Ibn al-Athīr, Atabegu, 26).
250. For the burial of Dubais at Mardin, cf. Ibn Khallikan, Wafayat, I, 504; Sibt b. al-JauzI, Mir'at, 155.

251. According to Ibn Khallikan, the sultan was afraid of the odium which the murder of al-Mustarshid would arouse. He therefore decided to kill Dubais and to try to persuade the world that Dubais had instigated the caliph's death (Wafayat, I, 506).

252. According to Ibn al-JauzI, the name of the naqib al-nuqaba' was Abu'l-Hasan b. al-Mu'ammar. Ibn al-JauzI confirms that he died when he was brought down from the citadel (Muntazam, X, 55). No doubt the sultan asked to see his eminent prisoners upon ordering their release from the citadel.

253. Ibn al-Azraq does not relate the events which preceded Sultan Mas'ud's visit to Baghdad in 530/1135-6 when he subjected the city to a protracted siege. Al-Rashid received a delegation of amirs, including Zangi, who were clad in mourning clothes, at the beginning of Safar 530/1135-6. These amirs succeeded in persuading al-Rashid to rebel and on Friday 14 Safar, 530 he had the Khutba said in the name of Da'ud, not Mas'ud (Ibn al-JauzI, Muntazam, X, 55).

254. Ms. A

كل يوم من حيّت ولي المسترضي

"From the moment al-Mustarshid assumed power". For the use of the conjunction من حيّت. cf. Chapter III, p. 96. Ibn WasiIl has: من حين تولى إبيه لم يتزكع الخروج عنيا (op. cit., 61).

255. This no doubt refers to the way in which the early Saljuq rulers had generally raised the status of the 'Abbásid caliphate and more particularly to the support given by Toghril to al-Qa'Im.
This speech by Mas'ud is an admirable summary of the later Saljuq sultans' attitude towards the caliph. As Guseynov expresses it: "The sultans were attentive to the caliphs in everything that did not touch on their own sovereignty" (Guseynov, "Sultan i Khalif," 128).

is a difficult word to translate. It implies a skill in arranging matters.

This passage is found almost verbatim in Ibn al-Furat who copies it from Ibn Wasi (Duwal, f.133b).

Abbāsid caliph 467-487/1075-94.

This is scarcely surprising.

Abbāsid caliph 487-512/1094-1118.

Ibn al-Athīr confirms that there were a large number of princes of the Abbāsid house at this time. Twenty of them were present at the ceremony of allegiance to al-Rashid (Atabegs, 50).

Sibt b. al-Jauzī borrows details from Ibn al-Azraq here. He states that al-Rashid had some twenty children when he became caliph and that his first child had been born to him when he was nine years old (Mīrāt, 158).

Presumably this lengthy list of Abbāsids is included to indicate that there was a wide choice for a suitable caliph to be found.

The phrase بيطعل عليهم is rendered by Ibn Wasi as (op.cit., 62). Ibn Wasi's phrase may be translated as "was privy to their secrets." This is one occasion where Ibn al-Azraq relies on an eye-witness account but does not divulge his source.
264. Ibn Ṭāsil omits parts of this account, probably because of propriety.

265. قتل السلطان مسعود صدقة بن دبيس

This passage is extremely garbled. It is well known that Sultan Mas'ūd killed Dubais b. Sadaqa one month after the death of the caliph al-Mustarshid. Dubais' murder occurred on 14 Dhu'l-Hijja 529 (Ibn al-'Adīm, Bughyat, 249).

Ibn al-Azraq has already described the killing of Dubais in its right place, after the murder of al-Mustarshid (Ms.A f.165b). Here, the author cites the month and year of Dubais' murder but gives the name as Sadaqa b. Dubais.

Ibn al-Azraq then makes a rare personal comment, casting doubts on the reliability of his source (دافعناه WIDTH=80). His own suggestions to clarify the report, however, are disastrously inaccurate.

Qaraoha al-Saqī was the atābeg of Saljuq-Shāh b. Muhammad. He was killed not by Mas'ūd but by Sanjar in 526/1132 (al-Husainī, Akhbār, 101).

As for the name متكثر , this is probably a reference to Mengū-Bars who was appointed governor of Fārs in 526/1132 by Sultan Togrūl, who made him atābeg to his son, Alp Arslan (ibid.). Mengū-Bars was not killed until 532/1138 (Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, XI, 39).

Ibn Ṭāsil interprets this sentence as follows:

لقد سلطاننا .... يا اختر اذهبه فیمن بولی

Ibn Ṭāsil interprets this sentence as follows:
"Sultan Masʿūd sent to his uncle, Sultan Sanjar, asking his advice as to whom he should appoint" (op. cit., 63).

267. The account by Ibn al-Athīr given in his History of the Atabegs of Mosul resembles that of Ibn al-Azraq in certain important details, although the order of events differs. In Ibn al-Athīr's version, al-Rāshid was first deposed. Then Masʿūd took advice on a suitable person to succeed as caliph. The vizier, Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī, recommended Abū ʿAbdallāh b. al-Mustazhir. Although someone else spoke up against this nomination, Abū ʿAbdallāh was chosen (Atabegs, 53).

268. Ms. B explains more clearly: "At that time Sharaf al-Dīn (al-Zainabī) was naqīb al-nugabāʾ; then he was transferred to the vizierate."

269. Ibn Wāsīl is more explicit: "Keep the matter hidden lest the affair be noised abroad and al-Rāshid biʾllah should kill his uncle, Amīr Abū ʿAbdallāh" (op. cit., 63).

270. Zangi was besieging Damascus when he received Rāshid's request for help in Baghdad. He made peace terms with Shihāb al-Dīn Mahmūd b. Mūrī and moved on to Hamā before going to Baghdad (Ibn Wāsīl, op. cit., 63-4).

271. Ibn al-Azraq's informant greatly simplifies the complicated events in Baghdad at the time of the deposition of al-Rāshid. His account implies that Zangi alone was involved in the resistance to Masʿūd. Other sources, however, make it clear that many more amīrs joined in the uprising against Masʿūd; their number included Dāʾūd b. Mahmūd b. Malik-Shāh, lord of Āzarbājījān, Sadaqa b. Dubais, lord of Hilla and Ibn al-Ahmadīlī.
The caliph had Da'ud's name mentioned in the khutba at Baghdad and he paid Zangî 30,000 dinars (Ibn Wâsil, op.cit., 64; Ibn al-Athîr, Kamil, XI, 22-4).

272. According to Yaqût, this fertile area on the eastern side of Baghdad was greatly devastated under the Saljuqs ("Reisen", 406).


According to Lambton, there was a certain blurring of functions between the wâkil dar and the amîr hâjib towards the end of Sultan Muhammad's reign (ibid.). The term hâjib al-bâb may well be a calque of wâkil dar.

274. "crieur, crieur public". (Dozy, Supplément I, 856).  

275. Once again, Ms.B is more accurate with its version of the text (الخريج الطهري). For a description of the Tâhirid Harîm in Baghdad, cf. G. Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate (Oxford, 1900), 119-21. This palace had the rights of sanctuary granted to it.

According to the sources cited by Le Strange (ibid., 121), it was the populace of Baghdad who plundered the Tâhirid Harîm in 530/1136 after the siege of the city by Sultan Mas'ud. At this point, much wealth was removed from the palace (ibid., 120-1).

276. The family of al-Zainabî was conspicuous in the office of naqîb al-nuqabâ' and also as viziers and qâdis. The chief qâdî mentioned here is the cousin of the vizier, Sharaf al-Dîn al-Zainabî. This cousin was called 'Ali b. al-Husain and is mentioned by Ibn al-Jauzî (Muntazam, X, 109).

278. Ms. A writes 17 Dhu'l-Qāda 530. This date has been changed in the translation to 12 Dhu'l-Qāda. Given the day-by-day sequence of events described here, beginning on 10 Dhu'l-Qāda, the date required here should be 12 Dhu'l-Qāda. The day after, which is the day suggested by Mas'ūd for the pledging of allegiance to al-Muqtafī, should logically be 13 Dhu'l-Qāda. Fortunately, this hypothesis is supported by Ms. B, which has:

فلا كان من غد هو الثلاثة عشر ذو التمرد

"The following day, which was Tuesday 13 Dhu'l-Qāda...."

279. Ibn Wāsil changes اعتقى to حكم (op. cit., 67).

280. Ibn al-Aṭhīr also mentioned Ibn al-Karkhī's role in the deposition of al-Rāshid (Atabeg, 53). Ibn al-Karkhī was consulted because the chief qādī was no longer in Baghdad but was with Zangī in Mosul (Kāmil, XI, 27).

281. This account is also found in Ibn al-Furat (Duwal, f. 144b).


283. The position of wakīldar was that of a "middle-man" between the ruler and his subjects. He was also responsible for the checking of the sultan's farāmans (Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 17). The wakīldar, the "keeper of the household", was supposed to be eloquent and knowledgeable, as well as tactful and understanding concerning the moods and temper of the sultan" (Klausner, op. cit., 18, citing Bundārī, Zubdat, 93-4).

284. The Ms. has a lacuna here. Ibn Wāsil, who copies this passage, has 492 (op. cit., 68).

285. The diwān al-inshā', "the state chancery", was the department responsible for conducting correspondence at home and abroad, as well as for drawing up deeds (Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 31).

287. Ms.A has Najm al-Daula b. Mālik. For a discussion of this name, cf. n. 213. The correct reading should probably be Shihāb al-Dīn Mālik.

288. This unnamed son of Mālik b. Ṣālim is Badrān (cf. n. 336).

289. Ibn Shaddād gives a brief description and history of al-Raqqa and lists its rulers with his customary inaccuracy over names (Jazīra, f.24).

290. Ibn al-Azraq calls Musayyib the son of Mālik. Ibn Shaddād says he is Mālik's brother, appointed by Mālik to govern al-Raqqa (ibid.). Musayyib is mentioned by Ibn Khallikān, who does not, however, specify who he is (Wafayat, I, 505). De Slane is not sure, either. He calls Musayyib "probably a near relative to Badrān" (ibid., 507, n.6). Ibn al-ʿΑdīm agrees with Ibn al-Azraq, calling him Musayyib b. Mālik (Zubda, 257).

Zangī took al-Raqqa from Musayyib on 20 Ῥaḇīʿ II 529 by means of a ruse, in which he asked merely for a bath for himself and his men. Once inside the citadel, he gained possession of it (ibid.).

291. Ms.B calls this person Nizām al-Dīn Abū Nasr Ahmad b. Nizām al-Mulk. This man served as vizier to Sultan Muhammad (Klausner, op.cit., 106) and then to the caliph al-Mustarshid (Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, X, 428). Ibn al-Athīr calls him Nizām al-Dīn too, whilst Klausner uses the laqab Diyaʾ al-Mulk (op.cit., 137). This son was but one of the many descendants of Nizām al-Mulk who held high office. He died in 544/1149 (cf. Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa, al-Fakhrī, 526-7).

There was great professional rivalry between Anūshīrwān and Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī (ibid., 528). Anūshīrwān was appointed vizier to the caliph al-Mustarshid in 526/1131-2 (Ibn al-Ṯīr, Kāmil, X, 480).

293. This man also held the office of vizier twice. He died in 522/1128. Cf. Ibn al-Tiqṭaqā, al-Fakhrī, 523-5.

294. According to al-Ḥusainī, al-Rāshid was afraid that Zangī would come to an arrangement with Masʿūd to hand him over. He therefore left Mosul with the intention of going to Sultan Sanjar in Khurāsān. Al-Rāshid, hearing that al-Muqtadī had been appointed caliph, wrote to Sultan Sanjar at the beginning of Ramadan 531, complaining bitterly about Sultan Masʿūd and asking for military help. When he received a negative response from Sanjar, al-Rāshid made for Iraq but was killed whilst at Isfahān (Akhbār, 108-9).

295. According to Abu'l-Fida', al-Rāshid went to Daʿūd in Azarbājān and Daʿūd and other border lords agreed to help to restore him to the caliphate. After Masʿūd had routed Daʿūd, the latter fled to Fārs, whilst al-Rāshid went to Isfahān (Mukhtasar III, 13). Cf. also Ibn al-Ṯīr, Kāmil, XI, 39-40.

296. Sibt b. al-Jauzī gives the exact date of al-Rāshid's death as 27 Ramadan 532 (Mir'āt, 167), whilst Ibn al-Ṯīr has 25 Ramadan 532 (Kāmil, XI, 41).

297. According to Yaqūt, Shahristān was situated beside the Zayanda Rud. The tomb of al-Rāshid was situated there (Barbier de Meynard, op.cit., 520).
298. The scribe had more difficulty than usual with these Persian words. The usual forms are زندروز and زندروز.

299. Sibt b. al-Jauzī analyses the murder of al-Rāshid in more detail than the other chroniclers. He says that there are differing reports on this event. Al-Rāshid was either poisoned; or killed by some Persians in his service; or murdered by the Isma'īlīs, who were sent by Sanjar and Mas'ūd (Mir'āt, 167).

300. Jalāl al-Dīn Abu'l-Rida b. Sadaqa was appointed vizier to Zangī on the death of Diyā' al-Dīn b. al-KafartūthĪ in 536/1141-2. He was dismissed two years later (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 276; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dhail, 277; al-ʿAzīmī, "Chronique", 422).


302. The Sanāsuna (Armenian Sanasnaik; Greek Sanasounitai) were the inhabitants of the region of Sasun to the west of Bitlīs (Canard, Hamdanides, 185). They pillaged armies and caravans. Cf. also Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 184.

303. The lord of Akhlat in 533/1138-9 was Sukmān b. Ibrāhīm (cf. Appendix A).

304. KhūwĪth (also known as Khoit) lay in a mountainous district to the east of Sasun. It was inhabited by the Khuwaithiyya (cf. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 206; Canard, Hamdanides, 185).

305. On f. 163b Ibn al-Azraq mentions the death of Sultan Toghrīl who according to him was murdered in 527, whilst the majority of sources agree on Muharram 529/October-November 1134 (cf. n. 411). Here "Malik Toghrīl" is said to have died in 529 outside Damascus.

This report is therefore most confused. Either this is a second reference to Sultan Toghrīl's death with the correct
date but the wrong place (Sultan Toghrtl died outside Hamadhan) or the reference concerns Malik Toghrtl Arslan b. Qilich Arslan of Malatya (cf. n. 180).

306. Cf. f. 163a.

307. Badr al-Daula Sulaiman had been made governor of Aleppo in 516/1122 by Il-Ghazi after the latter's own son, Shams al-Daula Sulaiman, had rebelled against him. Badr al-Daula Sulaiman held Aleppo only for a short time since Balak took it from him in Jumada I 517/June 1123 (Ibn al-'Adim, Bughyat, 198).

During his tenure of Aleppo he had begun building a madrasa there in 517/1123. After Zangi conquered Aleppo, he transferred the body of his father to the madrasa and finished building it (ibid., 106-7).

Badr al-Daula Sulaiman married one of the daughters of Malik Ridwan (ibid., 216-7). It is not clear if the daughter in question was Farkhunda Khatun or another one. Farkhunda Khatun had married Il-Ghazi when he took Aleppo (cf. f. 163 b) but the union was unconsummated. She then married Balak (ibid.) Zangi had also married a daughter of Malik Ridwan (Ibn al-'Adim, Zubda, 244).

308. كم: Sauvaget attests the name Köpek as a proper name (op.cit., 54). Cf. the Rūm Saljuq official Saʿd al-Dīn Köpek or the early 14th century Transoxanian ruler of the same name.

309. Al-Sur is listed by Ibn Shaddād amongst the citadels of Diyār Bakr (Jazīra, f.65b). Michael the Syrian places it near Mardin (Chronique, 250).

310. Ibn al-Azraq's chronology is probably erratic here. It would appear from other accounts that Zangi attacked Amīd first and
then made for the citadel of al-Sur. According to Ibn al-Athîr, Zangi took al-Sur because he failed to take Âmid. The battle outside Âmid took place in Jumâda II, 528; the conquest of al-Sur occurred in Rajab, 528 (Kâmîl, XI, 6-7). The account of Ibn al-Qalânisî is similar to that of Ibn al-Athîr (Dhaîl, 243). Cf. also Usâma, Memoirs, 185.

311. Probably because of his undeniably pro-Artuqid bias, Ibn al-Azraq never explicitly states that Temûr-Tash became the vassal of Zangi. Al-'Âzîî has no such deference for the Artuqids. He specifically says that in 528/1133-4 Husâm al-Dîn became the vassal of Atabeg Zangi and went with him to fight Dâ'ûd b. Artuq ("Chronique", 408). No doubt as a reward for his services, Zangi gave Temûr-Tash al-Sur.


313. Tall Shaikh was situated below Mûrdîn and Hîsîn Kaîfâ. It was a frequent meeting place for troops in the twelfth century (Cahen, Syrie, 215, n.35).

314. Zangi's attack on Âmid is described in a number of sources: Ibn al-Qalânisî, Dhaîl, 243; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 249-50; Ibn al-Athîr, Kâmîl, XI, 6-7; idem, Atabegs, 48. Cf. also M.H. Yînanc, "Diyarbekir", IA, 614.

According to Ibn al-Qalânisî, Dâ'ûd met Zangi and Temûr-Tash outside Âmid. Dâ'ûd was routed, some of his sons were taken prisoner and many of his men killed. The battle took place on the last day of Jumâda II, 528/April 1134. Zangi then laid siege to Âmid but was unsuccessful and withdrew (Dhaîl, 243).
315. Cahen points out that there were two places with very similar names, Tanza and Tanzī. Tanza was situated near Hattākh, to the north of Mayyāfāriqīn, although Cahen is not sure of its exact position ("Diyār Bakr", 224-5). The other, better-known place was in the region of Isʿird (cf. Minorsky, "Kurds", 412).


For Kafartūthā, cf. Canard, Ḥamdanides 99; Le Strange, Lands, 97.

317. Shams al-Daula Toghan Arslan al-Ahdab fought as the vassal of Il-Ghāzī. He was ruler of Arzan and Bitlīs (cf. n. 64). Ibn al-Qalānīsī puts his death in 532/1137-8 (Dbail, 267).

318. For a definition of the term ṭrabād (plural ṭrabād), cf. E. Lévi-Provençal, "ṭrabād", El. Lévi-Provençal defines a ṭrabād as the district of a town situated outside the central part, the madīna.

319. For a description of this part of Mayyāfāriqīn, which had its own mosque, bazaars and khāns, cf. Ibn Shaddād, Jazīra, f. 71a.

320. Ms. B and Ibn Shaddād state that the work of demolition began on 9 Muharram 530. Presumably these two areas of Mayyāfāriqīn were destroyed as a preventive measure since Temār-Tash could not defend it satisfactorily against the depredations of his cousin Daʿūd.

321. Jabal Ṣūr was to the north of Mayyāfāriqīn near al-Sīwān and Dhuʾl-Qarnain (cf. the map at the back of volume II of this thesis).

322. The scribe of Ms. A consistently writes the name of this citadel as ʿbal-qārin. Ibn Shaddād calls it Ḥisn Dhiʾl-Qarnain
The source of the Tigris lay below a castle called Dhu' l-Qarnain, north of Mayyāfāriqīn (Quatremère, Mongols, 362).

In 516/1122 a copper mine was discovered near the citadel and from that date onwards its resources were exploited (Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, X, 215). Taylor visited this place in 1862-3 (J.G. Taylor, "Travels in Kurdistan, with Notices of the Sources of the Eastern and Western Tigris, and Ancient Ruins in their Neighbourhood", The Journal of the Royal Geographical Society 35 [1865], 21-58.)

323. Jabal Jūr, Dhu' l-Qarnain and al-Sīwān were all three the possessions of Da'ūd and were handed over to Temtir-Tash. No doubt Da'ūd's hostility in 530/1135-6 may be attributed to this. Ibn al-'Adīm lists Zangī's conquests as al-Sūr, Bār'ī disaster, Jabal Jūr and Dhu' l-Qarnain and says that Zangī presented them all to Temtir-Tash. He kept only Tanza for himself (Zubda, 253).

324. Cf. Appendix B.

325. In an earlier passage, Ibn al-Azraq writes that the capture of al-Hattākh was in 528/1133-4 (ʿAwad, 254).

326. According to Michael the Syrian, the fortress of al-Hattākh had not yet been in Turkish hands but had remained in the possession of the Banū Marwān (Chronique, 264).

In 355/965-6, al-Hattākh was considered the frontier of Byzantine territory. It was six farsaks north-east of Mayyāfāriqīn (Canard, Hamdanides, 256).

Cf. also Tīrānī, Kitāb al-Diyārbakriyya II, 210, 388; Markwart, SiMdermenien, 249; Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 13.

Taylor visited the ruins of this place in 1862-3 (op.cit., 39).
327. Sibt b. al-Jauzî relates that in 531/1136-7 the lord of Mārīn took the citadel of al-Hattâkh, the last remaining possession of the Marwânid in Diyar Bakr (Mir'āt, 161).

The date of 531 for Temûr-Tash's capture of the citadel is confirmed by Ibn Abî Tayî'î in Ibn al-Furat, Duwal, f.93b.

In the earlier passage, Ibn al-Azraq says that many of the members of the Marwânid family stayed in the service of Temûr-Tash (Awad, 254).

328. Habashî had entered Temûr-Tash's service in 528/1133-4 after being in Hama with Salâh al-Dîn Muhammad al-Yaghî-Sîyanî (Ms. A, f.164b).

329. The cummâl (sing. âamil) were the tax-collectors from the diwân-i istîfâ-î mamâlik of Saljuq Iran. They were responsible to the local mustaufî for the collection of taxes in a particular area. According to Lambton, Nizâm al-Mulk recommended that the cummâl should be changed every two or three years to prevent their becoming too powerful locally (op.cit., 254, 258, 260).

330. The mutasarrifûn were the subordinates of the cummâl (ibid., 258).

331. The âamîd was another term for âamil (Klausner, op.cit., 20).

332. The word muhtasib is only a tentative suggestion. The Ms. is damaged here.


334. The conquest of al-Raqqâ by Zangî has already been mentioned on f. 167a.

336. Badrān b. Malik was the son of the union between his father and a beautiful Frankish girl who had been taken prisoner on a pilgrimage to Afāmiyya. After her husband's death (in 529), Badrān's mother left Qalīt Ja'bar, went to Sarūj which was in Frankish hands and married a shoemaker (Ibn Shaddād, Jazīra, f.34a).

337. According to Ibn Shaddād, 'Alī b. Malik killed his brother in 533/1138-9 and then remained in the citadel until Zangī attacked it in Dhu'l-Hijja 540/May-June 1146 (Jazīra, f.34a).

A tentative genealogy of the late Uqailids might be as follows:

```
| Salīm (d.519) | |
| Malik (d.529) |
| Badrān (d.c.530) |

'Alī Musayyib (?)
```

338. This digression into North African history is unusual for Ibn al-Azraq. Normally, he looks no further than Egypt. He displays none of the scruples shown by Ibn al-Qalānisī in his account of the rise of the Almohads. The latter historian is aware of the unreliability of some of his sources but nevertheless devotes much time to Maghribī material (Dhail, 291-3).

It seems probable that to contemporary Muslims the religious significance of these events transcended the remote area in which they occurred and impressed Muslims as far away as Syria and the Jazīra. Ibn al-Athīr devotes a much longer section than Ibn al-Qalānisī to the rise of the Almohads (Kāmil, X, 400-14).
339. Cf. EI¹ s.v. "Masmūda". A broken plural Masmūda is also found. The Masmūda were one of the principal Berber ethnic groups. Their home was the High Atlas mountains of Morocco.


341. The full name of ʿAbd al-Muʿmin was ʿAbd al-Muʿmin b. ʿAlī b. ʿAlawi al-Kūnī (al-Marrākushī, op.cit., 141).

For an account of the momentous encounter between Ibn Tūmart and ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, cf. ibid., 130.

342. The date of 519/1125-6 given by Ibn al-Azraq is much too late. Miranda puts the return of Ibn Tūmart to the Maghrib in 511/1117-8 (op.cit., I, 38).


Marrākush was not Ibn Tūmart's first port of call. He had already visited Tripolī, al-Mahdiyya, Tunis, Būjiyya, Fās and Sāla (A.H. Miranda, op.cit., I, 39-46). Whilst at Fās, he had engaged in theological debate and the fuqahāʾ had recommended his expulsion "lest he should corrupt the minds of the populace" (al-Marrākushī, op.cit., 132).
According to Miranda, Ibn Tumart met `Ali b. Yusuf b. Tashufin in the mosque at Marrakush and told him to correct the wrongs committed in his country. Ibn Tumart then met the fugaha of Marrakush. These men were mere casuists, used only to dealing with practical legal matters. They could not maintain a theological discussion with Ibn Tumart. The exception amongst them was Abu `Abdallah Malik b. Wuhayb (op.cit., 53-4).


Malik b. Wuhayb was persuaded by the envious fugaha to denounce Ibn Tumart as a dangerous innovator, who would corrupt morals and rebel against the Almoravid empire, provoking its ruin. Malik therefore advised `Ali to imprison Ibn Tumart. `Ali, however, opted for the compromise solution of expulsion (Miranda, op.cit., I, 54-5).

According to al-Marrakushi, Malik advised `Ali to kill Ibn Tumart (op.cit., 133).

The year 520/1126-7 is much too late for Ibn Tumart's expulsion from Marrakush. Miranda gives 514/1120-1 (op.cit., I, 59).

Ibn Tumart's tribe was the Hargha (al-Marrakushi, op.cit., 128). The Hargha were one of the Masmuda tribes (Abun-Nasr, op.cit., 103).
Ms. B adds "they refused to fulfil the obligations imposed on them" (f. 118b).

After leaving Marrakush, Ibn Tumart went to Aghmat and Tinmal. The latter was the heart-land of the Masmuda tribes and afforded him an excellent strategic position (Miranda, op. cit., 59-61; Julien, op. cit., 101). In the Atlas mountains, he organised a regular state with revenues drawn from taxation and fanatical troops ready for war (ibid., 103).

The meaning of these lines is confused by the ambiguity of the personal pronouns used. There would appear to have been two encounters between the troops of amir al-muslimin and the forces of Ibn Tumart. On the first occasion, it seems that Ibn Tumart was victorious since the amir al-muslimin thereafter took the field in person. In this second encounter, it was probably the amir al-muslimin who won.

Information is sparse about the early conflict between the Almohads and Almoravids. Abun-Nasr says that the struggle between them began in earnest only in the last year of Ibn Tumart's life (op. cit., 106). Julien mentions one encounter between them, in 516/1122-3 when Ibn Tumart's forces were victorious (op. cit., 103). Miranda also describes a skirmish in 517/1123-4 between 'Ali's army, under the leadership of Ibrāhīm b. Ta'āiyast, and Ibn Tumart's forces. In the ensuing battle Ibn Tumart achieved a great victory (op. cit., 61, 68-9).

The name given in Ms. A as 'Abdallāh b. Māwiya is written by Miranda as 'Abd Allah b. Ya'la b. Malwiya. This man was certainly not killed in these early fights since he took part in the campaign against Marrakush in 524/1130 (ibid., 84).
After the fighting in 517/1123-4, Ibn Tūmart spent the next year organizing his affairs. He strengthened the citadel at Tinmal.

The winter of 523-4/1128-9 was spent in preparation for the attack on Marrakush (ibid., 71-9).

Mss. A and B both have the mountain of Aran (أرَانِ). Ibn al-Qalānisī correctly writes Daran (ـ دران ) (Dhail, 292).


Ibn al-Azraq's facts are extremely inaccurate here. Ibn Tūmart died after the siege of Marrakush, not before.

According to al-Marrākushī, Ibn Tūmart sent out an army to Marrakush in 524/1129-30, under the leadership of 'Abd al-Mu'min. At the ensuing battle between the Almoravids and the Almohads which took place at Buhaira, the Almohads were defeated. That same year, Ibn Tūmart died (op.cit., 138-9).

Julien puts the siege of Marrakush and the ensuing defeat of the Almohads at an earlier date, 522-3/1128 (op.cit., 103). Miranda, however, gives the exact date of the battle as Saturday, 2 Jumāda I 524 (13 April, 1130). Ibn Tūmart died in Ramdān 524/August 1130 (Miranda, op.cit., 83-4, 87).

Ibn Tūmart's death was apparently concealed for more than two years (Julien, op.cit., 104).


Ms. A: 'Alī al-Waranshī. The correct name of this associate of Ibn Tūmart is 'Abdallāh b. Muḥsin al-Wansharishī (Miranda, op.cit., 46). He joined the service of Ibn Tūmart shortly after 'Abd al-Mu'min. He would probably have succeeded Ibn Tūmart.
if he had not been killed at Buhaira, thus allowing 'Abd al-Mu'min to step into the limelight (ibid.) Al-Wansharishī was commonly known as al-Bashīr.

Ibn al-Azraq is right to say that al-Wansharishī participated in the siege of Marrākush. Indeed, according to Abun-Nasr he led the troops jointly with 'Abd al-Mu'min (op.cit., 106). But al-Wansharishī did not take over the Almohad leadership after the death of Ibn Ṭūmart, as Ibn al-Azraq states, since he was himself killed at the battle of Buhaira.

356. 'Abd al-Mu'min succeeded Ibn Ṭūmart but concealed his death until his own authority was stronger (Julien, op.cit., 104).

357. Ms.A has 503.

358. 'Abd al-Mu'min first stayed in the mountain area, where he was stronger, and gradually conquered southern Morocco (Julien, op.cit., 104; Abun-Nasr, op.cit., 107). He took the lands of the Almoravids bit by bit until only Marrakush remained (al-Marrakushī, op.cit., 145).

359. The order of events is wrong here. The conquest of Spain and Ifriqiyya occurred after the death of Ṭashufīn b. 'Alī and the conquest of Marrakush.

For the conquest of Ifriqiyya, cf. al-Marrakushī, op.cit., 162-4. For the conquest of Spain, cf. ibid., 151 and 159.

360. 'Alī b. Yūṣuf b. Ṭashufīn had died in 537/1142-3 and had been succeeded by his son, Ṭashufīn (al-Marrakushī, op.cit., 145). The date given by Ibn al-Azraq for the death of Ṭashufīn tallies with that of al-Marrakushī - 540/1145-6 (ibid., 146).
361. Tashufîn died by accident. Julien says it was as a result of falling off a horse (op.cit., 105). One report said that the Almohads crucified his dead body (al-Marrâkûshî, op.cit., 146).

362. This is possibly a Sûfî term.

363. The year 542/1147-8 is much too early for 'Abd al-Mu'min's conquest of Tûnis. This occurred in 554/1159-60 (al-Marrâkûshî, op.cit., 163).

364. Al-Marrâkûshî describes Tûnis as "the capital of Ifriqiyya after al-Qairawân and the seat of its government" (op.cit., 162).
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This is not the same as twenty-one miles.

366. This sudden return to the history of the Jâzîra before the Maghribî episode is finished is typical of Ibn al-Azraq's disordered approach.

367. Ms.A gives this name as شاروخ. It is probably intended to be Shâhrûkh, although Ibn Shaddâd calls him سيا روخ.

This amîr had ruled Hânî as early as 497/1103-4 and had served Duqaq (‘Awad, 268-9). No doubt because of his advanced age, Da’ûd allowed him to remain in Hânî until he died.


369. The date of 532/1137-8 is much too early for the capture of al-Mahdiyya. This city was taken some time after the end of 553/1158-9 on the campaign which gave 'Abd al-Mu'min Tûnis and Tripoli too (al-Marrâkûshî, op.cit., 163-4). Julien gives the exact date of 22 January 1160 for the conquest of al-Mahdiyya.
but he does not state his source (op.cit., 112).

370. (?) This reading is only tentative. The Mss. are very unclear.

371. This second mention of al-Mahdiyya does not refer to the city of that name mentioned in the preceding footnote which is on the east coast of Tunisia, between Sousse and Sfax. Instead, it is a reference to the present city of Rabat, which for a short time bore the name al-Mahdiyya when it was a small military station founded by 'Abd al-Mu'min (cf. G. Marçais, "al-Mahdiya", EI¹; E. Lévi-Provençal, "Rabat", EI²). According to Julien, 'Abd al-Mu'min built Rabat as early as 545-6/1150 (op.cit., 113).

372. بريني Graff cites a form which is a vulgar version of "earthly" (G. Graff, Der Sprachgebrauch der ältesten christlich-arabischen Literatur [Leipzig, 1905], 84). It may be used here to indicate its position inland (cf. barr, which means land, as opposed to sea). Alternatively this word may be some form of بريني, "foreign", "external".

It is difficult to say what the other city mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq might be. 'Abd al-Mu'min founded many towns and restored a great number of others. He also repaired several sea-pots to shelter his fleet (E. Lévi-Provençal, "'Abd al-Mu'min", EI²).

373. 'Abd al-Mu'min died not in 540/1145-6 but on 27 Jumâda II, 558/ May 1163 (al-Marrakushi, op.cit., 168).

374. It is interesting to note that Ibn al-Azraq's attitude to Ibn Tûmart and the Almohads remains neutral. He does not indulge in the hostile invective of Ibn al-Qalânisî who dwells more on
the religious implications of the movement. Ibn al-Qalānisī is of course closer in time to the events than Ibn al-Azraq and the former deals only with the beginnings of the Almohad state.


377. Sibt b. al-Jauzī, who puts the conquest of Buzaʿā in 531/1136-7, mentions under the following year that the people of Aleppo and Buzaʿā were in an uproar in the mosques because of the treatment they had received at the hands of the Byzantines (Mirāt, 163).

378. According to Ibn al-Adīm, Zangī did not ask for help from Dāʾūd. On the contrary, Zangī sent Qara Arslan b. Dāʾūd specific orders to rejoin his father, saying that he did not need him (Zubda, 268).


382. According to Ibn al-Qalanisi, Zangī took Hīms in Ramadān, 533/ May 1138 (Dha'il, 266).

Qir-Khan had been Zangī's prisoner for some years.

383. Shihāb al-Dīn Mahmūd was murdered on 23 Shawwāl 533/23 June 1139 (Ibn al-Qalanisi, Dha'il, 268-9; Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 272; Sibt b. al-Jauzi, Mir'iāt, 169, 171-2).

384. Shihāb al-Dīn was in fact not succeeded by his son, as Ibn al-Azraq says, but by his brother, Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad, whom Mu'in al-Dīn Unur placed in power, having summoned him from Ba'albak (Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 272; Ibn al-Qalanisi, Dha'il, 269).

385. Ms.A: واباح rollback "the making of a thing allowable; lawful taking; it bears a meaning similar to spoliation" (Lane, op.cit., I, 273).

The more common construction would be the use of a direct object (for the thing plundered) and ل for the persons allowed to perform the action.

386. Ḥusam al-Daula Qurtī had succeeded his father as ruler of Arzān and Bitlīs in 533/1138-9 (or in 528/1133-4, if Ibn al-Azraq's date is to be trusted).

For further details on this ruler, cf. Minorsky, Studies, 85-6. Citing Vardan, Minorsky relates how Qurtī, whose brutality is also described by Ibn al-Qalanisi, placed the skulls of his enemies' heads on the ledges of a minaret (ibid., 86).

387. This name appears in Ms.A as مرمي. Ibn al-'Adīm, on the other hand, has كرمي.

388. The death of Sav-Tegin al-Karjī and Zangī's subsequent acquisition of Harrān is recorded in 533/1138-9 by Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 271.
Harran was an important town in Diyar Mudar. It was the centre of the Sabians and was situated four farsakhs from Edessa (Canard, H'amdanides, 93).

As is his custom, Ibn Shaddad lists the rulers of Harran. They are as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>497/1103-4</td>
<td>Chöker mish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502/1108-9</td>
<td>Il-GHzarl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516/1122-3</td>
<td>Balak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521/1127-8</td>
<td>ZangI, who granted the town as an iqta' to Sav-Tegin (the date of his death is not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544/1149-50</td>
<td>Qutb al-Din Maudud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547/1152-3</td>
<td>Zain al-Din 'Ali Khattak (Jazira, f.16b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


390. Ibn Shaddad relates that in (533/1138-9 ZangI and Temür-Tash quarrelled and that Salah al-Din (from Hamah) went to Mardin to make peace between them (Jazira, f.103b).

Later on in his obituary notice to Temür-Tash, (Ms.A, f.176b), Ibn al-Azraq explains that the disagreement arose because ZangI was angered by Temür-Tash's refusal to hand over Amīr Abū Bakr, lord of Nasibin, who had taken refuge with him.

Presumably the marriage with Temür-Tash's daughter and the acquisition of Dārā formed part of the peace-treaty. Cf. also al-'Azīmī, "Chronique", 417; Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 271. Ibn al-'Adīm says that ZangI took Rās 'Ain (sic), Jabal Jur and Dhu'l-Qarnain at the same time (ibid.).

391. This man was a valuable informant for Ibn al-Azraq (cf.n. 220).
392. For the marriage of al-Muqtafi to Fātimā, the daughter of
Sultan Muḥammad and sister of Sultan Mas'ūd, and for other
details about this woman, cf. Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, XI, 31;
Sibt b. al-Jauzī, Mīr'āt, 161; Ibn al-Jauzī, Muntazam, X, 67,
72; Ibn Khallīkān, Wafayāt, III, pt. 1, 239. Sibt b. al-Jauzī,
Ibn Khallīkān and Ibn al-Athīr say the marriage took place in
531/1136-7. Ibn Khallīkān says Fātimā could read and write.

393. The Bab al-Hujra was the Privy Chamber Gate. The caliph al-
Mustarshid added a great hall to the Tāj Palace in Baghdad and
this was called by the name of its gateway. He and succeeding
caliphs used to sit there bestowing robes of honour on their
favourites or ministers (Le Strange, Baghdad, 259-60).

394. "fiancailles" (Dozy, Supplément, II, 614).

