

THE EMIRATE OF ALEPPO

392/1002 - 487/1094

b y

Suheil Zakkar

Thesis submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of London

1 9 6 9



ProQuest Number: 10731672

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

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

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



ProQuest 10731672

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

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

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

A B S T R A C T

The ensuing thesis, which consists of five chapters and an introduction, deals with the history of the emirate of Aleppo during the years 1002-1094.

Within this period the emirate suffered the collapse of the Ḥamdānid dynasty (founded by Sayf al-Dawla, 945-967), the submission for the first time to a direct Fāṭimid rule, the establishment of the Mirdāsīd dynasty, and 'Uqaylid occupation and finally passed under direct Saljuq control.

Although, previous to the Saljuq conquest, the emirate was influenced by the policies of both the Fāṭimid caliphate and the Byzantine empire, most of that time it was ruled by the Mirdāsīd dynasty. Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās was the founder of this dynasty and after his death three of his sons, Naṣr, Thimāl and 'Atīṣya succeeded each other in ruling the emirate.

Maḥmūd b. Naṣr usurped the rulership from his uncle 'Atīṣya and it was during their struggle for power that some of the Turcomans entered the emirate. When he became Amir, Maḥmūd employed some of the Turcomans in his service, defended Aleppo when the Sultan Alp-Arslan campaigned against it and although his sons Naṣr and afterwards Ṣābiq succeeded him, the real power lay in the hands of the Turcomans.

The Mirdāsīd dynasty was tribal, emanating from the Arabic tribe of Kilāb which had migrated to northern Syria in the wake

of the Islamic conquest of the seventh century. The structure of the tribe, its customs and the general behaviour of its tribesmen characterised this dynasty and contributed both to its establishment and collapse. On the other hand the collapse was a direct result of the capture of Aleppo by Muslim b. Quraysh, Amir of the tribe of 'Uqayl and ruler of al-Mosul. His reign, however, was short-lived and the Saljuq conquest followed rapidly. This conquest took place during the sultanate of Malik Shah who appointed Aq-Sunqur as governor and caused profound political, religious and social changes.

The political instability did not end with the appointment of Aq Sunqur whose clash with Tutush, brother of Malik Shah, and struggle for supremacy was the cause of his death.

The rural population of the emirate participated in the political life and this was clearly illustrated by the part played by the Ahdath organisation.

Islam, Christianity and Judaism were the religions professed by the population and this has been touched upon in the last chapter of the thesis.

The principal sources upon which this thesis is based have been enumerated and described in the introduction.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>page</u>
Acknowledgements .. .. .	5
Introduction: SURVEY OF SOURCES .. .. .	6
Chapter I: PERIOD OF TRANSITION.. .. .	29
The fall of the Ḥamdānid Dynasty - The first Fāṭimid occupation	
Chapter II: THE MIRDĀSID DYNASTY I .. .. .	63
Its tribal background - Ṣāliḥ Ibn Mirdās and the establishment of the dynasty - the reign of Naṣr Ibn Ṣāliḥ.	
Chapter III: THE MIRDĀSID DYNASTY II .. .. .	134
Al-Dizbarī - Thimāl - 'Atiyya and Maḥmūd Ibn Naṣr.	
Chapter IV: THE TURCOMAN MIGRATION AND THE SALJUQ CONQUEST .. .. .	194
The reign of Naṣr b. Maḥmūd - Sābiq b. Maḥmūd and the fall of the Mirdāsīd dynasty - the Turcoman migration - Muslim b. Quraysh and the 'Uqaylid occupation - the Saljuq conquest and the reign of Aq-Sunqur.	
Chapter V: THE RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE	247
Bibliography and Abbreviations .. .. .	280

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

My thanks and acknowledgements are due, firstly to Professor Bernard Lewis, without whose able supervision the thesis could not have been written. I should also like to thank the Librarians and Staff, not only of the School of Oriental and African Studies, but also of the British Museum, Bodleian, Escorial (Spain), Topkapi Sarayi, Bayazid, Aya Sofya and ~~Al-~~Süleymaniye (Turkey).

Also, and by no means less, I would express my grateful thanks to the University of Damascus for facilitating my studies; to Professor A. 'Awa, Dean of the Faculty of Letters; to Professor N. Ḥātūm, Chairman of the History Department, and to Dr. Aḥmad Ṭarbain of the same Department for their kind consideration and encouragement.

I should also like to express my appreciation for the courtesy of the Management and Staff of the Department of Antiquities in Aleppo and to all other colleagues who have given me all possible assistance.

Introduction

SURVEY OF SOURCES

Information concerning the history of Aleppo during the 11th century emanates from four major sources; local Aleppine, Syrian, the general Muslim Annals and the work of Byzantine chroniclers of the period. In turn, the local Aleppine sources could be divided into four categories; work of the chroniclers, that of the 11th century poets, inscriptions and coins.

The work of the chroniclers is the primary source and during the 11th century there were a number of chroniclers who lived in the emirate of Aleppo. Unfortunately none of their works are, so far, known to have survived except as quotations preserved in the works of later chroniclers.

Abu Ghālib Hammām b. al-Faḍl b. Ja'far b. al-Muhadhhab was the most important chronicler of the 11th century. No biography of him is available but Ibn al-'Adīm, who quotes a considerable part of his work in his book, Bughyat al-Talab, mentions him among the disciples of the celebrated Abu 'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī (died 449 A.H./1057 A.D.).<sup>1</sup> The quotations from his work made by Ibn al-'Adīm indicate the calibre of his book. It contains general Islamic annals, mainly concentrated on the events which took place in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and Aleppo. In the surviving 10 volumes of his book Bughyat al-Talab Ibn al-'Adīm quotes large and detailed information from Ibn al-Muhadhhab's Tarikh concerning the events occurring

---

<sup>1</sup> Bughya, A.I., 196r; Ta'rif, 517.

in Aleppo during the 11th century such as the capture of Aleppo by Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās, some of the events which occurred during Ṣāliḥ's reign, the reign of Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ, his relation with the Fāṭimid Caliphate and al-Basāsiri and Maḥmūd's reign - in particular his relation with the Saljuq Sultan Alp-Arslan.<sup>2</sup>

Contemporary with Ibn al-Muhadhhab was the Christian physician Abu'l-Khayr al-Mubāarak b. Sharāra. In addition to being a physician, al-Mubāarak was a successful kātib. He lived in his native city of Aleppo until the reign of Ruḍwān b. Tutush (1095-1113 A.D.). He abandoned Aleppo and went to Antioch, thence to Tyre because Ruḍwan tried to force him to adopt Islam and ultimately died in Tyre (circa 490 A.H./1096 A.D.). Al-Mubāarak wrote a Tarikh chiefly narrating the events which occurred in his lifetime, particularly those which he witnessed in Aleppo. It would appear that this Tarikh was lost shortly after the death of its author for al-Qifti (died 646 A.H./1248 A.D.) says that he failed to find a copy of it. Al-Qifti, however, mentions that he received from Egypt a badly abridged copy by an unknown Egyptian.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Bughya, A.I., 219v-221r; II, 198r; III, 284 r.v.; VI, 102v-103r, 172r, 201r.-202v., 246r; it is noteworthy that Haji Khalifa II, 105 mentions Tarikh Ibn al-Muhadhhab which suggests that this book had survived until a later period.

<sup>3</sup>Al-Qifti, 330-331; Al-Ṭabbakh, I, 42; Al-A'lam, VI, 149.



Ibn al-‘Adīm quotes some information concerning the reign of Sābiq b. Maḥmūd, the last Mirdāsīd Amir from Maṣṣūr B. Tamīm b. al-Zankal. Maṣṣūr, who was a poet from Sarḥīn, witnessed the migration of the Turcomans to Northern Syria. We do not know the date of his death and Ibn al-‘Adīm's quotation from his work does not reveal the nature of this work.<sup>4</sup>

The Aleppine chroniclers of the 11th century dedicated the bulk of their annals to the history of Aleppo, and three of the 12th century chroniclers wrote a Tārīkh devoted exclusively to the history of Aleppo. They were Ḥamdān b. ‘Abdul-Raḥīm al-Atharībī (died 1147 A.D.), ‘Alī b. ‘Abdu’llāh b. Abī Jarādah (a relative of Ibn al-‘Adīm, died 1151) and Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-‘Aẓīmī (circa died 1161 A.D.). Only parts of their Tārīkhs of Aleppo survive as quotations, chiefly in the works of Ibn al-‘Adīm.

Ḥamdān was a physician and poet who possessed a good deal of the culture of his time. He, in different periods, served in an administrative capacity to both the Muslim authority of Aleppo (chiefly during Zankī's reign) and the crusaders of Antioch and its surroundings. From Aleppo he was sent by Zankī as an envoy to the crusaders of Antioch, to Egypt, to Damascus and probably to Baghdad. In Cairo he met the Fātimīd caliph Al-Āmir (1101-1130) after having proved that he professed the Shī‘a’ Imāmī doctrine and was not one of the Assassins. The life of Ḥamdān provides some very interesting information

---

<sup>4</sup>Bugha, A., II, 165v.-166.; VII, 145r.v.

about the life of the Muslims and the crusaders of Northern Syria and the relation between them during the first half of the 12th century.

The important book written by Ḥamdān was known as Al-Maffwaq. It was devoted to the history of Aleppo and in it Ḥamdān gave special attention to the events which occurred after 490 A.H./1096 A.D. and their connection with the crusaders.<sup>5</sup>

Contemporary with Ḥamdān, was his friend 'Alī b. 'Abdū'llah b. Abī Jarāda. Like Ḥamdān, 'Alī was a poet well versed in the knowledge of his time and professing the same Shi'a Imāmi doctrine. 'Alī wrote a book about Muluk Ḥalab (i.e. the sovereigns of Aleppo) from which Ibn al-'Adīm quotes some information concerning the collapse of the Mirdāsīd dynasty and the relation between the Muslim Sunnis and Imāmis of Aleppo during this dynasty.<sup>6</sup>

Contemporary with Ḥamdān and Ibn Abī Jarāda was al-'Aẓīmī who was also a poet and a school master. Al-'Aẓīmī wrote several tārikhs; one of them was devoted to Aleppo and another was called "Al-Muwassal 'Ala al-Aṣl al-Mu'assal" which was written as general annals.

<sup>5</sup> Bughya, A., III, 278v-280v; IV, 275v.-280v.; Yāqūt (al-Atharib); Irshād IV, 143; Al-Sakhāwī, 628, has mentioned Ḥamdān, but F. Rosenthal, the editor of al-Sakhāwī's book, has mistakenly read the title of Ḥamdān's book as Al-Qūt; Tahdhīb, IV, 431-432; H.M.E. III; Al-A'lām, II, 304-305.

<sup>6</sup> Irshād, V, 244-245; VI, 21-24; Al-Kharīda, II, 224-225; Bughya, A., IV, 277r., 280r.v.; VII, 146 r.v., 196 r.v.; al-Ṭabbakh, IV, 230-231; H.M.E. III.

What might be an abridgment of this has survived in a unique copy (Bayazid Library, Istanbul No. 398). In spite of its brevity the information it contains concerning Aleppo during the 11th century is very valuable. It covers almost all the events which occurred there during that century. Part of al-'Azimī's two other books has been cited by Ibn al-'Adīm. Some of the contents are connected with the reign of Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ, the reign of Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ and his relations with the Fāṭimid caliphate, the death of Naṣr b. Maḥmud, the collapse of the Mirdāsīd dynasty and the reign of Aq-Sunqur, the first Saljuq ruler of Aleppo.<sup>7</sup>

Although some of the 12th century chroniclers compiled books dealing with the history of Aleppo, the greater number of them continued to follow the classic method of writing general annals. Among the latter was Yaḥyā b. 'Alī al-Tanūkhī, generally known as Ibn Zurayq. He was born on the 18th Shawal, 442 A.H./5th March, 1051 A.D., at Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and probably died in the first decade of the 12th century. As a matter of fact all the above-mentioned chroniclers of the 12th century were born and spent parts of their lives during the 11th century. They are here considered as 12th century chroniclers according to the date of their deaths rather than births.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibn 'Asākir, XV, 384r.-385r.; Bughya, A., III, 267v-268r., 272r.v.; V, 222r.v.; VI, 100v.-102r.; VII, 146v., 220v.; Ḥāji, II, 126, 138; al-Wafī, IV, 131; al-Nujūm, V, 133; al-Ṭabbākh, IV, 248-249; al-'Amīlī XXXVI, 61-62; al-'Arīnī, 194-195; H.M.E.111; Part of al-'Azimī's surviving book which contains the annals of 455/1063 to the end of the book, has been edited by Claude Cahen. It was published in the Journal Asiatique, Tome CCXXX, Juillet-September 1938; Al-A'lām, VII, 165; Brock, S., 1, 586.

Ibn Zurayq wrote annals which he devoted chiefly to the history of the Saljuq occupation of Syria and to the crusaders' invasion. Concerning the 11th century, some information connected with the campaign of Alp-Arslan against Aleppo and the life of Khalaf b. Mulā'ib, together with his relation with Aq-Sunqur, has been quoted by Ibn al-'Adīm, via Al-Ulaymi, from Ibn Zurayq's tārīkh.<sup>8</sup>

The three Munqidhī amirs and brothers, Usāma (died 1188 A.D.), 'Alī and Munqidh, sons of Murshid, were among the chroniclers of the 12th century. Munqidh wrote annals as a dhayl to Ibn al-Muhadhdhab's tārīkh. Ibn al-'Adīm quotes part of the annals 483 A.H./1090 A.D, which relate the campaign led in that year by Aq-Sunqur, Buzān, Tutush and Yaghi-Siyān against Khalaf b. Mulā'ib.

Like his brother, 'Alī wrote annals which bear his name. Ibn al-'Adīm quotes 'Alī's annals of 441 A.H./1049 A.D., 463 A.H./1071 A.D., 468 A.H./1075 A.D., 484 A.H./1091 A.D. and 487 A.H./1094 A.D. which are connected with the reign of Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ and his relation with the Fāṭimid caliphate, the campaign of Alp-Arslan against Aleppo, the death of Naṣr b. Maḥmūd and the reign of Aq-Sunqur and his relation with Tutush.

Usāma wrote several books, some of which have survived and have been printed, and when Ibn al-'Adīm cites him in connection with

---

<sup>8</sup> al-Kharīdah, II, 693; al-Tabbakh, IV, 224-225; Bughya, A., III, 281r.; V, 222v.; H.M.E.111; the Biography of Khalaf b. Mulā'ib has been published by B. Lewis in Melanges Fuad Koprülü, Istanbul 1953, pp. 332-336.

the capture of the citadel of Aleppo by the Sultan Malik-Shāh and the life of Khalaf b. Mulā'ib, there is no mention of any book title but that the information was imparted vocally.<sup>9</sup>

Abu Ghālib 'Abdu'l-Wāhid b. Mas'ud b. al-Ḥuṣayn appears to have come from Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and he is the author of annals which bear his name. Ibn al-'Adīm cites from these annals, specially those of 463 A.H./1071 A.D., which were connected with the campaign of Alp-Arslan against Aleppo. There is no positive indication of the date of his death since no biography of him is extant.<sup>10</sup>

'Abdu'l-Qāhir b. 'Alawī was also from Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. Al-'Imad al-Iṣfahānī mentions that he was a poet, held the post of cadi in Ma'arrat Masrin and that in March, 1176 A.D., he met him in Ḥamāh. Ibn 'Alawī was the author of a book called Nuzhat al-Nāzir wa Rawḍat al-Khātir. Ibn al-'Adīm cites some information from this book which is connected with the reign of Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ, but he does not reveal the nature of the book or its style.<sup>11</sup>

Abu Maṣṣur Hibatu 'llāh b. Sa'd Allāh b. al-Jabarānī seems to have been from the city of Aleppo. We do not know the date of his death, but a son of his named Aḥmad died in 628 A.H./1031 A.D. Ibn al-'Adīm cites al-Jabarānī when he mentions the death of Aq-Sunqur.

---

<sup>9</sup>Bughya, A., II, 205v.-212v.; III, 269r.v.-271v., 284r.; V, 220v.-221v.; VI, 100r., 146v.-147r., 198v.; al-Kharīdah, I, 498-557.

<sup>10</sup>Bughya, A., III, 284v., 297v.; al-Kharīdah, II, 57-67.

<sup>11</sup>Bughya, F., 250r.v.; al-Kharīdah, II, 98-100.

He does not give the title of his book, but does however indicate that it was in the form of annals.<sup>12</sup>

The writing of Tārīkh in Aleppo reached its peak during the 13th century and, at that period, four important chroniclers lived and left for us some valuable Tārīkhs. They were Ibn Abi Tayy (Yahyā b. Ḥamīdān, died 630 A.H./1232-33 A.D.), al-Qiftī ('Alī-B. Yusuf, died 646 A.H./1248 A.D.), Ibn al-Adīm ('Umar b. Aḥmad, died 666 A.H./1267-1268 A.D.) and Ibn Shaddād (Muḥammad b. 'Alī, died 684 A.H./1285 A.D.).

Ibn Abi Tayy wrote several books, most of which have been lost and do not seem to be connected with the history of Aleppo during the 11th century. Ḥajī Khalīfah has mentioned that Ibn Abi Tayy wrote a book entitled Mā'din al-Dhahab, and that this book was devoted to the history of Aleppo. It would appear that even this book was connected with the period following the 11th century. All the quotations which have reached us from the works of Ibn Abi Tayy tell us nothing about the 11th century.<sup>13</sup>

Al-Qiftī, who held the post of vizier in Aleppo, is also the author of several books containing a variety of subjects. He wrote a book called Al-Isti'nās fi Akhbār Āl-Mirdās. No copy of it is known to be extant and except for what the title indicates, we know

---

<sup>12</sup> Bughya, A., III, 270r.; al-Ṭabbākh, IV, 372-374.

<sup>13</sup> Ḥajī, II, 126-127; al-Ṭabbākh, I, 14-15, 46-48; H.M.E.91, al-Rawdatain, I, 86, 119, 123-124, 143, 151, 209, 239, 250-251, 273, 276, 306, 311.

nothing concerning the contents of and the manner in which it was written.

Ikhbar al-'Ulama Bi Akhbār al-Hukamā' is the title of one of Al-Qiftī's books which has survived in Zawzani's abridgements. In the biography of the Baghdādi Christian physician, Ibn Baḥlān who, in 440 A.H./1048 A.D., visited Aleppo and lived there for a short while, al-Qiftī cites the bulk of Ibn Baḥlān's itinerary in which he describes the route from Baghdād to Aleppo and his impression of Aleppo.<sup>14</sup>

Ibn al-'Adīm, the descendant of a very prominent family of Aleppo, was born in Dhu'l-Ḥijja, 488 A.H./Dec.1192 A.D. In his autobiography, cited by Yaqut, Ibn al-'Adīm says that when he was seven years old he was sent to school and at the age of nine he was able to read the Koran. He received a good education and acquired a good portion of the culture of his time. He also received good training in the art of calligraphy and acquired a very fine handwriting. Judging by the surviving ten volumes of Buḥyat al-Ṭalab, all of which are in his own handwriting, he was one of the best and most accurate copyists in the history of Arabic literature. As a lad of fifteen he visited Jerusalem and Damascus which he again visited when he was eighteen. When he became twenty-eight years old he was given the post of school-master at one of the most important schools in Aleppo. Afterwards, on several occasions he

---

<sup>14</sup> al-Qiftī, 295-315; Fawāt, II, 191-193; al-Ṭabbākh, I, 48-49; IV, 414-427.

visited Egypt and Iraq, often as an envoy, for he had become one of the most distinguished persons in Aleppo and occupied the post of vizier there. The riches of private and general libraries in addition to the official records and documents were at his disposal. His journeys enabled him to consult most of the Syrian, Egyptian and Iraqi scholars of the time and to have accession to the libraries of these countries. The accumulated knowledge of his experience is manifested in the book of Bughyat al-Talab. Ibn al-'Adīm wrote several books on a variety of subjects, but history was predominant.

Concerning the eleventh century, three of Ibn al-'Adīm's books are the bulwark of any attempt at writing any history of this period. They are Bughyat al-Talab, Zubdat al-Halab and al-Inṣāf Wa'l-Taḥarrī, and only the text of the second named has reached us complete. The book of Bughyat al-Talab was said to comprise forty volumes, each one of more than three hundred folios. Only ten of them have survived and all, as has been previously mentioned, are in his own handwriting. These ten volumes contain the first and the last volume of the original forty and examination of them reveals Ibn al-'Adīm's plan when writing. He first writes about northern Syria from a prestige (Faḍā'il) and geographical standpoint and to this end he collected valuable material from almost all the works of the Muslim geographers. Following this Ibn al-'Adīm relates the history of the country year by year in



the form of annals. Next follows a biographical dictionary comprising the men of northern Syria and visitors to the country who were distinguished for their religious, cultural and political proficiency.

Some of the later chroniclers state that Ibn al-‘Adīm only wrote the first draft of this book and died before he was able to revise and complete it. This, in fact, would seem to be a misunderstanding of Ibn al-‘Adīm's methods. The survival of both the first and last volume of the annals prove that Ibn al-‘Adīm was able to complete his book before his death. Perhaps the reasons for the misunderstanding were that none of the later chroniclers were able to see more than a part of the book and the blank sheets, which are scattered throughout every volume of the book. Apparently these were left intentionally by Ibn al-‘Adīm, for the addition of new material, and in many of these places we find Ibn al-‘Adīm's son has added the material which his father was unable to collate. The book of Bughyat al-Ṭalab is a mine of information, not only to the history of Muslim northern Syria but to the entire Muslim world. It contains vital information concerning the life of the inhabitants of the Muslim-Byzantine frontier from which an excellent study could be made. It is impossible to give here a full survey or a description of this book because such a study would be more suitable to a separate thesis, or a complete book rather than a mere introduction or a survey.

The book of Zubdat al-Halab, which is an abridgment of the narrative of the book Bughyat al-Talab, is one of the main sources of this thesis for it covers its entire period.

The book of Al-Inṣāf Wa'l-Taharrī was written as a biography of the celebrated Abu 'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī. It provides some information concerning the reign of Ṣāliḥ Ibn Mirdās and the relation between the Muslims and Christians of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān.<sup>15</sup>

Ibn Shaddād is the author of several books among which is Al-'A'ālāq al-Khatira' Fi Dhikr Umarā' al-Shām Wa'l-Jazīra. In this book all the information which concerns Aleppo is cited by Ibn Shaddād from Ibn al-'Adīm's book of Bughyat al-Talab and most

---

<sup>15</sup>All the manuscripts of the 10 vols. of Bughyat al-Talab are in the libraries of Istanbul; one in Aya-Sofya, No. 3036; eight in Aḥmad III, Topkapi Sarayi No. 2925, and one in Fayḍ-Allah, No. 1404. A copy of the third vol. of that of Aḥmad III is in the Nationale Bibliothèque, No. 2138. A bad copy of the eighth is in the British Museum, No. Add. 23,354. I have been informed that there is a volume of the book in the library of the late Dāwud Shalabī in al-Mosul. While I was able to obtain microfilm copies of the ten volumes of Istanbul and that of Paris, I failed to do so for that of al-Mosul. All the information I received about it is that this volume is a copy of the first volume of Aḥmad III.

The surviving part of al-Inṣāf was published twice, once in Aleppo in 1925 inside the fourth volume of the book of 'I'lām al-Nubala' Bi Tārīkh Halab al-Shshba' by Muhammad Rāghib al-Ṭabbakh, pp. 78-154; and in Cairo in 1944 inside the book of Ta'rif al-Qudamā' Bi Abi'l-'Alā', pp. 483-578. See Irshād, VI, 18-46; Zubda, I, 13-79; al-Ṭabbakh, IV, 480-512; H.M.E.111-113; Al-'A'lām, 197; Brock, 1, 404(332); S.I.568.

of it is geographical. The geographical part of the book of Bughyat al-Ṭalab and most of its sources are still available and this renders that part of the A'ālāq which concerns northern Syria of little importance.<sup>16</sup>

The names of Ibn Abi'l-Dam (Ibrāhīm b. 'Abdu'llah, died 642/1244), Ibn al-Athīr al-Ḥalabī (Ismā'il, died 699/1300), Abu'l-Fidā' (Ismā'il b. 'Alī, died 732/1331-32), Ibn al-Warādī ('Umar, died 749/1348), Ibn Wāṣil al-Ḥamawī (Muḥammad b. Sālim, died 697/1297-8), Al-Badr al-'Aynī (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, died 855/1451), and Muḥammad al-Ḥamawī, author of the book Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī, could be added to those of the former chroniclers. The information concerning the subject of this thesis given in the works of these chroniclers is of little value, for it is scanty and chiefly depends on Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī, whose works will be examined later.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>The larger part of al-A'ālāq was published in Damascus 1953, 1956. There are several copies of the part concerning Qindrin which is still unpublished, one in the British Museum, Add. 23,334; one in Topkapi Sarayi, No. R.1564 and another in the Vatican Library, No. Arab 730. See also al-Ṭabbākh, I, 50; IV, 525; Al-A'lām, VII, 173; Brock, S.I.883.

<sup>17</sup>There are several copies of Tārīkh Ibn Abi'l-Dam; two in Khudabakhsh Library, Nos. 2868 and 2869; another in Alexandria, City Council Library, No. 1292b.; still another in the Bodleian Library, No. Marsh 60, which I used. There is a Persian translation of the book, a copy of which is in Aya-Sofya Library, Nos. 3087 and 3088; see Al-A'lām, I, 42.

'Iqd al-Jumān Fī Tārīkh Ahl al-Zamān is the title of al-Badr al-'Aynī's book of which I used vol. XI. This is in As'ad

Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Antākī (died circa 458 A.H./1066 A.D.), the 11th century Christian chronicler, could be classified among the northern Syrian chroniclers. Although he was born in Egypt (about 980 A.D.) and spent the first 35-40 years of his life there, the latter and longer period of his life was spent in Antioch. Yaḥya wrote an important Tārīkh which has reached us incomplete for, according to al-ʿAzīmī who uses the book, Yaḥya ended his Tārīkh with the annals of 458 A.H./1066 A.D. which probably was the year of his death. Valuable information concerning the rise of the Mirdāsīd dynasty and the reign of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās, followed by his son Naṣr and their relation with both the Byzantine Empire and the Fāṭimid caliphate is to be found in al-Antākī's Tārīkh.<sup>18</sup>

Four famous poets lived in the emirate of Aleppo and three of them attended the Mirdāsīd courts. They were Abu 'l-ʿAlā' al-Maʿarrī (Aḥmad b. ʿAbdu'llah b. Sulaymān al-Tanūkhī, died 449 A.H./1047 A.D.), Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī (ʿAbdu'llah b. Muḥammad b. Saʿīd, died 466 A.H./1073-74 A.D.), Ibn Abi Ḥasāna (al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd'l-lah, died 457 A.H./1065 A.D.) and Ibn Ḥayyūs (Muḥammad b. Sultān, died 473 A.H./1080 A.D.). The bulk of the work of these poets has

---

Afendi Library Istanbul, No.2317.

Ibn al-Athīr al-Ḥalabī is the author of a book entitled ʿIbrat Ulī al-Aḥsār Fī Mulūk al-Aḥsār, a copy of which is in the British Museum, No. OR.996.

<sup>18</sup>Al-ʿAzīmī, 180v.; al-Antākī, 92, 201-272; Enc. Islam, new ed. (al-Antākī).

survived and contains valuable information. Save that part which has been provided by the poems of Abu'l-'Alā' this information could be considered as official, for the poets often expressed the court's desire and opinion.

From the poetical works of Abu'l-'Alā' we are able to glean valuable social and political information. Although Abu'l-'Alā' was politically unbiased, his information should be treated with special caution, for his philosophical teaching and views led him to express what he believed should be expressed, rather than a complete and accurate picture. He, however, mentions the rise of the Mirdāsīd dynasty, the activities of the tribe of Ṭayy' in Palestine and those of Kilāb in northern Syria, the relation between the Muslims and the Christians of Ma'arrat al-Nu'man, the general behaviour of the people during his time, more particularly that of the rulers, and how deeply his contemporaries were devoted to their own religious beliefs.<sup>19</sup>

In the poems of Ibn Sinān we find some information about the relation between the Mirdāsīd and both the Byzantine empire and the Fāṭimid caliphate for he went to Constantinople as an envoy of the Mirdāsīd.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Al-Luzūmiyāt, I, 74, 77, 82, 104, 108, 115, 149, 158, 162, 171, 179, 263, 266, 281, 283; II, 79, 90, 100, 188, 199, 207-208, 210, 220, 308, 310, 318, 321; II, 77-78, 183, 204-205, 214, 216-217, 242, 249, 253, 266; IV, 116, 136, 204, 212, 220, 260, 383, 423; Saqt, 128-129.

<sup>20</sup> Ibn Sinān, 17-18, 40, 53.

Ibn Abī-Ḥasāna was specially attached to the court of Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ and in his poems there is mention of almost every event of Thimāl's life and reign, although many of them were not mentioned by the chroniclers.<sup>21</sup>

The poems of Ibn Ḥayyus have a special value for his early work eulogises al-Dizbarī, the Fāṭimid governor of Syria and opponent of the Mirdāsids. Not long after the death of al-Dizbarī, he came to Aleppo and lived in the Mirdāsīd court. Unlike Ibn Abī-Ḥasāna, who was loyal to the Mirdāsids, Ibn Ḥayyus was a professional poet. He praised and flattered most those who paid most and defamed their opponents with equal enthusiasm. From his poems which were dedicated to the eulogy of al-Dizbarī, it is possible to gauge the political situation in all Syria during the years 1023-1042 A.D. In his poem written in Aleppo he depicts the changes in the political scene which resulted from the Turco-man influx.<sup>22</sup>

Only two inscriptions appear to have survived and they confirm some of the information handed down to us by the chroniclers.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibn Abi Ḥasāna, I, 28-29, 32-33, 44, 61, 68, 71, 102-104, 145, 156-157, 200, 209-214, 237-238, 244-248, 253-256, 289, 295-298, 325.

<sup>22</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 4-6, 52-53, 60-63, 74-76, 102-103, 123-128, 139-140, 173, 205-207, 214, 220-221, 265-266, 271-273, 293-299, 320, 335, 337-343, 358-360; II, 378, 410-413, 416-417, 422-425, 432, 437-439, 443-446, 482-483, 520-522, 540-541, 552-554, 570-575, 602-604, 613-614, 638-639, 647, 669.

<sup>23</sup> N.Ch. (new series), XIII, 335-338; J.A.O.S., LXXIII, 89-95; R.Ch.E.A., VI, 164; VII, 188.

Three Mirdāsīd coins are known to be extant and these provide some additional information.

Yet further information may also be obtained from the works of other Syrian chroniclers, mainly from Damascus, such as Ibn al-Qalānīsī (Abu Ya'alā Ḥanẓal, died 551 A.H./1180 A.D.), Ibn 'Asākir ('Alī-b. al-Ḥasan, died 571 A.H./1175 A.D.), Abu Shāma (Abdu'l Raḥmān b. Ismā'il, died 665 A.H./1265 A.D.), Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī (Muḥammad, died 764 A.H./1336 A.D.) and Ibn Kathīr (Ismā'il, died 774 A.H./1333 A.D.). The information provided by Ibn al-Qalānīsī covers almost all the events which occurred in Aleppo during the 11th century and is of great value, but there appears to be very little of importance in the works of the other chroniclers.<sup>24</sup>

The works of a number of the Muslim non-Syrian chroniclers provide us with useful and detailed information. These chroniclers could be classified into two major categories: Egyptian, mainly concerned with the history of the Fāṭimid caliphate and others, chiefly from Iraq, who wrote general annals of the history of Islam. Among the Egyptians, Al-Musabbihī (Muḥammad b. Ubaidu'l-lah, died 1029 A.D.), Ibn Muyassar (Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Yusuf (died 1278 A.D.) and al-Maqrizi (Aḥmad b. 'Alī, died 845 A.H./1441 A.D.) are the important chroniclers. To them could be

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 68-115; H.M.E. 114-115; Al-A'Lām, II, 308.

added the name of Al-Mu'ayyad ʿĪ al-Dīn Dā'i' al-Du'āt (Hibatu'l-lah b. Musa, died 1078 A.D.) for his autobiography and their works provide detailed information concerning the relation between the Fāṭimid caliphate and the emirate of Aleppo. In the fragment of Al-Musabbiḥī's Tārīkh there is a minute detail of the events connected with the rise of the Mirdāsīd dynasty and the Fāṭimid caliphate's reaction towards it.<sup>25</sup>

In his autobiography, Al-Mu'ayyad ʿĪ al-Dīn relates what happened in Aleppo during Thimāl's reign at the time of al-Basāsīrī's rebellion and the value of his narrative has been discussed in ch. III, pp. 155-160.

In the available part of his book Akhbār Misr Ibn Muyassar gives useful information about the reigns of Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ and Maḥmūd b. Naṣr and their relation with the Fāṭimid caliphate. He also presents important material concerning the Turcoman migration and the Saljuq conquest of northern Syria.<sup>26</sup>

Although the work of most of the early Egyptian chroniclers has been lost, the core of their information has been preserved by al-Maqrīzī in his book of Itti'āz al-Ḥunafā' Bi-Akhbār al-A'immatu'l-Fāṭimiyīn al-Khulafā'. This book is another of the main sources of this thesis. In many ways it is no less valuable than the book of Zubdat al-Ḥalab, for its content covers in

---

<sup>25</sup>The fragment of al-Musabbiḥī's Tārīkh is in the Escorial Library, No. C.534, Pt. II. This same copy has been used by al-Maqrīzī, as he has stated in own handwriting on its first folio.

<sup>26</sup>Ibn Muyassar, II, 3-37.



detail the whole period of this thesis.<sup>27</sup>

Mention should be made here that some other Egyptian chroniclers, such as Ibn Munjib al-Ṣayrafi, author of Al-Ishāra ila Manā' al-Wizārah; Ibn Aybak al-Dawādārī, author of Al-Durrah al-Mudi'yah fi Akhbār al-Dawlah al-Fāṭimiya and Ibn Tagharrī Bardī, author of Al-Nujum al-Zāhira, provide us with some information.

The part provided by Al-Ṣayrafi is scanty and very brief and of little importance is the material presented by Ibn Aybak. There is large and detailed material in the book of Al-Nujūm, but since most of it has been cited from the book of Mir'at al-Zamān which will be considered later, its importance has been very much reduced.

Muḥammad b. Abdu'l-Nalik al-Hamadḥānī (died 1127 A.D.), author of the book 'Inwān al-Siyar, Ibn Abi'l Hayyā' (was alive during the 2nd half of the 12th century); Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Isfahānī (contemporary of Ibn Abi'l-Hayyā'); Ibn al-Jawzī (Abdu'l-Raḥmān b. 'Alī died 1201 A.D.); Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī ('Alī b. Muḥammad, died 1233 A.D.); Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī (Yusuf b. Kizughlu, died 1256 A.D.); Ibn al-'Amīd (Jirjus, died 1273 A.D.); Al-Dhahabī (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, died 1347 A.D.) and Ibn Khaldūn (Abdu'l Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, died 1405 A.D.) are the chroniclers who wrote general annals in which they provide interesting and relative material.

---

<sup>27</sup>A fragment of this book was published by Hugo Bunz, Leipzig

Al-Hamadhānī's book did not reach us but Ibn al-'Adīm made vast use of it. He quotes from it a long and important passage connected with the reign of Aq-Sunqur.<sup>28</sup>

Ibn Abi'l Hayyā' wrote a Tārīkh which bears his name and in its annals he relates a brief narrative which covers all the events occurring in the emirate of Aleppo during the 11th century.<sup>29</sup>

Similar brief accounts are given by Al-Iṣfahānī in his book Al-Bustān al-Jamī' le-Jamī' Tawārīkh Ahl al-Zamān.<sup>30</sup>

In his book of Al-Muntazam, Ibn al-Jawzī provides important information concerning the Saljuqs and their occupation of northern Syria, but he gives scanty information of the previous period.<sup>31</sup>

1909 and by the late Dr. Muhammad Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl, Cairo, 1948; there is a complete copy of the book in the Library of Aḥmad III, Istanbul, No. 3013, of which I obtained a micro-film copy and used. It is now being published in Cairo and one volume of it is out.

<sup>28</sup> Bughya, A., III, 268v.269v.; al-Qiftī, 110-111; in volume XII of his book Iqd al-Jumān al-Badra l-'Aynī has copied a large part of al-Hamadhānī's Tārīkh, all of which is connected with the period following the 11th century. H.M.E. 61-62.

<sup>29</sup> A unique manuscript of this book is in al-Aḥmadiya Library, Tunisia, No. 4915; see fols. 121v.-134v.

<sup>30</sup> See fols. 86r.-92v. A copy of this book is in the Library of Aḥmad III, Istanbul, No. 2959, and although its author was known as 'Imād al-Iṣfahānī, he is not the same 12th century's famous chronicler who held the same name and title but was distinguished as al-Kātib.

<sup>31</sup> Al-Muntazam, VIII, 12-331; IX, 7-77; H.M.E. 62-63.

In a few successive pages of his book Al-Kāmil, Ibn al-Athīr gives what he considered to be a full account of the Mirdāsīd dynasty. As a result of this little importance can be attached to this account which is a brief repetition of more reliable material. On the other hand, Ibn al-Athīr provides valuable details when he relates the Turcoman migration, the 'Uqaylīd occupation and the Saljuq conquest of northern Syria. He also relates an interesting narrative in his book Al-Bāhir fi al-Dawla al-Atābikiya concerning the reign of Aq-Sunqur.<sup>32</sup>

Exceedingly important is the ~~book~~ Mir'at al-Zamān fi Tārīkh al-'Ayyam by Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī. It provides valuable detailed narrative covering the whole period of this thesis. The most important part of this book is that which contains the annals of 448-480 A.H./1056-1086 A.D., for here Sibṭ cites almost the entire book of Tārīkh Ghars al-Ni'ma (Muḥammad b. Hilāl al-Ṣabī', died 1088). Ghars al-Ni'ma was a prominent personage in Baghdad. He was held in great repute in the Court of the Caliphate and by the Saljuq authority. He was an eye-witness of many of the events which took place in the second half of the 11th century. He had access to official documents and was able to contact many high officials and military leaders of the Saljuqs. He was thus able to obtain first hand information which he has embodied in his Tārīkh. The Tārīkh of Ghars al-

<sup>32</sup> For the account concerning the Mirdāsīd dynasty, see al-Kāmil, IX, 159-165; see also Al-Bahir, 6-15.

Ni'mah, as it appears through the Mir'at, contains the basic information concerning the Turcoman migration and Saljuq conquest of northern Syria.<sup>33</sup>

In his book Tarikh al-Muslimin, Ibn al-'Amid enumerates most of the events which occurred in the emirate of Aleppo during the 11th century. He provides no new detail but repeats what the other chroniclers have related.

The information given by al-Dhahabi in his three books of Tarikh al-Islam, Duwal al-Islam and al-'Ibar differs very little from that provided by Ibn al-'Amid. This material has, however, been used and is referred to throughout the thesis.

<sup>33</sup> See al-Qifti, 110-111; H.M.E., 61; Al-A'lam, VII, 357. There are at least two versions of the ~~book~~ Mir'at al-Zaman and as a result of this not all the surviving copies of it contain Tarikh Ghars al-Ni'mah, but only four - one of which is in the Bibliothèque Nationale, No. Arab 1506, and the rest in Istanbul, Ahmad III, 2907 C, Vol. XIII, and Turk-Islam Eserleri Muzesi, Nos. 2134 and 2141. Depending on these four manuscripts, Dr. 'Ali Sevim has selected the events which he considered to be connected with the Saljuqs and published them in Ankara in 1968. In spite of his efforts, Dr. Sevim failed to give a critical edition. It is not for him, as an editor, to decide that an event or passage is connected with the Saljuqs simply because it contains a direct reference to one of them and that another should be omitted because it has not such a reference. The works of the chroniclers cannot be treated and classified as documents in a records office. Dr. Sevim was, on the other hand, unable to read the text accurately, perhaps because of insufficient knowledge of Arabic and also the difficulty of the text and condition of the manuscripts. As a result of this numerous errors have arisen throughout the text. In addition he has not used the phonetic pronunciation of any of the names enumerated in the text, specially those of the Turcomans.

In the book al-'Ibar Wa Dīwān al-Mubtada Wa'l-Khabar, Ibn Khaldun briefly dealt with the Mirdāsīd dynasty - differing very little from Ibn Athir - and the other events occurring in Aleppo during the 11th century. Ibn Khaldun also repeats what the other chroniclers have related and brings no new information.

It is interesting to mention here that very scanty is the information provided by the chroniclers who wrote exclusively about the Saljuqs, such as Al-'Imād, Al-Iṣfahānī, Ibn Nāṣir and al-Rāwandī.<sup>34</sup>

Michael Psellus is the 11th century Byzantine chronicler who provides us with interesting information concerning the relation between the Mirdāsīd and the Byzantine empire during the reigns of Romanus III (Argyros 1028-34) and Romanus IV (Diogenes, 1068-71).<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibn Nāṣir, 75-76; al-Bundāri, 35-37, 49, 66, 69-71, 75; al-Rāwandī, 203, 629; H.M.E., 69-70.

<sup>35</sup>Psellus, 66-70, 351-356.

## Chapter I

### PERIOD OF TRANSITION

The fall of the Ḥamdānīd dynasty;  
the first Fāṭimīd occupation

This thesis is mainly concerned with the history of the emirate of Aleppo during the 11th century, particularly that part which marked a turning point in its history (and the history of Syria included with the Islamic world). Since the 7th century and until 1086 A.D., Aleppo was influenced or controlled by the Bedouin Arabs of northern Syria and Upper Mesopotamia. In 1086 Aleppo was captured by the Saljuqs and passed under their direct rule.

The Saljuq conquest came at the end of a long struggle for supremacy between the Bedouin Arabs and the nomad Turcoman who migrated into northern Syria before the Saljuq conquest had taken place. This will be discussed later in the fourth chapter of this thesis, but it is interesting to mention here that as soon as, in 1064, the first Turcoman band had entered Aleppo, the political scene underwent a fundamental change and the power of the Bedouin Arabs began to wane. Accordingly the history of Aleppo during the 11th century could be divided into two parts, Arab and Turcoman.

During the first part Aleppo was surrounded by two great powers, those of the Byzantine empire and the Fāṭimīd caliphate, and was influenced by their policies. Before dealing with the

history of this part it would be well to glance briefly at both the Fāṭimid caliphate's and Byzantine empire's policy towards Aleppo and the nature of its constitution as a state.

a) The Fāṭimid caliphate's (in Egypt) policy and interest in Aleppo sprang from two main conceptions, theoretical and practical; the theoretical was based on the doctrine of this caliphate which aimed at the capture of the universe in general and in particular bringing the Abāssīd Caliphate to an end. Aleppo was not only a part of the universe but "a doorway to Iraq; and if anyone should capture it, all the [countries] beyond it would be in his hands".<sup>1</sup> In fact the Fāṭimid's policy, though disguised in a doctrinal form, was merely a continuation of the traditional foreign policy of independent Egypt towards Syria, of which Aleppo was a part. Such a policy was the off-spring of the geographical structure of Egypt which consisted merely of a large plain which had no natural defensive boundaries, thus leaving the country open to easy invasion, particularly from the north, where lies Syria. In order to prevent this, Egypt captured Syria or part of it and used the country as a buffer state. Before invaders could reach Egypt, therefore, they would be met by Egyptian troops away from her own borders. This same policy, which had been adopted by Egypt during each period of independence, aroused the desire to acquire

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibn al-Qalānisi, 33-34; Ibn Hānī', 408.

more territory and led to the establishment of the Egyptian Empire.

The Fāṭimid Caliphate, who pursued this policy, succeeded in occupying southern Syria (although the South was usually insecure), but failed to dominate the north - save for some short periods - because it was thwarted by several obstacles which were beyond its might to overcome. Among the most serious of these obstacles were the remoteness of Cairo, The Fāṭimid centre, from Aleppo, the weakness of the Fāṭimid Caliphate during the eleventh century, the policy of the Byzantine Empire, which - as we shall see - both resented and resisted a Fāṭimid existence on its immediate borders of Asia Minor, the Aleppines, including the Syrians, hated and rejected the Fāṭimid rule for many reasons, especially financial, economic and administrative;<sup>2</sup> the nomadic tribes of Syria who retained great and effective power, not only - as Bedouins - rejected the Fāṭimid rule as a city and centralised domination and continually created trouble and havoc, but were more subtle; they took the opportunity which the situation offered and captured regions and cities and established tribal dynasties; the examples of the tribe of Tayy' in Palestine and the tribe of Kilāb in northern Syria are striking.

---

<sup>2</sup>A brief study of both books Zubdat al-Ḥalab and Dhayl Tārīkh Dimashq would be sufficient to prove this.



Such difficult conditions compelled the Fāṭimid Caliphate to modify its theoretical policy and arrive at a more realistic and practical one. The death-bed counsel of the celebrated Vizir Ya'qub b. Killis to the Fāṭimid Caliph Al-'Azīz (975-996 A.D.) emphasised this moderate and practical policy. He says "Peace let there be with the Byzantines as long as they keep peace with thee; be satisfied by the Ḥamdānīd - ruler of Aleppo - with the reference to you from their pulpits and on their coins; and do not leave Mufarrij b. Daḡḡfal (Amir, tribe of Tayy') alive when you have the opportunity to do otherwise".<sup>3</sup> Thus the Fāṭimid Caliphate often tolerated the existence of independent rule in Aleppo but tried not to tolerate that in Palestine because Palestine is in immediate proximity to Egypt.

b) The Byzantine Empire, who captured Aleppo during the 10th century<sup>4</sup> and was able to recapture it, did not try to retain the city or to annex it to its territory.<sup>5</sup> The reasons were that not only that the maintenance was both difficult and costly, but it would appear that the Byzantine Empire preferred to see an independent state in Aleppo. The preservation of semi- or completely independent rule in Aleppo would serve the interest of the Empire more; for such a small and weak State would be useful as a

---

<sup>3</sup>Al-Sayrafī, 23; Al-Nujūm, IV, 21; Al-Yāfi'ī, II, 252-253.

<sup>4</sup>Zubda, I, 133-140.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.; I, 191.

buffer, link or bridge to the Muslim world, a free international market and a deterrent to the fanatical Arabic nomadic tribes of Syria, checking them from raiding the Byzantine territory. Taking as example the case of a certain Ahmad b. Al-Ḥusain who, in 394 A.H./1003 A.D., rose among the Nomads who inhabited the region of Aleppo. He called for a Holy War against the infidels - the Byzantines - and styled himself as Al-Aṣfar Al-Ghāzī (a Messianic name). He caused trouble in the Byzantine land and the Emperor Basil II was unable to check him; therefore he asked Lu'lu', the ruler of Aleppo, to find a solution. Lu'lu' invited this Aṣfar to Aleppo on the pretext of conferring with a view to co-operation; but when Aṣfar entered the city he was immediately arrested and imprisoned in the Citadel of Aleppo.<sup>6</sup>

The Byzantine Empire often resisted by every means in its power the annexation of Aleppo to any of the Muslim States; for Byzantium the loss of Aleppo meant a step towards the loss of Antioch and other parts of Asia Minor. Evidence of this can be found in the history of the Macedonian Dynasty, taking for example the reign of the Emperor Basil II. During his reign

---

<sup>6</sup> Al-Antākī, 186-187; Zubda, I, 196; Al-Bustān, 83r.; Al-Man-suri, 70r. There is another Aṣfar who later, in 439/1037, emerged in upper Mesopotamia and was arrested by Naṣr al-Dawla, the Marwānid ruler of Diyār Bakr; see al-Muntazam, VIII, 132; Al-'Azimī, 174v; Al-Kāmil, IX, 369; Bar Hebraeus, 205; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 56.

the Fāṭimid Caliph Al-‘Azīz endeavoured to capture Aleppo; he sent one expedition after another to accomplish this, but Aleppo escaped capture because of the resistance of its rulers and peoples who were supported by Byzantine troops and other kinds of assistance. Once in 384 A.H./994 A.D., Aleppo after a long and hard Fāṭimid ~~si~~ge was on the brink of surrender. The Byzantine Governor of Antioch failed to relieve the city. On hearing the news from an Aleppine envoy, the Emperor Basil II who was campaigning against the Bulgars, left the battlefield and came hurrying with a detachment of his army towards Aleppo. Basil travelled three hundred parasangs in sixteen days, reached the region of Aleppo, took the Fāṭimid troops by surprise and rescued the city. His brother and co-Emperor, Constantine, said to him "Take Aleppo and Syria would be easy to possess". Basil refused to do so because he was 'honest and straightforward', as Ibn Al-‘Adīm alleged<sup>7</sup>!?

c) Aleppo's prestige was enhanced after the rise of independent Muslim Egypt by the establishment of the Ṭulunīd Dynasty (868-905 A.D.). Henceforward it lay on the crossroads of the caravan routes which joined the territories of the Egyptian State with those of the Abbāssīd Caliphate and the Byzantine Empire. After the establishment of the Ḥamdānīd Dynasty - in Aleppo -

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibn al-Qalānisi, 42-43; Zubda, I, 185-191; Ostrogorsky, 308.

by Sayf Al-Dawla in 945 A.D., Aleppo became a centre dominating parts of upper Syria and Mesopotamia. This establishment brought into being the State of Aleppo which, in the course of time, was accepted as an established fact, thus acquiring some kind of coherence and administrative distinction.

The extent of this State shrank or expanded according to the power and ambition of its ruler together with the political situation in the surrounding countries. The entire State was dependent on its centre - the city of Aleppo - and there is scanty information concerning other parts or cities within the domain. There are greater sources of information concerning the city of Aleppo itself and, in fact, any attempt at a history of the state of Aleppo is actually more relevant to the city itself than to the state. Future reference to Aleppo must comprise the State .

Aleppo had not been ruled by any local (Aleppine) dynasty, but there was always a local body of professional burcaucrats headed by a Vizier. This body was in charge of the State's affairs and held effective power. Before the Saljuq conquest changes in rulers or dynasties left no lasting impression on the State.

There was no Alopepine policy towards either the Byzantine or the Fāṭimid Caliphate, but there was reaction to the events of the time and the political attitude of individual rulers.

Prior to 1070 A.D. Aleppo suffered a succession of rulers and tribal Amirs. Some of the rulers were appointed by the Fāṭimid Caliphate, but in spite of their appointment all of them attempted to declare their independence after a short while. The circumstances prevailing in Aleppo and its nearby countries encouraged an attitude of independence.

The Amirs were all members of the Mirdāsīd dynasty which was established 415 A.H./1024 A.D.; in fact this dynasty was the successor to the Ḥamdānīd dynasty which came to an end in 1002. The period between 1002 and 1024 was a time of transition which ushered in the Mirdāsīd dynasty.

On the 15th of Ṣafar, 392 A.H./2nd January, 1002 A.D., Abu Al-Faḍā'il Sa'īd Al-Dawla, the Ḥamdānīd Amir of Aleppo died.<sup>8</sup> His death marked the actual end of the Ḥamadānīd dynasty of Aleppo. During this Amir's life the real ruler of Aleppo was the Chamberlain Lu'lu'.<sup>9</sup> Lu'lu', who was a former page (Ghulām) of Sayf Al-Dawla, the founder of the Ḥamdānīd dynasty of Aleppo, now became the ruler of the State, acting in the name of Sa'īd Al-Dawla's two children Abu Al-Ḥasan 'Alī and Abu Al-Ma'ālī Sharīf. Shortly afterwards he sent these two children to Egypt and declared himself as sole ruler of Aleppo. His son Maṅṣur

---

<sup>8</sup> Zubda, I, 192.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 190-192; Ibn al-'Amīd, 511-512; Ṣafadī, II, 83; Munajjim, I, 235v; 'Iqd, XI, 574.

was his assistant and partner.<sup>10</sup> Maṅṣūr and his father tyrannised over the remaining members of the Ḥamdānid dynasty and one of these members, known as Abu 'Al-Ḥayjā', brother of Sa'īd Al-Dawla, fled with the help of a Christian Allepine silk merchant to the Byzantine Empire. The Byzantine Emperor, Basil II, gave this Amir asylum with the honorary title of "Magister".<sup>11</sup> This Amir was a son-in-law of the Marwānid ruler of Diyār Bakr, Mumahhid Al-Dawla<sup>12</sup> (997-1101 A.D.)

At the end of the year 399 A.H./1008 A.D., Lu'lu' died and his son Maṅṣūr became the sole ruler of Aleppo. Unlike his father, Maṅṣūr was over-confident, short-sighted, a drunkard, "Oppressor and unjust". Because of this the Aleppines hated him and several of their poets cursed him in their poems.<sup>13</sup>

The population of Aleppo, who hated Maṅṣūr, began to search for a way to get rid of him. As time went by he was heedlessly and arrogantly increasing his oppression. There is no indication concerning the parties, factions or individuals who led the population in an endeavour to end his rule. We only know that the

---

<sup>10</sup> Zubda, I, 195; Al-'Aẓīmī, 157r.; Al-Antākī, 209-210; Ibn al-Amīd, 512.

<sup>11</sup> For the value of this title, see Cambridge Medieval History, vol. IV, part II, p.20.

<sup>12</sup> Zubda, I, 198; Al-Nujūm, IV, 161; Al-Antākī, 209-210.

<sup>13</sup> Zubda, I, 198; Al-'Aẓīmī, 159r.; Al-Antākī, 210; 'Iqd, XI, 554; Munajjim, I, 235v.; Nujūm, IV, 221; Ibn al-Amīd, 513.

Aleppines found that the restoration of the Ḥamdānīd dynasty would be the best solution. They recalled and emphasised the fact that Maṅṣūr himself was the son of Ḥamdānīd's slave who had betrayed his masters and who had usurped their rights.<sup>14</sup> For the Aleppines, the alternative was either to bring the two sons of Sa'īd Al-Dawla from Egypt or Abu Ḥayyajā from the Byzantine Empire. None of these Amirs were able to leave either Egypt or Byzantium without permission. Such permission would mean the support and involvement of the State which sponsored the return.

The Aleppines did not apply to Cairo as it was difficult to imagine that the Fāṭimid Caliph would bless their movement, because Maṅṣūr had built up good relations with the Caliph Al-Ḥākim. In 398 A.H./1007 A.D. - during his father, Lu'lu's life - Maṅṣūr sent his two sons to Cairo where the Caliph Al-Ḥākim conferred on them a large sum of money together with seven villages in Palestine and honoured their father by the title of "Mur-taḍā Al-Dawla" (that is, "the content of the State").<sup>15</sup> Many years before, the Fāṭimid Caliphate endeavoured to capture Aleppo and to bring the Ḥamdānīd dynasty to an end. Now this dynasty had vanished and Maṅṣūr's rule had no strong foundation. The time was now ripe for an easy conquest or, with a

---

<sup>14</sup>Al-Antākī, 210-211; Zubda, I, 199.

<sup>15</sup>Zubda, I, 198.

little patience, Aleppo would itself fall into their hands of its own volition.<sup>16</sup>

The other alternative facing the Aleppines, which they took, was to bring Abu al-Hayyajā from the Byzantine Empire. The Aleppines also won the support of the tribe of Kilāb which held the greatest power in the State; subsequently they applied to Mumahhid Al-Dawla, the Marwānīd ruler of Diyār-Bakr - and Abu Al-Hayyajā's father-in-law - who was on good terms with the Byzantine Empire - to assist in effecting his return. Mumahhid Al-Dawla, who held the Byzantine honorary title of "Magister" asked Basil II, the Byzantine Emperor, to permit Abu al-Hayyajā to leave Byzantium and resume the dynasty. Mumahhid Al-Dawla told Basil II that the Empire need spend no money as he himself would support his son-in-law and provide his needs. Basil II realised that this procedure would be beneficial to his Empire not only by ending the weak rule of Maṣṣūūr but at the same time it would end the Fāṭimīd influence and strengthen that of Byzantium. He gave Abu al-Hayyajā freedom to leave Byzantium and to return to Aleppo if he wished, but there is no record under what conditions this permission was granted. In 400 A.H./ 1009 A.D. Abu al-Hayyajā went to Mayyāfāriqīn where his father-in-law furnished him with a sum of money, how much is not

---

<sup>16</sup>See pp. 28-30.



known, and about 200 horsemen. Abu al-Hayjā' wrote to the Chiefs of the Tribe of Kilāb, asking their support and promising large rewards. On his way toward Aleppo a group of the Kilābī, Chiefs and Tribesmen, met him accompanied and promised him their support until his aim was accomplished.

Desperate in the face of this danger, Manṣūr rapidly moved. He wrote to the Kilābī Chieftains that he would, if they did not support Abu 'l-Hayjā', share with them the revenue and rulership of the outer regions of Aleppo. At the same time he asked Al-Ḥākim, the Fāṭimid Caliph, for aid promising that he would allow a Fāṭimid Governor to occupy the Citadel of Aleppo. Al-Ḥākim instructed the Cadi and Governor of Tripoli to lead the Fāṭimid troops garrisoned there towards Aleppo to the help of Manṣūr. When these troops entered Aleppo Abu 'l-Hayjā' together with the Tribe of Kilāb, had just reached the outskirts of Aleppo.

The Kilābī tribesmen and Chieftains, as Bedouins had their own standard of loyalty. Often they were willing to serve one man one day and another the next, thinking only of personal advancement and personal gain. On such men Abu 'l-Hayjā' depended for the success of his campaign. These Kilābī were secretly agreed to Manṣūr's offer and terms and they were ready to betray Abu 'l-Hayjā' and abandon him at a critical moment. Manṣūr asked 'Alī b. 'Abi'l-Wahid b. Ḥaydarah, the Cadi of Tripoli,

who was the leader of the Fāṭimid troops, to inform the Caliph Al-Ḥākim of the situation by letter, to be sent by carrier pigeon. Without waiting for an answer and without knowing anything of Manṣūr's plan and secret agreement with the tribe of Kilāb, Cadi 'Alī led his troops outside the city of Aleppo towards Abu 'l-Hayjā's camp. At his approach the Kilābīs scattered and betrayed their previous employer who fled towards the Byzantine territory. The Fāṭimid troops, after completely looting Abu 'l-Hayjā's camp, returned to Aleppo to find Manṣūr rewarding them by shutting the city's gates in their faces.

Disappointed and unable to take Aleppo by force, the Fāṭimid troops retired to Tripoli.

Basil II refused to accept Abu 'l-Hayjā in his country again, but Manṣūr - who distrusted the Kilābīs - was afraid that Abu 'l-Hayjā might make a second attempt, now appealed to the Emperor Basil II to permit, or rather to confine Abu 'l-Hayjā in Constantinople. The Emperor accepted the appeal and permitted the unfortunate Amir to return to Constantinople, where he spent the rest of his life.<sup>17</sup> Available sources say nothing of any activity among the Aleppines at this time.

Al-Ḥākim, the disappointed and angry Caliph, sent fresh troops and despatched with them Abu Al-Ma'ālī Sharīf b. Sa'id

---

<sup>17</sup>Al-Antākī, 210-211; Zubda, I, 198-200.

Al-Dawla, who was one of the two Ḥamdānid Amirs previously exiled to Cairo. In 402 A.H./1011 A.D. this Fāṭimid army reached Ma'arrat Al-Nu'mān, where it was resisted by the Bedouins (probably of the tribe of Kilāb) who endeavoured to kidnap the young Ḥamdānid Amir and to sell him to Manṣūr b. Lu'lu'. In the face of this danger the Fāṭimid troops retreated towards Cairo.<sup>18</sup>

It would appear that Manṣūr was able, after a while, to solve his problems with Al-Ḥākim who, in Ramaḍān 404 A.H./March 1014 A.D., sent him a diploma confirming his authority in Aleppo.<sup>19</sup> It is noteworthy that Manṣūr b. Lu'lu' was the first ruler of Aleppo who acknowledged the Fāṭimid Caliphate instead of the 'Abbāsīd, but the exact date of this is not known.<sup>20</sup>

Manṣūr who was thus able to solve his problems with both the Byzantine Empire and the Fāṭimid Caliphate, failed to satisfy the Tribe of Kilāb and here his rule was ultimately to collapse. The Kilābī Tribesmen and Chieftains asked Manṣūr to fulfil his obligations since they had carried out their part of the secret agreement and the Ḥamdānid Amir's attempts had failed. Manṣūr tried to avoid their demands by procrastination

---

<sup>18</sup> Zubda, I, 200.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., I, 200.

<sup>20</sup> Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 121v.-122r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 159; 'Iqd, XI, 574; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 147; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 544, 580; Munajjim, I, 235v.

and diplomacy. The diplomatic measures were successful when he dealt with the Fāṭimid Caliphate and the Byzantine Empire; but the Bedouins preferred settlement in a practical manner -- payment in gold; and neither understood nor trusted diplomacy. When Maṣṣūr paid nothing to the Kilābīs they began to take. They pitched their tents on the immediate outskirts of the city of Aleppo and devastated the region. Their herds grazed in the city gardens, orchards and among the grain-fields. They cut the green trees and used every method to cripple the city and its ruler.

Maṣṣūr, powerless to check them, pretended that he would not only fulfil his previous promises but would like to form a fresh pact and thus permanently settle the dispute. As a sign of good faith he invited the Tribe's Amirs and notable members to a banquet to be held inside the city. The tribe of Kilāb accepted the invitation and a number of its most prominent and other members entered Aleppo. Ibn al-ʿAdīm indicates that more than a thousand Kilābī entered the city, but Ibn Saʿīd Al-Antākī, who seemed to be one of Ibn Al-ʿAdīm's sources and who related this event in more detail, reported that the number was about 700. Other chroniclers, such as Ibn Al-Aṭhīr, Al-Badr Al-ʿAynī and Aḥmad b. Liṭf-Allāh (Munajjim Bāshi), alleged that not more than 500 Kilābī horsemen entered Aleppo. The account of Al-Antākī is the most acceptable of all these reports

because he was nearer to the event and well-informed. In addition, Al-'Aẓīmī and Ibn Al-'Adīm, who were fellow citizens of Aleppo and the most authoritative in its history, depended on Al-Antākī for their information. Al-'Aẓīmī acknowledged quoting from Al-Antākī, while Ibn 'Adīm, in spite of his lack of acknowledgment, appears to have quoted Al-Antākī literally.<sup>21</sup> Ibn Al-Athīr, who gave little attention to the event, did not name his sources; but it would seem to be that he was the source of both Al-'Aynī and Munajjim Bāshī.<sup>22</sup>

To their surprise the Kilābīs, when they entered Maṅṣur's palace, found the gates suddenly closed behind them and Maṅṣur with his pages (Ghulāms) welcomed them with their swords. Many Kilābīs were killed and those who were able to escape from the palace failed to get out of the city, for all the city gates were locked. The Kilābīs who escaped death were arrested and fettered then thrown into the prison dungeons of the Citadel. This event took place on the 2nd of Dhi'l-qa'ada 402 A.H./27th May 1012 A.D. These tactics were used during the Islamic history by several rulers in different countries and times. It will be sufficient to recall the death banquet of the Umayyad given by the Abbasid leader Abdū'l-lāh b. 'Alī and, the more modern example, the slaughter of the Mamluks by Muḥammad 'Alī in the Citadel of Cairo.

---

<sup>21</sup> Al-'Aẓīmī, 180v.; Zubda, I, 200-201; Al-Antākī, 210-211.

<sup>22</sup> Al-Kāmil, IX, 159-160; Iqd, XI, 574-575; Munajjim, I, 235v.

On hearing what had befallen its members, the tribe of Kilāb, under the leadership of one of its Amirs named Muqallid b. Zā'ida, moved from the outskirts of Aleppo southward and tried to capture Kafar-ḡāb. Upon hearing the news of this movement Manṣur b. Lu'lu' moved his captives from the prisons to other places with better conditions, equipment and more humane treatment. He gave special attention to the two brothers of Muqallid, Ḥamid and Jāmi', but this new attitude did not last long, for Manṣur received tidings that the tribe of Kilāb had failed to capture Kafar-ḡāb, its leader was killed in the siege and the tribe scattered. The Kilābīs were again thrown into the dungeons where they stayed for more than two years. Manṣur killed a number of Chieftains, but most of the prisoners lost their lives as a result of the bad conditions of their prisons and the harsh treatment they suffered.

Among the prisoners was Ṣāliḡ b. Mirdās, an energetic and bold Amir whom Manṣūr tried to humiliate. He forced him to divorce his wife who was famed for her beauty. Ibn Al-'Adīm related that her name was Ṭarūd and that she was mother of 'Aṭiyya b. Ṣāliḡ, but Ibn Al-Aṡḡir related that her name was Jābir and she was not only Ṣāliḡ's wife but his cousin. After the compulsory divorce had taken place, Manṣūr married her. It is questionable whether Manṣūr only intended to humiliate Ṣāliḡ and to enjoy her beauty or whether his object was to link himself with the tribe of

Kilāb or with part of it as a means of solving his problems with this tribe and removing the menace of hostility without which he could not retain his rule. It could perhaps be that Maṅṣūr desired to achieve all these advantages. The available sources give no direct reference to this matter, but Al-Antākī relates that by threatening death and promising freedom, Maṅṣūr induced a number of his Kilābī prisoners to accept him and his impositions. Accordingly, in Shawāl 403 A.H./April, 1013 A.D. he released a group of his Kilābī prisoners. We do not know their number or their names, but it seems, however, that they were only a few.

The actions Maṅṣūr took against Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās were unsuccessful and Ṣāliḥ's boldness and resentment increased. On several occasions, when he was drunk, Maṅṣūr was going to execute Ṣāliḥ. Ṣāliḥ received a file from an anonymous friend together with a warning of Maṅṣūr's intention. Ṣāliḥ made a hole in the wall of his prison and cut one of the two shackles which bound his feet but was unable to cut the other, so he tied the chain round his leg. In the dead of night of the 1st Muḥarram, 405 A.H./3rd July, 1014 A.D. Ṣāliḥ escaped to freedom. The sources tell us that Ṣāliḥ opened a hole in his prison wall then jumped from the citadel wall on to the hill below, hid in a drain-pipe for the night and on the next day reached the camp of his tribe in Marj-Dābiq. It is difficult to accept this version in its entirety. It would require a miracle to be able to jump from the high wall of

the citadel with a shackle, and a chain attached to a heavy block of iron on one leg, without receiving injury and without rousing the attention of the guard. In addition, there was the city wall, with its shut gates and vigilant guard. It would seem more likely that, either by bribe or through friendly arrangement, doors were unlocked for Ṣāliḥ. We also learn that later Maṅṣūr accused the governor of the citadel of connivance. Be that as it may, we know that by some means Ṣāliḥ escaped and rejoined his tribe.

Within a few days of his arrival the tribe of Kilāb, encouraged by the escape, assembled and gave Ṣāliḥ their allegiance. Without delay Ṣāliḥ led the tribe to lay siege to Aleppo. Skirmishes took place between the two sides and in one of these minor engagements the troops of Maṅṣūr were able to loot part of Ṣāliḥ's camp and to capture about fifty of the tribe's members. This encouraged Maṅṣūr who summoned all his troops and recruited all the city 'rabble' with large numbers from the Christian and Jewish communities. In the afternoon of the very hot summer's day of Ṣafar 12th, 405 A.H./Friday, 13th August, 1014 A.D., and not far from Aleppo, Maṅṣūr's army engaged the tribe of Kilāb in a decisive battle. The result was that Maṅṣūr's army was completely routed, more than 2,000 Aleppines were slaughtered, and Maṅṣūr himself together with his army's senior commanders, were captured.

When Maṅṣūr led his army, he was accompanied by his two brothers who escaped to Aleppo where, with the help of their



mother, they maintained order in the city and Ṣāliḥ was unable to capture it. A negotiation for settlement between Ṣāliḥ and Maṣṣūr, with his brothers, took place where the dignitaries of Aleppo acted as mediators. Before long an agreement was reached whereby Ṣāliḥ was to release Maṣṣūr and Maṣṣūr, in turn, was to release his Kilābī prisoners, to give Ṣāliḥ 50,000 golden dinars, 120 silver Aleppine ratels, 500 dress lengths of various materials, to divorce the two Kilābī women he had married - Ṣāliḥ's wife and another lady - to give his daughter to Ṣāliḥ as his wife and, more important, Ṣāliḥ would be the partner of Maṣṣūr who would assign to him half the State of Aleppo including Aleppo itself and to acknowledge Ṣāliḥ as being the supreme Amir who held authority and control over the tribe of Kilāb. Maṣṣūr's mother, wife and sons were put in Ṣāliḥ's hands as hostages. The significance of this agreement is in the last two conditions and, in spite of Maṣṣūr's unfulfilment of some of the promises he gave, Ṣāliḥ sustained his authority over the tribe of Kilāb and captured Manbij and Bālis (modern Masskanah on the Euphrates). By this, Ṣāliḥ actually laid the foundation of the Mirdāsīd dynasty.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Al-Antākī, 210-213; Zubda, I, 201-207; Ibn Abī Ḥaṣṣanah, II, 234-235; Bughya, A.S., 467-478; Ibn Abī'l-Hayjā', 121v-122r.v.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 159-161; Al-'Azīmī, 161r.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 514-515; Iqd, XI, 574-576; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 147-148; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 544-545; Al-Ṣafadi, II, 83; Munajjim, I, 235v.-236r.

