

THE HISTORY OF THE JAZĪRA 1100 - 1150:

THE CONTRIBUTION OF

IBN AL-AZRAQ AL-FĀRIQĪ

VOLUME I

BY

CAROLE HILLENBRAND

Thesis presented for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, University of Edinburgh

1979

THE HISTORY OF THE JAZĪRA 1100 - 1150:

THE CONTRIBUTION OF

IBN AL-AZRAQ AL-FĀRIQĪ

VOLUME I

BY

CAROLE HILLENBRAND

Thesis presented for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, University of Edinburgh

1979



LIST OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
<u>VOLUME I</u>	
Abstract	i - ii
Acknowledgements	iii - iv
Chapter I General Introduction	1 - 21
Chapter II Ibn al-Azraq as a Source for Later Medieval Authors	22 - 70
Chapter III The Language of Ibn al-Azraq	71 - 109
Chapter IV The Career of Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī	110 - 183
Chapter V <u>Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid</u> - Arabic Text	184 - 272
<u>VOLUME II</u>	
Chapter VI Translation of Ms.A of <u>Tārīkh</u> <u>Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid</u>	273 - 343
Chapter VII Commentary on Translation of Ms.A of <u>Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid</u>	344 - 472
Chapter VIII The Sons of Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī	473 - 503
Appendix A Chronological Lists of Relevant 12th Century Dynasties	.504 - 507
Appendix B Genealogical Table of the Artuqids with Commentary and Genealogical Table of the later Saljuqs	508 - 519

	<u>Pages</u>
Appendix C Translation of Ms.B of <u>Tārīkh</u> <u>Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid</u>	520 - 560
Appendix D Specimen Folios of Ms.A and Ms.B	561 - 564
Index of Names on Map	565 - 567
Index	568 - 607
Bibliography	608 - 619
Map (in back pocket)	

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

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

Individual chapters then explore some of the issues raised by the text. The chapters on Īl-Ghāzī and his sons seek by careful selection to establish the significant landmarks of their careers and to assess them as military and civil rulers. The beginning of their transition from semi-nomadic amīrs to settled dynasts is thereby clarified. Chapter II shows how later writers exploited the text of Ibn al-Azraq and thereby examines certain typical

Islamic approaches to works of history, biography and topography. Chapter III analyses the text as an interesting source for the study of late medieval Arabic.

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has benefited in many ways from the help I have received from various people and I am happy to record my debt to them.

I would like first of all to thank my supervisors for their efforts on my behalf: Mr. J.R. Walsh, who kindly read over the text of Ibn al-Azraq with me, and showed exemplary generosity in the loan of numerous books from his library, and Dr. I.K.A. Howard for his constant encouragement. Dr. 'Abd al-Rahim 'Ali patiently checked my translation of Ms.A and was able to shed light on several passages which had hitherto remained obscure. I also profited from the constructive advice of Mr. Jasim Husain on a few cruces in the text. Professor A.F.L. Beeston very kindly agreed to read Chapter III and made valuable comments on it. Mr. Shaukat Mahmood kindly exercised his calligraphic skill in writing out various Arabic phrases and words. For advice on the sketch map I am indebted to Dr. Ian Morrison; its elegant layout is the work of Mr. Ray Harris, who spared no pains to make it as accurate as possible.

To Mr. Alan Jones and Professor Victor Ménage I owe a long-standing debt of gratitude for their support and encouragement without which I would never have embarked on this thesis.

The staff of the Edinburgh University Library and the National Library of Scotland have accorded my work every facility and I am grateful to them.

I am very grateful to Mrs. Mona Bennett for her careful typing of the majority of this thesis and for her cheerfulness and patience. I should also like to thank Mrs. Audrey Walters for typing the commentary, Dona Straley who nobly took on the index and bibliography and Murray Campbell who typed Chapter VIII and the genealogical tables.

Yusuf al-Khatib took time off from his own thesis to type the Arabic text with great patience and care. I am extremely grateful to him.

My load over the last couple of months was greatly eased by much selfless help from Patsy and Murray Campbell, Rosemary Douglas and Louise Howard, all of whom cheerfully removed many a domestic burden from my shoulders. Without their help it would have been impossible to finish the thesis within the time limit set.

Finally I should like to thank my husband for all his moral support and encouragement since I began work on this thesis.

CHAPTER I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The value of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid of Ibn al-Azraq as a source for the history of the Jazīra has long been recognised. Amedroz,¹ who first drew attention to this text, subsequently transcribed some relevant sections of it in the footnotes to his edition of Ibn al-Qalānisi. Minorsky translated and analysed Ibn al-Azraq's account of Īl-Ghāzī's campaign to Tiflīs in 515/1121,³ whilst Cahen, in an early article, sketched the major political outlines of the part of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid which

1. H.F. Amedroz, "Three Arabic MSS. on the History of the City of Mayyāfāriqīn", Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (1902), 785-812.
2. Ibn al-Qalānisi, Dhail Tārīkh Dimashq, ed. H.F. Amedroz (Leyden, 1908).
3. V. Minorsky, "Caucasica in the History of Mayyāfāriqīn", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies XIII/I (1949), 31-5. Part of that account and other subsequent passages in Ibn al-Azraq which refer to Georgia are also published in an Arabic reader for Georgian students: Arabuli Krest'omathia, ed. G.V. T'seret'heli (Tiflis, 1949), 68-72. Minorsky later returned to the text giving translations of later passages of Ibn al-Azraq which deal with Caucasian affairs (Studies in Caucasian History, [London, 1953], 79, 87-8, 95, 97, 106 and 157). He also translated an account by Ibn al-Azraq of his visit to Darband in 549/1154-5 (A History of Sharvān and Darband [Cambridge, 1958], 170-3).

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

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

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

1. C. Cahen, "Le Diyār Bakr au temps des premiers Urtukides", Journal Asiatique CCXXVII (1935), 219-76. Cf. also M. Canard, who gives an extract from Ibn al-Azraq's text in his Sayf al-daula: Recueil de textes (Algiers, 1934), 284-5.
2. B.A.L. 'Awad, rev. M.S. Ghorbal, Tārīkh al-Fāriqī (Cairo, 1959).

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

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

Description of the manuscripts

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

Manuscript A (B.M. Or. 5803)

This is the longer and larger of the two manuscripts. The pages edited below usually have 23 lines¹; the pages measure about 7" x 5". The manuscript is written in black ink on yellow paper. New sections of the text are marked by titles written in

1. Not 22, as stated by Amedroz (op. cit., 785). Although the number of lines in the earlier part of the manuscript varies, from f.120b onwards the pages contain 23 lines. The only exceptions are ff.173a - b which have 22 lines.

larger letters. The manuscript is written in a fine hand and is provided with vowels and diacritical points.

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

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

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

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

1. Ff. 7b - 12b.

2. Ff.12b - 121b. The rise of the Hamdānids begins on f.110a.

5

subsequent rule in Diyār Bakr of Bād the Kurd follows. Ibn al-Azraq then gives an account of the Marwānid dynasty and of the chaotic years between their downfall and the establishment of Artuqid power.¹ The remainder of the text consists of a detailed description of the history of the early Artuqids. The manuscript ends around the death of Najm al-Dīn Alpī in 572/1176-7.

Folios 160b - 178b cover the reigns of Īl-Ghāzī and Temūr-Tash. It is these folios which are edited and translated in this thesis.

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

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

1. This is the section of Ibn al-Azraq's work which was edited by 'Awad (ff.121b - 160b).
2. The process can be noted at the end of the previous reign in the Tiflīs campaign of Īl-Ghāzī which occupies ff.161a-162b. Falling within the reign of Temūr-Tash are the accounts of

The uneasy juxtaposition of detailed anecdotes with a succession of short scraps of information which characterises the text edited below produces a very uneven, unco-ordinated narrative.

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

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

In fact there are several clues in the text. On f.177a, Ibn al-Azraq mentions that Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad "is now in power". This ruler succeeded his father Qara Arslan at Ḥiṣn Kaifā in 562/1166-7 and ruled until 581/1185-6. A little later, Ibn al-Azraq mentions the death of Shīrbārīk in 566/1170-1³ and Balak b. Arslan Toghmish b. Bektash who became an ascetic in (5)67/1171-2. On the evidence of these three references, it may be postulated that

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

1. Op. cit., 785.
2. Op. cit., 21.
3. F. 177b.

the manuscript was written in the reign of Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad, some time between 567 and 581.

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

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

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

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

1. F.200a.
2. Ff.163b - 164a.
3. Rawandī, Rāḥat al-Sudūr wa Āyat al-Surūr, ed. M. Iqbāl, (London, 1921), 301.
4. F.7b.

probably copied at Damascus in the seventh century A.H.¹ 'Awad, on the other hand, is justifiably unwilling to commit himself on a date for the copying but says that Mayyāfāriqīn would have been the most likely place.²

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

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

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

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

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

1. Op. cit., 785.

2. Op. cit., 23.

it is more carefully written than Ms.A.

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

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

Ms.B. was probably composed in 560/1164-5,¹ since on folio 94b the author speaks of the year in which he was writing as 560. It is not possible to ascertain the date of the copying of this manuscript. One fact is certain: Ms.B was available in some form to Ibn Shaddād in the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century since he copied long sections from it for his historical geography of the Jazīra. This work is found in the Bodleian manuscript entitled Marsh 333, which was composed in 679/1280-1 and copied in 789/1387-8.²

The title of Ibn al-Azraq's work

As explained above, both manuscripts lack folios at the

1. It was Amedroz who first mentioned this fact and cited f.94b as proof (op. cit., 785).
2. Amedroz, op. cit., 801.

beginning and end of the text, where the title of the work, the names of the author and the scribes and the dates of composition and copying would probably be found. Fortunately, Ibn Shaddād in Marsh 333 gives the full name of the author as Ahmad b. Yūsuf b. ‘Alī b. al-Azraq and the title of the work as the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid.¹ Ibn Khallikān calls it the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn.²

The edition of the text

a) Preliminary comments

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

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

1. Marsh 333, ff.79b and 81b.
2. Ibn Khallikān, Kitāb Wafayāt al-A‘yān, tr. de Slane (Paris and London, 1843-71) I, 158.
3. Op. cit., 27.

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

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

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

The edition of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid presented in this thesis covers Ms.A, ff.160b - 178b and Ms.B, ff.100b - 138b. The unpublished work of the historical geographer Ibn Shaddād on the Jazīra, entitled al-A'laq al-Khatīra fī dhikr umarā' al-Shām

wa'l-Jazira is used in this edition to elucidate passages which are unclear in both Mss.A and B. The relevant part of this text is to be found in the Bodleian manuscript, Marsh 333¹. It is a useful aid because a large portion of its contents are borrowed, often verbatim, from Ibn al-Azraq. Marsh 333 is based on Ms.B. It would have been of greater help in the preparation of this edition if it had taken material from Ms.A. Nevertheless, it is of value since it provides a third version of a limited number of incidents. Marsh 333 is cited in the edition only sparingly as it is so similar or identical to Ms.B. Ibn Shaddād has a better grasp of geographical names than Ibn al-Azraq or his copyists and his work is of value in this respect too.

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

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

1. For a longer discussion of the relationship between Ibn al-Azraq and Ibn Shaddād, cf. Chapter II of this thesis.

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

b) Detailed comments on the edition

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

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

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

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

2 **فنى رابع عشر جمادى الاخرة (فنى الرابع عشر من جمادى
الاخرة)**

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

2. Ms.A, f.161a.

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

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

Dhu'l-Qarnain = بالقرنين

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

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

A personal name is corrected in the edition only when there

1. Such names as Sulaimān often occur in written Arabic with the fatha replaced by a vertical stroke.

is a clear error either by the author or the scribes. For example, Zangī's son is called Qutb al-Dīn Mamdūd; this has been changed to Maudūd in the text.¹

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

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

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

Abbreviations used in this edition

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

1. Ms.A, f.174b.

Introduction to the translation of the text

Preliminary comments

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

In spite of his protestations and profuse apologies for his "literal" translation, Gibb's achievement with The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades¹ provides a polished model for any translator of an Arabic chronicle to try to emulate.

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

In the translation provided below, the simplistic style of

1. H.A.R. Gibb, The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades
(London, 1932), 13-14.

the Arabic has mostly been retained. From time to time, however, subordinate clauses introduced by temporal conjunctions have been used to vary the constant succession of short main clauses. On occasion, pronouns have been replaced by proper names in order to impose some clarity on obscure parts of the text.¹ Similarly, words such as "then" have sometimes been added to render the sequence of events more understandable.

For the sake of completeness and comparison, a translation of the whole of the corresponding portion of Ms.B is also provided.²

Points of detail

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

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

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

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

2. Cf. Appendix C.

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

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

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

e.g.	Togh-Tegin	<u>not</u>	Toghr-Tegin
	Toghril-Beg	<u>not</u>	Toghr-Beg
	Dhu'l-Qarnain	<u>not</u>	Bal-qarnain
	Bahmard	<u>not</u>	Bahmūd

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

1. J. Sauvaget, "Noms et Surnoms de Mamelouks", Journal Asiatique CCXXXVIII (1950), 31-58.
2. M.T. Houtsma, Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar (Leyden, 1894).

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

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

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

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

Reiches (Brussels, 1935), J. Markwart, Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen (Vienna, 1930) and by the numerous maps in A History of the Crusades, ed. K. Setton and M.W. Baldwin (Madison, Milwaukee and London, from 1969 onwards).

Transliteration table

ع	'	ع	'
ب	b	غ	gh
ت	t	ف	f
ث	th	ق	q
ج	j	ك	k
ح	h	ل	l
خ	kh	م	m
د	d	ن	n
ذ	dh	ه	h
ر	r	و	w
ز	z	ي	y
س	s	faṭha =	a
ش	sh	kasra =	i
ص	s	damma =	u
ض	d	faṭha + alif =	ā
ط	t	kasra + yā =	ī
ظ	z	damma + waw =	ū
		faṭha + ya =	ai
		faṭha + waw =	au

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

Apart from "caliph", "sultan" and "vizier", which are used throughout, as indicated above, the following English terms, one-word titles are transliterated: they are in lower case or underlined or prefixed by al- if none of these applies. They are not strictly transliterated.

CHAPTER II

IBN AL-AZRAQ AS A SOURCE FOR

LATER MEDIEVAL AUTHORS

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

Introductory Comments

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

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

It therefore seems worthwhile not merely to list the borrowings which can be identified but also to try to discover why later historians borrowed what they did and to discuss how and why they altered this material. In the process it might be

possible to glean some insights into the use which a medieval historian made of his sources.

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

Although the four authors to be studied in detail in this chapter have been termed "historians", the particular emphasis of their work varies. Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī and Ibn Wāsil qualify as genuine historians, as will be clear from the discussion below. Ibn Khallikān, however, was concerned with writing biographies and this naturally led him to ignore much that was of vital political interest. His borrowings from Ibn al-Azraq are dictated

by this somewhat narrow interest. Ibn Shaddād was a historical geographer whose approach was to write a concise history of each of the towns within his area of choice. Thus the same events are often repeated in several places in the text simply because they directly concern the town in question. Other events of much greater moment are omitted simply because they happened somewhere else. While each of the four authors under discussion quarried material from Ibn al-Azraq, their aims were not the same. But the very fact that they all used him, despite the differences in their approach, is ample testimony to the regard in which he was held in the century after his death.

Thus the evident lack of any literary merit in Ibn al-Azraq's work and indeed the wealth of grammatical errors and colloquial usages which occur on nearly every page do not apparently deter later writers from extracting significant portions of the text for incorporation into their own histories. The detailed subject matter clearly outweighs considerations of literary or linguistic merit in writers who themselves have lost contact with the literary standards much valued in the 'Abbāsīd period. As Fück demonstrates, the advent of the Saljuq Turks brought fundamental linguistic as well as political changes.¹ Even Usāma b. Munqidh (488/1095 - 584/1188), who is capable of writing correct classical Arabic in his poetry, used a simpler, more colloquial language in his biographical reminiscences.²

1. J. Fück, 'Arabiya, tr. C. Denizeau (Paris, 1955), 176-191.
2. Ibid., 191.

SIBT IBN AL-JAUZĪ AND IBN AL-AZRAQ

The work of Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī¹ entitled Mir'āt al-Zamān, belongs to the genre of universal history much favoured by Muslim writers. Like his grandfather, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī writes biographies of the 'ulamā' but blends these with historical accounts, culled either from other sources or - for the latter part of his work - from his own experience.

Cahen rightly comments on the derivative nature of the Mir'āt al-Zamān in the sections which deal with the sixth/twelfth century.² Here, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī draws heavily on the works of Ibn al-Qalānisī and Ibn al-Azraq and on the History of the Atabegs of Mosul³ by Ibn al-Athīr.

On the other hand, Gabrieli laments the fact that Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī has not been studied systematically, since his work is of primary value for the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk period.⁴ Whatever the merits of his history for the seventh/thirteenth century, the very fact that the Mir'āt al-Zamān copies other works so extensively for the period under discussion in this thesis is of value as one facet of a more detailed appraisal of the work of Ibn al-Azraq.

1. Born 582/1186-7; died 654/1256-7.
2. C. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades et la Principauté franque d'Antioche (Paris, 1940), 65.
3. Cahen, op. cit., 66.
4. F. Gabrieli, "The Arabic Historiography of the Crusades", in Historians of the Middle East, ed. B. Lewis and P.M. Holt (London, 1962), 105.

In the Mir'at al-Zamān, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī quotes several passages which appear to have been taken from Ibn al-Azraq. In the particular section of his history which deals with events between 500/1106-7 and 550/1155-6, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī does not, it is true, explicitly acknowledge that he has borrowed information from Ibn al-Azraq. Earlier, however, under the year 418 A.H. (1027-8), he says that his source for the details of the placing of a purse in the coffin of the vizier al-Maghribī¹ is the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn, a fact noted by Amedroz.²

Amedroz also draws attention to a statement by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī to the effect that he used the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn as his source for his information that the vizier al-Maghribī wanted to be buried beneath the feet of al-Husain.³ Such details are, however, not to be found in either Ms.A or Ms.B of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn. Similarly, the account given by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī of the defeat of Qīlīkh Arslan in 500/1106-7⁴ is very different from the version of this event given in 'Awad's edition which is based on Mss.A and B⁵. Yet here again Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī

1. Cf. 'Awad, op.cit., 138-9.
2. Op.cit., 799. Amedroz says that the information in Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī is to be found in Or.4619, f.216b.
3. Ibid.; Amedroz cites Or.4619, f.217a here.
4. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Orientaux, III (Paris, 1884), 533.
5. 'Awad, op.cit., 272-3.

expressly states that his source is the author of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn.¹ It would therefore appear likely that the manuscripts of Ibn al-Azraq's work under discussion in this thesis were not the only ones known in the medieval period. This suggests that Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī used a third version of Ibn al-Azraq's text for the portions of his work mentioned above.

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

The first example of this kind is the account by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī of Īl-Ghāzī's campaign to Tiflīs.² His version of this episode is an interesting mixture of summary, paraphrase and copying from the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid.³ His text runs as follows:

كان قوم من اهل تفليس يقال لهم بنو جعفر قد ملكوها فاقاموا
مائتي سنة ثم انقرض كبارهم وبقي شبابهم كل واحد منهم شهرا
فاقاموا على ذلك اربعين سنة وكان داود ملك الابخاز والكرج قد
ضايقها مضايقة شديدة فأرسلوا الى طغرل بن محمد شاه وهو صاحب

1. Recueil III, 533.

2. Mir'at al-Zamān VIII (Hyderabad, 1951), 101.

3. Ms.A, f.161a - b; Ms.B. f.102a - f.103a.

أرأيت فبعث اليهم شحنته فما نبع
 وملوك الاطراف شمس الدولة طغان صاحب ارزن وبدليس
 والسلطان طغريل وغيرهم وكان الموعد باب تفليس فنزل على
 اقل من نصف يوم ولم يكن وصل من عساكر الاطراف احد فتحدر
 الملك داؤد من الجبل في عساكر عظيمة فهزمهم وغنم اموالهم
 واخذ شيئا عظيما وهرب نجم الدين ودبيس

In both versions of the text in Ibn al-Azraq, on which this passage is based, Ibn al-Azraq uses the verb **نفذ** three times. A close reading of his work lends credence to the theory that for him this verb has a meaning close to "send" or "contact". His vocabulary is extremely limited in general but he particularly over-uses this verb, which can be found throughout his work.

Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī clearly finds the verb **نفذ** used in this way either incorrect, obscure or provincial, for he removes it completely from his version of this episode. Elsewhere he is not averse to borrowing from Ibn al-Azraq certain phrases which please him - the words **القرض كبارهم** (Ms.A) and **كان... قد ضايقها ضيقة شديدة** (Mss. A and B) are lifted intact into his own work¹ - but in this section he replaces the verb **نفذ** by three separate verbs. He changes **نفذوا** to **ارسلوا**² on the first occasion. When it appears again, he replaces **نفذ** by **بعث**³ The third time

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

Such a statement is far from true as a generalisation.

2. Ms. A and B: **نفذوا الى السلطان**
 3. Ms. A and B: **فنفذ لهم شحنة**

he writes the verb **سبو** instead of **نفذوا** .

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

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

The second extended account which Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī borrows from Ibn al-Azraq is that concerned with the capture of Tiflīs by King David the Restorer and his subsequent treatment of its inhabitants.²

1. Ms. A and B: **ونفذوا الى نجم الدين**

2. Mir'āt al-Zamān, op.cit., 101-2. The original passages in Ibn al-Azraq occur on f.162a (Ms.A) and f.103b - 104b (Ms.B).

The text is as follows:-

ثم نازل داؤد تغليس وفتحها بالسيف عنوة واحرقها ونهبها ثم طيب قلوب اهلها وسألوه اشياء فابقاها عليهم وهي جارية الى هلم جرا ، منها انه لا يذبح فيها خنزير وان يضرب على الدراهم والدنانير اسم الله ورسوله والخليفة وان تقام الجماعات بالاذان والخطبة يوم الجمعة وان لا يدخل الحمام مع المسلمين وان لا يؤذى كافر مسلما . فاليوم لهم جميع ذلك وكان داؤد يدخل كل يوم جمعة الجامع ومعه ولده ديمطرى ويسمع الخطبة والقراءة ويعطي الخطيب والمؤذنين الذهب الكثير وعمر الرباطات للضيوف والمنازل للوعاظ والصوفية والشعراء واقام لهم الضيافات وكان اذا اراد الانفصال عن تغليس اجازهم وزودهم بالمال الكثير وكان يحترم المسلمين اكثر مما يحترمهم ملوك الاسلام

This account by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī is not different in substance from the text of Ibn al-Azraq in either manuscript. The phraseology of Mss. A and B, however, has been drastically changed by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī, unless indeed his words are based on a version of Ibn al-Azraq's text which is now lost. But in view of the fundamental similarity in style between Mss. A and B, it is not very likely that any other version of Ibn al-Azraq's work would have been couched in the terms used by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī. Rather, the style of any missing manuscript would resemble closely that of Mss. A or B. Internal stylistic evidence in the passage above rules out the possibility that Ibn al-Azraq would use such phrases as **وهي جارية الى هلم جرا**. The wording here is far more likely to be that of Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī himself who has taken the liberty of eliminating some of the more difficult parts of Ibn al-Azraq's narrative and using his own phraseology for that which remains. In particular, he removes such words as athqāl, aqṣāt and the specific reference

to the bath of Ismā'īl at Tiflīs. On the question of King David's treatment of the religious élite in the city, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī seems to have had additional information, either from a missing copy of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn or from another source. He adds poets to the list of people helped by King David and mentions the detail that if the preachers, Sūfīs and poets wanted to leave Tiflīs the king allowed them to do so and supplied them with a lot of money.

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

The third episode borrowed from Ibn al-Azraq in the Mir'āt al-Zamān¹ is the account of the earthquake at Ganja.² This passage is modelled more closely on Ibn al-Azraq and retains much of his actual wording in Ms.A:-

وفيهما زلزلت جنزة وقيل كنجة وانخسف طرف منها وانهدم سورها
فسار اليها ملك الابخاز والكرج فسار اليها بمساكره فدخلها وساق
اهلها سبايا الى تفليس بحيث حملوا على المعجل وسبق المسلمون
مثل قطعات الغنم فاشترى اهل تفليس منها خلقا كثيرا واعتقوهم
فكان اهل تفليس يقولون ما افتقرنا غير تلك السنة .

1. Op. cit., 102.

2. Ms.A, f.162a - b; Ms.B, f.104b.

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

More important than the linguistic issues raised by a comparison of individual details in the accounts of these three episodes¹ in the texts of Ibn al-Azraq and Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī are the broader questions of the choice of material and the emphasis used.

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

1. Sibt Ibn al-Jauzī mentions the manner in which Sulaimān and the Khatun entered Mayyāfāriqīn in 516/1122 after the death of Il-Ghāzī but he fails to extract the full flavour of the anecdote because he only recounts half of it (op.cit., 103; Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.162b and Ms.B, f.104b - 105a).

for relevant material in Ibn al-Azraq, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī must have had to skim through a great deal of text which held no interest for him. Particular value therefore attaches to the sections he did decide to reproduce in his own history. In fact his selection of material from Ibn al-Azraq proves to be sensible, indeed intelligent. He chooses three episodes, all connected with Georgia. Not only are they concerned with events and places with which Ibn al-Azraq was familiar personally but they are also one major section of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid which contains unusual, even original, information not available in other Arabic chronicles accessible to Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī in the sixth/thirteenth century. For Syrian matters, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī rightly concentrates on the work of Ibn al-Qalānisī who handles this material with a firmer grasp and good chronology. Ibn al-Azraq's account of the ill-fated campaign into Georgia is much more convincing than the one given in Ibn al-Qalānisī, whilst his description of King David's treatment of the Muslims must have interested Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī, who gives it extended treatment in an account which is otherwise terse narrative.

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

1. M.F. Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie I (St. Petersburg, 1858), 368-9; O. Turan Selcuklular Tarihi ve Türk - Islām Medeniyeti (Ankara, 1965), 182.

in the events of late Saljuq history. Just as he can manifest a certain malicious satisfaction at the degrading fate of Sultan Sanjar, seeing it as God's retribution for the humiliation and death suffered by the caliph, al-Mustarshid,¹ so too this historian's horizons can extend to include material on the Caucasus connected with the decline of Saljuq power.

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

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

1. Cf. C.E. Bosworth in The Cambridge History of Iran, V, 150.

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

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

Ibn Khallikān and Ibn al-Azraq

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

1. Unlike Ibn al-Athīr, who, as Gibb has convincingly shown, was greatly influenced by his own beliefs and prejudices when borrowing material from Ibn al-Qalānisi (H.A.R.Gibb, "Notes on the History of the Early Crusades", BSOAS VII (1933-35), 745-754).
2. Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt al-a'yān (Cairo, 1299 A.H.), 2 vols.

so many regions.¹ For the lives of famous people from the Jazīra, Ibn Khallikān derives much information from the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid.

It is of no special value to list the numerous occasions when Ibn Khallikān borrows information from Ibn al-Azraq. The actual use Ibn Khallikān makes of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid is in any case probably more extensive than the obvious borrowings cited by Amedroz² and 'Awad.³ Since Ibn Khallikān does not employ a chronological approach for his vast undertaking and since he has a tendency to paraphrase rather than to quote his sources verbatim, it is difficult to trace all the details in his work which have Ibn al-Azraq as their source.

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

1. M. de Slane, Ibn Khallikān's Biographical Dictionary (Paris and London, 1843-1871), 4 vols. See also F. Wüstenfeld, Ueber die Quellen des Werkes Ibn Challikani vitae illustrium hominum (Göttingen, 1837).
2. H.F. Amedroz, "Three Arabic MSS. on the History of the City of Mayyāfāriqīn", JRAS (1902), 799.
3. B.A.L. 'Awad, Tārīkh al-Fāriqī (Cairo, 1959), 41-8.

rarely leaving the words of his source unchanged. Although Ibn Khallikān's literary style cannot be compared with that of such historians as Ibn al-Tiḡtaqā¹ and Miskawaih - he was admired more for the enormous wealth of his subject-matter - his style is manifestly superior to that of Ibn al-Azraq.

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

All this information does not come from Ibn al-Azraq who makes only a passing reference to the motive for Dubais' murder³

1. For an appreciation of Ibn al-Tiḡtaqā see J.B. Kritzeck, "Ibn al-Tiḡtaqā and the fall of Baghdād", in The World of Islam: Studies in honor of P.K. Hitti, eds. J.B. Kritzeck and R.B. Winder (Princeton, 1959), 159-84.
2. Op.cit., I, 222. The comparable account in Ibn al-Azraq is to be found on Ms.A, f.165b and Ms.B, f.111b.
3. He merely writes: "There had been a report that Dubais had incited the sultan to kill al-Mustarshid".

and in no way describes the mode of execution. However, for the less important account of Dubais' subsequent burial in Mayyāfāriqīn in the mashhad beside Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī, Ibn Khallikān quotes straight from the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid:¹

وذكر ابن الأزرق في تاريخه أن قتله كان على باب تبريز وأنه لما قتل حمل إلى ماردين إلى زوجته كهار خاتون فدفن بالمشهد عند نجم الدين الغازي صاحب ماردين والد كهار خاتون المذكورة ثم تزوج السلطان المذكور ابنة ديس المذكور وأمها شرف خاتون ابنة عميد الدولة بن فخر الدولة محمد بن جبير وأم شرف خاتون المذكورة زبيدة بنت الوزير نظام الملك

2

It is natural that for specific details concerned with Mayyāfāriqīn, where an important historical figure such as Dubais was buried, Ibn Khallikān should have recourse to the local historian, Ibn al-Azraq. Thus in another part of his work he gleans information from Ibn al-Azraq on libraries at Mayyāfāriqīn and Āmid.³ Conversely, when Ibn al-Azraq describes the burial of Īl-Ghāzī in 516/1122, it is Ibn Khallikān who provides an explanation for the buildings mentioned. Ibn al-

1. Op.cit., I, 223.
2. This appears to be based more on Ms.B than on Ms.A. The burial of Dubais in Ms.B is followed by the account of the sultan's marriage to the daughter of Dubais, whereas in Ms.A the order is reversed. But the dependence on Ms.B remains far from proven.
3. The vizier, al-Manazī, collected many books which he bequeathed as a waqf to the mosques of Mayyāfāriqīn and Āmid (Ibn Khallikān, op.cit., I,55; Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A,ff.134b-135a, Ms.B,f,44a).

Azraq writes:-

"He (Il-Ghāzī) was buried in the sidillī¹ (سدلی) for a while. Then he was removed and buried in the masjid al-amīr to the east of the qubbat al-sultān."²

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

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

1. "Three pillars".
2. Ms.A, f.162b; cf. also Ms.B, f.105a.
3. De Slane, op.cit., I, 157-9.

employed by Ibn Khallikān in treating material from this source. It is of some interest that whilst for trivial borrowings Ibn Khallikān acknowledges his debt to Ibn al-Azraq, in the following extracts - where he has borrowed substantially more - he remains silent.

In his biography of Sultan Mas'ūd, Ibn Khallikān borrows the following passage from Ibn al-Azraq without acknowledgement:-¹

وكان السلطان عادلا طيب الجانب كبير النفس فرق مملكته على اصحابه ولم يكن له من السلطنة غير الاسم وكان مع لين جانبه ما نراه أحد الا وظفر به وقتل من الامراء الا كابر خلقا كثيرا ومن جملة من قتل الخليفتان المسترشد بالله والراشد

2

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

1. Op. cit., II, 93.

2. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.175b; Ms.B, f.133b.

Thus by judicious selection Ibn Khallikān manages to highlight the crucial information. Ibn al-Azraq, by contrast, fails to do so and indeed contradicts himself.

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

كان قد وقع بينه وبين الخليفة المسترشد وحشة قبل استقلاله في
السلطنة فلما استقل استطال نوابه على العراق وعارضوا الخليفة في
أملاكه

1

The sentence **استطال نوابه على العراق وعارضوا الخليفة في أملاكه**

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

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

1. Op. cit., II, 93. The relevant passage in Ibn al-Azraq is to be found in Ms.A, f.165a.

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

A second interesting narrative which originates in Ibn al-Azraq is to be found in Ibn Khallikān's biography of Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī.¹ It runs as follows:-

ولما قتل عماد الدين على قلعة جبر كما ذكرناه في ترجمته كان كمال الدين المذكور حاضرا في المعسكر هو وأخوه تاج الدين أبو طاهر يحيى والد القاضي ضياء الدين فلما رجع المعسكر الى الموصل كانا في صحبته ولما تولى سيف الدين غازي ولد عماد الدين فوض الامور كلها الى القاضي كمال الدين وأخيه بالموصل وجميع مملكته ثم انه قبض عليهما في سنة اثنتين واربعين واعتقلهما بقلعة الموصل وأحضر نجم الدين ابا علي الحسن بن بهاء الدين أبي الحسن علي وهو ابن عم كمال الدين وكان قاضي الرحبة وولاه القضاء بالموصل وديار ربيعة عوضا عن كمال الدين ثم ان الخليفة المقتفي سير رسولا وشع في كمال الدين وأخيه وأخرجا من الاعتقال وقعدا في بيوتهما وعليهما الترسيم وحبس بالقلعة جلال الدين أبو أحمد ولد كمال الدين وهبها الدين ابو الفضائل القاسم بن تاج الدين ولما مات سيف الدين غازي في التاريخ المذكور في ترجمته رفع الترسيم عنهما وحضرا الى قطب الدين مودود بن زكي وقد تولى السلطنة بعد أخيه سيف الدين وكان راكبا في ميدان الموصل فلما قربا منه ترجلا وعليهما ثياب العزاء بغير لرحات فلما وصلا اليه ترجل لهما أيضا وعزياه عن أخيه وهناك بالولاية ثم ركبوا ووقف كل واحد منهما الى جانبه ثم عادا الى بيوتهما بغير ترسيم وصارا يركبان في الخدمة

1. Op. cit., I, 597.

In the first part of this passage Ibn Khallikān states that Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī and his brother Tāj al-Dīn were with the 'askar of Mosul at the time of Zangī's assassination and that Saif al-Dīn b. Zangī handed over all affairs to the two of them after his establishment in Mosul. Ibn Khallikān is here summarising a long narrative from Ibn al-Azraq.¹ Ibn Khallikān covers some of the same material under his biography of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī.² From the intervention of the caliph al-Muqtafī who sends messengers to try to intercede on behalf of the two brothers who have been imprisoned, this section of Ibn Khallikān's text is modelled more closely on Ibn al-Azraq.³ The details of the meeting between Qutb al-Dīn Maudūd and the two brothers in the maidān at Mosul are taken from the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid. Whole phrases, such as عزياه عن اخيه and بغير طرحات have been left unchanged. For the rest, the main lines of the narrative of Ibn al-Azraq are followed in sequence but the wording used by Ibn Khallikān is his own. The obscure نقد... جماعة... رسلاً gives way to the simpler سير رسلاً. The ubiquitous حصلوا in the text of Ibn al-Azraq is replaced by صاروا. Ibn Khallikān uses the words الاعتقال and الترسيم which do not appear to have formed part of Ibn al-Azraq's stock vocabulary. The confusion created by Ibn al-Azraq over the names in this passage is removed by Ibn Khallikān.⁴

1. Ms.A, ff.171b - 172a.
2. Cf. infra, p. 45.
3. Ms.A, ff.173b and 174b; Ms.B, f.131a-b.
4. Instead of "the son of Kamāl al-Dīn Abū Aḥmad al-Jalāl" (Ms.A, f.173b [sic]), Ibn Khallikān has "Jalāl al-Dīn Abū

One major change of interpretation made by Ibn Khallikān occurs in his handling of a phrase from Ibn al-Azraq which seems to read:- **وقد غيرا ثيابهما** "they had changed their clothes". According to this reading, they entered the maidān wearing different clothes, since their original ones would have been dirty from riding on the donkeys and they would wish to appear properly dressed to meet the new ruler of Mosul. An alternative reading might be **وقد غبرثيابهما** "their clothes were covered with dust", which would fit in well with the story.

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

In his treatment of the story of the two brothers al-Shahrazūrī,

Ahmad, son of Kamāl al-Dīn" (op. cit., I, 598). For Tāj al-Dīn Abu 'l-Faḍā'il al-Diyā' (Ms.A., f.173b [sic]), Ibn Khallikān writes "Diyā' al-Dīn Abu 'l-Faḍā'il al-Qāsim, son of Tāj al-Dīn" (ibid.).

Ibn Khallikān gives his narrative greater clarity and unity. Ibn al-Azraq records that the initial imprisonment of these men took place in 542/1147-8 and that they remained under house arrest until the death of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī in 544/1149-50. In Ibn al-Azraq's account, however, the various parts of the story are interrupted, as the author, true to the chronological framework of his work, breaks off to discuss other events which have no bearing on the imprisonment of Kamāl al-Dīn and Tāj al-Dīn. Two folios later, their story is resumed. Ibn Khallikān is not bound by the same restrictions of genre and again groups together all relevant parts of the narrative.