395. Among Sultan Mas'ūd's other wives were the daughter of
Dubais (Ms.A., f. 165 b; Sibt b. al-Jauzī, Mīr'āt, 164)
and the daughter of his uncle Qavurt Beg (ibid.).

Sibt b. al-Jauzī puts the marriage of Sultan Mas'ūd to
the daughter of al-Muqtafi in 532/1137-8 (ibid.).

Lambton points out that marriage alliances and occasionally
appointments to the vizierate (that is, the caliphal vizierate)
were a means of controlling the caliph in Saljuq times (op.cit.,
212).

396. Cf. n. 276.

397. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī had been the person responsible for
the appointment of al-Muqtafi, who was his son-in-law. He was
therefore rewarded with the post of vizier to the caliph, a
function which he had also performed under al-Mustarshid (cf.n. 223).
398. Here Ibn al-Azraq correctly calls this important official Kamāl al-Dīn, rather than Jamāl al-Dīn (cf.n. 224).

399. From the context, Ibn al-Azraq probably studied works on fīqh. Two Shāfi‘ite works with this title and of the correct historical period are listed by Brockelmann. These are the Kitāb al-Talkhīs fī ʿilm al-fāra‘īd, written by Abū Hakīm ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm b. ʿAlī al-Khabrī (d.476/1083-4) and Al-Ushnuhīya fi‘l-fāra‘īd by Abū’l-Fadl ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ushnuhī, who flourished around 505/1111-2 (C.Brockelmann, Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur, Leiden, 1943, I, 486 and 489).

400. This is probably a reference to Abū Mansūr al-Muzaffar al-Shahrazūrī who is mentioned by Ibn Khallīkān. He was born in 457/1064-5 and became qādī of Sinjār "at a very advanced age" (Ibn Khallīkān, Wafayat, II, 498).

401. The fasīḥ refers to the Kitāb al-Fasīḥ of Thālab, which was studied at this time in the Nizāmiyya madrasa (Fück, ʿArabiyya, Paris, 1955, 179).

402. The work referred to by Ibn al-Azraq as the ʿUmda is probably the Kitāb al-ʿUmda fī furū‘ al-Shafi‘īyya, which was composed by Abū Bakr Muhammad al-Mustazhirī (d.507/1113-4) (Brockelmann, op.cit., I, 489 and Supplement, I, 674).

403. Jawālīqī (466/1073-4 - 539/1144-5) wrote a number of works, including a dictionary of foreign words called al-Muṣarrab. He also taught at the Nizāmiyya madrasa in Baghdad (ibid.). Cf. also Brockelmann, op.cit., I, 126.

404. Abū Ḥasan Muhammad b. Abī ʿl-Bakā al-Mubārak b. Muḥammad, also called Ibn al-Khall, was born in 482/1089-90 and died in
He was a doctor of the Shafites and wrote a work in the form of a commentary on Abu Ishaq al-Shirazi's book, the *Tanbih*. Ibn al-Khall called his own commentary *Tajrib al-Tanbih* (Ibn Khallikan, *Wafayat*, II, 631-3).

According to Ibn al-Furat, Ibn al-Khall resided in a madrasa built by (Kamal al-Din) Ibn Talha (Duwal, f.129b).

Ibn al-Khallikan (Wafayat, II, 631-3).

According to de Slane, al-Razzaz was the head of the Shafites at Baghdad. He was born in 462/1069-70 and died in Dhu'l-Hijja 539/May-June 1145 (Ibn Khallikan, *Wafayat*, III, pt.1, 312, n.2). 'Imad al-Din al-Isfahani studied at the Nizamiyya under al-Razzaz (ibid., 306).

The word *min* is misplaced. The text has therefore been amended to read:

*Jama'at al-faqih[an min al-shaykh]*

The word *minhum* has been added.

'Abd al-Qadir Gilani (d.562/1166) was the famous spiritual leader who gave his name to the Qadiriyya branch of Sufis (A. Bausani, "Religion in the Saljuq Period", CHI, V, 297).


According to Sibt b. al-Jauzi, a person whom he designated *qadi al-Maristan* died in 535/1140-1 (*Mir'at*, 178).

According to Ibn Khallikan, 'Imad al-Din al-Isfahani studied

411. 'Abd al-Wahhab al-Anmatī is also mentioned by Sibt b. al-Jauzi (Mir'āt, 148-9).

412. In his obituary notice of 'Ali b. Tirād al-Zainabī, Ibn al-Jauzī also records this cooling of relations between him and the caliph. Ibn al-Jauzī outlines the career of al-Zainabī, mentioning that he had recommended the appointment of al-Muqtafī who had made him his vizier. Then al-Muqtafī's attitude changed towards him and al-Zainabī sought refuge in the sultan's palace (Muntazam, X, 109).

As subsequent events proved, al-Muqtafī was by no means as malleable and docile as Sultan Mas'ūd had hoped (cf. Ms.A, f. 65b). No doubt the clash between al-Zainabī and his protégé also arose because al-Muqtafī began to manifest signs of independence.

413. Ms.B adds: "He took up residence in the house of Najm al-Dīn Rashīd al-Jamdar" (f. 117a).

414. This person is Ibn al-Anbarī.

416. This office existed amongst the 'Abbāsids, Khwarizmshāhs and Mamluks, as well as the Saljuqs of Rūm. The ustadh al-dār looked after the sultan's valuables (Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devleti, 87).

417. For the appointment of Nişām al-Dīn as vizier, cf. Ibn al-Furat, Duvāl, f. 129b; al-'Āzīmī, "Chronique", 418; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dhail, 273. Ibn al-Furat confirms that he had previously been ustadh al-dār.


419. This sequence of events, in which Zangī proceeded from Ba'ālbak to Damascus, is followed by Ibn al-'Ādīm. Zangī was unsuccessful in this attempt on Damascus and after protracted negotiations had to be content with the moral triumph of having his name mentioned in the khutba and receiving a vague recognition of suzerainty from the new ruler of Damascus, Mujīr al-Dīn Abaq (Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dhail, 271-3; Ibn al-Athīr, Atabegs, 58-9; idem, Kāmil, 48-9; Ibn al-'Ādīm, Zubda, 273-4). For Buṣra, cf. Markwart, Südarmenien, 274.


421. This is probably a reference to the head of the finance ministry who under the Saljuqs of Rūm was called sāhib diwān istīfā (Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devleti, 103). However, the precise
definition of administrative offices in late Saljuq times is very difficult.

422. Cahen tentatively suggests that this quarrel between the two Artuqid cousins had been caused by Zangi's seizure of Bahmard, which had belonged to Dā'ūd, in the previous year ("Diyar Bakr", 247).

423. Both Mss. write فنشاب; so too does Cahen (ibid.). This is, however, surely a reference to the citadel of Bushāṭ (cf. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 152-3). Lehmann-Haupt described it as a Kurdish stronghold, standing to the north of Mayyāfāriqīn on the road to Inner Armenia (op. cit., 419). It was visited by Taylor, who described it as "a very ancient strong fort called Boshat" (op. cit., 40).

424. Ms. A: وكان السعيد هام الدين قد خرب تلده بئش وبني بها. Cahen interprets this sentence to the effect that Temūr-Tash had destroyed the citadel, as he could not defend it, but that he restored it ("une forteresse que Timurtāš, ne pouvant la défendre, avait détruite mais qu'il restaura").

It would make at least equally good sense to insert a concessive notion here: "although he had taken and built in it". It is also possible to assume, as no doubt Cahen does, that Temūr-Tash subsequently re-captured and re-built the citadel. This latter hypothesis is, however, not confirmed by Ibn al-Azraq's later narrative.

425. I.e. Tall Shaikh and Bushāṭ.

426. Ms. A: النهر; Ms. B: النهر. Either of these words makes some sense here. Ibn al-Azraq harps on the raiding of Dā'ūd since he is always biased in favour of Temūr-Tash. It would be
possible to interpret the text as referring to the theft of clothes, either in the day-time or from the river, although Ms. B's reading is more plausible.

427. Ms. A: (f. 12b). The word balad seems appropriate, therefore, to the context, although it is not justified by the partially legible word in Ms. A.

428. Ms. A: In one of the Āmid inscriptions analysed by van Berchem, the form of this name appears as which is very similar to Ibn al-Azraq's version and to that of Ibn Shaddād (Amida, 57).


429. Ms. B adds "Ibn Nisān" here (f. 122a). The most important members of the Nisānid family were Mu'ayyid al-Dīn Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad, who became de facto master of Āmid in 536/1141-2, and Jamāl al-Daula Kamāl al-Dīn Abu'l-Qāsim, who succeeded his father and who died in 551/1156-7 (van Berchem, Amida, 55).

430. The history of the family of Inal at Āmid is traced by van Berchem (ibid., 54-5) and is also discussed in some detail in Yinanc's article "Diyarbekir" which is based to a great extent on Ibn al-Azraq's text.

The Turcoman chief Inal founded his own small dynasty at Āmid around 490/1096-7. Thereafter, his family intermarried with the Artuqids. Van Berchem's genealogical table is
reproduced below:-

\[ \text{Fakhr al-Daula Ibrāhīm} \]

\[ \text{Sa'd al-Daula Ñl-aldī married Yumna Khatun Temūr-Tash} \]

\[ \text{Jamāl al-Dīn Shams al-Mulūk Maḥmūd married Ṣafīyya Khatun} \]

(\textit{op. cit.}, 55) Whilst this family lasted in power in ʿĀmid for four generations, until the conquests of Saladin, they became increasingly dominated by their viziers, who came from the Nīṣānid family (\textit{ibid.}).

431. A very interesting description of ʿĀmid in 534/1139-40 exists from the pen of an anonymous writer who visited the city at that time. His account is written in the margin of a manuscript of Ibn Ḫauqāl and has been translated by Kramers and Wiet. Although the testimony of this unknown writer is biased in favour of the Artuqids, he emphasises the devastation and the chaotic social conditions prevalent in the city, where "not a sign of life was to be found". Because of the tyranny of the Nīṣānids, the 'ulamā' and other inhabitants had been forced to move elsewhere (J. H. Kramers and G. Wiet, \textit{Configuration de la Terre} [Beirut and Paris, 1964], I, 217).

432. Shams al-Mulūk Ismāʿīl b. Tāj al-Mulūk Būrī had been killed in 529/1134-5 (Ibn al-Qalānīsī, \textit{Dhail}, 246). He was succeeded by his brother, Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Būrī, who was killed in
Ibn al-Azraq has confused these two rulers and the order in which they ruled at Damascus.

The phrase in Ms. A is incomplete, so has been added.

He had fled Habashi's tyranny in 531/1136-7 (cf. p. 503 f. 164r).

Cahen attributes this demand by Zangi to see Habashi as an indication of the deterioration in relations between Zangi and Temúr-Tash, following the rapprochement between the latter and his cousin, Dā'ūd ("Diyār Bakr", 247).

According to Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zangi made Habashi his vizier in 538/1143-4 (Zubda, 278).

Under the Mamluks, a gift from a ruler included a fully caparisoned horse, covered with a kunbūsh of gold (C. Huart, "Khilʿa", EI).

Habashi was clearly already won over to Zangi's side.

Ms. A is very uncertain of this name, which is given as

The real name of this official would appear to be Abu'l-Riḥā b. al-Sartān. Al-ʿAṣīmī says that he was Temūr-Tash's vizier and that he was seized in 537/1142-3 ("Chronique", 422).

The biography of Saʿd Allāh b. al-Sartān is given by Ibn al-ʿAdīm. He was made vizier to Badr al-Daula Sulaimān, the nephew of Īl-Ghāzi, at Aleppo in 517/1123-4. Ibn al-ʿAdīm does not know where and when Ibn al-Sartān died (Bughyat, 197-9).

It is not clear from the sources whether Zangi made two campaigns or one to Diyār Bakr and whether he went in
Qızıl Arslan (السع/الله) was a vassal of İl-Ghazi and ruled territories south of Lake Van, such as Is’ırd, Tanzî and Bahmard (‘Awād, 269). Dā’ūd of Ḫişn Kaifā snatched most of these territories from Qızıl Arslan’s son, Ya’qūb (Cahen, “Diyār Bakr”, 248). The remainder were now seized by Zangi: Khīzān, al-Ma’dan, Irūn and Qatālbas.

441. Khīzān was a fortress south of Lake Van, north-east of Is’ırd and south-east of Bitlis (cf. Markwart, Südarmenien, 341; Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 78-9, n. 12; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 321; Le Strange, Lands, 114; Tīhrānī, Kitāb Diyarbakriyya, II, 33).

442. Al-Ma’dan is described by Ibn al-Athīr as the place where the copper of Armenia is worked (Atabegs, 66).

443. Ibn Shaddād lists the citadel of Irūn amongst the fortresses of Diyār Bakr (Jazīra, f. 65b). Minorsky says it was one of the dependencies of Shīrwān, on the right bank of the Bohtān, below Khīzān, north-east of Is’ırd (“Kurds”, E1).

444. For Qaṭalbas, cf. Ibn Shaddād, Jazīra, f. 65b.

445. These conquests by Zangi in Diyār Bakr are also described by Ibn al-Athīr. As well as listing the places conquered in 538/1143-4, Ibn al-Athīr mentions that in 537/1142-3 Zangi sent threatening messages to the ruler of Amid who had said the khutba in Dā’ūd’s name, instead of his. As usual with Zangi’s threats, they were taken seriously and the ruler of Amid submitted to Zangi’s wishes (Atabegs, 64 and 66; Kāmil, XI, 62). Cf. also Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dha‘īl, 277; Ibn al-‘Adīm, Zubda, 277).
446. Tall Bashiṣī was to the west of Mārdīn (Canard, Ḥamdanides, 99; Honigmann, Ostpreußen, 21). Cahen puts it due south of Mārdīn on his map ("Diyār Bakr", 222).

447. Having conquered the citadels south of Lake Van, Zangī turned towards the north-west of Diyār Bakr and conquered Ḥānīf, Dhu'1-Ǧarnain and Jabal Jūr. Is'īrd is clearly misplaced here and should have been mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq amongst the earlier list of Zangī's conquests (n.446).

448. This must refer to the peace-treaty between Dā’ūd and Temūr-Tash.

449. The names of the murderers of Ḥabashi are much more clearly written in Ibn Shaddād's text than in either Ms. A or Ms. B. In Marsh 333, they appear as موصل الشاقصي and ممجد بن أبي الباي (f. 104a).

Al-ʿĀzīmī also mentions the murder of Ḥabashi. He says that Ḥabashi was killed in his tent by a group of Kurds ("Chronique", 422).

450. This would appear to imply that the assassins had been sent by Temūr-Tash, although it is equally likely that having outlived his usefulness to Zangī who had now made important inroads into Diyār Bakr, Zangī then disposed of him.

451. Cahen mistakenly reads this date as 29 Muḥarram 539, citing only Ibn al-Azraq as his source ("Diyār Bakr", 248).


452. The Muḥaddatha mosque was built by the Karwānid, Nāṣir al-Daula, in 423/1031-2 (Ibn Shaddād, Jazīra, f. 70a).
Qara Arslan was not Dā'ūd's eldest son. Arslan Toghmīsh, the eldest, had fled to Zangi (Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 258). He had rebelled against his father at Khartābūt (ibid., 237).

On his return from Zangi, Arslan Toghmīsh took Ḥānī (ibid., 258). He then seized Tall Arsani, enslaving fifteen thousand Christian inhabitants who had long resisted him (ibid., 265).

It is not clear if this is a new campaign or a repetition of the one just described on p. 311.

Arqanîn was situated to the west of the Arghana Su (cf. Markwart, Südarmenien, 107, 246, 333; Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 136, 178, 183, 185; Canard, H'amdanides, 78).

It has not proved possible to locate al-Hālār.

Tall Khūm lay to the west of the road from Amid to Malatya between Amid and Arqanîn (cf. Canard, H'amdanides, 78; Markwart, Südarmenien, 246, 257; Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 185). Matthew of Edessa, who is cited by Honigmann, says that Tall Khūm was occupied in the eleventh century mostly by Christians (Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 139).

Charmūk (also known as Ḷermik and Djermik) lay on a "left tributary of the Euphrates" (Canard, H'amdanides, 81; Markwart, Südarmenien, 251, 257, 346).

According to Ibn al-Furāt, Zangi took from Dā'ūd Bahmard, Tanzi, Khīzān, Arqanîn, Tall Khūm, Charmūk and Ḥānî (Duwal, f. 129b). Ibn al-Furāt adds that according to Ibn Abī Ṭayyi', Zangi also took from Dā'ūd the citadel of Qaisūn which he handed to Tamūr-Tash (ibid.).
According to Bundari, who also puts Sultan Dā'ūd's death in 538/1143-4, Zangi sent Ismā'īlīs to kill Dā'ūd because Sultan Mas'ūd had decided to send Dā'ūd to Syria (i.e. into Zangi's own area of influence) (Zubdat, 195).

Mas'ūd had nominated Dā'ūd as his successor and sent him to rule Arrān and Armenia (Mastufi, Guzida, 347-8).

For Dā'ūd's death, cf. also al-'Azīmi, "Chronique", 423; Ibn al-Qalānisi, Dhail, 277.

Ms. B has نه شهر اللهو الاب حاب . According to Lane, الاب حاب is apparently a dialectal variant of الاب حاب, an epithet applied to the month of Rajab (Lane, op. cit., I, pt. 4, 1640).

Ibn Khallikān gives exactly the same date as Ibn al-Azraq for the capture of Edessa by Zangi (Jafayat, I, 540). So too does Matthew of Edessa, who says he took Edessa on the feast of St. Stephen, Saturday, 23 December (Chronique, 326).

For other accounts of this event, cf. Ibn al-Qalānisi, Dhail, 279; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, XI, 64-6; idem, Atabecp, 66-70; Anon. Syr. Chron., 281-6; Ibn Shaddād, Jazira, f. 29a; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 260-4.

The year 492/1098-9 would appear to be the correct date of the capture of Edessa by the Franks (Matthew of Edessa, Chronique, 218-19; Anon. Syr. Chron., 70-1).

Tāj al-Daula Tutush, however, died in 487/1094-5 (Ibn al-Qalānisi, Dhail, 130).

Ms. B erroneously states that the Franks had held Edessa since 442/1050-1 (f. 123b).
464. Al-Bīra was a well-known citadel on the eastern bank of the Euphrates, due west of Edessa and Sarūj.

465. Ibn al-Athīr says that Zangi was on the point of taking the citadel when the news of Jaqar's murder reached him (Atabegs, 70).

466. As Ms. A makes no sense at all here, the version of the text in Ms. B has been used. Ms. A reads:–

467. Jaqar was assassinated at the instigation of the Saljuq malik, Alp Arslan b. Mahmūd, in Dhu'-l-Qa'da 539/April-May 1145. Zangi still used this prince as a faiñéant ruler to disguise his own power and was apparently awaiting the death of Sultan Mas'ūd before trying to install Alp Arslan as sultan. Death prevented him from doing this (Ibn al-Athīr, Atabegs, 71). Ibn al-'Adīm attributes the plot against Jaqar to the other Saljuq malik in Zangi's care, Farrukh-Shāh -- erroneously called Farkhān-Shāh by Ibn al-'Adīm (Zubda, 280-1).

468. Zangi left al-Bīra because he was now afraid for the safety of Mosul (Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 280; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 265).


470. The citadel of al-Bār'īa is mentioned by Ibn al-'Adīm in the context of Zangi's siege of Amid. It must have been situated near Amid. Zangi conquered al-Bār'īa at the same time as Şūr and Jabal Jūr (Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 254). It would appear from Usāma's account that he was personally present when Zangi took the citadel of al-Bār'īa (Memoirs, 186).
471. The benevolence of the régime of Zain al-Din 'Ali Kūčük is also stressed by Ibn al-Athīr, Atabega, 73.

472. Ibn al-Jauzī gives an obituary of a member of the Mu’awajj family, which must have been prominent in Baghdad (Kuntażam, IX, 51).


474. Shams al-Daula Sulaimān was the brother of Temūr-Tash.

475. Ms. A: جامع مات. This makes better sense with an extra min added.

476. The bodies of 'Il-Ghāzī and his son, Sulaimān, must have been taken from the masjid al-amir in Mayyāfāriqīn to Mārdīn some time between 518/1124 and 529/1135, since in Ibn al-Azraq’s account of the death of Dubais in 529/1134-5 he relates that Dubais’ body was taken to Mārdīn and buried beside 'Il-Ghāzī (Ms. A, f. 165b).

    Ibn al-‘Adīm states in his biography of Dubais:— "I saw the mashhad in which Dubais is buried. It is to the west of the city of Mārdīn.... The daughter of 'Il-Ghāzī b. Artuq, the wife of Dubais, built it" (Bughyat, 250).

    It seems probable that 'Il-Ghāzī was finally buried in Mārdīn. According to Ibrāhīm Artuk, 'Abd al-Salam, the former mufti of Mārdīn, writes that 'Il-Ghāzī is buried in a hikeme in the Ağfār mosque opposite the hospital in Mārdīn (op. cit., 61). Gabriel also mentions the Jāmi‘ al- Ağfār, which, he says, according to some traditions housed the tomb of 'Il-Ghāzī (A. Gabriel, Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale [Paris, 1940] I, 11).
477. The whole question of the Qaramān bridge is discussed in greater detail by Ibn al-Azraq on f. 171b.

478. Ms. A: الدهمہ "curtain wall"

479. The Egyptian vizier was not the first prisoner to escape with make-shift ropes from the lofty citadel of Mārdīn. Sulṭān-Shāh b. Rijwān escaped with ropes from a window of the citadel in 518/1124-5 (Ibn al-ʿAdīn, Zubdah, 220).

480. Bāghīn was a citadel north-west of Nayyāfārīqīn. It is listed by Ibn Shaddād amongst the citadels of Diyar Bakr. He calls it Qalʿat Bāghīn al-Suflā (Jazīra, f. 65b). Cf. also Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 178, 185; Cahen, "Diyār Bakr", 226.

481. This anecdote is an interesting reminder of continuing Ismāʿīlī activity in Diyar Bakr.

482. Temūr-Tash obviously paid regular visits to Nayyāfārīqīn from his base at Mārdīn.

483. Ms. A: وبلغ الأمير بلغاً عظيمةـ
A more normal construction here would be the use of عند with the امیر.

484. This is one of the castles of the Ismāʿīlīs listed by Dimishqī (G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Auslame [London, 1890], 352, quoting Dimishqī; Gaudfroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Namelouke [Paris, 1923], 114).

The citadel of Abū Qubais is not mentioned by al-ʿAlqashanī when he enumerates Ismāʿīlī citadels (Al-Ṣubh al-ʿAshā fi sināʿat al-inshā [Cairo, 1914-28], XIII, 245).
This is a reference to Temür-Tash's son, Najm al-Dīn Alpī.

These genealogical facts tally with Turan's family tree of the rulers of Akhūt, which he gives at the back of his history of Eastern Anatolia.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Sukmān al-Aṭṭī} & & \\
(1100-12) & & \\
\text{Āḥmad} & \text{Ibrāḥīm} & \text{Yaʿqūb} \\
(1126-7) & (1112-26) & \\
& & \\
\text{Sukmān II} & & \\
(1126-85) & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Najm al-Dīn Alpī married the daughter of Āḥmad. Her mother must also have been married to Ibrāḥīm and bore him Sukmān II.

The Mss. have the forms Aqramān and ʿaramān. Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī calls it the ʿaramān bridge (op. cit., 183). Cuatremèrē says there is a mention in the history by Rashīd al-Dīn of بقومان which flowed between Mayyafāriqīn and Arzan (op. cit., 363). The form Caramān has therefore been selected.

\[\text{i) Ms. A: جسراتراون على القناة} \]
\[\text{ii) Ms. B: جسراتراون بالقيمطعم} \]

These two divergent readings raise the question of the identity of the bridge. The reading in Ms. A has been chosen.

Cahen, who reads further into Ms. A into the reign of Najm al-Dīn Alpī, states that the work on the bridge was
interrupted twice by floods; once on the occasion analysed in this account and once later, when the bridge was damaged and rebuilt under Alpī.

The stone arch, of more than sixty spans, was one of the wonders of the age (Cahen, "Diyār Bakr", 272, citing Ms. A, f. 179b).

This later description of Ibn al-Azraq where the arched bridge is admired tallies with 1). Cahen, on his map of Diyār Bakr, places the Qaramān bridge due east of Mayyāfāriqīn on the Satidāmā (ibid., 222). The Satidāmā (also called the Nymphaeus) is the Batman Su and flows five miles east of Mayyāfāriqīn (Taylor, op. cit., 49).

Further confirmation that the bridge in question was on the Satidāmā/Batman Su is given by Gabriel, who mentions a monumental bridge going back to medieval times which crosses the Batman Su, a tributary of the Tigris, to the east of Mayyāfāriqīn (A. Gabriel, Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie Orientale [Paris, 1940], 231).

Gabriel gives a detailed analysis of the bridge, which he also sketches, and says that Sauvaget, who read the inscriptions, established with certainty the name Temūr-Tash and the year 542 on the bridge (ibid., 236). Gabriel believes that the bridge which remains corresponds to the initial building project begun in 541/1146-7 (ibid.).

In a later description of the bridge, Ibn al-Azraq writes:-

"Al-Saʿīd Ḥusayn al-Dīn had begun the building of the Qaramān bridge on the Sātīdāmā river. He built most of it, leaving unfinished some of the work for the completion of the arch.
After his death, al-Mlik al-Majm al-DIn set about completing it. He built and repaired it and completed the joining of the arch." (Ms. A, f. 179b).

Ibn al-Azraq then describes how this bridge became the model for other bridges in the area, especially the one built by Fakhr al-Din ala Arslan on the Tigris at Hgjn Kafa (ibid.).

ii) The version of Ms. B remains a problem: "the Qaraman bridge on the Qaiqum (sic)".

It is difficult to assess why Ibn al-Azraq, as a native of Kayyafriqin and its chronicler, should write this, since he must have been extremely familiar with the topography of the area. This variant reading must be due to scribal tampering. One possible interpretation of the reading in Ms. B is that the area Qaiqum is meant. Qaiqum lay to the west of the Euphrates, in the area of Hgjn Mangur, due west of Amid. In this area was an older, even more famous bridge which according to Ibn Hauqal was one of the wonders of the world (Le Strange, Lands, 123).

For an analysis of early bridges in this area, cf. also F. ?Itler, "Eine Gruppe der Frhthrkischen Brcken in S Dieostanatolien", IVme Congres International d'Art Turc (Aix and Paris, 1976), 99. "Itler calls the Qaraman bridge the "Malabadi" bridge, dates it between 1145-54 (540-9) and publishes a photograph of it.

489. Ms. A: 

Ms. B: (f. 126a)

The version of Ms. B has been used since it makes better sense.

490. i) Ms. A: 

ii) Ms. B: (f. 126a)
"Al-Zāhid claimed (money) from him (Temūr-Tash) for building it, so he was removed from it (the job)."

or

ii) "He (Temūr-Tash) fined al-Zāhid."

ii) seems to make better sense.


The correct form of this name is Saif aI-Din Shirbārik Mahmūd b. ‘Alī b. Alp Yarug b. Artuq (cf. the genealogical table of the Artuqids).

492. "And he worked on it until 548/1153-4 (Ms. B, f. 126b).

493. The ‘Uqailid ruler of the citadel.

494. This name presents some difficulties. Cahen calls this son of Temūr-Tash Janāl al-Dīn Tafratī ("Diyār Bakr", 251) but he is tentative about his reading. Artuk reads "Tughrati" (I. Artuk, op. cit., unnumbered last page). The disposition of the letters would also permit the reading "Surbi".

495. Cf. n. 387.

496. Ibn al-Athīr relates that Ḥassān was sent to try to persuade ‘Alī b. Mālik to surrender the citadel. He was chosen because of his friendship with ‘Alī. He was told by Zangī to offer ‘Alī inducements and gifts (Atabegs, 74).

497. Ibn al-Athīr’s account is broadly similar to that of Ibn al-Azraq. Ibn al-Athīr also explains the point of ‘Alī’s pithy comment about Balak and his fortuitous death at Manbij, where Ḥassān was governor (Atabegs, 64).

Ibn Shaddād’s account is slightly different:-

"‘Alī said: ‘Give me until tomorrow!’ So Ḥassān said to him:
'What can happen to you tomorrow?' 'Ali replied: 'What happened to Balak...while he was besieging you at Kanbij' (Jazîra, ff. 34a-b).

Ibn al-'Adîm suggests that Zangi's offer of money to 'Ali had been accepted but that Zangi subsequently broke faith with him (Zubda, 282). Ibn al-'Adîm also relates the anecdote about Balak (ibid., 283).

The dates given in the sources for Zangi's death may be tabulated as follows:-

Ibn al-Azraq: 5 or 9 Rabi' II, 541
Ibn Shaddâd: Monday, 6 Rabi' II, 541 (Jazîra, f. 34b)
Michael the Syrian: Sunday, 15 September, 1146 (Rabi' II, A.H. 541) (Chronique, 268)
Ibn Khallikân: Wednesday, 15 Rabi' II, 541 (Wafâyât, I, 541)
Ibn al-Qalânî: Sunday, 6 Rabi' II, 541 (Dhail, 285)
Ibn al-Athîr: 4 Rabi' II, 541 (Kamîl, XI, 72; Atabegs, 74)

The death of such an important figure as Zangi is overlaid in the sources with a wealth of details and apocryphal anecdotes. In one such anecdote, Ibn Khallikân relates that the poet, Ibn Munîr al-Tarabulûsî, always brought misfortune to those who were with him. Zangi liked his verses when they were read out to him during the siege of Qal'at Ja'bar and he summoned the poet to him. The night Ibn Munîr arrived, Zangi was murdered (Wafâyât, I, 138-43).

Ibn al-Qalânî says that Zangi was murdered by a slave of Frankish origin. He waited until Zangi was drunk and then
killed him in his sleep. He fled to 'Ali in the citadel, who did not believe that he had murdered Zangi but welcomed him (Dhail, 285).

Certainly the most likely person to have murdered Zangi would appear to have been 'Ali, especially since Zangi had apparently not kept faith with him. On the other hand, he could have been killed by partisans of Alp Arslan b. Mahmūd. It is equally possible that the murderer had some private score to settle with him; Zangi's ferocity was a legend in his own time and he must have been more vulnerable than most contemporary rulers to such personal grudges.

501. The confusion and chaos after Zangi's death is described most graphically by the Anonymous Syriac Chronicle:-
"Fear and confusion fell on the camp; they plundered one another, and each who had a grudge against his neighbour and had the power took vengeance on him...... The guards sacked the tent and camp of Zangi...... All went their own ways" (Op. cit., 291).

502. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Jawād al-Iṣfahānī was one of the most important officials employed in high positions by Zangi and by his sons, Saif al-Dīn Ghāzi and Qūṭ b. al-Jauzī, Mirāt, 248-50; Bundārī, Zubdat, 211-3).

503. These details are borrowed almost verbatim by Ibn Khallikān from Ibn al-Azraq (cf. p. 46). Ibn al-Azraq does not see any need to explain that the real intention of Jamāl al-Dīn and Kamāl al-Dīn was to conciliate Alp Arslan until Saif al-Dīn Ghāzi could reach Mosul and assume power.
504. The term *malik* has not been translated here and on the other
occasions where it appears in Ibn al-Azraq's text. Saljuq
princes were known as *maliks* in contradistinction to the
chief ruler, the sultan (cf. Lambton, op. cit., 218).

505. Şalāh al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Yağhī-Sıyani was certainly not the
same person as Şalāh al-Dīn b. Ayyūb, as Ms. A mistakenly
suggests.

506. The division of Zangi's forces into two factions is confirmed
by other sources (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 285; Michael the Syrian,
Chronique, 268). For the establishment of Nūr al-Dīn at


508. Cf. n. 54.

509. For references to Shahrazūr in the medieval geographers, cf.
Le Strange, Lands, 190-1.

510. Ms. B adds: "It is said that he killed the *malik*".

511. The *mustaufi* was the head of the *dīwān al-istifā* (Uzunçarşılı, 
Osmanlı devleti, 45 and 103).


513. The immediate descendants of Zangi who now enter Ibn al-Azraq's
history are as follows:—

```
 Zangi
      /\         /\           /\           /\             /\  
 Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī Nūr al-Dīn Nuṣrat al-Dīn Qutb al-Dīn daughter
          Maḥmūd            Amir Amīrān    Maudūd
```


For other accounts of the Armenian revolt at Edessa, cf. Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 270; Matthew of Edessa, Chronique, 328-9; Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, 272; Ibn al-‘Adīm, Zubda, 290; Ibn al-Qalanisī, Dhai, 288; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, XI, 75.

What Ibn al-Azraq fails to mention in his account is the complicity of Joscelin, who saw the period immediately following the death of Zangi as a propitious moment for the capture of Edessa. An even more important omission by Ibn al-Azraq is the fact that it was Nūr al-Dīn who took Edessa, whilst ‘Izz al-Dīn al-Dubaisī arrived before the city too late. Thus, Nūr al-Dīn, not his brother Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī from Nosul, whose associate ‘Izz al-Dīn al-Dubaisī was, had acquired the important possession of Edessa (Ibn al-‘Adīm, Zubda, 290; Ibn Shaddād, Jazīra, f. 29b).

515. Ibn Shaddād mentions the two citadels of al-Nawawzār and Jamālīn together. He states that they were situated between Diyār Nuḍar and Diyār Bakr, at a distance of one day’s journey from Harrān. They were held by the Franks after their capture of Edessa and later by the Artuqids. Zangi fortified al-Nawawzār in 535/1140-1 and Jamālīn in 538/1143-4. After Zangi’s death, they were re-captured by the Artuqids (f. 21b).

For Zangi’s capture of al-Nawawzār, cf. also Ibn al-Furāt, Duwal, f. 29b.
516. Tall Mauzan was situated on the road from Edessa to Mardin. It was a town built of black stones (Canard, H'amdanides, 93; Markwart, Südarmenien, 257; Honigmann, Ostrgrenze, 22).

517. Cf. n. 515.

518. The death of Zangi allowed the minor rulers of Diyar Bakr a new lease of life. Timur-Tash profited at once from this power vacuum to seize these citadels.

519. Qara Arslan acted in similar fashion.

520. The citadel of al-Haithum is mentioned by Ibn Shaddad (Jazira, f. 65b).

Michael the Syrian says that Qara Arslan invaded the Türk 'Abdîn, which had previously belonged to his father and which Zangi had seized. After numerous massacres he established his power over the area (op. cit., 268).

521. The Shāh-i Arman at this time was Sukmān II.

522. Cf. n. 640.

523. It would appear that Timur-Tash minted only one issue of coins, which were copper. The few examples that have been found were discussed by Lane-Poole. He mentions four such coins, none of which have a date or the place where they were minted (S. Lane-Poole, The Coins of the Turkmân Houses of Seljook, Urtuk, Zengee, etc. in the British Museum [London, 1877], 139-40).

524. Arslan Tughmīsh was the ruler of Mızgand (cf. n. 659).

525. The sequence of events here is not explained by Ibn al-Azraq. After Arslan Tughmīsh died, Qara Arslan went to take Mızgand. Timur-Tash profited from Qara Arslan's absence to seize Is'ird and Batāsā.
526. The declaration of suzerainty to Temür-Tash by the lord of Amid and his vizier and their participation in the attack on Isʿīrīd had probably been prompted by fear of Qara Arslan who had attacked Amid around this time (Michael the Syrian, Chronicle, 288).

527. Hadiyya Khatun, Temür-Tash's daughter, returned to Kaysīfārīqīn after the death of her husband, Arslan Toghmāš b. Dā'ūd. She had married him in 539/1144-5.

528. A quarrel between Temūr-Tash and Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī was inevitable as soon as the latter had established himself firmly at Mosul. Temūr-Tash had, after all, taken back Zangi's possessions after Zangi's death in 541/1146.

Temūr-Tash had taken back Dārā but in 544/1149-50 Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī re-conquered it. He extended his authority over a large section of the territory around Mārdīn. He then besieged Mārdīn itself and pillaged the countryside. Temūr-Tash was obliged to sue for peace and handed over his daughter Zumurrud Khatun in marriage to Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī (Ibn al-Athīr, Atabegs, 91).

Significantly, Ibn al-Azraq maintains a discreet silence over a defeat incurred by Temūr-Tash, his former master.

529. *Walnab sāliyaka [عَنْك] جماعة*

Since the plural given here is the plural of *mamliḳ*, it has been translated accordingly as "slaves". The proximity of the word *jamāʿa* "group" (of people) strengthens this hypothesis.

530. ʿIzz al-Dīn Saltuq was the ruler of Erzurum from 1132-68. He married his daughter to the ruler of Akhlāṭ, Sukmaḳ II (O. Turan, Doğu Anadolu, 9-10).
Ms. B adds that she wanted to perform the pilgrimage.

The Khatun was probably prevented from performing the pilgrimage because of the existence of hadiths which forbid a woman to travel alone. She should be accompanied by male relatives. The Khatun of Akhlāṭ was obviously a woman of independent spirit. As Spuler points out, although women had enjoyed a notable lack of restrictions in early Islamic times, they had lost this to a great extent thereafter. He goes on to say that much of the later impetus towards greater freedom for women can be attributed to the irruption of the nomadic Turks into the Near East (B. Spuler, Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit [Heidelberg, 1952], 380-3).

The proper title of this man was al-Mustauffi Mu'ayyid al-Daula Abu'1-‘īasan b. al-Mukhtar. He had first come to Kavgāfārīqīn to take over the diwān al-istifā' in 510/1116-7 (‘Awāq, 283).

In the provinces, the mushrif was the head of the diwān al-ishrāf which was the accounting department. The mushrif worked closely with the diwān al-istifā' (Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 51-2).

