

University of London

S. O. A. S.

THE 'ABBASID CALIPHATE

(575/1179 - [?]656/1258)

b y

Abdul Munim Rashad Mohamad

Thesis submitted for the degree

o f

Doctor of Philosophy

January 1963



ProQuest Number: 10731586

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 10731586

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

Although the history of 'Abbāsīd 'Irāq in the second half of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century has been least studied, yet the events of this period were of marked importance in the history of 'Irāq in particular and the Muslim world in general. Within this period fall the decline of the Seljūq rule, the rise of the Khwarizmian power, the subjugation of many Muslim countries by a heathen monarch, the Mongol, and finally the abolition of the traditional 'Abbāsīd Caliphate of Baghdād. 'Irāq lost its position as the centre of the Muslim world and became a vassal province of this heathen empire.

1. The theme of the present work is to study the period of the last four 'Abbāsīd Caliphs: al-Nāṣir (1180-1225), al-Zāhir (1225-6), al-Mustanṣir (1226-1242) and al-Musta'ṣim (1242-1258) and their political, religious, social and economic activities which aimed at restoring the lost authority of the Caliphate.
2. Chapter I treats of the political status of the Caliphate and the attempts of the Caliphs to establish their temporal rule and to extend their small principality. Al-Nāṣir succeeded in extending his dominions northwards to Takrīt, northeastwards to Dāqūq and southeastwards, by conquering Khūzistan.
3. Chapter II describes the religious policy of these Caliphs and their steps to confirm their spiritual position. Al-Nāṣir tried to reconcile in his person the different classes of the people by adopting and patronizing the chivalrous order, al-Futuwwa, and by transmitting the Ḥadīth. Although

he was successful in reviving the position of his Caliphate among the Muslims of his time, yet he was not able to achieve either the unity of Islam or the abolition of the rivalry between the Sunnī and the Shī'a communities in his kingdom. This rivalry persisted and because of it the internal stability of the Caliphate was undermined in the reign of al-Musta'ṣim.

4. Chapter III deals with the non-Muslim communities - the Dhimmīs - and their political, social and economic position in the Caliphate.

5. The relations with the Muslim rulers are treated in various chapters of the thesis.

6. Chapter IV treats of the Wazirate, with short biographical notes on the Wazīrs and Nā'ib Wazīrs (acting Wazīrs) who came to power in this period, with a special emphasis on their position in administering the internal and external affairs of the Caliphate.

7. Chapter V describes the revenue and the financial administration. Al-Nāṣir's fiscal measures were adequate enough to bring more revenue to the state but the economic decline of 'Irāq which occurred during the reign of the last Caliph resulted in a deficiency in the revenue. Subsequently the government was obliged to reduce its expenditure on its military organisation by reducing the number of troops. This, no doubt, made impossible the Caliphate's resistance to the Mongol invasion.

8. The ease with which the Caliphate was conquered by the Mongols in 1258 can be attributed to the internal state of affairs in Baghdād and to the superior organisation of the Mongol military forces.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my indebtedness to my supervisor, Professor Bernard Lewis, whose kind advice and encouragement were invaluable to me throughout the course of my work.

I have also to express my special thanks to the staffs of the Libraries of the British Museum, the School of Oriental and African Studies, the Aya Sofya, the Süleymaniye and the Topkapi Saryi Museum.

January 1963.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>page</u>
Abstract	2
Acknowledgments	4
Contents	5
Abbreviations	6
Introduction: Survey of Sources	7
Chapter I. Political Status of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate 575/1179 - 656/1258... ..	41
Chapter II. The Religious Policy of al-Naṣir and his Successors... ..	99
Chapter III. The <u>Dhimmi</u> s.	155
Chapter IV. The Wazirate.	176
Chapter V. The finance of the Caliphate	
I The Revenue.. .. .	209
II Financial administration	223
Bibliography	244

ABBREVIATIONS

A.C.	Acta Orientalia.
B.A.S.I.	Beiträge zur Arabistik, Semitistik und Islamwissenschaft hrsg. von. R. Hartmann und H. Scheel. Leipzig, 1944.
B.C.A.	Bulletin of the College of Arts (Majallat Kuliyyat al-Ādab, Baghdad).
B.E.O.	Bulletin d'etudes orientales.
B.J.R.L.	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
B.S.O.A.S.	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.
D.I.	Der Islam.
E.H.R.	The Economic History Revue.
E.I./I	Encyclopaedia of Islam 1st ed.
E.I./II	" " " 2nd ed.
E.O.	Etudes Orientales.
H.J.A.S.	Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies.
J.A.	Journal asiatique.
J.E.S.H.O.	Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient.
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
J.S.S.	Journal of Semitic Studies.
R.C.E.A.	Repertoire chronologique d'epigraphie arabe.
R.E.I.	Revue des etudes islamiques.
S.I.	Studia Islamica.
W.G.	Welt als Geschichte.

INTRODUCTION

SURVEY OF SOURCES

I. 'Irāqi Sources

The contemporary 'Irāqi sources, in general, constitute the major source of material for the study of the late 'Abbāsīd Caliphate. Their information is, without doubt, invaluable for the light it throws on the internal affairs of the Caliphate. They also provide the most detailed account of events that took place during the life times of their authors, as eye witnesses of these events, or of those events that took place shortly before their time.

Below is a quick look over these sources and their authors.

A. The Chronicles.

Ibn al-Sa'ī.

Abū Ṭālib 'Alī ibn Anjab Ṭaj al-Dīn al-Khāzin was born in 593/1196 and died on 20 Ramaḍān 674/8 Mar. 1276.¹ About his youth very little is known but, after the opening of al-Mustansiriyya College (in 631/1234), he was appointed librarian (Khāzin al-Kutub) there.² This

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 386; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 270; al-Nuwayrī, Nihayat al-Arab, (Paris MS. Supp. Ar. N. 739) XXIV, fol. 58b. On his life and works see Brockelmann, G.A.L., Supp. I, p. 590; see also the introduction of M. Jawād to his edition of al-Jamī' al-Mukhtaṣar, Baghdad 1934.

²Ibn al-Furat, The History of Ibn al-Furat, ed. by Q. Zurayq, VII, p. 61.

office, no doubt, allowed him to see many works on different subjects, but his main concern was with history,¹ on which he wrote many works. Below is a list of some of his writings:

1. Al-Īnās fī Manāqib Khulafā' banī 'l-'Abbās.

2. Ghazal al-Zurraf.

Both these works were dedicated to al-Mustansir and the author received 100 Dinars for each of them.

3. Nuzhat al-Absār, dedicated to al-Musta'sim on the occasion of the circumcision of the two sons of the Caliph.²

4. Sīrat al-Nasir.

5. Sīrat al-Mustansir.

6. Ta'rikh Nisā' al-Khulafā'.

7. Ta'rikh al-Wuzarā'.

8. Al-Ta'rikh al-Atabikī; this was written at the request of the ruler of Shahrazūr, Nur al-Dīn Arslānshāh.³

From these works one can say that Ibn al-Sā'ī was a professional historian⁴ and had close relations with the ruling class in Baghdad, as well as being

¹Ibn al-Sā'ī is called, by the following historians, al-Mu'arrikh, "The Historian": see Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 270, Dhahabī, XXI, fol. 22b, Nuwayrī, op.cit., XXIX, fol. 58b.

²Dhahabī, XXI, fol. 22b.

³Ibid.; for the full list of Ibn al-Sā'ī's works see M. Jawad's introduction to al-Jamī' al-Mukhtasar, but none of these works is extant.

⁴Cf. F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, Leiden 1952, pp. 51-2.

under the patronage of the Caliphs. He was, therefore, likely to be a court historian rather than an ordinary chronicler; thus one expects him to be loyal to the 'Abbāsid rule and to view events from the angle of Baghdād and the court. This patronage, no doubt, affected his style in recording his facts in his work al-Jāmi' al-Mukhtaṣar; for instance he puts the word "Azīz" - the mighty one - whenever the word Dīwān occurs, and the formula "May God be pleased with him" whenever the name of the Caliph al-Nāṣir occurs.¹

Of his work al-Jāmi' al-Mukhtaṣar fī 'Unwān al-Tawārīkh wa 'Uyūn al-Siyar there is one volume still extant, that is the ninth volume which covered the period 595-606/1199-1210.² According to Ibn al-Furāt this work was in 30 volumes.³ It is the most detailed work on the internal affairs of the Caliphate. The system followed by the author was that of giving the events at the beginning of every year, followed by the biographies of those who died during the same year. Ibn al-Sa'ī, in this work, gives a great deal of information about the late 'Abbāsid institutions by narrating every appointment to every post and the dismissals of these officials too, with the biographies of those officials who died in

¹See al-Jāmi' al-Mukhtaṣar, pp. 210, 221, 229, 258 etc.

²This volume was edited by Muṣṭafa Jawād and published in Baghdad in 1934; this edition is very poor, with many errors, especially in identifying the names.

³Ta'rikh, VII, 61; while Ibn al-'Imād says that this work was in 26 volumes, Shadharat, V, p. 344.

the year in question. He pays slight attention to the economic status of the country, except when there is some economic crisis. He preserves many valuable documents in this work, such as the decree which was issued by al-Nāṣir to re-organise al-Futuwwa,¹ and the decree of the appointment of Naqīb of the 'Alīds.²

The works of Ibn al-Sā'ī have been used extensively by later historians such as al-Dhahabī,³ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī⁴ and Ibn Kathīr.⁵

Ibn al-Fuwaṭī.

Abd al-Razzaq ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Shaybānī was born in Bagh-dād on 17 Muḥarram 642/25 June 1244 and, when the Mongols conquered Bagh-dād, he was taken captive by them but was released by Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, and became his student.⁶ He went to Marāgha and there he was appointed in charge of the library of the observatory⁷ which was founded by al-Ṭūsī in 657/1258-9.⁸ He stayed in Marāgha for several years; this

¹Al-Jamī' al-Mukhtaṣar, pp. 224-6.

²Ibid., pp. 193-99. Naqīb; chief, leader.

³Ta'riḫ al-Islām, XIX, fols. 252a, 230a, 14, 231 etc.

⁴Al-Hamādith al-Jamī'a, pp. 252, 260.

⁵Bidāya, XIII, p. 192.

⁶Ibn al-Imād, VI, p. 60.

⁷Ibn Ḥajar, II, p. 364.

⁸Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 341.

office, no doubt, gave him the opportunity to see and read many valuable works on history.¹ Ibn al-'Imād relates that Ibn al-Fuwaṭī obtained some information from al-Mubārak, the son of al-Musta'sim, in the year 666/1267-8 in Marāgha.² It is highly probable that the information he obtained from al-Mubārak was that concerning the fall of Baghdād and the death of the last Caliph.³

Ibn al-Fuwaṭī returned afterwards to Baghdād where he was appointed as a librarian of al-Mustanṣiriyya College; probably this appointment took place after the death of Ibn al-Sa'ī, the former librarian of this College. Ibn al-Fuwaṭī stayed in this office till his death on 3 Muḥarram 723/12 Jan. 1323.⁴

Ibn al-Fuwaṭī worked on different fields of knowledge, he even studied philosophy and astrology with al-Tūsī.⁵ History received a considerable part of his attention, judging from the list of his works which was mentioned by Dhahabī,⁶ but unfortunately there are, so far, only two books extant: the first is called Ta'rikh Majma' al-Adab, Vol. IV,⁷

¹Ibn Hajar relates that it has been said that there were 400,000 books in this library, see al-Durar, II, p. 364.

²Shadharāt, VI, p. 60.

³Al-Mubārak was born in 640/1242-3 and when Baghdād was conquered he was spared and sent to Marāgha, where he stayed till his death which occurred in 677/1278-9; see al-Kazirūnī, fol. 95b.

⁴Ibn Hajar, II, pp. 364-5.

⁵Ibn al-'Imād, VI, p. 60.

⁶Ibid., p. 61; for further detail about these works see the preface of M. Jawad to his edition of al-Hawadith al-Jami'a; Brock, S. II, p. 202

the second al-Hawadith al-Jami'a.¹ The latter work covered the period between 626-700/1228-1301. This work is the most detailed work on the history of 'Iraq during this period; therefore, it is the main source for the internal affairs of the Caliphate up to its destruction. The author follows a chronological order in relating his narratives, with great attention in recording all officials, their appointments and dismissals together with their biographies, without neglecting the events which occurred during the period, especially the political and economic crises.

Because of his post and his patronage under al-Tūsī one would expect him to favour the Mongols, but this is not always the case; for instance, he mentions the defeat of the Mongol army in 'Ayn Jalūt² without giving any reason for this defeat which would have helped the Mongols to save face.

He describes the fall of Baghdād in detail and mentions most of the actions which followed this event.³ Like the other 'Irāqi historians

(cont.)

Rosenthal, op.cit., pp. 350, 414; see also A. al-'Azzawī, al-Ta'rif bi'l-Mu'arrikhin, Baghdād 1957, pp. 160 ff.

⁷This work is extant in MS. in al-Zahiriyya Library in Damascus, see A. al-'Azzawī, p. 162.

¹Edited by M. Jawād and published in Baghdād in 1932, this edition is very poor with many errors in stating the names and in ordering the events, see the years 643 and 653 of the text.

²Al-Hawadith al-Jami'a, p. 344.

³Ibid., pp. 331 ff.

Ibn al-Fuwaṭī does not ascribe any role to Ibn al-'Alqamī, the Wazīr of al-Musta'ṣim, in the fall of the Caliphate, while all the Syrian and Egyptian historians of this period accused this Wazīr of an act of treachery towards the Caliph. In any case, either Ibn al-'Alqamī was innocent of this accusation, or Ibn al-Fuwaṭī deliberately exonerated him from this act by keeping silent because, if he had mentioned this treachery, he would have put the Mongols in a weak position and suggested that they could not have conquered Baghdād without the aid of a traitor.¹

Ibn al-Athīr.

'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Karīm 'Izz al-Dīn ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī was born at Jazirat Ibn 'Umar in 555/1160. His father took him to Mosul, where he began his scholastic career. He travelled to Baghdād and Damascus, where he studied under notable scholars. He finally settled in Mosul, and died there in 630/1233.²

He wrote several works, but the most important one among them is his universal history, al-Kāmil fī 'l-Ta'rikh. He lived under the patronage of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu', the governor of Mosul and wrote this work at

¹ Cf. below pp.

² Al-Subkī, V, p. 127; Ibn al-'Imād, V, p. 137; Ibn Taghri Bardī, VI, p. 282; for his life and works see Brock. I, p. 345, and S. I, p. 587; see also E.I./I, s.v. Ibn al-Athīr; Rosenthal, p. 49.

³ This work was printed several times, but the best edition is Tornberg's (1851-76) in 14 vols.

the request of his master.¹ He, therefore, views events from the angle of Mosul.²

The narratives of this work stopped at the year 629/1231-2, therefore the last part of this work, which covered the period 575-629, A.H. is of direct value to this study.

His narratives of Baghdād and the Caliphate are, in general, short and confined to the main events only. His account of the biographies of al-Nāṣir and al-Zāhir³ are of considerable value. Although he shows a great prejudice against al-Nāṣir, no doubt because of the latter's religious policy, he shows a great deal of favour towards al-Zāhir and showers him with his praise. Therefore a certain caution must be maintained in accepting any of his information about the 'Abbāsid Caliphate and especially any which concerns the Caliph al-Nāṣir.⁴

B. Biographical Works

Ibn al-Dubaithī.

Muḥammad ibn Abī 'l-Ma'ālī Sa'id ibn Yahya ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Dubaithī al-Wasiṭī was born in Wasit on 26 Rajab 558/30 June 1163.⁵ He

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 337; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 214.

² See B. Lewis, "The sources for the history of the Syrian Assassins", Speculum, XXVII, 1952, p. 483.

³ See al-Kāmil, XII, 285 ff.

⁴ Ibn al-Athīr's accounts of events that happened outside Mosul are not always reliable; see H.A.R. Gibb, "The Arabic sources for the life of Saladin", Speculum, XXV (1950), pp. 58 ff; idem, "Notes on the Arabic materials for the history of the early Crusades", B.S.O.A.S. VII (1933-5) pp. 747 ff.

⁵ Ibn Khallikān, I, p. 660.

started his scholarly career at Wasīṭ, and afterwards went to Bagh-
dād where he settled and was appointed 'Ald till his death on 8 Rabi'
II 637/8 Oct. 1239.¹ Ibn al-Dubaiṭhī wrote two works on history:
the first is Ta'rikh Wasīṭ, and the second is a continuation, in
three volumes, of the history of Baghḍad of 'Abd al-Karim al-Sam'ānī.²
Parts of the latter work are still in manuscript form in Paris³ and
in Istanbul.⁴ His style in this work is that of the biographers.
The work consists of the biographies of the notables of Baghḍad ar-
ranged in alphabetical order. This work is abridged by Dhahabī, who
called it Al-Mukhtaṣar al-Muhtaṭaj ilaihi min Ta'rikh al-Hafiz Abī 'Abd
Allāh Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Dubaiṭhī.⁵

From the biographies of al-Nāṣir⁶ and al-Zāhir⁷ one
can judge his 'Abbasid leanings and his loyalty to them.
For instance he several times refers to al-Nāṣir thus,

¹Al-Subkī, V, p. 26; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 188b; see also Brock. I,
p. 330, S.I., p. 565.

²Ibn Khallikān, I, p. 660.

³In the B.N., Arab. 5921-2; see Brock, S.I., p. 565.

⁴In Shahid 'Alī Pasha Collection, No. 1870. The biographies of al-Nāṣir,
the Wazīr ibn al-Qusṣab and al-Qummi were published by M. Jawād in his
appendix to Dhahabī's al-Mukhtaṣar, pp. 29 ff (of the appendix).

⁵The first volume of this Mukhtaṣar was ed. by M. Jawād and published
at Baghḍad in 1951.

⁶The Appendix of M. Jawād, op.cit., p. 34 ff.

⁷Shahid 'Alī Pasha MS. No. 1870, fols. 17b-18a.

"Our Master and our lord the leader, to whom obedience is a duty of all mankind, al-Naṣir li Dīn Allah."

Ibn al-Sa'ī was a student of Ibn al-Dubaithī and relates much information from his teachings.¹

Al-Kazirūnī.

'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd Ḥaḥīr al-Dīn al-Kazirūnī was born in 611/1214.² He died in 697/1297.³ He studied with many famous scholars such as Ibn al-Dubaithī. He was well-known for his mathematical knowledge and wrote a book on this subject.⁴ This knowledge, probably, helped him to enter the service of the Diwān in Baghdād.⁵

Al-Kazirūnī wrote a large historical work called Raudat al-Arib in 17 volumes,⁶ but none of it is extant. This work seems to cover the events in 'Irāq till shortly before the death of the author. However, it seems that this work was one of the important 'Irāqī chronicles on the conquest of Baghdād and the events following it, for Dhahabī, who

¹Al-Jamī' al-Mukhtaṣar, pp. 72, 86, 87, 155..etc.

²Al-Subkī, VI, p. 242; Ibn Ḥajar, III, p. 119.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 497; Ibn Ḥajar, III, p. 119; but al-Subkī says that he died about 700 A.H., Tabaqāt, VI, p. 242.

⁴Ibn Ḥajar, III, p. 119.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 397, where he adds that al-Kazirūnī served in very important posts in the Diwān.