The life and career of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās together with the establishment of the Mirdāsīd dynasty will be considered in detail in the following chapter. It is necessary here to note that since 399 A.H./1008 A.D. Ṣāliḥ was in control of Raḥba<sup>24</sup> (modern Mayadin on the Euphrates), and by gaining Manbij and Bālis he secured for himself what was, during the 11th century, the Mesopotamian division of the State of Aleppo. This division was not only fertile but strategically important, with a significant commercial value. Ṣāliḥ's acquisition put him into direct touch with Iraq, Byzantium and the Fāṭimid Caliphate and was used by him as a base for the capture of Aleppo at a later date. After the establishment of the Mirdāsīd dynasty in Aleppo the Mesopotamian division was a place of asylum for the members of this dynasty whenever, during the 11th century, they were obliged to abandon Aleppo; for this region was retained by the Mirdāsīds who invariably recaptured Aleppo.

Maṣṣūr fulfilled some of his promises to Ṣāliḥ, but as on previous occasions he repudiated most of them. He refused the marriage of Ṣāliḥ to his daughter and the sharing of the State income. As reprisal Ṣāliḥ invested the city of Aleppo and prevented commerce and provisions from entering it. This action

---

<sup>24</sup>Al-'Aẓīmī, 158v; Ibn Abi'l Hayjā', 121v.; Itti'āz, Annals 399 H; Ibn Junghul, IV, 196r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 138-139; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 580; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 82-83; Munajjim, I, 328r.

affected the city and caused hardship to its population and Maṅṣūr was helpless. Maṅṣūr solicited the support of the Byzantine Emperor, Basil II, against what he termed "a Bedouin uprising" which, if not checked, would harm not only Aleppo but the Byzantine Empire. Basil II responded to his request by sending 1,000 Armenian troops. Ṣāliḥ, however, appealed to the Emperor himself and submitted his case against Maṅṣūr, outlining his treacherous behaviour, and, at the same time he assured the Emperor of his own personal goodwill. According to Al-Antākī, Basil was convinced and agreed that Ṣāliḥ's cause was just. He ordered the withdrawal of the Armenian troops thus leaving Maṅṣūr to his fate.<sup>25</sup> Despite Al-Antākī's report it would perhaps be more appropriate to believe that this withdrawal was not the result of conviction but rather because of the Emperor's wish to avoid an open clash with the Bedouin tribes which could only have been detrimental to the Empire. Taking into consideration that, not only Ṣāliḥ's tribe and property bordered the Byzantine Empire but the fact that the tribe of Numayr, who was of the same origin as the tribe of Kilāb and with whom cordial relations had mostly existed, also bordered the Empire in the regions of Ḥarrān and Edessa. The withdrawal of the Byzantine troops weakened Maṅṣūr's position and strengthened Ṣāliḥ who sent one of his sons as his

---

<sup>25</sup>Al-Antākī, 212-213.

as his representative to Constantinople to give allegiance to the Emperor.<sup>26</sup>

The fatal blow to Maṣṣūr's rule came when he disputed with his page (Ghulām) Faṭḥ al-Qal'ī (i.e. Faṭḥ of the Citadel) the governor of Aleppo's Citadel. Maṣṣūr accused Faṭḥ of being the source of all his troubles, for by his carelessness or, rather, connivance, Ṣāliḥ had escaped. He who lacked the power to remove Faṭḥ endeavoured - as was his custom - to rid himself of him by other means. On realising his master's intrigue, Faṭḥ not only refused to descend and meet him but shut the citadel gate and went into open rebellion against him. At the same time he acknowledged the supremacy of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās and the Fāṭimid Caliph Al-Ḥākim. This occurred on the night of Saturday, 24th Rajab 406 A.H./7th January 1016 A.D. and took Maṣṣūr by surprise since he thought that Ṣāliḥ had captured the Citadel. He fled with his sons, brothers and some of his pages and a sum of money towards Antioch. When morning came the news of Maṣṣūr's flight had spread in the city of Aleppo and disorder prevailed. The palace of Maṣṣūr was looted and, what was worse, 80,000 dinars' worth of chattels was lost. But the most disastrous effect was (as Ibn Al-'Adīm relates) the loss of 28,000 volumes of manuscripts which were in the library of the palace. Some houses belonging to Christians and Jews were pillaged.

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 213-214.

Several Arabic chroniclers considered that this event marked the end of the Ḥamdānid dynasty. On the second day of his flight Maṣṣūr reached the city of Antioch, where he took asylum.<sup>27</sup> It was the policy of the Byzantine Empire, as it was also that of the Fāṭimid Caliphate, to give refuge to any ex-ruler of Aleppo who could serve as a political pawn or instrument of blackmail, to be held as a threat against and pressure upon the successive ruler; or as a reserve in time of need.

Some chroniclers reported that Faṭḥ's rebellion against his master was originally encouraged - if not arranged - by Al-Ḥākīm, the Fāṭimid Caliph, who had communicated with him. No-one of the chroniclers who were authoritative in the history of Aleppo, such as Al-Antākī, Al-ʿAẓīmī and Ibn Al-ʿAdīm, mentioned such an occurrence. They related that Faṭḥ, on the morning of his rebellion, agreed with Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās on sharing the State according to Ṣāliḥ-Maṣṣūr agreement. Faṭḥ also sent Ṣāliḥ the family of Maṣṣūr and Ṣāliḥ, in turn conveyed this family to Antioch, except Maṣṣūr's daughter whom he kept and married. At the same time, to secure his position, Faṭḥ wrote to the Fāṭimid ruler of Afāmya asking his support and inviting him with his troops to Aleppo. The Fāṭimid ruler of Afāmya, ʿAlī b. Aḥmad, generally

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 214-215; Zubda, I, 207-210; Ibn al-ʿAmīd, 514-515; Mirʿat, B.M., 200v.; Al-Bustān, 83r.; ʿIqd, XI, 575-577; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148; Al-Nujūm, IV, 221; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 544, 580; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 83; Munajjim, I, 236r.

known as Al-Ḍayf, responded to Faṭḥ's request and came to Aleppo with his troops. Afterwards Faṭḥ wrote to the Caliph Al-Ḥākim offering allegiance for which Al-Ḥākim thanked him and conferred on him the honorary title of Mubārak Al-Dawla Wa Sa'īdaha (i.e., the State's blessing and happiness). Al-Ḥākim wrote also to Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās asking him to co-operate with Al-Ḍayf and Faṭḥ and conferred on him the title of Asad Al-Dawla (i.e. the lion of the State). In order to gain popular support, Al-Ḥākim remitted several taxes and exempted Aleppo from the payment of a year's tribute. All this took place after the flight of Maṅṣūr.

The chroniclers who reported that a communication between Faṭḥ and Al-Ḥākim had taken place before the rebellion were Ibn Al-Aṭḥīr, Al-Badr, Al-'Aynī, Abu'l-Fidā', Ibn Khaldūn and Aḥmad b. Lutf-Allāh (Munajjim Bāshi). Ibn Al-Aṭḥīr seems to have been the source of all these chroniclers. Ibn Al-Aṭḥīr's account of the history of Aleppo during the 11th century is very brief and complicated, therefore it cannot be relied upon if there were not other chroniclers such as Ibn Al-'Adīm to corroborate it.<sup>28</sup>

The events which took place in Aleppo disturbed the Byzantine Empire and its re-action was to give Maṅṣūr asylum, to assign to him a stipend with a fief close to the border of Aleppo in order

---

<sup>28</sup> Al-Antākī, 214-215; Al-'Aẓīmī, 161r.v.; Zubda, I, 213-214; Ibn al-'Amīd, 514-515; Mir'āt, B.M., 200v.; Al-Bustān, 84r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 161; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā, 122r.; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 148; Iqd, XI, 575-577; Munajjim, I, 236r.; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 544-545; Al-Ṣafadi, II, 83.

to keep watch on events there, and, for this purpose, troops of his own were allowed to him. The Emperor "prohibited travel and commerce from all the Byzantine Empire to any part of Syria and Egypt".<sup>29</sup> Ṣāliḥ asked the Emperor Basil II to exempt him and his followers from this restriction and the Emperor acquiesced.<sup>30</sup>

Ṣāliḥ was against the Fāṭimid occupation and he warned and inspired Fath, advising him to get rid of them with his connivance on the basis of partnership where he, Ṣāliḥ would stay outside the city and Fath would remain in the citadel. Al-Ḥākim put pressure on Fath, offering him Sidon, Tyre and Beirut as life iqtā' together with all the treasures of the citadel of Aleppo if he should relinquish his office. Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās, probably with Byzantine encouragement, advised Fath to refuse the offer and again assured him of his readiness to assist him to expel the Fāṭimid troops. Fath was inclined to accept Ṣāliḥ's proposals. The people of Aleppo, who had just got rid of Maṣṣur, who had not forgotten Ṣāliḥ's blow, and who were enjoying the tax exemption, protested against Fath's intentions. They assembled at the gate of the citadel and told Fath that they preferred the rule of the Fāṭimid and had no desire for Bedouin Governorship.

---

<sup>29</sup>Al-Antākī, 214; Zubda, I, 209-210; Al-'Aẓīmī, 161r.v.

<sup>30</sup>Al-Antākī, 214.

This was the first and the last time, as we shall see, that the Aleppines favoured Fāṭimid rule.

Al-Ḍayf and his Fāṭimid troops were unable to calm the city, so he asked the Caliphate for re-inforcements. Al-Ḥākim ordered the rulers of Tripoli and Sidon to reinforce him, which they did. He also asked Ḥassān b. al-Mufarrij, Amir of the tribe of Ṭayy', and Sinān b. 'Ulaiyān, Amir of the tribe of Kalb, to move towards Aleppo and to be in readiness to support the Fāṭimid troops there. Ṣāliḥ was now handicapped and Fath was loth to relinquish his post and to go to Tyre.<sup>31</sup>

On the 2nd Ramadan 407 A.H./3rd February 1017 A.D. the first Fāṭimid-appointed ruler entered Aleppo. His name was Fātik and his title Amir Al-Umara 'Azīz al-Dawla. He was a freed page (Ghulām) of Armenian origin.<sup>32</sup> This ruler was ambitious and capable, for before long he had settled all the problems with Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās and persuaded him to send his Mother to live in Aleppo as a sign of their friendship. The available sources give no detail of the kind of settlement made. It would appear that Ṣāliḥ was satisfied and remained contented during the reign of this ruler, which lasted more than five years. The sources speak of no movement by Ṣāliḥ during this period. On the other hand, 'Azīz Al-Dawla was able to satisfy the Byzantine Emperor, Basil II, who

---

<sup>31</sup>Al-Antākī, 215-216; Al-'Aẓīmī, 161r.v.; Zubda, I, 214-215; Ibn al-'Amīd, 514-515; Ibn Abi'l Hayjā', 122r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 161-162; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 545, 580; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148; Iqd, XI, 576-578; Al-Ṣafadi, II, 83; Munajjim, I, 236r.

<sup>32</sup>Al-Antākī, 216; Zubda, I, 215-216; Al-'Aẓīmī, I, 161v;



removed the commercial blockade and permitted the resumption of communications between Aleppo and Byzantium.

These things, however, annoyed the Caliph Al-Ḥākim, who regarded them as a step towards independence, but he was unable to take any immediate action as there were no Fāṭimid troops in Aleppo. On assuming his post, 'Azīz Al-Dawla persuaded the leaders of the Fāṭimid troops that their mission was accomplished and that they should withdraw to their former bases. 'Azīz Al-Dawla not only ignored Al-Ḥākim's reproaches, made no attempt to bring about reconciliation but proclaimed his own independence, striking his own coins and decreeing that his name alone should be mentioned from the pulpits. It is not known exactly at what date this action took place. It was probably in the year 411 A.H./1020 A.D. for an inscription bearing this date, the name of Al-Ḥākim and 'Aziz Al-Dawla was found in Aleppo. To sustain this, the chroniclers relate that in 411 A.H./1020 A.D. Al-Ḥākim prepared an expedition against 'Aziz Al-Dawla and that 'Azīz Al-Dawla called on the Emperor Basil II offering to yield Aleppo to him. When Basil was on his way towards Aleppo, news of Al-Ḥākim's mysterious disappearance reached 'Azīz Al-Dawla. On hearing this news, 'Azīz Al-Dawla sent a communication to the Emperor Basil II informing him that his offer was now invalid and that he no longer required his help and, should he attempt

---

al-'Amīd, 515; Iṭī'az, Annals, 413H; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148; 'Iqd, XI, 576-577.

to capture Aleppo by force, he - 'Aziz Al-Dawla - and the tribe of Kilāb would be his enemies. Basil did not continue his journey towards Aleppo, but diverted his army towards Mināz-Jird.<sup>33</sup>

The mysterious disappearance of Al-Ḥākim, the Fāṭimid Caliph, and the succession of his young son Al-Zāhir gave confidence to 'Aziz Al-Dawla. This confidence was sustained by the gifts and Robe of Honour he received from the Caliphate at Cairo as a sign of reconciliation and recognition. 'Aziz Al-Dawla, however, was not over-confident, for he did not relax but took the opportunity to strengthen his position in Aleppo. He rebuilt and fortified the Palace at the foot of the Citadel in order to retain contact with it and to avoid any re-occurrence like that which had happened to Manṣūr b. Lu'lu'. He also procured a number of pages to be in his service and guard.

These pages lived in the Citadel and their Commander was a certain Badr, Turkish in origin, who at the same time held the post of governor of the Citadel. It would appear that when 'Aziz Al-Dawla placed his trust in this bodyguard of slaves, that he forgot the fact that he was, himself, a slave who had

---

<sup>33</sup> Al-Antākī, 216; Zubda, I, 216-219; Al-'Azīmī, 161v; Ibn al-'Amīd, 515, 520; Itti'āz, Annals, 413H; R.C.E.A., VI, 164 (No. 2311).

betrayed his master and that a similar fate could overtake him. And so it happened, for in Cairo the young Caliph was not the actual ruler, but the real power was in the hands of Al-Sayidah (i.e. the Mistress), his aunt, who was both subtle and scheming. With gifts and bribes Al-Sayidah induced Badr to betray his master. She promised him 'Azīz Al-Dawla's post if he would find a way to assassinate him. Apparently communications between Badr and Al-Sayidah passed unsuspected by 'Azīz Al-Dawla. It may have been carried by unknown merchants or, more probably, by the envoys who brought the gifts to 'Azīz Al-Dawla, after Al-Zāhir's accession to the Caliphate. It could well have been that the sending of the gifts was a two-edged sword. By this means it would have been possible to bring reconciliation and to find an avenue of treachery.

'Azīz Al-Dawla was a lover of beauty and literature, poetry and philosophy; he had good relations with the celebrated Abu'l-'Alā' Al-Ma'arrī who composed and dedicated several books to him. However, 'Azīz Al-Dawla had other love tendencies, he was extremely fond of one of his pages, an Indian by birth, named Tūzūn. Badr, ever watchful for an opportunity to consummate his intrigue with the Caliphate of Cairo, conceived a way to use Tūzūn. He insinuated the idea into Tuzun's mind that his master was weary of him and desired to be rid of him. Badr told Tuzun that he had averted death from him on several

occasions and that he, Badr, loved him and could not bear to contemplate his death. Trembling with fear, the wretched slave begged Badr for more help and further advice. Badr replied that it was a matter of either their lives or that of 'Azīz Al-Dawla. He added: let us kill 'Azīz Al-Dawla and succeed him. They decided on this course and awaited a suitable opportunity to carry out their plot. On Friday, 3rd of Rabī' Al-Ākhir 413 A.H./ 6th July 1022 A.D., the opportunity arose, for 'Azīz Al-Dawla spent that day in hunting. In his absence the plotters planned to kill him in the night after his return. The plan was that Badr should make him drunk and Tuzun should kill him in his bed when 'Azīz Al-Dawla, as was his custom would call upon him. In the evening of that day, 'Azīz Al-Dawla returned from his hunting, bathed himself, ate and drank, then after a while went to bed and slept. While asleep Tūzūn, who was with him, took 'Azīz Al-Dawla's sword and, with one blow, severed his head from his body. Badr, who was waiting and watching, saw the deed was accomplished. He raised a hue and cry which roused all the pages who immediately fell upon the luckless Tūzūn and killed him. This is the only narrative extant concerning 'Azīz Al-Dawla's assassination and it is difficult to accept it at its face value. The manner of 'Azīz Al-Dawla's assassination is of little matter compared with its consequences.

Badr reported the incident to the Caliphate in Cairo. The Caliphate openly commiserated the death, but rejoiced secretly and applauded Badr for his services. He was, however, appointed by the Caliphate as a successor to 'Azīz Al-Dawla and was given the honorary title of Wafyy Al-Dawla Wa Amīnahā (i.e. the State's loyal and faithful). This title indicates not only his guilt but the consent to and participation of the Caliphate in the crime. In fact, it is questionable whether Al-Sayidah actually participated in the plot to kill 'Azīz Al-Dawla, or whether the whole story was merely a reflection of how Al-Ḥākim, the Fāṭimid Caliph, met his fate. It is well-known that most of the Arabic Chroniclers alleged that Al-Sayidah conspired in the death of Al-Ḥākim, her brother, as they also report her part in the plot which killed 'Azīz Al-Dawla. In both cases the story, method and the end of her fellow conspirators are similar. The sources are unable to confirm or disprove either supposition and the matter will remain an enigma unless fresh sources are discovered.

The Caliphate used the appointment of Badr merely as a stop-gap in order to gain time. It would appear that Badr was aware of this for, from a letter sent from the Caliphate to him which Al-Maqrīzī quotes, it can be deduced that he was anxious concerning his future and that the letter was sent to restore his confidence in the goodwill of the Caliphate

towards him. This letter was carried by Al-Ḍayf who, previously, entered Aleppo to assist Faṭḥ after his rebellion against his master, Maṣṣūr b. Lu'lu'. Al-Ḍayf went into Aleppo and met Badr privately when he was able to persuade him to give up his post. After relinquishing the post which he had held for only 96 days, Badr was arrested and shortly after met his fate.<sup>34</sup>

On Wednesday, 11th Rajab 413 A.H./10th October 1022 A.D., two Fāṭimid Rulers appointed by Cairo, arrived in Aleppo, one for the City and the other for the Citadel. For the City, Ṣafyy Al-Dawla (i.e. the Chosen of the State) Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Ja'far b. Falāḥ, who was a Member of the militant Kutāmi tribe (one of the North African Barbar tribes who accompanied the Fāṭimid conquest of Egypt in 358 A.H./969 A.D.). In the Citadel, Yumn Al-Dawla (i.e. the Auspicious of the State) the eunuch Sa'ādat. By this time the Fāṭimid Caliphate had learned its lesson; it did not appoint only one ruler in Aleppo nor make the mistake of making the appointment a long-term one. We do not, therefore, know anything about the reign of these two rulers because, on the 15th Muḥarram 414 A.H./10th April 1023 A.D., Ṣafyy Al-Dawla was dismissed. His replacement was another Kutāmi known as Sanad Al-Dawla (i.e. the Support of the State) Al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Thu'bān. This new Ruler had previously been the governor of Afāmya. His reign, of which also nothing is known, ended with his death on Thursday, 21st Rabī'

al-Akhīr 415 A.H./2nd July 1024 A.D. which was the result of long illness.

On learning of Sanad al-Dawla's illness the Caliphate in Cairo despatched his brother from Egypt to act on his behalf. The name of this brother was Thu'ban and his title was Sadīd al-Mulk (that is, the right of kingship). He reached Aleppo twenty five days after his brother had died. The Caliphate assigned him to his brother's post and, at the same time, appointed the eunuch Mawṣuf, as a new governor for the citadel. The reign of both these rulers who were unpopular was short lived.<sup>35</sup> Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās, who was very active at that period, wrested Aleppo from them and founded the Mirdāsīd dynasty. Ṣāliḥ, who was Amir of the tribe of Kilāb, the dynasty founded by him in Aleppo was tribal; the rise of the Mirdāsīd dynasty and its tribal background will be examined in the following chapter.

---

<sup>35</sup> al-'Azīmī, 165r.; Zubda, I, 221-223; Ibn Al-'Amīd, 522-523; Iṭṭi'āz, Annals, 413H; Bughya, A., VII, 246r.; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148; 'Iqd, XI, 577; Al-Durra, 316.

Chapter II

THE MIRDĀSID DYNASTY I

Its Tribal Background; Ṣāliḥ Ibn Mirdās and the  
Establishment of the Dynasty; the Reign of Naṣr Ibn Ṣāliḥ.

Among the Arabic tribes who migrated to Syria with and after the 7th century's Islamic conquest was a part of the tribe of Kilāb. Kilāb, before the rise of Islam, was one of the large and prominent tribes of the Arabian Peninsula living in the region of the city of Medina. The portion which migrated into Syria settled in the region lying to the west of the upper bank of the Euphrates.<sup>1</sup> From the 7th century and until the end of the 11th, Kilāb played a very important role in the political life of Syria particularly in the northern part of the country; for example, during the Umayyad period, the struggle for the Caliphate after the death of Yazīd I (680-683 A.D.). Zufar b. al-Ḥārith Al-Kilābī, with his tribesmen, fought against Marwān b. Al-Ḥakam in the battle of Marj-Rāḥiṭ (64A.H./683 A.D.). Zufar was defeated and fled northward where he established a stronghold in the town of Qarqīsyā. He refused to give allegiance to Marwān, the new Caliph who in turn was unable to force him to do so.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Subḥ, I, 340; Qalā'id, 116; Wafā', II, 230.293.

<sup>2</sup>Khalīfa, I, 326; Ṭabarī, V, 540-542; Ibn 'Asākir, VI, 211r-212v.



The battle of Marj-Rāhiṭ was, in fact, a struggle for power between the two Bedouin divisions of Syria. According to the Arab genealogists, the Arabs were the descendants of two great ancestors, 'Adnān - who lived in northern Arabia - and Qaḥṭān - who lived in the south. After the establishment of the Islamic Empire, this (geographical) pedigree was almost the decisive factor in the political division of the Arabic tribes. The two parties who fought against each other in Marj-Rāhiṭ were southern descendants on the one side and northern on the opposite. Kalb was the prominent tribe among the southerners as, similarly, Kilāb was among the northerners. One significant result of the battle of Marj-Rāhiṭ was the frustration of the 'Adnāni tribes from occupying southern Syria; consequently Syria became divided into two tribal parts, unintentionally following the same pattern as Arabia, the original homeland. In the course of time this division was consolidated and accepted as an established fact. There is no account of any 'Adnāni tribe settling in southern Syria or, conversely, any Qaḥṭāni settling in the north.

The Kilābi tribesmen considered northern Syria to be their own (Diyār) regions and regarded as an offensive act the northward movement of any tribe of southern Syria. On several occasions during the 11th century the Fāṭimid Caliphate used the warriors of the tribe of Kalb in its expeditions

against Aleppo. On each of these occasions the tribe of Kilāb interpreted the expedition as a Kalbi intrusion into their own (Diyār) territory and not as a struggle between the Caliphate and the Mirdāsīd Amir of Aleppo. This was expressed by Ibn Abī Ḥaṣṣanā, the contemporary poet, and was manifested in 452 A.H./1060 A.D. when the Fāṭimid Caliphate attempted to use the tribe of Kalb against Al-Raḥba.<sup>3</sup> Al-Mu'ayyad Fi'l-din (the Fāṭimid Chief Dā'ī) realised this and took it into consideration when, in 448 A.H./1056 A.D., he was despatched from Cairo to help Al-Basāsīrī in his rebellion. After Al-Mu'ayyad reached Damascus, Cairo instructed him to take with him a Kalbi guard when he was required to travel northward. He defied the order and went alone, knowing that if he took a Kalbi guard it would be regarded by the Kilābī tribesmen as an act of aggression and would lead to the failure of his mission.<sup>4</sup> It is out of the scope of this study to discuss the whole history of the tribe of Kilāb. The 10th century is the period which is more directly connected with this thesis, not only because it is closer to the 11th century, but because there was a large new wave of Kilābī migration into Syria during this period. This fresh wave paved the way to the rise and establishment of the Mirdāsīd dynasty.

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibn abī Ḥaṣṣanā, I, 159-163; Mir'at, A., Annals, 452 H: see also p.123 of this main chapter.

<sup>4</sup>Al-Mu'ayyad, 101.

At the advent of the 10th century, the time of the Qarāmiṭa movement and activity, northern Syria and upper Mesopotamia suffered the influx of a new wave of Bedouins. This wave consisted of several tribes of 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'. They were mainly the tribes of Khafāja, 'Uqayl, Numayr, Qushayr and Kilāb. After a lapse of several years each of these tribes settled in a special region (Diyār); 'Uqayl in the province of the city of Al-Mosul; Khafāja, in lower Mesopotamia; Numayr on the Mesopotamian-Byzantine border, particularly in the region of the town of Ḥarrān; Qushayr in the region of Qal'at-Ja'bar, and Kilāb in the country round Aleppo, the former region of the tribe.<sup>5</sup>

Before their settlement, and even after, they -- in particular Kilāb -- supplied the personnel for the Qarāmiṭa uprising and activity.<sup>6</sup> This migration brought chaos and disorder into Syria and created the right atmosphere for the rapid emergence and then the disappearance of many adventurers, such as Al-Mutanabbī the poet and Al-Aṣfar Al-Ghazī. In Aleppo -- after the establishment of the Ḥamdānid dynasty there -- Kilāb was involved in the struggle of this dynasty against Byzantium,

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibn Ḥawqal, 203; Jamhara, 274-275; Bughya, A.S., 482-484; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 545; Subḥ, I, 340-343.

<sup>6</sup> For a few examples, see Ibn al-Qalānisi, 1-3; Itti'āz, Sh., 210, 220.

plunged into every uprising against its rule and also played a decisive part in the bid for power among the rival Amirs of this dynasty.<sup>7</sup>

Ibn Al-‘Adīm gives 309 A.H./921 A.D. as the date on which the tribe of Numayr arrived in Mesopotamia.<sup>8</sup> He also gives 320 A.H./932 A.D. as the year in which the new Kilābī wave arrived in Syria. He cites from Al-Asadi (see below) that this new wave was comprised of two Kilābī tribes known as Subayāh and Dhu‘aybah respectively. He goes on to say that in 322 A.H./933 A.D. these two tribes penetrated into upper Syria; in 325 A.H./937 A.D. they invaded Ma‘arrat Al-Nu‘mān, sacked its environments and captured its ruler together with most of his troops when they tried to resist them.<sup>9</sup>

For almost two centuries, the 10th and most of the 11th, the life of northern Syria and upper Mesopotamia, in every aspect greatly suffered from this new wave of Arab nomads. There was political instability together with disorder and lack of security. The tribal life in these regions was changed and the number of

---

<sup>7</sup> See Miskawīh, II, 214-215; Al-Antākī, 157, 186-187; Ibn al-Qalanīsī, 23-24, 27-30, 34-35, 41, 50-52; Al-‘Azimī, 174v.; Zubda, I, 149-151, 196; Al-Muntaẓam, VIII, 12, 132; Akhbār, 17r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 369; Bar Hebraeus, 205; Al-Mansūri, 70r.; Al-Bustan, 83r.; Mir‘āt, A., Annals 314 H; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 56.

<sup>8</sup> Bughya, A.S., 484.

<sup>9</sup> Bughya, A.S., 478-480; Bughya, A., I, 92r.-93r.; Zubda, I, 99, 293; Ibn Ḥayyūs, II, 424.

nomads rapidly increased. At the same time the extent of cultivated land became less while commercial life almost came to a standstill, as Ibn Ḥawqal, an eye witness, reports. He also relates that before the advent of the new migrants most of the tribes in these regions were almost sedentary. They had a few camels and were more closely related to urban life than to the roving life of the nomads.<sup>10</sup> The new Kilābīs settled in the same region together with their predecessors. The other tribes settled in Mesopotamia without great difficulty. They exerted pressure on the existing tribes who were mostly sedentary and obliged them to integrate into the rural life of the country or to withdraw to Byzantine territory. Ibn Ḥawqal describes all this; he also speaks of the removal of Banu-Ḥabīb from Mesopotamia to Byzantium which took place at the same time. Ibn Ḥawqal alleges the cause of their removal to be the policy of Sayf Al-Dawla Al-Ḥamdānī. In fact, if Ibn Ḥawqal's personal attitude of hatred towards Sayf Al-Dawla is waived, and the pressure made by the new migrants together with the fact that Sayf Al-Dawla and Banu-Ḥabīb originated from the same tribe of Taghlib are considered, it would then be easy to conceive a more apt reason for the removal rather than the one given by Ibn Ḥawqal. This would be that, after the arrival of the new migrants, Banu-Ḥabīb were driven out of their region and obliged

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibn Ḥawqal, 209-212, 228; Al-Iṣṭakhri, 43.

to enter Byzantium where they took refuge and adopted Christianity.<sup>11</sup>

Concerning the tribe, or rather the tribes, of Kilāb the new migrants no doubt had had some considerable effect on the life and organisation of the whole body of Kilāb. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to find any reliable information concerning this question. The chroniclers who mention the tribe of Kilāb seldom refer to any branch of the tribe and, in consequence, their information is inadequate for any attempt at discussion of the life and organisation of Kilāb. In his book Bughyat Al-Talab, Ibn Al-'Adīm writes a special chapter in 24 folios, enumerating the Arabic tribes who inhabited Aleppo. He gives especial attention to the tribe of Kilāb. The disadvantages of the information contained in this chapter are: that it is very complicated, involved and most of it cited from an unknown source. Ibn Al-'Adīm quotes almost all of his material from a book which was called Diwān Al-Arab Wa Jawharat Al-Adab Wa-'Idāb Al-Nasab by Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Abdullāh Al-Asadī. In spite of being a great chronicler and genealogist nothing certain is known about this author, for no biography of him is extant. The usage of "Saj'" in the title of this book indicates that it was written in a later period, 12th century or

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibn Ḥawqal, 209-212, 228.

after. There are several indications that this Asadī lived during the later 12th and early 13th centuries. He was a disciple of the celebrated Munqidhi Amir Usāma b. Murshid (died 1188 A.D.). Ibn al-'Adīm was one of his disciples and in his book Bughyat al-Talab he quotes a great deal of information received from him, both orally and from his written works.<sup>12</sup> Although Al-Asadī was alive in the early 13th century all the genealogical material which Ibn al-'Adīm quotes from his book is, as it indicates, local, northern Syrian, and drawn from an early 10th century source. There is no indication of the identity of this 10th century source, but in one place there is mention that its author was giving information in the year 320 A.H./932 A.D., and on another occasion, in 325 A.H./936 A.D., at the time of the arrival of the new migration.<sup>13</sup>

After arriving at a more or less conclusive date for this author, it may perhaps be possible to sketch an outline of the organisation of Kilāb at the time of the arrival of the new immigrants. Although Al-Asadī's information is very complicated - on the other hand it is valuable material. It would appear that its author was not dependent upon the accounts of the early genealogists, but reported what he witnessed. From this material it

---

<sup>12</sup>Bughya, A., III, 281 r.-v.; V, 221 v.

<sup>13</sup>Bughya, A.S., 476, 478-479.

can be deduced that, in the 10th century, the Kilābis were formed of four principal divisions. The members of these four divisions were the descendants of four sons of Kilāb, the great ancestor. The names of these sons were Mu'āwiya, 'Abdu'llāh, 'Amr and Abu-Bakr. Each division comprised several tribes and large clans, and each tribe consisted of a number of clans of differing size. The descendants of Abu-Bakr formed the largest division; then came Banu 'Amr; and the others were smaller but almost similar in size. After the Islamic conquest of Syria, parts of these four divisions migrated into Syria (this could be termed the first wave). According to Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ, there was a fifth division, the descendants of Ja'far b. Kilāb, but Al-Asadī does not mention it which could mean that its members had integrated into urban and rural life of the country.<sup>14</sup> It would appear that prior to the 9th century the 'Amr division was the largest and strongest one. It was always distinguished by its militant and warlike attitude. The fore-mentioned Zufar b. Al-Hārith was from this division. Ibn Al-Qalānisi, who describes how strong it was, relates that in 373 A.H./983 A.D. 500 of its warriors were in the army of Sa'īd Al-Dawla, the Ḥamadānid Amir of Aleppo (967-991 A.D.).<sup>15</sup> A tribal unit providing 500 mercenaries was

---

<sup>14</sup>Ṭabaqāt, 137-138, 776, 820, 824.



obviously a large one. After the 9th century this unit was outnumbered by the division of Abu-Bakr.

From Abu-Bakr came the last wave of migrants, but it would seem that probably a century before there had been another wave of migrants from this same division. This division was formed of three major tribal branches, 'Amr Rabi'ah and 'Auf, sons of Ka'b b. 'Abdu'llah b. Kilab. Part of 'Auf migrated into Syria after the Islamic conquest and from it came the last (3rd) wave of the 10th century. From 'Amr came a wave of migrants presumably during the 9th century. This could be termed the second wave of the Kilabi migration to Syria. During the 10th century and before the establishment of the Hamdanid Dynasty in Aleppo, the Ruler of this city was from this tribal unit. Saliḥ b. Mirdās, the founder of the Mirdasid dynasty, was from the 3rd unit of Rabi'ah. Apparently the division and organisation of Kilab in Syria originally followed the pre-migration tribal pattern. Some changes or developments must have affected this pattern after the migrants' settlement in Syria, and always after the arrival of a new influx. But for the lack of information we cannot ascertain the kinds of changes or how profound they were.

From Al-Asadi's account it can be deduced that in the 10th century, at the time of the arrival of the new migration, most of the Kilabi tribal units were semi-nomads and the tribal

combination was loose.<sup>16</sup> In fact the Kilābī dissolution was one of their characteristics which affected the Mirdāsīd dynasty and caused its final collapse. The impact of this dissolution on the Mirdāsīd dynasty will be mentioned in the sequence of the history of this dynasty. It is noteworthy that this dissolution was a feature which accompanied the Kilābis in their earlier and later history. Ibn al-‘Adīm alleges that the success of Sayf al-Dawla al-Ḥamdānī in establishing his dynasty in Aleppo was due to the Kilābī tribesmen's dissolution.<sup>17</sup> In a later period al-‘Umarī emphasises that if Banu Kilāb had united under the leadership of one Amir, no other Arabic tribe would ever be able to encounter them.<sup>18</sup> It would appear that the Kilābis believed that union and order were abnormal and unbearable; while in the time of disorder and dissolution life would be more enjoyable and profitable, for always there would be a large amount of booty. On many occasions and for the sake of booty the Kilābī tribesmen provoked quarrels between the Mirdāsīd Amirs.<sup>19</sup>

In the biography of al-‘A’sar b. Muhārīsh, a Kilābī "Knight

---

<sup>16</sup>For al-Asadī's account see Bughya, A.S., 475-482.

<sup>17</sup>Zubda, I, 111.

<sup>18</sup>Masālik, IV, 89v.

<sup>19</sup>Ibn Abi Ḥasān, I, 211-214; Ibn Ḥayyūs, II, 484-483; Zubda, I, 291-293; II, 10, 54-56.

and poet" of later 10th century, which was quoted by Ibn Al-'Adim, there is some interesting information concerning the life and character of Kilāb. From it can be deduced that, at that period, the Kilābī character and life was similar to that of the pre-Islamic Arab Peninsula nomads which is depicted by the Arabic literature. There was an everlasting razzia between the Kilābīs and their neighbouring tribes, for the love of booty and war, or as an act of reprisal. The fighting on the battlefield was usually begun as a combat between two horsemen while the main opposing groups stood watching. Before their fight each combatant would utter a few lines of 'Rajaz' describing his own valiance, his feats with the sharp scimitar, an open challenge to every warrior to come and meet his fate, and a eulogy of his tribe together with boasting of his own membership. Often there was no mass engagement but the death of a famous warrior or leader in the individual combat usually brought the fighting to an end. After a sudden razzia, the intruders - if successful - would capture the tribe and its property, enslave a number of the captives and release some for high ransom.

The life of the tribe held both romance and leisure and was not entirely given to hardship. There was love and loyalty but as in pre- and early Islamic times, when a poet or anyone else fell in love with a girl from his own tribe or from one of the neighbouring tribes, the girl would be mentioned in his poem

and thus trouble would follow. At first the two lovers would be prohibited from meeting; then the girl would be forced to submit to a compulsory marriage after her father had refused a request from her lover to be allowed to marry her on the pretext that his poems had already brought disgrace to the honour of the girl and such a marriage would be a stigma to the honour of her family and tribe. Such refusal not only created a dramatic love story but brought about feud between the families concerned and which invariably spread throughout the tribes. In spring time the youth of the tribe spent their time in horse-racing and drinking wine. The drinking was done in either a tavern (ḥānah) of which many were in the tribal camp and nearby villages, or on the bank of a brook (ghadīr).<sup>20</sup>

It would appear that the Kilābī women, in the main, enjoyed equality with the men and on the whole their life was untrammelled. During the Mirdāsīd period we read about a number of distinguished women such as Ṣāliḥ's mother and Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ's wife. Ṣāliḥ's mother was a wise lady and often gave her son sound political counsel. She was highly esteemed as, for instance, when 'Azīz al-Dawla wished to manifest his harmony with Ṣāliḥ, asked him to send his mother to live in the city of Aleppo.<sup>21</sup> Thimāl's wife was

---

<sup>20</sup> Bughya, A., III, 254v.-260v.

<sup>21</sup> Zubda, I, 218; Al-Kāmil, IX, 160.

known as al-Sayida (i.e. The Lady). She had been his brother's (Naṣr's) wife and the mother of Naṣr's son Maḥmūd. Thimāl married her after the death of his brother and with her help he was able to capture al-Raḡqa and Rāfiqa. To consolidate her position she married Thimāl which gave him the means to re-capture Aleppo. Al-Sayida's name was 'Alawiya, daughter of Waththāb, Amir of the tribe of Numayr. In 442 A.H./1050 A.D., Thimāl sent her to Cairo as envoy to solve his problems with al-Mustaṣfir, the Fāṭimid Caliph. Ibn al-'Adīm gives a vivid description of her interview with this Caliph. He says that after she had greeted the Caliph courteously he enquired about Thimāl and the people of Aleppo. She answered: "They will be in grace and blessing if you will grant them peace and protection." The Caliph, who admired her ready wit and manner of expression, asked her "Are you the one who is named 'The Lady'?" She replied "Yes, mistress of my people, but your slave, O Commander of the Believers. May Allah bless you." The Caliph said "God will not disappoint him who entrusts the management of his affairs to you in this mission." Some years later, in 453 A.H./1061 A.D., she was able to bring reconciliation between her brother Māni' b. Waththāb, Amir of the tribe of Numayr and her husband Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ. Once again, and ten years later, in 463 A.H./1071 A.D., she was able to solve the problems of her son Maḥmūd b. Naṣr, the Amir of Aleppo when the great Saljuq Sultan, Alp-Arslan, besieged the city of Aleppo with

intent to capture it and so put an end to the Mirdāsīd rulership. In the critical moment she (Al-Sayida) presented herself to the Sultan and managed to persuade him to drop the siege. She not only induced him to meet her son, but in addition to confer on him the robe of honour as a token of recognition of his rulership.<sup>22</sup>

During the 10th and 11th centuries, the Kilābī tribesmen were involved in almost every battle which was fought in northern Syria. They were involved either as mercenaries or on the tribe's behalf. As Bedouin mercenaries the Kilābī tribesmen seldom observed loyalty and paid full duty to no-one. They served those who paid most and often, at a time of crisis, would sell their employer to a higher bidder.<sup>23</sup>

The 11th century was an epoch which witnessed the highest activity and power of Kilāb and, at the same time, their sudden decline due to the Turcoman migration. In fact there is no detailed information about all the activities undertaken by the Kilābī tribesmen in this century. In spite of this contemporary literature (poets) give the impression that the activity of these tribesmen occupied the thought of the population of

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibn Abī Ḥaṣṣana, I, 243-256; Al-'Aẓīmī, 175v.; Zubda, I, 258-259, 267-268, 273-274, 281; II, 21-23; Al-Durra, 390-392.

<sup>23</sup> Al-Antākī, 210-211; Miskawih, II, 214-215; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 35-37; Zubda, I, 149-151, 199-200.

northern Syria and effectively influenced their lives. The poems of Abu' l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī and Ibn Ḥayyus reflect this.<sup>24</sup> These two poets mention no other tribal name existing in northern Syria except that of Kilāb. This means that the importance of Kilāb at that time eclipsed all the nomadic tribes of the area. Such a position could not have been won or maintained without the support of a vast number of warriors and it indicates that the tribe of Kilāb was very large. But the question arises here: - How large was it? Unfortunately there is no direct information concerning the numerical strength of this tribe. Some incidents which took place during the 11th century or shortly before give a clue to its size. It has been related that in the year 405 A.H./1014 A.D. the Kilābī troops of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās consisted of 2,000 horsemen.<sup>25</sup> Also in the year 452 A.H./1060 A.D., Maḥmūd b. Naṣr's tribal troops who defeated a Fāṭimid expedition aimed at the capture of Aleppo numbered about 2,000 horsemen.<sup>26</sup> From these two examples it may be deduced that the size of the tribe was not outstandingly large but it would seem that only a part of the Kilābīs took action on these two occasions and the whole tribe was, in fact, very large. Ibn al-'Adīm relates that in the year 468 A.H./1075 A.D. a dispute arose between the sons

---

<sup>24</sup> Al-Luzūmiyāt, I, 149, 162, 266, 281, 283; II, 79, 90, 308, 319; III, 77-78, 204-205, 214; IV, 260, 383; Saqṭ, 128-129; Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 5-6, 60-63, 123-128, 335; II, 443-446, 552-554.

<sup>25</sup> Al-Kāmil, IX, 160.

<sup>26</sup> Zubda, I, 278-279.

of Maḥmūd b. Naṣr, Sābiq and Waththāb over the rulership of Aleppo. Sābiq was supported by Turcoman troops and Waththāb by the tribe of Kilāb. Ibn al-‘Adīm says "And Banu Kilāb were in great multitude; they had never assembled in such great numbers before. It has been said that they were about 70,000 horsemen and infantry".<sup>27</sup> It is difficult to give entire credence to the number quoted by Ibn al-‘Adīm on this occasion, nor can it be entirely discredited. It at least reflects the immensity of Kilāb.

The Mirdāsids were not the only Emirate family of the tribe of Kilāb, but there were a number of similar families and lesser Amirs.<sup>28</sup> The title of Maḥmūd b. Naṣr was "Sharaf Umarā' al-Arab", i.e. the "Honour of the Arab Amirs".<sup>29</sup> As a ruler of Aleppo the Mirdāsīd Amir was the supreme Amir of the tribe. It was Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās (as discussed before, ch. I, p. 48 ) who established this supremacy. During the 11th century the most senior living member among Ṣāliḥ's descendents often held the post of ruler of Aleppo together with supremacy over the other Kilābī Amirs.

---

<sup>27</sup> Zubda, II, 54-55.

<sup>28</sup> Zubda, I, 202, 291-293; II, 55-63.

<sup>29</sup> Ibn Sinān, 8; Bughya, A., VII, 143r.-144r.; Zubda, I, 202-203, 281-286, 293-294; II, 9, 54-56, 58-61, 88-89; Mir'at, A. Annals, 472 H.



Frequently the tribe of Kilāb, who exercised greater influence over the dynasty than the dynasty held authority over, refused to give allegiance to the son of the former Amir if his uncle was still alive. A striking example of this occurred in the case of Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ. In 449 A.H./1057 A.D. he was Amir of Aleppo and was obliged to abdicate the Emirate in favour of a Fāṭimid governor. He went to Cairo and while he was there his nephew Maḥmud b. Naṣr collected the tribe and deposed the Fāṭimid ruler, Maḥmud himself assuming the Emirate. The Caliph in Cairo sent an army against him but it failed in its mission. Annoyed by this, the Caliph ordered Thimāl to return to Aleppo and to resume the Emirate. After Thimāl returned Maḥmud appealed to the tribe against Thimāl's resumption of the position, putting forward his own claim which he felt to be a just one. His uncle, he said, had proved unworthy of the Emirate and it was he, Maḥmud, who had been instrumental in restoring the dynasty. He, therefore, considered the Emirate to be his by right of conquest and by heredity from his father, Naṣr. The chiefs of the tribe, however, felt the Emirate could not pass to him during the life of his uncle. Their answer to his appeal and claim was: "Your uncle is the great Sheikh and the Arabs scorn to support the son against the Father".<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>Zubda, I, 282.

The nomadic way of life and customs of Kilāb were conspicuous in many aspects of life and rulership of the Mirdāsīd dynasty. During the time of this dynasty each of its Amirs who ruled in Aleppo always appeared as a Bedouin Chief rather than as a city ruler. This was depicted by the contemporary poets,<sup>31</sup> and also it was manifested in some of the actions of these Amirs. One of the customs of the Bedouin chiefs was to hold an occasional large banquet. Such a banquet would be given in the Spring, at lambing time or as a circumcisor or a wedding feast. During the banquet several kinds of food and sweet would be served. The principal dish was called Madira. This was prepared from meat and cooked in Yoghourt, then mixed with chunks of bread. Ibn al-'Adīm relates that the meat of 750 lambs was cooked for one of the banquets which was given by Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ to his tribe. The poet Ibn Abī Ḥaş̣na speaks of 50,000 people attending a banquet held by Thimāl at the celebration of his nephew, Maḥmūd b. Naṣr's circumcision. In al-Tuḥaf Wa'l-Hadāyā, the book of the Egyptian 5th/11th century Chronicler al-Raṣhīd b. al-Zubair we read about similar banquets which were held by other Mirdāsīd Amirs such as 'Aṭīyya b. Ṣāliḥ and Maḥmūd b. Naṣr.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> See Ibn Abī Ḥaş̣na, I, 146-147, 149, 151, 156-163, 166-168, 188, 199, 211-214, 217, 227-229, 232-233.

<sup>32</sup> Al-Tuḥaf, 106, 109; Ibn Abī Ḥaş̣na, I, 156-157; Zubda, I, 271-273; it is noteworthy that such banquets are still given by the Chiefs of the Syrian Bedouin tribes where the food and the occasions are almost similar to those of the 11th century.

It is noteworthy that the available information concerning the administration of the Mirdāsīd dynasty refers to only one new office created after the establishment of this dynasty. The head of this office was known as Sheykh al-Dawla (~~i.e. the Chief of the State~~). As in the tribe, the Sheykh was usually second only to the Amir and functioned as his deputy, so it was in the State. Sheykh al-Dawla was the Amir's "trusted confidant and secretary" as Ibn Al-'Adīm describes him. He was also the permanent representative of Aleppo's Amir in every diplomatic mission which was sent to either Cairo or Constantinople.<sup>33</sup>

Apparently each of the Kilābī tribal chiefs was granted an iqtā' after the establishment of the Mirdāsīd dynasty. There is an indirect reference to this by al-Antākī and for lack of information it is impossible to define this iqtā' and the conditions under which it was granted.<sup>34</sup>

The tribe of Kilāb professed the Shī'a Imāmī doctrine which was, at that time, the form of religion adopted by most of the Muslims of the city of Aleppo.<sup>35</sup> It is not known to what

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibn Abī Ḥaṣṣan, I, 289; Al-'Azīmī, 176r.; Zubda, I, 247-248, 264, 267-268, 270.

<sup>34</sup>Al-Antākī, 265-266.

<sup>35</sup>This will be discussed in more detail later.

extent the Kilābi tribesmen were attached to this doctrine except that a number of them had Shi'i names, such as 'Alī, 'Ulwān, Ḥasan, Ja'far, etc. Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās was known as Abu 'Alī and his son Thimāl as Abu 'Ulwān.<sup>36</sup> It is noteworthy that, apart from these religious names which were very few, the names which were used by most of the Kilābis were pure Arabic and not Islamic. There was no-one among the Mirdāsids or other outstanding figures among the tribe - to whom there is a reference - whose name has the prefix of "Abd", which is usually attached to one of the "100" Arabic names of "Allāh". Instead we find Thimāl, Waththāb, Sābiq, Shabīb, Muqallid, Māni', Zammā', Thābit, Rāfi', etc.<sup>37</sup>

The position of the tribe of Kilāb was very much affected by the Turcoman migration, a matter which will be discussed later in the sequence of this migration.

Living with Kilāb were some elements from other tribes, such as Banu-Asad who lived in Ma'arrat Maṣrin, Jabal al-Sumnaq, Nuqrat Banu-Asad which lay between Khanāsira and al-Abṣ mountain and, in the vicinity of Wadī Buḥnān as neighbours of Banu-'Abs, who occupied this valley and a nearby district was known

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibn Abī Ḥaṣṣana', I, 5, 8, 13.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, I, 15.

as Ḥiyār Banu'l-qa'qā'. A part of Abs also lived in Ḥādir Qinnasrīn. It would appear that most of these tribes became absorbed into urban life nevertheless they retained their tribal organisation and traditions.<sup>38</sup> Of similar calibre were Tanūkh of Ma'arrat al-Nūmān<sup>39</sup> and Banu Munqidh who inhabited the north-west region of the city of Ḥamāh. Banu Munqidh's centre was a fortress of Kafar-ḡāb until 473 A.H./1080 A.D. when they occupied the citadel of Shayzar. This tribe was large and strong to an extent which enabled it to play an influential role in the life of the Mirdāsīd dynasty. When in 433 A.H./1041 A.D. Al-Dizbari, the Fāṭimid ruler of Syria was obliged to abandon Damascus -as it will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter - and tried unsuccessfully to take refuge in Ḥamāh, Muqallid b. Munqidh came from Kafar-ḡāb to his help with 2,000 of his henchmen.<sup>40</sup> This number indicates the extent of power and size of Banu Munqidh. Muqallid's son 'Alī, the founder of the Munqidhi rule in Shayzar, was Maḥmud b. Naṣr's foster-brother. During the reign of Maḥmud 'Alī was prominent and active in both Aleppo and Tripoli. After the death of Maḥmud he became the outstanding figure in the state of Aleppo. He held the real power there during Naṣr b. Maḥmud's reign.

---

<sup>38</sup>Bughya, A.S., 464-465, 471-473.

<sup>39</sup>Ta'rif, 489.

<sup>40</sup>Al-Kāmil, IX, 333-334; Mir'at, A., Annals, 433H; Itti'āz, Annals, 433H; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 174.

After the death of Naṣr it was he who chose Sābiq b. Maḥmud, the last Mirdāsīd Amir. During that time he was able to prepare the capture of Shayzar and to play an effective part in bringing the Mirdāsīd rule to an end, replacing it by the 'Uqaylid.<sup>41</sup> Later Banu Munqidh acquired great fame during the subsequent struggle of the Muslims against the Crusaders.

-----

"By this time the Governorship of Aleppo by the state of Egypt ended; and it was conquered and ruled by Āl-Salih for 57 years."<sup>42</sup>

With these words, when he was enumerating the events of 415 A.H./1024 A.D. Al-'Azīmi, the Aleppine Chronicler, announces the end of the Fāṭimid occupation of Aleppo, which has previously been discussed, and the rise of the Mirdāsīd dynasty. This dynasty was founded by Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās, who invaded Aleppo and captured it from the Fāṭimid Governor. Before discussing the establishment of this dynasty, however, the early life and career of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās should be examined. According to the Syrian biographers, Ṣāliḥ was a descendant of the Emirate family of the

---

<sup>41</sup>Ibn al-Qalānisi, 106-107; Al-'Azīmi, 189r.-184v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 131v.; Zubda, II, 34-36, 40-41, 75-79; Bughya, A., VII, 143r.; Mir'at, A., Annals, 474 A.H.; Ibn al-'Amid, 568; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134r.-v.; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 11v.; Al-Nujūm, V, 113-114.

<sup>42</sup>al-'Azīmi, 165r.

branch of Abdu'llāh b. Abi-Bakr b. Kilāb (of the tribe of Kilāb). Ibn Ḥazm Al-Andalusi relates that Ṣāliḥ was a descendant of the branch of 'Amr b. Kilāb. It would be difficult to accept Ibn Ḥazm's information on account of the fact that he lived in Muslim Spain and the Syrian Biographers, such as Ibn Al-'Adīm and Ibn Khallikān confirm the first account.<sup>43</sup> According to Ibn Al-'Adīm, Ṣāliḥ's family, which was strong and noble, lived and held power in the vicinity of the city of Qinnasrīn. Ṣāliḥ's mother was also of noble birth. She was from the chief family of the clan of Zawqal of the tribe of Kilāb. Her name was Al-Rābāb, but she was usually known as Al-Zaqqaliyah. The clan of Zawqah inhabited the country which surrounded Aleppo. The date of Ṣāliḥ's birth is not known, nor yet his age when he died, and -- as a matter of fact -- there is no information concerning the age of any of the Mirdāsīd Amirs who succeeded Ṣāliḥ.

Until he escaped from the prison in the citadel of Aleppo, Ṣāliḥ was only the Amir of the Kilābīs who inhabited the locality of Aleppo; but after he defeated Maṣṣūr b. Lu'lu', as was discussed earlier, he became the supreme Amir of the entire body of the tribe of Kilāb.<sup>44</sup> Even before he became the supreme Amir,

---

<sup>43</sup>Bughya, A.S., 477; Wafayat, 1, 278-280; Jamhara, 270.

<sup>44</sup>Bughya, A.S., 468, 476-478.

it would appear that he was the outstanding figure among all the Amirs of the tribe of Kilāb. Unless this was the case, the other Amirs would not have yielded him their obedience. It has been seen how, when Ṣāliḥ was a prisoner in the city of Aleppo, Maṣṣur b. Lu'lu' tried his utmost to humiliate him in particular. Ṣāliḥ was already well-known before his imprisonment and his career did not begin in Aleppo but in Al-Raḥba on the Euphrates (modern Mayadīn).

Before 399 A.H./1008 A.D., the Faḥimid Caliph al-Ḥākim appointed 'Alī b. Thimāl - one of the tribe of Khafāja's Chieftains - as ruler of Al-Raḥba. Before long 'Alī was killed by 'Isā b. Khallāt, one of the tribe of 'Uqayl's Chieftains, 'Isa captured Al-Raḥba, but was unable to hold it for long, as another 'Uqayli Chief, named Badrān b. Al-Muqallid, wrested the city from him. The Caliph Al-Ḥākim instructed the Faḥimid ruler of Damascus to restore Al-Raḥba to Faḥimid dominion. This ruler executed the order, recaptured Al-Raḥba, appointed a Faḥimid ruler then retired to Damascus.

Once again the Faḥimid rule did not last long for a certain Ibn Miḥkān appropriated the power in Al-Raḥba and expelled the Faḥimid governor. ' Ibn Miḥkān was a native of Al-Raḥba and probably the Municipal Chief. If it was easy for Ibn Miḥkān to overthrow the Faḥimid governor and to assume power for himself, it was impossible for him to retain this power without



(foreign) support; for al-Raḥba was amid several powers, each of them wanting to possess it. Ibn Miḥkān called on Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās and made a deal with him. Ṣāliḥ was to support Ibn Miḥkān and to protect the town, but in exchange for what, the available sources do not tell. Ṣāliḥ did not garrison in the town but remained in his tribal camp. Not before long a dispute arose between him and Ibn Miḥkān and Ṣāliḥ besieged al-Raḥba and tried to take it by force. The dispute was, however, solved and a new bargain was struck. By this new deal, Ṣāliḥ was to marry Ibn Miḥkān's daughter and Ibn Miḥkān to move from al-Raḥba to 'Ānah from where he would rule both towns. After a while the people of 'Ānah rebelled against Ibn Miḥkān and expelled him from their town, whereupon he asked Ṣāliḥ to fulfil their agreement. Ṣāliḥ led a force of his tribesmen to recapture 'Ānah. When he was investing 'Ānah with Ibn Miḥkān, his father-in-law Ṣāliḥ contrived his assassination. After accomplishing this, Ṣāliḥ left 'Ānah and returned to al-Raḥba, which he captured in 399 A.H./1008 A.D. On establishing himself there he acknowledged the suzerainty of the Fāṭimid Caliph.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> al-'Aẓīmī, 158v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 121v.; al-Kāmil, IX, 138-139; Itti'āz, Annals 399H. Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 580; Ibn Junḥ, IV, 196r.; al-Ṣafadī, II, 82-83; Munajjim, I, 328r.

The capture of al-Raḥba was the first step in Ṣāliḥ's career and from which his ambition probably evolved.

We do not know the reason why Ibn Miḥkān chose Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās in preference to one of the other Bedouin chieftains. It may have been because Ṣāliḥ was an outstanding figure in the strong tribe of Kilāb, which, up to the time of Ibn Miḥkān's coup, had not been party to the struggle for al-Raḥba. The existing sources tell of no action undertaken by the tribe of Kilāb to possess al-Raḥba before b. Miḥkān's coup, but this silence does not necessarily mean that no prior action was undertaken. It could well have been that Ṣāliḥ with an early ambition to establish a State and realising the strategic advantage of al-Raḥba found an opportunity to capture it and moved to take it while there were several parties struggling towards the same goal. Therefore it is probable that, from the beginning, Ibn Miḥkān did not invite Ṣāliḥ to support him but rather compromised in a deal with him.

Before going further it is necessary to glance at the strategic value of al-Raḥba. It was the key to Syria and sometimes to Iraq. It was the first caravan stage inside Syria. From thence one could proceed towards Aleppo by following the western bank of the Euphrates, or to Damascus via the Syrian desert. Al-Raḥba, being close to the Syrian Desert, was in constant touch with the nomadic tribes who inhabited this

desert. To the Bedouin tribes who migrated from the south to the north al-Raḥba was the first stage in the capture of northern Syria. Al-Raḥba was an excellent base for these tribes from which to create trouble inside Syria as well as being a place of asylum and market. This was the case until the collapse of the Mirdāsīd dynasty in 1070 A.D.), when it was substituted by the city of al-Moṣul.

This was a part of the aftermath of the Turcoman migration. These new migrants of the 11th century came from the opposite direction to that of the Arabic tribes. Al-Moṣul was the first stage of the Turcoman migrants towards Aleppo and thence to the whole of Syria. Until the Turcoman migration al-Moṣul was mainly connected with Baghdad. It was a part of Iraq, but afterwards it became a part of Syria and the doorway to capturing it. Perhaps the cases of Muslim b. Quraysh al-'Uqaylī and later the Zanki dynasty prove this.

The capture of al-Raḥba by Ṣāliḥ and his establishment there no doubt strengthened his position and enhanced his prestige among his fellow tribesmen. The next episode in Ṣāliḥ's life, after the capture of al-Raḥba was his imprisonment in Aleppo and the struggle with Maṣṣur b. Lu'lu', which has been previously discussed. After the defeat and abdication of Maṣṣur and during the unstable Fāṭimid rule which followed, Ṣāliḥ was able to strengthen the foundation of his State. He had his

his in court and administration. In the year 410 A.H./1019 A.D. the Ma'arri poet Ibn <sup>Abi</sup> Ḥaṣṣanāḥ praised Thimāl, Ṣāliḥ's son, and hailed him as Malik (i.e. monarch). The same poet repeated his eulogy in the year 413 A.H./1022 A.D. From the stanzas of poems it can be deduced that there was a (tribal) court; poets presented themselves to praise the Amir or one of his sons. The object of the praise had the Bedouin's virtue of being generous, brave, skilled in fighting and of noble birth.<sup>46</sup> When, in 415 A.H./1025 A.D. - as we shall see - Ṣāliḥ captured Aleppo, he entrusted the siege of the citadel (i.e. of Aleppo) to *his* 'Kātib, Sulaymān b. Tuq.

The death of the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Ḥākim together with several other events which weakened the Caliphate, stimulated Ṣāliḥ to capture Aleppo and other parts of Syria. The instability which was increased in Aleppo after the assassination of 'Aziz al-Dawla created chaos and brought discontent among the population. This discontent which was augmented because of financial and administrative difficulties created the opportunity for Ṣāliḥ to take the city.<sup>47</sup> The uprising of both the tribe of Ṭayy' in Palestine and the tribe of Kalb in the province of

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibn Abi Ḥaṣṣanāḥ, I, 18-22, 86, 88.

<sup>47</sup> al-Antākī, 245-246; al-Musabbiḥī, 249, 269; Ibn al-'Amīd, 524; al-Kāmil, IV, 162; Bughya, A., VII, 201r.-202v.; Zubda, I, 227-228; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148; Itti'āz, Annals, 415H; 'Iqd, XI, 575-577; al-Ṣafadī, II, 83-84.

Damascus which the Fāṭimid Caliphate failed to quench, and their collusion with Ṣāliḥ, supplied the impetus.

Ḥassān b. al-Mufarrij, Amir of the tribe of Ṭayy' together with Sinān b. 'Ulaiyān, Amir of the tribe of Kalb, came to Ṣāliḥ's camp which was in the outskirts of Aleppo. After meeting Ṣāliḥ they formed a pact amongst themselves, thus combining the three major tribes of Syria in an alliance. They agreed to divide Syria among themselves, whereby Palestine would be dominated by the tribe of Ṭayy'; Damascus Province by the tribe of Kalb and Aleppo by the tribe of Kilāb. They aimed to use their combined forces to expel the Fāṭimids from Syria and to establish three Bedouin States; one for Ṭayy' in al-Ramlah; one for Kalb in Damascus and one for Kilāb in Aleppo. This was the first and also the last time the Syrian tribes were to form such an alliance, forgetting, for the first time, since the 7th century, their differing origins which had always been, as mentioned before, the basis for their political differences. The two tribes of Kalb and Ṭayy' were of Yemenite origin and Kilāb of 'Adnānid descent. It would appear that this pact was formed in the year 414 A.H./1025 A.D.;<sup>48</sup> but according to Al-Antākī what happened in this

---

<sup>48</sup> Bughya, F., 128r.v.; Zubda, I, 223-224; al-Muṣabbiḥī, 214-242; al-Antākī, 244-245; Itti'az, Annals, 415H; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 581-582; al-Ṣafadī, II, 83.

year was the renewal of an old pact previously formed between the three tribes near the end of the reign of al-Ḥākim, or at the commencement of the rule of al-Zāhir. Al-Antākī also reports that when the three tribes entered into their agreement they informed Basil II, the Byzantine Emperor of their intention and asked for his support. He goes on to say that Basil refused their request under the pretext that they were rebelling against their Caliph without just cause. Al-Antākī further relates that the Caliph made a reconciliation with them. Such reconciliation, however, was short-lived because of a new dispute which arose between the Caliph's ruler in Palestine and Ḥassān b. al-Mufarrīj, Amir of the tribe of Ḥayy', thereupon Ḥassān renewed his agreement with the tribe of Kalb, whose Amir Sinān b. 'Ulayyān was his brother-in-law, then Ḥassān and Sinān went to the region of Aleppo where they met Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās and agreed to cooperate on the basis of their old agreement to divide Syria among themselves.<sup>49</sup> After they renewed this agreement it would appear that the Emperor Basil II maintained his previous decision; for when, in the following year, 415 A.H./1024 A.D., Ṣāliḥ captured the city of Aleppo and besieged its citadel, he asked the support of the Byzantine governor of Antioch.

---

<sup>49</sup> al-Antākī, 244-245; Itti'āz, Annals 415H; al-Musabbiḥī, 265-266.

This governor sent him 300 archers, but when the governor informed the Emperor Basil of his action, Basil not only reproached him, but ordered the immediate withdrawal of the bowmen.<sup>50</sup> Al-Musabbiḥī reported that the people of Aleppo thought that Ṣāliḥ was working for the Byzantine Empire; for after his forces entered Aleppo they began to destroy the city wall and towers.<sup>51</sup> In fact this action of destruction was merely tactical. Ṣāliḥ's forces were Bedouins who not only were unaccustomed to the use of siege weapons (for this reason he probably invited the Byzantine bowmen) but disliked long drawn-out fighting. Actually Ṣāliḥ captured Aleppo not by force but because the city's population, or rather its Aḥdāth, opened the gate for him. By remembering this and considering the nature of his forces, and also in case the siege of the citadel would last a long time, or the Aleppines would change their minds and his forces be obliged to withdraw even temporarily - as it happened - it seemed that he ordered the destruction of the wall for easy recapture. The Mirdāsids practised this kind of tactic on several occasions as was the case in 441 A.H./1049 A.D. when the Fāḥimid Caliphate sent an expedition against Aleppo.

---

<sup>50</sup> al-Antākī, 246-247.

<sup>51</sup> al-Musabbiḥī, 269-270; Itti'āz, Annals, 415H.

The Mirdāsids destroyed the walls and citadels of both Ḥimṣ and Ma'arrat al-Nuḡmān for easy recapture.<sup>52</sup>

Before discussing the three tribes' struggle with the Caliphate of Cairo, it is necessary to pause for awhile in order to mention an important event which took place before the establishment - or renewal -- of the pact and which could be one of the reasons which encouraged Ṣāliḥ. It was after the death of al-Ḥākim, the Fāṭimid Caliph, that his cousin and nominated successor 'Abdu'l Raḥīm b. al-Yās, who was the governor of Damascus, at the time of the death, was arrested and carried to Cairo where he met his fate. 'Abdu'l Raḥīm's eldest son 'Abdu'l-'Azīz with his ('Abdu'l Raḥīm's) nephew Aḥmad b. al-Ṭayib fled to Ṣāliḥ's camp. Ṣāliḥ gave them refuge and they remained in his camp for ten months. During that period the Fāṭimid Caliphate endeavoured to get them back. Apparently this event affected the relationship between Ṣāliḥ and the Caliphate and was an encouragement and excuse for him to join the alliance and an incentive to capture Aleppo.<sup>53</sup>

The pact gave the three tribes a great military power which the Fāṭimid Caliphate was unable to challenge.<sup>54</sup> This pact surprised

---

<sup>52</sup>Bughya, A., VII, 99r.-103r.; Itti'āz, Annals, 440H.

<sup>53</sup>al-Antākī, 236.

<sup>54</sup>al-Musabbiḥī, 241-242; Itti'āz, Annals, 415H; al-Khiṭaṭ, II, 169; Nawrid al-Laṭāfa, 10; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 581-582.



the contemporary population of Syria who were, as Abu'l Alā' l-Ma'arri emphasises, accustomed to seeing the Bedouins prefer their tents and to live in the desert with their herds; to forsake this life and to choose the life of the city and kingship was a new and astonishing experience.<sup>55</sup>

Ṣāliḥ was the outstanding figure among the allies, particularly from a military standpoint. This fact was indicated in a letter sent by al-Dizbari, the Fāṭimid leader, to the Caliphate in Cairo.<sup>56</sup> Ḥassān managed the communications (foreign affairs) between the allies and the Caliphate. He wrote to the Fāṭimid Caliph telling him that the three tribes movement was not directed against him and that they still and would always acknowledge the suzerainty of the Caliph. The Caliph "should not worry himself about Syria" Ḥassān wrote, for he himself "would manage the affairs of Palestine and would collect the taxes and spend them on his men". Therefore there would be no need for the Caliphate to send either governor or troops which would be costly. Likewise in Damascus his brother-in-law Sinān b. al-Bannā Ṣamsām al-Dawla had already established an agreement with its people. Similarly the management of Aleppo

---

<sup>55</sup> al-Luzūmiyāt, I, 149, 266, 281; II, 207-208; III, 77, 214; Saqṭ, 128-129.

<sup>56</sup> al-Musabbiḥī, 250; Itti'āz, Annals, 415H.

was in the hands of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās Asad al-Dawla. By this the Caliph is relieved of all anxiety concerning the whole of Syria." This insulting and humiliating letter was sent to the Caliph in 414 A.H./1023 A.D. and the incapable Caliph was unable to do anything except to say to the courier "Leave! You have no answer from us!"<sup>57</sup>

It is out of the scope of this thesis to give a full account of the deeds wrought by the allies. The role of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās is our particular concern. In 414 A.H./1023 A.D. and, as it seems, immediately after the formation of the pact Ṣāliḥ with his tribal forces, moved southward. He co-operated in the defeat of the Fāṭimid troops led by al-Dizbarī and their expulsion from most of Palestine. After that he went with Sinān b. 'Ulaiyān, Amir of the tribe of Kalb, to lay siege on Damascus. Ḥassān was left in Palestine to chase the defeated Fāṭimid troops.<sup>58</sup>

In Sha'bān of the same year (Nov. 1023 A.D.) Ṣāliḥ left the siege of Damascus and returned towards Aleppo. He stationed himself at the gates of Aleppo thinking that the city would surrender to him on his arrival.<sup>59</sup> When nothing happened as he

---

<sup>57</sup> al-Musabbiḥī, 250; Itti'āz, Annals, 415H.

<sup>58</sup> al-Musabbiḥī, 241-242; Zubda, I, 223-224; al-Antākī, 244-245; Itti'āz, Annals, 415H.

<sup>59</sup> al-Musabbiḥī, 242, 249; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 128-129.

he had conceived Ṣāliḥ moved towards his tribal camp. He mobilised all the warriors of his own tribe and, with re-inforcement from the other Bedouins of the area, led these forces to lay siege on Aleppo in an attempt to capture it. The chroniclers say that Ṣāliḥ's forces were large but they give no estimate of the numbers. On Sunday, 17th Ramaḍān 415 A.H./22nd November, 1024 A.D. the siege began and lasted for 56 days; for on Saturday, 13th Dhul-qa'da 415 A.H./18th January, 1025 A.D., one of the city's gates opened and Ṣāliḥ went in and captured Aleppo. The gate was opened by Sālim b. Mustafād, the leader of the city's Aḥ-dāth (militia) who was also supported by the majority of the city's population. The immediate reason for Ṣālim's move was because a quarrel took place between him and the Fāḥimid governor of the citadel who intended to kill Sālim. Following the city's capture by Ṣāliḥ, the Fāḥimid garrison took strong hold in the citadel and the palace which was close to it. Ṣāliḥ appointed Ṣālim governor of the city of Aleppo (Ra'īs) and leader (Muqaddam) of the Aḥdāth. He instructed him and his - Ṣāliḥ's - Kātib to carry out the siege of the citadel and the palace, for he left Aleppo and moved southward with part of his troops.