Several possibilities may be adduced here:

i) The word bi‘a may have a more general meaning than "church".

ii) The word may be read as بقعة (place).

iii) Ibn Mukhtar was a Christian and remained one, although he adopted Muslim names.

iv) Ibn Mukhtar was a Muslim but was buried in a Christian building.

Of these possibilities, the third is the most likely. Mardin was a very important centre of Christianity and
Christians would certainly have outnumbered Muslims at this time. High administrative posts were often held by Christians. Even at the time when Niebuhr visited Mardin, he found that one-third of the population of the city was still Christian (V. F. Minorsky, "Mardin", FI, 276).

Quatremère translates the word bī'a as monastery (Konkola, 363) but the Christian affiliation of the building is unquestioned by him.

536. Ms. A has al-Mu'ayyid al-Daula. The al- has been deleted.

537. Al-Ḥāfiẓ died on 5 Jumādā II 544/1149-50 (Wüstenfeld, Fatimiden-Chalifen, 310).

538. Abu'l-Mangūr Ismā‘īl was the youngest son of al-Ḥāfiẓ. He was born in 527/1132-3 so he succeeded to the throne when he was only seventeen (ibid., 312).

539. According to Usâma, this man’s full name was Saif al-Dīn b. al-Sallār. After al-Ẓāfir had been forced to appoint him as vizier, Ibn al-Sallār assumed the title al-Malik al-‘Adil. In Ramāḍān 544/January 1150, al-Ẓāfir had Ibn al-Sallār put to death (Memoirs, 31-3).

Wüstenfeld corrects this last date to 6 Muḥarram 548 (Fatimiden-Chalifen, 317).

Sallār, the father of the vizier of al-Ẓāfir, was a Kurd. He had served in the laskar of Sukmān b. Artuq. When al-Afdul took Jerusalem, he joined the Egyptian army (ibid., 312).

540. Ms. A: (?) Jzn'Vjjj.,.Jj.J. "The ruler behind the scenes was the auīr al-juyush, (al-Malik) al-‘Adil (Ibn) al-Sallār". (?)
The difficulty is the reading which is not very satisfactory. The word might be or (?). Neither reading yields much sense.

541. Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī was one of the most famous officials of the age. He exercised great power first at Kosul and then at Damascus. He and his brother, Tāj al-Dīn Abū Tāhir Yahyā had been with Zangī at Qal‘at Ja‘bar and after the latter’s assassination they had been instrumental in putting Zangī’s son, Saif al-Dīn Ghāzi, in power. Saif al-Dīn had handed over the running of affairs in Mosul to these two brothers. Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī later served the Ayyūbids in Syria and founded madrasas in Mosul and Naṣībin (Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, II, 646-9; Ibn al-Jauzī, Muntaghām, X, 268).

542. Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī seems to have been the more powerful of the two brothers.

543. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī and Zain al-Dīn ‘Alī Küçük had been the faithful associates of Zangī. When Saif al-Dīn Ghāzi came to power in Mosul, Jamāl al-Dīn stayed as vizier and Zain al-Dīn was governor and commander of the ‘askar (Elisséeff, op. cit., II, 437). Relations between these two men and Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī appear to have become strained and the latter was imprisoned by Saif al-Dīn.

544. Cf. n. 34 and n. 380.

545. This rather complicated description of the administrative posts held by the Shahrazūrī family has been rendered more comprehensible by the occasional addition of nouns instead of ambiguous pronouns.

At the time of the Crusades, there were several kinds of dinār (gold coins): Imāmī dinārs struck at Baghdad by the caliph; Amīrī dinārs struck by the amīrs; Sūrī dinārs struck by the Fatimids and red dinārs possibly struck by the Seljuqs (Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, *Histoires Orientaux* [Paris, 1887], II, 115, n. 1).

The fact that Najm al-Dīn appointed his son, Bahā’ al-Dīn, as qāḍī of al-Rāhba has not been mentioned before.

Ibn Khallikān, who borrows this incident from Ibn al-Azraq, corrects the name of Kamāl al-Dīn’s son to Jalāl al-Dīn Abu’l-Aḥmad b. Kamāl al-Dīn (cf. *supra*, p. 43, n. 4).

Ibn Khallikān also corrects the name of the son of Tāj al-Dīn to read Дiyā’ al-Dīn Abu’l-Fadā’il al-Qāsim b. Tāj al-Dīn (*ibid.*).

This anecdote is written as a continuous narrative by Ibn Khallikān. Ibn al-Azraq resumes the story on f. 174b.


This is a repetition of events already described on p. 309.

Ms. A: \(\text{وادر نصلا} \)\\
\(\text{حكم نصلا} \)\\
The normal usage would be حكم نصلا.

Ms. A: Rashīd al-Daula b. al-Anbārī. This should read Sadīd al-Daula (cf. n. 220).

The vizier in question is still Niẓām al-Dīn, after his completion of the pilgrimage.

558. Ibn al-Tiqtaqī writes that the vizier Hizām al-Dīn was succeeded by Muʿtaman al-Daula Abu'l-ʿAsim ʿAlī b. Ṣadaqa (al-Fakhri, 534).

559. Ibn al-Jauzī says that Fāṭima Khatun bint Sultan Muḥammad died in Baghdad in Rabīʿ I 542/1147 (Kuntazam, 123).

Ibn Khallikān gives the exact date of her death as 22 Rabīʿ II 542/September 1147 (Haṭavāt, III, pt. 1, 239).


561. The name Atabeg Ghāzī refers to Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī b. Zangī.

562. This marriage had been arranged after Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī had attacked Mārīn (cf. n.528).

563. Ms. A: وقائد الوالي الشيخ عـروالشیوخ

The use of the word wāli presents problems here.

A bride is accompanied by a close male relative (والي). In certain madhhabs, the governor (والي) would deputise at a marriage, if the bride had no close male relative (والي) (This information was kindly provided by Dr. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ‘Alī).

Probably the concept  والي  is intended here and the word  والي  is a scribal error.

564. Again the word used is  والي  .

565. Husām al-Daula Qurtī and his family are discussed by Minorsky (V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History [London, 1953], 85–6). These amīrs ruled Arzan and Bitlis.

Their genealogy is as follows:-
Minorsky misreads Ibn al-Azraq’s text here (he follows the transcription of part of the text by Amedroz). Minorsky says that Daulat-Shah died in 539/1144 (ibid., 90, n. 1). In fact, Ibn al-Azraq relates that Da'ud of Ḥiṣn Kaifā died in 539/1144.

566. Ms. A: ىلصُرُبِدِبِت ىلصُرِبِبِت Ms. B: ىلصُبِبِبِت ىلصُبِبِبِت
The version of Ms. B has been preferred here, since it is usually followed by ب، whereas ب takes ب. ىلصُبِبِبِت ىلصُبِبِبِت.

567. This may be the same person whose pilgrimage is recorded on p. 52/f, 173b.

568. The diwan al-ishrāf, as well as holding responsibility for the collection of taxes, also administered waqfs (A. K. S. Lambton, op. cit., 259).

Ibn al-Azraq’s post was probably that of supervising waqfs. Yet again, however, problems are caused by the use of imprecise administrative terminology in this period.

Amedroz erroneously refers to Ibn al-Azraq’s post as the mutawalli ashraf (H. F. Amedroz, "Three Arabic Mss. on the History of the City of Mayyafarīqīn", JRAS [1902], 787).

Ashraf is the plural of sharif.

569. Saif al-Dīn Châṣī was probably at Naṣībīn during his campaign into Diyar Bakr in 544/1149-50 (Ibn al-Athīr, Atabegs, 90-1).
570. Şamşām al-Dīn Bahram was the brother of Zumurrud Khatun and the son of Temür-Tash.

571. When Zumurrud Khatun arrived in Mosul, her husband was already seriously ill, suffering from colic (Ibn al-Āthīr, Atabegs, 92; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dhail, 306). Their marriage was not consummated (Ibn al-Āthīr, Atabegs, 91).

572. Zumurrud Khatun stayed in the house of the daughter of Sukhān al-Quṭbī of Akhlaq. She had married Zangī after both he and Husām al-Daula Qurtbī from Arzan had asked for her hand (Usāma, Memoirs, 118-9; Ibn al-‘Adīm, Zubdā, 254).

573. Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī died at the end of Jumāda II, 544/November 1149 (Ibn al-Āthīr, Atabegs, 92). According to Ibn al-Āthīr, the best doctor of the time was summoned but to no avail (ibid.).

574. Ms. A: Maudūd. This has been corrected to Maudūd.

575. Quṭb al-Dīn Maudūd, another of Zangī's sons, was put in power at Mosul by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, the vizier, and by Zain al-Dīn 'Alī, the commander of the 'askar. They saw his malleability would be in their own interests (Ibn al-Āthīr, Atabegs, 94; Kāmil, XI, 91-2).

576. According to Ibn al-Āthīr, Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī was buried in a madrasa which he himself had founded at Mosul (Atabegs, 92).

577. This is the resumption of the story begun on p. 322/173a.

578. For a discussion of this passage, cf. Chapter II, p. 43 .

579. The tarba was a kind of hood worn by the chief nādis of the Shāfiʿite sect (Ibn Khallikān, Ḥafūvat, II, 649 -- n. 1 by de Slane quoting M. de Sacy in his Chrestomathie, II, 269).

580. Ms. A: بعد القضايحة الوثناء
This period is normally called the 'idda. It is a prescribed period of four months, ten days in which widows cannot contract a new marriage (cf. "‘idda", El).

581. Dārā was constantly changing hands. Zangī had taken it, and when he died, Temür-Tash took it back. Thereafter Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī captured it in 544/1149-50 (Atabegs, 90; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 275). No doubt the capture of Dārā by Temür-Tash recorded here was the immediate result of the news of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī’s death.

582. From around 539-42/1144-7, King Alphonso VII of Castile made raids into Andalusiā, pillaging the country as far as Almeria (Julien, op. cit., 91).

583. Ms. B simply says that the Bedouin attacked the pilgrimage.

584. Ms. A: ربط فهم

The underlined phrase is rather strange. Perhaps it should read

585. This is a fine piece of pro-Artuqīd propaganda. Temūr-Tash had in fact already proved powerless to resist the onslaught of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī in 544/1149-50. No doubt Ibn al-Azraq deliberately suppressed the circumstances of this affray.

There was a certain falling off of interest on the part of both Nūr al-Dīn and Quṭb al-Dīn, his brother, from Diyār Bakr. Thus it would be true to say that of the petty rulers of that area, Temūr-Tash was the master for a brief time — some three years — until his death in 547/1152-3. Qara Arslan of Ḫıṣn Kaifā was the faithful ally of Nūr al-Dīn and answered his appeals for help (Atabegs, 96).
This event is mentioned without comment by Ibn al-Azraq on two occasions. Nu‘īn al-Dīn Unur was the de facto ruler of Damascus, rather than the Būrid family behind whom he wielded his power. He died on 23 Rabi‘ II 544/30 August 1149 (Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dhail, 306).

According to Ibn al-Athīr, Nūr al-Dīn was defeated by the Franks, not the other way round. Joscelin captured some weapons from Nūr al-Dīn’s silāhdār and sent them to Sultan Mas‘ūd b. ʿIlīch Arslan in Konya, who was the father-in-law of Nūr al-Dīn. Joscelin sent a message too, telling Mas‘ūd that he would soon be receiving other weapons too. Nūr al-Dīn was extremely angered by this insult (Ibn al-Athīr, Atabergs, 101-2).

Joscelin of Bdesa owned a number of citadels such as Tall Bāshir, al-Bīra, Mar‘ash and ʿIyān Manṣūr (Cahen, Syrie, 365). He was captured by a group of Turcomans. Majd al-Dīn b. al-Dāya negotiated with them and Joscelin was brought into Aleppo in Muḥarram 545/May 1150 (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 301-2). For other accounts of Joscelin’s capture, cf. Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Dhail, 310; Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, 276.

Nūr al-Dīn attacked Joscelin’s territory and took a number of citadels. The sources vary on the exact identity of these acquisitions. Ibn al-Qalānīsī mentions Tall Bāshir and Tall Khālid (Dhail, 310 and 315). Ibn al-Athīr also lists these two citadels, as well as others (Atabergs, 102-3).

Sumaisāt was an important strategic point, between the Kīakhta Su and the Khalburji Su (Canard, H’amdanides, 265).

According to Ibn Shaddād, Temūr-Tash kept al-Bīra until Nūr al-Dīn took it from him and gave it as an iqṭā‘ to Shihāb
al-Dīn Muhammad b. Ayaz b. Īl-Ghazi, who held it until he died in 577/1181-2 (Jazīra, f. 36b).


593. Qara Arslan had begun the attacks on Joscelin’s territory. He took Bābālu and invaded the area around Gargar as early as 543/1148-9 (Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 290).

594. Bābālu is listed by Ibn Shaddād (Jazīra, f. 65b). Michael the Syrian says the fortress was on the bank of the Euphrates (Chronique, 290). Cahen places it opposite Charīmūk, between Gargar and Khānīzit (“Diyār Bakr”, 226).

595. Gargar was called Karkaron by the Byzantines. It was situated on the Euphrates (cf. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 116, 1333; Markwart, Südarmenien, 255; Canard, H’amdandes, 264; Gaudefroy-Demombynes, op. cit., 87).

596. Ms. A: Kaisūn. This must be a mistaken reference to Kaisūn, which Cahen describes as a prosperous little town between Qal’at al-Rūm and the Aq-Su. The citadel of Kaisūn which was originally of mud brick was partially re-built of stone by Baldwin of Mar’ash (Cahen, Syrie, 120).

597. Mas‘ūd sent his son Qilich Arslan to attack Mar’ash (Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 290). There is no mention, however, of Kaisūn. Ibn al-Athīr says that it was Nūr al-Dīn who took Mar’ash (Atabegs, 103).

598. Cahen implies that Ibn al-Azraq says that Temūr-Tash actually occupied Qal’at al-Rūm (“Diyār Bakr”, 254, n. 1). He must have misread the text.

599. This is a repetition of p. 329/f. 175a.
The word could also be read but makes little sense here. The sons of Jamāl al-Dīn were Temūr-Tash's grandsons. The verb "to circumcise" is the colloquial word. The classical usage would be.

The manshūr was the patent of appointment, sent by the caliph, which assigned to a new amīr all the territories which his father had held or which he himself might have acquired. The manshūr was read out before a large gathering and the ceremony ended with the donning by the amīr of a khilfa (a robe of honour) sent by the caliph (R. Levy, *The Social Structure of Islam* [Cambridge, 1971], 372).

Since Temūr-Tash had ruled Kārdīn for thirty years by this date, it is probable that the arrival of this edict from Baghdad finally recognising his authority in Diyār Bakr represents the apogee of his power, the brief moment when, unfettered by submission to the Zangids from Mosul, he enjoyed a small degree of independence.

The space between two rows of pillars in a mosque was called *riwān* (plural *arwān* or *riwāğāt*) (cf. J. Pedersen, "Haqāqīd", FII).

Ibn Shaddād adds here:—

"The rest of it (the mosque) was pulled down. Then he (Temūr-Tash) ordered that it should be re-built" (*Jazira*, f. 104b).

Ṣuṭb al-Dīn al-ʿAbbādī had come to Baghdad in 541/1146-7 on a mission from Sultan Sanjar to the caliph, and people flocked to hear his sermons. He died in 546/1151-2 whilst in Khūzistān as an envoy from the caliph to Muhammad b. Kaḥḥād (Amīdros, "Three Arabic MSS.", 790, n. 1, citing Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, Kāmil, XI, 78 and 103).
605. The appointment of Ibn Hubaira to the caliphal vizierate after Ibn ʿaṣāq is confirmed by Ibn Ṭiḥağhā (al-Fākirī, 534-5). Ibn al-ʿAṭīr also gives the date as 544/1149-50 (Kāmil, XI, 96). Ibn Hubaira was one of the principal architects of the reassertion of caliphal authority after the death of Sultan Masʿūd. In 549/1154-5 al-Nuqtūfī, in recognition of his vizier's services, accorded him the titles Sultan al-ʿIraq and malik al-juyūsh (Ibn al-Jauzī, Muntazam, x, 157). Cf. also Bundārī, Zubdat, 234-5.

606. The diwān al-zīmān waʿl-istīfā was the Treasury department (Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devleti, 45). In Saljuq Iran it was also called the diwān-i ʿistīfā-yi manālik (Lambton, op. cit., 257). For an analysis of the functions of this department under the Great Saljuqs, cf. Horst, Staatsverwaltung, 36-8.

Ibn Hubaira had been given charge of the diwān al-zīmān in 542/1147-8 (Ibn al-ʿAṭīr, Kāmil, XI, 81).

607. This may be a reference to Muḥāhid al-ʿDīn Būzān, a Kurdish amīr, who is mentioned frequently by Ibn al-ʿalānīsī. In 542/1147-8 he was entrusted with the fortress of Sarkhad (Dḥail, 292).

608. According to Bundārī, Masʿūd spent the winter of 545/1150-1 in Baghdad. Thereafter he never returned there again (Zubdat, 226).

609. This reference to the animals in Masʿūd's retinue may have been mentioned by Ibn al-ʿAẓrāq because of its curiosity value. Perhaps Masʿūd paraded such animals to excite awe and admiration amongst the populace. Certainly, even as late as Timur's time, the presence of elephants in his attack on Aleppo provoked panic amongst the inhabitants of that city.
The possession of elephants was a jealously guarded royal prerogative (C. E. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and Eastern Iran. 994-1040 [Edinburgh, 1963], 115-7).

Ibn Khallikān has exactly the same date as Ibn al-Azraq for the death of Masʿūd (Jafayāt, III, pt. 1, 363).

For other accounts of Masʿūd's death, cf. Ibn al-Athīr, Atabegs, 105; idem, Kāmil, XI, 105; Rawandi, Ṣāḥīḥ, 205; Bundārī, Zubdat, 226-7; Ibn al-Jauzī, Muntagam, X, 151; Mustaʿfī, Guzīda, 357.

The Tārikh-i Guzīda states that Masʿūd was buried in a madrasa in Hamadān, having died on 1 Rajab (ibid.). Ibn Khallikān says he was buried in a madrasa built by Jamāl al-Dīn Iqbāl al-Khādīm (Jafayāt, III, pt. 1, 364).

Ibn al-Azraq is unusually precise about his dates here. If they are correct, the implication is that the news of Sultan Masʿūd's death took three weeks to reach Baghdad. Perhaps the event had been deliberately kept hidden, as was often the case.

Al-Muqtaṣī chose Masʿūd's death as the most appropriate moment to manifest firm signs of his desire for independence, although there had been inklings right from the outset of his caliphate that he did not fit Sultan Masʿūd's blueprint of a puppet caliph (cf. p.153, f. 165b).

Ibn al-Athīr relates a significant anecdote about al-Muqtaṣī immediately after his accession. The new caliph gave a particularly clever and subtle reply to a question asked him by the sultan's vizier who wanted to know what his household requirements would be. The vizier returned to the sultan and said: "It would have been prudent to stay clear of this man.... I have seen
in him indications of great intellect, an ability to achieve his aims and a high degree of knowledge" (Atabeg, 54).

613. This man is normally called Has'ūd al-Bilālī. After his departure from Baghdad to Takrit, the caliph set about ransacking the houses of Saljuq officials in the city (Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, XI, 106).

614. Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī stresses the tyranny of Has'ūd al-Bilālī during his period as shīna of Baghdad. He had been appointed in 541/1146-7 and thereafter the populace suffered (Mir'āt, 186).

615. The 'askar were the standing army of the ruler. The jund came from a second line of troops who were called up to fight on more important occasions (H. A. R. Gibb, A Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades [London, 1932], 34-6).

616. Cf. n. 79. Ms. B adds mukāb to this list (f. 117b). For a definition of this term, cf. R. Le Tourneau, Damas de 1075 à 1154 (Damascus, 1952), 14, n. 1.

617. Ms. A: واسطة ارتفاع العراق جميعه

Horst defines irtifā'at as directly-raised taxes (Staatsverwaltung, 187).

This may well be a reference to Ibn Hubaira's fiscal policy of making lands once again directly taxable (Bosworth, "Iranian World", 168).

Ms. B specifically states that al-Nuqtāfī took al-Ḥilla and Wāgīt (f. 118a).

618. Bundārī confirms that Malik-Shāh was with his uncle at the time of the latter's death but it is not clear if Has'ūd had actually appointed Malik-Shāh his heir (Zubdat, 227).
This name is given in the Cambridge History of Iran, V as Khāqāq Beg Arslan b. Palang-Eri. Since Boyle's system has been the one adopted for the transliteration of the names in this thesis, for the sake of consistency this name above has also been adopted. The transliteration Palang-Eri does, however, seem unsatisfactory.

Khāqāq Beg had emerged as an increasingly powerful figure in the last few years of Mas'ūd's reign (Bundārī, Zubdat, 198). Khāqāq Beg's growing influence prompted Sanjar to go to Rayy in Sha'ban 544/December 1149-January 1150 to try to check the situation (ibid., 224).

After a very short time, Khāqāq Beg deposed Malik-Shāh and imprisoned him (ibid.). Ibn al-Athīr then writes that Khāqāq Beg wrote to Muhammad-Shāh who was in Khūzistān, inviting him to come and take over the sultanate. His aim was to arrest him too and thus rid himself of Saljuq contenders who stood in his way (Atabegs, 105).

Malik-Shāh escaped from prison and withdrew to Khūzistān (Mustaufi, Guzida, 357).

Muhammad accepted Khāqāq Beg's invitation to come to Hamadhan but he soon killed Khāqāq Beg and took complete control himself. This occurred in 548/1153-4 (Ibn al-Athīr, Atabegs, 105).

Ibn al-Azraq's obituary notice of Sultan Mas'ūd is borrowed almost verbatim by Ibn Khallikān (cf. Chapter II, p.40).
This description of Mas'ūd's "generosity" to his associates is hollow panegyric, especially in view of the details which follow. Ibn al-Athīr is only too well aware of the strength of Mas'ūd and stresses that with his death, the power of the Saljuq family was irrevocably damaged (Kāmil, XI, 105).

Whilst amīrs such as those listed below managed to acquire autonomy in the outlying provinces of Mas'ūd's empire, Mas'ūd did make positive attempts to bring them to heel.

625. Ms. A: مترووس This must be a reference to Nengū-Bars (cf. n. 245). He was made governor of Fārs in 526/1131-2 by the Saljuq sultan, who made him atābeg to his son (al-Ḥusainī, Akhbār, 101). He rebelled and was eventually imprisoned and put to death by Mas'ūd in 532/1137-8 (Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, XI, 39).

626. Qaracha al-Saqī is wrongly placed in this list. He commanded the right wing of the army of Mas'ūd and Saljuq-Shāh in the battle which these two princes lost against their uncle Sanjar on 8 Rajab 526. Qaracha al-Saqī was imprisoned and killed by Sanjar (al-Ḥusainī, Akhbār, 101).

627. Here Ibn al-Azraq states explicitly that Mas'ūd killed the two caliphs, regardless of his earlier narrative where he presented a number of reports about their death (cf. pp. 292-300 /ff. 165b and 167b).

628. Ms. A: بوژیبان This name is usually known as Boz-Abā.

Boz-Abā, the lieutenant of Nengū-Bars in Khūzistān, took Fārs and Khūzistān after the latter's death. He plotted against Sultan Mas'ūd with the Saljuq princes Muḥammad, Malik-Shāh and
Sulaimān-Shāh, and 'Abbās, the wāli of Rayy. Boz-ība was executed by Mas'ūd in 542/1147-8 (Bosworth, "Iranian World", 126).

629. Ms. A: عبد الرحمن بن طغريب

'Abd al-Rahmān Toghan-Yürek was killed by Mas'ūd in 541/1146-7. He was amīr hādīb to Mas'ūd (Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, XI, 76).


631. Ms. B adds: "He is now in the diwān of the lord of Arzan."

632. Ms. B adds: "He remained on the Hau (sic) bridge for a while before going to Tall al-'Alawiyya. Messages went backwards and forwards between them and he (Temur-Tash) took the harvest that year" (f. 134a).

633. The name of Ibn Nisān, the vizier of Amīd, as well as that of his "master", Mahmūd b. ʿIīl-alḍār, is mentioned in the inscriptions of 550/1155-6 on the Great Mosque at Amīd (van Berchem, Amīda, 61). Van Berchem points out that the protocol of one inscription is an indication of the true political situation at Amīd at this time. The name of the vizier is mentioned first. Although he has no title, he takes precedence in the inscription over his nominal master for all the latter's titles (ibid., 62).

634. Ms. A: فاقاما بقلعة ماردين يعملان بالفاعل

The precise meaning of this sentence and indeed of this whole anecdote is difficult to grasp.

Presumably, the money which Temūr-Tash was re-claiming was not to be found; either an unknown party, such as the vizier Zain al-Dīn, had appropriated it and hidden it away somewhere, or the vizier of Amīd was unwilling to hand it back and sent assassins to kill the vizier who had possibly prompted
Temür-Tash to ask for it in the first place.

Two possible translations of the sentence quoted above present themselves:-

i) The first is based on the supposition that الفاعل بعمل means "criminal, guilty party" (cf. Dozy, *Supplément*, II, 271) and that فاعل بcontains the nuance of "to work secretly or under cover" (Dozy, *Supplément*, II, 173). The sentence would then be translated as: "They stayed in the citadel for a few days (secretly) looking for the guilty party."

ii) Alternatively, الفاعل can mean "workman", "labourer". The sentence could then be translated: "They spent a few days in the citadel working as (hired) labourers."

635. Two daughters had now pre-deceased Temür-Tash.

636. For some reason Cahen does not accept this date. He writes that Temür-Tash died at the end of 547/1152 or perhaps in 548/1153 ("Diyār Bakr", 254).

The dates given by other sources for the death of Temür-Tash are as follows:-

Ibn al-Qalānīsī: 1 Muḥarram, 549/18 March 1154 (*Dhail*, 329)

Bundārī: 1 Muḥarram, 549/18 March 1154 (*Zubdat*, 244)

Ṣibt b. al-Jauzī: 2 Dhu’l-Qa‘da 548/19 January 1154 (*Mīrāt*, 218-9)

Ibn al-Athīr: 548/1153-4 (*Atabegs*, 106)

637. This incident is also related by Ibn al-Athīr when he gives his obituary of Ṣangī. Ṣangī laid siege to Nārīn because Temūr-Tash refused to hand over Abū Bakr (*Atabegs*, 79-80).

638. Ibn Shaddād says this ḥamā was Sarja (*Jazīra*, f. 104b).

639. Cf. n. 95.
The information provided in the rest of the translation of Ms. A about the genealogy of the Artuqids has been included in Appendix II, where there is a genealogical table. Any other minor comments on the rest of the text or translation are included below.

641. Ms. A: 

This should be al-葇arshiyya, which is listed by Ibn Shaddād as a fortress in Diyār Bakr (Jazira, f. 65b). Cahen does not know precisely where it was situated. He thinks it was near _REASON_ ("Diyār Bakr", 223).

642. Shawar was the famous Egyptian vizier who negotiated with Nur al-Dīn over the conquest of Egypt (cf. Runciman, op. cit., II, 367-9).

643. Qalb was a fortress in Diyār Bakr (Ibn Shaddād, Jazira, f. 65b).

644. The territory of Temür-Tash was divided out as follows: Najm al-Dīn Alpī ruled at Mārīn, Jamāl al-Dīn at Ǧānī and Ṣanṣān al-Dīn at Dārā (Michael the Syrian, Chroniques, 311).
CHAPTER VIII

THE SONS OF İL-GHĀZĪ
The sons of Najm al-Dīn Il-Ghāzī

I The succession problem

The sources are generally agreed that at the death of Il-Ghāzī in 516/1122-3, his son Sulaimān inherited Mayyāfāriqīn whilst another son, Temur-Tash, succeeded him at Mārdīn. Aleppo, which Il-Ghāzī also ruled at the time of his death, fell to his nephew, Badr al-Daula Sulaimān b. Ābd al-Jabbār.

Behind this apparently straightforward division of territories, however, there remain several unresolved issues which deserve further discussion and on which the Ṭārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Ṭāmīd sheds some new light.

According to Ibn al-Azraq, Temur-Tash b. Il-Ghāzī stayed behind in Mārdīn with his ātabeg whilst Il-Ghāzī attempted to make the journey to Mayyāfāriqīn with his wife and Sulaimān. Temur-Tash experienced no serious difficulties in assuming control of the Artuqid possession of Mārdīn on the news of his father’s death, since he already held the citadel. Besides, it would appear likely that Il-Ghāzī’s hold over that city was firm and that he felt a definite attachment to it. The sources frequently mention that Il-Ghāzī regularly returned to Mārdīn

1. Ibn al-Qalanisī, Dhail, 208; Anonymous Syriac Chronicle, 89;
   Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 218; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, X, 426.
for rest or reinforcements and he must have regarded it as his real base. He had held Mardin from around 502/1108-9.

The situation at Mayyafariqin was markedly different. Since Ibn Jahir had wrested Mayyafariqin from its Marwanid overlord in 478/1085-6 the city had been prey to a long succession of rulers, to the detriment of its economic and social welfare.

The date of the beginning of Il-Ghazi's rule at Mayyafariqin is given by Ibn al-Azraq as 14 Jumada II 512. Ibn al-Athir, however, writes that Il-Ghazi was awarded the city as an iqtada' by Sultan Mahmud as late as 515/1121-2.

Whatever the actual date of Il-Ghazi's acquisition of Mayyafariqin, and even if Ibn al-Azraq's much earlier date is accepted, Il-Ghazi did not have the opportunity to spend enough time in the city to consolidate his position there. An analysis of his activities during the years 512-516/1118-22 reveals that he could not possibly have accorded Mayyafariqin more than a passing interest.

Ibn al-Azraq's history contains a most interesting anecdote in which he describes the subterfuge employed by the widow and

---

1. Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, X, 389; Ibn al-Qalanisi, Dha'il, 200.
2. 'Awad, 212; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, X, 93-4.
4. Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, X, 418. If Ibn al-Athir's date is to be trusted, the granting of the city of Mayyafariqin to Il-Ghazi by the sultan may well have been merely the formal recognition of a de facto situation which had already existed for several years.
son of Íl-Ghāzī in order to gain access to the citadel of Mayyafārīqīn. On their arrival by night outside the gate of the city, the dead body of Íl-Ghāzī was put on his horse. The walā of the city opened the gate and only when the retinue had reached the very centre of the citadel was the death of Íl-Ghāzī made known.

Ruses of this kind, which concealed the death of a sovereign or an important leader, were far from rare in this period and were often the work of women who wanted to secure the succession for their sons or some other favourite. In this particular instance, Íl-Ghāzī's widow was helped by the fact that she was near Mayyafārīqīn and that she and Sulaimān could travel there with the body by night. Had Íl-Ghāzī died further from his seat of power, her ruse might well have failed.

The khatun had every reason to doubt that Sulaimān would be warmly welcomed as the new ruler of Mayyafārīqīn and to be aware of the need to secure the citadel before announcing the death of Íl-Ghāzī. There is no reason to assume that Íl-Ghāzī had behaved towards the inhabitants of Mayyafārīqīn in a more lenient way than any of that city's earlier overlords. His treatment of the inhabitants of Aleppo and the villages and countryside of Northern Syria shows him to have been a child of his times and casts

---

2. A famous incident of this kind involved the widow of Malik-Shāh, Terken Khatun, who concealed the death of her husband in 485/1092-3 (Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, X, 142-5). She did not, however, resort to the same extremes as Íl-Ghāzī's widow.
considerable doubt on the veracity of the eulogistic account of him given by Ibn al-Azraq. It cannot therefore be assumed that the people of Mayyafāriqīn would automatically have welcomed a son of his as their new ruler.

Quite apart from this consideration, it is not at all certain that Il-Ghāzī had in fact appointed Sulaimān as his successor in Mayyafāriqīn. Indeed, Michael the Syrian expressly states that Il-Ghāzī ordered that his son Temur-Tash should rule after him; but as the latter was not present at the time, Il-Ghāzī's son Sulaimān, who was with him, accompanied him to Mayyafāriqīn and when he died en route buried him in that city. He then ruled there.

Sulaimān's succession at Mayyafāriqīn may well have been effected in spite of the wishes of his father, whose attitude towards him at this time is unclear. The sources agree that Sulaimān, who had been left in Aleppo by Il-Ghāzī to manage affairs there, rebelled against his father in 515/1121-2, the year before Il-Ghāzī died. The precise nature of this revolt is not clear and Ibn al-'Adīm, who describes it in great detail, gives a very confusing account.

Ibn al-Athīr relates that in 515/1121-2 Sulaimān, egged on by bad advisers, rebelled against his father at Aleppo. Il-Ghāzī rushed there, seized his son, who was full of excuses, and meted out terrible punishments to his accomplices. Ibn al-'Adīm,

---

on the other hand, gives two accounts of the rebellion. The one relates that Sulaimān was displeased with the demands made on him by his father and rose up against him. During Il-Ghāzī's absence on his ill-starred campaign into Georgia, Sulaimān expelled various amīrs from Aleppo and imposed his own corrupt, despotic rule on the city. The other account given by Ibn al-ʿAdīm describes how Il-Ghāzī wrote to his son asking him to stage an apparent "rebellion" in order to free Il-Ghāzī from the obligation of giving Aleppo to Dubais b. Sadaqa, as he had rashly promised to do while on the Tiflis campaign. Sulaimān, who was of feckless temperament, actually did rebel. Il-Ghāzī reached Qal'at Ja'bar and there met messengers from Sulaimān imploring his pardon.

The opportunistic timing of the uprising, the speed with which Il-Ghāzī suppressed it, and the details of the torture which he inflicted on Sulaimān's confederates, all support the theory that Sulaimān acted of his own accord. On the other hand, Dubais was undoubtedly interested in acquiring Aleppo, as subsequent events proved, so there may have been some germ of truth in the Tiflis story.

Whether Sulaimān's rebellion was genuine or rigged, he was removed by his father from his position at Aleppo and replaced there by Il-Ghāzī's nephew, Badr al-Daula Sulaimān b. ʿAbd al-Jabbār. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Il-Ghāzī yielded to his

1. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 200.
2. Ibid., 200-2.
paternal feelings and spared his son's life. Sulaimān fled soon afterwards to Damascus and took refuge with Togh-Tegin, the father of the khatun. Togh-Tegin interceded on Sulaimān's behalf but to no avail. Ibn al-Furat also emphasises that İl-Ghāzī could not forgive Sulaimān.

In his forays against the Franks during the last year of his life, İl-Ghāzī turned increasingly to another nephew, Balak, who was to prove his real successor in Northern Syria until his premature death in 518/1124. It was to Balak that İl-Ghāzī entrusted his two sons, Sulaimān and Temur-Tash, at his death. This statement by Matthew of Edessa and the presence of Sulaimān with İl-Ghāzī on his last journey to Mayyafarīqīn would suggest that some kind of reconciliation had actually taken place between them. Indeed, the fact that İl-Ghāzī was prepared to undertake the journey from Mardin to Mayyafarīqīn at all might be interpreted as a last effort by a dying man to assert his presence in a city of whose loyalty he was unconvinced and thereby to ensure the succession of his son Sulaimān there.

Conversely, the presence of Sulaimān by İl-Ghāzī's side might be construed as the action of a son waiting to profit from his father's impending death and making certain that he was on the spot. This could have been his own idea or that of the khatun, who may well have been the motivating force behind their

1. Ibn al-Athīr, Kamil, X, 418.
entry into Mayyafarîqîn. Ibn al-‘Adîm describes Sulaimân as
feckless and his short-lived rule at Aleppo as despotic. He
was very young and easily swayed by the evil counsels of his
entourage.

Thus the events which immediately preceded the entry of
Sulaimân into Mayyafarîqîn and his acquisition of its citadel
in 516/1122-3 cast an interesting light on the dangerous ruse
which he and the khatun practised. They also explain to a
certain extent the necessity of such a ploy. It is ironic that,
after these elaborate manoeuvres and the eventually successful
outcome of the subterfuge, Sulaimân was to enjoy only a short­
lived rule in Mayyafarîqîn.

II  Shams al-Daula Sulaimân at Mayyafarîqîn, 516-518/1122-4

Little is known of the short reign of Sulaimân at
Mayyafarîqîn. The known facts come from Ibn al-Furat, Michael
the Syrian and Ibn al-Azraq. Had Sulaimân lived longer, he
would probably have pursued more aggressive policies than his
brother, Temur-Tash, at Mârdîn. Indeed, there are signs that
Sulaimân had territorial ambitions, not only in the immediate
area of Mayyafarîqîn but probably as far as Malatya.

Sulaimân took Haza from his cousin, Da’ud, villages around
Mayyafarîqîn from Qurtî, the ruler of Arzan, and - more
2 significantly - he seized Khartbait from Balak, either while

1. Ibn al-‘Adîm, Zubda, 200.
2. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms. A, f. 162b; Michael the Syrian, Chronique,
211; Ibn al-‘Adîm, Zubda, 220.
Balak was absent on campaign or at his death in Rabi‘I 518/May 1124. Sulaiman’s marriage to a daughter of Sultan Qilich Arslan of Malatya, which is recorded by Ibn al-Azraq, may well have been prompted by a desire on the part of Sulaiman to emulate his more successful cousin, Balak, who had also allied himself to the Saljuqs of Rum and acquired more power thereby.

The proximity of Sulaiman’s brother, Temur-Tash, who now held the citadel at Mardin, did not present problems initially. Ibn al-Qalanisi relates that at first the two brothers remained friendly. Relations between them were still harmonious as late as Rajab 518/September 1124 when, according to Ibn al-‘Adim, Temur-Tash (who had become disastrously enmeshed in Aleppan affairs) left to go to Diyar Bakr to fetch help from his brother, Sulaiman.

