

"THE DECLINE OF THE SALJŪQID EMPIRE"

Thesis presented for the

Degree of Ph.D.

At the University of London

1934 A.D.

- By -

SANĀULLĀH

-----oO-----

ProQuest Number: 10752712

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10752712

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

ABSTRACT OF A THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF Ph.D. (1934)

Subject:- "THE DECLINE OF THE SALJŪQID EMPIRE"

(485/1092 - 511/1117)

After a critical examination of the available sources and a chronological survey of the period, the thesis sets out to analyse the institutions of the Saljūqid State, so far as they can be identified. Among them are ^{the} royal family and Court including relations of princes and activities of wives, constitution of ^{the} armed forces, relations with amīrs and Turkmen and Arab tribes, civil administration, relations with ^{the} caliphate, religious opposition, and economic factors. The bearing of each upon the fortunes of the dynasty and the conditions in the Middle East is examined as fully as possible. Finally, the political history of the period is surveyed in the light of the factors analysed above.

The thesis thus aims at presenting for the first time a critical history of a period hitherto known only in general outline, and at isolating the features which marked the political life of the Eastern Islamic world during this period.

C O N T E N T S

	Page
i. Abstract of the Thesis	
ii. Preface	i - ii
iii. Bibliographical Introduction	iii - xi
iv. Chronological Survey of Events	xii - xx

P A R T I

Institutions of the Saljūqid Empire

CHAPTER I

The Royal Family and Court	1 - 8
Activities of Women	8 - 16

CHAPTER II

Constitution of the Armed Forces	17 - 19
Relations with Amīrs	20 - 27
" " Turkmen and Arab Tribes	28 - 32

CHAPTER III

Civil Administration	33 - 47
Relations with the Caliphate	48 - 54

CHAPTER IV

Religious Opposition	55 - 63
Economic Factors	63 - 73

P A R T II

Survey of the Political History

CHAPTER V

The Reign of Mahmūd b Malikshah	74 - 81
---------------------------------	---------

CHAPTER VI

The Reign of Barkiyāruq b Malikshah	82 - 102
-------------------------------------	----------

CHAPTER VII

The Reign of Muhammad b Malikshah	103 - 119
-----------------------------------	-----------

Bibliography	i - xii
--------------	---------

P R E F A C E

The Abbāsīd Empire, once supreme in the Near and Middle East during the ninth century, had been reduced in size and strength during the tenth^{century} and first few decades of the eleventh. The Fātimīd anti-calīphs of Egypt and the Eastern Roman Emperors in Byzantium were extending their sway in Asia at the expense of the Abbāsīd territories. At Baghdād, the metropolis of Islam, the officers of the Turkish slave soldiery had become the Calīph-makers. At this critical juncture the Saljūqīd power rose on the ruins of the Ghaznavīd sultanate and soon swallowed the Būyīd supremacy at Baghdād. Those rough and unsophisticated tribes who had embraced Islam with all the enthusiasm of new converts, once more revived the dying empire of the Abbāsīds. The successive reigns of Tughrīl (429/1037-455/1063), Alp Arslān (455/1063-465/1072) and Malikshah (465/1072-485/1092) fully illustrate the resumption of power and prosperity which had characterized the rule of the early Calīphs. If the rapidity of the Saljūqīd progress had been bewildering, their decline was equally remarkable. Within sixty years of their rise, symptoms of decline became more and more visible until their final downfall, with the captivity of Sultān Sanjar by the Ghuzz tribes and his ultimate death

in 552/1157.

The history of the Saljūqid Empire can, therefore, be divided into three periods of rise, decline and fall. The present thesis deals with the central and transitional period of decline. This period covers the years 485/1092-511/1117, including the reigns of Mahmūd (485-487), Barkiyāruq (487-498), and Muhammad (498-511).

Several historians, such as Gibbon, Malcolm, Markham, Ameer 'Ali, Browne and Sykes have, indeed, touched upon some events of this period, but their works can hardly be considered as complete. The history of the decline of the Saljūqid Empire remains, in fact, unwritten, and an attempt to fill this gap direct from the original Arabic and Persian sources is made in the following pages. Special attention is devoted to the study of the institutions of the Saljūqs which lay at the root of all troubles.

I am greatly indebted in preparing this work to Professor H.A.R. Gibb, M.A. for his able guidance and amiable supervision throughout the long course of three years, Dr. A.S. Tritton, D.Litt. for revising and correcting my translations from Ibnūl Athīr, Dr. A.S. Atiyā, M.A., Ph.D. for reading my work, and for advice on the technical aspect of my researches, and Professor V. Minorsky for occasional consultations and suggestions.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION

Although the historical sources relating to the great Saljūqs of Persia are exceptionally abundant for the period 429/1037-552/1157, unfortunately for the years under review the accounts are generally very brief and abrupt. While such valuable authorities as Baihaqī⁽¹⁾ belong to the preceding, many others like Ibnul Athīr belong to the succeeding generations. The three known contemporary sources - The Lightning Flash of Chronicles⁽²⁾ in Arabic by Abū Futūh Barakāt b Ismā'īl (500/1106-7) the History of the Saljūq⁽³⁾ Dynasty of Abū Tāhir Khātūnī and the Decline of the Times of Ministers and Ministers of the Times of Decline⁽⁴⁾ by Sharafuddīn Abū Naṣr Anūshirwān b Khālid Kāshānī (d.533/1138-9), have not come down to us intact and our knowledge of them is either incomplete or secondary.

The last work available to some extent in the Arabic revised version of Imāduddīn Kātib of Isfahān (Abū 'Abdullāh Md b Md d.597/1200-1). The title of his book is Help in Weariness and Refuge of Creation⁽⁵⁾ of which an abridgment by Fath b 'Alī b Md at-Bundārī (d.623/1226) entitled The Cream of the Book of Help and selection from the Book of Refuge,⁽⁶⁾ is in print.

(1) Abūl Fadl Md b Husain, d.470/1077-8 Tārīkh-i-Āli Sabuktagīn.

(2) Lam'ut Tawārīkh.

(3) Tarikh-i-Āli Saljūq.

(4) زوال عصر الوزراء ووزراء عصر الزوال

(5) Nuṣratulfatrah wa 'usratulfatrah.

(6) Zubdatun Naṣrah wa Nakhbatul 'usrah.

Despite Bundārī's assertion that he has simplified the florid and bombastic style of Isfahāni so that the book may be easily understood, it appears that his own work suffers from the same failures as the original source.

Diametrically opposed both in simplicity of style and wealth of details is the Great Universal History⁽¹⁾ of Ibnul Athīr (Izzuddīn Abul Husain 'Alī b Md, d.630/1232) up to 628/1230. I have translated almost literally his annals for the whole period of twenty-seven years (485/1092-511/1117) inclusive, omitting only such irrevelant points as the obituary notices on unimportant persons. I have made use of these translations in the following pages, as Ibnul Athīr appears to have remained the most reliable authority who has so far successfully stood the test of time and modern historical criticism. I have taken his work as the foundation of my study and compared and collated with it as many of the other sources extant in manuscript and in print as is possible in the present circumstances. Besides, Ibnul Athīr's accuracy and scrupulousness are certified in his introduction to Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion by that high authority W. Barthold, whose is the last comprehensive work on the subject.⁽²⁾

The unique British Museum manuscript Stowe Or 7, which is attributed to Sadruddin Abūl Hasan 'Alī b Nāsir al-Husainī

(1) Alkāmīl fi't Tārīkh.

(2) Page 3.

(d.590/1194) as his Cream of Chronicles⁽¹⁾ is a monograph on the Saljuqs. According to Hotttsma⁽²⁾ it is an abridgment of Imaduddin, while Karl Sussheim contends⁽³⁾ that the Cream of Chronicles was only one of the sources of the anonymous British Museum Chronicle Stowe Or 7. Sussheim's view is supported by the opening page of the manuscript where it reads⁽⁴⁾:- "Amīr Sayyad, the great learned leader Sadruddin Abūl Hasan 'Ali, son of Sayyad, the great martyred leader Abūl Fawāris Nāsir, son of 'Ali al-Husainī, may God be merciful to him, mentioned in his book which he named the Cream of Chronicles, the history of the Saljūqid amirs and kings. He narrated that ... " On the frontispiece, however, it is described as the "History of the Saljūqid Rule by the great Chief and the learned doctor Sadruddin Abūl Hasan 'Ali, son of the Sayyad martyred leader Abūl Fawāris Nāsir, son of 'Ali al-Husainī, may God the Great be merciful to them both."⁽⁵⁾ This seems to have misled scholars

(1) Zubdatuṭ Tawārikh.

(2) Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des seldjoucides vol. ii. p. v

(3) Prolegomena zu einer Ausgabe der im Britischen Museum zu London verwahrten Chronik des Seldschuqischen Reiches p.13 et seq.

(4) "ذكر الأمير السيد الإمام الأجل الكبير صدر الدين أبو (أبو سيّد) الفوارس ناصر بن طاهر الحسين رحمه الله في كتابه الذي سماه زبدة التواريخ أخبار الأئمة والملوك السجوقية ذكره أول من ..."

(5) "أخبار الدولة السجوقية للصدر الكبير العالم صدر الدين أبي (أبو سيّد) الحسين بن السيد الإمام الشهيد أبي (أبو سيّد) الفوارس ناصر بن الحسين رحمه الله تعالى"

into thinking that the work was composed by Ṣadruddin himself, and both Barthold,⁽¹⁾ and Amedroz⁽²⁾ apparently have adopted this misnomer from the British Museum catalogue (Supp. 550 Rieu. p.342). Md Iqbāl also has misquoted it in a footnote of the preface to Raḥtus Ṣudur.⁽³⁾

The real contemporary record is the History of Ibnul Qalānisī (Abū Yāla Ḥamza b Asad d.555/1160) known as the continuation of the History of Damascus.⁽⁴⁾ The main portions of this valuable source relating to the Crusades have been recently translated by Professor H.A.R. Gibb, with a very illuminating introduction and with notes.⁽⁵⁾ The work, as its name implies, is mainly concerned with the affairs of Damascus rather than those of Baghdād and Isfahān. Nevertheless, it throws an interesting sidelight on the prevailing conditions of the time. Besides, there are lengthy incidental passages directly dealing with some of the important events of the period. Furthermore, the value of the work has been enhanced by subsequent additions from the histories of Ibnul Azraq al-Fāriqī, Sibṭ Ibnul Jawzī and Ḥāfiẓ Dhahabī by the editor Amedroz.

(1) p. 29.

(2) pp. 8, 22, 129.

(3) p. 11, footnote 2.

(4) Dhail Tā rīkī Dimashq.

(5) The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades.

Many scattered pieces of information may also be gleaned from the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, (Historiens Orientaux)*, Sources Arabes, Vol. III. Most of the information is necessarily abrupt and incomplete, as the work is concerned with the Crusades alone.

Some valuable references may be drawn from the *Mirror of Time* ⁽¹⁾ of Sibṭ Ibnūl-Jawzī (Shamsuddīn Abul Muzaffar Yūsuf b Qizughtū b 'Abdullāh d.655/1257). The work is preserved in various manuscripts covering the years 440 A.H. and onwards in different libraries. But the Yale 138 *Mukhtasar* covering the years 495-645 A.H. belongs to a different recension from the rest. It is available in ^{the} facsimile edition of Dr. J.R. Jewett with a short introduction.

Ibn Khaldūn (Waliūddīn Abū Zaid Abdūr Raḥmān al Haḍaramī al-Maghribī d.808/1406) is more famous for his *Prolegomena* ⁽²⁾ than for his voluminous general history. ⁽³⁾ He was a real historical philosopher. But as a historian he is pedantic, inaccurate and insufficient on matters of detail. He does not seem to practise the canons of historical writing which he puts forward in his *Prolegomena*. Hence only little attention is devoted to his variance from other sources in this study.

(1) *Mir'atuz Zamān*.

(2) *Muqaddimah*.

(3) *Al 'ibar wa Diwān al Muḥtadā walkhabar* etc.

Varied and valuable details may be gleaned from the famous Biographical Dictionary⁽¹⁾ of Ibn Khallikān (Shamsuddīn Abūl 'Abbās Ahmad b Md d.681/1282). Though he has only slightly treated the lives of Barkiyāruq and Md, the biographies of Malikshah and Sanjar are furnished with many details in his work. To English readers this Dictionary is accessible in the excellent translation of Baron M. de Slane. The work is not entirely devoted to biographical studies, but also includes statements on other subjects of interest, such as the Muslim Educational System of that period, as can be seen from the index at the end of the translation. The work is, in fact, of encyclopaedic character.

Ghazālī's (Abū Hāmid Md b Md d.505/1111) Revivification of Religious Sciences⁽²⁾, especially the chapter on the Government of the Sultans (Idārāt al-Sulātīn) being the contemporary record of a man who took part in politics, throws an interesting sidelight on the chaotic conditions of the time. Disgusted with the corrupt and oppressive government of the time, Ghazālī retired from active life and completely dissociated himself from worldly affairs in 488/1095-6. He then proceeded to Syria and composed this famous book in the course of his journey.⁽³⁾ The book truly reflects the bent of his mind

(1) Wafayātul A'yan.

(2) Ihya' Ulum al-Dīn.

(3) I.A. x. 104.

at that time. He advocates a policy of passive non-cooperation with the régime of the day; declaring, as a jurist (sharīa lawyer) all sorts of social intercourse and business transactions with the officers of the government illegal. (Harām)⁽¹⁾ in order to bring moral pressure ^{to bear} upon them. But at the same time he considers the government by force as a necessary evil, and does not advise open insurrection against the established authority.⁽²⁾

The Solace of Hearts and Token of Joy⁽³⁾ of Rāwandī (Abū Bakr Md b 'Alī d.599/1202-3) is chiefly a monograph on the Saljūqs, though it contains other extraneous materials, such as proverbs, poems and similar subjects. The author's knowledge of this period is of a secondary nature and he appears to have drawn freely upon the Saljūqnāma of Zahiruddīn Nishāpūrī. Moreover, this ~~period~~ period is treated very briefly and in an uninteresting way. Although Zahirī's book has not come down to us, the later historians, Hamdullāh Mustawfi and Hāfiz Abrū have used it as an authentic historical source. M. Blochet is of the opinion that Mustawfi and Mirkhwānd directly copied from the Solace of Hearts. But I prefer the reasoning of Md Iqbāl

(1) Ihya II. 120, 122, 132.

(2) Ibid. 124.

(3) Rahtus sudūr wa Ayatus surūr.

(4) Preface to Rahtus sudūr, pp. 28-31.

as that these two authors have not mentioned the name of this book in the prefaces of their respective works, they must have used it indirectly. Again, both the Cream of Chronicles⁽¹⁾ of Hāfiz Abrū and the Select History⁽²⁾ of Mustawfi were used by the authors of the Garden of Purity⁽³⁾, the Friend of Biographies and the History of Thousand Years.⁽⁴⁾ Md Iqbāl quotes literally from the Solace of Hearts and the Select History and the Friend of Biographies.⁽⁵⁾ The anonymous compendium on the Saljūq History which appears at the end of the Paris manuscript of the History of the World Conqueror⁽⁶⁾ in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Supplement Persan 1556), the Abridgment called al 'Urāda fil Hikāyatis Saljūqiyah by Md b 'Abdullāh b Nizām al Husainī al Yandī (d.743/1342-3) the section of the Saljūqs in the great Jāmi' ut Tawārīkh of Rashīduddin Faḍlullāh the portion incorporated into the Turkish history Tawarikh-i-Āli Saljūq are directly drawn from Rahtus Sudūr; Qādī Ahmad Ghaffārī (16th century A.D.) might have used it in compiling his Tārīkh-i-Jahān Āra.

Professor Vuller's edition of Mirkhwān entitled Mirchondi Historia Seldschukidarum,⁽⁷⁾ adds to our knowledge of the subject by confirming various facts. On the other hand, its value as a source must not be exaggerated, as the author himself only used the earlier authorities.

(1) Zubdātut Tawārīkh.

(2) Tārīkhī-Gazīdah.

(3) Raudatus Safa.

(4) Tārīkhī Alfi.

(5) Habībus Siyar.

(6) Tarīkhī Jahāngushay.

(7) Saljūqid portion of Raudatus Safa.

In his Four Discourses⁽¹⁾ on secretaries, poets, astrologers and physicians Nizāmi 'Arūdī Samarqandī (Abūl Hasan Ahmad b 'Umar b 'Ali (12th century) relates some stories about the Saljūqs.

Mā 'Awfi (13th century) in his Lubabul Albāb, quotes some panegyric poems on Malikshah and Sultan Sanjar, but there is nothing to be found in it as regards the period under review. Such is the case ^{also} with the poetical work⁽²⁾ of Tughraī (Mu'ayyiduddin Husain b 'Ali d.514/1120. As a contemporary poet and as a wazīr it would appear at first sight that the reader might expect to find some penetrating passages indirectly touching upon the history of this period. On closer study the reader's efforts are only rewarded by disappointment, since Tughraī's work is merely a series of panegyrics on Nizāmūlmulk, Mu'ayyidūlmulk, Majdūlmulk, Muīnūlmulk and Tājūlmulk in absurd terms and humiliating flattery.

(1) Chahār Maqālah.

(2) Dīwān.

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY OF EVENTS

485/1092

Deaths of Nizāmalmulk and Malikshah.
Turkān Khatūn has Mahmūd proclaimed as Sultan.
Battle between Barkiyāruq and Turkān and
subsequent compromise. Khafājite raid on pilgrims
at Kūfa. Great fire at Baghdād.

486/1093

Battle between Barkiyāruq and Ismā'īl b Yāqūtī,
Ismail b. Yaqutō defeated by Barkiyāruq. His
proposed marriage with Turkān, and death.
Murder of Tajalmulk - ministry of 'Izzalmulk.
Second compromise between Turkān and Barkiyāruq.
Tutush rebels against Barkiyāruq. Battle of
Mudayya' and capture of Mawsil from the Arabs.
Tutush captures Diyār Bakr and Adharbaijōm and
returns to Syria. Ardshir, the 'Ibādī preacher,
comes to Baghdād, and is ordered to leave the city.
Riot at Baghdād, Karkh and the Basra Gate.
Barkiyāruq enters Baghdād with Sadaqa and 'Izzalmulk.
Birth of Mustarshid-billāh. Execution of Yalbard.
Pilgrims harassed near Mecca.

- 487/1094 Khutbakin Barkiyāruq's name. Death of Caliph Muqtadi, accession of Mustazhir. Tutush defeats Aqsungur and Būzān near Sabāin and executes them. He gains a second victory near Irbil; Khutbak recited for him at Baghdād. Death of Turkān Khātūn. Mahmūd welcomes fugitive Barkiyāruq at Isfahān. Death of Mahmūd from smallpox. Barkiyāruq sole Sultan. Execution of Takash with his son. Battle between Unar and Turanshah. Burning of the Basrah Gate. Earthquake in Syria. Riot between the inhabitants of Nahr Tābiq and Bāb-al-Arja. Occupation of Mecca by Isbabadh b Sartakin, its recapture by Amīr Qāsīm. Mu'ayyid-al-Mulk appointed Wazīr.
- 488/1095 Death of Ahmad Khān of Samargand. Expedition of Yūsuf b Abiq to Baghdād as Shihnah. Battle of Rayy between Barkiyāruq and Tutush; death of Tutush. Fakhr-al-Mulk appointed Wazīr in place of Mu'ayyid. Barkiyāruq wounded by a Bātinī. Riot at Nishāpūr. Death of Abu Shujā', the Wazīr of the Caliph. Ridwān occupies Aleppo and Duqāq Damascus.
- 489/1096 Deaths of Yūsuf b Abiq and Mājan Halabī. Death of Mansūr b Marwān, Wāli of Diyār Bakr. Occupation of Mawsil by Karbūqā. Khafājite raid on the

province of Ṣadaqah and depredations at Kərbala.

The great flood near Mecca.

- 490/1096-7 Barkiyāruq's expedition to Khurasan and assassination of Arslān Arghūn. Barkiyāruq appoints Sanjar as Wali of Khurasan. Revolt of Amīr Amīrān in Khurasan. Revolt of Yāruqtāsh and Qudān. Beginning of the reign of Mǫ b Khwa-razm-shah. Battle between Rūdwān and Duqāq. Khutbah in Egyptian anti-caliph's name within Rūdwān's province. Riot in Khurāsān between the inhabitants of Sabzawar and Khusrawgird. Murder of Bursuq, the first Shihnah of Baghdad.
- 491/1097-8 Franks invade Syria and Mesopotamia and capture Antioch and Edessa. Battle between Sanjar and Daulatshah in Khurasan. Caliph's deputation to Barkiyāruq regarding the Crusaders.
- 492/1098-9 Revolt and death of Unar. Capture of Jerusalem by the Franks. Battle between the Egyptians and the Franks. Activities of Mǫ b Malikshah. Khutbah at Baghdad in his name. Murder of Majd-al-Mulk Balāsāni. Barkiyāruq's letter to the Caliph. Famine in Khurāsān.

- 493/1099-1100 Restoration of Khutbah at Baghdād in Barkiyāruq's name. First battle between Barkiyāruq and Md; Barkiyāruq's defeat; Khutbah at Baghdād in Md's name; death of Kūharāin. Defeat of Barkiyāruq by Sanjar; death of Amīrdād. Dismissal and death of 'Amid-al-Daulah Jāhīr, Wazir of the Caliph. Bohemond captured by Ibn Dānishmand. Disorder at Baghdād. Famine in Iraq. Bohemond of Antioch besieges Afamia. Murder of Bulkābak.
- 494/1100-1 Second battle between Barkiyāruq and Md, the latter defeated; execution of Mu'ayyid-al-Mulk. Md meets Sanjar. Barkiyāruq's arrival at Baghdād. Revolt of Sadagā against Barkiyāruq. Md's arrival at Baghdād and Barkiyāruq's departure. Massacre and persecution of the Bātinīs throughout the empire. Battle between Duqāq and Baldwin. Battle between Suḡmān and the Franks. The occupation of Sarūj, Haifa, Arsuf and Qaisariyah by the Franks.
- 495/1101-1102 Death of Mustāli, the Fatimid caliph. Third battle between Barkiyāruq and Md. Fourth battle after violation of the treaty. Barkiyāruq besieges Md in Isfahān. Murder of 'Abdal-Jalīl Dihstānī, wazir of Barkiyāruq, and appointment of Khatīr Abu Mansūr. Riot between the 'Askar of Īlghāzi and the public

of Baghdād. Wālī of Basrah marches to Wāsīt. Death of Karbuqā; Mawsil occupied by the Turkman Mūsā and then by Jakarmish. Sugman occupies Hisa Kaifa. Siege of Tripoli by Crusaders. Restoration of the fort of Khaftīdhkān to Sarkhāb. Death of Qadir Khān of Samarqand. Abul Ma'ālī appointed as Wazir of the Caliph. Construction of Hillah. Murder of the Qādi of the tribe of Rabī' at Hīt.

496/1102-3 Rayy under Yanāl; his expulsion from it and arrival at Baghdād. Arrival of Qumushtakīn as Shihnah of Baghdād; riots between him and Ilghāzī and between Sugmān and Şadaqah. Şadaqah occupies Hīt. Fifth battle between Barkiyāruq and Md. Dismissal and detention of Sadīd-al-Mulk, Wazīr of the Caliph and Abū Sād Ibn-al-Mūsālāyā officiates for him. Duqāq occupies Rahbah. Battle between the Egyptians and the Franks. Death of the Sultana Tughril. Revolt of Saghirbeg in Transoxania. Abul Qāsim b Jahīr appointed as Wazir of the Caliph.

497/1103-4 Balak b Bahrām occupies 'Ānah. Treaty between Barkiyāruq and Md. Sugmān and Jakarmish wage war against the Franks. Death of Duqāq and the reign of his son. Şadaqah occupies Wāsīt. Dismissal of Tughrāī, wazīr of Sanjar. Riots at Baghdād. Buzghush's campaign against the Ismāīlīs.

498/1104-5

Death of Barkiyāruq; Khutbah in the name of Malikshah b Barkiyāruq. Md besieges Jakarmish at Mawsil; his arrival at Baghdād; makes peace with his nephew and Ayāz. Deaths of Ayāz and Suḡmān. Bātinī depredation in Khurāsān. Battle between the Muslims and the Franks. Battle between the Franks and the Egyptians. Turkmen ravages in Tarīq Khurāsān in 'Irāq; Balak b Bahrām appointed as special police officer. Āqsunuqur Bursuqī appointed as Shihnah of 'Irāq. Kūfa given to Qimaz as fief. Sultān Md's arrival at Isfahān. Smallpox in 'Irāq followed by epidemic of cholera.

499/1105-6

Revolt of Mankūbars and false prophet at Nihāwand. Battle between Tughtakin and the Franks. Tribal battle between the Ābādites and the Khafājites. Occupation of Basrah by Ṣadaḡal. Ridwān besieges Ndsāibīn and returns. Tughtakin occupies Buṣra. Frankish occupation of Afāmiyah. Sack of Baṣrah by the Ārabs. Arrival of a prince of Morocco at Baghdād. Qiliḡ Arslān marches to Ruhā against the Franks, occupies Harrān, falls ill and returns to Malatīyah.

- 500/1106-7 Murder of Fakhr-al-Mulk b Nizām-al-Mulk. Sadagah occupies Takrit. Battle between the 'Abādites and the Khafājites. Jāwalī Saqawā marches to Mawsil, takes Jakarmish captive, besieges Mawsil; death of Jakarmish. Qilij Arslān occupies Mawsil; his death; Jāwalī occupies Mawsil. Persecution of the Bātinīs. Rupture between Sadagah and Muhadhhib-al-Daulah of Baṭīnah. Execution of Saḍ-al-Mulk and ministry of Ahmad b Nizām-al-Mulk. Dismissal of Abul Qāsim 'Ali b Jahīr, Caliph's Wazīr; Abūl Hasan b Dāmaghānī officiates; Abul Ma'ali Hibatallāh appointed Wazīr. Death of Sarkhab b Badr.
- 501/1107-8 Death of Sadagah and Fakhr al-Mulk. Arrival of Ibn 'Ammār at Baghdād. Abolition of custom duties. Qādi Abūl 'Abbās appointed Muhtasib of Baghdād. Return of Sabāwa. Fire of Kharabah | Ibn Jardah. Md left Baghdād for Isfahān. Suspension of Caliph's Wazīr. Frankish attack on Tyre and Saida.
- 502/1108-9 Mandūd occupies Mawsil; departure of Jāwalī; Count of Ruha set free. Battle between Jāwalī and the Franks. Jāwalī returns to Md. Battle between Tughtakīn and the Franks; the armistice. Tughtakīn routed by the Franks. Reconciliation between the Shī'as and Sunnis of Baghdād. Return of Mansūr- b

Sadaqah. Flood and famine in Iraq. Dismissal of Caliph's Wazir; Ministry of Abul Qāsim b Jahīr. Betrothal of Md's sister to Mustazhir. Hillah given to Said b Hamid 'Umari. Suqmān Qutbī occupies Mayāfariqīn. Murders of Kadis of Isfahan and Nishāpūr. Successors of the Caliph blocked by the Franks.