Ṣāliḥ went to Palestine to reinforce Ḥassān b. al-Mufurrij who was fighting al-Dizbarī, who led a fresh Fāḥimid army.<sup>60</sup> With the aid of Ṣāliḥ this new army was defeated

---

<sup>60</sup> al-Musabbiḥī, 241-242, 269-270; al-Antāki, 245-248; Ibn

and Ṣāliḥ - on his way back -- sacked some of the coastal towns of the Levant. He also captured Hiṣn Ibn 'Akkār in the locality of Tripoli, Sidon, Ba'albank, Ḥims and Rafniya. He annexed these towns to his newly established State.<sup>61</sup>

During his absence from Aleppo, Sulaymān b. Ṭuq, his k̄atib, with the Kilābi forces and Ṣālim b. Mustafād with his Aḥdāth captured the citadel after a long siege. This occurred on Wednesday, 1st Jumadā al-Aulā, 416 A.H./30th June, 1025 A.D., and was made easier by a quarrel which broke out among the Fāṭimid troops garrisoned there. Even before the fall of the citadel the besiegers were able to destroy the palace and to undermine a trench which led to the well of the citadel and enabled them to block it, thus inflicting the additional hardship of thirst on the besieged. After the fall of the citadel the Fāṭimid garrison, with the exception of the two governors (of the city and the citadel) and the city's Cadi were allowed to leave Aleppo.

---

al-'Amīd, 425; al-'Aẓīmī, 164v.; Bughya, A.S., 477-478; Bughya, A., VII, 201r.-202v.; Zubda, I, 227-230; al-Kāmil, IX, 162; Mir'at, Annals, 415H; Wafayāt, I, 278-280, al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 128-129, 581-582; Itti'az, Annals, 415H; Iqd, XI, 577-578; al-Ṣafadī, II, 83-84; Munajjim, I, 328r.; in his article entitled "Byzantium and the Muslim World to the middle of the 11th century" (Cambridge Med. History, vol. IV, part I, p.725) Prof. M. Canard misleadingly says "After 1016 Aleppo passed into the hand of the Mirdāsīd....." He also mistakenly claims that in 1024 the Mirdāsīd appealed for Byzantine aid against the Fāṭimid Caliphate because its "troops had seized the citadel of Aleppo" from them.

<sup>61</sup> al-Antākī, 248; Zubda, I, 229-230; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 582; al-'Aẓīmī, 165r.; Iqd, XI, 577-578; Itti'az, Annals, 415H.

Although the garrison gained its freedom it suffered the loss of most of its equipment and chattels. When Ṣāliḥ returned to Aleppo he released the city ex-governor, Thu'ban b. Muḥammad on an agreed payment, but executed the eunuch Mawṣuf, the citadel ex-governor, and ordered the burial alive of the city's one-time Cadi. He also released the Fāṭimid Dā'i' who al-Antākī calls Abu-Hilāl.<sup>62</sup> It is noteworthy that al-Antākī is the only chronicler who mentions this Dā'i' and it is the only time we hear about an Isma'ili Dā'i' in Aleppo until the reign of Ruḍwān b. Tutush (1095-1113 A.D.).

In spite of all his activities against the Fāṭimid Caliphate, Ṣāliḥ did not deny this Caliph suzerainty. After he returned to Aleppo and established himself there, he sent his kātib Sulaymān b. Tuq to Cairo whereupon the Caliph, al-Zāhir, accepted the Mirdāsīd rule, increased the titles of Ṣāliḥ and sent Robes of Honour and gifts to him and his sons.<sup>63</sup>

Ṣāliḥ struck his own coins and on the only-known two surviving golden dinars dated 417 A.H./1026 A.D. and 419 A.H./1028 A.D. respectively, the name of al-Zāhir, the Fāṭimid Caliph,

---

<sup>62</sup> al-Antākī, 247-248; Ibn al-'Amīd, 522-523; al-'Aẓīmī, 165r.; Zubda, I, 223-224, 228-230; Bughya, A., VII, 201r-202v.; al-Kāmil, IX, 162; al-Dhahabī, Or 49, 92v.; Itti'āz, Annals, 415H; 'Iqd, XI, 577-578; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 582; Munajjim, I, 328r.

<sup>63</sup> al-Antākī, 248.

is inscribed beside that of Ṣāliḥ.<sup>64</sup>

Although the Fāṭimid Caliphate reluctantly accepted the Mir-  
 dāsīd rule in Aleppo, it entirely rejected the foundation of a  
 similar rule by the tribe of Ṭayy' in Palestine. The existence  
 of an independent State in Palestine threatened the survival of  
 the Caliphate itself.<sup>65</sup> The period between 416 A.H./1025 A.D.  
 and 419 A.H./1028 A.D. gave the opportunity to the Fāṭimid Caliph-  
 ate to prepare fresh troops. This period was also fortunate for  
 this Caliphate for, in 419 A.H./1028 A.D., Sinān b. 'Uliyān,  
 Amir of the tribe of Kalb, died. His nephew Rāfi' b. Abi'l-  
 Layyl b. 'Ulaiyān went to Cairo where the Caliph al-Zahir ap-  
 pointed him as successor to his uncle. He also assigned to him  
 all the iqtā' of his deceased uncle. In return the Caliphate  
 was able to win the allegiance of Rāfi' and his tribe, probably  
 by promises or perhaps by provocation of the ancient feud be-  
 tween Rāfi''s tribe, who was of Yemenite origin, and Kilab, who  
 was of a different origin, thus weakening the alliance of the  
 three tribes.

Accordingly in Dhu'l al-Qa'da 419 A.H./November 1028 A.D.,  
 a new Fāṭimid army led by al-Dizbarī - which comprised about  
 7,000 horsemen and infantry - advanced towards Palestine. This  
 army was accompanied by the tribe of Kalb and other Bedouins,

---

<sup>64</sup>N.Ch. (new series), XIII, 335-338; J.A.O.S., LXXIII, 89-91.

<sup>65</sup>See al-Musabbiḥī, 241-242; Ittīāz, Annals, 415 H.

mainly from the tribe of Fazāra. During the preparation for the advance of these forces, Ṣāliḥ with his Kilābī force went to Palestine to re-inforce Ḥassān. The first contact between Ṣāliḥ and Ḥassān's forces and those of the Fāṭimid and Kalbis took place in the region of Ghaza. Unable to encounter them, as it would seem, Ṣāliḥ and Ḥassān retreated and the advancing forces followed them. In the Jordan valley, at al-Uḡḡwānah, not far from Tabariya and Fīq, the two forces engaged in a decisive battle which resulted in victory for the Fāṭimid forces and the death of Ṣāliḥ together with that of his youngest son. This battle took place on May 12th (or 25th) 1029 A.D. and the main cause of the defeat was Ḥassān's flight together with his tribe, thus leaving Ṣāliḥ to bear the brunt alone. The reason behind Ḥassān's flight, whether an act of treachery or cowardice, is not known. By this victory the Fāṭimid Caliphate restored its authority over both Palestine and southern Syria, but Aleppo was retained by Naṣr and Thimāl, the sons of Ṣāliḥ, who escaped from the battle. This was the most decisive victory ever won by the Fāṭimid Caliphate from the Bedouins of Syria who, especially the tribe of Ṭayy', were for a long time unable to recover from this shattering blow.

The heads of Ṣāliḥ and his son, together with some other trophies, were sent to Cairo where they were put on display.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> al-Antākī, 253; al-Ṣayrafī, 37; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 71-74; Ibn

Ṣāliḥ's death robbed the Emirate of Aleppo of the towns of Ba'albak, Ḥims, Ṣidon, Rafniya and Ḥiṣn Ibn 'Akkār, for subsequent to his death the rulers whom he had placed over these towns abandoned them and they were consequently returned to Fāṭimid dominion.<sup>67</sup> In fact, the real motive behind Ṣāliḥ's capture of these towns is not known. The value of them lay in their strategic position, for they secured for Ṣāliḥ's State not only an outlet to the sea but the caravan route which joined Aleppo with it. The Emirate of Aleppo which dominated part of hinter Syria always needed this sea outlet, chiefly for economic reasons. The natural sea outlet for Aleppo can be found in the coastal region of Antioch, but it was impossible for Ṣāliḥ to acquire it from Byzantium, therefore the alternative lay in the Lebanese Coast. This may perhaps explain the reason why Ṣāliḥ captured these towns. This supposition suggests that there was a plan behind Ṣāliḥ's movement and that it was probably based on the realisation of Aleppo's economic position and role in addition to the need of a sea outlet and the big profit which would thereby accrue.

---

al-'Amīd, 524-525; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 123v.-124r.; al-'Aẓimī, 166r.; Zubda, I, 231-232; al-Kāmil, IX, 162, 260; Hawādith, 139r.; Ibn Kathīr, IX, 277; XI, 27; al-Dhahabī, OR 49, 13v, 112r., 171v.-172r.; al-Kutubī, 78v.; al-Muntaẓam, VIII, 45; Wafayāt, I, 278-280; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 415 H; Akhbar, 67r.; 'Ibrat, 173r.; al-Nujūm, IV, 252-253; al-Durra, 325-326; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 582; Itti'āz, Annals, 415 & 420 H; al-Ṣafadī, II, 83-84; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148, 165; 'Iqd, XI, 577-578; Munajjin, I, 328r.

<sup>67</sup> al-Antākī, 253; al-'Aẓimī, 167r.



The sources give no information concerning the motive which prompted Ṣāliḥ's action. These same sources relate also that Ṣāliḥ was a Bedouin. The lack of information and Ṣāliḥ's origin would prevent the assumption that an economic plan existed behind his action. On the other hand, these sources relate that Ṣāliḥ's Vizir was a Christian named Tādharus (Theodorus?) b. al-Ḥasan. Ibn al-'Adim reports that Tādharus had had great influence over Ṣāliḥ and his State and that he was the Commander of the State army and its administrative Chief. Tādharus accompanied Ṣāliḥ in all his campaigns, particularly in the capture of Sidon. He was killed with him on the same day and on the same battlefield.<sup>68</sup> The Christians of Aleppo, who were a large community, managed a large portion of the Emirate's economy (as will be discussed later in more detail). It is conceivable that Tādharus probably inspired Ṣāliḥ who, as a Bedouin, must have had an (instinctive) understanding of finance and commerce, to capture these towns. This matter must, however, remain an assumption because of the lack of information, especially that which concerns the economic situation.

Nothing is known of the impact the establishment of the Mir-dāsīd dynasty made on Aleppo. Similarly nothing is known about the changes, if any, in the administration of the State brought about by Ṣāliḥ. The Christian Chronicler Ibn al-'Amīd in his book of

---

<sup>68</sup> Bughya, A., I, 219v.-221r.; Zubda, I, 232-234; Ta'rif, 566-568.

Tārīkh al-Muslimīn, subsequent to his account of the capture of Aleppo by Ṣāliḥ, says "Ṣāliḥ put in order all [the State] matters and adopted the way of justice",<sup>69</sup> but how, Ibn al-'Amīd does not relate. At the same time nothing is known about the relation between Ṣāliḥ and the Byzantine Empire after he captured Aleppo nor anything of the Byzantine re-action.

Some information survives to indicate that Ṣāliḥ's prestige was considerably enhanced in Syria and Mesopotamia after he became the Amir of Aleppo. His role in southern Syria has already been described. In the north his influence was extended not only over the entire body of the tribe of Kilāb but over some other tribes in Mesopotamia. Taking as an instance the dispute between two of the Chieftains of the tribe of Numayr and Naṣr al-Dawla, the Marwānid Ruler of Mayyāfariqīn (1011-1061 A.D.) which concerned the rulership of the city of Edessa. When the latter captured it from the two Numayris they appealed to Ṣāliḥ, who intervened on their behalf and Naṣr al-Dawla accordingly yielded the city to them.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibn al-'Amīd, 524.

<sup>70</sup> In 422 A.H./1030 A.D., after Ṣāliḥ's death, the Numayris sold Edessa to the Byzantine Empire, see al-Antākī, 236; al-Kāmil, IX, 281-282, 331; Bar Hebraeus, 192-193; al-'Azīmī, 167v.; al-Bustān, 86v.; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 422H; al-Dhahabī, OR 49; 14r.; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 165; the Marwānids of Mayyāfariqīn tried to prevent this by attempting to wrest Edessa for themselves. In 1032 A.D. the Byzantine Empire ultimately acquired Edessa and foiled the Marwanids' attempt. In addition to the above mentioned references see Cambridge Med. History, IV, part I, 725, Ostrogorsky, 322.

Some of the chroniclers called Ṣāliḥ Amir Arab al-Shām<sup>71</sup> (i.e. the Amir of the Bedouins of Syria), a title of which the value is not known but at least indicates the high position of its holder. Ibn al-ʿAdīm says "In the year 472 A.H./1079-80 A.D. Dawlat [dynasty] of Banu Mirdās vanished. The Emirate of the Arab was retained by Banu Kilāb until the time of the reign of [the Ayyubid] al-Malik al-Zāhir [1260-1277 A.D.] when the tribe of Ḥayy' became more powerful" and usurped the title.<sup>72</sup> It is not known whether Ṣāliḥ was the first holder of this title or whether, indeed, it had existed previously. The origin of it is obscure for whether it was created among the tribes of Syria after Islam or whether it existed in Arabia before the rise of Islam and was then carried to Syria after the Islamic conquest of the 7th century is not known. Often we read in some of the Arabic biographies and chronographies "Sayid ahl al-Bādiya", i.e. "The Master of the Desert Dwellers" or "Sayid Qays", i.e., the "Master of the Tribes of Qays"<sup>73</sup> etc. Such a description might well be the starting point which, in the course of time, developed

---

<sup>71</sup>Duwal al-Islam, by al-Dhahabī, B.M.Ms. No. Or 1558, fol. 53r.

<sup>72</sup>Bughya, A.S., 478.

<sup>73</sup>Ibn ʿAsākir, VI, 211r.-212v.; Jamhara, 267.

to the title of Amir Arab al-Shām. On the other hand, before the Islamic conquest of Syria there was the tribe of Ghassān of which its Amir was the first among the Amirs of the other tribes. Accordingly the title of Amir al-Arab could well be a revival or a continuation of an old tradition which was founded in Syria before the rise of Islam.<sup>74</sup>

On the only two dinars so far known to be in existence of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās, the name Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ is inscribed in addition to that of his father and al-Zāhir, the Fāṭimid Caliph. This inscription indicates that Thimāl was his father's nominated successor (Walī al-‘Ahd). During his father's life and before the capture of Aleppo, Thimāl used to live in the town of al-Raḥba because his father preferred to live in his tribe's camp which was often in the outskirts of Aleppo.<sup>75</sup> Apparently Thimāl moved to Aleppo after its capture by his father and lived in its citadel. It is not clear whether or not Thimāl was with his father at the battle of al-Uḡḡuwānah, but it is certain that his brother Naṣr was there.

Naṣr was the eldest son of Ṣāliḥ; he escaped from al-

---

<sup>74</sup>The Byzantine Empire during the reign of Justinian (527-565) created a Ghassānid state under the government of supreme Phylarch, who was nominated by the emperor. This state held some influence over the Bedouin tribes of Syria. See J.B. Bury, History of the Later Roman Empire (New York, 1958), II, 91; see also J.A.O.S. LXXV, 205-216.

<sup>75</sup>Ibn Abi Ḥaṣṣanā, I, 18-22; 86; Bughya, F., 128r.-v.; J.A.O.S. LXXII, 89-90; N.Ch. (new series), XIII, 335-338.

Uqhuwānah to Aleppo where he shared with his brother Thimāl the rule of the State.<sup>76</sup> As it happened later, Naṣr was discontent with the appointment of his brother and waited for an opportunity to capture the citadel from him and to monopolise the rulership of the State. In 421 A.H./1030 A.D., Naṣr was able to sieze the citadel of Aleppo, while his brother Thimāl was absent from the city. Ibn al-‘Adīm relates that Thimāl quarreled with his wife who in fury left Aleppo and went to the tribe camp which was, as usual, in the outskirts of the city. To gain reconciliation with her Thimāl ordered a golden necklace encrusted with gems to be made and he himself took it to the camp. Ibn al-‘Adīm goes on to relate that Naṣr, who was ever watchful - knowing of the departure of his brother - led some of his followers, passed near the citadel as though intending to leave the city; on nearing the citadel gate, which was unsuspectingly open, with sword in hand and closely followed by his men, dashed at the gate and took the citadel by surprise. Ibn al-‘Adīm, when commenting on this event, says "... and since that day a big chain was put in front of the gate of the citadel of Aleppo to prevent any ascending rider from entering it unawares; and ordained that nobody, even the most intimate friend of its ruler, should be allowed to enter it if carrying a sword."<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Zubda, I, 237-238; Ibn al-‘Amīd, 525, al-‘Azīmī, 166r.

This incident brought about a new conception in the style of governorship of the Emirate of Aleppo, which lasted for a long time. Before it took place the rulers of Aleppo lived in a palace in the city while, in the citadel lived a garrison of whom its leader was the governor. Subsequent to Naṣr's coup, the citadel became the residence of the State's ruler. This enhanced the prestige of Aleppo's citadel and brought about the erection of magnificent apartments and reception halls.<sup>78</sup>

Thimāl's reaction to his brother's coup was to muster the tribe's forces with intent to recapture Aleppo by force. In the face of a Byzantine threat and by the efforts of the tribal Chieftains a reconciliation was reached. Accordingly they agreed to again share the rulership of the State, but this time by dividing it into two parts, Mesopotamian and Syrian. Thimāl was to rule the Mesopotamian part from al-Raḥba and Naṣr to remain in Aleppo from where he was to rule the Syrian division.<sup>79</sup> The Byzantine threat was constituted by the advance towards Aleppo of a huge army headed by the Emperor Romanus III himself.

Prior to discussion of the reason for and the outcome of the Byzantine expedition, it is noteworthy to mention that Ibn al-'Adīm, who relates the above incident, gives also another

---

<sup>78</sup>Bughya, A.S., 107; al-A'lāq, I, 23-24, 28-29; al-Durr, 49-50, 55, 61.

<sup>79</sup>al-'Azīmī, 166v.; al-Antākī, 257; Zubda, I, 238-239.

version of the story which appears to have been copied from al-Antākī. Al-Antākī relates that Naṣr made his coup after the failure of the Byzantine expedition and not before. For on hearing the news of the Byzantine advancing army Thimāl and Naṣr removed their families from Aleppo to the tribal camp. Naṣr led the tribal forces to fight the invader and Thimāl remained in Aleppo citadel for the defence of the city. After the defeat of the Byzantine army, Thimāl left Aleppo and went to bring his family back, which gave Naṣr the opportunity to sieze the citadel together with the city.<sup>80</sup> This version is more acceptable than the former one on the basis that in spite of the Byzantine defeat in 421 A.H./1030 A.D. and immediately after it, Naṣr sent a communication to Constantinople not only asking for forgiveness but the protection of the Empire. He offered to pay 500,000 dirhams rated at 60 for every dinar as an annual tribute together with the restoration of the 359 A.H./969 A.D. treaty between Aleppo and Byzantium.<sup>81</sup> It is abnormal to see a Bedouin Amir of a State offering tribute to the Byzantine Empire without peculiar reasons; thus it can be deduced that Naṣr was obliged to seek the Byzantine protection. This obligation

---

<sup>80</sup> al-Antākī, 257; Zubda, I, 245.

<sup>81</sup> al-Antākī, 257, 269-270; al-'Azīmī, 167v.; Zubda, I, 247. For the 359/969 treaty, see Zubda, I, 163-168; al-Antākī, 134; Ma'āthir, I. 306.

would be caused by either Fāṭimid threat or Kilābī dissension and threat. There was not any Fāṭimid threat at that time because, after he became the sole ruler in Aleppo, Naṣr sent an envoy to Cairo with a large number of gifts which won for him the approval of the Caliph for the time being, at least.<sup>82</sup> It would appear that Thimāl, after losing his post, gained the support of the tribe and planned to recapture Aleppo by force. This is perhaps the reason why Naṣr sought the protection of the Byzantine Empire.

To avoid a fraternal collision, the tribal chieftains brought about a reconciliation between the brothers and once again the rulership of the State was shared as has already been mentioned.<sup>83</sup>

The chroniclers give several reasons for the Emperor Romanus III's expedition. Al-Antākī considers it to be an act of punitive reprisal. He relates that, after the death of Ṣāliḥ, and in the same year 420 A.H./1029 A.D., during the co-rule of Thimāl and Naṣr, the Byzantine governor of Anticch led an expedition against Aleppo without the Emperor's knowledge and permission. The motive behind this campaign was to seize the opportunity

---

<sup>82</sup> Zubda, I, 247-248; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 75.

<sup>83</sup> al-Antākī, 257; al-'Aẓimī, 166v.; Zubda, I, 245.



which the death of Ṣāliḥ offered by capturing Aleppo or part of its territory before the Fāḥimids were able to do so. He assumed that Ṣāliḥ's sons were incapable of maintaining their father's estate. The assumption, however, was incorrect and the Byzantine troops were routed by the Kilābī warriors led by Naṣr and Thimāl in a surprise attack before they (the invaders) could enter Aleppo territory. According to al-Antākī and Ibn al-'Adīm, this defeat provoked Romanus III, who dismissed the governor of Antioch and prepared an expedition for punitive reprisal under his personal leadership.<sup>84</sup>

Ibn al-'Adīm gives another version of the expedition. He relates that in retaliation for his brother's coup, Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ summoned the tribal forces with intent to advance on Aleppo in an attempt to recapture it by force. In turn Naṣr, who was unable to withstand his brother's threat, called on the Byzantine Emperor to yield Aleppo to him. Romanus III responded and advanced at the head of a huge army towards Aleppo. The Chieftains of the tribe of Kilāb, who recognised the gravity of the situation, managed to bring reconciliation between the two brothers who once again agreed to share the State as has previously been described. Thereupon Naṣr sent his cousin Muqallid b. Kāmil as an envoy to Romanus III informing him of the reconciliation

---

<sup>84</sup> al-Antākī, 253-254; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 75; al-'Azīmi, 166v.; al-Kāmil, IX, 162; Zubda, I, 237, 245; al-Nujūm, IV, 253-254; al-Ṣafadi, II, 84; Munajjim, I, 328r.

and asking him to discontinue his advance, at the same time offering him his allegiance on the basis of the 359 A.H./969 A.D. treaty. Romanus refused the offer, arrested the envoy and proceeded towards Aleppo but with a lower morale.<sup>85</sup> This version is far from being acceptable for no-one among the chroniclers corroborates it, and as was previously discussed, Naḡr's coup took place after Romanus III's campaign and not before.

Michael Psellus, the contemporary official and chronicler, alleges that the expedition was provoked by a merely personal attitude of the Emperor who "setting his heart on military glory prepared for war against the barbarians east and west. Victory over the western barbarians, however easy, seemed no great triumph but an attack on the eastern enemies, he thought, would win him fame. There he could use the resources of his empire on a colossal scale. For these reasons although no real pretext for war existed, he made an unprovoked assault on the Saracens who lived in Coele-Syria, and whose capital was Chalēp<sup>86</sup> (Ḥalab = Aleppo)".

In spite of being contemporary, living and working in the Imperial Palace of Constantinople and his "account on Romanus is

---

<sup>85</sup> Zubda, I, 238-239; for the 359 A.H./969 A.D. Treaty, see the above note, 82.

<sup>86</sup> Psellus, 66.

quite independant"<sup>87</sup> Psellus' personal attitude affected his narrative and therefore a cautious approach to his account is advisable. Taking as evidence his absurd description of Romanus III, he says "He [Romanus] had a graceful turn of speech and a majestic utterance. A man of heroic stature, he looked very much a king".<sup>88</sup> Later Psellus himself says of this man who looked "every inch a king"... "merely he did nothing more than make projects or shall I say built castles in the air and then in actual practice hurled them down again.... of the science of war he was completely ignorant and as for the letters his experience was far from profound". This, in spite of "this gentleman nurtured on Greek literature also had some acquaintance with the literary works of the Italians".<sup>89</sup>

What would be more appropriate than all the previously mentioned reasons that Romanus, whose Empire's relations with the Fāṭimid Caliphate was not good at that time, aimed by his expedition to accomplish what the governor of Antioch failed to carry out? He was anxious lest Ṣāliḥ's sons, after the death of their father, would be incapable of retaining Aleppo and the Fāṭimid might recapture it. Evidence of this lies in the fact that Manṣur b. Lu'lu', the former governor of Aleppo, was among the entourage of

---

<sup>87</sup>Psellus, 63.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., 63.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., 63-65.

Romanus which rather indicates the intention of Romanus to restore Manṣur to his former position. Romanus III sent an envoy to Naṣr and Thimāl expressing his anxiety on account, as al-Antākī relates, "of their youthfulness he feared that someone among their enemies, by cunning action, might wrest the city from them, therefore he asked them to yield it to him and he, in turn, would give them in exchange or as a compensation the city together with the sum of money they would suggest".<sup>90</sup> Naṣr and Thimāl detained the envoy and sent their cousin Muqallid b. Kāmil with some gifts to meet Romanus and to try to persuade him to return or to change his direction.<sup>91</sup> Muqallid met the Emperor in Antioch which according to al-Antākī, Romanus reached on Monday, 16th Rajab, 421 A.H./20th July, 1030 A.D.<sup>92</sup> Muqallid seems to have been accompanied by a number of assistants. Psellus describes the Aleppine mission meeting with the Emperor Romanus III. He says "They declared that they had not wanted this war, nor had they given him [i.e. Romanus] any pretext for it. They were standing by the peace terms already concluded and they refused to repudiate the treaty still in force. On the other hand, seeing that he was

---

<sup>90</sup> al-Antākī, 254-255; Zubda, I, 245; Itti'āz, Annals, 427 H.

<sup>91</sup> al-Antākī, 255; Zubda, I, 238-245.

<sup>92</sup> al-Antākī, 255.

now adopting a policy of threats, and since he persisted in parading his strength, they themselves -- if he proved obdurate -- would from now on make their own preparations for conflict: They committed themselves to the fortunes of war".<sup>93</sup>

Romanus who "had one object only -- to draw up his line of battle, to set his men in array against the enemy, to lay ambushes, to go out foraging, to dig trenches, to drain off rivers, to take fortresses"<sup>94</sup> not only refused the Mirdāsids' offer but detained Muqallid and advanced towards Aleppo. He was encouraged by the tribe of Ṭayy' whose Amir Ḥassān b. al-Mufarrij sent several members of his family as envoys to the Emperor urging him to continue his advance and assuring him of their allegiance and promising to fight on his side.<sup>95</sup> Romanus stayed in Antioch for seven days, then departed from it in great pomp. Romanus chose a bad time for his campaign. It was the midsummer, intensely hot, the climate very dry with a consequent lack of water. Such adverse conditions dispirited the invading troops and caused great hardship among them. Not far from the fortress of 'Azāz and in a barren plain the Byzantine army encamped. As it was their custom,

---

<sup>93</sup>Psellus, 67.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., 67.

<sup>95</sup>al-Antākī, 254; Zubda, I, 238, 245; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 166.

the Byzantines dug round their camp a large and deep trench.<sup>96</sup> In Aleppo, Naṣr and Thimāl mobilised all the warriors of the tribe of Kilāb with reinforcements from the other Bedouins, especially from the tribe of Numayr. They also mustered -- under the pretext of holy war -- a great number of people from the country surrounding Aleppo and from Aleppo itself. Thimāl, with the greater part of the mustered forces, took strong hold in the city and citadel of Aleppo. He removed his family together with that of his brother to the tribal camp. Naṣr led the rest of the troops which were horsemen, most of them from the tribe of Kilāb, and some from the tribe of Numayr.<sup>97</sup>

According to al-Maqrizī, the number of the troops led by Naṣr was about 2,000 horsemen,<sup>98</sup> but al-‘Azīmī and Ibn al-‘Adim give the number as 923 horsemen.<sup>99</sup> Ibn al-‘Adim gives yet another number of 700, which Ibn Abi'l-Dam confirms<sup>100</sup> while Ibn al-Jawzī gives the peculiar number of 100 horsemen and 1,000 infantry.<sup>101</sup> This estimate by Ibn al-Jawzī is difficult to accept for the description of the fighting which took place between the Arabs and the Byzantines (as will be later discussed) leave no doubt that the Arabs

---

<sup>96</sup> al-Antākī, 256; al-Kāmil, IX, 286-287; Zubda, I, 239.

<sup>97</sup> al-Antākī, 255; Zubda, I, 240-241; al-‘Azīmī, 166v.; Itti'āz, Annals, 421 H.

<sup>98</sup> Itti'āz, Annals, 421 H.

<sup>99</sup> al-‘Azīmī, 166v.; Zubda, I, 241.

were entirely horsemen. In addition, all the chroniclers agree that Naṣr's force was comprised only of horsemen. The Muslim chroniclers, while meticulous concerning the number of the Arabic force, appear to give an ambiguous estimate of the Byzantine army. For Ibn al-Muḥadhdhab (a native of Ma'arrat al-Nu'man, an eleventh century chronicler), Ibn al-'Adīm and Ibn Abi'l-Dam number the Byzantine army at 600,000 warriors; it comprised the kings of Russia and Bulgaria (?) in addition to the Emperor Romanus III.<sup>102</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Maqrīzī, Ibn Khaldūn and al-Dhahabī allege that it numbered 300,000<sup>103</sup>

It is difficult to accept these conflicting and exaggerated estimates, but at the same time there is no doubt that the Byzantine army was by no means small. In fact, it was very large, but most of its troops were irregular for Romanus III thought, as al-Antākī and Psellus relate, that it was easier to win victory by numbers and pomp than by a regular and disciplined army. Psellus says "the whole Roman army was assembled and organised to fight those Saracens; the ranks were increased and fresh formations devised, while

---

<sup>100</sup> Zubda, I, 242; Ibn 'Abi al-Dam, 127v.

<sup>101</sup> al-Muntazam, VIII, 50.

<sup>102</sup> See Ibn al-Warādī, I, 341; Zubda, I, 238; Ibn 'Abi'l-Dam, 127v.

<sup>1-2</sup> al-Kāmil, IX, 286-287; al-Muntazam, VIII, 50; Itti'āz, Annals, 421 H; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 582-583; Duwal, I, 194.

the mercenaries were welded into one force and new troops conscripted. His (Romanus) plan, it appears was to overwhelm the enemy at the first attack. He thought that if he increased the army beyond its normal strength, or rather if the legion was made more numerous, when he came upon the foe with such masses of soldiers, Romanus and allies, no-one would be able to resist them."<sup>104</sup>

Ibn Junghul, a later Islamic chronicler, without naming his sources, alleges that Romanus' army consisted of 100,000 troops. Such a number could not be very far from accurate.<sup>105</sup> This army not only lacked experience and discipline but was riddled with conspiracy. A number of its high ranking officers were plotting against the life of the Emperor.<sup>106</sup> This army which had encircled its camp with a large ditch for defence purposes found itself trapped in a prison of its own making. The Bedouins' light and flexible cavalry surrounded the Byzantine camp and, by raids and ambushes, they brought horror and created havoc among their enemies.

The Emperor, whose army was hit by thirst and was teeming with rumours of intrigues and disorder, endeavoured to extricate his army. He sent a detachment of it towards the fortress of 'Azāz on a reconnaissance mission. This detachment was routed and most of its members were either killed or captured. On realising

---

<sup>104</sup>Psellus, 67; al-Antākī, 254.

<sup>105</sup>Ibn Junghul, IV, 187r.

<sup>106</sup>al-Kāmil, IX, 286-287; Itti'āz, Annals, 421H; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 582-583; Ibn Junghul, IV, 187r.



the gravity of the situation Romanus decided to retreat and ordered the siege instruments to be burned. The Armenians who were in his army took this as a signal to start pillaging the camp market store. This created tumult inside the camp and the guards, concerned with their personal safety, ceased their vigilance on the trench and began to abandon the camp.

At this critical moment of disorder the Kilābīs, with their allied cavalry, led by Naṣr, dashed at the retreating Byzantine camp, took the invaders by surprise and caused their flight.<sup>107</sup> Psellus dramatically depicts the event. He says: "A detachment of barbarian soldiers, all equipped in their own fashion, daring bareback riders..... suddenly they appeared on high ground yelling their war-cries and filling their opponents with consternation at this unexpected sight; they made a tremendous din as their horses charged to the attack. By not keeping in close order they created the illusion of great numbers running about in scattered groups and with no regular formations. This so terrorised the Roman soldiery and spread such panic in this mighty and famous army and so shattered their morale that they ran away dressed just as they were and not a thought did they give to anything but flight. Those who happened to be on horseback wheeled about and made off as fast as they could while the rest did not even wait to mount their horses

---

<sup>107</sup> al-Antākī, 257; Zubda, I, 242-243; Duwal, I, 194; al-Muntazam, VIII, 50; al-Kāmil, IX, 287.

but left them to the first master who claimed them and every man running off or wandering away sought his own safety to the best of his ability. It was an extraordinary sight..... first to feel the effects of the hubbub were the imperial guards. Without so much as a backward glance they deserted their Emperor and fled, indeed if someone had not helped him on to his horse, given him the rein and counselled him to escape, he would have been almost captured himself and made prisoner by the enemy..... The truth is if God had not at that moment restrained the barbarian onrush and He had not inspired them to moderation in the hour of victory, nothing could have saved the Roman army from complete annihilation and the Emperor would have fallen first of all. So the Romans ran off in disorder; meanwhile the enemy as if amazed at the sight of Romans routed and fleeing for no reason, merely stood and watched this outstanding triumph. Later on, after taking a handful of prisoners on the field and those men whom they knew to be of some importance, they told the rest to go free and turned to the foot."<sup>108</sup> This humiliating defeat took place a fortnight after the Emperor had left Antioch.<sup>109</sup>

Psellus' report of this battle is most interesting, describing as it does the tactics employed by the Kilābis in contrast to

---

<sup>108</sup>Psellus, 68-69; see also al-Antākī, 257; Zubda, I, 242-243; al-Kāmil, IX, 287; Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 358-360; Ibn Abi Ḥaş̣anā, I, 347; al-'Azīmi, 166v.; Ibn Abi 'l-Dam, 127v.; Duwal, I, 194; Itti'āz, Annals, 421 H; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 583.

<sup>109</sup>al-Antākī, 257.

the heavy movement of the Byzantine army. These tactics reveal the nomadic character and method of fighting.

The unexpected victory granted the Murdāsīd and their followers an immense quantity of booty. The Arabic chroniclers describe in detail how great was the volume of this booty which was carried on a train of several hundred mules.<sup>110</sup> "First they seized the Imperial tent" says Psellus... "it was filled with necklaces and bracelets and diadems, pearls and precious stones even more costly, all kinds of glorious booty. To count the multitude of these treasures would have been no easy task..."<sup>111</sup>

Although this battle marked the end of a phase of the Arabic-Byzantine relation which was begun in Aleppo by Sayf al-Dawla al-Ḥamdānī (945-967 A.D.) but, in fact, apart from the enormous quantity of booty it had no significant repercussion on Byzantium. The Mirdāsīds, as well as the two Muslim Caliphates of Baghdad and Cairo, were in a position of being incapable of exploiting the victory. On the contrary, shortly afterwards Byzantium was able to avenge its defeat by raiding south-west Syria, by the capture of the celebrated city of Edessa and by the application from Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ - the victor - for Byzantine pardon and protection and, in

---

<sup>110</sup> al-Kāmil, IX, 287; Zubda, I, 242-243; al-Muntazam, VIII, 50; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 127v; Itti'āz, Annals, 421 H; Ibn Junghul, IV, 187r.

<sup>111</sup> Psellus, 69.

turn offering to pay 500,000 dirhams as annual tribute.<sup>112</sup>

It would appear that Naṣr was obliged to do this for three main reasons; by the dissension among his tribe on account of the coup, by the removal of the tribe of Ṭayy' together with part of the tribe of Kalb to the country surrounding Aleppo and by his personal fear that Fāṭimid action might be taken against him. After his defeat Romanus sent a communication to Ḥassān b. Muḥarririj - Amir of the tribe of Ṭayy' - in accordance with which he and his tribe moved northwards to Aleppo region. Ḥassān was accompanied by a part of the tribe of Kalb, headed by Rāfi' b. Abī'l-Layl. According to al-Antākī, these Ṭayy'is and Kalbis were numbered about 20,000, which gave the impression to the Aleppine authorities that Romanus had invited them to fight Aleppo and to expel the tribe of Kilāb from thence. At the same time al-Dizbarī, the Fāṭimid ruler of Damascus, was doing his utmost to win some of the Kilābī dissenters and widen the breach in the tribe and to make use of them for his own ends. These circumstances compelled Naṣr to seek Byzantine protection by means of which he could escape Ṭayy'i and Kalbi invasion, uphold his own prestige among his tribe and secure his rule against action by al-Dizbarī.

---

<sup>112</sup>See al-Antākī, 257, 259-260, 263, 269-270; al-'Aẓīmī, 167v.; al-Kāmil, IX, 281-282, 286; Mir'at, A., Annals, 422 H; Itti'az, Annals, 422 H; al-Mukhtasar, I, 165-166; Bar Hebraeus, 192-193; al-Dhahabī, Or 49, 14r.; al-Bustān, 86v.

The Byzantine Emperor proclaimed that Naṣr had become a vassal of Byzantium and that the Empire now was under obligation to support and defend him against aggression. He (the Emperor) also informed the Fāṭimid Caliphate of this fact. This became the main obstacle to the peace negotiations between Byzantium and the Fāṭimid Caliphate which had just commenced. These negotiations were begun in the year following the defeat of Romanus (422 A.H./1031 A.D.) and made no progress for a few years because of the dispute concerning Aleppo. Not until both sides had agreed to omit the question of Aleppo from the negotiations were they able to conclude and ratify a ten year Armistice Treaty (a longer commitment is not allowed according to Muslim law) which began in the year of its issue, 427 A.H./1036 A.D.<sup>113</sup>

This Treaty affected the position of Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ and obliged him to give more careful attention to his relationship with the Fāṭimid Caliphate. He could now no longer rely on the support and protection of Byzantium, in fact this Treaty temporarily reduced the political value of Aleppo. It would appear that Byzantium, which by this Treaty, had solved most of its problems with the Fāṭimid Caliphate, lost interest in Aleppo or, at least, no longer deemed it to be the of the same political importance. This was manifested by the following events. Some chroniclers

---

<sup>113</sup> al-Antākī, 259-272; Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 4; al-'Aẓīmī, 168v.; Itti'āz, Annals, 422 H and 427 H; Bar Hebraeus, 169.

relate that in 428 A.H./1036 A.D. (shortly after the ratification of the Treaty) there was a rift in Naṣr's relationship with al-Muṣṭansir, the Fāṭimid Caliph (1036-1094 A.D.). They give no reason for the rift, but they relate that Naṣr appealed to Michael IV, the Byzantine Emperor, who in turn advised him to endeavour to gain the confidence of al-Muṣṭansir.<sup>114</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm says that after the defeat of Romanus III Naṣr sent an envoy to Cairo with a large quantity of the booty as a gift. This envoy remained in Cairo for a long time. He went there probably in 422 A.H./1030 A.D. during the life of the Caliph al-Zāhir and did not leave till after the death of this Caliph. He returned to Aleppo after the accession of al-Muṣṭansir.<sup>115</sup> The length of time that the envoy spent in Cairo augurs that there was a discord between Naṣr and the Caliphate. This appears to be the reason why he appealed to the Byzantine Emperor. The nature and cause of the discord is not known; it could have been a continuation of his father's quarrel with the Caliphate. There is no evidence that after the death of his father Naṣr sent any other envoy to Cairo for conciliation. On the other hand some relate that Naṣr requested the Caliphate to grant him rulership

---

<sup>114</sup> al-'Azīmi, 169v.; Itti'āz, Annals, 428 H.

<sup>115</sup> Zubda, I, 247-248; see also Ibn al-Qalānisi, 75; Itti'āz, Annals, 428 H.

over the region of Ḥimṣ.<sup>116</sup> We are not told whether the Caliphate at first refused the request or demanded too high a price thus causing a rift. What would be more probable than that the Fāṭimid Caliphate, whose army defeated Naṣr's father, and caused his death, should be discontented with Naṣr's attitude towards Byzantium. It probably felt that he should cease to acknowledge Byzantine suzerainty and stop payment of tribute to it; or it may have been that the Caliphate tried to enforce tribute and acknowledgement of its own supremacy, if not entirely, at least on the same level as that given to Byzantium. There is no evidence that, at that time, or indeed at any other, that Naṣr paid any tribute to Cairo. Al-Maqrīzī says that after the advice of the Byzantine Emperor, Naṣr did win the confidence of al-Mustanṣir and was granted rulership of the region of Ḥimṣ.<sup>117</sup> This would, perhaps, mean that after the rift Byzantium mediated between Naṣr and the Caliphate and helped them to reach a compromise in which Naṣr accepted Cairo's conditions, whatever they may have been, and in turn the Caliphate granted him the rulership over the region of Ḥimṣ. Unfortunately none of these probabilities can be ascertained because the chroniclers relate no more than that Naṣr's envoy returned from Cairo to Aleppo bringing to Naṣr some gifts,

---

<sup>116</sup> al-'Aẓīmī, 169v.; Itti'āz, Annals, 428 H.

<sup>117</sup> Itti'āz, Annals, 482H.

Robes of Honour, the Laqab of Mukhtas al-Umara, Khāṣṭu'l-Imām, Shams al-Dawla wal-Majdiḥā, Dhu'l-'A'zīmatayn in addition to his previous title of Shibl al-Dawla and the grant of rulership over the region of Ḥimṣ.<sup>118</sup>

This grant, however, did not strengthen Naṣr's position; on the contrary it was in fact the beginning of the end of his rule and brought about his death. This grant was given at the expense of the Fāṭimid ruler of Damascus. This ruler was al-Dizbarī, the victor over Ṣāliḥ, Naṣr's father. He was angered at what he considered to be an act of conspiracy against him.<sup>119</sup>

The life and career of al-Dizbarī will be discussed in the coming chapter but it is necessary here to point out that this man was ambitious. After his victory at the battle of Al-Uḡḡuwanāḥ he had established himself in Damascus. First of all he drove most of the Beduin tribes from the mainland of southern Syria to either the desert or to Byzantine territory.<sup>120</sup> Afterward he was able to win the confidence of some of the Beduin Chieftains and used them in his warfare.<sup>121</sup> In Cairo, Abu'l-Qāsim al-Jarjarā'ī, the

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 75; Zubda, I, 248; Itti'āz, Annals, 428 H.

<sup>119</sup> Itti'āz, Annals, 428 H.

<sup>120</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 5-6, 60-63, 102-103, 412; II, 378, 416-417, 540-541, 570-575; al-Antākī, 261-262, 265-266, 270; al-Nujūm, V, 34; Itti'āz, Annals, 422 H.

<sup>121</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 123-128, 265-266; II, 432; Zubda, I, 250-251.



vizier of the Caliphate, at that period, recognised al-Dizbarī's ambition together with his tendency to independence. Later, as it will be discussed, the vizier was able to bring the rule of al-Dizbarī to an end. Presumably Abu'l-Qāsim al-Jarjarā'ī aimed at this stage to limit the power of al-Dizbarī and not to ruin him. This could be one of the reasons why the Caliphate granted Naṣr the rulership of the region of Ḥimṣ. By this a collision between Naṣr and al-Dizbarī would be almost certain. Such a collision would not only weaken the power of both sides but would give the Caliphate a pretext and opportunity to interfere and enforce its own conditions.

Events, however, did not coincide with such a supposed plan, for when the inevitable clash took place Naṣr lost his life and al-Dizbarī captured Aleppo despite the desire of Abu'l-Qāsim al-Jarjarā'ī, as al-Maqrīzī says.<sup>122</sup> The quarrel between Naṣr and al-Dizbarī was, according to the chroniclers, created by Ja'far b. Kulayd al-Kutāmī, the Fāṭimid ruler of Ḥimṣ. Ja'far, who was one of al-Dizbarī's fellow-rulers, was directly affected by the loss of the rulership of Ḥimṣ region. He not only appealed to al-Dizbarī and warned him, but created trouble inside the territory of Aleppo. The old feud between Naṣr and al-Dizbarī the killer of his father - was resurrected. Al-Dizbarī prepared to campaign against Naṣr. He mustered all the Fāṭimid troops in Syria together

---

<sup>122</sup> Zubda, I, 259-260.

with many warriors from the tribe of Kalb. His relationship with Kalb was, at that time, good for he had previously, in 426 A.H./1035 A.D., married a daughter of its Amir Rāfi' b. Abī'l-Layyl. He also won the support of 'Allān, the son of Ḥassān b. al-Mufarij, Amir of the tribe of Ṭayy', and even enticed a group of the Kilābis to augment his forces.

Before the advance of these troops, al-Dizbarī informed the Byzantine Empire of his intention and assured it that the Byzantine's interest in Aleppo would not be affected. According to Ibn al-'Adīm, al-Dizbarī asked the Byzantine Emperor to permit him to wrest Aleppo from Naṣr promising that if he succeeded he would pay the Empire the same amount of tribute which had been paid by Naṣr. Ibn al-'Adīm goes on to say that the Emperor gave the required permission and al-Dizbarī advanced northward.

When Naṣr heard the news of the impending campaign he summoned his own troops together with as many warriors from the tribe of Kilāb as he could muster and led them southward. Naṣr's army met with and fought the invaders to the west of Salamiya. His army was defeated and retreated westward to re-form itself. While Naṣr was reorganising his troops and recruiting some reinforcements, al-Dizbarī's army entered the city of Ḥamāh, sacked it, then advanced towards Naṣr. On the 15th of Sha'bān 428 A.H./22nd May, 1038 A.D., or two days before, in the north-west of Ḥamāh and not too far from it, where lies the village of Laṭmīn,

the two armies once again faced each other. They engaged in combat and, during the fighting, Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ with his followers fled from the battlefield towards Aleppo thus leaving his brother Naṣr with only a few of his own men to wage the uneven struggle. The place of the battlefield was to the west of Laḥmīn and was known as Tal-Fās, and there Naṣr lost his life. Naṣr's head was carried to al-Dizbarī while his body was sent to Ḥamāh to be displayed on the citadel.<sup>123</sup>

It would appear that when Thimāl fled from the battlefield towards Aleppo it was his intention to restore his own position in Aleppo which Naṣr had usurped from him in an almost similar way. Thimāl, however, was unable to retain Aleppo and the Fāṭimid troops entered the city. Thereupon Aleppo once again returned to Fāṭimid dominion. This was the significant result of this battle, for it marked the beginning of a new period in the history of Aleppo. This period will be discussed in the following chapter, but it is noteworthy to mention here that the site of this battle emphasised the growing importance of the city of Ḥamāh. This city, which previously was a part of the province of Ḥimṣ, advanced in the 11th

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 337-343; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 75, 78-79; Ibn Abi'l-Ḥayjā, 123v.-124r.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 538-539; al-Kāmil, I, 162-163, 313; al-'Azīmi, 168v.-169v.; Zubda, I, 250-252; Akhbār, 67v.; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148, 170; Iqd, XI, 578; Itti'az, Annals, 428 H and 452 H; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 583; al-Ṣafadi, II, 84; Ibn Junghul, IV, 194r.; Munjjin, I, 328r.

century to become one of the principal cities of Syria. (In a later century it became the centre of one of the petty Ayyubid States). The main reason for this advance was the strategic position of the city which made it a battleground for the contending rulers of Aleppo and Damascus.

Before ending this chapter, however, another question concerning the reign of Naṣr presents itself. On the only dinar of Naṣr so far known to be extant, we find "the inscription on the obverse field is الأَمِير السَّيِّدُ // شَيْبِلُ الدَّوْلَةِ The inner margin consists of the complete Shi'ite formula while the outer margin consists of verse 33, chapter 9 of the Qur'an..... On the reverse, the field inscription reads الأَمِير السَّيِّدُ // أَبُو بَكْرٍ مُحَمَّدٌ The inner margin contains the phrase عَبْدُ اللَّهِ وَوَلِيُّهُ عَلِيُّ ابْنِ الْحُسَيْنِ الْأَمَامِ which is part of the name and title of al-Zāhir in Egypt. The outer margin of the reverse of this coin reads بِسْمِ اللَّهِ ضَرَبَ هَذَا الدِّينَارَ

بِحَلَبِ سَنَةِ سَبْعٍ وَعَشْرِينَ وَارْبَعَمِائَةٍ Thus we know by the evidence of this coin that Shibl al-Dawla [Naṣr]..... recognised the Fāṭimid al-Zāhir as Caliph, that he professed Shi'ah Islam, and that he probably designated Abu-Bakr Muḥammad as Wali al-'Ahd. It is impossible to state categorically that Abu-Bakr Muḥammad was so designated, as there is absolutely no indication of his identity." In the available Arabic sources it is "impossible to discover any individual whose full name contained these three names and who could possibly have been living or of importance",<sup>124</sup> in Aleppo, during

<sup>124</sup>J.A.O.S., LXXIII, 90-91.

the reign of Naṣr. As is mentioned before (p.107 ) on the two other known Mirdāsīd coins which were struck by Ṣāliḥ, Naṣr's father, the name of Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ, Naṣr's brother, is inscribed in addition to that of his father which indicates that Thimāl was his father's nominated successor (Wali al-'Ahd). It is within reason to suppose that, according to the inscriptions on these two coins, Abu-Bakr Muḥammad, whose name is inscribed on Naṣr's diner, was Naṣr's son and Wali al-'Ahd. The sources speak of only one son of Naṣr, Maḥmud, and mention no other. The Mirdāsīds were Shī'a, used some Shī'a names, but none of them used the name of Abu-Bakr. No-one of Ṣāliḥ's sons was named Muḥammad. It could be that this Abu-Bakr Muḥammad was not a member of the Mirdāsīds, but an Aleppine who held the post of Vizir. No doubt many of the Aleppines were, at that time, called Abu-Bakr Muḥammad. The administration of the Mirdāsīds was held by Aleppines and we have no complete record of those who worked as Vizir to Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ or any other Mirdāsīd Amir. It is conceivable that this Abu-Bakr Muḥammad, whose name is inscribed on Naṣr's dinar, held the post of Vizir. This supposition could be disputed by the fact that this Abu-Bakr Muḥammad held the title of Amir which indicates that he was a member of the Mirdāsīd Emirate family. In fact this is no problem for many people of that period, who were not members of the Mirdāsīd family nor of any of the Emirate families of the tribe of Kilāb, held the title of Amir. In Bughyat al-Ṭalab,

we read that the poet Ibn Abī Ḥaṣṣāna once praised Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ who in turn asked the poet what he would like as a reward. The poet said "I wish myself to be an Amir". Accordingly Naṣr granted him the coveted title.<sup>126</sup> In a State where the poets were granted the title of Amir, it is not difficult to conceive that its Vizir also held the same title.

In conclusion, the identity of this Abu-Bakr Muḥammad will remain as an enigma unless fresh sources with fresh information are discovered.

---

<sup>125</sup>Bughya, F., 250r.-v.

Chapter III

THE MIRDĀSID DYNASTY II

Al-Dizbarī, Thimāl, 'Aṭīyya and Maḥmūd Ibn Naṣr.

Al-Amir Al-Muzaffar, Amir Al-Juyush, 'Uddat Al-Imām, Sayf Al-Khilāfah 'Uḍud Al-Dawla, Sharaf Al-Ma'ālī, Abu-Manṣur, Anushtakin; these were the titles and name of Al-Dizbarī, the most distinguished Fāṭimid ruler who had ever ruled in Syria. The chroniclers relate that he was a Turk, born in the region of Khuttal beyond the Oxus. As a young lad he had been taken captive and was carried to Kashghar, presumably to be sold, but managed to escape to Bukhārā. In Bukhārā he was recaptured, enslaved and was carried to Baghdad and later to Damascus, where he arrived in 400 A.H./1009 A.D. and was sold to a Fāṭimid officer of Daylamite origin known as Dizbar. From him Anushtakin took his by-name - Al-Dizbarī.

To him Dizbar entrusted the stewardship of his properties. Anushtakin filled this post successfully for three years. His success gained him a reputation and it was the reason which brought about the turning point in his life and career.

In 403 A.H./1012 A.D. his master was obliged to present him to the Fāṭimid Caliph. He was taken to Cairo where he underwent two years' training. After this he was moved to the Palace of Al-Ḥākim, the Fāṭimid Caliph at that time. He served there for one year and during that period won the

confidence of many of the State's leading personalities. He also gained the confidence of Al-Ḥākim who appointed him "as an officer" in the army.

In 406 A.H./1015 A.D. he went with a Fāṭimid army to Damascus. where he lived in the house of Ḥayyus which lay in Zuqāq-ʿAttāf (Bāb al-Jābiya, probably now known as Al-Khdiriya). While in Damascus, he probably became acquainted with Syria and its politics in which, during the next twenty-seven years, he played a prominent part. As a guest in the house of Ḥayyus he was introduced to Ḥayyus' son, Muḥammad, the famous poet of the 11th century who later devoted most of his work to the eulogy of Al-Dizbarī.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Dizbarī, however, did not remain long in Damascus because he was summoned to return to Egypt.

The chroniclers do not give us the age of Al-Dizbarī at the time when he was sold in Damascus, neither do they speak of any previous education and training he may have received before he was sold in Damascus, nor of any received after he was sent to Cairo. The chroniclers attribute his rapid success to good fortune and his own ingenuity;<sup>2</sup> on the other hand they seem to indicate that he was over twenty years of age when he was sold in

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibn al-Qalānisi, 71-72; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 123v.-124r.; al-Dhahabī, Or. 49, 171v.-172r.; Ibn 'Asākir, III, 92r.; Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 7.

<sup>2</sup>Ibn al-Qalānisi, 71-72; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 124r.; al-Dhahabī, Or 49, 171v.-172r.



Damascus. His relationship with both Abu'l-'Alā Al-Ma'arri and Ibn Ḥayyūs, together with the high standard of Ibn Ḥayyūs' poetical language, suggest that he was well-informed in the knowledge of his age.<sup>3</sup> His victories over the Bedouins of Syria together with his success in subduing the whole of Syria to the Fāṭimid rule, also the maintenance of that rule for more than ten years, indicate that he had received a good administrative and military training.

The second episode in Al-Dizbarī's career was his appointment as the ruler of Ba'albak which he held for about four years. This appointment provided him with the opportunity to establish himself by acquiring a number of Ghulams (i.e. pages) to amass money and to develop his knowledge of Syrian politics and conditions. This last was probably the most important for it had a far-reaching effect on his career and brought him into public notice and also enhanced his prestige.

From Ba'albeak he was removed to Qaysāriyya where he appears to have remained for a short while. From Qaysāriyya he was promoted to the governorship of Palestine, which he occupied from April 1023 A.D.<sup>4</sup> This new post brought him into direct contact with the Syrian problems and involved him in military action. His victories over the Bedouins of Syria together with the death

---

<sup>3</sup>Ta'rif, 48, 108, 533, 566; Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 29-44.

<sup>4</sup>Ibn al-Qalānisi, 71-72; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 124r; al-Dhahabi, Or 49, 171v.-172r.; Itti'az, Annals, 413 H.

of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās and then that of Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ has already been discussed (Ch. II, pp. 102, 130).

After the death of Naṣr his brother Thimāl, who had fled from the battlefield, arrived at Aleppo. He was dispirited and thought that he would be incapable of retaining the city, so left it and went toward Mesopotamia to collect re-inforcements from the Bedouins of the area. He left his cousin Muqallid b. Kānil as a governor of the Citadel and a certain Khalīfa b. Jābir Al-Kilābī as governor of the city. When Thimāl left Aleppo, he took his family and that of his deceased brother with him. His departure was the signal for an outbreak of disorder which spread into Aleppo. At the same time a part of Al-Dizbarī's army, which was chasing the fugitives of the Mirdāsīd army, arrived at the gates of Aleppo and began to beisege the city. The siege, however, did not last long and on Saturday, 14th Ramadan 429 A.H./ 19th June 1038 A.D., Khalīfa b. Jābir, with the agreement of the Aleppines, opened the city's gates and surrendered it to the Fāṭimid troops. The leader of the Fāṭimid troops, a page of Al-Dizbarī, called Toghān, sent a communication to Al-Dizbarī telling him about the city's surrender. On receiving this news, Al-Dizbarī hurried towards Aleppo which he reached and entered on Tuesday, 22nd of the same month (June 1038 A.D.). In the course of a few days he was able to reach an agreement with Muqallid b. Kānil, the Mirdāsīd governor of the Citadel who accordingly surrendered

the citadel and left Aleppo.

By this once again Aleppo returned to Fāṭimid dominion, and, for the first and last time, the whole of Syria was united under the Governorship of one Fāṭimid ruler, whose centre was Damascus.<sup>5</sup>

After he took possession of Aleppo al-Dizbarī ordered all the Mirdāsīd's soldiers and followers to leave Aleppo. Al-Dizbarī did not stay long in Aleppo, but in the course of the third month after capturing it he returned to Damascus. Before he left he appointed two of his pages (Ghulāms), Fātik and Sabuktegin as rulers of the citadel. He also appointed another page (Ghulām) as ruler of the city. The name of this page was Banjutegin and he was given the title of Raḍi al-Dawla.<sup>6</sup> Although he captured Aleppo, al-Dizbarī was not able to get possession of all the Mirdāsīd's territory. The Mesopotamian part of the Emirate of Aleppo which consisted of the regions of Bālis, al-Raqqa, al-Rāfiqa and al-Raḥba remained in the hands of Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ who made al-Raqqa his centre in order to be as near as possible to Aleppo.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, II, 442-446; al-'Aẓimī, 169v.; Zubda, I, 255-258; al-Kāmil, IX, 162-163; Ibn al-'Amīd, 538; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 583; Iṭṭī'az, Annals, 429H; al-Ṣafadī, II, 84; Ibn Al-Qalanīsī, Ibn Abi l-Ḥayjā' and Al-Dhahabī relate another narrative which differs in detail from the one previously mentioned. These chroniclers relate that, after his victory over Naṣr, Al-Dizbarī returned with his army to Damascus where he stayed for a short time, then led another campaign against Aleppo by which he captured it. This narrative is not acceptable for several reasons. The chroniclers who related it were not Aleppines, nor were they

Before he left Aleppo and returned to Damascus, al-Dizbarī received a diploma (Sijill) from Al-Mustanşir, the Fāṭimid Caliph, conferring on him the rulership of Aleppo.<sup>8</sup> This was, in fact, a concession, for the Fāṭimid authority in Cairo, headed by Abu'l-Qāsim al-Jarjarā'ī, the vizier was against the capture of Aleppo by Al-Dizbarī. Abu'l-Qāsim Al-Jarjarā'ī interpreted the capture of Aleppo not as a restoration of it to the direct Fāṭimid rule, but as another step towards the loss of the whole of Syria.

While Abu'l-Qāsim al-Jarjarā'ī waited for a suitable pretext and opportunity to bring al-Dizbarī's rule to an end, the latter acted rapidly to strengthen his position and prepared himself for

---

from northern Syria; while most of the chroniclers who related the first narrative, such as Al-'Azīmī and Ibn Al-'Adīm were Aleppines and were authorities in the history of their own city. The versions of these two latter chroniclers is confirmed by the poet Ibn Ḥayyus who, in 429 A.H./1038 A.D., addressed Al-Dizbarī in a long stanza of eulogy where the place was the city of Aleppo and the occasion the celebration of Id Al-Fiṭr, the victory over Naṣr and the capture of Aleppo. Moreover, when Thimāl left Aleppo he did so because he was dispirited by the defeat and death of his brother and he himself being pursued by the Fatimid troops. To accept the second narrative which relates that after his victory, Al-Dizbarī did not pursue the Mirdāsids but retired to Damascus, would mean that Al-Dizbarī gave Thimāl the opportunity to retain Aleppo and to strengthen his position there. It would also suggest that Al-Dizbarī had no initiative to exploit his victories. Actually, the whole story of Al-Dizbarī's career indicates that he did not lack either initiative or ability to exploit his victories. See Ibn al-Qalānisi, 78; Ibn Abi'l-Ḥayjā', 124; Al-Dhahabī, Or 49, 171-172.

<sup>6</sup> Zubda, I, 257-258.

<sup>7</sup> al-'Azīmī, 169v.; al-Kāmil, IX, 336; Zubda, I, 259; Iṭṭi'āz, Annals, 429 H.

<sup>8</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 67.

independence. He procured a large number of Turkish pages and increased his military power. Meanwhile he married the daughter of a certain Kilābī Amir named Maṅṣūr b. Zughayb. He also gained possession of Qal'at Dawsar (later known as Qal'at-Ja'bar) and made a marriage proposal to Naṣr al-Dawla, the Marwanid ruler of Mayyāfāriqīn, that his daughter be betrothed to his (Al-Dizbarī's) son. Furthermore he endeavoured to make his rule acceptable to the population by restoring order and security to Syria.<sup>9</sup>

In Cairo, Abu'l-Qāsim al-Jarjarā'ī, whose state lacked the power to remove Al-Dizbarī by force, contrived to bring his rule to an end by intrigue. In 433 A.H./1041 A.D., a group of the Fāṭimid troops of Damascus who, as it would appear, did not like Al-Dizbarī's policy of recruiting new troops, went to Cairo and complained to the Vizier about it. Abu'l-Qāsim Al-Jarjarā'ī, who had waited for such an opportunity, told them that his opinion of al-Dizbarī was bad and asked them to return to Damascus. He also advised them to win to their cause as many as possible of the Fāṭimid troops in Damascus and to wait further instructions. Next, Abu'l-Qāsim Al-Jarjarā'ī wrote to all the rulers of Syrian cities and provinces, emancipating them from obedience to Al-Dizbarī and instructing them to contact

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 77, 167-169; al-Kāmil, IX, 162-163; Ibn 'Asākir, III, 92r.; al-Dhahabī, Or 49, 171v.-172r.; Zubda, I, 257-260; Mir'at, Annals, 433 H; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 130, 583; al-Nujūm, V, 34; al-Ṣafadī, II, 84.

Cairo directly and not via the ruler of Damascus as was the custom. Meanwhile he, in the name of al-Mustansir, wrote to Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ conferring on him the rulership of Aleppo and urging him to recapture it by force.

After this he wrote to Al-Dizbarī instructing him to remove his Kātib Abu Sa'īd, and to send him to Cairo for interrogation. In anger and without knowing the details of Abu'l-Qāsim Al-Jarjarā'ī's contrivance, Al-Dizbarī not only refused the order but summoned Abu'l-Qāsim Al-Jarjarā'ī's representative in Damascus to his presence and ordered his attendants to humiliate and strike him. By this Al-Dizbarī actually proclaimed his independence and during the days that followed he stopped payment of the Fāṭimid troops and paid only those who were loyal to him and not to the Caliph. This, however, did not pass without retaliation for a great number of the leaders of the troops were in secret agreement with Abu'l-Qāsim Al-Jarjarā'ī and went into open rebellion against Al-Dizbarī. Trouble and disorder spread in Damascus and Al-Dizbarī, who failed to quell the rebellion, was obliged to abandon Damascus accompanied by only a few of his own pages.

He tried to take refuge in Ba'albak, but failed and the same thing happened when he reached the city of Ḥamā. There he was on the brink of losing everything, even his life, but fortunately for him the Munqidhī Amir of Kafar-ḡāb came to his rescue (see p. 84 , Ch. II) and escorted him to Aleppo. During

that period Abu'l-Qāsim Al-Jarjārā'i, in the name of Al-Mustangir, issued several manifestos and Al-Dizbarī was proclaimed traitor (Khā'in), one who had betrayed his master and Caliph and therefore should suffer severe penalty. Al-Dizbarī, who was at that time suffering from great physical fatigue, was greatly affected by the accusation and according to the chroniclers he was unable to endure it. Consequently, in the second week of January - probably the 10th - 1042 A.D., he collapsed and died. This took place in the citadel of Aleppo only after the short period of about a month and a half, when he had come to it as a refugee.<sup>10</sup>

In the month which followed his death, Aleppo was recaptured by Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ (see below) who resumed the Mirdāsīd rule after an interruption of more than three and a half years. Meanwhile a new Fāṭimid governor was appointed in Damascus, thus once again the union between northern and southern Syria was abolished.

Although we have no information about domestic life in Aleppo under the rule of Al-Dizbarī, it would appear that this

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibn Abī Ḥasāna, I, 209; Ibn Al-Qalānisi, 76-79; al-'Aẓimī, 170v.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 538-539; Ibn Abi'l-Ḥayjā', 123v.-124r.; Ibn 'Asākir, III, 92r.; al-Kāmil, IX, 162-163, 333-334; Zubda, I, 259-261; Mir'at, Annals, 433 H; al-Bustān, 87r.; Hawadith, 141v.; Akhbār, 67v.; al-Dhahabī, Or 49, 171v-172r.; Iṭti'āz, Annals, 433H; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 174; al-Nujūm, V, 34; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 130, 583-584; al-Ṣafadī, II, 84; Munajjim, I, 328v.

rule was popular.<sup>11</sup> Again there is no information concerning the Byzantine Empire's reaction to Al-Dizbarī's occupation of Aleppo. On the whole, save for some minor incidents, which occurred in 432 A.H./1041 A.D. between the Byzantine troops of Antioch and those of Aleppo,<sup>12</sup> it seems that the relation of al-Dizbarī with Byzantium was good. Ibn Abi'l-Dam relates that in 432 A.H./1040 A.D. Al-Dizbarī sent provisions to Aleppo by sea. They were transported to the shore of Antioch, then carried on camels' backs - via the city of Antioch - to Aleppo. Although there is no further detail it does, however, suggest that there was co-operation between Al-Dizbarī and the Byzantine authority in Antioch.<sup>13</sup> Some other chroniclers relate that after he settled in Al-Raqqa, Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ appealed to Byzantium for help to restore Aleppo, but Byzantium refused this request and instead asked Thimāl to sell the city of Al-Raqqa on the same basis as when, in 422 A.H./1030 A.D. the two Numayrī Chieftains sold the city of Edessa.<sup>14</sup>

On bearing that Al-Dizbarī had been obliged to abandon Damascus and to take refuge in Aleppo Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ who had just

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 165, 173; II, 443; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 78; Zubda, I, 257; Mir'at, Annals, 433 H; al-Nujūm, V, 34.

<sup>12</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, II, 558-559, 587-589; al-'Aẓīmi, 170r.-v.; Zubda, I, 259-259; al-Kāmil, IX, 336-337; Iṭṭi'az, Annals, 432 H.

<sup>13</sup> Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 129r.; see also al-Kāmil, IX, 336-337.

<sup>14</sup> al-Kāmil, IX, 336; al-'Aẓīmi, 170v.; Zubda, I, 258-259; Iṭṭi'az, Annals, 432 H; see also note 71, ch. II.



received Abu'l-Qāsim Al-Jarjārā'ī's letter (which was signed by the Caliph Al-Mustansir), conferring on him the rulership of Aleppo, mobilised his own tribal forces together with an auxiliary Bedouin force and marched from Al-Raḡqa towards Aleppo. Thimāl reached Aleppo after the death of Al-Dizbarī and invested it because Al-Dizbarī's troops, which - according to Ibn Al-'Adīm - were supported by the Aleppines, defied the Caliph's order and refused to surrender the city. By the term 'Aleppines' it would appear that Ibn Al-'Adīm means Aleppo's Aḡdāth (militia) rather than the city's population. In his narrative, Ibn Al-'Adīm goes on to relate that Thimāl failed to take Aleppo by force and was obliged to retreat towards Qinnasrīn.

A few days later a quarrel broke out between the 'Aleppines' and Al-Maghāribā troops. It can be deduced from Ibn Al-'Adīm's text that the reason for the quarrel was the mastery of Aleppo. The same text indicates that after the death of Al-Dizbarī there were in Aleppo two factions struggling for supremacy; one in the citadel which consisted of Al-Dizbarī's own pages and the other in the city consisting of the Fāḡimid regular troops (Maghāribā) who were garrisoned in Aleppo and the city's Aḡdāth. When the quarrel between the Aḡdāth and the Maghāribā broke out, Aleppo had inside it three groups struggling for power. This quarrel eased the task of Thimāl. On the 22nd February, 1041 A.D. the Aleppines opened the city gates and surrendered it to Thimāl.

When this occurred, al-Marghārība took strong hold in the great palace which was beside the citadel while Al-Dizbarī's pages remained in the citadel and refused to surrender. Before long Thimāl's forces joined by Aleppo Ahdāth were able to capture the palace but the siege of the citadel lasted for seven months. After he had captured the citadel Thimāl received honorary gifts from the Caliph, Al-Mustanṣir, in token of approval of the resumption of his rule.<sup>15</sup>

Subsequent to his capture of the city of Aleppo and while he was besieging its citadel, Thimāl - according to Ibn Al-'Adīm - sent an envoy to Constantinople to inform the Empress Theodora about what had happened in Aleppo and to appeal for Byzantine support in exchange for his acknowledgement of the Empress' suzerainty. Ibn Al-'Adīm goes on to relate that the Empress accepted the offer and considered Thimāl as one of her Empire's vassals under the same conditions which had applied to his brother Naṣr (see p.123, ch. II). Accordingly the Empress granted Thimāl the title of Magister with all its privileges. At the same time and similarly she granted titles of a lesser degree to several members of the Mir-dāsīd family including Thimāl's wife. Ibn Al-'Adīm indicates that Thimāl's reason for this was a suspicion that sooner or later Cairo would change its attitude and take action against him.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibn Abi Ḥasān, I, 28-29; 42, 44, 68, 200, 209-210; al-'Azīmī, 170v.-171r.-v.; al-Kāmil, IX, 163, 333-334; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 125r.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 538; Zubda, I, 261-262; al-Bustān, 87r.;

Actually it was not long before a rift occurred between Thimāl and Al-Mustanşir. The cause of this was Thimāl's non-compliance with the conditions stipulated by Cairo. When Thimāl was allowed to recapture Aleppo it was under the condition that after capturing it he should send to Cairo all the money Al-Dizbarī had left in the citadel of Aleppo and also that he should pay Cairo 20,000 dinars as an annual tribute. The chroniclers relate that, when he died, Al-Dizbarī left in the citadel of Aleppo more than 600,000 dinars. Ibn Al-'Adīm speaks of only 200,000 of this sum being sent to Cairo which evidently did not satisfy Al-Mustanşir and caused the rift between him and Thimāl.