⁶Ibn Ḥajar, III, p. 119; but Cl. Cahen says that this work was in 27 volumes, "Les Chroniques Arabes..." R.E.I. X (1936) p. 342; al-Subkī puts the title of this work as Raudat al-Adib, see Tabaqāt, VI, p. 242.

was very careful in selecting his references, used it to state some of his information about the fall of Baghḍād and to give the biographies of Hūlagū and Abāqa.¹ In spite of this al-Dhahabī criticises him, in the biography of Hūlagū and says,

"Al-Kāzirūnī says that Hūlagū lived for 50 years, he was well acquainted with the art of ruling, and he treated the scholars with sympathy and the people with mercy. But I (al-Dhahabī) say how can a historian live in a heathen country or under a tyrant, Sultān without telling lies and praising this Sultān."²

The second work is called Mukhtaṣar al-Ta'rikh min Awwal al-Zaman ila Muntaha Dawlat banī 'l-'Abbas, and is extant in manuscript.³ In this work he follows the style of the biographical dictionaries, but confines himself to the Caliphs only. He narrates all the important events which occurred during the reign of the Caliph in question; for instance, in the biography of the last 'Abbāsid Caliph he mentions the fall of Baghḍād, the death of al-Musta'ṣim, the biographies of his sons and daughters, and then the names of his Wazīrs, Ḥājibs and Judges.

This manuscript is supposed to be the autograph of the author and is dated 663/1264-5,⁴ but there are some events mentioned in this

¹Ta'rikh al-Islām, XX, fols. 212, 260, 261; XXI, fol. 71

²Ibid., XX, fol. 261b.

³Istanbul, Jarullah Collection, No. 1625.

⁴The text fol. 96a, where is the sentence: "It was written and corrected by his author Zāhir al-Dīn al-Kāzirūnī in 663."; see Cl. Cahen, op.cit., p. 342.

work which occurred later than the date above mentioned, such as the death of al-Mubarak, the son of al-Musta'sim, in 677/1278-9,¹ and the date of the death of Faṭima, the daughter of the same caliph, in 676/1277-8.² These facts, however, suggest that this manuscript was written after 663/1264-5.

The attitude of the author towards the 'Abbasid Caliphate appears to have been respectful, judging from his style in narration; for instance he always puts the formula "May God have mercy on him" whenever he mentions the names of the Caliphs.

He puts the blame for the fall of Baghdād upon ³ *ولاة الأمر*,
(Masters of the affair) without referring to any certain name, and thus he exonerates the Caliph, al-Musta'sim, from any misconduct and his Wazir, Ibn al-'Alqamī, from any mischief towards the Caliphate.⁴

Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa.

Ṣafi al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Ṭabāṭabā b. al-Ṭiqṭaqa was born in 660/1261-2; he wrote his book, al-Fakhrī fī 'l-Adab al-Sultāniya wa
⁵ 'l Duwal-al-Islamiyya, in 701/1301-2 at Mosul and presented it to the

¹ The text fol. 95b.

² Ibid., fol. 96a.

³ Ibid., fol. 94b.

⁴ Cf. below pp.

⁵ Ed. Derenbourg, Paris, 1895; Eng. tr. C.E.J. Whitting, London, 1947.

governor of Mosul, Fakhr al-Din 'Isa b. Ibrahim. He was an 'Alīd and his father was one of the prominent personages among them.¹

Although al-Fakhrī is considered as a fine piece of literature and ^{Ibn} al-Ṭiqṭaqa's historical accounts are not biased,² yet one must bear in mind that Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa was a Shī'ite, wrote his book under the Mongols' control and dedicated it to one of their lieutenants. Therefore, one does not expect him to be entirely neutral towards the 'Abbāsids' history. His bias towards the Mongols is very clear throughout this book and he often called their empire "The conquering dynasty";³ his prejudices against those Caliphs who ill-treated the Shī'a is apparent also.

Regarding his account of the last four of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphs, he recorded some useful information about their life and their Wazīrs. In fact his prejudices do not appear in the biographies of the first three of these Caliphs, al-Nāṣir, al-Zāhir and al-Mustansir, no doubt because of their mild religious policy towards the Shī'a,⁴ but his prejudice is quite clear against the last Caliph, al-Musta'ṣim, because the Shī'a community in Baghḍād had suffered during the reign of this Caliph.⁵

¹For the life and works of this author see Brock, S., II, pp. 201-2; and A. al-'Azzawī, pp. 131ff.

²See R. A. Nicholson, A literary history of the Arabs, Cambridge 1953, p. 454; E.I./I, s.v. Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa (by Cl. Huart).

³Al-Fakhrī, p. 190.

⁴See below, Chapter II, pp. 99 ff.

⁵See al-Fakhrī, pp. 63 ff, 448, and pp. 49ff.

His account of the fall of Baghḍād is very concise, and his attitude towards this event, which is considered by many Sunnī chroniclers as the worst calamity that befell Islam,¹ is peculiar. He says, "Nothing happened in the reign of al-Musta'ṣim worthy of record save the looting of al-Karkh, and how bad [an incident that was]."²

ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baghḍadī.

ʿAbd al-Laṭīf ibn Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad al-Baghḍadī was born in Baghḍād in Rabīʿ I or II 557/Mar.-Apr. 1162 and died there on 12 Muḥarram 629/9 Nov. 1231.³ He travelled widely and lived for a long period in Aleppo.⁴

He wrote several works on many subjects, one of which is still extant, al-Ifāda wa 'l-I'tibār, a short description of Egypt.⁵ Although none of his historical writings are, so far, extant, yet al-Dhahabī preserved several quotations from the writings of this scholar in his Ta'rikh al-Islām; these quotations are:

1. The account of the Mongols' rise to power; Genghis Khan and his efforts to combine all the Tatar tribes; their

¹Al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl Mir'āt al-Zamān, I, p. 85; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 202; see also al-Subkī, V, pp. 109ff and p. 114.

²Al-Fakhrī, p. 451.

³Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 81 ff; see also al-Subkī, V, p. 132; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, II, pp. 201-13; see also E.I./II, s.v. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baghḍadī (by S.M.Stern); cf. J. Somogyi in J.R.A.S., 1936, pp. 596-7.

⁴Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 82a; al-Subkī, V, p. 132; cf. A. al-ʿAzzawī, pp. 15 ff.

⁵E.I./II, s.v. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf.

expansion westwards to Khurasān and their conflict with the Khwarizmian empire, and the destruction of the latter.¹ The Mongols' advance towards Jibāl province and Irbil, and how the army of Irbil and Baghdād were able to stop their progress.²

2. The biographies of the last two Khwarizmian sovereigns, 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad and his son Jalāl al-Dīn Mangubarti, with a fair description of the character of their troops.³
3. The biography of al-Nāṣir, with a detailed account of his personality.⁴
4. The succession of al-Mustanṣir.⁵

Judging from these quotations one can presume that al-Dhahabī copied these passages from a large work, perhaps a universal chronicle, written by al-Muwaffaq.

Al-Muwaffaq's account of al-Nāṣir's life is of great value, shedding light on the activity and personality of this Caliph.⁶ His point of view is that of 'Irāq, and he was favourable to al-Nāṣir and the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate.

¹Dhahabī, XVIII, fols. 222b-225a; see Somagyi in J.R.A.S., 1932, p. 854 ff, and idem in J.R.A.S., 1936, p. 598.

²Dhahabī, XVIII, fols. 244-7; see also below Chapter I, pp. 71-2.

³Dhahabī, XVIII, fols. 172-73; XIX, fols. 76-7, and fol. 239b.

⁴Ibid. XIX, fols. 10b ff.

⁵Ibid. fols. 222-3.

⁶See below, Chapter I, pp. 84-5 and Chapter II, pp. 128-9.

C. Geographical literature.

The 'Irāqi geographical literature of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in general, is very limited in quantity as well as in value to this study. Yāqūt al-Rūmī (564-626/1168-1229)¹ wrote Mu'jam al-Buldan² in this period. This geographical dictionary contains a considerable amount of information about the Caliphate principality and sheds some light on the economic condition of 'Irāq. Yāqūt drew most of his information from earlier sources, which have nothing to do with this study. His description of the Sawād is good but, while he relates the revenue of this province during the time of 'Umar I,³ he mentions nothing about his own time. Thus the value of this work in regard to the fiscal and economic life of the late 'Abbāsīd Caliphate is very limited.

II Non-Iraqi Sources

A. The general chronicles.

Although most of the non-'Irāqi chronicles pay slight attention to the affairs of the Caliphate, yet their information constitutes a good source of material for the history of 'Irāq. Their information, in

¹For the life and works of Yāqūt see: Brock, I, pp. 479 ff, S. I, p. 880; Ibn Khallikān, II, pp. 277 ff; also A. al-Azzawī, pp. 10 ff.

²This work was edited by Wüstenfeld (1866-73) in 6 volumes.

³The text, III, p. 178.

general, serves to supply another point of view towards the Caliphate affairs and also serves as a check for all the complementary evidence in the 'Irāqi sources. They also represent the attitude of the other Muslim rulers and a common impression of the Caliphate, and also clarify the relation between Baghdād and the other Muslim rulers. The most important among these general chronicles are:

Sibt ibn al-Jawzī.

Shams al-Dīn Abū 'l-Muzaffar Yūsuf ibn Qirughlu al-Baghdādī al-Hanafī, usually called Sibt ibn al-Jawzī, was born in 582/1186 at Baghdād. He studied with his grandfather Ibn al-Jawzī, the celebrated Hanbali Shaykh. Sibt went to Damascus after 600/1203-4. He entered the service of the Ayyubid ruler, al-Mu'azzam, who persuaded him to adopt the Hanafi school. Sibt was kept in the service of the Ayyubid rulers as Wā'iẓ (preacher), until his death, which occurred on 21 Dhu 'l-Hijja 654/10 Jan. 1257.¹

Sibt wrote several works² and on history he composed a universal chronicle called Mir'at al-Zamān,³ the events of which stopped at the be-

¹For the life of Sibt see Ibn al-'Imād, V, pp. 266-7; Ibn Abī 'l-Wafā', II, pp. 230-31; see also Abū Shāma, pp. 195; Brock. I, p. 347, S.I. p. 589; Rosenthal, pp. 412-3.

²See the list of his works in A. al-'Azzawī, p. 71.

³The last volume of this work (the eighth volume), which covered the events between 495-654 A.H., was published in facsimile by J.R. Jewett (Chicago 1907); another edition of the same volume was printed in Hyderabad (1951-2) but the latter edition is inadequate with many errors in identifying the proper names.

ginning of the year 654/1257, shortly before the death of the author.

However, it seems that because Sibṭ changed his school - Madhhab - from Ḥanbalī to Ḥanafī, Dhahabī criticising his authenticity in dealing with history called him "Adventurer".¹ Ibn Rajab also says about Sibṭ "But Abū 'l Muẓaffar was not an authority (هجة) in what he relates..."²

In Mir'at al-Zaman Sibṭ followed the method of his grandfather, Ibn al-Jawzī, in combining together the narratives as well as the biographies of the notables. Although his main concern was the events in Syria and Egypt, yet he recorded valuable information about the history of the Caliphate. Because of his patronage and service to the Ayyūbid rulers he undoubtedly represents the official Ayyūbid tendency towards the Caliphate. He tried, all the time, to represent his masters as good allies and vassals of the Caliphate. When, in 622/1225-6, Jalāl al-Dīn Mangubartī - the last Sultān of the Khwarizm-shahs - asked al-Mu'azzam to help him against the Caliph, al-Mu'azzam, says Sibṭ, denied him his aid and told Jalāl al-Dīn, "I am with you against anybody, except the Caliph, for he is the Imām of all the Muslims".³

¹Ta'rikh al-Islām, XVIII, fol. 231a.

²Ibn Abi 'l-Wafā', II, p. 231; see also A. al-'Azzawī, pp. 72-3.

³Mir'at al-Zaman, ed. Jewett, p. 417-8; cited also by Abū Shāma, p. 144.

In general, he was neutral towards the Caliphate's affairs and recorded what he heard, saw, or could copy from other chronicles. His work, Mir'at al-Zaman, became a source for later historians such as Abū Shāma, who copied Mir'at in many instances word for word (see below), and Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, Dhahabī and others.

Abū Shāma

Shihāb al-Dīn Abū 'l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Ismā'īl al-Maqdisī was born in Damascus on 23 Rabi' II 599/10 Jan. 1203. He died on 19 Ramaḍān 665/13 June 1267.¹

Abū Shāma wrote several works on history, but the most important are:

1. Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn fī Akhbar al-Dawlatayn, a history of Nūr al-Dīn and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn.
2. Al-Dhayl 'ala 'l-Rawḍatayn, a continuation of the preceding work.²

The latter work is the important one to this study, for it covers the events between 590-665 A.H., until shortly before the author's death. His information about the 'Abbāsid Caliphate was derived mainly from Sibṭ's Mir'at al-Zaman, in fact, on many occasions, he quotes Sibṭ word

¹On the life and works of this author see E.I./II, s.v. Abū Shāma (by Hilmy Ahmad); al-Kutubī, I, p. 322; Ibn al-'Imad, V, p. 318; Subkī, V, pp. 61-2; Brock. I, p. 386, S.I., p. 550; and A. al-'Azzamī, pp. 84 ff.

²The Dhayl was printed in Cairo (1947) with the title: Tarājim Rijāl al-Qarnayn al-Ṣadis wa 'l-Sabi'.

for word.¹

As one expects from him, as a Syrian historian, the affairs of Syria and Egypt occupied a very prominent place in his Dhayl. He was an accurate historian and was in his fifties when the Caliphate of Baghdād was brought to an end.² His report on the fall of Baghdād is short but he includes in it the treachery of Ibn al-'Alqamī, the Wazīr of the Caliphate;³ this accusation is of great importance, for Abū Shāma was the earliest Muslim historian to report this allegation.

Al-Yūnīnī.

Quṭb al-Dīn Mūsā ibn Muḥammad al-Yūnīnī al-Ḥanbalī was born at Ba'labak in Šafar 640/Aug. 1242. After the death of his brother he became the Shaykh of the town. He himself died in 726/1325-6.⁴ He wrote a Dhayl⁵ to Mir'āt al-Zamān of Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī. This Dhayl begins with the events of the year 654/1256-7 and his account of the history of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate of Baghdād confines itself to the fall of the Caliphate and the biography of the last Caliph, al-Musta'ṣim. His point of view is a Syrian one; his comment on the fall of the Caliphate is, "No calamity has befallen Islam like this calamity".⁶

¹See E.I./II, s.v. Abū Shāma; compare Sibṭ, ed. Jewett, p. 407, and Tarājim, p. 128; Sibṭ, p. 348 and Tarājim, p. 60, etc.

²See D. Ayalon, "Transfer of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate..", Arabica, VII, 1960, p. 51.

³Tarājim, pp. 198-9; see below pp.

⁴Ibn Ḥajar, IV, p. 382; cf. Ibn al-'Imād, VI, pp. 73-4.

⁵Two volumes of this Dhayl were printed in Hyderabad (1954-5).

⁶See Dhayl, I, p. 85.

Bar-Hebraeus.

Abū 'l-Faraj Gregorius, the son of Aaron, was born in 526/1225-6 at Malitene (Malaṭiya). His father was a distinguished physician of Hebrew descent. Abū 'l-Faraj studied philosophy, theology, Syriac and Arabic; he also acquired from his father a considerable knowledge of medicine. He visited Aleppo and, in 1246, he was ordained as Bishop of Jūbas. In 1264 he was elected a Morphan of the East. He held this office until his death on 30 July 1286 at Maragha.¹

He composed several works on different subjects and two on history; the first, in Syriac, a universal history,² the second, in Arabic, also a universal history³ translated by the author himself from his Syriac work with certain abridgment.⁴

In his Arabic work he usually omits all the paragraphs which carry down curses on the Arabs (as he usually calls the Muslims in his Syriac book). In his early information about the history of 'Irāq in general, and Baghdād in particular, he draws mainly from Ibn al-Athīr.⁵ As a

¹On the life of Bar-Hebraeus see the introduction of Ṣalḥānī to his edition of Mukhtaṣar and the introduction of E.A.W. Budge to his English tr. of the Syriac history of Bar-Hebraeus; E.I./I, s.v. Bar-Hebraeus; and the chapter on this author by Th. Noldeke in Sketches from Eastern History, London 1892; see also A. al-'Azzawī, p. 119 ff.

²This work was edited and translated into English with the title The Chronography of Gregory Abu 'l-Faraj, by E.A. Wallis Budge, Oxford 1932.

³Mukhtaṣar Ta'rīkh al-Duwal, ed. Ṣalḥānī, Bayrūth 1890.

⁴Cf. E.I./I, s.v. Bar-Hebraeus.

⁵Compare, for instance, Mukhtaṣar, pp. 404-5, and Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 217-8.

matter of fact, the two works are nowhere near alike; for example in the biography of al-Nāṣir, in his Arabic Mukhtaṣar, he reports the death of al-Nāṣir very briefly,¹ while in his Syriac book he reports the biography of this Caliph in detail and describes his personality fairly well, but with harshness and prejudice. He relates how al-Nāṣir forced the Khātun, the daughter of Qilj Arslan, to marry him. She was very beautiful and he cites the doubtful death of her husband which allowed al-Nāṣir to take her as a wife.² As one might expect, this story is not included in his Arabic chronicle.

As a Christian, one expects him to have a special point of view towards the history of the Caliphate. He is in favour of the Mongols' invasion and considers this invasion a great victory for the Christians and Christianity. However, his information about the Christian community in Baghdād is of great value (see below).

He treated the history of the Mongols with great detail and favour and, as he says, he derived all his information about them from Juvainī's work; he says:

"...Now his brother was 'Alā' al -Dīn, who was governor of Baghdād and who two years earlier had wellnigh died a natural death in Mūḡan; and he composed a marvellous Persian work on the chronology of the Kingdoms of the Seljuks, the Khawarāzmians and Ishmaelites and Mongols; what we have introduced into our work on these matters we have derived from his book."³

¹Mukhtaṣar, p. 414.

²Chronography, I, p. 387 ff.

³Ibid., p. 473; cf. J. A. Boyle in his introduction (p. XXVIII) to his English translation of Juvainī's work.

Juvainī.

'Alā' al-Dīn 'Aṭa Malik al-Juvainī was born in 1226 at Juvain (or Juwain) in Khurasān. He was descended from a family acquainted with the fiscal administration, his father and grandfather served the Seljūqid and Khwarizmian Sultāns. In 1255 'Alā' al-Dīn entered the service of Hūlagū and accompanied him to Baghdād. In 657/1259 he was appointed by Hūlagū as governor of Arabian 'Irāq and Khūzistān. He died in 1283.¹

He composed a history, Ta'rikh-i-Jahān-Gushā,² which consisted of three parts. The first deals with the Mongols' rise to power and the activities of Chingiz-Khān up to Hūlagū's military operations against the Assassins of Persia. The second deals with the history of the Khwarizmian empire until its destruction at the hands of the Mongol. The third deals with the history of the Assassins of Persia and the destruction of their rule by Hūlagū. This work is very useful to this study for it provides, with detail, the relations between the Caliphate and the Isma'īlis, the Khwarizm-shāhs and the Mongols. Juvainī's information on al-Nāṣir's military operations in Persia is of great value. He supplies a great deal of information on the hostile relations between al-Nāṣir and the last three Khwarizmian Sultāns, Takash, Muḥammad and

¹ On the life and works of Ata-Malik, see Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 339b; al-Kutubī, II, p. 45; C. A. Storey, Persian literature, section II (London 1935) pp. 260-1; see also the introduction of J. A. Boyle to his English tr. of Jahān-Gushā, pp. XV ff; and A. al-'Azzawī, pp. 102 ff.