503/1109-10 Frankish occupation of Tripoli, Beirut, Jubail and Banayās. Battle between Md Khān and Sāghirbeg. Expedition against Alamūt. Md's arrival at and departure from Baghdād. Dismissal of Caliph's Wazir; ministry of Ibn Jahīr. Death of Ibrāhīm Yanāl of 'Amid.

504/1110-1 Franks occupy Saida and Atharib. Dismissal of Ahmad b Nizām-al-Mulk, ministry of Khatīr. Byzantine embassy to Sultān. Celebration of Caliph's marriage with Md's sister.

505/1111-2 Expedition against Franks. Franks besiege Tyre. Death of Imām Ghazālī.

506/1112-3 Mandūd marches to Ruhā and Sarūj, encounters Franks. Md leaves Baghdād for Isfahān. Arrest of Abū Sād of Qum. Death of Qurajā of Hims.

- 507/1113-4 Defeat of Franks; death of Mandūd. Quarrel between Sanjar and Md Khān; a compromise reached. Damascus caravan to Egypt looted by Franks. Death of Caliph's Wazir. Ibn Jahīr; ministry of Rabīb Abū Mansūr. Death of Ridwan, succeeded by his son Alp Arslān, the Dumb; regency of Lūlū. Bātinī persecution.
- 508/1114-5 Āqsunqur marches to Syria; submission of Marāsh to him. Battle between Āqsunqur and Īlghāzī; latter taken captive. Death of 'Ala-al-Daulah of Ghaznah; succession of his son; Sanjar's intervention. Earthquake. Death of Alp Arslān b Ridwān, succeeded by his brother, Sultānshah.
- 509/1115-6 Franks defeat Sultan's army; occupy Rafaniyah; its recapture. Arrival of Md at Baghdād; reconciliation with Tughtakīn. Riot at Baghdād; Mawṣil given to Juyūshbeg.
- 510/1116-7 Jāwalī Saqāwa and Jaghrī b Md sent to Fars; their deaths. Riot of Tūs. Fire of Baghdād.
- 511/1117-8 Death of Sultan Md; accession of his son Mahmūd.

P A R T I

THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE SALJŪQID EMPIRE

CHAPTER I

The Royal Family and the Court
Activities of Women

The circumstances which had led to the gradual decline and ultimate downfall of the Saljūqid empire were no doubt very numerous. The factious relations between the members of the royal family, the unruly behaviour of the princes and governors of provinces, the policy of ruthless intrigue which characterised the activities of the strong women at the Sultan's court - all these were important factors in the impending tragedy of the Saljūqs.

Under the Saljūqids the head of the ruling family alone was given the title of Sultan and the honour of 'five bands' (Panj Naubat) while the vassal Saljūqids were called Maliks (Kings) and had the honour of 'three bands' only, as we learn from the terms of the treaty between Barkiyāruq and Muḥammad.⁽¹⁾ This fact is further proved by the text of the treaty between Bahrāmshāh and Sanjar where Sanjar was designated as Malik and Bahrāmshāh as Sultan in accordance with the custom of the latter's ancestors, although Sanjar became the liege lord of Bahrāmshah by the provisions of this treaty.⁽²⁾ So when

(1) I.A. 137, 138.

(2) Ibid. 213.

Ibn- al Athīr, looking back from a much later period, speaks of this as "a strange thing to hear," he of course forgets that Muhammad being the legal Sultan, Sanjar could not possibly arrogate to himself this title merely because he had conquered the kingdom of Ghaznah which had never before been under the Saljūqid sovereignty, even in the palmy days of Malikshah.⁽¹⁾ Much confusion can be avoided by keeping this conception constantly in mind while reading the Saljūqid history, as the chroniclers frequently make use of the words Sultan and Malik indiscriminately.⁽²⁾ This lack of discrimination, though excusable as a figurative literary expression or as a matter of courtesy, may easily lead astray the reader who is not careful to guard himself against accepting it as a historical statement.⁽³⁾

Taking the view that the unity of the State was sufficiently preserved by the nominal headship of the Caliph, the Saljūqid princes regarded the empire entrusted to the Sultan as their ancestral estate, to be divided among themselves in accordance with the law of inheritance after their

(1) Ibid 214.

(2) Ibid. 115, 137, 138. I.Q. 168, 127.

(3) The Saljūqids of Rūm had already in the time of Malikshah adopted the style of Sultan, at first possibly only as a courtesy title, though later on it was held to imply their independence. Ref. 117 I.Q. 157, 158. from Fāriqī.

fathers' demise. This idea is betrayed by the two compromises between Barkiyāruq and Turkān Khātūn; under the first one Barkiyāruq received 500,000 dīnars on account of the legacy of his father through the intermediary of amir Bulkābak Unar.⁽¹⁾ Under the second compromise the condominium of Barkiyāruq over those provinces from which his authority was already excluded, was acknowledged by Turkān on behalf of her infant son Mahmūd.⁽²⁾ The statement is further supported by the terms of the treaties between Barkiyāruq and Muḥammad, by which the empire was practically divided between the brothers, only reserving for Barkiyāruq the nominal title of Sultan.⁽³⁾ Furthermore, the lesser Saljūqid princes were sometimes termed amīrs, as can be seen from the genealogical table of the Raḥat al-Sudūr.⁽⁴⁾ The word amīr strictly meant the head of the military forces, while the word wāli implied the civil administrator of a province. But both the offices were often combined in the same person.⁽⁵⁾ All the princes of the royal blood had to be provided with some fief (iqṭā'). That this was regarded as a right can be inferred from the

(1) Rāwandī 141. According to Yazdi (p.74) through Abū'l Ghanāim and Majd al Mulk.

(2) I.Q. 127.

(3) I.A. 137.

(4) Rāwandī, 85.

(5) Nizām al-Mulk, 43. I.Q. 144, 84, 91.

unsuccessful revolts of Aslān Arghūn and Mankubars. The former solicited Khurāsān from Barkiyāruq as his fief⁽¹⁾ and the latter, finding his income insufficient for his needs, had no alternative but to revolt and claim the Sultanate in the hope of getting some fief.⁽²⁾ The son of Takash also quarrelled on this matter with Sultan Md and fled to Rudwān's son at Aleppo, whence he went to Tancred, Lord of Antioch, and finally to Egypt where he was cordially received and assigned revenues to ensure him a comfortable existence.⁽³⁾

The provincial fief holders were expected to pay a fixed annuity to the central government and to rally round the banner of the Sultan with their own troops fully equipped in times of war.⁽⁴⁾ They in their turn sometimes appointed subordinate fief holders independently of the Sultan, as the custom of tax farming was rampant in all parts of the empire. As a concrete example the renting out of Wāsīt by Sadaqah to Muhadh_hib al-Daulah of Baṭīḥah for 50,000 dinars for about three months only, may be mentioned here. Muhadh_hib on his part again rented it to his descendants and friends who rack-rented the inhabitants.⁽⁵⁾ Where the subordinate fief holders were unable to meet the conditions imposed upon them, the principal fief holder frequently administered their fiefs directly through a deputy.⁽⁶⁾

(1) I.A. 108.

(2) I.A. 166.

(3) Gibb. 131, 143, I.Q. 183, 189.

(4) Ibid. 176, 192, 142, 127.

(5) Ibid. 157, 182.

(6) e.g. Sadaqa's cousin Thabit b Kāmil was his deputy at Hīt I.A. 150, Ismā'il was Qimāj's deputy at Basrah, Ibid. 141.

The institution of the Atābegate which was peculiar to the Saljūqid system of administration, was a necessary corollary to the conception of the empire as a paternal property. Each prince of the blood royal was placed under the care of a Turkish general. During his infancy the atābeg acted as his regent, and after his father's death his mother married, as a matter of course, the prominent Atābeg who in his turn sometimes gave one of his daughters in marriage to his ward. This is clearly exemplified by the relations of Tughtakīn and Duqāq and Janāh al-Daulah and Rudwān after the death of Tutush.⁽¹⁾ Similarly Qumushtakīn Jāndār was appointed Atābeg of Barkiyāruq⁽²⁾ who at the time of his death appointed Amīr Ayāz Atābeg of his infant son Malikshah, who was nominated heir apparent.⁽³⁾ This system of the atābegate had a detrimental effect on the imperial structure, as it turned the princes into mere puppets in the hands of the adventurous amīrs, as was the case of Jaghrī b Sultan Muhammad and Jāwalī. The latter taught the former, a boy of two, to utter the words 'arrest him' in Persian and made use of this royal command to capture his political opponent.⁽⁴⁾ On the other hand, sometimes the more virile wards even fell out with their atabegs and put them to death if such an outrage was possible. Sultan Muhammad put

(1) I.A. 102.

(2) Bundārī 77, Yazdī 73.

(3) I.A. 158, I.Q. 131. Duqāq and Tughtakīn, Duqāq's son. 144.

(4) Ibid. 217, 211. Similar was the case of Masūd b Md, who was placed under the care of Āqsunqur al Bursuqī.

to death Qutlaghtakīn, his own atābeg.⁽¹⁾ Janāh al-Daulah was assassinated at the instigation of Rudwān, his ward, after he had separated from Rudwān and occupied Hims on his own account.⁽²⁾

The Atābegate system moreover was responsible for the investiture of several Saljūqid slaves with kingships if their wards suffered premature death.⁽³⁾ The Atābegs were the real rulers and their wards were so many figureheads. Nay, often an atābeg deposed one prince and promoted another in order to safeguard his own interests, as he naturally preferred the weak one over whom he could exercise his absolute authority, to the strong one who might be a constant danger to his autocracy. An instance of these political manoeuvres occurred after the death of Malik Duqāq when his atābeg Tughtakīn made on 12 Ramadān 497/1104 his one-year-old son Tutush Malik. Then he deposed him and proclaimed Bektāsh⁽⁴⁾ b Tutush, a boy of twelve, Malik. But later, perhaps finding some opposition in him, he got rid of Bektāsh by ruse and reinstated the infant of Duqāq as Malik.⁽⁵⁾ This kind of diarchy was one of the most potent factors in the political disintegration of the Saljūqid

(1) Ibid. 199.

(2) I.Q. 133, 142.

(3) Gibb 25. I.Q. 145.

(4) According to I.Q. 145, Irtāsh, whose mother was responsible for frightening him regarding the ill intention of Tughtakīn and Safwat al-Mulk. This is also the second version of I.A. The enemies of Tughtakīn also had a share in this affair.

(5) I.A. 157.

empire as it gradually substituted for the element of unity supplied by the family ties with the central government, a large number of disconnected and often hostile dynasties. Thus, to quote Gibbon's expressive description of a lamentable situation "a crowd of princes arose from the dust of their feet."⁽¹⁾

The Saljūqid Sultans seem to have carried their treasures with them wherever they happened to go, and the Court also, generally speaking, used to follow them on their journeys. For the Saljūqids retained from their former nomadic ways a distaste for settled life. This can be illustrated by the fact that Turkan Khātūn seized the entire imperial treasury on the death of Malikshah to the exclusion of his four sons.⁽²⁾ Again, on the death of Barkiyāruq at Burujird, on his way to Baghdād from Isfahān, Amīr Ayāz took possession of the imperial paraphernalia and treasure in the name and on behalf of Barkiyāruq's infant son Malikshah, who succeeded his father under the atābegaate of Ayāz.⁽³⁾ This appears to have been the custom of the Amīrs and Walīs as well, although some recorded cases could be found where the treasure was deposited in strong castles and forts for safe custody.⁽⁴⁾ The latter

(1) p. 24. Decline and Fall of the Eastern Roman Empire.

(2) I.A. 87.

(3) Ibid. 158.

(4) Ibid. 89. Sarkhab b Badr kept his treasures worth 2000,000 dinars in the fort of Khaftidhkan I.A. 144. In the fort of Takrit which belonged to Bani Muqan, a subtribe of the Uqailid, there were 500,000 dinars excluding jewellery, I.A. 175.

was more in consonance with the tactics of the Bātinī chiefs, as many of the mountain fortresses of the empire were occupied by them either by force or fraud.⁽¹⁾

The intervention of women in political disputes is a striking feature of the Saljūqid state. Their political status was almost similar to that of men, as can be shown by the importance attached to matrimonial alliances between the political leaders of the time.⁽²⁾ Their intrigue and influence therefore are of considerable importance in appreciating the decline and subsequent downfall of the Saljūqid empire. Turkān Khātūn, the favourite wife of Malikshah, known as the 'glorified lady'⁽³⁾ was the most prominent female figure in the civil war following the death of Malikshah. She was powerful in the administration even during the lifetime of Malikshah.⁽⁴⁾ She and her steward, Tāj-al-Mulk were responsible

(1) Ibid. 22. 131, where a detailed description is given.

(2) e.g. Marriages between Tughril and Caliph Qāim's daughter (I.A. 153), Mahmalik and Caliph Muqtadi (Yazdī 73), (Rāwandī 140), Malikshah's daughter and Mustazhir (I.A. 204) (I.Q. 173), Hammād and daughter of Muhadhhdhib (I.A. 183), sister of Barkiyāruq and Nasr, prince of Ghaznah (I.A. 212, 213), Budran b Sadaqah and daughter of Muhadhhdhib (I.A. 182), Yāghisiyān's daughter and Rudwān (I.Q. 189), daughter of Jakarmish and Iblī b Arslān Tāsh (I.A. 169), King of Samarqand and sister of Malikshah (I.Q. 120), daughter of Khīr Khān and Ayāz b Ilghāzī (I.A. 212), Ibn Takash and Ilghāzī's daughter (I.A. 146), Yanal and Ilghāzī's sister, widow of Tutush (I.A. 147), Sultan Md and Ismail b Yaqūti's daughter (I.A. 150).

(3) Khātūn Jahāliyah (I.A. 87).

(4) Bundārī 76.

for poisoning the mind of Malikshah against his Wazir, Niẓām-al-Mulk. A few weeks later, on the sudden death of Malikshah at Baghdād, she kept the news concealed, ^{and} took advantage of her Turkish origin in securing the allegiance of the army through bribery, for her infant son Mahmūd. (1) She was the first person to sow the seed of civil war among the sons of Malikshah by raising her son to the Sultanate without having the slightest regard for the rightful claim of Barkiyāruq, the ^{surviving} eldest son, the support of whose claim proved fatal to Niẓām-al-Mulk. (2) Turkān ~~deliberately~~ disregarded the legal opinion of Ghazālī, the most prominent jurist of the age. (3) She bullied down the unwilling Caliph Muqtadi by the threat of declaring his son Jāfar by Māh Malik Khātūn, daughter (4) of Malikshah, Caliph at Isfahān. The reluctant Caliph negotiated in vain with her to keep the Khutbah in his own name. At last he had to give way and on Friday 22 Shawwāl 485/1092, the Khutbah was recited in the name of Mahmūd, then aged four only, under the high-sounding title of the 'Helper of the world and religion'. (5) She further managed to have the Khutbah recited in the name of ^{the} infant Mahmūd at the holy cities of Mecca and Medina in order to give the investiture full legal sanction. (6)

(1) I.A. 87, 99, Bundārī 76.

(2) Yazdī 71.

(3) I.A. 88.

(4) I.A. 87, 90, 94. But in Rāwandī 140, Yazdī 73 and Tārīkh-i-Guzīdah 449 it is clearly written as the sister of Malikshah. Besides, the disparity of age lends support to the Persian historians.

(5) I.A. 88. Nāsir al-Duniyā wal-Dīn.

(6) I.A. 88.

She immediately dispatched Qiwām-al-Daulah Karbūqā to Isfahān to take charge of its fort under the guise of a forged order from the dead Sultan.⁽¹⁾ Then she sent troops to capture Barkiyāruq lest he should oppose the Sultanate of her son;⁽²⁾ and she herself also set out for Isfahān with the corpse of Malikshah in a litter. Ibn al-Athir justly laments the death of Malikshah in this connection by saying: "there is no parallel case of a Sultan like him, over whom nobody prayed and for whom no one mourned."⁽³⁾

She now actively incited Ismā'īl b Yaqūti, the maternal uncle of Barkiyāruq, to revolt, by promise of marriage. But her tactics fell through as Ismā'īl was defeated in a battle near Karj at the end of 486/1093. Ismā'īl retreated to Isfahān, where he was cordially received by Turkān, who inserted his name in the Khutbah and coins after that of her son.⁽⁴⁾ The proposed marriage was about to take place, when the amīrs, especially Unar, the military and administrative head of the government, vehemently opposed the union. The amīrs did not trust him; he on his part was suspicious of them. The mutual mistrust led Ismā'īl to seek refuge with his sister, Zubaidah Khātūn, mother of Barkiyāruq. The sister readily complied with the request and Ismā'īl came over to Barkiyāruq's camp. But

(1) I.A. 87.

(2) Ibid. 89.

(3) I.A. 87.

(4) Ibid. 92.

the lust of power and position infused in him by the ambitious Turkān did not easily desert him. Being suspected of political intrigue against Barkiyāruq's life, he was put to death by Kumush, Aqsunqur and Būzān.⁽¹⁾

Turkān was too clever and cunning to despair of her projected plan. Deprived of her long cherished union with Ismā'īl, by the interference of overbearing amīrs, she came to terms with Barkiyāruq. Under cover of this false settlement she was actually engaged in conspiracy and alliance with Tutush, the formidable enemy of Barkiyāruq. As the first step in her secret plot she marched with her troops from Isfahān to meet him. But she fell seriously ill on the way and returned to Isfahān, where she died in Ramadān 487/1094.⁽²⁾ Browne⁽³⁾ and Sykes⁽⁴⁾ state that she was put to death by Barkiyāruq. It appears, however, from a closer study of the sources, that there is no justification for this assumption. Turkan died a natural though sudden, and hence suspicious, death.

Her mercenary troops and bribed amīrs fell out amongst themselves. Some of them joined Barkiyāruq, while others went over to Tutush.⁽⁵⁾ Thus ended the chequered life of that charming singing girl, by whose dazzling beauty and ready wit Malikshah had been captivated.⁽⁶⁾ In fine, her short

(1) I.A. 93.

(2) I.Q. 127. I.A.99.

(3) vol. 2. p. 301.

(4) vol. 2. p. 40.

(5) I.Q. 127.

(6) Wafāyāt. Eng. Tran. vol. III. p. 444.

career as a regent-mother after the death of Malikshah was filled with insatiable ambition and vile political intrigue.

The case of Turkān Khātūn was by no means isolated, and the pages of the chronicles contain many references of the political activities of other women in high stations. Nay, even the non-Saljūqid ladies actively associated themselves with politics, perhaps in imitation of their Turkish comrades. The recorded instance of this kind, of a wife's political intrigue is that of Sultana Tughril, daughter of the late Caliph Qāim. In spite of all her piety and charity she was not free from the common political bias of the Saljūqid Sultanas. Being suspected of the conspiracy against the Caliphate of Mustazir Billah, she was confined to her palace, where she died on 6 Muharram 496/1102. (1)

We even find women holding ^{the} important office of fiefholders and taking ^{an} active part in battlefields. Şafia Khātūn, wife of Sharf^a-al-Daulah and aunt of Malikshah, was the heroine of the Saljūqid race. Malikshah gave her Balad as fief, but after the death of Malikshah she occupied Mawsil also with her son 'Ali, who was ~~opposed~~ by her stepson Muhammad. After the death of her first husband, Sharf^a-al-Daulah, she married his brother Ibrāhīm, to whom she handed over Mawsil after winning the battle near Kanāsah in 486/1093. A few months after, when Tutush conquered it from Ibrāhīm, he appointed both 'Ali and his mother jointly as his walis in Mawsil after the battle of Mudayya. (2)

X (1) I.A. 153. X

(2) I.A. 91.

The daughter of Bursuq and wife of Jāwalī Saqāwa was another tyrant who employed all her courage and heroism to terrorise her subjects. When Sultan Muhammad's army under Maudūd besieged Mawsil, Jāwalī went out of the city, leaving his wife as the governor of the citadel with 1500 Turkish Cavalry, besides infantry and others, in Ramadān 501/1108. But owing to her oppression and exaction the residents mutinied against her and surrendered the citadel to Mawdūd, despite all her efforts to retain it. As an administrator she was, no doubt, a failure, but as a diplomat she succeeded after eight days' negotiations with Maudūd, in obtaining permission to go to her brother Bursuq b Bursuq with all her belongings, under the protection of Maudūd - a very rare thing in those rough days⁽¹⁾ as we frequently find that those who took too prominent a place in political life were given short shrift by their opponents.

We sometimes find women acting as envoys, as was the case of Barkiyāruq's sister, who was married to Naṣr, the brother of 'Ala al-Daulah, the Sultan of Ghaznah. 'Ala al-Daulah put his brother to death, prohibited his widow, perhaps owing to her political activities, from leaving Ghaznah, and later married her. When after the death of 'Ala al-Daulah, Sanjar was championing the cause of Bahrāmshah against his brother

(1) I.A. 193.

Arslānshāh, the latter commissioned her with 200,000 dinars and many presents to Sanjar to secure the surrender of Bahrāmshāh. But she proved a dangerous weapon and actually turned into a spy of Sanjar by revealing to him the weak points of Arslānshāh and exciting him to war. She was so spiteful that she took revenge on the son for the grudge she bore to the father. (1)

Another intriguing and ambitious Saljūqid lady was the widow of Tutush, who married Janāh al-Daulah, the atābeg of her son Rudwān. (2) Mention may be made ^{also} of Şafwat al-Mulk, mother of Duqāq, who married Tughtakīn, the Atābeg of her son, after the death of Tutush, her husband; she also played a prominent part in the political field. (3) The wife of Urtuq combined both diplomacy and military spirit in one. She freed her grandson Yāqūtī from captivity by her representations to Karbūqā, and later, when he was killed by an arrow-shot from the army of Jakarmish, she rallied the Turkmens round her son Suqman to seek revenge for her grandson. But Suqmān was bought off by Jakarmish and it was proclaimed by

(1) I.A. 212, 213.*

(2) I.Q. 133. I.A. 102. I.Q. 190. Later she joined Tughtakīn.

(3) I.A. 103. I.Q. 144. When Duqāq was dying she insisted on his instructions regarding the atābegate of his son Tutush, which was accordingly given to her husband, Zahir al-Din Tughtakīn. I.Q. 201. She was the right hand of Tughtakīn and the moving spirit of his polity during her life time. Nay, even after her death he acted according to her last instructions.

Suqmān "that Yāqūtī was killed in the battle and his killer is not identifiable."⁽¹⁾ Zubaidah Khātūn, mother of Barkiyārūq, also took part in politics. After the conquest of Khurāsān she took charge of the seven-year-old son of Arslān Arghūn and appointed his caretaker.⁽²⁾ She was instrumental in dismissing Mu'ayyid-al-Mulk, the most competent wazir of Barkiyārūq⁽³⁾ who, however, took full revenge by strangling her after taking a bond of 5000 dinars. She was aged forty-two years at the time of her death in 492/1099.⁽⁴⁾

The last one of this period was the wife of Sultan Muhammad, who was alleged to have practised black magic on her husband and thus caused his death. According to Bundārī she was arrested and tortured, and some of her maidservants were put to death. The court incited the Sultan to blind her, which had been the most common punishment for political crimes among the Saljūqids.⁽⁵⁾ At the last moment of Muhammad's life the Courtiers forged an order from him to strangle her. So she was strangled, and Bundārī says that it was a strange coincidence that both Muhammad and his wife died at the same hour at the end of 511/1118, the former on his bed and the latter in her palace, hanged.⁽⁶⁾

(1) I.A. 163.

X(2) Ibid. 109. x

(3) Ibid. 105.

(4) Ibid. 119.

(5) I.A. 99.

(6) Bundārī. 108.

In all these tragic and disastrous events, we find that the armed forces of the empire played an important rôle. The constitution of these forces helped still more to aggravate the situation and a special study of this subject is therefore necessary for an understanding of the factors of decline in Saljūq power.

CHAPTER II

Constitution of the Armed Forces: Relations with Amirs
Relations with Turkmen and Arab Tribes

As regards the constitution of the armed forces of the State, Professor H.A.R. Gibb's scholarly introduction to the Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades leaves little room for improvement on the subject, and it is only necessary here to summarise his sound conclusions.⁽¹⁾ A few new facts are, however, added here to illustrate and strengthen those conclusions still further. The 'askar formed the regular standing army and the jund the territorial reserve⁽²⁾ although the annalists often use both words loosely, as we frequently find in the pages of Ibn al-Athīr.⁽³⁾ The relations between the local jund and the central forces are closely connected with the rights and duties of the provincial fiefholders towards their suzerain - a subject already treated elsewhere.⁽⁴⁾

Again, although it is difficult to show with precision the numerical strength of the 'askar and the jund, some examples derived from the sources may throw light on the subject. In the battle near Rayy in Safar 488/1095, in which Tutush was killed, Barkiyāruq's 'askar numbered 30,000.⁽⁵⁾ The jund of Mawsil were slaughtered while asleep by 200 'askaris of Sultan Md in Muharram 502/1108.⁽⁶⁾ It may be mentioned

(1) pp. 32, 175.

(2) I.Q. 130, 132, 134; I.A. 201.

(3) I.A. 99, 101, 201, 202.

(4) *Plante*

(5) Ibid. 101.

(6) Ibid. 193.

here that the Turks were an important element in the 'askar⁽¹⁾ while the jund were a heterogenous mixture of Turks, Turkmens, Arabs and Kurds.⁽²⁾ The Ahdāth were organised under Ra'is al-Ahdāth and might be termed as regular volunteers.⁽³⁾ We find Majan, the Ra'is al-Ahdāth of Aleppo in 489/1095 trying to become independent of Malik Rudwān by political intrigue and treachery.⁽⁴⁾ Jāwalī Saqāwa deported more than 20,000 ahdāth from Mawsil when it was besieged by the 'askar of Sultan Md under the command of Maudūd in Safar 502/1108.⁽⁵⁾ On particular occasions, especially in waging a holy war against the enemies of the faith, irregular volunteers (Muttawīdh) were also summoned to arms. There are examples of such summons in the wars with the Franks and with the Ismā'īlī heretics. This was done in the battle between Jāwalī Saqāwa and Tancred at Tell-Bashir in Safar of the same year.⁽⁶⁾ The fact is further illustrated by the siege of Ruha on 12 Shawwāl 503/1110 by Suqmān al-Qutbī and Maudūd in which innumerable volunteers took part.⁽⁷⁾ Buzgush's campaign in Khurāsān against the Ismā'īlīs in 497/1103-4 is another illustration.⁽⁸⁾

The commander-in-chief of the army bore the title of Amīr al-Juyūsh or more commonly ~~Amīr~~ Amīr. He was also

-
- (1) Ibid 201.
 (2) Ghazālī II, 260.
 (3) I.Q. 135; I.A. 192, 210.
 (4) I.Q. 137; I.A. 105.
 (5) I.A. 201.
 (6) Ibid. 196, 158.
 (7) I.Q. 169.
 (8) I.A. 158.

occasionally styled Sāhib al-Jaish⁽¹⁾ and 'Arid al-Jaish.⁽²⁾ Under him was Qāid al-Quwwād or colonel, who was the head of the Qāids or 'captains'. The Qāids were sometimes described as Muqaddims.⁽³⁾ Camp-followers or rabble were called Sūqah or Hawāshī.⁽⁴⁾ These ^{are described} on one occasion in Bundārī as a crowd of unknown people.⁽⁵⁾

The system of military reconnoitring was practised in warfare,⁽⁶⁾ although civil spying was to some extent discontinued under the pious policy of ^{Alp Arslān} Malikshah.⁽⁷⁾ The military governor of a fort was called 'Duzdār', a title which frequently occurs in the pages of Ibn-al-Athīr.⁽⁸⁾ The Jāndār was probably equivalent to the modern head of the bodyguard or aide-de-camp.⁽⁹⁾ The Sipah Salar is a Persian word meaning the commander of the army.⁽¹⁰⁾ The Arabicised Persian word Isbabadh⁽¹¹⁾ is perhaps a synonym of Sipah Salar and was originally the official designation of the provincial satraps of the pre-Islamic Persian empire, who also commanded the provincial garrisons.⁽¹²⁾

-
- (1) I.A. 92.
 (2) Bundārī 86.
 (3) I.Q. 147. Bundārī 83.
 (4) I.Q. 136.
 (5) p. 76
 (6) I.A. 145, 219, 157.
 (7) Levy, 208. ^{and Barukh}
 (8) I.A. 131, 179, 211.
 (9) Bundārī 77; Rāwandī 140; I.A. 93, 116.
 (10) Gibb 81; I.A. 90, 142, 164, 169, 196.
 (11) Rāwandī 141; I.Q. 130, Gibb 154, 156; Yazdī 77; I.A. 157; Bundārī 53, 83.
 (12) Sipah = soldier, bed = chief or master as in Mubed the priest; Paul Horn 44.