A third account which Ibn Khallikān borrows from Ibn al-Azraq is the description of the events which immediately followed the death of Zangī. Ibn Khallikān uses this material from Ibn al-Azraq¹ in his biography of Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Zangī.² Some of the details of Zangī's assassination according to the version of Ibn al-Azraq³ are given elsewhere in the Wafayāt al-A'yān, in the biography of Zangī.⁴ But this is a very abbreviated treatment by Ibn Khallikān, who shows much greater interest in the power struggle which ensued on Zangī's death. His account reads as follows:

اجتمع أكابر الدولة وفيهم الوزير جمال الدين محمد الاصبهاني
المعروف بالجواد والقاضي كمال الدين ابو الفضل محمد الشهرزوري
وسياتي ذكرهما ان شاء الله تعالى وقصدوا خيمة الب ارسلان المذكور

1. Ms.A, f.172a; Ms.B, ff.127b - 128a.

2. Op. cit., I, 507.

3. Ms.A, f.172a.

4. Op. cit., I, 241.

وقالوا له كان عماد الدين زنكي علامك ونحن غلمانك والبلاد لك وصمتوا
الناس بهذا الكلام ثم ان العسكر افترق فرقتين فطائفة منهم توجهت
صحبة نور الدين محمود ابن عماد الدين زنكي الآتي ذكره ان شاء الله
تعالى الى الشام والطائفة الثانية سارت مع الب ارسلان وعساكر
الموصل وديار ربيعة الى الموصل فلما انتهوا الى سنجار تخيل الب
ارسلان منهم الغدر فتركهم وهرب فلحقه بعض العسكر وردوه فلما
وصلوا الى الموصل وصلهم سيف الدين غازي المذكور وكان مقيما
بشهرزور لانها كانت اقطاعه من جهة السلطان مسعود السلجوقي الآتي
ذكره ان شاء الله تعالى فلما استقر بالموصل قبض على الب
ارسلان المذكور وسيره الى بعض القلاع وملك الموصل وما كان لايه من
ديار ربيعة وترتبت احواله

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

The conversation between Zangī's officials and Alp Arslan
closely echoes the one recorded by Ibn al-Azraq. Similarly, the
information about the two groups which were formed, the one heading
for Syria and the other for Mosul, comes from the same source,
although the wording is somewhat different. But then Ibn Khallikān
adds a statement of his own to the effect that the reason why the
malik fled after his arrival in Mosul was that he imagined himself
to be the object of some treacherous plot.

Thus Ibn Khallikān rounds off the bald narrative of events by an interpretative comment, whereas Ibn al-Azraq is here content simply to record what happened without looking for the motivation of the protagonists. The rest of Ibn Khallikān's account follows closely that of Ibn al-Azraq, whose words are paraphrased.

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

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

Stylistically, Ibn Khallikān displays the same sensitivity. He does not automatically reproduce the Arabic of his model. Instead, he prefers to paraphrase or summarise Ibn al-Azraq's text, only occasionally leaving unchanged phrases from the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid. Perhaps Ibn Khallikān was actuated by a desire to stamp his book with his own personal style.

Alternatively, the Arabic style of Ibn al-Azraq was too unpleasing for him to reproduce - though he himself is not the greatest of stylists. Whatever his motive, he is the only one of the four authors discussed in this chapter who can be critical of the matter as well as the wording of Ibn al-Azraq's work.

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

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

Ibn Shaddād and Ibn al-Azraq

It is well known that the author of the historical geography entitled al-A'lāq al-Khatīra fī dhikr umarā'al-Shām

wa'l-Jazīra¹ makes extensive use of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid in the part of his work which deals with the Jazīra. Amedroz drew attention to this fact² and also identified the author as Ibn Shaddād of Aleppo (613/1216-7 - 684/1285-6).³ The work was probably written between 671/1272-3 and 680/1281-2. More recently, Cahen analysed the geographical information on the Jazīra provided by Ibn Shaddād and discussed briefly the sources used by this author.⁴

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

1. The section of this work which deals with the Jazīra is unpublished. The part which describes Damascus has been edited (Ibn Shaddād, La Description de Damas d'Ibn Šaddād, ed. S. Dahān [Damascus, 1956]).
2. Op. cit., 800. Amedroz estimates that about a quarter of the contents of Marsh 333 comes from Ibn al-Azraq.
3. Cf. a note written by Amedroz at the front of the Bodleian manuscript, Marsh 333, where he states that the work is the "second volume of al-A'laq al-Khatīra fī dhikr umarā' al-Shām wa'l Jazīra of Ibn Shaddād of Aleppo".
4. C. Cahen, "La Djazira au milieu du treizième siècle d'après 'Izz ad-Din Ibn Chaddad", Revue des Etudes Islamiques VIII (1934), 109-28. In this work Cahen gives no assessment of the author.

up of quotations from other authors.¹ For the period under discussion in this thesis, Ibn Shaddād's sources are Ibn al-Azraq and Ibn al-Athīr.

Whilst Cahen is generally accurate as to the extent of the debt owed to Ibn al-Azraq by Ibn Shaddād, it would not be correct to say that the quotations from Ibn al-Azraq in Marsh 333 are an exact replica of his wording. These sections of Ibn Shaddād's text do therefore have some linguistic interest. In any case, the very selection of information by Ibn Shaddād, and even his omissions, quite apart from his changes of Ibn al-Azraq's wording, may be of some historical value. Ibn Shaddād only mentions the name of Ibn al-Azraq twice² but there is convincing evidence that he borrows from this author throughout Marsh 333.

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

The inevitable drawback of this method of writing is the

1. Cahen, "La Djazira", 110
2. Marsh 333, ff.79b and 81b.

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

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

1. The account of Yāqūtī's acquisition of Mārdīn is given twice: once under Mārdīn (Ms.B, ff.132b - 133a) and again under Rā's al-'Ain (Ms.B, f.42b). On both occasions it is a long narrative based on the same passage from Ibn al-Athīr (ed. Tornberg, X, 269).

The same ground will not be covered here. Instead, it seems preferable to make a few more general observations.

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

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

1. Ms. Marsh 333, ff.101b - 105a.
2. Cf. for example, Ibn Shaddād's rapid historical surveys of the towns of Sinjār (f.45a) and Sarūj (f.31b).

reigns of both Īl-Ghāzī and Temūr-Tash. He adds very few comments of his own and there appear to be no details which come from Ms.A or from another version of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid. In this respect the text of Ibn Shaddād differs from that of Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī.

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

1. Ms.B, f.102a.
2. Marsh 333, f.102a.
3. Ms.B, f.102b.
4. Marsh 333, f.102a - b.
5. Marsh 333, f.102b.

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

A more sensible policy has been adopted by Ibn Shaddād for his treatment of the reign of Temür-Tash¹. Once again, the order in which he gives his information is exactly that of the parallel information given by Ibn al-Azraq in Ms.B,² but material irrelevant to the history of Diyār Bakr has now been removed. Thus, Ibn Shaddād relates the taking of Mayyāfāriqīn by Temür-Tash in 518/1124-5³, the death of Sayyida Khatun, daughter of Qilich Arslan of Malatya, in 524/1129-30⁴, and the arrival of certain officials in Mayyāfāriqīn in 528/1133-4⁵ and the important struggle in the area between Zangī, Temür-Tash and Dā'ūd of Hisn Kaifā in the years 520-541/1126-47. Ibn Shaddād mentions the killing of Habashī in Zangī's camp in 538/1143-4,⁶ the death of Dā'ūd in 539/1144-5⁷ and that of Temür-Tash in 548/1153-4.⁸ His narrative ends with an

1. Op. cit., ff.103a - 105a.
2. Ms.B, ff.107a - f.137b.
3. Marsh 333, f.103a; Ms.B, ff.106b - 107a.
4. Marsh 333, f.103a; Ms.B, f.107a.
5. Marsh 333, f.103a - b; Ms.B, f.109a.
6. Marsh 333, f.104a; Ms.B, f.122b - 123a.
7. Marsh 333, f.104a; Ms.B, f.123a.
8. Marsh 333, f.104b; Ms.B, f.135b - 136a.

account of the officials who held office at Mayyāfāriqīn.¹

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

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

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

1. Marsh 333, ff. 104b - 105a; Ms.B, ff. 136b - 137b.

choice of information still further. Here he again shows good sense. He concentrates on those events specifically connected with the history of the Artuqids. Thus he reveals a certain ability to sift the available information and to highlight the significant items. Even the accounts about the Artuqids which Ibn Shaddād does choose to include in his own work are often much shortened from their original form in Ibn al-Azraq, as for example his brief reference to the death of Temür-Tash, an event which inspires Ibn al-Azraq to launch into a lengthy panegyric of his former master.¹

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

1. Marsh 333, f.104b; Ms.B, ff.135b - f.136a.
2. Marsh 333, f.34a - b; Ms.B, ff.126b - 127b.

Further confirmation of Ibn Shaddād's dependence on the Ms.B version of Ibn al-Azraq is provided by internal stylistic evidence. In his account of the reign of Īl-Ghāzī, Ibn Shaddād calls Dubais "Saif al-Daula Dubais b. Sadaqa al-Mazyadī".¹ The title **المزیدی** "al-Mazyadī" occurs only in Ms.B.² Īl-Ghāzī is written in Marsh 333 **ایلغازی** as in Ms.B, whereas in Ms.A it appears as **الغازی**. The word "tents" which is written so strangely in Ms.A as **نحرکوات** appears in both Marsh 333 and Ms.B as **نحرکاهات**.³ These are merely a few of the numerous occasions when Ibn Shaddād uses the exact wording of Ms.B.

The abilities of Ibn al-Azraq and Ibn Shaddād as historians are closely matched. Both writers invite severe criticisms as to their methods, lack of clarity and inaccuracies. However, Ibn Shaddād fails even more signally than Ibn al-Azraq in general respects. His grasp of genealogy is unusually defective. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this weakness, which pervades his work. Toghan Arslan al-Ahdab, the ruler of Arzan and Bitlīs, is called Toghan Arslan ibn al-Ahdab,⁴ and the key figure of Īl-Ghāzī b. Artuq is given the appellations Īl-Ghāzī b. Sukmān⁵ and on another occasion "the son of Sukmān's brother".⁶ There is some justification for Ibn Shaddād's confusion over the identity

1. Marsh 333, f.102a.
2. Ms.A, f.161b; Ms.B, f.102b.
3. Ms.A, f.161a; Ms.B, f.101b; Marsh 333, f.102a.
4. Marsh 333, f.102a.
5. Ibid., f.101b and f.133b.
6. Ibid., f.43b.

of the Artuqid al-Yāqūtī, since his bewilderment is shared by Ibn al-Azraq himself in his genealogical accounts.¹ But Ibn Shaddād labels al-Yāqūtī as "the son of the sister of Sukmān"² and elsewhere "the son of Artuq"³, whilst in another place it is Sukmān whom he calls "the son of Artuq"⁴.

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

1. For a discussion of al-Yāqūtī, cf. *p.* 352, *n.* 16.
2. F.132b.
3. F.43a.
4. F.127b.

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

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

1. N. Elisséeff, Nūr ad-dīn. Un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des Croisades (Damascus, 1967), I, 85.
2. Dahān calls Ibn Shaddād's account of the Jazīra "the best ancient Arabic source on the region" (S. Dahān, "The Origin and Development of the Local Histories of Syria", in Historians of the Middle East, eds. B. Lewis and P.M. Holt (London, 1962), 116.
3. Marsh 333, ff.65a - b.

Arzan and Mārdīn helps to narrow the field of choice and is therefore of some value.

Ibn Shaddād's description of Mayyāfāriqīn, however, is much more precise. He identifies buildings such as the burj al-mulk, the burj al-Rawābī and the bāb al-huwa, often mentioned cursorily by Ibn al-Azraq, who assumes that his reader is acquainted with them. He mentions the suburb known as al-Muhaddatha and the citadel¹ and a wealth of other details.

Ibn Wāsil and Ibn al-Azraq

The work entitled Mufarrij al-Kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb by Ibn Wāsil (604/1207 - 697/1298) is well known as a principal source for the history of the Ayyūbids. Cahen lavishes high praise on this author, saying that it is scandalous that this work of his is virtually never used.² Elisséeff also mentions Ibn Wāsil, emphasising the alertness with which the Mufarrij al-Kurūb is written.³ Neither of these scholars, however, have recognised the debt owed by Ibn Wāsil to Ibn al-Azraq. They both list the written sources used by Ibn Wāsil, mentioning the works of Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn al-'Adīm.⁴ Elisséeff adds that for the period of

1. Ff.67a - 69a cover the complete description of Mayyāfāriqīn.
2. C. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche (Paris, 1940), 70.
3. Op. cit., I, 62.
4. Cahen, op. cit., 69; Elisséeff, op. cit., 61.

Nūr al-Dīn Ibn Wāsil also drew on Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī, 'Imād al-Dīn and Bahā' al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād.¹ It was the editor of Ibn Wāsil, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl, who pinpointed the dependence of the Mufarrij al-Kurūb on the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid,² although he did not explore this topic in any detail. The value of a comparison between Ibn Wāsil and Ibn al-Azraq is both linguistic and historical, as with the other three authors discussed in this chapter.

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

1. Ibid.

2. Ibn Wāsil, Mufarrij al-Kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb, ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl (Cairo, 1953), I, 16-17.

also selects a key historical issue, namely the relationship between the 'Abbāsīd caliphs in the sixth/twelfth century and the Saljuq sultans. Ibn Wāsil concentrates his borrowings from Ibn al-Azraq on this topic, leaving aside the rest of the author's work and opting to follow the more lucid account of the Tārīkh al-Daula al-Atābakiyya¹ by Ibn al-Athīr for the general lines of his narrative elsewhere in the Mufarrij al-Kurūb.

The first important episode which Ibn Wāsil borrows without acknowledgement from Ibn al-Azraq is the account of the decision of al-Mustarshid to leave Baghdad and his subsequent murder outside Marāgha in 529/1134-5.² Ibn Wāsil's description is modelled extremely closely on that of Ibn al-Azraq in the version contained in Ms.A. Indeed, the wording is virtually identical. Ibn Wāsil adds a few explanatory comments, such as genealogical details about the Sultans Mahmūd and Mas'ūd, and he omits the odd phrase. He amends the wording of the line from al-Mutanabbī which is quoted wrongly in Ms.A but written correctly in Ms.B, and changes **من الغبن** to **من العجز**³. He also adds the statement that the line which the caliph was reciting was a quotation from al-Mutanabbī.

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

1. Ibn al-Athīr, Al-Tārīkh al-Bāhir fi'l-Daula al-Atābakiyya, ed. 'Abd al-Qādir Ahmad Tulaymāt (Cairo, 1963).
2. Ms.A, ff.165a - b; the parallel account by Ibn Wāsil is on pages 58-60 of al-Shayyāl's edition.
3. Op. cit., 59.

Sar-i Jahān which he says he visited in 549/1154-5.¹ Perhaps Ibn Wāsil wished to conceal this obvious reference to the source of his information or he may have felt that his own text could dispense with such a description.

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

ووصل... رسول... برسالة ظاهرها التقدم اليه بتعظيم الخليفة... وباطنها التذبير عليه و
الراحة منه
Whatever the source of this account, by its inclusion Ibn Wāsil places the blame for the death of al-Mustarshid firmly on Sanjar. The details of Mas'ūd's ostentatious display of false grief, however, clearly implicate him too. أظهر السلطان مسعود الجزع العظيم والحزن الكثير.

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

1. Ms.A, f.165a.
2. Ms.A, f.165b.
3. Op. cit., 61.

views on the future role of the caliphate.¹ Here the subject-matter is of such value that Ibn Wāsil quotes Ibn al-Azraq almost entirely verbatim.² He again adds short explanatory comments on the identities of the uncles of Rāshid who are potential claimants to the caliphate and removes two grammatical infelicities of Ibn al-Azraq. For Ibn al-Azraq's phrase **السلطان مسعود نفذ احضرنا** Ibn Wāsil writes simply **احضرنا**, whilst instead of Ibn al-Azraq's version **اريد يجلس الامن** Ibn Wāsil prefers **ولا اريد يلي الاسر الارجل**. Other than these minor linguistic changes, however, Ibn Wāsil retains this valuable portion of his source virtually intact.

He then moves on to the episode of al-Rāshid and the slave-girls.³ In the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid the flow of Ibn

1. Ms.A, f.165b; Ibn Wāsil, op. cit., 61-2.
2. It is interesting to note that Ibn al-Furāt also borrows a substantial portion of this material. Indeed, Ibn al-Furāt (734/1334 - 808/1405) borrows extensively from Ibn Wāsil and it is clear that Ibn al-Azraq's text is reproduced by Ibn al-Furāt from the version made by Ibn Wāsil. All the minor changes of wording made by Ibn Wāsil also occur in the text of Ibn al-Furāt (Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh al-Duwal wa'l-Mulūk, Vienna Ms.A.F. 118, II, ff.68b - 69a). On other occasions Ibn al-Furāt admits his dependence on Ibn al-Azraq's text itself, as for example in his account of the death of Sultan Mahmūd in 525/1130-1 where he acknowledges his source (f. 29b).
3. Ibn Wāsil, op. cit., 62.

al-Azraq's important political narrative is interrupted by this obtrusive and irrelevant anecdote which he places between Mas'ūd's statement on the qualities he is seeking from any future caliph and the next major passage which deals with the circumstances of the selection of al-Muqtafī.¹ The inclusion of this scandalous titbit of court gossip introduces a completely inappropriate tone to one of the most interesting parts of Ibn al-Azraq's text. Ibn Wāsil is also unable to resist the temptation to include the Rāshid episode, although it detracts greatly from the unity of his narrative. He could easily have included it elsewhere, for example when dealing with al-Rāshid's death.² Although he chooses to retain the Rāshid anecdote, Ibn Wāsil removes some of the more explicit statements, no doubt from motives of propriety.

The remainder of the material which Ibn Wāsil has borrowed from Ibn al-Azraq deals with the latter's extremely detailed account of events from the second meeting of Mas'ūd with the Baghdad officials until the oath of allegiance sworn to al-Muqtafī.³ These pages of Ibn Wāsil's history are copied very closely from Ibn al-Azraq.⁴ His dependence on his source is, however, not total, since he adds several minor explanatory comments of his own, and when other information is available to him he incorporates it into his text. For example, Ibn al-Azraq mentions that al-Rāshid

1. Ms.A, f.166a.
2. Op. cit., 70.
3. Ms.A, ff.166a - 167a; Ibn Wāsil, op. cit., 63, 65-67.
4. Ibn al-Furāt also borrows parts of Ibn Wāsil's text here (op. cit., ff.144b - 145a).

got in touch with Zangī in 529/1134-5 asking him to come and give him support in Baghdad. From his reading of other historians, especially Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn Wāsil can explain at this point exactly what Zangī was doing and outlines his subsequent actions before reaching Baghdad.¹ Once in Baghdad, Zangī encountered a number of border lords who had assembled to fight Sultan Mas'ūd.

This information is not found in the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid. Ibn Wāsil resumes his borrowing from Ibn al-Azraq with the account of how al-Rāshid imprisoned the members of the caliphal family in a cellar,² his escape to Mosul and his deposition.

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

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

1. Op. cit., 63.

2. Op. cit., 65.

the material he chooses. Cahen praises the intelligent, coherent presentation of facts which characterises the Mufarrij al-Kurūb and comments on its precise if not elegant language.¹ Certainly, Ibn Wāsil manifests such qualities in his treatment of Ibn al-Azraq as a source, since he rejects other areas of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid from which he might also have borrowed material. For such crucial topics as the career of Zangī he obviously prefers the clear account of Ibn al-Athīr to the incomplete and garbled version of Ibn al-Azraq with its chaotic chronology. It could therefore be said that he has recourse to Ibn al-Azraq only as a last resort, when the material he needs is not available elsewhere.

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

Conclusions

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

1. La Syrie du Nord, 70.

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

These writers draw on the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid in various different ways, with or without acknowledgement to its author. Sometimes they paraphrase Ibn al-Azraq's words; on other occasions they borrow portions of the text unchanged. The joins between their own material and that which they have borrowed are rarely advertised. It is a commonplace that Arab writers saw no shame in plagiarism. A great part of their work was quotation and a writer often neglected to mention the source of his material, viewing this as of little interest to himself, or his readers. Only in the case of Ibn Khallikān¹ are there some grounds for speculating that he deliberately suppressed a reference to his source in certain important passages.

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

1. A minor exception is Ibn Wāsil's omission of the reference to

is a valuable indication of the areas of the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid which they considered interesting. Their selection provides a possible pointer to which parts of Ibn al-Azraq's account display originality or special information.

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

A few tentative conclusions may now be drawn. The study of these four authors and their use of Ibn al-Azraq's text has revealed that writers composing in several different genres and therefore with varying aims drew on this work. Clearly it was more common for Ibn al-Azraq's history to be used uncritically than selectively. Moreover, later writers applied their critical faculties principally to the task of selection rather than to the task of evaluating Ibn al-Azraq's information. It is probable that the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid was considered sufficiently useful to be available in several copies and that a version of

the text existed which was similar to Ms.A although not identical. The existence of a third manuscript of substantially similar content to one of the two which survives, and of no later than 13th century date, provides a modicum of evidence in favour of the theory that much of Ibn al-Azraq's text - at least for the period 1100-1150 - has survived in Ms.A. At all events, the borrowings of the four writers discussed in this chapter afford no grounds for believing that Ms.A is lacunary. It is apparent that authors who were not themselves noted as great stylists felt, not surprisingly, the need to change, to a varying extent, the infelicitous, provincial Arabic of their source. Finally, the popularity of his text among writers of the next four generations strongly suggests that Ibn al-Azraq was probably the major source available for the area of the Jazīra in the period 1100 - 1150.

CHAPTER III

THE LANGUAGE OF IBN AL-AZRAQ

THE LANGUAGE OF IBN AL-AZRAQ

Introduction

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

Scholars such as Fück¹ have shown that the decline of classical Arabic, the language which had united Islam for barely two centuries, was accelerated by the advent of the Saljuqs. Al-Tabrīzī (420-502/1030-1109) needed to give an elementary explanation of classical Arabic poetry in his teaching at the Nizāmiyya madrasa in Baghdad² and al-Harīrī devoted a work to the grammatical mistakes made in Arabic by the educated classes.³ Especially revealing were the mistakes of al-Harīrī's contemporaries

- - - - -

1. J. Fück, 'Arabiya. Recherches sur l'histoire de la langue et du style arabe, French trans. C. Denizeau (Paris 1955) 87-96, 176-91.
2. Ibid., 177.
3. Ibid., 180-5.

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

If the educated classes in the cultural centre of Islam were no longer able to grasp the essential difference between 'Arabiyya and Middle Arabic,¹ it is scarcely surprising that an author such as Ibn al-Azraq who lived in such a linguistically mixed area as Diyār Bakr, and who had such a piecemeal grasp of any Arabic other than the colloquial dialects current in the regions where he lived and travelled, should have failed to reproduce fine classical Arabic.

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

1. The term Middle Arabic is used here according to the definition of Fück. It denotes the vernacular dialects spoken by the lower and middle classes in the first centuries of Islam. Middle Arabic first received literary expression in the works of Christians and Jews who spoke a colloquial form of Arabic but who were divorced from the culture which produced classical Arabic literature. When they wrote, they used the spoken language. By the Saljuq period, Middle Arabic characteristics had infiltrated the works of Muslim writers on a large scale (Fück, op. cit., 87-8).

tradition of Arabic historical chronicles and biographical writings of the sixth and seventh centuries A.H., the emphasis is more on subject-matter than on style and the vernacular increasingly infiltrates the would-be classical Arabic. Even the cultivated Usāma b. Munqidh, who is capable of writing correct classical Arabic poetry, adopts a more colloquial style for his memoirs.

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

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

1. Cf. Chapter II of this thesis for a longer discussion.
2. E.g. Ibn Khallikān, Ibn Shaddād, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī and Ibn Wāsil.

scribes also came from that area.¹

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

Orthography

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

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

1. It is of course possible that the manuscripts were copied in Mayyāfāriqīn itself.
2. The scribe of Ms.B had a markedly better grasp of classical Arabic than the scribe of Ms.A.

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

i) Mistakes made by the scribe

The scribe of Ms.A makes numerous spelling mistakes, amongst which are some caused by haplology, e.g. **الات**² for **الالات**. Others arise from metathesis, e.g. **السرية**³ for **السيرة** and **طرقته**⁴ for **طريقة**

An unfamiliarity with words of foreign origin causes him to give both **انخوابة**⁵ and **انخوبا**⁶ as a rendering of the Persian **خواجة**

1. Brinner notes a number of mistakes of this kind where **ر** is written for **ز**, **ح** for **خ**, **ث** for **ت**, **ع** for **غ**, **س** for **ش** and **ص** for **ض** (W.M. Brinner, A Chronicle of Damascus [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963], xx).
2. Ms.A, ff.167a and 171a.
3. Ms.A, f. 163a.
4. Ms.A, f. 163a.
5. Ms.A, f. 167a.
6. Ms.A, f. 167a.

whilst he offers **حركات**¹ as the plural of the Persian **نرگاه**
 The rendering of the place-name Pālū as **بالوا**² instead of
 the usual **بالو** may well have been prompted by a desire to make
 the form the same as the third person plural of the perfect
 indicative verb.

The scribe of Ms.A has several spellings for the number
 "five hundred". As well as the usual spelling, he writes
خمماية³, **خماية**⁴ and **خمماية**⁵.

The scribe of Ms.B also writes **اخواجا**⁶ instead of **خوابة**
 but otherwise makes fewer spelling mistakes than the scribe of
 Ms.A.

ii) Spelling mistakes probably caused by phonetic confusion

As Brinner points out, there is the greatest uncertainty and
 confusion in later medieval Arabic in the treatment of emphatic
 or velarised dental stops and spirants, the consonantal group
 where the Arabic colloquial dialects show the most divergence.⁷

1. Ms.A, f.161a.
2. Ms.A, f.170b.
3. This occurs on numerous occasions, e.g. f.161a.
4. Ff. 162a, 164a and b, 168a, 169a and b, 170a, 171a and b,
172b, 173b, 175a.
5. Ff. 164b, 167b, 168b.
6. Ms.B, f.115b.
7. Op. cit., xxi.

This uncertainty is mirrored in Ms.A of Ibn al-Azraq's text.

Ms.A uses **ص** for **س** in the word **سور** (wall), which is written **صور**¹, whilst Saljuq is rendered mostly by **ساجوق** but on one occasion by **صاجوق**².

The consonant **ظ** is confused with **ض**. Ms.A gives **ووضف** for **وظف** in the sentence:-

ووضف خدمة الكرجي في السنة خمسة دنانيراً (sic)

On another occasion, the scribe writes **نضر** for **نظر** in the phrase: **تولى نضر الديوان**⁴.

Ms.A also blurs the distinction between **ز** and **ذ** writing **ديوان الذمام والاستيفاء**⁵ for **ديوان زمام** in the phrase:

The error of writing **الى** for **الا** must be an aural one⁶:-
**ولى ميفرقين جماعة من الولاة منهم الحاجب البوكبر وبيرم و
عثمان كل منهم مرة الى الحاجب بيرم فولى مرتين**

There is also confusion over the name Sayyida Khātūn which is rendered mostly as **سيدة** but appears once as **سعيدة**⁷.

1. F.172a.

2. F.163b.

3. F.162a.

4. F.164b.

5. Ms.A, f.175a.

6. Ms.A, f.176b.

7. Ms.B, f.164a.

iii) Non-classical spellings

The hamza is usually omitted in hamzated verbs where the hamza is the second or third radical. Ms.A gives **اسله**¹ for **اسأله**, **هنوه**² for **هناؤه** and **بدت**³ for **بدأت**.

The hamza is rarely written after alif mamdūda. For example, Ms.A has **امرا**⁴ for **امراء**.

The spellings **هاولای** or **هاولا** are given for the classical **هؤلاء**⁵.

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

The scribe of Ms.A has a marked preference for a dotted yā instead of a final alif in **هذا** which he writes as **هذي**.

The letter yā is consistently written inside words like **اوایل**

1. Ms.A, f.161b.
2. Ms.A, f.161a.
3. Ms.A, f.161a.
4. Ms.A, f.175a.
5. Ms.A, f.177a.

where ➤ would normally be expected.¹ As Vitestam points out in the case of Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī,² this may well have been typical of the orthography of that period.

On some occasions, the first person plural of the perfect tense is written without a terminal alif, e.g., **فحضرنا** for **فحضرنا**.³

Morphology and syntax

Pronouns

i) Personal pronouns

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

وخلف ابنين هما نور الدين وعماد الدين

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

**نقل نجم الدين الغازي وشمس الدولة اخاه من مسجد الامير الى
ماردين ثم دفنهم
(for **دفنهما**)**

1. Cf. **فرايض** for **فرائض** (Ms.A, f.169b).

فضائل for **فضائل** (Ms.A, f.173b).

اوائل for **اوائل** (Ms.A, f.169b).

2. Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī, Kanz al-mulūk fī kaifiyyat al-sulūk, ed. G. Vitestam (Lund, 1970), 38.

3. Ms.B, f.111b.

4. Ms.A, f.177a.

5. Ms.A, f.171a.

Hum also replaces the third person feminine plural pronoun hunna when used as a suffix. The best example of this usage is the passage which is found in both manuscripts and which deals with Rāshid and the slave-girls. A small part of it will suffice to illustrate this linguistic feature:¹

اتخذ للراشد لما بلغ من
 عمره سبع سنين تمس جوار وامرهم ان يلاعبوه ويمكنوه من انفسهم
 وكان ذلك الى ان بلغ تسع سنين وكان فيهم جارية صفراء
 حبشية فحملت

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

ii) Demonstrative pronouns

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

فخرج عليه اوليك الرجلان
 (for ذانك الرجلان).²

iii) Relative pronouns

الذی is often found instead of التي, e.g.:³

وهو من العجايب الذي بنى في هذا الزمان

-
1. Ms.B, ff.112b-113a. The equivalent passage in Ms.A also demonstrates this point (f.166a).
 2. F.176a.
 3. Ms.A, f.171b.

وَبَدَأَ بِذِي مَرْيَمَ إِذِ ابْتِغَىٰ رَافِعًا

although on other occasions, **التي** is used correctly. **الذي** can also replace **الذين**, e.g.:²

3 **دَفَنُوا فِيهَا جَمِيعَ الَّذِينَ كَانُوا بِالْقَلْعَةِ**

4 **وَعَادَتِ الرِّسْلَ الَّذِي مَضَىٰ مَعَهُ**

but there are other instances where a classically correct usage of **الذين** is found.⁵

The dual relative pronoun does not occur and is replaced by the plural **الذين**. The sentence **6 قَتَلُوا الَّذِينَ قَتَلُوهُ**

is intended to express the idea "They killed the two men who killed them", which should read

قَتَلُوا لِلَّذِينَ قَتَلَاهُ

Another example is **7 أَحَدَ الْمَلِكِينَ الَّذِينَ كَانُوا مَعَهُ**; "one of the two maliks who were with him".

There is often an absence of the referential pronoun:

8 جَمِيعَ الْوَلَايَةِ الَّتِي أَخَذَ اتَابِكُ

"all the territory which the atabeg had taken".

Generally, **الذي** is by far the most common relative pronoun,

1. Ms.B, f.101b.
2. Ms.A, f.171a.
3. Ms.A, f.171a.
4. Ms.A, f.170b.
5. Ms.A, ff.170a and 177a.
6. Ms.A, f.171b.
7. Ms.B, 113b.
8. Ms.A, f.172b. This tendency is, however, found in good classical writers such as Tabarī and Ibn Hishām. I am grateful to Professor A.F.L. Beeston for pointing this out.

replacing on occasion either **التي** or **الذين** and thus breaking classical rules of agreement in gender or number. The text demonstrates that while the referential pronoun was often used it was sometimes forgotten.¹ Both Fück² and Blau³ discuss the widespread use of **الذي** in Middle Arabic and state that it is equivalent to the vernacular elli, which is invariable in gender, number and case.

General remarks on the use of pronouns

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

1. For an analysis of relative sentences in Middle Arabic, cf. G. Graf, Der Sprachgebrauch der ältesten christlich-arabischen Literatur (Leipzig, 1905), 69-70. Ibn al-Azraq's text shares some but not all of the characteristics listed by Graf. For example, in this text **الذي** does not introduce a relative clause which follows an indeterminate antecedent.
2. Op. cit., 95.
3. J. Blau, "The Importance of Middle Arabic Dialects for the History of Arabic" in Scripta Hierosolymitana IX, (Jerusalem, 1961), 216.
4. A.F.L. Beeston, The Arabic Language Today (London, 1970) 113.

confusion over borrowed historical data.¹

Nouns

i) The declension of the noun

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

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

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

There is also considerable confusion with pronouns in Ibn al-Azraq's genealogical accounts, especially those in Ms.A (ff.177a - 178b).

ending waw is of course to be expected, the following instances illustrate this feature of the text:-

1 اقطع عز الدين ابوبكر الجزيرة
2 (for ابا) لقد سألت الوالى كمال الدين ابوالفضل

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

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

3 (for ابى) حضرنا عند الامير ابو عبد الله
4 لعز الدين ابوبكر
5 (for اخى) فى خدمة جمال الدين اخو المالك نجم الدين
6 (for ذى) فى ذوالحجة

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

7 (for ابو) لقد قصده الامير ابابكر
8 (for اخاه) وولى اخيه
9 (for ابو) وصل حبشى ابى طالب

1. Ms.A, f.172b.
2. Ms.A, f.171b.
3. Ms.A, f.166b.
4. Ibid.
5. Ms.A, f.177a.
6. Ms.A, f.174b.
7. Ms.A, f.176b.
8. Ms.A, f.170b.
9. Ms.A, f.169b.

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

ii) The loss of the alif of tanwīn

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

The absence of the alif of tanwīn in the indeterminate accusative singular and the accusative of broken plurals is a feature of Middle Arabic.¹ It is present to a limited extent in Ibn al-Azraq's text.

وكان ملاكها قوم (for قوما) "Its rulers were a group..."²

An interesting example is:-

(sic) بننا مشهد ملييا³ "He built a fine mashhad".

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

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

This feature⁴ is noted both by Graf⁴ who treats material from as early as the second/eighth century and by Brinner⁵ who

1. Graf, op. cit., 24.

2. Ms.B, f.102a. The removal of the alif makes it unclear whether the noun is intended to be in the nominative or accusative.

3. Ms.A, f.171a.

4. Op. cit., 23. One example he cites is لايسيطع احددا

5. Op. cit., xxiii. Cf. also Fück, op. cit., 93.

points out examples from Ibn Saṣrā in the eighth/fourteenth century. In the following examples the accusative is used where the nominative would be correct:-

1 **وخرج عن يد السعيد حسام الدين مالا عظيما**

"A lot of money left the possession of al-Sa'īd Husam al-Dīn".

2 **ليس احدا منهم على الصحيح**

"Not one of them is right".

3 **ولم يبق بعد اتابك زنگى امير**

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

4 **سيقوا المسلمين** "The Muslims were driven along".

iv) Lack of differentiation between diptotes and triptotes

Whilst the alif of tanwīn is sometimes incorrectly omitted, it is also added in error to diptotes⁵, e.g.:-

6 **مواضع** (for **فتح من الافرنج مواضعا كثيرة**)

7 **دنانير** (for **خمسة دنانيرا**)

8 **ممايك** (for **نهب ممايك جماعة**)

1. Ms.A, f.176b.

2. Ms.A, f.164a.

3. Ms.B, f.132b.

4. Ms.A, f.162b.

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

6. Ms.A, f.168b.

7. Ms.A, f.172b.

8. Ms.A, f.162a.

v) Gender

There are few mistakes of gender in Ibn al-Azraq's text. The Jumādā months are occasionally treated as masculine,¹ as is the word dār once²:-

في احد دور السلطنة (for احدى)

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

vi) Plurals

The noun in the dual is used correctly in several phrases, e.g.:- نفذ ابن نيسان رجلين³ "Ibn Nīsān despatched two men". On other occasions, the dual of the noun is written correctly but its dependent adjective is in the plural:-

وبنامدين عظام⁴

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

1. E.g. Ms.A, f.175b:-

جمدى الاخر

2. Ms.A, f.166b.

3. Ms.A, f.176a.

4. Ms.B, f.119b.

5. Graf pinpoints the Middle Arabic preference, especially in the dual and the plural, for the accusative rather than the nominative. This is due to the predominance of the endings in and aini in the vulgar language (op.cit.,23). Cf. also Blau, op.cit.,214.

(ولدان ذكران) (for ~~بين عدد واحدين دور~~)

Although an opposite example also exists:-

2. وكانت خلافته سبعة عشر سنة وسبعة شهور
وليومان

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

Sound plurals are generally accurate too.

vii) Numerals

Blau points out that it was in the sphere of numerals that the most far-reaching changes occurred in Middle Arabic.³ Although the treatment of numerals in Ibn al-Azraq's text is careless, no consistent pattern of mistakes emerges. Certain features, however, may be noted.

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

4 (for عشرة) عشرفوارس "Ten horsemen"
5 (for ثلثه دنانير) ثلث دنانير "Three dinārs".

1. Ms.A, f.177b
2. Ms.A, f.165b
3. Op. cit., 217.
4. Ms.A, f.161b; Ms.B, f.102b
5. Ms.A, f.162a

اربع بنين¹ (for) "Four sons".

The correct case for a noun which follows a numeral between one and ten is not known. Some form of the singular is given instead of the genitive plural:-

عشرة الف² (for) "ten thousand dīnārs".
خمسة الف دينار³ (for) "five thousand dīnārs".

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

خمسة عشر وخمسمائة⁴ (for)
تسع عشرة⁵ (for)
في سنة خمسة عشر وخمسمائة
في سنة تسعة عشر وخمسمائة

A certain consistency is revealed here in that the form of the numeral used with a masculine noun has been taken in place of the form needed for a feminine noun.⁶ The treatment of the numeral

1. Ms.B, f.105b

2. Ms.A, f.161b; Ms.B, f.102b

3. Ms.A, f.174a. Graf also notes mistakes with الف where the singular is used for the plural, e.g. خمسة الف (op. cit., 28).

4. Ms.A, f.161a

5. Ms.A, ff.162a - b

6. Perhaps because of the superficial similarity of form between the ending of the word sanat and the ending of the first element of the compound numeral.

eighteen, however, is idiosyncratic:-

ثمانى عشرة¹ (for ثمانى عشرة وخمسة مائة)

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

فى سنة احدى² (for احدى)
 فى سنة اربعة واربعين وخمسة مائة³ (for اربع)
 فى سنة اثنين وتسعين واربع مائة⁴ (for اثنتين)

Verbs

i) Hamzated verbs

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

اسله⁵ (for اسأله)

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

بدت⁶ (for بدأت)

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

ii) Defective Verbs

Verbs whose last radical is ya are often written with a terminal alif, e.g.

سبا (for سبى) ¹

بنا (for بنى) ²

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

من آذاسلما (for آذى) ³

Verbs whose last radical is waw often have an otiose alif added to the third person masculine singular of the imperfect, ⁴ e.g.