Ibn al-Qalanisi records that later on a quarrel arose between the two brothers "which lasted because of both their faults". It would have been comparatively easy for harmony between them to be maintained when Temur-Tash was often away from Mardin in the service of Balak and it is not surprising that dissension really began when Temur-Tash returned to Diyar Bakr and no doubt interfered in the territorial ambitions of his brother.

2. Cf. O. Turan, Doğu Anadolu, 147.
3. Ibn al-Qalanisi, Dhail, 208.
5. Ibn al-Qalanisi, loc. cit.
Ibn al-Furat in fact implies that Sulaiman was preparing to attack Temur-Tash. Whatever the cause of the rift between the two brothers, Temur-Tash considered it more important to remain at Mardin than to answer numerous urgent summons for him to return to Aleppo.

A month or so after the departure of Temur-Tash from Aleppo to Mardin, Sulaiman died most opportunely in Ramadan 518/October-November 1124 at Mayyafariqin. This may not have been a mere coincidence. The predictable struggle for hegemony in Diyar Bakr between the two brothers was best settled by the death of one of them. Any complicity on the part of Temur-Tash in his brother's death must, however, remain a matter for speculation, especially since Ibn al-Azraq's testimony favours Temur-Tash throughout and the author would have suppressed any evidence which might reflect badly on his former master.

Sulaiman does not emerge from the sources as an especially admirable figure. Aside from Ibn al-Azraq's biased evidence, Ibn al-Adim confirms that Sulaiman was frivolous and a troublemaker. Temur-Tash may have lacked the flamboyant vigour of his father but he possessed the tenacity and adaptability necessary to stay in the area of Mardin and Mayyafariqin for thirty years.

3. Cf. Ibn al-Azraq's description of the depraved son of Sulaiman, Mahmud, where the author savours with obvious relish the details of this "black sheep" of the Artuqid family (Ms. A, f. 163a).
III The sources for the reign of Temur-Tash at Mardin and Mayyafariqin

It is not the intention in this chapter to discuss year by year the detailed events in the period of Temur-Tash's reign at Mardin and Mayyafariqin. This period has already been treated at some length in the commentary (Chapter VII). It seems appropriate, instead, to attempt to impose some order and, if possible, interpretations on the wealth of detailed incidents mentioned in Ibn al-Azraq and other chronicles.

The major sources for the rule of Temur-Tash at Mardin and Mayyafariqin are Ibn al-Azraq's text and the History of the Atabegs of Mosul by Ibn al-Athir. These two works form an interesting foil to one another; the one is highly biased in favour of Temur-Tash and the other sets out to eulogise the achievements of Zangi and his descendants. Both these works often treat the same historical events but because of the very different slant placed on them by their authors the narratives vary markedly. As well as these two major sources for the history of Diyar Bakr during the thirty years that Temur-Tash ruled, some events of the period are also mentioned by Michael the Syrian, Ibn al-Furat, al-‘Azimi and Ibn al-‘Adim. None of these sources have the particular bias of Ibn al-Azraq or of Ibn al-Athir and they can therefore in some measure be used as a control.

Ibn al-Azraq's testimony on the reign of Temur-Tash is especially valuable for its occasional references to institutions and to the social and economic life of the time. Such references are all too rare and are often only partially explained but they
provide information which is not found elsewhere. Ibn al-`Athîr's
*History of the Atabegs of Mosul*, on the other hand, sheds a
fascinating light on the relationship between Temur-Tash and
Zangî. This work provides detailed information on the figure who
dominated most of Temur-Tash’s reign and who even on the pages of
a tacitly hostile source such as Ibn al-Azraq’s history is
mentioned almost as often as Temur-Tash himself.

IV The early career of Temur-Tash b. `Il-Ghâzî

Although `Il-Ghâzî had a number of sons, Sulaimân and Temur-
Tash are the only two who play a significant role in Ibn al-
Azraq’s history. The reason for this is simple: `Il-Ghâzî’s
other sons had all predeceased him. Sulaimân and Temur-Tash
were still apparently quite young when their father died in
516/1122-3. During `Il-Ghâzî’s lifetime, Temur-Tash had despite
his youth performed two useful tasks for his father. He had been
left in Aleppo by `Il-Ghâzî in 511/1117-8 while the latter went
back to Mardîn to collect reinforcements. On another occasion,
in 515/1111-2, Temur-Tash had been sent by his father to Sultan

2. According to Ibn al-`Athîr, Temur-Tash was seventeen in 515/1111-2
   (Kâmîl, X, 418).
3. Ibn al-Qalânisî, Dhâil, 199; Ibn al-`Athîr, Kâmîl, X, 373; Ibn
   al-`Adîm, Zubda, 180; al-`Azîmî, "Chronique", 197.

   According to the last two sources, Temur-Tash was left in
   Aleppo as a hostage.
Maḥmūd to intercede on behalf of Dubais.

On the death of Īl-Ghāzī, Temūr-Tash acquired possession of Mārdīn without difficulty. The next two years, 516-518/1122-4, he spent in the service of his energetic cousin, Balak, to whose care his father had entrusted him before he died. Temūr-Tash was present at Balak's siege of Manbij in 518/1124. Indeed, Balak was preparing to leave Temūr-Tash in charge of the siege at Manbij when he was killed outside the walls of the town.

Significantly, at his death Balak bequeathed his estates to Temūr-Tash who proceeded to Aleppo and took possession of it in Rabī' I 518/May 1124.

Temūr-Tash has received much opprobrium for his short administration at Aleppo. Stevenson calls him "incompetent" whilst Gibb writes that Aleppo had reached the climax of its misfortunes "since it was now reduced to dependence on Īl-Ghāzī's indolent son and successor at Mardin, Timurtash". There is certainly ample evidence for a number of blunders and for a marked lack of judgement on the part of Temūr-Tash at this time.

His release of Baldwin was based on the perhaps naive assumption that Baldwin would keep his word. Far from doing so, Baldwin refused to comply with the terms of the agreement made with Temūr-Tash and even allied with Dubais although he had specifically promised not to do so. After a humiliating defeat

1. Ibn al-ʿAthīr, Kāmil, X, 418.
5. Stevenson, op. cit., 111.
6. H.A.R. Gibb, "Zengi and the Fall of Edessa", Setton and Baldwin,
outside Aleppo at the hands of Dubais, Temur-Tash withdrew to Mardin to try to obtain help from his brother, Sulaiman, and left Aleppo to its fate.

Whilst Temur-Tash's brief attempt at governing Aleppo was far from glorious, his own contribution to the city's decline may well have been exaggerated. Aleppo was notoriously difficult to rule and a boy of eighteen was scarcely the ideal person to be in charge of it. His preferred modus operandi in his later life was negotiation rather than ruse or the use of military strength, but at Aleppo in 518/1124 he lacked the experience and advisers to deal with such seasoned practitioners of the political art as Baldwin.

Aleppo at this particular juncture was coveted by several powerful amirs or groups - Dubais, who might justifiably have expected to receive the city as a reward for his loyalty to the Artuqids; the dispossessed Badr al-Daula, still smarting from the humiliation of being dismissed from his governorship of the city by Dalak; and, as always, the Franks. The various conflicting interests of these factions exerted a continuous pressure on Temur-Tash, who must soon have felt out of his depth in Aleppo.

Once he had arrived back at Mardin, Temur-Tash embarked on policies which furthered his own modest territorial ambitions in that area and he seems deliberately to have turned his back on Aleppo. This attitude on the part of Temur-Tash is severely

1. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 220-3.
condemned by Ibn al-ʿAdīm, who as the town-chronicler of Aleppo naturally sees Temur-Tash's actions in an adverse light and condemns his preoccupation with the affairs of Diyār Bakr to the exclusion of Aleppo. When messengers arrived from Aleppo to Mārdīn in 518/1124, Temur-Tash temporised with them, absorbed as he was with the death of his brother Sulaimān and his own acquisition of the town of Mayyāfāriqīn. He even went so far as to imprison the Aleppan envoys, who escaped and sought help for their city from another source, Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī from Mosul.

The involvement of Temur-Tash in the affairs of Aleppo was a singular failure. With a crass political blunder and a military defeat behind him, he retreated into the area of Mārdīn which his father, Īl-Ghāzī, had always regarded as his home base.

Thus ended the unsatisfactory bolstering of Aleppo by the Turcoman forces of Diyār Bakr, a process which had begun in 511/1117-8. Thereafter Temur-Tash rarely occupied himself with political affairs outside the immediate area of Diyār Bakr. He owed his tenure of Aleppo, in any case, to the bequest of Balak rather than to his own efforts to expand his territory. In this

1. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 225.
2. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Bughyat, 204-7.

Ibn al-Azraq's own reticence on this whole incident may well spring from ignorance. More probably, it is the result of a desire on his part to suppress evidence which is unfavourable to the Artuqid dynasty. Cf. Ms. A, f. 163a.
respect, he is to be contrasted with his father, whose ambition extended well beyond Aleppo. It may be concluded that Temur-Tash was temperamentally unsuited for the life of virtually ceaseless campaigning which the older generation of his family had led.

Viewed from the vantage-point of medieval Islamic history as a whole, this decision to withdraw to Diyār Bakr marks the end of the uncoordinated but grandiose Artuqid territorial ambitions which had prompted Īl-Ghāzī and his father Artuq before him to cover vast stretches of the Islamic world. As far as the livelihood of the Artuqid family was concerned, however, Temur-Tash's decision to retreat to the remote, difficult terrain of Diyār Bakr could be judged as realistic and astute.

On the death of his brother, Sulaimān, Temur-Tash took possession of Mayyāfarīqīn and ruled the two cities jointly for thirty years.

V The reign of Temur-Tash until the death of Zangī in 541/1146

Whilst Temur-Tash ruled at Mārdīn from 516/1122 and at Mayyāfarīqīn from 518/1124-5, his cousin Daʿūd had governed Ḫisn Kaifa since around 502/1108-9. Daʿūd had been prepared to accept the overall leadership of Īl-Ghāzī and had furnished him with troops on occasion. He was not, however, likely to allow Temur-Tash to dominate him in similar fashion. It is true that Temur-Tash succeeded in seizing Mayyāfarīqīn before Daʿūd but

this was one of the few occasions when he independently outwitted his more bellicose and enterprising cousin.

Ibn al-Azraq never explicitly states that Da’ud had the upper hand in his relationship with Temur-Tash but stresses in unusually emotive terms the savagery with which Da’ud pillaged and plundered. Ibn al-Athîr, on the other hand, who has no reason to take sides between the two Artuqids, clearly implies that it was Da’ud, not Temur-Tash, who presented the real threat to Zangi’s aspirations in Diyar Bakr and that Da’ud had inherited that much-prized ability to inspire devotion in the Turcomans which il-Ghâzi had possessed before him. According to Ibn al-Athîr, Zangi would have been kept busy if his only adversary had been Da’ud, who enjoyed such prestige with the Turcomans that all those capable of carrying arms would join him. Ibn al-Athîr admires Da’ud’s resilience and his ability to return to fight only a few days after a crushing defeat.

In the early years of Temur-Tash’s reign, Da’ud seized the territories formerly held by Balak, such as Khartâbit, and even participated with the ruler of Akhlât in a campaign against the Georgians. Any further ambitions Da’ud may have had were soon, however, laid aside in the face of the threat of Zangi who was made governor of Masul in 520/1126. The incipient rivalry between Da’ud and his cousin Temur-Tash was forgotten at the prospect of a common foe who was preparing to invade their territories.

1. Atabegs, 81.
Once Zangi had established himself at Mosul, his first act of aggression was to lay siege that same year (520/1126) to Nasibin, which belonged to Temur-Tash. Temur-Tash appealed to Da'ud for help against Zangi and this was promised him. After a well-known incident involving Zangi's interception of a pigeon carrying a message from Temur-Tash to the governor of Nasibin, Zangi tricked the garrison of the town into surrendering it to him.

This initial act by Zangi united the Artuqids and together they came to an agreement in 524/1130 with Ilaldî, the ruler of Amid, and other Turcoman chiefs to defend their territories against Zangi. In spite of their large numbers, the combined Artuqid forces were defeated by Zangi who took Dara and Sarja.

After this defeat at the hands of Zangi, the uneasy alliance between the two Artuqid cousins was at an end. There are signs that each of them reverted to their own natural mode of government; Temur-Tash consolidated his hold on the two cities under his command, whilst Da'ud energetically raised his sights to new conquests. The year after the defeat at Sarja, Da'ud seized several citadels south of Lake Van.

---

1. Ibn al-Athir, Atabegs, 36-7.
2. Ibid.,38-9; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 240; Ibn al-Athir, Kamîl, X, 467.
3. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms. A, ff. 164a-b. These citadels included Qatalbas and Batasa, as well as the important town of Is'ird.
It would appear that Temur-Tash was worried by the implications of Da‘ūd’s actions and that he sought a new protector. It is not clear whether he first approached Zangi or whether Zangi suggested an alliance with him. Even if their future collaboration was at Temur-Tash's instigation, Zangi dominated the relationship from the outset and knew how to exploit the rivalry between the two Artuqid cousins to his own advantage. Zangi and Temur-Tash clashed with Da‘ūd outside Amid in 528/1134 and Da‘ūd was defeated. Zangi then went on to take the citadel of al-Sür which he handed over to Temur-Tash. Although Ibn al-Azraq is silent at this point, al-‘Azīmī clearly states that Temur-Tash had become Zangi’s vassal.

Zangi’s gift of this citadel and other relatively unimportant possessions to Temur-Tash was a clever move on his part since he thereby weakened both Da‘ūd and Temur-Tash. Temur-Tash, well-pleased for a brief moment with his new possessions but not dangerously strengthened by them, could not enjoy for long the security afforded him by his new-found protector who spent only short periods in Diyār Bakr. Once Zangi had gone away, Da‘ūd, enraged by his loss of territories and Temur-Tash's agreement with Zangi, terrified Temur-Tash to such an extent that in 530/1135-6 he even demolished the rabad and another suburb of his own city of Ma‘īsāfāriqīn, presumably because he felt unable

---


to defend them against the depredations of his cousin. By setting the two Artuqids against one another, Zangī cleverly kept them occupied in Diyar Bakr and successfully diverted Da'ūd's energies away from Zangī's own sphere of influence.

"Temur-Tash had now tried to join forces with both Zangī and Da'ūd. In neither case had the alliance brought him significant advantages. In spite of the coalition with Da'ūd, Temur-Tash had lost Naṣībin and when he had subsequently thrown in his lot with Zangī, this had resulted in an exacerbation of the hostility between himself and Da'ūd. From 530/1135–6 onwards, Temur-Tash was formally attached to neither of his two rivals. For a decade he played a pragmatic but dangerous game of shifting alliances and no doubt careful diplomacy. The sources are silent on the exact details of his policies towards Da'ūd and Zangī but the results of his unobtrusive stance were successful. By the end of 541/1146–7, both Da'ūd and Zangī were dead. Temur-Tash was still alive and still had possession of the two cities of Mārdīn and Mayyāfārīqīn. His waiting game had proved worth while.

Before Zangī's death in 541/1146, their relationship had seriously deteriorated. One event which sparked off a quarrel between them occurred in 533/1138–9 when the governor of Naṣībin, Abū Bakr, fled to Temur-Tash for protection from Zangī. Zangī, whose brutality and iron discipline were legendary, asked for Abū Bakr to be handed over to him. When Temur-Tash refused,
Zangī came to Mardin. Temur-Tash extricated himself from this dangerous situation by conceding Dārū to Zangī, as well as giving his daughter in marriage; but - if Ibn al-Azraq is to be believed - he did not yield up Abu Bakr.

The agreement reached in 536/1141-2 between Dā'ūd and Temur-Tash probably prompted Zangī's demand to Temur-Tash to send his chief official, Ḥabashī, to him. Zangī's motives remain unknown but the incident ended with the assassination of Ḥabashī at Zangī's camp.

Temur-Tash could not fail to be worried by the sudden expansion of Zangī's lands immediately after the death of Dā'ūd in 539/1144-5 when Zangī seized nearly all Dā'ūd's territories. Ibn al-Azraq comments at this point that Temur-Tash and Zangī quarrelled but he gives no details. Even before Dā'ūd's death, there are signs that Temūr-Tash sought an alliance with Dā'ūd and Joscelin, the Frankish ruler of Edessa, since Zangī was approaching the height of his power and was not prepared to brook resistance from his former vassal. In 540/1145-6 Zangī came as far as Tall al-Shaikh and threatened the town of Mayyafārīqīn before withdrawing. Presumably this was a demonstration of strength on his part, intended to intimidate Temur-Tash. It was

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
exceedingly fortunate for the latter that very soon afterwards, in 541/1146, Zangi himself was assassinated at Qal‘at Ja‘bar.

With the removal in the space of two years of his two main rivals who had constantly harassed and restricted him, Temur-Tash suddenly found himself free to act in a more independent way than hitherto, especially since he himself had now been in power for a long period.

It is clear that by the end of Zangi’s career a degree of personal animosity had crept into his relationship with Temur-Tash. Indeed, relations between them resembled those between a lion and a mouse. Ibn al-Athīr sheds very interesting light on this. Several farmers had left Mosul to go to Mārdīn. Zangi was annoyed by this and asked Temur-Tash to send them back. Temur-Tash refused, saying that he treated farmers well, taking only one-tenth of their crops, and that if Zangi had done likewise, the farmers would not have left his territory. Zangi’s reply to this gesture of defiance was characteristically chilling:

"Tell your master that if he took (only) a one-hundredth share, that would be a large amount for him, occupied as he is

Even a favourable source such as Ibn al-Athīr abounds in such anecdotes which testify to Zangi’s cruelty and ability to inspire terror. Bundārī goes even further in his description of Zangi, calling him a "tyrant, striking at random, and a raging blast of calamities, tigerish in nature, lion-like in malevolence ... feared for his violence ... the death of his enemies and of his subjects" (Gibb, "Zengi", 457, n. 10, quoting Bundārī, Zubdat, 205).
with his pleasures in the citadel at Mardin .... If it had not
been for me, he would long since have ceased to drink water
safely at Mardin and the Franks would have taken it" (the city).
"Temur-Tash sent back the farmers.

VI Temur-Tash at the height of his power, 541-8/1146-53

According to Ibn al-Azraq, Temur-Tash reacted with joyful
alacrity to the news of Zangi's death. He left his garden
immediately and seized a number of neighbouring territories,
such as Hanî and Siwan. Such speed was imperative if the
citadels were to be captured before Zangi's successor at Mosul,
his son Saïf al-Dîn Ghazi, could establish himself and feel strong
enough to come to claim his father's old possessions.

Dâ'ud's son Qara Arslan, who had succeeded his father at
Hîsn Kaifa, had already been decisively defeated the year before
Zangi's death by Temur-Tash's troops and although Qara Arslan's
fortunes also rose with the removal of Zangi and accession of
Saïf al-Dîn Ghazi, it is clear that Qara Arslan soon recognised

1. Ibn al-Athîr, Atabegs, 79.
3. Ibid., f. 171a.
4. Qara Arslan acquired all the fortresses which Zangi had
taken from his father Dâ'ud (Ibn al-Azraq, Ms. A, f. 172b).
Cf. also Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 268.
the overall suzerainty of Temur-Tash.

Temur-Tash received a temporary setback in 543/1148-9 when he endured a humiliating defeat at the hands of Saif al-Din Ghazi who came as far as Mardin to regain Zangi's territories. This son of Zangi was not, however, destined to bother Temur-Tash for long since Saif al-Din died the following year (544/1149) at Mosul.

The remaining few years of Temur-Tash's reign were a period of genuine, if modest, power in the immediate area of Diyar Bakr. He obtained a recognition of his own suzerainty from the lord of Amid and acquired new territories, such as Sumaisat in 544/1149-50 when the ruler of Edessa, Joscelin, was taken prisoner by Nur al-Din.

All the evidence points to Temur-Tash's enjoyment of considerable local power before his death and to his being recognised as the most powerful ruler in Diyar Bakr. His brief but disastrous interlude at Aleppo when he was still a young man

---

1. This is the interpretation which may be placed on Temur-Tash's action in taking Isfird and then handing it back to Qara Arslan a little later (Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f. 173a).
5. Ibid., f. 175a; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 297.
was his only real taste of power outside Diyar Bakr. An analysis of his whole policy testifies to a definite decision on his part to restrict his aspirations to the maintenance of his two cities of Mardin and Mayyafariqin and to the acquisition of whatever territories he could retain within a modest distance of his base at Mardin. A negative appraisal of his rule could pinpoint a lack of energy and ambition or even — as Ibn al-Athir suggests — a life given over to pleasurable pursuits. More positively, however, his policies could be viewed as realistic and realisable.

In view of the evidence presented in the above discussion and the personality of Temur-Tash himself, who generally appears to have preferred negotiation to acts of sudden aggression, it is difficult to understand how the extraordinary but surely apocryphal story of Temur-Tash at Jerusalem continues to be treated seriously by Western historians of the Crusades.

According to this anecdote, which comes from William of Tyre, and only from him, Temur-Tash made a sudden attack on Jerusalem with his bands of Turcomans, prompted by a desire to regain the lands once owned by his grandfather, Artuq. This story is treated seriously by Weil, Rohricht and Stevenson and is allowed to remain unchallenged even by as recent a historian as Runciman.

1. Atabegs, 79.
5. Runciman, op. cit., II, 337.
According to Stevenson, this anecdote from William of Tyre calls the invader of Jerusalem "Hiaroquin". The identification of this name with Temur-Tash is Wilken's. Whether or not such an identification is linguistically feasible, it is entirely out of character that Temur-Tash should make this sudden, hare-brained and arduous foray towards Jerusalem. It is unwise, in any case, to treat as sacrosanct a narrative which appears only in this one source. If such a raid did indeed take place, then, directed as it was against Jerusalem - a prime bone of contention between Muslim and Frank in the twelfth century - it would surely have found some echo in Muslim and other Western sources. Temur-Tash's only audacious "coup" for which more than one account exists is an isolated reference to his capture of a caravan at Edessa in 533/1138-9. Whilst this incident, and his capture of a modest share of Joscelin's possessions - in which other neighbouring rulers also participated - testify to certain territorial ambitions they pale into insignificance beside a raid on Jerusalem itself.

---

3. Rohricht draws attention to this fact but does not in so doing cast doubts on the veracity of the anecdote (op. cit., 271, n. 2).
VII The administration of Temur-Tash.

Ibn al-Azraq, and to a much lesser extent Ibn al-Athīr, make isolated references to aspects of social and economic life in the reign of Temur-Tash. It would, however, be foolhardy to make anything other than very tentative statements on the basis of such remarks as are found in the sources. Such wider issues as the inter-relationship between towns and the nomadic groups present in the area of Diyār Bakr, as well as the treatment of the Christians who probably outnumbered the Muslims in Temur-Tash's reign, must remain almost entirely undiscussed through lack of information.

Certain concrete facts about Temur-Tash's domestic policy emerge from Ibn al-Azraq's history. He removed the remaining local resistance to him with his capture in 531/1136-7 of Hattākh, the last remaining Marwānid possession in Diyār Bakr. Individual members of the Marwānid family were, however, subsequently employed by Temur-Tash.

There is evidence of an interest in civil as well as military building, which testifies to Temur-Tash's desire to put down roots in the area of Mārdīn and Mayyūfīrīqīn. For Mārdīn, Ibn al-Azraq mentions the construction of a family tomb for the Artuqid family where the bodies of ʿĪl-Ghāzī and Sulaimān

1. Michael the Syrian, Chronique, 264; Sibt b. al-Jauzī, Mirāṭ, 161; Ibn al-Furat, Duwal, f. 93b.
2. ʿAwād, 254.
were eventually housed. The mosque at Mayyāfīrīqīn was rebuilt after its dome collapsed in 547/1152-3. The most ambitious building project, however, was clearly the construction of the Qaramān bridge which was begun in 541/1146-7, completed in 548/1153-4 and was clearly a most impressive edifice.

It is impossible to determine the exact religious allegiance of Temur-Tash, although his warm reception of the Ismaʿīlī shaikh is described in great detail by Ibn al-Azraq. Perhaps the elaborate deference which he accorded this shaikh testifies to the latter's personal magnetism rather than to any deep-rooted religious inclination towards the Ismaʿīlī creed. This shaikh eventually lost his hold over Temur-Tash and left him.

The evidence on commercial matters is also very slight. It is interesting to note that towards the end of his reign Temur-Tash minted coins. This one minting of copper coins is revealing on two counts. Firstly, it is an indication that some kind of trading took place with neighbouring areas, a supposition which is confirmed by the discovery in the reign of Temur-Tash of a copper mine north of Mayyāfīrīqīn. Secondly,

2. Ibid., f. 175a.
3. Ibid., ff. 171a-b, f. 179b. See Chapter VII, n. 488.
5. Ibid., f. 172b.
6. Copper coins were commonly those intended for local use. The lack of silver is not surprising; the Near East at this time was in the throes of a silver famine.
it is a sign that Temur-Tash had at least begun to assume some of the trappings of a traditional Muslim ruler—rather than those of a semi-nomadic chief. The fact that he did not strike gold coins which would have had a more than local currency is itself significant. Even in his arrogation to himself of the right to sīqa, Temur-Tash retained his customary local bias.

The civilian inhabitants of the area of Mardin and Mayyafārīqīn were probably well-treated. Ibn al-Azraq's biased testimony states that Temur-Tash behaved kindly towards the local 'ulama' and the important indigenous families. Ibn al-Athīr reveals that Temur-Tash appropriated in taxation only a tenth of the revenue from the harvests in comparison with Zangī who said that if it were necessary he would be prepared to levy as much as two-thirds for his important military commitments.

Allusions to Temur-Tash's treatment of the Christian population are all too rare. As well as the possibility mentioned in Ibn al-Azraq's text that Ibn Mukhtar, one of his officials, was a Christian, a possibility which Cahen sees as a certainty, Michael the Syrian relates that Temur-Tash did not treat the Christians well but that at the end of his reign he repented. Michael the Syrian is as capable of biased testimony as Ibn al-Azraq and it is difficult to assess the full

---

1. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms. A, f. 176b.
2. Atabegs, 79.
5. Chronique, 311.
significance of this one statement.

The frequent changes of vizier and other officials faithfully recorded by Ibn al-Azraq are not remarkable for the time. They are an indication of administrative malpractices prevalent among the Artuqids and other contemporary dynasties.

The major achievement of Temur-Tash was his ability to hold on to Mardin and Mayyafaridin in this troubled period and to bring some measure of stability to these two cities. A rather belated recognition of this achievement was made by the caliph in 547/1152-3, the year before Temur-Tash died. Robes of honour and an edict entitling him to the land arrived for him. This event is mentioned without comment by Ibn al-Azraq, although it is very significant that Temur-Tash only received official recognition from Baghdad thirty years after his taking possession of Mardin. This may be an indication of the relatively unimportant status accorded him by the caliph and the sultan. It may also reveal that Temur-Tash enjoyed real power in Diyar Bakr only towards the very end of his reign, a fact which is demonstrably proved by historical events. As Ibn al-Azraq's panegyric expresses it:—

"After Zangi (had been killed), no amir other than Husam al-Din (Temur-Tash) remained independent, unopposed, unchallenged and governing alone".

To balance this glowing testimony to Temur-Tash's achievements it should be added that whilst many medieval Muslim

1. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms. A, f. 175a.
2. Ibid.
historians record the death of his father, ʾIl-Ghāzi, his own death passes unmentioned except by a few sources.

Conclusions.

With the accession of Temur-Tash in 516/1122-3 at Mārdīn and 518/1124-5 at Mayyāfārīqīn, the territorial ambitions of the Artuqids shrank to the purely local area of the Jazīra. Temur-Tash was fortunate to survive for thirty years during a period which was dominated by the monumental figure of Zangi. Locally, Temur-Tash was dwarfed by his cousin Dāʾūd and enjoyed a brief interlude of genuine power in Diyār Bakr only in the last few years of his life, when both Zangi and Dāʾūd had died. Broadly speaking, his successors also retained the local emphasis of his polity. The death of ʾIl-Ghāzi in 516/1122-3 could have ended Artuqid hopes of acquiring for themselves a portion of Islamic territory as their permanent domain. With the succession of Temur-Tash at Mārdīn and Mayyāfārīqīn, a dynasty was firmly established and, against all odds, maintained itself in that same area until the early fifteenth century.
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Tables showing the reigns of neighbouring rulers

**Abbasid Caliphs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustazhir</td>
<td>487/1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustarshid</td>
<td>512/1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rashid</td>
<td>529/1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muqtasim</td>
<td>530/1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustanjid</td>
<td>555/1160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Great Saljuqs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saljuq</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malik-Shah</td>
<td>465/1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud</td>
<td>485/1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berk-Yaruq</td>
<td>487/1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik-Shah II</td>
<td>498/1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>498/1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjar</td>
<td>511/1117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saljuqs of Iraq**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saljuq</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud</td>
<td>511/1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da'ud</td>
<td>525/1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toghril</td>
<td>526/1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas'ud</td>
<td>527/1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik-Shah</td>
<td>547/1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>548/1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaiman-Shah</td>
<td>555/1160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kings of Georgia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giorgi II</td>
<td>464/1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>482/1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimitri</td>
<td>519/1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giorgi III</td>
<td>551/1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatimids</td>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Mustaqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Amir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Hafiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Zafir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Fadil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Adid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Almoravids</td>
<td>Yusuf b. Tashufin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tashufin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ishaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Almohads</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Tumart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Abd al-Mumin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abū Ya'qūb Yusuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Danishmehids</td>
<td>Amir Ghāzi Gümüşh Tegin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Zangids</td>
<td>a) At Mosul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imām al-Dīn Zangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saif al-Dīn Ghāzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qutb al-Dīn Maudūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saif al-Dīn Ghāzi II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) At Damascus and Aleppo

Nur al-Dīn

**Rulers of Arzan and Bitlis**

Tughrar Arslān

Husam al-Dīn Qurtī

Taqūt Arslān

Fakhr al-Dīn Daulat-Shāh

**Rulers of Amid**

Fakhr al-Daula Ibrāhīm

Sād al-Daula ʿIl-aldīy

Jāmāl al-Dīn Mahmūd

**Rulers of Akhlāt**

Sukmān al-Qutbī

Zahir al-Dīn Ibrāhīm

Aḥmad b. Sukmān

Naṣīr al-Dīn Sukmān

**The MASYADIDS of Hilla**

Saʿīf al-Daula ʿṢadaqa

Nūr al-Daula Dabais

Saʿīf al-Daula ʿṢadaqa

Muhammad

ʿAli

**The BūRIDS**

Zahir al-Dīn Togh-Tegin

Tāj al-Mulūk Būrī

Shams al-Mulūk Ismāʿīl

Shihāb al-Dīn Mahmūd

Jāmāl al-Dīn Muḥammad

Mujīr al-Dīn Abāq

541/1146 - 569/1174

498/1104

532/1137

538/1143

540/1145 - 588/1192

492/1098

504/1110

536/1142 - 579/1183

493/1100

506/1112

521/1127

522/1128 - 581/1185-6

479/1086

501/1108

529/1135

532/1138

540-5/1145-50

Ramādān 497/May-June 1104

Ṣafar 522/February-March 1128

Rajab 526/May-June 1132

14 Rabīʾ II 529/1 February 1135

24 Shawwāl 533/23 June 1139

(deposed 549/1154-5)

8 Shawbān 534/29 March 1140

(deposed 549/1154 by Muḥammad b. Zangī)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Saljuqs of Rum</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qılığh Arslan</td>
<td>485/1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik-Shah</td>
<td>500/1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukň al-Din Mas&quot;ud</td>
<td>510/1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Izz al-Din Qılığh Arslan</td>
<td>551/1156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Saltuqids of Erzerum</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abu'l-Qasim Saltuq</td>
<td>465/1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ali</td>
<td>496/1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu'l-Muzaffar Ghazi</td>
<td>518/1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Izz al-Din Saltuq</td>
<td>527/1132 - 564/1168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE ARTUQIDS

WITH COMMENTARY
APPENDIX B

Notes on the genealogical table (in back pocket):

The genealogy of the Artuqids provided by Ibn al-Azraq in his history is the earliest extant. For this reason, his information has been used as the principal basis for the table given in this appendix.

Other tables have been consulted, including those of Turan, Artuk and Zambaur. By far the fullest and best one is that of Cahen. Where there is disagreement with Cahen's reading of Ibn al-Azraq's information, this has been recorded in the footnotes.

It should be noted that Ms.A has been used since its account is much fuller than that found in Ms.B, which omits entirely any mention of Alp-Tash and Bektash, two of the sons of Artuq, and their

1 O.Turan, Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi (Istanbul, 1973). His table is on the last page which is unnumbered.

2 Op.cit. The table is also attached to the last page.


5 Ms.B, ff.105b-106b.
desendants. Ms.B also attributes the descendants of Alp-Yaruq to Siyawush and confuses the two people mentioned in the text of Ms.A as Shams al-Daula. Ms.B also gives no genealogy for Il-ChaZi himself.

A common error amongst the chronicles is the confusion between Sukman b. Artuq of Hizn-Kaif and Sukman al-Qutbi of Akhlat. This mistake is made by Ibn al-Azraq, who thereby contradicts himself. On f.160b he states correctly that Sukman b. Artuq died in 498/1104-5. On f.177a however, he writes that the death of Sukman b. Artuq occurred in 506/1112-3.


Ibn Taghribirdi makes a similar error in the NuJum al-ZahirA (Recueil, III, 495-6). Under the year 503/1109-10 he refers to Sukman b. Artuq (who had died in 498/1104-5) as lord of Armenia, Akhlat and Mayyasariqin. These territories were of course ruled at that time by Sukman al-Qutbi. Under 504/1110-1 he mentions the death of Qutb al-Din Sukman b. Artuq (sic) who was buried at Akhlat. He then gives a false genealogy for Sukman al-Qutbi, relating him to Il-Chazi and Artuq.

The following notes summarise Ibn al-Arzaq's information in Ms.A, with other comments, where necessary, from either Ms.B or other sources. The aim has not been to include genealogical information provided in the later part of Ibn al-Azraq's work, which is outside the historical period treated in this thesis, but rather to
facilitate a reading of ff. 177a-178b. Except where indicated, the information given in the notes which follow comes from these two folios. The reading of these folios is best accompanied by the visual aid of the table since the ambiguity of the personal pronouns renders the genealogy difficult to follow.

1. **Ibrahim**
   He is omitted in Ms.B.

2. **Arslan Toghamish**
   He ruled Mizgard after his father's death.

3. **Sulaiman**
   There is no information about this son of Dā'ūd.

4. **Mahmud**
   He took Tanzi and Qarshiyya.

5. **Ya'qub**
   He was in the service of Najm al-Dīn Alpī.

6. **Unnamed son of Sulaiman b. Dā'ūd**
   He was in the service of Jamāl al-Dīn b. Temür-Tash at Hānī.

7. **Dā'ūd**
   He was in the service of the sons of his uncle Qara Arslan at Hisn Kaifa.

8. **Nur al-Dīn Muhammad**
   He succeeded his father, Qara Arslan, at Hisn Kaifa.

9. **Balak**
   A very significant member of the Artuqid family who is virtually ignored by Ibn al-Azraq. Fortunately, other sources give ample coverage of his career.
10. **Balak's daughter**
   She married Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan.

11. **Yunus al-Haramī**
   He worked for Temür-Tash (Ms.A). The author met him personally (Ms.B).

12. **Sevinch**
   He was in the service of Jamāl al-Dīn b. Temür-Tash at Hanī. He married the daughter of Shīrbārīk by whom he had a son, Shāh Malik. He later married another daughter of Shīrbārīk.

13. **Alp-Yaruq**
   Ms.B omits any mention of this son of Artuq. His descendants, whom Ms.A enumerates, are attributed in Ms.B to Siyāwush. There is still justifiable confusion over the genealogy of Alp-Yaruq and especially over that of Yāqūtī. For example, Edhem, in his table of the Artuqids, has Yāqūtī as the son of Artuq, not the grandson (H.Edhem, Düvel-i İslamiye [Istanbul, 1927], 241).

14. **ʿAlī**
   He held Jabal Ḫur after losing Mārdīn (Ms.A).

15. **Shīrbārīk**
   He worked for Temür-Tash until the latter died. He moved to the service of Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan, then returned to work for Najm al-Dīn Alpī (Ms.A).

16. **Unnamed son of ʿAlī b. Alp-Yaruq**
   He lived in Khartabirt (Ms.A).

17. **Sevinch**
   He was the eldest son of Shīrbārīk. He died, leaving no issue. He married Ṣafīyya Khatun, daughter of Malik Riḍwan (Ms.A).
   Cahen records this fact without comment. It is just conceivable
that such a marriage took place but Ridwān, a contemporary of
Artuq's sons, died in 507/1113-4 and Sevinch was the great-
great-grandson of Artuq. Maybe this is a confused reference
to Sevinch b. Siyāwush (cf. n.12 above).

18. Ismā'īl
He was in the service of Najm al-Dīn Alpī (Ms.A).

19. Togrīl
(known as Toghr Beg in Ms.A). He died in Hīān Kāfā and was
buried in Mayyāfāriqīn (Ms.A).

20. The daughters of Shīrbarīk
One daughter married Sevinch. On her death, he married her
sister (Ms.A).

His mother was a slave-girl. He stayed with his father for a
while, then went to Egypt to serve Shāwar (Ms.A).

22. Yaghū-Siyan
He served at Akhlāt with the daughter of Sukmān (al-Qutbī).
There he had two sons. He then moved to the service of Qara
Arslan in Hīān Kāfā. He married a daughter of Arslan Toghāmīsh.
He died of epilepsy, leaving a son in the service of the sons of
Qara Arslan (Ms.A). Cahen says it was his son 'Īzz al-Dīn who
died of epilepsy, though Ibn al-Azraq clearly says that it was
the father who died in this way (Ms.A, f.177b).