The system of indiscriminate iqtā⁽¹⁾ (military fief), was probably the main factor at the root of all ^{the} troubles of the Saljūqid empire, as it was greatly responsible for making the relations of the Sultan and amīrs more troubled. The troops were placed in a precarious position of divided allegiance - nominal to the Sultan, real to their respective amīrs. Inexperienced Sultans, moreover, often lavishly rewarded ambitious amīrs for good services with the most flourishing provinces as fiefs, unmindful of the results of this generous but bad policy. The amīrs, thus becoming more powerful, pursued their own factious and warlike interests in order to annex the fiefs of their lesser fellow-fiefholders and not infrequently even contested the authority of ^{the} Sultans themselves. The latter had to combine with other amīrs to control the overbearing aggressors. As soon, however, as the suppression of a revolting amīr was complete, the young Sultans committed similar blunders by granting the other amīr or amīrs who upheld their cause the same fiefs, sometimes with additions and without betraying any sign of having learnt their lesson from their previous struggle. Thus the entire empire was plunged into a series of unending civil war with the weakening of the central control after the death of Malikshah.

(1) For fuller information regarding the five kinds of iqtā^c vide Māwardi pp. 181-7; for precautions to be taken against the abuse of iqtā system vide Nizām al-Mulk 119.

Among many others⁽¹⁾ the ever-changing amirate of Mawsil may be taken as a typical example to support the above statements.

After the death of Malikshah, his aunt Şafīyah Khātūn occupied Mawsil with her son 'Ali b Sharf-al-Daulah. Later she handed it over to her second husband, Ibrāhīm, after whose defeat and death in the battle of Mudayya' in Rabi' I 486/1093 she was appointed the wālī of Mawsil with her son 'Ali.⁽²⁾ In 489/1096, when Karbūqā and his brother Mtuntāsh were released by Malik Ruḍwān under instructions from Sultan Barkiyāruq, there at once gathered round them an 'askar of rogues and they occupied Harrān. Muhammad, the stepbrother of Amīr 'Ali and his vanquished foe, was at this time at Naṣībīn with Sarwān b Wahaib and Abūl Haija al-Kurdī. He sought the help of Karbūqā against 'Ali. The request being granted, Md met him near Naṣībīn, but the ambitious Karbūqā arrested him treacherously and occupied Naṣībīn also after forty days' siege. Then he marched to Mawsil and Amīr 'Ali asked for the help of Jākarmish, Amīr of Jazīrah. The latter's

(1) e.g. revolts of Arslān Arghūn; (I.A. 108) Amīr Amīrān (Ibid.109); Yāruqtāsh and Qūdan (Ibid.110); battle between Ruḍwān and Duqāq (Ibid.111); Sanjar and Daulatshah (Ibid.115); revolt of Unar (Ibid.116), of Sadaqah (Ibid.127); Ismā'īl's march to Wāsīt (Ibid.140); Duqāq's occupation of Raḥbah (Ibid.151); Bahrām's occupation of 'Anah (Ibid.153); occupation of Buṣrā by Tuḡtakīn (Ibid.170); Occupation of Mecca by Isbatadh b Sautakīn.

(2) I.A. 91.

help was intercepted by Altuntāsh, and in a pitched battle Jikārmish was defeated and forced to return to his province and to help Karbūqā in besieging Mawsil. After nine months' siege Amīr 'Alī was compelled to take refuge with Amīr Sadaqah of Hillah and Karbūqā occupied Mawsil. Altuntāsh was put to death for extracting money from the inhabitants and disobeying Karbūqā on the third day after the fall of Mawsil.⁽¹⁾ Karbūqā administered it well for about nine years.

In 494/1100-1 he was sent ^{by Barkiyāruq} to Adharbaijān to suppress a rebellion, ^{by Barkiyāruq} and he fulfilled his mission successfully. On his way home he died near Khūy in Dhūl Qādah 495/1102, after appointing his lieutenant Sunqurja his successor and taking an oath of allegiance from his Turkish troops to that effect. Then Sunqurja occupied Mawsil but the prominent inhabitants wrote to Mūsā,⁽²⁾ the Turkmen deputy of Karbūqā at

(1) Ibid. 106.

(2) During this period of internal troubles the inhabitants of towns played a very important part, e.g. those of Aleppo resisted the army of the Sultan and declared rebellion in 509/1115. I.A. 214. The inhabitants of Nishāpūr gave battle to the Khurāsānian Amīr who besieged it for about forty days in Dhūl Hijjah 488/1095 and in despair had to withdraw in Muharram 489/1095. The inhabitants of Shahraban resisted the tyrant Yanāl in 496/1104. In the battle many inhabitants lost their lives, but Yanāl had to retire to Adharbaijān. I.A. 148. The inhabitants of Baghdād attacked Ilghāzī, Suqman, and Dubais b Sadaqah, while they encamped at Ramlah in 496/1104. In the pitched battle four of them were killed and a group of them were taken captive; but they were released after being disarmed. I.A. 148. In Dhulhijjah 495/1102 the inhabitants of Isfahan kept at bay 100,000 rioters and robbers after the secret departure of Md. I.A. 139. In Jumada 499/1106 Sadaqah had a hard fight with the inhabitants of Basrah, in which he lost his cousin Abu Najm. I.A. 168.

Ḥisn Kaifa^{offerings} to surrender the city to him. Sunqurjā thought that Mūsā was coming to pay his respects to him so he went out to welcome him with the inhabitants of the city. On first meeting they dismounted from their horses, embraced each other and wept over the death of Karbūqā. While they were walking together Sunqurja said to Mūsā: "Whatever is left by our late master is at your disposal." But Mūsā said: "Who are we that we should have such rank, the command belongs to the Sultan; he will prefer whomsoever he wishes and he will appoint whomsoever he pleases." During this altercation Sunqurja drew his sword and struck with the flat of it the head of Musa. In the course of a hand to hand fight Sunqurja was killed by Mansūr b Marwān and Mūsā became the Amīr of Mawsil.⁽¹⁾ When this news reached Jdkārmish, the Amīr of Jazīrah, he immediately marched on Naṣībīn and occupied it. Mūsā, on the other hand marched to Jazīrah, but when he drew near Jdkārmish his troops treacherously changed sides, so he hurried back to Mawsil and Jdkārmish followed him and besieged Mawsil for a long time. In the meantime Mūsā sought the help of Suqmān b Urtuq, who was at that time in Diyār Bakr, by offering him Ḥisn Kaifa and 10,000 dīnārs. So he marched to him and Jdkārmish withdrew. Mūsā came out to receive Suqmān and was murdered by the slaves of Karbūqā

(1) T.A. 142.

near the village of Karāthā. Suqmān went back to Hisn Kaifa and occupied it, and it remained under his sons till 620 A.H. Now Jākarmish again besieged Mawsil and occupied it by capitulation after a few days' siege. Thus he became "the master of the Arabs and the Kurds." (1)

Under the terms of the treaty between Barkiyāruq and Muhammad, Mawsil was given to the latter, but Jākarmish was reluctant to recognise this settlement. So Muhammad besieged Mawsil and said to Jākarmish: "If you obey, I shall not take it away from you, rather shall I confirm it under you and the Khutbah will be in my name." Jākarmish said: "Letters from Barkiyāruq have come to me after the treaty ordering me not to hand over the city to anyone except him." But both parties being persistent in their claims, the battle continued till 10 Jumada I 498/1105, when the news of the death of Barkiyāruq reached Jākarmish. (2)

After consulting the inhabitants, he took ^{the} oath of allegiance to Md, who honoured him and embraced him. Then he requested the Sultan to enter into the city in state. That being refused, he prepared a great feast outside Mawsil and carried to the Sultan and his ministers many valuable presents and gifts. (3) Then the Sultan marched to Baghdād with him to capture the Sultanate from Malikshah b Barkiyāruq. Afterwards

(1) I.A. 143.

(2) I.A. 159.

(3) I.A. 159.

Jākarmish came back to Mawsil, but he did not fulfil his duties as a wālī in paying the annuity and rendering military service. So Muhammad gave Mawsil, Diyār Bakr and Jazīrah as fief to Jāwalī Ṣaqāwā, the tyrant of the places between Khuzistan and Fars, who submitted to the Sultan with great reluctance in Muharram 500/1106.⁽¹⁾ Jāwalī first went to Baghdād and stayed there till the beginning of Rabi' I, then marched to Mawsil via Bawāzīj, which he occupied and sacked for four days, despite the guarantee of security^{given} to the inhabitants. Then he proceeded to Irbil where he encountered Jākarmish, but Jākarmish was defeated and taken captive. The inhabitants of Mawsil, however, immediately proclaimed Zankī b Jākarmish their Amīr and had the Khutbah recited in his name.⁽²⁾ Qizughli, the slave governor of the fort, was the ringleader of this plan; he further invoked the help of Ṣadaqah, Qilij Arslān and Bursuqī, Shihnah of Baghdād, offering to each one of them to surrender the city to him.⁽³⁾ Ṣadaqah did not respond at all. The succour of Qilij Arslān and Bursuqī was rather tardy. Meanwhile, Jāwalī besieged Mawsil, but when he heard of the arrival of Qilij Arslān at Nasībīn he left Mawsil for Sanjār. After the departure of Jāwalī, Bursuqī also reached Mawsil, but the inhabitants gave him a very cold

(1) Ibid. 176.

(2) Ibid. 177.

(3) I.A. 178.

reception, so he had to return on the very day of his arrival. Qiliġ Arslān, while at Naṣībīn, swore to safeguard the interests of the inhabitants of Mawsil, and they on their part took an oath of allegiance to him. So he proceeded to Mawsil and encamped outside the gate, and on 25 Rajab 500/1106, at Marufah, where the son of Jākirmish and the chiefs of the city came to welcome him. He presented them with robes of honour, sat on the throne and inserted his own name in the Khutbah instead of that of Sultan Md.⁽¹⁾ He took over the fort from Qizughli and appointed his own governor over it. He confirmed Qādī Abū Md 'Abdullāh in his post and made Abul Barakāt his wālī over Mawsil. Then he marched against Jāwalī, leaving his eleven-year-old son Malikshah with Amīr Aydbarah and a detachment of troops at Mawsil. In a battle on the banks of the Khābūr, 20 Dhūl Qaḍh 500/1107, Qiliġ was defeated and he drowned himself in the river for fear of ignominy.⁽²⁾

After his victory Jāwalī marched to Mawsil and the inhabitants opened the gate to him. He, however, encamped outside the city and arrested the devoted followers of the late Jākirmish, who had joined Qiliġ Arslān and fined them. He restored the Khutbah in the name of Sultan Md at Mawsil. Then he marched to Jazīrah and besieged there Habshī b Jākirmish

(1) Ibid 178.

(2) Ibid. 180.

and Qizughli for some time, when they came to terms with him on payment of 6000 dinārs and much clothing and many beasts of burden.⁽¹⁾ Now he returned to Mawsil and sent Malikshah b. Qiliġ Arslān to Sultan Md, with whom he remained until his escape from the camp at the beginning of the year 503/1109.⁽²⁾

Jāwalī, however did not learn his lesson even from his own actions, when he himself had taken Mawsil from Jākarmish about a year before as a penalty for wavering allegiance. So he sided secretly with Šadaqah in his campaign against Sultan Md and refrained from joining the Sultan in spite of repeated requests on the part of his liege lord. Hence, soon after the suppression of Šadaqah, the Sultan sent almost all the amīrs⁽³⁾ to capture Mawsil from Jāwalī,^{and} this having been done, Maudūd became the wālī of Mawsil in Šafar 502/1108.⁽⁴⁾ He remained wālī of Mawsil till his murder in the cathedral mosque of Damascus on the last Friday of Rabī' I 507/1113.⁽⁵⁾ After him Āqsunqur Bursuqī was appointed the wālī of Mawsil, with whom Masūd b. Sultan Md was deputed as his ward in 508/1114.⁽⁶⁾ After the defeat of Āqsunqur by Īlghāzī, Sultān Md gave Mawsil and its dependencies as fief to Amīr Juyūqshbeg and sent his son, Malik Masūd to him in 509/1115-6. Bursuqī stayed in his fief Rahbah till the death of Sultan Md.

(1) I.A. 180.

(2) Gibb. 81. I.Q. 158.

(3) Among them were Amīrs of Banū Bursuq, Sukmān al-Qutbī, Maudūd b. Tuntakīn, Āqsunqur b. Bursuqī, Nasr b. Mulhalhal b. Abī-al-Shawk al-Kurdi, and Abul Haija, wālī of Ibbil.

I.A. 192.

(4) I.A. 193.

(5) Ibid. 209, Gibb 139, Rabī' II. I.Q. 187.

(6) I.A. 211.

To add to the misfortunes of the dynasty there were many turbulent Turkmen and free Arab tribes under their local leaders who fanned the flame of jealousy in the hope of collecting booty from the debris of vanquished armies and provinces.⁽¹⁾ Their relations with the central or provincial governments were very nebulous and they were always ready to join any adventurer who sought to acquire an amirate or even the sultanate. So we find ^{that} when after the death of Tutush, his son Rudwān's atābeg, Janāh-al-Daulah tried to recover Aleppo from its former wāli, Abul Qāsim Hasan b 'Ali of Khwārazm, he asked for the favour of the Magharib troops who formed the majority of the army. Accordingly, at the dead of night they shouted the slogan of Rudwān and captured Abul Qāsim.⁽²⁾ These unstable and troublesome elements were equally dangerous in those turbulent times, both to their enemies and allies, as they felt little scruple in changing sides at the most critical moment. Again, when Mankubars claimed the sultanate against Muhammad, he sought the help of Banū Bursuq. Sultan Muhammad, knowing this, prudently arrested Zankī b Bursuq, who wrote to his brothers warning them against giving allegiance to Mankubars and to arrange his arrest. Accordingly, they

-
- (1) e.g. Banū Munqidh at Shaizar, 'Uqailids and Bani Kilāb. Gibb 17, 18. I.A. 199; I.Q. 190-191. Banū Kisarit of Mawsil I.A. 177. 'Uqailid enmity against Sadaqah I.A. 149. In Jumada I 495/1102 Banu Numair killed Mu'ayyid b Sharf al-Daulah Muslim b Quraish, the Amir of Banu 'Uqail near Hit in revenge. I.A. 146.
- (2) I.A. 101. I.Q. 122, Bani Kilāb rallied round Tutush, activities of Bani 'Uqail, Bani Kāmil I.Q. 122-124.

wrote to Mankubars offering their false allegiance. So he proceeded to ^{join} them but they arrested him at Khuzistān and presented him to Sultān Md at Isfahān, where he was imprisoned with the sons of Takash. Zankī was released and restored to his dignity, and his brothers were lavishly patronised by Sultan Md. (1)

The intermittent warfare between the 'Abādites and the ^hKhafājites is another testimony to the tribal jealousy. The iron hand of Sadaqah was not sufficient to keep them under proper control. They sometimes even ravished his own territory so he had no alternative but to pursue the policy of 'divide and rule'. During this period the Khafājites appear on the scene first in 485/1092 as an armed robber gang, to harass the pilgrims and plunder Kūfah. They massacred most of the 'jund' stationed there and even stole the clothes of men and women whom they came across. The inhabitants defended them^{selves} with ^{their} arrows and they left the town after vigorously looting it. When this news reached Baghdad the 'askar' were sent forthwith to suppress them. After an encounter they were defeated and their position became weak. (2)

In 499/1105-6 heavy fighting took place between the Khafājites and the rival tribe of 'Abādites, as a group of the former captured two she-camels from a member of the latter. The demand to return the camels being rejected, the man looted

(1) Ibid. 166.

(2) I.A. 89, 90.

eleven of the Khafājite camels, whereupon they followed him, killed one of his followers and cut off the hand of another. After some abortive negotiations a battle was fought near Kūfah and the 'Abādites were defeated, as Ṣadaqah secretly helped the Khafājites. (1)

In the following year the victorious Khafājites began to raid the territory of Ṣadaqah. He accordingly sent his son Budrān with an army to the frontier adjoining Baṭīnah to protect his subjects from the Khafājite depredations. But they paid little heed to the expedition under Budrān. The latter wrote to his father informing him of the real position he was in. So Ṣadaqah summoned the 'Abādites and made them the vanguard of his army. The battle was fought in Rabi' I, and the Khafājites were defeated and ruthlessly persecuted. (2)

Another striking instance of the tribal activities is the sack of Baṣrah by Rabīah, Muntafiq and other neighbouring 'Arab tribes in 499/1105-6. Al-tūntāsh, the deputy of Ṣadaqah, opposed them with only 120 horsemen, but his party was defeated and he himself was taken captive. The 'Arab tribes entered into the city at the end of Dhūl Qādah, burnt down the markets and other fine buildings and plundered whatever they could lay hands upon. For thirty-two days complete anarchy prevailed and arson and loot had free play. The

(1) Ibid. 167.

(2) I.A. 176.

inhabitants fled away into the country in panic. The famous library, dedicated by Qādi Abūl Faraj b Abūl Baqā, was also pillaged. Sadaqah's tardy help came when the 'Arabs had left the city. ^{Consequently} Sultan Md took it away from him and appointed his own Shihnah and 'amid, whereupon the inhabitants returned and began to rebuild it. (1)

We further find Sadaqah in his last battle with Sultan Md in 501/1107-8, in which he was killed, exciting the 'Arabs by rousing their tribal pride and shouting to them: "O tribe of Khazimah! O tribe of Nashirah! O tribe of 'Auf!" Because the 'Abādites and the Khafājites, having learnt their lessons from the ^{ir} past experiences, did not support him actively in this decisive battle. (2)

Nomadic tribes such as the Salghar and the Shawānkāra were a continual source of conflict with the neighbouring amīrs, who hoped to impose their jurisdictional power over them. Their frequent seasonal movements from one place to another made many amīrs claim power over them, and ultimately those amīrs took to fighting with one another in defence of what they regarded as their own right. As a glaring example, we find under the year 495/1101-2 that Alqarabli of the Turkmen

(1) Ibid. 172. In Šafar 495/1101 the tribe of Rabiā killed their Qādi at Hit. I.A. 146. They opened the gate of Hit to Sadaqah in 496. I.A. 149.

(2) I.A. 188.

tribe of Salghar came to the province of Sarkhābb Badr. But the latter prevented him from ^{entering the} pasturing grounds and killed some of his followers. Then al Qarabli went back to his tribe and raised a huge army, with which he killed about 2000 of the Kurdish followers of Badr. Badr, being defeated, retired to some mountain with only twenty followers.⁽¹⁾ Another instance is that of the Shawānkāra, when they took shelter with the King of Kirmān in 510/1116-7; and Jāwalī on behalf of Sultān Md demanded their return as they were the Sultān's subjects. He sent Qādi Abū Tāhir of Shīrāz with his ultimatum, and fought an unsuccessful battle on this pretext with the King of Kirmān.⁽²⁾

In 502/1108 we find Banū Numair led by their Shaikh Jūshan occupying Raqqah by killing its wāli, 'Alī, whose father, Sālim, amīr of Jābar, was compelled to seek the help of the fugitive Jāwalī. Sālim further requisitioned the aid of his liege lord Rudwān, but Banū Numair were clever enough to meet the situation by buying ~~ought~~ peace from both of them by appropriate means.⁽³⁾

(1) I.A. 144.

(2) Ibid. 219.

(3) I.A. 195.

CHAPTER III

Civil Administration: Relations with the Caliphate

The administrative system of the Saljūqs was closely connected with that of the Wazirate. When the occupant of that ministerial dignity was a strong man, the system seems to have worked to the benefit of the reigning Sultan and his empire, and when an impotent and unworthy person succeeded to that post the whole framework of administration betrayed signs of disorder. This was due to the importance of the function and place of the wazirs in the system under review.

This becomes quite evident when we examine the situation before and after the death of Nizām al-Mulk. During his lifetime his beneficial influence kept the organs of the state in harmony. After his death and on the accession of unworthy officials to the wazirate, they lost their administrative independence and had to act according to the will of the strong military authorities who cared for little more than their own individual interests. To make matters worse the frequent change of Wazirs became the order of the day, and continuity of policy could, therefore, not be sustained. The Saljūqids were originally pastoral tribes of the steppe, and they therefore could not understand the proper functions of the elaborate bureaucratic system which the highly cultured

'Abbasid rulers had developed in past centuries, as we can see from the pages of *Ahkām al-Sultāniyah* of Māwardī and the *Siyāsatnamah* of Nizām al-Mulk. But as long as they were fortunate enough to have able wazīrs, such as Nizām al-Mulk who was the product of a preceding civilization, they were able to manage their affairs and control their extensive empire with the aid of organized and valiant military forces. This was the case in the reign of Malikshah, after whose death the elements of insubordination were let loose.

Turning to matters of detail we find that the Saljūqids abolished the Barīd system (postal department) and many other intricate political institutions which they could not understand for lack of training in these traditions.⁽¹⁾ These institutions were, however, essential for speedy communication and to keep the central government informed as to the course of events in the far-flung provinces. Thus the machinery of administration was paralysed by that unwise measure and the provincial amīrs were given ample opportunity for intrigue and self-aggrandisement.

As a concrete example we may refer to the case of the siege of Mawsil by Muḥammad in 498/1105. If the news of the death of Barkiyāruq, which took place on 12 Rabi' II at Burūjird, had been

(1) Samarqandi 23. A system of combined espionage and express posts. Levy 208.

quickly conveyed to Mawsil, the subsequent loss of life and property in the battles with Jikirmish could have easily been avoided. Unfortunately the news reached Mawsil after about a month on 10 Jumada I when Jikirmish immediately convened a conference of the inhabitants and asked their advice as to the policy to be followed after the death of Barkiyāruq. They said: "Our property and lives are at your disposal and you are the better judge; you may nevertheless consult the warriors who are also better acquainted with the situation."⁽¹⁾ So Jikirmish summoned his amirs and sought their opinion. They said: "While the Sultan was alive we refused him (Md) and none could enter into our city, but when he is dead there is no Sultan for the people but him (Md) and it is better to take ^{the} oath of allegiance to him."⁽²⁾ Accordingly, Jikirmish invited Saḍ al-Mulk, the wazīr of Md, and an armistice was arranged.

Again, if we believe Ibn Khaldūn⁽³⁾, the frequent changes of capital had also their cumulative evil influence culminating in the collapse of the central government. Although there were no changes in this period, Baghdād had been the metropolis of Islam for many centuries since its construction by Caliph Maḥmūd.⁽⁴⁾ But with the rise of the Saljūqids the administrative

(1) I.A. 160.

(2) Ibid. 160.

(3) Muqaddimah, p. 328.

(4) Yāqut, I. 679.

headquarters of the sultanate as distinct from the Caliphate, had been changing with each Sultan. Tughril's capital was Nishāpūr, while Alp Arslan ruled at Merv. (1) Malikshah had his headquarters at Isfahān, which was retained by Mahmūd, Barkiyāruq and Muḥammad after whose death Sanjar again transferred the capital, (2) to Khurasān.

Instability of the ministry and incompetence of the individual wazīrs (3) were responsible to a great extent for the loosening of the central control. The successive wazīrs were worthless persons and so were either dismissed or disgraced, nay, even handed over to their political opponents at the whim of the untrained and uneducated Sultans who ascended the imperial throne in their early youth or even infancy and died before attaining maturity.

(1) Qazwīnī p. Nuzhat^w, Kinneir. 179.

(2) Yāqūt iv. 509.

(3) Wazīrs like Nizām al-Mulk were actual rulers of the state possessing all the authority of the modern British Prime Minister, while on the other hand, Wazīrs like Khaṭīr al-Mulk were impotent and had to abide by the resolutions of other ministers, even more than a modern French Premier. The first kind is technically termed Wazīr al-Tafwīdh - the delegated Wazīr, and the second, Wazīr al-Taufīdh - the executive Wazīr by Māwarīdī, p. 21 et. seq.

The careers of the successive wazirs after Nizām-al-Mulk will fully illustrate the chaotic conditions of the empire during this period. With the murder of Nizām-al-Mulk the ministry was completely reconstructed, for the worse, as has been verified by Abul Ma'ali Nahhās; Tāj al-Mulk took the place of Nizām-al-Mulk, while Sharf^a-al-Mulk Abu Sa'īd, and Kamāl al-Daulah Abu Rīda were substituted by Majd al-Mulk Abul Fadl Qummī and Sadīd-al-Daulah Abul Ma'ālī respectively. Tāj al-Mulk⁽¹⁾ held office from Ramaḍān 485 till Muharram 486 under his protégé Mahmūd, when after the defeat at Burūjird he was captured and presented before Barkiyāruq who, aware of his excellent parts intended to make him his wazīr. Tāj-al-Mulk on his part tried to reconcile the Nizāmītes, but they were irreconcilable. At the instigation of 'Uthmān he was

(1) Tāj-al-Mulk Abul Ghanāim was a descendant of the Persian wazīr. He was in the service of Sarhank Sautakīn, who was an influential amir of the Saljūqīd empire. On the recommendation of Sautakīn, Malikshah appointed him as household steward and put him in charge of the Dīwāns of Tughrā and Inshā. Subsequently he poisoned the mind of Malikshah against Nizām-al-Mulk. At this time Majd al-Mulk was the Mustaufī and Abu Rīda was the 'Ārid of the jund; both of them joined Tāj-al-Mulk in his intrigue against the old Nizām-al-Mulk. So on the final fall of Nizām-al-Mulk when Tāj-al-Mulk became the chief wazīr, his lieutenants were included in the cabinet and were given important portfolios. (Bundārī 58-59.) p. 136.