It would appear that Thimāl not only refused to send the residue as requested but ceased to pay the annual tribute. Thereupon Al-Mustanşir instructed Nāşir Al-Dawla Al-Ḥamdānī, the ruler of Damascus to lead an expedition against Thimāl. Nāşir Al-Dawla executed the order and advanced towards Aleppo. His army consisted of the Fāṭimid garrison of Damascus and Ḥims together with a great number of Bedouin mercenaries, particularly from the tribe of Kalb. On his way towards Aleppo he captured Ḥamāh and Ma'arrat Al-Nu'mān. When he arrived at Aleppo, Thimāl together

---

Iṭṭi'āz, Annals, 433H and 452 H; al-Muntaẓam, VIII, 115; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 50; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 129r; al-Mukhtasar, I, 148-149; Iqd, XI, 578-579; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 130, 594; Munajjim, I, 328v.

<sup>16</sup>Zubda, I, 262-263.

with his tribal forces, supported by many Aleppines, tried to repulse him, but failed. Thimāl was therefore obliged to enter Aleppo and take up a defensive position behind its walls. According to the chroniclers when Nāṣir al-Dawla reached Aleppo, he conceived that on his approach the city would surrender to him, but when he found himself faced with Thimāl's resistance, he was obliged to retreat in order to re-organise his army and prepare for siege.

It was in autumn, 1048 A.D., when Nāṣir Al-Dawla left the walls of Aleppo and retreated to a village called Ṣildī which was near Aleppo and lay on the bank of the river Quwayq. It would appear that Nāṣir Al-Dawla chose this site because it was not far from Aleppo and there was water for his men. The river Quwayq dwindled to a small stream in the summer months and achieved full spate and flooding almost immediately after every sudden heavy rainfall. Nāṣir Al-Dawla, who had encamped in close proximity to this stream, did not appear to anticipate any rain. However, this was a miscalculation and, according to Al-Maqrizī, in the night of the 28th October, 1048 A.D., a very heavy rain fell, flooding the river and wreaking disaster upon Nāṣir Al-Dawla's forces. On the following morning Nāṣir Al-Dawla, whose force had lost much equipment and many members, fled southward to Damascus. By the help of nature and good fortune rather than by the power of arms, Thimāl's reign survived.

Knowing that Al-Mustangir would send another expedition, Thimāl acted promptly and tried to achieve reconciliation with this Caliph. He sent an envoy to Cairo for this purpose and by the help of Hārūn b. Sahl, a prominent Jew of Cairo at that time, who mediated between the Caliph and the envoy, a settlement was almost reached.

After he sent an envoy to Cairo, Thimāl sent troops to recapture Ma'arrat Al-Nu'mān and Ḥamāh. These troops clashed with the Fāṭimid governor of Ḥimṣ, defeated his army and killed him. When the news of this incident reached Cairo, the court of which was riddled with intrigue, the Vizier Abu'l-Barakāt Al-Jarjarā'ī, who hated and envied the Jew Ibn Sahl, accused him of being a spy to Thimāl; Abu'l-Barakāt Al-Jarjarā'ī told the Caliph that Ibn Sahl's real purpose was rather to seek revenge for his brother Abu Sa'd's (or Sa'īd's) recent death than to serve the Caliph by acting as a mediator. Abu'l-Barakāt Al-Jarjarā'ī inferred that, by his pretended mediation, Ibn Sahl was actually assisting Thimāl. Abu'l Barakāt Al-Jarjarā'ī further insinuated that Ibn Sahl wanted to ingratiate himself into Thimāl's favour, being desirous to escape to Aleppo.

The outcome of this conspiracy was the arrest of Ibn Sahl and his subsequent death, the dismissal of Thimāl's envoy and the preparation for another expedition against Aleppo.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibn Muyassar, II, 3; Ibn al-Qalṣnisi, 79; al-'Aẓimī, 174v.-175r.;

A very large army consisting, according to Ibn Muyassar, of about 30,000 warriors, was prepared to be sent against Aleppo. Al-Mustanşir appointed the eunuch Rifq as the leader of this army, governor of Damascus and ruler of Aleppo, if he captured it. The Caliph also conferred on Rifq the laqab of Amir Al-Umara, Al-Muzaffar, Fakhr Al-Mulk, 'Umdat Al-Dawla Wa-Imāduhā and he himself went outside the city of Cairo in order to bid him farewell. Moreover this Caliph instructed all the Fāṭimid governors in all Syria (Bilād Al-Shām) to obey Rifq's instructions.

There is no doubt that Al-Mustanşir built great hopes on the success of this army but, in spite of all hopes and all the pomp which accompanied the preparation of this expedition, it was from the beginning doomed to failure. This was for several reasons among which was the nature of the army which was not only untrained and undisciplined but consisted of diverse and antagonistic groups such as Maghāribā, Mashariqa and negroes ('Abid); this condition was further deteriorated when the army reached Syria and Rifq found himself obliged to recruit a great number of mercenaries from the Bedouin tribes of Fazara, Kalb and Ṭayy'; Rifq, who was appointed to lead the expedition, was incompetent: he was aged about eighty years and, as it proved, he lacked military

---

Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 124r.; Zubda, I, 262-265; Bughya, F., 186r.-187r.; al-Kāmil, IX, 163, 374-375; al-Dhahabi, OR 49, 23r., 172r.; Iḥṣān, Annals, 440 H; Khiṭāṭ, II, 170; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 384; al-Ṣafadī, II, 84-85; Munajjim, I, 328v.; Fischel, 69.

knowledge and, finally, the Mirdāsīd determination and resistance, which was encouraged by Byzantine interference and aid.

In Aleppo Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ, on hearing the news of the intended expedition, appealed to Byzantium to fulfil its obligation to protect him and, at the same time, sent his cousin Muqallid b. Kāmil with Kilābī tribal forces southward. Muqallid went towards Ḥimṣ, captured it and destroyed its citadel and walls then he returned northward to Ḥamāh, repeating the process and afterwards moved to Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān which also suffered the same fate. After accomplishing his task, Muqallid returned to Aleppo and rejoined Thimāl. These destructive actions served Thimāl well, for he saved all his strength for the defence of Aleppo, thus avoiding the necessity to leave any troops to garrison any of the three cities; it also provided him with the opportunity of later easy recapture.

The Byzantine Emperor, Constantine IX, responded to Thimāl's appeal. He sent an envoy to Cairo asking Al-Mustanṣir to cancel his intended expedition and induce him to make reconciliation with Thimāl. The envoy was also instructed to inform Al-Mustanṣir that if he refused to accept these proposals, Byzantium would stand by Thimāl and help him in his defence. The envoy met Rifq at Al-Ramla, and upon learning the content of his message Rifq sent him to Cairo and himself, together with his expeditionary force, halted at Al-Ramla and waited further instructions from Cairo.

In Cairo, the Vizier Abu'l-Barakāt Al-Jarjarā'ī, held the envoy and delayed the answer to his message. Meanwhile Abu'l-Barabāt Al-Jarjarā'ī instructed Rifq to resume his advance and to hasten the capture of Aleppo. This Vizier hoped that Aleppo would soon be seized by Rifq and that the accomplished fact would present the answer to Byzantium. It was, however, a miscalculation for events proved otherwise. Rifq's movement was frustrated in Al-Ramla by a part of the tribe of Tayy' who raided the camp of the Fāṭimid advance army and sacked part of its provision and equipment. Not only did Rifq fail to punish these Bedouins, but was obliged to recruit them into his army in order to avoid similar raids. When he resumed his march towards Damascus he was compelled, for similar reasons, to recruit a great number from the tribes of Kalb and Fazāra.

In Damascus quarrelling and fighting broke out among the diverse groups and tribes of this arm, and the country surrounding the city suffered from looting and pillaging. After a while the army was able to move northward and, before it reached Aleppo, it stopped at Ḥimṣ and then at Ḥamāh where, in each city, similar events of enforced recruitment and fighting took place. On 22nd Rabi', Al-Awal 441 A.H./24th August 1049 A.D. Rifq's army approached the outskirts of Aleppo almost five months after it had left Cairo. When it arrived at its destination it was in very bad shape.



In Aleppo, Thimāl was prepared to defend the city and was supported by his tribe together with the city's population in addition to the backing of Byzantium. When the Byzantine Emperor Constantine IX received no reply to his message and learned that the Fāṭimid army was continuing its advance towards Aleppo, he sent to Thimāl a sum of money - the amount of which is not known - and instructed the Byzantine governor of Antioch to lead his troops towards Aleppo in readiness to interfere in the fighting should it become necessary. In the two days following the arrival of Rifq's army, part of his troops engaged the Aleppines in several skirmishes. During these two days a division of the Kalbī mercenaries defected and joined the Aleppines.

Recognising the gravity of the situation and the sad condition of the army, some of Rifq's officers proposed to him to cease fighting and to withdraw the army a few miles to the south of Aleppo for re-organisation. They also recommended that he should arrest the Kalbī's and Ṭayy'i's chieftains as they were the source of all the disturbances. When Rifq did not accept their counsel the officers suggested that he should reach a reconciliation with Thimāl by writing a diploma (sijill) in the name of Al-Mustanṣir conferring on him the rulership of Aleppo. Once again Rifq refused to accept the suggestion and many of them, together with their own units, deserted the army and went southward. According to the chroniclers, this coincided with the execution of

Rifq's order to remove the treasure of the army and some of its provision to Ma'arrat-Maṣrīn.

This action, together with the desertions, acted as a signal to the rest of the army to take flight and to the Bedouin mercenaries to commence looting. The incompetent Rifq was unable to restore order and when morning came he was left with only a few soldiers to be attacked by Thimāl's cavalry, who captured him and many of the deserters and brought them back to Aleppo. Rifq was injured in the head and after three days, during which he had lost his reason, he died.

As usual there was a large amount of booty gained by the Aleppines and once again Aleppo escaped capture, and Thimāl's reign had survived,<sup>18</sup> not so much by actual conflict but as a result of good fortune.

The Mirdāsīd dynasty was far from being strong and, in fact, the Fāṭimid Caliphate during the 11th century was not strong either. Furthermore, after the death of Al-Dizbarī, it had no-one either capable or strong enough to regain dominion over Aleppo by the use of power, therefore, after the failure of Rifq, Al-Mustanṣir dismissed the Vizier. Abu'l-Barakāt Al-Jarjarā'ī, and banished him to the city of Tyre<sup>19</sup> and then received an embassy from Thimāl.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibn Abī Ḥasānā, I, 244-247; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 126r.; Ibn Muyassar, II, 4-5; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 85; Al-Kāmil, IX, 163; Bughya, A., VI, 99r.-103r.; Zubda, I, 265-267; Iṭṭi'az, Annals, 440-441 H; Khīṭaṭ, II, 170; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 148-149; Iqd. XI, 578; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 584-585; Al-Nujum, V, 45; Munajjim, I, 328v.

<sup>19</sup> Ibn Muyassar, II, 4-5; Iṭṭi'az, Annals, 440 H.

This embassy consisted of 'Alī b. Ahmad b. Al-Aysar, who was Shaykh Al-Dawla at that time (see Ch. II, p. 82), Al-Sayyida, Thimāl's wife and their son, Waththāb. Before sending this embassy, and as a gesture of conciliation, Thimāl released all the prisoners who had been captured from Rifq's army. Meanwhile, according to al-Maqrizī, the Kadi of Tyre, 'Alī b. 'I'yād, mediated between Thimāl and the Caliph and induced the latter to receive the Aleppine embassy. In addition to many valuable gifts, the embassy carried to Cairo the sum of 40,000 dinars in payment of twoyears' tribute.

It was sent in 442 A.H./1050 A.D. and succeeded in its mission. According to Ibn Al-'Adīm the success was due to the effort of Al-Sayyidah (see Ch. II, p. 76). When the embassy returned, it brought back to Thimāl confirmation of his appointment as Amir of Aleppo together with a robe of honour. It, in fact, brought stability to the reign of Thimāl and confidence to the hearts of the Aleppines, as Ibn al-'Adīm says.<sup>20</sup>

This stability lasted until 449 A.H./1057 A.D. when, as a result of Al-Basāsiri's rebellion, Thimāl was obliged to give up the rulership of Aleppo in favour of a Fāṭimid ruler. It is outside the scope of this thesis to discuss this rebellion, its cause, detail of the current events and its entire outcome.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibn Abi Ḥasāna, I, 253-256; Zubda, I, 267-268; Itti'āz, Annals, 442 H.

Discussion is here concerned with that part connected with Aleppo. Al-Mu'ayyad fi Al-Dīn Dā'i Al-Du'āl has written a full account of the events which occurred in Aleppo during the time of the Basāsīrī rebellion, and gives a detailed narrative of how Thimāl was obliged to abandon Aleppo. In his own peculiar way, Al-Mu'ayyad wrote for only one purpose which was to emphasise that only he was the really active and influential person behind every event which took place, and relates how he miraculously, in his own simple way and humble person, was able to solve every problem. Because of this, caution should be applied before using his narrative.

In 448 A.H./1056 A.D. Al-Mu'ayyad was despatched from Cairo with a large sum of money estimated by Maqrīzī to be 2,300,000 dinars. His destination was Aleppo and his mission was to assist Al-Basāsīrī in his rebellion.<sup>21</sup> In the previous year (447 A.H./1055 A.D.) Al-Basāsīrī took refuge in the Emirate of Aleppo in the region of Al-Raḥba after having fled from Baghdād. Al-Mu'ayyad's mission was to go to Al-Raḥba, meet Al-Basāsīrī, deliver the money to him and assist him in his rebellion.

After he reached Damascus Al-Mu'ayyad corresponded with Thimāl who, after a while, agreed to receive him in his emirate. Thimāl met Al-Mu'ayyad at the village of Al-Rastan (on the

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibn Muyassar, II, 8; Iṭṭi'āz, Annals, 448H.

river Orontes) then accompanied him to Aleppo (see ch. II, p. 64) and from thence to al-Raḥba where he met al-Basāsīrī.

It would appear that Thimāl did not foresee any danger to his reign when he allowed al-Basāsīrī to make the region of al-Raḥba a base for his activities. His reception of al-Mu'ayyad whom he escorted to al-Raḥba to join al-Basāsīrī confirm this and explains why he (Thimāl) - as Ibn al-'Adīm relates - did not allow his Kilābī tribesmen to arrest al-Basāsīrī when he first entered the region of al-Raḥba. Ibn al-'Adīm does not mention why the Kilābīs wanted to arrest al-Basāsīrī, but it is conceivable that they aimed to sell him to Tuḡhril - Beg or to the Caliph of Baghdad rather than that they foresaw any future danger.

When al-Basāsīrī received the money sent to him from Cairo he was able to muster a large army with which he compelled Thimāl to yield to him the town of al-Raḥba which he made the centre of his activities. This occurred in 448 A.H./1056 A.D. not long after the arrival of al-Mu'ayyad and was the first step towards Thimāl's loss of the emirate. Shortly after and under similar pressure Thimāl was obliged to yield al-Raḡqa to Māni' b. Shahīb b. Waththāb, Amir of the tribe of Numayr.

This last event angered the tribe of Kilāb and brought dissension among its members which developed into a split among it, when a quarrel broke out between Thimāl and his brother 'Atiyya. The quarrel began when the latter seized for himself a

large sum of money sent from Cairo to al-Basāsīrī. This sum was sent to Thimāl who in turn asked his brother 'Aṭīyya to convey it to al-Basāsīrī; instead 'Aṭīyya kept it for himself.<sup>22</sup> Al-Mu'ayyad relates that after 'Aṭīyya had stolen the money he (al-Mu'ayyad) left al-Raḥba for Aleppo. He goes on to say that three leagues before reaching Aleppo he met 'Aṭīyya and settled the dispute with him. On the next day he (al-Mu'ayyad) met Thimāl, who was resolved to take punitive action against his brother and succeeded in calming him and stopping him from taking any action. Al-Mu'ayyad comments that he succeeded in avoiding fraternal conflict among the Kilābis, also this served Aleppo - as he says - which escaped the repercussions of such a conflict.<sup>23</sup>

After giving an account of this al-Mu'ayyad relates that al-Basāsīrī, accompanied by Quraysh b. Badrān, Amir of the tribe of 'Uqayl, together with several of the tribe's chieftains, followed him and came to the region of Bālis which was two leagues distant from Aleppo. Al-Mu'ayyad gives as the reason for this movement that al-Basāsīrī appealed to Naṣr al-Dawla, the Marwānid ruler of Mayyāfāriqīn (1011-1061 A.D.) to give him asylum in his country, but when he received no answer he lost patience and moved towards

---

<sup>22</sup> Al-Mu'ayyad, 101-104, 107-108, 121, 125, 126, 129, 153, 170; Ibn Abi'l Hayjā', 126v.; al-'Aẓīmī, 178r.; Zubda, I, 270-274; Mir'at, A., Annals 449 H; Al-Nujūm, V, 57.

<sup>23</sup> Al-Mu'ayyad, 170.

Aleppo.<sup>24</sup>

On scrutinising this narrative it is apparent that al-Mu'ayyad avoids the issue. The goal of al-Basāsīrī was Baghdād and al-Raḥba was the most suitable base for the success of his task. It was not far from Baghdād, near the Syrian desert for refuge in time of need and, still more important, in this desert as in the valley of the Euphrates there were then - as now - numerous Bedouin tribes who were ready, at a price, to provide him with the necessary warriors. To go to the Marwānid State would have meant the loss of all these advantages and quitting the rebellion. It is, therefore, conceivable that al-Basāsīrī appealed to the Marwānids purely for assistance and not for refuge as al-Mu'ayyad relates. It is apparent that al-Basāsīrī's movement was actuated by other reasons which al-Mu'ayyad circumvents, but which could be deduced from the accounts of some other chroniclers.

Muḥammad b. Hilāl b. al-Ṣabi' (ḡars al-Ni'ma) relates that 'Aṭiyya (Thimāl's brother) was at that time ruler of the town of Bālis.<sup>25</sup> This proffers a good reason for the movement of al-Basāsīrī, especially with the knowledge that the Amir of the tribe of 'Uqayl together with a number of the tribal chieftains were with

---

<sup>24</sup>Al-Mu'ayyad, 170.

<sup>25</sup>Mir'at, Annals, 449H.

him. No doubt these chieftains were accompanied by their own fellow-tribesmen which suggests that punitive action was contemplated against 'Atiyya for depriving them of their anticipated money. But here a question arises; why al-Mu'ayyad had previously met 'Atiyya and allayed his anxiety, then met Thimāl, calmed him and stopped him from taking any action against his brother? Not long after the arrival of al-Basāsīrī at Bālis Thimāl was obliged to abdicate his post in favour of a Fāṭimid ruler. Perhaps this event suggests the answer to this question.

Al-Maqrīzī, but with insufficient detail, speaks of a secret plan devised by the Vizier al-Y'azūrī to bring the rule of Thimāl to an end.<sup>26</sup> It would appear that when al-Mu'ayyad moved from al-Raḥba towards Aleppo, where on his way he met 'Atiyya and Thimāl, he aimed to conceal the plan which, if discovered, would certainly unite the quarrelling brothers against the common enemy.

After meeting the two brothers, between whom no reconciliation was made, Thimāl returned to Aleppo, the tribe of Kilāb scattered and the way was left open to al-Basāsīrī to advance. Al-Mu'ayyad states that when he entered Aleppo he found that Thimāl, angry with his brother 'Atiyya, the dissension of his tribe, the proximity of al-Basāsīrī and his troops, desired to abdicate in favour of a Fāṭimid ruler. Here, once again, al-Mu'ayyad evades the

---

<sup>26</sup> Iṭṭi'āz, Annals, 452H.



issue. He tells us that Thimāl wrote to the Caliph, al-Mustansir, requesting him to appoint a successor to him in Aleppo and to permit him to retire to Cairo.<sup>27</sup>

Events, however, were not so simply concluded. In 447 A.H./1055 A.D. the relationship between the Byzantine Empire and the Fāṭimid Caliphate had deteriorated. Al-Mustansir, the Fāṭimid Caliph, sent a large army led by al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Mulhim to Syria. This army had several skirmishes with the Byzantine forces of Antioch. Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ endeavoured unsuccessfully to bring reconciliation between the two sides and the Fāṭimid troops stationed near the Byzantine frontier not far from Aleppo.<sup>28</sup>

During the year 449 A.H./1057-58 A.D. there was a drought and harvest failed in the emirate of Aleppo. According to al-Dhahabī, this was the main reason for the abdication of Thimāl.<sup>29</sup> Tribal dissension, drought, al-Basāsiri together with his forces pressing on Aleppo from one side and Ibn Mulhim, together with his troops from the other side, were the stresses under which Thimāl lived in 449 A.H./1057-58 A.D. To them can be added the circumstances that Byzantium was, at that time, busy with its own problems, mainly the migration of the Turcomans.

In Cairo the Vizier al-Yāzūrī seized the awaited opportunity and sent Ibn 'Aqīl, the Kadi of Tyre who had previously mediated between Thimāl and the Caliph al-Mustansir to induce Thimāl to

<sup>27</sup> Al-Mu'ayyad, 171-172.

<sup>28</sup> Ibn Muyassar, II, 7-8; Al-'Aẓimī, 178r.; Iṭṭi'āz, Annals, 447 H.

<sup>29</sup> Al-'Ibar, D.H., III, 215-218; Al-Durra, 369-370.

abdicate. Ibn 'Aqīl was successful and the rulership of Beirut, Acre and Jubayl were bestowed upon Thimāl. Matters were thus arranged and, on Thursday, 26th Dhu 'l-Qa'da 449 A.H./23rd January 1058 A.D., Thimāl left Aleppo. Al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Mulhim, whose laqab was Makīn al-Dawla together with his army entered Aleppo and was appointed ruler. This operation went smoothly without any of the expected trouble from Aleppo Aḥdāth. It would appear that the rulership of the three towns bestowed upon Thimāl was merely a nominal one, and probably tributary, as Thimāl went direct to Cairo where he was welcomed by al-Mustanṣir.<sup>30</sup>

-----

On the former occasions, when the Mirdāsids lost the city of Aleppo, the Mesopotamian part of their emirate remained under their control. On this occasion only Bālis remained in the hands of 'Aṭiyya b. Ṣāliḥ, while al-Raqqā was under the control of the tribe of Numayr and al-Raḥba was the centre of al-Basāsiri's activity. This situation handicapped the tribe of Kilāb and prevented it from making any attempt to recapture Aleppo; thus giving Ibn Mulhim, the new Fāṭimid ruler, the chance to settle in Aleppo and maintain order with apparently a small number of troops.

---

<sup>30</sup> Al-Mu'ayyad, 172-175; Ibn Muyassar, II, 8; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 86; Ibn Abi'l Hayjā', 126v.-127r.; Al-'Azīmī, 178 r.v.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 544-545; Zubda, I, 273-274; Al-Kāmil, IX, 136-164, 383; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 23v.; Duwal, I, 206; Mir'at, A., Annals, 450 H; Iṭṭi'āz, Annals, 449, 452 H; Al-Ṣafādī, II, 84-85; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 149, 178; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 585; 'Iqd, XI, 578; Ibn Junghul, IV, 201 v.; Munajjim, I, 328 v.

This situation remained unchanged until 451 A.H./1059 A.D., when al-Basāsīrī was defeated and killed by Tughril-Beg, the Saljuq Sultan.<sup>31</sup> The death of al-Basāsīrī marked a turning-point in the history of Islamic Syria. Since the 7th century and until that time the Arabic tribes were the dominating power in the political life of Syria. From then onwards these tribes lost almost all their power and Syria fell under non-Arabic rule and remained so until the end of the first world war. The history of Islamic Syria can therefore be divided into two epochs, Arabic and non-Arabic; for its particular features the latter, in many ways, could be designated as a period of absolutism. This, however, will be partially discussed later in more detail, in the sequence of the Saljuq conquest of Syria.

Returning to the main course of events, we find that the death of al-Basāsīrī provided the opportunity for the tribe of Kilāb to move and recapture Aleppo. After his death 'Aṭīyya b. Ṣāliḥ marched on al-Raḥba, captured it in Ṣafar 452 A.H./April 1060 A.D. and seized all that al-Basāsīrī had stored in it of money, equipment and provisions.<sup>32</sup> According to Ibn al-'Adīm, the recapture of al-Raḥba by 'Aṭīyya stimulated the tribe of Kilāb and encouraged it to attempt to recapture Aleppo. Ibn al-'Adīm says that the Kilābī tribesmen chose Maḥmūd b. Naṣr as a leader because his father Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ was an Amir of Aleppo. Ibn al-'Adīm goes on to say that in Jumada al-Aulā 452 A.H./

<sup>31</sup>Zubda, I, 274-275; Khiṭāṭ, II, 171; Al-Durra, 373.

<sup>32</sup>Al-Tuḥaf, 195-196; Zubda, I, 275; Mir'āt. A.. Annals.

June 1060 A.D. Maḥmūd led his tribal forces in an advance on Aleppo but found himself unable to take it by force and retreated. After Maḥmūd's withdrawal, Ibn al-ʿAdīm says that a dispute arose between Ibn Mulhim, the Fāṭimid governor of the city, and the city's Aḥdāth.<sup>33</sup>

Some other chroniclers, such as Ibn al-ʿAmīd, Ibn al-Aḥīr and Ibn Khaldun, mention this dispute and, together with Ibn al-ʿAdīm, relate that as a result of it, Aleppo's Aḥdāth called on Maḥmūd, opened the city's gates and surrendered Aleppo to him. They go on to say that in the beginning of July, 1060 A.D. Maḥmūd entered Aleppo and began to siege its citadel in which the Fāṭimid garrison had taken strong defensive possession. These same chroniclers further state that the Fāṭimid troops appealed to the Caliph in Cairo for help and the latter responded by ordering the governor of Damascus to lead a relief army towards Aleppo. This governor executed the order and advanced towards Aleppo. He reached it just over 32 days after Maḥmūd had entered it.<sup>34</sup>

---

452 H; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 2v.; Duwal, I, 205-206; Al-ʿIbar, D.H., III, 227; Al-Nujūm, V, 66; Al-ʿAzīmī, 179r.; Ibn al-Qalanīsī, 90.

<sup>33</sup> Zubda, I, 276-277.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 277-278; Ibn al-ʿAmīd, 549-550; al-Kāmil, IX, 163-164; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 585; see also Iqd, XI, 578; al-Ṣafadī, II, 85; Munajjim, I, 328v.; all these latter chroniclers cite their information from Ibn al-Aḥīr.

It is difficult to credit all the statements made in this narrative. It was 'Aṭiyya who recaptured al-Raḥba and seized all the stores belonging to al-Basāsiri. At that time 'Aṭiyya was the most senior member of the Mirdāsīd family and now had probably become the most wealthy. For these reasons it is within the range of credibility that the tribe of Kilāb should choose him in preference to his nephew Maḥmūd b. Naṣr, as Ibn al-'Adīm relates.

It is impossible to imagine that in the space of only 32 days a messenger went from Aleppo to Cairo carrying an appeal for aid, Cairo responded by instructing the governor of Damascus to undertake the duty of relieving Aleppo, this governor formed an army of 10,000 to 15,000 troops and then led it to Aleppo. Even in our modern age, no state, with all modern equipment and swift transport, could accomplish such a feat.

In search for an apt narrative which bears scrutiny we find Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī cites Muḥammad b. Hilāl al-Ṣabi' (Ghars al-Ni'ma) as relating that when 'Aṭiyya recaptured al-Raḥba he was afraid that the Saljuq Sultan might take action against him. Because of that he sent one of his followers to Baghḍad as his representative, offering his allegiance and asking for title and robe of honour (Khil'a' and Laqab) as recompense for reciting the Khutba in the name of the Caliph of Baghḍad and the Saljuq Sultan. The Fāṭimid governor of Aleppo reported the action of 'Aṭiyya to the Fāṭimid authority in Cairo. The Fāṭimid authority, angered by the

news, instructed the governor of Damascus to lead his troops together with the tribe of Kalb towards al-Raḥba and to endeavour to wrest the city from 'Aṭiyya.

On learning this, the chieftains of the tribe of Kilāb sent a delegation to Aleppo to inform its governor that they considered the movement of the tribe of Kalb from its own Diyār (region) towards the Diyār of Kilāb an act of aggression, not only against 'Aṭiyya but also against the whole tribe of Kilāb. That delegation warned the governor that, if Kalb were not to stop by an order from the Fāṭimid authority the Kilābī warriors would undertake the duty of defending their own Diyār. Moreover, this delegation promised that if the movement of the tribe of Kalb was restrained, the chieftains of Kilāb would solve the problem of 'Aṭiyya in accordance with the Fāṭimids' wishes.

The governor of Aleppo replied to the Kilābī delegation that he could do nothing for there was a clear order from Cairo which nobody could question. Thereupon the chieftains of Kilāb called on 'Aṭiyya and chose him as their Amir and leader. After he had been elected 'Aṭiyya led his tribesmen together with an auxiliary force from other Bedouin tribes such as Khafāja and 'Uqayl towards Ḥimṣ - which was at that time in the Diyār of Kalb - captured it, destroyed its walls, sacked it then turned towards Ḥamāh which also suffered the same fate.

While all this was taking place al-Sayida, Maḥmūd b. Naṣr's

mother, who was in Aleppo, succeeded in gaining the confidence of some of the city's Aḥdāth. She plotted with these Aḥdāth against the Fāṭimid governor of the city and prepared the way for her son Maḥmūd to take Aleppo. She communicated with Maḥmūd who, on receiving the information, proceeded to Aleppo accompanied by his cousin Māni' and some of their Kilābī followers. On arriving at the walls of Aleppo, they found the city's gates open thus enabling them to capture it without any effort. The Fāṭimid garrison, who were taken by surprise, entrenched themselves in the citadel which Maḥmūd immediately began to siege.

The capture of Aleppo by Maḥmūd annoyed his uncle 'Aṭiyya and split the tribe of Kilāb into two parts. After the desertion of many of his Kilābī followers to Maḥmūd, 'Aṭiyya was inclined to make reconciliation with the Fāṭimid authority and, after achieving it, withdrew towards al-Raḥba. This gave an opportunity to the Fāṭimid governor of Damascus to advance on Aleppo leading his own troops together with those of the tribe of Kalb.<sup>35</sup>

Concerning all the events which occurred afterwards, the chroniclers Ibn al-Ḡalānisī, al-'Aḏīmī, Ibn al-'Adīm, Ibn al-'Amīd, Ibn al-Aṭhīr, al-Dhahabī and Ibn Khaldun give the same accounts, all of which repeat that of Ghars al-Ni'ma. They relate that when he was unable to seize the citadel of Aleppo and heard that a Fāṭimid army was advancing northward from Damascus,

---

<sup>35</sup>Mir'at, A. Annals, 452 H.

Maḥmūd b. Naṣr found it was dangerous to remain in Aleppo so, together with his tribal forces and most of Aleppo's Aḥdāth, left the city and withdrew eastward. When this happened, Ibn Mulhim together with his garrison descended from the citadel to the city, sacked it and killed every member of the Aḥdāth they found there.

Before long, the relief forces, which Ghars al-Ni'ma estimates as 10,000 troops and Ibn al-'Adīm as 15,000 horsemen, reached Aleppo. When Nāṣir al-Dawla al-Ḥamdānī, the leader of these forces, tried to sack Aleppo he was informed that Ibn Mulhim had left nothing for him to sack, therefore Nāṣir al-Dawla gave orders that the Aleppines should pay him all he had spent in his campaign. While the money was being collected he led his forces towards the camp of Maḥmūd b. Naṣr. Maḥmūd engaged him in conflict at al-Funaydiq a few miles from Aleppo. As had happened on several previous occasions the Kalbīs and Ṭayy'īs in Nāṣir al-Dawla's army abandoned the battlefield while fighting was still in progress and left him with his few regular troops to bear the brunt of it. It was on Wednesday, 30th Rajab, 452 A.H./30th August, 1060 A.D. when the army of Nāṣir al-Dawla was routed and he himself was injured and taken prisoner.

On the ensuing days 'Aṭīyya arrived at Aleppo having been invited by Ibn Mulhim, who had decided to yield the city to him, but in the evening of the same day, 'Aṭīyya departed from the city because he found himself unable to retain it. It was on Friday, 2nd Sha'bān, 452 A.H./1st September, 1060 A.D. when Maḥmūd b. Naṣr entered Aleppo and not long after Ibn Mulhim surrendered the



citadel to him. Ibn al-‘Adīm comments on the recapture of Aleppo by Maḥmūd that it was a very strange circumstance which made Aleppo suffer a succession of three sovereigns in three days.<sup>36</sup> Ibn Muḥim was the last Fāṭimid governor to rule Aleppo and Naṣir al-Dawla led the last Fāṭimid expedition against it.

In Cairo the Caliph al-Mustaṣfir, who was unsatisfied with what had happened in Aleppo, notified Thimāl b. Ṣāliḥ who was at that time in Cairo, that he could no longer be regarded as the ruler of Beirut, Acre and Jubayl. When Thimāl protested that the happening in Aleppo was not the fault of him but of the Fāṭimid governors of Damascus and Aleppo al-Mustaṣfir replied to the protest by offering him a sum of money, a new title (laqab) and his support if he cared to return to Aleppo and endeavour to re-establish his sovereignty there.

Thimāl accepted the offer, left Cairo and returned to Syria. When he reached the city of Ḥimṣ he wrote to his tribe asking for their support. Part of the tribe responded to his call, came to Ḥimṣ and then marched with him northward. In January 1061 A.D. Thimāl arrived at the walls of Aleppo which he invested. It would seem that the larger part of Kilāb had rallied to his support and because of this Maḥmūd took a defensive position. During the siege a group of the Aḥdāth opened one of the city's gates to give entrance to Thimāl. Some of Thimāl's men entered but Maḥmūd

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibn Muḥassar, II, 12; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 86-87, 90-91; Ibn Abi'l Hayjā', 127v.; Al-‘Azīnī, 179r.v.; Mir'at, A., Annals, 450, 452 H; Ibn al-‘Amīd, 550-551; al-Kāmil, IX, 163-164; X, 7; Zubda, I, 278-281; Yāqūt (al-Funaydiq); Iṭṭi'āz, Annals, 452H; al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 149; al-Nujūm, V, 63; al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 2r.; Duval, I, 205-206; Al-‘Ibar, Dh, III, 227; ‘Iqd, XI, 578; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 585; al-Ṣafadī, II, 85; Munajjim, I, 328v.

rebuffed them and re-shut the gate.

Maḥmūd, having few Kilābī supporters, appealed for help to both the Byzantine Empire and the tribe of Numayr, his mother's tribe. Numayr responded to the appeal and advanced towards Aleppo to relieve Maḥmūd. The movement of Numayr obliged Thimāl to abandon the siege and to withdraw his forces a few miles from the city. After this Maḥmūd together with his additional supporters engaged his uncle's forces but was defeated and fled to his previous defensive position inside Aleppo. Maḥmūd then pleaded his cause with the chieftains of Kilāb (see ch. II, p.80 ). The chieftains, while refusing his plea, mediated between him and his uncle and, on Wednesday, 24th Rabī' al-Awal, 453 A.H./18th April, 1061 A.D., an agreement was reached between them. As a result Maḥmūd agreed to yield Aleppo to his uncle Thimāl in exchange for 50,000 dinars together with 30,000 Makkuks (a measurement used for all cereals) of cereal (Ghallah) as an apparently yearly stipend. On Monday, 23rd April, 1061 A.D. Maḥmūd surrendered Aleppo and its citadel to his uncle who thus resumed sovereignty of Aleppo for the fourth time.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 91; Al-'Azīmi, 179v.-180r.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 551; Bughya, F., 156v.; Zubda, I, 281-282, 285-286; Mir'at, A., Annals, 452H.; Al-Kamil, IX, 164; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 149; Iḥti'az, Annals, 453H.; Iqd, XI, 579; Al-Ṣafadi, II, 85-86; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 586; Munajjim, I, 328v.; for the size of the Makkuk, see al-Maqdisi, 181-182; Subḥ, IV, 118, 216.

Thimāl's reign, this time, did not last long for on 23rd Dhu'l-Qa'da of the following year, 454 A.H./November 28th 1062 A.D., he died.<sup>38</sup> The significant occurrences during this short period were his clash with Byzantium and his dispute with the Amir of the tribe of Numayr. The dispute with this Amir was over al-Raḥba which, it would appear, he tried to wrest from the Mirdāsids. In August 1061 A.D., Thimāl sent his brother 'Atiyya at the head of an army to maintain it in the domain of his family and 'Atiyya succeeded in his mission. Afterwards al-Sayida, Thimāl's wife, and Māni' b. Waththāb, Amir of the tribe of Numayr's sister, mediated between her husband and her brother and brought reconciliation between them.<sup>39</sup>

The clash with Byzantium occurred in May 1062 A.D., when an Aleppine force led by Thimāl engaged a Byzantine army at the castle of Artāḥ, which lay a few miles to the north of Aleppo. This resulted in the defeat of the Byzantines and was followed in October of the same year by two similar clashes on a smaller scale. On a previous occasion when he was the sole Emir of Aleppo Thimāl had had good relations with the Byzantine empire to the extent that he was considered by it as a vassal.

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibn al-Qalānisi, 91; Al-Kāmil, IX, 164; Mir'at, A., Annals, 454H; Mir'at, BM, 249r.; Al-'Azīmi, 179v.-180r.; Zubda, I, 288; Hawadith, 151r.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 552; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 47v.; Al-'Ibar, DH, III, 231; Iqd, XI, 579-580; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 86; Munajjim, I, 328v.

<sup>39</sup>Zubda, I, 286.

The former policy of the Fāṭimid Caliphate and the actions it undertook against the Mirdāsids obliged this dynasty to seek Byzantine friendship and protection, but now, when Thimāl returned to his post it was from Cairo where he had lived for a few years. It would appear that when he was in Cairo, Thimāl recognised that the Fāṭimid Caliphate was no longer capable of bringing any military pressure to bear upon Aleppo. On the other hand it is probable that he also noticed the trouble created inside Byzantium by the Turcomans and the changes in the balance of power in that area (i.e. the Middle East) after the Saljuqs had taken over Baghdad. These circumstances together with some other happenings were probably the reasons behind Thimāl's change of attitude towards Byzantium and his clashes with this empire. It would seem that during the struggle between Thimāl and his nephew Maḥmūd, Byzantium favoured Maḥmūd.

In January 1062 A.D. Byzantium rebuilt a number of castles lying near Aleppo on what might be called the Byzantine-Aleppo frontier. This action angered Thimāl, who led an army and engaged the Byzantines at Artāl as mentioned above. Afterwards a reconciliation was made between Thimāl and Byzantium after which the latter agreed to destroy the restored castles and to pay Thimāl an annual sum of money. Later, however, Byzantium violated the agreement by not only stopping the payment but its governor in Antioch directed - or participated - in a plot made by a group of Aleppo's Aḥdāth against Thimāl's regime. The plot, however,

was discovered and this led to further clashes with Byzantium (as is also mentioned before). Thimāl died before the problem was solved.<sup>40</sup> The death of Thimāl was followed by a struggle for his succession between his brother 'Aṭīyya and his nephew Maḥmūd b. Naṣr. This struggle diverted the Mirdāsīd's attention and that of the Kilābī tribesmen and, for the time being, there were no further clashes with Byzantium.

-----

Before his death Thimāl had fallen ill and during his illness he summoned his brother 'Aṭīyya to Aleppo and appointed him as his successor.<sup>41</sup> After the death of Thimāl, 'Aṭīyya became the Amir of Aleppo. This annoyed Maḥmūd b. Naṣr who was at that time living in Ḥarrān, the centre of the tribe of Numayr. Maḥmūd sent 'Aṭīyya a message repudiating his right to the Emirate of Aleppo. Maḥmūd claimed that he himself was the only member of the Mirdāsīds who had the right to be Thimāl's successor. He stated that it was he who had restored Aleppo to the Mirdāsīd rule when he wrested it

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibn Abi'l Hayjā', 128r.; Al-'Aẓīmī, 180r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 164; Zubda, I, 286-287; Mir'at, BM. 249r.; Hawādith, 151r.; al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 2r., 47v.; Al-'Ibar, D.H., III, 231; 'Iqd, XI, 579-580; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 86; Munajjim, I, 328v.

<sup>41</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 91; Zubda, I, 288; Al-Kāmil, IX, 164; Hawādith, 151r.; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 2r.; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 586; 'Iqd, XI, 580; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 86; Munajjim, I, 328v.

from the Fāṭimids, and when he yielded it to Thimāl the latter promised to appoint him as his successor. Furthermore, Maḥmūd claimed that Aleppo was the heritage of his father, Naṣr, and therefore only he had the right to inherit it. The greater number of the Kilābī chieftains approved Maḥmūd's claim and stated their readiness to support him against 'Aṭiyya.

'Aṭiyya does not seem to have commanded the same respect from the tribe as did his brothers Naṣr and Thimāl. We have no information concerning the reason for this but perhaps 'Aṭiyya's own character and his mother's compulsory divorce and subsequent marriage (see ch. I, p.45) were the causes. We do not know whether 'Aṭiyya was born before or after this compulsory marriage, but his name ('Aṭiyya, i.e. The Gift) suggests that the event happened after the marriage and probably cast its shadow over the child.

In Rajab 455 A.H./July 1063 A.D. Maḥmūd led the tribe of Kilāb against Aleppo which he invested in an attempt to capture it and to bring the rule of 'Aṭiyya to an end.

With the death of Thimāl, the time in which the Kilābī chieftains and tribesmen held the decisive power in the struggle for Aleppo had passed. Immediately after his death a band of Turcomans headed by a chief known as Ibn Khān entered the Emirate of Aleppo. The Turcomans migration through northern Syria together with the Saljuq conquest of Aleppo will be discussed in the following chapter. It is sufficient to mention here that,

from the time the first band of Turcomans entered Aleppo, they became involved in the struggle for its supremacy in which they held the balance of power.

When Maḥmūd, who was supported by his tribe, was besieging Aleppo, 'Aṭiyya called on Ibn Khān to come to Aleppo and to enter his service. Apparently 'Aṭiyya's action angered Māni' b. Muqallid, a prominent wealthy Kilābī Amir, who had taken no part in the struggle when it began, and caused him to join Maḥmūd. During the siege, Māni' was killed and this incident, together with expected Turcoman interference, disheartened Maḥmūd and his Kilābī supporters. Therefore when 'Aṭiyya offered to grant Maḥmūd an iqtā' worth 25,000 dinars if he stopped the siege and withdrew Maḥmūd accepted the offer and thus a temporary settlement was achieved.

During the first week of May of the following year 1064 A.D., Maḥmūd gained possession of Ḥamāh and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān together with the fort of Kafar-ḥāb. He then led the tribe of Kilāb towards Aleppo. 'Aṭiyya failed to stop the Kilābī advance forces and Aleppo once again became besieged. It was a severe siege which obliged 'Aṭiyya to appeal to Ibn Khān to come to his aid. Ibn Khān, who was at that time in upper Mesopotamia, responded to 'Aṭiyya's appeal and came to Aleppo. The arrival of Ibn Khān forced Maḥmūd to stop the siege and withdraw.

Afterward, in December of the same year, 1064 A.D., and after long negotiation, a new settlement was reached by which

Maḥmūd became the ruler of the region lying in the south of Aleppo, consisting of Ḥamāh, Ma'arrat al-Nu'man and Kafar-ṭāb.

When Ibn Khān arrived at Aleppo he entered the city and immediately began to exercise his power over the Emirate. The Aleppines, particularly the Aḥdāth, did not like the new Turcomans living in Aleppo. The Aḥdāth were worried because they found themselves gradually losing their traditional influence; similarly 'Aṭīyya also found himself losing his power as Master of Aleppo. After settling his problems with Maḥmūd, 'Aṭīyya led Aleppo's Aḥdāth together with Ibn Khān's followers to raid Byzantine territory. After the raid, when he returned to Aleppo, 'Aṭīyya unwillingly found himself accompanied by Ibn Khān.

On a night in January 1065 A.D., while Ibn Khān was outside Aleppo, 'Aṭīyya found an opportunity to get rid of him and his followers. That night 'Aṭīyya instructed Aleppo's Aḥdāth to raid the place the Turcomans were occupying. The Aḥdāth carried out his instructions, seized the arms and horses of the Turcomans, killed a number of them and obliged the rest to flee outside Aleppo. After seeing what had befallen his followers, Ibn Khān led the remnant of his men eastward to Mesopotamia. The Bedouin tribes, who were inhabiting the country surrounding Aleppo, prevented Ibn Khān from reaching Mesopotamia, instead he went towards Sarḥīn. There he met Maḥmūd b. Naṣr and offered him his service.



This encouraged Maḥmūd who summoned his Kilābī tribesmen and marched towards Aleppo. In vain 'Aṭīyya endeavoured to stop the advancing forces and, once again, Aleppo was under siege. The siege lasted almost three and a half months and when 'Aṭīyya was unable to resist any longer, he agreed to surrender Aleppo to Maḥmūd.

Maḥmūd, who had been encouraged and supported during the siege by both the Byzantine Empire and the Fāṭimid Caliphate, entered Aleppo on the 19th August, 1065 A.D., and commenced his second reign.

'Aṭīyya, however, did not lose everything for when he surrendered Aleppo to Maḥmūd it was on an agreement to divide the emirate of Aleppo into two parts, Syrian under the rule of Maḥmūd and Mesopotamia under the rule of 'Aṭīyya. This agreement was probably based on the Thimāl-Naṣr precedent of dividing the emirate between them<sup>42</sup> (see ch. II, p.109).

When Maḥmūd captured Aleppo Ibn Khān did not enter it because he was afraid of the city's Aḥdāth. He went to Iraq and, in the following year, 1066 A.D., he returned to the emirate of Aleppo. When Ibn Khān came back Maḥmūd conferred on him as an iqṭā' Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. According to Ibn al-'Adīm, on the 10th September, 1066 A.D. Ibn Khān together with his followers who numbered about 1,000 warriors combining Turcoman, Kurd, Daylan and Uj,

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibn Abi'l-Hayja, 128v.; Ibn al-Qalanīsi, 92-93; Al-'Azimī, 180r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 164-165; Zubda, I, 291-297; II, 9; Mir'at, A., Annals, 455-457H; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 3r., 112r.; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 113; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 149; 'Iqd, XI, 580-581; Ibn Khal-dūn, IV, 586-587; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 86; Munajjim, I, 328v.

occupied Ma'arrat al-Nu'man.<sup>43</sup>

Ibn Khān and his followers were an effective instrument in Maḥmūd's hands for strengthening his position and subduing the Bedouins who were living in his emirate. Ibn al-'Adīm related that in 1067 A.D. Maḥmūd, accompanied by part of the tribe of Kilab together with Ibn Khān and his followers, went southward to the region of Ḥamāh where he subdued all the Bedouins who dwelt in that region. In explaining what was happening among the Bedouins of Ḥamāh, Ibn al-'Adīm relates that these Bedouins tried to make trouble between Maḥmūd and his uncle 'Aṭīyya who was then in the city of Ḥimṣ.<sup>44</sup>

The centre of 'Aṭīyya was al-Raqqa or al-Raḥba<sup>45</sup> and Ibn al-'Adīm does not explain why, in 1067 A.D., 'Aṭīyya was in Ḥimṣ which was under Fāṭimid rule. The explanation has, however, been given by Ghars al-Ni'ma Muḥammad and Abu'l-Maḥāsīn who relate that in 1067 A.D. al-Mustansīr the Fāṭimid Caliph wrote to Maḥmūd b. Naṣr demanding that he should send Cairo an annual tribute, make a raid on the Byzantine territory and dismiss from his service Ibn Khān and his followers. These two chroniclers go on to

---

<sup>43</sup>Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 93; Al-'Azīmī, 180v.; Zubda, II, 10; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 457H. Uj is a term by which the inhabitants of the Muslim-Byzantine frontier were called.

<sup>44</sup>Zubda, II, 10.

<sup>45</sup>Al-Kāmil, IX, 165; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 149; 'Iqd, XI, 581; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 587; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 86; Munajjim, I, 328v.

say that Maḥmūd replied to al-Mustanṣir making it clear that he was not able to fulfil any of the demands. The reasons Maḥmūd gave were: i) He had no spare money to pay to Cairo, for during his attempts to capture Aleppo from his uncle 'Aṭiyya he had spent a large sum of money, most of which he had borrowed and had not yet been able to repay; ii) he was not able to raid Byzantine territory because prior to the capture of Aleppo he had made a friendly agreement with that empire which had lent him a sum of money after he had given his son as a guarantee of repayment and which sum was still outstanding; iii) concerning Ibn Khān and his followers Maḥmūd said that he had no power to dismiss them and, in fact, he employed them because it was the only way in which he could avoid the trouble they were able to create and which he was incapable to prevent. Maḥmūd ended his reply by saying that if the Caliph wanted to get rid of Ibn Khān he must send an army to undertake his expulsion and he (Maḥmūd) would be ready to give assistance. Upon receipt of this communication, al-Mustanṣir wrote to Badr al-Jamālī the Fāṭimid governor of Damascus informing him that Maḥmūd b. Naṣr had rebelled against the Fāṭimid Caliphate and contemplated changing allegiance to that of the Caliphate of Baghdad. Al-Mustanṣir commanded Badr to march on Aleppo and capture it from Maḥmūd. Badr, incapable of leading such an expedition, instead wrote to 'Aṭiyya who was in al-Raḥba, informing him that the Caliph desired him to recapture Aleppo. In the

same letter, Badr advised 'Aṭīyya that he was ready to supply him with all necessary equipment.

On receiving Badr's communication, 'Aṭīyya left al-Raḥba and came to Ḥims and began to recruit among Kilāb and other Bedouin tribes. News of this reached Maḥmūd who on receiving it marched from Aleppo towards Ḥamāh in an endeavour to prevent the escalation of 'Aṭīyya's recruitment. 'Aṭīyya and Maḥmūd were once again on the verge of fraternal strife but Ibn 'Ammār, the cadī and then ruler of Tripoli, mediated between them and succeeded in inducing reconciliation. The reconciliation was based on the reaffirmation of the previous agreement which divided the emirate between them. Ibn 'Ammār also persuaded both Maḥmūd and 'Aṭīyya to reaffirm their allegiance to al-Mustanṣir.<sup>46</sup>

There is no information why, in 1067 A.D., a large part of the tribe of Kilāb together with other Bedouin tribes assembled in the region of Ḥamāh. The normal places of assembly for Kilāb were either in the vicinity of Aleppo and Ma'arrat al-Nu'man or in the regions of al-Raqqā and al-Raḥba. Despite this lack of information it is conceivable that these tribes moved southward because of pressure from the Turcomans who were, at that time, penetrating upper Mesopotamia and northern Syria. In upper Mesopotamia, al-Mosul was directly under this pressure and the 'Uqaylī

---

<sup>46</sup>Mir'at, A., Annals, 459H; Al-Nujūm, V, 79.

dynasty, which dominated it, was also affected by it. The tribe of 'Uqayl, headed by Muslim b. Quraysh (1061-1085 A.D.), Amir al-Mosul, was gradually forced to move westwards. During the movement the Mirdāsīd state was the major obstacle the 'Uqaylids had to overcome.

They began to occupy this state little by little until, as we shall see, they captured Aleppo and brought the Mirdāsīd dynasty to an end. In 1067 A.D., after 'Aṭīyya made the reconciliation with his nephew Maḥmūd, he did not return to al-Raḥba, but went to Damascus. In the following year, 1068 A.D., while 'Aṭīyya was absent, Muslim b. Quraysh marched on al-Raḥba and captured it. Later, in 463 A.H./1070-71 A.D., Muslim was also able to capture al-Raḥba.

Now 'Aṭīyya, who had lost all his property, went to Byzantium to seek aid after he had unsuccessfully appealed to the Fāṭimid authority in Damascus. In 1071 A.D., after the battle of Mināz-kird, 'Aṭīyya assisted by the Byzantine troops of Antioch, raided the territory of Aleppo. This raid had no significant issue and after that 'Aṭīyya went to Constantinople, where he died in July 1073 A.D.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 106; Al-Kāmil, IX, 165; X, 38-39; Al-'Azīmī, 182r.; Mir'at, A., Annals, 459, 468H; Zubda, II, 31-32; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 149; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 133r.; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 587; Iqd, XI, 580-581; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 86; Munajjim, I, 328v.

Apparently, when Byzantium accepted 'Aṭīyya in its territory, and employed him in action against Aleppo, it aimed at limiting the power of Maḥmūd's Turcoman troops or expelling them from Aleppo. Before the time of Mināz-kird and when the Turcomans were penetrating the Byzantine territory of Asia Minor Aleppo was the important centre for their activities. Some of the Turcomans settled in Aleppo itself and took service under Maḥmūd while others regarded Aleppo as a place in which to purchase their provisions and to sell their spoils. The quantity of booty taken by the Turcomans from Byzantium was enormous. Ibn al-'Adīm relates that in the years 459-460 A.H./1066-67 A.D. Turcoman bands pillaged from the region of Antioch about 40,000 buffaloes and countless numbers of other kinds of cattle. Ibn al-'Adīm adds that during these two years about 70,000 people of Byzantine origin were sold as slaves in the market of Aleppo. Ibn al-'Adīm further relates that this was the number recorded in the register of the market tax collector and a considerable number escaped unrecorded, as sales had taken place outside Aleppo.<sup>48</sup>

The Byzantine empire, whose head was at that time Romanus Diogenes, endeavoured to secure its frontiers and to stop the Turcomans from penetrating its territory. For this purpose, during the three successive years of 461-464 A.H./1068-1071 A.D. Romanus led three campaigns, the first two of which were directed

---

<sup>48</sup>Zubda, II, 11-13.

against the emirate of Aleppo.

The battle of Mināz-kird, which was the issue of the third campaign and the most important of the three, had a decisive effect not only on Muslim-Byzantine relations, but on the whole of the medieval world. This battle was indirectly connected with Aleppo and this will be mentioned later.

The two campaigns which Diogenes led against Aleppo had no significant results for he only succeeded in capturing the town of Manbij. It is not certain whether the capture of Manbij occurred during the first or the second campaign for the Arabic chroniclers do not give a clear narrative about this. Psellus, who lived through the events, also is not helpful in this respect. Concerning the first campaign he merely says that Diogenes "left the city [of Constantinople] with all his army and advanced against the barbarians not knowing where he was marching nor what he was going to do. He wandered over the countryside planning to go one way, marching by another, traversing Syria as well as Persia and all the success he met with was to lead his army into the interior, establish his men on some high hill, bring them down again, cut them off in narrow passes and suffer heavy casualties through his manoeuvring. However, he returned still - to all appearances - victorious, neither from the Medes nor from the Persians did he bring us any spoils of war. One thing alone established him that he had marched against his foes."

However, it would seem that the capture of Manbij occurred during the second campaign because the Arabic chroniclers relate that when the city was captured, many of its inhabitants fell into captivity. Such occurrences are confirmed by Psellus who participated in the campaign and relates that "a mere handful of our adversaries were taken prisoner".

From the narratives of the Arabic chroniclers it would appear that during the first campaign Diogenes invaded the emirate of Aleppo from the region of Antioch, captured two or three small Aleppine fortresses and defeated Maḥmūd and his Turco-Kilabi army. Diogenes was obliged to withdraw for news reached him that a band of Turcomans led by a Chief known as al-Afshīn captured the Byzantine city of 'Ammūriya (Amorion) and had advanced towards Constantinople. In the second campaign apparently Diogenes invaded the territory of Aleppo from upper Mesopotamia, captured the town of Manbij, destroyed it, rebuilt its former citadel and garrisoned it. Shortly after he returned to Constantinople because his army was insufficiently provisioned.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup>Psellus, 352-356; Ibn al-Qalānīsī, 94; Al-Bundārī, 35; Al-'Azīmī, 181 r.-v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 128v.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 554-555; Al-Kāmil, X, 40; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 256; Zubda, II, 13-15; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 461-462H; Bar Hebraeus, 218-219; Al-Bustan, 90r.; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 5r.; Duwal, I, 208; Al-'Ibar, D.H., III, 231, 248-249; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 99; Ibn Junghal, IV, 224v.; Munajjim, I, 328 v.; Setton, I, 148-149, 192-193.



Diogenes' two campaigns, together with the migration of some Turcoman bands, offered no real threat to the Mirdāsīd rule in Aleppo. Meanwhile the Fāṭimid Caliphate was too much occupied with its own problems to give any attention to Aleppo and its affairs. These problems were mainly manifested in Nāṣir al-Dawla al-Ḥamdānī's attempt to grasp the power in Cairo and his device to bring the Fāṭimid Caliphate to an end. To further the success of his plan, Nāṣir al-Dawla sent an envoy to Iraq calling upon Alp-Arslan - the Muslim orthodox sultan - to come to Egypt, take over its rule and to bring the Fāṭimid-heretic-caliphate to an end.

Alp Arslan responded to this call, and led his army westward. This movement seriously threatened Maḥmūd's position. For several reasons Alp-Arslan was unable to reach Egypt and not to travel further than the walls of Aleppo. Most of these reasons are not the concern of this thesis, therefore only those which connect with Aleppo will be dealt with. Before doing so, it is necessary to mention that Maḥmūd whose allegiance was to the Fāṭimid Caliphate, realised the change in the balance of power in the Islamic world. As a result of this, in Shawāl 462 A.H./1070 A.D. and before the westward movement of Alp-Arslan took place, Maḥmūd had ceased to acknowledge the suzerainty of al-Mustanṣir, the Fāṭimid Caliph. Afterward Maḥmūd sent an envoy to Baghdad to inform the authority there that he had ceased to acknowledge

the suzerainty of al-Mustansir and of his intention to acknowledge the supremacy of both al-Qā'im, the Abbasid Caliph and Alp Arslan, the Saljuq sultan. The message carried by Maḥmūd's envoy was welcomed by the Abbasid authority of Bagh̄dad who sent Naqib al-Nuqaba Farrād al-Zaynī to Aleppo to represent al-Qā'im in the ceremony of the first Khutba in the name of that Caliph and to give Maḥmūd the Khila' which were bestowed on him.

In Aleppo, for religious reasons, Maḥmūd's action did not pass without public objection but this matter will be discussed later in the last chapter of this thesis.

On the 14th of Rabi' al-Ākhir, 463 A.H./19th January, 1071 A.D. Alp Arslan and his army crossed the Euphrates and entered the territory of Aleppo. Before he crossed this river Alp Arslan called on Maḥmūd b. Naṣr to come to his presence and pay him homage as all the Mesopotamian amirs and governors had done. Maḥmūd refused to obey and Alp Arslan advanced on Aleppo. It took him about two months to reach Aleppo and during that time he sent more than one envoy to Maḥmūd who persisted in his refusal to leave Aleppo, therefore Alp Arslan decided to take Aleppo by force and the city, for the first time, went under siege from the Turcomans. Before the siege took place, Maḥmūd fortified Aleppo's walls and received reinforcements from all over Syria.

For more than a month Alp Arslan's mighty army failed to capture Aleppo. The chief reasons for this failure were the

obstinate resistance of the city's defenders, Aleppo's strong and well fortified walls and the inefficiency of the Saljuq army at that period in siege warfare. The previous failure of this same army to capture the town of Edessa, after more than a month of siege, provides an example of its inefficiency. During the siege, the Saljuq army made several attempts to storm the city and to breach its walls, but the Aleppines were able to rebuff them. Apparently the morale of the Aleppines during the siege was very high and they were confident inside their defences. The Aleppines expressed that in their arms and their own other special ways.

The strongest tower in the city's walls was known as Burj al-Ghanam and the Saljuq army concentrated on capturing it. The Aleppines not only repulsed the aggressors but taunted them with their own peculiar sense of humour. They took a roll of silk material and bound it round the top of the tower. When Alp Arslan enquired the reason for this, he was told that the "Aleppines were saying in mockery that the stones of the mangonel caused the tower to have a headache, so they put a bandage round it". On hearing this, Alp Arslan became furious and he ordered 30,000 arrows to be distributed among his men in addition to the quantity they already had. On the following morning he led the whole army in an assault on the city. It was a failure and Alp Arslan himself narrowly escaped death, therefore Alp Arslan stopped the attack and summoned to his camp all those chieftains of the tribe

of Kilāb who were in the region of Aleppo. He aimed at appointing one of them as Amir of Aleppo and to authorise him to capture the city from Maḥmūd.

When this was reported to Maḥmūd, who well knew the characteristics of his kinsmen, he realised the danger of such a move. Without loss of time he astutely made a counter-move in an endeavour to achieve a settlement with the Sultan. He wrote to Aytāqin al-Sulaymānī, one of Alp Arslan's officers, who on several occasions had been sent as an envoy to Maḥmūd. He told him that he would submit to the Sultan's orders. Consequently in the night of the first of Sha'ban, 463 A.H./4th May, 1071 A.D. Maḥmūd, disguised in Turcoman costume and accompanied by his mother al-Sayida secretly left Aleppo and went to the camp of the Sultan. There they met Alp Arslan and achieved an agreement according to which Maḥmūd was to remain in his post. On the following day a ceremony was arranged and publicly Maḥmūd left Aleppo and entered the Sultan's camp where he paid him homage.

To justify his failure in taking Aleppo by force, the Arabic chroniclers allege that Alp Arslan declared that his intention was not to capture Aleppo by force but by his failure to demonstrate its impregnability in the eyes of Byzantium. This is, of course, poor justification and we are not even sure whether Alp Arslan actually said it or whether it was an invention of one of the chroniclers.

There is no detailed information concerning the terms of the Maḥmūd-Alp Arslan agreement. The chroniclers relate that after the settlement, Maḥmūd met the Sultan frequently inside his camp, for there is no indication that Alp Arslan entered the city. Shortly after the settlement the Sultan decided to go back and not to continue his journey towards Egypt.

Before he left, he received a Byzantine envoy who informed him of his Emperor's willingness to relinquish to him several places he had previously captured from the Muslims, but in exchange for what we do not know. Siḥt b. al-Jawzī, who relates this, gives an indication that Alp Arslan agreed to Byzantine terms. After that, Alp Arslan moved back eastward leaving behind him a part of his forces under the leadership of Aytāqin al-Sulaymānī. The task of al-Sulaymānī was to join his force with that of Maḥmūd and together try to capture Damascus and southern Syria. After he crossed the Euphrates Alp Arslan received the news of a Byzantine army led by the Emperor himself and bound for the conquest of his territory, whereupon he immediately changed direction, led his army to meet that of Byzantium and defeated it at Mināz-kird. Except for the far-reaching effect of this victory, Alp Arslan's expedition would have been a fruitless one.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Al-Bundārī, 36-37; Ibn Muyassar, II, 19-20; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 260; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 129v.; Al-Kāmil, X, 42-44; Ibn al-'Anid, 55-56; Al-'Azīmī, 181v.; Zubda, II, 16-23; Bughya, A., III, 280r.-285v.; Ibn Nāṣir, 46-53; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 463H; Itti'āz, Annals, 462H; Ibn al-Muqaffa', 198-201;

A few days after Alp Arslan's departure from Aleppo, Maḥmūd and al-Sulaymānī led their forces southward towards Damascus. They halted at Ba'albak to plan for their campaign. During the halt, Maḥmūd received news that his uncle 'Aṭīyya, assisted by the Byzantine troops of Antioch, had raided the territory of Aleppo. This obliged Maḥmūd to return to Aleppo and to engage the Byzantines in a battle in which he was defeated.

When he was unable to prevent the Byzantines from raiding his territory, Maḥmūd appealed to the Turcoman chiefs who were trying to capture Palestine. With their help Maḥmūd was not only able to prevent the Byzantines from raiding his territory, but also to restore al-Raḥba to his dominion in 465 A.H./1072 A.D. After the recapture of al-Raḥba from the 'Uqaylids of al-Mosul the Turcomans left Maḥmūd and returned towards Palestine after receiving from him a sum of money and a number of horses. This gave the Byzantines an opportunity to resume their raids but, in 466 A.H./1073 A.D., Maḥmūd was able to defeat the Byzantine army of Antioch and afterwards, on 12th December of the same year, to capture one of Antioch's castles known as al-Sin.<sup>51</sup>

---

Bar Hebraeus, 220; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 132v.-133r.; Al-Durra, 388-392; Al-Bustān, 90r.; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 101; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 196; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 5v.-6r.; Al-'Ibar, Dh., III, 50; Duwal, I, 209-210; Al-Nujūm, V, 86-87; Ibn Khalḍūn, IV, 587; Setton, I, 148, 191.

<sup>51</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, II, 511-512; Ibn al-Qalanīsī, 106; Al-'Aẓīmī, 182r.; Zubda, II, 30-32, 42; Mir'at, A., Annals, 464 H.

In Jumada al-Aula of the following year, 467 A.H./January 1075 A.D., Maḥmūd died and the cause of his death, according to Ibn al-‘Adīm, was ulcers in the gut. In his book Mir‘at al-Zamān Sibṭ b. al-Jawazī, when enumerating the events of 467 H, he mentions the death of Maḥmūd but without specifying the cause. He gives the same date (Jumada al-Aulā) as both Ibn al-‘Adīm and Ibn al-Qalānisi. Oddly enough, when he gives an account of obituaries of the same year, Sibṭ himself says that on Thursday, the 13th of Sha‘ban, 467 A.H./3rd April, 1075 A.D. Maḥmūd b. Naṣr died with grief over the death of his favourite girl slave who had preceded him by two days. Abu‘l Maḥāsin corroborates this account but apparently his source was Mir‘at al-Zamān for there is a verbatim analogy between his text and that of the Mir‘at.<sup>52</sup>

Ibn al-‘Adīm relates that when he died Maḥmūd left what was worth 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> million dinars. This was a very large sum of money to be left by a petty amir who ruled over the small emirate of Aleppo in the abnormal time of the Turcoman migration. Apparently most of Maḥmūd's wealth was collected by extortion. Ibn al-‘Adīm describes Maḥmūd as being a good ruler prior to the time of Alp Arslan's

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 107; Al-‘Azīmi, 182v.; Zubda, II, 42; Al-Muntaḡam, V-II, 304; Ibn Abi‘l-Hayjā, 130r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 165; X, 72; Ibn al-‘Amīd, 561-562; Mir‘at, A., Annals, 467H; Al-Nujūm, V, 100-101; Al-Mansuri, 74v.; Hawādith, 154r; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 10r. 112r.; Duwal, II, 2; Al-Ibār, Dh., III, 266; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 149, 202; Ibn Kathir, XI, 113; Ibn Junghal, IV, 232; Al-Ṣafadi, II, 86; ‘Iqd, XI, 580.

siege of Aleppo. After that he became a greedy and miserly money collector. In the biographies of Zura' b. Musa, Maḥmūd's Kātib, and Abu-Bishr al-Ḥalabī, Maḥmūd's vizier, Ibn al-'Adīm gives account of the ways in which Maḥmūd extorted money from the officials of his state. An interesting point emerges from Ibn al-'Adīm's account... When the extortion occurred it was accompanied by court intrigue in a similar manner to the extortions which took place in the courts of almost every Islamic state, particularly during decline periods.<sup>53</sup> It would appear that after the siege of Aleppo by Alp Arslan, Maḥmūd realised that it would be very difficult for him to maintain his position in the future. This was probably the main reason for the change in his character from generosity to greed.

During the reign of Maḥmūd, some kind of military iqtā' was founded in Aleppo. There is insufficient information about this iqtā', except that in 458 A.H./1066 A.D. Maḥmūd gave Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān to the Turcomans who had helped him during his struggle with his uncle 'Aṭīyya; and that in 1071 A.D. he planned to grant the rule of every castle in his estate to prominent Aleppines under condition that their families should remain in Aleppo as hostages.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup>Zubda, II, 32-34, 42, 45; Bughya A., VI, 172r.; VIII, 16r.-v. 17r.-v.; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 202.

<sup>54</sup>Bughya, AS, 279-280; Zubda, II, 10, 36-40; Al-A'ālāq, BM 54v.-56v.



The reign of Maḥmūd marked the decline of the Arabic control over Aleppo and his death the actual end of this control. After his death and for centuries onwards the Turcomans became the real rulers of Aleppo.

It is noteworthy to mention here that the only surviving inscription of the Mirdāsīd period is that belonging to Maḥmūd. This inscription is chiselled on a stone, sized 51 x 31 cm. It now rests inside the great Mosque of the citadel of Aleppo. It is not known whether this stone was found in the citadel or whether it was brought there. The inscription on it is formed in five lines of Kufī-Arabīc writing, which contain the names and titles of Maḥmūd and bears the date 465 A.H./1072 A.D., and it reads.<sup>55</sup>

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ ( أَمْرٌ بِحَمْدِ الْأَمِيرِ )  
 الْأَجَلُ تَلَجُ الْمُلُوكِ نَاصِرِ الدِّينِ شَرِّ ( ف )  
 الْأُمَمَةِ ذُرِّ الْحَسْبِيِّينَ خَالِصَةِ الْأَمِيرِ  
 الْمُؤْتَمِرِينَ . أَبُو سَلَامَةَ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ  
 نَصْرِ بْنِ صَالِحٍ . سَنَةِ خَمْسِ وَرِسْتِينَ وَأَرْبَعِمِائَةٍ .