وكان يغزوا الفرنج ⁵ (for يغزوا) "He conducted raids

against the Franks".

حصل يبدوا ⁶ (for يبدو) "There began to appear".

iii) Doubly weak verbs

The jussive of رأى is not known: - ولم يرى ⁷.

The derived forms of the verb رأى are imperfectly known.

1. Ms.A, f.162a.

2. Ms.A, f.171a; Ms.B, f.124b.

3. Ms.A, f.162a.

4. This feature is noted by Vitestam and Brinner.

5. Ms.B, f.106a; Ms.A, f.177a.

6. Ms.A, f.171b.

7. Ms.B, f.136a

The sixth form is given as **تريا**¹ ("he came into view") instead of the classically correct **تراءى**, whilst the eighth form is rendered by **ارتوا** in place of the correct **ارتأوا**² ("they took thought").

iv) The dual

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

اطلق القاضى كمال الدين واخوه من دورهم وعادا الى مقرهما 3

and

لفذابن نيسان رجلين فاقاما بقلعة 4

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

اجتمع السعيد حسام الدين واتبك وكسروا الامير داود 5

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

فحملا الى القلعة..... فذخلا على الامير وقالوا نحن قتلنا الوزير 6

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

1. Ms.A, f.172a; Ms.B, f.126b.

2. Ms.A, f.162b.

3. Ms.A, f.174b.

4. Ms.A, f.176a.

5. Ms.B, f.120a.

6. Ms.B, f.134b.

1 وسار بها الدين ولغير الدين وصلاح الدين الى بغداد وحملوا خزائنه وخدموا السلطان

General comments on syntax

i) The role of the imperfect

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

Ms.B. **فاتفقوا ان يحملون ... عشرة الف دينار** ² (for **يحملوا**)

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

وعزمهم ان يولون غيره ³ (for **يولوا**)

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

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

1. Ms.B, f.107b.

2. Ms.B, f.102b.

3. Ms.B, f.113b.

ii) Agreement

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

نفذوا (for نفذ) أهل تغليس³

ونخرجوا الأمدية (for خرج)⁴

Tribes are also given a plural verb:-

5

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

فاختلفوا الناس⁶ (for اختلف)

واقاموا الاولاد⁷ (for اقام)

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

(استقرت⁸ for استقرقواعده)

1. The use of the dual has already been mentioned.
2. The term "verbal sentence" is interpreted here according to the definition given by Arab grammarians who call it

الجملة الفعلية. In such a sentence, the verb is put first and is followed by its noun-subject. Such a verb is always in the singular but is congruous in gender.

3. Ms.B, f.102b.
4. Ms.B, f.135a.
5. Ms.A, f.167b.
6. Ms.A, f.164a.
7. Ms.A, f.177b.
8. Ms.A, f.171b.

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

1 وكان لها تحت

Ibn al-Azraq's text has:-

2 (for كانت) وكان امها شرف خاتون

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

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

3 وكان توفيت

4 وكان اخذتها الا فرنج

5 وكان يخرجون الناس

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

-
1. Op. cit., 35.
 2. Ms.B, f.111b.
 3. Ms.A, f.178a.
 4. Ms.A, f.170b.
 5. Ms.B, f.101b.

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

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

3 **من حيث ملك نجم الدين استقروا فى دورهم**

"While (or from the moment that) Najm al-Dīn ruled, they were secure in their homes".

4 **وكانت خلافته من حيث بويغ له بعد قتل ابيه الى ان بويغ للمقتضى احد عشر شهرا**

"His caliphate, from the time allegiance was pledged to him after the murder of his father until the ceremony of allegiance to al-Muqtafī, lasted eleven months".

5 **وكان امر الدولة من حيث قتل زنگى اليه**

"The running of the state had been in his possession since the murder of Zangī".

1. Op. cit., 95.
2. R.P.A. Dozy, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes (Leiden, 1881), I, 344.
3. Ms.B, f.101b.
4. Ms.A, f.167b.
5. Ms.A, f.173a.

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

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

2 **كبير النفس بميت انه فرق ولايته على اصحابه**

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

3 **هتك الحرم بميت لو عزت الا فرنج ما صنعت
بالمسلمين اكثر من ذلك**
(sic)

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

Vocabulary

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

1. Op. cit., I, 344.

2. Ms.A, f.175b.

3. Ms.A, f.168a.

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

i) Foreign borrowings

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

There is little evidence that individual Turkish words have been borrowed, other than the obvious plethora of personal names. The usual problem of rendering Turkish names in Arabic remains unresolved in this text too. The Turkish names in Ms.A have a very idiosyncratic form, e.g. Temür-tash is written ³تمرداش and Toghril is rendered in Ms.A as ^{تغر}. These versions of well-known names probably reflect local pronunciation.

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

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

1. Ms.A, f.166b.
2. Ms.A, ff.178a, 175b.
3. F. 162b.

text may have a possible Syriac origin. The forms **خرتیت** (for Kharput) and **میردین** (for Mārdīn) are especially noteworthy.¹ Ibn al-Azraq also on occasion uses the names of Syriac months such as kānūn al-awwal.²

ii) Unusual vocabulary

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

Ibn al-Azraq uses the verb **نفذ**⁴ throughout his text. In his account of ʿIl-Ghāzī's campaign to Tiflīs in 515/1121⁵

1. The widely accepted view that the form **میا فارقین** (for **میفرقین**) comes from the Syriac is systematically demolished by Markwart in seven pages of detailed discussion (J. Markwart, Südarmerien und die Tigrisquellen [Vienna 1930], 163-70).
2. Ms.A, f.170b.
3. For a much longer discussion on the writers who used Ibn al-Azraq's text, cf. Chapter II.
4. In the second form. Only once, in Ms.B, does the fourth form **انفذ** appear (f.113b).
5. Ms.A, f.161a-b; Ms.B, ff.102a - 103a.

this verb is employed three times in quick succession. Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzī¹, who borrows Ibn al-Azraq's account almost verbatim, removes **نفذ** each time it appears, replacing it by **بعث** and **ارسل** and **كتب**. Ibn Khallikān, who also borrows from the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid in his biography of Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī,² replaces Ibn al-Azraq's phrase (sic) **نفذ جماعة رسلاً**³ by **سير رسلاً**

The ubiquitous **نفذ** is not a unique case. Ibn al-Azraq also over-uses the verb **حصل**. In one short sentence, he writes **حصل** three times, in each case with a different meaning implied:-⁴

و حصل اذا كان الامير بميفرقين كان معه واذا سار الى ماردین سار معه وكان يقيم حيث اقام الامير و حصل له الناموس العظيم حيث انه مدة مقامه عند الامير ما يقيم له يوما قط و حصل يبدوا منه ما لا يليق بمثله

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

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

1. Mir'āt al-Zamān (Hyderabad, 1951), VIII, 101.
2. Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt al-a'yān (Cairo, 1299 A.H.) I, 597.
3. Ms.A, f.173b.
4. Ms.A, f.171a-b.
5. On another occasion, Ibn Khallikān replaces Ibn al-Azraq's use of **حصل** by **صار** (op. cit., I, 597).

In an earlier part of the text, Ibn al-Azraq writes **فلما حصلوا في** **ارض القصر**¹, "when they arrived in the area of the citadel". Verbs with various meanings are not unusual but the fact that in one short anecdote Ibn al-Azraq chooses to use **حصل** in this way is an indication of his limited ability to express himself in Arabic.²

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

The use of the verb **اعتنق** is also worthy of note. On the occasion of the deposition of the caliph al-Rashīd, Ibn al-Azraq records that the 'ulamā' gave a fatwā to that effect. He then writes **واعتنق ذلك القاضي عماد الدين**⁴. In the equivalent account in Ms.B a participle is used instead:-

وكان المعتنق لذلك شرف القضاة ابن الكرخي⁵

1. Ms.A, f.162b; cf. Ms.B, f.105a.

2. Cf. also Ms.A, f.176a:- **وحصلوا من جملته وتحت امره**
"They became his followers and under his command."

3. E.W. Lane, An Arabic-English Lexicon (London, 1872), Bk.I, pt.4, 1640.

4. Ms.A, f.167a.

5. Ms.B, f.115b.

wniist **اعتنى** is perfectly acceptable for expressing the concept of the adoption of a belief or a doctrine, it is not the usual verb to employ for a judge pronouncing a verdict or taking responsibility for a decision. Significantly, Ibn Wāsil, who copies Ibn al-Azraq's accounts of this incident, replaces **اعتنى** by **حكم** in this context.¹ It is difficult to assess whether Ibn al-Azraq's use of **اعتنى** was caused by the influence of a provincial usage or whether he was consciously trying to use the correct judicial term but chose the wrong one through ignorance. Possibly also in this category of unusual vocabulary is Ibn al-Azraq's usage in the sentence:-² **ودخل الى بغداد وحضر دار الخلافة واورد فصلا بحضور الوزير نظام الدين**
 The phrase **اورد فصلا** may mean **حكم فصلا** since the person concerned was a qādī.

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

4 **اولد منها الصاحب نجم الدين آلبي**

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

-
1. Ibn Wāsil, Mufarrij al-Kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb, ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl (Cairo, 1953), I, 67.
 2. Ms.A, f.173b.
 3. E.g. **اولد اربعة بنين** "he sired four sons" (Ms.A, f.177a).
 4. Ms.A, f.163a. The normal construction here is the use of two accusatives.

Alternatively, **اولد** may be used of a woman bearing a child:-¹

وكانت زوجة الامير حسام الدين واولدت منه صفية خاتون

"She was the wife of Husām al-Dīn and she had by him Safiyya Khatun."

This usage may also be provincial in origin.

iii) Colloquial vocabulary

There are traces of colloquial words and phrases in the Arabic of Ibn al-Azraq, especially in the snatches of conversation which he records. Colloquial words such as the interrogative **ايش**² and the verb **جاب**³ occur occasionally and the colloquial verb **طهر**⁴ is used in preference for the classical **حتن**.

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

5 تعلم ما بيني وبينك و اتابك تعرف ايش هو

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

6 تعلم ما بيني وبينك من صداقة وانت تعرف اتابك وما هو عليه ❖

-
1. Ms.A, f.175a.
 2. Ms.A, f.172a; Ms. B, f.127a.
 3. Ms.A, f.174a.
 4. Ms.A, f.175a.
 5. F.172a.
 6. Ff.126b - 127a.

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

In the account of the Tiflīs campaign, the phraseology is colloquial in parts:-¹ **نفذوا اهل تفليس الى نجم الدين
الغازي يستدعونه ليلتموا اليه تفليس وكان لها بيد
اهلها مقدر اربعين سنة**

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

General remarks on the language and style of the text

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

1. Ms.A, f.161a.

2. A. Socin, "Der arabische Dialect von Mōsul und Mārdīn,"

ZDMG 36 (1882), 1.

It seems unlikely that Ibn al-Azraq was of Syriac origin since he mentions that he needed a Syriac text translated for him before he could include it in his history.¹ It is also improbable that he was a Christian. He relates that a Syriac book, the *Tash'ith*, was translated for him into Arabic by "one of the Christians". The author also gives prominence in his text to his own personal discussions in Baghdad with the most famous Shāfi'ite 'ulamā' of his day.² It seems logical therefore to assume that he was a Sunnī Muslim, although he may conceivably have begun life as a Christian. His ethnic origin becomes narrowed therefore to Kurdish, Armenian or Arab. Even if he was an Arab, his grounding in classical Arabic was poor. But the evidence is not strong enough to permit a definite conclusion about his ethnic origin.

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

1. 'Awad, op. cit., 35; Ms.A, f.7b.

2. Ms.A, f.169b.

Significantly, these passages in Ibn al-Azraq's text are lengthy anecdotes, culled from his own personal experience or based on eye-witness accounts which he himself recorded.¹ There is little doubt therefore that these passages were written by Ibn al-Azraq himself and not borrowed from other written sources, which would have been couched in an Arabic different or better than his own.² It is important to note that these are sections of the text which were written early since they are found in Ms.B, composed in 560/1164-5, as well as in the later Ms.A.

Side by side with the passages which mirror Ibn al-Azraq's own particular style are others where the phraseology seems less alien. His material which deals with the caliphate, for example, is written in a much clearer style and the syntax deviates less dramatically from that used in other roughly contemporary historical chronicles.³

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

1. E.g. the account of the Tiflīs campaign (Ms.A, ff.161a - 162b; Ms.B, ff.102a - 104b) or the anecdote about al-Rāshid and the slave-girls (Ms.A, ff.165b - 166a; Ms.B, ff.112b - 113a).
2. E.g. the borrowed accounts of the rise of 'Abd al-Mu'min (Ms.A, ff.168a - 169a; Ms.B, ff.118b - 119a) or the short excursus into Fātimid history.
3. E.g. Ibn al-Qalānisi or Ibn al-Athīr.

phrasing of the text.

The text of Ms.A presents two clearly distinct strands: one is a series of disjointed scraps of information which resemble terse diary entries and are linked only by the framework of chronology, while the other consists of disproportionately long, detailed accounts of a few isolated episodes which Ibn al-Azraq had the opportunity to record from eye-witnesses or his own experience.

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

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

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

1. Op. cit., 216.

position in the text.

Conclusions

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

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

Ibn al-Azraq's language shares certain similarities with Middle Arabic texts written long before it in Christian and

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

CHAPTER IV

THE CAREER OF NAJM AL-DĪN ĪL-GHĀZĪ

THE CAREER OF NAJM AL-DĪN ĪL-GHĀZĪ

Introduction

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

- - - - -

1. Cf. W.B. Stevenson, The Crusaders in the East (repr. Beirut, 1968), 97-109; R. Grousset, Histoire des Croisades et du Royaume Franc de Jérusalem I (Paris 1934), 548-83; and R. Röhrich, Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem (Innsbruck, 1898), 106-8, 115-7, 134-6, 138-43, 150-5. Īl-Ghāzī is also discussed in K.M. Setton and M.W. Baldwin, A History of the Crusades I, (Madison ^{and London,} Milwaukee 1969), 114-6, 171-4, 403-5, 412-8, 450-2.
2. Cf. S. Runciman, A History of the Crusades II (Cambridge, 1954), 107-8, 111-2, 121-3, 128-9, 131-4, 147-55, 158-62.

that has appeared on Nūr al-Dīn¹ and especially Saladin.²

It is perhaps premature to attempt to analyse the career of Īl-Ghāzī in a way which deviates from the standard approach of outlining the various stages of his career in chronological sequence and providing documentary support for the information given. Yet many good studies of the chronological kind have already been made, notably the article by Claude Cahen³ in which from a wide array of sources he gives in broad outline the complex political history of the period covered by the Artuqid section of Ibn al-Azraq's Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid. This deals with the period from the establishment of Īl-Ghāzī in Diyār Bakr to the reign of the third Artuqid ruler of Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn, Najm al-Dīn Alpī. More recently, the Turkish scholar, Ali Sevim,

1. Cf. especially N. Elisséeff, Nūr ad-Dīn, un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des Croisades I - III (Damascus 1967), and H.A.R. Gibb, "The Career of Nūr ad-Dīn," in Setton and Baldwin, op.cit., 513-27.
2. Cf. especially S. Lane-Poole, Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem (London and New York, 1898); H.A.R. Gibb, "The Rise of Saladin, 1169-89", in Setton and Baldwin, op.cit., 563-89; idem, Saladin (Oxford, 1971); A.S. Ehrenkreutz, Saladin (Albany, New York, 1972).
3. C. Cahen, "Le Diyār Bakr au temps des premiers Urtukides", Journal Asiatique CCXXVII (1935), 227-40. These pages deal specifically with Īl-Ghāzī's political career. Cf. also M.F. Köprülü's "critique" of the above article in Belleten, Cilt 1, sayı 1 (1937) 283-8. Köprülü raises few major objections to Cahen's article, contenting himself with criticisms of Cahen's renderings of Turkish names.

has written at some length about "the political deeds" of Artuq, Īl-Ghāzī's father, Sukmān, his brother, and Īl-Ghāzī himself;¹ and Osman Turan devotes six pages to Īl-Ghāzī in his recent history of Eastern Turkey.² He adds nothing new, however. More summary and general still are the articles on the Artuqids, and more especially on Īl-Ghāzī, in the Encyclopedia of Islam³ and the Türk Ansiklopedesi.⁴ Although of varying standard, these provide a skeletal chronological framework for the career of Īl-Ghāzī. The various works listed in this paragraph may differ in points of detail but their basic concerns remain similar; to establish a chronology which includes the major political events of Īl-Ghāzī's life and not to analyse the implications of the various facts cited.

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

1. A. Sevim, "Artukların Soyu ve Artuk Bey'in Siyasi Faaliyetleri", Bellekten, Cilt xxvi, sayı 101, (1962), 121-47; "Artukoğlu Sokmen'in Siyasi Faaliyetleri", ibid., 103, 501-20; "Artuk Oğlu İlgazi", ibid., 104, 649-91.
2. O. Turan, Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi (Istanbul, 1973), 145-51.
3. C. Cahen, art. "Artukids", EI², 667; E. Honigmann, art. "Ortokids", EI¹; K. Süssheim, art. "İlghāzī", EI¹.
4. M.F. Köprülü, art. "Artuk Oğulları", I.A. 617-25.
5. H.A.R. Gibb, "Notes on the Arabic Materials for the History of the Early Crusades", BSOAS VII (1933-5), 739.

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

The sources used are those concerned with the First Crusade, which are too well-known¹ to be described yet again and which in any case are cited throughout the commentary on the Tārīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid contained in this thesis. The work of Ibn al-Azraq will also be used as a source, but principally for Īl-Ghāzī's activities in Diyār Bakr and above all for the author's account of Īl-Ghāzī's campaign into Georgia in 515/1121-2.

Historians of the Crusades have discussed what they take to be the flamboyantly barbaric personality of Īl-Ghāzī and despite the somewhat lacunary information available have pronounced strong judgements upon him. Röhrich, as a creature of his times, condemns Īl-Ghāzī as a brute given over to drunkenness and excess², whilst the same opinion is expressed with greater restraint by Grousset, who labels him a coarse old trooper.³ Runciman has more level-headed criticisms of Īl-Ghāzī⁴, but even he judges him to a great extent, though not entirely, from the viewpoint of Crusader history. Such an attitude is entirely justified in a

1. Cf. the bibliography in Runciman (op. cit., 480-5) and in the individual chapters on the First Crusade in Setton and Baldwin (op. cit., 135-76 , 368-403, 410-48).
2. Op. cit., 136.
3. Op. cit., 560.
4. Op. cit., 155.

scholar who is writing about the Crusades but it presents a rather one-sided view of ʾĪl-Ghāzī, leaving undiscussed many vital facets of his career. From the Muslim standpoint his dealings with the Franks were of secondary importance in comparison with his crucial role in the Jazīra.

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

2

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

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

2. For the list of abbreviations used for the citation of primary sources in this chapter, see infra, p.185.

the early twelfth century. They will not take over the foreground of the discussion, as is standard practice in works on the Crusades.

The career of Īl-Ghāzī - first phase

The decline of the Saljuq empire did not manifest itself markedly until the deaths in quick succession of Nizām al-Mulk and Sultan Malik-Shāh in 485/1092-3, although the seeds of its decay had been sown long before.¹ During the early part of his career, that is before 485/1092-3, Īl-Ghāzī's role was most probably identical with that of many prominent leaders of the Turcoman tribes who had helped to bring the Saljuqs to power in the Islamic world. He fought in the service of the Saljuq sultans wherever they might send him and was presumably rewarded. At this stage there would have been little opportunity for him to gain independence or to acquire territory on his own account. Sultan Malik-Shāh and Nizām al-Mulk seem to have exercised a tight control and commanded loyalty from their military commanders, who were ordered to take cities and subjugate enemies but in the name of Malik-Shāh.²

1. For an analysis of Saljuq history after the death of Malik-Shāh, cf. C.E. Bosworth, "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World", in The Cambridge History of Iran, ed. J.A. Boyle (Cambridge, 1968), especially 102-18, and M.F. Sanullah, The Decline of the Saljūqid Empire (Calcutta, 1938).
2. For example, the campaign conducted by Ibn Jahīr against the Marwānids in Diyār Bakr in 477/1084-5. The purpose of this campaign was to quell the Marwānids and secure Diyār Bakr for the Saljuqs (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 86-8, 93-4; Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 208-12; Ibn al-Athīr, Atāb., 5).

Before 485/1092-3 Īl-Ghāzī probably fought with his father, Artuq, on his various military campaigns to Diyār Bakr¹ and Jerusalem,² and while Artuq was alive, Īl-Ghāzī was under his controlling influence.

The career of Īl-Ghāzī - second phase

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

1. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 210.
2. Tutush gave Jerusalem to Artuq as an iqṭā' in 478/1085-6 (Ibn al-Athīr, Atāb, 7); Ibn Khallikān, III, 171-2.
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 268; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 147; Matthew of Edessa, 256.

the Saljuq contenders. According to the caprice of fortune they could gain wealth and power if they had backed the winning side, but they found death or imprisonment if they lost. In the last decades of the eleventh century, then, Īl-Ghāzī sought advancement in the same way as the other Turcoman chiefs in the Saljuq empire by attaching himself to a powerful scion of the Saljuq family. He was active in Northern Syria in the struggle between Duqaq and Ridwān¹ and he held power briefly in Jerusalem.

Artuq, Īl-Ghāzī's father, had been given Jerusalem as an iqṭā' by Tutush in 478/1085-6. When Artuq died, Sukmān and Īl-Ghāzī succeeded him there. It is not altogether clear which of the two brothers was in charge or whether they ruled jointly.² Whatever the arrangement in Jerusalem, it was short-lived, since the Fātimids, profiting from Saljuq weakness, attacked the city

1. Before he died in 488/1095, Tutush asked his supporters to pledge their allegiance to his son Ridwān. Amongst the amīrs who were in Tutush's service was Īl-Ghāzī whom Tutush had left to fight alongside his son Ridwān (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 167).
2. It would appear that at one stage Īl-Ghāzī was governor in Jerusalem, and not Sukmān, since after Duqaq had detained Īl-Ghāzī in Damascus, as a move in his struggle against his brother Ridwān, Sukmān went to take over from his brother's deputies in Jerusalem (Ibn al-'Adīm, Bughyat, 139; idem, Zubḍa . . . , 124). On the other hand, Ibn al-Athīr says that Jerusalem had been given to Sukmān by Tutush (X, 193).

in 489/1095-6 and took it from the Artuqid family.¹ At that point both Sukmān and Īl-Ghāzī were there, with their cousin Sevinch and their nephew Yāqūtī. The presence of this cluster of Artuqid princes may be interpreted as an attempt by the family to carve out an appanage for themselves in the Jerusalem area. After al-Afdal had granted them safe conduct out of Jerusalem, the two brothers parted company, Sukmān staying in Edessa whilst Īl-Ghāzī went to Iraq.²

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

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

1. It is hard to share the enthusiasm for Artuqid rule expressed by Ibn Khallikān in his biography of the Fātimid caliph, al-Mustalī. Describing the capture of Jerusalem by al-Afdal, he writes that al-Afdal "then appointed a governor to rule it in his name, but this person, being unable to resist the Franks, yielded the city up to them; had it been in the possession of the Ortuk family, it would have been better for the Muslim people" (tr. de Slane, I, 160).
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 193; Ibn al-Azraq, f.160b.

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

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

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

1. Ibn Khallikān, op. cit., III, 171.
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 210.
3. Ibid., 225; Ibn Khallikān, op. cit., III, 171-2.

sphere of influence.¹ The evidence given by Ibn al-Athīr reveals that Īl-Ghāzī became attached to this office, although the people of Baghdad did not share this enthusiasm. The presence in and around Baghdad of Īl-Ghāzī's Turcoman groups engendered civil unrest and riots. On one occasion, in Rajab 495/April-May 1102, Īl-Ghāzī, instead of using diplomacy and his power as their leader to subdue his men, set about looting the city in retaliation for the seizure of one of his followers. Only the efforts of the caliph, al-Mustazhir, prevented Īl-Ghāzī from extending the pillaging elsewhere in the city.² There is no record that Muhammad exacted retribution for this gross misrule.

Perhaps the enjoyment he found in controlling Baghdad and his lack of any territory apart from Hulwān contributed to a disastrous political mistake which Īl-Ghāzī made in 497/1103-4 when he changed his allegiance from Muhammad to Berk-Yaruq. Under the terms of the uneasy peace-treaty made between Muhammad, Berk-Yaruq and Sanjar in that year,³ Berk-Yaruq was to be overlord of Baghdad. Instead of removing himself from that city to seek service elsewhere with Muhammad, who had been given the territories of Armenia, Āzarbāijān, the Jazīra, Mosul and Syria - territories which lay

1. For an analysis of the role of the shihna, see C.L. Klausner, The Seljuk Vezirate, A Study of Civil Administration, 1055-1194 (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), 20, 28 and 123.
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 231-2. The caliph sent the chief qādī and a professor from the Nizāmiyya madrasa to intercede (ibid.).
3. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 147; Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, ed. Jewett, 8; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 253.

more within Īl-Ghāzī's sphere of operations than south-western Iran and southern Iraq - Īl-Ghāzī remained in Baghdad and inserted Berk-Yaruq's name in the khutba in Jumādā I 497/February 1104.¹ It is not hard to guess Īl-Ghāzī's motivation in changing sides. He explained his reasons to Sadaqa who announced his intention of driving Īl-Ghāzī out of Baghdad. He told Sadaqa that his only possession until he became shihna of Baghdad had been Hulwān, and that it was because of Baghdad that he had recognised Berk-Yaruq as his sultan. Sadaqa apparently understood these arguments and returned to Hilla.²

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

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 254.

2. Ibid.

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

4. Sadaqa had originally sided with Berk-Yaruq. He changed his allegiance to Muhammad after Berk-Yaruq's vizier, Abu'l-Mahāsīn al-Dihistānī, demanded a large sum of money from him in 494/1100-1 and threatened to use force against him (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 209).

from Hisn Kaifā, and together they had succeeded in driving Gümüş-Tegin out of Baghdad.¹ It seems unlikely that their joint action was instigated by Sultan Muhammad although he was no doubt glad of the discomfiture of Gümüş-Tegin.

But İl-Ghāzī had now rendered himself unacceptable to Sultan Muhammad and was at best reluctantly allowed by Berk-Yaruq to continue as shihna. İl-Ghāzī's visit to Isfahān in 498/1104-5 to see Berk-Yaruq may well have been motivated by a desire to persuade the sultan of his loyalty, as well as to press him to come to Baghdad to strengthen his precarious hold over the city. It was en route to Baghdad that Berk-Yaruq died.²

Instead of attempting at this point to make amends to Muhammad by mentioning his name in the khutba at Baghdad, a move which might conceivably have reinstated İl-Ghāzī in Muhammad's favour, İl-Ghāzī proceeded with Berk-Yaruq's infant son, Malik-Shāh, and his atabeg Ayaz, as far as Baghdad. There they proclaimed Malik-Shāh sultan.³ This move was of course prompted by a desire to acquire more power for themselves since they could rule through the small boy. İl-Ghāzī's attachment to his post in Baghdad had induced him to make another egregious error of judgement.

Soon after, Muhammad marched on Baghdad and assumed control of

1. Ibid., 244-6.
2. Ibid., 262; Bundārī, 90.
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 262.

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

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

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

1. Bundārī, 90; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 265.
2. There seems to be no record of a quarrel between Muhammad and Īl-Ghāzī although Süssheim justifiably infers that one did take place (EI¹ art. "Īl-Ghāzī"). The chronology of Īl-Ghāzī's departure from Baghdad and the death of his brother Sukmān is not clear. Perhaps he left Baghdad of his own accord, out of fear of possible reprisals from Muhammad and with the aim of taking over his brother's lands. Alternatively, Muhammad may have sent him away on his own arrival in Baghdad.
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 268; Ibn al-'Adīm, Bughyat, 204 (he gives no date).

who had possession of Ḥiṣn Kaifā and Mārdīn, died on his way to answer an appeal from Tagh-Tegin in Damascus.¹ Ḥl-Ghāzī's decision to go to Diyār Bakr and assume the leadership of those members of his family who were already there was to pave the way for his eventual acquisition of his own territory.

The career of Ḥl-Ghāzī - third phase

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

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

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 268; Ibn Khallikān, op. cit., III, 171-2; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 147.
2. Cf. Sanaullah, op. cit., 114. Whether Muhammad was stronger than his brother, as the sources imply, is discussed later in this chapter.

sultan or any other person. He had only to call and they would come with their troops.¹ This is one explicit indication of ʾĪl-Ghāzī's declared willingness to lend support to powerful enemies of the sultan.

Once secure in the fortress of Mārdīn, well-known to be virtually impregnable and situated far from Muhammad's centre of government - a fortress which he took in 502/1108-9 - ʾĪl-Ghāzī gradually became bolder in his hostility to the sultan. Muhammad appointed Maudūd to the post of governor of Mosul, dismissing Chavli Saqao in 501/1107-8.² This position was of key importance in consolidating the sultan's authority over the Jazīra and carried with it great prestige. Opinions vary as to the extent to which the successive armies which were sent out from Mosul between 500/1106-7 and 509/1115-6 acted on the direct orders of the sultan. Some scholars have seen these campaigns as expressing the ambitions of successive governors of Mosul; others regard them as inspired at least in part by the sultan, who called on his amīrs to participate in a joint enterprise against rebel amīrs (ʾĪl-Ghāzī and Togh-Tegin) and the Franks, in order to restore his direct control over Syria and Diyār Bakr.³ Whatever the exact motivation

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 308.
2. Idem , X, 319.
3. Gibb thinks that Grousset was wrong to regard every offensive against the Franks as a "counter-Crusade" ("Notes on the Arabic Materials for the History of the Early Crusades", BSOAS VII [1933-5], 741). Gibb regards as misleading the idea that the expeditions sent out under the governors of Mosul were the

of such campaigns, a series of armies were sent out from Mosul, under Maudūd, Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī and Bursuq b. Bursuq, within the space of five years. Their activities directly affected Īl-Ghāzī, already incensed by the appointment of Maudūd as governor of Mosul. Two of these armies were sent via Mārdīn so that efforts could be made to bring Īl-Ghāzī to heel. These efforts were invariably unsuccessful. In the event, the latter two armies also experienced humiliating reverses.

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

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

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 321. This retreat by Īl-Ghāzī was not prompted by loyalty to Muḥammad, as Turan implies when he says that Īl-Ghāzī, in spite of the fact that Muḥammad had dismissed him from the post of shihna of Baghdad, would not help and returned to Mārdīn (op.cit., 146). Turan also confuses Chokermish (who died in 500/1106-7) and Chavli. Īl-Ghāzī did not reveal himself to be loyal to Muḥammad either

A similar inconsistency marked Īl-Ghāzī's conduct in 503/1109-10, when he went to Syria with his Turcoman groups in answer to the sultan's appeal to take part in a joint campaign with other amīrs under the leadership of Maudūd, lord of Mosul.¹ Although he participated in the fighting, Īl-Ghāzī quarrelled with Sukmān al-Qutbī during the campaign. Sukmān was a close territorial rival of his and his career, in contrast to Īl-Ghāzī's, had advanced smoothly through his calculated loyalty to the sultan. After the quarrel, Īl-Ghāzī withdrew to Mārdīn.² There he

shortly before or after this incident. His refusal to co-operate with Chavlī was probably caused by an awareness of his own lack of strength at that point and perhaps by a feeling that he might still be restored to Muhammad's favour eventually. He may also have had doubts about the particular suitability of Chavlī as an ally.

1. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 154-5; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 169-70.

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

This campaign is not mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr.

2. Ibn al-Qalānisī, 170. Cahen's article on the Artuqids (EI²) is misleading in its analysis of Īl-Ghāzī's relationship with Sultan Muhammad. Cahen dates the cooling of relations between them to the rupture in mid-campaign between Īl-Ghāzī and Sukmān al-Qutbī. A more likely moment for the beginning of

remained, refusing to fight. When the campaign was renewed the following year (504/1110-11) a vast army assembled under the leadership of Maudūd. As Īl-Ghāzī did not dare at this early stage to refuse the sultan altogether nor to oppose his army, he did send troops, but under the leadership of his son Ayaz, not himself. He was the only amīr summoned to fight who did not appear in person.¹

The murder of Maudūd in 507/1113-4² removed one powerful

animosity between Muhammad and Īl-Ghāzī would be in 498/1104-5 when Muhammad dismissed Īl-Ghāzī from the office of shihna of Baghdad after he had shifted his allegiance to his brother Berk-Yaruq.

1. For an account of this campaign, see Ibn al-Qalānisī, who gives the date as 504/1110-1 (op.cit., 174-5) and Ibn al-Athīr, who has two versions (X, 340-1 and Atab. 18). In the Kāmil he records the episode under the year 505/1111-2. It was on this campaign that Sukmān al-Qutbī died. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Īl-Ghāzī made a surprise attack on his men who were taking his body back to Akhlāt (ibid.; see also Ibn al-Furāt, f. 54b.)
2. Ibn al-Qalānisī, 187; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 347-8; Michael the Syrian, 216; Matthew of Edessa, 285-6; al-'Azīmī, 382; Anon. Syr.Chron., 85. According to Fink, Maudūd of Mosul was motivated by religious idealism in his offensives against the Franks (H.S. Fink, "Mawdud of Mosul, Precursor of Saladin," The Muslim World, XLIII (1953), 18-27. Sivan refutes his claims saying that Fink does not give convincing

rival from ʾĪl-Ghāzī's path but in the event its consequences were to fan still further his resentment against Muhammad. ʾĪl-Ghāzī had already been ignored once by the sultan when the latter had appointed Maudūd as governor of Mosul. Now, in 508/1114-5, the sultan replaced Maudūd with Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī, the man who had taken over ʾĪl-Ghāzī's position as shihna in Baghdad.¹ ʾĪl-Ghāzī's short-lived attempt at conformity with the sultan's wishes had proved fruitless, and he refused to answer the next call to arms from the sultan.

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

At this juncture, ʾĪl-Ghāzī apparently began to fear the wrath of the sultan, even in the security of his fortress at Mārdīn,

evidence that Maudūd attempted to give his campaigns a religious character (op. cit., 56, n.8).

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 350-1; Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 52.
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 351.
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 352; Michael the Syrian, 216-7; Matthew of Edessa, 287; Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 284.

especially after he received threatening letters from Muhammad. Seeking an ally with a similar outlook, he fled to Togh-Tegin in Damascus and joined forces with him.¹ Togh-Tegin had just cause to believe that he had incurred the sultan's displeasure after Maudūd had been murdered in the previous year whilst in his company at Damascus. Although the blame for the assassination had been placed as usual on the Ismā'īlīs, some of the chroniclers suggest Togh-Tegin's own complicity in the deed.²

The alliance formed by ʾl-Ghāzī and Togh-Tegin in 508/1114-5 was of long duration and mutually beneficial. Together they made a treaty that same year with Roger of Antioch³ and awaited the arrival of the combined forces of the sultan sent out under a new general, Bursuq. The twin objectives of this campaign were to quell the pride of ʾl-Ghāzī and to prosecute the jihād against the Franks.⁴ The order of priorities is significant here. After ʾl-Ghāzī, Togh-Tegin and Roger of Antioch had assembled their troops and Bursuq's army had arrived near Aleppo, no battle actually took place. After eight days, Bursuq retreated, fell

1. Michael the Syrian, 217; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 352.
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 352; Matthew of Edessa, 285. Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī mentions the rumour but rejects it as untrue (op.cit., 51). Ibn al-Qalānisī, as the Damascus chronicler and from a viewpoint of warm enthusiasm for Togh-Tegin, places the blame squarely on the Ismā'īlīs and emphasises Togh-Tegin's profound grief at Maudūd's death (op. cit., 187).
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 352; Matthew of Edessa, 292.
4. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 356-7.

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

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

1. Matthew of Edessa, 292; Usāma, tr. Hitti, 102-6.
2. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 193; Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 55-6; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 360.
3. Runciman mentions only Togh-Tegin's reconciliation with Sultan Muhammad (op. cit., 133). Stevenson, on the other hand, states that "Ilgazi and Tugtakin both effected their reconciliation with the sultan" (op. cit., 100). There would appear to be no evidence of this rapprochement in the chronicles. Indeed, it would be more consistent if Īl-Ghāzī made no move towards the sultan.

Mahmūd, with whom no doubt he hoped to have more friendly but indirect relations.¹

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

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

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 418.
2. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 168; M.F. Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie (St. Petersburg, 1858) I, 358-361; Ibn al-Azraq, Ms. A, f.161b; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 398-9.

unity to a decaying state, torn apart by internal strife.¹ Whilst fortune favoured him by the absence of any strong rival claimants to the throne, his efforts to establish his authority over his amīrs, especially Īl-Ghāzī and Tugh-Tegin, were remarkably unsuccessful. Fear of reprisals by Muhammad may have dogged the steps of these two rebels but it did not generally deter them from continuing to pursue their own independent policies. Once Maudūd had been killed, and two successive armies from Mosul had been defeated, one by Īl-Ghāzī himself and one by the Franks at Dānīth, Sultan Muhammad's hold on affairs in Syria and Jazīra became seriously enfeebled. His death provided the opportunity for even more independent actions by the amīrs of the Jazīra and Syria.²

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

1. Bundārī, 134; al-Ḥusainī, 82; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt al-A'yan, (Cairo, 1310) II, 47. The latter two writers praise Muhammad's efforts against the Ismā'īlīs.
2. It is difficult to agree with Turan's view that "Sultan Maḥmūd inherited a strong state from his father, Sultan Muhammad" (O. Turan, Selcuklular Tarihi ve Türk Islam Medeniyeti, 182). A closer analysis of the period would indicate that at least in the west Sultan Muhammad's authority had been seriously undermined by Īl-Ghāzī and

he acquired territory must have been arduous and complex. The difficulty of holding onto any city or citadel in a land where the central government barely controlled the contending local warlords was a perennial one in the medieval period. But at this time it was exacerbated by the presence in Diyār Bakr of the nomadic or semi-nomadic Turcoman groups from whose ranks Īl-Ghāzī had come. The two major exigencies of nomadic existence had to be satisfied: one was grazing lands for their flocks, the other was booty. The inherent mobility of nomadic life, and the raids necessary to make a livelihood, explain on the one hand the vast geographical area, extending from Jerusalem to Tiflīs, from Aleppo to Isfahān, which was covered by Īl-Ghāzī and his Turcomans, and on the other highlight some of the difficulties they must have experienced in becoming entrenched in one specific geographical area.