Rāwandī is wrong in putting al-'Ārid after Abū Rīdā. He thus confuses the partisan of Tāj-al-Mulk with that of Nizām al-Mulk, as is quite clear from Bundārī. In order to avoid further confusion their names are given in full with their respective designations. Kamāl al-Daulah Abū Rīdā Fadl Allā b Md and Sharf al-Mulk Abu Sa'd Md b Mansūr b Md were in charge of Dīwāns of Inshā and Tughrā and Zimām and Istifā respectively in the ministry of Nizām-al-Mulk; and they were superseded by Sadīd-al-Mulk Abul Ma'ālī al-Mafdal b 'Abd al-Rizzaq b 'Umar al-'Ārid and Majd-al-Mulk Abul Fadl Qummī. (B.56).

assassinated in Muharram 486. The limbs of his body were separated and one of his fingers was sent to Baghdād (I.A.89).

Then 'Izz-al-Mulk b Nizām al-Mulk became the wazīr of Barkiyāruq. He was, however, succeeded after his death at Mawsil by his brother Mu'ayyid al-Mulk in Dhūl Hijjah 487/1094. 'Izz al-Mulk was worthless and addicted to drinking. Mu'ayyid was the only redeeming ^{character} of this series of wazīrs after his father. His full name was Abū Bakr 'Ubaidallah. He was equally gifted in both the arts of the sword and of the pen. (B78). He was probably the most talented man of his time and the ablest of the sons of the famous Nizām-al-Mulk. He tried to put the empire on a sound basis and to restore order in the midst of chaos. On his appointment he issued an appeal to the amirs of 'Irāq and Khurāsān and they readily responded to his call. The imperial army and finance increased and Barkiyāruq's position became firm. But Mu'ayyid was dismissed and imprisoned⁽¹⁾ within less than a year through the intrigue of Majd-al-Mulk Balāsānī,⁽²⁾ his colleague, Zubaidah Khātūn, the Sultan's mother and Fakhr-al-Mulk, his brother. The wazīr was, of course, imprudent in incurring the Sultan's displeasure by advising him to desert his mother Zubaidah, on account of

(1) Bundārī 80.

(2) After the battle of Dashlū, Balāsānī hastened from Rayy to Isfahān and courted the favour of Zubaidah Khātūn, which was easily won. He then arrested Ustād 'Alī, the Mustaufi, and blinded him. Bundārī 79.

her loose character, thus affording his jealous colleague Balāsānī and his discontented brother Fakhr, who was deprived of his late father's jewellery, an opportunity of revenge and retaliation. Bribery and corruption played their part and the young Sultan not only lost the services of his efficient wazīr, but also created a formidable enemy of him. Fakhr-al-Mulk thus secured the Wāzīrate for himself, but he was a puppet in the hands of the ambitious Majd-al-Mulk.⁽¹⁾

The death of Majd al-Mulk will fully illustrate the administrative weakness of the Saljūqid system during this period. When the murder of the great amīrs by the Bātinīs became frequent they gave out that he had set them to do the same. This tense feeling was further intensified by the assassination of Bursuq in 492/1098-9. The sons of Bursuq, Īlghāzī, Aqburi and others accused him of this assassination and they consequently deserted the Sultan. Barkiyāruq had to proceed to Zanjān on account of the march of Md against him. At this critical juncture the amīrs took the opportunity and sent the Amīr Ākhur, Bulkābak, ^{and} Tughayāruq b yazan to the sons of Bursuq, inviting them to join with them in demanding the surrender of Majd-al-Mulk from the Sultan. Accordingly, the sons of Bursuq came and wrote to the Sultan to that effect from Sabjas, a town near Hamadān, and the entire army sided

(1) Bundari 79.

with them. But Barkiyāruq refused to surrender his wazīr, whereupon Majd-al-Mulk wrote to him to conciliate the amīrs by putting him to death himself, because if the mob were to kill him, as they actually did, the prestige of the Sultan's government would be lowered in addition in the eyes of the people. His head was sent to Muāyyid al-Mulk. Even after the murder of Majd al-Mulk the amīrs betrayed Barkiyāruq; the 'askar robbed him of his property and that of his mother and followers and went over to Md. So he had to return to Rayy with only two hundred horsemen.⁽¹⁾

Majd al-Mulk was succeeded by 'Abdal-Jalīl Dihstānī, who was wazīr from Šafar 493 till Šafar 495. He was also incompetent and tyrannical in the version of Bundārī. This is apparently due to the personal jealousy of Khālid Anūshirwān, who is naturally vindictive to his political opponents, as is evidenced by his bitter satires hurled at them throughout the pages of his book. But he found an excellent apologist in Ibn al-Athīr,⁽²⁾ who certifies that he was a generous and good man; and the people did not like him simply because of the fact that he accepted the wazirate at a time when there was no constitutional government. The treasury of the Sultan being empty he had to take recourse to questionable means which made him unpopular. He exacted 50,000 dinars from the

(1) I.A. 120.

(2) p. 139.

Caliph, 30,000 dinars from Ibn Sulaiḥah, Qādi of Jabalah, the fugitive refugee at Baghdād, (1) and also extorted money from the inhabitants of Baghdād. (2) While Barkiyāruq was leaving Baghdād at the approach of Md and Sanjar in Dhūl Hijjah 494/1101, his followers plundered the villages en route. This, perhaps, aroused public feeling against the wazīr. (3) Dahstānī was, however, specially favourable to the merchant class. Ibn-al-Athīr narrates a long story of his trading integrity. (4) He was assassinated at the gate of Hamadān by a Bātinī on 12 Ṣafar 495/1101. (5)

Khatīr Abu Mansūr Maibudhī, the traitor-wazīr of Md, was unexpectedly raised to the position of a wazīr. He betrayed his own master at the siege of Isfahān where he was put in charge of a gate which he left in the dark of night, in accordance with a previous promise given to Barkiyāruq while he was at Rayy. Yanāl b Anūshtakīn, an amīr of Barkiyāruq's party, reminded him of his words which had induced them to come to Rayy from Isfahān and to undertake all the trouble of besieging a fortified city. (6) He even deceived his new ally, Barkiyāruq, by fleeing to Maibudh and taking shelter there in his castle which was besieged by the army of Barkiyāruq. He was forced to surrender and solicit quarter. While he was being carried to the main army on a mule with pack-saddle, he received the letter of the Sultan granting him safety and the

(1) I.A.129. (2) Ibid.127. (3) Ibid.128. (4) Ibid.139.

(5) I.A.139. It is also narrated that he was murdered by a red-haired youth in revenge for his master, Abu Saīd, the blacksmith whom the wazīr put to death in the preceding year.

(6) Ibid.140.

news of the murder of Dahstānī. On his arrival at the Sultan's camp, Barkiyāruq presented him with a robe of honour and made him wazīr. He ^{was} also worthless and Bundārī quotes a satirical verse on him which runs as follows:- "A wazīr sunk in fat and flesh, having no intelligence and understanding; if he wears white he is like unto cotton and if he wears black he looks like a black hillock."⁽¹⁾ He further laments the lack of selective power in the Sultan regarding his wazīrs, while he was careful in selecting even his hunting dogs.⁽²⁾

Two other wazīrs, Sa'd-al-Mulk⁽³⁾ and Ahmad b Nizām-al-Mulk were also incompetent. The former was put to death on

(1) p. 95.

(2) p. 94.

(3) Khālid Anūshirwān gives an entirely different story about Sa'd-al-Mulk. According to him Sa'd was a competent wazīr and so long as he was wazīr he performed his duties with full credit. He was a bitter enemy of the Bātinīs. He arranged the attack of the fort of Shāhdiz (Royal fort) which was situated on a hillock in Isfahān, and was the headquarters of the Bātinī rebel chief, Ibn 'Attāsh. He also conquered the fort of Khaulanjan, near Isfahān. But 'Abdūllah al Khaṭībī, the 'raīs' of Isfahān, maligned him to the Sultan, alleging that he was a Bātinī, although in all other respects he was good and sincere. So Sultan Md arrested him and through the importunity and tactics of al-Khaṭībī he was imprisoned and later on crucified with some of the chiefs of the Secretariat. Anūshirwān further says that when Sa'd became aware of the intrigue of al-Khaṭībī he also tried to counteract it by producing some letters that were exchanged between al-Khaṭībī and Ibn 'Attāsh in the beginning of the latter's activities. So he sent a man to Ibn 'Attāsh with a letter and some presents to have those letters, but his letter was intercepted by the guard of the fort and handed over to the Sultan, who produced it as an evidence against Sa'd. Khālid Anūshirwān had a close personal contact with Sa'd, as he says in the beginning of this version; so his account is probably to be preferred to anyone else's.
B. 83-85.

on account of his Bātinī heresy, together with four of his chief supporters; his property was confiscated and his body was impaled on the gate of Isfahān; (1) the latter was selected simply because of the reputation of his father. Khatīr al-Mulk was also again associated with him in the working of the wazīrate. But their dual control proved a failure and Khalid Anūshirwān was asked to officiate for them when Khatīr was arrested and imprisoned. (3) Then the nobles and amīrs advised the Sultan to import a competent wazīr from the house of the Caliph: accordingly Rabīb al-Daulah was summoned from Baghdād to Isfahān and appointed wazīr. (4)

In other fields of civil administration too, we find similar inefficiency and instability owing to the civil war between the rival political factions. The situation is well illustrated by the frequent changes of the holders of the office of Shihna (5) the military governor who was mainly responsible for the preservation of law and order in the chief cities of the empire. We may mention, for example, the instance

(1) (I.A. 183)

(2) Ibid. 183-184. Bundārī 88.

(3) Bundārī. 99-100, 106

(4) Ibid. 106. According to I.A. Ahmad was dismissed in 504/1109-10 and Khatīr succeeded him.

(5) Under him was the 'naqib' who was the actual administrator of the department corresponding to the present permanent secretaries of state or administrative heads. I.A.99. Māwardī 93.

of the shihnahs of Baghdād during this period. At the time of the death of Malikshah, Sa'd al-Daulah Kūharain was the Shihnah of Baghdād, but Barkiyāruq soon dismissed him in 486/1093 and confiscated his fiefs on account of his treason in assisting the rebel Tutush. Yalbarād succeeded him, both in the shihnahship of Baghdād and in ^{his} fiefs. (1) Again, in Rajab 487/1094 we find Aytakīn Jab, the shihnah of Tutush establishing his jurisdiction by driving out Yalbarād, who was, however, put to death by Barkiyāruq himself in the very year of his appointment after his return from Daqūqa, for slandering the mother of the Sultan. (2) In Ṣafar 488/1095 Yūsuf b Abaq, the Turkmen, was sent as shihnah by Tutush with a horde of Turkmens, but he was refused admittance into the city. On the arrival of Sadaqah from Hillah he retired to Tarīq Khurāsān and plundered Bājsarā. Then again on the return of Sadaqah to Hillah he came back to Baghdād and intended to plunder and massacre the inhabitants in reprisal, but one of his amīrs dissuaded him. (3) In the meantime the news of the defeat and death of Tutush reached him, so he at once left Baghdād and came to Mawṣil and thence to Aleppo, where he was killed in Muharram 489/1095 by Majan, the Ra'īs al-ahdāth (popular leader). (4) Then ʿIlghāzī was appointed shihnah by Sultan Md; during his term of office Kumashtakīn Qaisarī was sent by Barkiyāruq as shihnah in

(1) Ibid. 92. He was appointed by Alp Arslān, I.A. 122.

(2) Ibid. 93.

(3) I.A. 101.

(4) Ibid. 105

Rabi' I 496/1102, but he had to vacate Baghdād on 12 Rabi' II of the same year, at the intervention of Ṣadaqah and the Caliph.⁽¹⁾ After the treaty between Barkiyāruq and Md, Īlghāzī transferred his allegiance to Barkiyāruq, for which he was abused by Ṣadaqah.⁽²⁾ Perhaps as a consequence of this wavering allegiance, in Sha'ban 498/1105 Sultan Md appointed Qasim al-Daulah Aqsunqur Bursuqi, who remained his constant companion in all the battles, shihnah over 'Irāq.⁽³⁾ He was, however, superseded in 502/1108-9 by Mujāhid al-Dīn Bahrūz, who rendered valuable services to Sultan Md by realising the monies exacted from Abul Qasim Husain, the treasurer, and Abul Faraj, the son of Ra'is al-Ruāsā and repairing the government houses.⁽⁴⁾

The head of the police in each town was called Sāhib al-Shurṭah (Prefect of Police). In 487 we find Sāhib al-Shurṭah Yaman appearing at Nahr Tābiq after it had been completely burnt down in the communal riot between its inhabitants and those of the Irjā Gate (Bāb al-Irjā). He killed a concealed fugitive and thus became unpopular, so he was dismissed on the third day.⁽⁵⁾ The police force under him was semi-military in organisation like ^{the} modern 'gendarmes'. Probably he was in charge of what Māwāzī mentions as Watayat al-Mazālim (the criminal department).⁽⁶⁾ For purely civil purposes, however,

(1) I.A. 148.

(2) Ibid. 178.

(3) Ibid. 165.

(4) Ibid. 199.

(5) I.A. 98.

(6) p. 73; the sovereign himself or his representative normally heard the cases.

there was another police force under the Muhtasib or Wālī al-Hisbah (inquisitor), an old office whose continuance is shown, for example, by the appointment in Ramadān 501/1108 of Qādi Abul 'Abbas Ibn Raṭābi as Muhtasib of Baghdād. (1)

On the judicial side the head of the department was the chief justice (Qādi-al-Qudāh), under whom were many judges (Qādis) in each province. Their various functions have been summarised by H.F. Amedroz (2) from Māwardī. (3) In addition to their normal judicial functions the chief justice and judges played also, during this period of civil war, an important part as intermediaries between the rival sultans and sometimes between the Sultan and the Caliph too. In Rabi' II 497/1104 Sultan Barkiyāruq sent Qādi Abul Muzaffar and Qādi Abul Faraj Ahmad to his brother Muḥammad to negotiate a settlement. (4) In Rabi' II 501/1107 the Sultan sent the chief justice, Abu Sa'id Hārāwī to Şadaqah to assure him of his goodwill and to invite him to join a holy war against the crusade's, which was, however foiled by the evil influence of Şadaqah's rash general Sa'id. The Caliph also sent him to Şadaqah, afterwards, with the terms of agreement from the Sultan. (5)

The 'Ra'īs' in each town resembled the modern mayor and acted on ceremonial occasions such as the coronation of a new Sultān. Abū Muslim, the Ra'īs of Rayy put the golden crown on

(1) I.A. 191.

(2) The Office of Kadi in the Ahkām Sultāniyyah of Māwardī J.R. A.S. July 1910 also published separately.

(3) pp. 61-73.

(4) I.A. 154.

(5) I.A. 187

Barkiyāruq's head on his accession to the throne.⁽¹⁾ The Mustawfi was the chief accountant corresponding to the modern chancellor of the exchequer or financial administrator. During the ministry of Sa'd al-Mulk, Zain al-Mulk Abu Sa'd b Hindū was the Mustawfi of Sultan Md. He was extravagant and taxed the people heavily and took away their property unjustly. After the death of Sa'd al-Mulk he was arrested on charges of corruption and imprisoned for many years. His property was confiscated and his houses were plundered.⁽²⁾

The 'wakīldar' was the courier between the Sultan and the wazīr. His rank was higher than that of the ordinary Chamberlain (Hājib). Amīrī Qazwīnī called Zakī was appointed wakīldar by Sa'd al-Mulk without having any regard to his qualifications and competence. He was originally a merchant, so he was ignorant of the manners of the Court. All the courtiers, and even the Sultan ^{himself,} were offended by his rudeness, and Sa'd al-Mulk himself had to suffer for him.⁽³⁾ ~~May,~~ Even the secretaries and scribes of this period were, generally speaking, men of no consequence and qualifications. Khālid Anūshirwān rightly laments their lack of education in the following anonymous verse: "Woe for the time, it has brought wonders, branches of knowledge and manners have been effaced; it has brought forth scribes whom, had I my way, I would have sent back to elementary schools." ⁽⁴⁾

(1) Rāwandī 140-141.

(2) Bundārī, 85. Rāwandī, 140, Barthold 27.

(3) Bundārī, 86.

(4) Ibid. 93.

The sultanate,^{as} a political institution distinct from the caliphate, was created when the 'Abbasid power was on the wane, to accommodate the ambition of the most prominent provincial rulers by delegating to them temporal powers and reserving to the Caliphs only the religious supervision. Mahmūd of Ghaznah was, perhaps, the first person to assume the title of Sultan in this sense.⁽¹⁾ But the jurisdiction of Caliph and Sultan became coterminous for the first time in the Saljūqid empire, and as there was no clear line of demarcation between the two fields of temporal and religious matters in Islam, the two jurisdictions necessarily overlapped.⁽²⁾ The Caliph's all-important function, it seems, was the insertion of the legitimate Sultan's name in the *Khutbah* after his own name. This can safely be inferred from the eagerness of each of the rival claimants to the sultanate to have his authority legalized by the Caliph during the unending civil war after the death of Malikshah. Turkān *Khātūn*,⁽³⁾ Tutush,⁽⁴⁾ Barkiyāruq⁽⁵⁾ and Md⁽⁶⁾ all wanted to have their power duly authorised by the Caliph. If they could not enforce their will by request, some of them even took recourse to the questionable means of intimidation.

(1) Nizām al-Mulk 44. 'Utbī. I.A. Margin p.19. Gardizī - 62-63.

(2) Samarqandī. 11.

(3) Yazdī 72. I.A. 159. Malikshah b Barkiyāruq's *Khutbah*.

(4) I.A. 91.

(5) I.A. 94.

(6) Ibid. 119, 122.

Nay, in times of high political tension the rival sultans and even amīrs arrogated to themselves the right to insert the name of whomsoever they liked in the Khutbah.⁽¹⁾

Regarding the relations of the Saljūqid Sultans during this period with the Caliphate of Baghdād, Dr. A.H. Siddīqī's thesis "Caliphate and Kingship in Medieval Persia", especially the chapter on "Caliphate and Sultanate", covers the ground fairly well.⁽²⁾ It is, therefore, proposed here simply to supplement it with a few new facts shedding more light on the matter. During this period the Caliph had no temporal control over any part of the empire except the dubious dual administration of Baghdād itself, which was a necessary corollary of the absence of the Sultan from the metropolis of Islām. At Baghdād the Shihnah was the representative of the Sultan, responsible for the preservation of law and order in the city.⁽³⁾ But when he exceeded his power and oppressed the people, the Caliph

(1) As was done by Tutush after the conquest of Raḥbah in 486/1093 (I.A. 91) and by Ṣadaqah in substituting Mā's name for Barkiyāruq's in 494 (I.A.127) by Yanal at Rayy (I.A.147) by Turkan (I.A. 92).

(2) pp. 90-141.

(3) For civil and revenue affairs of Baghdād the Sultan used to appoint an 'Amīd, who was the head of the Chancery or correspondence department (Dīwān al-Rasā'il) I.A. 172. Gibb, 8. 'Az Abul Mahāsin was appointed 'Amīd of Sultan Mā by his wazīr Mu'ayyad in 493. I.A. 124. Abul Ma'ālī Mafḍal b 'Abd al-Razzāq and Ilghāzī were appointed tax-collector and shihnah respectively of Baghdād by Sultan Mā in 495/1101. I.A. 136.

invariably used to intervene in the matter. In Rajab 487/1094 Aytakīn Jab, the Shihnah of Baghdād, sent his brother to punish the insolent inhabitants of the Basrah Gate which was entirely burnt down under instructions from him. The naqīb Turad al-Zainabī had a secretary called Ibn Sinān who was murdered, so the naqīb requisitioned a new secretary from the shihnah to take charge of the administration. The shihnah sent his own hājib Muḥammad, but the insurgent inhabitants stoned even him. The hājib returned to his master, the shihnah, and reported the matter, whereupon a punitive expedition was at once dispatched to restore law and order in the distracted area, as is the primary duty of every government. The inhabitants of Karkh were too greedy to miss this opportunity of fishing in troubled waters; they readily joined the expedition, which was already overcrowded. Arson and loot had free play: when one side revels in lawlessness the other side is not expected to play the lamb. So excess on the part of the executive was a natural consequence of the insubordination of the inhabitants. Yet Caliph Muqtadi ordered restraint and cessation and the shihnah obeyed his order. (1) The Caliph similarly interfered with Īlghāzī in Rajab 495/1102 through the chief justice and Alkiya al-Harrās, the teacher of Nizāmiyah, and prevented him from sacking the west bank of Baghdād. (2)

(1) I.A. 90.

(2) Ibid 140.

The Caliph, having no army of his own, had to depend upon the troops of the Sultān and amīrs, as we find Caliph Mustazhir appealing to Ṣadaqah in order to prevent the oppression of Yanāl at Baghdād after the failure of his request through Abul Hasan Dāmaghānī, the chief justice. Ṣadaqah accordingly reached Baghdād on 4 Shawwāl 496/1103 and pitched his tent at Najmī. But an agreement being reached, Ṣadaqah left for Hillah, leaving his son Dubais to enforce the fulfilment of its terms. Yanāl subsequently violated the terms, oppressed the people and gave villages as fiefs to his followers. The Caliph again had to requisition the help of Ṣadaqah. This time he sent 1000 horsemen, who marched towards Yanāl with a group of the Caliph's followers (*معه جماعة من أصحابه*) and Īlghāzī, the shihnah of Baghdād. On hearing this, Janāl crossed the Tigris and proceeded to Bājsarā; so the expedition came back without any fighting. (I.A. 147) In Shābān 493/1100 we find Caliph Mustazhir ordering Kamāl al-Daulah Yaman to restore peace and order in the city, as the disorders of the 'Ayyārs (1) went to the extreme in the western part of Baghdād. Kamāl arrested a group of their chiefs and searched for the rest, so they had to flee from the city. (2) In Rabī' II 488/1095 we find the public of

(1) Corporation of robbers, originally Ghāzīs: Barthold 215, 312; Gardizi texts, p.5.

(2) I.A. 124. They were the cause of disorder at Baghdād in 497/1103-4 I.A. 157. They took part in the riot between Īlghāzī and the public of Baghdād in Rajab 495. I.A.140.

Baghdād observing the day of commencing the construction of a wall of the palace as a day of festivity and ceremony by order of 'Amid al-Daulah, the wazīr of the Caliph.(1)

The Sultans had, however, to take a formal oath of allegiance to the Caliph, and the latter thus became involved in the political strife of the period. Although everything was decided by the sword, the Caliph nonetheless gave the finishing touch by his ex post facto legal sanction to the triumphant party. The Caliph's action in fact was tantamount to a modern act of indemnity by which the legislature legalizes an illegal act of the executive. Thus we find that though Mahmūd was de jure Sultan duly recognized by Caliph Muqtadi, yet the latter, replying to the deputation of the rebel Tutush regarding the Khutbah said: "I am waiting the arrival of messengers from the army."(2) Again, Caliph Mustazhir duly invested Barkiyāruq by presenting him with the robe of honour through his wazīr, 'Amid al-Daulah, and by delivering the Khutbah in his name under the title of Rukn al-Dīn (the pillar of religion) on Friday 14 Muharram 487/1094. But in the very same year the same Caliph delivered the Khutbah in the name of the rebel Tutush after his victory over Barkiyāruq at the instance of Fakhr-al-Mulk and Aytakīn Jab.(3) He acted similarly in

(1) I.A. 104. In Jumada I 485/1092 we find him taking a prominent part in extinguishing the fire of Baghdād by his untiring efforts. I.A. 90.

(2) Ibid. 91.

(3) Ibid. 96.

the case of the rebel Md by delivering the Khutbah in his name under the title of "the Refuge of the World and Religion", on Friday 17 Dhul Hijjah 492/1099 at the request of Sa'd al-Daulah Kūharain.⁽¹⁾ The whole affair was stage-managed like a farce. In the following year we find the puppet Caliph again delivering the Khutbah in Barkiyāruq's name on Friday (~~Mud~~ Safar) two days before the latter's arrival at Baghdād.⁽²⁾ The Caliph sent a sealed decree to Sultan Md at the Sultan's palace at Baghdād, guaranteeing him the redress of the misbehaviour of Barkiyāruq and his party and congratulating him on his august visit with his brother Sanjar, and the Khutbah was again automatically delivered in his name.⁽³⁾ Nay, we sometimes find the Caliph actively inciting one party against the other. After the departure of Md from Baghdād, news reached the Caliph that Barkiyāruq had slandered him at Wāsīt in the presence of his nobles. So he sent after Md and brought him back to Baghdād, narrated to him the whole story, declared his intention to march with Md against Barkiyāruq, whereupon Md said: "There is no need of ^{the} Commander of the Faithful's march, I alone am strong enough for this pleasant task."⁽⁴⁾

The Caliphate being a religious institution, the wazīrs of the Caliph were often made responsible for the inconsistency

-
- (1) I.A. 119.
 (2) Ibid. 121.
 (3) Ibid. 128.
 (4) Ibid. 136.

and illegal acts of the Caliph. The English legal maxim 'the king can do no wrong' was perhaps practised in those early days. 'Amid-al-Daulah b Jahir, the wazir of Caliph Mustazhir was imprisoned by Barkiyaruq apparently for the political reason of delivering the Khutbah in Md's name. The wazir further had to pay Barkiyaruq 160,000 dinars as arrears of annuity due from him and his father, who had been the walis of Diyar Bakr and Mawsil during the reign of Malikshah. (1) He was again made the victim of the wrath of Sultan Md, perhaps for the same political offence of delivering the Khutbah in Barkiyaruq's name. This time he was dismissed and imprisoned together with his brothers. He had to pay a fine of 25,000 dinars at the instance of Aaz Abul Mahasin, who was specially deputed to Baghdad for this purpose by Mu'ayyid, the wazir of Md. (2) The wazirs of the Caliph, besides, were often dismissed and appointed under instructions from the Sultan, as was done in the case of Majd al-Din Ibn Mutṭalib who was, however, afterwards restored to his office with the permission of Sultan Md on conditions of justice, good behaviour and non-employment of any of the protected people (*اصول الرعية*) in the state service. (3) Sometimes Caliph's wazirs were appointed Sultan's wazirs and vice versa. (4)

(1) I.A. 122.

(2) Ibid. 124.

(3) Ibid. 191.

(4) Sadīdal-Mulk, Sultan's wazir was appointed Caliph's wazir (I.A. 151), while Rabīb Abu Mansūr, Caliph's wazir, was appointed Sultan's wazir (I.A. 209). Bundari 106

CHAPTER IV

Religious Opposition: Economic Factors

On the purely religious side, we find that Sectarianism was one of the curses of the Saljūqid empire. The decline of the strong central government facilitated the promotion and propagation of the subversive Batini heresy, which in its turn still more weakened those at the head of the State by murdering the political geniuses of the time. The fidais, who were the lowest in the order of the Ismā'īlīs, were so fanatical and so rash that they even held their own lives very cheaply and death never scared them. Mothers used to weep for grief whenever they found that their sons returned home safely after the accomplishment of murders allotted to them.⁽¹⁾ Their first political victim was the famous Nizām al-Mulk himself, who was approached by a Dailamī boy in the guise of a plaintiff, after his breakfast in the evening of 10 Ramadān 485/1092. The boy murdered him with a knife and while he was fleeing, stumbled on the rope of the tent at Nihāwand, consequently he was caught and killed there and then.⁽²⁾ In Safar of 490/1097 they murdered all on a sudden 'Abdur Rahmān Sumairamī, the wazir of the mother of Barkiyāruq, but this time the assailant was also put to death afterwards.⁽³⁾ In the end of Ramadān 493/1100 two Batinis

(1) Browne. vol ii. p.209

(2) I.A. 84. According to I.Q. 121, the murder took place at Hamadan and the assailant escaped. Bundari (59) gives no details.