<sup>55</sup>The text of this inscription was published by J. Sauvaget in Repertoire Chronologique d'Epigraphie Arabe, VII, 188; a word in the text was misunderstood; Al-Hasabayn is read as al-Husnayn. Maḥmūd was known as Dhu al-Hasabayn (i.e. the one with two pedigrees) for his father was Kilabi and his mother was from the tribe of Numayr (see Ibn Sinān, 40 and Ibn Ḥayyūs, II, 605).



Chapter IV

THE TURCOMAN MIGRATION AND THE SALJUQ CONQUEST

The Reign of Naṣr Ibn Maḥmūd; Sābiq Ibn Maḥmūd and the  
Fall of the Mirdāsīd Dynasty; the Turcoman Migration  
Muslim Ibn Quraysh and the 'Uqaylid Occupation; the  
Saljuq Conquest and the Reign of Aq-Sunqur.

"When the Great Sultan, Alp-Arslan, crossed the Euphrates ... Al-Fāqih Abu-Ja'far said to him 'Sire, see though thank Allah for the grace he hath bestowed upon thee'; the Sultan said 'And what is this grace?' Abu Ja'far replied: 'This river hath not been crossed before by any Turk except as a slave, and to-day thou hast crossed it as a monarch'."<sup>1</sup>

Before his death Maḥmūd b. Naṣr nominated Shabīb, his youngest son, as his successor. After his death his will was disregarded, for Shabīb was still young and the outstanding figures of the State, together with the troops did not favour him. They preferred Naṣr, Maḥmūd's eldest son and chose him as the new Amir of Aleppo.<sup>2</sup> Naṣr commenced his reign by ordering the death of his father's Vizier, 'Alī b. Abi'l-Thurayyā. According to Ibn al-'Adīm, Naṣr accused 'Alī of having prompted his father not to nominate him as his successor. Ibn al-'Adīm calls 'Alī "al-Qā'id"<sup>2</sup> which indicates

---

<sup>1</sup>The name of Abu Ja'far was Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Bukhārī and he was Nāṣir al-Dawla al-Ḥamdānī's envoy to Alp-Arslan; Bughya, A., III, 282r.; Zubda, II, 20.

<sup>2</sup>Ibn al-Qalānisī, 108; Al-Muntaẓam, VIII, 304; Al-Kāmil, IX, 165; X, 10; Zubda, II, 45; Ibn Abi'l Hayjā, 130r.; Al-Azīmī,

that he had some connection with military life. It is probable that 'Alī served in the troops of the Mirdāsīd or was perhaps one of the leaders of Aleppo Aḥdāth. Either post would fit him to become Maḥmūd's Vizier and to participate in the struggle for succession which followed the death of Maḥmūd.<sup>4</sup>

Apparently when Naṣr became Amir of Aleppo he was supported by the Turcomans who were living in the city at that time and whose Chief was known as Aḥmad-Shāh. Ibn al-'Adīm indicates that Aḥmad Shāh was loyal in his service to Naṣr.<sup>5</sup> In 1075 A.D. Naṣr sent an army led by Aḥmad Shāh to restore the town of Manbij which was under Byzantine control. On the 21st (or 24th) September, 1075 A.D., and after a long siege, the Byzantine garrison surrendered the town to the Aleppine army.<sup>6</sup> Not long after, Atsiz - the Turcoman Chief - together with his brother Jāwli began to plunder the southern territory of Aleppo. When Naṣr failed to

---

182v.; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 467H; Hawādith, 154r.; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 112r.; Al-Ibar, Dh., III, 266; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 149, 202; Ibn al-'Amīd, 563-565; Al-Nujūm, V, 100-101; Iqd, XI, 581; Al-Safadī, II, 87; Ibn Junghul, IV, 233r.

<sup>3</sup>Al-'Azīmī, 182v.; Bughya, A., VIII, 16 r.v.-17r.v.; Zubda, II, 48.

<sup>4</sup>Bughya, A., VIII, 16r.v.-17 r.v.

<sup>5</sup>Zubda, II, 46-48.

<sup>6</sup>Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 205-207; Al-'Azīmī, 181v., 183r.; Zubda, II, 46-47; Bughya, A., II, 165v.; Al-Kāmil, X, 69; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 468H; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 10r.; Duwal, II, 3; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 112; Ibn Junghul, IV, 232.

prevent them from devastating his emirate by offering them a sum of money, he sent Aḥmad-Shāh at the head of an army and, after two engagements, Aḥmad-Shāh succeeded in expelling them.<sup>7</sup>

For some unknown reason Naṣr arrested Aḥmad-Shāh and imprisoned him in the citadel of Aleppo. This occurred on the 9th May, 1076 A.D., which was the second day of 'Id al-Fiṭr. Apparently Aḥmad-Shāh came alone on the morning of that day to the citadel to pay Naṣr the Feast Visit and Naṣr took the opportunity and arrested him. After the arrest Naṣr indulged himself in an orgy of wine which lasted until late in the day. In addition to being irrational, as Ibn al-'Adīm describes him, and also completely drunk by this time Naṣr rode his horse to Aleppo Ḥādir. Although the Ḥādir was part of Aleppo, it lay at that time outside the city's walls and it was here that the Turcoman community was living. According to several chroniclers, when Naṣr went to al-Ḥādir he aimed to sack its inhabitants and to seize some of their women, for he was heard to say "We want the beautiful faces". One of the Turcoman, who were alarmed by the arrest of their Chief, shot Naṣr with an arrow and caused his death. After he had been killed the Turcoman advanced on Aleppo demanding the release of their leader. The news of the death disturbed the Aleppines who were enjoying the celebration of their feast on a beautiful Spring day, as Ibn al-'Adīm says. At the news of Naṣr's death, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibn Ḥayūūs, I, 271-273; Zubda, II, 46-48; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 468H.

gates of Aleppo together with that of the citadel were immediately closed.<sup>8</sup>

On becoming Amir of Aleppo, Naṣr had entrusted most of the emirate's affairs to his foster-uncle, the Munqidhī Amir, 'Alī b. Muqallid, who became known as Sadīd al-Mulk. At the same time he ordered the death of 'Alī b. Abi'l Thurayyā, his father's Vizier. Naṣr had appointed Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Tamīmī, who was known as Abu Naṣr b. al-Naḥḥās, as his Vizier. Both Ibn Muqallid and Ibn al-Naḥḥās shared a common interest in literature which formed a friendship between them and, after Naṣr had been killed, they were able to maintain order in both the city and the citadel. On the evening of that day and only a few hours after Naṣr's death they brought his brother Sābiq to the citadel and acclaimed him as the new Amir. Ibn al-'Adīm relates that when Sābiq, who was living in the city, was brought to the citadel he too was very drunk. He did not enter the citadel by its gate but was hoisted over its wall by a rope.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 108-109; Al-'Azīmi, 183r.; Ibn Abi 'l Hayjā', 130v.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 165; Ibn al-'Amīd, 563-565; Bughya, A., II, 165v., 166r.; VII, 146r.v.; Zubda, II, 49; Mir'at, A., Annals, 468H; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134r.; Al-Munsūri, 74v.; Al-Bustan, 91r.; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 149, 202; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 112r.; Al-'Ibar Dh., III, 266; 'Iqd, XI, 581; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 87; Munajjim, I, 328v.

<sup>9</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 109; Al-'Azīmi, 183r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 165; Ibn al-'Amīd, 562-563; Bughya, A., II, 165v.; VII, 142v.; 143r., 146r.v., 147r.; Zubda, II, 48, 53; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134r., Al-Mansūri, 74v.; Al-Bustan, 91r.; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 87; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 202; 'Iqd, XI, 581; Munajjim, I, 328v.

After he became an Amir, Sābiq was advised to release Ahmad-Shāh from his prison. Immediately Ahmad-Shāh was released and brought to the presence of Sābiq who conferred on him a robe of honour and assured him of his goodwill towards him and his followers. Forthwith Ahmad-Shāh left the citadel and went to al-Ḥādir where he met his Turcomans and allayed their anxiety. Ibn al-'Adīm describes Sābiq as an inefficient ruler, as a result of which he became a puppet controlled by Ahmad-Shāh and his Turcomans who began to monopolise the power of the State. This angered the Kilābi Chieftains who reacted by proclaiming Waththāb b. Maḥmūd, Sābiq's brother, as their Amir and also caused 'Alī b. Muqallid to abandon Aleppo for Kafar-ḡāb where he planned for the capture of Shayzar.

The tribe of Kilāb was mobilised and assembled in the country surrounding Qinnasrin from where it began to invest Aleppo. There were about 70,000 Kilābi horsemen and infantry (see ch. II, pp. 78-79) as we are informed by Ibn al-'Adīm, who prepared to storm Aleppo. From contemporary verse composed by Ibn Ḥayyus and recited at that time it can be deduced that there was united pressure of Sābiq to avoid open conflict with his tribe and to endeavour to seek a peaceful settlement. It was, however, not the incapable Sābiq who could initiate a settlement but it was accomplished by Ahmad-Shāh. He made contact with a Turcoman Chief named Muḥammad b. Dimlāj and asked him to join forces with him. Ibn Dimlāj, who was camping together with his 500 Turcoman horsemen near the Byzantine

frontier, arrived at Aleppo during the first week of June, 1076 A.D. On Wednesday, the 7th July, 1076 A.D., Aḥmad-Shāh, together with Ibn Dimlāj, led their followers and made a sudden raid on the too-confident Kilābīs. The Kilābīs, who were taken by surprise, fled without resistance, leaving the Turcomans in possession of all their property. This included a large quantity of chattels, 400,000 sheep and 100,000 camels and a great number of slaves.<sup>10</sup> Thirteen days after this event Sābiq had an opportunity to rid himself of Aḥmad-Shāh and to make reconciliation with his tribe. It arose when Ibn Dimlāj made a banquet, thirteen days after the victory, to which he invited Aḥmad-Shāh. While the banquet was in progress, Ibn Dimlāj arrested Aḥmad-Shāh and made him his prisoner. Instead of inciting the followers of Aḥmad-Shāh to rescue their Chief and providing grounds for the two Turcoman bands to strive against one another and so lose some of their strength. Ṣābiq paid Ibn Dimlāj a sum of 10,000 dinars together with 20 horses for the ransom of Aḥmad-Shāh.<sup>11</sup>

The defeated Waththāb b. Maḥmūd together with some of the Kilābī Chieftains left the region of Aleppo and went to Khurasan where they met the Saljuq Sultan, Malik-Shāh. They complained to him and begged his help against Sābiq and Aḥmad-Shāh. According

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, II, 482-483, 647; Bughya, A., II, 165v.-166r.; VII, 143r.v.-144r., 147r.v.; Zubda, II, 53-55.

<sup>11</sup> Bughya, A., II, 166r.; Zubda, II, 55.



to Ibn al-'Adīm, Malik-Shāh gave his sympathy to the Kilābī Chieftains. He conferred on each of them an iqtā' in Northern Syria. Meanwhile he assigned his brother, Tutush, to Syria with an injunction to assume personal control over it. Tutush moved westward with a small Turcoman army and when he passed Diyār-Bakr, the tribe of Kilāb joined him. On his arrival at the city of Aleppo, Muslim b. Quraysh al-'Uqaylī together with his army of al-Moṣul, on instruction from the Sultan, reluctantly came to his assistance.<sup>12</sup> In Aleppo, when Sābiq heard the news of Tutush's campaign he informed Ahmad-Shāh, who was besieging Antioch, and summoned him to return to Aleppo. In 469 A.H./1077 A.D., Ahmad-Shāh had led the troops from Aleppo and marched on Antioch. He besieged it and began to starve its population, but when he received the news of Tutush's expedition, accepted the Byzantine offer of 5,000 dinars, lifted the siege and went to Aleppo.<sup>13</sup>

In 470 A.H./1077 A.D., Tutush reached Aleppo and began to invest it. Shortly afterwards he lifted the siege and withdrew a few miles from the city. This withdrawal was either tactical or a preparation for a long siege, for not long after Tutush

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibn Abi'l-Hayyja, 130r.; Ibn al-Qalānisī, 112; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 313; Al-Kāmil, X, 71; Ibn al-'Amīd, V, 567; Bughya, A., VII, 143r.v., 144r.; Zubda, II, 55-56; Mir'at, A., Annals, 468H; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134r.; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 203; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 137; Al-Ṣafadī, II, 123.

<sup>13</sup>Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 139-140; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 307; Zubda, II, 55-56.

returned and resumed the attack. It was a siege which lasted for three months, but it was not a particularly effective one because Muslim b. Quraysh did not wish to see the Saljuq conquering Aleppo. During the siege he communicated with Sābiq and encouraged him to hold out. Meanwhile he reproached the Kilābī Chieftains for supporting the alien Turcomans against their own kinsmen. Ahmad-Shāh was killed during the siege and this eased the way for Muslim. He was able to persuade the Kilābī Chieftains to desert Tutush and Waththāb and Shabīb to enter Aleppo and join forces with their brother. After accomplishing all this Muslim informed Tutush of his own intended departure. He led his troops via the gate (probably Bab al-Iraq) of Aleppo, halted there and permitted his men to sell the provisions they had to the Aleppines.<sup>14</sup>

After the withdrawal of Muslim Tutush continued the siege of Aleppo but apparently before this withdrawal had taken place he sent a messenger to his brother asking for re-inforcements together with implements of siege warfare. On his way towards his territory Muslim met a unit of Ghuzz troops at Sinjār consisting of 1,000 horsemen carrying with them some siege implements. The leader of

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 112; Al-'Azīmi, 183v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 130r.; Al-Kāmil, X, 71; Ibn al-'Amīd, 567-568; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 313; Bughya, A., II, 166r.; VII, 143r.v.-144r.; Zubda, II, 56-58; Mir'at, A., Annals, 471H; Al-Bustān, 91r; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 10v.; Al-Durra, 405; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134r.; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 203; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 1357; Al-Şafadī, II, 123.

this unit was known as "Turcoman" and his destination was Aleppo to reinforce Tutush. When Muslim failed to persuade Turcoman not to continue his journey he communicated with Sābiq and informed him of this reinforcement. With the help of Muslim an army consisting of about 1,000 horsemen and 500 infantry was formed from the tribes of Kilāb. 'Uqayl, Numayr and Qushayr. This tribal army ambushed the Ghuzz reinforcement, routed it and killed most of its men.

When news of this reached Tutush he left the walls of Aleppo and led most of his troops against the tribe of Kilāb. After he had departed the Aleppines came out of their city, sacked all the provisions of Tutush's army and killed some of the men he had left behind him to guard them. It would appear that Tutush was unable to take any punitive action against Kilāb who retreated to the desert; he therefore crossed the Euphrates to plan reprisals against Muslim b. Quraysh. When Tutush learnt that Muslim was in full preparation, he abandoned his plan and went to Diyār-Bakr where he spent the winter.<sup>15</sup>

When the winter had passed Tutush returned towards Aleppo with a new plan in a fresh attempt to capture it. His first move was to strip it of all its nearby strategic points, castles and

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 52-53; Ibn al-Qālanisī, 112; Zubda, II, 58-62; Bughya, A., VII, 144r.v.-145r.v.; Mir'at, A., Annals, 471H.

fortresses. He captured Manbij, Hiṣn al-Fāyā, Hiṣn Bazā'a' and 'Azāz, then turned to Aleppo and aimed at taking it by force. As his army approached the walls it was met by Aleppo troops who, taking it by surprise, rebuffed it. For the time being Tutuṣh did not attempt to capture Aleppo, but went southward where he succeeded in taking possession of Damascus and establishing himself there.<sup>16</sup>

In contemporary poetry and accounts by the chroniclers it is clear that the chief motive behind Muslim b. Quraysh's attitude and action in helping the Mirdāsids against the Saljuqs was the Arab ties between him and the Mirdāsids. In these sources we meet clearly defined groups - the Arabs and Turks, both of whom struggled for supremacy. We also read that "Mulk al-'Arab" in Aleppo needed to be preserved before it should be demolished by the alien Turks.

Ibn al-'Adīm relates that while Tutuṣh was besieging Aleppo, Sābiq wrote to his brothers Shabīb and Waththāb who were co-operating with Tutuṣh against him and said "I am defending your land and authority and if this city [i.e. Aleppo] falls into the possession of Tutuṣh, he will demolish the 'Mulk al-'Arab [i.e. the rule of the Bedouin Arab]!" The sentiments of this letter were echoed in the poems of Ibn Ḥayyus and were repeated in another letter written in verse which Sābiq sent to one of the Kilābī Chieftains. In it

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 112; Ibn al-'Amīd, 566-567; Zubda, II, 62-63; Bughya, A., VII, 145r.v.; Al-A'ulāq, BM.60r.v.

Sābiq urged the Kilābī tribesmen to unite against the alien Turks who were endeavouring to occupy their territory and usurp their authority. Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī relates that in 1079 Sābiq appealed for help to Muslim b. Quraysh against Tutuṣh pleading that the ties of their Arab blood should oblige him to come to his support. Sibṭ also cites Ghars al-Ni'ma as relating that, in 1080, during Muslim's attempt to capture the citadel of Aleppo (see below, pp.213-14 ) he informed the Chieftains of Kilāb that he had come to Aleppo in answer to their request and as fulfilment of his obligation as an Arab to defend their land and property against the Ghuzz. For this, he said, he had spent time, money and effort and the Chieftains agreed that their intentions had been to co-operate in defence of their common cause.

The term "Arab" mentioned in the sources refers only to the Arabic Bedouin tribes of northern Syria and Upper Mesopotamia (as well as the rest of Syria) and not the whole population of the country. At the same time the term "Turks" was used to designate the Turcoman migrants who accompanied the Saljuq conquest of the 11th century. Prior to this conquest Aleppo, al-Moṣul, Ḥarrān and Qal'it-Ja'bar were controlled by tribal Arabic dynasties from Kilāb, 'Uqayl, Numayr and Quṣhayr. After years of struggle, as will be discussed in more detail, the migrants succeeded in stripping these dynasties of their power and usurped it for themselves. The struggle was, therefore, merely for power and, save

for occasional participation by the Aḥdāth, it was purely a nomadic one. The nature of the Aḥdāth will be dealt with in the following chapter, but it is necessary to mention here that although this militant organisation was a civic one, it certainly did not represent the bulk of the population in any city in which it held power. In fact, any participation by the Aḥdāth was taken in their own interest which was threatened by the coming of the Turcomans.<sup>17</sup>

The common danger caused the Arab tribes to join forces to preserve their sovereignty, but why did the Turcoman Aḥmad-Shāh, as well as Ibn Khān before him, fight against their kinsmen and support the Mirdāsids? Was the reason self-interest and lust for power or were there more important ones? In an effort to solve this problem, the Turcoman migration to northern Syria which took place before the final Saljuq conquest, should be discussed first.

In 435 A.H./1043 A.D., the city of al-Moṣul was raided for the first time by Ghuzz bands.<sup>18</sup> The result of this was immediately reflected in Aleppo and was expressed in the poem of Ibn Abi Ḥas̄nā who calls the intruders "al-Atrāk" (i.e. The Turks) and relates that these Turks did not dare to raid the territory of Aleppo because

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 52-53; II, 482-483, 570-575; Al-'Azīmī, 183v.; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 114; Zubda, II, 57-61; Bughya, A., VII, 143v.-146v; Mir'at, A., Annals, 472H; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 588.

<sup>18</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 172r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 274-276; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 117; Ibn Abi'l Ḥayyā, 125v.; Hawādith, 142r.; Al-Munsūri, 72v.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 540-541; Duwal, I, 199.

they knew beforehand how well this country was defended.<sup>19</sup>

According to Ibn al-‘Adīm, it was not until the death of Thi-māl, during the struggle for succession between ‘Atiyya and Maḥmud, that in 456 A.H./1064 A.D. the first Turcoman band entered Aleppo upon a request for aid by ‘Atiyya. The leader of this band was known as Ibn Khān, a name which indicates the rank of its holder. Ibn al-‘Adīm relates that Ibn Khān was the son of "Malik al-Turk" and that, in anger, he deserted his father and came to the Marwānid's territory in Upper Mesopotamia. Ibn al-‘Adīm, who does not explain who "Malik al-Turk" was, appears unconsciously to have rendered the term "Ibn Khān" in Arabic form. The information emanating from Arabic sources concerning the origin of Ibn Khān is both obscure and insufficient. From Ibn al-‘Adīm we know that his first name was Hārūn and that when he entered Aleppo his followers numbered 1,000 archers. The role played by Ibn Khān in the affairs of Aleppo has been dealt with in the previous chapter and further discussion is unnecessary.

As a result of ‘Atiyya's duplicity, Ibn Khān lost most of his men and when he was obliged to join Maḥmud against ‘Atiyya, he had but a handful left. Both Al-‘Azīmī and Ibn al-Qalānisi relate that after Ibn Khān had joined Maḥmūd both of them went to Tripoli, then returned and began to besiege Aleppo, which siege ended the

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibn Abi Ḥaṣṣan, I, 34, 36.

rule of 'Aṭīyya there. We are not informed why Maḥmūd and Ibn Khān went to Tripoli, but there is information that when Maḥmūd had besieged Aleppo, Ibn Khān had his own Turcoman troops who were the effective force during the siege. This infers that, while in Tripoli with Maḥmūd, Ibn Khān was able to raise a Turcoman army. Moreover, this points conclusively to the fact that there were some Turcomans in the region of Tripoli at that time.

The sources especially Mir'āt al-Zamān speak of Turcoman groups known as "al-Nāwīkiya", most of whom had migrated to Byzantium, south-western Syria and Palestine. Apparently al-Nāwīkiya were the first Turcoman groups to enter Syria and to influence and participate in its affairs. In 1071 A.D. the Chief of the Nāwīkiya in south-western Syria was known as "Qurlu" and Ibn al-'Adīm describes him as being the nephew of Ibn Khān. In 1070 A.D. Ibn Khān had left Aleppo and went to Tyre where he entered the service of Ibn 'Aqīl, its ruler. Not before long, in the same year, and by the contrivance of Ibn 'Aqīl, Ibn Khān was assassinated by some of his own men. From all of this it could be deduced that Ibn Khān was from al-Nāwīkiya and probably was the Chief of all the Nāwīkiya who had migrated to Syria. It would appear that the Nāwīkiya was not the name of one of the Turcoman tribes, but was a name given to certain bands who had not submitted to the Saljuq Sultan. The greater part of these bands were Turcomans and the rest were of various origins gathered from the remnants of armies



of the states which were conquered by the Saljuqs. After Maḥmūd's capture of Aleppo from his uncle 'Aṭīyya. (see Ch. III, p. 176) Ibn Khān went to Iraq, perhaps to enlist more of his kinsmen or perhaps to recruit another army for himself. He returned to Aleppo with 1,000 followers of Turcomans, Kurd, Daylam and Uj origin.

Al-Nāwīkiya did not pay allegiance to the Saljuq Sultan and it would appear that Ibn Khān left Aleppo before the arrival of Alp-Arslan, whom he feared. Alp-Arslan accused Ibn Khān's (?brother) brother of instigating Maḥmūd Ibn Naṣr to resist the Sultan instead of giving him homage. The Turcomans who came to the aid of Maḥmūd against the Byzantines (see Ch. III, pp.189-190 ) were from the Nāwīkiya and their leader was Qurlu. When Qurlu and his followers (once estimated by Ibn al-Aṭhīr as 12,000 horsemen) left Maḥmūd to return to south-western Syria, Maḥmūd retained 1,000 of these warriors and employed them in his own service. Aḥmad-Shāh was probably the leader of these 1,000 warriors and this perhaps explains why he fought against Tutuṣh and other Turcomans who acknowledged the Sultan.<sup>20</sup>

In spite of the fact that the Nāwīkiya did not give allegiance to the Saljuq Sultan, they pioneered the Saljuqs' cause and paved the way for their ultimate possession of Syria. From 1070 A.D.

---

<sup>20</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 180r.v., 183v.; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 92-93; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 130v.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 164-165; X, 40-41; Bughya, A., II, 165v., 166r.; Zubda, I, 294-297; II, 10, 31-32, 55-58; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134r.; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 586-587; Mir'āt, Sevim, 122, 124, 143-144, 146-147, 149, 153, 171, 173, 174, 176, 178, 243; Setton, I, 147-148; Pre-Ottoman, 27; Sevim, I, 19.

onward a number of Turcoman bands entered Syria. These bands differed from the Nāwīkiya. They acknowledged the supremacy of the Saljuq Sultan and, therefore, when they entered the country had no need to become mercenaries of any existing states, but behaved as conquerors claiming that they were acting on behalf of the Sultan. Their method of conquest was the destruction of the towns and villages, killing great numbers of the inhabitants and looting everything within reach. Şandaq and Afshīn are the names of two of their chiefs which have survived. In 1070 A.D., Şandaq entered Syria from Byzantium and devastated the region between Hims and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. Afshīn was before this time, acting inside the Byzantine territory. Both Şandaq and Afshīn joined forces with Tutush when he entered Syria and attempted to capture Aleppo.<sup>21</sup> After Tutush had taken possession of Damascus and had killed Atsiz, its first Turcoman (Saljuq) ruler,<sup>22</sup> Afshīn apprehensive of what might befall him, deserted Tutush taking with him the larger part of his forces and travelling northward. It may be said that Afshīn was the most destructive and cruel chief of all the Turcomans (who entered Syria). Ghars al-Ni'ma and Ibn al-'Adim relate that after deserting Tutush, Afshīn and his Turcoman freebooters raided the region of Ba'albak and sacked a number of its villages. From there they proceeded to Rafniya which they reached on the 10th Jumādā al-Aulā 472 ...H./8th November,

<sup>21</sup> Zubda, II, 11-13, 16; Mir'at, Sevin, 137, 138, 144, 146, 149, 197; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 254-255.

<sup>22</sup> Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 131r; Al-'Azīnī, 183v.; Ibn Al-'Amīd, 566-567; Al-Kāmil, X, 71-72; Ibn Muyassar, II, 26; Zubda, II, 65, Mir'at,

1079 A.D. In Rafniya there were, at that time, a group of merchants and a number of caravans loaded with goods en route for Tripoli. Afshīn made a surprise attack on Rafniya, killed some of the merchants and looted everything he found. After spending ten destructive days in Rafniya he went to Shayzar which, due to its impregnability and the effort of the Munqidhi Amir, 'Alī b. Muqallid, escaped devastation. From Shayzar Afshīn proceeded towards Antioch. The country between Shayzar and Aleppo suffered a worse devastation at his hands than it had suffered since the 7th century. He destroyed every landmark and burned everything which was not portable. Ibn al-'Adīm (who witnessed the Mongol invasion) says that never in its history had this territory suffered such disaster. The aftermath of this destruction was dearth, then famine which drove many to cannibalism. Under these stresses most of the survivors fled from their homes and went to Mesopotamia where they found shelter in the state of Muslim b. Quraysh.<sup>23</sup> Almost a score of years later the crusaders, after capturing Antioch, passed through this mountainous terrain and possessed it without meeting any effective resistance. This indicates that even after twenty years the region was not able to recover from the havoc; but a few years later, when it had partially recovered, it was very

---

Sevim, 201; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134r.; Al-Bustān, 90r.v.; Duwal, II, 4; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 11r.; Ibn Kathir, XI, 119; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 203; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 137-138; Al-Ṣafadi, II, 123.

<sup>23</sup>Zubda, II, 65-67; Mir'at, Sevim, 201.

difficult for Nur al-Din Maḥmūd Zankī and his successors to wrest it from the crusaders.

Everybody was convinced that Sābiq was incapable of doing anything to improve the situation in his Emirate, therefore the population of northern Syria, including the tribe of Kilāb, looked for a strong and just leader. The Sultan, Malik-Shāh, certainly did not fit this role for he was living far away from the scene of events. His brother, Tutush, equally could not satisfy the need, for his behaviour was no better than that of Afshīn. Muslim b. Quraysh, the 'Uqayli Amir of al-Moṣul, appeared to be the man to fit the character. Several delegations and a great number of refugees went to his domains appealing to him to come and take over Aleppo. The chroniclers relate that even Sābiq b. Maḥmūd made the same appeal to Muslim. In the poetical work of Ibn Ḥayyūs, who spent about sixty years of his life eulogising the Fāḥimid Governors of Damascus, the Mirdāsids of Aleppo and a number of the Fāḥimid Viziers and Officials in Cairo, there is a particular stanza which he recited at the end of his life. It is very warm and sentimental. He addressed it to Muslim b. Quraysh after he had taken possession of Aleppo. Muslim was described as the mercy of heaven sent to give life to a nation (Ummah) which had, for a long time, suffered from the Turcomans who had no mercy. Muslim, he said, had removed the darkness of disasters, driven away fear and oppression and restored northern Syria to

peace and security. He returned dignity to the 'Arabs' and soon he would purge Syria from every Turcoman.<sup>24</sup> Ibn Ḥayyus cherished a dream of purging Syria from the Turcomans which, as we shall see in detail, did not materialise, and they ultimately defeated Muslim killing him and dominating Syria for centuries.

Upon hearing of the destruction wreaked by Afshīn, Tutush left Damascus and went northward under the pretext that his intention was to chastise Afshīn and thus prevent further destruction. His real intention was, however, to seize the opportunity provided by Afshīn and to capture Aleppo. He besieged Aleppo for a few days but when he found himself unable to take it by force, he lifted the siege and went north raiding several of the nearby villages and after returned to Damascus.<sup>25</sup>

In the town of al-Mosul Muslim b. Quraysh received an Aleppine delegation together with a communication from Aleppo Aḥdāth calling on him once again to come to the rescue of Aleppo. He also received the Chieftains of the tribe of Kilāh who made the same request and offered the support of their tribesmen. According to some chroniclers, Sābiq b. Maḥmūd also wrote to Muslim not only appealing for help but offering to relinquish Aleppo. From the accounts of the chroniclers it is not clear what kind

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibn Ḥayyūs, II, 570-575; Zubda, II, 67; Bughya, A., VII, 146r.-148v.; Mir'at, Sevim, 202-203; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 588.

<sup>25</sup> Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 130r.; Al-Kāmil, X, 74; Bughya, A., VII, 145v.; Zubda, II, 66-67; Mir'at, Sevim, 201; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 571.

of offer Sābiq had made, but it is certain that he offered him at least part of the emirate.

Muslim, who received these encouraging demands, decided not only to capture Aleppo but to gain possession of the whole of Syria. One of Muslim's wives was the sister of Alp-Arslan and when he intended to march on Aleppo he took the precaution of sending her son to the Sultan Malik-Shāh offering him the sum of 300,000? dinars as an annual tribute if he would permit him (i.e. Muslim) to take Aleppo. The Sultan accepted the offer and Muslim led a Bedouin army towards Aleppo. It was raised from all the tribes of upper Mesopotamia and northern Syria, but chiefly from the tribes of 'Uqayl, Kilāb and Numayr. When Muslim approached Aleppo, Shabīb and Waththāb, Sābiq's brothers, obliged him to shut the city's gates and to refuse to surrender it to Muslim. The Aleppines together with the Aḥdāth, however, favoured the surrender and opposed resistance to Muslim. During the last ten days of June 1080 A.D. the Aḥdāth opened the city's gates and Muslim entered and took possession of it. The Mirdāsīd Amir persisted in their refusal and Sābiq entrenched himself in the citadel while his brothers Shabīb and Waththāb did the same in the palace which was attached to it. Muslim began to lay siege to the palace and the citadel, and the siege lasted for more than four months. Out of patience, during this period, Muslim was inclined to lift the siege, abandon Aleppo and withdraw to Mesopotamia;

but the encouragement he received from the population and promises made by the Kilābī chieftains together with the outstanding personnel of the state to mediate between him and the Mirdāsīd Amirs induced him to remain in Aleppo and maintain the siege.

A dispute arose among the three Mirdāsīd brothers, which created an opportunity to be immediately seized by the Munqidhi Amir, 'Alī b. Muqallid, to mediate between Muslim and the three brothers. 'Alī succeeded in persuading them to surrender the palace and the citadel to Muslim. This resulted in an agreement arranged between Muslim and the Mirdāsīds by which Muslim took possession of the citadel together with the palace, married Manī'ah, sister of the three brothers, granted Shabīb and Waththāb the castles of 'Azāz and al-Atharīb together with several villages as an iqtā', and also granted Sābiq an iqtā' in the region of al-Raḥba. It was Sunday the 10th of Rabi' al-Ākhir, 473 (or Tuesday 5th) A.H./27th September, 1130 A.D. when Muslim b. Quraysh became Master of the Citadel of Aleppo and so brought the Mirdāsīd dynasty to an end.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibn al-Qalānisi, 113; Al-'Aẓimī, 184r.; Al-Kāmil, IX, 165; X, 74; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 323; Ibn al-'Amīd, 568; Zubda, II, 67-70, 73, 75; Bughya, A., VII, 145v.-147v.; Mir'at, Sevim, 202-203, 207; Ibn Abi'l-Dar, 134r.; Al-Bundāri, 66; Al-Mansūri, 74v.; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 149-150, 203; Duwal, II, 4; Al-Dhahabi, OR 50, 11r.; Al-Durra, 406; Iqd., XI, 581; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 571-572, 588; Al-Ṣafadi, II, 87; Munajjim, I, 328v.

Previous to this, during the reign of Sābiq, the Munqidhī Amir, 'Alī b. Muqallid of Kafar-Ṭāb, had planned to possess the impregnable castle of Shayzar. This castle was ruled by the Bishop of al-Bārah who acknowledged the overlordship of the Byzantine Emperor. Unable to take the castle by force, 'Alī b. Muqallid built a counter castle nearby on the bank of the Orontes which became known as Qal'at al-Jisr (i.e. the castle of the Bridge). By this means 'Alī was able to carry out a long siege and to inflict starvation on the garrison of Shayzar. After the fall of the Mirdāsīd dynasty, 'Alī b. Muqallid left Aleppo and went back to Qal'at al-Jisr and focussed his energies on the capture of Shayzar. By dint of siege and promises, 'Alī succeeded in inducing the Bishop to relinquish it to him in exchange for a sum of money. On Sunday, 15th Rajab, 474 A.H./19th December 1081 A.D. 'Alī b. Muqallid became the Lord of the castle of Shayzar and began the Munqidhī rule of Shayzar.<sup>27</sup>

In Aleppo, when Muslim received the news of 'Alī's gain, he moved rapidly in an attempt to wrest Shayzar from him. Firstly he sent an army led by his brother 'Alī b. Quraysh which began to lay siege on Shayzar. Within the castle, its Munqidhī Master was fully prepared. After futile attempts by 'Alī b. Quraysh, Muslim

---

<sup>27</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 184v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā, 131v.; Ibn Al-'Amīd, 568; Bughya, A., VII, 147r.v.; Zubda, II, 75, 77; Mir'at, A., Annals, 474H; Al-Mansūrī, 74v.; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 11v.; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134 r.v.; Duwal, II, 4; Al-Nujūm, V, 113-114.



took personal command of his entire forces and marched on Shayzar. In June, 1082 A.D. Muslim began to besiege Shayzar, but when in July he found himself baffled he went to Ḥimṣ leaving a division of his troops to continue the siege. The Munqidhi Amir sent to Ḥimṣ a delegation consisting of his wife, his sister and his son. This delegation met Muslim and, by offering him the sum of 10,000 dinars, they succeeded in inducing him to order his troops to withdraw.

Ibn al-'Adīm alleges that envy was the reason for Muslim's desire to capture Shayzar.<sup>28</sup> Events prove, however, that the more likely reason was that Muslim was endeavouring to establish a united state under his direct rule. After he had captured Aleppo Muslim's ambition turned him towards the Numayri principality at Ḥarrān which he annexed to his dominions.<sup>29</sup> After that Muslim deprived all the Mirdāsīd Amirs of their iqtā's, wrested those parts of the emirate of Aleppo which were in Turcoman hands, purged the Turcomans from northern Syria as far as Ḥamah, and prevented - for the time being - any of the Turcoman bands from entering or passing through any of his territory. Moreover, he extended his influence over the Byzantine towns of Edessa and Antioch.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Zubda, II, 77; Mir'āt, Sevim, 215.

<sup>29</sup> Ibn Abi'l-Ḥayjā', 131v.; Al-Kāmil, X, 78; Mir'āt, Sevim, 208; Duwal, II, 4; Al-Nujūm, V, 113.

<sup>30</sup> Al-Kāmil, X, 78; Zubda, II, 75, 78-79; Mir'āt, Sevim, 208, 216.

After he left Shayzar and went to Ḥimṣ he aimed at capturing it together with its citadel from Khalaf b. Mulā'ib. Muslim was able to capture the city of Ḥimṣ and began to lay siege to its citadel. During the siege he learned that Tutush intended to march against him from Damascus. Unprepared for a clash with Tutush - the Sultan's brother - Muslim accepted the Munqidhi's offer, agreed to leave Ibn Mulā'ib in his post and withdrew from Ḥimṣ. He returned to Aleppo and went from there to al-Moḡul where he began to prepare an expedition against Damascus.

Since he had captured Aleppo or even before, Muslim, who professed the Shī'a doctrine (twelver), communicated with the Fāṭimid Caliphate in Cairo and while arranging a campaign against Damascus he had received a promise from Badr al-Janālī that when he approached Damascus there would be a Fāṭimid army ready to assist him. Meanwhile in Damascus Tutush received letters from the two Mirdāsīd Amirs, Shabīb and Waththāb, from Khalaf b. Mulā'ib and from the Munqidhi Amir of Shayzar; they complained against Muslim and offered Tutush their support if he would come to northern Syria and attempt to take it from Muslim. Tutush responded to the call and went to the region of Antioch, while those Chiefs who called on him assembled their forces and advanced towards Aleppo. After possessing Ḥamah they tried to capture Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and after to continue towards Aleppo. This indicates

that there was a plan to capture Aleppo according to which Tutush would capture the north-west region of Aleppo and then advance on the city itself while the Arab Chiefs would capture the southern region and afterwards join Tutush at the walls of Aleppo where they would unite in an endeavour to gain possession of it.

This assumed plan was only partially carried out, for when Muslim received news of Tutush and his allies' activities he led his forces across the Euphrates aiming first at Aleppo and then at Damascus. This obliged Tutush and his allies to retreat to their own bases where they took defensive positions. In June, 1083, Muslim laid siege to Damascus, thus making the last and perhaps most important step towards the establishment of an Arabic kingdom comprising Syria and Upper Mesopotamia.

After he had besieged Damascus for about a month, Muslim failed to conquer it and was obliged to withdraw. The dominant reasons for his failure were:

- a) The tribal composition of his army containing elements from his own 'Uqayli' tribesmen in addition to large auxiliary forces from the tribes of Kilab and Numayr which, later was augmented by some members of the tribes of Tayy', Kalb and 'Ulaym. The only section of this army which was, to some extent, loyal to Muslim was that of the 'Uqaylids. The others had joined his army because he had obliged them

to do so or because they hoped to gain his favour and booty by his conquest of Damascus. It would be well to note here that, up to the time of this event, the number of the Turcomans who had entered Syria and settled there could not be estimated at more than 15,000. There were only a few Chiefs and every Chief, as we saw before, had 500 to 1,000 followers. The aggregate number of the Turcomans was therefore far less than any one of the Arab tribes who were inhabiting Syria and Upper Mesopotamia at that time. But, while the Arabs greatly outnumbered the Turcomans, their fighting capacity was greatly inferior. The Turcomans had the greater advantage in archery against which the Arabs were unable to compete and, more important still, the Turcomans possessed the fierce nomadic spirit which the Arabs had lost some centuries before. There is much evidence to support this, but perhaps the defeat of the tribe of Kilāb at the hands of Ahmad-Shāh which has already been mentioned and Muslim b. Quraysh's end, which will be dealt with later, are sufficient examples.

- b) Tutush's resistance and successful counter-attack.
- c) The broken promise of the Fāṭimid Caliphate to send assistance.
- d) A rebellion which occurred against Muslim in Ḥarrān was the reason for lifting the siege and final withdrawal.

He hastened northward to Ḥarrān and when he arrived there he stormed it and brutally slaughtered the rebels and many citizens alike. Ḥarrān's rebellion was chiefly prompted by religious emotion. It was led by the city's Kadi who, together with most of the city's population professed the Sunni doctrine. During their rebellion they called on Jubuq, one of the Turcoman Chiefs, who was at that time in the region, to come to their help against the hretic Muslim.<sup>31</sup>

At this juncture a new Turcoman wave arrived in northern Syria and upper Mesopotamia. The most notable Chiefs in this wave were Jubuq and Artuq, in fact Artuq was the more important for, in the years following, he played a very effective part in dealing the final blow to the Arabic power in upper Mesopotamia, and also in the struggle for Syria amongst the Turcomans themselves.

At the time when the Saljuqs were laying the foundation of their empire and extending their control over the Muslim states, it was not only the Turcoman Chiefs who endeavoured to sieze opportunity to establish principalities for themselves, but many members of the Muslim Bureaucracy did the same. Among these latter

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 131v.; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 114-115; Al-'Azimī, 184v.-185r.; Al-Kāmil, X, 82, 84; Zubda, II, 78-83; Mir'at, Sevim, 208, 215-216, 219-223; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 12r.; 165v; Al-'Ibar, Dh., III, 383; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 572-573; Al-Bustān, 91v., 92r.; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 124; Al-Manṣūri, 75r.; Al-Nujūm, V, 113-115.

was the family of Jahīr whose head Muḥammad b. Aḥmad occupied the post of vizier in al-Moṣul, his native town. Also in Aleppo during Thimāl's reign, then in Moyyafariqin and eventually in Bagḥdad as the Vizier of the Abbasid Caliph al-Qā'im, then to his successor al-Muqtadī. Muḥammad who was known as Fakhr al-Dawlā, had established a very good relation with the celebrated Saljuq Vizier, Nizām al-Mulk. His son, Muḥammad, known as 'Amid al-Dawlā, married two of the daughters of Nizām al-Mulk. By pressure from Nizām al-Mulk, 'Amid al-Dawlā succeeded his father as the Caliph's Vizier and held that post until he was finally dismissed on Friday, 25th Ṣafar, 476 A.H./14th July, 1083 A.D. Upon this the whole family of Jahīr left Bagḥdad and went to Iṣfahan where they were met and welcomed by both Nizām al-Mulk and the Sultan Malik-Shāh. In October of the same year the Sultan commissioned Fakhr al-Dawlā to lead an army towards Mesopotamia for the capture of Diyār-Bakr and the abolishment of the Marwānid dynasty. Aq-Sunqur, the first Saljuq ruler of Aleppo whose reign will be discussed later, was the officer charged with the military affairs of this army. In Mesopotamia the news of this army called for a pact and temporary cessation of hostilities between Muslim b. Quraysh and the Marwānids. As a price for his assistance the Marwānids yielded to Muslim the town of Āmid. Muslim's army was assembled near Āmid and prepared to encounter that of Fakhr al-Dawla. Fakhr al-Dawla informed the Sultan of the situation and asked for reinforcements.

Upon this, the Sultan sent an instruction to Artuq to lead his fellow-Turcomans and to join forces with Fakhr al-Dawlā. To avoid a clash with Muslim or rather, as some chroniclers relate, to avoid the Arabs' power being destroyed by his hand, Fakhr al-Dawla communicated with Muslim and persuaded him to withdraw. Artuq was apparently contented with this arrangement but the rank and file of the Turcomans would not consent to forego the spoils of war, therefore, while negotiation concerning the withdrawal was in process, they made a sudden attack on Muslim's troops, routed them, took a great number of the Chiefs together with many men and women of the tribe of 'Uqayl into captivity, seized the property of 'Uqayl and obliged Muslim to entrench himself behind the walls of Āmid. Fakhr al-Dawlā informed the Sultan of what had occurred and ordered Artuq to besiege Āmid and to keep vigilant watch on Muslim to prevent his escape.

In Iṣfahān, on hearing the news, the Sultan prematurely considered Syria and upper Mesopotamia already in his hands and, in order to consolidate and exploit the victory of Āmid, he led his forces toward al-Moḡul which he occupied. IN Āmid, at a high price, Muslim induced Artuq - who preferred his own interest to that of the Sultan - to facilitate his escape. On his way to al-Moḡul the Sultan Malik-Shāh learned that on Sunday, 27th July, 1084 A.D. Muslim had escaped and afterwards, in al-Moḡul, he was informed that his brother Tekish was leading a rebellion against him in

Khurāsān. These two events, especially the latter, obliged the Sultan to seek a settlement with Muslim. He sent Nizām al-Mulk's son to al-Raḥba where he met Muslim and arranged a settlement. Accordingly Muslim came to al-Moḡul, paid homage to the Sultan and proffered him a sum of money, how much is not known, and a number of horses together with some valuable objects. Afterwards the Sultan departed from al-Moḡul and thus, in spite of his severe defeat, Muslim did not lose any part of his dominions.<sup>32</sup>

Despite his settlement with the Sultan, Muslim was unable to restore his power and recover from the severe blow he suffered at Āmid. When he escaped from Āmid, Muslim sent his uncle, Muqbil b. Badrān, to Cairo as an envoy. The mission of Muqbil was to meet Badr al-Jamālī and to try to form a pact between Muslim and the Fāṭimid Caliphate. According to Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, Muqbil informed the authorities of Cairo that Muslim was ready to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Fāṭimid Caliph and to secure for him Syria, Mesopotamia and Iraq if they would supply him with the necessary aid. Sibṭ also relates that Artuq, who feared that retaliation would follow from the Sultan on account of Muslim's escape from Āmid, was from the beginning involved in Muslim's plan, and both of them

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibn Abi 'l-Hayjā', 132r.; Al-'Aẓimī, 185v.; Al-Muntazam, IX, 7, 14; Al-Kāmil, X, 83, 86-88; Al-Bundārī, 69-71; Zubda, II, 84-86; Bar Hebraeus, 228; Mufarrij, I, 11-14; Mir'at, Sevim, 223-229; Al-Bustān, 92r.; Al-Mukhtaṣar, 204-205, 209; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 12v.-13r., 165v.; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 124, 126; Al-Rawdatain, I, 59; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 573-575.



hoped that Tutush would join forces with them. Prior to the time of this plan, however, Tutush had contacted Cairo and, in 1083, he was to marry Badr al-Jamāli's daughter.<sup>33</sup>

Muslim's plan, however, was too late to help him to recover from his plight and the Fāṭimid Caliphate was unable to supply him with any effective aid. Not long after the escape of Muslim from Āmid, Antioch was captured by the Saljuq Chief, Sulaymān b. Qutulmush.<sup>34</sup> The capture of Antioch was another blow to Muslim's regime for it brought a positive threat to his position in Aleppo. Sulaymān began to extend his control over the region of Aleppo in preparation to seizing Aleppo itself. Many of the Mirdāsids and their followers, together with some of Muslim's own troops, deserted him and rallied to Sulaymān.

Facing this drastic situation Muslim collected an army, crossed the Euphrates and arrived at Aleppo. Muslim's army upon which he depended for the inevitable clash with Sulaymān was formed of tribal troops and the Turcoman followers Jubuq. After he arrived at Aleppo Muslim made a raid on Antioch territory and plundered it. In turn, as an act of retaliation, Sulaymān made a similar raid on the region of Aleppo. According to the chroniclers

---

<sup>33</sup> Zubda, II, 84-85; Mir'āt, Sevim, 224, 245-246.

<sup>34</sup> For details of this capture see Al-'Azīmī, 183r.; 185v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 132r.; Zubda, II, 86-88; Bar Hebraeus, 229; Mufarrij, I, 14; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 205; Al-Mansūrī, 75v; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 126; Al-Nujūm, V, 124; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 13r.

the peasants who suffered from this raid complained to Sulaymān and he returned most of their property. He justified his action by affirming that it was not in his nature to pillage the Muslims, but that Muslim b. Quraysh's action had forced him to retaliate.

Muslim gave as a reason for his raid Sulaymān's non-compliance with his demands. Prior to the capture of Antioch by Sulaymān the Byzantine authority of the town had paid Muslim an annual sum of money as tribute. When he came to Aleppo, Muslim demanded that Sulaymān should continue to pay him the same amount and Sulaymān had refused the demand saying that the Byzantine Christians were compelled to pay a poll tax, but "I am, thanks to Allah, a Believer and do not pay poll tax".

Muslim was advised to avoid a struggle with Sulaymān who was not on good terms with the Sultan and to find a way for reconciliation. Muslim, however, refused the advice and decided to invade Antioch and to take it by force. He led his troops, which were about 6,000, and marched on Antioch and was intercepted by Sulaymān who had an army of about 4,000 horsemen. By the small river running near 'Afrīn, at a place called Qarzāḥil, and in the late afternoon of Saturday, 24th Ṣafar, 478 A.H./21st June, 1085 A.D., the two armies engaged in combat. The eyes of Muslim's troops were dazzled by the brilliant rays of the sun, which they faced. Almost at the beginning of the engagement most of Muslim's tribesmen fled and Jubuq fellow-Turcomans defected to Sulaymān. When he found

that most of his troops had deserted him Muslim tried to escape to Aleppo. Six hundred of Aleppo Aḥdāth were in his army and loyally endeavoured to cover his escape. Four hundred of them vainly paid for this with their lives and Muslim received a blow which ended his own life.<sup>35</sup>

-----

The death of Muslim marked the end of a period during which the struggle for Aleppo was between the Arab Bedouins and the Turcoman nomads. From that time the Arab Bedouins were almost obliterated from the political scene and the struggle for Aleppo became one between the Turcomans.

When Muslim had captured Aleppo it was the city's Aḥdāth which had opened the gates to his troops and surrendered it to him. The Chief of the Aḥdāth at that time was al-Sharīf Ḥasan b. Hibat-Allāh al-Ḥutaytī. Al-Ḥutaytī was the actual ruler of the city of Aleppo during Muslim's reign. It would appear that the number of the Aḥdāth at this period had increased as we are informed that six hundred of them were in Muslim's army. During Muslim's reign his cousin Salim b. Mālik was governor of the citadel of Aleppo, but after his death the fate of Aleppo rested in the hands of al-Ḥutaytī.

---

<sup>35</sup>Al-'Aẓīmī, 185v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 132r.; Ibn Al-'Amīd, 568-569; Al-Kāmil, X, 90-91; Al-Bāhir, 6; Zubda, II, 88-92; Mir'at, Sevim, 229-230, 234; Bar Hebraeus, 229-230; Mufarrij, I, 15; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 135r.; Al-Bustān, 92r.; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 205; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 13r.v., 46v., 165v.; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 575-575; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 126; Al-Nujūm, V, 119.

After his victory Sulaymān b. Qutulmush brought the body of Muslim and threw it at the gate of Aleppo hoping that the city would soon surrender to him. Al-Ḥutaytī refused to surrender it and Sulaymān began to besiege it. During the siege, al-Ḥutaytī sent a message to the Sultan Malik-Shāh informing him of the situation in Aleppo and calling on him to come to Aleppo and take direct control of it.

Meanwhile to secure his position in Aleppo, al-Ḥutaytī, who had no control over the citadel, built a second citadel in the southern part of the city for himself and his followers. The site of this citadel still retains its original name of Qal'at al-Sharīf (i.e. the citadel of the Sharif).

Sulaymān did not give his entire attention to the siege but busied himself in capturing Kafar-Ṭab, Laḥmīn and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. To be near Aleppo and in constant observation of it he restored part of the town of Qinassrīn and made it a base for his activities.

In Khurāsān the Sultan Malik-Shāh responded to al-Ḥutaytī's call and moved towards Aleppo. His progress was, however, slow and the anxious al-Ḥutaytī became impatient and called on Tutush, Malik-Shāh's brother, to come to Aleppo and take possession of it.

In Damascus Tutush, who had previously been joined by Artuq and his followers, was delighted with the call; he mustered

his troops together with those of Artuq and in Muḥarram, 479 A.H./ April 1085 A.D., marched northward to Aleppo. Before approaching it, Tutush was intercepted by Sulaymān and his army who endeavoured to prevent him from reaching Aleppo. The two Saljuq armies engaged in conflict which ended in victory for Tutush and the death of Sulaymān. This battle, which took place almost a year after the death of Muslim b. Quraysh,<sup>36</sup> inaugurated a new era in the history of Aleppo. It is important not only because it was the first conflict among the Saljuqs for Aleppo, but also because, for the first time in its history, Aleppo was placed under direct Saljuq rule. This rule had a significant value for, as we shall see, it caused fundamental changes in the political and social life of the inhabitants of northern Syria.

After his victory over Sulaymān, Tutush came to Aleppo hoping that on his arrival the gates of the city would be opened to him and that he would become its sole ruler. To his surprise, when Tutush reached Aleppo, he found the gates not only closed but guarded and that al-Ḥutaytī refused to yield the city to him on the grounds that he received a communication from the Sultan informing him of his imminent arrival. As a result of this Tutush began to besiege Aleppo but it was a very short siege, for on Saturday 26th

---

<sup>36</sup> Al-‘Aẓīmī, 185v.; Ibn Abi ‘l-Hayjā’, 133r.; Ibn al-‘Amīd, 569-571; Al-Kāmil, X, 96-97; Al-Bāhir, 7; Bughya, A., VII, 197r.v., 198v.; Zubda, II, 94-98; Nir‘at, Sevim, 236-239, 234; Ibn Abi ‘l-Dam, 135r.; Bar Hebraeus, 230; Mufarrij, I, 15-16; Al-Bustān, 92r.; Al-Mukhtaḡar, I, 206-207; Al-Durra, 428; Al-Nujūm, V, 124; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 14v.; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 130; Ibn Khalidūn, IV, 589; Al-Durr, 35.

Rabi' al-Awal, 479 A.H./11th July, 1086 A.D. a group of the Aleppines who disliked al-Ḥutaytī opened one of the city's gates and enabled Tutuṣh to become its possessor.

When Tutuṣh took possession of Aleppo, al-Ḥutaytī, together with some of his fellow Aḥdāth, entrenched themselves in his citadel - Qal'at al-Sharīf - and refused to surrender. Meanwhile the great citadel also refused to surrender, for its governor Sālim b. Mālik proclaimed that he would not yield it to anyone except the Sultan himself. Before long al-Ḥutaytī ended his resistance and surrendered himself after receiving safe conduct from Tutuṣh. For a month Tutuṣh besieged the great citadel but, when he learnt that the vanguard of his brother's army had arrived in the vicinity of Aleppo he lifted the siege and withdrew towards Damascus, thus avoiding a clash with his brother. It is worthy of mention here that after al-Ḥutaytī had surrendered himself to Tutuṣh he was exiled to Jerusalem and never allowed to return to Aleppo.<sup>37</sup>

A large division of Malik-Shāh's army reached Aleppo before the Sultan himself. This division was headed by three Chiefs, Bur-suq, Iyāz and Buzān. On the 3rd December, 1086 A.D., Malik-Shāh arrived at Aleppo and took possession of it and its citadel. By way of compensation for the citadel of Aleppo he conferred on Sālim b. Mālik, Qal'at-Ja'bar, as an iqtā'. He also granted

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 133r.; Ibn al-'Amīd, 507-571; Al-Kāmil, X, 96-97; Bughya, A., VII, 197v., 198r.v.; Zubda, II, 98-99; Mir'āt, Sevim, 239; Mufarrij, I, 16-17; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 207; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 589.

Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Quraysh, who was his paternal cousin, al-Raḥba, al-Raḡqa, Ḥarrān, Surūj and al-Khābur as iqtā's, and allowed him to marry his (i.e. Malik-Shāh's) sister. This grant was a partial revival of the heritage of Muslim b. Quraysh, but meanwhile it was given at the expense of the state of Aleppo, for it deprived this state of its Mesopotamian territory. It also indicates that the tribe of Kilāb lost its footing and traditional power in this territory.<sup>38</sup>

The Sultan spent a few days in Aleppo and went from there to Antioch, where he also remained for a few days. Before returning to Aleppo he appointed one of his officers, Yaḡhi-Siyān, as Governor of Antioch. In Aleppo, Malik-Shāh celebrated 'īd al-Fiṭr (8th January, 1087 A.D.) then departed and went eastward to Khurāsān. While he was in Aleppo, Malik-Shāh received a communication from Naṣr b. 'Alī, the Munqidhi Amir of Shayzar, offering allegiance and relinquishing to him Latakia, Afanya and Kafar-Ṭāb. Before he left Aleppo, Malik-Shāh appointed a certain Nuḥ al-Turki as governor of the citadel of Aleppo and Aq-Sunqur as ruler of the state of Aleppo. He conferred on Aq-Sunqur the title of Qasim al-Dawla and left with him a garrison of 4,000 horsemen. On his way back, Malik-Shāh appointed another of his officers, Buzān, as governor of

---

<sup>38</sup> Al-Kāmil, X, 105; Al-Bāhir, 8; Al-'Azīmī, 186v.; Zubda, II, 100-101; Bughya, A., VII, 198r.v.; Mufarrij, I, 18; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 207-208; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 15v.; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 590; Ibn Kathir, XI, 131; Al-Bustān, 92r.

the town of Edessa.<sup>39</sup>

Malik-Shāh's campaign was the second major military expedition led against northern Syria by a Saljuq Sultan. In his expedition Malik-Shāh followed the same route as his father, but by possessing Edessa, Aleppo and Antioch, he accomplished what his father had failed to do, and brought the Saljuq Empire to its zenith. In fact, the two campaigns of Malik-Shāh and his father together with that of Ibn Jahīr were rather more than military expeditions. They were actually influxes of Turcoman migrants. It was the campaign of Alp-Arslan which brought to Syria Atsiz, Tutuṣh and Afshīn together with their followers. Similarly the campaign of Ibn Jahīr opened the way for Jubuq and Artuq together with their fellow Turcomans to enter Syria and the campaign of Malik-Shāh left behind it Buzān, Yaghi-Siyān and Aq-Sunqur together with their followers.

The reign of Aq-Sunqur in Aleppo lasted for almost seven years. It was an important period in the history of Aleppo for it created fundamental changes covering every aspect of its life. In the account of the chroniclers of this period Aq-Sunqur is most conspicuous and highly praised not because he was Zanki's father and Nur al-Dīn' Maḥmūd's grandfather but because he brought stability

---

<sup>39</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 186v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 133r.; Al-Kāmil, X, 98, 107; Al-Bāhir, 8; Bughya, A., III, 267v., 268v., 272r.; Zubda, II, 101-102; Mir'at, Sevim, 240-241; Mufarrij, I, 18-19; Bar Hebraeus, 231; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 14v.; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 136v.; Al-Bustān, 92r.; Al-Mansūrī, 75r.; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 207; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 130-131; Ibn Khaldūn, IV, 590; Al-Rawḍatayn, I, 61.



and security to Aleppo whose population, for many years, had suffered from insecurity and political uncertainty. During Aq-Sunqur's reign, Al-'Azīnī says, everything became plentiful and cheap. He loved the Aleppines and looked after their interests and they, in turn, loved and respected him. Al-'Azīnī goes on to say that he observed the rule of justice and revived the law of Islam and by his order the minaret of the Great Mosque of Aleppo and two Mashhads were erected.<sup>40</sup>

Aq-Sunqur was the first Saljuq ruler of Aleppo to assume the place of its Arabic-Bedouin Amir. Whereas Aq-Sunqur's influence penetrated deeply into every aspect of the life of Aleppo, that of the former Arabic Amirs had been little more than a shadow. The Arabic rulers had lived in the citadel of Aleppo and, save for taxation, perhaps had made but little impact on the Aleppines. On the contrary, Aq-Sunqur imposed himself on all - even into the minor - affairs of the state. During the Arabic period the Amir of Aleppo remained as a tribal chief whose duty was only to defend his tribe and his post from all intruders. Aq-Sunqur's behaviour was entirely different from that of his Arabic predecessors. He turned most of his attention to the life of Aleppo and its people and frequently interfered with the details of everyday life. He personally in-

---

<sup>40</sup>Al-Kāmil, X, 107; Al-Bāhir, 8; Zubda, II, 102-103; Bughya, A., III, 267v.-268r.v., 272r.; Mufarrij, I, 19; Nir'at, Sevim, 244.

spected everything, even enquiring from a peasant the reason for not leaving his plough in the field during the night.

He had previously ordained that no-one in his dominion should fear any loss of property; any thief or offender would be dealt with drastically; any caravan suffering loss while passing through city or village must be reimbursed by the inhabitants. He expected his orders to be implicitly obeyed. For this purpose he himself carried out the inspection which enforced obedience. The conclusion of the incident referred to above emphasises this point and indicates the method by which he was able to interfere in the lives of his subjects. The peasant's reply was that his plough was removed not from fear of theft but for fear that a wandering jackal might devour its leather straps. Aq-Sunqur, who could not tolerate disobedience from wild animals, decreed that all jackals be immediately exterminated. Needless to say, the order was effectively carried out, for Ibn al-'Adim reports later in the thirteenth century that, as a result of this, there were no jackals in the state of Aleppo.<sup>1</sup>

Aq-Sunqur's general behaviour was that of an autocrat. He had been trained and had lived in the court of the Saljuq Sultan in Persia and there his conception of government was formulated. The traditional rule of this court was autocratic and emanated

---

<sup>41</sup>Zubda, II, 104-105; Bughya, III, 268r.v.

from Turkish origin which was largely influenced by the tradition of Muslim Persia. It was a new experiment in Aleppo whose people were accustomed chiefly to the Bedouin way of rule. During the Arab period, as we saw, the Amir of Aleppo depended chiefly on his tribesmen and his state therefore was a tribal one (see ch. II, pp. 63-82). It remained without change, because the Mirdāsīd rule was spasmodically interrupted. The term of each Mirdāsīd Amir was too short to give opportunity for any effective change.

In the Mirdāsīd tribal state and during the 'Uqaylid period the chieftains of the tribes were the outstanding figures of the state. They played a vital role in the political life of the emirate and impressed it with their own character and customs. The undisciplined chiefs together with their own fellow tribesmen preferred instability and had their own standards of loyalty which were volatile and fluctuated between various contestants for power. By this behaviour it was possible for internal groups to flourish and to exercise their influence over the affairs of the state. In addition it opened the way to alien groups, such as the Turcomans, to infiltrate into their state and finally to usurp it.

Under this somewhat loose and though not autocratic rule it was sufficiently liberal for people with free minds, such as Abu 'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī to live and teach their philosophy. There is no doubt that if Abu 'l-'Alā' had lived during the Saljuq's reign in which al-Ash'arī was cursed from the pulpits<sup>42</sup> he would have

---

<sup>42</sup>Al-'Azīmī, 177v.; Al-Nujūm, V, 54-55; al-Rawḍatayn, I, 58.

been executed. The collapse of the Arabic regime put an end to the progress of its culture. After the Turcoman autocrats had replaced the Amirs, there were no more poets such as Abu 'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī, Ibn Ḥayyūs, Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī or Ibn Abi Ḥaş̄nān, etc.

The rule of these autocrats depended on semi-professional troops, thus the Turcoman rule was a military one. Aq-Sunqur was one of the Sultan's officers and, as has been previously mentioned, when he was appointed he commanded 4,000 horsemen. At a later period under this type of regime, the officers of the army became the most powerful figures of the state and their ambition brought about changes in the political scene. To exemplify this, Zanki and Saladin were officers and caused political changes and established new dynasties.

After the manner of the autocrats, who allow no power but their own, from the time when Aleppo was conquered by the Saljuqs, the power of the Ahdāth diminished and finally vanished. Autocratic government invariably acquires wealth in order to satisfy its own desire and to maintain its troops. Aq-Sunqur had raised the sum of 1,500 dinars every day from Aleppo's city market and, when in 1091 A.D. he arrived at the court of the Sultan who was then holding a celebration near Baghdad, his (i.e. Aq-Sunqur's) pomp and magnificent procession were incomparable.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>Al-Kāmil, X, 133-134; Al-Bāhir, 8; Al-Bundari, 75; Mufarrij, I, 19; Bughya, A., III, 269r.

The autocratic rulers make a pretence of being interested in the welfare of their subjects and appear as pious rulers who fight heretics and cherish orthodoxy. It is mentioned above that the chroniclers relate that Aq-Sunqur revived the law of Islam and built the minaret of the Great Mosque together with two Mash-hads. In later periods this policy was developed and many new mosques and shrines were erected. It was also accompanied by the prompting of religious men thus promulgating a new social strata which developed an effective power.

In the history of Syria there has always been a rivalry or rather struggle for supremacy between south and north. During the eleventh century Damascus remained the centre of the south and Aleppo that of the north and as a result of this these two cities were the focus of this struggle. The controversy between them was social, economical and frequently political. Prior to the Saljuq's conquest the Fāṭimid rulers of Damascus attempted to, and on some occasions succeeded in, extending their control over Aleppo. After the Saljuq conquest the struggle between Damascus and Aleppo continued. The most important events which occurred during Aq-Sunqur's reign in Aleppo were the outcome of his relation with Tutush, either during the life of Malik-Shāh or after his death. The significance of this relation, as we shall see later in detail, was the victory of Tutush and the death of Aq-Sunqur.

Although after the death of Aq-Sunqur Tutush became the lord of Aleppo, the struggle between Aleppo and Damascus did not cease. Shortly after he became the lord of Aleppo, Tutush was killed. His son Ruḍwān succeeded him in Aleppo and Duqqāq, his other son, in Damascus. Ruḍwān was not on good terms with his brother. The history of his reign is more concerned with the twelfth century, its assassins and crusaders, rather than with the history of the eleventh century. Tutush lost his life in Persia far from Aleppo and this occurred during his struggle to succeed his brother as the Sultan of the Saljuq Empire.<sup>44</sup> Because of this the discussion will end with the death of Aq-Sunqur.

Since he became the lord of Damascus Tutush had endeavoured to extend his control over the important cities of the Levant. There he was met with local opposition and Fāṭimid resistance. According to Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, in 480 A.H./1087 A.D. Tutush appealed to his brother Malik-Shāh for help and Malik-Shāh instructed Aq-Sunqur and Buzān, the governor of Edessa, to supply Tutush with the needed assistance.<sup>45</sup> In 482 A.H./1089 A.D. a Fāṭimid army succeeded in capturing the towns of Tyre, Sidon, Jubayl and Acre. This army besieged the town of Ba'albak and there, during the siege, Khalaf b. Mulā'ib, the ruler of Ḥimṣ and Afāmya met its leader and formally acknowledged the suzerainty of the Fāṭimid Caliph. During

---

<sup>44</sup>For the death of Tutush and the succession of Ruḍwān, see al-'Azīmi, 188v.; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 134v.; Al-Kāmil, X, 166-167; Ibn al-'Amīd, 575-577; Zubda, II, 119-120; Bughya, A., VI,

its expedition the Fāṭimid army seized some of Tutush's property.<sup>46</sup> As a result of this Tutush repeated his appeal and Aq-Sunqur and Buzān together with Yaghi-Siyān received an order from Malik-Shāh to join their forces with those of Tutush, to take punitive action against Ibn Mulā'ib and to attempt to wrest all the Fāṭimid property in Syria.

The leadership of these joint forces was assigned by Malik-Shāh to Tutush. It would appear that Aq-Sunqur and Buzān reluctantly accepted this. They did not like Tutush's leadership for personal reasons, for everything they gained went to Tutush. Their reluctance undermined Tutush's plan and gave it only partial success. The reasons for taking punitive action against Ibn Mulā'ib were not only because of his allegiance to the Fāṭimids but also because he was a brigand, practising highway robbery.

In 1090 A.D. the forces of Buzān, Aq-Sunqur, Yaghi-Siyān and Tutush joined at Ḥimṣ and succeeded in capturing it from Ibn Mulā'ib and in taking him prisoner. The rulership of Ḥimṣ was bestowed on Tutush and Ibn Mulā'ib was put in an iron cage and sent

---

89r.-95r.; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 486-488H; Al-Mansūri, 75v; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 216-217; Al-Nujūm, V, 155.

<sup>45</sup>Mir'āt, Sevin, 244; Al-Kāmil, X, 78-94; Ibn Abi'l-Dam, 134r., 136v; Al-Bustān, 91v.; Al-Mansūri, 75r.; Al-Nujūm, V, 111, 113, 116, 125.

<sup>46</sup>Al-Kāmil, X, 116, 117; Ibn Muyassar, II, 28; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 482H; Al-Dhahabī, OR. 50, 17r.; Al-Nujūm, V, 128.

and sent to the Sultan.

In the accounts of the chroniclers it is not clear what was the next step taken by Tutush and his co-leaders. We have been informed that in 1091 A.D. the city of Tripoli was besieged by them and Afānya was captured by Aq-Sunqur. It is not certain whether, after the capture of Ḥimṣ, each of them returned to his own territory or whether they proceeded to Tripoli. Presumably it was to Tripoli, which Tutush desired to wrest for himself. Ibn al-'Adīm relates that, after Ḥimṣ had been captured, it came under the control of Aq-Sunqur who by the Sultan's order reluctantly relinquished it to Tutush. When they arrived at Tripoli they began to besiege it, but Aq-Sunqur - who did not wish to see Tutush annex Tripoli to his state - worked for an opportunity to prevent his success. In Tripoli, Ibn 'Ammār, its ruler, protested against the siege and produced documents signed by the Sultan conferring on him the rulership of Tripoli. Meanwhile Ibn 'Ammār, who seemed to be aware of Aq-Sunqur's attitude towards Tutush, offered Aq-Sunqur the sum of 30,000 dinars if he would help him. Upon this Aq-Sunqur told Tutush that by besieging Tripoli they were disobeying the Sultan.