² This work was edited by M. Qazmini, in 3 vols. (G.M.S., Old Series, XVI/1, 2, 3) London, 1912, 1916 and 1937; J.A. Boyle translated this work into English with the title "The History of the World Conqueror", Manchester, 1958, 2 vol.

Jalal al-Dīn.¹

Although Juvainī was denied freedom of expression, for he wrote his work under Mongol control, yet he recorded most events with considerable honesty and accuracy. And being in their service did not affect his style and honesty, though he relates with modesty and tolerance all the destruction resulting from the Mongols' invasion of the Muslim lands.²

Al-Rawandī.

Abū Bakr Najm al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Sulaimān al-Rawandī. He was in the service of the last Seljūqid Sultān Tughrīl II (571-590/1175-94). In 599-1202 he began to write his Rāḥat al-Sudūr, which he dedicated to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw, the Seljūqid Sultān of Asia Minor.³

Rāḥat al-Sudūr wa-āyat al-Surūr,⁴ a history of the "Great Seljūqs" from the rise of the dynasty to the year 595/1199. His account of the last Sultān, Tughrīl II, is of special importance for the author was an eye witness to most of the activities of this Sultān and his relations with Baghdād.

¹ See Chapter I below, pp. 50 ff.

² See the introduction of J.A. Boyle's English tr. of Juvainī's work, I, pp. XXIX, ff; cf. Barthold, Turkestan, pp. 40 ff.

³ C.A. Storey, Persian literature, section I¹/I (London 1935) pp. 256-7.

⁴ Edited by M. Iqbāl, London, 1921.

Abu 'l-Fidā.

Isma'īl ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar ibn Shahan-shāh ibn Ayyūb, the Ayyubid prince of Ḥamāh, was born at Damascus in Jumāda I, 672/Nov. 1273. He served the Mamluk Sultān Muḥammad ibn Qalā'un, who appointed him to the governorship of Ḥamāh. Abu 'l-Fidā died at Ḥamāh on 23 Muḥarram 732/27 Oct. 1331. He was well known as a historian and a geographer.¹ His work, Mukhtaṣar Ta'rīkh al-Bashar,² as its title indicates, is a concise universal history covering the pre-Islamic period and Islamic history down to 729/1329. Al-Kāmil of Ibn al-Athīr was his main source for the history of the late 'Abbasid period and, after the year 628/1230-31, the year al-Kāmil was ended, Abu 'l-Fidā's narratives about the 'Abbasid Caliphate become very rare and concise.³

Al-Dhahabī.

Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān ibn Qaymāz al-Turkumānī, the celebrated theologian and historian, was born at Damascus or at Mayyā-fāriqīn in 673/1274 and died at Damascus 748/1348.⁴

¹For his biography see Subkī, VI, p. 84 ff; Ibn Ḥajar, I, pp. 371-2; al-Kutubī, Fawat, p. 20 ff; Ibn al-'Imād, VI, pp. 98 ff; see also E.I./II, s.v. Abu 'l-Fidā (by H.A.R.Gibb).

²This work was printed at Istanbul in four volumes in 1286/1869-70.

³Cf. E.I./II, op.cit.; also Barthold, Turkestan, p. 2; compare the biography of al-Nasir in Mukhtaṣar of Abu 'l-Fidā, III, pp. 142-3 with that of Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 285 ff, and the biography of al-Zāhir, Ibn al-Athīr XII, pp. 287-8, Mukhtaṣar, III, pp. 143-4.

⁴Subkī, V, pp. 216 ff; Ibn Ḥajar, III, pp. 336 ff; cf. E.I./II, s.v. al-Dhahabī; A. al-'Azzawī, pp. 183 ff.

Al-Dhahabī studied several subjects and wrote many works on Tradition, canon law and history. The most important historical work he composed is Ta'rikh al-Islām (History of Islam). He wrote this work in twenty-one volumes, starting with the biography of the prophet Muḥammad and ending with the year 700/1300-1.¹ In this work al-Dhahabī follows the system of Ibn al-Jawzī in al-Muntazam. He combined both the general narratives and the obituary notices.² He always mentioned his sources and sometimes quoted contradictory statements regarding a certain event or a certain biography; moreover, he used a large variety of references in compiling this work. Although he was a Syrian and not contemporary with the 'Abbāsid Caliphate of Baghḍād his fine method in selecting his references and the large number of sources he quotes make his work very useful and indispensable for the study of the late 'Abbāsid history. In his account of al-Nāṣir's biography he quoted Al-Muwaffaq 'Abd al-Laṭīf,³ Ibn al-Athīr,⁴ Ibn al-Sā'ī,⁵ Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī⁶ and Ibn Waṣīl.⁷ No doubt,

¹E.I./II, s.v. al-Dhahabī. The manuscript of Ta'rikh al-Islām which was consulted in this study is that of Aya Sofya Library (Istanbul), Nos. 3010-3014; these five volumes which cover the period 580-700 are the autograph of the author himself and written in large characters and very clearly; see the description of Brock. II, pp. 46-8, S.II, pp. 45-7; and Cl. Cahen in R.E.I., X (1936) pp. 345 ff.

²For further details on his method see E.I./II, s.v. al-Dhahabī.

³Ta'rikh al-Islām, XIX, fol. 10b.

⁴Ibid., fol. 14b.

⁵Ibid., fol. 14a.

⁶Ibid., fol. 229b.

⁷Ibid., fols. 13-14.

with the various points of view of these historians, Ta'rikh al-Islam, mostly, does not represent any particular point of view, but is a collection of narratives. With this laborious method al-Dhahabī preserved for the later historians a vast quantity of information, especially from those works which are no longer extant such as the works of 'Abd al-Laṭīf and Ibn al-Sa'ī.

Ibn Kathīr.

'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'īl ibn 'Umar ibn Kathīr was born in 700 or 701/1301-2 at Baṣra. When he was seven years old his father took him to Damascus where he studied with many famous scholars such as Taqī al-Dīn ibn Tay-miyya. On history he wrote al-Bidāya. He died in 774/1371-2.¹

Al-Bidāya wa 'l-Nihāya,² a universal chronicle, is very useful to this study. In this work Ibn Kathīr preserved many valuable narratives concerning the history of the late 'Abbāsīd period. On the biography of al-Nāṣir Ibn Kathīr quoted Ibn al-Sa'ī and Ibn al-Athīr.³ His point of view is that of Syria and to some extent favours the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate.

His quotations from earlier sources, especially from 'Irāqī sources such as Ibn al-Sa'ī,⁴ add to the importance of his work.

¹Ibn al-'Imād, VI, pp. 231; Ibn Ḥajar, I, p. 373; Brock. S.II, pp. 48-9.

²This work was printed in Cairo, 1351/1932.

³See Bidāya, XIII, p. 106.

⁴Ibid., pp. 161, 192.

B. Biographical works.

Al-Nasawī.

Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Nasawī, the secretary (Kātib al-Inṣhā') of Jalāl al-Dīn Mangubirtī. He served Jalāl al-Dīn after the latter returned from India (in 1223) until his death which occurred in 1231.¹ In 639/1241 he wrote the history of his sovereign; this was entitled Sīrat al-Sultān Jalāl al-Dīn Mangubirtī.² This work begins with the account of Muḥammad's - the father of Jalāl al-Dīn - campaign to 'Irāq in 614/1217. His account of the relations between Baghdad and the last two Khwarizm-shāh Sultāns is of great importance, for he was an eye witness as well as being in a position which enabled him to see everything closely. Although one expects him to represent the Khwarizmian point of view towards the struggle between the Khwarizm-shāhs and the Caliphate, yet he discussed fairly these relations in terms of respect to the 'Abbāsid Caliphate in an almost unprejudiced manner.³

Al-Kutubī.

Abū 'Alī Muḥammad ibn Shakir ibn Aḥmad al-Dimashqī al-Kutubī died in 764/1336.⁴ Al-Kutubī wrote Fawāt al-Wafayāt⁵ as a supplement to

¹On the author see Barthold, Turkestan, pp. 38-9; Brock. S.I., p. 552; E.I./I, s.v. Nasawī.

²This work was edited and translated into French by O. Houdas, Paris, 1891-5.

³See below, Chapter I, pp. 62 ff.

⁴For the life of the author see Ibn Ḥajar, III, pp. 451-2; Ibn al-'Imād, VI, p. 203; Brock, S.II, p. 48.

⁵This work was printed at Cairo in 1283/1866-7 in two volumes.

Wafayāt al-A'yan of Ibn Khallikān (608-681/1211-1282).

The dictionary of al-Kutubī is more important to this study than the biographical dictionary of Ibn Khallikān, for it contains a detailed account of the biographies of the last 'Abbāsīd Caliph, al-Musta'ṣim¹ and his Wazīr, Ibn al-'Alqamī.²

Al-Subkī.

Tāj al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb ibn Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī died in 771/1369/70.³ His work Tabaqāt al-Shafi'iyya al-Kubrā⁴ is of special importance for it contains a detailed account of the fall of Baghḍād and the destruction of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate, with the biography of al-Musta'ṣim and a good description of the conditions of the Caliphate before its downfall. Al-Subkī also reported the treachery of Ibn al-'Alqamī.⁵

C. The Travellers.

Ibn Jubāir.

Abū 'Al-Ḥusayn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Jubāir al-Kinānī al-Andalusī (died in 614/1217).⁶ He wrote an interesting account of his pilgrimage

¹See Fawāt, I, pp. 302 ff.

²Ibid., II, pp. 189 ff.

³On his life and works see Brock. G. II, 89, 105; see also A. al-'Azzawī, p. 196.

⁴This work was printed at Cairo in 1324/1906-7.

⁵See Tabaqāt, V, pp. 109 ff.

⁶For the life of the author see Brock. I, p. 478; the introduction of the edition of De Goeje of the Travels of Ibn Jubāir (Leyden 1907) pp. 13 ff

from Granada to Macca and of his journey back through 'Iraq during the years 579-81/1183-5.¹ His account of what he had seen in Baghḍād is of great importance, as an eye witness of the conditions of the Caliphate in the reign of al-Naṣir, as well as his description of the agricultural lands of the Caliphate. Although his account of Baghḍād was not detailed, yet it contains very useful remarks and observations about the people of the Caliphate and the financial life of the country.

Benjamin of Tudela.

Rabbi Benjamin ben Jonah of Tudela, the famous Jewish traveller.² He travelled from Tudela, in the north of Spain, through Rome to Constantinople, then to Anatolia and then he proceeded to Damascus, Baghḍād and Persia. He completed his travels in 1173.³ Thus he visited Baghḍād shortly before the accession of al-Naṣir to the throne of the Caliphate. His account of what he saw in Baghḍād, especially of the conditions of his co-religionists, is of remarkable importance. He describes in detail the position, leadership and religious foundations of the Jewish community in

¹On the editions and translations of this work see J. Sauvaget, Introduction à l'histoire de l'Orient Musulman, ed. by Cl. Cahen (Paris 1961), p. 169.

²His travels have been translated into many languages, and into English by A. Asher, (London 1840); and also by M.N.Adler (London 1907); it was also translated into Arabic by E.H.Haddad (Baghḍād 1945). These three translations were consulted in this study, for they contain some differences.

³E.N.Adler, Jewish Travellers, London 1930, p. 38; see also Benjamin Itinerary, tr. A. Asher, II, p. XI ff, and pp. 251-2; cf. the Arabic tr. pp. 23 ff.

'Iraq. His interesting remarks on the social and economic position of this community throw light on the conditions of all the non-Muslim communities living under the Caliphate and reveal the nature of the relation between the Caliphate and the non-Muslim people.¹

Petachia of Ratisbon.

Rabbi Petachia, son of Rabbi Jacob, born in Ratisbon in the first half of the twelfth century. He lived in Prague and from this city he set out upon his travels prior to 1187, probably some time between 1175 and 1185.² Thus it seems that he visited Baghḍād during the reign of al-Nāṣir. His account of the Jewish community in Baghḍād supplemented the account of Benjamin of Tudela.

Although his Itinerary³ did not become as famous as that of Benjamin because the account of his travels was written down by his follower R. Jahuda ben Samuel and because his notes were incomplete and without any order,⁴ yet his account of the Jews in Baghḍād is of great importance, for he describes in detail the Jewish leadership and the offices, as well as the relation of the Jews with the Caliphate.

¹ See below, Chapter III, pp. 159 ff.

² Benjamin of Tudela, tr. of E. Haddad, pp. 17-8; cf. Jewish Travellers, p. 64.

³ For the editions and translations of these travels see Jewish Travellers, p. 64.

⁴ See Dr. Zunz's, "An Essay on the geographical literature of the Jews", in Asher's tr. of Benjamin's Itinerary, II (London 1841), p. 253.

III. Coins and Inscriptions.

Coins and inscriptions in general add valuable information to what is known from chronicles and other works and thus they constitute a very important source of information for the Caliph or period in question. In certain cases they provide new facts, or clarify doubtful points. They are also a means of checking facts contained in chronicles which are liable to distortion, intentionally or unintentionally, by their authors. Although information from this kind of source is concise, yet it is to the point and almost certainly truthful. Although the coins and inscriptions belonging to the last epoch of the 'Abbasid Caliphate are limited in number, nevertheless those that do exist provide valuable and interesting facts. Coins provide, besides the name of the Caliph, the name of his heir-apparent and the year and place of the mint.¹ Al-Nasir's coins bear the title of his heir-apparent as 'Udat al-Dunya Abu Nasr (عُدة الدنيا ابو نصر),² later al-Zahir. This was done, without doubt, as a further means of confirming and publicizing the position of his heir-apparent. Furthermore, study of the weight and fineness of the gold and silver coins reveals the financial conditions of the state and the economic life in general and whether it was stable or otherwise.³

¹See Naqshabandi, al-Dinar al-Islami, Baghdad 1953, p. 182.

²Ibid., pp. 178 ff.

³See below, Chapter V, pp. 236 ff.

The inscriptions on buildings provide another means of information, especially the name of the Caliph and some of his titles; the year of the construction or restoration and, often, the name of the official in charge are given.¹

IV The Modern Studies.

This period of the 'Abbasid history is almost entirely neglected by the modern historians and Orientalists save for some studies on the Futuwwa of al-Nāṣir by F. Taeschner and P. Kahle, with some other studies on the biographies of the last four 'Abbasid Caliphs. But the history of the Caliphate in general has not been investigated thoroughly. Even the most recent work, A History of the Crusades,² devoted several chapters to the Seljūqid of Persia and Anatolia, to the Ayyūbids of Syria and Egypt, but only two pages were given to the Caliphate.³ This neglect is, perhaps, due to the fact that most of the information and narratives available about this period of the history of 'Irāq are short, contradictory and scattered in many works, the majority of which are still extant in manuscript. In the words of the historian Barthold,

"The second half of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century belong on the whole to the darkest

¹For example see R.C.E.A., X, p. 28, and pp. 185 ff; see also below Chapter II, pp. 139 ff.

²Edited by Kenneth M. Setton (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962), second vol.

³Ibid., pp. 665-7.

pages of Muslim history. The testimony of the sources which have come down to us is contradictory in the extreme, and the establishment of the chronology even of ¹ the most important events presents great difficulties."

This statement is, perhaps, true for the history of central Asia and Persia, but it could not be applied to the history of 'Irāq in this period for the flourishing state of affairs of the Caliphate continued up to the reign of the last Caliph, al-Musta'sim (640-656/1242-1258) and then the decline appeared and was completed with the fall of Baghdād. Many chronicles and biographical dictionaries were compiled in 'Irāq during this period by famous historians such as Ibn al-Sā'ī, Ibn al-Dubā'ithī and Ibn al-Najjār but, unfortunately, some of these works were lost and the rest were not published.

No doubt, in the history of 'Irāq, the darkest pages of history prevailed after the conquest of 'Irāq by the Mongols and not before it.

¹Turkestan, p. 30.

Chapter I.

THE POLITICAL STATUS OF

THE 'ABBĀSID CALIPHATE

575/1179 - 656/1258

The great Seljuq Sultanate had collapsed during the twelfth century and broken up into many minor states; 'Irāq was ruled by a local dynasty of these Seljuqs. But towards the middle of the twelfth century those Sultāns lost their control over Baghdād.¹ From this time forward the Caliphs of Baghdād tried to strengthen their position and to regain their authority over 'Irāq. The most active among them was al-Nāṣir, who came to power in 575/1180. He was able to pursue a consistent policy, which was directed towards restoring the temporal power of the Caliphate.² He started his policy of expansion by conquering some of the provinces around Baghdād. In 579/1183-4 he conquered Dāqūq,³ in 585/1189-90 he was able to restore his authority over Takrīt,⁴ and in 586/1190-91 he took Ḥadithat 'Āna.⁵

¹Ibn al-Athīr, Al-Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, XI, pp. 140-42.

²E.I./I, s.v. al-Nāṣir lī-Dīn Allāh (by F. Taeschner).

³Sibt ibn al-Jamzī, Mir'āt al-Zamān, ed. Jewett, p. 240.

⁴Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 27.

⁵Ibid., XII, p. 38; see also Sibt, p. 256; but Ibn Khaldūn puts the date in 585/1189-90, al-'Ibar, Cairo (1867), III, p. 530.

But soon this policy of al-Nāṣir was confronted with a very serious obstacle, which was the growing power of the last Seljuq sultān, Ṭughrīl II.

Ṭughrīl II succeeded to the throne in 571/1175 at the age of seven with no real power; the power was in the hands of Atabeg Muḥammad Pehlewān.¹ The Atabeg was able to subject all 'Irāq 'Ajam (or 'Irāq 'Ajami),² Adharbayjān, and Arran to his rule.³ Al-Nāṣir's ambitious policy of extending his territory led to a collision between him and the Seljuqid government. The Atabeg persuaded the Sultān Ṭughrīl to deprive the caliph of his temporal power. According to Rāwandī, a contemporary historian of these events, the adherents of the Sultān and the Atabeg discoursed to the people declaring that the main duty of the Caliph was the performance of Namaz and condemned as senseless his interference in the affairs of temporal rule, which had to be entrusted to the Sultāns.⁴

On the death of Atabeg Pehlewān in 581/1186⁵ or 582/1186-7⁶ Ṭughrīl II found a favourable opportunity to seize power himself. He

¹ E.I./I. s.v. Ṭughrīl II, (by M. Th. Houtsma).

² Al-Jibāl or 'Irāq 'Ajam are two names for one country, but the latter name was used by the Persians, and apparently introduced during the later Seljuq period. Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, Mu'jam al-Bulḍān, ed. Wüstenfeld, II, pp. 15-16.

³ Ḥusaini, Zubdat al-Tawārikh, ed. M. Iqbāl (1933), pp. 171-2.

⁴ Rahat al-Sudur, ed. M. Iqbāl (1921), p. 334; see also Barthold, Turkestan, (1928), pp. 346-7.

⁵ Abū Ḥamid, "Dhayl Seljuqname Zahir-i-Nishapuri", Mihr II (1313), p. 241.