(3) I.A. 112.

assassinated Amīr Bulkābak Sarmaz, the Shihnah of Isfahan, in the palace of Sultan Md at Isfahān. One of them escaped and the other was killed. Bulkābak always used to wear a coat of mail and was never without a large bodyguard, as he was very alarmed by the Bātinī atrocities. This day he entered the palace with a small bodyguard and neglected to wear his coat of mail, thus the Bātinīs were given a good chance.⁽¹⁾ In the year 499/1105-6 Abul 'Ala Sa'id Abu Muhammad, Qādi of Nīshāpūr was murdered by a Bātinī in the cathedral mosque of Isfahān.⁽²⁾ Abul Muzaffar b al-Khajandī was murdered by an 'Alid Bātinī at Rayy as soon as he left the chair after preaching a sermon in 497/1103-4.⁽³⁾ Under the year 500/1105 Ibn al-Athīr mentions the murder of Fakhr-al-Mulk, the eldest son of Nizām-al-Mulk,⁽⁴⁾ by a Bātinī, with a long fanciful story of his dream. He was fasting on 10 Muharram and in the afternoon he left his room intending to go to the female quarter when he heard the touching cry of a plaintiff, saying: "Muslims are gone, there is none to remove an oppression and to take by the hand one oppressed." So he sent for him and the man handed over to him a letter. While he was pondering over it, the Bātinī dispatched him at the age of sixty-six with a knife. The murderer was arrested

-
- (1) I.A. 125. This and the murders of Arghūsh, Kumash the Nizāmite slaves, Md's father-in-law and other prominent partisans of Md were imputed to Barkiyāruq. I.A. 133.
- (2) I.A. 173.
- (3) Ibid. 153.
- (4) His full name is Abul Muzaffar 'Alī, he was the wazīr of Barkiyāruq; after his dismissal he went to Nīshāpūr and was appointed wazīr by Sanjar b Malikshah. I.A. 174.

and taken before Sanjar, to whom he deposed against the nobles of the Sultan, falsely alleging that they had set him to commit the murder. The persons named, though innocent, were put to death along with the Bātinī. The story clearly illustrates the shrewdness and sagacity of the Bātinīs and shows how they used to decimate their enemies, even by their very deaths. (1)

In Ṣafar 502/1108 they murdered 'Ubaidullah b 'Ali, the Qādi of Isfahān, at Hamadān on Friday, when one 'Ajamiī penetrated to him in the midst of his followers and did away with him. The Qādi was a bitter antagonist of this sect and used to wear a coat of mail out of fear. In the same year on the day of 'Īd al Fiṭr, Sa'īd b 'Abd al-Rahmān, Qādi of Nīshāpūr, was assassinated by a Bātinī, who was also put to death. (2)

In the same year in Muḥarram, Ibn-al-Athīr records the unnatural death of 'Abdāl Wāhid, the Shaffīte jurist of Rūyān in Tabaristān. Although Browne ^{mentions} his name as one of the victims of the Bātinīs, (3) it is not quite clear from the text of the source where ~~simply~~ the word 'qataf' is used without any further (4) indication.

(1) I.A. 175.

(2) Ibid. 199.

(3) Vol. 2. p. 311.

(4) I.A. 200. According to Yazdī, Sultan Barkiyāruq's assailants were also Bātinīs. He uses the same words (سيرة قتال) for the murder of Nizām-al-Mulk also. p. 66 and 76.

The political factions often employed the Bātinīs as their instrument in clearing the field of their opponents. The first instance is the murder of Nizām al-Mulk which was arranged at the direction of Tājal-Mulk, his rival colleague.⁽¹⁾ The second is the murder of Janāh al-Daulah, the lord of Hims, by three Persians belonging to the Bātinīyah at the cathedral mosque in 496/1102-3.⁽²⁾ They were commissioned by al-Hakīm al-Munajjim, apparently at the instigation of Rudwān, who was in open enmity with him.⁽³⁾ The third case is the murder of Mawdūd in Rabī' I 507/1113 at the cathedral mosque of Damascus, while he was walking in the courtyard of the mosque, having his hand in the hand of Tughtakīn after the prayer. A Bātinī struck him, wounding him in four places and he was at once taken to the house of Tughtakīn, who attempted in vain to break his fast. Mawdūd died on the same day, the Bātinī also was killed and his head was taken for identification, but nobody could identify him, so his body was burnt down perhaps as an exemplary punishment, but more probably lest he should divulge the secret, as was done by Macbeth under similar circumstances to the sleeping grooms of the murdered Duncan. Tughtakīn was suspected of complicity in the plot, not only by Sultan Md against whom he sided with Īlghāzī, both of them allied with the Franks, but

(1) Yazdī. 65-66.

(2) Gibb. pp. 57-58. I.Q. 142.

(3) I.Q. 133. 'Umari f 92.

also by the crusading King of the Franks, who wrote a letter to Tughtakīn stating that a nation whose 'amid was killed in the house of their Lord on their Sabbath day should be destroyed by God.⁽¹⁾ The last recorded case of this period is the murder of Ahmadil b Ibrāhīm b Wahsudan, the wālī of Marāghah, in the palace of the Sultan at Baghdād in the beginning of Muharram 510/1116. While Ahmadil was sitting by the side of Tughtakīn, who was, perhaps, the real object of murder, a Bātinī came, [^]in accordance [^]with their usual tactics, in the guise of a weeping oppressed man with a letter in his hand. He requested Ahmadil to hand over the letter to Sultan Md. But as soon as he took the letter from his hand the Bātinī struck him with a knife. Ahmadil drew him down and sat on him; at this stage another Bātinī Rafiq dashed forward, but Ahmadil killed them both, then a third Rafiq came forward and killed Ahmadil.⁽²⁾ Though the target was missed and Ibn-al-Athīr says that the doubt of Tughtakīn and those present was dispelled by the fact that the assailants were Bātinīs at whose audacity they were wondering, yet the practice was more in consonance with the past record and personal philosophy⁽³⁾ of Sultan Md. He practised a similar trick in getting rid of Amir Ayāz on 13 Jumada II 498/1105 after his apparent reconciliation with him.⁽⁴⁾

(1) I.A. 209. There is also another version in I.A. stating that the Bātinīs did it on their own account as they were afraid of Maudūd.

(2) Ibid. 217.

(3) Samarqandī. 45.

(4) Ibid. 161.

The Batinis occupied by force or fraud many mountain fortresses of the empire⁽¹⁾ and established a rule of terror throughout the country, so much so that even the wazirs and other high officials of the state were in constant danger of loss of life. So as a precautionary measure they obtained permission from the Sultans to appear before them with a coat of mail under their ordinary civil dress,⁽²⁾ while some of them used to carry their winding sheets with them wherever they went.⁽³⁾ The derivation of the very word assassin from 'Hashishin' may serve to describe their horrible character.⁽⁴⁾ They also took a prominent part in the unending civil war after the death of Malikshah. Thus we find Barkiyāruq being accused of inclining towards the Bātinīs by the partisans of Md.⁽⁵⁾ Nay, even the Bātinī elements in the army of Barkiyāruq intimidated their religious opponents and were on the verge of a mutiny when Barkiyāruq ordered a ruthless suppression of them. All the Bātinīs of the army who were properly identified were executed. Md b Dushmanziār, the amir of Yazd was the leader of the projected coup d'Etat. He fled, but on the second day he was overtaken by the army of the Sultān, as he had lost his way. His tent was raided and the prepared arms and armour were

(1) Browne II. 204, 316. I.A. 131.

(2) I.A. 199, 125, 133.

(3) Ibid. 120. e.g. Majd al-Mulk Balāsānī.

(4) Chambers's Dict. Encyclo. Brit.

(5) ~~Ibid~~ I.A. 133.

found. The crowd of suspects were taken out into the parade ground and killed. There were killed also a number of innocent men who were not Bātinīs through the instigation of their enemies. (1) In the battle between Saūjar and Barkiyāruq, Amīrdād Habshī b Tūntāq employed 5000 Bātinī foot soldiers. (2) Malik Rudwān was also sympathetic to the Bātinīs who enlisted his favour by deceitful devices and intrigues, but after his death his son Alp Arslān persecuted them at the instance of Ibn Badī, the Raīs of Aleppo. (3)

Besides the Bātinī vandalism many other communal riots took place during this period between the Shīas and the Sunnīs, as well as between the Shafīs and the Haḥbalīs. (4) Many lives and much property were lost in their conflicts and the ultimate result was impoverishment of the population. We may mention a few of them in detail.

In Dhul Hijjah 488/1095 one of the amīrs of Khurāsān mustered a huge army, marched to Nīshāpūr and besieged it. But, fortunately, the inhabitants united together and fought him valiantly, so that after about forty days' siege he had to withdraw his forces in Muharram 489/1095. As soon, however, as the common enemy disappeared the emboldened inhabitants began to dissipate their energy in sectarian riots. Nīshāpūr,

-
- (1) Among them was the son of Kaiqubād, the military governor of Takrīt I.A. 134.
 (2) Ibid. 123.
 (3) Gibb, 145. I.Q. 187-188. I.A. 209.
 (4) I.A. 98.

saved from the clutches of the Khurāsānī Amīr, was turned into a more vicious arena of communal clashes. The Hanafīs and Shafīīs joined hands under their respective leaders Qādī Md b Ahmad b Sa'īd and Abul Qāsim b Imām al-Haramain Abūl Ma'ālī al-Juwainī against the Karramites, who were led by Md Shād. After ~~many~~ many acts of vandalism ^{were committed} on both sides, including the destruction of the Karramite madrasahs, the Hanafīs and the Shafīīs got the upper hand. There was great loss of life in this fratricidal feud. (1)

On Muharram 10, 510/1116 there took place another great sectarian riot at the Mashhad of 'Alī b Mūsā al-Rīdā in Tūs. A certain 'Alid quarrelled with some of the learned jurists of Tūs on that day, which ultimately led to fighting, but the matter was then dropped. Afterwards both parties sought the help of their partisans and the entire inhabitants of Tūs were involved in the riot. Here also, apparently the Sunnīs besieged Mashhad and demolished it. They killed whomsoever they came across and plundered the property of all. Then they dispersed. But the inhabitants of Mashhad became so panic-stricken that they dropped the Khutbah, which is an essential part of the prayer on Fridays, till Adud al-Dīn Faramarz b 'Alī constructed a protective wall in 515/1121. (2)

(1) I.A. 104.

(2) Ibid. 220.

Although details of such sectarian feuds are preserved to us only in a few cases, there is good reason to presume that similar feuds distracted other towns in the Empire as well, and so contributed to a general lowering of ^{the} standard of economic prosperity.

The economic system of the Saljūqs offered little to relieve the growing miseries of a bad situation. They had recourse to ^{an} indiscriminate iqtā' system⁽¹⁾ for ready collection of land revenues, as was done by Lord Cornwallis in 1777, by introducing permanent settlement in Bengal during the decline of the Moghul empire. The contrast between the two systems was that the iqtā' was unstable while the Permanent Settlement of Bengal is still in vogue. Besides, unlike the iqtā', the Permanent Settlement had no military stipulation attached to it; it was a purely civil arrangement while iqtā' made the fief-holders military vassals of the Sultan by requiring them to maintain troops of their own entirely at their own expense, to be utilised by the Sultan in times of war. This device was also made to relieve the imperial treasury of the drain on the upkeep of the armed forces of the state. But this palliative proved a fatal weapon in the hands of the ambitious amirs who

(1) Some of the iqtā's e.g. 'iqtā'-itamlik' were certainly hereditary, as we learn from the letters patent (Manshūr) of Sultān Mā to Zahir al-Dīn Tughtakīn granting him the province of Syria. I.Q. 194.

vied with one another for the privilege of milking the most productive districts. (1) Furthermore, it provided a standing encouragement to rebellion and the foundation of independent principalities. The rivalry between the amīrs has already been dealt with in detail; as regards the independent principalities, mention may be made of the Saljūqs of Rūm and Kirmān as well as that of the dynasty of the Khwārazmshāhs who succeeded the great Saljūqs. (2)

The unhappy empire suffered from many earthquakes of unprecedented violence, which reduced prosperous places to wrecks and ruins during this period. In Jumada II 508/1114 a great earthquake occurred in Syria and Jazīrah, as a result of which Ruhā, Harrān, Sumaisāt, Bālis and other towns became desolate and many people lost their lives under the fall of buildings. (3) In Rabi' II 487/1094 there took place many consecutive earthquakes of longer duration, but there was less destruction. (4)

The visitation of plagues and pestilence was also very common in those days, and famines were not infrequent. These were caused chiefly by serious droughts which laid waste the countryside, or by the excessive floods which totally destroyed the crops. As an illustration of the former we ^{may} mention the

(1) Gibb. 34. See ante p.22

(2) I.A. 110-111.

(3) Gibb. 149. I.Q. 191. I.A. 214.

(4) I.A. 98. I.Q. 127.

great famine of Irāq in 493/1099-1100. The rivers became dry as there was no rain for a long time. Prices rose abnormally high, so much so that one Kurr of wheat was sold for seventy dinars and often even exceeded that. People perished in great numbers, sometimes six dead bodies were carried in a single bier.⁽¹⁾ The latter would be exemplified by the description of the flood of Irāq in 502/1108-9. In April the Tigris rose very high; ^{the} roads being inundated, communications were cut off and the winter and summer crops were drowned. A great famine broke out, the price of one round pad (Kurr) of bran mixed with flour went up to ten Imāmi dīnārs and there was no bread at all. People lived on dates and green broad beans. The inhabitants of Sawād ate nothing during the whole month of Ramaḍān and half of Shawwāl except dry grass and mulberries.⁽²⁾ In 492/1098-9 a terrible famine broke out in Khurāsān which lasted for two years, as the heavy snowfall destroyed the crops completely. It was followed by the pestilence of cholera, of which many people died; the number was so great that burial could not be provided for.⁽³⁾

(1) I.A. 125.

(2) Ibid. 198.

(3) Ibid. 121. Regarding measures to prevent famines the following is the only recorded instance. In 489/1095-6, when the six planets were in the same line, the astrologers predicted a deluge like that of Noah. Then the Caliph Mustazhir summoned Ibn 'Isūn the astrologer, who opined that during Noah's time the seven planets were in the same line and that a city or a place where many people from different countries gathered together might be submerged. The people apprehended Baghdād as falling within the definition; and the dams and weak points on the bank were consequently repaired and strengthened. I.A. 107.

Moreover, these were often the direct result of the depredations of the rapacious warlike bands whom Professor H.A.R. Gibb justly describes as robber-baron amirs.⁽¹⁾ Some of them even practised brigandage as a profession with the connivance of the local wālis. The story of Yāqūti, nephew of Suqman, will make the matter clear. After his release by Karbūqā through the intercession of his grandmother, he stayed near Mārdīn with a view to capturing it from its wāli, the singer of Barkiyāruq, who had already been harassed by the Kurdish brigands. Yāqūti wrote to the Singer wāli in the following words: "We have become friends and I intend to fortify your city in order to prevent the Kurds from ^{attacking} it and I shall plunder other places and thereby gather riches which I shall spend in your city and I shall live in the suburb." Accordingly the wāli permitted him to carry on his plan and he began to plunder from Bāb-i-Khilāt up to Baghdād. Some of the soldiers of the fort also used to accompany him for the sake of booty. He used to honour them and never interfered with them so they confided in him. On a certain day by chance most of the soldiers accompanied him. But when they returned from the raid he gave orders to arrest and imprison them and thus preceded them to the fort and called out to their families to open the gate on pain of death. On their refusal he killed one of them and the panic-stricken residents surrendered the

(1) p. 22.

fort to him. He made it his headquarters and proceeded to Nāsībīn and plundered Jazīrah which was under Jikirmish.⁽¹⁾

Again, the prolonged sieges of prosperous towns by rival amīrs, Fātimid navies, and later by crusaders, impoverished these trade emporia to a very large extent, and the frequency of sieges made their recovery almost impossible. Nay, they often gave rise to temporary famines of great severity.⁽²⁾

In Jumada II 494/1101 we find the army of Saṅjar destroying everything they could lay hands upon at Dāmaghān. The terrified inhabitants took shelter in the fort of Kardkūh. Prices rose high till the people ate corpses of dogs and even human flesh.⁽³⁾ Even the army of Sultan Barkiyāruq ravaged the country on his way from Baghdād to Wāsīt. Abu 'Alī al-Fāriqī the Qādi of Wāsīt had to petition the Sultān repeatedly in order to prevent its being plunder^{ed} by his army in 495/1101. In the same year the army of Md plundered and laid waste Tāriq Khurāsān, where they were temporarily stationed.⁽⁴⁾ Md and Saṅjar sacked Hamadān and exacted money from its wealthy inhabitants; the Raīs of Hamadān alone was fined 100,000 dīnārs.⁽⁵⁾

During the prolonged siege of Isfahān by Barkiyāruq in Jumada I 495/1102 Md drove out from the city the weak and the indigent, so ^{that} the quarters became ^{uninhabited} and provisions ran short

(1) I.A. 163.

(2) I.Q. 127.

(3) I.A. 126.

(4) Ibid. 123, 137. So did the army of Tutush in Rabi' II 487, I.Q. 126, 129. Dhahabī f 94 a.

(5) I.A. 127.

and the people began to eat horses, camels and the like. He exacted money ^{by} force from the inhabitants to satisfy the ever-increasing demand of his troops. Prices ~~rose~~ very high, ten mans of wheat were sold for a dinar, four ritls of meat for a dinar and even 100 ritls of straw for four dinārs; and furniture became cheap for want of customers. (1)

In Rabi' I 496/1102, during the Qaisari tangle, we find Ilghāzī and Suqmān plundering Dujail. "They stayed neither at a large village nor at a small one but ^{they} plundered the properties and spoiled the maidens," says Ibn al-Athīr. (2) The Arabs and Kurds of Sadaqah also ravaged Nahr Malik, but unlike the Turkmens they did not meddle with women. They simply destroyed everything they came across by sword or fire. So the means of living were ruined and prices rose high; the wheat that was sold ten ritls for a qirāṭ became three ritls for a qirāṭ, and every other commodity followed suit. (3)

At the end of 506/1112 we find Baldwin, the Frankish King, consecutively raiding the villages surrounding Damascus and thereby causing a famine in the city. Consequently prices rose high and provisions became scanty. So in Muharram of the following year Maudūd of Mawsil, Tamīrak of Sanjar, Ayāz b Ilghāzī and Tughtakīn of Damascus took concerted action against the crusaders. (4)

(1) I.A. 138. I.Q. 127. Dhah-rabi f 94 a.

(2) I.A. 148.

(3) Ibid. 149.

(4) Ibid. 208. Gibb 132. I.Q. 183-184. According to I.Q. he incessantly raided Bathaniyah one of its districts and as a result the road was intercepted.

Arson and outbreak of fire, in the absence of any fire brigade, were responsible for the desolation of prosperous towns and flourishing villages throughout the empire. In Jumada I 485/1092 a fire broke out at Baghdād in which Nahr al-Māla, 'Aqd al-Hadīd up to Kharbat al-Hirrās and Gate of the Mint, the quarter of money exchangers and florists, together with many inhabitants, were burnt down.⁽¹⁾ In Dhūl Hijjah 501/1108, Kharābah Ibn Jardah was burnt, in which many people perished and uncountable property was destroyed. Some people escaped through a hole which they dug into the wall of the ward, to the cemetery of the Abraz Gate. A group of Jews did not shift anything on account of their Sabbath day. After this there took place many other fires at different quarters, and Ibn-al-Athīr gives a fascinating love story about the origin of these fires which made the inhabitants restless.⁽²⁾ In 510/1116-1117 a great fire broke out in the sheep folds near the Nizāmiyyah College and the woodwork within was burnt down; the fire spread to Salsalah quarter and the sparks flew to the Marātib Gate where some houses were burnt; the library of the Nizāmiyyah was also burnt down, but the books were saved as the jurists shifted them in good time.⁽³⁾

(1) I.A. 90.

(2) p. 191-192. I.Q. says that more than 500 houses were burnt down and the inhabitants became paupers. p. 162.

(3) I.A. 220. Shams al-Dīn, f. 267.

Again, as the Bāṭinīs succeeded in establishing a sort of brigand government within the imperial state, the revenues of the places under the de facto authority of the former were naturally lost to the de jure sovereignty of the latter. This queer kind of rival duplication of jurisdiction led to the abject pauperisation of the population and to the deficiency of the imperial 'exchequer'.⁽¹⁾ So the Sultāns resorted to base means of collecting revenues by imposing illegal customs and excise duties (Mukūs). Malikshah abolished all kinds of taxes that were calculated to be a barrier to the natural flow of commerce and trade in 479/1086.⁽²⁾ Thus we find commerce at its best during the last few years of his reign, with its system of free circulation of bills of exchange from Khurāsān to Antioch. Nizām al-Mulk gave a bill of exchange on Antioch to the ferrymen of the Oxus (Jīhūn) in 471/1078.⁽³⁾ Sultan Md tried to emulate his father in Shābān 501/1108 by abolishing, perhaps momentarily, as was the case before, customs and excise duties, and in commemoration of this 'free trade' policy sign-boards were erected at the central markets of Irāq.⁽⁴⁾ Besides, commerce was stifled by the political unsettlement and unending revolts, although a fresh impetus was given to it by the direct contact of the west with the east through the agency of the Crusaders.. Furthermore, warfare and rebellion being the order

(1) This was the reason of Sultān Md's persecution of the Bāṭinīs in the beginning of his reign 500/1106-7. I.A.181.

(2) I.Q. 118. I.A. 88.

(3) Qazwinī-Tārīkh-i-Guzīdah, 444.

(4) I.A. 191.

of the day, most of the male adults were recruited for fighting in the fields of battle. Thus the factors of production were used as agents of destruction at the whim of the jingoist amīrs and young sultans. Here and there, however, we find some benevolent spirits trying to protest against the prevailing jingoism of the period by offering the rival sultāns and amīrs sound advice for amicable settlements of their differences. But their efforts were foiled by the self-seeking amīrs. We find wazīr A'az Abul Mahāsīn and Amīr Ayāz readily responding to the peace efforts of Amīd Baldaji in 495/1101; and in Jumada II of the same year the treaty was violated by Md through the active help of Amīr Yanāl b. Anūshtakīn, who deserted Barkiyāruq and joined Md after persecuting the Bātinīs of the mountain fortresses. (1)

Owing to the depletion of the imperial treasury, the sultans were often satisfied with a petty sum of money as a share of the brigandage and treachery of the amīrs and their deputies. Thus we find in 495/1101-2, when Sarkhāb b Badr was defeated by Ilqarabli, the former's military governors of Khaftidhkan rebelled against him and occupied it with more than 2,000,000 dīnārs, and when Sultan Barkiyāruq was passing by it, they sent him 200,000 dīnārs. (2)

(1) I.A. 137, 154.

(2) Ibid, 144.

The Sultans even did not shrink from handing over their own officials to their enemies if a handsome price for their heads was offered. According to Rāwandī, (1) Sultan Md sold the head of Abū Hashim, the Raīs of Hamadān for 500,000 dīnārs to his wazīr Ahmad b Nizām al-Mulk. But when Abū Hashim came to know of it he secretly came to the Sultān at Isfahān after a week's journey by a round-about way. He bribed Lala Qaratagīn, a servant of the Sultān, by paying him 10,000 dīnārs in ten purses and thus got admittance to the Sultān at night. Qutlagh Khātūn, the sultan's wife was present and Abū Hashim presented a unique pearl, the like of which was not in the Sultān's possession. After praising the Sultān and shedding tears, Abū Hashim pathetically appealed to the Sultan as a descendant of the Prophet and offered 800,000 dīnārs for the head of Ahmad b Nizām al-Mulk; and the Sultān, being a mammon-worshipper agreed to the proposal. Abū Hashim returned to Hamadān with an officer of the treasury, who brought to the Sultān the stipulated amount within a month. Abū Hashim paid the entire amount out of his own treasury without borrowing or selling anything. This story illustrates that the officers of the State became extraordinarily rich at the expense of the people. (2)

The Sultan did a similar thing with Zain al-Mulk Abū Sa'd, his

(1) Pages 162-165.

(2) Also corroborated by Bundari 89-90 with slight variations. According to (I.A. 200) 700,000; Khālīd Anūshirwān himself was the person deputed to bring the money.

Mustawfi in 506/1112-1113 after his arrival at Isfahān from Baghdād. According to Bundārī he handed over Abū Sa'd to Tuntāsh for 200,000 dīnārs, who took him to Sāwah and crucified him in its street on Friday, and the amīrs made the Sultān forget about the amount which was misappropriated by Ibn al-Kāfī, the officiating wazīr.⁽¹⁾ Ibn-al-Athīr gives a different version.⁽²⁾ According to him Abū Sa'd was handed over to Amīr Kāmyār on account of a grudge between them. When he reached Rayy he mounted Abū Sa'd on a horse with a gold litter, proclaiming that the Sultān had presented Abū Sa'd with a robe of honour for a fixed sum of money. Thus he realised a large amount of money from the family of Abū Sa'd and then crucified him. The motive of his arrest as given by Ibn-al-Athīr was that he ^{frequently} used to talk ill of the Caliph and the Sultān ~~very much~~.⁽³⁾ Besides, the sultāns illegally exacted huge sums from their forlorn subjects in times of distress and allowed the troops to plunder the country in return for their services. Sultān Md exacted 50,000 dīnārs from Mukhtaṣ al-Mulk.⁽⁴⁾ He also took illegal money from Abūl Qāsim and Abūl Faraj in 502.⁽⁵⁾

(1) p. 96.

(2) I.A. 207.

(3) Ibid. 208.

(4) Bundārī, 106-7.

(5) I.A. 199.

PART II

SURVEY OF THE POLITICAL HISTORY (485/1092 - 511/1117)

CHAPTER V

Maḥmūd b. Malikshah's Reign
 Shawwāl 485/1092 - Shawwāl 487/1094

The Saljūqid supremacy was at its zenith during the eighties of the eleventh century. But the famous Nizām al-Mulk whose mild diplomacy and sagacity were responsible for preserving the cordial relations between the Caliph and the Sultan on the one hand, and for maintaining the effective control between the central government and unwieldy wālis on the other, suddenly fell from the favour of the Court.⁽¹⁾ Soon after he was assassinated by a Bāṭinī, near Nihāwand, at the age of ninety-three, and on 10 Ramadān 485/1092 while he was on his way to Baghdād with Malikshah. Whether the Sultan was directly and personally involved in this plot is not certain. That the impertinence and officiousness of the numerous sons and grandsons of the great administrator holding important imperial offices led to the rupture between the Sultan and his wazīr, appears to be beyond doubt.⁽²⁾ Malikshah also followed him to the grave after

(1) It is clear from Bundārī p. 59-60, I.A. p. 84-85 and I.Q. p. 121 that Nizām al-Mulk was not actually dismissed. Rāwandī, Fadl Allāh, Qazwīnī and other Persian historians got the idea of dismissal from the verse of Abū Ma'ālī Nahhās, which might as well mean that the reconstruction of the ministry took place after the murder of Nizām al-Mulk.