A quarrel arose between them and Aq-Sunqur withdrew his forces and went back towards Aleppo, thus obliging Tutush - who was unable to carry the siege alone - to lift it and withdraw to Damascus.<sup>48</sup> Apparently, on his way to Aleppo in September

---

<sup>48</sup>Al-Kāmil, X, 136-137; Zubda, II, 106; Mir'at, A., Annals, 484H; Mufarrij, I, 22; Al-Nujūm, V, 132.



of the same year, 1091 A.D., Aq-Sunqur captured Afāmya, which was a part of Ibn Mulā'id's heritage. After capturing it Aq-Sunqur entrusted its rule to Naṣr b. 'Alī, the Munqidhi ruler of Shayzar. This suggests that the relation between Aq-Sunqur and this Amir was good. The relationship between them, however, was not always good for in 1088 A.D. Aq-Sunqur made an unsuccessful attempt to capture Shayzar.<sup>49</sup> It would appear that Aq-Sunqur passed Afāmya to the Munqidhi to prevent Tutush from possessing it and meanwhile to avoid any pretext by which Tutush could make complaint to the Sultan.

The Sultan Malik-Shāh summoned to his presence all the governors of Syria and Mesopotamia. On the 28th Ramadan, 484 A.H./13th November, 1091 A.D., Malik-Shāh arrived at Baghdad and there he remained for a few months celebrating, parading his forces and receiving his appointed governors. At the court of Malik-Shāh, Tutush lost his case against Aq-Sunqur because the Sultan did not credit his accusation. The Munqidhi chroniclers 'Alī b. Murshid Ibn al-Athīr and Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī relate this, but Sibṭ comments that it is difficult to credit that Tutush made the journey to his brother's court. Sibṭ gives evidence for his doubt. When Malik-Shāh had come to Aleppo Tutush avoided him and went to Damascus without paying respect to him. Neither Al-'Imād al-Iṣfahānī nor Ibn Wāṣil mention the name of Tutush among those who came to the presence of the Sultan. Al-'Imād only cites

---

<sup>49</sup>Al-'Aẓīmī, 187v.; Al-Kāmil, X, 111; Bughya, A., III, 272r.;

the names of Aq-Sunqur and Buzān. He does not mention the dispute between Aq-Sunqur and Tutush, but he as well as Ibn Wāsil and other chroniclers relate that Malik-Shāh authorised Tutush to conquer Egypt's property in Syria and for this purpose he ordered Aq-Sunqur to join forces with him and to be under his command. The capture of Ḥimṣ has already been spoken of and that Malik-Shāh conferred its rulership upon Tutush. The appointment of Tutush as leader together with the grant of Ḥimṣ infers that, after Malik-Shāh had left Aleppo, Tutush made a reconciliation with him. If this were so there is no reason to disbelieve that Tutush actually made the journey to Baghdad and presented his case to his brother. In 1094 A.D., as we shall see in detail, Tutush executed in cold blood and by his own hands Aq-Sunqur whom he hated. The Munqidhi chronicler 'Alī b. Murshid relates that when Tutush was presenting his complaint to the Sultan, Aq-Sunqur accused him of lying and having evil designs against his brother. As a result of this Tutush not only lost his case but before he left for Damascus he was obliged to leave one of his sons as hostage in the court of the Sultan. Shortly after Tutush had left, the Sultan gave leave to Aq-Sunqur, who returned to his

---

V, 221v.-222r.; Zubda, II, 105-106; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 481, 484H; Mufarrij, I, 19-21; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 208; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 16r.; Al-Nujūm, V, 132.

post in Aleppo more firmly established.<sup>50</sup>

The relation between them developed further, not as a direct result of what had happened in Baghhdad, but because on the 29th November 1092 A.D., the Sultan Malik-Shhah died.<sup>51</sup> Malik-Shhah died at the age of thirty eight years and he left a number of sons none of whom were old enough to rule in his place. A struggle broke out among the Saljuqs for his succession. During this struggle, Aq-Sunqur and Buzān shared the same opinion and stood by each other through the changing political scene. Their allegiance fluctuated between the struggling parties of the Saljuqs until fate overtook them both. Ibn al-'Adīm relates that after Malik-Shhah had died Aq-Sunqur acknowledged the Sultanate of Mahmur, Malik-Shhah's younger son.<sup>52</sup>

When Tutush was informed of his brother's death he proclaimed himself as his successor and to consolidate this he recruited a large army. In Aleppo Aq-Sunqur realised the significance of Tutush's move and also learned that the sons of Malik-Shhah were fighting each other for succession. He found himself unable to

---

<sup>50</sup> Al-Kāmil, X, 133-134; Al-Bāhir, 8; Bughya, A., III, 269r.; Mir'at, A., Annals, 485H; Al-Bundāri, 65-66, 75; Mufarrij, I, 19; Al-Nujūm, V, 133.

<sup>51</sup> Al-Bāhir, 10; Al-Bundāri, 64, 75; Zubda, II, 106; Bar Hebraeus, 231-232; Mufarrij, I, 23; Al-Rawdatain, I, 65.

<sup>52</sup> Zubda, II, 106.

resist Tutush and therefore reluctantly acknowledged his claim. In 1093 A.D., probably in February of that year, Tutush passed by Aleppo aiming at Khurāsān and was joined by Aq-Sunqur, Yaghi-Siyān and Buzān. On their way they captured al-Raḥba and Nuṣaybin.

In the region of al-Moṣul they were faced by an 'Uqaylid army of 30,000 warriors led by Ibrāhīm b. Quraysh who had assumed power in al-Moṣul after the death of his brother Muslim. The Turkish army, which consisted of 10,000 warriors, was by the efforts of Aq-Sunqur able to inflict a severe defeat on the 'Uqaylids. The battlefield which lay a few miles from al-Moṣul was known as Muḍayya' and there a great number of the 'Uqaylids, including their Amir, lost their lives and property.

This victory enhanced the position of Tutush and gave him the mastery over the whole of Mesopotamia. He wrote to the Caliph of Baghdad demanding that he should proclaim him as Sultan. The Caliph refused to do so and said that could only be when Tutush had acquired Persia and the consent of all the Saljuqs. Tutush therefore proceeded towards Persia but when he arrived at the city of Tabriz, Aq-Sunqur and Buzān together with their followers deserted him.

They went to the city of al-Ray - near modern Teheran - where they joined Barkyāruq, son of Malik-Shāh, who had assumed succession to his father, Malik-Shāh. They helped Barkyāruq to strengthen his position and when they asked his leave to return to their own territories he accompanied them to al-Raḥba.

There Barkyāruq was able to make a pact between them and 'Alī b. Muslim b. Quraysh who became the outstanding Amir in the tribe of 'Uqayl after the death of his uncle Ibrāhīm. From al-Raḥba Aq-Sunqur, accompanied by his own men, and escorted by some of the 'Uqayli tribesmen together with some of Barkyāruq's troops proceeded to Aleppo which he reached in November of the same year.<sup>53</sup>

The desertion of Al-Sunqur and Buzān was a severe setback to Tutush's plans. He was obliged to leave Persia and to return to Syria. He first went with Yaghi-Siyān to Antioch and there he spent the winter of 1093 A.D. Afterwards he went to Damascus where he raised a large army and made preparation to resume his bid for the Sultanate. In Aleppo, Aq-Sunqur also made counter-preparations and aimed at preventing Tutush from departing from Syria or perhaps capturing Damascus from him. He received as reinforcements Buzān, the governor of Edessa, Karbugha, the governor of Al-Moṣul, Yosuf b. Ābiq, the governor of Al-Raḥba, together with their troops which comprised 2,500 horsemen.

He also recruited a great number from the tribe of Kilāb. It is noteworthy that Tutush gathered most of his recruits from

---

<sup>53</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 187v.-188r.; Al-Kāmil, X, 149-151; Al-Bāhīf, 13; Al-Muntazam, IX, 77; Ibn al-'Amīd, 574; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 134r.v., Zubda, II, 106, 108-110; Bughya, A., III, 272v.; Mir'at, A., Annals, 486; Bar Hebraeus, 232; Mufarrij, I, 22-25; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 214; Al-Bustān, 92v.; Al-Nujūm, V, 137-138; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 20v.-21r.; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 144; Al-Rawdatayn, I.65.

among the Bedouin tribes, especially from Kilāb. It would appear that after the fall of their dynasty, the Mirdāsids lost most of their control over the tribe of Kilāb. During Aq-Sunqur's reign the bulk of the tribe was under the leadership of Shibl. b. Jāmi' and seemed to dwell mostly in the south-western region of Aleppo. The remaining part of the tribe was led by the Mirdāsīd Amir, Waththāb b. Maḥmūd, who entered the service of Tutush.

On the whole, the relation between Aq-Sunqur and the tribe of Kilāb was not good. Aq-Sunqur was obliged to recruit the Kilābis in his army because the number of his Turkish troops was insufficient, and he did not receive from Barkyāruq any further reinforcements; also because Kilāb was the best, if not the only source of recruitment in northern Syria. He was aware of their attitude towards him and always suspected their loyalty

For similar reasons Tutush left Damascus and marched northward. At Ḥamāh he was joined by Yaghi-Siyān together with his troops of Antioch. His plan was to go to Antioch first and probably to prepare the second stage of his campaign from there. Tutush was, however, intercepted by Aq-Sunqur who was at the head of an army consisting of more than 6,000 troops (according to some chroniclers, more than 30,000 troops). On either Thursday, 25th May or on Saturday, 26th, the army of Aq-Sunqur engaged that of Tutush at the stream of Sab'in which lay six parasanges to the east of Aleppo. There Aq-Sunqur lost the day

because he hastened the engagement without proper formation of his army.

His suspicion of the loyalty of the Kilābīs was the reason which caused his mismanagement of the fight and because of this, during the fight, not only the Kilābīs but most of his Turcomans fled and left him at the mercy of Tutush. Aq-Sunqur fell prisoner to Tutush and was brought to his presence. We are told by eye-witnesses that when Aq-Sunqur was brought before Tutush he asked him what he would do if he, Tutush, were his prisoner. Aq-Sunqur's dignified reply was "' would execute you". "The same sentence has been passed upon you" replied Tutush and thereupon carried it out by his own hand.

On the following day Tutush took possession of Aleppo and remained there for three days, then proceeded towards Persia where he met his fate.

---

<sup>54</sup>Al-'Aẓīmī, 188r.v.; Al-Muntazam, IX, 77; Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', 134v.; Ibn al-'Amid, 575-577; Zubda, II, 107, 110-113, 117-119; Bughya, A., III, 268v.-271r., 272v.; Mir'āt, A., Annals, 486-487H; Mufarrij, I, 25-26; Al-Bāhir, 15; Al-Bundārī, 77-78; Ibn Nāṣir, 75-76; Al-Mukhtaṣar, I, 214-215; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 144-145; Al-Bustan, 92v.-93r.; Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 20v.-21r; Al-Rawḍatayn, I, 66; Al-Nujūm, V, 141, 155.

Chapter V

THE RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE

"History we know now is not merely or even primarily past politics. It is also past economics, past society, past religion, past civilisation - in short, past everything."<sup>1</sup>

Hitherto it was possible to depict, perhaps not fully, the past politics of the Emirate of Aleppo during the eleventh century. In turning the attention to the economic history of this emirate, we find it is impossible, for lack of sufficient or specific information, to write anything about it. As is well-known, the works of the Arabic geographers are a prime source of information concerning the economic history of the Muslim world. In the first volume of his book Bughyat al-Ṭalab, Ibn al-ʿAdīm quotes almost every account given by all the Arabic geographers up to the thirteenth century, about the emirate of Aleppo.<sup>2</sup> Some of these accounts, such as that of al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad al-Muḥallabī, which he wrote in his book al-Masālik Wa'l-Mamālik (generally known as Kitāb al-ʿAzīzī because he dedicated it to the Fāṭimid Caliph al-ʿAzīz, 975-996 A.D.) has survived to reach us only from his quotations.<sup>3</sup> Save for the

---

<sup>1</sup>S.T. Bindoff, 'Approaches to History, I'.

<sup>2</sup>Bughya, AS., 29-397.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 114-116.



quotation from the itinerary of the Baghdādī Christian physician Ibn Baṭlān (al-Mukhtār b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Abdūn) who, in 440 A.H./1048 A.D., had visited Aleppo and lived there for a short while, all the information given in the other quotations belong to periods before or after the eleventh century. Ibn Baṭlān's information is both inadequate and vague. All he says is "... and in it [al-Raḥba] countless kinds of fruits, and in it also nineteen kinds of grapes... and it [Aleppo] is a city which has little fruit and vegetables and wine except those which come from Byzantium..... and one of the wonders of Aleppo is that in the silk market [Qisariyat al-Bazz] there are twenty shops belonging to the agents [al-Wukalā']; 20,000 dinars' worth of goods sold in them every day and this has been uninterrupted for twenty years".<sup>4</sup>

Ibn Baṭlān was not the only traveller who visited Aleppo during the eleventh century. Nāsiri Khusrāu also visited it in 1047 A.D., almost a year before Ibn Baṭlān. After describing the city he says "This city is a place where they levy the customs [on merchandise passing] between the land of Syria and al-Rūm [Byzantium] and Diyār Bakr and Egypt and Iraq and there come merchants and traders from out all these lands to Aleppo." and, after visiting Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān he says "...

---

<sup>4</sup> Bughya, AS., 117; see also Al-Qiftī, 295-296; Yāqūt (Halab); Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'ah, 1, 241.

I saw its markets which are many, teeming with life... there are here also fig trees and olives and pistachios and almonds and grapes in plenty".<sup>5</sup> This scanty information of both Ibn Baḥlān and Nāsiri Khusrau is not enough on which to build an economic history of Aleppo at that time. In addition the works of the chroniclers add very little or nothing to our knowledge. They merely mention that in 1031, 1032, 1033, 1056, 1057, 1066, 1076 A.D. Syria, including Aleppo, was affected either by dearth or pestilence as a result of drought, plagues, locusts or earthquakes.<sup>6</sup>

-----

"And its Aleppo's population" writes al-Muhallabī in his book al-'Azīzī, "a mixture of peoples from Arabic and non-Arabic Mawālī" origins.<sup>7</sup> Some of the Arabs originated from the tribes

---

<sup>5</sup>P.P.T.S., IV, 1-3; Ta'rif, 582; Safar-Noma (Al-Khashshāb), 10-11.

<sup>6</sup>Al-Antākī, 272-272; Al-Kāmil, IX, 290, 298; XI, 95; Al-Muntazam, VIII, 246; Zubda, II, 10; Bar Hebraeus, 194, 209, 225-226, 230; Al-Bundārī, 49; Al-Nujūm, V, 59; Ibn Kathīr, XI, 112; Al-'Ibar, Dh., III, 218; Al-Durra, 369-370. In 359/970 an important treaty between Aleppo and Byzantium was formed. Ibn al-'Adīm gives full details of this treaty which contains valuable information concerning the economic relations between Aleppo and Byzantium during the latter part of the 10th century. It is hazardous to presume that similar conditions were extant during the 11th century because of political changes occurring during this century and for the lack of information, which is even more important. For this treaty, see Zubda, I, 163-168; A. Lewis, The Naval Power, 213; H.L. Adelson, Medieval Commerce, 55-56, 61-62, 143-144. For

of Tamukh and Quraysh.<sup>8</sup> There is information that some of the non-Arabs were of Kurdish origin. Āl-al-Khashshāb was one of the prominent families of Aleppo during the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries and it was of Kurdish descent.<sup>9</sup>

During the eleventh century (even before and after) Islam, Christianity and Judaism were the religions professed by the population of Aleppo. Because of this, it would, perhaps be more apt to classify the population of Aleppo as three major communities, Muslim Christian and Jewish.

Little or nothing is known of the Jewish community save that it inhabited a large section in the north-west of the city known as Maḥallāt al-Yahūd (i.e. the Jewish Quarter). Neither Ibn Baḥlān nor Nāseri ~~Khosrau~~ mention this community, but the latter however mentions that the city had four gates and one of them was known as Bāb al-Yahūd (i.e. the Jewish Gate). Ibn al-'Adīm says "... and this gate acquired its name because the Jewish quarter was immediately inside it and their cemetery lay outside the gate".<sup>10</sup> The Jewish community, presumably, had

---

the political changes of the 11th century, see B. Lewis, in Cambridge Medieval History, IV, part 1, 649.

<sup>7</sup>Bughya, AS., 114.

<sup>8</sup>Bughya, AS., 114-116, 460, 463-464, 494.

<sup>9</sup>Bughya, A., I, 18v.

<sup>10</sup>P.P.T.S. IV, 2; Safar Nama (Al-Khashshāb), 11; Al-Qifti, 295-296; Bughya, AS., 117; Yāqūt (Ḥalab); Baron, III,

its social and religious organisation and participated in the commercial life of Aleppo and the Muslim world, especially the Fāṭimid State. The members of this community spoke an Arabic dialect of their own and used both Arabic and Hebrew languages and characters in their writings.<sup>11</sup>

There is more detailed information concerning both the Muslims and the Christians and the relations between them. Before dealing with this it is well to mention that the life of the Christians of northern Syria, together with their relation with Muslims was shaped by special circumstances. Since the seventh century northern Syria had been the battlefield for both Muslim and Christian power. Perpetual religious strife gave this region and its inhabitants special attributes and made its impression on the entire domestic life.

Southern Syria adopted Islam from comparatively early times and it was not long before the local Syrians and the Muslim conquerors integrated. This was not the case in northern Syria where the local Syrians, most of whom were Christians, probably devout in their beliefs and resistant to every attempt to divert their faith, maintained a clear division between themselves and the Muslims. It is noticeable that there was always

---

104; V, 50, 311; VII, 247, 447; Jewish Encyclopaedia (Aleppo), . This gate retained its name until the reign of the Ayyubid al-Malik al-Zāhir (1186-1216). He destroyed this gate and built in its place a new one named Bāb al-Naṣr (i.e. victory gate) which has been maintained until the present day. Bughya, AS., 110.

<sup>11</sup> Zubda, I, 204; Mediterranean Society, I, 271, 294.

a large Christian community in northern Syria. This community remained large for several reasons among which was the struggle between the Byzantine Empire and the Muslim States. This struggle strengthened the Christians in their belief rather than subverted them from it. The Muslims who came to northern Syria (particularly before the 11th century) were, for the most part, troops devoted to their military commitments or nomadic tribes who held their religious beliefs somewhat loosely. The religious policies practised in both Byzantium and the Muslim world together with the lack of religious freedom and social security which often followed local disturbances or crises brought about the movement of many Christians to a country which they hoped would offer greater security. During the reign of al-Ḥākim (the Fāṭimid Caliph 996-1021) and as a result of his religious policy of ill-treatment and humiliation of both Jews and Christians in Egypt and southern Syria, great numbers of Christians migrated to north and north-western Syria and Byzantium.<sup>12</sup> Most of these Christians preferred north and north-western Syria rather than Byzantium because their beliefs did not coincide with the Byzantine Church.

There was always a large Armenian community in Aleppo and

---

<sup>12</sup>Al-Antākī, 201, 204, 207, 221, 222; Al-Kāmil, IX, 137; Bar Hebraeus, 185; Ibn al-Qalānisi, 68; Mir'at, B.M. 195r.v.; Akhbār, 63r.; Al-'Ibar, Dh., III, 66-67.

its surroundings (see below) and this was, perhaps, due to the policy pursued by the Byzantine Empire or as a result of invasions. In more recent times the policy of the Ottomans (the successive empire) has caused more Armenians to join the community which had migrated to these regions for similar reasons to those during previous centuries.

During the eleventh century, a large portion of the Christian community lived in the city of Aleppo itself. There is no direct information concerning their proportion of the whole population of the city. Ibn Baṭṭān reports that there were two chapels and one mosque in the citadel and six churches and one mosque in the city. This indicates that the Christians were a considerable part of the entire population.<sup>13</sup> It is noteworthy that the city's mosque mentioned by Ibn Baṭṭān had no minaret when he visited Aleppo. In a long list of names and

---

<sup>13</sup>Al-Qiftī, 295-296; Bughya, AS., 117; Yāqūt (Ḥalab). One of the city's churches was a large and famous cathedral built, according to the Arabic chroniclers, by Flavia Gulia Helena (248-327 A.D.; generally known as St. Helena, mother of the Emperor Constantine the Great). It remained the most venerated Christian temple in Aleppo until 518 A.H./1124 A.D., when a crusader army besieged the city. This army failed to capture Aleppo and, in revenge, exhumed the Muslim cemeteries. Muḥammad Ibn Yaḥya al Khashshāb, the caḍi of Aleppo at that time, made reprisal by taking possession of four of the six churches and converting them to Islamic mosques. Perhaps this is one of the many incidents which occurred at and after the coming of the crusaders and which show one reason why the power of the Christian Syrians dwindled. See Al-A'laq, I, 31, 41, 45-46; Al-Durr, 81-83, 115; Zubda, II, 224.

a description of Aleppo's mosques presented by Ibn Shaddād we find only one more mosque named al-Ghadā'irī in addition to the one mentioned by Ibn Baḥlān.<sup>14</sup> The erection of mosques began to spread in Aleppo after the Sāljuq conquest (see ch. IV, p.236).

Some Christians also lived in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and its surroundings. Some of their villages were distinguished by the prefix "Kafar" (i.e. village or town), such as Kafar-Nubbu.<sup>15</sup> The greater number of Christians occupied the northern districts of Aleppo and it would appear that most of them were of Armenian origin.<sup>16</sup>

The Byzantine revival of the tenth century, which enabled the empire to capture a large part of northern Syria and to annexe Armenia,<sup>17</sup> had a particular effect on the structure of the population in northern Syria. It increased the number of the

---

<sup>14</sup>This minaret was built during Aq-Sunqur's reign, see ch. IV, p.232; Al-A'ḥlāq, I, 44.

<sup>15</sup>Al-Durr al-Maknūn, 77v.; Yāqūt (Kafar-Roma, Kafar-Sut, Kafar-Ghamma, Kafar-Lātha, Kafar-Tahtha, Kafar-Nabbu, Kafar-Najd, Kafar-Dhubbin). These villages were in the region of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and other parts of the emirate of Aleppo and some of their inhabitants were Christians, as Yāqūt relates, Al-Jundī, I, 134.

<sup>16</sup>Mir'at, Sevim, II, 34; Al-Qiftī, 296; Bughya, AS., 139; Zubda, II, 12-13, 127; Al-A'ḥlāq, BM.59v.; Yāqūt (Tal-Bashir, 'Imm).

<sup>17</sup>Cambridge Medieval History, IV, part 1, 151, 169-171, 619; Vasiliev, I, 309-314.

the Christians and decreased that of the Muslims. It also brought about the revival of Christianity in Egypt and Syria. In spite of some instances of ill-treatment (credited by some authors as the major cause of the crusades) the epoch between the second half of the tenth century and the latter part of the eleventh was, in fact, a golden age for the Christians of Syria. Prior to this period little is heard of Christian activity hereabout, but from this period they are to be found everywhere, especially in the palaces and courts of the rulers. They monopolised much of the administration of Syria. Many of them occupied posts of vizier and chief clerk (Katib) and tax farmers. Al-Maqdisi states that at the end of the tenth century all the state officials in Syria were Christians.<sup>18</sup>

In Aleppo the vizier of Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās was a Christian by the name of Tādharus (Theodorus ?) b. al-Ḥasan. "This Christian had a great influence over Ṣāliḥ" says Ibn al-'Adīm. "He was the commander of both the military and administrative affairs [Ṣāḥib al-Sayf Wa'l-Qalam]. It has been said that governors, Cadis and those of lower ranks used to dismount to him" as a sign of homage.<sup>19</sup> Tādharus died with Ṣāliḥ (Ch. II,

---

<sup>18</sup> Al-Maqdisi, 183; Zubda, I, 132-144; Bar Hebraeus, 180; Ibn al-Qalanisi, 57-58, 60-61.

<sup>19</sup> Zubda, I, 232-234; Bughya, A., I, 219v.-221r.; Ta'rif, 566-568; Irshad, I, 215-216.



p.102) and when Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ became the amir of Aleppo he appointed the Christian Abu'l-Faraj al-Mu'ammil b. Yusuf al-Shammās as his vizier. Ibn al-'Adīm praises him and describes him as a good capable man. The brother of this vizier was the governor of the suburb of Aleppo. Ibn al-'Adīm relates that this governor rebuilt this suburb and its mosques. An interesting point which indicates the tolerance of the Christians of the city of Aleppo towards the Muslims is a matter which will be discussed below. The vizier of Maḥmūd b. Naṣr was also a Christian named Abu Bishr. He was wealthy and supported Maḥmūd by money and effort until he captured Aleppo. As a result of an intrigue Abu Bishr was killed by Maḥmūd's order. Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Yusuf b. Abi'l-Thurayyā was the man who plotted against Abu Bishr and killed him in order to gain his post. Ibn Abi'l-Thurayyā was killed by Naṣr b. Maḥmūd's order when he became Amir of Aleppo (see ch. IV, p.194). Ibn al-'Adīm cites some contemporary Muslims as saying that Abu Bishr died as a martyr and Ibn Abi'l-Thurayyā suffered the death of a dog. This, in turn, indicates the tolerant attitude of the Muslims of the city of Aleppo towards their Christian neighbours. One of Maḥmūd b. Naṣr's chief clerks (Katib) and sometime his vizier was a Christian named Zurra' b. Musā. Another one of his chief clerks was also a Christian by the name of Sa'id b. 'Isā (*i.e.* ~~Sa'id the son of Jesus~~) who was also a great poet. Once again,

a Christian named 'Īsa b. Biḡrus (i.e. Jesus, son of Peter) served as a vizier to Sābiq b. Maḥmūd, the last Mirdāsīd Amir.

In this conjunction it is worthy to note that our information concerning these Christian viziers (together with three other Muslim viziers) and chief clerks gives no indication of their function and therefore it is impossible to discuss the administration in Aleppo during the eleventh century.<sup>20</sup> In addition the sparse information concerning those who held the post of *cadi* adds nothing to clarify this administration.<sup>21</sup>

Many Christians were well educated men, poets and physicians (for there was a small hospital in Aleppo) and no doubt participated in the business life of the emirate.<sup>22</sup> They specialised in certain branches of trade which the Muslims did not try to undertake for religious and other reasons. The Bedouin origin of some of the Muslims precluded participation in certain industries such as blacksmith, gold and silver-smiths, masonry, etc. Islamic teaching forbade drinking and trading in wine and those trades akin to it, such as the keeping of public taverns and brothels.

---

<sup>20</sup> Bughya, A., VI, 172r.; VIII, 16r.-17v.; Zubda, I, 238, 269, 284-285, 293; II, 32-34, 48, 70; Al-Mukhtasar, I, 209; Al-Durr, 56.

<sup>21</sup> Al-'Azīmī, 177r., 184v.; Zubda, I, 232, 269; II, 92; Al-Dhahabī, OR 49, 92v.

<sup>22</sup> Al-Qiftī, 295-298; Y'āqūt (Ḥalab); Bughya, AS., 117, Bughya, A., III, 25v.; Zubda, I, 284-285.

In the emirate of Aleppo during the eleventh century there were many public taverns and inns (Mākhūr, Ḥānah, Khān and Funduq) where travellers with money could be provided with wine, women and song in addition to a night's lodging. This kind of house is mentioned by some chroniclers, travellers and poets of the period, such as Ibn Baṭṭān, Abu'l al-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī and his relative who was also one of his disciples, the chronicler Abu-Ghālib, Hammām b. Faḍl b. Ja'far b. al-Muhadhhab. Our information about the house which was in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān is perhaps a sufficient example. It is connected with an incident which occurred in 417 A.H./1026 A.D. This house was apparently situated in the suburb of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. The main structure of the building was wood and it housed several harlots and flautists whom we are told adorned their hands and feet with henna. It would appear that this house, though state owned, was let to a Christian tenant (Ḍāmin) who proffered varied entertainment and wine. In 1026 A.H. the Ḍāmin of this house tried to seduce a Muslim woman who, apparently, refused and came on a Friday to the Cathedral Mosque (al-Masjid al-Jāmi') and cried out "that Ṣāhib al-Mākhūr /i.e. the keeper of the tavern/ tried to rape her". All who were in the mosque rushed out, marched on the tavern and completely demolished the house and everything in it. This indicates that there was high tension in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān which was easily inflamed

by any ~~small~~ provocation. Religious fervour and disapproval of the things which were taking place in that house was probably at the root of the tension.

After the destruction of the tavern the people of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān became apprehensive that Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās, the amir of Aleppo, would take punitive action against them. Ṣāliḥ, who was not in Aleppo when the incident took place, returned there during the first week of November, 1027 A.D. and immediately ordered the arrest of all the notable personnel of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. Seventy people were cast into prison for more than seventy days (?) and Ṣāliḥ was advised by Tādharus to kill some of them, if not all. The celebrated Abu'l-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī, who had chosen to live in solitude for many years past, became alarmed at the gravity of the situation. For the first and last time he broke his solitude, left Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and went to meet Ṣāliḥ. When they met he pleaded for the lives and liberty of the prisoners. As a gesture of respect and perhaps propaganda, the plea was granted and the prisoners were released, not, however, without payment of 1,000 dinars as a fine.<sup>23</sup>

Tādharus advised Ṣāliḥ to inflict severe penalty on the people of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān because of his hatred towards them

---

<sup>23</sup> Al-Luzūmiyāt, II, 100, 188; Zubda, I, 233-234; Bughya, A., I, 219v.-221r.; Bughya, AS., 139; Ta'rif, 566-568; Al-Qifṭī, 295-298; Yaqūt (Halab, Antakia, Ladhiqiya); Irshād, I, 215-216.

and a desire for personal revenge. On a previous occasion the people of the village of Ḥās, which lay close to Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, had killed Tādharus' father-in-law, who was a priest (Khurī). After he heard the news of this Tādharus led some of Aleppo's troops and marched on Ḥās. He arrested some of the murderers whom he tortured and afterwards crucified. "When their bodies had been brought down from the crosses for funeral prayer and burial a great Muslim multitude attended the ceremony. The Muslims then said - in order to annoy the Christians - 'we saw white birds on them and they are nothing but angels'" thus indicating martyrdom. When Tādharus learnt what the Muslims of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān had said he was annoyed and waited for an opportunity for revenge. The release of the Ma'arrī prisoners did not put an end to the struggle between the Muslims and the Christians. In the year 420 A.H./1029 A.D., after the defeat of Ṣāliḥ's troops and his own death, together with that of Tādharus (see ch. II, pp.102-104) the Muslims of the districts surrounding Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān raided the Christian village of Kafar-Nubbu (or Nubbul) which was surrounded by a defensive wall. The Christians defended their village and killed some of the invaders but ultimately they were obliged to abandon their homes and to migrate to another nearby village under Byzantine control.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup>Zubda, I, 232-233; Ta'rif, 568; Al-Durr al-Maknūn, 77v.; Al-Jundī, I, 134.

It is questionable why the Muslims of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and its environment were hostile to their Christian neighbours while most of those in the city of Aleppo were tolerant. It was not the ordinary Muslims of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān who were intolerant but the highly educated Abu'l-'Alā' was even more so. After he mentions the woman and her cries in the mosque, Abu'l-'Alā' says that if the Muslims of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān had not supported her, the heaven of Allāh would have rained down fire and brimstone upon them. On several occasions in his poems Abu'l-'Alā' tries to prove the falsity of Christianity. He deplored the conversion of a certain Ḥāriq, who was more than thirty years of age, to Christianity. Abu'l-'Alā' reproved Ḥāriq's action and wondered how any sensible man could depart from the grace of Islam and prostrate himself before the cross. Abu'l-'Alā' went on to say that the prayer of the mosque was more rewarding than that of the patriarchs; for they had in their churches the enchantment of music and song, silken garments, velvet furnishing and the beautiful faces of monks and nuns, none of which had lasting value or any benefit. Abu'l-'Alā' wondered how Ḥāriq preferred the fire of hell to poverty, the meat of the pig to the stigma of a bad name. Abu'l-'Alā' believed that poverty should be endured and that it was no disgrace to wear the clothing of the common people.<sup>25</sup> An interesting

---

<sup>25</sup> Al-Luzūmiyāt, I, 129, 158; II, 188; III, 216-217.

point in Abu'l-'Alā's poem is that the Christians of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and probably the whole emirate of Aleppo were more prosperous than the Muslims. Abu'l-'Alā' appears to consider that Ḥārīq's conversion was due rather to prosperity than faith. On the other hand, there were some conversions from Christianity to Islam, but not necessarily for the love of Islam, as Abu'l-'Alā' declares. It was, he says, either for the acquisition of high posts, through fear or for marriage to a Muslim girl.<sup>26</sup>

It would appear that the amir of Aleppo used to approve and sometimes to appoint the religious leaders of the Christians. Al-Qiftī relates that after Ibn Baḥlān had entered Aleppo he presented himself to Ḥimāl b. Ṣāliḥ and asked him to appoint him to supervise the Christian worship. Ibn Baḥlān undertook the performance of the religious rites in a strictly orthodox manner. Some of the Christians hated Ibn Baḥlān's insistence on religious duties and succeeded in embarrassing him so much that he left Aleppo and retired to Antioch.<sup>27</sup>

There were some occasions when the governor of Aleppo conscripted both Christians and Jews for military duty. Such action took place in 1014 A.D. during the struggle for Aleppo between Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās and Maḥmūd b. Lu'lu'. When the latter tried

---

<sup>26</sup> Al-Luzūmiyāt, IV, 212.

<sup>27</sup> Al-Qiftī, 315; Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'ah, I, 241.

to quell Ṣāliḥ's rebellion and prevent him from invading Aleppo, he mustered an Aleppine army (see ch. I, p. 47 ). Ibn al-ʿAdīm describes Ibn Luʿluʿ' s action: "... and he collected his troops and mustered all who were in Aleppo of the rabble, commoners, Christians and Jews and obliged them to go with him... Ṣāliḥ sent a spy to Ibn Luʿluʿ' s army who informed him, on his return, that most of his [Ibn Luʿluʿ' s] troops were Jews and Christians."<sup>28</sup> It is worthy of mention here that when Maṅṣūr b. Luʿluʿ' was obliged to abandon Aleppo (see ch. I, pp. 50-51 ) disorder prevailed in the city for a short while - an opportunity which was seized by the Muslim mobs to pillage some houses and shops belonging to the Jews and Christians.<sup>29</sup>

The Muslims of Aleppo could be divided into two parts, Sunni and Shīʿa. Most of the Shīʿa professed the Imāmi doctrine (Twelver) and the rest were Duruz and Ismaʿili. Al-Muhalabī reports that the Muslim Aleppines professed Sunnism during his time. Ibn al-ʿAdīm comments on this by saying that this was the case until the year 351 A.H./969 A.D. when the Byzantine troops conquered Aleppo and killed most of its Muslim population(?). After this Sayf al-Dawla al-Ḥamdānī, its ruler, 945-967 A.D., restored some of the population from the inhabitants of Ḥarrān. Those professed the Shīʿa Twelver faith, as

---

<sup>28</sup>Zubda, I, 204-205.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., I, 208-209; Al-Antākī, 214.



did Sayf al-Dawla himself and by their efforts and those of Sayf al-Dawla, their faith spread in Aleppo and finally became predominant. This is confirmed by Ibn Baṭlān who relates that when he was in Aleppo: "... the divines [al-Fuqaha'] were dispensing the law [yufṭun] in accordance with the Twelver doctrine."<sup>30</sup>

There is no reference to the existence of an Ismā'ili mission or any followers in the city of Aleppo during our period. It would seem that the Ismā'ili missionaries who later appeared in Aleppo were, during this period, more successfully active in the region around the city. This is shown in the district of Jabal (mountain) al-Summāq and Sarṁīn (a large village which lies at the foot of this mountain).<sup>31</sup> This region was also the scene of a different kind of Ismā'ili activity, that is of the Duruz sect, who believed in the divinity of al-Ḥākim, the Fāṭimid Caliph. The Duruz missionary effort culminated in a rebellion which took place in the year 423 A.H./1031 A.D., during Naṣr b. Ṣāliḥ's reign. Al-Antākī gives detailed account of this rebellion. He says "... and it happened that a group of the Durzi assembled in

---

<sup>30</sup> Al-Qifṭī, 295-296; Yāqūt (Ḥalab); Bughya, AS., 115-117.

<sup>31</sup> Ibn Muyassar, II, 37; Yāqūt (Aqminas, Jabal al-Summaq); Zubda, II, 122; Bughya, AS., 41, 280-282; Al-Durr, 35, 164; The Assassins, 100, 103.

the Byzantine part of Jabal al-Summaq. They proclaimed their doctrine and destroyed all the mosques that were there. Their missionaries (du'ātīhim) and a great many of their followers took defensive positions in lofty and inaccessible caves. Their number increased as many people of the same faith joined them." They afterwards raided the nearby villages causing disturbance and harm alike to Muslims and Byzantines. The Byzantine governor of Antioch, assisted by Aleppine troops, besieged their caves; by use of fire and smoke the rebellion was quelled.<sup>32</sup>

In the Annals of 426 A.H./1034 A.D., al-Dhahabī mentions the death of a certain Abu Bakr al-Mannīnī, and says that he was the only religious man in Syria who was called Abu Bakr. By this al-Dhahabī indicates that the Shī'a' doctrines prevailed at that time throughout Syria; a condition he clearly emphasised when he enumerated the annals of 451 A.H./1059 A.D.<sup>33</sup> Al-Dhahabī's statement, however, does not accord with the facts. Concerning the emirate of Aleppo, Shī'a' doctrines were professed by the majority of the Muslims of the city of Aleppo and by a small minority of the urban and rural Muslims of the state. The Muslims of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān together with those of the region

---

<sup>32</sup>Al-Antākī, 265; Al-'Azīmī, 168r.; Zubda, I, 248-249; Itti'āz, Annals, 425 H; Al-'Ibar, Dh., III, 98; Al-Durra, 334.

<sup>33</sup>Al-Dhahabī, OR 50, 2r.; Al-'Ibar, Dh., III, 160.

of Kafar-Ṭāb professed Sunnism.<sup>34</sup> The orthodox belief of these Muslims perhaps provides an explanation of the rigid attitude they exercised toward their Christian neighbours. On the other hand the Shi'a' belief of the majority of Muslims in the city of Aleppo was the possible explanation of their tolerant attitude towards the Christians of the city. To this may be added another reason. Since there were in the city of Aleppo a minority of orthodox Muslims, the whole Muslim community was probably too pre-occupied with its own internal quarrel to pay attention to other religious communities.

There is scanty information about the Muslim Sunnis of the city of Aleppo and their quarrel with the Shi'a'. They probably occupied a special quarter in the northern part of the city called Baḥṣita. There is information about a clash between them and the Shi'a' which occurred on an 'Ashūrā' day (which commemorated the death of al-Ḥusain b. 'Alī, the grandson of the prophet), probably during the reign of Ṭhīmāl. This clash ended in bloodshed and the looting of what might be described as Aleppo's general library which was in the Cathedral Mosque.<sup>35</sup> Al-Khashshāb family which has already been mentioned as one of the prominent families of Aleppo, many of whose members held high posts,

---

<sup>34</sup> Bughya, A, VII, 190r.; Ta'rīf, 556-557.

<sup>35</sup> Ibn Sinān, 18; Yāqūt (Baḥṣita); Bughya, A., VII, 196r.v.; Ta'rīf, 556-557.

professed the Shi'a' (Twelver) faith.<sup>36</sup> Al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. 'Alī b. al-Mu'allim is the name of one of Aleppo's Twelver learned men and a religious leader. In addition to being a poet and well-informed in Arabic literature, he wrote two books on theology named Al-Tāji and Ma'alim al-Din. Unfortunately there is no information on the contents of these two books, since no copy of them appears to be extant and no quotation from them has reached us.

On the other side Sālim b. 'Alī, generally known as Ibn al-Ḥammāni, is the name of one of Aleppo's Sunni learned men and a religious leader. He was alive in 445 A.H./1072 A.D. and we know nothing about the content of his teaching and writing.<sup>37</sup>

The Shi'a' Twelver Aleppines were attached to their belief and violently resisted any attempt made to bring them back to the Sunni faith. This was manifested by Aleppo's long resistance to the Saljuqs, especially when the city was besieged by the Sultan, Alp-Arslan (see Ch. III, pp. 185-6). Previous to this siege in Shawāl 462 A.H./July 1070 A.D. Maḥmūd b. Naḡr had ceased to acknowledge the suzerainty of al-Mustansir, the Fāṭimid Caliph, and instead proclaimed the supremacy of both al-Qā'im, the 'Abbāsīd

---

<sup>36</sup> Bughya, A., I, 18v.; see also previous note no. 13.

<sup>37</sup> Bughya, F., 152r.v.; Bughya, A., VII, 196r.-197r.; Ta'rīf, 556-557.

Caliph, and Alp-Arslan, the Saljuq Sultan (see Ch. III, pp. 184-185). Mahmud did this after consulting and inducing the Twelver leaders of Aleppo. During the ceremony of the first Khutba in the names of al-Qā'im and Alp-Arslan, most of the people who were present protested by abandoning the mosque when the names of al-Qā'im and Alp-Arslan were recited. On the following Friday Mahmud posted Ibn Khān at the gate of the mosque and ordered him to kill everyone who would desert the mosque and not attend the ceremony. By this the ceremony was performed without interruption but shortly after, when probably Ibn Khān and his followers withdrew, the Shi'a Aleppines came to the mosque and, in protest, purloined all the prayer-mats saying "these mats belong to 'Alī, let Abu Bakr bring his own for the people to pray on". The proclamation of al-Qā'im and Alp-Arslan did not end the Shi'a belief in the city of Aleppo, for for a long time to come the Muezzins of Aleppo continued to use the Shi'a calls (Hayya 'Alā Khayr al-'Amal) to prayer.<sup>38</sup>

-----

In the history of Aleppo all the Rulers and Dynasties which dominated the state were alien in the sense that they were not of

---

<sup>38</sup> Al-Kāmil, X, 42-44; Zubda, II, 16-18; Bughya, A., I, 281v.-282r.; Al-Durra, 388-389; Al-Durr, 109.

Aleppine origins. No Aleppine had tried, or succeeded in establishing a local dynasty as had happened, for instance, in Tripoli. Presumably the reason for this was that Aleppo on account of its geographical position was always surrounded by greater powers who were alert and eager to capture it. The existence of alien rule did not mean that the Aleppines were deprived of participation in the management of state affairs. In fact, the people of Aleppo, as we saw, were, on many occasions, able to decide the future of their city and they had great influence in the business life of Aleppo. Of them were the merchants and the administrators who wielded the actual power of the emirate.

During the struggle for Aleppo between Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās and Maṅṣūr b. Lu'lu' (see Ch. I, pp. 47-48 ) chiefs from among the population of the city mediated between the struggling parties and participated in arranging the future rule of their city. Ibn Sinān al-Khāfajī, who professed Shī'a' (Twelver) and was a poet in the Mirdāsīd court, mentions Mukābir and Banukah as two of Aleppo's Twelver popular leaders. On the other hand, Ibn al-'Adīm describes them as members of the Shī'a' Twelver ghawghā' (i.e. rabble or vulgar) who led the Shī'a' in their clash with the Sunni,<sup>39</sup> which is mentioned below. But how the Shī'a' and the Sunni were organised and functioned we do not know, in fact

---

<sup>39</sup>Bughya, A., VII, 196r.v.; Ta'rīf, 557; Zubda, I, 206-207.

our information concerning the society classes, factions and parties is non-existent save for that concerning the militant organization of the Aḥdāth.

The Aḥdāth, says Claud Cahen "literally young men, a kind of urban militia, which played a considerable role in the 4th/10th to the 6th/12th centuries and is particularly well-known at Aleppo and Damascus. Officially its role is that of police, charged with public order, fire-fighting etc., ... the only distinction between them and any ordinary police is the local non-professional nature of their recruitment, but it is precisely that which gives them an effective function much more important and often quite different from that of police ... the term is found in earlier centuries in Iraq especially in Basra and Kufa in the second/eighth century, but also in Baghdad and elsewhere... the further question arises of the relation between the Syrian and Mesopotamian Aḥdāth and the Fityān and 'Ayyārūn, whose existence is documented in Iraq and the Iranian regions throughout the middle ages and who were also specially active from the 4th/10th to the 6th/12th centuries. These certainly played the role of active wing of the popular opposition to the official authorities... in fact the two institutions differ in their origin ... it may not be accidental that the boundary between cities with Fityān and those with Aḥdāth corresponds very closely to the ancient Byzantine Sasanid frontier, a fact which suggests that the

Aḥdāth may possibly be related to the ancient factions of the later Roman empire."<sup>40</sup>

The Aḥdāth movement in Syria was simultaneous with and similar to the 'Ayyārūn and Fityān movements which were Iraqi and were the outcome of the special circumstances prevailing through both countries. There is no evidence to connect the Aḥdāth organisation with the factions of the later Roman empire. In spite of the fact that Syria and upper Mesopotamia were under Byzantine rule before the Islamic conquest of the 7th century, there is no record to support the theory that such factions existed in Syria before the Islamic conquest. A foreign nation ruling another does not necessarily implant its constitution and customs upon the one that it rules. When Syria was under the rule of Rome, and later Constantinople, her social and religious influence on them was greater than those countries on her. Whilst Syria was under Byzantine rule she was more occupied by religious rather than social factions.<sup>41</sup>

The Aḥdāth was born and matured chiefly in Damascus and Aleppo; although these cities, during the Byzantine occupation, were not the principal cities of Syria. They were Antioch and Jerusalem. The Muslim conquest obscured, to a large extent, the fame of Antioch and some other cities which were prominent during the

---

<sup>40</sup> Encyclopaedia of Islam (new Ed.), I, (Aḥdāth).

<sup>41</sup> See Downey, History of Antioch, 574-578; Ostrogorsky, 95, 100, 107, 108; Cambridge Medieval History, IV, pt. I, 56-59.



Byzantine occupation and developed the importance of Damascus and, more particularly, that of Aleppo. What would be more likely than that the movement of the Aḥdāth was the outcome of the political and social circumstances which had dominated Syria and upper Mesopotamia since the second half of the third/ninth century. The Abbasid power declined; the strife with the Byzantine empire continued; the rise of independent Egypt and its policy towards Syria; the Qaramita revolutions and the Bedouin incurxions no doubt created instability and resentment among the urban population of Syria. Under these conditions it is conceivable that the inhabitants of cities and villages organised some kind of resistance to aggression or intrusion and some force to maintain social order.<sup>42</sup> Such a force originally created to serve public order eventually developed into a form of militia and was used for the personal gain of its leaders or other ambitious personalities. It is also probable that some rulers encouraged the militia by using the organisation as an instrument for their own purposes.

In Aleppo, during the 5th/11th centuries, the Aḥdāth (militia) were in their golden age, for their activity and influence over the city's affairs then reached its peak. Al-Mu'ayyad Fi al-Din, who was in Aleppo in the year 449 A.H./1057 A.D.,

---

<sup>42</sup>In 902, Aleppo was besieged by al-Qaramiṭa and when an Abbasid army of more than 10,000 troops failed to repulse them, the Aleppines organised a local resistance which was able to

says "... and in the city Al-Aleppo itself a group of people named the Aḥdāth, who possess it more than its possessors and who hold sovereignty more than its sovereign, between them and al-Magharibah literally the westerners - the name applied to Egyptian authority at that time] from old times are hatreds and feuds; its eyes could not sleep and its debt could not be repaid".<sup>43</sup> Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās captured Aleppo by the help of the Aḥdāth, whose leader Salim b. Mustafad (a son of a former page (ghulam) cf Sayf al-Dawla al-Ḥamdānī) opened the city's gate of Qinnasrin and welcomed Ṣāliḥ in the name of Aleppo's population (see Ch. II, p. 98). Ṣālim, together with his fellow Aḥdāth, aided Ṣāliḥ's troops in fighting the Fāṭimid garrison which had taken stronghold in the citadel. After the capture of the citadel, Ṣālim was rewarded by Ṣāliḥ who conferred on him the rulership of the city of Aleppo and entrusted to him the post of its Ra'is together with the leadership (muqaddamat) of the Aḥdāth. This is cited by Ibn al-'Adīm from Ibn al-Muhadhḥab, the Ma'arri chronicler of the 11th century. It does, however, indicate that both posts of Aleppo's Ra'is and the Aḥdāth leadership were in existence before.

There are references to the Aḥdāth as being active in Aleppo before this period, but we have no reference to the post of

---

foil the al-Qarāmiṭa attempt to capture the city, see Bughya, A., V., 231v.-233r.; Ṭabarī, 2222, 2231; for other similar examples see Zubda, I, 134-139.

<sup>43</sup>Al-Mu'ayyad, 172-173.

Aleppo's Ra'is. This, however, caused Professor Claude Cahen to suppose that this post was probably created for the first time for Sālīm by Ṣāliḥ. In the biography of Sālīm, Ibn al-'Adīm cites Ibn al-Muhadhdhab as saying that Sālīm was a distinguished person and one of Aleppo's famous military leaders (quwād). Sālīm, whose father served in the army of Sayf-al-Dawla, grew up in the same profession. It is therefore possible that there were many similar cases among the Aḥdāth; it is also conceivable that some ex-military men became absorbed into the Aḥdāth organisation and may have helped to develop its military character.

After Ṣāliḥ's death and during the reign of his son Naṣr, Sālīm retained his posts until the year 423 A.H./103, A.D., when a dispute arose between him and Naṣr. We do not know its reason but we know that it culminated in an open rebellion. Sālīm mobilised the city's Aḥdāth and mob and prepared himself to besiege the citadel where Naṣr had his residence. A Christian k̄atib by the name of Toma (Thomas) acted as envoy between Naṣr and Sālīm. Toma, however, distorted Sālīm's messages and exaggerated his demands. What his motive was is obscure. Because of this and without allowing Sālīm time for further organisation, Naṣr descended upon him and completely routed him which was an easy task, for most of the Aḥdāth had deserted Sālīm and Naṣr arrested him

and then put him to death.

Al-'Azīmī relates that Naṣr killed Sālim after consulting the Byzantine governor of Antioch, but he does not explain why. Although there is no information concerning the cause of the dispute, we know that Naṣr, in spite of his victory over the Byzantine emperor, Romanus III had asked for Byzantine pardon and protection and offered to pay an annual tribute (see Ch. II, pp. 122-124 ). It is possible to suppose that Sālim was not content with this arrangement which also probably displeased the population of Aleppo and Sālim attempted to make use of the opportunity for personal promotion.<sup>44</sup>

The death of Sālim left no significant diminution of the Aḥdāth power, neither did it affect their preference for the Mir-dāsīs; for after the short Fāṭimid occupation which followed the death of Naṣr, the Aḥdāth, as we saw, helped Thimāl to recapture Aleppo (ch. III, p.144 ). Once again, when Thimāl was obliged to abdicate his post in favour of a Fāṭimid ruler, the Aḥdāth resisted and after a while rebelled against the Fāṭimid governor and helped Thimāl's nephew, Maḥmūd b. Naṣr, to take possession (see Ch. III, pp.166-167 ).

---

<sup>44</sup>Al-Antākī, 245-246; Zubda, I, 227-230, 249; Bughya, A., VII, 201r.-202v.; Al-'Azīmī, 168r.; Arabica, V, 239-242.

On the occasions of dispute between the Mirdāsīd amirs for the rulership of Aleppo, such as that between Thimāl and Maḥmud (see Ch. III, p.177) and between Maḥmud and 'Atiyya, the Ahdāth played an effective part in deciding the future of each amir.<sup>45</sup> On some occasions the Ahdāth had been used as regular troops. 'Atiyya used them in raiding the Byzantine territory (see ch. III, p.175) and 600 of them were in the army of Muslim b. Quraysh when he fought against Sulaymān b. Qutulmush (see ch. IV, p.226).

These few examples illustrate how important was the role that the Ahdāth played in Aleppo during the 11th century. Their attitude towards the Turcomans and the Saljuqs, together with their participation in every event which took place in Aleppo during this period, has been discussed throughout this thesis and repetition is not necessary.

The Ahdāth used to receive a yearly payment; how much is not known and, on occasion of disorder they often demanded increased payment.<sup>46</sup>

---

During the 5th/11th century, Aleppo was "a fine city" and well populated. "It has a great wall," says Nāṣiri Khusrau,

---

<sup>45</sup>Zubda, I, 286-287, 294.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., 276-277, 294.

"whose height I estimate at 25 cubits." Most of its houses were built of stone, but because of the wall which limited the area of the city and because of the density of the population "... all the houses and buildings of Aleppo stand close one beside the other"<sup>47</sup>.

The city had insufficient sources of water for the Quwayq river was small and only in full spate in winter and dried up in the summer. In the north of Aleppo where lies the village of Hilān there were several springs. The waters of these springs were carried to Aleppo by canal, but the supply was inadequate and the canal services only the lower parts of the city; because of that, every house in Aleppo had its own cistern (sahriġ) which was frequently replenished by rain water.<sup>48</sup>

In spite of the fact that the 5th/11th century was a period of political instability and there is insufficient information to enable us to deal with the economic situation, it would appear that Aleppo was a prosperous city. Its population was "... a superior people both in face and figure (?); most of their complexions are either fair, rosy or olive and their eyes large and black. They have the best character and finest appearance of all human beings."<sup>49</sup> Al-Maqdisī says "and its /Aleppo/

---

<sup>47</sup>P.P.T.S., IV, 2; Bughya, AS., 114-115; Al-Maqdisī, 115.

<sup>48</sup>This was stated by Ibn Baṭlān, see Bughya, AS., 117.

<sup>49</sup>Bughya, AS., 114-115 (quotation from Kitāb al-‘Azīzī).

people have humour, wisdom and wealth".<sup>50</sup> Perhaps the humour was expressed in the forementioned incident of the silk bandage round the tower which had been struck by the stones from the mangonel (see ch. III, p. ).

A great number of poets had lived in the Mirdāsīd court and each one received an annual payment in addition to occasional prize bonuses. Among these poets there were three outstanding ones, Ibn Sinān al-Kahfājī, Ibn Ḥayyūs and Ibn <sup>Abī</sup> Ḥaṣṣīnā, who were dignified by the title of amir.<sup>51</sup> The bulk of their poetical works has survived and reached us. They contain valuable information which has been used throughout this thesis. The standard of these poets and their place in the history of Arabic literature, together with the cultural life of the emirate of Aleppo during the 11th century, is rather the topic of the student of Arabic literature than that of the student of Islamic history.

From the poems written by these poets, we know that the residence of the Mirdāsīds in the citadel of Aleppo comprised several halls. One of these halls was known as Dār al-Dhahab (i.e. the golden hall). Its floor was paved with red alabaster (marmar) and its walls were probably gilded. Another hall had a dome

---

<sup>50</sup> Al-Maqdisī, 115.

<sup>51</sup> Ibn Abi Ḥaṣṣīnā, I, 17, 22-25; Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 17, 18; Bughya, A., I, 65v., 66v., 74v.; Al-Kharīda, II, 53.

adorned by the picture of the rising sun. Maḥmūd b. Naṣr built a house and adorned its rooms and halls with gold, mosaic and coloured glass. These materials were used in such a way that they depicted scenes of battle, various kinds of birds, two giraffes, one elephant with its mahout, camels, the sea with its ships and fishes, palm trees and a view which showed the story of Majnun Layla. The floors were paved with various coloured marbles in beautiful designs; and pictures of glorious gardens were painted on the ceilings.<sup>52</sup>

Unfortunately none of these buildings have survived and no excavation has taken place in the citadel to improve our meagre knowledge of this period and to separate fact from fantasy in the work of poets and other literary sources.

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibn Abi Ḥaṣṣānā, I, 73, 292; Ibn Ḥayyūs, I, 322-324.



B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Ibn Abi'l-Dam (Ibrāhīm), Tārīkh Ibn Abi'l-Dam, Bodleian Library, Marsh, 60.
- Abu'l-Fidā' (Ismā'īl b. 'Alī), al-Mukhtaṣar Fī Akhbār al-Bashar, Istanbul, 1869.
- Ibn Abi Ḥaṣṣanā: (Al-Ḥasan b. 'Abdu'llāh), Diwān Ibn Abi Ḥaṣṣanā:, Ed. As'ad Ṭalas, Damascus, 1956.
- Ibn Abi'l Hayjā', Tārīkh Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā', Aḥmadiya Library No. 4915, Tunisia.
- Abu Shāma ('Abdu'l-Raḥmān b. Ismā'īl), al-Rawdatain Fī Akhbār al-Dawlatain al-Nuriya Wa'l-Ṣalahiya, Ed. Muḥammad Hilmi Aḥmad, Cairo, 1956.
- Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a (Aḥmad b. al-Qāsim), Uyun al-Anba Fī Ṭabaqāt al-Aḫḫaba, "al-Maḥḥba' al-Wahbiya", Cairo, 1882.
- Ibn al-'Adīm (Kamal al-Dīn 'Umar b. Aḥmad)
- a) Bughyat al-Talab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab, Aya Sofya, No. 3036; Aḥmad III, No. 2925; Fayḍ Allāh, No. 1404, Turkey.
  - b) Al-Insāf Wa'l-Taḥarrī (Ed. inside Ta'rīf al-Qudama Bi Abi'l-'Alā', pp. 483-578.
  - c) Zubdat al-Ḥalab Min Tārīkh Ḥalab, Ed. Sāmi Dahān, Damascus, 1951, 54, 68.

Ibn al-'Amīd (Jirjus), Tārīkh al-Muslimīn, Leiden, 1625.

Al-Antākī (Yahya b. Sa'id), Tārīkh Yahya b. Sa'id al-Antākī,  
Ed. L. Shikhu, Beirut, 1909.

Ibn 'Asākir ('Alī b. al-Ḥasan), Tārīkh Madīnat Dimashq, al-  
Zahiriya Library, No. 5316 General,  
205 Literature, Damascus, vol. I and  
Vol. II, pt. I, Ed. Ṣalāḥ Munajjid,  
Damascus, 1951; vol. X, Ed. Aḥmad Dihmān,  
Damascus, 1963.

Ibn al-Athīr, al-Ḥalabī (Isma'īl), 'Ibrat Uli al-Abṣār Fi Muluk  
al-Amsār, Brit. Museum, No. Add.23, 334.

Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī (Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī)

a) al-Kāmil Fi'l-Tārīkh, Ed. Carolos  
Johannes Tornberg.

b) al-Tārīkh al-Bāhir Fī al-Dawla al-  
Atābikiya, Ed. 'Abd'l-Qādir Aḥmad  
Ṭulymāt, Cairo, 1963.

Ibn Aybak al-Dawadārī (Abdu'llāh), al-Durra al-Mudi'ya Fi Akhbār  
al-Dawla al-Fāṭimiya, Ed. Ṣalāḥ Muna-  
jjid, Cairo, 1961.

Al-'Aynī (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad), 'Iqd al-Jumān Fi Tārīkh Ahl al-  
Zamān, Bayazid Library, No. 2317,  
Istanbul.

Al-Azdī ('Alī b. Zāfir), Akhbār al-Duwal al-Munqati'a, British  
Museum O.R. 3685; Gotha (East Germany)

Arab. 1555.

Al-'Azīmī (Muḥammad b. 'Alī), Tārīkh al-'Azīmī, Bayazid Library,  
Istanbul, No. 398; *Journale Asiatique*,  
1938.

Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī, Tārīkh al-Fariqī, Ed. B.A.L. 'Awaḍ,  
Cairo, 1959.

Badran (Abdu'l Qādir) Tahdhīb Tārīkh Ibn 'Asākir, Damascus, 1913.

Al-Bundārī (al-Faṭḥ b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad), Tārīkh Dawlat Al-  
Saljuq, Cairo, 1900.

Al-Dhahabī (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad)

a) Tārīkh al-Islam, British Museum O.R.  
49 and O.R. 50.

b) Al-'Ibar Fi Khabar Man Ghabar, Ed.  
Fu'ād al-Sayid, Kuwait, 1961.

c) Duwal al-Islam, British Museum  
O.R. 1558; Hyderabad, 1919.

Ḥāji Khalifa, Kashf al-Zunun 'An Asāmī al-Kutub Wa'l-Funun,  
Ed. Gustavus Fluegel, Leipzig, 1837.

Al-Ḥamawī (Muḥammad), al-Tārīkh al-Manṣurī, Ed. P.A. Gryaz-  
nevic, Moscow, 1960.

al-Ḥamawī (Yāqut b. Abdu'llāh)

a) Irshād al-Arib Ila Ma'rifat al-Adīb

(Mu'jam al-Udabā'), Ed. D.S.Margoliouth, Cairo, 1907-1927.

b) Mu'jam al-Buldān, Ed. Ferdinand Wustenfeld, Leipzig, 1867.

Ibn Hānī' (Muḥammad), Tabayīn al-Ma'āni Fi Sharḥ Diwān Ibn Hānī', Ed. Zāhid 'Alī, Cairo, 1933.

Ibn Ḥawqal (Muḥammad), Ṣurat al-Ard, Ed. J. H. Kramers, Leiden, 1939.

Ibn Ḥayyūs (Muḥammad b. Sulṭān), Diwān Ibn Ḥayyūs, Ed. Khalīl Mardam Bey, Damascus, 1951.

Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī (Muḥammad b. 'Alī), Jamharat Ansāb al-'Arab, Ed. L. Provinciale, Cairo, 1949.

Al-Iṣfahānī (Muḥammad b. Muḥammad), al-Bustān al-Jāmi' le-Jāmi' Tawārīkh Ahl al-Zamān, Aḥmad III Library, No. 2959, Istanbul; Bulletin d'Études Orientales, Tomes VII-VIII, Institut Français de Damas, Damascus, 1938.

Al-Iṣfahānī (Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, known as al-'Imād al-Kātib), Khariḍat al-Qaṣr Wa Jaridat al-'Asr, Ed. Shukrī Fayṣal, Damascus, 1955, 1959.

Al-Iṣṭakhri (Ibrahim b. Muḥammad)

a) Masālik al-Mamālik, Ed. J. de Goeje, Leiden, 1927.

b) Al-Masālik Wa'l-Mamālik, Ed.

Muhammad Jabir Abdu'l-Al al-Hayni,  
Cairo, 1961.

Ibn al-Jawzī ('Abdu'l-Raḥman), al-Muntazam Fi Tārīkh al-Muluk  
Wa'l-Umam, Hyderabad, 1940.

Ibn Junghul (Muhammad b. 'Alī), Tārīkh Ibn Junghul, British  
Museum O.R. No. 5912.

Ibn Kathīr (Ismā'īl b. 'Umar), Al-Bidāyah Wa'l Nihāyah, Cairo,  
1932.

Ibn Khaldun (Abdu'l-Raḥman), Al-'Ibar Wa Diwān al-Mubtada Wa'l  
Khabar, Ed. Dar al-Katib al-Lubniānī,  
Beirut, 1958.

Ibn Khallikān (Aḥmad b. Muhammad), Wafayāt al-A'yan (Dar al-  
Ma'mun Edn.), Cairo - no date.

Ibn Khayyāṭ (Khalīfa),

a) Ṭabaqāt Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Ed. S.  
Zakkar, Damascus, 1966-67.

b) Tārīkh Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, Ed. S.  
Zakkar, Damascus, 1967-68.

Khusrau (Nāsiri), Safar Namah, Arabic Trans., Tahya al-  
Khashshāb, Cairo, 1945.

Al-Ma'arri (Abu'l al-'Alā' Aḥmad b. Abdu'llāh b. Sulaymān),

a) Diwān Luzūm Mala Yazam, Ed. Ibrahim  
al-A'rābī, Beirut, 1952.

b) Diwān Saq̄ al-Zand, Ed. Amin  
Hindiya, Cairo, 1901.

Al-Maqdisī (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad), Aḥsan al-Taqaṣim, Ed. J. de  
Goeje, Leiden, 1877.

Al-Maqrīzī (Aḥmad b. 'Alī),

a) Itti'āz al-Ḥunafā' Bi Akhbār al-  
A'imah al-Fatimiyyin al-Khulafa,  
Aḥmad III Library, No. 3013, Istanbul;  
Ed. (part) Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl,  
Cairo, 1948.

b) Khiṭaṭ al-Maqrīzī, Cairo, 1906-1908.

Miskawīh (Aḥmad b. Muḥammad), Tajārib al-Uman, Ed. H.F. Amedroz,  
Cairo, 1914-15.

Al-Muayyad Fi'l-Dīn (Hibatu'llāh b. Musa), Sirat al-Muayyad Fi'l-  
Dīn Dā'ī al-Du'āt, Ed. Muḥammad Kāmil  
Ḥusain, Cairo, 1949.

Munajjim Bāshī (Aḥmad b. Luṭf Allāh), Tārīkh Ra'īs al-Munajjimin,  
Nur Uthmāniya Library, No. 3171,  
Istanbul.

Ibn al-Muqaffa' (Sawirus), Tārīkh Baḥāriqat al-Kanīsa al-  
Miṣriya, Ed. Yassā Abd al-Masīh,  
D.H.E. Burmester and 'Azīz Suryāl  
'Atiyya, Cairo, 1959.

Al-Musabbiḥī (Muḥammad b. 'Ubaidu'llāh), Akhbār Miṣr.....

Escorial Library, Cod. 534, pt. 2.

Ibn Muyassar (Muḥammad b. 'Alī), Akhbār Miṣr, Ed. H. Massé,

Cairo, 1919.

Ibn Nāṣir (Abu'l Ḥasan 'Alī), Akhbār al-Dawla al-Saljuqiya

(or Zubdat al-Tawārikh), Ed. Muḥammad

Iqbāl, Lahore, 1933.

Ibn al-Qalānisi (Ḥamza), Dhayl Tārīkh Dimashq, Ed. H.F.A. Amedroz,

Beirut, 1908; English Trans. H.A.R. Gibb,

"The Damascus Chronicler of the Crusade",

London, 1932.

Al-Qalqashandī (Abu'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Abdu'llāh),

a) Subḥ al-A'asha Fi Ṣinā'at al-Insha,

Ed. Dar al-Kutub al-Misriya, Cairo,

1913-1918.

b) Ma'āthir al-Inafa, Ed. 'Abdu'l-

Sattar Aḥmad Farraj, Kuwait, 1964.

c) Qalā'id al-Jumān, Ed. Ibrahīm al-

al-Ibyārī, Cairo, 1964.

Al-Qifṭī (Ali b. Yusuf), Ikhbār al-Ulama Bi Akhbār al-Hukamā',

Ed. Julius Lipp, Leipzig, 1902.

Al-Rāwandī (Muḥammad b. 'Alī), Rāhatu'l Ṣudur Wa Āyatu'l -

Surur Fi Tārīkh al-Dawla al-Saljuqiya,

Arabic Trans. by A. Shawārby; A.N. Has-

anin and F.M. Sayyad.

- Al-Şafadī (Khalīl b. Aybak), al-Wāfī Bi'l-Wafayāt, Vol. IV,  
Ed. H. Ritter, Damascus, 1959.
- Al-Safadī (Rizq Allāh Maqarius), Tarikh Duwal al-Islam,  
Cairo, 1907.
- Al-Şayrafī ('Alī b. Munjib), Al-Ishāra Ila Man Nāl al-Wizāra,  
Ed. 'Abdu'llāh Mukhlis, Cairo, 1923.
- Ibn Shaddād (Muḥammad b. 'Alī), al-A'laq al-Khaṭīrah (Damascus,  
pt.) Ed. Sāmi Dahān, 1956; (Aleppo  
pt.) Ed. Dominique Sourdel, Damascus,  
1953.
- Ibn Shākīr al-Kutubī (Muḥammad),  
a) 'Uyūn al-Tawārikh, British Museum  
O.R. No. 3005.  
b) Fawāt al-Wafayat, Ed. Muḥammad  
Muhyi'l-Din Abdu'l Hamid, Cairo, 1951.
- Ibn al-Shihna (Muḥammad), Al-Durr al-Muntakhab Fi Tarikh, Mamlakat  
Halab, Ed. Yusuf b. Ilyān Sarkis, Beirut,  
1909.
- Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī (Yusuf b. Qizughli), Mir'āt al-Zamān, British  
Museum, O.R. No. 464; Aḥmad III, No.  
2907c, Istanbul; Bibliothèque Nation-  
ale Arab, No. 1506, Paris; Extract  
from the part contains Tarikh Ghars  
al-Ni'ma, Ed. 'Alī Sevim, Ankara, 1968.



- Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī ('Abdu'llāh b. Muḥammad b. Sa'id),  
Diwān ibn Sinān al-Khafājī, Beirut,  
 1868.
- Al-Ṭabari (Muḥammad b. Jarīr), Tarikh al-Rusul Wa'l-Muluk, Ed.  
 J. de Goeje, Leiden, 1879-1901.
- Ibn Taghri Bardī (Abu'l-Maḥāsin Yusuf), Al-Nujum al-Zāhira Fi  
 Muluk Miṣr Wa'l-Qāhira, Ed. Dar al-  
 Kutub al-Miṣriya, Cairo, 1929-1936.
- Al-'Umari (Aḥmad b. Yaḥya), Masālik al-Absār, Aya Sofya, No. 3417,  
 Istanbul.
- Al-'Umari (Yasin b. Khayr Allāh), Al-Durr al-Maknūn Fi Ma'āthir  
 al-Mādiya Min al-Qurun, British Museum  
 Add. No. 23, 312.
- Unknown Chronicler, Hawādith al-Sinīn, Aḥmad III, No. 2981,  
 Istanbul.
- Ibn al-Warīdī ('Umar), Tatimmat al-Mukhtaṣar Fi Akhbār al-Bashar,  
 Cairo, 1868.
- Ibn Wāṣil al-Ḥamawī (Muḥammad b. Sālim), Mufarrij al-Kurub Fi  
 Akhbār Banī Ayyub, Vol. I, Ed. Jamāl  
 al-Dīn al-Shayyāl, Cairo, 1953.
- Al-Yāfi'ī (Muḥammad b. Abdu'llah), Mir'at al-Jinān Wa 'Ibratu'l-  
 Yaqzān, Hyderabad, 1919.
- Ibn al-Zubair (al-Qāḍī al-Rashīd), al-Tuhaf Wa'l-Hadāyā,  
 Ed. Muḥammad Ḥamīd Allāh, Kuwait, 1959.