The area which Īl-Ghāzī had selected for his territory was Diyār Bakr. He had probably visited it with his father, Artuq, who took part in Ibn Jahīr's campaign to seize Mayyāfāriqīn in the name of Malīk-Shāh, stamp out the Marwānids and take their treasures.¹ The territory of Diyār Bakr was eminently suitable for Īl-Ghāzī's purposes. His brother had possession of Hisn Kaifā and Mārdīn and other members of the Artuqid family were

Togh-Tegin. At best, he left a state strong in the central area of his empire only. For a balanced assessment of Sultan Muhammad, cf. C.E. Bosworth, "The Iranian World", 113-4.

1. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 208.

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

The interplay between the settled areas - the cities of Mārdīn, Mayyāfāriqīn and other smaller Artuqid possessions - and Īl-Ghāzī's Turcomans must have been violent and disruptive, although the custom of the times demanded that a city should be protected by its citadel, held by some armed force. The sources abound with examples of cities such as Tiflīs,³ Aleppo⁴ and Mayyāfāriqīn desperately seeking military protection from various Turcoman and other leaders, since to be defenceless was even more of a disaster than to be ruled despotically.⁵

1. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.160b; 'Awad, op. cit., 269.
2. These are listed by Ibn Shaddād (Marsh 333, ff.65a-b).
3. According to Ibn al-Azraq, the people of Tiflīs had already sought the protection of the Saljuq malik, Toghrīl, in Arrān, but in 515/1121-2, as his help had proved inadequate, they asked Īl-Ghāzī to come (Ms.A, f.161a).
4. Aleppo had a succession of rulers after the death of Ridwān in 507/1113-4. The initiative for their taking command frequently came from influential citizens, especially Ibn al-Khashshāb.
5. This attitude was shown by the people of Aleppo who finally asked Īl-Ghāzī to take over control of their city in 511/1117-8. He was clearly their last resort (Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 185).

Ibn al-Azraq is an unreliable source for any assessment of the effect of Īl-Ghāzī and his Turcomans on the cities he owned. His testimony is blatantly pro-Artuqid, since he worked for Īl-Ghāzī's son, Temūr-Tash, who incidentally receives far more eulogies than his father. The changes which Ibn al-Azraq claims that Īl-Ghāzī made are therefore intrinsically suspect but they are nonetheless revealing. Īl-Ghāzī is said to have abolished billeting in the houses of Mayyāfāriqīn, most of which was in ruins, and to have made the countryside safe from robbers who plundered the caravans in the immediate area of the town.¹ There is, however, no reason to assume that in the years 502-516/1108-1122, when Īl-Ghāzī's centre of operations was Diyār Bakr, there was any improvement in the uneasy relationship between his Turcoman troops and the local inhabitants. The detailed description given by Ibn al-Athīr of one turbulent incident at Baghdad during Īl-Ghāzī's time as shihna² is probably a more accurate picture of the impact of the Turcomans on Mārdīn, Mayyāfāriqīn and Aleppo than that implied by Ibn al-Azraq's bland eulogies. The real beginnings of a fruitful relationship

1. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161a.
2. In Rajab 495/April-May 1102, whilst Īl-Ghāzī was away from Baghdad, some of his men wanted to cross the Tigris. A sailor who took a long time to answer their request for a boat was promptly killed. The murderer, who was seized by the populace, was then rescued by Īl-Ghāzī's son, whilst the townspeople threw stones at the Turcomans. Although the hājib al-bāb seized those people who were involved in the incident, Īl-Ghāzī was not satisfied. He went over to

between the Turcomans and the people of the cities ruled by the Artuqid family must have been made in the reign of Temür-Tash, who held on to Mayyāfāriqīn and Mārdīn for thirty years. Genuine sedentarisation of course took very much longer than a single generation.¹

After acquiring Mārdīn around 502/1108-9, Īl-Ghāzī must have wielded power unofficially in Mayyāfāriqīn too² and his grip on

the sailors' quarter and pillaged it.

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

1. Cf. S. Vryonis, Jr., The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century, (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1971), 143-288.
2. The fate of Mayyāfāriqīn need not necessarily, of course, have been linked to that of Mārdīn. Mayyāfāriqīn had been the centre of Marwānid power, whereas under Qilīch Arslan b. Sulaimān b. Qutlumush the town had been ruled from Malatya. It was subsequently taken over by Sukmān al-Qutbī, who ruled it from Akhlāt. It was therefore no novelty for the fortunes of Mayyāfāriqīn to be linked with those of a neighbouring city ruled by a dominant power.

the city must have tightened after the death of its overlord, Sukmān al-Qutbī, in 504/1110-1. The official date given by Ibn al-Azraq for his acquisition of the city is 512/1118-9.¹ The vulnerability of the hinterland of this city after Sukmān al-Qutbī's death was soon revealed, as "despotic hands reached out" to snatch whatever territory they could.² Prominent amongst the claimants for this temporarily ungoverned territory was ʿIl-Ghāzī himself, who by that time had probably established himself as the overlord of the other amīrs in that area. These included Toghan Arslan of Arzan and Bitlīs, who answered his call to arms on the Tiflīs campaign,³ and Amīr Ibrāhīm, the lord of Āmid.⁴ The more recent rulers of Mayyāfāriqīn had been local amīrs and it must have seemed natural for the pattern to continue. Thus in 498/1104-5 Qilīch Arslan of Malatya had entered Mayyāfāriqīn and received oaths of allegiance from the local amīrs already

1. Ibn al-Azraq is very specific on the date of ʿIl-Ghāzī's acquisition of Mayyāfāriqīn: 14 Jumādā II, 512 (Ms.A, f.161a). According to Ibn al-Athīr, however, ʿIl-Ghāzī received Mayyāfāriqīn in 515/1121-22 (X, 418). This may well have been only the formalisation of his de facto rule over the city.
2. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 283.
3. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161b.
4. Ibn al-Azraq lists the local princelings of Diyār Bakr (ed. 'Awad, 272). They include Qizil Arslan of Is'ird, Shāhrūkh of Hānī and Ibrāhīm of Āmid.

established in the area.¹ After Qilīch Arslan had drowned in the Khābūr in 500/1105-6 Sukmān al-Qutbī had assumed overall control of Diyār Bakr from his centre at Akhlāt.² With his death the most likely choice was Īl-Ghāzī.

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

Īl-Ghāzī at Aleppo

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

-
1. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 272.
 2. Ibid., 275.
 3. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 129.

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

Aleppo was a vital strategic point but, as indicated above, it was dangerous to own, especially as the Franks, now masters of Antioch and Edessa, became increasingly aggressive; and its economy was in a lamentable state. Although the other cities owned by ʾil-Ghāzī - Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn - had been subjected to constant changes of government and their surrounding countryside had been ravaged,³ the plight of Aleppo seems to have been especially pitiful. It had fallen prey to the depredations of the Turcomans some thirty or forty years earlier and had been continually harassed thereafter.⁴ According to Ibn al-ʿAdīm,

1. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 180-6.
2. "The inhabitants, despairing of finding support from any Muslim prince, decided to send deputations ... to ʾil-Ghāzī" (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, ibid., 185).
3. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161a.
4. Cf. S. Zakkar, The Emirate of Aleppo 1004-1094, (Beirut 1971), 186-234.

Îl-Ghāzī was not the Aleppans' first choice of protector though they desperately needed someone to guarantee the security of the city.¹ Nor was his first attempt at gaining possession of the city successful.² He departed, leaving his son Temür-Tash behind, according to some sources as a hostage.³ On his second entry into Aleppo, however, Îl-Ghāzī gained access to the citadel⁴ and managed to make himself acceptable as the new ruler of the city.

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

1. Nor was he the only ruler interested in acquiring Aleppo (Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 180).
2. In 511/117-8, Îl-Ghāzī was invited to come from Mārdīn and rid the city of Aq-Sonqur. On this first occasion, Îl-Ghāzī was not able to gain access to the big citadel and had to make do with the qal'at al-sharīf (ibid., 179-80).
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 373; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 199; al-'Azīmī, 384.
4. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 185. Sivan says that the personal intervention of Ibn al-Khashshāb was needed before power in Aleppo could be transferred to Îl-Ghāzī (op. cit., 41, citing Ibn Abī Tayyī' in Ibn al-Furāt, I, ff.121b - 122b).

them. Above all, ʾil-Ghāzī found the treasury empty.¹ There was nothing with which to satisfy his Turcoman supporters who had come with him from Mārdīn. He stayed long enough to put the affairs of the city in order, placed his son Temūr-Tash in charge as his deputy there and hastened back to Mārdīn.²

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

1. According to Ibn al-Athīr, the treasury in Aleppo was empty because the eunuchs had shared out its contents amongst themselves (op. cit., X, 372).
2. According to Ibn al-ʿAdīm, the revenues of Aleppo were not adequate for the needs of ʾil-Ghāzī and his Turcomans. He became estranged from the people of Aleppo and left for Mārdīn (Zubda, 180).
3. ʾil-Ghāzī's attitude to Aleppo is summed up by Ibn al-ʿAdīm who says that the city was too weakened to be a suitable place in which ʾil-Ghāzī might live (ibid., 193).

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

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

1. The report that Dubais joined in an attack on Aleppo after Īl-Ghāzī's death reveals his continuing interest in the city (Ibn al-'Adīm, Bughyat, 205).
2. Such is the version of Ibn al-Azraq (Ms.A, f.161a). Ibn

who ruled in Arrān,¹ and who was therefore the nearest person to whom the people of Tiflīs might turn in trouble, had been unsuccessful in curbing the incursions of King David the Restorer into the area. Īl-Ghāzī, whose reputation was at its height at the time of the request for assistance from Tiflīs, must have been flattered by this appeal. Besides, Georgia was a frontier area, well suited for someone who wanted - as Īl-Ghāzī had consistently done - to rule independently of the central power. He had the requisite military strength, but an analysis of the exhausting schedule of activities which preceded his departure for Georgia reveals that he was foolhardy to undertake such a long journey into unfamiliar terrain. He had campaigned early in his career into parts of Armenia² but it is very unlikely that he had penetrated Georgia itself. The resounding defeat which David and his son Dimitri inflicted on Īl-Ghāzī and his army (the battle is analysed in detail below) was a bitter humiliation from which

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

1. Toghrīl was the brother of Sultan Mahmūd. He had first ruled in the area of Zanjān (Bundārī, 134; al-Husainī, 90). In 514/1120-1 he rebelled against Mahmūd and took Ganja (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 383-5).
2. Minorsky, citing Vardan, states: "In 1092 famine visited Armenia, and then the country was invaded by Al-Khazi (Ēl-Ghāzī b. Artuq). The latter, with 7,000 men, reached Ani but the Pahlavid Grigor slew his giant brother and the aggressors were beaten off" (Studies in Caucasian History [London, 1953], 82).

Îl-Ghāzī's pride did not recover. Most of his men were killed or taken prisoner and he escaped with Dubais and a small band of followers to Mārdīn.¹

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

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

1. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161b.
2. Op. cit., 204-5.
3. Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 101-2; Abu' l-Mahāsin, RHC III, 499.

hostile Christian sources.¹ This same sentiment may well have inspired Īl-Ghāzī briefly with a vision of his rule over a principality extending from Aleppo to Tiflīs. If so, the dream was soon shattered.

Īl-Ghāzī's military ability

(a) His relationship with the Turcomans

Īl-Ghāzī depended for his military strength on his bands of Turcomans who, according to the sources, were based in the area around Mārdīn.² Īl-Ghāzī would embark on a campaign in the spring and would return with his Turcomans in the autumn to Mārdīn.

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

"Each of them would come with a bag containing flour and mutton".³

Ibn al-Qalānisi likens them to birds and beasts of prey:-

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

1. Anon. Syr. Chron., 89; Matthew of Edessa, 304.
2. Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 73; Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 193.
3. Op. cit., X, 400.

their prey and gerfalcons hovering over their victims."¹

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

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

1. Ibn al-Qalānisī, tr. Gibb, 159.
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 400.
3. Op. cit., 217.
4. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 280.

pillaging livestock and other possessions.¹

The behaviour of the Turcoman troops after a victory in battle could be disciplined and restrained under Īl-Ghāzī's command. There was not always a wild rush for booty. After the victory over Roger of Antioch at Balāt, for example, the Turcoman chiefs came bearing their spoils to Īl-Ghāzī, who had taken over Roger's tent. He allowed the chiefs to retain what booty they had taken, reserving for himself only a few items, to present as gifts to other rulers.² If such calculated generosity was typical of his dealings with his Turcomans, their loyalty to him would not be surprising.

On the other hand, Īl-Ghāzī's operations were also seriously curtailed by his use of Turcoman troops. Since the Turcomans could be persuaded to participate in a campaign only if there was the prospect of booty, Īl-Ghāzī was unable to consolidate his gains in a given area. Once a battle was finished, the Turcomans were unwilling to linger. They wished to return to Mārdīn straight after the battle with their spoils. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Īl-Ghāzī never embarked on long campaigns against the Franks. Every hour mattered, since the Turcomans were anxious to return as quickly as possible. In fact, if the campaign became prolonged, they would disperse as he had no money to give them.³

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 280.
2. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 190.
3. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 400.

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

The Turcoman response to the empty treasury at Aleppo exercised a great influence on Īl-Ghāzī's attitude to that city and made him leave for Mārdīn, earlier perhaps than he had intended.¹ Furthermore, the blame for Īl-Ghāzī's failure to take Antioch after his victory at Balāt may be attributed at least in part to the Turcomans. They refused to stay on after the battle and thus rendered Īl-Ghāzī incapable of moving on to Antioch, which as Ibn al-Qalānisī stresses lay defenceless after the death of Roger at Balāt.² Their short-term tactics thus foiled any possible long-term strategy which Īl-Ghāzī may have

1. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 180.

2. Ibn al-Qalānisī, 201. This point is also made by Ibn al-'Adīm (Zubda, 191).

planned.

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

"It was agreed between them that the amīr Najm al-Dīn Īl-Ghāzī b. Ortuq, for the better executing of his undertaking, should proceed to Mārdīn in order to assemble the Turkmens from his provinces, and urge them to destroy the factions of infidelity and error. It was considered desirable that the amīr Zahīr al-Dīn [Togh-Tegin] should go with him to reinforce their purpose and facilitate the realization of their hopes."¹

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

1. Ibn al-Qalānisī, tr. Gibb, 158-9.

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

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

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

1. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 200.
2. Sivan, op. cit., 41.
3. Ibid., 32-43.

explaining the factors which contributed to the absence of an awareness of jihād amongst the Muslims of Northern Syria at the time of Frankish expansion and consolidation in the area in the period 491-512/1097-1118, Sivan analyses the beginnings of a change of attitude in the face of increasing aggression on the part of the Franks who were threatening to take Aleppo around 1118.¹

Sivan asserts that in 1118, when ʾĪl-Ghāzī came back to Aleppo for the second time after the city had been under siege from the Franks, and when he finally assumed control there, he seems to have been in no way imbued with the zeal of a "warrior of the faith". He had been an ally of the Franks in the past and had been enticed into Aleppo only after the promise of considerable financial rewards. The following year, with increasing pressure on Aleppo from Roger of Antioch, however, ʾĪl-Ghāzī found himself in a city in a ferment with the idea of jihād. He now realised full well the use he could make of this "galvanising" idea to boost the morale of his troops in this dangerous enterprise.² The appearance of the qādī Ibn Khashshāb before the assembled Turcoman troops is seen by Sivan as the first instance of the use of an official jihād propaganda in the Muslims' fight against the Crusaders. ʾĪl-Ghāzī made his amirs swear an oath "to do their duty courageously, to fight heroically, and not to retreat, even if they had to shed all their blood for the holy war".³

1. Sivan, op. cit., 39.
2. Ibid., 41.
3. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 188.

After encountering initial indifference and even contempt,¹ Ibn al-Khashshāb brought "tears of ecstasy" to the eyes of the Turcomans, who then went into battle and won a glorious victory over the Franks.

Sivan's evidence is certainly persuasive. It may well be that ʾĪl-Ghāzī had perceived the benefits of jihād propaganda and used it to strengthen his flagging hold over his troops.²

The events of the following year are also significant. In that year, 514/1120-1, ʾĪl-Ghāzī crossed the Euphrates with his men on a new campaign, having made the unusual prohibition that they were not to pillage during the campaign. When some of his men disobeyed, he punished them by shaving and hamstringing them. At this point, his troops disbanded and deserted him, leaving him with only a small handful of men. It was very fortunate for him that Togh-Tegin came in time to save him from Frankish attacks.³ The sequel showed, then, that ʾĪl-Ghāzī was ill-advised to decree that his soldiers were not to pillage during the campaign. His motives for taking this unusual step are not clear. Perhaps he thought it would be wasteful to pillage territory that would soon be his. Or perhaps he was

1. One Turcoman soldier is reported to have cried out, "Was it to obey this man with a turban that we left our country?" (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 189).
2. This whole issue is discussed at greater length in this chapter on pages 173-5.
3. Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Zubda, 195.

determined that his men would concentrate their energies only on fighting. Presumably he was confident that he could control them with the promise of battle plunder, in place of the casual pillaging of fields and livestock which was their normal practice. But what most probably motivated his rash decree was a misplaced confidence in his own abilities as a general, a confidence greatly strengthened by his recent victory at Balāt.

During the years 513/1119-20 and 514/1120-1, therefore, Īl-Ghāzī's control over the Turcomans seems to have been slackening. His troops were subsequently decimated in the Tiflis campaign and it may well be that if the casualty figures were as high as the chroniclers suggest¹ Īl-Ghāzī's forces were irremediably depleted. He engaged in no major offensive after Tiflīs in 513/1121-22, nor is there evidence that he was planning one, and he died a year later.²

Īl-Ghāzī - a military strategist?

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

1. Ibn al-Azraq says that Īl-Ghāzī escaped with only twenty horsemen (Ms.B, f.103b).
2. For accounts of the death of Īl-Ghāzī, cf. Bar Hebraeus, 250; al-'Azīmī, 389; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 426; Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 206; Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.162b; Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 103; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 208.

Saljuq sultan Muhammad, such as Dubais. He also allied himself with rulers who were near at hand, such as Togh-Tegin and Roger of Antioch. But he played the same game of making and breaking alliances as the other local chieftains in the struggle for power in Northern Syria. Īl-Ghāzī's military abilities may be highlighted by a detailed analysis of his two major battles, Balāt in 513/1119 and Tiflīs in 515/1121. These are well-documented. They also represent victory and defeat and thus present a certain balance.

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

1. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 187.
2. The sources vary widely as to the quantities of troops on both sides but it would appear that Īl-Ghāzī's men greatly outnumbered Roger's.

were powerless to resist. Roger was killed and the flower of the Norman cavalry was cut down. Ibn al-Qalānisi writes that the Turcomans swooped down like a flight of falcons wanting to protect their nests¹ and even the anonymous Christian writer of the Syriac chronicle is moved to an unusual descriptive detail, saying that the Turcomans showered arrows on the camp like clouds of hail.²

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

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

1. Op. cit., 201.
2. Op. cit., 88. For other descriptions of the battle, cf. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 188-9 and Michael the Syrian, 204.

They made what preparations they could¹ but Īl-Ghāzī did not follow up the great opportunity that presented itself.

Instead his troops, following the time-honoured practices of nomadic life, dispersed with their booty and according to western sources perpetrated a full-scale massacre of Frankish prisoners.² The Turcomans would not contemplate further battles and thus Antioch slipped from Īl-Ghāzī's hands. But it is not even entirely clear that Īl-Ghāzī himself had intended to exploit this rare opportunity. The sources say that he was unable to fight for three weeks after the battle. According to some writers, including Usāma,³ the illness was caused by excessive bouts of drinking in celebration of his victory. Such a report would accord ill with the image of a great strategist but it tallies with earlier accounts of Muslim historians stressing the drunken habits of Īl-Ghāzī. At all events, by the time he fought the Franks again, in August, the outcome was indecisive; Baldwin had had time to restore the morale of the Franks and forestall any immediate threat to Antioch.⁴

Īl-Ghāzī has incurred much opprobrium from modern historians

1. Runciman, op. cit., 151, citing Walter the Chancellor.
2. Ibid. Ibn al-'Adīm gives no indication that there was a particularly barbarous massacre of Frankish prisoners. He simply states that Īl-Ghāzī took ransom money from rich captives, killing the rest (Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 193).
3. Usāma, tr. Hitti, 149.
4. Runciman, op. cit., 154.

for his failure to follow up his victory at Balāt by an attack on Antioch. As Runciman expresses it:-

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

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

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

1. Op. cit., 155.

after Balat:-

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

It is all the more ironic, therefore, to reflect that after Balāt Īl-Ghāzī's career petered out dramatically.

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

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

1. These lines are quoted in Ibn al-Athīr, X, 390.

2. Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 195.

3. Ibid., 200.

4. This event is discussed in Chapter VIII of this thesis.

to consolidate their position in Northern Syria unhampered by their principal opponent.

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

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

1. Anon. Syr. Chron., 89.
2. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 398-9; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 204-5; Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 101; Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161a-b; Matthew of Edessa, 304-5; al-'Azīmī, 388; Anon. Syr. Chron., 89.
3. Ibn al-Qalānisi, 204-5.

who only the year before had brought such glory to the Muslim cause, was now lucky to escape with Dubais and a handful of men and return in disgrace to Mārdīn. His men he could not save.

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

Īl-Ghāzī's political ability

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

In the immediate area of Mārdīn, Qilich Arslan, to whom the

amirs of Diyār Bakr had declared their allegiance in 498/1104-5,¹ had been defeated in battle and drowned.² The career of Sukmān al-Qutbī, which, as noted above, had advanced smoothly thanks to a policy of strict adherence to the sultan's commands, reached its apogee when he took Mayyāfāriqīn, now without an overlord, in 502/1108-9.³ He had already ruled the area around Akhlāt and the local princelings thought it prudent to declare suzerainty to him.⁴ It is significant that Sukmān took possession of Mayyāfāriqīn in the same year as ʾIl-Ghāzī gained Mārdīn, already in the hands of his family. It seems likely that both had their eyes on Mayyāfāriqīn and that by seizing it first Sukmān was underlining his dominance in Diyār Bakr. Their peaceful co-existence was virtually impossible. Fortunately for ʾIl-Ghāzī, Sukmān died soon afterwards,⁵ and thereby vacated the overlordship of Diyār Bakr for his rival. Ibn al-Athīr describes the raid which ʾIl-Ghāzī led on Sukmān's men as they returned to Akhlāt with their master's coffin.⁶ This was not merely an attempt to obtain plunder but was a deliberate move to destroy Sukmān's

1. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 272.
2. Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 17-18.
3. Sukmān al-Qutbī fought on Muhammad's side in 496/1102-3 (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 247-8) and in 498/1104-5 (ibid., 264). Ibn al-Azraq relates his taking possession of Mayyāfāriqīn (op. cit., ed. 'Awad, 274-5).
4. Ibid.
5. For the death of Sukmān al-Qutbī, cf. Ibn al-Athīr, Atab., 18; Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 36.
6. Ibid. Cf. also Ibn al-Furāt, f.54b (apud Cahen, "Le Diyār Bakr", 233).

troops and thereby weaken the power of the principality nearest his own. Although the attack on Sukmān al-Qutbī's troops was unsuccessful, Sukmān's son, Ibrāhīm, never offered a serious threat to ʾĪl-Ghāzī's growing power in Diyār Bakr. The struggle for power within the Artuqid family itself, and especially between ʾĪl-Ghāzī and his brother's son, Ibrāhīm b. Sukmān, seems to have been resolved with the death of Ibrāhīm around 502/1108-9.¹ For a short time Sukmān had ruled Mārdīn and Ḥiṣn Kaifā² jointly. Ibrāhīm had wished to do likewise after his father's death in 498/1104-5, when he inherited Mārdīn and ruled it from Ḥiṣn Kaifā. Thereafter, when ʾĪl-Ghāzī came to Diyār Bakr, dismissed from his post as shihna and without obvious territorial possessions, there must have been a struggle for control of Mārdīn between him and Ibrāhīm, culminating in Ibrāhīm's death. Ibrāhīm's brother, Dā'ūd, then took Ḥiṣn Kaifā,³ whilst ʾĪl-Ghāzī ruled at Mārdīn. Thus these two cities, the cornerstones of Artuqid power, began to be ruled separately, a pattern which was to continue for a long time. After the death of Ibrāhīm, ʾĪl-Ghāzī wielded supremacy

1. Ibn al-Azraq writes that Ibrāhīm succeeded Sukmān, his father, but he does not give a date for Ibrāhīm's death (ed. 'Awad, 269; Ms.A, f.160b).
2. Sukmān had acquired Ḥiṣn Kaifā after he had helped Mūsā in a campaign against Chökermish in 495/1101-2 (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 235). He gained possession of Mārdīn sometime between this date and his own death, after 'Alī, the wālī of its citadel, had invited him to take the town (ibid., 270).
3. Ibn al-Azraq, ed. 'Awad, 269.

over the Artuqid family. The amīr whose power most nearly approached his own was his nephew Dā'ūd, whose subordinate status may be inferred from the fact that he sent troops to Īl-Ghāzī when he was called upon to do so.²

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

1. The struggle between Īl-Ghāzī and his brother's son, Sukmān, epitomises a major problem of succession amongst the ruling Turcoman families; namely whether a brother or the eldest son should inherit territories. After the death of Alp Arslān in 465/1072, Qavurt, his brother, claimed the greater right to the inheritance whereas Malik-Shāh adduced the argument "A brother does not inherit where there is a son" (Bosworth, op.cit., 88). In this unresolved inheritance problem the outcome usually depended on a trial of strength.
2. Īl-Ghāzī called on his nephew to help him fight Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī in 508/1114-15 (Michael the Syrian, 216-7; Matthew of Edessa, 287; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 352).

of personality and energy than either the wayward, frivolous Sulaimān or the more docile Temūr-Tash. Certainly, from the viewpoint of the continuation of jihād against the Franks, Balak was Īl-Ghāzī's heir, not his sons. Balak's qualities as a warrior were recognised by more than one medieval historian. He died, however, soon after his uncle in 518/1124.

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

"Ghāzī had become powerful and was uplifted because he ruled his own land, that of his brother Suqman's sons, and that of his uncle's son Daud¹, as far as Assyria, Armenia, and the land of the Iberians."²

Īl-Ghāzī and administration

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

1. Sic.

2. Anon. Syr. Chron., 89.

built up in Mayyāfāriqīn and Mārdīn.¹ Although he emphasises that Īl-Ghāzī was still a nomadic leader who spent his time in wide-ranging expeditions, he adds that while other Turkish chiefs were mere pillagers Īl-Ghāzī busied himself with administration and religious matters.² This statement is self-contradictory and is not supported by evidence. The events of the last years of Īl-Ghāzī's life and the vast geographical areas he covered left him little time for administration, even if he had possessed the inclination or ability for it. The two cities for which documentary evidence is available, namely Aleppo and Mayyāfāriqīn, seem to have been governed under Īl-Ghāzī in the manner customary during the period. Local families, such as the Banū Nubāta in Mayyāfāriqīn, would be handed the task of the day-to-day administration of the city.³ Whether in the winter months Īl-Ghāzī took a direct part in the affairs of Mārdīn, a city which he seems to have preferred to Mayyāfāriqīn, is impossible to say. But it is unlikely that his interests went further than the initial removal of burdensome taxation to ingratiate himself with the inhabitants, as in Mayyāfāriqīn,⁴ followed by the use of customary methods⁵ to raise funds for his men and for his military activities.

1. Cahen, op. cit., 237.
2. Ibid.
3. Members of this family consistently held high office in Mayyāfāriqīn in the Marwānid period and also under the Artuqids.
4. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161a.
5. In 511/1117-8 Īl-Ghāzī mulcted Aleppo's officials of large sums of money with which to buy a truce with the Franks. This move was intended to give him time to fetch reinforcements from Mārdīn (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 373).

It is hard to join in Cahen's eulogy of Īl-Ghāzī, when, basing his enthusiasm upon the naively pro-Artuqid statements of Ibn al-Azraq, he writes:

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

The same sweeping praise is lavished on Īl-Ghāzī by Sevim who labels him "not only a shrewd soldier but also a politician and a good administrator".² This is hard to reconcile with the description by Ibn al-'Adīm of events at Aleppo when Īl-Ghāzī and his Turcomans arrived to take command of the city. Rapacity was then the key motivation and it was not mitigated by the slightest interest in the well-being of the urban populace.³ Ibn al-Athīr's account of Īl-Ghāzī at Aleppo agrees in spirit with that of Ibn al-'Adīm, whilst adding more details.⁴ Descriptions of a conquering military chief entering a city and removing burdensome taxation from its inhabitants abound in the sources and are couched in stereotyped phrases.⁵ There is no justification for attaching particular significance to the actions

1. Cahen, op. cit., 237.
2. Sevim, op. cit., 690.
3. Op. cit., 180.
4. Op. cit., X, 372-3.
5. Cf. the phrases used by Ibn al-'Adīm to describe how Aq-Sonqur al-Bursuqī removed the burden of taxation from the people of Aleppo (Bughyat, 204).

of Īl-Ghāzī when he in turn conquered a city.

It may, however, be conceded that by the time Īl-Ghāzī had become a significant power in the political struggle in Northern Syria around 511/1117-8 he seems to have acquired confidence and some rudimentary political skills. His alliance with Togh-Tegin of Damascus in 508/1114-5 and his earlier experience as a military leader for Tutush and Ridwān had given him a knowledge of Syrian politics. The support of Togh-Tegin proved invaluable. Alone, Īl-Ghāzī might not have withstood the pressure exerted on him by Sultan Muhammad. But the relationship between Īl-Ghāzī and Togh-Tegin was not always harmonious. Whilst, according to obviously biased sources, they had both been guilty of savagery after Balāt, especially at Aleppo where the Frankish prisoners were massacred for the enjoyment of the population,¹ the death of the Frankish leader, Robert, at the hands of Togh-Tegin himself seems to have angered even Īl-Ghāzī. Īl-Ghāzī had sent Robert to Togh-Tegin in an attempt to extort a higher ransom from him but Togh-Tegin rashly beheaded him with his own sword.² In general, Īl-Ghāzī's attitude to Frankish prisoners seems to have been level-headed. He saw his most prominent captives as a source of ransom money, especially as he was often short of the funds needed to pay his troops.³

1. Runciman, op. cit., 151.
2. Usāma, tr. Hitti, 149.
3. "Īl-Ghāzī sent a messenger, reproaching the atabek, saying, "We are in need of even one dinar to pay our Turkoman soldiers. Here was a man who had fixed his own ransom at ten thousand

By a fortuitous set of circumstances, ʾĪl-Ghāzī did not wait for Tagh-Tegin to arrive with his troops before Balāt. Since he attacked alone, the glory of the first major Muslim victory against the infidel fell exclusively to ʾĪl-Ghāzī.

In the years between his taking Mārdīn and his establishment in Aleppo, ʾĪl-Ghāzī's relations with the Franks were characterised by flexibility and pragmatism. Contacts on the personal level between Frankish and Muslim rulers at this time are well-documented.¹ ʾĪl-Ghāzī was impressed on occasion by individual Frankish leaders, one of whom he allowed to live because of "his proud bearing".² Since the Franks were a significant power-group in Northern Syria, ʾĪl-Ghāzī inevitably came into conflict with them on occasions, sometimes emerging triumphant, sometimes not. When Bursuq was sent out at the head of a large army in Dhu'l-Hijja 508/May 1115, to take reprisals against ʾĪl-Ghāzī and Tagh-Tegin, the two rebellious amīrs were in abject fear of the sultan and did not feel strong enough to face the forthcoming attack alone. They therefore made an alliance with Roger of Antioch. Thus, when Bursuq's army arrived, the local princes of Northern Syria, Muslim and Frankish alike, joined forces against the outside aggressor. The defence of territory clearly

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

1. Cf. especially the memoirs of Usāma.
2. Runciman, op. cit., 150. ʾĪl-Ghāzī sent this leader, Reynald Mazoir, his ring as a guarantee of safety (Röhricht, op. cit., 135).

counted for more than the defence of the faith. But it would appear even then that the two rebel amīrs were reluctant to actually engage with the army of Bursuq, which fell into an ambush set by Roger alone.

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

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

Aleppo and was threatening the city itself.

Combined with a heightened awareness of the danger of his new foe was Īl-Ghāzī's new-found freedom from direct Saljuq interference and from opposition from within his own territory of Diyār Bakr. Sultan Muhammad died in 511/1118. Sanjar was still preoccupied with affairs further east. Mahmud, the new sultan, was embroiled with the problem of rival contenders for his throne.¹ In his own territory of Diyār Bakr, Īl-Ghāzī could at last feel secure. The new sultan had asked him to take over Mayyāfāriqīn in 512 probably in response to a request from Īl-Ghāzī. Indeed, Mahmud was scarcely in a position to refuse such a request from a senior amīr whose lands were distant and whose loyalty was suspect.² Īl-Ghāzī also ruled Harrān, Rā's al-'Ain and Nasībīn.³ Armed with a new confidence and the ability to act independently, Īl-Ghāzī and Togh-Tegin planned a joint campaign against the Franks in 512/1118-9. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Īl-Ghāzī could muster 20,000 men at Mārdīn⁴ before embarking on

1. Cf. Bosworth, op.cit., 119-121.
2. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161a. The date of 515/1121-2 given by Ibn al-Athīr is less trustworthy than that of Ibn al-Azraq who gives the exact day, month and year of the entry of Īl-Ghāzī into the city. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Īl-Ghāzī sent Temūr-Tash to Sultan Mahmud in 515/1121-2 to plead for mercy for Dubais. It was at this point that the sultan added Mayyāfāriqīn to the iqtā's already held by Īl-Ghāzī (X, 418).
3. Ibn Shaddād (Marsh 333, ff.17b, 43b and 39b).
4. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 389.

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

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

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

1. Ibid., X, 383.

2. This was mentioned briefly supra, 151-3.

well have suggested that the taking of such an oath, backed up by his own eloquence to the Turcoman troops, would be a possible means of holding their loyalty a little longer.

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

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

1. After Balāt, ʾl-Ghāzī took only Athārib and Zardana (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 390).

but his deliberate adoption of a jihād propaganda seems unlikely. It would have been more in character with the opportunistic Realpolitik which ʾĪl-Ghāzī and his ilk habitually practised for the adoption of jihād propaganda to have been a ploy. If so, such propaganda would have been lightly adopted for reasons of expedience - after all, it could do no harm - and as lightly discarded when it had served its turn.

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

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

1. This is certainly the interpretation given by Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī (op. cit., 79).

died and could not undertake another campaign into Georgia.¹ He then mentions a letter which, according to Bar Hebraeus (and apparently only him) the Byzantine emperor wrote to Īl-Ghāzī in which he informed Īl-Ghāzī that a large Crusader force was coming to the coasts of Syria. He then added:-

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

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

Relations with the Ismā'īlīs

Īl-Ghāzī was aware of the political necessity of establishing some kind of rapport or at any rate modus vivendi with the Ismā'īlīs, especially while he was master of Aleppo, a city which had been bolstered by their military strength in the area. They had in fact provided military support for Aleppo for several years and Ridwān had indeed shown them outright favour. According to Ibn al-Furāt³, Īl-Ghāzī seems to have engaged in a wily game of diplomacy from which he emerged the victor. He was approached on one occasion in Mārdīn by a messenger from the leading

1. O. Turan, Selcuklular Zamanında Türkiye, 166.
2. Ibid., citing Bar Hebraeus, tr. Budge, 249-50.
3. Quoted by E. Quatremère in "Notice historique sur les Ismaéliens" in Fundgruben des Orients, ed. Graf W. Rzewusky (Vienna, 1818) IV, 346.

Ismā'īlī in Aleppo who asked him to hand over the citadel of al-Sharīf to the Ismā'īlīs. Īl-Ghāzī coolly announced that he had just given orders for the demolition of that fortress and added that he would hand it over if the work of destruction had not already begun. Whilst his secretary occupied the envoy, Īl-Ghāzī despatched a message by pigeon ordering the immediate demolition of the citadel of al-Sharīf and ordering that some prominent citizens of Aleppo should occupy the ground where it had previously stood. The messenger from the Ismā'īlīs arrived back in Aleppo to find the building no longer standing. Īl-Ghāzī later informed the Ismā'īlīs that he would gladly have given it to them if they had come to him secretly and not announced their intentions publicly.¹ The citadel had been an important strategic point in Aleppo and clearly Īl-Ghāzī had at once realised the danger of ceding it to the Ismā'īlīs.

Relations with the Caliphate

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

1. This incident from Ibn al-Furāt is quoted in full by Quatremère (ibid.). Cf. also Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 199.
2. Cf. the stormy relationship between the caliph al-Mustarshid and Sultan Mas'ūd which culminated in the caliph's murder in 529/1135.

caliph al-Mustarshid and had ravaged the countryside around Baghdad, sought refuge first at Qal'at Ja'bar with the Arab ruler¹ there and then with ʾl-Ghāzī, who became so absorbed with his guest and accorded him such lavish hospitality that he neglected his administrative duties. Dubais, as a further mark of their mutual bond, married ʾl-Ghāzī's daughter, Farkhundā Khātūn.² When al-Mustarshid wrote to ʾl-Ghāzī, sending him robes of honour, he requested him at the same time to break off relations with Dubais. Whilst ʾl-Ghāzī agreed to participate in the jihād, he refused to sever his links with Dubais.³

Religion

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

1. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.165a-b; Ibn al-'Adīm, Zubda, 197; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 202.
2. Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 89; Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.161b.
3. Ibn al-Athir, X, 399-400.
4. Michael the Syrian, 217; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 352; Usāma, tr.Hitti, 149; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 191; Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 52.
5. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.167a.