(2) I.A. 84.

thirty-five days, (1) at the age of thirty-eight years. Thus was the unhappy realization of the prediction of the enraged and disgraced wazir when he said: "Tell the Sultan on my behalf that the stability of that crown is dependent on this inkpot, and their unity is strength and advantage, but when the one is eliminated the other goes with it." (2) Turkān and Tāj al-Mulk were instrumental both in changing the mind of Malikshah against Nizām al-Mulk and finally bringing about his death. The subject of contention was the heir-apparentship of the Empire. Turkān had been cherishing the hope of raising her infant son, Mahmud to the Sultanate after Malikshah, and Nizām al-Mulk was naturally favourable to Barkiyāruq, the eldest surviving son of the Sultan by another wife. (3) She succeeded, however, by tactics in installing Mahmūd to the Sultanate. (4) Barkiyāruq was taken into custody as a precautionary measure. (5) But when the news of the death of Malikshah became known to the followers of Nizām al-Mulk they rose in arms, rescued him, read the Khutbah

(1) According to I.Q. 121 and Bundārī 59, 33 days. According to Price, 18 days.

(2) I.A. 84-85. Bundārī 59-60.

(3) Bundārī 58-60, Rāwandī 140. Yadzī p. 65-66.

(4) Ibn Abi al-Sarūr f 156. On the rôle of Turkān in this struggle see above page 3.

(5) According to Rāwandī (p.140-141) and Bundārī. p.76, Barkiyāruq was not arrested but the followers of Nizām al-Mulk took him out of Isfahān at night to the direction of Sāwah and Abhah, where they appointed Kumushtagin his 'atābeg'. They ultimately took him to Rayy, made him ascend the throne and Abu Muslim, the Rais of Rayy put the golden crown on his head; and at the gate of Rayy about 20,000 troops gathered round him.

in his name at Isfahān and proclaimed him Sultān. Thus many people gathered round him and a battle took place between the rival forces of Barkiyāruq and Turkān at the end of Dhūl Hijjah 485/1092 near Burūjird.(1)

The army of Turkān was defeated owing to the defection of some of the amīrs who went over to Barkiyāruq. The routed army returned to Isfahān but Barkiyāruq followed them and besieged the town.(2) Tāj al-Mulk took part in this battle. After the defeat he fled to some part of Burūjird, but was caught up later and taken to the army of Barkiyāruq while it was besieging Isfahān. Barkiyāruq, aware of his excellent accomplishments, intended to appoint him wazīr. Tāj al-Mulk on his part tried to reconcile the Nizāmites in vain. At the instigation of ʿUthmān, a Nizāmite slave, he was assassinated in Muharram 486/1093.(3) Turkān, thus being deprived of her wazīr, compromised with Barkiyāruq. But she never gave up her long cherished plan of self-aggrandisement. She then allured Ismāīl b Yāqūtī to rebel against Barkiyāruq.(4) After the sudden death of Ismāīl she again came to terms with Barkiyāruq. Under cover of this false settlement she tried to ally herself with Tutush. This time sudden death put an end to her career of intrigues.(5)

(1) I.A. 89.

(2) Ibid. 89.

(3) Ibid. 89.

(4) Ibid. 92. Rāwandī 141-142.

(5) Ibid. 99. Rāwandī 142.

Tutush was the wālī of Damascus and its neighbouring provinces. As he was proceeding to Baghdād to see his brother and liege lord Malikshah in 485/1092, the news of the Sultan's death reached him at Hit, which he immediately seized, and thence returned to Damascus in order to muster his forces for an attempt to wrestle the sultānate for himself.⁽¹⁾ He tried to occupy Raḥbah and wrote to its wālī to surrender it without success.⁽²⁾ At Damascus he raised a huge army and spent a large amount of money on its equipment for fighting. His intention was first to march to Aleppo, where Qasīm al-Daulah Āqsunqur was the wālī. Seeing the dissension among the sons of his late master, and the incapacity of his own arms to combat the usurper, Āqsunqur joined Tutush and marched with him. He further wrote to Yaḡhisiyān, wālī of Antioch and Būzān, wālī of Ruhā and Harrān to obey Tutush pending the final issue of the forthcoming conflict between the sons of Malikshah. So they also joined hands with Tutush and delivered the Khutbah in his name in their respective provinces. Then they all marched together to Raḥbah and occupied it by capitulation in Muharram 486/1093.⁽³⁾ He restored order in Raḥbah and appointed his own officials.⁽⁴⁾ Afterwards they marched to Naṣībīn, the inhabitants of which were hostile to Tutush, inasmuch as they openly abused him.

-
- (1) I.A. 90.
 (2) I.Q. 122.
 (3) I.A. 91.
 (4) I.Q. 122.

Tutush however besieged it and finally occupied it by force in Safar 486/1093. After a terrible sack of the town it was handed over to Md, the 'Uqailid.(1) The next object of the expedition was Mawṣil, which was in a troubled condition. There were two factions, one supporting the cause of Ṣafia Khātūn and her son 'Alī by her late husband, Sharaf al-Daulah, and the other siding with Md, her stepson. In a battle near Kanāsah 'Alī won the day and occupied Mawṣil, which was, however, soon handed over to her second husband Ibrāhīm on his release by Turkān after the death of Malikshah, who imprisoned him.(2)

Now after the conquest of Naṣībīn, Tutush asked Ibrāhīm to deliver the Khutbah in his name and to grant him safe conduct to Baghdād. The request being refused, a battle took place at Mudayyāf in Rabī' I 486/1093.(3) The parties were unequally balanced, 30,000 men fought for Ibrāhīm while Tutush had only 10,000 men, yet Tutush was victorious because Būzān and Āqsunqur were on his left and right wings respectively. Ibrāhīm and some of the 'Arab amīrs were taken captives and put to death. The property of the 'Arabs - their camels, goats, horses and equipment, were taken as booty. Many 'Arab women committed suicide for fear of ignominious treatment and captivity.(4)

(1) I.A. 91.

(2) Ibid. 91.

(3) According to I.Q., on Sunday the 2nd Rabī' I on the bank of the river Harmas. p. 123.

(4) I.A. 91.

Ibn al-Qalānisi gives a very graphic and pathetic description of the atrocities.(1)

Tutush and the party next marched to Diyār Bakr in Rabi' II of the year and captured Mayāfāriqīn and the entire Diyār Bakr from Ibn al-Marwān and afterwards moved to Adharbaijān.(2) At this time the news of the revolt of Tutush reached Barkiyāruq, who had succeeded in occupying Rayy, Hamadān and the intermediate districts. So he at once dispatched an army against Tutush. When the armies approached one another Āqsunqur and Būzān changed sides in accordance with their projected scheme. Tutush, finding himself unequal to the situation, returned to Syria at the end of Dhūl Hijjah(3) and thus for the time being Barkiyāruq's position became secure.

On his arrival at Damascus Tutush raised a great army and again in 487/1094 marched to Aleppo to capture the Sultanate. This time, however, Āqsunqur and Būzān came out together and marched with Karbūqā, who was sent by Barkiyāruq to oppose Tutush. The parties came into conflict near Nahr Sabain, adjoining Tall al-Sultān at a distance of six farasakhs from Aleppo in Jumada I. Owing to the defection in the camp of Āqsunqur, Tutush won the battle and Āqsunqur was seized and

(1) I.Q. 122.

(2) I.A. 91-92.

(3) I.Q. 124.

put to death.⁽¹⁾ Karbūqā and Būzān took refuge at Aleppo, which was besieged and afterwards handed over to Tutush by the residents of Qal'at al-Sharīf.⁽²⁾ Tutush arrested Karbūqā and Būzān and sent his army to Ruhā and Harrān, the provinces of Būzān, but the army was resisted by the inhabitants. So Būzān was put to death and his head was sent to them and then they surrendered to the army of Tutush. Karbūqā was sent to Homs where he remained in chains till he was released by Rudwān b Tutush after the death of his father.⁽³⁾

Thus being encouraged by this victory, Tutush sought to carry through his plan and marched for further conquests. At this time Barkiyāruq was at Naṣībīn, whence he also marched to stop Tutush's progress. He thus crossed the Tigris at a place above Mawṣil and proceeded to Irbil and thence to the province of Sarkhāb b Badr. He pitched his camp at a distance of nine farasakhs from Tutush's headquarters. Barkiyāruq had only 1000 men, while Tutush had an army of 50,000 strong. Amīr Yāqūb b Abīq, from the side of Tutush, attacked Barkiyāruq, defeated his army and plundered his camp in Shawwāl 487/1094. Barkiyāruq escaped with amīrs Bursuq, Kumushtagīn and Yāruq and journeyed to Isfahān. Maḥmūd ^{was} ~~was~~ naturally favourable to his elder brother and the two brothers embraced each other. But the

(1) I.A. 95-96. Al-Makin f 175.

(2) I.Q. 127.

(3) I.A. 96.

intriguing amīr Unar and Bulkābak was trying to keep the last words of Turkān by capturing Barkiyāruq. They were determined to blind him in order to make him unfit for the sultanate.⁽¹⁾ In the meantime Mahmūd was attacked with small-pox, and the physician, Amīn al-Daulah b. Tilmīdh persuaded the amīrs to postpone the blinding till the recovery of Mahmūd, as they were against Tutush, so that if Mahmūd died they could make Barkiyāruq Sultān. Mahmūd, however, died at the end of Shawwāl 487/1094, aged about seven years and Barkiyāruq became the sole Sultan.⁽²⁾

(1) I.A. 96.

(2) Ibid. 96-97.

CHAPTER VI

The Reign of Barkiyāruq b. Malikshah

Shawwāl 487/1094 - Rabī' II 498/1104

The death of Turkān and of her son Mahmūd, freed Barkiyāruq from his most immediate danger. He could now count on the support of at least a large proportion of the amīrs who had hitherto opposed him on behalf of Mahmūd, and of all those who, for one reason or another, were hostile to Tutush. But in spite of this improvement in his prospects, he was yet far from having secured his position; and by ill fortune he was at this critical juncture incapacitated by an attack of small-pox for some two months. (Dhūl-Qādat and Dhūl Hijjah).⁽¹⁾

(1) Since Mahmūd died "at the end of Shawwāl" and Barkiyāruq was at that time well enough to hold the usual mourning ceremonies. I.A. 97.

Meantime Tutush was continuing his triumphal progress in the north.⁽¹⁾ After the occupation of Harrān and Ruhā, he had secured Mesopotamia, Diyār Bakr and Adharbayjān, by his defeat of Barkiyāruq, and now began to advance into Persia. At Hamadhān the Amīr Ākhur⁽²⁾ at first resisted, but on venturing out to attack and loot Tutush's luggage-train, he was caught and defeated, and saved his life only by surrendering Hamadhān. Tutush now prepared to march on Isfahān direct, hoping to seize the opportunity of Barkiyāruq's illness, and opened a secret correspondence with the amīrs who, uncertain whether Barkiyāruq would recover, thought it prudent to conceal their hostility to him and promised to join his side. Another stroke of good fortune also favoured Tutush for the moment. Fakhr al-Mulk, son of Nizām al-Mulk who, like the other members of his family favoured the cause of Barkiyāruq, fell into his hands at Hamadhān. His life was spared at the instance of Yāghisiyān, who pointed out the advantages of appointing him as wazīr and so gaining the powerful sympathy of the adherents of their house. Added to this, Tutush had brought pressure to bear on the Caliph through his *shihnah* at Baghdād, Aytakīn, and after Barkiyāruq's defeat, had been proclaimed Sultān at Baghdād,⁽³⁾

(1) I.Q. 127.

(2) Amir Ākhur is a title - he was "Master of the Horse" I.A.101

(3) The persistent hostility of the local troops towards him was, however, shown by the reception given to his next *shihnah*, Yūsuf b Abaq, on his arrival in Šafar of the following year. He was refused entry at first and only after defeating the Mazyadite forces at Baqūbā could he force his way in, just before the news of the death of Tutush arrived. I.A. 101.

Barkiyāruq's position thus seemed desperate, and had Tutush carried out his plan of marching directly on Isfahān, there seems little reason to doubt that he would have established himself in the sultanate with the minimum of opposition. Fortunately for Barkiyāruq, however, the opportunity was thrown away by a characteristic display of revengefulness on the part of Tutush.

The Amīr Ākhur, after his surrender of Hamadhān, had made a show of loyal submission to Tutush, and asked permission to proceed to Jurbādhaḡān (half-way between Hamadhān and Isfahān) to prepare forage and provisions for the advance of Tutush's army. Thence he fled to Isfahān, and exposed the situation to Barkiyāruq. Tutush, in revenge, sacked Jurbādhaḡān, and instead of continuing on to Isfahān, turned north-eastwards and occupied Rayy. No reason is alleged for this strange change of plan, though possibly the difficulty of furnishing forage and provisions for a large force in mid-winter may account for it. (1)

Barkiyāruq was thus afforded a breathing-space, which was energetically utilised. His first action on recovery was to counter Tutush's appointment of Fakhr al-Mulk by appointing

(1) According to Ibn al-Athīr's account (p.101), it was from Rayy that Tutush opened communications with the amīrs at Isfahān, but as this episode is expressly placed during Barkiyāruq's illness, it must have taken place in Dhu'l-Qāda, at latest, and in any case it fits in more naturally with Tutush's preparations for the march on Isfahān.

the latter's brother Mu'ayyid al-Mulk as his own wazīr (Dhū'l Hijjah). Mu'ayyid al-Mulk at once opened up communication with the amirs of Irāq and Khurāsān and gained their adhesion to Barkiyāruq.

Thus reassured, Barkiyāruq set out with his small force from Isfahān early in the following month (Muharram 488/1095) and on arrival at Jarbadhagan, halted to await reinforcements. There "troops advanced to join them from every side," until, with an army now swelled to the figure of 30,000 men, according to Ibn Athīr, he felt himself strong enough to take the offensive. Tutush had alienated all sympathies by his harshness and by the ruthlessness with which his army had plundered the country; (1) the troops of Āqsunqur and Būzān still nourished bitter feelings towards him, and he realised that he could not hope to stand a siege in Rayy. (2) Risking all on the issue of the conflict, he marched out towards Barkiyāruq, and at the village of Dashtū, twelve farsakhs from Rayy, battle was joined on 17 Safar. In spite of his own brave stand, his troops were defeated, and in the heat of battle, one of Āqsunqur's men revenged his former master's execution by seizing and decapitating him. (3) The remnants of his officers and troops fled back to Syria, leaving Barkiyāruq undisputed master of the field.

(1) I.Q. 129.

(2) According to I.Q. (127) he had in fact called for his son Rudwān, his deputy in Damascus to join him with reinforcements. I.A. 102.

(3) I.Q. 130. It is also narrated that a slave of Būzān (sic Qurhān) was his assailant. Recueil Hist. Crois. Or. vol. iii. 485 from al-Najūm al-Zāhirah.

Barkiyāruq had now at last vindicated his claim to the sultānate by the disappearance of all serious rivals. It remained to consolidate his position and assert, as far as possible, his control over the territories which had acknowledged the suzerainty of his father. The central provinces, Jibal and 'Irāq, were for the moment quiet, undisturbed by revolts, and al-Mawṣil was recovered (from the governor appointed by Tutush) by the amīrs Karbūqā and Altūntāsh, who acknowledged the suzerainty of Barkiyāruq.⁽¹⁾ The two principal areas from which opposition might be apprehended were, consequently, Khurāsān and Syria.

Although Khurāsān was the cradle of the Saljūqid power, it always remained a somewhat difficult problem for the Great Saljūqs to maintain their hold over it. In the absence of full information, it is difficult to discover in detail the causes of this restiveness, but two factors may generally be discerned. In the first place the extent of the province itself made it necessary for the governor to maintain a very large standing army, while its wealth and the facilities for recruiting Turkish troops from the neighbouring frontier districts supplied him with ready means for doing so. The possession of such large forces formed a standing temptation

(1) See ante p. 21, also I.A. 107.

to assert independence at times of disturbance, when the Sultān was precluded from intervening effectively. It must not be forgotten also that large numbers of Turkmen tribes had entered Khurāsān along with and after the Saljūqids, and though we are badly informed about their pasturage areas and activities, there can be little doubt that, like the Turkmen tribes in other provinces, they were always ready to join in any enterprise which promised warfare and ready loot.

In addition to this external factor, however, there was another arising from the character of the population itself. Their feudal organization, which had been maintained under the Sāmānids, and fighting capacities made them valuable allies, or, on the other hand, redoubtable opponents. This warlike character was even more marked amongst the inhabitants of the large cities, Rayy, Nīshāpūr, Mērv, Balkh, etc., who not infrequently closed their gates in the face of even powerful armies, and forced their rulers to respect their liberties. There were not a few cases when these cities even took the initiative in political action.⁽¹⁾ For good or evil, however, the cities, and the population generally, lacked, so far as

(1) It was rumoured, for example, that even during the lifetime of Mahmūd the citizens of Balkh were in communication with Takash b. Alp-Arslān, then imprisoned at Takrīt, until he was put to death by Barkiyāruq in Rabi' I 487 (I.A. 98, 99, 104) See also note on p. 22 ante.

can be seen, any organisation which might enable them to concert joint action; each acted simply in his own interests, without paying heed to the others. It is possible that religious factions entered into the matter to some extent; Nishāpūr had a reputation for Shi'ite proclivities, and was, in the very year of Barkiyāruq's victory over Tutush, the scene of a violent conflict between Sunnīs and Karramīs. While, therefore, the population by itself might annoy the central government, but scarcely endanger its authority, if cities and governor made common cause against it, it might prove a very difficult task to re-establish control.

In the conflict which now ensued between Barkiyāruq and Arslān Arghūn, however, such evidence as can be gathered from Ibn al-Athīr's narrative is against the hypothesis of any co-operation between the population and the latter. Arslān Arghūn, a brother of Malikshah, had left Baghdād after his brother's death, with the evident intention of taking advantage of the dispute over the succession in order to make himself independent in Khurāsān. He was repulsed by the population of Nishāpūr, but found an ally in Qūdun, the governor of Merv, who surrendered the city to him and assisted him to gain possession of Balkh, Tirmīdh, and subsequently of Western Khurāsān as well, including Nishāpūr. This done, Arslān offered to recognise Barkiyāruq's title to the sultānate and pay tribute, on condition that all

Khurāsān, excluding Nishāpūr,⁽¹⁾ were given him in fief. Mahmūd was still alive, and under the circumstances Barkiyāruq was unable to do other than acquiesce for the time being.

The relations between uncle and nephew remained on this basis even after the death of Tutush for a time. In the course of the same year, however, Barkiyāruq removed Mula'yyid al-Mulk from the wazirate and imprisoned him, at the instance of his mother, Zubaida Khātūn,⁽²⁾ replacing him by Fakhr al-Mulk, and the real control of affairs passed into the hands of her favourite, Majd al-Mulk al-Balāsānī. Arslān Arghūn seized upon this as a pretext to break off relations with Barkiyāruq, who retaliated by despatching several squadrons to Khurāsān under the command of his uncle, Arslān's half-brother, Būribars b Alp Arslān. The latter was successful in the first encounter, but withdrew to Herat while Arslān Arghūn assembled fresh forces at Balkh and forcibly recovered Merv, dismantling its fortifications and putting a great many of its inhabitants to death. He succeeded also in winning over the Amīr Ākhur, who was with Būribars, and though the Amīr Ākhur and his son were put to death by a rival commander, the dissension amongst his forces so weakened Būribars that he was defeated and captured

(1) This exclusion of Nishāpūr suggests that I.A.(108) is mistaken in including Nishāpūr in his conquests - or else the continued hostility of its population suggested to him that his position would be stronger without it.

(2) See ante p. 15. Bundārī 79, 81, I.A. 104-5.

towards the end of 488. Arslān Arghūn now felt himself secure in his independence, and for a year governed Khurāsān with the utmost rigour, destroying the walls of the cities and the principal fortresses, amongst them the Qūhandiz of Nishāpūr. His suspicions extended also to the principal officers of the 'askar of Khurāsān, many of whom were put to death. 'Imād al-Mulk, another of Nizām al-Mulk's sons, who had joined him and been appointed his wazir, also suffered the common fate of confiscation and execution.

Such tyrannical conduct (especially on the part of a usurper) could not be long in meeting retribution. Before the end of 489 Barkiyāruq already had a second army on the way, and it was possibly the fear of a mutiny of his own troops that led Arslān Arghūn to the extreme step of putting Būribars to death after a year's imprisonment in Tirmīdh. Shortly afterwards, in Muharram 490, Arslān was assassinated by his own guards, outraged by his cruelties, and a seven-year-old son of his proclaimed in his stead.⁽¹⁾ The imperial forces were under the nominal command of Barkiyāruq's brother Sanjar, then only eleven or thirteen years of age, to whom Qumāj was attached as Atābeg and al-Tughra'ī as wazir. The news of the assassination reached them at Dāmaghān, and they halted there until Barkiyāruq joined them in person on 5th Jumada I. As was to be expected,

(1) Hāfiz Abrū f 218 b.

his march through Khurāsān was in the nature of a triumphal progress; after the tyranny of Arslān Arghūn the cities welcomed the restoration of imperial rule and opened their gates without opposition. Arslān's askar, with the young prince, fled from Balkh into the mountains of Tukhāristān, and opened negotiations for their surrender and amnesty. Barkiyāruq granted the request, and the whole force, 15,000 in number, was incorporated in the imperial armies. After completing the re-occupation of Khurāsān by taking Tirmīdh, Barkiyāruq remained for seven months at Balkh, occupied partly in regulating the situation in Transoxania,⁽¹⁾ where the Qārakhāmid ruler Ahmad had been put to death for heresy in 488, and partly in putting down (by means of Sanjar) a revolt led by Amīr Amīran (Mhd. b. Sulaimān, a cousin of Malikshah) and supported by the Ghaznevid sultan Ibrāhīm.

The intervention of the Ghaznevid introduced yet a third factor into the problem of holding Khurāsān. During the thirty years of Alp Arslān's and Malikshah's reign, Ibrāhīm had resigned himself to the loss of Khurāsān and cultivated a policy of peace, cemented by matrimonial alliances, with the Saljūqs, while extending his rule in the Panjāb. But the unsettlement which had followed the death of Malikshah revived his ambitions to regain his ancestral territories. He formally

(1) See Barthold 318-9.

adopted the title of Sultān,⁽¹⁾ and now gave his support to Amīr Amīrān on the express condition that he should be recognised in the Khutbah in all the territories recovered. A second motive for his intervention may also be discerned in the fact that Arslān Arghūn had been married to one of his daughters.

The brief account given by Ibn al-Athīr of the rising renders it difficult to estimate the extent and seriousness of the movement. Apparently a number of districts were captured⁽²⁾ with the aid of a strong Ghaznevid force, which included elephants, but it collapsed when Amīr Amīrān was captured in a surprise attack by the troops of Sanjar and blinded. The death of Ibrahim two years later and the energetic government of Sanjar precluded any further attempts to revive the Ghaznevid claims.

-
- (1) See Encyc. of Islam s.v. Ghaznavids, p. 157. Vol. II. Since the publication of Lane Poole's Catalogue, two gold coins of Ibrāhīm's reign have been acquired by the British Museum, one dated 460 A.H. and the date of the other is obliterated. But there is no mention of Ibrāhīm as Sultan on any one of them, although on his undated silver coins he styles himself as Sultān, Sayyid al-Sulātīn and al-Sultān al-Āzam. So it cannot be precisely determined at present from what year he formally adopted this title in competition with the Saljūqs. The Ghaznavids after Sultān Mahmūd were, however, called sultāns by courtesy. Lane Poole's Catalogue 558, 560. Additions to vol vi pp. 237, 243. See ante p. 48 Hāfiz Abrū f 220 b.
- (2) The statement in the printed text of I.A. (110) (ed. Tornberg x, 181) that Amīr Amīrān began his revolt at Balkh is probably to be rejected. Ibn al-Athīr has previously stated that Barkiyāruq stayed at Balkh for seven months, and the words 'wa tawajjaha ilā Balkh' are missing in two MSS. As no dates are mentioned, however, it is possible that the revolt broke out when Barkiyāruq had already left Balkh on his return march.

On the return of Barkiyāruq to Irāq in the latter part of 490, Sanjar was left behind at Balkh. The opportunity was seized by Qūdun, who had remained behind at Merv on a pretext of illness; in conjunction with another amīr, Yāruqtāsh, he seized and put to death Ikinjī, the governor of Khwārizm, and took possession of his province, ostensibly in the name of the Sultān. Barkiyāruq first continued his march to Irāq to deal with a revolt which had broken out there, and subsequently detached Dād Habastī b. Altuntag to deal with the two amīrs. Dād-beg succeeded in dislodging them and appointed Muḥammad b. Anushtakīn to the position of Khwarizm-shah, himself remaining wālī of Khurāsān. Qūdun was pardoned by Sanjar, but died shortly afterwards; Yāruqtāsh remained in prison, to play a part later on.

In contrast to his energetic intervention in Khurāsān, Barkiyāruq left Syria entirely alone. The first, and principal reason, was no doubt his preoccupation with the situation in Khurāsān, and by the time he returned to Irāq, the advent of the Crusaders had already changed the aspect of affairs in Syria. But on the other hand Syria had always been, and remained a minor appendage of the Saljūqid empire. Malikshah's rare appearances within its boundaries had been solely for the purpose of preventing his brother or his cousin of Rūm from becoming too powerful. For a brief moment Tutush had loomed up menacingly, but with his death Syria relapsed - from the

point of view of the sultān - into its old unimportance, unless, indeed, Qilij Arslān of Rūm should emulate his father's ambitious projects. The weakling sons of Tutush, Rudwān and Duqāq, had flown at each other's throats with the usual entourage of ambitious amīrs to egg them on.⁽¹⁾ There was no danger to be apprehended there, even if either or both of them were to refuse to acknowledge his suzerainty, which was unlikely. It is true that for a moment Rudwān, hoping to attract Egyptian aid against Duqāq (or under the influence of Ismā'īlī missionaries - for Shi'ism had a strong hold in Aleppo), had been seduced into acknowledging the Fātimid Caliph of Cairo (490), but his amīrs had quickly intervened.⁽²⁾

Then, while Barkiyāruq was still in Khurāsān, the Frankish armies had appeared before Antioch and shortly afterwards occupied al-Ruhā. Karbūqā of Mawṣil attempted to form a coalition against them, but his action was taken, it would seem, entirely on his own initiative, since it is nowhere stated that he was ordered to intervene by either Sultān or Caliph. When his attempt failed, mainly through the intrigues of Rudwān, and Antioch was finally captured, the Caliph addressed a remonstrance to Barkiyāruq, urging him to take the field against the Franks before they became too firmly established. The appeal went

(1) Gibb 30-31.

(2) The Khutbah in the Egyptian Caliph's name was continued for four Fridays only. I.A. 111-12. Yaffī f 250 b.

unheeded, and neither then nor at any later period of his reign, did Barkiyāruq, hard pressed by internal difficulties, show the slightest desire to intervene in the affairs of Syria.