23. Badr al-Daula Sulaimān
When he lost Aleppo, he joined the service of Temūr-Tash who
gave him Qalb as an īqtāʿ. He remained until his death in the
service of Temūr-Tash (Ms.A).
24. **Arslan b. 'Abd al-Jabbar**

He took Jabal Jūr, Dhu'l-Qarnain and al-Sūwān until Temūr-Tash wrested them from him. He then moved to the service of Dā'ūd in Hīṣn Kaifa where he died (Ms.A). Cahen does not mention this information but states that Arslan joined the service of Temūr-Tash and Alpī, after the death of Dā'ūd.

25. **Unnamed son of Yaghī-Siyyan**

He worked for the sons of Qara Arslan (Ms.A).

26. **Köpek**

He was brought to Mādiṇ after his father's death by his mother whom Temūr-Tash subsequently married. Köpek married Hadiyya Khatun and died in 554/1159-60 outside Nāṣībin (Ms.A). Cahen says he died outside Mādiṇ, but gives no source for this information.

27. **Unnamed daughter of Arslan b. 'Abd al-Jabbar**

She married Za'īm al-Daula Musayyib b. Malik, lord of al-Raqqa (Ms.A).

28. **Bulaq**

He was in the service of Najm al-Din Alpī until he died (Ms.A).

29. **'Alī al-Harāmi**

He died in the service of Temūr-Tash (Ms.A).

30. **Abū Bakr**

He became a Sūfī and a faqīr. He had a long life. He was in the service of the sons of Qara Arslan in Hīṣn Kaifa (Ms.A).

31. **Arslan Toghmish**

He worked for Togh-Tegin of Damascus. He married 'A'isha Khatun, the daughter of the brother of the vizier, Muḥammad al-Dvīnī. He stayed with the Būrīds until 543/1148-9; he then went to
Mosul and moved to the service of Temür-Tash, who gave him a number of iqṭāʾs in 544/1149-50. He died shortly afterwards (Ms.A).

32. Shams al-Daula

He died two years after his father in the service of Temür-Tash (Ms.A). Ms.B confuses this Shams al-Daula Sulaiman with the better-known man of the same name who was the son of ɪl-Ghāzī. It was ɪl-Ghāzī's son, Sulaiman, who had a son - Mahmūd - whose scandalous way of life Ibn al-Azraq deplored.

33. Masʿūd

He stayed in the service of Alpī, then moved to work for Qara Arslan (Ms.A). Cahen calls him Mahmūd.

34. Balak

He remained with Alpī until (5)67/1171-2 and then became an ascetic. He was still alive when Ibn al-Azraq wrote his account (Ms.A).

35. ʻUmar

His mother was a slave-girl. He died, leaving no issue. ɪl-Ghāzī married ʻUmar's mother to one of his supporters (Ms.A).

36. Naṣr

His mother was also a slave-girl, whom ɪl-Ghāzī married to the ḫājjī ʻUmar al-Khaṣṣ. Naṣr died without leaving any issue (Ms.A).

37. Ayaz

He was sent by ɪl-Ghāzī to fight with the troops from Mosul in 504/1110-1 (Ibn al-Qalānisi, 174-5; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 340-1 and Atab., 18). He was killed in 509/1115-6 by the men whom Bursuq had appointed to guard him (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 358).
38. **Guhar Khatun**

She married Dubais, by whom she had a son, 'Izz al-Dīn Muhammad. He stayed with her until Dubais was killed. He then spent time both at al-Hilla with his brothers and at Mardīn, where he served Alp. Guhar Khatun died in 559/1163-4 and was buried at Mardīn (Ms.A).

39. **Al-Bazm**

He was killed in ʿIl-Chāzī's lifetime (Ms.A). Artuk calls him Elbazmi, Cahen Al-Bazmi/Bazmi.

40. **Sulaimān**

He ruled Mayyāfārīqīn after his father (Ms.A).

41. **Safra Khatun**

She married Qurtī, the lord of Arzan and Bitlīs. She had a son Yaghiš-Basan, who at the time Ibn al-Azraq was writing was in the service of his uncle, Daulat-Shāh (Ms.A). She is not mentioned by Cahen.

42. **Yuana Khatun**

A daughter of such a name is not mentioned in the genealogical account of Ms.A., which speaks of Āina Khatun. But elsewhere in Ms.A (f.170a), the wife of ʿIl-aldī of ʿĀmid is called Yuana Khatun. She was the mother of Shams al-Mulūk Māhmūd, who was lord of ʿĀmid in Ibn al-Azraq's time.

43. **Shīhāb al-Dīn Muhammad**

He grew up in the service of Temūr-Tash, who gave him Tall Bāšaš as an ʿiqṭā. He ended up in Syria in the service of Nūr al-Dīn, who gave him many ʿiqṭās. He was still alive in Ibn al-Azraq's time (Ms.A).
44. **Shah Malik**

He married the daughter of Shirbarik in 507/1113-4 (sic) (Ms.A). This date is much too early and is probably due to a scribal error.

45. **Mahmud**

The author met him in Mardin (Ms.A; cf. no.32 supra). Cahen says he was governor of Mardin and was then exiled to the Sahil.

46. **Jamal al-Din Tughrati (?) (or Surbi ?)**

Temür-Tasq gave him Hānī, al-Si and Qalb (Ms.A). Tughrati is the version of the name given by Artuk. Cahen prefers Tafrati, whilst Turam avoids the problem by omitting that part of the name.

47. **Samsam al-Din Bahram**

He was lord of Dara (Ms.A).

48. **Hadiyya Khatun**

She lived in Hanī with her brother (Ms.A).

49. **Zumurrud Khatun**

She married Qutb al-Din Maudūd b. Zangī. She had four sons by him (Ms.A).

50. **Safiyya Khatun**

She married the lord of Amid (Ms.A).

51. **The sons of Shihab al-Din Muhammad**

They served Nūr al-Din (Ms.A).

52. **Naura Khatun**

She was the wife of the lord of Arzan (Ms.A).
A genealogy of the late Saljuqs

Alp Arslan

Malik-Shāh*  Tutush

Berk-Yaruq  Muhammad*  Mahmūd  Sanjar*  Duqaq  Ridwān*

Mahmūd*  Mas'ūd*  Toghrīl*  Sulaimān-Shāh  Saljuq-Shāh*  Alp Arslan-Al-Akhras  Sultan-Shāh

Malik-Shāh*  Dā'ūd*  Muhammad*  Alp Arslan*  Farrūkh-Shāh*†  Arslan-Shāh*  Bahram-Shāh*  son*

* mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq.
† referred to by Ibn al-Azraq as 'al-khafājī'.
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Notes on the genealogical table of the late Saljuqs

Only names important to an understanding of Ibn al-Azraq's account of the history of the Jazira in the first half of the sixth/twelfth century have been mentioned.

Ibn al-Azraq's own genealogy of the Saljuqs is found on ff.163-164a. This has been assessed against the genealogical information found in secondary sources. ¹

Those persons mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq in this part of his text are marked with an asterisk.

Apart from a few errors, Ibn al-Azraq has managed to produce a reasonably accurate genealogy.

¹

i) Zambaur, op.cit., 221-2


APPENDIX C

TRANSLATION OF MS. B OF

TARIKH MAYYA'FARIQIN WA AMID
Translation of Or.6310 (MS.b)  
(f.100b) The Account of the Beginning of the Rule of Najm al-Dīn II-Ghāzī and his Reign in Mayyāfāriqīn

It is reported that when Ibn Jahīr conquered Diyar Bakr, Amir Artuq was with him. When Ibn Jahīr had completed his conquest of the country, Artuq left him and went to Syria where he lived for a while. Then he conquered Jerusalem and its environs and lived on the Sāhil. On his death, Amir Sukmān took Jerusalem. (f.101a)

Najm al-Dīn II-Ghāzī went to Sultan Muhammad who granted him Hulwān as an igtā' for a while. Then he gave him the post of shihna of Baghdad where he remained for a time. At the time that the Franks took Jerusalem, Amir Sukmān arrived in this area and took possession of Hisn Kaifa. The amīr Yaqūtī was (already) lord of Mārdīn. Najm al-Dīn arrived and remained there until 512. The sultan got in touch with Ilduz Beg ordering him to hand over Mayyāfāriqīn to Najm al-Dīn. So he surrendered it to him on 14 Jumādā II 512. He entered the city and took possession of it. Ilduz Beg left and took up quarters in al-Rawābī (?) for 3 days. On the fourth day, a messenger came in haste from the sultan ordering him not to surrender the city but he found that it was already too late. Najm al-Dīn became established in Mayyāfāriqīn and he showed justice, equity and kindness to the inhabitants.

Mayyāfāriqīn had declined and gone to rack and ruin because of constant changes of régime and overlord. All those who had conquered the people had treated them harshly and tyrannised them,
the majority of the houses in the city had become ruined because they had been used as billets for troops and the people had been leaving their homes. From the moment that Najm al-Dīn ruled, they became secure in their homes and houses and the billeting stopped. Thereupon the soldiers who had no homes began to camp in the ruins of the city in tents as the city was devastated and the countryside was terrorised by robbers. Caravans would only go from Mayyāfāriqīn to Āmid, Hānī, Arzān, Mārdīn and Hīsīn Kāfā if they had a cavalry escort to protect them (even) over this short distance.

From the moment that Najm al-Dīn ruled, the countryside and roads were safe, the robbers fled, the villages flourished and Mayyāfāriqīn began to prosper. He ruled the people extremely well.

Things continued thus until 513, when he fought the Franks, defeated them decisively and took a great deal of plunder from them. This was the defeat at Balāt.

It is reported that in this year the Friday mosque at Āmid was burned.

In (5)14, Najm al-Dīn took Nāṣībīn. Qādī ʿAlām al-Dīn Abūʾl-Ḥasan b. Nūbaṭa and a group of the prominent men in Mayyāfāriqīn went and met him at Nāṣībīn and congratulated him on his conquest of the city. He put ceremonial garments on them, treated them well and then sent them back again.

In 515 the population of Tiflīs got in touch with Najm al-Dīn asking him to come so that they might hand over Tiflīs to him. The inhabitants had run the administration by themselves for 40 years.
A family called the Banū Ja'far had ruled the city for about 200 years and when they died out, the citizens themselves took over the administration. Every month one of them would be in charge. When King Da‘ūd, the king of the Gurj and the Abkhaz, oppressed the city sorely, they contacted Sultan Toghril who was in Janja and Arrân and he sent a shihna to them (f.161a). But the tyranny of the king of the Gurj towards them continued and they agreed to pay him 10,000 dinars every year. They also agreed to have a shihna with no more than 10 horsemen. After continuing like that for a while, they approached Najm al-Dīn and asked him to come. He set out, accompanied by Saif al-Daula Dubais b. Sadaqa al-Mazyadī who was his son-in-law - being married to his daughter Guhar Khatun - and who had joined him that year. Najm al-Dīn took troops with him and also Qadi 'Alam al-Dīn Abu'l-Hasan, whose son Qadi Abu 'l-Fath is now qāḍī of Mardin, and the vizier Abū Tammām b. 'Abdūn too. When they arrived in Erzerum, the qāḍī and the vizier stayed behind there. Najm al-Dīn took the troops to Kars and entered Georgia by way of Tharyālīth; many troops assembled. Sultan Toghril came from the Ganja area and Fakhr al-Dīn Toghan Arslan al-Ahdab from the district of Dvin. The troops advanced until they were only a half day's journey away from the mountain near Tiflis (f.161a). King Da‘ūd sallied forth from the western side while his son Dimitri swooped down on them from the top of the mountain when they were at the bottom of it. They engaged in a mighty battle there and countless Muslims were killed. The Georgians routed and took prisoner innumerable Muslims and Arabs, and acquired a great amount of plunder from them; indeed, prisoners have remained in their possession right up to our own time.
I saw the place of the battle when I came to Tiflis in 548 and entered the service of the king of the Abkhaz, Dimitri, in Tiflis. We travelled on a visit round his territory for a period of over 70 days, as far as al-Lan and the edge of Darband. One day we came to a broad meadow beneath a mountain, at the foot of which was a forbidding citadel. The king of the Abkhaz camped at this place (f.161b) and said to me: "O. so and so! In this citadel is a foreigner who has been a prisoner since the time of Il-Ghazi. (f.103b) When morning comes go up to him and see him and ask him where he comes from." So I decided to do so. That night the king received the news that some of the provinces had rebelled against him. So the bugle for departure was sounded at once and the king left and God did not decree that we should meet that man. (f.162a)

When the Muslims had been put to flight, Najm al-Din and Dubais left with 20 horsemen. Najm al-Din left for his own country, (f.162) taking all his belongings with him, and returned to Mayyafariqin.

After the defeat of the Muslim troops, the king of the Abkhaz went back and camped before Tiflis and besieged it. Then he took it by sword and entered it at the end of the year (5)15. He plundered and burned it. Then he promised its inhabitants security, treated them fairly and laid down for them the conditions which they asked for. He stipulated that there should be no pigs in the area where the Muslims lived and that these animals should not be slaughtered amongst them. He also struck dirhams for them, on one side of which was the name of the caliph and the sultan. He inclined to their wishes over the call to prayer and over public prayers (f.104a) and he stipulated on their behalf that no Georgian, Jew or Armenian
should enter the bath of Isma‘īl, and that prayers should be said on Fridays from the minbar for the caliph and the sultan but not for himself. He assessed the tax of a Georgian at five dīnārs, a Jew at four dīnārs and a Muslim at three dīnārs. He decreed that the Muslims might shed with impunity the blood of anyone who harmed them. He treated the Muslims extremely kindly, whilst to the people of religion and 'ilm and the Sufis he accorded a level of respect and reverence which they did not receive (even) amongst the Muslims. I witnessed all these conditions still in force for the Muslims in our own time, when I visited the city in the year 548. That year I saw King Dimitri who had come to Tiflis. After he had stayed there a few days, he went down on the Friday to the mosque and sat down on a dikka opposite the minbar and the preacher. After he had heard the entire khutba and had remained standing until the people had prayed, he went out and donated that day 200 gold dīnārs to the mosque. I used to see him accord considerable respect to the people of religion, the 'ulama', the Sufis, the preachers and the sharifs who would seek him out. He treated them kindly, showing them honour and respect and giving them many presents.

It is reported that in the year 516 there was an earthquake in the city of Ganja; part of it fell to pieces and its walls collapsed. King Da‘ūd left (Tiflis) and attacked the city. He captured and imprisoned many of its inhabitants, whom he carried away on carts like sheep, and he plundered everything in the city. When he brought the prisoners into Tiflis, the citizens bought most of them and set them free.

When Najm al-Dīn returned to Mayyafāriqīn, he went to Mārdīn
where he stayed until 516. He fell ill and was taken to Aushal al-
Haina in the district of Mayyafarîqîn, accompanied by the khatun,
the daughter of Togh-Tegin and his son, Shams al-Daula (f.105a)
Sulaymân. Al-Sa'îd Husâm al-Dîn stayed behind in Mârdîn. Najm al-
Dîn was ill for a few days and then died on Thursday 17 Ramadan 516
in al-Aushal. Shams al-Daula and the khatun set off on horseback
by night and came to the Huwa gate where they shouted for the wâli,
whose name was al-Hâjib Oghuzoglu. He came down and opened the Huwa
gate and they went in, with Najm al-Dîn placed on a horse, held up-
right by a man behind him, while Shams al-Daula and the khatun rode
beside him. Once inside the citadel they told the wâlî that the
amîr was ill. When they reached the centre of the citadel, they
began shouting and yelling, the amîr was taken down and they announced
that he had just died. In the morning the population went up to the
citadel and the amîr was washed. He was buried in the citadel in
the sidillî for a while, then he was removed to the masjid al-amîr
where he was buried, as we shall relate later on. Najm al-Dîn had (f.162b
married the khatun - Farkhundâ, the daughter of Malik Ridwân - when
he had taken possession of Aleppo but he did not (f.105b) consummate
the marriage, nor did he visit her, and he died without having met her.

We will mention now the amîrs who are the descendants of Artuq.

When Artuq died he left a number of sons amongst whom were
Sukmân, Najm al-Dîn Il-Ghâzî, Bahrâm, 'Abd al-Jabbar, Siyâwush and
Alp-Yaruq. These are the ones who had children and whose descendants
remained in Diyar Bakr. He left other sons apart from these, but (f.177a
as I have found no descendants of theirs living in our own time I
have not mentioned them.
Amir Sukmān left Amir Dāʿūd, who took possession of Hisn Khīfā after Sukmān and subsequently conquered other cities too. Dāʿūd had four sons:— Amir Arslan Toghmīsh, Sulaimān, Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan and Mahmūd.

Bahrām left Balak, who took possession of the province of Khartabīrūt and Bālū and its environs. Balak married the khatun, the daughter of Malik Ridwān, after Najm al-Dīn (had died) and he took Aleppo. He consummated the marriage with the khatun. He took some of the territory on that side of the Euphrates and he made raids against the Franks.

As regards Siyawūsh, he left Amir Yūnus al-Hārāmī whom I have met, and he came and worked for al-Saʿīd Husām al-Dīn and died in his service. Siyawūsh (also) left sons, amongst whom was Amir 'Alī. The latter fathered Shīrbārīk and his brother, who died, leaving a son who is still alive today. Shīrbārīk also had sons, of whom the ones still alive now are Sevinch and Ismāʿīl. The eldest of Shīrbārīk's children, who was called Zangī, was born of a slave-girl. He left his father for a while and went away to Egypt. He is now in the service of the caliph of Egypt. Shīrbārīk remained in the service of al-Saʿīd Husām al-Dīn until the latter died. He then transferred to the service of Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan and remained with him for a time before returning to employment with al-Malik Najm al-Dīn.

As for 'Abd al-Jabbar, he left three sons: Yaghū-Siyan, Arslan and Sulaimān. Yaghū-Siyan moved away and served in the government of Akhlāṭ. He had two sons there; the one was called Ahmad and the...
other had the laqab 'Izz al-Dīn. Yaghl-Sīyān then moved to the service of Fakhr al-Dīn with whom he remained and who married Yaghl-Sīyān to the daughter of his elder brother. He died while he was with him, leaving a son who is in his employ. As regards Arslan, he took Jabal Jūr, Dhu 'l-Qarnain and al-Sīwān on behalf of his father and Khutlugh-Shāh took over the post of wāli of the town. Shams al-Daula left a son whose name was Mahmūd and who was in Mādīn. He was in a bad way because of the evil life he led and his disobedience to the members of his family, his lack of ambition and the depravity of his soul. I do not know what became of him.

The account of the rule of al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn, may God be pleased with him

When Shams al-Daula died, al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn came and camped outside the gate (of Mayyāfārīqīn). He made contact with Khutlugh-Shāh and the affair was settled between them. Khutlugh-Shāh surrendered to him and Husam al-Dīn took possession of the town (f.107a) in Shawwāl (f.162 and 528). He appointed 'Abd al-Malik as vizier. Husam al-Dīn became established and he acquired everything that had belonged to his father Najm al-Dīn. He took Aleppo and wielded independent power. He married the wife of his brother Ayaz and he had by her Safiyya Khatun who was the eldest of his children. Then he married the khatun, the daughter of Ghāzi of Erzerum. She came to Mayyāfārīqīn, he consummated the marriage with her, and had by her the lord Najm al-Dīn (in 520), Jamāl al-Dīn Surbī (?) (in 521), Hadiyya Khatun (lacuna) and Samāsam al-Dīn Bahrām in the year (lacuna). Husam al-Dīn took power and acquired everything that had belonged to his father. He was a knowledgeable, just amīr, who possessed intelligence, sagacity and familiarity with all
branches of knowledge.

It is reported that in 522 Nur al-Daula (f.107b) Balak was killed outside Manbij in Syria. He left no children other than a daughter whom Pakhr al-Din Qara Arslan married. Rukn al-Daula (f.163b) Da'ud took all Balak's possessions in the area of Khartabirt, Balu and its neighbourhood.

It is reported that in 521 al-Bursuqi was killed in the Friday mosque at Mosul. His son Mas'ud took over the country and Mosul after him. Baha' al-Din b. al-Shahrazuri, Nasir al-Din Jaqar and Salah al-Din Muhammad al-Yaghli-Sfyan'i went to Baghdad taking funds. They paid their respects to Sultan Mahmud in order that they might put al-Bursuqi's son in power. But when they arrived, they reconsidered and said (to one another): "He is a young boy. It may well be that he will not remain in power and there is no unborn child." They therefore had a meeting with Atabeg Zangi b. Aq-Sonqur, who was shihna in Baghdad, and they came to an arrangement with him. They exacted an oath from him promising that the post of qadi of the country should go to Baha' al-Din, that Nasir al-Din should control Mosul and all the walis and that Salah al-Din should have the post of chamberlain and control of the troops (f.108a). When that had been decided, they paid the sultan the money, asking for one of his children for whom Zangi should act as atabeg. The sultan handed over to him two sons, Alp Arslan and al-Khafaji, and the country (of Mosul) became theirs. Zangi entered the city at the beginning of 522 and took possession of the whole country.

In 523 the Atabeg Togh-Tagin died in Damascus and his son,
Tāj al-Mulūk, assumed power.

In 524 Sultan Mahmūd died outside Isfahān and he was buried there. His brother, Masʿūd, became sultan. In (5)24, Princess Sayyida Khatun, the daughter of al-Qilīch Arslan, died in Mayyafāriqīn and was buried beside her father in the qubba. After a while her brother, Malik Toghrīl, came from Hīn Kaifa and collected what she had bequeathed to him. He was the son-in-law of the amīr, being married to his daughter. Amir Dāʾūd had (f.108b) married 'Āʾisha Khatun, her mother.

In the year 526 the caliph al-Mustarshid bi'llāh went to Mosul. He encamped before it and laid siege to it for a while. In command of the city was Nasīr al-Dīn Jaqar who had dug a trench around Mosul and re-built (the walls). The caliph pressed the siege but he was unsuccessful and returned to Baghdad.

In 527 the vizier ʿAbd al-Malik died in Mayyafāriqīn and al-Nāsiḥ ʿAlī b. Ahmad al-Āmidī took over the supervision of the diwan. When he was mutawalli in Āmid, Ibn Nīsān had seized him, mulcted him for 30,000 dinārs and taken over his post. His son Abū Nasr (f.164b) arrived in Mayyafāriqīn when the vizier ʿAbd al-Malik was in power and the latter had given him the profit from the harvest. He gave al-Nāsiḥ himself the post of administering the waqfs. He stayed until the vizier died and he then took over control of the diwan (f.109a).

In 528, al-Muʿayyid Abuʾl-Hasan b. Mukhtar arrived from the Jazīra. He had been mulcted by the vizier ʿAbd al-Malik and had gone off to the Jazīra where he had stayed until that year. He
then came to Mayyāfāriqīn and met the amīr who appointed him to the
dīwān al-istīfa' with al-Nāsīh. His brother Abū Sa'īd was in
Mayyāfāriqīn and he remained a while too.

At the end of 528 Habashī b. Muhammad b. Habashī arrived from
the people of Iraq and al-Makīn Abu'l-Barakāt
b. Abī'l-Fahm al-Harrānī came with him into the
service of al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn. Habashī became established as
vizier. He had worked for Salāḥ al-Dīn in Hamā, but he had seized
him and tortured him by tying a dog to him inside a sack. While the
dog struck and bit his body, he squeezed the dog's head and wedged it
between his legs. He finally wrung its neck so that it died in the
sack. Habashī was released and he ran away. (f.164b)
Having stayed
in Qal‘at Ja‘bar with Shihāb al-Dīn Mālik b. Sālim b. Mālik for a
time, he left him and came to Mārdīn that year. After a while he
took over as vizier and acquired an unprecedented degree of power,
ruling as a complete autocrat. When he came to Mayyāfāriqīn at the
beginning of 529, he conducted an inspection of tax-officials and
scribes, oppressed them most cruelly and humiliated and coerced them.
When they (Habashī and his followers) arrived in Mayyāfāriqīn, al-
Mu‘ayyid Abu'l-Hasan ran away and returned to the Jazīra. Habashī
seized al-Nāsīh and his son and mulcted them both. Al-Nāsīh died
in Mayyāfāriqīn but Amir al-Hasadā b. 'Azīz (?) fixed a price for
his son and took him to ʿĀmid. Al-'Amīd Abū Tahir b. al-Muhtasib
took over power in Mayyāfāriqīn. He had been in prison for six
years and Habashī released him and appointed him wālī.

It is reported (f.110a) that in 529 the Caliph al-Mustarshid left
Baghdad and joined battle against Sultan Mas'ūd, who defeated him and
seized him and all his state officials. When I went down to Baghdad
in the months of 534, I asked al-Sa‘īd Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn Sadīd al-Daula
Abū ‘Abdallāh Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm b. al-Anbārī, may God have
mercy on him, about the affair of al-Mustarshid, about the battle (f.164b
and its outcome, the reason why al-Muqtafī assumed office and how
he came to hold exclusive power.

Al-Anbārī said: 'After al-Mustarshid had declared his earnest
intention to rebel and persisted in this and Jamāl al-Dīn b. Talha
had expressed his agreement to such a plan, and I had been summoned (f.165a
to them, we went in to see the caliph and the vizier said: "O
master, where are you going and who will give you support and help?
Whom can we trust? We are strongest if we stay in Baghdad. If
anyone attacks us here, we will win and Iraq (f.110b) is our protection.
When al-Husain b. ‘Alī, blessings be upon him, went out towards Iraq,
he met his fate and if he had stayed in Mecca and Medina nobody
would have turned against him and all the people would have paid (f.165a
allegiance to him.” The caliph said: "O scribe, what do you think?"
So I said: "We should stay put. What the vizier has advised is the
right thing to do. No-one will attack us in Iraq. Would God that
Iraq remains ours.” So he said to the treasurer: "O wākīl, what do
you say?" He replied: "I think the same way as my master.” Al-
Mustarshid said: "If death is inevitable, it is weak to be a coward.”
Thereupon he left taking troops.

When the armies met outside Hamadhān, we were defeated, the camp
was plundered and al-Mustarshid, the vizier and the functionaries of
state were taken prisoner. We were brought to a citadel called Sarī(f.165a
Jahān near Qazwīn and Rayy. (I [the author] saw the citadel on my
journey (f.111a) to Rayy in 549, looming into view at the top of a
mountain). The vizier Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī and Jamāl al-Dīn the treasurer, the qaḍī of the ‘Alīids and I were taken to the citadel, where we remained for a time. The sultan took al-Mustarshid with him and went round Azarbājān with him until he was outside Marāgha. It was then that three heretics entered al-Mustarshid’s tent and he was murdered — may God be pleased with him. A man called Ibn Sakīna who was leading him in prayer was killed with him. It was on Thursday 26 Dhu‘l-Qa‘da 529. The caliphate of al-Mustarshid lasted seventeen years and a few months. He had appointed as heir his son Abū Ja‘far al-Mansūr al-Rashid bi’llāh, Commander of the Faithful, who had stayed behind in Baghdad. It is said that Sultan Sanjar sent the people who killed al-Mustarshid. But another report says that Sultan Mas‘ūd, after having asked for — and received — permission from his uncle Sanjar to kill him, commissioned those men who accordingly went into his tent and killed him. He was buried in the city of Marāgha.

Saif al-Daula Dubais was with the sultan in the camp when the caliph was captured and it is said that he incited the sultan to kill him. So when the sultan came near Tabrīz, Dubais was killed. He was taken from Tabrīz to Mārḍīn to Guhar Khatun and buried in the mashhad of Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī. After a short time the sultan married the daughter of Dubais. Her mother was Sharaf Khatun, the daughter of ‘Amīd al-Daula b. Jahīr by Zubaida the daughter of Nizām al-Mulk al-Ḥasan b. Ishaq.

The narrative of al-Sa‘īd Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn continued thus: When al-Mustarshid was killed, Sultan Mas‘ūd summoned us to his
presence, so the vizier, the treasurer (f.112a) (and I) went to see him. The َناجيب الْثَّيْر had died in the citadel where he was buried. (f.16)

We went in to see the sultan who said: "What is your opinion? What should be done about the caliphate? Whom do you think suitable?"
The vizier said: "O master! The caliphate belongs to the heir, al-Rashid, for the people already pledged allegiance to him when he was made heir-apparent and have again done so now after the murder of his father." The sultan said: "That is completely impossible. I will never confirm him as caliph, for he is thinking of rebelling just like his father did. Al-Mustarshid constantly rebelled against (f.165 us from the moment he assumed power; he rebelled against my brother Mahmūd twice, against me once before and now yet again. He got what was coming to him but it is we who will be saddled with the shame and ignominy of his murder until the end of time. I want to appoint someone who will involve himself in nothing but caliphal and religious matters and who will not rebel against me nor against the members of my family. There are several members of the family.

Choose (f.112b) a shaikh from amongst their number who possesses judgement and resourcefulness, who keeps himself to himself and does not leave his house. Do not look further than Hārūn b. al-Muqtadī for he is an old shaikh, and will not stir up dissension. He was recommended by my uncle, Sanjar, Sultan of the World." (f.165t

There were at that time in the palace seven brothers, the sons of al-Muqtadī. They too had sons and grand-sons. Some lived until the year 553. There were (also) in the palace seven brothers, who were the sons of al-Mustazhir, amongst whom were Amir Abū 'Abdallāh,
Abu Tālib, Abu Nasr, Abu'l-Qasim, Abū 'Alī, Ismā'Il and Yahya. They (too) had a number of sons and grandsons. Al-Mustarshid also had a number of sons. And then there was al-Rāshid who had some twenty sons, the eldest of whom was the amīr al-ja'īsh who had been born to his father al-Rāshid when he was nine years old. This is an unprecedented occurrence.

Someone I trust in Baghdad told me that al-Mustarshid (f.165b) acquired five concubines for al-Rāshid, when he was seven years old. He ordered them to play with him and to make themselves available to him. This situation lasted until he was nine when a yellow-skinned Abyssinian slave-girl amongst them became pregnant. This information reached al-Mustarshid who refused to believe it. He summoned the girl and threatened her. She said: "By God, he (al-Rāshid) is the only person who has been near me. He is mature like all other men." (So) the slave-girl wore a piece of cloth, while he had intercourse with her. When he rose from her, she removed the piece of cloth and there was semen on it. The people had a close look and there was semen with each concubine. When the slave-girl reached the end of her confinement, she gave birth to a son whom al-Mustarshid called amīr al-ja'īsh and he was extremely happy about him.

It is said that al-Rāshid followed his father's courageous and ambitious policies and that is why the sultan turned away from him. It is reported that Sultan Mas'ūd approached his uncle asking for advice on whom he should appoint (as caliph). He received a reply from Sanjar as follows: "Appoint only someone on whom the vizier, the treasurer and the katib al-inšā' agree and whose good
conduct they will guarantee, and for whom they will accept responsibility." So when Sultan Mas'ūd suggested appointing Ḥārūn, Sharaf al-Dīn (al-Zainabī) said, "If that is going to be our responsibility, then we will appoint someone we think suitable. The person (whom we have in mind) leads an ascetic life and worships (God). There is no-one like him in the palace." The sultan asked: "Who is he?". The vizier replied: "He is Amir Abū 'Abdallāh b. al-Mustazhir." He was the son-in-law of Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zainabī, being married to a daughter of his. He had married her in the reign of his father al-Mustazhir and she had died while with him. At that time al-Zainabī was the naqīb al-nuqabā'. He was subsequently transferred to the post of vizier.

Then the sultan set off for Baghdad accompanied by the vizier and all his retinue. Al-Rāshid had sent a message to Atabeg Zangī asking him to come, and guaranteeing to him that he would appoint as sultan one of the maliks, the sons of Mahmūd, who were with him, (and) that he would make Zangī atābeg for the sultanate and the caliphate. Zangī therefore went down to Baghdad, camped on its western side and stayed until the sultan approached Baghdad. When Al-Rāshid realised the situation, and that their arrival (i.e. that of the sultan’s party) was imminent, that they were resolved to appoint (as caliph) someone other than him and that they had got as far as al-Nahrawān, he put all the amīrs in a cellar in the palace and imprisoned them in it. I heard this story from al-Ajall Zain al-Daula b. al-Sāhib who was ḥājib al-bāb with Al-Rāshid at that time. He said: 'Al-Rāshid called me in and gave me a sword. He took a sword in his hand and said: "Here is my hand and here is yours. When we fetch out each amīr we will kill him so that not one of them remains and there will be no-one left to
assume power." So he ordered the cellar to be opened. Then the messenger came to say that Atabeg Zangi had left. He had stayed until he heard that the sultan had arrived in al-Nahrawān. At that point he had gone off to plunder the Tāhirid harīm and then left. When al-Rāshid heard the news he threw the sword from his hand and went into the palace. He grabbed jewels of inestimable value, giving me some of them too. He then went away, taking with him the chief qādī, al-Zainabī, and followed Atabeg Zangi towards Mosul.

Al-Sa'īd Mu'ayyid al-Dīn said: 'The following morning, we entered Baghdad on 10 Dhu'l-Qa'da 530. The sultan went to his palace and we and the vizier went to our houses. The next morning we entered the caliphal palace and went in to see Amir 'Abdallāh. The vizier and other officials had a talk with him and fixed the conditions on which he was to become caliph and stipulated that he should respect and obey the sultan. We informed him that we had vouched on his behalf for all the conditions which the sultan and the vizier had suggested. He was content with all that and we left him. The following morning we went to the sultan and told him what had happened and that Amir Abū 'Abdallāh had agreed to all the conditions we had imposed on him. So the sultan said: "Tomorrow, summon the people to pledge allegiance to him". The next day, which was Tuesday 13 Dhu'l-Qa'da 530, Amir Abū 'Abdallāh was in the palace and I handed him a paper with some names on it; al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh, al-Mustadī' bi-Nūr Allāh and al-Mustanjīd bi'llāh. So Abū 'Abdallāh said: "That's up to you". The vizier said to me: "What do you think?" So I said: "Al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh." Then the caliph said: "Blessed be that name." Then the
caliph stretched out his hand and the vizier said: "I have pledged allegiance to our lord and master al-Muqtadī li-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Faithful, on God's book and on the sunna and the ijtihad of his prophet, the messenger of God." He kissed his hand and stood up. Jāmāl al-Dīn, the treasurer, pledged allegiance to him in the same way, kissed his hand and stood up. I took his hand and said: "I have pledged allegiance to our lord and master al-Muqtadī li-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Faithful, on the same conditions as I pledged allegiance to his father, his brother and his nephew and at the heir-apparent ceremony of the latter (al-Rāshid). I kissed his hand and stood up. Then the people came in and the 'ulama', the fuqahā', (f.115b) all the amīrs in the palace, the notables and military leaders pledged allegiance to him.'

Objects and articles were removed from the palace of al-Rāshid and the fuqahā' issued a fatwa deposing him and declaring him unfit for the office. The qādī who pronounced this judgement was Sharaf al-Qudat Ibn al-Karkhī, the qādī of the Shafi'ites. Three days later, Sultan Mas'ūd arrived and went in to see the caliph. He pledged allegiance to him and kissed his hand. The khwaja Amir Tātār the hājīb and all the sultan's officials pledged allegiance to him. He assumed power and became established in the caliphate.

The caliphate of al-Rāshid, from the moment when his father rebelled and was killed until his own deposition, lasted approximately one year and two months. A number of people had held office as vizier to al-Mustarshid in his time. Amongst them were Nizām al-Dīn Abū Nasr Ahmad b. Nizām al-Mulk and Sharaf al-Dīn Anushīrwān, each of whom held office twice. Then Jalāl al-Dīn Abū 'Alī b. Sadaqa became vizier
until he died. Then the naqīb al-nuqabā’, Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Ṭirād al-Zainabī (f.116a) held office as vizier to al-Mustarshid until the caliph was killed. Al-Zainabī then came to Baghdad and when al-Muqtafī assumed control, he served as his vizier.

To go back to what happened to al-Rāshid: he left and went (f.167a) to Mosul, accompanied by the chief qādī, al-Zainabī, for he had left Jalāl al-Dīn Abu’l-Rida b. Sadaqa as vizier in Baghdad and taken al-Zainabī with him to Mosul. Having stayed in Mosul with Atabeg Zangī, he went with Zangī up as far as Nasībīn and then returned to Mosul. Thereafter he left the atabeg and went in search of the sultan, to ask his permission to enter Khurāsān. When he was near (f.167b) Isfahān a group of heretics rose against him, went into his tent and killed him in the month of Ramadan 532. He was taken to Isfahān and buried in the city of Shahrīstān which is one farsakh from Isfahān. It is said that it was built by Alexander on a bridge over the river Zayanda. It is reported that the sultan sent people who killed al-Rāshid and he put the blame on the heretics.

The chief qādī and Jalāl al-Dīn (f.116b) had stayed in Mosul after al-Rāshid’s departure. The chief qādī then went down to Baghdad and returned to his post. As for Jalāl al-Dīn Abu’l-Rida (f.167b) b. Sadaqa, he stayed in Mosul and became vizier to Atabeg Zangī for a while after the death of Diyā’ al-Dīn Abū Sa‘īd b. al-Kafartūthī. He was subsequently dismissed and returned to Baghdad.

Al-Muqtafī became established in the caliphate and his rule was
secure. He married Fātimā Khatun, the daughter of Sultan Muhammad, (f.169e) who was brought to him in Baghdad during the year (5)34 and joined him in the caliphal palace. I was in Baghdad that year and I saw Caliph Muqtafī on the day Khwāja ‘Izz al-Mulk came and pledged allegiance to him. I was present at the betrothal of the daughter of Caliph Muqtafī to Sultan Mas'ūd which took place this year after Fātimā Khatun had come to live with al-Muqtafī and the betrothal ceremony was in the Bāb al-Hujira. The khwāja Amir Tatār al-hājib (f.169f) was present and Qadi al-Zainabī preached a sermon.