⁶ Ḥusaini, p. 172; also Sibṭī, p. 250; Ibn al-Athir, XI, p. 346.

was assisted by the fact that Pehlewān's successor, Qizil Arslān, had quarrelled with the widow of his deceased brother and her two sons, Qutluḡ Inānj Maḥmūd and Amir Amīrān. Besides these two Pehlewān had, by female slaves, two other sons, Abū Bakr and Ozbeg. The former was brought up by his uncle Qizil Arslān, who treated him as his own son. Pehlewān had divided his territory amongst his sons under the supremacy of his brother, and after his death the latter controlled the government. The ambitious princess felt much aggrieved by this course of affairs, above all because her sons would be made inferior to the son of a slave by the predilection of Qizil Arslān towards Abū Bakr. She, therefore, rebelled, aided by some Amirs, but as Qizil Arslān marched against her at Rayy, the Amirs left her and she was forced to abandon the city and accompany Qizil Arslān, who married her, though he allowed her to reside in the castle of Sarjahān.¹

When the Atabeg reached Rayy, Ṭuḡhrīl left him and went to Simnān in Jumada I 583/July-Aug. 1187, where he was able to make arrangements with a number of Turkish Amīrs.² By this alliance Ṭuḡhrīl was able to capture Hamadhān and to put Qizil Arslān to flight. Moreover, Qutluḡ Inānnj and Amir Amīrān deserted their uncle and followed Ṭuḡh-

¹Husaini, pp. 172 ff; cited by M. The. Houtsma, "Some remarks on the history of the Seljuks", A.O., III (1924), pp. 143-4.

²Abū Ḥamid, in Mihr II (1313) pp. 241-2. According to Husainī Ṭuḡhrīl went to Damghan, Zubdat, p. 175.

rīl;¹ as a result of this act the Atābeg found himself in a weak position. He, therefore, left 'Irāq 'Ajam on 4 Ramaḍān 583/7 Nov. 1187 and went to Adharbayjān.² In order to destroy his opponent, Qizil Arslān sent a message to the Caliph al-Nāṣir asking his help against Ṭuḡhrīl and at the same time warning him of the increasing power of this Seljuq Sultān.³

Ṭuḡhrīl was able to subject a considerable part of 'Irāq 'Ajam to his rule; after he had achieved this success, he sent an envoy to Baghdād asking the Caliph to acknowledge his rule with the title of Sultān,⁴ and asking that the Sultānate Palace /Dar al-Saltāna/ should be repaired because he was intending to come to Baghdād to reside there.⁵ Al-Nāṣir was very quick in his response to these requests by issuing orders to demolish this Palace and even to remove all trace of it;⁶ and in the meantime he ordered an army to march against Ṭuḡhrīl. The expedition was prepared,⁷ and its leadership was given to

¹Husaini, p. 176.

²Abū Ḥamid, p. 242; cf. Husaini, p. 176.

³Husaini, p. 176; Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 371.

⁴Abū Shāma, Dhayl, Cairo (1947), p. 6.

⁵Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 371; Rawandi, p. 334; cf. Nakhjavani, Tajarib al-Salaf, Tahrān (1313), pp. 323-4.

⁶Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 371; cf. Nakhjavani, pp. 323-4; see also Ibn Khaldūn, III, p. 529.

⁷According to Husaini, the Caliph spent 600,000 Dinars on this expedition, Zubdat al-Tawarikh, pp. 177-8.

the Wazir ibn Yūnus.¹ This army left Baghdād at the end of Ṣafar 584/April 1188 for 'Irāq 'Ajam,² intending to wait for Qizil Arslan and his army in a certain spot; but Ibn Yūnus proceeded towards Hamadhān without waiting for the coming of the Atabeg.³ On reaching Daymarg this army attacked Ṭuḡhrīl on 6 Rabi' I 584/5 May 1188,⁴ but the army of Baghdād was defeated as a result of the desertion of the Turkoman troops under their chieftain Maḥmūd ibn Barjam al-Ivāi; and Ibn Yūnus was taken captive.⁵

On receiving this news, al-Nāṣir did not give up his intention to destroy his foe, but ordered another army to set out against Ṭuḡhrīl. This army left Baghdād and proceeded to Hamadhān.⁶ In the meantime, Ṭuḡhrīl prepared his own ruin by a breach with his Turkish Amīrs. He ordered the death of two of the greatest Amīrs, Aiaba and Ozaba, in Jumāda I 584/July 1188. This act caused Qutluḡh Inānj to desert him and to join his uncle, Qizil Arslan. Thus, instead of one enemy, Qizil Arslan, he had also to fight against Qutluḡh Inānj.⁷ With this

¹Abū Ḥamid puts the number of this army as 15,000 horsemen, Mihr II, p. 242.

²Abū Ḥamid, p. 242; Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 10-11.

³Ḥusaīnī, pp. 177-8.

⁴Abū Ḥamid, in Mihr, II, p. 242.

⁵Ḥusaīnī, p. 178; see also Houtsma in A.O. III, p. 148; also E.I./I, s.v. Ṭuḡhrīl II; Nakhjavani, pp. 327-8; On this expedition see also Kafesoglu, pp. 111-2.

⁶Ḥusaīnī, p. 178; cf. Rawandī, pp. 346-8.

⁷Abū Ḥamid, in Mihr II, p. 242; also Houtsma, in A.O., III, p. 149.

reinforcement, Qizil Arslān returned to 'Irāq 'Ajam, where he joined the army of Baghdād. The allied army was able to capture Hamad¹han. In Rajab 584/Aug.-Sept. 1188 the Atabeg proclaimed Sanjar ibn Sulaimān Sultān instead of Tughrīl.² Tughrīl lost his authority over 'Irāq 'Ajam and, as a result of many skirmishes between his followers and the troops of Qizil Arslān, he found it was impossible for him to stay in this province; he, therefore, left it for Adharbayjān, where he found a refuge at the castle of a Turkoman chief named 'Izz al-Din Ḥasan ibn Qifjāq.³ He tried to strengthen his position by applying for help to several Muslim rulers, including Saladin, but without success.⁴

Tughrīl realised the bad consequences of opposing the Caliph. He, therefore, tried to come to terms with al-Nāṣir. He sent an ambassador with his son, Alp Arslān, to Baghdād, to apologise on behalf of his father and ask forgiveness for what he had done to the Wazīr Ibn Yūnus, with the promise that he would henceforth respect the orders of the Caliph.⁵ He also sent a message to Qizil Arslān, but the latter refused to listen to his proposals. Thus all his efforts to settle the

¹Houtsma, in A.O., III, p. 149; while Ḥusainī says that the army of Baghdad alone captured Hamad¹han and Qizil Arslān arrived afterwards, see Zubdat, p. 178.

²Abū Ḥamid, p. 243.

³Ḥusainī, pp. 179-80; also Houtsma, in A.O. III, p. 149; cf. Abū Ḥamid, p. 243.

⁴E.I./I, s.v. Tughrīl II (by Houtsma).

⁵Ḥusainī, pp. 179-80: Abū Ḥamid (Mihr II), p. 243; Cf. Houtsma, in A.O. III, p. 150. Sibī puts the date of this embassy on 7 Muḥarram 586/14 Feb. 1190, Mir'āt, p. 256.

dispute with his enemies peacefully were in vain, and he was obliged to surrender to Qizil Arslān. He was imprisoned with his son in the castle of Kahrān near Tabrīz in Ramaḍān 586/Oct. 1190.¹ The Atabeg, who had before proclaimed Sanjar ibn Sulaimān Sultān instead of Ṭuḡhrīl, now put aside this puppet Sultān and went to Hamadhān where he took possession of the Seljuqid throne with the approval of the Caliph.² Thus the danger of Ṭuḡhrīl was checked and 'Irāq 'Ajam was controlled by a good ally of al-Nāṣir. Ṭuḡhrīl was kept in prison till the death of Qizil Arslān, which occurred in 587/1191.³ He resumed his activities to subdue 'Irāq 'Ajam after he regained his freedom. Qutluḡ Inānj, on hearing this news, marched against Ṭuḡhrīl, but the latter was able to defeat him. After this victory, Ṭuḡhrīl marched towards Hamadhān and was able to capture it;⁴ in fact, he was able to resume his authority over a large part of 'Irāq 'Ajam.⁵

¹Abū Ḥamid, pp. 243-4; Ḥusainī, pp. 180-81; see also Houtsma in A.O., p. 150.

²Houtsma, in A.O., p. 150; cf. Rawandī, pp. 346-7.

³According to Abū Ḥamid (p. 244) the Atabeg was killed in Shawwāl 587/Oct.-Nov. 1191; while Rawandī (p. 363) puts the date on 5 Sha'ban 587/28 Aug. 1191. For more details on the relations between Qizil Arslān and Ṭuḡhrīl see I. Kafesoglu, Harezmshahlar Devleti Tarihi, Ankara (1956), pp. 116 ff.

⁴Abū Ḥamid, p. 244; Cf. Ḥusainī, pp. 181-2.

⁵Abū Ḥamid, p. 244; cf. Juvaini, Jahan Kusha, English trans. by J. A. Boyle, I, p. 299; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 69-70.

Now a new enemy for the Sultān appeared, the Khwarizm-Shāh, who had profited from the reigning disorder in 'Irāq 'Ajam and Adhar-bayjān to occupy al-Ray. Ṭuḡhrīl assembled a huge army but the Khwarizm-Shāh entered into negotiations because of his dispute with his brother, Sultānshāh, which forced him to withdraw his troops from 'Irāq 'Ajam. Ṭuḡhrīl marched towards al-Ray and expelled the Khwarizmians from it. This action of Ṭuḡhrīl aroused the anger of Takash - the Khwarizm-Shāh, who prepared an army and led it personally against him.¹ In the meantime, al-Nāṣir gave Takash another legal means to attack Ṭuḡhrīl, by sending an envoy to him to ask for help against Ṭuḡhrīl.²

The Sultān, instead of preparing himself for the more serious war with the Khwarizm-Shāh, passed his days at al-Ray in merry-making and refused to hear the advice of his Amīrs. The Khwarizmian force arrived at al-Ray, and after a short battle Ṭuḡhrīl was defeated and put to death on 29 Rabi' I 590/24 Mar. 1194;³ his head was dispatched to Baghdād, where it was hung on the gate of al-Nūbī.⁴ This victory raised Takash from the status of a local ruler to a ruler of a great

¹Abū Ḥamid, pp. 244-5; see also Houtsma, in A.O., pp. 150-51.

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 70.

³Abū Ḥamid, p. 245; also Juvaini, I, p. 303; but Ḥusainī puts the date on 9 Rabi' I, see Zubdat, p. 193. Ibn al-Athīr (XII, p. 70), puts the date at 24 Rabi' I; cf. Kafesoglu, pp. 125-6.

⁴Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 70; cf. Abū Ḥamid, p. 245; Abu Shāma says that this head was afterwards stored in خزانة الرأس, Dhayl, p.6.

empire and henceforth he called himself on his coins no longer Khwarizm-Shāh, but "Sulṭān son of the Khwarizm-shāh".¹

Takash became master of 'Irāq 'Ajam; the Caliph realized the danger of this neighbourhood and tried by means of negotiation to control this province. According to Juvaini, he sent messengers to Takash asking him to surrender 'Irāq 'Ajam or part of it to the Caliphate, but Takash refused this; then the Caliph sent his Wazīr, Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb, with robes of honour and gifts, to persuade the Sulṭān to obey the Caliph.² But the misconduct of the Wazīr, who demanded that the Khwarizm-shāh should appear before him on foot and show great humility, aroused the anger of Takash, who marched to punish the Wazīr. The conflict between the two armies was avoided by the act of the Wazīr, who retreated to some mountains when he heard of the advance of Takash towards him.³

Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb, after he had failed in his mission, returned to Baghdād, where he was received with great honour and the Caliph bestowed on him the robe of the Wīzāra (in Sha'bān, 590/July-Aug. 1194).⁴

¹E.I./I, s.v. Takash (by W. Barthold).

²But Ibn al-Athīr reports that ibn al-Qaṣṣāb had been already in this province with an army, sent as reinforcement to Takash in his struggle with Tughrīl; see al-Kāmil, XII, p. 70.

³Juvaini, I, pp. 303-4; see also Kafesoğlu, pp. 126-7.

⁴Till this date Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb was only deputy Wazīr (نائب في الوزارة) but from now on he was placed as a Wazīr. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 70-71. See also below, pp. 186-7.

After the death of Tughril II, al-Nāṣir was free to fulfil some of his ambitions for expansion; therefore, he sent his Wazīr in Ramaḍān 590/Aug.-Sept. 1194 to Khūzistān, soon after the death of the ruler of this country, Ibn Shamlā. Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb was able to conquer this province and to annex it to the 'Abbāsīd principality.¹ From Khūzistān, Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb marched northwards. When he reached Misān he was joined by some forces under the leadership of Qutluḡ Inānj, the Khwarizmian's viceroy in 'Irāq 'Ajam.² This army reached Karman-shāh and from there they marched against Hamadhān, which they were able to capture, and the son of Takash and the garrison left it. Afterwards the Caliph's army marched to al-Ray, which was captured also.³ At the same time there was another expedition sent from Baghdād to Iṣpahān, at the request of Ra'īs al-Shafi'īya in that city, because the Khwarizmian rule there was unpopular.⁴

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 71; Sibṭ, pp. 285-6.

²Qutluḡ Inānj joined the Caliph's army as a result of a dispute between him and the leader of the Khwarizmian army, Mayanchuq. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 72. But Juvaini reports that Qutluḡ Inānj came to al-Ray to assist Mayanchuq against the Baghdad army. But after several days Mayanchuq attacked Qutluḡ Inānj and killed him. He sent his head to Khwarizm claiming that he had been meditating rebellion. Juvaini, I, p. 307.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 72-3; see also Kafesoğlu, pp. 132 ff.

⁴Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 76; see also Bar-Hebraeus, Chronography, I, p. 345.

Thus al-Nāṣir was able to restore his authority over the western part of Persia, but this was only temporary. Takash, who claimed western Iran as a successor to the Seljuq Sultanate and regarded al-Nāṣir's extension of territory as a usurpation, was angry at this act and, therefore, sent to Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb asking him to leave this province. When he received the refusal of the Wazīr, he marched with his army towards 'Irāq 'Ajam. But in the beginning of Sha'ban 592/July 1196, Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb died in Hamadhān, and thus the Caliphate army was deprived of its active leader. Soon after his death, Takash reached Hamadhān where a collision between his army and the Caliphate troops took place and resulted in the defeat of the latter. Takash entered Hamadhān in triumph, stayed there for a while and returned back to Khurasān.¹

In 593/1196-7 al-Nāṣir sent another army to control Hamadhān but this expedition was unsuccessful.²

By the year 594/1197-8 the Khwarizm-shāh could finally subdue all 'Irāq 'Ajam,³ and he demanded the Khutba and the title of Sultān from al-Nāṣir - i.e. that the Caliph should hand over to him the secular

¹Ibn al-Athir, XII, p. 73; Juvaini, I, pp. 307-8; cf. Kafesoğlu, p. 135.

²Ibn al-Athir, XII, pp. 81-2.

³Ibid., p. 88; see also Minhaj-i-Sirāj, Ṭabaqat Nāṣirī, English trans., I, pp. 241-2.

power in Baghdād itself.¹ The Caliph realized that he could no longer resist Takash and his increasing power alone; he, therefore, appealed for help from Ghiyāth al-Dīn, the Ghūrīd Sultān, to stop Takash from penetrating into the possessions of the Caliphate. Ghiyāth al-Dīn offered his services to the Caliph and engaged in a battle in Khurasān against Takash, the latter appealed for help to the Qara-Khitays and received an army from them. The allies were defeated by the Ghūrs; therefore Takash entered into negotiations with Ghiyāth al-Dīn, who demanded that Takash should obey the Caliph.² Al-Nāṣir realized that he could gain nothing from his struggle against Takash and that it was far better for him to settle the dispute peacefully. Therefore, in 595/1198-9, al-Nāṣir sent the robe of honour with gifts and the patent of ruling to Takash,³ according to Juvaini, "a patent conferring the title of Sultān of 'Irāq /i.e. 'Irāq 'Ajam/, Khorasan and Turkistān".⁴ This patent, according to Ibn al-Sā'ī, was sent at the request of Takash himself.⁵ If Ibn al-Sā'ī is to be believed,

¹E.I./I, s.v. Takash (by W. Barthold).

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 88-90; Tabaqat Nāṣiri, I, p. 243; for further details see Barthold, Turkestan, pp. 344-5.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 100.

⁴Juvaini, I, p. 312.

⁵Al-Jāmi' al-Mukhtasar, ed. M. Jawad (1934), pp. 34-5.

Takash contented himself with this title and gave up his intentions to have the Khutba in his name in Baghdād.¹ Thus the dispute between al-Nāṣir and Takash was settled, and it seems that the peaceful relations between them existed till the death of Takash on 20 Ramaḍān 596/4 July 1200.² Although Sibṭ and Abū Shāma report that Takash died on his way to conquer Baghdād,³ yet that seems unlikely since Takash, at this time, was occupied with the struggle against the Ghūrs and the Assassins. Furthermore, Juvaini states that Takash died on his way to wreak vengeance on the Assassins, after they had murdered his Wazīr, Nizām al-Mulk.⁴

In the period 596-611/1200-1214, Muhammad Khwarizm-shāh, the son and successor of Takash, was occupied with the wars against his enemies, the Ghūrs and the Qara-Khitays; because of this, he was unable to pay any attention to the west. Al-Nāṣir took this opportunity to strengthen his position inside and outside Baghdād against expected strife between him and the Khwarizm-shāh.

¹Al-Jāmi' al-Mukhtasar, p. 19 and p. 24; where he reports: "In Ramaḍān (596/June-July 1200), Takash sent his nephew, Saif al-Dīn, to Baghdād, where he paid tribute to the Caliph, and apologized on behalf of his uncle for demanding the Khutba from the Caliph."

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 103; also ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 35. But Juvaini puts the date of his death at 19 Ramaḍān, Juvaini, I, p. 315; cf. Ḥamdallah Mustawfī, Tarikh-i-Guzīda, p. 493; see also Kafesoğlu, p. 146.

³Mir'at, p. 304; and Abū Shāma, p. 17.

⁴Juvaini, I, pp. 313-4; Ḥamdallah Mustawfī, p. 493; cf. M. Hodgson, The Order of the Assassins, (1955), p. 215. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Nizām al-Mulk was murdered in Jumada II, 596/Mar.-Apr. 1200, al-Kamil, XII, p. 104.

In Baghdād he tried several means to strengthen his position, in order to enable him to carry out his ambitious policy and to check the menace of the Khwarizm-shāh. He had, early in his reign, adopted and patronized the Futuwwa order in order to approach the Shī'ite element to support him; he issued the edict to re-organize this order in 604/1207, placing it under his sole leadership.¹ At the same time, he tried to satisfy the Sunni element, especially the 'Ulamā', by obtaining a Mashyakha from famous scholars in tradition. He even composed a book called Rūḥ al-'Arfīn (the spirit of sages) and authorized many scholars to recite this work to their students.²

In 604/1207-8 he opened 20 houses for the poor to take their food in Ramaḍān,³ but this practice was short lived.⁴ At the same time, outside Baghdād, he maintained his good relations with the Ghūrīd sovereign, Shihāb al-Dīn, by sending many envoys to this Sultān.⁵ It seems that the Caliph offered Shihāb al-Dīn the title of Sultān, and the honour of being called تصميم امير المؤمنين⁶ (The Partner of the

¹See below, pp. 113 ff.