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

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

1. Ibn Shaddād, Marsh 333, f.130b.
2. Ridwān had even given the khutba in the name of the Fāṭimids for a short time in 490/1096-7 (Ibn al-Athīr, X, 184).
R.W. Crawford views Ridwān's attitude to the Ismāʿīlīs as prompted by an awareness of political realities rather than personal or doctrinal motives ("Ridwān the Maligned" in

Aleppo. Moreover, the Ismā'īlīs were powerful at this time both in Northern Syria and in Diyār Bakr itself, as the slaughter of several hundred of their number at Āmid in 519/1125¹ and the deep influence exerted by one Ismā'īlī shaikh over Īl-Ghāzī's son, Temūr-Tash, testify.² Īl-Ghāzī is known to have established contact with the Ismā'īlīs in Northern Syria whilst he governed Aleppo though it is evident that he distrusted them.

Personality

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

The World of Islam, Studies in honour of Philip K. Hitti

eds. J. Kritzeck and R. Bayly Winder (London, 1959), 135-144).

1. Ibn al-Athīr, X, 441; Sibṭ b. al-Jauzī, 69.
2. Ibn al-Azraq, Ms.A, f.171a-b.

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

1. After his extremely detailed article, Sevim can only pass a favourable judgement on Īl-Ghāzī in his concluding two pages. He labels him a shrewd soldier, a politician and a good administrator (op. cit., 690). He ignores other less positive interpretations which the evidence provokes.

his power was his Turcoman forces but by the end of his long career there are signs that a rift was developing between them.

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

In the wider sweep of Islamic history, Īl-Ghāzī played a significant role in the slow undermining of the central Saljuq authority and in the gradual establishment of independent emirates in the Jazīra and Northern Syria. His victory at Balāt was an early indication of the source of the future Muslim counter-Crusade against the Franks. That revanche was destined to come not from the efforts of Saljuq sultans far away in Western Iran but from small dynasties established locally at Aleppo and other cities in Syria and at Mosul. Yet it is ironic that before Balāt Īl-Ghāzī's actions positively helped the Franks. The attention of Sultan Muhammad was often occupied in trying to curb his rebellious stance, whilst in the meantime the Franks were able to consolidate their position and expand their territories in Northern Syria. The armies from Mosul, even under the command of the energetic Maudūd, directed their efforts towards the subjugation of Īl-Ghāzī and Togh-Tegin instead of attacking the Franks. Yet even if Īl-Ghāzī had joined the

armies sent from Mosul in campaigns against the infidels, it is unlikely that the Muslims would have achieved the successes of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin. The religious climate of the early decades of the twelfth century was only beginning to betray a consciousness that the Franks might be different from other factions fighting for hegemony in Syria. ʿIl-Ghāzī was too inconsistent and unpredictable, too bound to his semi-nomadic heritage, to have achieved the successes of Zangī, whilst he lacked the religious motivation shown by Nūr al-Dīn in his later years.

Abbreviations used in Chapter IV

- Anon. Syr. Chron. A.S. Tritton, "The First and Second Crusades from an Anonymous Syriac Chronicle", with notes by H.A.R. Gibb, *JRAS* 1933, 69-101, 273-305
- al-ʿAzīmī C. Cahen, ed., "La chronique abrégée d al-ʿAzīmī", *JĀ* CCXXX (1938), 353-44
- Bar Hebraeus The Chronography of Gregory Abū'l Faraj, the Hebrew Physician, commonly known as Bar Hebraeus, tr. E.A.W. Sudge (London, 1932)
- Bundārī Zubdat al-nusra wa nukhbat al-usra, ed. K.T. Houtsma (Leiden, 1879)
- al-Husainī Akhbār al-Daula al-Saljūqiyya ed. M. Iqbal (Lahore, 1933)
- Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Bughyat Halab, ed. A. Sevim (Ankara, 1976)
- , Zubda II Halab II, ed. S. Dahan (Damascus, 1984)
- Ibn al-Athīr X al-Kāmil fi'l-Tārīkh X, ed. C.J. Tornberg (Leiden and Uppsala, 1864)
- , Atāb, ed. A. Tulaimāt (Cairo, 1963)
- Ibn al-Azraq, ed. ʿAwad Tārīkh al-Farīqī, ed. B.A.L. ʿAwad (Cairo, 1959)
- Ibn al-Furāt Tārīkh al-Duwal wa'l-Mulūk, Vienna MS A.F. 811
- Ibn Khallikān Wafayāt al-aʿyān, tr. Baron W.M. de Slane (Paris, 1843-71)
- Ibn al-Qalānisi Dhail tārīkh Dimashq, ed. H.F. Amedroz (Leiden, 1908)
- Marsh 333 Ibn Shaddād, al-Aʿlāq al-Khatīra, Bodleian Ms. Marsh 333
- Matthew of Edessa Patmut' iwn, tr. E. Dulaurier (Paris, 1858)
- Michael the Syrian Chronique de Michel le Syrien, tr. J.-B. Chabot (Paris, 1899-1914)
- RHC Recueil des Historiens des Croisades. Historiens orientaux (Paris, 1872-1906)
- Sibt b. al-Jauzi Mir'āt al-Zamān (Hyderabad, 1351); facsimile ed. by J. Jewett (Chicago, 1927)
- Usāma, tr. Hitti Memoirs of an Arab-Syrian Gentleman, tr. P.A. Hitti (repr. Beirut, 1964)

CHAPTER V

TĀRĪKH MAYYĀFĀRIQĪN WA ĀMID

ARABIC TEXT

تاریخ سیافارقین و آمد

بمؤلفہ

احمد بن یوسف بن علی بن الازرق الفاروقی

کیمرل پبلشرز انڈیا

ذكر ولاية¹ نجم الدين الغازي² وملكه³ في ميفرقين

قيل لما فتح ابن جهير ديار بكر كان الامير ارتق معه
 فلما استقر ولم يبق له موضع انفصل عنه ومضى لما جاء ملكشاه الى
 الشام وملك بيت المقدس وما حوله واقام بالساحل ومات هناك
 وملك بيت المقدس بعده ولداه⁴ الامير سكرمان والامير نجم الدين
 الغازي مدة
 وسار نجم الدين الغازي الى السلطان محمد وبقي في خدمته
 واقطعه حلوان مدة ثم اعطاه شحنكية⁵ العراق فاقام ببغداد وملك
 الاقربج الساحل وبيت المقدس فوصل الامير سكرمان الى هذه البلاد
 وملك حصن كيفا وكان ملك الامر الياقوتي مارددين فوصل نجم الدين
 الغازي الى هذه البلاد ومات الياقوتي⁶ وكان فيها من قبل
 الياقوتي فدخل تحت طاعة سكرمان من حصن كيفا وبقي بها وملكها
 قيل في سنة ثمان وتسعين واربعمائة مات الامير سكرمان و بقي
 فيها الى ان مات الامير سكرمان⁷
 وملك بعده ولده الامير ابراهيم بن سكرمان فنفذ الى
 شمس بماردين⁸ واخذ ابنا له رهينة وبقي عنده بحصن كيفا مدة
 ثم بلفه انه اساء⁹ الى¹⁰ ولده وحبسها فلما وصل نجم الدين

1. ذكر ابتداء ولاية MS.B.
2. MS.B uses the form ايل غازي throughout.
3. MS. في is written above the line.
4. MS. ولده
5. MS. شحنكية ; MS.B. سنجر
6. MS. الباقون
7. MS. مات is illegible.
8. MS. in the margin بماردين صح
9. MS. اساء
10. MS. الى is written above the line.

الغازي سلمها اليه

وبقي الامير ابراهيم مدة ثم مات بحسن كيفا و ولي

موضعه اخوه الامير داود بعد اخيه سكرمان¹ وبقي مدة و كان

الامير شمس وماردين بيده لم يسلمها الي احد و حضر نجم الدين

وسلمها اليه في سنة سبع وخمسمائة حصلت للغازي و اولاده من ذلك

اليوم الي الان

واما الامير شمس فاولد الامير سنقر² واولد سنقر يوسف واولد يوسف

رسول وقتل ملك ماردين في سنة سبع او ثمان³ و خمسمائة على ان

بقي بها الي سنة اثنتي عشرة وخمسمائة

ثم نفذ الي⁴ السلطان يقول له ان ميافارقين خربت

واضمحلت وهي بلد لا يرى مثله فنفذ السلطان الي الدزبك⁵ رسولا

ياأمره ان يسلم ميفرقين الي نجم الدين الغازي فحضر وسلمها

اليه فدخل اليها في رابع عشر جمادى الآخرة سنة اثنتي عشرة

وخمسمائة وملكها وخرج الدزبك ونزل على الروابي⁶ و اقام ثلاثة ايام

فلما كان في اليوم الرابع وصله رسول مجد من السلطان يقول له

لا تسلم فوجد الامر قد فات واستقر نجم الدين بميفرقين و اظهر

1. MS. sic.

2. MS. يو سنقر

3. MS. و

4. الي added.

5. الرزبك . This name is very uncertain. MS. f.161a, 1.4:

MS. f.161a, 1.5: الرزبك Marsh 333, f.101b: زنكي

. الرزبيكي 'Awad, op.cit., 283:

6. MS. الي on the line, above it.

العدل والاحسان¹ الى الناس وازال عنهم² الاثقال والاقساط والانزال²
من دورها وكان الناس من المنزل في دورهم في شدة شدة
وكان اكثرها خرابا³ لاختلاف الدول وتغير الاصحاب كل قليل
ومن يملكهم يحيف عليهم ويظلمهم ويصادرهم لعلمه انه لا يقيم ولا
يدوم ملكه ومن حيث ملك نجم الدين الغازي استقر وطابت قلوبهم
واستقر الناس في دورهم
وحصلت الاجناد التي ما لهم دور منزلون بها ويضربون
لهم في خرابات المدينة خركاهات⁵ لان اكثر المدينة كانت خرابا
وكانت الطرقات مخيفة من الحرامية وقطاع الطريق بحيث انه كان
لا تقدر القافلة تمضي الى آمد الا ومعها الشحنة والخيول وكذلك
الى ارزن وحسن كيفا وحاني وماردين محتاجون من يخفرهم في
المسافة القريبة لخراب البلاد والضياع فمن حيث ملك نجم الدين
امنت الطرقات والبلاد وانهزمت الحرامية وانعمرت الضياع وبدأت⁶
مفرقين في العمارة وساس الناس احسن سياسة
وبقي الى سنة ست عشرة⁷ وخمسمائة وملك حلب ولقي
الافرنج وكسرهم كسرة عظيمة⁸ وغنم اموالهم واسر منهم خلقا
عظيما وهي كسرة البلاط واما حلب فانه اخذها من سلطان شاه
بن الملك رضوان وكان اخذها من الأمير ابن ملك⁹

1. العدل والانصاف والاحسان MS.B
2. Marsh 333 (f.102a). الإنزال
3. MS. خراب
4. Marsh 333 (f.102a) مساكن
5. Marsh 333 (f.102a) خركاهات ; MS.B خركاهات ; MS خركاوات
6. MS بدت
7. MS. ثلث عشرة but MS.B. ستة عشرة
8. MS. كسرة is written above the line.
9. MS. (sic)

قبل وفي سنة ثلث عشرة¹ وخمسمائة احترق جامع آمد
 وفي سنة اربع عشرة² وخمسمائة ملك نجم الدين نصيبين وسار
 اليه القاضي علم الدين بن نباتة³ وجملة من اهل ميفرقين فلقوه بها
 وهناؤه⁴ بفتحها وخلص عليهم واحسن اليهم وعادوا الى ميفرقين⁵
 قبل وفي سنة خمس عشرة⁶ وخمسمائة نفذ⁷ اهل تفليس الى
 نجم الدين الغازي يستدعونه ليعلموا اليه تفليس وكان لها يد
 اهلها مقدار⁸ اربعين سنة وكان ملاكها قوما⁹ من اهلها يسمون بني¹⁰
 جعفر من مقدار¹¹ مأتي سنة ثم انقرض كبارهم واضمحلت فعاد امرها
 الى اهلها¹² وكان كل شهر يلي امرهم واحد منهم¹³ وبقوا
 كذلك مدة اربعين سنة
 وكان الملك داود¹⁴ ملك الابخاز والكرج قد ضايقها مضايقة
 شديدة واضمحلت وكان قد نفذوا الى السلطان طغريك بن السلطان
 محمد وكان ملك جنزى وآران فنفذ لهم شحنة وزادت مضايقة ملك
 الكرج لهم وبقوا على هذا مدة فاتفقوا ان يحملوا¹⁵ له في
 الكرج¹⁶

1. MS. ثلث عشر
2. MS. اربعة عشر
3. MS.B. علم الدين ابو الحسن بن
4. MS. هناؤه
5. Marsh 333 (f.102a). اجازهم
6. MS. خمسة عشر
7. MS. نفذوا
8. MS. مقدر
9. MS. قوم
10. MS. بنو
11. MS. مقدر
12. MS. is repeated. الى اهلها
13. MS. امرهم is written above منهم صح
14. MS.B. داوود
15. MS. In the right margin is ذات مضايقة . ما زالت MS.B. (op.cit., 205). ذات Amedroz omits
16. MS. يحملون

كل سنة عشرة آلاف دينار¹ ويكون عندهم شحنة معه عشرة² فوارس³
 فيقوا على ذلك مدة ونفذوا الى نجم الدين الغازي يستدعونه
 فسار معه عساكر عظيمة ومعه ديبس بن صدقة⁴ ملك العرب وكان
 صهر نجم الدين على ابنته كهار خاتون وكان قد وصل اليه
 في تلك السنة فسار بالعساكر ونفذ الى شمس الدولة طغان أرسلان
 صاحب ارزن وبدليس وكان له مدينة دوين وامره ان يدخل من شرقي
 تفليس وسار واخذ معه القاضي علم الدين بن نباتة ومعه ولده
 القاضي علم الدين ابو الفتح الكبير هو الان قاضي ماردين
 والوزير ابي⁵ تمام بن عبدون وسار معه فوصلوا الى ارزن الروم
 وتخلف القاضي والوزير بارزن الروم
 ودخل بالعساكر من ولاية الفرس وطريق تريايت
 واتفقوا ان تجتمع العساكر اجمع على باب تفليس وتجهز السلطان
 طغر بك⁶ من ناحية جنزى وسار طغان أرسلان الاحدب من دوين

1. MS. الف
2. MS. عشر
3. MS.B. adds لا غير
4. MS.B. المزيدى
5. MS. ابو
6. MS. sic; MS.B. طغرل

و وصل نجم الدين الى ان بقي بينه وبين تفليس الجبل مقدار¹
 نصف يوم وخرج الملك داود ومعه ولده ديميطرى من جانب الغرب
 في عساكر عظيمة وكان يحدر عليهم من الجبل وهم في لحفه
 ولم تكن² وصلت عساكر السلطان طغريك ولا شمس الدولة الاحدب
 بمن معه وتقاتلوا قتالا عظيما وكسر نجم الدين وقتل منه
 خلقا كثيرا وغنم الكفار منهم غنيمة عظيمة وخرج نجم الدين
 و ديبس³ في نفر يسير بحيث ان بقي عندهم من الاسرى الى زماننا
 ولقد رأيت موضع الواقعة حين دخلت الى تفليس في
 سنة ثمان واربعين وخمسمائة فاقمت بها ثم وصلت الى خدمة
 ملك الابخاز وبقيت عنده وخرجت معه وسرت في ولايته معه
 مقدار⁴ نيف وسبعين يوما واجتاز الى الان⁵ وطرف الدر بند والى
 ولاية الابخاز⁶ ولقد وصلنا بعض الايام في ولاية الابخاز الى مرج⁷
 واسع تحت جبل في قلعة شامخة فنزل الملك هناك وقال لي ملك⁸

1. MS. مقدر

2. MS. يكن

3. MS. is written in the margin. وديبس صح

4. MS. مقدر

5. MS. sic

6. MS. ولقد وصلنا MS.B. ; الابخاز لقد وصلنا MS.

7. MS. مرج or برج

8. The phrase فنزل الملك MS.B. is barely legible.

الابخاز يا فلان ان في هذه القلعة رجلا اسيرا مستغربا¹ من نوبة
الغازي فاصعد اليه² من الغد وابصره و اساله³ من اين هو فعولت
على ذلك وقلت اطلبه من الملك ليطلقه فبت تلك الليلة فلما
كان من وقت السحر ضرب بوق (f.162a) الرحيل⁴ لانه وصل اليه
الخبر ان بعض ولايته⁵ قد تشوشت عليه فحين وصله الخبر رحل
ورحل الناس ولم يقدر الله⁶ الاجتماع بذلك الرجل
وقبل في سنة خمس عشرة⁷ وخمسمائة مات والاول اصح⁸
الملك رضوان بحلب ولما كسر نجم الدين وعاد بمن بقي معه⁹
رحل ملك الابخاز بالفنائم والاسرى ونزل على تفليس وحاصرها
مدة ثم هدم سورها من قبل الغرب ودخلها سيفا واحرقها ونهبها
بعد ثلثة ايام امن اهلها وطيب قلوبهم ووعدهم بالجميل
واسقط عنهم تلك السنة الاثقال والمون والاقساط

1. مستغرب MS.B. رجل اسير مستغرب MS.
2. MS. is repeated. فاصعد اليه MS.
3. MS. اسله
4. MS.B. adds من وقته
5. MS.B. بعض الولايات
6. . الله MS.B. has MS.A. This word is not clear in
Amedroz reads على (op. cit.,206).
7. MS. خمسة عشر
8. Cf. infra, 366 , n.77.
9. MS.B. has عاد after في عشرين فارما MS.

والخراج وشرط للمسلمين كلما ارادوه من الشرط الذي هو الان
 باق بها انه لا يعبر الى جانب المسلمين و المدينة الخنزير¹
 ولا يذبح بها ولا في سوقها وضرب لهم الدراهم² وعليها اسم السلطان
 والخليفة في الوجه الواحد وفي الوجه³ اسم الله واسم النبي
 عليه السلام واسمه على جانب الدرهم و نادى في البلد انه من
 آذى مسلماً فقد اهدر دمه وشرط لهم الاذان والصلاة والقراءة⁴
 ظاهراً و ان يخطب يوم الجمعة و يصلى و يدعى للخليفة⁵
 والسلطان ولا يدعى لغيرهما⁶ على المنبر وشرط ان حمام
 اسماعيل بتفليس لا يدخله⁷ كرجي و لا ارمني ولا يهودى ووظف⁸
 خدمة الكرجي في السنة خمسة دنانير⁹ وخدمة اليهودى اربعة
 دنانير¹⁰ وخدمة المسلم ثلثة¹¹ دنانير¹² و احسن الى المسلمين
 غاية الاحسان و جعل لاهل العلم والدين و الصوفية اكرم المنازل¹³

1. Ms. has a lacuna here. Ms.B. الخنزير
2. Ms. الدارهم
3. Ms. sic.
4. Ms. اذا
5. Ms. يدعا
6. Ms. والسلطان ولا يدعى لغيرهما صح is written in the left margin.
7. Ms. يدخلها
8. Ms. ووظف
9. Ms. دنانيراً
10. Ms. دنانيراً
11. Ms. ثلث
12. Ms. دنانيراً
13. Ms. اكرام

وما ليس لهم عند المسلمين

ولقد رأيت هذه الشروط كلها¹ لما دخلت الى تفليس

في سنة ثمان واربعين وخمسة و لقد رأيت ملك الابخاز
ديمطري الذي كنت في خدمته وقد قدم² الى تفليس واقام بها
اياما ونزل ذات يوم جمعة الى³ الجامع وجلس على دكة مقابل
الخطيب فوقف موضعه حتى خطب الخطيب⁴ سمع الخطبة
جميعها ثم خرج واطلق برسم الجامع مائتي دينار احمر⁵ وكنت
ارى العلماء والوعاظ والاشراف الذين يقصدونه⁶ والصوفية
والذين يهلون اليه فيكرمهم ويعطيهم ويحترمهم ويعتمد معهم
ما ليس بمثله⁷ ولقد كنت ارى لاحترامه للمسلمين ما لو انهم
ببغداد ما احترموا تلك الحرمة

قيل وفي سنة ست عشرة وخمسة تزلزلت مدينة جنزي

وهي كنجة وانخسف طرف منها وانهدم سورها وسار الملك داود
باصحابه وخيله ورجاله⁸ وقصدها ونهب اموالهم وما كان فيها

1. ولقد رأيت هذه الشروط جميعا باقية للمسلمين كلهما MS.
2. نزل الى Amedroz has . وقد قدم MS.B. has MS. is damaged here. (op.cit., 206).
3. الى MS.B. has MS. is damaged here. The MS.
4. (op.cit., وكل الناس يسمع الخطبة Amedroz has MS. is damaged here. The MS. is damaged here. The subject matter in MS.B. is ordered differently here 206). but mentions that the people prayed. A possible reading here might therefore be صلى الناس
5. احمرأ MS.
6. الذين يقصدونه MS.B. The MS. is illegible here.
7. مثله MS.
8. رجله MS.

وقتل منهم خلقا عظيما وسبى¹ منهم خلقا عظيما لا يحصى بحيث
دخلت الاسارى الى تفليس على العجل من كثرتهم (f.162b) سيقوا
المسلمون² مثل قطعات الاغنام اسارى ودخل بهم الى تفليس
فاشترى اهل تفليس اكثرهم واطلقوهم وقال لي جماعة من اهل
تفليس اننا ما افتقرنا الا من تلك السنة
قيل وفي سنة خمس عشرة³ وخمسمائة قتل مودود⁴ بجامع
دمشق ودفن بالبرج
قيل وفي سنة خمس عشرة⁵ وخمسمائة عاد نجم الدين الى
ماردين⁶ واقام بها الى سنة ست عشرة⁷ وخمسمائة وخرج الى
اوسل⁹ الهيئة من بلد ميفرقين واقام هناك ومعه زوجته الخاتون
بنت تفرتكين¹⁰ صاحب دمشق فمرض وتوفي يوم الخميس سابع عشرين
رمضان فحمل ليلا وركب ولده الامير شمس الدولة سليمان والخاتون
ووصلوا ميفرقين ليلا ووصلوا الى باب الهوة و اجلسوا الامير
على فرسه ومن ورائه رجل يمسكه وتقدموا وصاحوا فنزل الوالي
وكان اسمه كزغلي¹¹ فدخل شيخ ممن صحب الامير نجم الدين من اول

1. MS. سبا
2. MS. المسلمين
3. MS. خمسة عشر
4. MS. ممدود
5. MS. خمسة عشر
6. MS.B. ميردين
7. is supplied from MS.B. الى
8. MS. ست عشرة ; MS.B. ست
9. The name occurs twice in MS.B. اوسل (f.104b), اوشل (f.105a).
Marsh 333 اوشل (f.102b).
10. MS. sic ; MS.B. طفتكين
11. MS. sic ; MS.B. sic.

زمانه وكلمه شمس الدولة و الخاتون ففتح الباب فقالوا ان
الامير مريض فلما حصلوا في ارض القصر صاحوا وضجوا¹ وقالوا مات
الامير في هذه الساعة

واصبح الناس وصعد اهل البلد ومن كان بها من الجند الى
القصر وغسل الامير وصلي عليه ودفن بالسدلي مدة ثم اخرج ودفن
في مسجد الامير شرقي قبة السلطان فدفن هناك
وكان نجم الدين الغازي قد تزوج بفرخندا خاتون بنت
الملك رضوان لما ملك حلب وعقد عليها ولم يدخل بها ولا رآها
ومات ولم يرها² تزوجها بعده الامير بك بن³ بهرام بن⁴ ارتق
قبيل واستقر شمس الدولة سليمان بميفرقين واستوزر عبد
الملك بن⁵ ثابت ورد الامور اليه واخذ خربت من الامير بك
وبقيت معه الى ان مات واخذها الامير داود واخذ بلد حزة من
الامير داود واخذ الضياع التي⁶ اخذها حسام الدولة⁷ صاحب ارزن
من بلد ميفرقين
وفي سنة سبع عشرة⁸ قتل الانزل امير الجيوش بمصر قتلته
الهاطنية

1. Ms. B adds وحط الامير after ضجوا
2. Ms. لم يراها
3. Ms. ابن
4. Ms. ابن
5. Ms. ابن
6. Ms. الذي
7. Ms. الدين
8. Ms. سبعة عشر

وترك والي مفرقين في برج الملك مملوكه ختلج شاه
 ونفذ خطب سيدة خاتون بنت السلطان قليج أرسلان بن سليمان
 بن قنلمش ومضى القاضي تاج الدين ابو سالم بن نباتة احضرها
 اليه من ملطية ودخل بها وكان مقامه بميفرقين
 وكان لما مات نجم الدين ابن السعيد حسام الدين تمرد اش¹
 ولده² بماردين فملك ماردين واستبد بها وكان معه الصاحب
 الحاجب شمس الحجاب محمد اكديش وكان زوجه نجم الدين الغازي
 بام السعيد حسام الدين
 قبل وفي سادس عشرين ربيع الاخر مات القاضي علم الدين
 ابو الحسن علي بن³ يحيى بن⁴ نباتة بميفرقين وولي القاضي ولده
 تاج الدين القضاء وهو ابو سالم رحمه الله وخلق عليه شمس
 الدولة واكرمه وولاه موضع ابيه واستقر في القضاء وكان ولد
 لشمس الدولة (f.163a) ابنا اسمه محمود ولقد رأته بماردين وهو
 في اسوأ حال من سو طريقته⁵ وقبح سيرته في حق نفسه وخروجه
 عن طاعة اهل بيته⁶ و رذالة نفسه وما اعلم ما كان منه وكان

1. MS. sic.

2. MS. وولده

3. MS. ابن

4. MS. ابن

5. MS.A سو حال من سو طريقته ; MS.B. في اسو حال من سو طريقته
 (f.106b).

6. MS.B. adds . بينه after وقلة همته

شمس الدولة اميرا عادلا حسن السيرة¹ مقداما شجاعا وعاش الى
الخميس في سادس شهر رمضان وكان وقت العصر فمات في سنة ثمان
عشرة وخمسمائة ودفن عند ابيه في مسجد الامير واستبد الوالي
ختلشاه بميفرقين وحصلت له وتحت حكمه

ذكر ولاية حسام الدين

قيل لما مات شمس الدولة استبد ختلشاه بميفرقين والوزير
عبد الملك فوصل حسام الدين وحضر بباب المدينة ونزل في خيم
ظاهر البلد وراسل⁴ ختلشاه وكان الامير داود بن سكرمان صاحب
حصن كيفا هم بالخروج فسبق السعيد حسام الدين وراسل ختلشاه
وحلف له على الذي اراد وحلف ان لا يغير على اهل البلد شيئا
وان يسوزر عبد الملك فحلف على ما اقترحوا ودخل البلد في شوال
سنة ثمان عشرة⁵ وخمسمائة واستوزر عبد الملك واستقر حاله وحصل
له جميع ما كان لابيهِ نجم الدين واحسن الى الناس واحبوه واستبد
بالمك

وتزوج بزوجة اخيه الامير اياس بن نجم الدين وكان له منها الامير
شهاب الدين محمد بن اياس⁶ واولد منها بنتا هي صفية خاتون وهي

1. Ms. السرية
2. Ms. (?). سادس عادس
3. Ms. واقت
4. The Ms. has an initial | deleted and a second | placed
between the ر and the س
5. Ms. ثمان عشر
6. Ms.B. الياس

القاضي الشهرزوري ونصير الدين جقر وصلاح الدين محمد البفسباني¹
 وحصلوا خزانة و خدمة و نزلوا الى بغداد ليخدموا² السلطان
 محمود ويقرؤا³ الامير مسعود ولد البرسقي في البلاد لما وصلوا
 ارتأوا⁴ وقالوا ان هذا صبي ولا يقوم (f.163b) بالملك⁵ وربما
 لا يدبر البلاد و يكون الحيف علينا فاقتضى رأيهم انهم
 اجتمعوا بقسيم الدولة زنكي بن آق سنقر و كان شحنة بغداد في
 تلك السنة وقرروا معه ما ارادوا من مصالحهم و استخلفوه ان
 يكون لبهاء الدين قضاء الموصل وجميع البلاد و ما فيها من
 القضاء و الامور الدينية له فحلف ان تكون الحجة و امانة
 العسكر لصلاح الدين و ان تكون ولاية الموصل وجميع البلاد
 الى نصير الدين ويولى فيها من يراه فحلف لهم على ذلك و تقرر
 الامر اليهم بينهم ثم انهم خدموا السلطان واصحابه والخليفة
 واصحابه بالمال الذي وصل معهم وطلبوا⁶ زنكي فسلم اليه
 السلطان ابنيه آلب ارسلان⁷ والخفاجي و حصل اتابكهما و وقع⁸
 له بالبلاد و سار الى الموصل و ملك الموصل و البلاد اول⁹ سنة
 اثنتين وعشرين و خمسمائة

1. MS.B. الاغسيباني

2. MS. ليخدم

3. MS. ويقر

4. MS. ارتأوا

5. MS.B. adds بالملك after ولا حمل

6. MS.B. has وطلبوا بعض اولاده و ان يكون زنكي
 اتابك

7. MS. sic ; MS.B. الب ارسلان

8. The MS. is very damaged here. MS.B. has ووقع لهما بالبلاد

9. MS.B. اوائل

قيل و في سنة اثنتين وعشرين و خمسمائة قتل نور
 الدولة وملك على منبج بالشام وكان محاصرا لها فجاءه سهم
 فذبحه وملك بلاده خربت وبالو¹ و ميزکرد و ما حولها الامير
 داود وكان الامير بك قد اخذ هذه الولاية من اولاد² جبق و مات
 و لم يعقب غير بنت تزوجها فخر الدين قرا³ رسلان بن داود
 قيل و في سنة ثلث و عشرين و خمسمائة مات آتابك
 طفتكين بدمشق وولي ولده تاج الملوك بوري دمشق و ما حولها
 قيل و في يوم⁴ خامس شوال سنة اربع⁵ و عشرين و خمسمائة
 مات السلطان محمود صاحب اصفهان و فيها قتل الوزير المزدغاني⁶
 و هرام (و)⁷ الباطنية اجمع بدمشق و دفن بها و ولي السلطان
 اخوه تغربك⁸ السلطنة مدة سنتين ثم مات في اوائل سبع
 و عشرين و خمسمائة و ولي اخوه السلطان مسعود السلطنة
 قيل وكان خلف السلطان⁹ اولادا جماعة منهم السلطان

1. MS. كالوا
2. In the MS. there is no sign of او and the د
is written above the لا
3. MS. sic. ز MS.B. sic.
4. MS. سنة
5. MS. اربعة
6. MS. sic. Usually known as المزدقاني
7. MS. و has been added .
8. MS. sic.
9. MS; i.e. Muhammad.

محمود ولي الامر وحده طغريك¹ وسلطان سليمان شاه ومسعود وسلجوك²
 شاه وبهرام شاه قيل واخذ وخلف السلطان محمود السلطان داود
 وكان اكبر اولاده وملك اذربيجان وقتل في تبريز في سنة تسع
 وثلاثين وخمسمائة قتلته³ الباطنية في وسط السوق ودفن بتبريز
 وخلف محمد شاه وملك السلطنة بعد عمه مسعود وتزوج ابنته وخلف
 ملك شاه وكان في حياة⁴ عمه مسعود معه في العسكر وملك خوزستان
 وخلف آلب أرسلان والخفاجي مع آتابك زنكي بالموصل وقتل بالموصل
 وخلف بنتا من بنت السلطان سنجر كوهار ملك⁵ وعاشت الى ما
 يقارب سنة سبع وخمسين وخمسمائة

واما سليمان شاه فمات ولم يعقب واما سلجوق⁶ فله ابن هو
 الان بالموصل كان عند مسعود بلال بقلعة تكريت فلما
 اخذت نقلوه الى الموصل وهو الان بها وله اولاد واما
 السلطان طغريك⁷ فانه خلف أرسلان شاه امه زوجة الامير

1. Ms. sic

2. Ms. sic

3. Ms. قتلته

4. Ms. حيوة

5. Ms. sic

6. Ms. sic

7. Ms. sic

الدكر وهو (f.164a) الار السلطان من اصفهان وهمذان
 واذريجان واران الى مدينة جنزى وشمكورا¹
 وبي سنة اربع وعشرين وخمسة كسر حسام الدين
 وداود على سرجة تحت دارا كسرهما² آتبيك زنكي
 قيل وفي سنة اربع وعشرين وخمسة ماتت
 سيدة³ خاتون بنت القليج آرسلان بميفرقين ودفنت في القبة
 عند ابيها وكانت امها زوجة الامير ركن الدولة داود⁴ و بعد
 ام حضر اخوها السلطان طغرىك⁵ من حسن كيفا وكان صهر ركن
 الدولة داود على ابنته الى ميفرقين و اقام بالقبة و اخذ
 دخلها جميعه⁶
 قيل وفي سنة خمس وعشرين وخمسة مات
 الامر باحكام الله خليفة مصر و لم يخلف ولدا و خلف امرأة
 حاملا
 قيل وفي هذه السنة نفذ السلطان سنجر الى
 زنكي امره باطلاق ديسر فاطقه فقصد⁷ السلطان مسعود وفي
 سنة ست [وعشرين]⁸ و خمسة غرقت مراكب الاخلاطية بالبحر
 بالقسطنطينية⁹ فيها جماعة من الاخلاطية وبيها مات نور

1. MS. sic. Possibly شكور
2. MS. كسرهم
3. MS. sic. MS.B. الملكة سيدة خاتون
4. MS.B. has وكان الامير داود تزوج بعائشة خاتون امها
 عند ابيها after
5. MS. sic. MS.B. الملك طغرل
6. MS.B. has instead of اخذ دخلها جميعه وتسلم ما خلفته
7. This word is illegible in the MS.
8. is omitted in the MS. عشرين
9. This word is illegible.

الدولة صاحب فنك و ولي ولده الامير ابو نصر و فيها تسلم
الامير داود قلعة فطلبس و باتاسا
قيل و اختلف اهل مصر و ماجوا وقالوا هذا¹ البيت
لا سموت الامام منهم الا وقد خلف ولدا ذكرا منصوصا عليه
بالامامة و هذا لم يخلف ولدا ولا نصر الاحملا وكان قيل موته
نصر على الحمل فقالوا يجوز النصر على الحمل و يمكن ان يكون
ذكرا فبقوا ينتظرون الحمل الى ان وضع فوضعت بنتا فاختلف²
الناس و ماجوا و اخرجوا رجلا من القصر من اولاد المستنصر
اسمه عبد المجيد و كنى بابي الميمون و يلقب بالحافظ لدين
الله في آخر سنة خمس وعشرين و خمسمائة و قيل هو عبد المجيد
بن³ المستنصر و قيل هو عبد المجيد بن⁴ ابي القسم المستعلي بن⁵
المستنصر و قيل ولد غير المستعلي للمستنصر فولى الخلافة
و اجمعوا عليه و انقطع النصر من قبل المستعلي و اولاده وهو قول
الاسماعيلية وان النصر في ايامهم متصل من المستنصر الى نزار الى
الان وهو مذهبهم وليس احد⁶ منهم على الصحيح و بقي الحافظ في

1. MS. is repeated. وقالوا هذا.

2. MS. فاختلفوا

3. MS. ابن

4. MS. ابن

5. MS. ابن

6. MS. احدا

الخلافة واستقر وتوطد ملكه وليست¹ خلافة الا في بني العباس لقول
النبي صلعم في حق العباس² انت ابو الاملاك³ من امتي الى يوم
القيامة و اهل مصر و الاسماعيلية على الباطل و انما اهل
الاغراض والاهواء يقولون ذلك ولا امام ولا خليفة الا ببغداد من آل
العباس

قيل وفي سنة خمس وعشرين و خمسمائة ملك الامير داود
اسعد و باهمود و باتاسا و في (f.164b) سنة اربع⁴ وعشرين
وخمسمائة لقي آتابك زنكي حسام الدين والامر داود وكسروا على
سرجة والتجوا الى دارا و سار زنكي الى الشام و ملك حماة و ما
حولها و حمص و قصد دمشق و اخذ ديبس من دمشق و عاد الى الموصل
و معه ديبس مقيدا

قيل وفي سنة ست و عشرين و خمسمائة قصد الخليفة
المسترشد⁵ في شهر رمضان الموصل و نزل عليها و حاصرها مدة وكان
بها نصير الدين جقر واليا فقاتلهم الخليفة و كان حصنها و حفر
الخندق⁶ و ضيق عليها الخليفة ولم ينل منها⁷ مقصودا و عاد الى
بغداد ودخل في تاسع عشرين ذي القعدة

قيل و في سنة سبع و عشرين و خمسمائة مات الوزير عبد
الملك بمفرقين و ولي نظر⁸ الديوان الناصح علي بن احمد الآمدي
و كان متوليا بآمد فقبضه مؤيد الدين بن نيسان و صادره بثلاثين

1. MS. ليس
2. In the margin of the MS. is written قول الد في حق ال
3. MS. sic. i.e., الملوك
4. MS. اربعة
5. MS. B. adds بالله
6. MS. B. adds وحفر الخندق after دائرة الموصل و بناه
7. MS. B. بها
8. MS. النظر بالديوان. MS. B. ; نظر

الدينار و ولى موضعه و وصل الى ميفرقين فضم ولده ابو نصر
الشمرة¹ و اعطى الناصح الوقف فيقي² الى ان مات الوزير(و) تولى³
نظر⁴ الديوان

قبل و في سنة ثمان و عشرين و خمسمائة وصل المؤيد

ابو الحسن بن مخطر الى ميفرقين من الجزيرة و كان صادره
الوزير عبد الملك و عاقبه و اخذ منه مالا كثيرا و انتقل
الى الجزيرة فلما مات الوزير عبد الملك عاد الى ميفرقين
و ولي الاستيفاء مع الناصح

و في سنة ثمان و عشرين و خمسمائة وصل شرف الدين

حبشي ابو طالب بن حبشي⁷ من اهل العراق الى خدمة السعيد
حسام الدين و اقام عنده على احسن سبل الضافة و كان في
خدمة صلاح الدين محمد اليفساني⁸ بحماة و كان قبضه و عاقبه
و شد معه كلبا في غرارة و كان يضرب الكلب وينهش بدنه
و استدار في الغرارة حتى وقع رأس الكلب بين فخذه و عصر
على حلقه حتى مات في الغرارة و اطلق فانهزم الى قلعة جمبر
و اقام عند نجم الدولة⁹ مالك بن سالم¹⁰ بن مالك ثم انتقل

1. The reading شمرة is very tentative. MS. B. has
the same word فاعطى ابنه ابا نصر الشمرة
2. فيقي is added from MS. B.
3. ولى has been added. MS. B. و
4. MS. نظر
5. وفي اخر سنة has been supplied from MS. B., which has
6. MS. ابي
7. MS. B. حبشي بن محمد بن حبشي
8. MS. اليفساني
9. MS. B. شهاب الدين
10. MS. مالك بن سالم is not legible.