In this year the vizier Sharaf (f.117a) al-Dīn left his house in high dudgeon and went to the sultan's palace. He then stayed in the house of Najm al-Dīn Rashīd al-Jāmdār.

After the caliph had got in touch with the sultan asking his permission to dismiss Sharaf al-Dīn, he was duly dismissed. I was (f.169t) in Baghdad at the time of his dismissal, with Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn the treasurer and Muwaffiq al-Daula Buqsh al-Khādīm and then I left Baghdad. At the beginning of the year (5)30 the caliph appointed as vizier the ustadh al-dār, who at that time was Nizām al-Dīn Abu'l-Muzaffar b. al-Za‘īm b. Jahīr. The chief qādī, al-Zainabī, had deputised as vizier for a while, as had al-Sa‘īd Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn, until Nizām al-Dīn became vizier. He remained in office until 542 (f.173t) when he was dismissed and Qawām al-Dīn b. Sadaqa, who was the treasurer, took over. He stayed in office until the beginning of (5)44 when he was dismissed and replaced in (5)44 by ‘Aun al-Dīn Abū Muzaffar (f.174s) Muhammad b. Yahyā b. Hubaira, who had been in charge of the dīwān al-zimām wa‘l-istīfā. Al-Muqtafī became established (f.117b) in the caliphate. In (5)43 his wife, Fātimā Khatun, died. In (5)44 he (f.173)
made his son, Amir Abū Muzaffar, his heir, the people paid homage to him and a sermon was preached before him at the ceremony celebrating him as heir-apparent. The affairs of the caliphate remained stable until the year 54- when Sultan Mas'ūd came to Baghdad. He spent the winter there and in the spring he went to Hamadhān. That year I was in Baghdad where I stayed until 1 Rajab (5)47 when I went to Mayyafāriqīn. When we arrived in Takrīt we heard that Sultan Mas'ūd had died. He had been ill outside Hamadhān for a few days and died on 11 Jumādā II 547. The caliph sallied forth and occupied the palace of the sultan. He mobilised troops and seizing Iraq he took sole possession of it. Fakhr al-Dīn Mas'ūd Bilāl, the shihna of Baghdad, fled to Takrīt. The caliph removed the mu'an, the a'shar and the mukūs in their entirety. He treated the people kindly and acted justly towards his subjects. All Iraq came under his sway. After he had sent troops, al-Hilla and Wāsit were taken and he acquired all the revenues of Iraq.

At the time of his death Sultan Mas'ūd had Malik-Shāh, the son of his brother Mahmūd, in the 'askar with him. This man seized power and set himself up as sultan. After a while he got in touch with Ibn Palang-Eri, summoned his brother from Khūzistān and became secure as sultan. When Malik-Shāh went to Khūzistān, his brother Muhammad-Shah, the son-in-law of Mas'ūd - being married to his daughter - stayed behind. He set himself up as sultan and became established in the sultanate at Hamadhān, without being mentioned in the khutba in Iraq. He took the region of Hamadhān and Isfahān and that side, and after a time he killed Khāss Beg b. Palang-Eri, becoming secure and stable in the sultanate.
It is reported that in 528 'Abd al-Mu'min conquered the Maghrib (f.16)
I will mention something about him and how his career began. The
story goes as follows. Muhammad b. Tūmart, who was from the
Masmūda (tribe), went (f.118b) to the countries of the east where (f.168)
he remained for a while before returning to the Maghrib in 519.
While he was staying in Marrākush a group of the fuqahā' met him.
When he had debated with them they realised that his views were
unorthodox for the madhhab and religious faith of the people of the
Maghrib. They therefore disapproved of him and held a meeting
with the amīr al-muslimīn, 'Alī b. Yūsuf b. Tashufīn, in 520, at
which they said: "Send this man away from us. If you don't, he
will corrupt the people." 'Alī therefore ordered him to be sent (f.168)
away, banishing him to the mountain area of the Masmūda, a group
of Berbers who were his own tribe. After he had spent some time
with them, he incited them to disobey the amīr al-muslimīn and they
refused to fulfil the obligations imposed on them. Having mobilised
troops he joined battle with them and defeated them. The commander
of the troops, 'Abdallāh b. Māfiya, was killed. The amīr al-muslimīn
therefore went out in person and joining battle with him, defeated (f.168)
him. Ibn Tūmart consolidated his position in the mountains, which
is a journey of a month or two. This mountain area is called Daran
and is in the province of Marrākush and Sūs. Ibn Tūmart lived there
until 523 (f.119a) when he died.

His place was taken by 'Alī al-Wansharishī who equipped troops and
laid siege to Marrākush in 524. After the amīr al-muslimīn had
defeated him and hounded him out of Marrākush, al-Wansharishī fled to (f.168b)
the mountains and strengthened his position there. The situation
between the two of them remained more or less unchanged until 528 when al-
Wansharishi died. He was succeeded by ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn b. ‘Alī who belonged to the Hargha people. He was one of the companions, disciples and supporters of Muhammad b. Tūmart al-Ṣūsi, and was a Berber tribesman. Having mobilised troops he met the amīr al-muslimīn in battle and defeated him. He took possession of the whole mountain area, seizing another province too before going down in the year (lacuna) to the desert. Then he conquered most of the land of the Maghrib, acquiring every place. He took all of Ifriqiyya and most of al-Andalūs, seizing a great deal of territory from the Christians. In 540 he met the amīr al-muslimīn, Tashufīn b. ‘Alī b. Yūsuf, and defeated him. He killed a great number of people and imprisoned and killed the amīr al-muslimīn. His grip on the country tightened, (f.119b) the people stood in awe of him and he increased in their estimation. In 542 he took the city of Tūnis, which is a large area, for it is said in the Kitāb al-masālik wa’ l-māmalik that the circumference of its walls is 21 miles. In 547 he conquered the province of the Banū Hammad and drove them from it, killing a group of their leaders. In 552 he conquered and took possession of al-Mahdiyya and in 553 he seized Almeria which the Christians had taken from the Banū Hammad in 549. When the Christians had looted it, the plunder from the city had reached even as far as the Sāhil and Syria (f.165) and the city had remained in their hands until ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn conquered it from them, encountering no resistance at all. He built two great cities, one of which is (a port) and which he called al-Mahdiyya and the other is (inland) which he called (lacuna). His sovereignty became established and he is still in the land of the Christians of the west, conquering it bit by bit. This is what I have heard about him.
In 529 (f.120a) al-Sa'id Husam al-Din had married the princess, (f.167b the daughter of Ridwan and the widow of Badr al-Daula, and Majd al-Din b. al-Sadid had drawn up the marriage contract. This year I was in Mardin and it was the first time I had travelled away from Mayyafarigin.

In 528 Atabeg Zangi and al-Sa'id Husam al-Din had attacked the citadel of al-Sur. The Atabeg conquered it and killed Amir Hamdan b. Aslam who was living there. It had been in the possession of Amir Rukn al-Daula Da'ud and Zangi handed it over to al-Sa'id Husam al-Din. In 530 he (al-Sa'id Husam al-Din) gave orders for the rabad and the muhaddatha to be destroyed, for a quarrel had broken out between al-Sa'id Husam al-Din and Amir Da'ud and he (Da'ud) began wrecking the town on Friday 9 Muharram. Al-Sa'id Husam al-Din and the Atabeg joined forces and defeated Da'ud outside Amid, before moving on to Jabal Jur which they seized, together with al-Siwan and Dhu'l-Qarnain. These places the Atabeg handed over to al-Sa'id Husam al-Din while Amir Arslan fled to Amir Da'ud. In 528 Amir Da'ud had plundered the rabad of TanzI and carried off all its inhabitants into captivity. The women were raped with more savagery than if the Christians had attacked them.

In 532 the Byzantine emperor left Constantinople for Syria. He seized Buza'a, leading all its inhabitants into captivity, and encamped before Aleppo. Although he clashed with Atabeg Zangi, he remained fixed on his goal, but when more troops joined Zangi and Amir Da'ud sent his son with soldiers, the Byzantine emperor left Aleppo and returned to his own country.

In this year Bahaa al-Din al-Shahrazuri died in al-Raqqa. He was succeeded as chief qadi by his son Najm al-Din. This year I was in the Jazira where I stayed for a while.
In 533 Amir Da‘ūd looted Arzan, taking all its inhabitants into captivity, and he made over the people, their property and their women to his troops for them to loot and plunder. They received even more barbaric treatment than the people of Tanzī. When al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn arrived in Mayyafārīqīn, Husām al-Daula Qurtī b. al-Ahdab joined him from Arzan. In this year Husām al-Dīn defeated the Franks outside Edessa and the caravan was seized. In this year Atabeg Zangī and al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn quarrelled and Salāḥ al-Dīn went up to Mārdīn and established peace between them. Husām al-Dīn handed Dārā over to Zangī who married Safiyya Khatun, daughter of Husām al-Dīn. At the end of this year I was in Ἁميد and I returned to Mayyafārīqīn. At the end of Dhu‘l-Hijja I travelled to Baghdad, passing through Mosul.

In Safar 534 Safiyya Khatun arrived in Mosul and she was taken to the malik. I was in Mosul and I went down to Baghdad where I stayed for six months before returning to Mayyafārīqīn.

In Muharram 535 Amir Da‘ūd raided Mayyafārīqīn, plundering the town. He encamped before it and stayed eight days before going to Tall Shaikh, which he took and distributed as an iqtā‘. He subsequently went up to Bushāṭ and took it. The whole area came under his sway. Each day he continued raiding up as far as the gate and even taking the people's clothes from the river. In power in Mayyafārīqīn were Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥabashi and the chamberlain Yūsuf Ḫnāl, with Ḥabashi having control of the ‘askar and the town and ruling the people. The quarrel between al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn and Da‘ūd lasted until the beginning of 536 when they made peace and reached agreement. Amir
Da'ud came to Mayyafarin and the two of them met in the citadel where they reached agreement.

Halfway through Jumada I 536 Amir Sa'd al-Daula Il-aldī, lord of Amid, died. Mu'ayyid al-Dīn b. Nisān was in the town, so he appointed Il-aldī's son, Shams al-Kulūk Māhmūd, and made him amīr. This year I was in Amid.

At the end of 536 Sharaf al-Dīn Habashi went to Mosul with a letter for the atābeg and the amīrs who went with him returned. In 534 Ḥabashi had seized al-Mu'ayyid Abu'l-Hasan b. Mūkhtar and imprisoned him until this year. After Ḥabashi had become established in Mosul, al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn released Abu'l-Hasan, appointed him to the dīwān al-istifā' and gave back all (administrative) responsibilities to him. In this year he seized al-Ajall Abu'l-Wafā b. al-Sarātān. Having been imprisoned for a while, he was thrown from the citadel down to the rabād of Mārdīn.

It is reported that Ḥabashi planted the idea in the atābeg's mind that he should seize Mayyafarīqīn for himself. So in 537 he went and attacked the province of Amir Ya'qūb, taking possession of Khīzān, al-Ma'dan, Arzan, Qatalbas and all his territory. This year I was in Mosul for two months. Then in 538 he went and attacked this area, arriving at Tall Bashmi where the troops made camp. A few nights later, Mu'amīl al-Shaqasi and Muḥammad b. Abī'l-Mukārim entered Ḥabashi's tent and struck him down with their swords. They took his head and went outside, whereupon there was a clamour (f.123a) and the people were in uproar. The atābeg woke up, left early in the morning (f.170)
and returned to his own country.

It is reported that on Sunday, 19 Muharram (5)39 Amir Dā'ūd died in Ḥānī. He was carried away in his bier which passed (through Mayyāfāriqīn) on the Monday and was placed in the Muhaddatha mosque. After the people and Qur'anic readers had come out of the city to visit it, he was taken the next morning to Hisn Kaifā. His son, Pakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan, ruled Hisn Kaifā, Khartabirt and his other possessions after him. Another son of his, Arslan Toghmīsh, took possession of the citadel of Mīzgard. The atābeg, setting out for his own territory, went and took Ḥānī, Jabal Jūr, al-Sīwān, Dhu’l-Qarnain, Arqānīn, Charmūk and all that area and (so) the atābeg and Husām quarrelled.

In 537 Arslan Toghmīsh married Hadiyya Khatun, the daughter of al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn, and she was taken to Mīzgard. Atabeg Zangī set out for Edessa. Having laid siege to the city for a while, he took it by force in the holy month of Rajab, which was 23 Kānūn I. The Franks had held the city for 47 years since the year 442. Then Zangī withdrew from it and attacked al-Bīrā. Some days later the news reached him that Nasīr al-Dīn, governor of Mosul, had been killed by his ghulāms on 8 Dhu’l-Qa‘da (5)39. Zangī therefore went down to Mosul, organised its affairs and put Zain al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Beg-Tegin in charge of it. He was kind to the inhabitants and treated the town justly. The people have received every kindness from him until now.

In Rajab Qadi ‘Alam al-Dīn Abu’l-Fath b. Nubāta had been summoned from Mayyāfāriqīn to Mārdīn, for Majd al-Dīn Dā’ūd
b. al-Sādīd had been dismissed from the post of qādī of Mārdīn. (f.170)
Al-Mu‘ayyid Abū’l-Ḥasan b. Mukhtar al-Mustauffī had engineered that.
Bahā’ al-Dīn Abū Tāhīr was appointed khatīb of Māyyāfīrīqīn deputising
for his uncle ‘Alam al-Dīn and after two days he was appointed
khatīb of Mārdīn too. Amir Ibrāhīm b. Munqīdh, the Egyptian, had (f.171f
come to Mārdīn to work for al-Sā‘īd Ḥusām al-Dīn and he was made
vizier two days after the appointment of ‘Alam al-Dīn, with the
Baghdad muḥaddhīb ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad al-‘Īrāqī as his deputy. He
used to say that he was from the Mu‘wajj family in Baghdad and he (f.171f
was a scribe in the mashḥad of Mārdīn.

Al-Sā‘īd Ḥusām al-Dīn (f.124b) at the beginning of his rule had
transferred Najm al-Dīn ʿIl-Ghazī and Shams al-Daula from the Masjīd al-
Amīr to the citadel of Mārdīn. There was in the citadel a turba for
them in which were buried a group of people who had died at the time
of ʿIl-Ghazī. They were buried here for a short time and then he (f.171f
built at ‘Ain Bāqīrā a mashḥad and a turba on which he expended a
great deal of money. He transported them there and established a
waqf on the building.

In (5)40 the Egyptian vizier was imprisoned. Whilst in prison (f.171f
he got hold of pieces of material made of rough cotton and succeeded
in escaping from the citadel of Mārdīn and took flight. The
following morning the people were in an uproar and horsemen went in
search of him. They caught up with him on the mountain-side and
he was brought back to al-Sā‘īd Ḥusām al-Dīn who released him.

It is reported that in 540 al-Sā‘īd Ḥusām al-Dīn inflicted a (f.171f
defeat on Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan at f.125a Baghdān. It was a memorable day and the victory was won by Shīhāb al-Dīn Mūhammad b. Ayaz. In 540 Shaikh Sulaymān the Allāh came from Is‘īrīd to Mayyafarīqīn. The inhabitants and the amīr with his entourage went out to meet him, for he possessed indescribable knowledge. He stayed with Tāj al-Dīn and when the amīr went in to see him he sat in the mosque and preached. It was a memorable day. The people were captivated by him and he rose to the highest position with the amīr. He moved to the house of Khwaja Lu‘lu’ and his status became such that if the amīr went to Wārdīn he would go with him, he lived wherever the amīr lived, and if the amīr went in to see him, he would not stand up for him. He acquired considerable fame and respect, exercising total control over the amīr. Then he changed his way of life, took servants and began to act in a way which was inappropriate for the likes of him. Having gone down in the people’s estimation he went off to Syria, where he remained for a while. He returned to the amīr and stayed for a time before going to Is‘īrīd where he remained a while, until the month of Rabi‘I (5)46. As he was going into the mosque to perform the Friday prayer, two men attacked him. One of them hit him with a sword he was holding in his hand while the other jumped on him striking him with a knife. He fell down, the people were in an uproar and he was carried away. His assailants were arrested. They were ʿIsmā‘īlīs. After his death, may God be pleased with him, he was buried in the Khidr mosque in Is‘īrīd and his two murderers were killed.

In 540 al-Mālik Najm al-Dīn became joined in marriage to the whatun, the daughter f.126a of Qutb al-Dīn Ahmad b. Sukmān. She
was the uterine sister of the Shahīdarman and the daughter of his paternal uncle. Ṣaḥī al-Dīn b. Rashīq, Athīr al-Dīn ‘Abbād and a group of state dignitaries from Akhlāt arrived in Mayyāfāriqīn where they stayed a few days before going on to Mārūn, where they met Najm al-Dīn. The matter was arranged and they returned home where they stayed until 541 when Qadi ‘Alam al-Dīn and a group of state dignitaries went to Akhlāt and fetched the khatun. The state dignitaries from Akhlāt came with her and the wedding took place in Mārūn.

In this year al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn began the building of the Qarāmān bridge on the Qaisūn under the supervision of al-Zāhid Abu’l-Hasan ‘Alī who established its foundations on both sides. Then floods came and destroyed it because of his inadequate craftsmanship. A fine was imposed on al-Zāhid and his place was taken by Saif al-Dīn (f.126b) Shīrbarīk Maudūd b. ‘Alī b. Artuq. He began the work of building it under the supervision of Abu’l-Khair b. al-Hākim al-Fasūl (?). He worked on it until 548 and only a small part remained unfinished. (?)

In 541 Atabeg Zangī attacked Qal‘at Ja‘bar, which was held by Saif al-Daula ‘Alī b. Mālik. He pressed the siege with vigour and the citadel was on the verge of being conquered. He arrested Jamal al-Dīn, the son of al-Sa‘īd, who was in his service, and imprisoned him in the camp. I asked Qadi Kamāl al-Dīn Abū ‘Abdallāh Muhammad b. al-Shahrazūrī about the killing of the atabeg and what happened. He said: 'After we had laid siege to the citadel for a while, Ḥassān al-Manbījī went out one day and said: 'I want Amir ‘Alī to speak to me'. When ‘Alī appeared in front of him on
the walls, he said to him:— "You know what friendship exists between us and you (f.127a) know the atābeg and what he is like. You have no back to lean on. You must surrender; if not, he will take the citadel by the sword with undesirable consequences. After such an eventuality what fate can you expect?" ‘Alī replied: "O Hassān! I am expecting what you expected at Manbij when Amir Balak was besieging it, and God took care of him for you." Kamāl al-Dīn continued:— "And by God, hardly had half of that night passed when the town-crier shouted to us from the citadel that the atābeg had been killed. That day was Wednesday 9 Rabī‘ II (541). People shouted and clamoured. It had come about because a slave had been spending the night with Zangi in his tent and when he was asleep he killed him. Taking the knife with the blood on it he went up to the rabad of the citadel and shouted to the people "I have killed the atābeg." When they did not believe him, he showed them the knife and other effects which he had taken from him, and they took him up to the citadel (f.127b) and called out the news. The people in great confusion and disagreement got up and came to me. (f.172

I said "We must find the malik." So I rode off and when Malik Alp Arslan b. Mahmūd had come out I said: "What was Zangī (anyway)? We all belong to the sultan." Jamal al-Dīn was released and taken to his father. When the camp of Jamal al-Dīn al-Mustaufī was plundered, he fled to me and I hid him in the house of a friend of mine. Then the ‘askar divided into two factions. Salah al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Yaghī-Siyānī took Nūr al-Dīn Mahmūd b. Atabeg (Zangī) and the Syrian ‘askar, set off for Syria and took Aleppo. As for us, we took the malik to Mosul with our ‘askar. When we arrived at
Sinjar the malik ran away and went to the Jazīra but Ta'īj al-Dīn Abū Tahir Yahya b. al-Shahrazūrī, may God have mercy on him, and ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dubaisī caught up with him, made promises to him and brought him back to the camp before going down to Mosul. Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī (f.128a) b. Atabeg (Zangi) came from Shahrazūr which had been given to him as an iqtā' and took possession of Mosul. It is said that he killed the malik. He took the whole of Diyar Rabī‘a and he gave the Jazīra to al-Dubaisī as an iqtā'.


It is reported that after the murder of the atabeg the people of Edessa rose up and killed a number of Muslims. They took possession of the city and sent messengers summoning the Franks. A group of Muslims decided together to get the city back.

When ‘Izz al-Dīn al-Dubaisī and Hassān al-Manbījī had arrived the people rallied together and the city was conquered. All its inhabitants were plundered and a number of people there were killed. When the news of the murder of the atabeg arrived (f.128b) al-Sa‘īd Ḥussān al-Dīn was in Mayyafāriqīn. He immediately rode out of his Citadel garden and making for Ḥanī he attacked it and conquered it on Wednesday 23 Rabī‘ II (541). Thereafter he took Jabal Jūr, al-Sīwān and Dhu‘l-Qarnain before going down to seize Shabakhtān, al-Muwazzar, Tall Mauzan, Jamalān and Rā‘s ‘Ain al-Khābūr. He then returned home. This year I was in Mardin and Dunaisir. Fakhr
al-Dīn Qara Arslan went and took Arqanīn, Charmūk and all the area which the atābeg had taken after (the death of) Amir Dā‘ūd. He also seized on that side Arūq, Qatalbas, the town of Sāf, the citadel of al-Haithum, Is‘īrd, Bahmard, Tanzi and Bātāsā. The lord of Akhlāt went down and took Khīzān, al-Ma‘dan, Īrūn and all the province of Amir Ya‘qūb.

In 542 (f.129a) al-Sa‘īd Husūm al-Dīn and Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī quarrelled and Saif al-Dīn plundered the town of Mārdīn taking from it a great many slaves and plundering a great part of it. He then encamped in the plain of Mārdīn. I was in Āmid. Then peace was established between them and Saif al-Dīn married Zumurrud Khatun, daughter of the amīr. Shaikh Abū Sa‘d b. ‘Asrūn came to Mayyafāriqīn and drew up the marriage contract for 20,000 dīnārs. With him was Amir Ibrāhīm al-Bahmardī and a group of people from Mosul.

In this year Saif al-Dīn, having arrested Qādī Kamāl al-Dīn b. al-Shahrazūrī and his brother Tāj al-Dīn from the Jazīra, appointed Najm al-Dīn Abū ‘Alī b. Bahā‘ al-Dīn qādī of Mosul and al-Daqqūqī qādī of the Jazīra.

In 542 the amīr issued copper coins after I had gone to al-Ma‘dan (f.17) to fetch the copper (f.129b). In (5)42 Arslan Togmūsh b. Dā‘ūd died, leaving as issue from the daughter of the amīr a son who survived him for a few days before he too died.

In (5)43 al-Sa‘īd Husūm al-Dīn went and camped before Is‘īrd (f.172) and took possession of it. He also seized Bātāsā. Jamāl al-Dīn, lord of Āmid, and Ibn Nīsān had recognised him as overlord.
city remained his for a while, then he returned it to Pakhr al-Dīn. When Pakhr al-Dīn conquered the citadel of Mizgard, Hadiyya Khatun returned to her father.

In Sha'ban 'Izz al-Daula b. Nīsān came to Mayyafāriqīn and concluded a marriage contract for 50,000 dinārs between Safiyya Khatun, daughter of the amīr, and Jamāl al-Dīn, lord of Āmid. He took her away during the last five days of Sha'ban and brought her to Āmid.

This year Tāj al-Dīn, may God have mercy on him, had gone to the Hijāz and Baha' al-Dīn Abū Tahir took over as gādi deputising for him.

In (5)43 Diya' al-Dīn Ayyūb came and concluded a marriage contract between Naura Khatun, daughter of al-Sa'id Husam al-Dīn, and Pakhr al-Dīn Daulat-Shāh b. Toghan Arslan, lord of Arzan and Bitlīs. This man had assumed power in succession to his brother Yaqūt Arslan. When Daulat-Shāh's brother Husam al-Daula Qurtī died in (5)38, his place was taken by his brother Yaqūt Arslan who remained in power until (5)40. Yaqūt Arslan sent his brother Daulat Shāh into the service of Atabeg (Zangī) when the latter passed through to seize the territories of Amir Dā'ūd after Dā'ūd's death. Yaqūt Arslan died on a Saturday, at the beginning of Ramadan (5)40. Diya' al-Dīn Ayyūb, who was the stepfather of Daulat-Shāh, went to the camp of the atabeg and brought Daulat-Shāh back to Arzan. The latter passed by Mayyafāriqīn and proceeded to take possession of Arzan and all the territory that had belonged to his father and his brother. He (then) transferred his allegiance to al-Sa'id Husam al-Dīn. Daulat-Shāh remained in power.
until Dhu'l-Hijja of the year --3, when Bahā' al-Dīn Sevinch b. (Kuhmūsh) came and took the city of Arzan. After he had gone there it remained in his possession for a while.

In this year the khatun, lady of Akhlāt, the daughter of ‘Izz (f.172b) al-Dīn Saltuq, arrived in Ḥisn Kaifā on her way to perform the ḥajj, and she stayed with Fakhr al-Dīn, who treated her well. (Thereupon) Bahā' al-Dīn Aus b. Abī Ma'ādh came to Mayyāfāriqīn, accompanied by Athīr al-Dīn 'Abbād and 'Alam al-Dīn b. Tabar, the qādi of Arjīsh. Bahā' al-Dīn stayed in the house of al-Mu'ayyid al-Mustaufī. Pakhr al-Dīn sent the khatun back to Akhlāt and made it impossible for her to go to the Hijāz. Bahā' al-Dīn and everyone else went home again.

In 542 al-Mu'ayyid Abu'l-Hasan al-Mubārak b. Mukhtar al- Mustaufī, who had been in control of the diwan, had died in Mārdīn. His brothers Samsām al-Dīn and Shīrbārīk had arrived with some state officials and were lodged in the house of the family of Sukmān where they stayed a few days.

I was in Mosul (f.131a) when Atabeg Ghāzī died and was buried in the 'Imādiyya mosque in Mosul.

In Safar 544 Qutb al-Dīn Maudūd b. Zangi took over as amīr and his position was made secure through the good offices of Zain al-Dīn and al-Dubaisī and the vizier Jamāl al-Dīn. Four days after the death of Ghāzī, Kamāl al-Dīn and Tāj al-Dīn, the sons of al-Shahrzūrī, were set free having been confined to their houses with guards at their doors. When the atabeg had arrested them, he had imprisoned them in the citadel of Mosul, but after a messenger had arrived from the caliph to deal with their case, they were allowed to go to their homes. The situation had remained thus until the day (f.174b
in question when they were summoned to the maidan to the door of the atabegs. They entered, having changed their clothes for they had ridden without tarhās. When they had entered the maidan and approached Atabeg Qutb al-Dīn they dismounted, and he dismounted for them. After he had embraced him they complained to him about his brother and congratulated him on becoming amīr. He got on his horse while they mounted theirs, and they positioned themselves on each side of him. I was present in the maidan that day.

After a while, they got in contact with al-Ṣa‘īd Husam al-Dīn and settled with him the matter of the khatun and her marriage to Qutb al-Dīn Maudūd. It was fixed on the basis that the city of Dārā should be the dowry and Qutb al-Dīn became joined in marriage to her, after the completion of her period of mourning, and he consummated the marriage with her. He attacked Dārā and conquered it on 12 Dhu'l-Hijja (544). At that point I was in the camp. He appointed the chamberlain Yūnus al-Dunaisirī to rule Dārā.

In this year the sons of Tāj al-Dīn quarrelled and Diya’ al-Dīn b. Nubāta went to the camp in Dārā (132a) and took over as qādi before returning as governor to Mayyāfāriqīn. In 544 Qutb al-Dīn, the son of the lord Najm al-Dīn, was born, may God perpetuate their shadows.

In 544 news came that the Franks had taken Almeria from the Muslims. All their possessions had been plundered and sold in Syria and the Sāhil.

In 545 Samsām al-Dīn married the daughter of the atabeg and he came to Mosul in 546. At the time of the marriage I was in Mosul. In Muharram of 545 the Bedouin plundered the hajj and many people...
were killed. Something like that had not been heard of for years and only a small number of people escaped alive. I was (then) living in Mosul.

Al-Safīd Husam al-Dīn with his sons assumed control over all the rulers of Diyār Bakr, Diyār Rabī‘a and Armenia and all amīrs in these areas who were subordinate to them. After Atabeg Zangī (had died), no independent amīr ruling his own area remained without being challenged and opposed and without doing exactly what he was told.

In Muḥarram 545 Nur al-Dīn joined battle with the Franks and took prisoner the son of Joscelin, whose entire territory he seized. Husam al-Dīn took Sumaisat on 6 Rabī‘I 545 and al-Bīra in 546, Nur al-Dīn seized Tall Bāshir and its environs and a great deal of territory whilst Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan took Hisn Mansūr and Bābalū, seizing also the citadel of Gargar from the Armenians and Sultan Qīlīch Arslan took Mar‘ash and Kaisūn and its environs. Thereafter not a single place remained on the Euphrates which did not belong to the Muslims, other than Qal‘at al-Rūm which if al-Safīd Husam al-Dīn had lived he would have taken too.

In 547 Jalāl al-Mulūk b. Badr al-Daula married Hadiyya Khatun. Saif al-Dīn Mahmūd b. Dā‘ūd also married her and took her via Mayyāfāriqīn to the province of Tanzi and the town of Tall Fafān and al-Qarshiyya where she is still with him today.

In 546 al-Safīd Husam al-Dīn circumcised the sons of Jamāl al-Dīn. He received an edict entitling him to the land. The robe of honour arrived (from the caliph) and the edict was read in the mosque to the assembled people. After two nights, on the night of Monday
22 Rabī‘ I 547, the mosque collapsed and the minbar area and the arcades fell down. The rest of the building was pulled down and the foundation of the dome-chamber was dug. Work on it began from the end of 547.

This year I was living in Baghdad and I saw Sultan Mas‘ūd before he went to Hamadhān where he died as we have already related.

Sultan Mas‘ūd was of tractable disposition and easy-going temperament. There was no other sultan like him (in this respect). Ibn Palang-Eri conquered all his territory and it came under his sway. Mas‘ūd killed some of the great amīrs whom no-one else had managed to defeat; he killed al-Mustarshid, al-Rashid, Dubais, Boz-Aba, ‘Abbās, Qaracha al-Sāqī, Mengū-Bars, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Toghan Yūrek, and the number of high-ranking amīrs and commanders and governors of the provinces he killed is known precisely. He killed ‘Izz al-Mulk, the khwāja-yi buzurg Amir Tatār, the chamberlain. He was intrepid and he led an unprecedently fortunate life. When he died he left three small sons.

It is reported that in 544 Safiyya Khatun died in Āmid.

In (f.134a) 545 al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn appointed as vizier Zain al-Dīn As‘ad b. ‘Abd al-Khāliq, the brother of al-Mu‘ayyid who had been the vizier of al-Bursuqi and who had also become vizier of the sultan. He confirmed al-Mu‘ayyid and al-Muhaddhib in their posts in the diwan, appointing as deputy a scribe with the laqab of al-Shihāb, who is now working in the diwan of the lord of Arzan. Zain al-Dīn remained established as vizier until 546. Al-Sa‘īd Husām al-Dīn went out to Āmid, attacked it, oppressed it and handed it out as an ʾiqtā‘. He reclaimed from the people of Āmid the marriage settlement
of the khatun, his daughter. He remained on the Hauw bridge for a while before going to Tall al-‘Alawiyya. Messages went backwards and forwards between them and he seized the harvest that year. Then Ibn Nīsān settled the matter and the amīr withdrew.

Ibn Nīsān plotted to send people to kill the vizier Zain al-Dīn in Mārdīn. It happened as follows. He had ridden out one day to the citadel of Fajāz (?) and was in a narrow place when two men attacked him. One of them had an axe with which he struck him on the head, so that he fell. The people who were with him went after the killer and his accomplice. One (of them) said: "What do you want? We will go up to the amīr and tell him that we killed the vizier." When they reached the citadel, they said to the commander: "Tell the amīr that we killed the vizier". They were taken to the citadel with the people following behind them. The two men went into the amīr and said: "We have killed the vizier". So he said: "Why?" They said:"We were ordered to do it." It is said that Ibn Nīsān plotted and sent people to kill him. The amīr gave orders concerning the two of them and they were killed on the grave of the vizier, who was buried in the rabād at Mārdīn.

Husām al-Dīn resumed his attacks on ṬāMiscid and harassed it. The vizier (f.135a) Bahā’ al-Dīn Aus, the vizier of Akhlāt, came and discussed the government of ṬāMiscid, talked to him and interceded on behalf of the inhabitants. Then the vizier went into ṬāMiscid and met Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn b. Nīsān and settled the matter with him. Ibn Nīsān went out to see the amīr and peace terms were agreed. The people of ṬāMiscid went out to pay their respects to him and acknowledged his suzerainty. Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn went out to him (alone) the first time (f.176a and then returned to ṬāMiscid. The next morning the amīr went out
accompanied by the khatun and his sons and the sons of the ra'īs. Their authority became established and the amīr withdrew from them. (f.176a)

In the last ten days of Rajab Naura Khatun, the wife of the lord of Arzan, died, leaving a son who survived her for a while before he too died. She was buried in Arzan. The amīr was deeply attached to her.

After the killing of Zain al-Dīn, the amīr remained without a vizier, making do with al-Ajall Mu'ayyid al-Daula Karīm al-Mulk who served him better than anyone else had done. He remained amīr until Thursday 2 Dhu'l-Qa'da 548 when he died in Mārdīn, may God have mercy on him and be pleased with him. He was buried in the mashhad. His illness lasted only from Saturday. There was a remission from Monday to Thursday but then he died. His rule had lasted thirty years.

He was, may God have mercy on him, a learned, just amīr, well-versed in all branches of knowledge. He liked the people of religion and the best practitioners of all crafts. He was kind, generous, intelligent - and hospitable to an extent unknown even amongst the Bedouin. Amir Ābū Bakr, lord of Nasībin, sought him out and joined him after fleeing from Atabeg Zangi. Husām al-Dīn gave him asylum and would not surrender him. The atābeg demanded his surrender and there was a serious quarrel between them on his account, in consequence of which the atābeg took Dārā. But although Husām al-Dīn lost a great deal, he would not surrender him. This man was the reason for the cooling of relations between the two of them. After Ābū Bakr had left Husām al-Dīn he went to Sultan Mas'ūd, to whom the atābeg sent someone demanding that he be given up. Mas'ūd handed him
over, (and) he was taken to the atābeg, who killed him.

Husām al-Dīn, may God be pleased with him, used to show regard for the members of the Prophet's family and look after their affairs and he did not contemplate the extirpation of an ancient family. Numerous members of the Prophet's family from the whole territory used to seek him out and he would treat them kindly, make them gifts, furnish them with hospitality and arrange for them to stay in his service. He took care of the qādis and jurists and if he was convinced that a man possessed special knowledge he would bring him into his company, make him draw near, give him presents and ask him about what knowledge or craft he had.

When he died, I was in the territory of the Georgians in the service of King Dimitri, the King of the Georgians. One day we were in his territory near Darband when he summoned me and said: "I have just heard that your master, Husām al-Dīn, has died". That was on 4 Muharram 549, may God have mercy on him and be pleased with him.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
لقد استعبلت ببعض الرزمات أثناء العدد، وكانت النهاية في نهاية المجلة.

فلم يكن وجدناught من مساعد على تأليفه. ثم فتحنا على عند السخن.

شهد له أن ليس هناك غيره في الأزول. وكدن

لا يوجد مسند سلمه ولم يسمع به مصدقا

وذهب بينهم، ثم رجعوا ونفد المعبر وصمد.

أمامي، ولصق في الموصل. وقيلة عنا، له

فمن تعقد سمن سلمه، ومزأ اللد.

ووجدناها ونشدها، بلداً دفع على بحبلين.

المدкр وعليه، سنم أطي في، للأن

وعلى شهر يحبس، في الأ덮ة، لعله.

سماه.
الملحق القاضي بأمر السلطان، أرسلوا
دعوات إلى دول أخرى للاستماع إلى أمورهم.
أرسلوا إلى الأشراف المحسوب، ومعهم البلاد، وساروا إليها.
معناً، و maxlength استغل، وقررت ملخص
الملحق الملحق، وأرسل إلى السلطان.
هناك ثلاث عشرة سنة، إلا أن السلطان
لم يدع الملحق، ثم أرسله إياً إلى السلطان.
هناك ما كان بها دو، إلا أنه عند السلطان،
هناك عزلت الملحق حاول ملخص السلم.
ودعت عليه بالمدينة، وصلت، وأعد اللواء.
ج שיש خليفة ملخص، وانصرف إليه، كأنه
Index of names on the map of Syria and the Jazira

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>Charmûk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhlâṭ</td>
<td>Cilicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amid</td>
<td>Dânîth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani</td>
<td>Daqūqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Dârâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat, Mount</td>
<td>Dhu’l-Šarmain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araxes, River</td>
<td>Diyâr Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjîsh</td>
<td>Diyâr Kuçur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arzan</td>
<td>Dunaisir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A‘zâz</td>
<td>Dvîn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba‘albâk</td>
<td>Edessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Erivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâghîn</td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balâṭ</td>
<td>Erzinjun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâlu</td>
<td>Euphrates, River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba‘qûbûd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batman Su</td>
<td>Finik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Gargar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bîra</td>
<td>Greater Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitlîs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitlîs Su</td>
<td>Hûmûd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushâṭ</td>
<td>Hûnî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzâ‘a</td>
<td>Hanzît</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrûn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
al-Hattāsh
Jīlā
‘Ism
‘Iṣr al-Sanāsuna
‘Iṣr Kaifā
‘Iṣr Nanṣūr
Is‘īrd
Jazīra
Jazīrat ibn ‘Umar
Jīsr Nahrawān-Sifwā
Kafartūthā
Khurtabīrt
Khīzān
Lake Vān
Malaṭya
Manbij
Mar‘ash
Mārdīn
Mayyāfāriqīn
Mīzgārīd
Mosul
Nūsh
Naṣībīn
Sal‘at al-Kūn
Sal‘at Ja‘bar
‘Ayrataīn
‘Alb
‘Alb Su
Raḥba
Raqqa
Rā‘s al-Qin
Sarūj
Shaizār
Shmshāṭ
Sidon
Sinjār
Sunwisāṭ
Syria
Takrīt
Tall Bāshir
Tall Bāshra
Tall Fāfān
Tall Khālid
Tall Khūm
Tall Kauzan
Ţanzī
Tigris, River
Tripoli
Türkiye
Tyre
Vânb
Introduction

The index provided with this thesis is more detailed than the indices of most books on Islamic subjects and the quantity of cross-referring may seem excessive. The sole aim of this procedure, however, has been to make information in the text more easily traceable. Moreover, Ibn al-Azraq frequently refers to the same person under several names -- kunya, laqab, ism, or parts and combinations of any of these, and apparently assumes that his readers will easily identify the person in question. When a full name has been broken up in this way its constituent parts are separately indexed and cross-referenced. This system admittedly produces certain anomalies: thus Ṣadaqa, the father of Dubais, occurs in the index as a separate name although in the text proper he appears only as part of the name of his son. The result of including such entries is that the index is more detailed than might be expected but the system not only helps the reader to track down information quickly but also links the text to the commentary where many of the names recur under several forms. The wealth of names in the text itself makes an index desirable but it is doubly valuable in view of the muddled chronology of Ibn al-Azraq. A detailed index of proper names to some extent compensates for this deficiency. Finally, the extension of the index to Ms. B facilitates detailed comparisons between the two texts.