²Sibt, p. 354; Abū Shāma, p. 69; see also below, pp. 124 ff.

³Sibt, p. 348; Abū Shāma, p. 60; Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 229-30; Cf. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 184.

⁴Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 286.

⁵Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 143, 167-8, and p. 262.

⁶The inscription of Quṭb Manār, RCEA, X, p. 13; cf. Ḥasan al-Bāshā, al-Alqāb al-Islamiyya, pp. 204-5.

Commander of the Faithful - in his sovereignty). This title was, in fact, the highest title offered by the 'Abbāsid Caliphs to the Seljuq Sultāns; and it was even considered as an emblem for the Seljuqid Sultanate.¹

As a result of al-Nāṣir's policy of seeking allies in the east, the Assassins of Alamūt declared in 608/1211-12 their conversion to orthodox Islam.²

It seems that the motive for Ḥasan III to declare his conversion was his fear of the Khwarizmian's increasing power and control over Persia. Even Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir was aware of this threat and ascribes the action of Ḥasan to this reason.³ Thus the cause of this conversion was a merely political one, without any intention of destroying the doctrine of the sect.⁴

The Khwarizmian's menace to the Assassins of Persia started with the expedition led by Takash in 590/1194 against the last Seljuq sultān, Tughril II. This menace was increased at the end of the reign of Takash, when the latter was able to resume his control over 'Irāq 'Ajam and to settle the dispute between him and the Caliph. Thus Takash was free to

¹Abu 'l-Faḍa'il al-Ḥamawī, al-Ta'rikh al-Mansūrī, Moscow (1960), fol. 132b.

²Ibn Wāṣil, fol. 169; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 195; Cf. B. Lewis, "The Isma'īlites and the Assassins" in A History of the Crusades, Pennsylvania (1955), I, pp. 127-8.

³Ibn 'Abdal-Zāhir, Siyrat al-Malik al-Zāhir, fols. 141b-142a; also Nuwairī, XXIX, fol. 62a; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 13b-14a.

⁴Van-Berchem, "Epegraphies des Assassins de Syrie", J.A. IX, (1897), p. 477.

uproot the Assassins.¹ He started the hostile action by his attack on Mazendaran,² and then on Arsalān-Gushai fortress, of which he was able to take possession.³ The hostile relations between the Assassins and Takash resulted in the assassination of the latter's Wazīr, Nizām al-Mulk, because they noticed that the Sultān's hostility was due to the efforts of this Wazīr.⁴ They may have aimed by this assassination to threaten Takash himself in order to stop any further action against them.⁵

In the period between 596-607 (i.e. between the death of Takash and the succession of Ḥasan III) the Khwarizmian authority in Persia was at a standstill; and Muḥammad Khwarizm-shāh could not pay much attention to restoring his authority in this province because he was occupied with his wars against his enemies in Khurasān and Turkestan. Thus, when Ḥasan III came to the throne of Alamūt he found the opportunity favourable for strengthening his position against any attack of the Khwarizmians. In order to achieve this purpose he had to settle the dispute between the Ismā'īlīs and their Sunnī neighbours. This settlement could not be reached unless he would abandon his faith, outwardly at least, and that is what he did. In 608/1211-12 Ḥasan III

¹Juvaini, I, p. 312.

²Rawandī, p. 390; cf. Hodgson, p. 212.

³This fortress situated near Qazwīn on the border of Rudbar of Alamūt, see Juvaini, I, p. 312; Qazwīnī, Athar al-Bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 194.

⁴Juvaini, I, pp. 213-4. Cf. Hodgson, p. 215; see also above, p. 54.

⁵Sibt reports that the Assassins tried to assassinate Takash but they could not; Sibt, pp. 303-304; also Abū Shāma, p. 17.

declared his conversion to orthodox Islam and sent messengers to the Caliph, to the Khwarizm-shāh, and to the rest of the Muslim rulers, to notify them of this decision.¹ However, al-Muwaffaq 'Abd al-Latīf reports that this conversion took place as a result of an active part played by al-Nāṣir, after long negotiation,² and suggests that al-Nāṣir aimed at winning the Assassins to his side in an alliance against their enemies.³ Juvaini confirms the strong relation between al-Nāṣir and Ḥasan by saying, "the Caliph asked Jalal ad-Dīn for a band of Fida'is, and he sent him a body of men whom he had ordered not to deviate from whatever the Caliph commanded".⁴

For a while Ḥasan continued the Khutba to Muḥammad Khwarizm-shāh but al-Nāṣir succeeded in making a breach between them;⁵ when Ḥasan's mother entered Baghdād on her way to Macca, al-Nāṣir received her with great honour, and ordered the standard of Ḥasan to be carried in front of that of Muḥammad, who received this news with much distress.⁶

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 195; Juvaini, II, p. 699; cf. Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. M. T. Danesh-Pajuh, Tehran (1960), p. 174.

²Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 13b-14a; where he says:

[واقف - الناصر - سنين (?) يرأس جلال الدين حسن صاحب البيت يرأوه ان يعبد شمس الاسلام]

³Ibid [انكم اذا فعلتم ذلك كنتم اعداء واحدة ولم يتغير عليكم من احوالكم شيئاً]

⁴Juvaini, II, p. 391.

⁵See Hodgson, p. 224.

⁶Juvaini, II, p. 391; Nasawī, p. 12. Cf. Rashīd al-Dīn, p. 175. Juvaini in another place in his work [Vol. II, p. 701], says that Ḥasan's mother went on the pilgrimage in 609, while the other sources put the date in 608, that is to say immediately after the declaration of Ḥasan. See Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 195, Sibṭ, p. 363; Abū Shāma, p. 78; Ibn Waṣīl, fol. 169.

Ḥasan was not only in alliance with al-Nāṣir, but at first with the Khwarizm-shāh, and also with Oz-Beg, the latter alliance being based, according to Juvaini, upon real friendship,¹ evidenced by the long visit to Oz-Beg's capital at the beginning of Ḥasan's reign.² He helped Oz-Beg to remove both Mengli and his successor, Ighlamish, who were both revolted Mamluks of Oz-Beg in 'Irāq 'Ajam. Moreover, according to Juvaini, Ḥasan was the first Muslim ruler to send ambassadors and give allegiance to Chingiz-Khan when the latter had entered the lands of Islam.³ Judging from this active policy, Ḥasan would be very ambitious and he might aim at following this line of policy to strengthen his position and to stop the hostile action of his Sunnī neighbours against his followers. It seems likely that this ambition had led him to declare his conversion to orthodox Islam: a declaration by which he would lose nothing but gain the respect of the other Sunnī rulers, and become one of them. What is more, the Assassins of Syria adopted the Shāfi'ī school;⁴ they may have aimed at satisfying the Ayyūbid rulers, who were Shāfi'īs themselves.⁵

¹Juvaini, II, p. 701; Rashīd al-Dīn, p. 176; cf. Hodgson, p. 224.

²Juvaini, II, pp. 701-2.

³Ibid., II, p. 703.

⁴Ibn Waṣīl, fol. 169 cited by Van Berchem, J.A. (1897), p. 475.

⁵E.I./II, s.v. Ayyubids (by C. Cohen).

Towards the end of the reign of Takash, in 596/1200, al-Nāṣir lost his authority over 'Irāq 'Ajam province; but he had never given up the intention of controlling this province. Therefore, in 608/1211 the Caliph received with honour the former governor of this province, Aydoghmush.¹ The Caliph seized this opportunity and bestowed on him the robe of honour and provided him with money and soldiers, and sent him to Hamadhān. But this expedition failed to achieve any success, and Aydoghmush was killed in Muharram 610/May-June 1213 and Mengli succeeded in keeping his control over 'Irāq 'Ajam.² However, on receiving this news the Caliph did not abandon his intention, and sent to Oz-Beg and to Jalāl ad-Dīn Ḥasan, the master of Alamūt, for help against Mengli. After they had reached an agreement to divide the province of 'Irāq 'Ajam among the three of them, the Caliph sent his army, which consisted of some reinforcements from Irbil, Jazīra and Aleppo. The allied army was able to defeat Mengli, who was killed and his head dispatched to Baghdād.³ But according to Juvaini, the instigator of this alliance was Oz-Beg, not the Caliph; because Mengli was a revolted Mamluk of Oz-Beg, and his troops were planning an attack on the lands of Jalāl al-Dīn Ḥasan. Oz-Beg and Ḥasan III concluded an

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 194-5; Sibṭ, p. 363. Aydoghmush lost his authority as a result of a conflict between him and Mengli, a Mamluk of Oz-Beg, the ruler of Adharbayjan and Arran. See Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 200; cf. Kafesoğlu, pp. 181-2.

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 197; Sibṭ, p. 366.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 200-201.

alliance and in 610/1213-14 Hasan III entered Adharbayjān to join Oz-Beg. They sent joint ambassadors to Baghdād, Syria, and the other lands to seek assistance in expelling Mengli from 'Irāq 'Ajam.¹ In the year 611/1214-15 they defeated Mengli.² Abhar and Zanjān were given to Jalal al-Dīn as a reward for his assistance.³ The rest of the province was taken by Oz-Beg who entrusted it to his mamluk "Ighlamish".⁴ It is evident that al-Nāṣir did not control, or demand to control, this province; this suggests that al-Nāṣir, this time, attempted to form a buffer-state between his principality and the Khwarizmian dominions. But it seems that this policy failed, since the new governor of 'Irāq 'Ajam, "Ighlamish", was in close relations with the Khwarizm-shāh.⁵ "Ighlamish" shortly after his appointment introduced the Khutba in the name of Muḥammad Khwarizm-shāh in his province.⁶

¹ Juvaini, II, pp. 701-702; cf. Rashīd al-Dīn, pp. 176-7.

² Juvaini, II, p. 702; while Ibn al-Athīr puts the date in Jumada I 612/Sept.-Oct. 1212, al-Kamil, XII, p. 200.

³ Juvaini, II, p. 702; Ibn al-Athīr says that Jalāl ad-Dīn was given what the allies agreed upon previously, al-Kamil, XII, pp. 200-201.

⁴ Juvaini, II, p. 702; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 201. The most likely form of this name is Ighlamish as it was identified by Qazvini in his edition of Jahan Gushai, III, p. 246, n.6, and p. 414, n.3. "Ighlamish" in Turkish means "He wept", Juvaini, II, p. 391, n.6.

⁵ "Ighlamish", originally a slave of the brother of Oz-Beg, afterwards entered the service of Sultān Muḥammad Khwarizm-shāh. See Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 201.

⁶ Ibid., XII, p. 206.

By the year 1215 Muḥammad became sole master over Turkestan and Khurasan. Therefore, he demanded of the Caliph that the Khutba should be introduced in his name in Baghdād;¹ with this in view he sent as his envoy to Baghdād the Qaḍī Mujīr al-Dīn, who there announced the claims of his master, but the government of Baghdād rejected them. According to Nasawī, this rejection was due to al-Naṣir's awareness of the troubles of Muḥammad in Turkestan.² Al-Nasawī, quoting the words of Mujīr al-Dīn, reports the following argument: that when the Qaḍī presented his Master's claims to the Dīwān in Baghdād, they rejected them firmly and said that wrong circumstances led to the Seljuq Sultāns being Masters of Baghdād, but this did not mean that there should always be a sultān holding the power of the Caliphate.³

The Qaḍī Mujīr al-Dīn returned to his master without success. He was accompanied by Shaykh Suhrawardī, the Caliph's envoy. According to Sibṭ the Shaykh was received at the court of Muḥammad with far less honour than was due to his learning and personal qualities⁴, while al-Nasawi states that the Shaykh was received with honour and respect.⁵ The

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 206. According to Abu al-Faḍa'il al-Ḥamawī, Muḥammad sent an embassy in 611/1214-15 to Baghdad with his claim to the Khutba and to be called by the title of the Seljuq Sultāns, "The Partner of the Commander of the Faithful". al-Tarīkh al-Mansūrī, fol. 132b.

²Nasawī, p. 11. See also Kafesoğlu, p. 217 ff.

³Nasawī, pp. 11-12, where he says:
[والا نبيسى يحتم ان يكون مع الزمان على اكتاف الخلافة تعلم يا مريد ربنا كيف شأنا]

⁴Sibṭ, p. 382; Abu Shāma, pp. 100-101; cf. Kafesoğlu, p. 217-8.

⁵Nasawī, p. 12.

Shaykh asked permission to recite a Hadīth; the Sultān granted it. The sense of the Hadīth was that the Prophet warned the Faithful against causing any harm to the family of 'Abbās. The Sultān answered:

"Although I am a Turk, and know the Arabic language badly, yet I have understood the meaning of the Hadīth; but I have not caused any harm to the family of 'Abbās.

Meanwhile I have heard that a number of them are in the prison of the Commander of the Faithful, and even multiply and increase there; if the Shaykh were to repeat this Hadīth in the presence of the Commander of the Faithful, it would be better and more to the point."¹

The Shaykh attempted to prove that the Caliph in his capacity as an interpreter /Mujtahid/ had the right to imprison individual people for the good of the whole community; but in vain. Thus the embassy of al-Suhrawardī failed to achieve any success.²

But Sibṭ, who quotes from the words of the Shaykh himself, reports that when Suhrawardī entered the tent of Muḥammad, he recited a Khutba, in which he mentioned the good personality of the Caliph, and how he was very pious and religious; then Muḥammad said, through an interpreter, "The person you describe does not exist in Baghdād, but I will go there and set up a Caliph with these qualities".³ This shows the intention of the Khwarizm-shāh to destroy al-Nāṣir's rule and to replace him with another Caliph. After the failure of these nego-

¹Nasawī, p. 13; cited by Barthold, Turkestan, pp. 373-4. cf. Ibn Khaldūn, V, p. 109.

²Nasawī, p. 13.

³Sibṭ, p. 382; also Abū Shāma, p. 101.

tiations, it seems likely that al-Nāṣir took further steps to check the ambition of the Khwarizm-shāh, when Ighlamīsh, the governor of 'Irāq 'Ajam, was stabbed and killed by the Assassins.¹ According to Juvaini, the Caliph himself sent some Fida'is to stab and kill him.²

The Khwarizm-shāh, seeking for the support of the religious men in his kingdom and to legitimize his struggle with the Caliph, succeeded in obtaining Fatwa from the Imams of his kingdom to the effect that:

"the 'Abbāsids had no right to the Caliphate; that the title belonged to the Sayyids of the line of Ḥusaini, and that whoever had the power to do so was under an obligation to redress wrongs. Moreover the 'Abbāsid Caliph had been backward in undertaking holy wars in the way of God Almighty and, though possessing the means thereto, had failed to defend the frontiers, to extirpate the heterodox and the heretical, and to call the infidel to the true faith, as is incumbent on, nay obligatory to, all in command; and so had neglected the pillar, which is the main pillar of Islam. With such arguments as his pretext, he designated 'Ala al-Mulk of Termidh, one of the chief Sayyids, to be set up as Caliph".³

Juvaini adds, in another place in his history, the following argument of this Fatwa:

"...when such an Imam made an attack upon a Sultan who succoured Islam and had passed a lifetime in Holy war, that Sultan had the right to reject that Imam and to set up another in his place".⁴

¹ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 206.

² Juvaini, II, p. 391.

³ Ibid., pp. 364-5. Ḥamdallah Mustawfi states the name of this Caliph as: Sayyid 'Imād al-Dīn of Termidh, Tarikh-i-Guzida, p. 496.

⁴ Juvaini, II, p. 392.

This Fatwa shows the new phase of struggle between al-Nāṣir and the Khwarizm-Shah, in which Muḥammad used every effort to crush his foe; and in obtaining this Fatwa a legal support to his rivalry was provided.

Juvaini gives a brilliant argument about the purpose of this Fatwa by saying,

"However, the Sultan needed some excuse where by he might be secured from the reproach of mankind and the rulers all around him; and such as might prevent its being said that a Sultan professing Islam had, out of lust for empire, attacked that Imam to do homage to whom is to complete the pillar of Islam, and in so doing cast his faith to the winds".¹

But the problem was not solved by this argument, and the main question was still not answered: why did Muḥammad set up a Shī'ite Caliph, apart from the argument of the Fatwa about the Shī'ite right to this office? It seems likely that Muḥammad either aimed by this act to centralize the Shī'ite community around himself, thereby strengthening his position in his struggle with his mother, in which the military class and the priesthood were on the side of the latter;² or he tried to compete with al-Nāṣir in patronizing the Shī'ite element, but went too far and appointed a Caliph from them, probably to undermine the strength of al-Nāṣir, especially in Baghdād, where a large Shī'ite community was living.³ But since no Arabic source, so far known, mentions

¹Juvaini, II, p. 392.

²The mercenary army constitutes the sole support of the Sultān. About the struggle between Muḥammad and his mother, see Barthold, Turkestan, pp. 375-7.

³Abū Shāma, p. 24.

this Fatwa or this Shī'ite Caliph, it seems that this action of Muḥammad had very little consequences at this time, otherwise the other contemporary historians would mention it. Instead there are two reports: the first is that of Ibn al-Athīr who says that when Muḥammad returned from his campaign to conquer Baghdād, he reached Khurasān and, at Nishabūr, he ordered the name of al-Nāṣir to be omitted from the Khuṭba and said that the Caliph was dead.¹ The second report is that of Sibṭ, who refers to the intention of the Khwarizm-Shah to set up a new Caliph.²

About the Shī'ite Caliph there are no Arabic sources, so far known, to support the narrative of Juvaini; moreover there is no information whatever about the fate of this Caliph.³

Muḥammad the Khwarizm-Shah did not lack excuses to attack the Caliph; in addition to what was mentioned in the Fatwa, the historians mention other excuses of which the Khwarizm-Shah took advantage, in order to find a legal basis for his struggle with the head of Islam.

The first excuse is that, when Ḥasan III was converted to orthodox Islam, he sent a Sabīl on the pilgrimage, in order to make his conversion widely known. The Caliph commanded his standard to be carried in front of that of Sulṭān Muḥammad, and when news of this reached the

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 207.

²Sibṭ, p. 382.

³See Barthold, Turkestan, p. 375, n.6.

Sultān he was much distressed and offended.¹ The second is the assassination of Ighlamish, the viceroy of the Khwarizm-Shah, in 'Irāq 'Ajam. According to Juvaini, this assassination took place at the instigation of al-Nāṣir.²

The third is as follows: Muḥammad revealed the secret of messages dispatched from al-Nāṣir to the Qara-Khitays and the Ghurs, asking them to help him against the Khwarizm-Shah. These secrets came to light when Muḥammad came to Ghaznin and, a search being made in the treasuries of the Ghurs, this correspondence was found, in which the Caliph egged on Shihāb ad-Dīn to attack the Sultān and asked him to render aid to the army of the Qara-Khitay.³

These excuses were not more than a cover for his main purpose which was to have the Khuṭba proclaimed in his name in Baghdād and to be recognised as a Sultān, like the Sultāns of the Būyids and the Seljuqs.⁴

In 614/1217 Muḥammad took a further step to fulfil his aim, this time by marching with his troops to conquer Baghdād.⁵ He had

¹Juvaini, II, p. 391; cf. Nasawi, p.12.

²Juvaini, II, p. 391.

³Ibid., pp. 390-391.

⁴Ibid., p. 391; cf. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 206.