الى ماردين و بقي عند حسام الدين مدة و ولي الوزارة¹ مع
السعيد حسام الدين و بلغ من الدولة ما لم يبلغه احد² و تحكّم
اوفى تحكّم
و في هذه السنة³ وصل الى ماردين المكين⁴ ابو
البركات بن ابي الفهم⁵ الحراني منهزما من بني عمه من حران
و اقام عند السعيد حسام الدين على سبيل الضيافة
و قيل خرج في شعبان سنة تسع و عشرين و خمسمائة
قبل و في سنة ثمان و عشرين و خمسمائة⁶ خرج الخليفة المسترشد
من بغداد و لقي السلطان مسعود بباب همذان الى موضع سمي
داى مرك قريب من جبل بهستون و نهب العسكر و كان جمع السلطان
خلقا عظيما (f.165a) و معه صاحب خربتيت⁷ بجيشه و عسكره و كان
نفذ له عمه السلطان سنجر عسكرا عظيما فالتقوا و كسروا⁸
الخليفة و اسروه و اسروا ارباب المناصب كلها
ولقد سألت السعيد مؤيد الدين⁹ ابا عبد الله محمد
بن عبد الكريم الانباري رحمه الله في سنة اربع و ثلاثين
و خمسمائة ببغداد حين نزلت اليه في هذه السنة عن حال المسترشد

1. MS. الوزارة

2. MS. B. وبلغ مرتمة لم يبلغها غيره Marsh 333 ; غيره

3. MS. وفي هذه السنة ووصل.

4. MS. المكين ; MS. B. الملكين

5. MS. الفهم ; MS. B. الفهر

6. MS. B. mentions only 528.

7. MS. sic .

8. MS. وكسر

9. MS. B. adds مؤيد الدين after سديد الدولة

تقول قال في نفسي ما في نفس مولانا و كان هو حمله على الخروج
قال المسترشد

و اذ لم يكن من الموت بد فمن الغبن¹ ان تموت جانا²
ثم انه جهز و جمع و كان قد حصل في خدمته جماعة من امراء
الاثراك و اعطاهم مالا عظيما ثم خرج و خرجنا فلما قاربنا
همذان خرج السلطان مسعود فالتقوا في موضع يسمى داي مرك
قريب من جبل بهستون قريب من همذان فلما اصطفت المعسكر
و هموا بالقتال ففر من معسكرنا جميع الامراء و الاثراك الى
جانب السلطان فانهزم الخليفة و من بقي معه و نهب المعسكر
و قبض الخليفة و ارباب المناصب و حمل الوزير و صاحب المخزن
و انا و نقيب العلويين الى قلعة سرجهان بالقرب من قزوين³
و الري و لقد رأيتها في تسع و اربعين و خمسمائة لما سافرت الى
الري و رأيتها وهي تلوح على راس جبل عال و اخذ السلطان
المسترشد معه و طاف به في اذربيجان الى ان وصل به الى مراغة
فنزل هناك فدخل عليه ثلثة⁴ نفر من الملاحدة فقتلوه فرضي
الله عنه و قتل (f.165b) معه رجل كان يعلي به يسمى ابن سكينه
يوم الخميس سادس عشر⁵ ذي القعدة سنة تسع و عشرين و خمسمائة
و كانت خلافته سبعة عشر سنة و سبعة شهور و يومين⁶

1. MS. sic ; MS. B. has المعجز

2. MS. B. و اذ لم يكن من الموت بد فمن المعجز ان يكون جانا

3. The MS. is damaged here. MS. B. قزوين

4. MS. ثلث

5. MS. سادس عشرين MS. B. سادس عشر

6. MS. يومان

وكان ولي عهده ولده ابا جعفر المنصور الراشد بالله
وكان تخلف ببغداد فلما وصل الخبر الى بغداد بقتله بايعوا
الراشد بالخلافة وقيل ان¹ السلطان سنجر نفذ اليه من قتله وقيل
ان السلطان مسعود نفذ استأذن عمه سنجر فاذن له في قتله
فرتب اولئك² فدخلوا عليه فقتلوه ودفن في مدينة المراغة
وكان مع السلطان في معسكره³ دبيس بن صدقة بن⁴ مزيد⁵
ورحل السلطان بعد مدة الى باب تبريز وركب بعض الايام ونزل
ودخل اليه سيف الدولة دبيس فضرب عنقه وبقي السلطان اياما
وتزوج بنت دبيس وكانت⁶ امها شرف خاتون بنت عميد الدولة
بن جهير من زبيده بنت نظام الملك⁷ وحمل دبيس الى ماردين
الى زوجته كهار خاتون فدفن بالمشهد عند نجم الدين الغازي⁹
رحمهما الله وكان قد قيل ان دبيس حمل السلطان على قتل
المسترشد قال مؤيد الدين لما قتل المسترشد نفذ¹⁰ السلطان
مسعود احضرنا عنده فحضر الوزير شرف الدين و جمال الدين

1. Ms. بل
2. Ms. اوايك
3. Ms.B adds سيفالدولة in front of دبيس
4. Ms. ابن
5. Ms.B adds حين قبض الخليفة ويقال انه حمل السلطان على قتله
6. Ms. كان with ت written below the line
7. Ms الدين is written on the line, ملك above it. Ms.B adds الحسن بن اسحق
8. Ms.B adds حمل after من باب تبريز
9. Ms.B دفن في مشهد نجم الدين
10. ونفذ is best placed here, as in Ms.B. In Ms.A مسعود is written above

صاحب المخزن وانا وكان نقيب العلويين¹ قد مات بقلعة سرجهان
 ودفن هناك فلما حضرنا عنده² قال ما الرأي وما التدبير
 في امر الخلافة من ترون فقال الوزير يا مولانا الخلافة³ لولي
 العهد⁴ وقد بايعه الناس وجلس واستقر وقد بويع له بولاية العهد
 والآن بعد قتل ابيه فقال ما الى هذا سبيل ابدا ولا اقره
 عليها فانه يحدث نفسه بالخروج مثل ابيه ونحن كل يوم من حيث
 ولي المسترشد لم يزل يخرج علينا وكان خرج على اخي محمود
 مرتين وعلي مرة⁵ وهدي⁵ اخرى ثم عليه ما تم وبقيت علينا
 شناعة عظيمة وسية الى آخر الدهر ويقولون قتلوا الخليفة
 وهم كانوا السبب في عود الخلافة الى هذا البيت اريد لا يجلس⁶
 الا من لا يداخل نفسه⁷ في غير امور الدين ولا يجند ولا يتخذ ولا
 يجمع ولا يخرج علي ولا على اهل بيتي وفي الدار جماعة فاعتمدوا
 على شيخ منهم صاحب عقل ورأى وتدبير ويلزم نفسه ما يحب من
 طاعتنا ولا يخرج من داره ولا تعرجوا على هرون بن المقتدى فهو
 شيخ كبير ولا يرى الفتنة وقد اشار به عمي سنجر⁸

1. MS. B. النقيب الطاهر

2. MS. B. احضرنا عنده فحضرنا

3. MS. is written in من ترون فقال الوزير يا مولانا الخلافة صح
 the right margin.

4. MS. B. adds الرائد لولي العهد After

5. MS. favours this form.

6. لا is provided from MS. B.

7. MS. B. has في غير امر الخلافة
 وامر الدين لا يداخل نفسه After

8. MS. B. سلطان العالم سنجر عمي

وكان في الدار في ذلك الوقت سبعة اخوة من اولاد
المقتدى ولهم اولاد واولاد واولاد وبقية من السبعة الى سنة نيف¹
وخمسين وخمسمائة وكان في الدار من اولاد المستظهر سبعة
اخوة منهم الامير ابو عبد الله و ابو طالب و ابو نصر و ابو
القاسم و ابو علي و اسماعيل² ويحيى ولهم اولاد جماعة وكان
للمسترشد اولاد جماعة و للراشد و له مقدار³ نيف و عشرين
ولدا اكبرهم امير الجيش وكان ولد لابييه وهو ابن سبع سنين
ولم ير مثل ذلك قط

ولقد حدثني بعض من اثق اليه ببغداد ممن كان يدخل
(f.166a) الى دار الخلافة ويطلع عليهم ان المسترشد اشترى⁴ للراشد
لما كان عمره سبع سنين خمس جوارى⁵ و امرهن⁶ ان يلاعبنه و يمكنه⁷
من انفسهن⁸ و يحملنه⁹ على ذلك فكن¹⁰ معه¹¹ على ذلك الى ان صار

1. MS. B. ثلث

2. MS. B. اعمل

3. MS. مقدر

4. MS. B. اتخذ

5. MS. B. جوار

6. MS. امرهم

7. MS. يمكنوه

8. MS. انفسهم

9. MS. يحملونه

10. MS. فكانوا

11. After MS. B. has وكان ذلك الى ان بلغ معه

عمره تسع سنين (و)¹ بلغ مبلغ الرجال وكانت فيهن² جارية صفراء حبشية فواقعها ذات يوم فحملت منه فبلغ المسترشد ذلك فانكره واحضرها وهددها فقالت والله ما تقدم اليّ سواه وانه بالغ مثل جميع الرجال فمثل³ باقي الجوار فقلن⁴ مثل ذلك فامر ان تحمل الجارية قلنا ثم وطئها فلما قام عنها اخرجت القين والمني⁵ عليه وكذلك فعل بباقي الجوار⁶ فخرج المني⁶ ففرح المسترشد بذلك فلما تم حملها وضعت ابنا فسماه المسترشد امير الجيش وسر به سرورا شديدا⁷ وهذا ما لم يسمع بمثله الا في الحجاز يقال ان نساء تهامة يحضن لتسع وتبلغ صبيانهم لتسع اقرب ما رأى بين اب وابنه ما رأى بين عمرو بن العاص وبين ابنه عبد الله وكان ولد له وعمره اثنتا عشرة⁸ سنة ولم ير مثله الا ما ذكرناه من امر الراشد وكان الراشد على طريقة ابيه وكان بايعه الناس في آخر سنة تسع وعشرين وخمسمائة وكان شهما من الرجال شريف النفس ذا رأى وهمة فلهدا انحرف السلطان عن تولينه الخلافة

1. is added. و

2. MS. وكان فيهم

3. MS. سيل

4. MS. فقالوا

5. MS. B. فوقه

6. MS. B. has واعتبروا مكان المنى مع كل MS. B. has وفعل بباقي الجوار واحدة

7. MS. B. جيدا

8. MS. عشر

قيل وفي ذى الحجة سنة تسع وعشرين وخمسمائة قتل

السلطان مسعود صدقة بن ديس بين يديه صبرا واطنه وهما لان

الذى قتله كان قراجا (و) ¹ منكورس ²

قيل ونفذ السلطان مسعود الى عمه سنجر بأخذ اذنه فيمن

تولى تنفيذ اليه ³ يقول لا تول ⁴ الا من يضمنه الوزير وصاحب

المخزن وابن الانباري ⁵ فاجتمع السلطان بهم وشاورهم واثار

بهرون ⁶ وعرضهم ما امرهم السلطان سنجر وقال الوزير اذا كان

هذا الامر يلزمنا فنحن نولي من نراه وهو الزاهد العابد

الدين الذى ليس في الدار مثله قال السلطان من هو قال

الامير عبد الله بن المستظهر فقال وتضمنون ما يجرى منه

فقال الوزير نعم

وكان الامير ابو عبد الله صهر الوزير شرف الدين على

ابنته فانها دخلت ذات يوم في الدار في زمن المستظهر فرآها

الامير ابو عبد الله فطلبها من ابيه فزوجه اياها وكان شرف

الدين اذ ذاك نقيب النقباء ⁷ ودخل بها وبقيت عنده مدة وماتت

عنده فقال السلطان ذاك اليكم واكنتموا الحال لثلا بنمو الامر

1. has been added. و

2. MS. sic.

3. MS. B. has instead of فوصله الجواب اليه

4. MS. لا تولى

5. After MS. B. has صاحب الوزير وراى عليه راى الوزير وصاحب لا تول المخزن وكاتب الانشاء ويضمنون ما جرى منه ويكون الجواب عليهم

6. MS. B. اشار السلطان بولاية هرون

7. MS. B. adds ثم انتقل الى الوزارة

after نقيب النقباء

فَيَقْتُلُ الْمُقْتَنِي بِبَغْدَادِ ثُمَّ رَجَلَ السُّلْطَانَ وَ الْجَمَاعَةَ إِلَى
 بَغْدَادِ (f.166b) وَالْوَزِيرَ وَنَحْنُ أَجْمَعُ فِي صَحْبَتِهِ
 قَبِيلٌ وَكَانَ الرَّاشِدُ بَعْدَ قَتْلِ أَبِيهِ قَدْ بَايَعَهُ النَّاسُ وَاسْتَبَدَّ
 وَاسْتَفْرَ وَنَفَّذَ¹ إِلَى آتَابِكِهِ زَنْكِي إِلَى الْمَوْصِلِ وَاسْتَدْعَاهُ وَضَمَّنَ لَهُ
 أَنْ تَكُونَ السُّلْطَنَةَ فِي² الْمَلِكِ آلِ بَرْسَلَانَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ الَّذِي عِنْدَ
 آتَابِكِ³ وَتَكُونَ الْآتَابِكِيَّةَ وَالْخِلَافَةَ بِحُكْمِهِ فَنَزَلَ آتَابِكُ إِلَى بَغْدَادِ
 وَنَزَلَ بِالْجَانِبِ الشَّرْقِيِّ⁴ فِي أَحَدِي⁵ دُورِ السُّلْطَنَةِ وَبَقِيَ إِلَى أَنْ وَصَلَهُ
 أَنَّ السُّلْطَانَ قَدْ ظَلَمَ بَغْدَادَ فَخِيمَ فِي الْجَانِبِ الْغَرْبِيِّ
 وَلَمَّا قَرِبَ السُّلْطَانَ مِنْ بَغْدَادَ وَنَزَلَ قَرِيبًا مِنَ النَّهْرَوَانَ
 حَقَّقَ الرَّاشِدُ الْحَالَ وَأَنَّهُ⁶ لَا بَدَّ مِنْ تَوَلِيَّةٍ غَيْرِهِ فَجَمَعَ الْأَمْرَاءَ
 بِأَسْرِهِمُ الَّذِينَ كَانُوا فِي الدَّارِ مِنْ بَنِي الْخُلَفَاءِ فِي سَرْدَابِ⁷
 وَتَقَدَّمَ بِأَنْ يَطْبُقَ السَّرْدَابِ⁸ وَلَقَدْ حَدَّثَنِي زَيْنُ الدَّوَلَةِ أَبُو الْقَاسِمِ
 عَلِيُّ بْنُ الصَّاحِبِ وَكَانَ هُوَ حَاجِبَ الْبَابِ هُوَ وَأَبُوهُ وَجَدَهُ وَكَانَ بَيْنَ
 سَدَى الرَّاشِدِ قَالَ لَمَّا جَمَعَ الرَّاشِدُ الْأَمْرَاءَ فِي السَّرْدَابِ اسْتَدْعَانِي
 وَقَالَ يَا عَلِيُّ خُذْ هَذَا السِّيفَ وَكَانَ بِيَدِهِ سَيْفًا⁹ وَقَالَ أَحْذَرُ أَنْ

1. MS. B. انفذ

2. After MS. B. has احد الملكين الذين (sic) كانا معه من اولاد محمود السلطنة في

3. MS. B. has عند آتاك after ويوليه الاتابكية للسلطنة والخلافة

4. MS. B. الغربي

5. MS. احد

6. After MS. B. has ان اليوم واصلون وعزمهم ان يولون غيره الحال

7. On the four occasions this word is used, it is spelt سرداب

8. MS. B. سجنهم فيه

9. MS. سيفا

يسبق سيفي سيفك¹ فاني اريد اخرج كل من في السرداب واقتل
الجميع حتى لا يبقى من يصلح للخلافة فان هؤلاء² ربما دخلوا
وغيروا وولوا غيري ثم امر بفتح السرداب فالصائح جاءه فقال
ما الخبر فقال ان آتابك زنكي نهب الحريم الطاهري³ وطلب
الموصل في ذى القعدة واما السلطان فوصل وعبر النهر وان ولما
حقق آتابك نزول السلطان بالنهر وان انهزم فرمى السيف من يده
ودخل الى الدار واخذ معه من الجواهر ما لا تعرف⁴ لها قيمة
واعطاني منها مثل ذلك وخرج واخرج معه قاضي القضاة الزينبي
وكان قد استوزر جلال الدين ابا⁵ الرضا(بن)⁶ صدقة فخرج
وخرجنا ولحق آتابك زنكي⁷ على طريق الموصل
قال السعيد مؤيد الدين رحمه الله فلما كان بكرة ذلك
اليوم دخل السلطان بغداد ودخلنا معه فنزل في داره ونزلنا نحن
في دورنا وكان دخولنا عاشر ذى القعدة سنة ثلثين وخمسمائة
فلما كان من الغد مضى الوزير الى دار السلطنة⁸ ونحن معه
واستأذنه فيما يفعل فاخذ خطه وخطوطنا بالضمآن ثم عدنا الى

1. MS. B. يدى ويدك
2. MS. هآولاء
3. MS. طاهري; MS. B. الطاهر
4. MS. يعرف
5. MS. ابو
6. بن has been added.
7. MS. B. has instead of لسار سعى آتابك
8. MS. السلطنة is illegible.

دورنا واصبحنا يوم الاثنين سابع عشر ذى القعدة سنة ثلثين
 وخمسائة وحضرنا عند الامير ابي¹ عبد الله وتحدث الوزير معه
 وتحدثنا معه وشرط عليه القيام بامر الخلافة² وطاعة السلطان³
 واعلمناه اننا قد ضمنا ذلك من السلطان جميع ما اقترحه عليك
 فرضي بذلك وانفصلنا عنه ومضينا³ الى السلطان واعلمناه ما جرى
 وانه رضي بما شرط⁴ عليه (f.167a) فقال السلطان اذا كان من
 الغد⁵ فبايعوه فلما اصبحنا صعدنا الى الدار⁶ واخرجنا من
 الدار اشياء من الالات⁷ التي تصلح للغناء واشياء لا تليق⁸ وشهد
 جماعة من اهل الدار انه شرب الخمر فافتى العلماء بخلمه
 واعتنق ذلك القاضي عماد الدين شرف القضاة ابو طاهر احمد
 بن الكرخي المحتسب⁹ وكان قاضي اصحاب الشافعي رحمه الله
 واجتمع العلماء والاكابر فخلعوه

ودخل اليه الوزير وصاحب المخزن وانا وتحدثنا وناولته

رقعة فيها ما يسمى¹⁰ به من اللقب وكان فيها المقتفي لامر
 الله والمستفيء¹¹ بامر¹¹ الله والمستنجد بالله فقال ذلك اليكم
 فقال لي الخليفة¹² ما ترى فقلت المقتفي لامر الله فقال مبارك

1. Ms. ابو
2. Ms.B والاكرام وطاعة السلطان
3. Ms.B adds من غدوة
4. Ms. شرطت
5. Ms.B اذا كان من غد وهو الثلاثاء ثالث عشر ذى القعدة سنة
 ثلثين و خمسمائة
6. Ms.B دار الراشد
7. Ms. الات
8. Ms. يليق
9. Ms. B فتى الفقهاء بخلمه وانه لا يصلح لذلك وكان المعتنق
 لذلك شرف القضاة ابن الكرخي
10. Ms. يسم
11. Ms.B بنور الله
12. Ms.B فقال له (sic) الوزير لي

ثم مد يده فاخذها الوزير وقبلها وقال بايعت سيدنا ومولانا
المُقتفي لامر الله امير المؤمنين على كتاب الله وسنة رسول
الله واجتهاده ثم اخذها صاحب المخزن وقبلها¹ وبايعه على مثل
ذلك ثم اخذت يده وقلت بعد ان قبلتها بايعت سيدنا ومولانا
الامام المقتفي لامر الله امير المؤمنين على ما بايعت عليه
اباء واخاء وابن اخيه في ولاية عهده وكنت بايعت الامام
المستظهر بالله لما خدمته في وكالة الدار سنة 20000² وتسعين
وبقيت الى سنة سبع وخمسمائة لما وليت ديوان الانشاء وبايعت
المسترشد والراشد ثم قمنا من عنده ودخل الى الدار وبايعه
الناس³ ودخل العلماء والفقهاء والقضاة واکابر الناس⁴ اجمع
فبايعوه وحضر السلطان مسعود بعد ثلاثة ايام وبايعه وبايعه
جميع اصحابه من خواجة⁵ والامير حاجب⁶ وجميع ارباب دولته
واستبد له الامر واستقر في الخلافة
قبل وفي سنة تسع وعشرين وخمسمائة مات نجم الدولة

1. Ms.B adds وقام
2. Ms. has a lacuna here
3. الناس is supplied from Ms.B.
4. Ms.B والمقدمون
5. Ms. اخواجة
6. Ms.B adds تشار

ابن مالك بالقلعة وولي ولده وفيها اخذ آتابك زنكي الرقة
من معيب بن مالك

وكان وزير للمسترشد في ايامه جماعة منهم امين الدين
خواجه¹ احمد بن نظام الملك² مرتين وشرف الدين انوشروان
مرتين وجلال الدين ابو علي بن صدقة³ الى ان مات و وزير له
شرف الدين الزينبي⁴ الى ان قتل واسر معه على ما ذكرناه³
واما ما كان من الراشد فانه خرج مع آتابك زنكي في صفر
سنة احدى⁵ وثلاثين وخمسمائة الى الموصل ومعه قاضي القضاة
الزينبي وجلال الدين ابو الرضا بن صدقة⁶ اخي الوزير ابي
علي⁷ وبقي عنده مدة فوصل معه الى باب نصيبين واقام اياما⁸
ثم انفصل عنه ومضى الى السلطان مسعود ليدخل عليه ويمضي الى
السلطان سنجر⁹

وقيل قصد السلطان داوود¹⁰ و دخل عليه حتي يرده الى
الخلافة فلما قارب اصفهان¹¹ خرج عليه قوم من الملاحدة

1. Ms. اخواجا
2. Ms.B نظام الدين ابو نصر احمد
3. Ms.B adds نقيب النقباء
4. Ms.B adds علي بن طراد
5. Ms. احد
6. Ms. اخ
7. Ms.B وكان قد استوزر جلال الدين ابا الرضا بن صدقة بهغداد
8. Ms.B وعاد الى الموصل
9. Ms.B وسار يطلب السلطان حتى يستأذنه ويدخل الى خراسان
10. Ms. sic
11. Ms. has اصفهان with ف written above the line.

ودخلوا عليه فقتلوه في شهر رمضان سنة اثنتين وثلاثين وخمسمائة
وحمل الى اصفهان فدفن بها في مدينة شهرستان من اصفهان على
فرسخ ويقال انها من ابنية¹ ذى القرنين على ما يعرف بزر اود² على
القنطرة وكانت خلافته من حيث بويغ له بعد قتل ابيه الى ان
بويغ للمقتفي³ احد عشر شهرا زائدا فناقصا وقيل ان السلطان
نفذ من دخل عليه وقتله⁴ وخلف له في الدار نيفا وعشرين ولدا
منهم الكبير امير الجيش ويقال انه ولاء العهد قبل خروجه من
بغداد⁵ واما قاضي القضاة الزينبي رحمه الله فانه عاد ونزل
الى بغداد وعاد الى منصبه واما جلال الدين ابو الرضا بن⁶
صدقة فانه وزير آتابك زكي مدة وعزل وعاد الى بغداد وكان
وزير آتابك بعد موت ضياء الدين ابي سعيد الكفرتوشي واستقر
المقتفي في الخلافة وتوطد امره
قبل وفي سنة اثنتين وثلاثين حاصر السلطان سلجوق شاه
خلاط مدة ورحل عنها⁷ وفي سنة ثلث وثلاثين خطب الامير
داود للمقتفي الجمعة ثالث عشرين المحرم

1. Ms.B بنيه
2. Ms. sic; Ms.B • زیدارد
3. Ms. المقتفي
4. Ms.B adds وجعل الاسم الملاحظة
5. Ms.B adds وبقي قاضي القضاة وجلال الدين بالموصل بعد انفصاله
6. Ms. ابن
7. Ms. has a lacuna here. Perhaps it should read قبل

وفي سنة¹ وثلاثين² اسر² السناسنة صاحب الاخلاط واعطوا
 خوويت³ واغلق⁴ بسفارة حسام الدين في جمادى الاولى سنة ثلث
 وثلاثين
 قيل وفي سنة تسع وعشرين وخمسمائة مات الملك طغرىك⁵
 بهاب دمشق وحمل الى العراق قيل⁶
 وفي سنة تسع وعشرين وخمسمائة سافرت من ميفرقين الى
 ماردين ولم اكن قبل ذلك خرجت من ميفرقين وبقيت بها مدة⁷ (و)
 وصل تاهوت ديبس وانا بماردين ودفن بالمشهد وهذه السنة
 ماتت فيها زوجة الامير شهاب الدين محمد بن⁸ الياس وكانت
 زوجة الامير حسام الدين واولدت منه صفة خاتون وكنت بماردين
 هذه السنة وتزوج السعيد حسام الدين بالملكة⁹ خاتون
 بنت الملك رضوان وكانت وصلت تلك السنة من حلب وكانت زوجة
 بدر الدولة سليمان بن عبد الجبار ابن ارتق وماتت بماردين
 و وصلت من حلب ومعها ولد اسمه¹⁰ كبك و يلقب بمجد الملوك

1. A number has been omitted here.
2. Ms. اسروا
3. Ms. اخويت
4. Ms. has واغلق صح in the margin.
5. Ms. sic
6. Ms. sic
7. و has been added.
8. Ms. ابن
9. Ms. has a lacuna here.
10. Ms. مجد

فبقيت مدة وتزوجها السعيد حسام الدين وكان وصل هذه السنة
تاج الدين ابو سالم بن نباتة رضي الله عنه الى ماردين
قيل وكان في سنة ثمان وعشرين وخمسمائة نازل آتابك
زنكي وحسام الدين قلعة الصور فاخذها حادى عشرين رجب وسلمها
الى السعيد حسام الدين وقتل جنرال¹ بن اسلم وكان اميرا
مقداما² من اصحاب الامير داود وكان امير الصور للامير داود
وفيها (f.168a) وصل آتابك زنكي الى تل شيخ (و)³ اجتمع بحسام⁴
الدين ولقوا داود بهاب آمد وكسروه ودخل الى الصور واخذها
وفيها ملك آتابك زنكي طنزى ومن تل الشيخ (و)⁵ وزير ضياء⁶
الدين ابو سعيد بن الكفرتوشي آتابك زنكي وحصل في خدمته وفي
تلك السنة مات شمس الدولة الاحدب

وقيل وفي سنة ثلثين امر حسام الدين بنقض الربض
والمحدثة فنقضا⁷ وكان قد وقع الخلف بين السعيد حسام الدين
والامير داود (و)⁸ آتابك مع الامير حسام الدين فكسروا الامير

1. حمدان Ms. B ; Marsh 333 (f.103a) حمدان
Ms. sic.
2. Ms. مقدا
3. is added. و
4. Ms. حسام
5. is added. و
6. Ms. ضيها
7. Ms.B فابتدى في نقضه في الجمعة تاسع المحرم
8. is added. و

داود على باب آمد وساروا فملكوا جبل جور وبالقرنين¹ والسيوان
اخذت من الامير أرسلان بن عبد الجبار بن ارتق وسلمها آتابك
الى السعيد حسام الدين وانهزم الامير أرسلان² الى خدمة الامير
داود

قبيل وفي سنة ثمان وعشرين نهب الامير داود ربض طنزى
وسبى³ كل من فيها⁴ ونهب اموالهم وهتك النساء⁵ بحيث لو غزت
الافرنج ما فعلت اكثر من ذلك⁶ وفي سنة ثمان وعشرين ملك السعيد
حسام الدين الهتاج على ما ذكرناه واخذها من الامير شمس الدولة
عيسى بن احمد بن نظام الدين بن مروان⁷

قبيل وفي سنة احدى وثلاثين وخمسة مائة وصل السعيد حسام
الدين الى ميفرقين ومعه حبشي بن حبشي⁸ وعمل حساب العمال
والمصرفين وصادر اهلها وقلمهم واجحف باهلها ولقي الناس
منه شدة لا توصف من الشتم والجور والظلم وسلك بهم اصعب الطرق
من الحيف والقهر وقبض الناصح الآمدى وكان متوليا بديوان
ميفرقين وقبض ابنه ابا نصر وكان المؤيد بن مخطر متوليا

1. Ms. sic
2. Ms. B رسلان
3. Ms. سبا
4. Ms. كلما فيه Ms.B ; فيه Ms.
5. Ms.B هتكت الحرم
6. Ms.B ما صنعت بالمسلمين
7. Ms. ابن
8. ابن

فانهزم من يد حبشي ومضى الى الجزيرة وقبض اخاه ابا سعيد
واخرج العميد ابا طاهر بن المحتسب من الحبس وكان له مدة
محبوسا وولاه... الناس ولقي الناس منه شدة ومثقة لا توصف
وكنت في هذه السنة بالجزيرة واقمت بها مدة وعدت الى

ميفرقين واجتزت بنصيبين ورايت آتابك زنكي بنصيبين

قبل وفي سنة تسع وعشرين مات نجم الدولة مالك بن

مالك بالقلعة واخذ آتابك زنكي الرقة من الامير مسيب وسار الى
دمشق وحاصرها مدة ثم دخل فيها وفي القلعة ولده بدران مدة
وبقي (الى)² ان دخل سنة ثلثين وقتله اخوه الامير علي بن
مالك وولي القلعة

قبل وفي سنة ثمان وعشرين وخمسائة ظهر عبد المؤمن

بالمغرب وانا اذكر من حاله وما وصل الي من امره وهو ان

محمد بن تومرت كان من المصامدة وخرج الى بلاد المشرق وهو

شيخ عبد المؤمن بن علي الكومي من جبال السوس الاقصى بالمغرب

وكان محمد بن تومرت الادريسي الحسيني خرج (f.168b) الى المشرق

وبقي مدة ثم عاد الى المغرب في سنة تسع عشرة³ وخمسائة

واقام بمروكش⁴ واجتمع اليه جماعة من الفقهاء فناظرهم فجرى

بينهم اشياء غير ما جرت به عادة المغاربة وخارجا عن طريقهم⁵

فانكر عليهم وانكروا عليه ثم انهم اجتمعوا الى امير المسلمين

1. The Ms. is damaged here. The terminal ساب is visible.

احتساب (?)

2. الى has been added.

3. Ms. تسعة عشر

4. Ms. sic ; Ms.B sic

5. Ms.B فرأوه خارجا عن مذهب المغاربة و طريقتهن

علي ابن يوسف بن تاشفين وقالوا له تخرج هذا من بيننا والا
افسد الناس واهلكهم فتقدم اليه بالخروج فخرج في سنة عشرين
وخمسمائة ونفاه الى الجبل الى الممامدة وهم جنس من البربر
وكانوا عشيرته فاقام بينهم وحملهم على ترك طاعة امير¹
المسلمين² فخرج اليه امير المسلمين فلقبه فكسره وقتل رأس
العسكر عبد الله بن ماوية فخرج امير المسلمين بنفسه وجمع
الجموع فلقبه وكسره وتمكن في الجبل وهو مسيرة شهر في شهر وهو
جبل درن³ بولاية مركوش⁴ والسوس واجتمع اليه خلق كثير عظيم
وبقي الى سنة ثلث وعشرين وخمسمائة ومات محمد بن تومرت وولي
موضعه علي الورنشي وجيز العساكر وحاصر مركوش⁵ في سنة اربع⁶
وعشرين وخمسمائة فكسره امير المسلمين وازاحه من مركوش⁷
فانهزم الى الجبل وتحصن به وبقي الامر بينه وبين امير
المسلمين يزيد وينقض الى سنة ثمان وعشرين وخمسمائة ومات
علي الورنشي

وتولى موضعه عبد المؤمن بن علي الكومي⁸ وكان من جملة
اصحاب محمد بن تومرت وتلامذته واصحابه ومعاضدته⁹ فجمع ولقي
امير المسلمين وكسره وملك الجبل باسره وملك ولاية اخرى ونزل

-
1. Ms. الامير للمسلمين
 2. Ms.B adds وامتنعوا من اداء ما كان عليهم فجمع الجيوش
 3. Ms. ارن ; Ms.B ارن
 4. Ms. sic .
 5. Ms. sic .
 6. Ms. اربعة
 7. Ms. sic .
 8. Ms.B adds من اهل عرعر (sic)
 9. Ms.B adds وهو بربري الجنس

في سنة ثلثين¹ وخمسمائة الحمراء وفتح اكثر بلاد امير المسلمين
 وكانت له البقاع وفتح اكثر افرقية وبلادا من الاندلس وفتح
 اكثر بلاد امير المسلمين وفتح من الافرنج مواضع² كثيرة و بقي
 الى سنة اربعين وخمسمائة ولقي امير المسلمين تاشفين³ بن⁴
 علي بن يوسف وكسره وقتل خلقا كثيرا واسره وقتله وتوطدت له
 البلاد وفتح اكثر المغرب وهابه الناس⁵ وكان لا يفتح مدينة الا
 قتل كل من فيها وكان يقول انا صاحب الزمان وملك في سنة
 اثنتين واربعين مدينة تونس وهي من اعظم مدن المغرب وقد
 ذكرت في كتاب المسالك والممالك ان دور سورها احد وعشرين
 ميلا

وفي سنة احدى وثلثين في رابع ذي القعدة تسلم الامير
 داود هاني من الامير شاروخ واعطاه اقطاعا واقام في خدمته⁶
 (في)⁷ ريف حاني الى ان مات ودفن في حاني
 قيل وفي سنة احدى واربعين وخمسمائة ملك عبد المؤمن
 من ولاية بني حماد واجلاهم عنها⁸ وفي سنة اثنتين وثلثين

1. Ms. ثلث
2. Ms. مواضعا
3. Ms. تاشعين
4. Ms. ابن
5. Ms.B adds وكثر في اعينهم
6. Ms. written in left margin. خدمته
7. في has been added.
8. Ms.B adds وقتل من اكابهم جماعة

وخمسمائة فتح المهديّة وملكها ولم يبق له منازع ولا من بناويه
 ولا من يقاومه وبني مدينتين عظيمتين احدهما¹ بريني² وسماها
 المهديّة (p.169a) والآخرى بريني³ واستقر في ملكه وبقي يفتح
 من بلاد الاقرج طرفا فطرفا الى ان مات في سنة اربعين
 وخمسمائة⁴ وبقي اولاده من بعده في الملك ويقال انه خلف نيفا
 واربعين⁵ ولدا ذكورا

قيل وفي سنة اثنتين وثلاثين وخمسمائة خرج ملك الروم
 من القسطنطينية الى الشام وملك بزاعة وانه حمل اهلها باسهم
 وسبى⁶ كل من فيها ونهب ما كان بها وحط على حلب وحاصرها ولقيه
 آتابك زنكي وبقي في وجهه وسارت اليه عساكر ديار بكر وديار
 ربيعة اجمع ونفذ الامير داود ولده معه عساكر التركمان فرحل
 من حلب وعاد الى بلاده

وفي هذه السنة مات بهاء الدين ابو الحسن بن علي ابن
 الشهرزوري بالرقّة⁷ ودفن بها وصل نعيّة الى الجزيرة وكنّت
 بالجزيرة وفي هذه السنة اقامت بها مدة وعدت الى ميفرقين وفي

1. Ms. احدهما
2. Ms. sic ; Ms.B في بريني
3. Ms.B ... والآخرى في بريني وسماها
4. Ms.B وهو الى الان في يد الاقرج من المغرب يفتح
5. Ms. اربعون
6. Ms. سبا
7. Ms.B وولى ولده نجم الدين قضا القضاة

سنة اثنتين وثلاثين اصطلح زنكي مع صاحب دمشق وتزوج بامه
 وفيها تعلم زنكي حمص وقتل قرخان صاحبها وفيها قتل شهاب
 الدين صاحب دمشق وولي ابنه
 قبيل وفي سنة ثلث وثلاثين وخمسمائة نهب الامير داود
 ارزن وسى¹ اهلها ونهب اموالهم واهاج الجند كلها² وكان بها
 وجرى عليهم اكثر مما جرى على اهل طنزى ولقي الناس منه ما
 لا يوصف و وصل السعيد حسام الدين الى ميفرقين و وصل اليه
 حسام الدولة قرتي بن³ الاحدب صاحب ارزن
 قبيل وفي شوال سنة ثلث وثلاثين توفي سوتكين المرجي
 صاحب حران وقعدا آتابك وتسلمها وفي هذه السنة كسر حسام
 الدين الافرنج في شبختان واخذ القافلة من باب الرها وكنت في
 هذه السنة بآمد وفي هذه السنة اصطلح السعيد حسام الدين
 وآتابك زنكي واخذ دارا⁴ وتزوج بصفية خاتون بنت السعيد حسام
 الدين وحملت في سنة اربع وثلاثين وخمسمائة الى الموصل وكنت
 بها

واقمت بميافارقين الى اخر سنة ثلث(وثلاثين)⁵ وخمسمائة
 وانحدرت الى بغداد واجتمعت بالسعيد مؤيد الدين ابي عبد الله
 محمد بن الانباري رحمه الله و وصلتها في شهر ربيع الاول سنة
 اربع وثلاثين وخمسمائة لانني كنت اقامت بالجزيرة والموصل مدة

1. Ms. سبا
2. Ms.B واهاج العسكر الناس و اموالهم و نساءهم
3. Ms. ابن
4. Ms.B وصعد صلاح الدين الى ماردين وقرر امر الصلح بينهما
 فعلم اليه دارا
5. has been added. وثلاثين

واقمت ببغداد مدة ستة اشهر ورأيت الخليفة المقتفي لما
 بايعه خواجه¹ عز الملك ودخل الخليفة المقتفي باخت السلطان
 فكنت ببغداد وحضرت باب الحجرة واملأك السلطان مسعود باهنة
 الخليفة المقتفي وخطب قاضي القضاة الزينبي رحمه الله وكان
 الوزير شرف الدين علي بن طراد² الزينبي وكمال الدين صاحب
 المخزن

ورأيت جماعة من كبار اهل العراق وقرأت على الشيخ ابي
 المظفر بن الشهرزوري المطار (f.169b) الفرائض³ وقرأت الفصيح
 والعمدة على الشيخ⁴ ابي منصور الجواليقي وقرأت التنبيه على
 الشيخ ابي حسن⁵ ابن الخل ولقيت الشيخ ابا منصور الرزاز
 وجماعة من⁶ الفقهاء منهم⁷ الشيخ عبد القادر ابن النراوى
 و اولاد قاضي القضاة الديرغاني ويوسف الدمشقي وجماعة من
 اصحاب الحديث منهم القاضي ابو بكر قاضي اليمارستان وابن
 السمرقندى وعبد الوهاب الانماطي وجماعة كثيرة وسمعت عليهم
 وقرأت على الشيخ ابي محمد بن نبت الشيخ القرآن وعلى الشيخ عبد
 الوهاب الخفاف واقمت ببغداد وزرت جميع المشاهد بها ونزلت

1. Ms. اخواجا
2. Ms. حراد
3. Ms. الفرائض
4. Ms. للشيخ
5. Ms. written in the right margin. الشيخ ابي حسن صح
6. Ms. . وجماعة الفقهاء من The من is misplaced.
7. Ms. ^{الشيخ} منهم has been added.