The cross-references allow a person to be traced via his ism or his laqab. Either may be used as the basis of the main entry in the index, but the principle is that a person is recorded under the name that is most often used. In cases of doubt the father's name is added to the ism or laqab in the index entry. When a genealogy, complete
with titles, is given at length in the index; it is in order to enable the reader to trace the person in question more easily. Ibn al-Azraq frequently gives names in shorthand form and only on subsequent (often much later) occasions does he give the name in full; e.g. the name Tāj al-Dīn Abū Sālim Ṭahir b. Ḥubīta first appears in full as late as f. 174a.

Names spelt variously within the same manuscript are given a single "standard" form in the index. Some inconsistencies may therefore be detected between the form of a name in the index and a given occurrence in the text. This is particularly likely to happen over the introduction or omission of îbn in a name. Where the text itself is inconsistent in this matter the more common form of the name appears in the index. But where Mss. A and B give different versions of a name, as distinct from several versions in one text alone, both versions have customarily been indexed. As a result the same person may appear under two headings in the index, where one Ms. gives the full name and the other only a component of that name, the name is indexed only once, with as many cross-references as seem necessary.

Names which span two pages, or two folios, occur in the index under both pages or folios.

In general, where a person is known by his office, that office is given after his name in the index entry. However, where the text refers to a person by his office only and not by any element of his name (e.g. "the sultan") these references do not appear in the index. Hisbas are usually recorded separately and cross-referenced.

For purposes of alphabetical order, al- as the first element of a name should be ignored. Where it appears elsewhere in a name, e.g. Abu'l-Ḥasan, it is however subject to strict alphabetical order.
Hayyāfārīqīn does not appear in the index as it is by far the commonest of the proper names in the text.

Where references occur in brackets, the names in question have been incorporated into the translation for the sake of clarity. They do not occur in the Arabic text.

The system employed in the index requires a word of explanation. References to Ms. A are cited first in the form of the page of the translation on which they occur. An oblique stroke divides the reference to the translation from the reference to the original text. Thus 35/167b means that the name occurs on page 35 of the translation and f. 167b of the text. Three dots precede references to Ms. B. Where an entry begins with three dots, the name in question occurs in that form only in Ms. B.

Since the index was prepared for use long before final typing, its page references to the translation are not those of the pagination in the thesis itself. To obviate this difficulty, the previous pagination will be found in the lower right-hand corner of the page in Chapter VI and Appendix C.
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al-ʿAbbās 16/164a
ʿAbbās, lord of Rayy 60/175b...38/133b
ʿAbbāsids 16/164a
ʿAbd al-Jabbār b. Artuq 29/167b, 30/168a, 61/175b, 61/176a, 65/176b, 67/177b...6/105b, 7/106a
ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Anbārī see Muʿayyid al-Dīn Sadīd al-Daula
ʿAbd al-Karīm the ḥājib 64/176b
ʿAbd al-Khāliq 61/176a...38/134a
ʿAbdallāh al-Shahrazūrī (father of Kamāl al-Dīn) 45/171b, 50/172b, 51/173b...32/127b, 33/129a, 35/131a
ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAmr 23/166a
ʿAbdallāh b. Malwiya 32/168b...22/118b
ʿAbdallāh b. Muʿayyid al-Dīn Muḥammad 18/165a, 35/169a
ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad al-ʿIrāqī (sic) see al-Muhaddhhib
ʿAbd al-Majīd 15/164a
ʿAbd al-Malik b. Thābit the vizier 9/162b, 11/163a, 17/164b...8/107a, 10/108b, 10/109a
ʿAbd al-Muʿīn 32/168a, 33/168b, 34/168b...22/118a, 23/119a, 23/119b
ʿAbd al-ʿĀdir the shaikh 36/169b
ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Toghaṅ Yārek 60/175b...38/133b
ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Anmāṭī, Shaikh 36/169b
ʿAbdūn 5/161b...3/102b
Abkhāz 4/161b, 5/161b, 6/161b, 6/162a, 63/176b, 64/176b...3/102a, 4/103a, 4/103b
Abū ʿAbdallāh b. al-Mustagḥir, Amir (the future caliph al-Muqtāfi) 22/165b, 24/166a, 26/166b, 26/167a...14/112b, 16/113b, 17/114b, 17/115a
Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad see al-Muhaddhib
Abū ʿAbdallāh see Muʿayyid al-Dīn Abū ʿAbdallāh
Abū Aḥmad al-Jalāl b. Kamāl al-Dīn 52/173b
Abū Aḥmad see Shams al-Dīn Abū Aḥmad
Abū ‘Alī b. al-Mustaḥfīr 22/165b...15/112b
Abū ‘Alī b. Bahā’ al-Dīn see Najm al-Dīn Abū ‘Alī
Abū ‘Alī see Jalāl al-Dīn
Abū Bakr al-Dubaisi see ‘Īzz al-Dīn
Abū Bakr b. al-Dāya see Majd al-Dīn
Abū Bakr b. Amīr ‘Alī the faqrī 67/177b
Abū Bakr b. Fakhr al-Dīn see ‘Īsād al-Dīn Abū Bakr
Abū Bakr the amīr, lord of Naṣībīn 63/176b...40/135b, 40/136a
Abū Bakr the ḥājib 64/176b
Abū Bakr the gādī 36/169b
Abū Ḥasan Abū’l-Khall, Shaikh 36/169b
Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr see al-Rāshid bi’llāh
Abū Ja’far see Nizām al-Dīn Abū Ja’far
Abū’l-Barakāt see al-Makīn
Abū’l-Barakāt the doctor 55/174b
Abu’l-Faḍl al-Dīn see Tāj al-Dīn Abu’l-Faḍl al-Dīn
Abu’l-Faḍl Muḥammad see Kamāl al-Dīn the gādī
Abu’l-Fahm see al-Makīn
Abu’l-Fatḥ al-Kabīr see ‘Ālam al-Dīn the gādī
Abu’l-Fatḥ b. al-‘Umrānī 53/173b
Abu’l-Fatḥ Muḥammad see ‘Ālam al-Dīn
Abu’l-Futūḥ 44/171b
Abu’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Mālik see Saif al-Daula Abu’l-Ḥasan
Abu’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī see ‘Ālam al-Dīn Abu’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī
Abu’l-Ḥasan b. (al-) Mukhtār see al-Mu’ayyid
Abu’l-Khaṭir al-Fāsūl 45/171b...30/126b
Abu'l-Maimūn 15/164a
Abu'l-Mukarrim 39/170a...26/122b
Abu'l-Muṣaffar b. al-Shahrazūri al-‘Aṭṭār, Shaikh 36/169a
Abu'l-Muṣaffar see al-Ajall Jamāl al-Dīn
Abu'l-Qāsim ‘Alī see Zain al-Daula
Abu'l-Qāsim b. al-Muṣṭaḥṣir 22/165b...15/112b
Abu'l-Qāsim b. Ḥabashi see ‘Izz al-Shuyūkh
Abu'l-Qāsim b. Nīsān see Jamāl al-Dīn Abu'l-Qāsim
Abu'l-Riḍā see Jalāl al-Dīn
Abu'l-Riḍā b. Saratān, al-Ajall 39/170a...26/122b
Abū Na‘ādh (father of Bahā‘ al-Dīn Aus) ...35/130b
Abū Mansūr al-Jawālīqī, Shaikh 36/169b
Abū Mansūr al-Razzāz, Shaikh 36/169b
Abū Mansūr Khālid b. al-Mubārak see al-Ajall Karīm al-Daula
Abū Muḥammad b. Naft, Shaikh 36/169b
Abū Muṣaffar b. al-Muqtaff, Amir ...21/117b
Abū Naqr Aḥmad see Niṣām al-Dīn
Abū Naqr b. al-Muṣṭāḥṣir 22/165b...15/112b
Abū Naqr b. al-Nāṣīḥ 17/164b, 31/168a
Abū Naqr b. Nīsān see ‘Izz al-Daula
Abū Naqr b. Nūr al-Daula 15/164a
Abū Qubais 44/171b
Abū Sa‘d b. ‘Aṣrūn, Shaikh ...33/129a
Abū Sa‘īd al-Ra‘īs 38/170a
Abū Sa‘īd b. Mukhtār 31/168a...11/109a
Abū Sa‘īd see al-Kafartūthī
Abū Sālim see Tāj al-Dīn
Abū Ṭāhir b. al-Muḥtasib see al-‘Amīd Abū Ṭāhir
Abū Ṭāhir b. 'Aqīl see Bahā' al-Dīn Abū Ṭāhir
Abū Ṭāhir see 'Imād al-Dīn
Abū Ṭāhir see Tāj al-Dīn
Abū Ṭāhir Yaḥyā see Tāj al-Dīn
Abū Ṭalīb b. al-Muṣtaṣḥir 22/165b...15/112b
Abū Ṭalīb b. Ḥabashī see Ḥabashī
Abū Tammām b. 'Abdūn 5/161b...3/102b
Abyssinian 22/166a...15/113a
al-‘Adil (b.) al-Sallār 50/173a
al-Afḍāl 9/162b
al-Aḥdab see Toghan Arslan
Aḥmad al-‘Āmīdī see al-Nāṣīḥ
Aḥmad b. al-Karkhī see ‘Imād al-Dīn
Aḥmad b. Nīẓām al-Dīn 31/168a
Aḥmad b. Nīẓām al-Mulk see Amin al-Dīn
Aḥmad b. Sukmān 44/171b...29/126a
Aḥmad b. Yagḥī-Sīyān 67/177b...7/106b
Aḥwāz 60/175b
‘A’in Sā‘rī 42/171a...28/124b (= Bāqīrā)
‘A‘isha Khatun 68/177b...10/106b
al-Ajāl Abū’l-Hiǧā b. Sarāṭān see Abū’l-Hiǧā
al-Ajāl Karīm al-Daula Abū Manṣūr Khālid see Karīm al-Daula Abū Manṣūr
al-Ajāl Mu‘ayyid al-Daula Abū Manṣūr see Mu‘ayyid al-Daula Abū Manṣūr
al-Ajāl Mu‘ayyid al-Daula Karīm al-Mulūk see Mu‘ayyid al-Daula Karīm al-Mulūk
al-Ajāl Zain al-Daula b. al-Ṣāḥib see Zain al-Daula
Akhlaṭ 15/164a, 29/167b, 44/171b, 45/171b, 49/172b, 50/173a, 58/175a, 62/176a, 67/177b...30/126a, 33/128b, 35/130b, 39/135a

Akhlaṭī 15/164a

ʿAlam al-Dīn Abu’l-Fath al-Kabīr 5/161b...3/102b

ʿAlam al-Dīn Abu’l-Fath Muḥammad (b. ʿAlī?) b. Nubāṭa, Qadi 4/161a, 5/161b, 41/170b, 42/171a, 43/171a, 44/171b...1/102a, 3/102b, 27/123b, 28/124a, 30/126a

ʿAlam al-Dīn Abu’l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Yaḥyā b. Nubāṭa 4/161a, 5/161b, 10/162b...1/102a

ʿAlam al-Dīn b. Ṭabar 49/173a...35/130b

Aleppo 3/161a, 6/162a, 9/162b, 11/163a, 29/167b, 34/169a, 47/172a, 47/172b, 68/177b...6/105a, 7/105b, 8/107a, 24/120b, 31/127b, 32/128a

Alexander 28/167b...19/116a

ʿAlī al-Ḥarāmī b. Alp-Tash, Amir 66/177b...7/106a

ʿAlī al-Īṣfahānī 47/172a...32/128a

ʿAlī al-Kūmī 32/168a, 33/168b

ʿAlī al-Shahrazūrī (father of Bahā’ al-Dīn) 12/163a, 34/169a...9/107b

ʿAlī al-Wansharīshī 33/168b...22/119a, 23/119a

ʿAlī, Amir (malik of Jabal Jūr) 66/177a

ʿAlī, Amir, wāli of Qalʿat Jaʿbar 45/172a, 46/172a...30/126b, 31/127a

ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib 19/165a

ʿAlī b. Aḥmad see al-Nāṣīḥ

ʿAlī b. al-Qāsim 50/173a

ʿAlī b. al-Ṣāḥib see Zain al-Daula

ʿAlī b. Artuq 45/171b...30/126b

ʿAlī b. Mālik 31/168a

ʿAlī b. Mālik see Saif al-Daula Abu’l-Ḥasan

ʿAlī b. Nubāṭa 41/170b

ʿAlī b. Siyāwush, Amir ...7/106a

ʿAlī b. Ṭirād see al-Zainabī
'Ali b. Yaḥyā see 'Alam al-Dīn

'Ali b. Yūṣuf b. Tāshufīn 32/168b, 33/168b...22/118b, 23/119a

'Ali (father of ʿAbd al-Wuʾmin) ...23/119a

'Ali (father of Najm al-Dīn Abu’l-Ḥasan) 51/173a

'Ali Küğük see Zain al-Dīn

'Ali see 'Alam al-Dīn Abu’l-Ḥasan

'Alīds 19/165a, 21/165b, 43/171a...13/111a, 29/125a

Almeria 57/174b...23/119b, 36/162a

Alp-Ārslan b. Mahmūd 13/163b, 14/163b, 24/166b, 46/172a...9/108a, 31/127b

Alp-Tash 65/177a, 67/177a

Alp-Yaruq b. Artuq 65/177a, 66/177a...6/105b

Alpī, Najm al-Dīn, al-Mālik 11/163a, 44/171b, 57/174b, 65/177a, 66/177a, 67/177b, 68/177b, 69/178a, 70/178a, 71/178b...7/106a, 8/107a, 36/132a

Āmid 3/161a, 17/164b, 30/168a, 35/169a, 38/170a, 39/170a, 41/170b, 53/174a, 61/176a, 62/176a, 69/178a, 70/178a, 71/178b...2/101b, 2/102a, 10/108b, 11/109b, 24/120a, 25/121a, 26/122a, 35/129a, 34/129b, 38/133b, 38/134a, 39/134a, 39/135a

'Amīd al-Daula see Ibn Jahīr 'Amīd al-Daula

al-ʿAmīd Abū Ṭāhir b. al-Muḥtasib 38/170a, 54/174a...11/109b

al-ʿAmīdī see al-Nāṣihī

Aṃīn al-Dīn Khwaja Aḥmad b. Niẓām al-Mulk 27/167a

Āmīr bi-Aḥkām Allāh, Fāṭimīd caliph 15/164a

Āmīr the general 70/178a

ʿAmr b. al-ʿAṣ 23/166a

al-Anderson (father of huʾayyid al-Dīn Sadīd al-Daula) 23/166a, 53/173b

al-Andalūs ...23/119a

al-Annāṭī see 'Abd al-Wahhāb

Anūshīrwan, Sharaf al-Dīn 27/167a...18/115b
‘Aqīl b. Ṭāhir 52/173b
Aq-Sonqur 12/163b...9/107b
Arabs 4/161b, 63/176b...3/103a
Arjīsh 49/173a...35/130b
Armenia 57/175a...37/132a
Armenians 7/162a, 43/172b, 58/175a, 60/175b...4/104a, 37/132b
Arqānīn 40/170b, 48/172b...27/123a, 33/128b
Arrān 4/161b, 14/164a...3/102a
Arslan b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār 30/168a, 67/177b...7/106a, 8/106b, 24/120b
Arslan-Shāh b. Toghrīl Beg 14/163b
Arslan Toghmīsh b. Dāʿūd 40/170b, 49/172b, 65/177a, 67/177b...7/105b, 27/123a, 33/129b
Arslan Toghmīsh b. Bektaš 68/177b
Artuq 1/160b, 9/162b, 29/167b, 30/168a, 45/171b, 61/176a, 64/177a, 65/177a, 66/177a...1/100b, 6/105b, 30/126b
Artuqīds 64/176b, 71/178b
Arzān 3/161a, 5/161b, 9/162b, 35/169a, 53/174a, 62/176a, 70/178a, 71/178b...2/101b, 25/121a, 26/122b, 34/130a, 35/130a, 38/134a, 40/135a
Arūq ...33/128b
al-‘Aq 23/166a
Asad al-Dīn see Shīrkūh
As‘ād b. ‘Abd al-Khāliq see Zain al-Dīn As‘ād
Aslam 30/167b...24/120a
‘Aṣrūn 53/173b...33/129a
‘Athīr al-Dīn ‘Abbād 44/171b, 43/173a...30/126a, 35/130b
al-‘Aṭṭār see Abu’l-Mu’affar
‘Aun al-Dīn al-Mu’affar Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Ḥubaira 59/175a...20/117a
Aushal al-Hain 8/162b...6/104b, 6/105a
Ayaz b. ʿIl-Ghāzi 11/163a, 29/167b, 43/171a, 69/178a, 70/178a...8/107a, 29/125a
Ayyūb (father of Yaghī-Ṣiyan) 47/172a
Azar Khatun 65/177a
Azarbāījān 14/163b, 14/164a, 20/165a...13/111a
‘Azīz (father of Amir al-Ḥasādā) ...11/109b

B

Bāb al-Hujra 35/169a...20/116b
Bābalū 58/175a...37/132b
Badr al-Daula Sulaimān see Sulaimān b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār
Badrān b. Mālik 31/168a
Baghdād 1/160b, 7/162a, 12/163a, 12/163b, 16/164a, 16/164b, 18/164b, 18/165a, 19/165a, 20/165b, 22/165b, 24/166a, 24/166b, 26/166b, 28/167b, 29/167b, 35/169a, 36/169b, 42/171a, 52/173b, 53/173b, 54/174a, 55/174b, 59/175a, 59/175b...1/101a, 9/107b, 10/108b, 11/110a, 12/110a, 13/111a, 15/112b, 16/113b, 16/114a, 17/114b, 19/116a, 19/116b, 20/116b, 20/117a, 21/117b, 25/121a, 25/121b, 27/124a, 38/133a
al-Baghdādī see al-Muḥadhdhib
Bāghīn 43/171a...29/125a
Bahā’ al-Dīn Abū Ṭāhir b. ‘Aqīl b. Ṭāhir b. Ṣubāṭa 52/173b...28/124a, 34/129b
Bahā’ al-Dīn Abu’l-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī al-Shahrāzūrī the gāḍī 12/163a, 12/163b, 34/169a, 50/173a, 51/173a, 52/173b...9/107b, 24/120b
Bahā’ al-Dīn Aus (vizier of Akhlāṭ) 62/176a...35/130b, 39/135a
Bahā’ al-Dīn b. al-Ḥasan 50/173a...33/129a
Bahā’ al-Dīn b. Najm al-Dīn 52/173b
Bahā’ al-Dīn Sevinch b. Kūmhāsh 53/174a...35/130a
Bahā’ al-Dīn the khaṭīb 41/170b
Bahā’ al-Dīn the vizier 49/173a
Bahmār 16/164a, 40/170b, 48/172b...33/128b
al-Bahmārdī see Ībrāhīm al-Bahmārdī
Bahram 13/163b
Bahram b. Artuq 9/162b, 65/177a, 66/177a...6/105b, 7/105b
Bahram b. Muhammad 13/163b
Bahram b. Temür-Taşh, Amir Şamşam al-Dīn 11/163a, 55/174b, 71/178b...
8/107a, 56/132a
Bairam (the hājib) 64/176b
Balak, Amir Nur al-Daula 9/162b, 13/163b, 46/172a, 66/177a...7/105b,
9/107a, 9/107b, 31/127b
Balak b. Arslan Toghmish 69/173a

al-Balāṭ 3/161a...2/102a
Balābak 37/169b
Bālū 13/163b, 40/170b, 66/177a...7/105b, 9/107b
Banū Ḥammād 34/168b...23/119b
Banū Ja'far 4/161a...3/102a
Banū Za’tb 57/175a
Ba‘qūbā 59/175b
Bār’īa 41/170b
Baqra 60/175b
Bātasā 15/164a, 16/164a, 40/170b, 48/172b, 49/172b...33/128b, 33/129b
Bāṭiniyya 9/162b, 12/163a, 14/163b
Baṭrān 57/175a
al-Bazm b. Īl-Ghāzi 69/178a
Bedouin 57/175a, 63/176b...36/132a, 40/135b
Bektash b. Artuq 65/177a, 68/177b
Bek-Tegin ...27/123b, 32/128a
Berber(s) 32/168b...22/118b, 23/119a
Bihistūn 18/164b, 19/165a
Bihrūz see Mujāhid al-Dīn
Bilāl see Masʿūd Bilāl the shiḥna
al-Bīra 40/170b, 41/170b, 58/175a...27/123b, 37/132b
Bitlis 5/161b, 53/174a, 70/178a...34/130a
Boz-Aba 60/175b...33/133b
Bulāq, Amir 68/177b
Buqsh 56/174b
Buqsh al-Khādim see Huwaffiq al-Daula
Būrī b. Toghr-Tegin, Tāj al-Mulūk 13/163b...10/108a
al-Bursuqī 12/163a...9/107b, 38/134a
Bushāṯ 37/169b...25/121b
Buṣra 37/169b
Buzāʿa 34/169a...24/120b
Byzantine emperor 34/169a...24/120b

C

Charmūk 40/170b, 48/172b...27/123a, 33/128b
Christians 40/170b, 57/174b...23/119a, 23/119b, 24/120b
Christmas 40/170b
Constantinople 15/164a, 34/169a...24/120b

D

Damascus 8/162b, 13/163b, 16/164b, 29/167b, 31/168a, 34/169a,
37/169b, 38/170a, 57/175a, 58/175a, 68/177b, 68/178a...9/108a
al-Dāmghānī 36/169b
Daqūqā 52/173b
al-Daqūqī the qāḍī ...33/129a
Dārā 14/164a, 16/164b, 35/169a, 56/174b, 57/174b, 63/176b, 64/176b,
69/178a, 71/178b...25/121a, 36/131b, 40/155b
Daran 32/168b...22/118b

Darb Durrāj 55/174b

Darband 5/161b, 64/176b...4/103a, 41/136b

Dā'ūd b. al-Sa'id see Majd al-Dīn

Dā'ūd b. Sukmān, Amir Ṣukan al-Daula 2/160b, 9/162b, 11/163a, 13/163b, 14/164a, 15/164a, 16/164a, 16/164b, 29/167b, 30/168a, 33/168b, 34/169a, 35/169a, 37/169b, 39/170a, 39/170b, 40/170b, 48/172b, 49/172b, 54/174a, 65/177a, 66/177a, 68/177b...9/107b, 10/108a, 24/120a, 24/120b, 25/121a, 25/121b, 25/122a, 27/123a, 33/128b, 33/129b, 34/130a

Dā'ūd b. Sultan Maḥmūd 13/163b, 28/167a, 40/170b

Dā'ūd (father of Saif al-Dīn Maḥmūd) ...37/133a

Dā'ūd, King (King David the Restorer) 4/161b, 5/161b, 8/162a, 8/162b, 63/176b...3/102a, 3/103a, 5/104b

Daulat-Shāh see Fakhr al-Dīn Daulat-Shāh

Day Marg 18/164b, 19/165a

al-Dāya 47/172b...32/128a

December 40/170b

Dhu'l-Hijja 23/166a, 54/174a, 56/174b...25/121a, 35/130b, 36/131b

Dhu'l-Qa'da 16/164b, 20/165b, 25/166b, 26/166b, 33/168b, 41/170b, 62/176a, 64/176b...13/111a, 17/114b, 17/115a, 27/123b, 40/135b

Dhu'l-Qarnain 30/168a, 39/170a, 40/170b, 48/172b, 67/177b, 68/177b...8/106b, 24/120a, 27/123a, 32/128b

Al-Dimīšqī see Yūsuf

Dīmīṯrī 5/161b, 6/161b, 6/162a, 7/162a, 63/176b...3/103a, 4/103a, 5/104a, 41/136a

Ḍīyāʾ al-Dīn Ayyūb (the vizier) 54/174a, 56/174b, 57/174b...34/130a, 36/132a

Ḍīyāʾ al-Dīn see al-Kafartūthī

Ḍīyāʾ al-Dīn (the vizier) 53/174a

al-Ḍīyāʾ see Tāj al-Dīn Abu'l-Faḍā'il al-Ḍīyāʾ

Diyār Bakr 1/160b, 34/169a, 39/170a, 57/175a, 65/177a...1/100b, 6/105b, 37/132a
_ār Rabī‘a 12/163a, 34/169a, 47/172a, 57/175a...32/128a, 37/132a
Dubais b. Șadaqa, Saif al-Daula 4/161b, 5/161b, 15/164a, 16/164b, 20/165b, 23/166a, 29/167b, 60/175b, 70/178a...3/102b, 4/103b, 13/111b, 38/133b
al-Dubaisī see 'Izz al-Dīn
Dunaisir ...33/128b
al-Dunaisirī see Yūnus b. Buqsh
Dvīn  5/161b...3/102b
al-Dvīnī see Muhammad al-Dvīnī

E

Edessa 35/169a, 40/170b, 48/172b, 58/175a...25/121a, 27/123b, 32/128a
Egypt 9/162b, 15/164a, 16/164a, 41/171a, 57/175a, 67/177b...7/106a
Egyptian 42/171a...28/124a, 28/124b
Eldigüz 14/163b
Erzerum 5/161b, 11/163a...3/102b, 8/107a
Euphrates 66/177a...7/106a, 37/132b

F

Fajāz 39/134b
Fakhr al-Dīn Daulat-Shāh b. Toghan Arslan 53/174a, 54/174a, 70/178b...34/130a, 34/130b
Fakhr al-Dīn Qara Arslan b. Dā‘ūd 13/163b, 40/170b, 43/171a, 48/172b, 49/172b, 49/173a, 58/175a, 60/175b, 65/177a, 66/177a, 67/177b, 68/177b, 69/178a...7/105b, 7/106a, 8/106b, 9/107b, 27/123a, 29/124b, 33/128b, 34/129b, 35/130b, 37/132b
Farkhunda Khatun 9/162b, 29/167b, 66/177a...6/105a, 7/105b
Pārs 60/175b
al-Fāsūl see Abu‘l-Khair
Fāṭima Khatun bint Sultan Muḥammad 53/173b...20/116b, 20/117b
Finik 15/164a

Franks 1/160b, 3/161a, 30/168a, 33/168b, 34/169a, 35/169a, 40/170b, 57/175a, 66/177a...1/101a, 2/101b, 7/106a, 25/121a, 27/123b, 32/128a, 35/132a, 37/132b

Friday(s) 7/162a, 8/162b, 12/163a, 29/167b, 44/171b...2/102a, 5/104a, 9/107b, 24/120a, 29/125b

G

Ganja 4/161b, 5/161b, 8/162a, 14/164a...3/102a, 3/102b, 5/104b
Gargar 58/175a, 60/175b...37/132b
Georgia ...3/102b
Georgia... 4/161b, 5/161b, 7/162a...3/102b, 4/104a, 5/104a, 41/136a
Ghars al-Daula Inal 64/176b
Ghażī, Amir of Erzerum 11/163a...8/107a
Ghażī b. al-Mihrī, Amir 48/172b
Ghażī b. Zangī see Saif al-Dīn Ghażī
Guhar bint Maḥmūd 14/163b
Guhar Khatun bint Il-Ghāżī 4/161b, 20/165b, 69/178a, 70/178a...3/102b, 13/111b
Gurj 4/161b, 63/176b...3/102a

H

Ḥabashi (b. Muḥammad) b. Ḥabashi, Sharaf al-Dīn Abū Ṭālib 17/164b, 31/169a, 37/169b, 38/170a, 39/170a...11/109a, 11/109b, 25/121b, 26/122a, 26/122b

Ḥabashi (father of Shaikh ʿIzz al-Shuyūkh) 53/174a

Hadiyya Khatun bint Temür-Tash 11/163a, 40/170b, 49/172b, 61/176a, 68/177b, 71/178b...8/107a, 27/123a, 34/129b, 37/133a
al-Ḥāfiẓ li-Dīn Allāh 15/164a, 16/164a, 50/173a
al-Haithum 48/172b...33/128b
al-Ḥajj see ‘Uthmān b. Khumarāsh
al-Hālār 40/170b, 48/172b
al-Ḥākim al-Fāsūl see Abu’l-Khair
Ḥāmā 16/164b, 17/164b, 47/172a...11/109a
Ḥamdān b. Aslam 30/167b...24/120a
Hamadhān 14/164a, 18/164b, 19/165a, 59/175b, 60/175b...12/110b, 21/117b, 21/118a, 38/133b
Ḥammād see Banū Ḥammād
Ḥamza 52/173b
Ḥānif 3/161a, 33/168b, 34/168b, 39/170a, 40/170b, 48/172b, 65/177a, 66/177a, 71/178b...2/101b, 27/123a, 32/128b
al-Ḥārāmī see ‘Alī al-Ḥarūmī
Ḥargha ...23/119a
Ḥarrān 18/164b, 35/169a, 47/172a
al-Ḥarrānī see al-Makīn
Ḥārūn b. al-Muqtadī 21/165b, 23/166a...14/112a, 16/113b
al-Ḥasadā, Amir ...11/109b
al-Ḥasan b. ‘Ali 50/173a
al-Ḥasan b. Ishāq see Niṣām al-Mulk
al-Ḥashimi see Šaff al-Dīn
Ḥassān al-Maṃbīji, Amir 45/172a, 48/172b...30/126b, 30/127b, 32/128a
al-Hattākh 31/168a
Hauw bridge ...39/134a
Ḥaza 9/162b
Hiba 53/173b
Ḥijāz 23/166a, 49/172b, 50/173a, 54/174a...34/129b, 35/130b
al-Ḥilla 70/178a...21/118a
Ibn Buqsh see Yûnus b. Buqsh
Ibn al-Anbārī see Mu`ayyid al-Dīn Sadīd al-Daula Abū `Abdallāh
Ibn al-Samarqandī 36/169b
Ibn Ḥamza 52/173b
Ibn Jahīr, `Amīd al-Daula 1/160b, 20/165b...1/100b, 13/111b
Ibn Jahīr, Za`īm al-Ru`asa` 36/169b, 52/173b...20/117a
Ibn Mukhtar see al-Mu`ayyid Abu`l-Ḥasan
Ibn Nisān see Mu`ayyid al-Dīn b. Nisān
Ibn Palang-Eri see Khāqās Beg
Ibn Sakīna 20/165b...13/111a
Ibn Tūmart 32/168a, 32/168b...22/118a, 22/118b, 23/119a
Ibrāhīm al-Bahmardī, Amir 33/129a
Ibrāhīm b. Munqidh see Nākīn al-Daula
Ibrahim b. Sukmān 1/160b, 2/160b, 65/177a

Ibrahim (father of İl-aldı) 38/170a

al-Idrīsī (Ibn Tūmart) 32/168a

Ifriqiyya 33/168b...23/119a

Igdīsh see Shams al-Ḥujjāb

İl-aldı see Saʿd al-Daula

İlūz Beg 2/161a...1/101a

İl-Ghāzi b. Artuq, Najm al-Dīn 1/160b, 2/160b, 2/161a, 3/161a, 4/161a, 4/161b, 5/161b, 6/161b, 6/162a, 8/162b, 9/162b, 10/162b, 10/163a, 11/163a, 20/165b, 36/170a, 42/171a, 43/171a, 65/177a, 66/177a, 69/178a, 70/178a, 71/178b...1/101a, 2/101b, 2/102a, 3/102b, 4/103a, 4/103b, 5/104b, 6/105a, 7/105b, 8/107a, 13/111b, 23/124b

İl-Ghāzi b. al-Malik Najm al-Dīn see Qutb al-Dīn

'Imād al-Dīn Abū Bakr b. Fakhr al-Dīn 65/177a

'Imād al-Dīn Sharaf al-Ćuqāt Abū Tāhir Aḥmad b. al-Karkhī 26/167a, 31/168a...13/115b

'Imādiyya madrasa, Mosul 55/174b

'Imādiyya mosque, Mosul ...35/131a

İnal see Ghars al-Daula

Iraq 11/163a, 12/163a, 17/164b, 18/165a, 19/165a, 29/167b, 36/169a, 59/175b, 60/175b...11/109a, 12/110a, 12/110b, 21/117b, 21/118a

al-İrāqī see al-Muhadhdhib

İrūn 39/170a, 49/172b...33/129b

İsā b. Aḥmad 31/168a

İsfahān 13/163b, 14/164a, 28/167b, 59/175b, 60/175b...10/108a, 19/166a, 21/118a

İsḥāq (father of Niẓām al-Mulk) ...13/111b

İs’īrd 16/164a, 39/170a, 40/170b, 43/171a, 44/171b, 49/172b, 49/172b...29/125a, 29/125b, 33/128b, 33/129b

İsmā’īl 7/162a...5/104a

İsmā’īl b. al-Mustaṣṭhir 22/165b...15/112b

İsmā’īl b. Shīrbarīk 66/177a, 67/177b...7/106a
Ismā‘īl (the caliph al-Ẓāfir) see al-Manṣūr Ismā‘īl

Ismā‘īlīs 13/163b, 16/164a, 44/171a, 62/176a...29/125b

‘Izz al-Daula Abū Naqr b. Nisān 53/174a...10/108b, 34/129b

‘Izz al-Daula (sic) (for ‘Izz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Dūbais) 70/178a

‘Izz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dūbaisī 47/172a, 47/172b, 48/172b, 52/173b, 55/174b...32/127b, 32/128a, 35/131a

‘Izz al-Dīn b. Yaqīb-Sīyān 67/177b...8/106b

‘Izz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Dūbais, Amir 70/178a

‘Izz al-Dīn Saltuq 49/172b...35/130b

‘Izz al-Mulk see Khwaja ‘Izz al-Mulk

‘Izz al-Shuyūkh Abu’l-Qāsim b. Ḫabashi 53/174a

J

Jabal Jūr 30/168a, 37/169b, 39/170a, 40/170b, 48/172b, 66/177a, 67/177b...8/106b, 24/120a, 27/123a, 32/128b

Ja’far, Banū 4/161a

Ja’far (father of Jalāl al-Dīn) 59/175b

Ja’far (father of Za’īm al-Dīn) 53/173b

Jahīr (father of ‘Amīd al-Daula) 1/160b, 20/165b...1/100b, 13/111b

Jahīr (father of Za’īm al-Ru’asā’) 36/169b, 52/173b...20/117a

Jalāl al-Dīn Abū ‘Alī b. Ǧadaqa 27/167a, 28/167a...18/115b

Jalāl al-Dīn Abu’l-Miqā b. Ǧadaqa 25/166b, 28/167a, 28/167b...19/116a, 19/116b

Jalāl al-Dīn b. Ja’far 59/175a, 59/175b

Jalāl al-Mulūk Köpek b. Badr al-Daula Sulaimān b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Artuq 60/175b, 61/175b, 61/176a, 68/177b...37/133a

al-Jalāl see Abū Aḥmad al-Jalāl


Jamāl al-Dīn Abu’l-Qāsim b. Nisān 49/172b
Jamāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd, lord of Amid see Maḥmūd b. ʿIl-aldī

Jamāl al-Dīn al-Mustaufī Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Iṣfahānī 47/172a, 50/173a...31/127b, 32/128a

Jamāl al-Dīn see Tughrātī

Jamāl al-Dīn (the vizier) 46/172a, 55/174b, 56/174b...35/131a

Jamālīn 48/172b...32/128b

al-Jāmdār see Najm al-Dīn Raḥīd

Jaqar, Naṣīr al-Dīn 12/163a, 12/163b, 16/164b, 41/170b...9/107b, 10/108b, 27/123b

al-Jawālīqī 36/169b

al-Jazīra 17/164b, 31/168a, 34/169a, 35/169a, 47/172a, 47/172b, 51/173a, 52/173b...10/109a, 11/109b, 24/121a, 32/128a, 33/129a

Jerusalem 1/160b...1/100b, 1/101a

Jews 7/162a...4/103b, 5/104a

Joscelin 58/175a...37/132b

Jubuq 13/163b

Juldūk al-Khalīfātī, Amir 55/174b

Jumādā I 29/167b, 59/175b...26/122a

Jumādā II 40/170b, 59/175b...1/101a, 21/117b

K

al-Kaffartūthī, Ḍiyāʿ al-Dīn Abū Saʿīd 29/167b, 30/168a...11/109a, 19/116b

Kaisūn 58/175a...37/132b

Kamāl al-Dīn Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh al-Shahrazūrī, al-Maqdār al-Kāmil Ṣāfī al-Qudāt 45/171b, 46/172a, 50/173a, 51/173a, 51/173b, 52/173b, 55/174b...30/126b, 31/127a, 33/129a, 35/131a