The remaining years of Barkiyāruq's reign (490-98) were a period of strife with Md who sustained a claim to the Sultanate. The history of their struggle for the throne of the Saljūqid empire is a complicated narrative of battles, compromises and treaties until the death of Barkiyāruq and the accession of Md. temporarily put an end to the civil war.

The first of these conflicts came when Muayyid al-Mulk and Unar decided to fight for Md's cause. The first was ~~the former~~ wazīr of Barkiyāruq and the second ~~the~~ wālī of Fārs, both of whom had ^{been} dismissed from office by the Sultān and thus became his enemies. Fighting was imminent, when Unar was murdered by some of his men. (1) Although that relieved him of a dangerous foe, he still had the difficult task of subjugating Md and Muayyid al-Mulk. The situation was made more difficult by the murder of Barkiyāruq's wazīr, Balāsānī, and the desertion of many of his followers. He therefore had to retire from his present headquarters at Rayy to Isfahān, where the inhabitants

(1) According to Qazwīnī, Unar was murdered by the Bāṭinīs at Sawah on his way to Khurāsān in the beginning of Muḥarram 492: *Tarīkhī Guzīdah* 44, *Fa'id Allah* f 306, named as Bulkābak, Unar Bulkābak, same person as Rashīd al-Dīn puts both the names ~~part~~ together f 112 b. Yazdī's version Unar wa Bulkābak is rather misleading (p. 75) the more so as he mentions him only as Isfahsalār Unar in p. 77.

fearing molestation by the soldiers, refused him admission in their city while Md was marching on his trail. Barkiyāruq proceeded to Wāsīt, and after his army was reinforced by Ṣadaqah together with his followers, they went to Baghdād on 17 Ṣafar 493/1099, where the Caliph presented him with robes of honour. (1)

Encouraged by considerable forces and with the religious influence of the Caliph, Barkiyāruq thought himself powerful enough to come into open battle with Md. This proved to be a bitter disillusion, for when he finally started fighting at Safidrūd (2) on 4 Rajab, 493/1100, his army was routed and he was forced to flee to 'Uṭmah with only fifty men. Md then approached the Caliph to recite the Khuṭbah in his name, and the Caliph could do nothing but confirm his claim. (3)

In the meantime Barkiyāruq seems to have recovered from his first defeat by Md. He raised recruits from the surrounding provinces and marched to Isfahān by way of Niṣhāpūr, Jurjān and Dāmāghān. (4) The number of his followers increased during the march and Md, becoming aware of the situation, hastened to the capital and forced his antagonist to take a different line of progress. Barkiyāruq thus went to Hamadhān by way of

(1) I.A. 121.

(2) Situated at a distance of several farsakhs from Hamadān; I.A. 122. 20,000 warriors fought for Md in this battle.

(3) See ante p.52

(4) Where Barkiyāruq and Amīr Dād, its wāli, fought an unsuccessful battle with Sanjar in the field of Nūshjān. I.A. 123

Samīram and Khuzistān where he was reinforced by Bursuq's sons, Zankī and Abakī - together with their troops. At Hamadhān he further received the support of Ayāz as a result of his suspicion that Md's wazīr, Mu'ayyid al-Mulk had poisoned his (Ayāz's) father by adoption.⁽¹⁾ The second battle between the two contestants took place at Hamadhān on 3 Jumada II 494/1101, and the tide this time turned in Barkiyāruq's favour, for Md was defeated and his wazīr was captured and put to death. The immediate result of this battle was the re-establishment of Barkiyāruq's influence and the flight of Md to Jurjān in Khurāsān. This province was ruled by his brother, Sanjar, Barkiyāruq's enemy.⁽³⁾

The two brothers then marched with their amīrs from Jurjān to Rayy, where they were reinforced by the Nizāmites and other mercenary troops. Meanwhile Barkiyāruq's victory attracted many followers to his camp near Rayy. His army rose to the number of 100,000 including many Bātinīa and thus became too unwieldy to control and too numerous to supply with the necessary provisions. He therefore had to disband a considerable portion⁽²⁾ of his followers, while others left the camp in

(1) The Amīr Ākhur. I.A. 125.

(2) After disbandment, Dubais returned to his father at Hillah, and Kārbūqā was sent with 10,000 horsemen to Adharbaijān to subdue the rebellious Maudūd b Ismā'il b Yāqūtī. I.A. 126.

(3) Who, being a full brother of Md, naturally took his side against Barkiyāruq. Moreover, Sanjar used to abhor Barkiyāruq's reckless ways of life. I.A. 145.

quest of food. With this depleted army, Barkiyāruq had, therefore, to face the combined forces of Md and Sanjar, but seeing no prospect of victory in the circumstances, he preferred to retreat to Hamadhān to join Ayāz, whom he had previously sent there on the occasion of the Ramadān fast. On the way, however, he had to stop the march owing to the treacherous behaviour of Ayāz, who offered allegiance to Md to save his own province, and Barkiyāruq had to retire again to Khuzistān, then to 'Irāq in search of help. Near Tustar he invited the sons of Bursuq without any response from them.⁽¹⁾

After a circuitous march to Baghdād, followed by Md and Sanjar, Barkiyāruq became seriously ill at the capital, and to avoid the danger of a clash with the enemy, the nobles carried the Sultān in a litter, crossed the Tigris and pitched a temporary camp at Ramlah, whereupon they proceeded to Wāsīt. There he recovered from his illness and the troops of Wāsīt joined his forces. This encouraged him to meet Md for a decisive battle and he marched to Rūdhrawār. Md had arrived at Baghdād⁽²⁾ and, instigated by the Caliph, he also marched to Rūdhrawār. The hostile forces were almost equal at this time - each numbering about 10,000 horsemen. On the first

(1) I.A. 127.

(2) On the arrival of Md and Sanjar the Caliph Mustazhir billah presented them with two banners with his own hand.
Stowe or 7 f 44 a.

day no fighting took place on account of the extremely cold weather. In the meantime negotiations were exchanged between the two claimants for an amicable settlement to avoid bloodshed. They were able to patch up a pact, the terms of which are mentioned elsewhere. (1) Barkiyāruq retained his title and the empire was divided between the two brothers. Barkiyāruq proceeded to Sāwah and Md to Asadābād, while their armies retired to their fiefs.

The pact, however, was far from being a permanent settlement; for Md soon accused the envoys who concluded it of treason, and arrogated to himself the honour of five bands reserved for the Sultān. This was a breach of the terms with Barkiyāruq who surprised his brother at Rayy in Jumada I 495/1101 and the fourth battle took place. Both parties were equally balanced, each having 10,000 horsemen. Md was the loser this time. After his defeat he retired to Isfahān. Barkiyāruq followed him, and his forces increased on the way by 5000 horsemen. He set siege to the city, within the walls of which Md had only 11,000 horsemen and 500 footmen. The siege was prolonged and the besieged became short of provisions. Md, therefore, had to leave Isfahān secretly. When the news of his flight reached Barkiyāruq, he sent Ayāz to capture him,

(1) Chap. 1. p. 3.

but without success. (1) Barkiyāruq ^{withdrew from} ~~re-entered~~ the city and returned to Hamadhān on 18 Dhūlhijja, 495/1102, leaving his son, Malikshah al-Shahristān Tarshak with 1000 horsemen.

Rayy had been the halting place of some of Md's men who were on their way to reinforce his army at Isfahān without knowing of his secret flight. (2) Learning, however, of the escape of Md from Isfahān, they set out and met him at Hamadhān, and the number of the combined forces rose to 6000 horsemen. But just before Barkiyāruq's arrival they had been divided into two sections - the one under Yanāl and his brother 'Alī marching in the direction of Rayy, while the other proceeded to Shirwān. Before arriving at Shirwān, however, this last section won the support of Maudud b Ismā'īl at Ardabīl. The sudden death of Maudūd at this time did not change the resolution of his troops to fight under Md's banner. The joint army therefore went to Khūy in Adharbaijān, at the gate of which Barkiyāruq overtook them and the fifth and last battle took place between the two brothers on Jumada II 496/1103. Md was defeated and fled to Tirmidh by way of Arjīsh, Khilāt and Āani with a few of his followers and finally went to Tabrīz. After a few days' rest on a verdant mountain (3) Barkiyāruq journeyed to Zanjān,

(1) According to another version of Ibn-al-Athīr, Ayāz caught up with him but left him alone after taking away his standard and three loads of dinars. p. 139.

(2) They were under the command of Qizughlī accompanied by Mansūr b Nizām al-Mulk and his nephew Md b Mu'ayyid al-Mulk. I.A. 150.

(3) Ibid. 151.

and then to Rayy.

While Md was at Tabrīz and Barkiyāruq at Rayy, negotiations were begun to settle their long-standing dispute.⁽¹⁾ The unstable position of the first owing to the last defeat, and the difficult circumstances of the second, arising from the need for money to satisfy his victorious but turbulent troops, created a favourable atmosphere^{for the establishment} of peace between the two. Barkiyāruq retained his title of Sultan and Md his right to the 'band' (naubah). Further, Barkiyāruq's name was not to be mentioned in the Khutbah in Md's provinces. No correspondence was to be exchanged directly between the two monarchs - their wazirs should attend to that. The subjects were given the option of joining the army of either at their own choice without interference from the other.⁽²⁾ Such precarious terms appear to have left the two antagonists in as anomalous a position as they had been before, and the peace of the empire of the Saljūqs was observed partly on account of the exhaustion on both sides, but chiefly because the remaining period of Barkiyāruq's reign was a very short one.

The Sultan became seriously ill at Isfahān and Īlghāzī took him in a litter in the direction of Baghdād. On the way

-
- (1) The envoys reached Md while he was near Marāghah. I.A. 154. See ante p. 46.
- (2) After the ratification of the treaty, Barkiyāruq presented 300 she camels and 120 mules' load of other things to the family of Md while they were leaving Isfahān. I.A. 155.

however, at Burūjird⁽¹⁾ his condition became very critical and he had to halt there for forty days until his death. Before the end, he summoned his amīrs and declared to them his intention to nominate his son Malikshah, a boy of four years and eight months, as his successor, with Ayāz as his Atābeg. The amīrs recognised his will and swore to uphold it. Then the Sultan died on 12 Rabī' II, 498/1104 at the age of twenty-five,⁽²⁾ and was carried to Isfahān where he was buried with his ancestors.⁽³⁾

He was generous, patient, forbearing and considerate according to Ibn al-Athīr, who does not, perhaps, owing to a saying of the Prophet,⁽⁴⁾ record any of his vices. On the other hand, from Bundārī,⁽⁵⁾ Stowe or 7⁽⁶⁾ and Jurjānī⁽⁷⁾ it is quite clear that he was addicted to drinking and other vices. Ibn al-Athīr, however, says elsewhere by the way, that Barkiyāruq appointed his singer, wālī of Mārdīn, from which we can easily infer that he was also a passionate lover of music.⁽⁸⁾

(1) 18 farsakhs from Hamadān; Wafayāt, vol. 1. 251.

(2) Bundārī 83, Mīrkhwānd 161.

(3) I.A. 158. According to Rashīd al-Dīn on Thursday 2 Rabī' II. f. 144 a.

(4) Uḡkurū maḥāsina mautākum. "Mention the good qualities of your dead."

(5) p. 78.

(6) f. 43 b.

(7) f. 108 b.

(8) I.A. 163.

Ayāz, Īlghāzī and the party reached Baghdād with Malikshah, after having been delayed by inclement weather on 17 Rabi' II, 498/1104, for the formal confirmation of the new Sultan to his office. The Khutbah was delivered in his name under the title of Jalāl al-Daulah at the instance of Īlghāzī and Tughayāruq on the last Friday of the month, and money was distributed amongst the people in honour of the occasion.⁽¹⁾ Probably, Īlghāzī and others, who were once champions of the cause of Md, were actuated by the motive of self-interest in preferring an infant and docile Sultan to a virile and energetic one.

(1) I.A. 159.

CHAPTER VII

The Reign of Muḥammad b. Malikshah

Rabi' II 498/1104 - Dhulhijjah 511/1118

After the struggles which filled the reign of Barkiyāruq and seemed to herald the dissolution of the Saljūqid empire, the accession of Sultān Muḥammad opened a period in which the imperial power reasserted itself in an effort to regain the prestige and authority which it had well-nigh lost. By the historians he is always celebrated as the Sultān "who restored the fortunes of the Saljūqs which had declined since the death of Malikshah." (1) He "fought infidels and sectarians in his zeal for Sunnī Islām (2) and the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate" and "was the perfect man of the Saljūqs and their strong he-camel." (3)

At the time of the death of Barkiyāruq, Md was engaged in the siege of Mawsil against Jakarmish who, however, after

(1) Encyclopaedia of Islam, vol. iii. p.673.

(2) This is undoubtedly one of the causes that led Ghazali to address his Tibr al-Masbūk, Ibn al-Balkhī to dedicate his Fārs-nāmah to him and the Sunnī chroniclers to sing his praises. Encyclopaedia of Islam, vol.ii, p. 146. Ibn al-Balkhī, p. 1, Rashid al-Din, f. 114 b. Stowe Or 7, f. 45 a, Bundārī 81. Nay, some of them even went to the extent of wrongly attributing to him some of the Indian conquests of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghaznah in order to put a halo of imaginary glory around their hero. Qazwini, Nuzhat 56.

(3) Encyclopaedia of Islām, vol.iii, p. 674. Bundārī 108.

due deliberation with his civil and military officials, on hearing the news of Barkiyāruq's death, submitted to him.⁽¹⁾ In 'Irāq Barkiyāruq's death supplied Ṣadaqah with a golden opportunity of attacking Īlghāzī and his party, from which he had desisted rather unwillingly a few months earlier. Ṣadaqah mustered a huge army of 15,000 horsemen and 10,000 infantry and sent his sons Budrān and Dubais to Mawsil to invite and perhaps more accurately to incite Md to march on Baghdād.⁽²⁾ Accordingly Md proceeded to the Metropolis with Suqmān Qutbī, Jakarmish and other amīrs. Ayāz on the other hand, still committed to the cause of Barkiyāruq's young son Malikshah, prepared to resist him. On hearing of ^{Md's approach} /, he came out of Baghdād with his followers and encamped at Zāhir. He further conferred with his amīrs who swore allegiance to him in view of the forthcoming fighting. Yanāl and Ṣabāwā favoured the option to resort to arms in support of the cause of the boy Sultan; but the Wazīr Safī abul-Mahāsin advised him to the contrary. Being undecided as to whether a policy of conflict would succeed, Ayāz adopted the safer attitude of compromise. After the exchange of envoys with Md, who had now reached the neighbourhood

(1) I.A. 160.

(2) I.A. 160. Here Rāwandī (p.153), Qazwīnī (p.454), Rashīd al-Dīn and Mirkhwānd (p.162) confuse the two distinct events - deaths of Ayāz (1105) and Ṣadaqah (1108). These chroniclers mistakenly stated Ṣadaqah to be an enemy of Md at this time, while he was an ally; because he actually became an enemy three years after. Acta Orientalia. vol. iii. p.138.

of Baghdād ready for battle, an agreement was reached whereby an amnesty was declared in favour of all but Yanāl and Šabāwā.⁽¹⁾ Thus Md became the undisputed Sultan.

Ayāz's submission, however, did not save him from the new Sultan, who was enraged by an unfortunate incident in Ayāz's house during celebrations to commemorate the settlement of peace in the land. Md noticed that one of Ayāz's men had a coat of mail under his shirt, and thus becoming suspicious, left his host's house and decided to rid himself of an uncertain follower. Later he summoned Ayāz to a council of state and put him to a violent death by ordering one of his slaves to strike him on the head as he entered into the Sultan's presence.⁽²⁾ As soon as the news of Ayāz's murder spread, his own troops hastened to their master's house and pillaged it, while his Wazīr, Šafi became a fugitive, but was ultimately arrested and also put to death at the age of thirty-six, in Ramadān 498/1105.⁽³⁾

In the following year (499/1106) Md was called upon to deal swiftly with the revolt of Mankubars and a false prophet at Nihāwand. Mankūbars was soon arrested by Md's allies,

-
- (1) Alkiya al-Harrās, the teacher at the Nizāmiyah, administered the oath to Md on this occasion. Md treated his nephew Malikshah as his own son. I.A. 161.
- (2) He was forty at the time of his death on 13 Jumada I 498/1105. His body was thrown on the street near the Dīwān. Ibid. 162.
- (3) I.A. He came of the family of the Rāis of Hamadān. I.A. 162.

Banu Bursuq and carried to Isfahān where he was imprisoned by the Sultan. The false prophet was mercilessly put to death.⁽¹⁾ Comparatively free from internal disputes and dissensions at his Court, Md's next action was to turn against the Bātinīs in 500/1107. That sect had, during the stormy reign of Barkiyāruq, established itself in many mountain fortresses, with their headquarters at Alamūt. The Sultan had no difficulty in capturing many of these strongholds,⁽²⁾ but Alamūt itself was never completely captured, even after repeated expeditions,⁽³⁾ although throughout his reign the work of Bātinī persecution and the campaign against those heretics never really ceased.

Turning to a different field in Syria, we find that the capture of Tripoli by the Crusaders in 502/1109 and their renewed operations against Aleppo, occasioned a fresh appeal

-
- (1) So the inhabitants used to say: "Within two months two men appeared to us, one claiming the title of Sultan and the other that of a prophet, but neither of them succeeded in his ambition." I.A. 166. Sibṭ Ibn-al Jauzī, p.10.
- (2) He personally besieged the fort of Shahdiz near Isfahān on 6 Shāban 500/1107. I.A. 181, I.Q. 151. His Wazīr, Sa'd al-Mulk was involved in secret correspondence with Ibn 'Attāsh. Bundārī 85, Yazdī 83, Rāwandī 153. Le Strange is wrong in putting the construction of this fort by Malikshah in the year 500/1107 (Lands of the Eastern Caliphate p.205) as it involves a serious anachronism.
- (3) In Muharram 503/1109 Aḥmad b. Niẓām al-Mulk, the wazīr, besieged Alamūt, but the expedition returned without any operations owing to the advent of winter. I.A. 202. Again, just before the death of the Sultan, Amīr Shīrgīr was sent to capture it, but this time too, the death of the Sultan intervened and the besieging troops scattered without listening to the good counsels of their commander. I.A.222 Qazwīnī 456. T. Gazidah, Dhababī, f. 98 b.

from the population of the threatened city to both the Caliph and the Sultan for concerted action against the Franks. Before the arrival of the envoys, an ambassador of the Byzantine emperor reached Baghdād to negotiate an alliance with the Muslims against the Franks. The advent of the latter on the scene left no room for hesitation in the minds of the public, and the marriage festivities of the Sultan's sister to the Caliph, then being celebrated, had to be interrupted for a council of war. (1)

On the Caliph's advice the Sultan ordered the amirs present to return to their provinces and equip themselves for a holy war. He sent his son Masūd with Maudūd to Mawsil. The amirs gathered together from all parts of the empire and marched towards Sanjar. (2) They seized many Frankish forts on the way. The Muslim army, however, broke up after the death of Suqmān, and the illness of Bursuq b Bursuq gave the amirs an opportunity to revive old personal jealousies and dissensions. Maudūd alone continued the contest by annual expeditions into Syria, until after a successful campaign in Palestine in 507/1113, he was assassinated in Damascus. (3) After his death Tamīrak took possession of his equipment and carried them to Sultan Md. His successors at Mawsil became embroiled with Īlghāzī of Mārdīn. (4)

(1) I.A. 204, I.Q. 173.

(2) The following amirs took part in this expedition in addition to Maudūd of Mawsil:- Suqmān Qutbī of Tabriz, Ilbaki and Zanki of Hamadān, Ahmad II of Marāghah, Ayāz b Īlghāzī of Mārdīn as a deputy of his father and the Bakjite amirs. I.A. 205.

(3) I.Q. 159. I.A. 209. Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī p.31. (4) I.A. 211.

The receipt of threatening letters from the Sultan decided the latter to seek refuge in Syria, where he made common cause with Tughtagīn who was also apprehensive of the Sultan's vengeance for the murder of Maudūd, which was attributed to him. Both malcontents agreed to defy the Sultan and to form a coalition with the Franks, (1)

Sultan Md, on hearing this news of the rebellion of Īlghāzī and Tughtagīn, despatched an expedition under Bursuq b Bursuq of Hamadān in Ramadān 508/1115 to punish the rebels and take action against their allies, the Franks. Bursuq succeeded in capturing Hamah from Tughtagīn, and having sacked it for three days, handed it over to Qīrkhān, the wālī of Hims, under instructions from the Sultan, as a reward for his loyalty. (2)

Eventually, however, after suffering a severe defeat at the hands of Roger of Antioch, he fled with his brother Zanki, and both brothers died in bitter disappointment in 510/1115. (3)

As a result of this rout the Muslims of Syria were stricken by fear, and Tughtagīn visited Baghdād to make his peace with Sultan Md, who pardoned him and presented him with a robe of honour. (4)

(1) I.A. 211, 212; other amīrs accompanying him were Juyūshbeg and Kantghadi.

(2) I.A. 215.

(3) Ibid. 215.

(4) Ibid. 217.

The intrigues of the self-seeking wālis now turned against one another as there was no rival Sultan in the arena. At first Rudwān of Aleppo collected a huge army to fight the crusaders. Īlghāzī, Ṣabāwā, Ilbi also joined hands with him. But Īlghāzī, probably owing to some personal grudge, though under a different cover, suggested an attack upon the province of Jakarmish, to which Ilbi, for similar reasons, readily agreed. So they besieged Naṣībīn in Ramaḍān 499/1106 with 10,000 horsemen, in the absence of Jakarmish, who was at Hamah for a change of climate. Two of his amīrs fought the invading army from within the city wall. Ilbi was seriously wounded by an arrow and left for Sanjar. On hearing this news, Jakarmish immediately proceeded to Mawṣil where the panic-stricken inhabitants of Sawād had already taken refuge. He encamped at the gate of the city for a battle with Rudwān. But in the long run he had recourse to milder diplomacy by setting Rudwān against Īlghāzī.⁽¹⁾ Accordingly Īlghāzī was arrested and his numerous Turkmen followers broke up and plundered the country. Rudwān now returned to Aleppo, while Jakarmish marched to Sanjar to punish Ilbi for his misbehaviour. Rudwān, ^{in turn} sent messengers to Jakarmish while he was at Sanjar, asking for his help against the Franks. Jakarmish fraudulently

(1) I.A. 169.

promised him help which he did not render in time of need. Ilbi was seriously ill, perhaps as a result of the arrow-wound. He was brought out in a litter to offer welcome and apologies to Jakarmish. The latter was moved to pity and at once sent him back to the city. Ilbi, however, died soon after, and his followers rebelled against Jakarmish and resisted him successfully till the end of Shawwāl 499/1106, when Tamīrak, uncle of Ilbi, intervened and restored good relations with Jakarmish. Being assured of their allegiance, Jakarmish returned to Mawsil.⁽¹⁾ On the other hand, his followers at Harran surrendered the town to Qilij Arslān in the vain hope of fighting the Franks at Ruha, which was abandoned owing to the sudden sickness of Qilij.⁽²⁾

Now, the doom of Şadaqah was drawing nigh. He was generously treated by Sultan Mō for his past services and implicit obedience. Wāsīt and Baṣrah were granted to him as additional fiefs. These favours, unfortunately, made him rather officious and over-bearing. He gave refuge to every malcontent that escaped from the Caliph and the Sultan.⁽³⁾

This naturally turned the Sultan's mind against him. Furthermore, Amīd Abū Jāfar and Arghūn Sādī at court did all they

(1) I.A. 170.

(2) Ibid. 173. He then returned to Malatīyah.

(3) Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī, p. 10. In 500 Abulqasim Ibn Jahīr, the Caliph's dismissed wazīr, took refuge with him. Ibid. p.16.

could to alienate Md from Ṣadaqah.⁽¹⁾ They even went to the extent of falsely accusing him and his followers of the Bātinī heresy, an accusation which had no basis of truth, as it is certain that Ṣadaqah was only a Shi'ite.⁽²⁾ All these circumstances grouped together had their disastrous results on Ṣadaqah. The immediate cause of the rupture was, however, that Abū Dulaf Sarkhāb b Kaikhusraw of Sāwah and Abah took refuge with Ṣadaqah from the wrath of the Sultan, who wrote to his vassal asking him to surrender the fugitive to the Sultan's representative. Unfortunately, Ṣadaqah refused to obey his master's orders and further acted in such a way as to exasperate Md, who marched to 'Irāq to investigate the matter and punish the culprits.⁽³⁾

On hearing the news of the forthcoming expedition against him, Ṣadaqah held a council of his followers for a decision as to the right course of action. His son Dubais wisely advised him to conciliate the Sultān. On the other hand, Saīd b Hamīd, Ṣadaqah's rash and pretentious general, insisted on a declaration of war and mustered an army of 20,000 horsemen⁽⁴⁾ and 30,000 footmen. The Caliph repeatedly tried

(1) I.Q. 159.

(2) I.A. 185.

(3) The army of the Sultan reached Baghdād at the end of Rabi' i 501. I.Q. 159. According to I.A. on 20 Rabi' II, accompanied by Ahmad b Niẓām al-Mulk, his wazīr. p. 185.

(4) Composed of Kurds, Turks, Dailamites and Arabs. Stowe Or 7, f. 45 b.

in vain to mediate for peace. After the final failure of peace overtures, the Sultan sent amīr Md b Būqā, the Turkmen, to evict Ṣadaqah's deputy from Wāsīt. After doing so, Md b Būqā marched to Qūsān, a district of Ṣadaqah, and ruthlessly sacked it. Ṣadaqah, on his part, sent his cousin, Thābit, to repel Md b Būqā. In a skirmish on the bank of the Sālim, Thābit was routed. (1)

At the end of Jumada I, 501/1107 the Sultan gave Wāsīt as a fief to Bursuqī and ordered Ibn Būqā to attack and sack the province of Ṣadaqah, which was accordingly badly ravaged. The Sultan himself marched from Baghdād to Zāfarāniah on 2 Jumada II. But having been requested by the Caliph, through his wazīr Ibn Muṭṭalib, he stopped his march for a time, more especially as the Qādi of Isfahān also advised him to act in conformity with the Caliph's suggestion. Meanwhile the latter sent a letter to Ṣadaqah with the chief naqīb, 'Alī b. Ṭarrād and Mukhtas, the eunuch, ordering him to submit to the Sultan. This time Ṣadaqah submitted and was on the point of despatching his son Dubais to the Sultan with two envoys, but the turbulent Turks became discontented and tried to lay hands on some booty before the signing of a treaty. So they crossed the Tigris and attacked the army of Ṣadaqah without the authorisation of the Sultan. They were, however, disillusioned, as they were soon defeated by the Arabs. (2)

(1) I.A. 186.

(2) Ibid. 187.