الى المداين وزرت قبر سلمان الفارسي واقمت بهفداد الى خامس
محرم سنة خمس وثلاثين وخمسمائة
وكان شرف الدين الزينبي في الوزارة فغضب في اخر
سنة اربع¹ وثلاثين وخمسمائة ومضى الى دار السلطان مغضبا
واقام بها² ونفذ الخليفة الى السلطان خادما اسمه نجاح
استأذن في عزله وناب في الوزارة³ قاضي القضاة الزينبي مدة
وناب بعده مؤيد الدين سديد الدولة و وصل امر السلطان بعزله
في سنة خمس وثلاثين وخمسمائة وولي الوزارة⁴ نظام الدين
ابا المظفر بن الزعيم بن جهير وكان استاذ الدار واستقر بها
قبيل وفي سنة اربع وثلاثين وخمسمائة ملك آتابك زنكي
قلعة بعلبك ونزل على دمشق وحاصرها مدة ثم سلموا اليه قلعة
بصرى قبيل واستقال صاحب المخزن كمال الدين ومضى الى مكة وولي
موضعه قوام الدين بن صدقة⁵ ولزم شرف الدين الزينبي داره
وكان صاحب الديوان صفي الدين بن⁶ الزوان الهاشمي واستقر نظام
الدين في الوزارة ثم عدت الى ميفرقين في اوائل⁷ محرم سنة
خمس وثلاثين وخمسمائة وعبرت بالموصل وحصن كيفا فصادفت الامير

-
1. Ms. اربعة
 2. Ms.B ونزل بدار نجم الدين رشيد الجامدار
 3. Ms. الوزارة
 4. Ms. الوزارة
 5. Ms. ابن
 6. Ms. ابن
 7. Ms. او ايل

داود قد وقع بينه وبين السعيد حسام الدين ونهب بلد ميفرقين
 في محرم سنة ست وثلثين ونزل على باب المدينة واقام بها
 ثمانية ايام ثم رحل وكان قد اغار على جميع البلد ورحل الى تل
 شيخ واخذها واقطع البلد وكان السعيد¹ حسام الدين قد خرب
 قلعة بشاط² واخذها وبني³ بها واقطع الجبل جميعه وبقي كل
 يوم يغير من الموضعين الى باب المدينة وتؤخذ ثياب الناس
 في النهار⁴ وكان⁵ حبشي في البلاد والحاجب يوسف بنال في الولاية
 وساس الناس وحفظ...⁶ وبقي الامر كذلك الى آخر سنة خمس وثلثين
 وخمسة وفي سنة ست وثلثين اصطلح الامير داود والسعيد حسام
 الدين ووصل الامير داود الى ميفرقين ودخل باب القصر واتفق
 ان وقع الاتفاق بينهما

قيل وفي منتصف جمادى الاولى⁷ سنة ست وثلثين وخمسة
 مات الامير^(f.170a) سعد الدولة بالبلدى⁸ ابن ابراهيم صاحب آمد
 وكان مؤيد الدين⁹ متولي آمد فرتب ولده شمس الملوك محمود في

1. Ms. كان السعيد. illegible.
2. Ms. فشاط
3. Ms. بنا
4. Ms. B النهر ; Marsh 333 (f.103b) النهر
5. Ms. B adds شرف الدين
6. The Ms. is damaged here. It appears to read الك... و
 A likely word would be الرعايا
7. Ms. الاول
8. Ms. sic. The usual form in this Ms. is ايللدى
9. Ms. B ابن نيسان

الامارة وقررها وكانت امه اليمنى خاتون بنت نجم الدين الفازى
وكان حسام الدين خاله وكنت في هذه السنة بآمد وكنت في صحبة
والدى رحمه الله وقيل في سنة ست وثلاثين وخمسمائة قتل¹ شمس
الملوك بدمشق

قيل وكان شرف الدين الحبشي والعميد ابو طاهر ابن
المحتسب (في الولاية)² لما عاد المؤيد ابو الحسن بن المخضر
الى خدمة السعيد حسام الدين قبضه حبشي في سنة اربع وثلاثين
وبقي في القبض وقتل اخاه الرئيس ابا سعيد تحت العقوبة وبقي
الى آخر سنة ست وثلاثين ونفذ آتاهك زنكي الى حسام الدين يقول
ان كان رسول يعلني منك او يعلك مني . لا ينصحوك و لا ينصحوني
فان اردت اتفاقنا فننذ الي حبشي فننذ اليه ومعه الحاجب
ناصر ومعه جماعة فلما لقوه انزلهم وبقي ثلاثة ايام ثم ولي
شرف الدين حبشي الاستيفاء وخلع عليه الجبة الاطلس والبركان
بالذهب العراقي والفرس بالمركب وعاد الرسل الذين مضوا³ معه⁴
ثم انه تضمن لآياك زنكي اخذ البلاد⁵ وقاطعه في ذلك فقال لي
من قد حلف لي ومتى وصلنا الى البلاد سلمتها اليك

1. Ms. قتل followed by which is deleted.
2. في الولاية has been added.
3. Ms. عادت الرسل الذى
4. Ms.B مضى شرف الدين حبشي الى الموصل برسالة الى اتاهك وعادت الامراء الذين مضوا معه
5. Ms.B قيل ان حبشي رتب في نفس اتاهك انه

وفي هذه السنة قبض السعيد حسام الدين على الاجل ابي¹
الوفا بن² السرطان³ و حبس مدة ثم قلع عينيه ورمى به من رأس
قلعة ماردين الى الميدان⁴
قيل وفي سنة سبع وثلاثين وخمسمائة صد آتابك زنكي الى
ديار بكر ودخل الى ولاية الامير يعقوب بن⁵ السبع الاحمر فقمعد
مخيزان و المعدن و ايرون و قطليس و اخذ جميع الولاية و كنت بالموصل
في هذه السنة

وفي سنة ثمان وثلاثين وخمسمائة قعد آتابك زنكي
البلاد و وصل الى بلد ماردين و دخل الى تل بشمى على انه يدخل
الى ولاية آمد و ميفرقين و كان قد ملك حاني و اسعرد و جبل جور
و بالقرنين⁶ و جميع تلك الولاية اخذها بعد صلح الامير داود و نزل
في الزيتون الذى في تل بشمى⁷ فلما كان بعض الليالي⁸ دخل على
حبشي في الخيمة مؤمل⁹ الشاقصي و محمد بن ابي المكارم المحلي

1. Ms. ابو
2. Ms. ابن
3. Ms.B رطان ; Ms. بن السرطان
4. Ms.B الى ريف ميردين
5. Ms. ابن
6. Ms. sic.
7. Ms.B و وصل الى تل بشمى و حط بها المعسكر
8. Marsh 333 (f.104a) ففي اثنا الليل
9. The Ms. is illegible here; Ms.B and Marsh 333 (f.104a) مؤمل

وضرباه بالسيوف واخذاً¹ رأسه و ساراً² به الى السعيد حمام الدين
 ووقعت³ الصيحة واختبط الناس والعسكر واصبح آتابك من غدوة
 فرحل وعاد الى نصيبين

قبل وفي يوم الاحد تاسع عشر محرم سنة تسع وثلثين
 وخمسمائة مات الامير داود بحاني وحمل الى حصن كيفا وعبر
 تاهوته يوم الاثنين وحط بجامع المحدثه وخرج اليه الناس
 والقرآء وحمل من غدوة الى (f.170b) حصن كيفا وملك بعده ولده
 الامير فخر الدين قرا أرسلان حصن كيفا وخرتبيت وبالوا⁴ وملك
 ولده أرسلان تغمش قلعة ميزکرد وقعد آتابك ولاية الامير داود
 فملك اسعد وهامود وطنزى وباتاسا وجميع الولاية المتصلة
 بولاية المعدن وعبر الى الولاية الاخرى وذلك حاني وجبل جور
 وبالقرنين⁵ والسيوان فنزل وملك ارقنين والها لار وتل خوم
 وجرموك وجميع ذلك غير خرتبيت وبالوا⁶ وميزکرد وبقيت بيد
 اولاد الامير داود

وفي هذه السنة قتل السلطان داود بسوق تهريز وفي هذه
 السنة تزوج أرسلان تغمش بن⁷ داود بهدية خاتون بنت السعيد

1. Ms. اخذ ; Ms.B اخذا
2. Ms. سار
3. Ms. وقع ; Ms.B وقعت
4. Ms. sic
5. Ms. sic
6. Ms. sic
7. Ms. ابن

حسام الدين وحملت اليه الى ميزكرد ووقع الخلف بين آتابك
وحسام الدين

ومضى آتابك ونزل الى الرها وحاصرها مدة ثم فتحها عنوة
في خامس والعشرين من جمادى الآخرة¹ وكان ثالث عشرين كانون
الاول سنة تسع وثلثين وخمسمائة وكانت اخذتها الاقرنج بعد موت
تاج الدولة في سنة اثنتين وتسعين واربعمائة وكان لها بايديهم
سبعة واربعين سنة ثم رحل عنها بعدما رتب امرها ونزل الى
البيرة فحاصرها مدة وكانت النصارى يقولون ان آتابك يقتل
ليلة الميلاد وكانوا منتظرين² ذلك وكان فتحها ليلة الميلاد
وسلم آتابك وكذبوا قيل وبقي يحاصر البيرة مدة فوصله الخبر
بعد ايام بقتل نصير الدين جقر³ والي الموصل وكان قتله غلماناه
في ثامن ذى القعدة سنة تسع وثلثين وخمسمائة فرحل آتابك عن
البيرة ونزل الى الموصل وقرر حالها ورتب فيها زين الدين
علي كوشك⁴ وكان في سنة تسع وثلثين مات الامير كرج غازى صاحب
البارعية بآمد وكان لقي الناس من نصير الدين شدة من الجور
والظلم والقتل والمصادرات والاقساط فلما ولي زين الدين
ازال ذلك جميعه واحسن الى الناس والرعايا في جميع البلاد
ورأى الناس منه كل خير الى (ان)⁵ مات في سنة اربع وستين
وخمسمائة

1. Ms. في شهر الله الاصب Ms.B; الاخر Ms.
2. Ms. منتظرون
3. ان نصير الدين جقروا وصل الى الموصل وقتل Ms.
فوصله الخبر بعد ايام بقتل Ms.B. The more coherent version is in
نصير الدين
4. Ms.B adds بن بكتكين
5. has been added. ان

وكان في شهر رجب سنة ثمان وثلثين وخمسمائة استدعى
علم الدين ابا¹ الفتح محمد بن علي بن نباتة² الى ماردين
و ولاء الامير حسام الدين قضاء ماردين و ولي اخاه³ بهاء الدين
خطابة ميفرقين وكان قاضي ماردين مجد الدين داود بن القاضي
السديد فحزل في تلك السنة و ولي علم الدين وكان المؤيد ابو⁴
الحسن بن مخطر المستوفي المتولي لذلك وبعد يومين ولي الخطابة
بماردين وكان بميفرقين له الخطابة فولي قضاء ماردين واستقر
واقام بها ونقل اهله واولاده الى ماردين وهو بها الى الان
وكان وصل الى ماردين مكيين الدولة (f.171a) ابراهيم
بن منقذ من اهل مصر فاقام في ضيافة السعيد حسام الدين مدة
ثم انه بعد يومين من ولاية علم الدين قضاء ماردين ولاء حسام
الدين الوزارة⁵ واستناب⁶ المهذب البغدادي وكان ناسخا بمشهد
ماردين⁷ وهو ابو عبد الله محمد بن محمد العراقي وكان يقول
وانا من بيت المعوج من اهل بغداد وكنت في هذه السنة
بماردين

1. Ms. ابي
2. Ms.B من ميفرقين
3. Ms. اخيه
4. Ms. ابا
5. Ms. الوزارة
6. Ms. واستناب Ms.B زستان
7. Ms.B ميردين

وكان السعيد حسام الدين في اول ولايته بميفرقين نقل
 نجم¹ الدين الغازى وشمس الدولة اخاه من مسجد الامير الى
 ماردين ثم دفنهما² بقلعة ماردين في مسجد الخضر بالقلعة وكان
 في ذلك الموضع تربة³ فيها جماعة من من مات في ايام الغازى
 فدفن الغازى وشمس الدولة هناك مدة ثم ان السعيد حسام الدين
 بنى⁴ تحت ربهض ماردين عند عين باقرى⁵ مشهدا⁶ مليحا وبنى⁷
 فيه تربة وغرم عليها مالا عظيما ووقف عليها الوقف وحط
 المقابر اليها ودفنوا فيها جميع الذين⁸ كانوا بالقلعة اولا
 فاخيرا ونفذ اليها البسط والستور والالات⁹ وجمع فيها خزانة
 كتب وحصل فيها كتب كثيرة¹⁰ وهي الى الان بها
 قيل وفي سنة تسع وثلثين وخمسةائة انهدمت عمارة جسر

-
1. Ms. شمش
 2. Ms. دفنهم
 3. Ms.B وكان لهم تربة بالقلعة
 4. Ms. بنا
 5. Ms. sic; Ms.B باقيرا
 6. Ms. مشهد
 7. Ms. بنا
 8. Ms. الذى
 9. Ms. الات
 10. Ms. كتبها كثيرا

قرا مان ومن سنة ثمان واربعين وفيها انهدمت البدنة داخل
ميفرقين وبنيت

قيل وفي سنة اربعين قبض الوزير المصري وحبس في
قلعة ماردين فحصل عنده في الحبس ثياب خام وخرج من الحبس
وشدها في وسطه وتدلى من قلعة ماردين¹ وانهمز فلما اصحوا
طلبوه فلم يعادفوه ورأوا الخام مشدودا فطلبوه فوجدوه² في
طرف الجبل فحملوه الى السعيد حسام الدين فاطلقه وصرفه ولم
يسئ اليه

قيل وفي سنة اربعين وخمسمائة كسر السعيد حسام الدين
فخر الدين قرا أرسلان على باغين وكان يوما عظيما مشهودا
وكانت الكسرة والفتح لشهاب الدين محمد بن الياس بن الغازي
فانه كان رأس المعسكر مع عمه حسام الدين وفي سنة اربعين وصل
آتابك زنكي الى ميفرقين واخذ تل شيخ وضايق ميفرقين مدة ثم سار
قيل وفي سنة اربعين وخمسمائة وصل الشيخ نور الهدى

سليمن بن عمر العلوي من اسعد الى ميفرقين وكان حسام الدين
بالبلد فخرج اهل ميفرقين باسرههم ولقوه مقدار³ فرسخ وخرج
الامير فلقية⁴ عند قبة السلطان وكان فاخلا عالما ونزل عند تاج
الدين رحمه الله في دار علم الدين وبعد يوم نزل الامير اليه
ولم يقم له وجلس في الجامع ووعظ وتكلم وافتتن الناس به وبلغ

1. Ms.B ميردين

2. Ms.B فلما اصحوا ماجو وركبت الخيل لطلبه فلحقوه

3. Ms. مقدر

4. Ms.B ولقيه الامير والجماعة

الامير مهلفا عظيما وكان في اوفى منزلة وحصل اذا كان الامير
 بميفرقين كان معه واذا سار الى مارددين سار معه وكان يقيم
 حيث اقام (f.171b) الامير وحصل له الناموس العظيم¹ بحيث انه
 مدة مقامه عند الامير ما يقيم له يوما قط وحصل² يهدو³ منه ما
 لا يليق بمثله فنقص في اعين الناس وسار الى الشام وبقي مدة
 واخذ قلعة ابي قبيس ووقع بينه وبين الاسماعيلية وعاد الى
 الصعيد حسام الدين واقام مدة وكان اطعم الصعيد حسام الدين
 في عمل الكيمياء⁴ ولم يصح منه شيء ومضى الى اسمرود واقام بها
 مدة الى شهر ربيع الاول سنة ست واربعين وخمسمائة فدخل الى
 الجامع⁵ وكان يوم الجمعة فوثب عليه رجلان من الاسماعيلية⁶
 فضربه احدهما بخنجر فضربه بسيف كان بيده فوثب عليه رجل⁷
 فضربه بسكين فوقع واختبط الناس وقبض الذي ضربه⁸ ورفيقه
 وبقي الى يومه ومات رحمه الله ودفن باسمرود في مسجد الخضر
 عليه السلم وقتلوا اللذين قتلاه⁹

1. حصل له من الناموس والحرمة ما ليس بالقليل ويحكم على Ms.B.
2. ثم انه يغير عن الطريقة واخذ الخدم Ms.B adds
3. يهدوا Ms.
4. الكيما Ms.
5. ليصلي Ms.B adds
6. الاسماعيلية Ms.
7. فوثب عليه آخر Ms.B
8. وكان من الاسماعيلية (في) Ms.B adds
9. الذين قتلوه Ms.

قيل وفي سنة اربعين وخمسائة اتصل المولى نجم الدين
 المالك الى خاتون بنت الامير¹ احمد بن سيمان صاحب خلاط وكانت
 اخت شاه ارمن لاهه وبنت عمه و وصل صفى الدين بن رشيق و اشير
 الدين عباد² بن ابي الفتوح وسراج الدين بن كامل غازى وجماعة
 من اكاهر دولة³ سيمان واقاموا اياما بميفرقين وساروا الى
 ماردين⁴ وعادوا ومضى القاضي علم الدين ابو الفتوح محمد ابن
 نباتة ومعه اكاهر الدولة⁵ الى خلاط في سنة احدى واربعين
 وخمسائة واحضروا الخاتون وكان العرس بماردين وحضر اكاهر
 دولة خلاط

قيل وفي سنة احدى واربعين وخمسائة شرع السعيد⁶ حسام
 الدين رحمه الله في بناء جسر اقرا مان على القنطرة⁷ بتولي
 الزاهد ابن الطويل واستقرت⁸ قواعده من الجانب الشرقي⁹ وقلعه
 المد و اخربه لضعف¹⁰ عمله واخربه والزمه الزاهد الغمارة¹¹ فاخرج

-
1. Ms.B adds قطب الدين
 2. Ms.B ابن عباد
 3. Ms. بيت written on the line, دولة above it.
 4. Ms.B خلاط
 5. Ms.B وساروا الى ماردين ولقوا صاحب وتقرر الحال
 6. Ms. العميد
 7. Ms. sic ; Ms.B بالقيطوم
 8. Ms. استقر ; Ms.B اسس
 9. Ms.B من الجانبين (sic); Marsh 333
 10. Ms.B وضعف ; Ms. وضعف
 11. Ms. بممارته ; Ms.B and Marsh 333 الغرامة

عليه ثم وليه الامير سيف الدين شير باريك ممدود بن علي بن
ارتق¹ و شرع في عمارته بتولي ابي الخير الفاسول² واحضر
اخشاها لم ير مثلها وابتدأ في عمارته³ وهو من العجائب التي
بنيت⁴ في هذا الزمان وبقي العمل فيه⁵
وفي سنة احدى واربعين وخمسمائة نازل آتابك زنكي قلعة
جمبر وفيها سيف الدولة ابو الحسن علي بن مالك وضايقها
مضايقة شديدة واشرفت على الاخذ وكان جمال الدين سربي ولد
السعيد حسام الدين في خدمته ومعه عسكر وكان قبضه وحبسه في
بيعة ربض القلعة

ولقد سألت الوالي المصدر الكامل قاضي القضاة كمال
الدين ابا الفضل محمد بن عبد الله الشهرزوى ادام الله ظله
في سنة اربع واربعين وخمسمائة بالموصل عن قتل (f.172a) آتابك
وما جرى فقال كنا نازلنا القلعة مدة فلما كان بعض الايام خرج
الامير حسان المنهجي⁶ وصاح اريد اكلم الامير علي فتراءى له⁸
من على السور⁹ وقال له تعلم ما بيني وبينك¹⁰ وatabك تعرف
ايش هو¹¹ ومالك من تلتجئ اليه ولا من يعرفه عنك¹² والراى ان¹³

-
1. Ms. sic. It should read ارتق بن ارتق
 2. Ms.B ابي الخير بن الحكيم الفاسول
 3. Ms.B فعمله الى سنة ثمان واربعين وخمسمائة
 4. Ms. الذى بنى
 5. Ms.B وبقي شيء يسير
 6. Ms. حسان المنهجي ; Ms.B حسام الدين المنهجي
 7. Ms.B اريد يكلمني الامير علي
 8. Ms. فترايا
 9. Ms. السور ; Ms.B الصور
 10. Ms.B adds من الصداقة
 11. Ms.B وانت تعرف اتابك وما هو عليه
 12. Ms.B وما لك ظهر مستند اليه
 13. Ms.B الواجب

تسلم والا ان اخذها بالسيف يجرى ما لا تقدر على دفعه¹ وبعد
 هذا ايضاً تنتظر فقال له يا امير حسان انتظر الفرج من الله تعالى
 وما انتظرت على منبج لما حاصرها الامير بك وكفاك الله امره
 فقال كمال الدين والله ما كان الا تلك الليلة نصف الليل وكان
 ذلك اليوم الاربعاء خامس شهر ربيع الاخر وقيل تاسعة سنة احدى
 واربعين وخمسمائة² والصايح³ من القلعة⁴ يصبح قتل آتابك يا ابن حسام
 الدين لك البشرى واختبط الناس وماجوا وكان سبب ذلك ان الامير
 آتابك كان يبيت في الخيمة وعنده خادم فما كان يبيت عنده غيره
 فلما نام تلك الليلة قتله الخادم في الخيمة فاخذ السكين
 بالدم وخرج وطلع الى الربض الى تحت القلعة وصاح اليهم قتلت
 آتابك فلم يصدقوه فأراهم السكين وعلامة اخرى كان اخذها من
 عنده فاصدوه اليهم وحققوا الحال منه وصاحوا فاختبط الناس
 واختلفوا وقصد⁴ الناس مخيم جمال الدين الوزير⁵ فنهب وانهزم
 وجاء الي⁶ وقصدني⁷ الامراء والكبار وركبت⁸ وقالوا ما رأى الملك

1. Ms.B لا تريد
2. Ms.B جاءنا
3. Ms.B الى القلعة
4. Ms. قصدوا
5. Ms.B المستوفي
6. Ms.B فاخفيته عند بعض اصحابي
7. Ms. وقصدوني
8. Ms.B adds فقلت الملك

فقتدوا وقصدت خيمة الملك آلب عملان¹ بن محمود وقلت انا
والناس وآتابك غلمان الملك والبلاد له والكل خدمه وممالكك
السلطان² فاجتمع الناس على الملك واطلق جمال الدين سربي
من البيعة³ وسيروه⁴ الى ماردين⁴
وتفرق الناس فريقين فاخذ صلاح الدين محمد⁵ ابن ايوب
اليغسياني⁶ نور الدين محمود بن آتابك وعسكر الشام ومضوا الى
الشام فملك حلب وحماة ومنبج وحران وحمص وجميع ما بيد
آتابك من الشام واستقر به وسرنا نحن مع الملك وعساكر ديار
ربيعة فطلبنا الموصل فوصلنا الى سنجار فانهزم الملك وطلب
الجزيرة فلحقه اخي تاج الدين ابو طاهر يحيى رحمه الله وعز
الدين ابو بكر الدهيسي وحلفا له ورداه الى المعسكر ونزلنا
الى الموصل و وصل سيف الدين غازي بن آتابك من بلد
شهرزور وكانت اقطاعه من السلطان فملك ديار ربيعة باسرها
وحمل الملك الى قلعة الثلو عند سنجار⁷ وملك الموصل وجميع

1. Ms. sic ; Ms.B أرسلان
2. Ms.B وقلت ايش كان اتابك والكل ممالك السلطان
3. Ms.B سير
4. Ms.B الى ابيه
5. Ms. محمد Ms.B محمود
6. Ms.B الاغسياني
7. Ms.B ويقال انه قتل الملك

البلاد وسيف الدين غازى استوزر جمال الدين محمد بن الاصفهاني
 وكان مستوفي ديوان ابيه (f.172b) واقطع¹ الجزيرة لعز الدين
 ابي² بكر الدبيسي³ واستقر في البلاد
 وتولى امير نور الدين صلاح الدين⁴ واسد الدين شيركوه
 واحتجب مجد الدين ابا بكر بن⁵ الداية وكانت امه داية نور
 الدين وهي رتبة وكان مجد الدين يخدمه من صباه فلما ولي الامير
 رد اليه الامر وولاه حلب واستقر في الشام
 وبعد ايام من قتل آتابك وثب اهل الرها من الارمن على
 من كان بها من المسلمين وقتلوا جماعة⁶ و وصل عز الدين الدبيسي
 و حسان صاحب منبج وجماعة من التركمان وتكاثروا عليها ونهبوها
 وفتحوها وقتل منها خلق كثير⁷ واقام بها جماعة
 وكان عند قتل آتابك السعيد حيام الدين بميفرقين فوصله الخبر
 المعر وهو في بستان المحوط فسار من وقته⁸ وكان قبل ذلك اليوم
 وصله الخبر بقبض ولده جمال الدين فضاقت صدره ثم وصله الخبر

1. Ms. وقطع

2. Ms. ابو

3. Ms.B adds وولى سيف الدين غازى زين الدين علي بن بكتكين
 وعز الدين الدبيسي

4. Ms.B adds وولده الاكبر

5. Ms. ابن

6. Ms.B adds وملكوها ونعدوا يستدعون الافرنج فاجتمع عليها خلق
 من المسلمين

7. Ms. خلقا كثيرا

8. Ms.B من ليلته

بقتله وسار الى حاني فنازلها وبقي عليها مدة ثم اخذها وكان
 فيها الامير غازى ابن المهري فتحها ثالث عشرين شهر ربيع
 الاخر سنة احدى واربعين وخمسمائة وسار فاخذ السيوان وجبل جور
 وبالقرنين¹ ونزل ثم اخذ شيختان (و)² الموزر و تل موزن
 وجملين ورأس عين الخابور وعاد وكنت في هذه السنة بماردين³
 و سار فخر الدين قرآرسلان⁴ وملك ارقنين وجرموك وتل
 خوم⁵ والهالار وجميع الحصون التي كان اخذها⁶ آتابك من ابيه
 الامير داود وملك جانب اسعد الشرقي⁷ وبهمود⁸ وباتاما وطنزى
 والروق وقطلبس وبلد صاف وقلعة الهيثم التي في جبل طورعبدین
 ونزل صاحب اخلاط شاه ارمن فملك خيزان و المعدن وايرون وجميع
 الولاية التي اخذها⁹ آتابك من الامير يعقوب
 وفي هذه السنة وهي سنة اثنتين واربعين وخمسمائة ضرب¹⁰
 السعيد حسام الدين الفلوس الصفار ومضيت الى المعدن واشترت
 صفرا برسم الفلوس
 وفي سنة ثلث واربعين مات عسلان¹¹ تغمشر بن الامير داود¹²
 و نازل السعيد حسام الدين اسعد اياما واخذها

1. Ms. sic
2. و has been added.
3. Ms.B بميردين ودينسر
4. Ms. sic
5. Ms. تل خرم
6. Ms. اخذ
7. Ms. حصل له من جانب الحصن اروق Ms.B ; جانب الشرقي اسعد
8. Ms. B باهمود
9. Ms. اخذ
10. Ms.B صرف
11. Ms. sic
12. Ms.B adds وخلف ابنا من ابنة الامير عاش بعده اياما قلائل ومات

وصل الى خدمته جمال الدين محمود صاحب آمد وجمال الدين
 ابو القاسم بن¹ نيسان² وكان معه على اسعد فلما اخذها عاد
 الى ميفرقين وبعد مدة ردها الى فخر الدين وفي هذه المدة
 ملك³ فخر الدين قرا أرسلان ميزكرد وعادت هدية خاتون الى
 ميفرقين وفي هذه السنة وقع الخلف بين السعيد حسام الدين
 وابن آتابك سيف الدين غازي ونهب بلد ماردين ونهب مماليك⁴
 جماعة

وفي هذه السنة وصلت الخاتون بنت عز الدين سلتق
 صاحبة اخلاط الى حصن كيفا طلبت⁵ الحجاز فانزلها فخر الدين
 قر أرسلان واحسن في اكرامها⁶ ووصل بهاء الدين⁷ الوزير
 واثير الدين عباد وعلم الدين بن طبن قاضي ارجيش ونزلوا في
 دار المؤيد⁸ بن مخطر بميفرقين واقاموا اياما ونفذ السعيد
 حسام الدين الى فخر الدين ومنعوا الخاتون من المسير الى

1. Ms. ابن
2. Ms. نيسان
3. Ms. omits a verb ; Ms.B ملك
4. Ms. ممالিকা
5. Ms. طالبت
Ms.B فطلب الحج
6. Ms. اكرامها (sic)
7. Ms.B adds اوس ابن ابي معاز (sic).
8. Ms.B المستوفي

الحجاز¹ وكان شاه ارمن سألهم ذلك فسألوا الخاتون حتى عادوا
جميعا الى خلاط

وفي هذه السنة مات المؤيد المستوفي ابو الحسن
المبارك بن مخطر وكان متولي الديوان وكان معه المهذب العراقي
مشرفا ودفن في ماردين في البيعة التي بناها و ولي موضعه
ولده الاجل كريم الدولة ابو منصور خالد و يلقب بلقب² ابيه
مؤيد الدولة كريم الملك واقام بشرائط الخدمة و تابع ما فوض
اليه و استقل وزاد على ما يرجو منه وحصل الامور كلها بحكمه
قيل وفي سنة اثنتين واربعين وخمسة مائة مات الخليفة
الحافظ بمصر و ولي موضعه ولده المنصور اسماعيل و يلقب
بالظافر وكان السلطان امير الجيوش العادل السلار من المختبي
وقرر امر الدولة ورتب العساكر واستقر الظافر بالخلافة
قيل في سنة اثنتين واربعين وخمسة مائة قبض آتابك
غازي على القاضي كمال الدين و تاج الدين ابني عبد الله
الشهرزوري وكان امر الدولة من حيث قتل آتابك زنكي اليه
فسمى جمال الدين الوزير و زين الدين في ذلك³ وقبض⁴ عليهما ورفعا
الى قلعة الموصل واستحضر⁵ القاضي نجم الدين ابا علي بن بهاء

1. Ms. B ورد فخر الدين الى خلاط ولم يمكنها من المسير الى الحجاز
2. Ms. لقب
3. Ms. written in left margin. في ذلك صح
4. Ms. وقبضا
5. Ms. استحضروا

الدين ابن الحسن بن علي بن القسم الشهرزوري من الرحبة وكان
 بها متولي القضاء فانه لما مات بهاء الدين الشهرزوري في سنة
 اثنتين وثلاثين وخمسمائة بالرقعة على ما ذكرناه ولي قضاء بلاد
 آتابك اجمع ولده القاضي نجم الدين ابو الحسن بن علي و ولي
 ابن اخيه شمس الدين ابو احمد الموصل و ولي كمال الدين
 قضاء نصيبين و العسكر و ولي تاج الدين ابو طاهر قضاء
 الجزيرة و ولي شرف الدين اخو بهاء الدين سنجار وكل منهم ولي
 مستقلا من غير نيابة فانهم كانوا جميعهم في هذى¹ المواضع
 نيابة عن بهاء الدين فلما مات تولى هؤلاء² هذه البلاد
 و ولي نجم الدين ولد بهاء الدين باقي البلاد اجمع فيها
 القضاة نوابه وبقي الى سنة ثلث وثلاثين وخمسمائة و تولى شمس
 الدين ابو احمد موضع قاضي القضاة بالموصل و خدم نجم الدين
 فاخذ قضاء الموصل مضافا الى ما كان بيده وبقي الى سنة خمس
 وثلاثين و خمسمائة وقبض نجم الدين متولي نصيبين وصودر وحبس
 وعوقب عقوبة (f.173b) عظيمة و اخذ منه مصادرة ما يقارب مائة
 الف وثلثين الف دينار أمرية و ولي كمال الدين ابو الفضل
 محمد بن عبد الله الشهرزوري البلاد جميعها واستقل بالامر
 وحصلت الولاية من القضاء والبلاد والمعسكر وجميع الامور مردودة

1. Ms. sic

The scribe often prefers this form.