Kamāl al-Dīn Ṭalḥa the treasurer 18/165a, 21/165b, 36/169a, 37/169b...12/110a, 13/111a, 18/115a

Kāmil Ghāzī 44/171b

Kāmūn I ...27/123b
Karīm al-Daula Abū Manṣūr Khālid, al-Ajjalī 50/173a
Karīm al-Mulk see al-Mu'ayyid al-Daula
al-Karjī see Sav-Tegin al-Karjī
al-Karkhī 26/167a...18/115b
Kars 5/161b...3/102b
al-Khābūr 48/172b
al-Khafājī b. Māhmūd 13/163b, 14/163b...9/108a
Khālid b. al-Mubārak see al-Ajjal Mu'ayyid al-Daula Abū Manṣūr
Khālid see Karīm al-Daula Abū Manṣūr
al-Khalifatī see Julduk
Kharttabīr 9/162b, 13/163b, 18/165a, 40/170b, 66/177a...7/105b, 9/107b, 27/123a
al-Khāṣlaqī see Tāj al-'Ulama'
Khāṣṣ Beg b. Palang-Eri 60/175b...21/118a, 38/133b
Khatun bint Aḥmad b. Sukmān 44/171b
Khatun bint Ghāzi ...8/107a
Khatun bint Riḍwān 61/176a, 68/177b
Khatun bint Sultuq 49/172b, 49/173a, 50/173a
Khatun bint Sukmān 55/174b
Khatun bint Togh-Tegin 8/162b, 11/163a...5/104b, 6/105a
Khatun Fāṭima see Fāṭima
Khatun (wife of Il-aldī) 69/178a
Khīḍr mosque, Is‘īrd 44/171b...29/125b
Khīḍr mosque, Mārdīn 42/171a
Khīfāf 36/169b
Khīzān 39/170a, 49/172b...26/122b, 33/128b
Khumar-Tash 64/176b
Khūrāsān ...19/116a
Khūrāsānī 52/173b
Khutlugh-Shah 9/162b, 10/163a, 11/163a...8/106b
Khūẕīth 29/167b
Khūzistān 14/163b, 60/175b...21/118a
Khwaja Aḥmad see Amīn al-Dīn
Khwaja Lu’lu’...29/125a
Khwaja ‘Izz al-Mulk 35/169a...20/116b, 38/133b
Kitāb al-Masālik wa’l-Mamālik 33/168b...23/119b
Köpek b. Sulaimān 29/167b
Kuhmish 53/174a...35/130b
al-Kūmī see ‘Alī al-Kūmī
Kurj Ghāzī, Amir 41/170b

L
al-Lān 5/161b, 63/176b...4/103a
Lu’lu’ see Khwaja Lu’lu’

M
al-Maḍā’īn 36/169b
al-Ma’dān 39/170a, 40/170b, 49/172b...26/122b, 33/128b, 33/129a
Maghrib 32/168a, 32/168b, 33/168b...22/118a, 22/118b, 23/119a
al-Mahdiyya 34/168b...23/119b
Maḥmūd b. Amir ‘Alī 66/177a
Maḥmūd b. Amir Arslan 68/177b
Maḥmūd b. Dāʾūd 65/177a...7/105b
Maḥmūd b. Ḥl-aldī, Jamāl al-Dīn Shams al-Mulūk, lord of Āmid 38/170a,
49/172b, 53/174a, 70/178a...26/122b, 33/129b, 34/129b
Maḥmūd b. Sulaimān 10/163a, 71/178b...8/106b
Maḥmūd b. Zangi see Nūr al-Dīn
Maḥmūd, Sultan 2/161a, 11/163a, 12/163a, 13/163b, 14/163b, 18/165a, 21/165b...9/107b, 10/108a, 14/112a, 16/113b, 21/118a, 31/127b
Majd al-Dīn Abū Bakr b. al-Dāya 47/172b...32/128a
Majd al-Dīn b. al-Sadīd ...24/120a
Majd al-Dīn Dāʿūd 41/170b...27/124a
Majd al-Mulūk see Köpek
al-Makīn Abuʾl-Barakāt b. Abīʾl-Fahl al-Ḥarrānī 18/164b...11/109a
Makīn al-Daula Ibrāhīm 41/170b...28/124a
Makīn al-Dīn al-Mīrī (the vizier) 54/174a
Malāṭya 10/162b
Mālik 17/164b, 31/168a
Malik al-Nūlūk Saif Ghāzī see Saif Ghāzī b. Maudūd
al-Malik Alp Arslan see Alp Arslan
Mālik b. Sālim see Najm al-Daula
Mālik (father of Saif al-Daula Abuʾl-Ḥasan) 45/171b...30/126b
Mālik (father of Zaʿīm al-Daula Musayyib) 6/177b
Malik Najm al-Dīn see Najm al-Dīn
Malik-Shāh 1/160b
Malik-Shāh b. Sultan Maḥmūd 14/163b, 60/175b...21/118a
Malwiyya 32/168b...22/118b
Manbij 13/163b, 46/172a, 47/172a, 48/172b, 66/177a...9/107b, 31/127b
al-Manbījī see Ḥassān al-Manbījī
al-Manṣūr al-Rašīd biʾl-lāh see al-Rašīd biʾl-lāh
al-Manṣūr Ismāʾīl (the caliph al-Ẓāfīr) 50/173a
Marāgha 20/165a, 20/165b...13/111a, 13/111b
Marʿash 58/175a...37/132b
Mardin 1/160b, 2/160b, 2/161a, 3/161a, 5/161b, 8/162b, 10/162b, 10/163a, 17/164b, 18/164b, 20/165b, 29/167b, 30/167b, 39/170a, 41/170b, 42/171a, 43/171a, 44/171b, 47/172a, 48/172b, 49/172b, 50/173a, 55/174b, 61/176a, 62/176a, 66/177b, 70/178a, 71/178b…1/101a, 2/101b, 3/102b, 5/104b, 6/105a, 8/106b, 11/109b, 13/111b, 24/120a, 25/121a, 26/122b, 27/124a, 28/124a, 28/124b, 29/125a, 30/126a, 33/128b, 33/129a, 35/130b, 38/134a, 38/134b, 40/135b

Marrakush 32/168b, 33/168b...22/118b, 22/119a

Marwan 31/168a

al-Maghar al-Kamal see Kamal al-Din

Masjid al-Amir 42/171a…28/124b

Masjid Yaqut, Mayyafariqin 69/178a

Masmuda 32/168a, 32/168b…22/118a, 22/118b

Mas’ud b. Arslan Toghmish 69/178a

Mas’ud Bilal the shihna 14/163b, 59/175b…21/117b

Mas’ud b. Bursuqi 12/163a…9/107b

Mas’ud b. Sultan Muhammad, Sultan 13/163b, 14/163b, 15/164a, 18/164b, 18/165a, 19/165a, 20/165b, 21/165b, 23/166a, 27/167a, 28/167a, 36/169a, 59/175b, 60/175b, 63/176b…10/108a, 11/110a, 13/111b, 15/113a, 16/113b, 18/115b, 20/116b, 21/117b, 21/118a, 38/133b, 40/136a

Maudud 8/162b

Maudud b. ‘Alf see Shirbārik Maudud

Maudud b. Zangī see Qūtb al-Dīn

al-Maulā Najm al-Dīn al-Mālik see Alpī

al-Mazdaqānī 13/163b

Mazyad 20/165b

al-Mazyādī …3/102b

Mecca 19/165a, 37/169b, 52/173b, 57/175a…12/110b

Medina 57/175a…12/110b

Mengū-Barz 23/166a, 60/175b…38/133b

al-Mihrif 48/172b
Izzgard 13/163b, 40/170b, 49/172b, 65/177a...27/123a, 27/123b, 34/129b

Konday 26/166b, 39/170a, 58/175a...27/123a, 37/133a, 40/135b

Mosul 12/163a, 12/163b, 13/163b, 14/163b, 16/164a, 24/166b, 25/166b, 28/167a, (28/167b), 35/169a, 37/169b, 39/170a, 41/170b, 47/172a, 50/173a, 51/173a, 52/173b, 53/173b, 55/174b, 56/174b, 57/175a, 59/175b, 68/178a, 71/178b...9/107b, 9/108a, 10/108b, 17/114b, 19/116a, 19/116b, 25/121a, 25/121b, 26/122a, 26/122b, 27/123b, 32/127b, 32/128a, 33/129a, 35/130b, 35/131a, 36/132a, 37/132a

Mu'mamil al-Shāqiṣī 39/170a...26/122b

al-Mu'ayyid Abū'l-Hasan al-Mubārak b. (al-) Mukhtar al-Kustauff 17/164b, 18/165a, 23/166a, 31/168a, 35/169a, 38/170a, 41/170b, 49/173a, 50/173a, 54/174a, 55/174a, 61/176a...10/109a, 11/109b, 26/122a, 28/124a, 35/130b, 38/134a

Mu'ayyid al-Daula Abū Mansūr Khālid b. al-Mubārak b. Mukhtar, al-Ajall 62/176a

Mu'ayyid al-Daula Karīm al-Mūdūk, al-Ajall ...40/135b

Mu'ayyid al-Dīn Sadīd al-Daula Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm b. al-Anbārī, al-Sa'id 18/165a, 20/165b, 21/165b, 23/166a, 35/169a, 36/169b, 53/173b...11/110a, 12/110a, 13/111b, 17/114b, 20/117a

Mu'ayyid al-Dīn b. Mīsān 17/164b, 21/165b, 25/166b, 38/170a, 61/176a, 62/176a...10/108b, 26/122a, 34/129b, 39/134a, 39/134b, 39/135a

al-Mu'ayyid Zain al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Khālīq (the sultan's vizier) 61/176a...35/134a

al-Mubārak b. Mukhtar 62/176a

al-Mubārak see al-Mu'ayyid Abū'l-Ḥasan

al-Muḥadhdhib al-Baghdādī 42/171a

al-Muḥadhdhib al-ʿIrāqī 50/173a, 54/174a, 55/174a, 61/176a...38/134a

Muḥaddatha mosque 39/170a...27/123a

al-Muḥalṭā see Kuḥammād b. Abī'l-Muḥārīm

Kuḥammād al-Dīnī (the vizier) 68/178a

Kuḥammād b. 'Abd al-Karīm see Mu'ayyid al-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh

Kuḥammād b. Abī'l-Muḥārīm al-Muḥalṭā 39/170a...26/122b

Kuḥammād b. al-Īṣfaḥānī see Janāl al-Dīn Kuḥammād

Kuḥammād b. 'Alī see 'Alam al-Dīn
Muhammad b. al-Zain see al-Kuzaifar Muhammad
Muhammad b. Ayaz see Shihab al-Din Muhammad
Muhammad b. Dubais see 'Izz al-Din Muhammad
Muhammad b. Fakhr al-Din see Nur al-Din Muhammad
Muhammad b. Habashi ...11/109a
Muhammad b. Muhammad see al-Muhaddhib
Muhammad b. Tumart see Ibn Tumart
Muhammad b. Yahya see 'Aun al-Din
Muhammad (father of al-Muhaddhib) 42/171a
Muhammad-Sa'd b. Sultan Hashim 14/163b, 60/175b...21/118a
Muhammad, Sultan 1/160b, 2/161a, 4/161b, 13/163b...1/101a, 20/116b
Muhammad, the Prophet see Prophet Muhammad
Muhtarram 29/167b, 36/169b, 37/169b, 39/170a, 57/174b, 64/176b...
24/120a, 25/121b, 27/123a, 36/132a, 37/132b, 41/136b
al-Muhtasib (father of al-'Amid Abu Tahir) 38/170a, 54/174a...11/109b
Mu'in al-Din Unur 57/175a, 58/175a
Mujahid al-Din Bihruz 59/175b
Mukhtar 17/164b, 31/168a, 38/170a, 49/173a, 50/173a...10/109a
Mukhtar (father of al-Mubarak) 62/176a...26/122a, 28/124a, 35/130b
Munqidh 41/171a...28/124a
al-Muqtadi 21/165b, 22/165b...14/112b
al-Muqtadhi li-Amr Allah 24/166a, 26/167a, 27/167a, 28/167b, 29/167b,
35/169a, 36/169a, 52/173b, 53/173b...12/110a, 17/115a, 18/115a,
19/116a, 19/116b, 20/116b, 20/117a
Musayyib b. Malik 27/167a, 31/168a, 68/177b
Muslim(s) 6/162a, 7/162a, 8/162b, 48/172b, 57/175a...3/103a, 4/103b,
5/104a, 32/128a, 36/132a, 37/132b
al-Musta'jib bi-Amr Allah 26/167a
al-Mustajib bi-Nur Allah ...17/115a
al-Musta'li, Abu'l-Qasim 15/164a, 16/164a
al-Mustanjid bi'llāh 26/167a...17/115a

al-Mustanjīr 15/164a, 16/164a

al-Mustarshīd 12/163a, 16/164a, 18/164b, 19/165a, 19/165a, 20/165a, 20/165b, 21/165b, 22/165b, 22/166a, 23/166a, 27/167a, 60/175b...10/108b, 11/110a, 12/110a, 12/110b, 13/111a, 13/111b, 14/112a, 18/115b, 19/116a, 38/133b

al-Mustaghib bi'llāh 22/165b, 24/166a, 27/167a...14/112b, 15/112b, 15/113a, 16/113b

Muwaffiq al-Daula Buqsh al-Khādin ...20/117a

Mu‘wajj 42/171a...28/124a

al-Muwazzar 48/172b...32/128b

al-Mu‘affar Muḥammad b. al-Za‘īm b. Jahīr (the vizier) 52/173b

al-Mu‘affar Muḥammad b. Yahyā see ‘Aun al-Dīn

N

al-Nahrawān 25/166b...16/114a, 17/114a

Nājāḥ 36/169b

Najm al-Daula b. Mālik (sic) see next entry

Najm al-Daula Mālik b. Sālim b. Mālik 17/164b, 27/167a, 31/168a

Najm al-Dīn Abū ‘Alī b. Bahā’ al-Dīn b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī (the qāḍī) 50/173a...24/120b, 33/129a

Najm al-Dīn Abū’l-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī (the qāḍī) 51/173a, 51/173b, 52/173b

Najm al-Dīn Alpī, al-Mālik see Alpī

Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī see Īl-Ghāzī

Najm al-Dīn Rashīd al-Jāmdār ...20/117a

al-Narawī 36/169b

Naṣībīn 4/161a, 28/167a, 31/168a, 39/170a, 51/173a, 55/174b, 63/176b, 66/177b...2/102a, 19/116a, 40/135b

al-Naṣīḥ ‘Alī b. Ahmad al-‘Amīdī 17/164b, 31/168a...10/108b, 11/109a, 11/109b
Naṣir al-Daula Sandal 64/176b
Naṣir al-Dīn see Jaqar
Naṣir the hājib 38/170a
Naṣr b. ʿIl-Ghāzī 70/178a
Naura Khatun bint Temūr-Tash 54/174a, 62/176a, 71/178b...34/130a, 40/135a
Nīsān 17/164b, 49/172b, 53/174a, 61/176a, 62/176a...10/108b, 26/122a, 34/129b, 39/134a, 39/134b, 39/135a
Nīẓām al-Dīn Abū Jaʿfar 52/173b; see also al-Muṣaffar Muḥammad b. al-Zaʿīm and Nīẓām al-Dīn Abu’l-Muṣaffar
Nīẓām al-Dīn Abu’l-Muṣaffar b. al-Zaʿīm b. Jahīr (the vizier) 36/169b, 37/169b, 53/173b...20/117a
Nīẓām al-Dīn Abū Naṣr Aḥmad b. Nīẓām al-Mulk ...18/115b
Nīẓām al-Dīn b. Marwān 31/168a
Nīẓām al-Mulk 20/165b, 27/167a...13/111b, 18/115b
Nizār 16/164a
Nūbāta 4/161a, 5/161b, 10/162b, 30/167b, 41/170b, 52/173b...2/102a, 27/123b, 36/162a
Nūr al-Daula 13/163b
Nūr al-Daula, lord of Finik 15/164a
Nūr al-Daula see Balak
Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Zangī 47/172a, 47/172b, 57/175a, 58/175a, 69/178a...31/127b, 32/128a, 37/132b
Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Fakhr al-Dīn 65/177a
Nūr al-Huda Sulaimān b. ʿUmar, Shaikh 43/171a...29/125a

0

Oghuzoglu 8/162b, 64/176b...6/105a
P

Palang-Eri  60/175b...21/118a, 38/133b
Prophet Muḥammad  6/162a, 16/164a, 27/167a, 63/176b...41/136a

Q

Qaimāz, Amir  64/176b
Qaisūm  ...30/126a
Qalʿat Jaʿbar  17/164b, 27/167a, 31/168a, 45/171b...11/109b, 30/126b
Qalʿat al-Rūm  58/175a...37/132b
Qalb  68/177b
Qara Arslan see Fakhr al-Dīn
Qaracha al-Sāqī  23/166a(?), 60/175b...38/133b
Qaramān bridge  42/171a, 45/171b...30/126a
al-Qarshiyya  65/177a...37/133a
Qāsim al-Daula see Zangī b. Aq-Sonqur
al-Qāsim (father of ‘Alī)  50/173a
Qaṭalbas  15/164a, 39/170a, 48/172b...26/122b, 33/128b
Qawām al-Dīn b. Ṣadaqa  37/169b, 52/173b, 53/173b, 59/175a...20/117a
Qazwīn  19/165a...12/110b
Qūfich Arslan b. Sulaimān, Sultan  9/162b, 14/164a, 58/175a
...10/108a, 37/132b
Qūf-Khan  34/169a
Qūfīl Arslan  39/170a
Qubbat al-Sulṭān  43/171a
Qurʿān (ic)  (7/162a), 36/169b, 39/170a...27/123a
Qurtī see Ḥusām al-Daula
Qūṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad see Aḥmad b. Sukmān
Quṭb al-Dīn al-‘Abbādī (the preacher) 58/175a, 59/175a
Quṭb al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī 57/174b...36/132a
Quṭb al-Dīn Maudūd b. Zangī 55/174b, 56/174b, 57/175a, 71/178b...
Outilhumsh 10/162b

R

Rabī‘ I 35/169a, 44/171b, 58/175a, 64/176b...29/125b, 37/132b, 37/133a
Rabī‘ II 10/162b, 46/172a, 48/172b...31/127a, 32/128b
al-Raḥba 50/173a, 51/173b, 52/173b
al-Ra‘īs see Abū Sa‘īd
Rajab 30/167b, 62/176a, 64/176b, 67/177b...21/117b, 27/123b, 40/135a
Ramāḍān 8/162b, 10/163a, 16/164b, 28/167b, 54/174a, 55/175a...6/105a, 19/116a, 34/130a
al-Raqqa 27/167a, 31/169a, 34/169a, 51/173a, 68/177b...24/120b
Rā’s ‘Ain al-Khābūr (i.e. Rā’s al-‘Ain) 48/172b...32/128b
al-Rashīd bi’llāh 20/165b, 22/165b, 22/166a, 23/166a, 24/166b, 25/166b, 26/167a, 27/167a, 28/167a, 28/167b, 60/175b...13/111a, 14/112a, 15/112b, 15/113a, 16/113b, 16/114a, 17/114a, 18/115b, 19/116a, 38/133b

Rashīd al-Jāmdār see Najm al-Dīn Rashīd
Rashīq 44/171b...30/126a
Rasūl b. Yūsuf 2/161a
al-Rawāţī 2/161a...1/101a
Rayy 19/165a, 60/175b...12/110b, 12/111a
Riḍwān, Malik 6/162a, 9/162b, 29/167b, 61/176a, 66/177a, 67/177b, 68/177b...6/105a, 24/120a
al-Rūq 48/172b...33/128b
Sa'd al-Daula Īl-aldî b. Ibrāhîm, Amir 38/170a, 53/174a, 69/178a, 70/178a...26/122a

Sa'd al-Daula see Mu'ayyid al-Dīn
Sa'd b. 'Aṣrūn 53/173b

Ṣadaqa b. Dubais 23/166a

Ṣadaqa (father of Dubais) 4/161b, 5/161b...3/102b

Ṣadaqa (father of Jalāl al-Dīn Abū 'Alī) 27/167a...18/115b

Ṣadaqa (father of Jalāl al-Dīn Abu'l-Riḍā) 25/166b, 28/167a, 28/167b...19/116a, 19/116b

Ṣadaqa, Kamāl al-Dīn (and father of Qawām al-Dīn) 37/169b, 52/173b, 53/173b, 59/175a...20/117a

Ṣadd 57/175a

al-Sadiq (father of Majd al-Daula Majd al-Dīn) ...24/120a, 24/124a

al-Sadīq, qāḏī 41/170b

Ṣadīq al-Daula see Mu'ayyid al-Dīn

al-Qāf 48/172b...33/128b

Ṣafar 28/167a, 55/174b...25/121b, 35/131a

Ṣaff al-Dīn b. al-Zuwān al-Ḥashimī 37/169b

Ṣaff al-Dīn b. Rashīq 44/171b...30/126a

Ṣafīyya Khatun bint Malik Ṭawān 67/177b

Ṣafīyya Khatun bint Temūr-Tash 11/163a, 29/167b, 35/169a, 53/174a, 61/176a, 71/178b...6/107a, 25/121a, 25/121b, 34/129b, 38/133b

Ṣafra Khatun bint Īl-Ḡāzī 70/178a

al-Ṣāḥib 25/166b...16/114a

al-Ṣāḥib the chamberlain 10/162b

Ṣāḥil 1/160b, 57/175a...1/100b, 23/119b, 36/162a

al-SA‘ĪD Ḥusām al-Dīn see Temūr-Tash

al-SA‘ĪD Mu'ayyid al-Dīn see Mu'ayyid al-Dīn Abū 'Abdallāh
Saif al-Daula Abu'l-Hasan 'Ali b. Malik 45/171b...30/126b
Saif al-Daula see Dubais b. Šadaqa
Saif al-Din Ghazi b. Zangi 47/172a, 49/172b, 50/173a, 53/174a, 55/174a, 55/174b, 32/127b, 32/128a, 33/129a, 35/131a
Saif al-Din Mahmud b. Dā'ūd 37/133a
Saif al-Din Shīrbārik see Shīrbārik Maudūd
Saif Ghazi b. Maudūd 71/178a
Sakīna 20/165b...13/111a
Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad see al-Yaghī-Šīyānī
Ṣālim b. Mālik 17/164b
Saljuq-Shāh b. Sultan Muḥammad 13/163b, 14/163b, 29/167b
al-Sallār see al-'Adil
Salmān al-Fārisī 36/169b
Salṭuq see 'Īzz al-Dīn Saltuq
al-Samarqandī 36/169b
Ṣāmṣām al-Dīn b. Mukhtar 35/130b
Ṣāmṣām al-Dīn see Bahram b. Temur-Tash
Sanāsuna 29/167b
Sandal see Naṣīr al-Daula
Sanjar, Sultan 14/163b, 15/164a, 18/165a, 20/165b, 21/165b, 23/166a, 28/167a...13/111a, 13/111b, 14/112b, 15/113a
al-Sāqī see Qaracha
Sar-i Jahān 19/165a, 21/165b...12/110b
al-Sarajān 39/170a...26/122b
Sarja 14/164a, 16/164b
Saturday 54/174a, 62/176a...34/130a, 40/135b
Sav-Tegen al-Karji 35/169a
Sayyida Khatun bint al-Tīlich Arslan 9/162b, 14/164a...10/108a
Sevinch b. Kuhmish see Bahā' al-Dīn Sevinch
Sevinch b. Shīr bārīk 66/177a, 67/177b...7/106a
Sevinch b. Siyāwush 66/177a
Shā‘bān 18/164b, 53/174a...34/129b
Shāfi‘ites 26/167a...18/115b
Shāh-i Armān 44/171b, 49/172b, 50/173a...30/126a
Shāh Malik b. Sevinch 66/177a
Shahbakhtān 35/169a, 48/172b...32/128b
Shahrazūr 47/172a...32/128a
al-Shahrazūrī (father of Shaikh Abu’l-Mu‘affar) 36/169a
al-Shahrazūrī see ‘Abdallāh al-Shahrazūrī
al-Shahrazūrī see ‘Alī al-Shahrazūrī
al-Shahrazūrī see Najm al-Dīn Abū ‘Alī
Shahrīstān 28/167b...19/116a
Shāhrukh 33/168b
Shamkūr 1/164a
Shams 1/160b, 2/160b, 2/161a
Shams al-Daula al-Abdāb see Toghan Arslan
Shams al-Daula b. Arslan Toghmīsh 69/178a
Shams al-Daula ‘Īsā see ‘Īsā b. Aḥmad
Shams al-Daula Sulaimān see Sulaimān b. ʿIl-Ḥāṣī
Shams al-Dīn Abū Aḥmad 51/173a
Shams al-Dīn Yāqūt Arslan 54/174a...34/130a
Shams al-Ḥujjāb Muḥammad ʿIṣāṣīsh 10/162b
Shams al-Kulūk see Maḥmūd b. ʿIl-ʿalāḍī
al-Shāqīṭī see Muʿammīl
Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Ẓirūd see al-Zainabī
Sharaf al-Dīn Anūshīrwān see Anūshīrwān
Sharaf al-Dīn b. Saʿd b. ‘Aṣrūn 53/173b
Sharaf al-Dīn (brother of Qādi Bahā' al-Dīn) 51/173a
Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥabashi see Ḥabashi
Sharaf al-ʿugāt see ʿImād al-Dīn
Sharaf Khatun bint ʿAmīd al-Daula 20/165b...13/111b
Shāwar 67/177b
Shawwāl 11/163a, 13/163b, 35/169a...8/107a
al-Shīhāb (the scribe) 61/176a...38/134a
Shīhāb al-Dīn, lord of Damascus 34/169a
Shīhāb al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAyaz, Amir 11/163a, 29/167b, 43/171a, 69/178a, 70/178a...29/125a
Shīrāz 60/175b
Shīrbārīk, Amir 66/177a
Shīrbārīk b. Mukhṭar ...35/130b
Shīrbārīk b. Siyāwūsh ...7/106a
Shīrbārīk Maudūd, Amir Saif al-Dīn b. ʿAlī 45/171b, 66/177a, 67/177b...30/126a, 30/126b
Shīrkūh, Asad al-Dīn 47/172b...32/128a
Sińdār 1/160b, 47/172a, 51/173a...32/172b
Sirāj al-Dīn 44/171b
al-Sīwān 30/168a, 40/170b, 48/172b, 68/177b, 71/178b...24/120a, 27/123a, 32/128b
Siyāwūsh b. Artuq 65/177a, 66/177a...6/105b, 7/106a
Spain 33/168b
Ṣūfīs 7/162a, 67/177b...5/104a, 5/104b
Sukmān b. Artuq 1/160b, 2/160b, 9/162b, 11/163a, 65/177a, 67/177b ...1/100b, 1/101a, 6/105b, 7/105b
Sukmān (father of Amir Ḥāmīd, lord of Akhlāj) 44/171b...29/126a, 35/130b
Sultan-Shāh b. Riḍwān 3/161a
Sunqur b. Shams, Amir 2/161a
Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Jabbār, Badr al-Daula 29/167b, 61/175b, 67/177b, 68/177b...7/106a, 24/120a

Sulaimān b. Dā'ūd 65/177a...7/105b

Sulaimān b. Ḫāzī, Amir Shams al-Daula 8/162b, 9/162b, 10/162b, 10/163a, 42/171a, 66/177a, 70/178b...6/104b, 6/105a, 8/106b, 28/124b

Sulaimān b. Qutlumush 10/162b

Sulaimān b. 'Umar the 'Alīd see Nūr al-Huda

Sulaimān-Shāh b. Muḥammad 13/163b, 14/163b

Sumaisāḥ 58/175a...37/132b

Sunday 39/170a...27/123a

al-Ṣūr 30/167b, 30/168a...24/120a

Sūs 32/168a, 32/168b...22/118b, 37/133a

al-Sūsī ...23/119a (Muḥammad b. Tūmart)

Syria 16/164b, 34/169a, 44/171b, 47/172a, 48/172b, 57/175a, 69/178a...1/100b, 9/107b, 23/119b, 24/120b, 29/125b, 31/127b, 36/162a

T

Ṭabar 49/173a...35/130b

Ṭabriz 14/163b, 20/165b, 40/170b...13/111b

Ṭāhir b. Nubāṭa 52/173b

Ṭāhirid 25/166b...17/114a

Ṭāj al-Daula 40/170b

Ṭāj al-Dīn Abū Ṣālim Ṭāhir b. Nubāṭa (the ʿamīd) 10/162b, 30/167b, 43/171a, 54/174a, 56/174b...29/125a, 34/129b, 36/131b

Ṭāj al-Dīn Abū Ṭāhir Yaḥyā b. al-Shahrazūrī 47/172a, 50/173a...32/127b, 33/129a, 35/131a

Ṭāj al-Dīn Abuʾl-Faḍāʾil al-Ḍiyā' 52/173b

Ṭāj al-Mulāk see Būrī
Tāj al-‘Ulamā’ al-Khaṣlaqī (al-khatīb) 53/174a
Takrit 14/163b, 59/175b...21/117b
Ṭalḥa see Kamāl al-Dīn Ṭalḥa
Tall al-‘Alawiyya ...39/134a
Tall Bāshir 58/175a...37/132b
Tall Bashmi 39/170a, 69/178a...26/122b
Tall Fāfān ...37/133a
Tall Khālid 58/175a
Tall Khūm 40/170b, 48/172b
Tall Mauzan 48/172b...32/128b
Tall Shaikh 30/168a, 37/169b, 43/171a...25/121b
Ṭanẓī 30/168a, 35/169a, 40/170b, 48/172b, 65/177a...24/120b, 25/121a, 32/128b
Ṭashufīn 32/168b...22/118b
Ṭashufīn b. ‘Ali b. Yūsuf 33/168b...23/119a
Ṭātār, Amīr, the ḥājib, khwāja-yi buzurg ...18/115b, 20/116b, 38/133b
al-Ṭawīl 45/171b...30/126a
Temūr-Tash b. ʿIl-Qāzī, al-Ṣaʿīd Ḫusām al-Dīn 10/162b, 10/163a, 11/163a, 14/164a, 16/164b, 17/164b, 18/164b, 29/167b, 30/167b, 30/168a, 31/168a, 34/169a, 37/169b, 38/170a, 39/170a, 40/170b, 41/170b, 41/171a, 42/171a, 43/171a, 44/171b, 45/171b, 46/172a, 48/172b, 49/172b, 49/173a, 53/173b, 53/174a, 54/174a, 55/174a, 56/174b, 57/174b, 57/175a, 58/175a, 61/176a, 62/176b, 62/176b, 63/176b, 64/176b, 65/177a, 66/177a, 67/177b, 68/177b, 68/178a, 69/178a, 71/178b...6/105a, 7/106a, 8/106b, 8/107a, 11/109a, 13/111a, 24/120a, 24/120b, 25/121a, 25/121b, 26/122a, 27/123a, 27/123b, 28/124a, 28/124b, 30/126a, 30/126a, 30/126b, 32/128b, 33/129a, 33/129b, 34/130a, 34/130b, 36/131b, 37/132a, 37/132b, 37/133a, 39/134a, 38/134b, 40/135b, 40/136a, 41/136a, 41/136b
Ṭhābit 9/162b
Ṭalḥa 47/172a
Ṭhāryālīth 5/161b...3/102b
Ṭurābī 8/162b, 10/165a, 20/165b, 62/176a...6/105a, 13/111a, 40/135b
Tiflis 4/161a, 5/161b, 6/162a, 7/162a, 8/162a, 8/162b, 63/176b...2/102a, 3/102b, 4/103a, 4/103b, 5/104a, 5/104b

Tihama 23/166a

Tirād 18/165a, 36/169a

Togh-Tegin 8/162b, 13/163b, 68/177b, 68/178a...6/104b, 9/108a

Toghan Arslan al-Aḥḍāb, Fakhr al-Dīn (sic) see next entry

Toghan Arslan al-Aḥḍāb, Shams al-Daula 5/161b, 30/168a, 35/169a...3/102b, 25/121a, 34/130a

Toghan Arslan (father of Fakhr al-Dīn Daulat-Shāh) 53/174a

Toghan Yūrek 60/175b...38/133b

Toghrīl Beg b. Muḥammad, Sultan 4/161b, 5/161b, 13/163b, 14/163b, 29/167b, 60/175b...3/102a, 3/102b

Toghrīl Beg b. Shīrbārīk 66/177a, 67/166b

Toghrīl Beg b. Īlīč Arslan, Malik 14/164a...10/108a

Tuesday ...17/115a

Tughrātī (?), Jamāl al-Dīn, Amir 11/163a, 21/165b, 45/171b, 46/172a, 47/172a, 48/172b, 58/175a, 65/177a, 66/177a, 71/178a...8/107a, 30/126b, 31/127b

Tūmart 32/168a, 32/168b, 33/168b...22/118a, 22/118b

Tūnis 33/168b...23/119b

Tūr ‘Abdīn 48/172b

Turcomans 34/169a, 48/172b

U

‘Umar 43/171a

‘Umar al-Khāsq (the ḥāṣib) 58/175a, 70/178a

‘Umar b. ʿIl-Ghāzī 70/178a

al-ʿUmrānī (father of Abu’l-Fatḥ) 53/173b

Unur see Muʿīn al-Dīn

‘Uthmān b. Khumar-Tash al-Ḥajj 64/176b
al-Vansharishi see ‘Ali al-Vansharishi

Wāsīt ...21/118a

Wednesday 46/172a, 56/174b...31/127a, 32/128b

Yaghī-Basan b. Qurtī 70/178a
Yaghī-Sīyan b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār 67/177b...7/106a, 7/106b, 8/106b
al-Yaghī-Sīyanī, Ṣālāḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad 12/163a, 12/163b, 17/164b, 47/172a, 47/172b...3/107b, 11/109a, 25/121a, 31/127b, 32/128a

Yaḥyā b. al-Mustaḥṣir 22/165b...15/112b
Yaḥyā b. Hubaira 59/175a...20/117a
Yaḥyā b. ‘Ubaḍa 10/162b
Yaḥyā (brother of Ibn al-Azraq) see Tāj al-Dīn
Ya‘qūb b. Qızılı Arslan, Amir 39/170a, 49/172b...26/122b, 33/128b
Ya‘qūb b. Sulaimān 65/177a
Yaqūt Arslan see Shams al-Dīn
al-Yaqūtī, Amir 1/160b...1/101a

Yumna Khatun bint ʻIl-Ghāzi 38/170a, 70/178a

Yūnus al-Ḥarāmī, Amir 66/177a...7/106a

Yūnus b. Buqsh al-Dunaisīrī (the hājib) 56/174b...36/131b

Yūsuf al-Dimishqī 36/169b

Yūsuf b. Sonqur 2/161a

Yūsuf b. Taṣhufīn 32/168b, 33/168b...22/118b, 23/119a

Yūsuf Inal (the hājib) 37/169b, 64/176b...25/121b
al-Ẓāfir 50/173a
al-Zāhid b. al-Ṭawil 45/171b...30/126a
al-Za'īm (i.e. Za'īm al-Ru'asā' b. Jahīr) 36/169b, 52/173b...20/117a
Za'īm al-Daula see Musayyib b. Mālik
Za'īm al-Dīn b. Ja'far 53/173b
Zain al-Daula Abu'l-Qasim 'Alī b. al-Ṣāqib, al-Ajall 25/166b...16/114a
Zain al-Dīn 'Ali Küçük 41/170b, 50/173a, 55/174b, 56/174b
Zain al-Dīn As'ad b. 'Abd al-Khāliq (the vizier) 61/176a, 62/176a
...38/134a, 38/134b, 40/135a
Zain al-Dīn (the sultan's vizier) see al-Ru'ayyid Zain al-Dīn
al-Zainabi, ‘Ali b. Tirād Sharaf al-Dīn (the vizier) 18/165a, 19/165a, 21/165b, 24/166a, 28/167a, 36/169a, 36/169b, 37/169b, 52/173b...13/110b, 16/113b, 17/114b, 19/116a, 20/116b, 20/117a
al-Zainabi (the chief gāfī) 25/166b, 28/167a, 28/167b, 36/169a, 36/169b...20/116b, 20/117a
Zangi b. Aq-Sonqur 12/163b, 13/163b, 14/163b, 14/164a, 15/164a, 16/164b, 24/166b, 25/166b, 27/167a, 28/167a, 28/167b, 29/167b, 30/167b, 30/168a, 31/168a, 34/169a, 35/169a, 37/169b, 38/170a, 39/170a, 40/170b, 41/170b, 43/171a, 45/171b, 45/172a, 46/172a, 47/172a, 48/172b, 49/172b, 50/173a, 51/173b, 54/174a, 55/174a, 55/174b, 57/175a, 62/176b, 64/176b, 71/178b...9/107a, 9/108a, 16/113b, 16/114a, 17/114b, 19/116a, 19/116b, 24/120a, 24/120b, 25/121a, 27/123b, 30/126b, 31/127a, 31/127b, 34/130a, 35/131a, 37/132a, 40/135b
Zangi b. Shīrbarīk 66/177a, 67/177b...7/106a
Zāyanda Rūd 28/167b...19/116a
Zubāb 57/175a
Zubaīda bint Hijām al-Mulk 20/165b...13/111b
Zumurrud Khatun bint Temūr-Tash 53/173b, 55/174b, 56/174b, 71/178b
...33/129a
al-Zuwaīn 37/169b
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