Bar Hebraeus (Abu'l Faraj, Son of Aron), The History of the World, Eng. Trans. by Ernest A. Wallis Budge, Oxford, 1932.

Psellus (Michael), Fourteen Byzantine Rulers (Eng. Trans. Penguin Edn., London, 1966).

Al-'Amilī (Muḥsin al-Amīn), A'yan al-Shī'a', Damascus, 1935.

Al-'Arīnī (al-Sayid al-Baz), Mu'arrikhu al-Hurub al-Salībiyah, Cairo, 1962.

Al-Ghazzī (Kamil b. Ḥusain), Nahr al-Dhahab Fi Tārīkh Ḥalab, Aleppo, 1921.

Al-Jundī (Salīm), Tārīkh al-Ma'arra, Damascus, 1963.

Kaḥḥala (Umar Riḍa), Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn, Damascus, 1957-61.

Surūr (Muḥammad Jamal al-Dīn), Al-Nufudh al-Fāḥimī Fi Bilād al-Shām Wa'l-'Irāq, Cairo, 1964.

Al-Ṭabbākh (Muḥammad Rāghib), I'lām al-Nubala Bi Tārīkh Ḥalab al-Shahbā, Aleppo, 1923-25.

Ṭalas (Muḥammad As'ad), Al-Athār al-Islāmiya Wa'l-Tārīkhiya Fi Ḥalab, Damascus, 1956.

Ta'rif al-Qudama Bi Abi'l 'Alā', Ed. Ṭaha Husain, Mustafa al-Ssaqqā, Abdul-Raḥīm Maḥmud, Abdul-Salām Ḥārūn, Ibrāhīm al-Ibyārī and Ḥamid Abdu'l-Majīd, Cairo, 1944.

Al-Zirkilī (Khair al-Dīn), Al-A'lām, 2nd ed. Cairo - no date.

-----

Adelson, H.L., Medieval Commerce, Princeton, 1962.

Baron, S.W., Social and Religious History of the Jews, New York,  
1952.

Baynes, N.H. and Moss, H. St. B., Byzantium, Oxford, 1962.

Brockelmann, Carl, Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur and its  
Supplement, Leiden, 1937-43.

Cahen, C., Mouvements Populaires et Autonomisme Urbains dans  
L'Asie Musulmane du Moyen Age I, Arabica  
Vol. V, pp. 225-250, 1958.

--- Pre-Ottoman Turkey (Eng. Trans.), London,  
1968.

---- J. Sauvaget's Introduction to the History  
of the Muslim East (Recast, California,  
1965).

Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. V, Ed. J.A.Boyle, Cambridge, 1968.

Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. IV, Ed. Joan M. Hussey, Cam-  
bridge, 1966-67.

Crawford, Robert W., Reconstruction of a Struggle Within the  
Mirdasid Dynasty in Halab, Journal of  
American Oriental Society, Vol.LXXIII,  
pp. 89-95, 1953. (Yale Univ.)

Downey, J., History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest, Princeton, 1961.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, new Edn., London, 1960.

Finberg, H.P.R., Approaches to History, London, 1962.

Fischel, W., Jews in the Economic and Political Life of Medieval Islam, London, 1937.

Goitein, S.D., Mediterranean Society I, California, 1967.

Historians of the Middle East, Ed. B. Lewis and P.M.Holt, Oxford, 1964.

History of the Crusades, I, Ed. K.M.Setton, Philadelphia, 1955.

Jewish Encyclopedia, The, London and New York, 1925.

Kawar, Irfan, Arethas, Son of Jabalah, Journal of American Oriental Society, Vol. LXXV, pp. 205-216, 1955 (Yale Univ.).

Lewis, A., Naval Power and Trade in the Mediterranean, A.D. 500-1100, Princeton, 1951.

Lewis, B., The Assassins, London, 1967.

--- Three Biographies from Kamāl-al-Dīn  
(The Biography of Khalaf b. Mula'ib),  
Melanges Fuad Koprülü, pp. 332-336,  
Istanbul, 1953.

Ostrogorsky, J., History of the Byzantine State, Eng. Trans. Hussey, Oxford, 1968.

Palestine Pilgrimage Text Society, Vol. IV, London, 1897.

- Rosenthal, F., A History of the Muslim Histrography, Leiden,  
1968: Arabic Trans., by Şalih al-  
'Alī, Baghdad, 1963.
- Sauvaget, J., and Weit, G., Repertoire Chronolgique d'Epi-  
graphie Arab, Vols. V & VI, Cairo, 1934.
- Sauvains, H., "A Dinār of Sālih cbn Mirdās of Aleppo," The Numis-  
matic Chronicle and Journal of the  
Numismatic Society, N/s, Vol. XIII,  
pp. 335-341, London, 1873.
- Sevim, A., Suriye Selçuklulari, I, Ankara, 1965.
- Thompson, James Westfal, Economic and Social History of the  
Middle Ages, New York, 1928.
- Vasiliev, A., History of the Byzantine Empire, Winsconsin,  
1964.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Al-A'ḥlāq	<u>Al-A'ḥlāq al-Khaṭīrah</u>
Ibn Abi'l-Dam	<u>Tārīkh Ibn Abi'l-Dam</u>
Ibn Abi Ḥaṣenah	<u>Diwān Ibn Abi Ḥaṣenah</u>
Ibn Abi'l-Hayjā'	<u>Tārīkh Ibn Abi'l Hayjā'</u>
Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a	<u>'Uyun al-Anba Fi Ṭabaqāt al-Aṭuba</u>
<u>Akhbār</u>	<u>Akhbār al-Duwal al-Munqati'a</u>
Ibn al-'Amīd	<u>Tārīkh al-Muslimīn</u>
Al-Āmili	<u>A'yān al-Shī'a</u>
Al-Antākī	<u>Tārīkh Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Antākī</u>
Ibn 'Asākīr	<u>Tārīkh Madīnat Dimashq</u>
Al-'Azīmī	<u>Tārīkh al-'Azīmī</u>
<u>Al-Bāhir</u>	<u>Al-Tārīkh al-Bāhir Fi al-Dawla</u>
	<u>al-Atābikiya</u>
Baron	<u>Social and Religious History of</u>
	<u>the Jews</u>
Brock	<u>Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur</u>
<u>Bughya</u>	<u>Bughyat al-Ṭalab Fi Tārīkh Ḥalab</u>
al-Bundārī	<u>Tārīkh Dawlat Āl-Saljuq</u>
<u>Al-Bustān</u>	<u>Al-Bustān al-Jāmi' la Jamī'</u>
	<u>Tawārīkh Ahl al-Zamān</u>
Al-Dhahabī	<u>Tārīkh al-Islām</u>
Downey	<u>History of Antioch in Syria...</u>

<u>Al-Durr</u>	<u>Al-Durr Muntakhab Fi Tārīkh</u>
	<u>Mamlakat Halab</u>
<u>Al-Durr al Maknūn</u>	<u>Al-Durr al-Mamnūn Fi Ma'athir al-</u>
	<u>Madiya Min al-Qurun</u>
<u>Al-Durra</u>	<u>Al-Durra al-Mudī'ya Fi Akhbār al-Dawla</u>
	<u>al-Fā'imīya</u>
<u>Duwal</u>	<u>Duwal al-Islām (Dhahabī)</u>
<u>Fawāt</u>	<u>Fawāt al-Wafayāt</u>
Fischel	<u>Jews in the Economic and Political</u>
	<u>Life of Medieval Islam</u>
Ḥajī Khalifa	<u>Kashf al-Zunun 'An Asāmi al-Kutub</u>
	<u>Wa'l-Funun</u>
Ibn Ḥanī	<u>Tabyīn al-Ma'ani Fi Sharḥ Diwān</u>
	<u>Ibn Ḥanī</u>
<u>Hawādith</u>	<u>Hawādith al-Sinin</u>
Ibn Ḥawqal	<u>Surat al-Ard</u>
<u>Ibn Ḥayyūs</u>	<u>Diwān Ibn Ḥayyūs</u>
Bar Hebraeus	<u>The History of the World</u>
H.M.E.	<u>Historians of the Middle East</u>
<u>Al-'Ibar (Dh)</u>	<u>Al-'Ibar Fi Khabar Man Ghabar</u>
<u>'Ibrat</u>	<u>'Ibrat Uli al-Absār Fi Muluk al-Anṣar</u>
<u>'Iqd</u>	<u>'Iqd al-Jumān Fi Tārīkh Ahl al-</u>
	<u>Zamān</u>
<u>Irshād</u>	<u>Irshād al-Arīb Ilā Ma'rifat al-Adīb</u>

<u>Al-Iṣṭakhri</u>	<u>Masālik al-Mamalik</u>
<u>Itti'āz</u>	<u>Itti'āz al-Hunafa Bi Akhbār al-</u> <u>A'ima al-Fatimiyyin al-Khulafa</u> (Sh indicates the part edited by al-Shayyal)
<u>Jamhara</u>	<u>Jamharat Ansābal-'Arab</u>
J.A.O.S.	<u>Journal of American Oriental Society</u>
<u>Al-Jundī</u>	<u>Tārīkh al-Ma'arra</u>
Ibn Junghul	<u>Tārīkh Ibn Junghul</u>
<u>Al-Kāmil</u>	<u>Al-Kāmil Fi'l-Tārīkh</u>
Ibn Kathīr	<u>Al-Bidayah Wa'l Nihayah</u>
<u>Al-Kutubī</u>	<u>'Uyun al-Tawārīkh</u>
Ibn Khaldūn	<u>Al-'Ibar Wa Diwān al-Mubtada Wa'l-</u> <u>Khabar</u>
Khalīfa	<u>Tārīkh Khalīfa B. Khayyāṭ</u>
<u>Al-Kharīda</u>	<u>Kharīdat al-Qaṣr Wa Jarīdat al-'Aṣr</u>
<u>Al-Khiṭaṭ</u>	<u>Khiṭaṭ al-Maqrīzī</u>
<u>Al-Luzūmiyāt</u>	<u>Diwān Luzūm Mala Yalzam</u>
<u>Ma'āthir</u>	<u>Ma'āthir al-Ināfa</u>
<u>Al-Maqdisī</u>	<u>Aḥsan al-Taḡāsīm</u>
<u>Masālik</u>	<u>Masalik al-Abṣār</u>
<u>Mir'at</u>	<u>Mir'at al-Zamān</u> (The initial Sevim indicates the part edited by 'Alī Sevim.)



Miskawīh	<u>Tajarib al-Umam</u>
Al-Muayyad	<u>Sirat al-Muayyad Fi al-Din...</u>
<u>Mufarrij</u>	<u>Mufarrij al-Kurub Fi Akhbār Bani</u> <u>Ayyub</u>
<u>Al-Mukhtaṣar</u>	<u>Al-Mukhtaṣar Fi Akhbār al-Bashar</u>
Munajjim	<u>Tārīkh Ra'is al Munajjimin</u>
<u>Al-Manṣūrī</u>	<u>Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī</u>
<u>Al-Muntaẓam</u>	<u>Al-Muntaẓam Fi Tārīkh al-Muluk</u> <u>Wa'l-Umam</u>
Ibn al-Muqaffa'	<u>Tārīkh Baṭāriqat al-Kanisa al-</u> <u>Misriya</u>
Al-Musabbiḥī	<u>Akhbār Miṣr...</u>
Ibn Muyassar	<u>Akhbār Miṣr</u>
Ibn Naṣīr	<u>Akhbār al-Dawla al-Saljuqiya</u>
<u>Al-Nujūm</u>	<u>Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira...</u>
N.Ch.	<u>Numismatic Chronicle...</u>
P.P.T.S.	<u>Palestine Pilgrimage Text Society</u>
Psellus	<u>Fourteen Byzantine Rulers</u>
Ostrogorsky	<u>History of the Byzantine State</u>
<u>Qalā'id</u>	<u>Qalā'id al-Juman...</u>
Ibn al-Qalānisi	<u>Dhayl Tārīkh Dimashq</u>
Al-Qifti	<u>Ikhbār al-Ulama Bi Akhbār al-Ḥukama</u>
Al-Rāwandi	<u>Rāhatu'l-Ṣudur...</u>
<u>Al-Rawḍatayn</u>	<u>Al-Rawḍatayn Fi Akhbār al-Dawlatayn</u>

R.C.E.A.	<u>Repertoire Chronologique d'Épi- graphie Arab</u>
Al-Ṣafadī	<u>Tārīkh Duwal al-Islām</u>
Saqt	<u>Diwān Saqt al-Zand</u>
Al-Ṣayrafī	<u>Al-Ishāra Ila Man Wal al-Wizāra</u>
Setton	<u>History of the Crusades</u>
Sevim	<u>Suriye Selçüklulari</u>
Ibn Sinān	<u>Diwān Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī</u>
<u>Subh</u>	<u>Subh al-A'asha Fi Sina'at al-Inshā</u>
Al-Ṭabbākh	<u>I'lām al-Nubala Bi Tārīkh Ḥalab al-Shahba</u>
Al-Ṭabari	<u>Tārīkh al-Rusul Wa'l Muluk</u>
<u>Tahdhīb</u>	<u>Tahdhīb Tārīkh Ibn 'Asākir</u>
<u>Ta'rīf</u>	<u>Ta'rīf al-Qudama Bi Abi'l 'Alā', and Al-Inṣāf Wa'l Tahhari</u>
<u>Al-Tuhaf</u>	<u>Al-Tuhaf Wa'l-Hadāya</u>
Vasiliev	<u>History of the Byzantine Empire</u>
<u>Wafayāt</u>	<u>Wafayāt al-A'yān</u>
<u>Al-Wafī</u>	<u>Al-Wafī Bi'l-Wafayāt</u>
Ibn al-Warādī	<u>Tatimat al-Mukhtaṣar Fi Akhbār al-Bashar</u>
Al-Yafī'i	<u>Mir'āt al-Jinan Wa 'Ibrat al- Yaqzān</u>

Yāqūt

Mu'jam al-BuldānZubdaZubdat al-Halab Min Tārīkh Halab

Initial A attached to the name of any book indicates that the copy is in the Library of Ahmad III, A.S. in the Library of Aya Sofya, F. in the Library of Fayḍ-Allāh, Istanbul, B.M. - British Museum.

26 Radjab 681/30 October 1282 in Damascus.

Ibn Khallikān was a man of keen intellect, a shrewd observer, well versed in all legal matters, and just and impartial in his judgement; he was also very cultured, sociable, witty, and a lover of the pleasures of life. He was very fond of poetry and a connoisseur of the *Dīwān* of Mutanabbī. Amongst his friends were the Egyptian poets Bahā' al-Dīn Zubayr [q.v.] and Ibn Maṭrūḥ (*Wafayāt*, no. 821). Above all he had a liking for historical studies, so much so that he began to collect materials on the lives of persons who for some reason or other had gained fame. Later on he arranged his notes alphabetically according to the *ism* of the person concerned. Thus began his famous biographical dictionary *Wafayāt al-a'yān wa-anbā' abnā' al-zamān*, which contains only persons whose year of death the author could ascertain. He omitted on purpose (1) the Companions of the Prophet, (2) the transmitters of the second generation (*tābi'ūn*) with few exceptions, and (3) all caliphs, because information about persons belonging to one of these groups was easily available in biographical and historical works. He began with the arrangement in 654/1256 at Cairo, but when in 659/1260 he had come to the article on Yaḥyā b. Khalīd b. Barmak (no. 816) he had to stop, owing to his transfer to Damascus; it was only after his return to Cairo in 669/1271 that he could revise and finish his work in 672/1274. This book, intended by its author as a historical compendium, is a mine of information, especially in those parts where he speaks of contemporaries, whilst in the articles on men of earlier times he often quotes sources which are either lost or not yet published. He himself took pains to improve his book; his autograph (in the British Museum, *Cat.* no. 1505 and *Supplement* no. 607) is full of emendations and marginal notes. This and the popularity of the book explain also the differences in the number and serial order of the articles in manuscripts and editions. A supplement, *Fawā'id al-Wafayāt*, was written by Muḥammad b. Shākir al-Kutubī (d. 764/1363). There exist also translations into Persian and Turkish.

*Bibliography*: Yāfī, *Mir'āt al-djinnān*, iv, 143-7; Subki, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya*, v, 14 f.; Taṣḥköprüzāde, *Miftāḥ al-sa'āda*, i, 208 f.; Ulughkhānī, *Zafar al-wāliḥ*, ed. E. D. Ross, i, 184 (quoting al-Birzālī's *Mu'djam*); Ibn al-'Imād, *Shadharāt al-dhahab*, v, 370 f.; see also Quatremère, *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks par Makrizi*, i/2, 180-9, 271; Brockelmann I, 326-8; S I, 561; and de Slane's introduction to his translation of Ibn Khallikān's Biographical Dictionary.

(J. W. FÜCK)

**IBN KHAMĪS**, ABŪ 'ABD ALLĀH MUḤ. B. 'UMAR B. MUḤ. B. 'UMAR B. MUḤ. B. MUḤ. B. 'UMAR B. MUḤ. AL-ḤIMYARĪ, AL-ḤADRĪ AL-RU'AYNĪ, AL-TILIMSĀNĪ (and not al-Tūnūsī as Ibn Ḳunfudh mistakenly says), Arab poet born at Tlemcen in 650/1252 and assassinated at Granada in 708/1308.

On his origins, which he traces to the tribe of Ḥimyar in the Yemen, there is known only what he himself states in his poems; of the early part of the 58 years of his life we know only that he knew poverty and lived in "a room in a *funduk* with sheepskins for bed-covers", that he was able to give himself freely to pleasures, of which he later repented in his poems, and that he received a very profound literary education, to judge by his work and by his appointment, in 681/1282, to the office of personal secretary of the sultan Abū Sa'īd 'Uḥmān I b. Yaḡmūrāsān (681-703/1282-1303).

It is not known how long he occupied this post. In 688/1299, the traveller al-'Abdarī, who was passing through Tlemcen and who had a great admiration for him, found him in difficult circumstances. Ten years later, Tlemcen was invested by the Marinid Abu Ya'qūb Yūsuf (685-706/1286-1307) and the siege lasted a hundred months, until the besieger was assassinated. Although the exact date and the manner are unknown, it was during this siege that Ibn Khamīs left his native town, following an attempt on his life by those in power who accused him of being in favour of a surrender of the city. This at least is what he himself insinuates in two of his poems. He went to Ceuta, at that time governed by Abū Ṭālib 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥ. b. 'Aḥmad al-'Azafī and his brother Abū Ḥātim; there he attempted to establish himself as a teacher, but his attempt failed, his own pupils, instigated by a rival named Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Abi 'l-Rabī', having baffled him from the start by hurling at him embarrassing grammatical questions. He went to Algeciras, then to Malaga and finally, in 703/1304, to Granada. Everywhere he earned his living by teaching and by writing poems in which he gives himself the "pleasure of praising" the great. The ruler of Granada at this time was Muḥammad III, known as al-Maḥlū' (701-8/1302-9), whose vizier, Ibn al-Ḥakīm Muḥ. b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ibrāhīm (660-708/1262-1308), was an important personality of the period and by way of being a patron. Returning from a long voyage in the east, the latter had passed through Tlemcen where he had met Ibn Khamīs. At Granada his court was attended by scholars and men of letters; he invited Ibn Khamīs to join it, thus assuring him at last an easy life, in return of course for laudatory poems. In 706/1306, Ibn Khamīs returned to Malaga on a visit, then went to Almeria where the general Ibn Kumāshā, a subordinate of Ibn al-Ḥakīm, hastened to welcome him. He loved to travel—"I am", he said "like the blood; I put myself in motion every spring". He never forgot Tlemcen, and dreamed of returning there. But, one morning, on the feast of the breaking of the fast in the year 708/1309, he was surprised in his dwelling at Granada by a riot resulting from the coup d'état provoked by Abu 'l-Djuyūsh Naṣr b. Muḥammad, who seized power (708-13/1309-14); a certain 'Alī b. Naṣr, called al-Abkam (= the dumb), killed him with a lance. The reason for the murder was his connexion with Ibn al-Ḥakīm, who was killed on the same day.

The biographers of Ibn Khamīs describe him as a scholar, philosopher, sage, astrologer, alchemist, heresiographer, and littérateur. But there is no positive evidence for these attributes and all that is certain is that he was a poet. All that have survived of any works he may have written are poems. They are said to have been collected by a certain *ḳāḍī* Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥ. b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥaḍramī, who has not been further identified, in a collection entitled *al-Durr al-nafīs fī shi'r Ibn Khamīs*, of which nothing more is known. The poems of Ibn Khamīs are nevertheless accessible, if not entirely, at least in large part. They are scattered throughout the works of al-'Abdarī, Yaḥyā Ibn Khalīd, Ibn al-Ḳāḍī and al-Maḳḳarī, who reproduces Ibn al-Khaṭīb. Ibn Maṣṣūr was able to collect of them sixteen *ḳaṣīdas*, totalling more than 610 verses, ten of them each consisting of more than 30 verses and two reaching 80 verses each.

We find in them the traditional themes: *madḥ*, *hidā'ā*, *fakhr*, sometimes preceded by *nasīb*. He praises the Banū Zayyān of Tlemcen, the traveller

Ibn Rushayd and especially the vizier Ibn al-Ḥakīm, who has protected the poet and confounded his enemies, and who has power, courage, generosity, etc. . . . He directs his satire against the Banū Yaḡhmūr (sic), who have attempted to have him assassinated and who are thus responsible for his exile far from his own small country, bruised by anarchy, who have "forfeited his loyalty for a cheap return" and who are proud, pitiless and vile tyrants. He prides himself on his illustrious ancestry: Mudjāshī<sup>c</sup>, Nahshal, Ḥimyar, Sakāsik, etc.

Apart from this, his poems are embroidered with proper names and unusual words, revealing a depth of culture which it is surprising to find in a native of 7th/13th century Tlemcen of modest circumstances. His works are composed against a background of the stories of Arab, Persian and Greco-Roman antiquity: Hermes, Socrates, al-Fārābī, al-Suhrawardī, Sayf b. Dhī Yazan, 'Amr b. Hind, Nu'mān, Imru' al-Qays and many others form a gallery of the famous. In addition, his guiding principle as regards form is summarized in a verse: "He who does not chew over obscure (*hūshī*) language does not taste the savour of the art of good expression (*balāgha*)". This strange precept was not merely a theoretical one, and some of his poems are impossible to understand without a good dictionary. This is probably the reason why he has formerly been classed, with Shanfarā, Ta'abbata Sharran and Sulayk b. 'Amir, among the "stallions" (*fuḥūl*) of Arabic poetry.

*Bibliography*: Yahyā Ibn Khaldūn, *Bughyat al-ruwād fi dhikr al-mulūk min banī 'Abd al-Wād*, Algiers 1903, i, 10-43, 117; Ibn Kunfudh, *Wafayāt*, ed. H. Pérès, Algiers, n.d., 53, no. 708; Ibn al-Kāḍī, *Durrat al-hidjāl*, ed. Allouche, Rabat 1934, i, 163, no. 470; Ibn Maryam, *Bustān*, Algiers 1908, 225; Maḳkarī, *Nafḥ al-fīb*, Cairo 1949, vii, 280-95; idem, *Azhār al-riyād*, Cairo 1939, ii, 301-36; J.-J.-L. Bargès, *Complément de l'histoire des Béni-Zeiyan*, Paris 1887, 22-4; Abdesselam Meziane, *Ibn Khamīs, poète tlemcenien du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in *Deuxième congrès de la Fédération des sociétés savantes de l'Afrique du Nord à Tlemcen 14-17 avril 1936*, Algiers 1936, ii, 1057-66; 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. Maṣṣūr, *al-Muntakhab al-nafīs min shi'r Ibn Khamīs*, Tlemcen 1365; 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Djilālī, *Ta'rīkh al-Djazā'ir al-'āmm*, Algiers 1955, ii, 146. (M. HADJ-SADOK)

IBN AL-KHASHSHĀB, ABŪ MUḤAMMAD 'ABD ALLĀH B. AḤMAD B. AḤMAD B. AḤMAD AL-KHASHSHĀB (afterwards called IBN AL-KHĀSHSHĀB) AL-NĀIḤWĪ (this form for his name is given by his contemporary Ibn al-Djawzī, *al-Muntazam*, x, Ḥaydarābād 1358, 238); his place of birth is unknown, while the date given for his birth, 492/1099, is not certain (see the criticism of Ibn Khallikān, ii, 289). He lived in Baghdād and died there on 3 Ramaḍān 567/30 April 1172, a date generally accepted.

Ibn al-Khashshāb is a complex character. There was in him an insatiable intellectual curiosity. Among his teachers were al-Djawālīkī and Abū Sa'āda Ibn al-Shadjārī, but he went to hear all the teachers of repute of his day, and he read incessantly. In short, he learnt practically everything that could be learnt at that time in Baghdād. He studied the Islamic sciences, mention being made of *farā'id* (division of inheritances) and *nasab* (genealogy). He excelled in grammar (*naḥw*), and then in *ḥadīth*. In addition, he had a knowledge of arithmetic, geometry (*ḥandasa*) and logic (*manṭīk*), and according to Yāḳūt even of *falsafa* (philosophy).

He was a teacher, who spoke well and easily; he

knew how to crack a joke successfully, and moreover he had very beautiful handwriting. Among his pupils were Abū Sa'd al-Sam'ānī and 'Imād al-Dīn al-Iṣbahānī; the latter composed a dithyrambic panegyric of him (*Khārīdat al-ḥaṣr*, i, *al-Kīsm al-'Irāqī*, Damascus 1375/1955, 28, and al-Kifṭī, *Inbāh*, ii, 102). But, apart from such rewarding teaching, his great intellectual activity bore very little fruit: four *radd*s (refutations), his reaction to what he read or to accepted teaching; three *sharḥ*s which he did not complete, and certain other writings. Something was lacking in all this great activity. Al-Kifṭī (*op. cit.*, 101) speaks of the *dadjar*, the black mood, to which he was subject. Here we have an indication that his nervous equilibrium was unsatisfactory. This point may explain the lack of control which revealed itself even in his dress and conduct and which was the cause of adverse criticism; and he was also accused of avarice.

The *radd*s: *Radd* of Ibn Bābashādh in his *Sharḥ* to the *K. al-Djūmal al-kabīr* of al-Zadīdjādī (Ḥādīdjī Khalīfa, ii, no. 4197). *Radd* of Abū Zakariyyā' al-Tibrīzī in his *Tahdhīb* of the *Islāh al-manāḳik* of Ibn al-Sikkīt (*ibid.*, i, no. 828). *Radd* of Abū Sa'āda Ibn al-Shadjārī, last *madjlīs* of his *Amālī*, on the subject of verses of al-Mutanabbī (*ibid.*, i, no. 1180). Only one has been preserved, the *Radd* of the *Maḳāmāt* of al-Ḥarīrī, in manuscript with varying titles (Brockelmann, S I, 494), published under the title *al-Istidrākāt 'alā Maḳāmāt al-Ḥarīrī wa-'ntīṣār Ibn Barrī* (Istanbul 1328) and also following these *Maḳāmāt* (Cairo 1326); see also Ḥādīdjī Khalīfa, i, no. 1319. On the question of his glosses on the subject of the *Durrat al-ghawwās* of al-Ḥarīrī and the reply of Ibn Barrī, see Ch. C. Torrey, *Orient. Studien Th. Nöldeke gewidmet*, Giessen 1906, i, 212-3.

The *sharḥ*s: *Sharḥ* to the *K. al-Luma' fi 'l-naḥw* of Ibn Djinnī. *Sharḥ* to the *Muḳaddīma fi 'l-naḥw* of the vizier Ibn Hubayra. The only one to have survived is the *Sharḥ* to the *K. al-Djūmal fi 'l-naḥw* of 'Abd al-Kāhīr al-Djurjānī, which he called *al-Murtadjal fi sharḥ al-Djūmal*, MSS at Gotha (211) and elsewhere (Brockelmann, S I, 504).

Ḥādīdjī Khalīfa (v, no. 11019) also refers to his *al-Lāmi' fi 'l-naḥw* and *Mawālīd ahl al-bayt* (vi, no. 13360), which does indeed seem to be his work and which is relevant to what has been called his knowledge of *nasab*.

Two works not mentioned in the sources consulted have survived in manuscript. MS Köprülü 1393/5 (five folios) (MSO, xiv, 1911, 193, no. 57) contains *al-Luma' fi 'l-kalām 'alā lafẓat amīn al-musta'mala fi 'l-du'a' wa-ḥukmihā*, a study on the word *amīn* (amen). MS Cairo<sup>2</sup>, iii, 281-2, has preserved *al-Kaṣīda al-badī'a al-'arabiyya al-djāmi'a li-shatāt al-fadā'il wa 'l-rumūz al-'ilmīyya*, dedicated to Abu 'l-Barakāt Ibn al-Anbārī (like himself, a pupil of al-Djawālīkī); it is a versified work on ten subjects relating to the Islamic sciences, enumerated in the Catalogue (282) referred to, and repeated by Brockelmann (S I, 494). This Catalogue gives the reference: see 'Abd al-Kādir al-Maghribī in *al-Bayyināt fi 'l-dīn wa 'l-idjtimā' wa 'l-adab wa 'l-ta'rīkh*, i, 204-17.

*Bibliography*: In addition to the references in the text: Brockelmann, II, 696 and S I, 493-4; H. Suter, *Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber und ihre Werke*, Leipzig, 1900 no. 298. Arabic sources: information was gathered together by Yāḳūt, *Mu'djam al-udabā'*, xii, 47-54 = *Irshād*, iv, 286-8 and Kifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt*, Cairo 1371/1952, ii, 99-103. For the date of his birth, Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, ii, 288-90, no. 323. In

the other authors mainly repetitions: Abū Aḥmad al-Yāfi'ī, *Mir'āt al-djānān*, Ḥaydarābād 1338, iii, 381-2; Ibn al-ʿImād, *Shadhārāt*, Cairo 1350, iv, 220-2; Suyūfī, *Bughya*, 276-7, copied Yāqūt, references given above; etc. See references in Kīfī. *Inbāh*, ii, 99, n. 1. (H. FLEISCH)

**IBN AL-KHAṢĪB**, AḤMAD B. AL-KHĀṢĪB and AḤMAD B. ʿUBAYD ALLĀH [see AL-KHAṢĪBĪ].

**IBN AL-KHAṢĪB**, ABŪ ʿALĪ AḤMAD B. ISMĀʿĪL B. IBRĀHĪM B. AL-KHĀṢĪB AL-ANBĀRĪ, *kātib* and man of letters of the 3rd/9th century, called NAṬṬĀHA and known also, as his grandfather Ibrāhīm had been (Ibn al-Muʿtazz, *Ṭabaqāt*, 92), as al-Khaṣībī, after the ancestor of the family, the governor of Egypt al-Khaṣīb b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, who had been praised by Abū Nuwās (see E. Wagner, *Abū Nuwās*, Wiesbaden 1965, 70 ff. and index).

Often confused with the viziers Aḥmad b. al-Khaṣīb and his grandson Aḥmad b. ʿUbayd Allāh [see AL-KHAṢĪBĪ], he was in fact only the secretary of ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭāhīr (d. 300/913); according to the *Fihrist* (Cairo ed., 181), he was executed by Muḥammad b. Ṭāhīr (d. 296/908-9), but this may have been the son of ʿUbayd Allāh (d. 301/914); however, no further details are available on this person, who has nevertheless a permanent place in Arabic epistolography (see e.g., A. Z. Šafwat, *Djāmhārāt rasāʿil al-ʿArab*, iv, 362-4).

Ibn al-Nadīm (Cairo ed., 180) and, after him, Yāqūt (*Udabāʿ*, ii, 227-30) attribute particularly to Naṭṭāha a voluminous collection of letters, a *K. al-Ṭabīkh*, a *K. Ṭabaqāt al-kuttāb*, a *K. Šifat al-nafs* and a collection of private letters; Ibn al-Nadīm states that the majority of his letters are *ikhwānīyyāt* and notes that he had carried on a correspondence with Ibn al-Muʿtazz. He was also well known as a poet, and some lines of his have survived.

*Bibliography*: in the article; see also Ḥuṣrī, *Zahr*, 113 (correcting *baṭāha* to *Naṭṭāha*). (ED.)

**IBN AL-KHAṢĪB**, ABŪ BAKR AL-ḤASAN B. AL-KHĀṢĪB, astrologer who lived in the 2nd/8-9th century, in the circle of the Barmakids (cf. in Ibn al-Kīfī the mention of a *Kitāb al-Manṭhūr* dedicated to Yahyā b. Khālid). He was known in Europe under the name of "Alkasīn filius Alkasit" (cf. colophon of MS Bibliothèque Nationale 7.934 and Derwischt, *Bibliographie générale de l'astronomie*, London 1964), or more frequently under that of "Albubather" (Scheibel, *Astronomische bibliographie*, Breslau 1792, under year 1492). He was given the flattering description of "Auctor astronomiae perspicuus". This "astronomer", to judge by the works which have survived (cf. Brockelmann), was primarily an astrologer. Little is known of his life except that he was of Persian origin and lived for a long time at Kūfa. His learning reflects strongly this origin and the special position which astrology had acquired among the Persians. Probably of "Sabian" sympathies, he practised with enthusiasm the art of *ikhṭiyārāt*, *masāʿil* (*electiones*, *interrogationes*). He made use of "lots" (*sahm*, *pars*, cf. al-Bīrūnī, *Kitāb al-Tafhīm*, ed. Djalāl Paymānī, 440). Going beyond the apparently scientific reserve affected by Ptolemy in his *Tetrabiblion* (*opus quadripartitum*), he enjoyed speculating on the compatibility and incompatibility of the planets, signs and houses of the Zodiac, and "lots". He also used *haylādī*/hyleg. He was also bold enough to predict the duration of states and dynasties (*taḥwīl sinī ʿl-ʿālam*, an idea of Zurvanite or Indian origin). He earned thus the wrath of his biographer Ibn al-Kīfī, who complains of having been misled by the falseness of these prophecies, based on the

absolute confidence which Ibn al-Khaṣīb placed in the geographical dominance of the sign of Gemini over Egypt. He thus was a man of resource, with an ample supply of prescriptions of all kinds, whose enormous repertoire probably gained him the goodwill of his patrons and later the interested approbation of foreign civilizations. The work which earned him the most lasting success was the *Mughnī fi ʿl-mawāʿid*, *De nativitatibus*, an extract from a sort of astrological encyclopaedia to which he had given the Persian name of *Kār-i mihtar* ("The Practice of the Prince"?). The text of it is preserved in the Arabic collection in the Escorial, in Latin translation in the manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale mentioned above and in the two Sessa editions published in Venice in 1492 and 1501. Ibn al-Khaṣīb's translator was the Jewish scholar Plato of Tivoli, whose manuscript was the basis for the works of Sessa. Two centuries later, the learned librarian of the Elector of Saxony, Johannes Milius, drew attention to and wrote a commentary on the works of Albubather. The *De nativitatibus* was from then on inseparable from the *Centilogium* of the pseudo-Hermes Trismegistus, with which Sessa linked it in a single volume (Milius, *Memorabilia bibliothecae ienensis sive Designatio manuscriptorum*, 199). At the end of his career, as at the beginning, Albubather's works formed an integral part of Hermetic literature.

*Bibliography*: In addition to the works mentioned in the article, see *Fihrist*, 272; Ibn al-Kīfī, ed. Khāndjī, Cairo, II, 4; Brockelmann, I, 221, S I, 394. (J.-C. VADET)

**IBN AL-KHAṬĪB**, ABŪ ʿABD ALLĀH MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABD ALLĀH B. SAʿĪD B. ʿABD ALLĀH B. SAʿĪD B. ʿALĪ B. AḤMAD AL-SALMĀNĪ, vizier and historian of Granada, who bore the *laqabs* of Lisān al-Dīn and Dhu ʿl-wizāratayn, apart from those by which he was designated after his death. Of Arab descent through the sub-tribe of the Salmān, a clan of the Murād of the Yemen, he came from a family which was established in Syria and which arrived in the Iberian peninsula in the 2nd/8th century, took up residence in Cordova, and then moved successively to Toledo, Loja and Granada. At first the family was known by the name Banū Wazīr, but after Saʿīd al-Salmānī it had the name Banu ʿl-Khaṭīb.

Lisān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb was born in Loja, about 50 km. from Granada, on 25 Rādjab 713/15 November 1313, but he was educated in Granada where his father had settled in order to enter the service of the sultan Abu ʿl-Walīd Ismāʿīl. He had numerous eminent teachers who are listed by his biographers and, thanks to their instruction and to his own particular aptitudes, he succeeded in acquiring a vast fund of knowledge which later enabled him to win distinction in various branches of learning and to write many works, whose titles number more than 60. After his father's death in the battle of Salado or Tarifa on 7 Djumādā I 741/30 October 1340, his talents and learning enabled him to enter the service of sultan Abu ʿl-Ḥadīdjādī Yūsuf b. Ismāʿīl as secretary, under the administrative and technical direction of the vizier Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. al-Djāyṣ; when the latter died of the plague in the middle of Shawwāl 749/mid-January 1349, Ibn Khaṭīb was appointed to the office of *kātib al-inṣhāʿ*, head of the royal chancellery, with the title of vizier; he retained this office in the reign of Muḥammad V al-Ghānī bi-ʿllāh who raised his rank, and it was then that he assumed the title of Dhu ʿl-wizāratayn. After Muḥammad V's deposition (760/1358-9), Ibn al-Khaṭīb's fortune changed for some years; the

*ḥādīq* Ridwān, the protector of Ibn Khaṭīb, who had enjoyed great influence and authority in that sovereign's reign before his fall, was assassinated, Lisān al-Dīn was put in prison, and it was only as a result of the intervention of his friend Ibn Marzūk, secretary of the Marinid sultan Abū Sālim, that he regained his freedom and was permitted to go to Morocco, accompanying the dethroned sovereign into exile. He travelled throughout the territory of the Marinids and finally settled in Salé where he acquired estates and wrote some of his works (see A. M. al-Abbādi, *Mu'allafāt Lisān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb fi 'l-Maghrib*, in *Hespéris*, xlv (1959), 247-53). When Muḥammad V was restored to the throne in Djumādā II 763/March-April 1362, Ibn al-Khaṭīb returned to Granada where he was restored to the office of vizier and became the chief dignitary of the court. But some years later, finding himself the victim of intrigues and fearing the worst, he seized the opportunity provided by a tour of inspection of fortresses in the western part of the kingdom of Granada to cross over to Ceuta and, from there, to Tlemcen (773/1371-2), where he was very favourably received by the sultan Abū Fāris 'Abd al-'Azīz; throughout the short reign of his son and successor Abū Zayyān Muḥammad al-Sa'īd (a minor), he was safe from the demands of Muḥammad V that he should be sent to Granada for trial, for he had been unjustly accused of heresy, among other crimes, as a result of the calumnies of his influential rivals in Granada, especially the *ḥādī* al-Nubāhī and the vizier Ibn Zamrak. When Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-'Azīz was dethroned, Abu 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Abī Sālim was proclaimed his successor; then for a short time, through the hostility of one of his enemies, Sulaymān b. Dāwūd, who held important offices at the Marinid court, Ibn al-Khaṭīb experienced the harshest days of his life. Cast into prison, he was brought to trial, through the influence of Ibn Zamrak, who had succeeded him as chief minister of Granada and who had elected to be his accuser, before a private court set up for this purpose, and, although no conclusive sentence seems to have been pronounced in spite of the wishes of those who were in favour of his execution, he was put to death at the instigation of Sulaymān b. Dāwūd, being strangled in prison, at the end of 776/May-June 1375.

Ibn al-Khaṭīb was the greatest Muslim writer of Granada and an almost unparalleled source for knowledge of the history and culture of the end of the 7th/13th and of the greater part of the 8th/14th century. He distinguished himself in almost all branches of learning and wrote works on history, poetry, medicine, *adab* and mystico-philosophic subjects. The chancellery correspondence that came from his pen, in its beauty of style, represents, in the words of one author "a marvel of literature"; there is a specimen of it in the *Rayḥānat al-kuttāb wa-nu'djat al-muntāb*, from which M. Gaspar y Remiro published and translated various texts in his *Correspondencia diplomática entre Granada y Fez (siglo XIV). Extractos de la «Raihana Alcuttab» ... (Mss. de la Bibl. del Escorial)*, Granada 1916. His journeys as ambassador to the Marinid sultans and during his exile in Morocco as well as in his capacity of overseer of fortresses in the kingdom of Granada and also in other circumstances gave him the opportunity to write various *riḥlas*, *risālas* and *maḥāmas* which have enjoyed a well-deserved reputation (for some of these, see A. M. al-Abbādi, *Mushāhadāt Lisān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb fi bilād al-Maghrib wa 'l-Andalus (Madjma'a min rasā'ili-hi)*,

Alexandria 1958, who re-publishes the *Khaṭrat al-ṣayf fi riḥlat al-shi'ā' wa 'l-ṣayf; Muṣāḥharāt Mālaḥa wa-Salā*, translated, from the text of Müller in his *Beiträge*, i, 1-13, under the title *El "Parangón entre Málaga y Salé"*, by E. García Gómez, in *al-Andalus*, ii (1934), 183-96; and *Mi'yār al-ikhtibār fi-dhikr al-ma'āhid wa 'l-diyār*, edited earlier by Simonet, in *Descripción del reino de Granada bajo la dominación de los naseritas*, Madrid 1861, and by Müller in his *Beiträge*, i, 45-100; finally, 'Abbādi gives for the first time an edition of a *Riḥla* of Lisān al-Dīn across the Maghrib taken from the *K. Nuṣāḍat al-djirāb fi 'ulālat al-ighṭirāb* (ms. Escorial 1755), the whole preceded by an introduction and accompanied by notes and a bibliography, all helpful).

Ibn al-Khaṭīb is also the author of medical works such as *al-Ma'lūma* and the *Risāla fi takwīn (takawwun?) al-djanin* (cf. Renaud, in *Hespéris*, xix (1942-5), 97 ff., xxxiii (1946), 213 ff.) and of an anthology of poetry entitled *Djaysḥ al-tawshīḥ* (cf. Stern, *Two anthologies of muwašṣaḥ poetry: Ibn al-Khaṭīb's ...*, in *Arabica*, ii (1955), 151-69), without counting the poems of his own composition which occur in his works. Pending the completion of Mme. Arié's thesis on the writings of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, the most complete list of his works is that given by al-Maḥḥari in the final sections of the *Nafḥ al-ṭib*, to which one must refer for everything relating to this great figure of the politics and literature of Granada (see also Ibn Khaldūn; Pons Boigues, *Ensayo*, 334-47, no. 294; and Brockelmann, II, 260-3 and S II, 372).

In spite of Ibn al-Khaṭīb's large corpus of writings, which also include certain works on mystico-philosophic subjects such as the *Rawḍat al-ta'rif bi 'l-ḥubb al-sharīf* (ms. Damascus Zāhiriyya, *taṣawwuf* 85) and others (see 'Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Abd Allāh, *al-Falsafa wa 'l-akhlāq 'ind Ibn al-Khaṭīb*, Tetuan 1953 and, lastly, Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Ṭiṭṭawānī, *Ibn al-Khaṭīb min khilāl kutubih*, which have no apparatus criticus), it is above all as an historian that he is renowned. In this field of writing, we may select in particular: (1) *al-Iḥāta fi ta'rikh (var. akhbār) Gharnāṭa*, a long monograph on Granada divided into two parts containing the description of the town and the biographies of celebrated personages, including the *amīrs*, who were born or lived in Granada or who visited it, with most interesting historical notes, in some cases unique; only a number of incomplete editions have appeared: Cairo 1319/1901-2, 2 vols., very imperfect; Cairo 1955, one vol. by 'Abd Allāh 'Inān (on this ed. and the surviving mss. of the *Iḥāta*, see, in addition to the editor's introd., *MIDEO*, iii (1956), 324-8). (2) *al-Lamḥa al-badriyya fi 'l-dawla al-naṣriyya* (Casiri has given long extracts from this, as well as from the *Iḥāta*, together with a Latin trans., in his *Bibliotheca*, ii, 71 ff., 177-246, 246-319. A fairly acceptable edition of the *Lamḥa* was published in Cairo in 1347/1928-9; I. S. Allouche translated some chapters from it in his article *La vie économique et sociale à Grenade au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in *Mél. d'hist. et d'archéol.: Hommage à G. Marçais*, Algiers 1957, ii, 7-12). This work of Ibn al-Khaṭīb presents a panorama of the civilization of Granada, with biographies of the Naṣrid sovereigns, from approximately 628 to 765/1230 to 1363. (3) *A'māl al-a'lām fi-man būyi'a ḥabl al-iḥtilām min mulūk al-Islām*, one of the last works written by Ibn al-Khaṭīb, in 774 and 776/1372-4 (partial ed. by Ḥ. H. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, in *Centenario M. Amari*, ii (1910), 427-82 (trans. R. Castrillo, *El Africa del Norte en el «A'māl al-a'lām» de Ibn al-Jaṭīb*, Madrid

1958) and E. Lévi-Provençal, *Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane extraite du «Kitāb A'māl al-ʿAlām»*, Rabat 1934, Beirut 1956; partial ed. by A. M. al-ʿAbbādi and M. I. al-Kattāni, *al-Maghrib al-ʿarabi fi 'l-ʿaṣr al-wasīṭ*, Casablanca 1964. This is an unfinished history of Islam, the first part of which is devoted to the East, the second to Muslim Spain, and the third to North Africa and Sicily.

**Bibliography:** in addition to the works mentioned in the text and the references given there, the following should also be noted: M. M. Antuña, *El poligrafo granadino Abenajātib en la Real Biblioteca del Escorial*, Escorial 1926; Cl. Sánchez Albornoz, *Fuentes de la historia hispano-musulmana del siglo VIII*, vol. ii of *En torno a los orígenes del feudalismo*, Mendoza 1942, index s.v. Aben Aljatib (some correction necessary); E. García Gómez, *Ibn Zamrak, el poeta de la Alhambra*, Madrid 1943; Aḥmad Mukhtār al-ʿAbbādi, *Los móviles económicos en la vida de Ibn al-Jatib*, in *al-Andalus*, xx (1955), 214-21. (J. BOSCH-VILÀ)

**IBN KHĀTĪMA**, ABŪ DJĀʿFAR AḤMAD B. ʿALĪ B. MUḤAMMAD B. ʿALĪ B. KHĀTĪMA AL-ANSĀRĪ, man of letters, poet, historian and grammarian of al-Andalus. Born at an unknown date in Almería, where he spent the greater part of his life, he died in 770/1369. An intimate friend of Lisān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb, he associated with the most eminent personages in the kingdom of Granada, but he does not appear to have held any office other than that of *kātib* and *muḥri* at the mosque of Almería. His teachers included Abu 'l-Barakāt al-Balāfiḳī, Ibn Luyūn, Ibn Dījābir, Ibn Shuʿayb and Ibn Farkūn. Held in high esteem in his own lifetime, he is the author of works of merit in various fields. Those known are:

1. *Taḥṣīl al-gharaḍ al-kāṣid fi tafṣīl al-maraḍ al-wāfīd*, on the outbreak of the plague which occurred in 749-50/1348-9. In medicine, Ibn Khātīma studied epidemics in general, and the causes and effects of that of 749-50 in the town of Almería in particular; mss: Berlin 6369, Escorial (Derenbourg, no. 1785); German trans. Taha Dinanah, in *Arch. für Gesch. d. Med.*, xx (1926), 27-81; Spanish trans., from the German text, of the medical part by J. Fernández Martínez, in *Actualidad médica* (Granada), 403-4 (1958), 449-512, 566-88.

2. *Masiyyat al-Mariyya ʿalā ghayrihā min al-bilād al-andalusīyya*; this work, of a historical character, is lost, but it is often quoted as a source by Ibn al-Khaṭīb, al-Maḳḳarī, Ibn al-Kāḍī and other historians of the period.

3. *Dīwān*; autograph ms. Escorial (Derenbourg 381), divided into five parts: (a) *fi 'l-madh wa 'l-ḥanā*; (b) *fi 'l-nasīb wa 'l-ghazal*; (c) *fi 'l-mulāh wa 'l-fukāhāt*; (d) *fi 'l-waṣāyā wa 'l-ḥikam*; (e) *muwāshshahāt*; study and Spanish trans. of the *dīwān* by S. Gibert (thesis, Madrid 1951). There is another ms. in Rabat, Bibl. Générale, no. 269.

4. *Kitāb raʾīḳ al-taḥliya fi fāʾiḳ al-tawriya*; a collection of poems of Ibn Khātīma containing *tawriyas* [see BAYĀN], compiled by one of his pupils named Ibn Zarkala; mss: Escorial (Derenbourg, no. 419), Bibl. Nat. Paris (Blochet, no. 5749), Rabat (*Catal.* 1958, no. 1826); study and comm. on this work by S. Gibert in *Etudes d'orientalisme* . . . Lévi-Provençal, Paris 1962, 543-57.

5. *al-Faṣl al-ʿādil bayn al-raḳīb wa 'l-wāshī wa 'l-ādḥīl*, a short treatise in rhyming prose on the distinction between the spy, the informer and the censor; ed. and trans. S. Gibert, in *al-Andalus*, xviii (1954), 1-16.

6. *Irād al-laʾāl fi anshād al-dawāl*(1), a résumé of a treatise on philology by al-Zubaydī and Ibn Makki of Cordova with a commentary by Ibn Hishām and arranged in order by Ibn Hānī al-Sabṭī; ed. and comm. by G. S. Colin, in *Hespéris*, xii (1931), 1-32.

In his *Nayl al-ibṭihādī* (Cairo 1350, 72), Aḥmad Bābā gives the title of another work of Ibn Khātīma, on some questions of grammar, *Iḥāḳ al-ʿaḳl bi 'l-ḥiss*, of which nothing further is known.

The National Library of Madrid (ms. 511 gg. 390 Cat. Guillén Robles) possesses a poem of Ibn Khātīma that is also included in his *Dīwān*; it is a *taḳḥmīs* of a poem of Ibn al-Khaynī of mystical character.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works referred to: Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *Iḥāḳ*, Cairo 1939, i, 114-29; Maḳḳarī, *Nafḥ al-ṭīb*, Cairo 1364/1949, viii, 139-48; idem, *Azhār al-riyāḍ*, Cairo 1358-61/1940-2, i, 23, 250, ii, 252, 259, 302, 346, 395; Ibn al-Kāḍī, *Durrat al-ḥidjāl*, Rabat 1934, i, no. 116; Aḥmad Bābā al-Tumbuktī, *Nayl*, Cairo 1350, 72; Dījazarī, *Ghāyat al-nihāya fi ṭabaḳāt al-ḥurrā*, Paris 1932, i, 78; ʿUmārī, *Masālik al-absār fi mamālik al-amṣār*, ms. Paris, no. 2327, xvii, fol. 210; Brockelmann, II, 259, S II, 396; Pons Boigues, *Ensayo*, 331-3; G. S. Colin, *Quelques poètes arabes d'occident au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in *Hespéris*, 1931, 241; M. Antuña, *Abenjatima de Almería y su tratado de la peste*, in *Religión y Cultura*, Madrid, Oct. 1928.

(S. GIBERT)

**IBN KHATṬĀB** [see AL-KHAṬṬĀBĪ].

**IBN KHAYR AL-ISHBĪLĪ**, ABŪ BAKR MUḤAMMAD B. KHAYR B. ʿUMAR B. KHALĪFA AL-LANTŪNĪ AL-AMAWĪ, philologist and traditionist of Seville, where he was born in 502/1108. He became *imām* of the mosque at Cordova, and died in that city in 575/1179. Ibn Khayr, who studied under many teachers in different regions of al-Andalus, owes his fame to the catalogue (*fahrasa* [q.v.]) of the works which he had read and of the teachers who had given him their *idjāza* at Seville, Cordova, Almería, Malaga, Granada, etc. This work, called *Fahrasat mā raʾāhu ʿan shuyūḳhi-hi min al-dawāwīn al-muṣannafa fi durūb al-ʿilm wa-anwāʿ al-maʿārif*, was published in Saragossa in 1894-5 by J. Ribera y Tarragó (2 vols., as vols. ix-x of the *BAH*) under the title *Index librorum de diversis scientiarum ordinibus quos a magistris didicit*. After an introduction studded with *hadīths*, the author enumerates the works he has studied on Qurʾānic sciences (readings, abrogating and abrogated verses, commentary), goes on to *hadīth*, to which he devotes much space, together with the *siyar* and the *ansāb*, then to Mālikī *fiḳh*. Next come grammar, lexicography, *adāb*, poetry. Finally, he lists the *fahrasas* which preceded his own. For each discipline he quotes the names of his masters, classifying them by region, but gives hardly any biographical information on them. This catalogue is a most important document for the study of the works known and taught in the author's day in Muslim Spain (see H. Pérès, *Poesie andalouse*, 28 ff.). Ibn Khayr in his turn had a great many pupils, a list of whom occupied, it is said, ten thirty-page notebooks.

**Bibliography:** Ḍabbī, *Bughya*, 112; Ibn al-Abbār, *Takmila*, 780; Ḥādīdījī Khālifa, vii, 540; Pons Boigues, *Ensayo*, 242-4; Wüstenfeld, *Geschichtschreiber*, no. 231; Ahwānī, in *RIMA*, i/1 (1955), 97-8; González Palencia, *Literatura*<sup>2</sup>, 195; Brockelmann, S I, 499. (CH. PELLAT)

**IBN AL-KHAYYĀT**, ABŪ BAKR MUḤAMMAD B. AḤMAD B. MANṢŪR, KNOWN AS IBN AL-KHAYYĀT,



grammarian, a native of Samarqand who lived in Baṣra and Baghdād. In Baghdād he is said to have quarrelled over grammatical matters with al-Zaḍḍijādī (d. 316/928 [q.v.]). Among his pupils are mentioned Abu ‘l-Kāsim al-Zaḍḍijādī and Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisī. The latter, in a reply to Sayf al-Dawla, denied having tried to denigrate Ibn al-Khayyāt (see Yāqūt); and from this we learn also that at a certain period of his life the grammarian became afflicted by complete deafness. But Yāqūt also depicts Ibn al-Khayyāt as endowed with a splendid physique and as being a pleasant companion. He died at Baṣra in 320/932.

Apart from the *K. Ma‘āni ‘l-Kur‘ān*, all the works attributed to Ibn al-Khayyāt are concerned with Arabic grammar: *al-Naḥw al-habīr*, *al-Mūḍjaz fi ‘l-naḥw*, *al-Muknī‘ fi ‘l-naḥw*. Since the time of the *Fihrist* (77 and 81), this grammarian has been classed *minnman khalafa ‘l-madhhabayn*, “among those who combine the two systems” of grammar: those of Baṣra and of Kūfa. But this should not be misinterpreted: it means that, while using the Baṣran method on certain points, he adopted certain Kūfan view-points, but not that he adopted a mixed grammatical system, since, properly speaking, there did not exist an eclectic grammatical system of grammar at Baghdād.

*Bibliography*: Ibn al-Khayyāt is not mentioned in Brockelmann. All the references given in Kaḥḥāla, ix, 23, add nothing to Yāqūt, *Mu‘djam al-udabā’*, xvii, 141-2 = *Irshād*, vi, 283-4. See also an anecdote in Zubaydī, *Ṭabaḳāt*, Cairo 1373/1954, 75-6. (Ed.)

IBN AL-KHAYYĀṬ, ABU ‘L-ḤASAN ‘ALĪ B. MUḤAMMAD AL-KABA‘Ī, Arab poet who lived for almost half a century at the court of the Kalbī amīrs of Sicily, to whom the government on the island had been entrusted by the Fāṭimids in 337/948 [see ŞIKILLIYA].

Practically nothing is known of the life of Ibn al-Khayyāt at Palermo, and indeed all traces of his activity as a poet at the court of the last representatives of the Banū Kalb (until 431/1040) would have been lost if Abu ‘l-Ṭāhir Ismā‘īl b. Aḥmad al-Tuḍjībī al-Barkī had not preserved in his commentary on the *Ikhtiyār al-Khālidīyyayn min shi‘r Bashshār* (ed. Muḥ. Badr al-Dīn al-‘Alawī, Cairo 1934) some fragments of the work of the poet, who was a great friend of his, though we do not know where and when this friendship was formed.

To judge by the some two hundred lines of his poems which are to be found in various sources, Ibn al-Khayyāt is to be considered as the true panegyrist of the Kalbīs, whose political actions, and especially struggles against frequent conspiracies and acts of sedition, he followed for some fifty years, that is until the fall of the dynasty, which was hastened by the treachery of the *kā'id* Ibn al-Thumna. Although it is difficult to form a judgement on the poet on the basis of the few verses which have survived, the fragments of his work show, besides his sincere attachment to the cause of the Kalbī family, a sensitivity to certain aspects of the natural background of the country in which he spent the whole of his life.

*Bibliography*: The only attempt to penetrate the spirit of the poetry of Ibn al-Khayyāt has been made by Iḥsān ‘Abbās in *al-‘Arab fi Şikillīyya*, Cairo 1959, 207-23 (cf. U. Rizzitano, *Il contributo del mondo arabo agli studi arabo-siculi*, in *RSO*, xxxvi (1961), 83-4). Sources (apart from al-Tuḍjībī) which have preserved verses by Ibn al-Khayyāt

are mentioned in U. Rizzitano, *Nuove fonti arabe per la storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, in *RSO*, xxxii (1957) [*Scritti in onore di G. Furlani*], 536, n. 2. (U. RIZZITANO)

IBN KHAYYĀṬ AL-‘UṢFURĪ, KHALĪFA, d. 240/854, generally known as *Shabāb*, was a prominent chronicler and genealogist who specialized in the study of tradition (*muḥaddith*). Little is known about his life. He seems to have lived for about 80 years. He was born in Baṣra, and it would appear that he was educated and also taught exclusively in his native city, not travelling to other cities as was then customary. This is indicated by the fact that al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī does not mention him in his *History of Baghdād*, nor does any other chronicler or biographer refer to any journey that he undertook; furthermore, most of his teachers were of Baṣrī origin or had resided in Baṣra. He came of a well-educated family; his grandfather, who bore the same name, and also his father, were authorities in Tradition. Several men of outstanding culture were among his teachers, such as Yazīd b. Zuray‘, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, Muḥammad b. Ḍja‘far Ghundar, Hishām al-Kalbī, ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Madā‘inī, etc., but he was closest to Yazīd b. Zuray‘ [q.v.], who is described by Ibn Sa‘d as a worthy man with ‘Uṭhmānī tendencies. These tendencies are apparent, to some extent, in Ibn Khayyāt’s works.

On the whole Ibn Khayyāt is regarded by scholars of traditions as honourable, straightforward and trustworthy. Among his many disciples were al-Bukhārī, ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad, Ibn Ḥanbal and Bakī b. Maḥlad.

According to Ibn al-Nadīm, he was the author of four books: *al-Ta‘rīkh*, *Ṭabaḳāt al-Kurrā’*, *Ta‘rīkh al-Zammā wa ‘l-‘urdjān wa ‘l-mardā wa ‘l-‘umyān*, and *Kitāb Adjzā’ al-Kur‘ān wa-‘shārihi wa-asbā‘ihi wa-āyātih*. It would appear that the *Ṭabaḳāt al-Kurrā’* mentioned by Ibn al-Nadīm is identical with the book which has survived under the title of *Ṭabaḳāt Khalīfa b. Khayyāt* (the unique copy of this book is now in al-Zāhiriyya Library, Damascus).

*Al-Ta‘rīkh* has also survived, in a copy found in Morocco (the only copy so far known). In a single volume of 168 fols., it was copied in Muslim Spain in 477/1084.

The author commences his book by defining the word *ta‘rīkh*. After discussing the birth of the Prophet he covers the period from the Hidjra to the year 232/846, thus ignoring the Meccan period of the Prophet’s life. The importance of the work lies not only in the fact that it is the oldest complete Islamic survey of events which has reached us, but also in the materials it contains and the way in which it was written. The author gives special attention to the Umayyad Caliphate of Damascus and to Muslim foreign affairs, in particular to the extension of the Islamic Empire. He usually narrates each event from two points of view, local and official. He pays little attention to Islamic internal affairs, but he does deal with such decisive events as the death of ‘Uṭhmān, the war between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiya, the battle of al-Ḥarra, the Khāridjī movements, etc.

This book is a very important document for the study of Islamic administration in its early years, as the author, at the end of his account of each Caliph’s reign, enumerates all the statesmen, generals and senior officials who held office under him.

As for the biographical *al-Ṭabaḳāt*, it too is the oldest complete book of its kind to have survived; Ibn Sa‘d, though earlier, is incomplete. The unique

copy was made by one of the author's disciples, probably during the author's life-time. It consists of 97 folios, written in a fine hand between *kifī* and *nashh*. Age and mishandling have made it very difficult to read. It contains the biographies of approximately 3375 men and women who were cited as authorities for Islamic traditions during the first 236 years of Islam. It is divided into two unequal parts, a very large one devoted to the men and a smaller to the women.

Ibn Khayyāṭ composed his book in a different way from his contemporary and fellow-citizen Ibn Saʿd. He begins by enumerating the men who were authorities in tradition and lived in Medina, commencing with the Prophet, then the members of Quraysh, group by group according to their pedigree and their relation to the Prophet; then the members of the other Arab tribes. He then takes the Muslim cities and centres and deals with them in a similar manner. The author's biographical accounts are very brief but the significance of the book lies in the fact of its completeness and the close attention which the author pays to genealogy: he enumerates every Arab tribe, group and family who had migrated at the rise of Islam and names their place of settlement. Such information is most valuable for the study of the Islamic movement, the great Arab migration of the 1st/7th century and the history of the Umayyad Caliphate, because of the vital role played by the tribes under this dynasty. The book is of at least equal importance for the study of Islamic dogma, culture and society.

Both texts were edited, independently, by Suhayl Zakkār (Damascus 1967) and by Akram al-ʿUmarī (Baghdād 1967).

*Bibliography*: Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaḳāt*, vii, Beirut 1957, 289; al-Bukhārī, *al-Taʾrīkh al-kabīr*, Haydarābād 1360-78, 644; Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *al-Djarh wa 'l-taʿdīl*, Haydarābād 1360-73, i/2, 378; *Fihrist*, 232; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-aʿyān*, i, 172; Ibn ʿAdī, *al-Kāmil*, MS Zāhiriyya, Damascus, fol. 123; Ibn Ḥaḍjar, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, Haydarābād 1325-7, iii, 160-1; Dhahabī, *Huffāz*, Haydarābād 1375-7, 436, 945, 973, 1405; *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, MS Istanbul, Ahmed III, viii, fols. 126-7; Ibn Taghribirdī, Cairo, ii, 303; Ibn al-ʿImād, *Shadharāt*, ii, 94. (S. ZAKKAR)

IBN KHĀZIM [see ʿABD ALLĀH B. KHĀZIM].

IBN KHURRĀDĀHBĪH, ABU 'L-KĀSĪM ʿUBAYD ALLĀH B. ʿABD ALLĀH (var. AHMAD), is one of the earliest geographical writers in Arabic whose writings have survived more or less in their original form. His biography did not interest early authors. Only al-Masʿūdī, Ibn al-Nadīm and al-Iṣfahānī, all of the 4th/10th century, provided some brief particulars concerning his work. His grandfather's Iranian name was transliterated *Kh.r.dā.dh.b.h.* and read both as *Khurdādhbih*, "excellent gift of the sun", and *Khurradādhbih*, "created by the excellent sun". Originally a Zoroastrian, he embraced Islam in order, it is said, to please a member of the powerful Iranian family of the Barāmika [q.v.] viziers, probably Yahyā b. Khālīd [q.v.].

Of his father, it is known only that in 201/816, during the caliphate of al-Maʾmūn, he was governor of Ṭabaristān and that he succeeded in bringing certain districts of Daylam [q.v.] into submission.

He himself seems to have been born in Khurāsān; as to the dates of his birth and death there is some disagreement: the years 205/820 and 211/825 have been suggested for the former and 300/911 for the latter. He grew up apparently in Baghdād, in ease

and comfort, and received an excellent literary and artistic education from teachers of the standing of Ishāk al-Mawṣilī [q.v.]. He is said to have had a marked propensity for knowledge and study.

When he reached manhood, his principal career was at first as Director of Posts and Intelligence (*ṣāhib al-barīd wa 'l-khabar*) in the province of Dībāl [q.v.], subsequently being promoted to the office of director-general of the same department in Baghdād and later in Sāmarrā. In this capacity he had access to the caliph al-Muʿtamid and soon became his familiar and friend, taking part in his diversions and sharing his taste for entertainment, secular literature and the arts.

This turn of mind, his Iranian origins and the requirements of his professional career are all reflected in his literary works. A list of them, apparently incomplete, is given by Ibn al-Nadīm, according to whom he wrote the following works: 1. *Adab al-samāʿ* (correct behaviour when listening to singing and music); 2. *Kitāb al-Ṭabīkh* (on the culinary art); 3. *Kitāb al-Sharāb* (on drinking); 4. *Kitāb al-Nudamāʾ wa 'l-djulasāʾ* (on boon-companions and fellow revellers); 5. *Kitāb al-Anwāʾ* [q.v.]. None of these five works has survived. 6. *Kitāb al-Lahw wa 'l-malāhī*, edited from the unique manuscript by I. A. Khalīfē (Beirut 1964); it is presumably to this work that al-Maʿarrī [q.v.] is alluding in his *Risālat al-Ghufṛān* when he speaks of the "classes of singers" (*ṭabaḳāt al-mughannīn*). In this book he treats of music and musicians, borrowing the basic technical vocabulary from Persian and giving allegedly historical information (which al-Iṣfahānī considered to be unacceptable). Al-Masʿūdī reproduces five pages from the text of a dissertation on the same subject given by Ibn Khurradādhbih in the presence of the caliph al-Muʿtamid. These have been edited by al-ʿAzzāwī under the title *K. al-Lahw wa 'l-malāhī*. De Goeje translated this title as "Le livre du jeu et des instruments de musique" (The book of playing and of musical instruments). 7. *Kitāb Djamharat* (var. *Djumhūr*) *ansāb al-Furs wa 'l-nawākil* (var. *nawāfil*) (= The book of the principal genealogies of the Persians and of the transplanted population). 8. *Kitāb al-Taʾrīkh*, regarded by al-Masʿūdī as "the best constructed and most exhaustive" work of its kind (yet it does not appear in Ibn al-Nadīm's list). These two works are frequently cited by al-Thaʿālibī and no. 8 is cited once by Ibn Shaddād. 9. *Kitāb al-Masālik wa 'l-mamālik* (= The book of itineraries and kingdoms), which made his reputation, often copied or used as a model for imitation and twice edited and translated into French in full, and once in part only; it has been the subject of a controversy that is still unresolved in regard to the date of its composition and the authenticity of the version which has survived; finally, in regard to its scientific value, it has given rise to contradictory appreciations by the early Arab writers and by modern orientalists.

*Bibliography*: Brockelmann, I, 225-6; S I, 404; Ṭabarī, iii and *passim*; Masʿūdī, *Murūdj*, i, 72, viii, 80 (Cairo ed., 1367/1948, i, 14, iv, 220-5); *Aghānī*, *passim*; *Fihrist*, 149 (Cairo ed., 1348/1929, 212); Thaʿālibī, *Ghurar akhbār mulūk al-Furs* (= History of the Kings of the Persians), Paris 1900, *passim*; Maʿarrī, *Risālat al-Ghufṛān*, Cairo 1950, 461; Ibn Shaddād, *al-Aʿlāk al-khaṭira fī dhikr umarāʾ al-Shām wa 'l-Djazira* (= Ibn Shaddād's description of Damascus), Damascus 1956, 25; C. Barbier de Meynard, in *JA*, v (1865); *BGA*, vi, 1889; J. Marquart, *Osteuropäische und ostasia-*

*tische Streifzüge*, Leipzig 1903, 390; *Di. Zaydān, Ta'riḫh ādāb al-luḡha al-ʿarabiyya*, Cairo 1912, ii, 202; Carra de Vaux, *Les penseurs de l'Islām*, Paris 1921-6, ii, 7; Mieli, *La Science arabe*, Leiden 1938, 81; H. G. Farmer, *The sources of Arabian music*, Bearsden (Scotland) 1940, 33; R. Blachère, *Extraits des principaux géographes arabes*, Paris 1932, 21; Hadj-Sadok, *Description du Maghreb et de l'Europe au III<sup>e</sup>/IX<sup>e</sup> s.*, Algiers 1949; ʿAbbās al-ʿAzzāwī, *al-Mūsikā al-ʿiraḳiyya fī ʿahd al-Muḡhūl wa'l-Turkumān*, Baghdād 1370/1951, 94-5; Father A. Khalifa, *Mukhtār min Kitāb al-lahw wa'l-malāhī li 'bn Khurrādādhbih*, Beirut 1961; I. Yu. Kračkovskiy, *Izbrannīe sočineniya*, iv, Moscow-Leningrad 1957, 17, 23, 80, 147 ff. (Arabic trans. by Šalāh al-Dīn ʿUṯmān Hāshim, under the title *Ta'riḫh al-adab al-djuḡhrāfī al-ʿarabī*, i, Cairo 1963); A. Miquel, *La géographie humaine du monde musulman*, Paris-The Hague 1967, index.