When this news reached Ṣadaqah he naturally became suspicious and demanded security and safe conduct for his son Dubais from the envoys. This they did not dare to give, so he wrote to the Caliph explaining his failure to send his son owing to the adverse events which had since taken place. The Caliph renewed his correspondence for peace with Ṣadaqah. A provisional settlement was ~~about~~ to be arranged, the first condition of which was that Ṣadaqah should set all the captives free and restore all the properties that were taken by the Arabs from the Turks at the last encounter. Ṣadaqah again became suspicious and hesitatingly sent some counter proposals claiming the restoration of all that was taken by the army of the Sultan from his province, as well as the confirmation of the grant of Sawah as the fief of Sarkhāb b Kaikhusraw and the sworn guarantee of the Caliph's Wazīr for the observance of these terms.⁽¹⁾

The envoys came back with these proposals and Abu Mansūr b Maṛuf, the plenipotentiary of Ṣadaqah. They were again sent to Ṣadaqah by the Caliph and the Sultan to effect acceptance of the Sultan's original offer. In his turn, Ṣadaqah insisted on his own terms. Hence arbitration by force of arms became more and more inevitable every day. So the Sultan marched from Zafaranjah on 8 Rajab 501/1108 and Ṣadaqah also marched to the village of Maṭr. Thābit, cousin of Ṣadaqah, went over

(1) I.A. 188.

to the Sultan's side as he was jealous of Şadaqah. The troops of the Sultan crossed the Tigris and encountered the enemy on 19 Rajab.⁽¹⁾ The wind was at first adverse to the Sultan's army, but ~~afterwards~~ changed and became favourable to them.⁽²⁾ The 'Abādah and the Khafājah tribes betrayed Şadaqah in the field, as they had suffered very ~~greatly~~ from his past policy of "divide and rule." Şadaqah, therefore, sustained a crushing defeat and was ultimately decapitated⁽³⁾ by a slave called Buzghush, at the age of fifty-nine. His head was carried to Bursuqi who presented it to the Sultan to take to Baghdād. More than 3000 of his cavalry were killed. His son Dubais, his Commander Sa'īd and Sarkhāb who was the cause of the war, were taken captives. His son Budrān fled to Hillah and sent his mother and wives to his father-in-law Muhadhhib, the wālī of Baīḥah. Later on, Şadaqah's widow was brought to Baghdād by order of the Sultan and treated very courteously. He further set her son Dubais free, on being assured of his allegiance. Şadaqah had been amīr for twenty-one years. He built Hillah in 495/1101-2. He was a master of the art of riding and possessed a ready wit, but could not write. His library contained thousands of volumes. He was a father to his people.⁽⁴⁾

(1) According to Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī (p.16) after Friday prayers on 16 Rajab.

(2) From this natural phenomenon Zāhīr al-Dīn Nīshāpūrī invented a fanciful story about the appearance of a dragon in the sky as a divine favour to Mū, and it has been copied and misplaced by later chroniclers in their zeal for him. Acta Orientalia, vol. iii, p. 139.

(3) Yafi'i, f. 254 b.

(4) He never married a second wife nor kept a concubine. I.A. 189. Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī, p. 16.

Turning from the events which had ended in the death of Ṣadaqah in Irāq, to the situation in the North Eastern section of the Saljūqid empire, we find that Sanjar, Sultan Md's brother, had become the central figure in the activities that led to the subjugation of unruly amīrs. (1)

Md Khān of Transoxania was over-boldened by the final defeat of Sāghirbeg in 503/1109-10. (2) He behaved tyrannically towards ~~with~~ his people and even disregarded the orders of Sanjar who, therefore, organised an expedition against him in 507/1113-4. In fear of disastrous consequences Md Khān sought the mediation of the amīrs Qumāj (3) and Khwārazmshah. On their request Sanjar agreed to pardon him on condition that he should come to Sanjar's court and "tread his carpet." (4) Being suspicious of Sanjar's intention, Md Khan rode to the eastern bank of the Jehun and there dismounted and "kissed the ground" while Sanjar was riding on the western bank. After reconciliation they returned to their respective territories.

However,

The Ghaznawids were considerably weakened by the Saljūqids, although they retained their titles as kings. During the

(1) Yazdī 95, et.seq. Rāwandī 168 et.seq.

(2) I.A. 201.

(3) I.A. 209. He was the right-hand man of Sanjar at this time.

(4) Ibid. 209.

governorship of Sanjar, another opportunity occurred for ~~Sultan~~ intervention in the affairs of Ghaznah. On the death of 'Alā al-Daulah in Shawwāl 508/1115, his son Arslān Shah⁽¹⁾ succeeded him, and for fear of dispute in the matter of the succession, he imprisoned all his brothers, one of whom, Bahrām, escaped and took refuge with Sanjar, who supported his cause.⁽²⁾ Meanwhile, Arslān courted Sultān Md's favour by sending an envoy to complain against Sanjar.⁽³⁾ Md wished to issue instructions to Sanjar to desist from invading Ghaznawid territory but it was too late, as the army of Sanjar had already approached Bust. After desperate fighting at Mashar-ābād⁽⁴⁾ the Ghaznawid army was defeated and Sanjar entered Ghaznah with Bahrām on 20 Shawwāl 510/1117. He enthroned Bahrām who, in his turn, did not waver from the pursuit of his brother until he caught him and strangled him to avoid any further complications.⁽⁵⁾

(1) His mother was a Saljūqid, sister of Alp Arslān. I.A. 212.

(2) I.A. 212.

(3) See ante p. 13.

(4) Within a farsakh from Ghaznah; in this battle Arslān had an army of 30,000 cavalry and a great number of infantry, together with 120 elephants, which caused considerable consternation in the army of Sanjar insomuch that they were on the verge of flight. I.A.213, Rāwandī 169.

(5) I.A. 214.

The last but not the least of Sultan Mūd's attempts to subjugate or win over to his side all the important amīrs within his empire was the episode in which Jāwalī came to the Sultān's camp at Isfahān. He had previously refused to aid the Sultān against the revolting Ṣadaqah⁽¹⁾ and thus incurred his suzerain's wrath. As a result of this behaviour, he became a hunted enemy of the Sultan and after a period of tribulation and uncertainty as to his fate, he decided to surrender himself and repent for all the misdeeds that he had committed.⁽²⁾ He came to Isfahān incognito and through the intercession of his friend, amīr Husain, the Sultān pardoned him and installed him as Wāli of Fars. In recognition of this great favour, Jāwalī

-
- (1) He even secretly sided with Ṣadaqah and incited him against the Sultan. I.A. 192.
- (2) After leaving Mawsil, when besieged by the Sultān's army at the end of 501, Jāwalī went to Naṣībīn to form a coalition against the Sultān with Īlghāzī who, however, tactfully avoided him as an undesirable ally. I.A. 193, I.Q. 160. Then he proceeded to Raḥbah where he was met by Budrān and Mansūr, sons of the deceased Ṣadaqah, with whom he concluded an alliance against the Sultān. But being advised by Ṣabāwā, the newly appointed wāli of Raḥbah, he proceeded to Syria to fight the Franks. Meanwhile he secured some money and horses from Banū Numair and Ibn Ammār, and Amīr Husain met him on the mission of peace from the Sultan which was, however, frustrated by the imprudent Maudūd. Next he seized Bālis on 18 Safar 502/110 and sacked it. Thus being fully equipped with men and money, he encountered the combined forces of Rudwān and his Frankish allies at Tell-Bāshir at the end of the month. While victory was within sight his troops deserted him as they thought he was not entitled to their allegiance after the capture of Mawsil by Maudūd. After the defeat Ṣabāwā marched to Syria, Budrān to Qalāt Jābar, Ibn Jakarmish to Jazīrah and Jāwalī to Raḥbah, whence in fear of a raiding battalion of Maudūd's troops and confident of Husain's support, he decided to surrender to the Sultān. I.A. 196.

served Md faithfully in his province by suppressing all the elements of dissension. On his way to Fars, he killed Balajī,^d whose loyalty had come under suspicion and took possession of his fortress of Istakhr.⁽¹⁾ Another amīr, Hasan b al-Mubārīz,⁽²⁾ was surprised and his forces were crushed. Hasan took to flight and after some negotiations came to terms with Jāwalī and declared himself for his cause. Jāwalī then marched to Shīrāz and occupied Kāzrūn. He further besieged Abu Sād Md b Mamas for two years and ultimately put him to death.⁽³⁾ The district of Dārābjird was also seized and plundered. Next he turned against the amīr of Kirmān to punish him for the favour he had shown to Ibrāhīm, wālī of Dārābjird in his contest with Jāwalī.⁽⁴⁾ Here, however, he found that his task was exceptionally difficult and the amīr of Kirmān

(1) See ante p. 5. I.A. 218.

(2) He was the head of the Shawānkārite amīrs and was called Khusraw. Ibid. 218.

(3) After the protracted siege Jawali tried to compromise with Abu Sād, who was very arrogant at first. As, however, his provisions became depleted, he was forced to seek quarter from Jāwalī. The latter occupied the fort and granted him quarter. Afterwards Jāwalī treated him badly so he escaped but was traced by a spy and put to death. I.A. 218.

(4) Seeing the natural defensive points of their hill fortress of Rananah too strong for him, Jāwalī made a false move towards the desert of Kirmān and came back as if the reinforcements from Kirmān were under Ibrāhīm. So the simple inhabitants rejoiced and opened the gate, whereupon they were put to the sword and their property pillaged. Ibid. 219.

inflicted a defeat upon him.⁽¹⁾ Jāwalī's position was further weakened by the untimely death of Jaghrī, the Sultan's son, who accompanied him on his journey. As he was preparing another expedition against Kirmān, death overtook him in 510/1116.

Meanwhile the amīr of Kirmān had sent an envoy to the Sultān at Baghdād to stop the incursions of Jāwalī. The Sultan replied by ordering him to surrender Farj and satisfy Jāwalī, whose death, however, made the situation critical and Md himself had to take matters in hand.⁽²⁾

At this critical juncture, Md had to hurry from Baghdād to Isfahān, fearing an attack on Fars by the amīr of Kirmān. But unfortunately the end of the Sultan's life was approaching. He fell ill in Shābān and died on 24 Dhūlhijjah 511/1118⁽³⁾ at Isfahān, after nominating his son Mahmūd, a boy of little more than fourteen, as his successor. Mahmūd was however, ousted by his uncle, Sanjar, who became the last of the Saljūqid Sultans. Sanjar's long reign, comprising the downfall of the Saljūqid empire, would be a fit subject for independent research.

(1) This time the cunning Jāwalī was trapped as the army of Kirmān evaded the reconnoitring soldiers by following a by-path and surprised him by night while fast asleep under the influence of drink. The tongue of the first informer was cut off. The second time he realized the danger and rode out, but was defeated in Shawwāl 508/1115. I.A. 219.

(2) Ibid. 219.

(3) *Tārīkh Gazidah* p.457. According to Stowe Or 7 (f.46 b) and Ibn al-Qalānisi (p.198) the date of his death is 11 Dhūlhijjah. He was aged 37 years and 4 months and 6 days I.A. 221. Ameer 'Ali (p.334) is wrong in putting the date of his death on 15 Dhūlhijjah as it is unsupported by the authorities. According to Dhahabī (f.98 b) he left for his son Mahmūd 11,000,000 dīnars in cash together with many other things (min al-hawaṣil). This proves Rāwandī's statement (p.162) that he was fond of gathering wealth.

BIBLIOGRAPHYMANUSCRIPT SOURCESARABIC

- ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ - Ikhtisār al-Dāris, British Museum Oriental 6772.
- Dhahabī Md. Ahmad - Kitāb al-Ibar, B.M., Or., 6428.
- Ibn Abi Al-Sarūr - ‘Uyun al-Akhbār, B.M., Or., 5633.
- al-‘Isami Abu Md. - Simt-al-Nujūm, B.M., Or., 1553.
- Azdi Ibn Zāfir Jamāl al-Dīn - Akhbār al-Dual al-Manqāṭiah,
B.M., Or., 3684.
- al-Jibrihī ‘Ali - Al-Durr al-Muntakhab fi Tārīkh Halab Arund,
B.M., Or., 25.
- Jirjis b al-Mākin - Al-Tārīkh al-Mukhtasar, B.M., Or., 7564.
- Muhibb al-Dīn - Raudat al-Manāzir, B.M., Or., 1618.
- Mujīr al-Dīn - Kitāb Tārīkh, B.M., Or., 1544.
- al-Nu‘aimi Nūr al-Dīn - Al-Majmu‘, B.M., Or., 1550.
- Shams al-Dīn Md. b ‘Ali b Junghul - Chronicles, B.M., Or.,
5912. Vol. IV.
- Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī - Mir‘at al-Zamān, B.M., Or., 6419.
- Stowe, B.M., Or., 7.
- Kitāb Al-Tawarikh ^{al-Ibn Rāhib} - B.M., Or., 1337.
- al-‘Umari yasin b Khair Allah - Al-Āthar al-Jāliyah, B.M., Or.,
6300.
- al-Yafī‘-Abu Md. ‘Abd Allah - Mir‘at al-Janān, B.M., Or., 1511.

PERSIAN

- Abu Sulaiman Dāud - Raḡdatu-Ulilalbāb, British Museum, Additional. 7626.
- Alansāri al-Lārī Md b Musliḥ al-Dīn - Mir'at al-Adwār, B.M., Add., 7650.
- Al Makūn Md 'Ali b Md Sādiq - Mir'at al-Ṣafā, B.M., Add., 6539.
- Almansu b Al-Qādi Ahmad b Md. - Nasḫi Jahān Ārā, B.M., Or, 141.
- 'Awfi Md. - Jami' al-Hikayat, India Office, W. 79. B.M., Or, 236.
- Faid Allah Zaiḡ al-'Ābidīn - Jami' Tārīkh Lilghāzan B.M., Add., 7629.
- Geneological Tables of the Principal Dynasties of the East. B.M., Add., 19531.
- Hāfiz Abrū - Jami' al-Tawārīkh, B.M., Or. 1577.
- Hajī khalīfab- Taqwīm al-Tawārīkh, B.M., Add., 23886.
- Husainī khūrshah - Tārīkh Ilichī Nizāmshah, B.M., Add., 23513.
- Ibn Md Ahmad - Nigārstān, B.M., Add., 26286.
- Isfahānī Faql b Rūzbahān - Suluk al-Muluk, B.M., Or., 253.
- Jurjānī Md Minhāj Sirāj - Ṭabaqāti Nāsirī, B.M., Add., 26189.
- Khānī Md Bihāmand - Tārīkh i-Muḥammadī, B.M., Or, 137.
- Khwāndmīr - Khulasat al-Akḫbār, B.M., Or., 1292. Habīb al-Siyar, B.M., Add., 23508.
- Kuhstānī Masūd b 'Uthmān - Tārīkh-i-'Abi al-Khair Khānī, B.M., Add., 26188.
- Mashhad Mīrza Md - Tuḥfat al-Akḫyār, B.M., Or., 209.
- Md b. 'Ali b. Md - Majma' al-Ansāb, B.M., Add. 16696.
- Md Bakhtawār Khān - Mir'at al-'Ālam, B.M., Add., 7657.
- Md Bāqir - Afsah al-Akḫbār, B.M., Or., 138.

- Md Yūsuf - Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh, B.M., Add., 16695.
- Mīrkhwānd - Raudat al-Ṣafā, B.M., Add., 16672.
- Mīrza Md - Jannat al-Firdaus, B.M., Or., 144.
- Nafais al-Maʿasir - B.M., Or., 1761.
- Qazwīnī Amīr Yahyā - Lubb al-Tawārīkh, B.M., Or., 140.
- Qazwīnī Hamd Allah Mastawfī - Tārīkhī Gāzidah, B.M., Add., 22693.
- Rashīd al-Dīn Fadl Allah - Jamīʿ al-Tawārīkh, B.M., Or., 1684;
Add., 7628.
- Tahir Md b ʿImād-al-Dīn - Raudat al-Tahirīn, B.M., Or., 168.
- Tārīkh Wassāf - B.M., Add., 23517.
- Tabrizī Mīrza Md Rīda - Zinat al-Tawārīkh, B.M., Add., 23514.

PRINTED SOURCESARABIC

- Abul Fida - Taqwīm al-Buldān (Reinaud) Paris, 1840.
- Al-Dhahabī Md b Ahmad - Dual-al-Islām, Hyderabad Deccan, 1337.A.H.
(Al-Dhahabī - Taqwīm al-Buldān - al-Buldān, 2 vols.)
Cairo, 1905.
- Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, 8 vols., De Goeje.
- Bundārī Fath b 'Ali - Daulat āb Saljūq, Cairo 1900.
- Ghazālī - Ihya 'Ulum al-Dīn, 4 vols., Cairo.
Al-Tibr al-Masbūk, Cairo, 1317 A.H.
- Ibn al-'Adīm 'Umar b Ahmad - Al-Muntakhab Min ...
... Tārīkh Halab, Luteliæ Parisiorum Freytag 1819.
- Ibn al-Athīr - Al-Kāmil. Vol. X., Cairo 1301 A.H.
- Ibn al-Jubair - Riḥlat (De Goeje) G.M.S. London, 1907.
- Ibn al-Qalānisī - Dhail Tarikh Dimashq (Amedroz) Leyden 1908.
- Ibn al-Tiktaka - Kitāb al-Fakhrī (Derenbourg) Paris 1895.
- Ibn Khaldūn - Al-'Ibar etc. 7 vols., Būlak 1867.
Muqaddimah - Beyrout, 1886.
- Ibn Khalliḡān - Wafayāt al-'Āyan (De Slane Trans.) 4 vols.,
Paris and London 1842-71.
- Māwardī Abūl Ḥasan 'Ali b Md - Ahkām al-Sultāniyah, Cairo,
1298. A.H.
- Recueil des Historiens Croisades Sources Arabes.
- Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī - Mir'at al-Zamān
(Jewett) facsimile, Yale, 1907.
- Suyūṭī-Jalāl-al-Dīn - Tārīkh al-Khulāfā
Trans. Jarrett, Calcutta, 1881.

Tugh ra'ī - Dīwān Constantinople, 1883.

‘Utbi Md b ‘Abd al-Jabbār - Tarikh al-Yamīnī
(on the margin of Ibn al-Athīr), Cairo.

Yaqūt b ‘Abd Allah al-Hamawī - Muʿjam al-Buldān, 6 vols.
(Wustenfēld) Leipzig, 1866.

Irshād al-Arīb (Margolionth) G.M.S. London 1908-13.

Zaidān, G. - Tārīkh al-Tamaddun al-Islāmī, 5 vols. Cairo, 1902-6.
Omayyads and Abbasids Tr. Margolionth) G.M.S.,
London, 1907.

PERSIAN

- ʿAwfi Md. - Lubab al-Albāb (Browne), G.M.S., London 1903.
- Baihāqī - Tārīkh i Āl-i-Sabuktagīn, Tehran 1258 A.H.
- Gardizī - Zain al-Akhhbār (Narim) B.M.S., 1928.
- Ibn al-Balkhī - Farsnāma (Le Strange) G.M.S. London, 1921.
- Ibn Isfandiyār - History of Ṭabaristān (Browne) G.M.S. London, 1905.
- Juwaynī ʿAṭā Malik - Tārīkh-i-Jahan-Gushay
(M.M. Qazwini) G.M.S., London, 1912.
- Khwāndmīr - Habīb al-Siyar Bombay, 1857.
- Mīrkhwānd - Raudat al-Ṣafā (Vuller) Gissae, 1839.
- Nāsir Khusrāw - Safarnāmāh, Berlin, 1922.
- Nizām al-Mulk - Siyāsāt Nāmāh (Schefer) Paris, 1891.
Supplement 1897.
- Qazwini Mustaufi Ḥamd Allah - Tārīkh Gazīdah, G.M.S. London, 1910.
Nuzhat al-Qulūb (Le Strange) G.M.S. London, 1915.
- Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allah - Jamīʿ al-Tawārīkh
(Blochet) G.M.S., London, 1912.
- Rāwandī - Raḥat al-Ṣudūr (Iqbal) G.M.S., London, 1921.
- Samarqandī Nizāmī ʿArūdī - Chahān Maḡalah (Browne).
- Yazdī - ʿUrāda fi al-Hikayat al-Saljūqiyyah (Sussheim);
Leiden, 1909.

SECONDARY AUTHORITIES

- Amedroz, H.F. and
Margoliouth, D.S. - The Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate.
Oxford, 1920-21.
- Ameer 'Ali Sayad - A short history of the Saracens, London, 1899.
Persian Culture - Persian Society, June, 1913.
- Arbuthnot, F.F. - Persian Portraits - a sketch of Persian History
London, 1887.
- Arnold, Sir T.W. - The Caliphate, London, 1924.
- Barthold, W. - Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion, London, 1928
Caliph and Sultan. Tr. H.A.R. Gibb.
- Beale, T.W. and Keene, H.G. - An Oriental Biographical Dictionary
London, 1894.
- Beroaldas, P. - A Short View of Persian Monarchy, London, 1590.
- Braithwaite, R. - The Kingdom of the Shah, 1873.
- Bretschneider, E. - Notices of Mediaeval Geography and History
of Central and Western Asia, 1876.
- Browne, E.G. - Literary History of Persia - 4 volumes. London,
1928.
A Year Amongst the Persians. London, 1893.
- Clement, H. - Ancient Persian and Iranian Civilisation,
London, 1927.
- Defrémery, C.H. - Historie des Seldjouikides extrait du
Tarkhgusideh.
Recherches sur le regne de Barkiarok (1092-1104
J.R.A.S. 1848-1853. (Also published
separately.
- Dosabhai Framji Karaki - History of the Persis. 2 vols. 1884.
- Dumret - Historie des Seldjouikides extrait de l'ouvrage
intitute Khelassetoul.
Archbar. J. Asit. 13. p. 240.

- Eden Richards - The History of Trawayle in the West and East and other countries lying either way as Mascovia, Persia, Arabia, Syria etc. gathered by Richard Wallis, 1577.
- Gibb, H.A.R. - The Damascus Chronicle of Crusades, London, 1932.
- Gibbon, E. - History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. 6 vols. London, 1854. Ed. O. Smeaton.
- Griffiths Rogers, A. - In Persia's Golden Days, 1889.
- Houtsma, M.Th. and others - Encyclopaedia of Islam
- Houtsma, M.Th. - Zur Geschichte der Seldjucken Von Kerman Zeit. deuts, Mogenland. Ges 1885 xxxix, pp. 362-402.
Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljoncides. 4 vols. L Lugduni, Batavorium, 1886-1902.
Death of Nizam al-Mulk and the consequences. Journal of Indian History. Vol. 3. Part II. Serial No. 6., Sept. 1924.
- Jackson, A.V.W. - Persia Past and Present. New York, 1906.
- Jhabvala, S.H. - A brief history of Persia. Bombay, 1920.
- Kaempfer, E. - Journey in Persia - 1736.
- Kinneir, Sir J.M. - Geographical Memoir of the Persian Empire. London, 1813.
- Kramer, A. Von - The Orient under the Caliphs. Translated by S. Khudabakhsh. Calcutta, 1920.
- Kramers, J.H. - Article on Sultan in the Encyclopaedia of Islam.

- Lane-Poole, S. - Muhammadan Dynasties. London, 1894.
Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British
Museum. 10 vols.
Additions to the Oriental Collections of
Coins in the British Museum, London, 1890.
- Le Strange, G. - Lands of the Eastern Caliphate. London, 1905.
Description of Syria. London, 1892.
Description of the Province of Fars in Persia
Asia. soc. mono. 1912. Diary of a journey
through Persia. London 1888.
Baghdad During the Abbasid Caliphate. London,
1924.
- Levy, R. - A Baghdad Chronicle. Cambridge, 1929,
Sociology of Islam. 2 vols. London, 1931-33.
- Low, C.R. - Land of the Sun. 1870.
- Mahdi Md. - Translation of Jahangushay by Gaffar A. Syed -
Ahmedabad, 1908.
- Malcolm, Sir John - History of Persia. 2 vols. London, 1829.
Sketches of Persia. London, 1828.
- Malcolm (Malkum) Khān - Persian Civilisation Contemporary Review
February, 1891.
- Margoliouth, D.S. - The Place of Persia in the History of Islam.
Persia. society monograph, 1925.
- Markham, Sir C.B. - A General Sketch of the History of Persia.
London, 1874.
History of Persia. London, 1874.
- Morgan, J. De - Feudalism in Persia, its Origin, Development
and Present Condition. Report,
Smithsonian Institution. 1913. pp.576-606
- Muir, Sir W. - The Caliphate - Edinburgh, 1924.
- Mustafa Khan Fāteh - Taxation in Persia - Bulletin of School
of Oriental Studies. 1928 - vol. iv.
pp. 723-43.

- Nāzim, M. - Sultan Mahmūd. Cambridge, 1931.
- Nicholson, R.A. - Literary History of the Arabs. Cambridge, 1930.
- Parker, E.H. - A Thousand Years of the Tartars, 1895.
- Piggot, J. - Persia Ancient and Modern. 2 vols. 1874.
- Price, D. - Mahommudan History. 3 vols. London, 1821.
- Rabino, H.L. - Mazandaran and Astarabād. G.M.S. London, 1928.
- Embassy to the Court of the Great Khan, 1618-19. Edited by W. Foster. 1911.
- Ross, Sir E.D. - The Persians. London, 1932.
- Schefer, C. - Quelques Chapitres de l'Abrégé du Seldjouk-nameh de l'emir Nassireddin Yahya Recueil de textes, published by the Ecole Nat. des lang. Orient. viv Paris, 1889. vol 1. pp. 3-102.
- Shobert, F. - Persia. London, 1822. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1828.
- Speede, J. - The Kingdom of Persia. 1626.
- Stevens, J. - The History of Persia - 1715.
- Sussheim, Karl - Prolegomena zu Einer Ausgabe der im Britischen Museum zu London verwahrten Chronik des Seldschuqischen Reiches. 1911.
- Sykes, Sir Percy - History of Persia. 2 vols. London, 1930.
A History of Persia, 1915-22.

- Warfield, W. - The Gate of Asia. 1916.
- Warree, D. de - Peeps into Persia. 1913.
- Watson, R.G. - History of Persia. London, 1866.
- Wilmot Buxton, E.M. - Stories of Persian Heroes. New York. 1908.
- Wilson, A.J. - Sketch of the Political History of Persia
and Arabia. 1917.
- (Yoncel, B. Mirza - The History of the War between the Turks
and Persians. 1895.)
- Yoncel, B. Mirza - Iran of Iranians. Baltimore, 1913.

MISCELLANEOUS

- A Bibliography of Persia (Wilson, Sir A.T.) London, 1930.
- A Dictionary of Oriental Quotations (Field, C.H.A.)
(Arabic and Persian) 1911.
- A Handbook of Historical Terms (Howells, I. and Edwards, T.J.)
London, 1931.
- Acta Orientalia.
- Al-Qāmūs.
Arabic - English Lexicon (Lane) E.W.) London 1880.
- British Academy Report: Transliteration of Arabic and Persian.
London.
- Burhan Qāṭi'.
- Bulletin of School of Oriental Studies.
- Chambers's Dictionary.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam.
- Grundriss der Neupersischen Etymologie (Paul Horn) Strassburg, 1893.
- Jewish Travellers. Edited by Adler.
Johnson's Persian Dictionary, London 1852.
- Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- Lisān al-Ārab.
- Mishkat al-Masabih.
Redhouse's Turkish Dictionary, London 1863.
- Report of the Smithsonian Institution.
- Vergleichungs Tabellen (Wustenfeld, H.F. and Mahler, E)
Leipzig, 1926.