⁵Sibt mentions the number of this army as 40⁰,000 or [as it was said] 660,000, among them 70,000 Khitays (?), Sibt, p.382; see Abū Shāma, pp. 100-101; also Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 219.

proceeded into 'Irāq 'Ajam and he was able to restore his authority over it. He entered Hamadhān in triumph and made it a headquarters for his military operations. There he succeeded in persuading Oz-Beg, the ruler of Adharbayjān, to introduce the Khutba in his name - i.e. to be his vassal.¹ Thus al-Nāṣir had lost one of his allies in Persia.

On receiving the news of the advance of the Khwarizm-Shāh, al-Nāṣir prepared his army and distributed arms and money among his troops.²

According to Ibn al-Athīr, Muḥammad sent from Hamadhān a division of 15,000 men towards 'Irāq and, when this division had reached Ḥalwān, he sent another division in the same direction; but the second division was overtaken by snow-storms in the mountains of Kurdestan and sustained heavy losses, its remnant was all but exterminated by the Kurds and the Turks. Thus Muḥammad took this as an evil omen, abandoned his intention, and returned to Khurasān.³ But according to Juvaini⁴ and Nasawī⁵ the

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 206-7; cf. Juvaini, II, p. 366.

²Sibt, p. 382; Abū Shāma, p. 100. cf. Ibn Taghrī-Berdī, VI, p. 119; Dhahabī, quotes al-Muwaffaq 'Abd al-Ḥaṭīf, XIX, fol. 116.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 207. Barthold used Ibn al-Athīr, but he says that this division was overtaken by the snow storms in the winter of the year 1217, Turkestan, p. 375. But Ibn al-Athīr does not mention this particular winter. Moreover, Juvaini says that by the time the Sultān had reached Asadabad it was mid-autumn. Juvaini, II, p. 360. Also al-Muwaffaq reports that this snow fell not at its usual time; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 11. On this expedition see also Kafesoğlu, p. 219.

⁴Juvaini, II, pp. 366-7.

⁵Nasawī, p. 20.

main body of Khwarizmian army, with Muhammad himself, received this blow when he proceeded from Hamadhān and reached Asadabād.¹

A cruel blow thus attacked the prestige of the Khwarizm-Shah.² As for the causes of his retreat to Khurasān, Ibn al-Athīr reports that Muhammad returned to Khurasān for fear of the invasion of the Mongols.³ Al-Muwaffaq, however, without specifying the Mongols, says that the Turks - meaning either the Qara-Khitays or the Mongols - took advantage of the absence of Muhammad from his kingdom, and planned an attack on his dominions, and Muhammad on receiving this news abandoned his plan to capture Baghdād and hurried back.⁴

Most of the historians attribute this bad luck of Muhammad to his sacrèligious campaign against the 'Abbāsīd House.⁵ Some of these historians go too far and say that this very attack on the 'Abbāsīd House is one of the causes of the sad end of Muhammad Khwarizm-shah and his Empire.⁶

The sudden retreat of Muhammad towards Khurasān raises the question of the accusation against al-Nāṣir found in some historians,

¹Nasawī, p. 20, he adds that this snow-storm lasted for three days, while al-Muwaffaq says that it lasted for 20 days; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 11. cf. Hamdallah Mustawfī, Tarikh-i-Guzida, p. 496.

²Hamdallah Mustawfī, p. 496; cf. Juvainī, II, p. 367.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 207.

⁴Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 11.

⁵Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 207; Nasawī, pp. 20-21; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 11; see Barthold, p. 375.

⁶Juvainī, II, p. 364 and pp. 366-7; see also Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 207.

who say that it was he who was responsible for the Mongol invasion of the Muslim lands, and that al-Nāṣir sent an envoy to Chingiz-Khan to seek his assistance to stop the advance of the Khwarizm-Shāh into Baghdād. Ibn al-Athīr says, "If there is truth in what the Persians [‘Ajam] said of al-Nāṣir - that he called the Mongols into the land of Islam - then this is a calamity so great that every other great sin appears small in comparison".¹ It is highly probably that this story was fabricated by Jalāl al-Dīn, the son and successor of Muḥammad, in order to legitimize his attack on the Caliph's dominions.²

Muḥammad left ‘Irāq ‘Ajam to return to Khurasān, but it seems that he did not abandon his intention of conquering Baghdād, because, when he left this province, he appointed ‘Imād al-Mulk al-Sāwī to act as Atabeg and administer the country;³ the latter was vehemently desirous to subdue ‘Irāq.⁴

According to Ibn al-Athīr, Muḥammad did not renounce his feud with al-Nāṣir and, when he arrived in Nishapūr in Dhu’l-Qa‘da 614/Feb. 1218, he immediately ordered al-Nāṣir's name to be omitted from the Khuṭba and said that the Caliph was dead. The same measures were carried

¹ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 287; see also: Abū ‘l-Fidā, III, p. 143; Maqrīzī, Suluk, I/I, p. 218; cf. Barthold, Turkestan, p. 375, n.3.

² Sibṭ, pp. 417-8; see also below, p. 77; cf. Barthold, Histoire des Turcs de Asia Central, Paris (1945), p. 124; cf. Kafesoğlu, pp. 243-5.

³ Juvaini, II, p. 474.

⁴ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 207.

out in other towns such as Marv, Balkh, Bukhara and Sarakhs, but did not extend to Khwarizm, Samarquand or Helat, as those towns were not in such close dependence on the government.¹ Al-Nasawī² affirms that Muḥammad himself, after his misfortune, expressed his repentance and endeavoured, outwardly at least, to make peace with the Caliph. It is very likely that Muḥammad, in fact, considered it necessary to make this concession to public opinion, and that the omission of al-Nāṣir's name from the Khuṭba was made before the expedition to Baghdād.³

After the Mongols had swept the Khwarizmian empire they reached by their raids the western part of Persia. Thus the Caliph was confronted by a new and very dangerous enemy. In 618/1221-2 the Mongols attacked Karman-Shāh, which was not far from Baghdād.⁴ According to al-Muwaffaq 'Abd al-Laṭīf, when the Mongols reached al-Jibāl province they split into two parties, the first aimed at Adharabayjān, and the second reached Hamadhān and Ispahān and almost reached Ḥulwān on their way to Baghdād.⁵ Ibn al-Athīr, on the other hand, does not mention anything about this split; he only says that, after the Mongols had plundered Adharabayjān and captured Maragha, they proceeded in the direction of Irbil.⁶

¹ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 207, cited by Barthold, Turkestan, p. 375. Nasawī also refers to this and says that when the Sultān had left Hamadhān, without fulfilling his aim of conquering Baghdād, he ordered al-Nāṣir's name to be omitted from the Khuṭba throughout his kingdom, the text, p. 187.

² Nasawī, pp. 20-21.

³ Barthold, p. 375; Juvaini affirms that Muḥammad omitted al-Nāṣir's name from the Khuṭba, throughout his kingdom, immediately after he had issued the Fatwa of the deposition of the Caliph. Juvaini, II, p. 392. Al-Muwaffaq puts this omission before Muḥammad's expedition to Baghdād, see (cont.)

When the Mongols proceeded towards 'Irāq, the Begteginid ruler of Irbil, Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökburī,¹ sent many Kurds to control the Derband and to protect it; meanwhile the Caliph concentrated all his troops on Baghdād.² The Caliph also sent his envoys to Irbil, Mosul and to Syria calling upon the rulers of these countries to render him help and to send their troops to join his in order to protect Baghdād. Muẓaffar al-Dīn marched with his troops and encamped in Dāqūq. The Caliph sent him a reinforcement of 800 soldiers; Muẓaffar al-Dīn was disappointed by this small number and could not venture to attack the Mongol with his little army. When the Mongols heard of the arrival of the armies to meet them, they did not go any further and, moreover, they retreated from the frontiers of 'Irāq without any assault on the Caliphate army.³ But according to al-Muwaffaq, the 'Abbāsid capital was spared from the Mongol invasion because the Muslims received the Mongol's ambassador, who was probably sent to spy out the enemy's camp, with great military parades and great ceremony in Irbil, in Dāqūq and finally in Baghdād, and his report on his visit discouraged and frightened the Mongols, who this time desisted from attacking Baghdād.⁴

(cont.)

¹Dhahabī, XVIII, fol. 173a, and also XIX, fol. 11.

⁴Sibt, p. 407; also Abū Shāma, p. 128.

⁵Dhahabī, XVIII, fols. 245-6.

⁶Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 247.

¹On Muẓaffar al-Dīn see E.I./II, s.v. Begteginids (by L. Cohen).

²Dhahabī, XVIII, fols. 245-6.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 247-8.

(cont.)

After the death of Muḥammad Khwarizm-Shāh in 617/1220-21 his empire fell to pieces and was overwhelmed by the Mongols. But the Mongols could not subdue the western parts of Persia; they had only covered it by their plundering raids.

The sons of Muḥammad were dispersed, along with their armies, by the Mongols. But soon afterwards those sons were able to restore their authority over some parts of their dominions, especially Ghiyāth al-Dīn, who by the year 620/1223-24 was able to restore al-Jibāl and Fārs provinces to his rule.¹ Ghiyāth al-Dīn started his activities in Fārs in 619/1222-23 and subsequently subdued Shirāz. His menace to the Caliph's dominions began after he had subdued Fārs to his rule. He soon marched from this province to Khūzistān, where he met, in a short assault, with the governor of this province, Muẓaffar al-Dīn Wajh al-Sabū', a mamluk of the Caliph; but he soon retreated from the territories of the Caliphate principality to al-Jibāl.²

Al-Nāṣir was alarmed by the progress of Ghiyāth al-Dīn into his territory and therefore prepared defensive measures in Baghdād and sent envoys to Irbil, Jazīra, and to Diyār Bakr for help in checking the

¹ (cont.)

⁴ Dhahabī, XVIII, fols. 245-6; also cited by J. De Somogyi, "Adh-Dhahabī's 'Ta'rikh al-Islam' as an authority on the Mongol invasion of the Caliphate". JRAS (1936), pp. 600-601.

¹ Abu 'l-Fidā, III, p. 139; also Juvaini, II, p. 417. According to Juvaini, Kerman was assigned to Ghiyāth al-Dīn by his father in 617/1220-21 shortly before his death, Juvaini, II, pp. 468-9.

² Ibid. p. 469.

progress of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, and at the same time sent an envoy to Ghiyāth al-Dīn asking him to leave his territory in peace, and it seems that the Caliph's injunction was obeyed.¹

Al-Nāṣir did not stop in his action against Ghiyāth al-Dīn at this point, but according to Ibn al-Athīr he tried to undermine the strength of Ghiyāth al-Dīn from within, by sending secret messages to the uncle of the latter, Ighān Ṭā'sī (or Ṭā'isī)² urging him to revolt against his nephew, with the offer of the patent of governorship of 'Irāq 'Ajam. The uncle separated from his nephew and started a war against him, but without success.³

Ghiyāth al-Dīn did not enjoy his rule very long, for soon after that, in 621/1224-5, his brother, Jalāl al-Dīn, marched from India through Kermān to 'Irāq 'Ajam, which was subdued by him, and his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn was also made subject to his authority.⁴

By the coming of Jalāl al-Dīn to western Persia a new menace to the Caliph sprang up and, this time, a more powerful and dangerous foe than Ghiyāth al-Dīn came to be a neighbour of the Caliph's dominions.

¹Nasawī, p.78; where he says that Ghiyāth al-Dīn marched from Fars to the frontier of Amhar(?) which is a dependency of Baghdād, and 'Alam al-Dīn Qaysar, the viceroy of the Caliph there, retreated before the Khwarizmian progress.

²Abu 'l-Fidā mentions another form of this name, (بغیان طابسي) see Abu 'l-Fidā, III, p. 139.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 270. (He puts this event in the year 620)

⁴Ibid. XII, p. 276; Juvaini, II, p. 420.

Jalāl al-Dīn, for his part, immediately after he had destroyed the rule of his brother, marched into Khūzistān to pass the winter there.¹ According to Ibn al-Athīr, Jalāl al-Dīn marched to Khūzistān and laid waste the country, and besieged Tustar in Muḥarram 622/Jan.-Feb. 1125. Muẓaffar al-Dīn Wajh al-Sabū', the governor of this province, put up a great resistance and did not submit to Jalāl al-Dīn. The Khwarizmian troops dispersed in every direction and laid waste this province. Some of Jalāl al-Dīn's troops reached Baṣra, which they plundered, capturing a lot of booty, but the Shiḥna was able to drive them back from this city. Al-Nāṣir, alarmed by the attack of Jalāl al-Dīn, therefore took immediate steps to save his capital; he sent his mamlūk, Jamāl al-Dīn Qūsh Temur with an army, to stop the advance of Jalāl al-Dīn, but the mamlūk was unable to stop the Khwarizm-shāh.² At the same time, carrier pigeons were dispatched to Irbil with the message that Muẓaffar al-Dīn, its ruler, should send 10,000 men to the aid of the Caliph.³

Al-Nāṣir prepared his defensive measures in Baghdād and distributed arms among his troops.⁴ Jalāl al-Dīn reached Ba'qūba, stayed there

¹Nasawī, p. 109; also Juvaini, II, p. 421.

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 276-7.

³Juvaini, II, p. 422; where he adds that the ruler of Irbil marched with his troops against Jalāl al-Dīn, but the latter was able to check him after a short battle; while Ibn al-Athīr reports that Jalāl al-Dīn entered into negotiations with Muẓaffar al-Dīn without a real clash taking place between them. See al-Kāmil, XII, pp. 277-8.

⁴According to al-Yafī'ī the caliph spent 1,000,000 Dīnars on his troops, see Mir'at al-Janan, Hyderabad (1918-20), IV, p. 49.

for a while, and marched towards Adharbayjān. When he reached Dāqūq its citizens cursed him openly for his attack on the Caliph's dominions. Angered by the action of the citizens of the city, Jalāl al-Dīn besieged Dāqūq and after a severe battle captured it; and the Khwarizmians laid waste and plundered it. Then he left 'Irāq for Adharbayjān.¹

Here a question arises as to what the aim of Jalāl al-Dīn was in attacking the territory of the Caliphate? On the one hand, Juvaini gives the following argument to this question: he says that Jalāl al-Dīn set out for Baghdād expecting the Caliph to render him assistance and make of him a bulwark against the Mongols. He sent a message in advance to announce his arrival and explain his intentions. But the Caliph paid no attention to his words, for he still harboured resentment for what he had suffered at the hands of the Sulṭān's father and grandfather. Instead, al-Nāṣir deputed Qush-Temur to lead an army of 20,000 valiant men to expel the Sulṭān from his territory.²

If Jalāl al-Dīn was sincere in his claims, he should not, then, have laid waste Khūzistān and plundered all the territories he passed through on his way to Baghdād.

¹Nasawī, p. 109; cf. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 277-8.

²Juvaini, II, pp. 422-3.

Sibt, on the other hand, says that Jalāl al-Dīn attacked the territory of Baghdād to wreak vengeance on al-Nāṣir because the latter was the cause of the death of his father, and the calling of the infidels to the countries of Islam.¹ It seems that this is the excuse which Jalāl al-Dīn claimed in order to legitimize his attack on the principality of the Caliph.²

It seems very likely that his main purpose in attacking the territory of the Caliph was not to conquer Baghdād but to obtain as much booty as possible. For, as Ibn al-Athīr reports, when Jalāl al-Dīn with his army entered Khūzistān, they were in great need of everything, especially of horses and mules.³ And this explains why he did not attack Baghdād while he was encamped a few miles away from it.

About the sudden retreat of Jalāl al-Dīn from 'Irāq there are two reports. The first is that of Sibt, who says that Jalāl al-Dīn had, before he reached the outskirts of Baghdād, sent an expedition to Georgia. But when he marched to conquer Baghdād, a messenger from this expedition reached him, and asked him urgently to render help to

¹Sibt, in this narrative, quotes the words of al-Malik al-Mu'azzam who received a letter from Jalāl al-Dīn to this effect and, moreover, asking al-Mu'azzam's help against the Caliph; Sibt, pp. 417-8; Abū Shama, p. 144. The same narrative appears in Ibn Taghribirdi, al-Nujum, VI, pp. 260-261.

²cf. above, p. 69-70.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 277; cf. Dhahabi, XIX, fol. 14a.

them against the Georgians; therefore he left Baghdād and marched towards Aḥarbayjān.¹ But Abu 'al-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī states a fantastic story of the reason of Jalāl al-Dīn's retreat from 'Irāq. He says that when Jalāl al-Dīn entered 'Irāq he plundered and took captives. He came near Baghdād where he encamped for 18 days. When al-Nāṣir heard of this, he sent oxen and ploughed the lands which the Khwarizmian reached, and thus there was nothing left to feed the mounts of Jalāl al-Dīn's army and, because of this, he desisted from attacking Baghdād.² Al-Nāṣir realized the danger of Jalāl al-Dīn and, therefore, returned to his policy of seeking allies in Western Persia. The Caliph found a favourable opportunity in the separation of Ghiyāth al-Dīn from his brother, after a dispute between the latter and one of the Amīrs of Jalāl al-Dīn.³ Ghiyāth al-Dīn sent his Wazīr, Karīm al-Sharq, to Baghdād asking for help against his brother. Al-Nāṣir honoured Ghiyāth al-Dīn with presents and provided him with 30,000 Dīnārs.⁴ But Ghiyāth al-Dīn could not achieve any success, and he was soon killed by the governor of Kermān, Baraq Ḥājib.⁵

¹Sibt, pp. 417-8.

²Abu 'al-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, al-Ta'rikh al-Manṣūrī, fols. 149b-150a.

³Juvaini, II, pp. 471-2.

⁴Nasawī, p. 143.

⁵Juvaini, II, p. 473.

The Caliph turned again to Ighān Ṭa'īsī, the uncle of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, who was wandering with his army in Adharbayjān. He sent to Ighān, encouraging him to march against Hamadhān to capture it, by giving him the patent to rule it. Ighān marched to Hamadhān, but Jalāl al-Dīn met him and after a sudden attack from the latter, Ighān was captured and submitted to the authority of Jalāl al-Dīn.¹ Thus al-Nāṣir's attempts to crush the power of the last Khwarizmian Sultān was in vain. But his threat was over and, from now on, the Khwarizmian danger to Baghdād was at an end.

The relation between al-Nāṣir and the rulers of the no longer closely integrated provinces of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate was a peaceful one. He tried to strengthen the position of the Caliphate among them by sending envoys from time to time, and yearly sending for each of the rulers the patent of rule to give them the legal means to rule their provinces.² He accompanied this investiture with several gifts of symbolic rather than of material value such as: robes of honour, Futuwwa clothes and titles.³ This practice was for the purpose of "maintaining outward prestige and [so that] their name [the Caliphs' names] might appear in the Marches on the coinage and in the Khutba".⁴

¹ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 280-281.

² Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, pp. 41-2.

³ For example see Sibt, p. 333; Abū Shāma, p. 33; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 261.

⁴ Ibn Ṭiqṭaqa, p.42.

Al-Nāṣir sent envoys to these rulers especially when there were conflicts between them, to settle their differences and at the same time to place himself in a favourable position for interfering in their local affairs.

In spite of his good relations with the Ayyūbid rulers, nevertheless he was anxious concerning the powerful one among them. Therefore he opposed al-ʿAdil's action to conquer Sinjār in 606/1209-10, and sent a message to him asking him to leave this city to its ruler.¹ And when al-Malik al-Ashraf marched to northern ʿIrāq in 615/1218-9 to capture Irbil, at the request of the ruler of Mosul, the Caliph sent an ambassador, who asked al-Ashraf not to march against Irbil, the latter obeyed the Caliph's request and returned to Sinjār.²

Although the relations between Baghdād and the Ayyūbids were smooth and peaceful, yet the relation between Mecca and Baghdād was at a standstill.