(M. HADJ-SADOK)

**IBN AL-KĪFTĪ**, *DJAMĀL AL-DĪN ABU 'L-ḤASAN ʿALĪ B. YŪSUF B. IBRĀHĪM B. ʿABD AL-WĀHĪD AL-ŠĪAYBĀNĪ*, versatile Arab writer, born in 568/1172 at Kifṭ in Upper Egypt. He received his early education in Cairo and in 583/1187 went to Jerusalem, where his father had been appointed as deputy to the *Ḳāḏī al-Fāḏil*, the famous chancellor and adviser of Šalāh al-Dīn (Salāḏin). During the many years which he spent as a student there he was already collecting the material for his later works. He was forced by the disturbances which followed Šalāh al-Dīn's death to go in 598/1201 to Aleppo, where, under the protection and with the encouragement of a friend of his father, he was able again to pursue his scholarly interests for several years, until the Atabeg of Aleppo, al-Malik al-Zāhir, placed him in charge of the *diwān* of the finances, a task which he undertook only reluctantly, but which brought him the honorific title of *al-Ḳāḏī al-Akrām*. After al-Zāhir's death (613/1216) he resigned, but three years later was appointed by al-Zāhir's successor to the same post, which he then held without interruption until 628/1230. There is no doubt that Ibn al-Kifṭī had used his influential position in order to further the cause of scholarship, for during these years he gave shelter in Aleppo to Yāḳūt, who had fled from the Mongols, and gave him much help in the compilation of his great geographical dictionary. Dismissed at his own request in 628/1230, Ibn al-Kifṭī was able to devote a few years to his own studies until he was appointed vizier by al-Malik al-ʿAziz in 633/1236. He remained in this office until his death in 646/1248.

Of the 26 works of Ibn al-Kifṭī of which the titles are known only two survive: (1) *The Kitāb Iḫḫbār al-ʿulamāʾ bi-akhbār al-hukamāʾ*, usually referred to simply as *Ta'riḫh al-hukamāʾ*, which exists in an epitome by al-Zawzani (written in 647/1249), ed. J. Lippert, Leipzig 1903; it contains 414 biographies of physicians, philosophers and astronomers with many statements from Greek writers which have not survived in the original; (2) *Inbāh al-ruwāʾ ʿalā anbāh al-nuḫāt*, parts i-iii ed. by Muḡ. Abu 'l-Faḏl Ibrāhīm, Cairo 1369-74, which contains about a thousand biographies of scholars. Of the posthumous *Aḫḫbār al-Muḡammadīn min al-šhuʿarāʾ* there exist only fragments in Ms. Paris arab. 3335. The remaining titles are mainly of historical works: a history of Cairo until the reign of Šalāh al-Dīn, a history of the Seldjūqs, of the Mirdāsids, of the Būyids, of Maḡmūd b. Sabuktakīn, of the Maḡrib, of the Yemen; a comprehensive *Ta'riḫh al-Kifṭī* in

the epitome of Ibn Maktūm (d. 749/1348) is evidently identical with the history of Cairo mentioned above. Other titles indicate individual biographies (of Ibn Rašḫīḳ, Abū Saʿīd al-Sirāfī), the history of scholarship (the *Šayḫs* of al-Kindī), a supplement to the *Ansāb* of al-Balādhuri, etc.

*Bibliography*: Kutubī, *Fawāt*, Cairo 1951, ii, 191-3; Yāḳūt, *Muʿdjam al-udabāʾ*, Cairo, xv, 175-204 = *Irshād*, ed. Margoliouth, v, 477-94; idem, *Muʿdjam al-buldān*, iv, 152; Ibn Abi Uṣaybiʿa, *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ*, index; Barhebraeus, *Ta'riḫh mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, ed. Šālḫānī, 476; Suyūṭī, *Buḡhya*, Cairo 1326, 358; idem, *Husn al-muḡāḏara*, Cairo 1321, i, 265; Ibn al-ʿImād, *Šaḏḏarāt*, v, 236; Adfawī, *al-Ṭālīʿ al-saʿīd*, Cairo 1333, 237 f.; Ibn Tagḡribirdī, *Nuḏjūm*, vi, Cairo 1355, 361; A. Müller in *Actes du 8<sup>e</sup> Congrès Internat. des Orientalistes*, Section I, Leiden 1890, 15-36; Brockelmann, I<sup>2</sup>, 396 f., S I, 559; R. Sellheim, in *Oriens*, viii (1955), 348-52.

(A. DIETRICH)

**IBN KILLIS**, *ABU 'L-FARĀḐI YAʿḲŪB B. YŪSUF*, famous Fāṭimid vizier of the caliph al-ʿAziz [q.v.]. He was by origin a Jew, born in Baghdād in 318/930. He went with his father to Syria and settled at Ramla, becoming an agent for various merchants; but, according to one tradition, having appropriated their money and being unable to repay it, he fled to Egypt, where he entered the service of Kāfūr [q.v.], who thought highly of him and whose complete confidence he gained by enabling him to appropriate various inheritances whose existence he brought to his notice and in addition by making purchases for him for which Kāfūr paid in drafts on state land. He acquired precise information on the revenues of all the villages in the country and obtained control of expenditure for Syria and Egypt. Kāfūr having declared one day that if he were a Muslim he ought to be vizier, Ibn Killis aspired to the vizierate, embraced Islam in 356/967 and devoted himself to an assiduous study of the *Ḳurʾān* and the laws of Islam under the guidance of a teacher. But the following year Kāfūr died, and the vizier Abu 'l-Faḏl *Djaʿfar b. al-Furāt*, who was jealous of Ibn Killis, had him arrested. Later the son of this vizier was to marry a daughter of Ibn Killis (Yāḳūt, *Udabāʾ*, vii, 173). Thanks to interventions and bribes, he was released and set off for North Africa. It is possible that, while still in Egypt, he had been won over by the Fāṭimid propaganda which was active at the time.

He entered the service of al-Muʿizz li-din Allāh who was impressed by his qualities as an administrator. He returned with him to Egypt, which he had encouraged him to conquer, in 362/969. From the beginning of 363/October 973 he was entrusted with the reorganization of the financial system with the assistance of Uslūḏj b. al-Ḥasan. By vigorous measures he considerably increased the revenues of the state and ensured confidence in the *muʿizzī dīnār*. After the death of al-Muʿizz in 365/975, he continued to manage affairs on behalf of his son al-ʿAziz, who appointed him vizier at the beginning of 367/August 977 and, in Ramaḏān of the following year/February 979, conferred on him the title of *al-wazīr al-aḏjālī* ("the illustrious vizier"). He was thus the first vizier of the Fāṭimid dynasty. Al-ʿAziz bestowed on him honours and wealth, and it was during his tenure of office that under this caliph Egypt enjoyed a prosperity never before attained and the Fāṭimid empire saw its greatest territorial expansion.

Ibn Killis's foreign policy was expressed in the advice which he gave before he died to al-ʿAziz: to undertake nothing against the Byzantines so long as they themselves did not attack, to be satisfied with a vague acknowledgement of vassalage from the Ḥamdānids of Aleppo, but not to spare Mufarridj b. al-Djarrāh, the chief of the Ṭayyi Arabs of Palestine [see DJARRĀHIDS]. He carried it out successfully but not without resorting to intrigue, to deception and even to attempts at assassination. He re-took Damascus from the Turk Alptakin, ally of the Ḳarmanīs, but when the latter, having become a favourite of the caliph in Egypt, showed the vizier little respect, he had him poisoned (Ibn al-Aṭḥir, viii, 219, s.a. 365). Ibn Killis put an end to the complicated situation created in Syria and Palestine by Ḳassām, the successor of Alptakin in Damascus, the Ḥamdānid Abū Taghlib, who had come from Djazira to seek his fortune in Syria, and Mufarridj b. al-Djarrāh; then he forced Bakdjūr, the Ḥamdānid representative at Hims (whom al-ʿAziz had made governor of Damascus and whom Ibn Killis hated because he had had put to death the tenant of the lands which the vizier owned in the region of Damascus and had seized these lands) to leave Damascus [for details, see AL-ʿAZIZ]. But Ibn Killis prevented the caliph from getting too deeply engaged in northern Syria.

In domestic policy, the favour which Ibn Killis enjoyed suffered only one eclipse of some months (373-4), the reasons for which were perhaps the caliph's anger after the poisoning of Alptakin, or disturbances caused by a famine in Egypt. He soon recovered all his offices and his immense riches. Moreover Ibn Killis did not fail to flatter his master, as witness the episode of the cherries which he had brought for him by pigeons from Syria (al-Ḳalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ*, xiv, 391 and ii, 93; Gaudelroy-Demombynes, *La Syrie*, 252), and the flattering verses in which Ibn Killis explained how it had come about that one of his pigeons had outstripped that of the caliph in a race, a fact of which the vizier's enemies had made use to slander him.

Ibn Killis was noted for the magnificence of the life he led in his palace, his liberality to scholars, jurists, physicians, men of letters and poets, and his concern to promote learning: he was the first to have the idea of making al-Azhar into a university, and he maintained thirty-five jurists. He was a sincere supporter of Fāṭimism; he imprisoned an ʿAlid of Damascus who had mocked at the genealogy of the Fāṭimids. He was a specialist in *Ismāʿīlī fiḳḥ*: all his biographers emphasize the fact that he composed, on the basis of traditions received from al-Muʿizz and al-ʿAziz, a legal treatise known as *al-Risāla al-wazīriyya*, that he taught it in lectures which he gave personally, and that *fatwās* were given on the authority of his teaching. He had a mosque built in his palace, supervised the building of the mosque known as that of al-Ḥākim, and added in 378 a *fawwāra* (fountain) in the mosque of ʿAmr (Yāqūt, iii, 899). He appears to have contributed to the development of Fāṭimid ceremonial by instituting at the caliph's court a corps of picked troops (the *ḳuwwād*) who paraded in processions, and by founding the regiment which bore his name, *al-ṭāʿifa al-wazīriyya*.

Ibn Killis's biographers praise him highly, although they do not conceal the questionable means which he used to achieve success or to rid himself of his own enemies and those of the dynasty. On his death, at the end of 380/February 991, al-ʿAziz, who led the

funeral prayer for him, wept and showed great grief. The Christian Yahyā b. Saʿid states that Ibn Killis was worthy of this; but the Egyptian populace accused him of showing too great favour to the Christians and to the Jews.

*Bibliography*: Yahyā b. Saʿid al-Anṭākī, *Annales*, ed. Cheikho, 155, 163, 164, 172, 173 (= *P.O.*, xxiii, 390 (183), 411 (203), 414 (206), 433 (225)); Abū Shudjāʿ al-Rudhrawārī, *Dhayl Kitāb Tadjārib al-umam*, 185; Ibn al-Ṣayrafi, *Kitāb al-Ishāra ilā man nāl al-wizāra*, in *BIFAO*, xxv (1925), 19-23; Ibn al-Ḳalānīsī, *Dhayl Taʾriḫ Dimashq*, 15, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32; Ibn Ḥammād, *Aḫbār mulūk Banī ʿUbayd*, ed. Vonderheyden, 49; Ibn al-Aṭḥir, 1303 ed., viii, 219, ix, 6, 19, 27; Ibn Saʿid, *Kitāb al-Mughrib* . . ., book iv, ed. Tallqvist, 76; Ibn Muyassar, *Aḫbār Miṣr*, ed. H. Massé, 45, 51; Ibn Ḳhallikān, *Bulāḳ* ed., ii, 440-4 (tr. de Slaue, iv, 359); Kutubi, *Bulāḳ* ed., i, 104; Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz al-durar wa-djāmiʿ al-ghurar*, *djuz* vi, ed. Ṣ. Munadjjid, Cairo 1961, 165, 193, 198, 201-3, 205, 208, 210-3, 216, 218-23, 225-6; Maḳrizī, *Ḳhiṭaṭ*, *Bulāḳ* ed., i, 439, ii, 5-6, 226, 341; idem, *Iṭiʿāz al-hunafāʾ*, ed. Shayyāl, 196, 198-9, 275, 279, 296; Quatremère, *Vie du calife fat. Moezz-hidin-Allah*, in *JA*, 3rd series, nos. 2 and 3; Wüstenfeld, *Gesch. d. Fatimiden-Chalifen*, 50-1, 133 ff.; idem, *Die Statthalter von Ägypten* . . ., 51; R. Gottheil, *A Fetwa on the appointment of Dhimmis to office*, in *Festschrift Goldziher*, 222; G. Wiet, *L'Égypte arabe (Hist. de la Nation égypt.)*, iv, 1937, 149-50, 188, 192, 194; W. Björkman, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Staatskanzlei im islam. Ägypten*, 1928, 19, 28, 64; W. J. Fischel, *Jews in the economic and political life of medieval Islam*, London 1937, 45-68. See also Ḥasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan, *Taʾriḫ al-dawla al-fāṭimiyya*, Cairo 1958, 270-2, 298-300, 426-7, 444-5, 536-7, 632-3 and index; Muḥammad Kāmil Ḥusayn, *Fī adab Miṣr al-fāṭimiyya*, Cairo 1950, 54-9, 174-6 and index. (M. CANARD)

**IBN AL-ḲIRRIYYA**, ABŪ SULAYMĀN AYYŪB B. ZAYD, of the Zayd Manāt (al-Ḳirriyya was probably the name of his mother or of one of his grandmothers). is presented as an illiterate Bedouin whose eloquence, however, became proverbial to the extent of eclipsing the fame of Saḫbān Waʿil [*q.v.*]. Tradition relates that he lived in the entourage of al-Ḥadīdjādī [*q.v.*], and *adab* books contain discourses, generally rhymed, which he is said to have given on various occasions or in reply to questions from his master. He is reported however to have joined the party of Ibn al-Ashʿath [*q.v.*], drawing up his letters and preparing his speeches; he is even credited with the famous sentence, usually attributed to al-Ḡhaḍbān b. al-Ḳabaṭharā: "Lunch off al-Ḥadīdjādī before he dines off you". He was imprisoned with other supporters of Ibn al-Ashʿath and was either beheaded by the public executioner or killed with a lance by al-Ḥadīdjādī himself in 84/703.

The *Aghānī* (Beirut ed., ii, 6) however, records a statement by al-Aṣmaʿī [*q.v.*] which throws doubt on the historical existence of Ibn al-Ḳirriyya: "Two men have always been known only by the name of Maḍjūnūn: the Maḍjūnūn of the Banū ʿĀmir [see MAḌJŪNŪN LAYLĀ] and Ibn al-Ḳirriyya, but both were invented by the *ruwāt*."

*Bibliography*: Djāhīz, *Ḥayawān*, ii, 104; idem, *Bayān*, index; Ibn Ḳutayba, *Maʿārif*, index; Balāḍhūrī, *Futūḫ*, 290; Ṭabarī, ii, 1127-9; Masʿūdī, *Murūdj*, v, 323, 383, 394-6; *Aghānī*, index; Ḥuṣrī, *Zahr*, 304, 476, 905; Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾriḫ Dimashq*,

iii, 216-19; Ibn *Khallikān*, i, 83. See also *BAYĀN*, 1115a. (CH. PELLAT)

IBN AL-ḲIṬṬ, by-name of the Umayyad prince Aḥmad b. Mu'āwiya b. Muḥammad b. Hiṣṣām b. Mu'āwiya b. Hiṣṣām I, famous for his attack on Zamora in 288/901.

At the end of the reign of *amīr* Muḥammad I and throughout that of his successor 'Abd Allāh, the unity of the Umayyad emirate of Cordova was on the point of being destroyed. The disloyalty and incessant revolts of the Arab and Berber lords in the provinces made it possible for Alfonso III of León to extend his conquests from strategic bases at Coïmbra, Astorga, León and Amaya; in 280/893 he rebuilt the fortress of Zamora, and the garrison made continual raids on the Berbers in the vicinity. Moreover, the Banū Ḳasī in Aragon, Ibn Marwān in Extremadura and above all Ibn Ḥafṣūn [*q.v.*] in the mountainous region near Ronda were striving to break away from the central authority. At the same time, towards the borders of León, where the Berbers were more numerous, there came a stream of mystics and fanatics, while the doctrines of the Mu'tazilīs were being introduced from the East and the philosopher Ibn Masarra [*q.v.*] was expounding his metaphysical ideas in the Sierra of Cordova. Amidst such disturbances in both the spiritual and political spheres, various adventurers, either zealots or impostors, made their appearance, declaring themselves the enemies of the régime; they found enthusiastic support among the Berbers of the mountainous zone in the centre of the peninsula. One of these figures, who, in the traditional manner, prepared to censure social behaviour and morality at the very time when the Fāṭimid *da'wa* was spreading the Ismā'īlī doctrine in North Africa, was the Andalusian missionary Abū 'Alī al-Sarrāḏī who, under pretext of preaching the holy war, worked against the régime, cunningly disguised as a Muslim ascetic. Dressed in coarse homespun, wearing rope sandals and riding a donkey, he travelled all over the country. In this disguise, "he worked actively to bring to fruition a projected alliance which had been planned in 285/898 between the Banū Ḳasī of Aragon and 'Umar b. Ḥafṣūn"; he did not succeed in carrying through his plan, but three years later he was able to persuade the Umayyad prince Aḥmad b. Mu'āwiya, a devotee of astrology who did not conceal his aspirations to the throne, to come out in open revolt. Ibn Sarrāḏī presented him as the reforming Mahdī, and the two of them traversed the district of Los Pedroches (Faḥṣ al-Ballūṭ) and the Sierra of Almadén (*Djabal al-Barānis*), where they were received with enthusiasm by the Berbers to whom they preached the holy war against Zamora. Ibn al-Ḳiṭṭ's displays of conjuring increased the number of his supporters (whom the Arab sources put at over 60,000), and this fanatical horde, before whom he had promised the seven walls of Zamora would crumble, approached the fortress. While al-Sarrāḏī prudently withdrew, Ibn al-Ḳiṭṭ invited Alfonso III to embrace Islam if he did not wish to be exterminated with all his men; Alfonso indignantly took up his position on the right bank of the Duero and, after a combat which according to Arab sources was favourable to Ibn al-Ḳiṭṭ, siege was laid to Zamora. But the Berber leader Nafza, being disillusioned, left Ibn al-Ḳiṭṭ together with all his troops, and his departure provoked new desertions. After some indecisive skirmishes, Ibn al-Ḳiṭṭ, finding himself abandoned by almost all his followers, launched a desperate attack on the enemy and was

killed, on 20 *Radjab* 288/10 July 901. For a long time his head remained hanging from the top of one of the gates of Zamora. "This tragic-comical expedition was no more than an isolated episode in the annals of the lower and central Marches" at the end of the 3rd/9th century and at the beginning of the 4th/10th, and its only repercussion is the expedition said to have been undertaken in the same year by the future Ordoño III, son of Alfonso III, who, setting out from Viseo, crossed the Tagus and then the Guadiana to reach the region of Seville, where he sacked and burnt one of the villages".

*Bibliography*: E. Lévi-Provençal, *Hist. Esp. Mus.*, i, 382-5; Dozy, *Hist. Mus. Esp.*<sup>2</sup>, ii, 132-4; Ibn al-Abbār, *Ḥulla*, 91-2; Sampiro, re-ed. Huici, in *Crón. lat. de la Reconquista*, i, 269; Cirot, *Chron. léonaise*, ii, 33; Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, i, 363 (description of Zamora reproduced by Maḳḳarī, *Analectes*, i, 223). (A. HUICI MIRANDA)

IBN ḲUBṬŪRNA [sec IBN ḲABṬŪRNU].

IBN ḲUDĀMA AL-MAḲDISĪ, MUWAFFAḲ AL-DĪN ABŪ MUḤAMMAD 'ABD ALLĀH B. AḤMAD B. MUḤAMMAD, Ḥanbalī ascetic, jurisconsult and traditionalist theologian. He was born in *Djammā'īl*, near Jerusalem (Bayt al-Maḳḏīs, whence his ethnic name) in *Shā'bān* 541/Jan.-Feb. 1147, and died in Damascus on 5 or 6 *Djumādā* II 620/6 or 7 July 1223.

In 551/1156, the Banū Ḳudāma moved from *Djammā'īl* to take up residence in Damascus. The chroniclers explain this exodus as caused by the bad treatment the Muslims were receiving at the hands of the Franks.

From the sources available to us at the present time it is possible to reconstruct two main branches of this large family from the 5th/11th to the 10th/16th centuries. At the head of one branch is MuwaffaḲ al-Dīn's father, the *Shaykh* Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḳudāma (491-558/1097-1162), the preacher (*ḥaṭīb*) of *Djammā'īl*, a man known for his asceticism, for whom a mosque was built in Damascus (Nu'aymī, *Dāris*, ii, 354). On his brother Yūsuf, who stands at the head of the other branch, the sources seem to be silent; but he is the ancestor of Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Hādī (840-909/1436-1503), whose autograph certificates of audition (*samā'ī*) are to be seen on the margins and in the colophons of many of the manuscripts of the *Zāhiriyya* library in Damascus. The most numerous sub-branch of this family is by far that of MuwaffaḲ al-Dīn's brother, the ascetic *Shaykh* Abū 'Umar (528-607/1133-1210). Regarding the other brother, 'Ubayd Allāh, our sources are silent, though other members of this sub-branch are known: the son Aḥmad (573-613/1177-1216), the latter's two grandsons Aḥmad (614-687/1217-1288) and 'Ubayd Allāh (635-684/1237-1285), and the latter's grandson 'Abd Allāh (d. 803/1400).

The smallest sub-branch of all is that of MuwaffaḲ al-Dīn Ibn Ḳudāma, whose three sons died in his lifetime and who was survived by his grandson Aḥmad (605-643/1208-1245).

MuwaffaḲ al-Dīn received the first phase of his education in Damascus where he studied the *Ḳur'ān* and *ḥadīth*. He made his first visit to *Baghdād* in 561 in the company of his maternal cousin, a well-known Ḥanbalī traditionist, 'Abd al-Ḡhanī al-Maḳḏisī (541-600/1146-1203), also originally from *Djammā'īl*, a member of a numerous family tracing their origin back to a certain Surūr b. Rāfi'. Arriving at *Baghdād* they were received by the leading Ḥanbalī of the day, the celebrated mystic 'Abd al-Ḳādir al-*Djilī* [*q.v.*]. Their discipleship was cut short by the latter's death.

Brief though it may have been, this experience must have had its influence on the young Muwaffaq al-Dīn, who was to reserve a special place in his heart for mystics and mysticism. This is attested by what the present author regards as his condoning of Ibn 'Aqil's [q.v.] veneration for the great mystic al-Ḥallādjī [q.v.]; and in a *silsila* preserved in a manuscript in the Zāhiriyya library of Damascus (see *Madjūmū'* 18, fol. 254b), Muwaffaq al-Dīn figures as having received the *khirka* from 'Abd al-Qādir al-Djili and passed it on to another Ḥanbalī, his cousin Ibrāhīm b. 'Abd al-Wāhid (543-614/1148-1217), brother of the above mentioned 'Abd al-Ḡhani. On the other hand, Muwaffaq al-Dīn did not condone what he believed to be the excessive rationalism of Ibn 'Aqil, against whom he wrote *Tahrīm al-naẓar fī kutub ahl al-kalām* (see G. Makdisi, *Ibn Qudāma's censure of speculative theology*, London 1962).

Muwaffaq al-Dīn's first sojourn in Baghdād lasted four years. He is known to have visited it again in 567 and 574, making his pilgrimage to Mecca in the previous year 573, and finally settling in Damascus in 575. He left Damascus once again in 583 to take part in Saladin's expedition against the Franks, particularly in the conquest of Jerusalem, which occurred that year.

Muwaffaq al-Dīn is known especially for his works on Ḥanbalī law: *al-Mughnī* and *al-'Umda* on positive law, and *Rawḍat al-nāzir*, on the methodology of law, all of which have been published.

*Bibliography*: For further details on his life, works and ideas, see Brockelmann, I, 398, S I, 688-9; H. Laoust, *Le Précis de Droit d'Ibn Qudāma*, Beirut 1950; H. Laoust, *Le Ḥanbalisme sous le califat de Baghdād*, in *REI*, xxvii (1959), 125-6; G. Makdisi, *Kitāb al-Tawwābīn "Le Livre des Pénitents" de Muwaffaq ad-Dīn Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī*, Damascus 1961; idem, *Ibn Qudāma's censure of speculative theology*, London 1962.

(G. MAKDISI)

**IBN KUNĀSA**, ABŪ YAḤYĀ MUḤAMMAD B. 'ABD ALLĀH (= KUNĀSA) B. 'ABD AL-A'ĪLĀ AL-MĀZINĪ AL-ASADĪ, poet, philologist and *rāwī* of the 'Abbāsīd period. Born at Kūfa in 123/741, he studied in his native town poetry, *hadīth* and the other traditional sciences under the most distinguished members of the Banū Asad and became the transmitter of the works of several poets, among whom the most famous was al-Kumayt [q.v.]. He also transmitted a certain number of *hadīths* to such important traditionists as al-A'mash [q.v.] and Sufyān al-Thawrī [q.v.]. Although he lived at Baghdād he does not seem to have tried to gain admittance to the court. He died at Kūfa on 3 Shawwāl 207/19 February 823, or in 209/824.

So far as can be judged by the few verses which have survived, Ibn Kunāsa was not a great poet, but his poetry, of great simplicity, reflects a morality and a serenity which are worthy of note. Nephew of Ibrāhīm b. al-Adham [q.v.] and brought up in a milieu of extreme piety, Ibn Kunāsa nevertheless was the owner of a well-known slave singing-girl, Danānīr, whose death he lamented. His descriptions of Kūfa are also worthy of mention.

He wrote in addition several works, among which the *Fihrist* mentions a *Kitāb Ma'ānī 'l-shi'r*, a *K. Sariḳāt al-Kumayt min al-Kur'ān* and a *K. al-Anwā'*, which was much used by later writers and is probably the earliest work of this type (see Ch. Pellat in *Arabica*, 1955/1, 36).

*Bibliography*: Djāhīz, *Bayān* and *Ḥayawān*, index; *Fihrist*, Cairo ed., 105, 225; Ibn Qutayba,

*Anwā'*, index; idem, *Ma'ārif*, 543; *Aghānī*, xii, 105-10 (Beirut ed., xiii, 338-47); Birūnī, *Āthār*, 336; Ibn al-Djarrāh, *Warāqa*, 81-3; *Khātib Baghdādī*, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, v, 404-8; Ibn Khallikān, tr. de Slane, i, 473; 'Amrūsī, *al-Djāwārī al-mughanniyāt*, Cairo n.d., 155-62; F. Bustānī, *Dā'irat al-ma'ārif*, iii, 482-3. (CH. PELLAT)

**IBN QUNFUDH**, ABŪ 'L-'ABBĀS AḤMAD B. ḤASAN (incorrect var. ḤUSAYN) B. 'ALĪ B. ḤASAN AL-KHAṬĪB B. 'ALĪ B. MAYMŪN B. QUNFUDH (var. AL-QUNFUDH), Algerian jurist, traditionist and historian born in 731/1330 or, more probably, in 741/1340, died in 809/1406 or 810/1407, in Constantine, a member of a family of teachers and jurists from that town and its environs. His ancestor, Ḥasan b. 'Alī al-Khaṭīb, who taught *hadīth* in Constantine and claimed to belong to the confraternity of the *Shādhiliyya*, died in 664/1265 (cf. *Wafayāt*, 51); his grandfather 'Alī b. Ḥasan, also *khaṭīb* in Constantine for half a century and *kādī* for many years, died in 733/1332 (cf. *Wafayāt*, 54). His maternal grandfather Yūsuf b. Ya'qūb al-Mallārī, a disciple of Abū Madyan [q.v.] the mystic, was director of a *zāwiya*, "two stages to the west of Constantine", where he taught; he died in 680/1281 (cf. *Wafayāt*, 58). Finally, his father Ḥasan b. 'Alī, also *khaṭīb* in Constantine, was a jurist of repute and author of a work entitled *al-Masnūn fī aḥkām al-lā'ūn*; he died in 750/1350 (cf. *Wafayāt*, 56).

It is therefore probable that, in the first instance, it was from such relatives as these that he received the essential part of his cultural education. But we know that he left his native town as early as 759/1357, at the age of eighteen, on travels which lasted for eighteen years and which took him first to Fās and later to Marrākush. In 763/1361-2 he was with the Hintāta, one of the principal tribes of the Moroccan Atlas and renowned for its piety, and he went to Tinmellel to meditate at the tomb of the *mahdī* Ibn Tumart. Next he was in Salā (Salé), where he had the signal privilege of approaching the aged theologian and mystic Ibn 'Āshīr [q.v.]. In 776/1374 he was in Tlemcen, where he met the Ḥafṣīd prince Abū 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad (770-96/1368-93), and after that in Tunis where, together with another Ḥafṣīd prince, Abū Fāris 'Abd al-'Azīz (797-834/1393-1434), he attended the lectures of the scholar Abū Mahdī 'Isā b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ḡhubrīnī (d. 816/1412). Finally he returned to Constantine, at an unknown date, and there assumed the offices of *muftī* and *kādī*. In 804/1401 he was dismissed, and he lived in disgrace until his death.

During his travels, he endeavoured to perfect his knowledge of *tafsīr*, *hadīth*, *fikh*, *manṭiq*, *naḥw*, *ḥirā'āt*, mathematics, etc. and to obtain diplomas (*idjāza*) from his various masters, whose names he subsequently recorded with care in his *Wafayāt*, in chronological order according to the date of death. They are: (a) in Fās: 1. Abū Zayd 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Sulaymān al-Laḍjī'ī, d. 773/1371, a pupil of the mathematician Ibn al-Bannā'; 2. Abū 'Imrān Mūsā b. Muḥammad b. Mu'ṭī al-'Abdūsī, d. 776/1374, a native of Meknès; 3. Abū 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad al-Ḳabbāb, d. 779/1378; 4. Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh al-Wānaghūlī, the blind, d. 779/1378; 5. Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ḥayātī, d. 781/1379; 6. Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥaḳḳ al-Haskūrī; (b) in Salé: 7. Ibn 'Āshīr Abū 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad, d. 765/1353; 8. Lisān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb, d. 776/1374; (c) in Marrākush: 9. Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh al-Zukandarī, d. 768/1367; (d) in Tlemcen: 10. Abū

‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā, d. 771/1369; 11. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Marzūk, d. 780/1379; (c) in Constantine: 12. Abū ‘Alī Ḥasan b. Abī ‘l-Ḳāsim b. Bādīs, d. 787/1385; 13. Ḥasan b. Ḳhalaf Allāh b. Ḥasan b. Abī ‘l-Ḳāsim b. Maymūn b. Bādīs, cousin of the last-named, d. 784/1382; (f) in Tunis: 14. Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Baṭarnī (var. al-Baṭrūnī and al-Baṭṭiwi), d. 793/1390; 15. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Arafa, d. 803/1400; 16. Abū Mahdī ‘Isā al-Ḡhubrīnī, named above; 17. Abu ‘l-Ḳāsim Muḥammad b. Aḥmad . . . al-Sabtī, *kāḍī* of Granada, d. 761/1359, who gave him a general *idjāza* after admitting him to the “pleasure of being present at his lectures” (cf. *Wafayāt*, 58); 18. Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar al-Raḍīrādī (probably al-Ragrāgī), d. 810/1407, after the writing of the *Wafayāt*; 19. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abī Ishāk Ibrāhīm b. Abī Bakr. . . b. ‘Abbād al-Rundī [q.v.], died in Fās in 792/1390. The last two are not named in the *Wafayāt*.

Ibn Ẹunfuḍḥ was equally scrupulous, at the end of the same work, in compiling a list of his own writings. Of the 26 titles contained in this list, at the present time, roughly speaking, we know only the following: (1) *Bughyat al-fāriḍ min al-ḥisāb wa ‘l-farā’id*, which is probably the same as the *Mu‘āwanat al-rā’id fi mabādi ‘l-farā’id* or again the *Sharḥ al-urḍiūza* (var. *al-manzūma*) *al-tilimsāniyya fi ‘l-farā’id* and which, according to M. Ben Cheneb, is said to exist in a private (?) library; (2) *al-Fārisiyya fi mabādi’ al-dawla al-ḥafsiyya*, ed. M. Nayfar and ‘A. Turki, Tunis 1968, with an important introd. (3) *al-Masāfa al-saniyya fi ‘khtisār al-riḥla al-‘abdarīyya*, the source of Aḥmad Bābā, *Nayl al-ibtihādī*, Fās ed., 394, Cairo ed., 70 and passim; (4) *Sharaf al-tālib fi asnā al-maṭālib* (see mss. in *al-Fārisiyya*, 74-7). (5) *Taysīr al-maṭālib fi ta’dil al-kawākib*, ms. Rabat 512 bis; (6) *Uns al-fakīr wa-‘izz al-ḥakīr*, a biography of the Andalusian mystic Abū Madyan and his followers; ms. Rabat, 385; Cairo, vii, 344 v. 45; ed. M. al-Fāsi and A. Faure, Rabat 1965; (7) *Ḥaṭṭ al-nikāb ‘an wuḍūḥ ‘amal al-ḥisāb*, a commentary on the *Talkḥiṣ ‘amal al-ḥisāb* of Ibn al-Bannā’ [q.v.], ms. Rabat 531.

M. Ben Cheneb attributes to him other works whose titles do not appear on his own list; (8) *Taḥṣīl al-manāḳib fi takmil al-ma’ārib*, a commentary on (5) above; ms. Rabat 512 bis. (9) *Sharḥ urḍiūzat Ibn Abī ‘l-Riḍiāl* [q.v.], ms. Rabat 466, 467, 512 bis (1); Br. Mus. 977a

On the other hand, a number of mss have been discovered (see Introd. to *al-Fārisiyya*), in particular: (10) *Urḍiūba fi ‘l-ṭibb*; (11) *Tuḥfat al-wārid fi ‘khtisās al-sharaf min kibāl al-wālid*; (12) *Tashīl al-maṭālib fi ta’dil al-kawākib*; (13) *Sirādī al-ṭhiḳāt fi ‘ilm al-awḳāt*.

The remainder are now considered to be lost: (a) *‘Alāmat al-nadīḳ fi mabādi’ al-iṣṭilāḥ*; (b) *Anwār al-sa‘āda fi uṣūl al-‘ibāda*; (c) *Basṭ al-rumūz al-ḫafsiyya fi sharḥ ‘arūḍ al-Ḳhazaradīyya*; (d) *Ḥidāyat al-sālik fi bayān Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik*; (e) *Idāḥ al-ma‘ānī fi bayān al-mabānī*; (f) *al-Ibrāhīmiyya fi mabādi’ ‘ilm al-‘arabiyya*; (g) *al-Ẹunfuḍḥiyya fi ibṭāl al-dilāla al-falakiyya*; (h) *al-Lubāb fi ‘khtisār al-Djallāb*; (i) *Taḥḥim al-tālib li-masā’il uṣūl* (var. *aṣṣlay*) *Ibn al-Ḥādīb*; (j) *al-Taḥḥiṣ fi sharḥ al-talkḥiṣ*; (k) *Taḥriḳ al-dilāla fi sharḥ al-risāla*; (l) *Talkḥiṣ ‘amal fi sharḥ al-Djūmal* of al-Ḳḥunādī (cf. Brockelmann, I, 463); (m) *Tashīl al-‘ibāra fi ta’dil al-iṣḥāra*; (n) *Wasīlat al-Islām bi ‘l-nabī ‘alayḥ al-ṣalāt wa ‘l-salām*; (o) *Wiḳāyat al-muwakkḳit wanikāyat al-munakkḳit*.

*Bibliography*: Ibn al-Ḳāḍī, *Djadhwat al-*

*iktibās fi man ḥalla min al-‘alām madīnat Fās*, lith. Fās 1309, 79; idem *Durrat al-ḫidjāl fi asmā’ al-riḍiāl*, Rabat 1934, i, 60; Aḥmad Bābā, *Nayl al-ibtihādī bi-taṭrīz al-Dībādī*, Cairo 1351/1932, 75; Ḳādīrī, *Nashr al-mathānī li ahl al-ḫarn al-ḥādī ‘aṣḥar wa ‘l-ṭhānī*, lith. Fās 1310, i, 4; Ibn Maryam-*al-Bustān fi ḍiḳr al-awliyā’ wa ‘l-‘ulamā’ bi, Tīlīmsān*, Algiers 1326/1908, 309; Ḥafnāwī, *Ta’rīf al-ḫhalaf bi-riḍiāl al-salaf*, Algiers 1328/1909, 27-32; Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris wa ‘l-akḫbāt*, ii, 323; R. Basset, *Rech. bibliographiques sur les sources de la Salouat al-Anfās*, Algiers 1905, no. 20; E. Lévi-Provençal, *Chorfa*, 98, n. 2, 247, n. 5; M. Ben Cheneb, in *Hesṭeris*, 1928, 37-49; Brockelmann, II, 241, S I, 598, S II, 341, 361; Cl. Huart, *Litt. ar.*, 343; Naṣīrī, *K. al-Istīḳṣā li-akḫbār duwal al-Maghrib al-aḳṣā*, Casablanca 1954-6, iv, 83; H. Pérès, ed. of the *Wafayāt* of Ibn Ẹunfuḍḥ, Algiers n.d., 58 ff.

(M. HADJ-SADOK)

**IBN ẸUTAYBA**, ABŪ MUḤAMMAD ‘ABD ALLĀH B. MUSLIM AL-DĪNAWARĪ (some add AL-KŪFĪ, which refers to his place of birth, and AL-MARWAZĪ, which is probably the ethnic name of his father), one of the great Sunnī polygraphs of the 3rd/9th century, being both a theologian and a writer of *adab*. He seems to have been descended, in the second or third generation, from an Arabicized Iranian family from Ḳhurāsān which was connected on the female side with the Bāhilīs of Baṣra and may have come to ‘Irāq in the wake of the ‘Abbāsīd armies during the second half of the 2nd/8th century.

He was born at Kūfa in 213/828, but little is known of his childhood and adolescence. At the most we are able to compile a list of his teachers which, on careful examination, provides much information on his education. Among the most important of them we find men who owe their reputations generally to their attachment to the *Ṣunna*, either as theologians, traditionists or philologists, or usually as all three. The biographers and critics have produced long lists of them, but a few names should be mentioned here. The three persons who had the greatest influence on the young Ibn Ẹutayba are undoubtedly Ishāk b. Ibrāhīm b. Rāhawayḥ al-Ḥanzālī (d. ca. 237/851), a Sunnī theologian, a disciple of Ibn Ḥanbal and protégé of the Ṭāhirīds of Nisābūr, where he appears to have spent most of his life, Abū Ḥatīm Sahl b. Muḥammad al-Sidjīstānī (d. ca. 250/864), Sunnī philologist and traditionist and a master of everybody who in ‘Irāq was interested in philology and tradition, and finally al-‘Abbās b. al-Farādī al-Riyāṣhī (d. 257/871), one of the leaders of philological studies in ‘Irāq, transmitter of the works of al-Aṣma‘ī, Abū ‘Ubayda and other pioneers of the 2nd/8th century.

Very few details are available of Ibn Ẹutayba’s career, but a comparison of information from different sources allows the following tentative reconstruction: after the change in ideology accepted by al-Mutawakkil and his chief henchmen from 232/846 onwards, Ibn Ẹutayba found himself favoured because of his literary works, the ideas of which tallied pretty well with the new trend. It was perhaps writings of the type of his introduction to the *Adab al-kātib* which caused him to be noticed and given an appointment by the vizier Abu ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Yaḥyā b. Ḳḥākān, one of those chiefly responsible for the new policy, who may well have continued to be his patron until his disappearance in 263/877. There is no doubt that he owed to him his appointment as *kāḍī* of Dīnawar in about

236/851. He seems to have remained in this office until 256/870, when he may have stayed for a short time as inspector of *maẓālim* of Baṣra until the sacking of this town by the Zandj in Shawwāl 257/November 871. It is not impossible, however, that he owed the latter appointment to the favour of another powerful official of the 'Abbāsid administration, possibly the Nestorian convert Ṣā'id b. Maḳhlād. Mention should also be made of his relations, perhaps only occasional, with the Ṭāhirid governors of Baḡhdād ('*Uyūn*, ii, 222).

After 257/871, Ibn Ẹutayba devoted himself to the teaching of his works in a district of Baḡhdād, where he remained until his death in 276/889.

Ibn Ẹutayba's son, Aḡmad, appears to have been his chief disciple. He is certainly responsible, as is his son 'Abd al-Wāḡid, for the transmission to Egypt, and indirectly to the West—especially through the intermediary of Abū 'Alī al-Ḳālī—of the greater part of the works of Abū Muḡammad. In al-Andalus, the direct transmission of Ibn Ẹutayba's work was ensured by the famous Ḳāsim b. Aṣḡbaḡh, who had come to study in Baḡhdād in 274/887. Among the eastern disciples, 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḡmān al-Sukkārī (d. 323/935) seems to have played a particularly important part, his name being found at the head of numerous *isnāds*. But there should also be mentioned Abū Muḡammad 'Abd Allāh b. Dja'far Ibn Durustawayḡ [*q.v.*], and Ibrāḡim b. Muḡammad b. Ayyūb al-Ṣā'igh (d. 313/925), in addition to other minor disciples.

It can be stated that, with the exception of two titles, all the authentic works of Ibn Ẹutayba as at present known have been published. We list them here, giving for each the most useful edition and a brief description of the contents:

(1) *K. Adab al-kātib* (ed. Grünert, Leiden 1900), manual of philology for the use of secretaries, with a famous introduction which may be regarded as a politico-cultural profession of faith.

(2) *K. al-Anwā'* (ed. Pellat-Hamidullah, Ḥaydarābād 1375/1956), treatise on practical astronomy and meteorology.

(3) *K. al-'Arab* (ed. Kurd 'Alī, in *Rasā'il al-Bulaghā'*, Cairo 1325/1946, 344-77), treatise in the anti-Ṣhu'ūbi tradition on the relative merits of the Arabs, the Persians, and the inhabitants of Ḳhurāsān.

(4) *K. al-Ashribā* (ed. Kurd 'Alī, Damascus 1366/1947), *fatwā* on drinks written in *adab* style.

(5) *K. al-Ikhtilāf fi 'l-lafẓ wa 'l-radd 'ala 'l-Djahmiyya wa 'l-Mushabbihā* (ed. Muḡammad Ṣāḡid al-Kawḡharī, Cairo 1349), a theological pamphlet refuting the position of the *Mushabbihā* on attributes and that of the *Mu'tazilis* with *Djahmiyya* tendencies on the pronunciation of the *Ḳur'ān*.

(6) *K. Ma'ānī 'l-shi'r* (2 vols., Ḥaydarābād 1368/1949), long work on the themes of poetry.

(7) *K. al-Ma'ārif* (ed. 'Uḡāṣha, Cairo 1960), a historical manual with encyclopaedic appendices on very varied subjects.

(8) *K. al-Masā'il wa 'l-adjwiba* (Cairo 1349 H.), a theological work.

(9) *K. al-Maysir wa 'l-ḡidāh* (ed. Muḡibb al-Dīn al-Khaṡib, Cairo 1343), a juridico-philological study on games of chance, as the *K. al-Ashribā* was on fermented drinks.

(10) *K. al-Shi'r wa 'l-shu'arā'* (ed. Aḡmad Ṣāḡir, 2 vols., Cairo 1364-69/1945-50), poetical anthology arranged chronologically, devoting a large section to the "modern" poets. The introduction, somewhat overrated, is often considered as a manifesto of neo-classicism (ed. and tr. Gaudefroy-Demombynes

under the title *Introduction au Livre de la Poésie et des Poètes*, Paris 1947).

(11) *K. Tafsīr ḡharīb al-Ḳur'ān* (ed. Aḡmad Ṣāḡir, Cairo 1378/1958), philological commentary on the difficult passages of the text of the *Ḳur'ān*.

(12) *K. Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḡadīth* (ed. Faraḡī Allāh Zakī al-Kurdī, Maḡmūd Ṣḡukrī al-Alūsī, Maḡmūd Ṣḡābandār-zāde, Cairo 1326), Ibn Ẹutayba's most important "theological" work, in which are clearly set out his religious, heresiographical and political ideas (Fr. tr. by G. Lecomte, Damascus 1962).

(13) *K. Ta'wīl mushkil al-Ḳur'ān* (ed. Aḡmad Ṣāḡir, Cairo 1373/1954), treatise on *Ḳur'ānic* rhetoric and on *i'djāz al-Ḳur'ān*.

(14) *K. 'Uyūn al-akḡbār* (ed. Aḡmad Zakī al-'Adawī, Cairo 1343-8/1925-30), a large compendium of *adab*, on a number of apparently secular subjects; important introduction.

The only two authentic texts which are unpublished are:

(15) *K. ḡharīb al-ḡadīth*, an incomplete manuscript of which exists in the *Zāhiriyya* at Damascus (*luḡha*, 34-5), a philological commentary on *ḡadīth*, in the broadest sense, from the Prophet to *Mu'āwiya*.

(16) *K. Iṣlāḡ al-ḡhalaṡ fi ḡharīb al-ḡadīth li-Abī 'Ubayd al-Ḳāsim b. Sallām* (Aya Sofya, 457; *Zāhiriyya*, 7899), a separate fascicule of no. 15 concerning Abū 'Ubayd's errors of interpretation.

The other titles of works attributed to Ibn Ẹutayba are for the present doubtful. Among those whose existence seems the least problematical may however be mentioned: (17) a *K. Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*; (18) a *K. al-Fiḡh*; (19) a *K. I'rāb al-Ḳur'ān*; (20) a *K. al-Naḡw*; and perhaps: (21) a *K. al-Ḳalam*; (22) a *K. Ta'bir al-ru'yā*; (23) a *K. al-Ḳirā'āt*.

All the other titles found in the biographies are of works of dubious authenticity. Several of them probably represent the whole or part of the known works mentioned above.

Finally there should be mentioned the apocryphal works, of which up to now the following are known:

(1) *K. al-Alfāz al-muḡhraba bi 'l-alkāb al-mu'ṡraba* (Fās, Ḳarawiyīn, *luḡha*, 1262); (2) *K. al-Djarāḡhim*, an artificial philological collection published in fragments; (3) *K. al-Imāma wa 'l-siyāsa* (Cairo 1322, 1327, 1377) which it has been suggested might be attributed to Ibn al-Ḳūṡiyya; (4) *K. Talkīn al-muta'allim fi 'l-naḡw*, Paris, Bibl. Nat. 4715.

In addition to showing the influence of Ibn Ẹutayba's teachers briefly listed above, these works bear traces of the main cultural ideas current in 'Abbāsid society in the 3rd/9th century, which means that they drew their inspiration also from a very wide range of written sources.

First, the essential ideas found in the work of Ibn al-Muḡaffa' [*q.v.*] certainly seem to have passed into that of Ibn Ẹutayba, and particularly in the '*Uyūn al-akḡbār* and in *Ma'ārif*: *K. Kalīla wa-Dimna*, *K. al-Adab al-kabīr*, *K. al-Āyīn* and *K. Siyar mulūk al-'Adjām* (translated from the history of the kings of Persia entitled *Ḳhudḡaynāma*). Next, a fair proportion of the Aristotelian or pseudo-Aristotelian works translated into Arabic at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, mainly under the titles of *K. al-Ḥayawān* and *K. al-Filāḡa*. Although borrowings from the *K. al-Ḥayawān* of al-Djāḡiz cannot be excluded, it seems that the *K. al-Filāḡa* (which is in fact the *Geoponica* of Cassianus) constitutes an original source. Ibn Ẹutayba knew the works of al-Djāḡiz remarkably well. Nevertheless his only acknowledged borrowings from this author concern the *K. al-*



*Bukhālā*?. About the remainder one can only guess. Finally, it is not without interest to note that Ibn Ẹutayba borrowed extensively from existing, and remarkably faithful, translations of the Torah and of the Gospels (in *Ma'ārif*, *Mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* and *'Uyūn al-akhbār*).

Interested mainly in his work on *adab*, which in fact was until recently the only example of his literary output in their libraries, western critics have often tended to overlook Ibn Ẹutayba's "theological" work and to pass in silence over his religious ideas.

It seems clear however that at some stage Ibn Ẹutayba put his literary talents at the service of the enterprise of the restoration of Sunnism which was undertaken by al-Mutawakkil and his chief helpers. This meant that a number of his works were intended to expound a politico-religious doctrine which we might expect would take its place in the ideological line of the Sunna then coming into being, and particularly that represented by Ibn Ḥanbal and Ishāk b. Rāhawwayh.

Nevertheless, Ibn Ẹutayba, who admits to having been tempted in his youth by the quasi-rationalist ideologies which were in vogue at the time, was at times somewhat troubled by the dogmatic intransigence of the upholders of Tradition.

Although his theodicy is fairly clearly "Ḥanbali", his attitude on *ḡadar* has nevertheless some strange nuances; although his attitude concerning the Ẹur'ān is orthodox, he is much less categorical on the problem of *lafz* [q.v.], which he states does not prevent membership of the Sunni community; although his attitude concerning the Companions is that which remained in later times the touchstone of the Sunna, he nevertheless retained a deep and reverent respect for the family and descendants of the Prophet, so far as they were politically neutral. Even his opinions about the "national groups" (*Shu'ūbiyya*) seem much more subtle than has hitherto been admitted: whether he is writing of ethnic or of religious groups, one is led to think that he tends to gather together peaceably around the reigning dynasty those among them whom he considers it possible to win over politically.

On the other hand Ibn Ẹutayba's methodology — of which he nowhere gives a systematic definition — certainly seems steadfastly to despise the rational or intellectual criteria held for example among the Shāfi'is and the Ḥanafis. The Ẹur'ān and the Sunna remain for him the two fundamental bases of doctrine; the third is *idjmā'*, of which his conception is perhaps nearer to that of Mālik than of Ibn Ḥanbal. The Ḥanafī *ra'y* and the Shāfi'ī *ḡiyās* are fiercely demolished in the *Mukhtalif*, as are all their equivalents (*naẓar*, *'aḡl*, *istiḡsān*, etc.).

Thus all the religious, political and literary work of Ibn Ẹutayba combines to make him an eminent representative, if not the exclusive spokesman, of the *ahl al-Sunna wa 'l-Djāmā'a*, who in fact from this period were the party of the 'Abbāsīd dynasty after it abandoned the Mu'tazilī ideology.

Critics from Ibn al-Nadīm onwards all reproduce the same ready-made opinion concerning Ibn Ẹutayba's place in the "philological schools". It is admitted without hesitation that he was the chief creator of a "Baḡhdādī synthesis" between the philological doctrines of Kūfa and of Baḡra. On close inspection this opinion is shown to be open to doubt. In fact, in addition to the point already emphasized by G. Weil (introd. to the ed. of the *K. al-Inṣāf fī masā'il al-ḡhīlāf* . . . of Ibn al-Anbārī, Leiden 1913) that the schools of Baḡra and of Kūfa can scarcely have assumed their distinctive characteristics before the

end of the 3rd/9th century, nothing has been found in Ibn Ẹutayba's philological work, or at least in what now survives, which could really justify this point of view. Although he in effect contrasts them with the "Baḡrans", he regularly refers to those who were later to be attached to the "School of Kūfa" as "Baḡhdādīs", and the synthesis of which so much has been made is no more than a genuine eclecticism which never claimed to form a school.

All that can be said is that Ibn Ẹutayba in fact joins certain reputedly Kūfī tendencies to others considered to be Baḡran. His position may be summarized by stating that in grammar he remains on the whole a supporter of the norm, *i.e.*, "Baḡran", in spite of his attachment to the teaching of al-Kisā'i and of al-Farrā', whereas in a more general way, in philology and especially in poetry, he does not hesitate to depart from the usually accepted views, an attitude considered to be "Kūfī".

Ibn Ẹutayba's writing on poetry is found mainly in two works: the *K. Ma'ānī 'l-shi'r*, a long anthology of poetic themes, and the *K. al-Shi'r wa 'l-shu'arā'*, a mainly chronologically arranged anthology. It is possible that other works, now lost, were also on poetry. Thus there is frequently mentioned a *K. 'Uyūn al-shi'r* of which nothing is known. It is usual (see Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *op. cit.*) to attribute great importance to the introduction to the *K. al-Shi'r wa 'l-shu'arā'*. It is true that it appears as a "veritable manuel du néo-classicisme" (R. Blachère, *HLA*, i, 140) in the sense that it exhorts writers to "create antique verses on new thoughts" and contributes some original ideas on the ideal poetic technique. But one has no hesitation in saying that this text, though of some interest for the evidence it contains, is nevertheless grossly overrated as a treatise on style. Close inspection reveals that its few main ideas have nothing at all to do with poetic style. They concern in fact a great problem of cultural ethos, that of the quarrel of Ancients and Moderns, and in addition an important problem of historical method, that of the documentary value of a literary work in the strict sense. There is nothing in this which truly concerns poetics. As Ibn Ẹutayba composed no poetry at all himself, he continues to be regarded as a writer of prose.

Nevertheless, he must be regarded as an innovator, in the sense that he devotes in his anthologies, and particularly in the *Shi'r*, at least as much space to the "modern" as to the "ancient" poets. Thus he professes a great admiration for writers such as Baḡshār and Abū Nuwās, to mention only the greatest. In addition he has the merit of mentioning poets of whom otherwise almost nothing is known.

Ibn Ẹutayba's reputation, especially in the West, is based mainly on his ability as a writer of *adab*. His *adab*, which comprises an ethos and a culture in which are united all the intellectual currents of 'Abbāsīd society at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, and which displays an intent to popularize, at least for a certain literate public, is in this sense a kind of humanism. But it would be wrong, in the light of the eclectic professions of faith in the introductions of the *'Uyūn* and the *Adab al-kātib*, to regard it as a secularist or even simply as a secular humanism, as some have tended to do in the West. What has been said above on his religious position and his attitude as defender of the *Sunna* clearly proves that in his mind there is no difference in kind but simply one of degree between the religious and the secular aspect of his educational work.

Ibn Ẹutayba's culture amalgamates in several

ways the four great cultural trends of his period: the Arabic trend proper, which consists of the "Arabic" sciences, *i.e.*, the religious sciences properly so-called, to which must be added the philological and "historical" sciences; the Indo-Iranian current, which contributes a certain administrative culture and a certain conception of the social relations in a developed society; the Judaeo-Christian trend, which adds a certain spiritual ferment; and, in a lesser degree, the Hellenistic trend which contributes the taste for logic and experimental knowledge.

Similarly Ibn Qutayba's ethic brings together the great ethical systems conveyed by these different cultures: the proud and pitiless ethic of the desert, that of the virile and sober qualities of the pre-Islamic *muruwwa*, the civilized and opportunist ethic of the Persian tradition, the spiritual and mystic ethic of the three revealed religions. Nevertheless, one seeks in vain in the resulting synthesis for any influence of Aristotelian or Platonic ethics, they being too clearly incompatible with the developing Sunni ideal.

It is usual to consider the style of a compiler as a myth. Certainly it must be admitted that the great mass of Ibn Qutayba's work cannot be directly attributed to him. The data of *adab* and *ḥadīth* are obviously not written by him. Nevertheless it must not be forgotten that all his works are preceded by introductions, usually long, and apparently on the whole original, consisting of several hundred pages in all. Furthermore it cannot be denied that his works of polemical ideology such as the *Mukhtalif*, the *Iḥtibāl fi 'l-laḥz* and the *Masā'il* are entirely original. Thus, paradoxically, it is in the works or parts of works of the most technical nature that we must expect to find passages which demonstrate Ibn Qutayba's qualities as a writer.

Ibn Qutayba is, so far as is known at present, the third great writer of Arabic prose chronologically after Ibn al-Muḥaffa' and al-Djāhiz. After the bombastic and often obscure literary prose of the middle of the 2nd/8th century, and after the brilliant but difficult style of al-Djāhiz, Ibn Qutayba introduced a prose whose dominant characteristic was ease and facility. Far from the oratorical periods of the *kuṭūb* of the 2nd century and from the faceted style of al-Djāhiz, his sentences are simple, short and without artifice; his language is that in current use, with no concession to *gharīb* and not bound by an exaggerated respect for the norms of grammatical theory. It is already "modern Arabic".

The two aspects of Ibn Qutayba, the "secular" and the "religious", which are however distinguished only for the purpose of explanation, reflect a double personality: with a mind open to all the current intellectual ideas, which he attempted to spread among the responsible people of his time, Ibn Qutayba, requested at a certain time to give the support of his literary authority to al-Mutawakkil's reform, found himself, as was said by Ibn Taymiyya, spokesman of the nascent Sunna. It is not surprising if, after this, this eclectic man of letters felt himself constrained to stifle certain of his syncretist tendencies. This explains the reticence concerning him which was maintained in later years, in the East as well as in the West, though generally for opposite reasons; and this explains why none of the great ideological schools of Islam has ever dared to claim him.

*Bibliography:* (1) Principal bio-bibliographical references: Dhahabī, *Mizān*, Cairo 1325, ii, 77; Khaṭīb Baghdādī, *Ta'rikh*, Cairo 1349/1931, x,

170 (no. 5309); Ibn al-Aṭhīr, *Lubāb*, Cairo 1356, ii, 242; Ibn Ḥadījar, *Lisān al-Mizān*, Ḥaydarābād 1329-31, iii, 357-9; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, Cairo 1948, ii, 246 (no. 304); Ibn al-Imād, *Shadharāt*, Cairo 1350, ii, 169-70; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, Cairo 1348, 121; Kifī, *Inbāh*, Cairo 1371/1952, ii, 143 and note; Sam'ānī, *Ausāb*, Leiden 1912, fol. 443a; Suyūṭī, *Bughya*, Cairo 1326, 291; Yāfi'ī, *Mir'āt al-djānān*, Ḥaydarābād 1337, ii, 191; Yāqūt, *Irshād*, Leiden 1907-31, i, 160-1. (2) Modern references: Ziriklī, *A'lām*, Cairo 1927-8, ii, 586; 'Umar Riḍā Kahhāla, *Mu'djam al-mu'allifin*, Damascus 1375-80/1955-61, vi, 150-1. The remainder are now out of date, including Brockelmann I, 120-1 and S I, 184-5; Flügel, *Die grammatischen Schulen der Araber*, Leipzig 1862, 287-90. (3) Principal general studies: Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, introduction to the edition of the *Maysir*, Cairo 1343, 3-28; Aḥmad Zakī al-'Adawī, notice at the beginning of vol. iv of the edition of the *'Uyūn al-akḥbār*, Cairo 1349/1930, 5-40; Muḥammad Zaghlūl Sallām, introduction to his extracts from Ibn Qutayba in *Nawābiḡh al-fikr al-'arabī*, Cairo 1957, no. 18, 5-62; Tharwat 'Ukāsha, introduction to the edition of the *Ma'ārif*, Cairo 1960, 3-100 (in Arabic), 3-30 (in French); Ishāq Mūsā al-Ḥusaynī, *The life and works of Ibn Qutayba*, Beirut 1950; Sayyid Aḥmad Ṣaqr, introduction to the edition of the *Mushkil al-Kur'ān*, Cairo 1373/1954, 3-67; G. Lecomte, *Ibn Qutayba, L'homme, son oeuvre, ses idées*, Damascus 1965 (with extensive bibliography); idem, *Addenda*, in *Arabica*, 1966, 173-96. (4) Miscellaneous works: L. Kopf and F. S. Bodenheimer, *The natural history section from a 9th century "Book of useful knowledge"*, the *'Uyūn al-akḥbār* of Ibn Qutayba, Paris-Leiden 1949; Ch. Pellat, *Ibn Qutayba wa 'l-ḥaqāfa al-'arabiyya*, in the Ṭāhā Ḥusayn memorial volume, Cairo 1962; G. Lecomte, *Le Traité des divergences du ḥadīth d'Ibn Qutayba* (annotated tr. of the *K. Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*), Damascus 1962; idem, *L'Ifrīqiya et l'Occident dans le K. al-Ma'ārif d'Ibn Qutayba*, in *CT*, 1957, 252-5; idem, *Les citations de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament dans l'oeuvre d'Ibn Qutayba*, in *Arabica*, 1958, 34-46 (see on the same subject G. Vajda, in *REJ*, 1935, 68-80); idem, *Les descendants d'Ibn Qutayba en Égypte*, in *Études Lévi-Provençal*, Paris 1961, i, 165-73; idem, *La waṣiyya (testament spirituel) attribuée à... Ibn Qutayba*, in *REI*, i (1960), 71-92; idem, *Les disciples directs d'Ibn Qutayba*, in *Arabica*, 1963, 282-300; idem, *Le problème d'Abū 'Ubayd; réflexions sur les "erreurs" que lui attribue Ibn Qutayba*, in *Arabica*, 1965, 140-74.

For Ibn Qutayba's place in the development of rhetoric, see BALĀGHA and AL-MA'ĀNĪ WA'L-BAYĀN.

(G. LECOMTE)

IBN AL-KUṬĪYYA, ABŪ BAKR B. 'UMAR B. 'ABD AL-'AZĪZ B. IBRĀHĪM B. 'ĪSĀ B. MUZĀHĪM, a grammarian and, in particular, historian of Muslim Spain, who owes his appellation "son of the Gothic woman" to the fact that one of his ancestors, 'Īsā b. Muzāhīm, a freedman of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, had married Sara, daughter of Olmundo and granddaughter of the penultimate Visigothic king, Vitiza. Leaving Seville where her family was living, Sara had gone to Damascus to complain to the caliph Ḥishām b. 'Abd al-Malik of the losses she had suffered at the hands of her uncle Ardabasto who, on the death of his brother, had seized his possessions in the East of al-Andalus. 'Īsā and Sara returned to al-Andalus, and their descendants lived in Seville.

Ibn al-Ḳuṭīyya was thus a *mawlā* of the Umayyads and a descendant of the Visigothic nobility. Born in Seville, he settled in Cordova after studying in his native town and in the capital of al-Andalus, under such famous teachers as Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Zubayrī, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Aymān, Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. Lubāba and Ḳāsim b. Aṣḡagh. He lectured in Cordova and had several pupils, some of them well-known, especially the *ḥādī* Abu 'l-Ḥazm Ḳhalaf b. ʿIsā al-Waṣḡki and the historian Ibn al-Faraḡī, his principal biographer. He won distinction as a poet, but even more through his knowledge of grammar and lexicography, on which subjects he wrote works highly esteemed by later generations. He also gained a reputation as a jurist-consult and traditionist and, though criticized, he was none the less consulted as to the meaning or idea of such and such a phrase from the grammatical or lexicological point of view. His fame led to his being presented to al-Ḥakam II as the greatest philologist of his time; he held the office of *ḥādī* and enjoyed great prestige during his lifetime. He died in Cordova, in old age, on Tuesday 23 Rabiʿ I 367/6 November 977.

Of his various works, among which was his *Kitāb al-Maḡṣūr wa 'l-mamdūd*, the only ones to have survived are: (1) *Kitāb Taṣārif al-afʿāl*, published by I. Guidi (*Il libro dei verbi di . . . Ibn al-Quṭīyya*, Leiden 1894) and re-edited recently by ʿAlī Fawda under the title *al-Afʿāl*, Cairo 1953. (2) *Taʿrīkh ifṭiāḥ* (var. *fatḥ*) *al-Andalus*, a history of the conquest of the Iberian peninsula and of the emirate to the end of the reign of the *amīr* ʿAbd Allāh; the Arabic text, prepared from ms. Paris 706 by Gayangos, Saavedra and Codera, was printed in 1868, but it was published only by J. Ribera, with a Spanish trans. and a helpful introduction, under the title *Historia de la conquista de España de Abenalcotia el cordobés* (vol. ii of the *Colección de obras arábigas de historia y geografía que publica la Real Academia de la Historia*), Madrid 1926. Earlier, A. Cherbonneau had brought out an incomplete French trans. (*Histoire de la conquête de l'Espagne par les Musulmans*, in *JA*, i (1853), 458-85 and viii (1856), 428-527); O. Houdas published the first part of the Arabic text with a French trans. (*Histoire de la conquête de l'Andalousie*, in *Recueil de textes . . .*, published by the staff of the École des Langues Orientales, i, Paris 1889, 219-80); E. Fagnan also published a trans. of some fragments in his *Extraits*, 195 ff. The *Taʿrīkh* was re-edited recently by ʿAbd Allāh Anīs al-ʿAbbāʿ, Beirut n.d. [?1957].

The chronicle of Ibn al-Ḳuṭīyya was dictated in the second half of the 4th/10th century and was written down by one of his pupils; it consists of a series of detached notes taken down from dictation, and it is possible that there existed various recensions or copies made by other pupils; a hypothesis of this kind is supported by the fact that the incomplete edition of the *Taʿrīkh fatḥ al-Andalus* published in Cairo contains many variants (see Muḥ. Ibn ʿAzzūz, *Una edición parcial poco conocida de la "Historia de Ibn al-Quṭīyya"*, in *al-Andalus*, xvii (1952), 233-7). This chronicle, which could not have been disseminated before the 5th/11th century, has a special value for the history of al-Andalus in the 3rd/9th century, since it contains traditions, anecdotes, observations and personal impressions, not to be found in any other authors, on specific aspects of life at the Cordovan court and of certain personages. However, it provides, in its first part particularly, only somewhat scanty, imprecise and uncertain information.

*Bibliography*: Ibn al-Faraḡī, *Taʿrīkh ʿulamāʾ al-Andalus*, no. 1316; Dabbi, *Bughyat al-mullamān*, no. 223; Ibn Ḳhallikān, *Būlāk*, ii, 336 (de Slane, iii, 79); Thaʿālibī, *Yatīma*, i, 411; al-Faḥ b. Ḳhāḡān, *Maṣmah*, Istanbul 1302, 58; Suyūṭī, *Bughya*, 84; Dozy, *Hist. de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne*, intitulée *al-Bayano 'l-Mogrib*, Leiden 1848-51, i, 28-30 (still useful); Wüstenfeld, *Geschichtschreiber*, no. 141; Pons Boigues, *Ensayo*, no. 45; Brockelmann, I, 150, S I, 232; Muhammad Ben Cheneb, *Ét. sur les personnages mentionnés dans l'Idjāza du Cheikh ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Fāsi*, no. 231; Sánchez Albornoz, *Fuentes de la historia Hispano-Musulmana del siglo VIII (En torno a los orígenes del feudalismo)*, ii, Mendoza 1942, 216-23 and index (critical and fundamental). (J. BOSCH-VILÀ)

**IBN ḲUṬLÜBUḠĀ**, ḲĀSIM B. ḲUṬLÜBUḠĀ AL-ḤANAFĪ, Egyptian scholar in *ḥadīth* and religious law. He was born in Muḥarram 802/September 1399. His father, Ḳuṭlūbughā, a freedman of Sūdūn al-Shayḡhūnī (d. 798/1396), died while he was still young. He supported himself in his youth as an accomplished tailor (needleworker) but embarked early upon his religious studies, which he pursued all his life. An early teacher of his was ʿIzz al-Dīn Ibn Djamāʿa (d. 819/1416). His principal *shayḡh* was Ibn al-Ḥunām (d. 861/1457). Like all the aspiring young scholars of the time, he also studied with Ibn Ḥaḡḡar. His travels, not very extensive ones, brought him to Damascus, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Mecca. His professional career was not outstanding. He held only shortlived teaching appointments, for instance, in the Baybarsiyya and in the *madrasa* of Djanibak al-Djiddāwī. Equally shortlived stipends from influential friends, consisting in one instance of a monthly allowance of 800, and in another of 2000 *dirhams*, helped him to support his large family. But his scholarly prestige was great, and it seems that his writings and his legal advisory work yielded enough income for his needs. He had close Sūfi connexions and, in the great debate about mysticism, took a stand favorable to Ibn al-ʿArabī and Ibn al-Fāriḡ. Death came to him on the night of Wednesday-Thursday, 4 Rabiʿ II 879/17-18 August 1474.

His literary production, begun in his nineteenth year, was voluminous, approaching, it would seem, about a hundred titles. Among them, there are some works of historical interest and even a treatise on Avicennan logic. However, practically all he did was in the fields of *ḥadīth* and law. His works were the usual commentaries on legal school texts, compilations of traditions, glosses, additions, indexes of legal works, compilations of biographies of religious scholars, studies on Abū Ḥanīfa and his *Musnad*, discussions of individual legal problems, *fatwās*, and the like. Manuscripts of his more popular works have been preserved in great profusion. The catalogue of the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul, for instance, lists about seventy manuscripts, among them some twenty of his *Tāḡī al-tarāḡīm*. This compilation of brief biographies of Ḥanafi authors was first published by G. Flügel and made Ibn Ḳuṭlūbughā's name known in the West (*Abh. K. M.*, ii/3, 1862, also Baghdād 1962; a manuscript dated 866 in Chester Beatty 3572[3]). Another of his biographical compilations, the large collection of brief biographies of reliable transmitters entitled *al-Thiḡāt min al-ruwāt*, is largely preserved in the Mss. Istanbul Köprülü, i, 264 and 1060. An inventory of his surviving writings, let alone a census of autograph copies and important old manuscripts, has