2. Ms. هاؤلاء

الى كمال الدين الى ان قتل آتابك على ما ذكرناه
 وبقي نجم الدين في الحبس مدة اربع سنين ثم ان القاضي
 كمال الدين توصل في اخراجه و ولاء قضاء الرحبة فانه كان في
 ايام ابيه بهاء الدين وبقي فيه الى ان قبض كمال الدين على ما
 ذكرناه و حضر و ولي الموصل و رتب ولده الأكبر بهاء الدين على
 ما ذكرناه بالرحبة واستقر هو بالموصل وبقي كمال الدين وتاج
 الدين في حبس الموصل بالقلعة مدة فنفاذ الامام المقتفي الخليفة
 رحمة الله عليه جماعة¹ ١٠٠٠٠٠٠ رسلا الى الموصل فتوصلوا في
 اخراجها الى دورهما ورتب على باب كل واحد منهما رجلين
 خراسانيين² بحيث لا يدخلون ولا يخرجون و اخذ ولد كمال الدين
 ابو احمد الجلال و (ولد)³ تاج الدين ابو الفضائل⁴ الضياء
 وحبسما في قلعة الموصل فاستبد نجم الدين بقضاء الموصل واقطع
 عز الدين ابا⁵ بكر الدبيسي الجزيرة ورتب فيها قاضيا يعرف
 بابن حمزة من اهل دقوقا مدة⁶

قيل وكان في سنة ست وثلثين وخمسمائة ولي الوزير نظام
 الدين ابو جعفر وقيل المظفر محمد بن الزعيم بن جهير وزارة
 الخليفة بعد ما عاد الاذن من السلطان مسعود بعزل شرف الدين
 الزينبي و ولي قوام الدين بن صدقة المخزن على ما ذكرناه وبقي

1. Ms. There is a lacuna here.
2. Ms. خراسينية
3. ولد has been added.
4. Ms. الفضائل
5. Ms. ابو
6. Ms.B وولى الجزيرة الدقوقي

الوزير الى سنة احدى واربعين وخمسمائة في الوزارة ومضى الى مكة و حج وعاد الى بغداد و في هذه السنة حج بهاء الدين ابو طاهر بن عقيل بن طاهر بن نباتة من ميفرقين و دخل الى بغداد و حضر دار الخلافة و اورد فعلا بحضور الوزير نظام الدين و رشيد الدولة ابن الانباري رحمهما الله و جمع ارباب دولة الخليفة وعاد و خلع عليه الخليفة وكان صحبه¹ غير القضاة ابو الفتح ابن العمراني و بعد عود الوزير الى بغداد بقي مدة و عزل من الوزارة و ولي قوام الدين بن صدقة الوزارة² و ولي المخزن زعيم الدين بن جعفر و ولي الديوان الاجل جمال الدين ابو المظهر بن هبة

قيل و في سنة ثلث و اربعين وخمسمائة ماتت الخاتون فاطمة زوجة الخليفة المقتني ببغداد و في سنة ثلث و اربعين وخمسمائة حضر الشيخ شرف الدين بن سعد بن³ عصرون من الموصل و عقد على زمرد خاتون بنت السعيد حسام الدين (f.174a) لاتبك⁴ غازي وكان الاملاك بقصر ميافارقين على عشرين الف دينار و كان الوالي⁵ الشيخ عز الشيوخ ابو القاسم بن⁶ حبشي و في شعبان سنة ثلث⁷ و اربعين وخمسمائة وصل عز الدولة ابو نصر بن⁸ نيسان الى ميفرقين و عقد على صفية خاتون بنت

-
1. Ms. صحبه
 2. Ms. الوزارة
 3. Ms. ابن
 4. Ms. اتابك
 5. Ms. sic (?). الولي
 6. Ms. ابن
 7. Ms. ثلث written above the line, on it.
 8. Ms. ابن

السعيد حسام الدين لجمال الدين شمس الملوك محمود بن ايللدى¹
صاحب آمد على خمسة² الاف³ دينار⁴ وكان الوالي⁵ الخطيب تاج
العلماء الحصلي⁶ وحملها في⁶ الخمس الاواخر من شعبان الى آمد
وفي سنة ثلث واربعين وخمسمائة حضر الامير بهاء الدين
سيونج بن كهمش (و)⁷ الوزير ضياء الدين⁸ من عند الامير فخر
الدين دولت شاه بن طغان أرسلان صاحب ارزن وبدليس وعقدا على
نورة خاتون بنت السعيد حسام الدين⁹ على خمسين الف دينار وكان
الوالي¹⁰ وكان العقد بميفرقين
وكان في سنة ثمان وثلثين وخمسمائة مات حسام الدولة
قرتى¹¹ بارزن وولي الامارة اخوه شمس الدين ياقوت أرسلان الى
سنة اربعين وخمسمائة ونفذ اخاه دولت شاه الى خدمة آتابك زنكي

-
1. Ms. sic
 2. Ms. خمس
 3. Ms. الف
 4. Ms.B خمسين الف دينار
 5. Ms. sic (?) الوالي
 6. Ms. sic (?)
 7. و has been added.
 8. Ms.B adds ايوب
 9. Ms.B adds لفخر الدين دولت شاه بن طغان أرسلان
 10. Ms. sic (?) الوالي
 11. Ms. قوتى

لما عبر واخذ بلاد الامير داود بعد موته ثم مات ياقوت أرسلان
يوم السبت مستهل شهر رمضان سنة اربعين وخمسمائة و سار ضياء
الدين ايوب¹ الى معسكر آتابك فجابوا² الامير دولت شاه ويلقب
بفخر³ الدين وعبر به على باب ميفرقين وسار الى ارزن وملك
البلاد واستبد بالامارة و ملك جميع ولاية ابيه و اخوته⁴ و كان
ضياء الدين ايوب تزوج امه وانتقل⁵ الى السعيد حسام الدين وفي
ذي الحجة وصلوا الى ميفرقين و اخذوا الخاتون و ساروا بها
الى ارزن وعمل العرس بميفرقين⁶
وفي سنة ثلث و اربعين وخمسمائة سار تاج الدين ابو
سالم طاهر بن نباتة الى الحجاز ودخل بغداد وحضر ديوان الخلافة
وفي سنة ثلث و اربعين وخمسمائة عاد الوزير مكين الدين المصري
الى ميفرقين و ولاه السعيد حسام الدين الوزارة وبقي اياما
وكنت في هذه السنة متولي اشراف ظاهر بلد ميفرقين وبقي مدة ثم

-
1. Ms.B adds وكان زوج امه
 2. Ms. sic ; وعاد به الى ارزن Ms.B
 3. Ms. فخر
 4. Ms.B اخيه
 5. Ms.B اتصل Ms. ز انتقل
 6. Ms.B ووصل بهاء الدين سونج بن واخذها و سار الى ارزن وبقيت عنده مدة

انه قبض المؤيد والمهذب وعاقبهما بالقصر اياما ثم انه رتب العميد بن¹ ابي طاهر بن المحتسب في عمل حساب الديوان فجلس يومين لا غير و رسم السعيد حسام الدين بعزله و صفه وحلق لحيته و ركب حمارا و دوروا به في البلد ونفي و اصرف عن البلد و بقي الوزير اياما ثم خرج بعد المصير و غلامه خلفه و سير حول البلد ثم طلب طريق حصن كيفا و مضى فقبل للسعيد حسام الدين قد هرب فقال ما اخذ منا شيئا فلا تطلبوه فمضى و في بكرة الغد اعيد المؤيد و المهذب الى الديوان واستقر امرهما و عادا الى اوفى منزلة

قيل و في سنة اربع و اربعين و خمسمائة خرج ابن آتابك غازي (f.174b) الى باب نصيبين و نفذ الامير جلدك الخليفة الى ماردين و اخذ زمرد خاتون الى باب نصيبين و نزل معها صمصام الدين و مرض ابن² آتابك سيف الدين غازي فحملت الى الموصل و نزلت في درب دراج و في دار الخاتون بنت سكرمان زوجة آتابك زنكي و دخل سيف الدين غازي وهو مريض على شدة و اقام بالموصل و قد نفذ الى بغداد فاحضروا الحكيم ابا البركات فحضر و عالجه اياما و مات في صفر سنة اربع³ و اربعين و خمسمائة و ولي الامارة اخوه قطب الدين مودود⁴ بن آتابك⁵ و استقر في الامارة و رتب الدولة جمال الدين الوزير و زين الدين و عز

1. Ms. ابن
2. Ms. بن written above the line.
3. Ms. اربعة
4. Ms.B مودود ; مودود
5. Ms. ابن

الدين¹ و دفن سيف الدين غازى في المدرسة العمادية²
 وبعد موت سيف الدين³ اطلق القاضي كمال الدين واخوه
 من دورهما⁴ و استدعيا الى الميدان⁵ وكنت في هذه السنة
 بالموصل في خدمة السعيد حسام الدين في بيع الحديد وكنت حاضرا
 بالميدان وكان نفذ الوزير جمال الدين لهما بغلتين فركبا وحضرا
 الميدان داخل الموصل فلما دخلا باب الميدان وقد غيرا شياهما
 وركبا بغير طرحات ترجلا فلما رأهما آتابك قطب الدين طلبهما
 وترجل لهما ولقياه⁶ وعزياه عن اخيه و هناه⁷ بالامارة وركبا⁸
 ووقفا من ناحيته وبقيا⁹ ساعة وعادا الى مقرهما وازالوا
 الاجناد من على ابوابهما وحصلا يركبان ويمطيان¹⁰ في كل اسبوع
 الى خدمة آتابك وزين الدين وجمال الدين وبعد مدة نفذوا
 وقرروا الحال مع السعيد حسام الدين¹¹ وعقد آتابك قطب الدين
 على زمرد خاتون بعد انقضاء مدة الوفاء¹² و دخل بها بالموصل

1. واستقر بوساطة زين الدين والديسي وجمال الدين الوزير Ms.B
2. Ms.B adds بالموصل
3. Ms.B adds باربعة ايام
4. Ms. دورهم
5. Ms.B adds بباب الدار الاتابكية
6. Ms.B وعانقهم
7. Ms. هناه
8. Ms.B وركب وركبا
9. Ms. وبقوا
10. Ms. in left margin. يمطيان صح
11. Ms.B (?) متقرر ذلك على ان مدينة دارا
12. Ms. الوفاة

وفي آخر سنة اربع¹ واربعين نازل السعيد حسام الدين
مدينة دارا وامتنع الوالي من تسليمها² فحاصرها مدة ثم
سلمها اليه يوم الاربعاء ثاني عشر ذي الحجة³ وملكها ورتب
فيها واليا الحاجب ابن بقش الدنيسرى وكنت بالمعسكر⁴ حتى فتحها
في خدمة السعيد حسام الدين وفي هذه السنة سنة اربع واربعين
احترق سوق القبة بميفارقين وفي هذه السنة في ذي الحجة وقع
الخلف بين اولاد العميد تاج الدين ابي سالم بن نباتة⁵ وسار
ضياء الدين الى دارا فلقى السعيد حسام الدين وخدم واخذ القفلاء
وعاد الى ميفارقين وفي⁶ ثاني عشر محرم سنة اربع⁷ واربعين
وخمسمائة ولد قطب الدين⁸ ايل غازى ولد المالك نجم الدين
دام ظلهما

وفي سنة اربع⁹ واربعين وخمسمائة اخذت الافرنج المرية
(f.175a) من المسلمين ونهب وحمل نهبها وبيع¹⁰ بديار مصر والساحل

-
1. Ms. اربعة
 2. The Ms. has a lacuna here اليه (?)
 3. Ms. ذو
 4. Ms.B adds وكنت اذ ذاك بالمعسكر
 5. Ms. ابن
 6. Ms. (sic) في سنة ثاني
 7. Ms. اربعة
 8. Ms. ابن ايل غازى
 9. Ms. اربعة
 10. Ms. بيع ; Ms.B ابيع

والشام

وفي سنة خمس واربعين وخمسمائة املك صمصام الدين بهرام بن¹ السعيد حسام الدين بهنت آتابك اخت قطب الدين وكنت وقت الاملاك في الموصل

وفي² سنة خمس واربعين وخمسمائة نهب العرب بنو زعب وغيرهم³ وذباب وبطران آخر الحاج واخذوا جميع ما كان معهم بين مكة والمدينة عند موضع يسمى سد وتلف خلق كثير عظيم⁴ ولم يسمع بذلك الا من سنين بعيدة ولم يسلم الا الاقل من الناس وكنت في هذه السنة بالموصل مقيما

وملك حسام الدين باولاده جميع امراء⁵ ديار بكر وديار ربيعة وارمنية واتصاله بهم⁶ ولم يبق بعد آتابك زنكي امير مستقل بنفسه من غير معارض ولا منازع ولا من يحكم عليه غير الصعيد حسام الدين⁷

وفي سنة خمس واربعين وخمسمائة مات معين الدين انر بدمشق وفيها⁸ لقي نور الدين محمود بن زنكي ملك الشام الافرنج

1. Ms. ابن
2. Ms.B adds في المحرم
3. Ms.B نهب العرب الحاج
4. Ms. تلف خلق عظيم written above the line; Ms.B
5. Ms.B ملوك
6. Ms. B Ms. sic ز امراءها باتصاله اليهم
7. Ms.B has لم يبق بعد آتابك زنكي باتصاله اليهم After اميرا (sic) مستقل بنفسه يحكم في ولايته في غير معارض ولا منازع ولا يعمل الا ما يأمره غيره
8. Ms.B في المحرم

وكسرهم اقبح كسرة واسر ابن جوسلين صاحب الرها وما حولها
وملكت بلاده جميعها وملك نور الدين تل باشر وما حولها وتل
خالد وما يليها¹ وملك السعيد حسام الدين سميطا وفي سادس
شهر ربيع الاول سنة خمس واربعين وخمسمائة ملك البيرة وفي
سنة ست واربعين قتل في هذه الكسرة الحاجب عمر الخاص وكان
في خدمة نور الدين وملك فخر الدين قر² أرسلان من ولاية ابن
جوسلين حصن منصور وبابلوا واخذ من الارمن قلعة كركر وملك
السلطان قليج أرسلان مرعش وكيسوم وما جاورها ولم يبق لابن
جوسلين من الولاية غير قلعة الروم³ ولو عاش السعيد حسام الدين
كان ملكها⁴

وفي سنة خمس واربعين وخمسمائة مات معين الدين انر

بدمشق

وفي سنة ست واربعين سافرت الى خلاط وعدت انحدرت الى
بغداد فوصلتها سابع عشرين شهر رمضان واقمت بها وفي سنة ست
واربعين طهر السعيد حسام الدين اولاد الامير جمال الدين سربي
بميفرقين

وفي سبع واربعين وصل الى السعيد حسام الدين منشور
من السلطان والخليفة وقرئ على المنبر بالبلاد⁵ ووصلت الخلع⁶

-
1. Ms.B has ما يليها instead of ولاية كثيرة
 2. Ms. sic ; Ms.B قرا أرسلان
 3. Ms.B has ولم يبق على الفرات موضع ليس هوللمسلمين غير قلعة الروم
 4. Ms. كان قد ملكها ; Ms.B وكان ملكها
 5. Ms.B adds واجتمع الناس
 6. is supplied from Ms.B وصلت

وبعد ليلتين وهي ليلة الاثنين ثاني عشرين شهر ربيع الاول سنة
 سبع واربعين انهدم الجامع بميفرقين موضع المنبر و الاروقة¹
 وكنت ببغداد و اجتمعت ببغداد بقطب الدين العبادى الواعظ
 وصحبته مدة وكتبت عنه شياً كثيراً من مجالس
 وكان سنة اربع واربعين في آخرها ولي الوزارة عون
 الدين المظفر محمد بن يحيى بن² هبيرة وعزل قوام الدين بن³
 صدقة من الوزارة واستقر عون الدين فيها وكان اليه ديوان
 الزمام والاستيفاء و ولي ديوان الزمام⁴ جلال الدين
 ابن جعفر اخو صاحب المخزن وكان ابوهما من اهل قرية باعقوبا⁵
 وكان وزير لمجاهد الدين بهروز مدة حياته وبقي الخليفة مستقر
 الاحوال

وفي سنة ست واربعين وصل السلطان مسعود الي بغداد
 واقام بها جميع الشتوة⁶ ورأيته في هذه السنة ببغداد ورأيت
 الفيل والبهفة والقرد وسار السلطان الي باب همذان فمرض في
 جمادى⁷ الاولى سنة سبع واربعين وبقي الي حادى عشر جمادى⁸

1. Ms.B موقع موضع المنبر و الاروقة ونقض الباقي وحفر اساس القبة وابتدى
2. Ms. ابن
3. Ms. provided from Ms.B. بن
4. Ms. الذمام
5. Ms. بايعقوبا
6. Ms.B adds الي الربيع
7. Ms. جمدى
8. Ms. جمدى

الآخرة¹ ومات بهاب همذان وحمل الى اصفهان فاقمت ببغداد الى
 اول رجب من السنة وسرت الى ميفرقين فلما وصلنا الى تكريت
 وقع الخبر بان² السلطان قد مات فاخبط الناس وسرنا الى
 الموصل
 وخرج الخليفة ونزل في دار السلطان وملك بغداد³ وهرب
 مسعود بلال الى تكريت وكان شحنة بغداد وكان قد عمل امارا
 الحج سنين ولقي الناس منه كل خير وراحة وجند الخليفة الجنود
 والعاكر فاسقط المؤمن والاعشار⁴ التي كان يأخذها اصحاب
 السلطان واحسن الى الناس وعدل في الرعية وحصل العراق
 واشتغل ارتفاع العراق جميعه⁵ فانه كان للسلطان والخواتين
 واصحاب السلطان بالعراق معيشة عشرين الف فارس فحصل الجميع
 للخليفة

ولما مات السلطان مسعود بهاب همذان كان السلطان
 محمد شاه بن محمود⁶ وكان صهره على ابنته في خوزستان وكان
 معه في المعسكر⁷ اخوه ملك شاه بن محمود فرتب خاصهيك بن
 اليلنكري في السلطنة مدة⁸ فلما سمع محمد شاه سار من خوزستان

1. Ms. الآخر
2. Ms. ان
3. Ms.B adds وملك العراق واستبد به
4. Ms.B adds والمكوس بأسرها
5. Ms.B حصل جميع العراق بحكمه ونفذ العساكر واخذت الحلة
 وواسط واشتغل بارتفاع العراق جميعه
6. Ms.B ملك شاه ; محمود ابن محمود.
7. Ms. في المعسكر
8. Ms.B تتملك وترتب في السلطنة وبقي مدة

الى همدان واخذ السلطنة¹ وسار اخوه ملك شاه فملك خوزستان
والاهواز وطرفا من البصرة وبقي مدة وقتل خاصيك بن² البلنكري
واستبد بالسلطنة محمد شاه وكان السلطان مسعود رحمه الله
سلطانا عادلا لين الجانب كبير النفس بحيث انه فرق ولايته
اجمع على اصحابه وما كان له غير الاسم من السلطنة وكان مع
لين جانبه ما حارب احدا الا ظفر به وقتل من الامراء الكبار
ما لاقتل غيره منهم منكوروش وقراجا الساقى صاحب فرس³
وشيراز وقتل عباس صاحب الري وقتل الراشد والمسترشد ودهيس
وبوزباه⁴ وعبد الرحمن بن طغريبك⁵ وجماعة من الامراء (و)⁶
الاسفهلارية الكبار وسعد سعادة عظيمة ومات وخلف ثلثة⁷ بنين
صغار واستقر محمد شاه في السلطنة وملك همدان واصفهان وما
حولها⁸ من غير خطبة بالعراق

قيل وفي سنة سبع واربعين ملك فخر الدين قرا آرسلان
حصن كركر من الارمن (و)⁹ في سنة سبع واربعين وخمسمائة تزوج
جلال الملوك كيك بن¹⁰ سليمان بن عبد الجبار (f.176a) بن ارتق
بهديّة خاتون بنت السعيد حسام الدين بسفارة امه الملكة بنت

-
1. Ms.B has ثم نفذ ابن البلنكري واحضر اخاه من خوزستان واستقر في السلطنة
 2. Ms. ابن
 3. Ms. برس
 4. Ms. sic
 5. Ms. sic
 6. و is provided from Ms.B
 7. Ms. ثلث
 8. Ms. B has instead of ذلك الجانب ماحولها
 9. و is provided from Ms.B
 10. Ms. ابن

رضوان زوجة حسام الدين

وفي سنة خمس واربعين كان وصل الى ماردين الوزير زين الدين اسعد بن عبد الخالق اخو المؤيد زين الدين وزير السلطان واقام عند حسام الدين واستوزره وبقي في الديوان ومعه المؤيد المستوفي والمهذب² واستناب رجلا كاتباً يلقب بالشهاب³ واستقر في الوزارة الى سنة ست⁴ واربعين وخمسمائة وكان في سنة اربع واربعين وخمسمائة ماتت صفة خاتون بآمد

وفي اول سنة ست واربعين خرج السعيد حسام الدين ونازل آمد⁵ وطلبهم بصداق صفة خاتون وبقي مدة⁶ ورحل عن آمد الى ماردين⁷ وبقي اياماً ونفذ ابن نيسان رجلين فاقاما بقلعة ماردين يعملان بالفاعل اياماً ثم ان الوزير زين الدين ركب ذات يوم وصعد الى القلعة فجاز في موضع ضيق فخرج عليه ذاك⁸ الرجلان فضربه احدهما بفأس في رأسه فوق فطلب جماعة كانوا بين يدي الوزير الرجلين⁹ فقالا¹⁰ لهم ما تريدون نحن نصد

1. اخي المؤيد الذي كان وزير البرستي وحصل وزير السلطان Ms.B
2. ورتب المؤيد والمهذب معه بالديوان على حالهما Ms.B
3. وهو الان في ديوان صاحب ارزن Ms.B adds
4. Ms. سنة
5. ونازلها وضايقها واقطع البلد Ms.B adds
6. على جسر الحو Ms.B adds
7. ثم رحل الى تل العلوية وجرى بينهم خطاب عظيم واخذ Ms.B الغلة تلك السنة ثم ان ابن نيسان دبر امره ورحل الامير عنه
8. Ms. اوليك (sic)
9. Ms.B الرجل ورفيقه
10. Ms. فقال ; Ms.B فقال

معكم الى الامير¹ فصعدا مع القوم الى باب القلعة² والناس خلفهما³ ودخلا القلعة الى بين يدي الامير وقالوا نحن قتلنا الوزير فقال ولما فقالا امرنا بذلك واكثر الناس قالوا ان ابن نيسان دس عليه⁴ وقتله فامر الامير حسام الدين بضرب رقابهما على قبره وكان دفن بماردين وكان الرجلان من الملاحدة وعاد حسام الدين نزل⁵ على آمد وضايقها فحضر بهاء الدين اوس وزير اخلاط فاجتمع بالسعيد حسام الدين على باب آمد⁶ وتحدث معه وسأله فيهم ثم دخل الى آمد واجتمع بمؤيد الدين ابن نيسان وقرر معه الحال فخرج مؤيد الدين الى الامير واستقر الصلح وخرج⁷ الآمدية الى السعيد حسام الدين وحصلوا من جملته وتحت امره⁸ ورحل عنهم

وفي العشر الاواخر⁹ من شهر رجب سنة ست واربعين وخمسة مائة ماتت نورة خاتون بنت حسام الدين عند صاحب ارزن

1. Ms.B adds ونخبره اننا قتلناه
2. Ms.B adds وقالوا للأسفهلراعلم الامير اننا قد قتلنا الوزير
3. Ms. خلفهم
4. Ms.B من قتله
5. Ms.B فنزل
6. Ms.B على ولاية آمد
7. Ms. خرجوا
- 8 Ms.B وخرجوا الآمدية الى خدمته وحصلوا في خدمته وخرج اليه مؤيد الدين في النبوة الاولى وعاد رده الى آمد و خرج من بكرة الامير والخاتون واولاد الامير واولاد الرئيس واستقرت قاعدتهم

و خلفت ابنا عاش بعدها اباما و مات و دفنت بارزن و ضاق صدر
السعيد حسام الدين لموتها¹ و بقي حسام الدين بعد قتل الوزير
زين الدين بغير وزير و اکتفى بالاجل مؤيد الدولة² ابي منصور
خالد بن³ المبارك بن مخطر الى ان مات فقام بما فوض اليه
احسن القيام

و بقي السعيد حسام الدين في الولاية⁴ الى يوم الخميس

ثاني ذى القعدة سنة ثمان و اربعين و خمسمائة و توفي بماردين
و كان مرضه من يوم السبت الى يوم الخميس⁵ ثاني ذى القعدة و دفن
بالمشهد تحت ماردين و كانت ولايته ميفرقين ثلثين سنة

و ماردين اثنتين و ثلثين سنة (f.176 b) فرضي الله عنه و كان
اميرا عالما مطلعا على جميع العلوم يحب اهل العلم و يخالطهم
ويكرم ارباب الفضل من كل صناعة و كان كريما جوادا مفضالا لا
يرى القتل الا عند الضرورة و كان له من الذمة و الجوار ما لا
كان للعرب العرباء⁶ و لقد قعه الامير ابو⁷ بكر صاحب نصيبين
منهزما من آتاهك زنكي فذم له و طلبه آتاهك ولم يسلمه اليه
و جرى بينهما امر عظيم⁸ و اخذ آتاهك دارا و نهب البلاد و خرج عن

1. Ms.B ولحق الامير عليها امر عظيم

2. Ms.B adds كريم الملك

3. Ms. ابن

4. Ms.B الامارة

5. Ms.B وجميع مرضه من يوم السبت و انقطع من الاحد الى الخميس

6. Ms. وكان له من الذمة و حسن الجوار ما لا كان للعرب Ms.B للعرباء للعرب

7. Ms. ابا

8. Ms. adds لاجله

يد السيد حسام الدين مال عظيم¹ ولم يسلمه وهو كان سبب

الوحشة بين السيد وبين آتابك ثم انفصل عنه ومضى الى

السلطان مسعود فقبضه السلطان ونفذه الى آتابك² فقتله³

وكان السيد حسام الدين رحمه الله يراعي ارباب البيوت

وينظر في احوالهم ولا يرى قلع البيوت الكبار⁴ وكان اذا قصده

رجل من اصحاب العمائم والعلوم⁵ انزله واكرمه واحسن اليه

وافضل اليه جميع ما يحتاج اليه⁶ وكان اذا تحقق في رجل شياً

من اي العلوم كان قربه وادناه واعطاه وسأله⁷ عما يعلمه من

علم وصناعة

وكنت لما مات بولاية الكرج في خدمة ملك الابخاز ديمطري

بن داود ملك الولاية باسرها فاني كنت دخلت في سنة ثمان

واربعين الى تفليس و وصلت الى خدمته و سرت معه الى ولاية

الان⁸ و الابخاز و الدر بند و كنا ذات يوم قريبا من بلد الدر بند

و كان ذلك اليوم رابع المحرم سنة تسع واربعين وخمسائة

فاستدعاني وقال ان صاحبكم حسام الدين قد مات وقد وصلني

الخير في هذا اليوم⁹

1. Ms. مالا عظيما

2. Ms.B نسيذ آتابك في طلبه فتسلمه اليه فحمله الى آتابك

3. Ms. written in the left margin. فقتله

4. Ms.B قلع بيت قديم

5. Ms.B وكان يقصده جماعة من ارباب البيوتات من جميع البلاد

6. Ms.B ويعطيهم ويقوم عليهم الاقامة والراتب مدة مقامهم في خدمته

7. Ms. سله

8. Ms. sic

9. Ms.B وقال وصلني الخير بموت صاحبكم

و كان ولي ميفرقين في ايامه جماعة من الولاة منهم
الحاجب ابو بكر وبيرم و عثمان¹ بن² خمرتاش الحاج كل منهم مرة
الا³ الحاجب بيرم فولي مرتين ثم ولي الحاجب عبد الكريم ثم
عزل و ولي الحاجب يوسف ينال ثم عزل واعطي تحت دارا اقطاعا⁴
واخذها منه آتاهك زنكي و ولي ميفرقين مملوكا كان للامير اسمه
قزغلي مدة و مات وجلس في القصر الامير قيمار الخادم والحاجب
مدة ثم ولي الحاجب برنقش مدة⁵ و عاد الحاجب يوسف ينال مرة
ثانية و بقي في الولاية الى⁶ ثالث رجب سنة تسع وثلثين و مات
و دفن بميفرقين ثم ولي ناصر الدولة صندل في ذي القعدة سنة
تسع وثلثين و بقي الى⁷ شهر ربيع الاول سنة ثلث واربعين و مات
و بقي ولده غرس الدولة ينال بهرج الملك وجلس الحاجب بيرم
في القصر مدة و استقل ينال بالولاية و بقي واليا الى ان
مات السعيد حسام الدين رحمه الله على ما ذكرناه ان شاء الله
تعالى

1. Ms. sic عثمان ; Ms.B
2. Ms.B بنو
3. Ms. الى Ms.B الا
4. Ms.B قلعة سرجة
5. Ms.B يرنقش الحسامي
6. Ms.B adds الجمعة
7. Ms.B adds الى الخميس في

و انا اذكر نسب الارتقين¹

وما وصل الي من احوالهم و من بقي من نسل (f.177a) الامير
ارتق رحمه الله قيل لما مات الامير ارتق خلف اولادا جماعة منهم
الامير سيمان ونجم الدين غازي² وبهرام وعبد الجبار وسياويش³
و آلب يارق واهنا آخر نذكر اسمه⁴ بكداش و اهنا آخر اسمه
آلبتاش و هؤلاء⁵ الذين اعقبوا وبقي نسلهم الى الان بديار بكر
وخلف غير هؤلاء⁶ وما سمعت بان⁷ لهم الان عقباً⁸ فاهملت ذكرهم
فاما سيمان فانه ملك حصن كيفا وبقي مدة ومات سنة
ست وخمسةائة وخلف الامير ركن الدولة داود والامير ابراهيم
وملك حصن كيفا بعد ابيه مدة ومات وملكها بعده ركن الدولة
داود وازر خاتون وملك ركن الدولة⁹ حصن كيفا بعده وملك غيرها
بعد ذلك واولد اربعة¹⁰ بنين هم " آرسلان تغمش و قر آرسلان

1. ونحن نذكر الامراء الذين من نسل ارتق Ms.B
2. الغازي Ms.B
3. ساوس Ms.B
4. اسمه is written as an alternative above نسله Ms
5. هاولا Ms.
6. هاولا Ms.
7. ان Ms.
8. عقب Ms.
9. وملك حصن كيفا بعد ابيه مدة ومات وملكها بعده ركن الدولة وازر خاتون وملك ركن الدولة صح Ms.

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

10. اربع Ms.
11. هما Ms.

و سليمان و محمود و اما أرسلان تغمش فمات وكان ملك ميزکرد
 وكان ملكها بعد ابيه وخلف ابنها من ابنة السعيد حسام الدين
 و مات بعد ابيه بمدة يسيرة واما سليمان فانه مات وخلف ابنها
 اسمه يعقوب هو الان في خدمة المالك¹ نجم الدين و ابنها آخر
 هو في خدمة جمال الدين في حاني و اما محمود فملك² طنزى
 والقريشة³ و مات وخلف ابنها يسمى داود وهو في خدمة اولاد عمه
 فخر الدين بحصن كيفا و اما فخر الدين قر أرسلان فانه ملك
 البلاد جميعها التي كانت لابيه بعد موته على ما ذكرناه و مات
 وخلف ابنين هما نور الدين محمد⁴ و عماد الدين ابو بكر و ولي
 الامر⁵ بعده نور الدين وهو الان في الملك وخلف بناتنا جماعة
 و اما الامير بهرام بن⁶ ارتق فانه خلف الامير نور
 الدولة بك و ملك خرتبيت وبالوا⁷ و ما حولها واخذها منه شمس
 الدولة سليمان بن⁸ الغازى واخذها بعد ذلك الامير داود بعد

- 1 . Ms. الملك
- 2 . Ms. ملك
- 3 . Ms. sic
- 4 . Ms. محمود
- 5 . Ms. الامير
- 6 . Ms. ابن
- 7 . Ms. sic Ms.B بالود
- 8 . Ms. ابن

موت سليمان و كان تزوج بالملكة فرخندا خاتون بنت الملك
 رضوان بعد نجم الدين الغازي وهو دخل بها وملك طرفا من قرب
 الفرات وكان يغزوا¹ الافرنج وقتل على منبج على ما ذكرناه وخلف
 بنتا تزوجها فخر الدين فراآرملان ومات عنها

واما سیاويش بن ارتق فانه خلف الامير يونس الحرامي
 ورأيت في خدمة السعيد حسام الدين رحمه الله² واولد اولادا
 منهم في خدمة اولاد فخر الدين بحصن كيفا والامير سيونج وهو
 في حاني في خدمة جمال الدين اخي³ المالك⁴ نجم الدين و تزوج
 ببنت الامير شيرباريك و اولد منها ابنا اسمه شاه ملك وماتت
 وتزوج باخت لها اخرى

و اما آلب يارق بن ارتق فانه خلف اولادا منهم الامير
 علي ملك جبل جور و اولد الامير ممدود وهو شيرباريك و ابنا
 آخر مات اسمه محمود و اولد ابنا اسمه⁵ وهو في خرتبيت
 وتزوج شاه ملك ببنت شيرباريك في سنة سبع وخمسة و اولد
 شيرباريك سيونج و اسمعيل و طغربك⁶ وبناتا جماعة و اولد ابنا

1. Ms. يغزوا
2. Ms.B adds ومات في خدمته
3. Ms. اخو
4. Ms. الملك
5. Ms. has a lacuna here
6. Ms. sic

من جارية اسمه زنكي وبقي في خدمة ابيه مدة و مضى
الى مصر و توفي بها في ايام شاور واما طغربك¹ فمات بحصن كيفا
و حمل الى ميصرقين و اما سيونج وكان اكبرهم فتزوج² بصفية
خاتون بنت الملك رضوان ومات ولم يعقب و اما اسمعيل فله
ولدان ذكران³ وهو في خدمة المالك⁴ نجم الدين وبقي شيرباريك
في خدمة المالك⁵ حسام الدين الى ان مات وانتقل الى خدمة فخر
الدين قرا أرسلان وبقي عنده مدة وعاد الى خدمة المالك نجم
الدين و مات في رجب سنة ست وستين وخمسائة ودفن في قرية
لهم في اسفل المقابر
و اما عبد الجبار بن⁶ ارتق فانه خلف ثلاثة⁷ بنين
اغسيان و أرسلان⁸ وسليمن فاما اغسيان⁹ فانه انتقل وخدم

1. Ms. sic
2. Ms. وتزوج
3. Ms. ولدين ذكور
4. Ms. الملك
5. Ms. الملك
6. Ms. ابن
7. Ms. ثلث
8. Ms. رسلان
9. Ms. اعيان

بولاية اخلاط مع بنت سكرمان واولد هناك ولدين الامير احمد والآخر
يلقب بعز¹ الدين و انتقل الى خدمة فخر الدين قر أرسلان بحصن
كيفنا وحصل عنده في اوفى درجة وزوجه بنت اخيه أرسلان² تغمش
ومات بالصرع وخلف ابنا له هو في خدمة اولاد فخر الدين
واما آلبتاش فانه خلف الامير علي الحرامي ومات
في خدمة حسام الدين وخلف ولدين احدهما ابو³ بكر وقد لبس
الصوف وهو فقير وعمر وهو في خدمة اولاد فخر الدين بحصن كيفنا
واما الامير أرسلان بن⁴ عبد الجبار فانه ملك جبل
جور وبالقنين⁵ والسيوان وبقي مدة واخذها منه السعيد حسام
الدين وانتقل الى حصن كيفنا الى خدمة ركن الدولة داود ومات
في خدمته وخلف اولادا منهم بلاق ومحمود وبناتا وكان زوج بنتنا
في حياته من الامير زعيم الدولة مسيب بن⁶ مالك صاحب الرقة
واقام⁷ الاولاد في خدمة فخر الدين وانتقل الامير بلاق الى خدمة

1. Ms. عز
2. Ms. رسلان
3. Ms. ابي
4. Ms. ابن
5. Ms. sic
6. Ms. ابن
7. Ms. اقاموا

المالك نجم الدين ومات

واما سليمان كان يلقب بهدر¹ الدولة فانه ملك حلب
وتزوج بالخاتون الملكة بنت رضوان التي كانت زوجة الامير بك
واولد منها ابنا سماه كيك ويلقب بجلال الملوك واخذت منه حلب
ووصل الى خدمة السعيد حسام الدين واقطعه بلد قلب وحصنها
وبقي في خدمته الى ان مات ووصلت الملكة الى ماردين بعد موته
ومعها ولده فاقامت بماردين وتزوجها السعيد² حسام الدين على
ما ذكرناه وزوج ولدها جلال الملوك من ابنة هدية خاتون في
سنة سبع واربعين وبقي الى سنة اربع وخمسين وخمسمائة وتوفي
بباب نصيبين على ما سنذكره ان شاء الله تعالى

واما الابن الاخر وهو بكداش فانه اولد رسلان³ طغتمش
وانتقل الى خدمة آتابك طغتكين⁴ صاحب دمشق فانه كان عنده في
اوفى منزلة وتزوج بعائشة خاتون ابنة اخي الوزير (f.178e) محمد
الدويني واقام بدمشق الى سنة ثلث واربعين وخمسمائة في خدمة
اولاد طغتكين وقصد الموصل فاقام في خدمة صاحبها مدة يسيرة

1. Ms. بدر
2. Ms. للسعيد
3. Ms. sic
4. Ms. طعلتكين

ثم انتقل الى خدمة السعيد حسام الدين واكرمه واقطعه اقلماعا
 كثيرة في آخر سنة اربع واربعين عندما ملك دارا وبقي مدة
 بميرة ومات وخلف ثلثة بنين اقدمهم كان يلقب بشمس¹ الدولة عاش
 في خدمة السعيد بعد ابيه مدة سنتين ومات وبقي الابنان مسعود
 وبك وبقي مسعود في خدمة المالك نجم الدين مدة وانتقل الى
 خدمة فخر الدين قرا أرسلان واما بك فانه بقي في خدمة المالك
 نجم الدين الى سنة سبع وستين وتزهد وانقطع وجلس في مسجد
 يساقوت قريبا من باب الهوة في رأس الربض وهو الى الان
 مقيم به

واما نجم الدين الغازي فانه اولد اولادا جماعة اقدمهم
 الياس والبزم قتلا في حياته و كهار خاتون واما الياس فانه
 اولد الامير شهاب الدين محمد بن الياس وبنتا من خاتون²
 تزوجها سعد الدولة ايللدي³ صاحب آمد وله منها ولد في آمد
 واما شهاب الدين محمد فانه نشأ في خدمة عمه السعيد حسام
 الدين واقطعه تل بشمي وكان عنده مكرما الى ان مات وبقي مدة
 بعد موته وانتقل الى الشام الى خدمة نور الدين فاقطعه اقطاعا
 كثيرة⁴ وبقي في خدمته الى الان وله ثلثة بنين وهم الان في خدمة

1. Ms. شمس
2. Ms. has a lacuna here
3. Ms. ايللدي
4. Ms. كثيرا

نور الدين واولد نجم الدين ابنا من جارية اسمه عمر زوجها
بالامير اسفهملار¹ ومات الولد ولم يعقب واولد ابنا اسمه
نصر من جارية زوجها بالحاج عمر الخاص ومات ولم يعقب وزوج
كهار خاتون من سيف الدولة ديبس واولدت منه الامير عز الدين
محمد وبقي عندها بماردين الى ان قتل ديبس ومضى الى الحلة
وملك مع اخوته وبقي مدة وعاد الى خدمة المالك نجم الدين
وتردد مرارا وتوفي بعد امه وكانت² توفيت في سنة تسع وخمسين
وخمسمائة ودفنت بماردين وخلف عز الدولة ابنا هو الان في خدمة
شهاب الدين محمد بن الياس واولد نجم الدين بنتا سماها عينا
خاتون تزوجها الامير ايللدى صاحب آمد واولد منها جمال الدين
شمس الملوك محمود وهو الان صاحب آمد وماتت وتزوج بعدها باخت
شهاب الدين على ما ذكرناه واولد بنتا اسمها سفري خاتون
تزوجها حسام الدولة قرتى بن³ طغان آرسلان صاحب ارزن وبدليس
وماتت⁴ وخلفت ابنا اسمه ياغي بسان (f.178b) وهو في خدمة فخر
الدين دولت شاه عمه واولد شمس الدولة سليمان وملك ميفرقين
بعد ابيه وتوفي وخلف ابنا اسمه محمود ورايته في ماردين وهو
في اسوأ حال⁵ وما اعلم ما كان منه واولد السعيد حسام الدين

1. Ms. illegible or امره (?)
2. Ms. كان
3. Ms. ابن
4. Ms. مات
5. Ms. سوء حال ; Ms.B ; اسو حال

تمرتاش وكان عين البيت وسيد الاولاد فملك ما ردين على ما ذكرناه
 بعد ابيه وملك مي فرقين بعد اخيه وبقي الى ان مات وخلف من
 الاولاد المالك نجم الدين آبي وملك الملك بعد ابيه وجمال
 الدين سربي اعطاه اخوه حاني والسيوان وحصن قلب وضمصام الدين
 بهرام ملك دارا وهدية خاتون هي عند اخيها جمال الدين بحاني
 وزمرد خاتون بالموصل مات عنها قطب الدين مودود بن زنكي وخلف
 منها اربعة اولاد ملك الملوك سيف غازي بن مودود¹ على ما سنذكره
 ان شاء الله ومات في حياته صفة خاتون زوجة صاحب آمد ونورة
 خاتون زوجة صاحب ارزن على ما ذكرناه فرحمة الله عليه ورضوانه
 لديه فهذا ما وصل الي من نسب من بقي من الارتقية والله اعلم
 بالصواب