After Ḥasan III had declared his conversion to Orthodox Islam in 608/1211-12,³ he sent his mother to go on the pilgrimage. On the day of ʿArafāt certain Ismāʿīlīs attacked a noble from the family of Qutāda,⁴

¹Ibn al-Saʿī, p. 288; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 187-8; Sibṭ, p. 353.

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 225-6; Ibn al-ʿIbrī, Mukhtaṣar, pp. 405-6.

³see above, pp.

⁴On Qutāda see Ibn ʿUtba (or ʿUnba), ʿUmdat al-Talib, ed. Najaf (1961) pp. 138ff; Qalqashandī, Subḥ al-Aṣḥa, IV, pp. 271 ff.

the ruler of Mecca, called Abū Hārūn 'Azīz,¹ and killed him. In fact, they aimed at Qutāda himself. Qutāda understood this and seized this opportunity to plunder and sack the caravan of the 'Irāqi pilgrims. After mediation from Ayyūbid Amīrs, who accompanied the Syrian caravan, Qutāda agreed to stop his attack on the 'Irāqi pilgrims and allowed them to continue their religious performances, after he had imposed on them a fine of 100,000 Dīnars.² It seems likely that al-Naṣir was the instigator of this assassination -as Juvaini suggests.³ This attitude of al-Naṣir towards Qutāda was due either to the attitude of Qutāda towards the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate and to his claim that he had more right to the Caliphate than al-Naṣir,⁴ or to the fact that he controlled from "the frontiers of Yemen to al-Madīna and also Yanbu'", and his army had increased".⁵ Moreover, Qutāda refused to accept the invitation of al-Naṣir to visit Bagh^hdad.⁶

¹Maqrīzī, Sulūk, I/I, pp. 175-6.

²Sibt, pp. 363-4; Abū Shāma, pp. 78-9; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 195. But Barthold says that Qutāda was killed by those Assassins. Turkestan, p. 374. This is incorrect since most of the sources agree that it was a cousin of Qutāda who was killed. Moreover Juvaini says that it was his brother that they stabbed and killed; see Juvaini, II, p. 391.

³Juvaini, II, p. 391.

⁴Sibt, pp. 406-7; Abū Shāma, p. 123.

⁵Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 195.

⁶Sibt, pp. 406-7; Abū Shāma, p. 123.

Therefore the motive of al-Nāṣir to remove Qutāda is very clear.

Afterwards, Qutāda realized the foolish consequences of opposing al-Nāṣir so openly, therefore he sent his son with some of his courtiers to Baghdād, to apologise to the Caliph.¹

Al-Nāṣir did not abandon his attention of interfering in Meccan affairs in order to set up a loyal governor. When Qutāda died in 617/1220-21² or 618/1221-22³ he was succeeded by his son, Ḥasan. But there was another son called Rājih, who demanded the governorship for himself. Rājih asked for help from the Caliph, and he received it at the hand of Aqbāsh, the Amīr of the 'Irāqi pilgrimage caravan. Ḥasan met this expedition with his army and, after a short battle, Aqbāsh was killed and his army fled.⁴ But shortly afterwards Ḥasan sent an envoy to Baghdād offering his apology and asking the forgiveness of al-Nāṣir.⁵ Thus al-Nāṣir's attempt to control Mecca failed and, furthermore, the 'Irāqi caravan of pilgrims often met with a very unfriendly reception at Mecca, as had happened in 619/1222-3 when al-Malik al-Mas'ūd, the Ayyūbid governor of Yemen, captured Mecca. He prevented the Caliph's standard

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 195.

²Sibt, pp. 401-2; also Abū Shāma, pp. 123-4.

³Ibn al-Athīr, Vol. XII, p. 195.

⁴Ibid., Vol. XII, pp. 261-2. According to Sibt Aqbāsh did not agree to offer his assistance to Rājih, but Ḥasan mistakenly thought that Aqbāsh was collaborating with his brother and attacked the 'Irāqi caravan. Aqbāsh for his part came alone to meet Ḥasan's army in order to settle the dispute, but they killed him. Sibt, pp. 401-2.

⁵Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 262.

being carried up on the 'Arafā mountain until sunset, after which he allowed them to carry it up.¹

Al-Nāṣir was not free from troubles inside his principality. In 606/1209-10 the governor of Khūzistān, Quṭb ad-Dīn Sanjar, tried to break out of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate. But al-Nāṣir was quick to take the necessary measures to stop this action; at first he attempted to settle the dispute by peaceful means, therefore he called upon Sanjar to come to Baghdād, but the latter refused to obey the Caliph. Therefore al-Nāṣir sent his Wazīr Mu'ayad al-Dīn al-Qummi and his cup-bearer, Najah al-Dīn with an army. They were able to drive Sanjar out of Khūzistān, and later on they were able to capture him.²

In spite of the failure of al-Nāṣir's policy of expansion in western Persia, he was able to keep his authority over Khūzistān, in fact this province was kept under the control of Baghdād till the fall of the Caliphate in 656/1258.

In spite of the political weakness of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate, its moral power was great and effective, especially over the rulers of the different parts of the Muslim world. These rulers needed the patents to rule their provinces. Ibn at-Tiqṭāqa was clever enough to put this as follows:

¹Sibt, pp. 410-11.

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 190-91. See Sibt, pp. 354-5.

"No doubt the rulers of the Marches, such as those of Syria and Egypt, and the prince of Mosul used to transmit to them (the Caliphs) annually something by way of a present to secure their good offices. They sought from them (the Caliphs) investiture in the government of their territories, thereby to rule absolutely over their subjects and by this means to impose on them obedience as a duty."¹

From this al-Nāṣir took advantage by withholding these patents from those rulers who opposed him, such as the Seljuq Sultān, Tughrīl II, and the Khwarizmian Sultāns, and granted it to those who showed him their obedience. And what is more those rulers needed his approval and encouragement against their enemies, especially the Crusaders, as when the Franks attacked Damietta, al-Nāṣir sent (in 616/1219-20) messages to all the rulers of the Marches to help al-Malik al-Kāmil.² And when the Franks attacked al-Ṭūr fortress, al-Mu'azzam of Damascus sent to the Caliph a message, asking for his assistance against the Crusaders.³

Al-Nāṣir had also increased the capacity of his intelligence service, by sending spies to the different provinces to spy out the internal affairs of the rulers. Al-Muwaffaq 'Abd al-latif gives a good example of the activity of this Caliph in the spying out of the number of the troops of Muḥammad Khwarizm-Shāh when the latter marched to attack Baghdād in 614/1217-18.⁴

¹Al-Fakhri, p. 42 (Eng. tr. 28).

²Abu'l-Fada'il al-Hamawi, al-Ta'rikh al-Mansuri, fol. 136b. According to Sibṭ, al-Nāṣir refused to help the Ayyubid sovereign against the Crusaders; Abu-Shāma, p. 147.

³Ibid., p. 103; Sibṭ, p. 383.

⁴Dhahabi, XIX, fol. 12a-b. For some other examples of al-Nāṣir's espionage see: al-Fakhri, pp. 433-4; Bar-Hebraeus, Chronography, I, p. 387. See below, pp 127 ff.

Al-Nāṣir was the last strong and powerful Caliph of Baghdād, and the best statement to conclude this short sketch of his political activities is the narrative of al-Muwaffaq 'Abd-al-laṭīf, who says:

"Al-Nāṣir filled all hearts with fear and awe and re-suscitated the prestige of the Caliphate after it had died on the death of al-Mu'taṣim, and it was dead on his own death."¹

Al-Nāṣir died on the night preceding the first of Shawwāl 622/6 October 1225.² He was succeeded by his son al-Ẓāhir, who came to the throne at the age of 52.³ Although he was praised and esteemed by all the historians of this period, he remains obscure as regards his ability as a politician, because he reigned for a short period, nine and a half months only. He died on 13 Rajab 623/10 July 1226, and was succeeded by al-Mustanṣir.⁴

Al-Mustanṣir was a capable ruler;⁵ he tried to follow the same lines of al-Nāṣir's policy to strengthen his position. However al-Nāṣir tried to shake the power of Jalāl al-Dīn Khwarizm-Shāh, but Jalāl al-Dīn was still the great opponent of the Caliphate; his power was

¹Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 13b.

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 285; also Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 14a. Ibn al-'Ibrī, p.414.

³Sibt, p.419.

⁴Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 33b; while Ibn al-Athīr puts his reign as 9 months and 14 days, Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 298. Cf. al-Kāzirunī, fol. 91a; E.I./I, sv. al-Ẓāhir.

⁵E.I./I, s.v. al-Mustanṣir.

increased after the death of al-Nāṣir and he controlled all western Persia, i.e. from Kermān in the south to Adharbayjān and Armenia in the north. Jalāl al-Dīn, in fact, needed the approval of the Caliphs of Baghdād, as well as their/^{symbolic}gifts, to strengthen his position before the increasing menace of the Mongols. Therefore he asked these Caliphs to invest him with the title of Sultān but they refused his requests.¹ Al-Mustanṣir realized that he could gain nothing from opposing Jalāl al-Dīn, but he would gain a strong ally by settling the differences between Baghdād and the Khwarizm-Shāh, especially if he settled the dispute over al-Jibāl province. Therefore, when Jalāl al-Dīn in 626/1229 laid siege to Akhlāt,² the Caliph dispatched his chamberlain, Sa'd al-Dīn, to negotiate with Jalāl al-Dīn, and to represent the claims of his master. The claims of the Caliph were: first, that Jalāl al-Dīn should not interfere in the affairs of Badr al-Dīn lu'lu', the ruler of Mosul, Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gök-buri, the ruler of Irbil, Shihāb al-Dīn Sulāimān-Shāh, the ruler of the Iṣṣe Turcomans and 'Imād al-Dīn Pehlewān, the ruler of al-Jibāl; and moreover that he should consider them as vassals of the Diwān. Second, that the Khutba on the name of the Caliph should be introduced in all the Khwarizmian dominions, this practice having been suspended at the time of Muḥammad Khwarizm-Shāh. Jalāl al-

¹Nasawī, p. 247.

²Sibt, p. 434.

Dīn agreed to these terms and dispatched his approval by his Chamberlain.¹ The Caliph received the envoy of the Khwarizm-Shāh with great honour and sent many presents with him to his master, the gifts included the Futuwwa clothes², and, calling Jalāl al-Dīn in his message (الجناب العالي لك منشا هي) (the Supreme Imperial Court).³ The Caliph also requested him, through these envoys, to leave Akhlāt to its ruler, but Jalāl al-Dīn refused to accede to this request.⁴

Akhlāt⁵ at this time belonged to al-Ashraf, the Ayyūbid ruler of Damascus and Mesopotamia. Al-Ashraf, alarmed at the increasing menace of Jalāl al-Dīn, decided to expel him from his territories. He concluded an alliance with the Seljuq Sultān of Rūm, 'Alā' al-Dīn Kayqubād̲h̲, and the allied army marched towards Jalāl al-Dīn, and they were able to defeat him at Erzinjān and to put him to flight.⁶ Jalāl al-Dīn retreated to Tabrūz in Adharbayjān. There he received the news of the advance of the Mongol army against him. He was alarmed at this progress and sent to the Caliph, to al-Ashraf and to the Sultān of Rūm, asking them for help and drawing their attention to the fact that he was like a dam.

¹Nasawī, p. 187 ff.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 4-5.

³Nasawī, pp. 187-90.

⁴Ibid., p. 191; also Abu 'al-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, fol. 185b. According to Juvaini (II, p. 443), the citizens of Akhlāt asked the Caliph to mediate with Jalāl al-Dīn.

⁵Akhlāt or Khilāt, was one of the largest cities in Armenia; see le Strange, The lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 183.

⁶Ibn al-'Ibrī, Mukhtarsal, pp. 429-30; Sibṭī, pp. 436-7.

between them and the Mongols. But they did not pay any attention to his appeal.¹ The Mongol army advanced against him and after a short battle he was defeated and put to flight. Soon after this battle Jalāl al-Dīn died as a fugitive in the middle of Shawwal in 628/16 Aug. 1231.²

With the collapse of the Khwarizmian empire and the death of Jalāl al-Dīn, the last obstacle between the Mongols and 'Irāq was removed. Al-Mustanṣir realized this danger and tried to protect his dominions by the annexation of Irbil. Irbil has a very important strategic position near the mountain pass (Darband), by which most of the enemies coming from the east had to pass on their way to 'Irāq. In order to achieve this aim, the Caliph received with great honour and tremendous celebration the ruler of this province, Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gök-bōri, when the latter came to pay a visit to Baghdād in 628/1230/1. Muẓaffar al-Dīn was so impressed by the honour bestowed upon him by the Caliph that, when he returned to Irbil, he imposed an oath on his Amīrs to the effect that they should surrender his province to the Caliph after his own death.³ However, when Muẓaffar al-Dīn died

¹ Ibn al-'Ibrī, op.cit., pp. 430.32.

² Nasawī, p. 247; Sibṭī, pp. 442-3; cf. Juvaini, II, pp. 459-60.

³ Ibn al-Fuwaṭi, pp. 19 ff; Sibṭī, however, says that when Muẓaffar al-Dīn visited Baghdād he brought with him the keys of Irbil and its dependencies; Mir'āt, p. 450.

in Ramaḍān 630/June-July 1233,¹ those Amīrs refused to surrender Irbil to the Dīwān; therefore the Caliph sent his army with Iqbāl al-Sharābī and the Amīr Qush-Temur; this army laid siege to Irbil and after a few days they were able to conquer it. On receiving the news of this victory the Caliph rejoiced, and immediately ordered a complete staff of officials to be sent to this province.² Soon after the death of Jalāl al-Dīn, the Mongols covered with their raids all Adharbayjān and in Dhu 'l-Hijja 628/Sept.-Oct. 1231 a band of them penetrated into the province of Irbil and plundered it and continued their attack as far as Dāquq.³

Their raid was repeated in 629/123-2 and this time they attacked Shahrazūr. The Caliph sent for help to Syria and Irbil; and for his part he prepared his troops.⁴ The allied army reached Shahrazūr, but the Mongols, on hearing of its advance, retreated to Adharbayjān.⁵

It seems that the main aim of the Mongols from these raids and plunders was to collect booty and to test the strength and military power of these provinces.

¹Sibt, p.452; Ibn al-'Ibri, p. 435.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 44 ff; cf. E.I/II, s.v. Begteginds (by L. Cahen.)

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 327-8; Maqrīzī, Suluk, I/I, p. 241.

⁴Abu 'l-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, fol. 212a.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 27 ff; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 241b. On these raids see also Tabaqat-i-Nasiri, Eng. tr. II, p. 1117.

The Mongol's raid was repeated in 633/1235-6, they attacked Irbil, Mosul and Sinjār. The Caliph ordered his army to proceed into Irbil to drive the Mongols back, but when this army reached the Darband (the mountain pass) they discovered that the Mongols had retreated.¹

In 634/1236-7 the Mongols attacked Irbil and were able to force their way into the town, but they were unable to capture the citadel.² The army of Baghdād marched towards Irbil, but the Mongols retreated from this town. At the same time, the Caliph ordered the fortification of his capital.³

In 635/1237-8 the Mongols marched into Irbil, but its governor took all the necessary precautions to defend his city. Therefore they turned towards Baghdād, they penetrated into Irāq till they reached Dāquq, and laid waste this province. The Caliph sent his army out of Baghdād under the leadership of al-Sharābī and Qush-Temur, who were able to drive the Mongols back. In Baghdād the Caliph ordered ~~the~~

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 84-5; Ibn al-ʿIbrī, Mukhtaṣar, p. 436; al-Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 245a. On this raid see also S. D. Goitein, "Glimpses on Naval warfare in the Mediterranean", S.O. Levi Della Vida, I, p. 399 and pp. 405 ff. Sibṭ (p.460) quotes a letter dispatched from Lu'lu', the ruler of Mosul, to al-Ashraf, telling him that the Mongols had crossed the river Tigris in 100 divisions and every division consisted of 500 soldiers. It seems that this estimation of Sibṭ is much exaggerated.

²Sibṭ, p. 462.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 98-9; Abū Shāma, p. 165; cf. Bar-Hebraeus, Chronography, p. 402; idem Mukhtaṣar, p. 437.

the wall of his capital to be repaired and that engines of war be set up on it.¹ According to Bar-Hebraeus a band of those Mongols reached Samarra' and killed most of its population.²

Another raid took place in the same year (Rajab 635/Feb.-Mar. 1238). This time they attacked Khāniqīn.³ The Caliph sent for help to many Muslim rulers, and received some reinforcements from them. But the Mongols were able to defeat the Muslim army and to obtain a lot of booty, and they left Khāniqīn on their way to al-Jibāl.⁴ They even sent an envoy to Baghdād in Rabi' II 636/Nov.-Dec. 1238 and after a short visit he left it with the envoy of the Caliph.⁵ Al-Mustansir recognised the increasing danger of the Mongols and in order to meet this danger, he tried to increase the number of his troops; he, therefore, sent money to al-Malik al-Kāmil, the Ayyūbid ruler of Syria and Egypt, to collect soldiers for him. Al-Kāmil did so and sent 3,000 soldiers to Baghdād.⁶ The Caliph also obtained a religious Fatwa in

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 109 ff.

²Chronography, p. 404; Mukhtasar, p. 438.

³Chronography, p. 404.

⁴Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 111 ff; Bar-Hebraeus, Ch., p. 404; Mukhtasar, pp. 438-9.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 1143. According to Dhahabī, three embassies had been exchanged between Baghdād and the Mongols until 639/1241-2, but there are no indications to reveal what were the topics dealt with on these embassies. Ta'rikh al-Islam, XIX, fol. 253a.

⁶Ibn al-'Amīd, edited by Cl. Cahen in B.E.O., XV (1955-7), fols. 238-9; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 246b; cf. Maqrīzī, Suluk I/I, pp. 257-8. For further details see below, p. 218.

634/1236-7 to the effect that in such a circumstance to prosecute the Holy War was more necessary than to prepare the pilgrimage caravan.¹ In fact the 'Irāqi pilgrimage caravan was stopped from this year till the death of al-Mustanşir in 640/1242.² The Caliph aimed by this to stop the expenditure on this religious practice in order to concentrate his efforts on dealing with the Mongols.

As a result of the military weaknesses of the rulers of the Marches, and the increasing menace of the Mongols, those rulers found themselves in great need of more of the moral authority of the Caliphate. In spite of the fact that al-Mustanşir followed the classical practice of bestowing patents of rule and robes of honour upon those rulers, by now they followed another practice, that of coming to Baghdād and enjoying the honour of being in the capital of the Caliphate. When Muzaffar al-Dīn, the ruler of Irbil, came to Baghdād in 628/1230-31, he saw the Caliph twice and, on receiving this news, the rest of the rulers of the Muslim world envied Muzaffar al-Dīn this great honour, and even asked permission of the Caliph to come to Baghdād; but he refused this and advised them to stay where they were to keep order in their provinces.³

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 98.

²Ibid., pp. 163-4.

³Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 129.

In 634/1236-7 the ruler of Shahrazūr came to Baghdād, where he was honoured with the Futuwwa clothes.¹ In 637/1239-40 al-Jawād, the Ayyūbid ruler of Sinjār, visited Baghdād after he had sold Sinjār to Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu';² it seems that al-Jawād discussed a proposal to give 'Āna to the Caliph which, in fact, surrendered to the deputy of the Dīwān in the same year.³

The Caliph also encouraged the remaining troops of the Khwarizmian to come to Baghdād so that he might employ them; in 631/1233-4 the Caliph employed 4,000 cavalry from them.⁴ In 638/1240-41 the Caliph received with honour some of the Khwarizmian Amīrs.⁵

In the days of al-Mustansir, there was comparative peace at Baghdād, learning flourished and schools and libraries were established, such as the famous Mustansiriyya College.⁶ He followed also the policy of his grandfather, al-Nāṣir, of approaching the Shī'ite community through the Futuwwa organisation, and of visiting their shrines and offering money to them.⁷ However, he kept his good relations with the

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 88-9.

²Ibid., pp. 121-2.

³Ibid., p. 131; also Sibṭ, p. 483.

⁴Abu al-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, fol. 226b.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 143-4.

⁶Ibid., p. 53; see below, pp. 144 ff.

⁷Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 95; see also below, pp. 146 ff.

Sunnī community by several means.¹

Al-Mustanşir died on 10 Jumada II 640/5 Dec. 1242.² He was succeeded by his son al-Musta'şim (640-656/1242-56). This Caliph, as related by some historians,³ was a weak sovereign, although he tried, vainly, to follow the policy of his predecessors. He tried to make his reign popular by resuming the sending out of the pilgrimage caravan, which had been suspended since 634/1236-7.⁴

Soon after his succession to the throne, he was faced with a serious danger inside Baghḍād itself. In Sha'bān 640/Jan.-Feb. 1243 the Mamlūks of his father and grandfather demanded an increase in their salaries, but Iqbāl al-Sharābī, the powerful cup-bearer, refused to grant their request. They, therefore, declared that they were intending to leave Baghḍād and, in fact, they left the city and encamped outside its walls, thus threatening the peace of the population. As a

¹Cf. below, pp. 144 ff.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 155 ff; al-Kazirūnī, fol. 92b; Ibn al-ʿIbrī, Mukhtaṣar, p. 442; Dhahabī, Duwal al-Islām, II, pp. 110-11; cf. Ibn al-ʿAmīd, fol. 246a, Ibn Khalḍūn, III, pp. 536 ff; see also Abu 'l-Fiḍā, III, p. 179; E.I./I, s.v. al-Mustanşir (by K. G. Zettersteen).

³See Bar-Hebraeus, Chronography, I, p. 409; idem Mukhtaṣar, p. 443; al-ʿUmārī, XXVI, fol. 129a; and E.I./I, s.v. al-Musta'şim (by K. V. Zettersteen).

⁴Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 163-4.

result of the mediation of a certain pious man, the dispute was settled after seven days of the Mamluks' strike.¹

The Mongols' raid on 'Irāq continued during the reign of this Caliph: in 642/1244-5 a Mongol army attacked Shahrazūr; they were able to force their way into the town, but retreated after a while, with the booty.²

In 643/1245-6 another raid took place and the Mongols reached Ba'qūba, 30 miles north-east of Baghdād, but the army of Baghdād, under the leadership of the young Dawādār (al-Duwaydār al-Ṣaghīr),³ a mamlūk of the Caliph, was able to defeat them and to force them back.⁴ The Caliph was alarmed for his capital, and therefore asked the Beduins to come to Baghdād to assist his army.⁵ In 647/1249-50 another raid was made on Khāniqīn, and the Mongols marched to Dāqūq, where they killed many people and captured many prisoners and much booty.

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 168 ff.

²Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 256b; Ibn al-ʿIbrī, Mukhtaṣar, p. 446; Ta'rikh Ibn al-Furāt, Vatican MS. (No. 726 Arab), fol. 46a.

³Dawādār or Duwaydār means the bearer and keeper of the royal inkpot; see E.I./II, s.v. Dawādār (by D. Ayalon).

⁴Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 258b; also Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 168. On the one hand Ibn al-Fuwaṭī reports that the Mongols retreated without making assault on the army of Baghdād; Hawādith, pp. 199-200. On the other hand, Bar-Hebraeus reports the Mongols went to Baghdād, but they were not able to capture it because a great crowd of people rose up and opposed them with a violent assault. Chronography, I, p. 410.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p.200.

The Caliph took all the available precautions to defend his capital.¹

While Baghdād and the Caliphate were in serious danger of the Mongol invasion, it is to be observed that in 650/1252-3 a large number of soldiers left Baghdād for Syria, because their salaries had been suspended.² It seems very likely that the financial resources of the Caliphate were so limited that the government could not maintain a large number of troops.³ Although ambassadors went to and fro between Baghdād and the Mongols,⁴ there are no indications as to the topics discussed at these meetings.

In Baghdād the government was very weak and its authority declined so that it could not even keep order in the city. In 644/1246-47 the burglars increased and became a nuisance to the citizens;⁵ in 648/1250-51 these burglars had a leader called Ghayth.⁶ The 'Ayyārūn also became a dangerous element in Baghdād. In 648/1250-51 they attacked in bands, and even sacked the houses of the Amīrs.⁷ In 653/1255-6 the 'Ayyārūn became so powerful that they attacked and robbed

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 241-2; see also Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 265a; al-Maqrizī, I/II, p. 355.

² Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 261.

³ See below, pp. 221-2

⁴ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 220; see also Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 261b, and XX, fol. 210a.

⁵ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 213.

⁶ Dhahabī, XIX, fol 268b.

⁷ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 254. 'Ayyār, literally "rascal or tramp". From the 9th to the 12th century it was the name for certain warriors who were
(cont.)

the people openly, and robbed the shops of Darb Zāhil.¹ The disputes and the fights between the different quarters of Baghdād continued; and the fights between the Shī'ite and Sunnī communities were repeated throughout the reign of this Caliph.² Baghdād was flooded several times,³ because the government was too weak to undertake the irrigation system. Moreover, the messengers of the Mongols reached Baghdād in 655/1257-8 and openly and fearlessly granted Firmans (safe-conducts) to certain people and, in fact, the government did not take any steps to stop their activities.⁴ The Pilgrimage Caravan from Baghdād had been stopped since 643/1245-6 not only because of the menace of the Mongols, but also because the government was too weak to keep order in southern 'Irāq, where the Beduins were threatening the pilgrims and attacking their caravan, and extorting as much money as possible for guiding and guarding the pilgrims.⁵

The last blow to the Caliphate came in 656/1258, when Hūlāgū marched with his huge army towards Baghdād and laid siege to it. The

(cont.)

grouped together under the Futuwwa organization; E.I./II, s.v. 'Ayyār (by F. Taeschner); cf. A.A.Durī, "Nushu' al-Aṣṇaf wa'l-Ḥṛaf fi al-Islam", B.C.A. I (1959), pp. 157 ff.

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 278.

²Ibid., pp. 298, 314; for more details see below, pp. 151 ff.

³see below, pp. 220-21.

⁴Dhahabī, XX, fol. 210a.

⁵Ibid., XIX, fol. 269a; also Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 290.

Caliphate army engaged in a battle against the Mongols, but it was defeated and overtaken by the Mongols. The siege was continued for more than a month, and the Mongols were able to force their way into the city, through a breach in the wall near al-'Ajamī tower, but the defenders were able to drive them back. At this stage of affairs the Caliph and his advisers recognised that they could not maintain their city any longer. Therefore, the Caliph sent a delegation to Hūlagū to negotiate the terms of their submission.

On 4 Šafar 656/10 Feb. 1258 Baghdād was surrendered to the Mongols, and the Caliph with his household were taken captive and then put to death. The people of Baghdād were put to the sword for a week, and thus the 'Abbāsid Caliphate of Baghdād was abolished.¹

¹ On the fall of Baghdād see: Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 323 ff; Naṣir al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, Dhayḥ of Jahan Kusha of Juvaini, ed. Qazminī, III (1937) pp. 282 ff; (the English tr. of this Dhayḥ by J.A. Boyle in JSS, VI/2 1961⁴⁵⁻⁴⁶ pp.); Ibn Khaldūn, III, pp. 537-8; Ibn Kathir, XIII, pp. 200 ff; Yūnīnī, I, pp. 86 ff; Abū Shāma, pp. 198-9; Bar-Hebraeus, Chronography, I, pp. 429 ff; idem, Mukhtaṣar, pp. 473 ff; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VII, pp. 47 ff; Abū 'l-Fida, III, pp. 202-3; Ibn al-'Amīd, fols. 261-2; Dhahabī, XX, fol. 155-6, and fols. 211 ff.; al-Kazirūnī, fols 93 ff; Ibn Tiqtāqa, pp. 452 ff.; Tabaqat Nasiri, (English tr.) II, pp. 1228 ff; E. Bretschneider, I, pp. 118 ff. On the story of the death of the last Caliph, see G. le Strange, "The Story of the Death of the last 'Abbasid Caliph..." JRAS, (1900) pp. 293 ff. ...etc. etc.

Chapter II

THE RELIGIOUS POLICY OF AL-NĀSIR

AND HIS SUCCESSORS

Al-Nāṣir's ambitions to restore the temporal power of the Caliphate led him to follow a very peculiar religious policy. In fact, he showed a certain favour to the Shī'a of the Imāmī sect throughout his reign wishing, perhaps, to reconcile in his person the claims of the 'Abbasids and 'Alīds.¹ Nevertheless, some historians have gone further and accused him of being Shī'ite himself.²

However, it seems that he followed several religious policies during his long reign; even al-Muwaffaq 'Abd al-Latīf was aware of this and accused him of following a contradictory religious policy; he says:

"The Shī'a creed flourished because of ibn al-Ṣāhib and was abolished by his death. Then the extreme Sunnism appeared, and disappeared in its turn. Then the Futuwa, the Bundug³ and the Carrier-pigeons appeared...."⁴

¹ E.I./I, s.v. al-Nāṣir, by F. Taeschner.

² Ibn al-Ṭiqṭāqa, p. 433; Abu al-Fidā', III, p. 142; Ibn al-Fuṭat, fol. 206; Ibn Waṣil in al-Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 13-14; and al-'Umārī, XXVII, fol. 99a. This accusation seems untrue, since none of these historians was contemporary with al-Nāṣir; even Ibn al-Athīr, who clearly displayed his hostility to al-Nāṣir, did not mention this matter; see al-Kāmil, XII, pp. 286-7.

³ The Bundug is a certain kind of cross-bow especially made to shoot missiles resembling, in shape, hazel-nuts; it was used by the notables for sporting purposes, especially for hunting birds. For further ex-

In fact, al-Muwaffaq's statement describes accurately the stages of al-Nāṣir's religious policy. The following are the three stages:

1. The first period between 575/1180 and 583/1187.

During this period al-Nāṣir followed a purely Shī'ite policy. However, it seems that this attitude was not of his choosing, but arose from the circumstances of his succession to the throne, which affected his career and led him to follow this trend of policy. His father, al-Mustaḍī', followed an extreme Sunnī policy, favouring the Ḥanbalīs and appointing the Ḥanbalite, Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, as treasurer /Ṣahib al-Makhzan/ and, later on, installing him as Deputy Wazīr /Na'ib fi al-Wizāra/.¹ The Caliph also took a deep interest in the teaching of the Ḥanbalite shaykh Ibn al-Jawzī,² and even put five schools under the supervision of this shaykh to teach in them his Madhhab.³ By this policy, to be sure, the Shī'ite community suffered considerably and was humiliated.⁴ Even Ibn al-Jawzī, by the support of Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, was given a free hand to abolish the innovations /Bida' because, "It

(cont.)

planation about a similar arms, see L. Cahen, "Un traite..." B.E.O. XII, (1947-8), pp. 108 ff, 129 ff, 151 ff.

⁴Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 11; see also Ibn al-Aṭṭār, XII, p. 286, where he says: "He (al-Nāṣir) used to do the thing and its contradiction".

¹Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, Hayderabad ed. X, p. 275.

²Ibid., pp. 252-3, 256, 258, 260, 272, 283, 284...etc.

³Ibid., p. 284; see also Sibṭ, ed. Jewett, p. 206.

⁴Ibn al-Jawzī, Xpp. 235-6.

had reached the understanding of the commander of the Faithful that Rafd was increased".¹ Although al-Mustaḍī' followed this pro-Ḥanbalite policy, yet the Shī'ite community were represented in the court by Ibn al-Ṣāhib, the Ustādh al-Dār.² At the end of al-Mustaḍī's reign the issue of designating an heir-apparent was raised, because the Caliph had two sons, Abū Manṣūr and Abū al-'Abbās (later on al-Nāṣir). However, it seems that the court was divided into two parties in regard to this issue, the Ḥanbalites under the leadership of Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, and the Shī'ite party under the leadership of Ibn al-Ṣāhib. Each party supported one candidate, the Shī'ite supported al-Nāṣir, and the other supported Abū Manṣūr. According to al-Dhahabī,

"al-Mustaḍī' was suspicious of Abū al-'Abbās [al-Nāṣir], therefore he put him in prison, and started to favour his other son, Abū Manṣūr. Ibn al-'Aṭṭār with the majority of the courtiers were in favour of Abū Manṣūr, but the concubine of the Caliph [Banafsha] and al-Majd ibn al-Ṣāhib, with a few followers, supported Abū al-'Abbās."³

¹ Ibn al-Jawzī, p. 259. About the religious policy of al-Mustaḍī' see also H. Lasurī, "Le Hanbalisme sous le Califat de Bagdad," REI, 1959, pp. 113 ff.

² This title used to designate the officer who was in charge of the Caliphal household, with power to look after the revenue of the personal estates of the Caliph, and the expenditure of the Palace. See al-Qalqashandī, V, p. 457; also Ismail Hakki Uzuncarsili, Osmanli Devleti Taskilatina Medhal, Istanbul 1941, pp. 87-8. The form of this title, as it appears in the contemporary chronicles, is: Ustādh al-Dār, see for examples: Ibn al-Jawzī, X, p. 259; Ibn al-Aṭṭār, XI, p. 304; Ibn Jubair, p. 228; Ibn al-Sa'i, p. 163; and Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 16 and 25. etc. But al-Qalqashandī criticised those who used this form, because in his opinion the correct form is Istadar [استدار]; Subh al-'Asha, V, p. 457.

³ Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 10b; see also Sibṭī, pp. 224-6.

Although al-Nāṣir's supporters were fewer than his opponents, nevertheless, his father proclaimed him heir-apparent on 22 Shawwāl 575/ 21 March 1180.¹ A few days later he was proclaimed Caliph, on 2nd Dhu al-Qa'da 575/30 March 1180, after the death of his father.²

Al-Nāṣir was very quick in his reaction against Ibn al-'Aṭṭār and his party. On 7th Dhu al-Qa'da (4th April) he deposed him from his posts and put him in prison with all his followers, some of whom held high positions, such as the cup-bearer of his father and Naqīb Bāb al-Nūbī, Mas'ūd. The common people looted their houses and their properties were confiscated.³ On 11th (8th April)⁴ or 18th (15th April)⁵ of the same month, Ibn al-'Aṭṭār was killed in prison and, when the corpse was taken for burial, the common people took it and dragged it through the streets of Baghdād. According to Sibṭ this action of the common people was due to the bad career of Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, who ill-treated all the people, especially "The Shī'a of al-Mukhtāra, al-Karkh and Mūsa ibn Ja'far quarters, and had suspended their salaries and dispersed them".⁶

¹ Dhahabī, al-Mukhtaṣar al-Muhtāj ilaihi min Ta'rīkh al-Dubā'ihī, ed. M. Jawād, Baghdad (1951), p. 180, and the appendix of the editor (at the end of the book) p. 32; Ibn Kathīr, XII, p. 305; but Sibṭ puts the date at the end of Dhu al-Qa'da 574/May 1179, Mir'at al-Zaman, p. 224.

² Ibn al-Aṭṭār, XI, p. 304; Sibṭ, p. 225.

³ Ibn al-Aṭṭār, XI, p. 304; Sibṭ, pp. 226 and 228.

⁴ Ibid., p. 228.

⁵ Ibn al-Aṭṭār, XI, p. 304; according to ibn Khaldūn, the death of ibn al-'Aṭṭār occurred on 10th Dhu al-Qa'da, see al-'Ibar, III, p. 528.

⁶ Sibṭ, p. 229.

This indicates that the Shī'a's reaction was against the fanatical Sunī policy which was undertaken by the deputy Wazīr.

Soon after the removal of the influence of Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, Ibn al-Ṣāhib found a favourable opportunity to exercise his own influence on the Caliph. In fact, he became the strongest person in the court.¹ Ibn Jubāir, who visited Baghdād in 580/1184-5, recorded the following account about Ibn al-Ṣāhib,

"He [al-Nāṣir] has a Guardian over all the 'Abbāsīd regions, and Trustee over all the remaining dignities [of the Caliphate]... who is known as al-Ṣāhib Majd al-Dīn Uṣṭādh al-Dār...",

and that his name was mentioned in the Khuṭba after that of the Caliph.² In spite of the fact that Ibn al-Ṣāhib did not reach the position of Wazīr, nevertheless, having his name mentioned after the name of the Caliph in the Khuṭba was a great privilege, which indicates his influence and power. As a result of this influence the Caliph followed a very clear pro-Shī'ite policy. According to al-Muwaffaq, "The Shī'ism flourished because of Ibn al-Ṣāhib".³ Moreover, the Caliph allowed this community to practice all their religious rituals, including the cursing of the Companion of the Prophet, in public. According to al-Qādisī, the continuer of the Muntaẓam of Ibn al-Jawzī,

¹Ibn al-Aṭṭār, XI, p. 304 and p. 372; see also ibn Kḥaldūn, III, p. 529; and Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 10b.

²Ibn Jubāir, p. 227.

³Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 11a.

"On the day of 'Āshurā' in the year 582 (1186) [the Shi'a community of Baghdād celebrated the anniversary of the death of al-Ḥusain ibn 'Alī publicly. Their procession was marching in Baghdād, while the robes of honour were distributed among them. They even cursed Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, Ṭalḥa, Zubair and 'Āisha [the wife of the prophet]. The people of Karkh shouted 'there is no more Kitman', [i.e. there is no fear from the authority, because it has not any objection to this anti-Sunnī action]. Then they gave the platform to a woman called Ibnat Qaraba [the daughter of Qaraba], whose father had been killed previously because Ibn al-'Aṭṭār seized him and found in his possession books with the curse of the companions of the prophet written on them.¹ She stood on a stone bench under the balcony of the Caliph in al-Rayḥāniyīn quarter and thousands of men and women gathered around her, while she was reciting the poems of al-'Umī and others and cursing 'Āisha, and says 'Curse the rider of the camel' [referring to 'Āisha]. She has also mentioned the Ufuk story and the prophet in the worst terms and insults. He said [al-Qādisī], 'and all this was ascribed to the affect of Ustadh al-Dar, Ibn al-Ṣāhib."²

It is evident from this account, if it is true, that the Caliph allowed the Shi'a community immense freedom to declare their anti-Sunnī tendency. However, distributing the robes of honour among those who participated in this ceremony indicates that the government did not only tolerate this anti-Sunnī action, but encouraged it; otherwise the Caliph would have taken severe measures to stop it. Moreover, al-Qādisī openly accused Ibn al-Ṣāhib of instigating this policy.

¹Ibn al-Jawzī named this man as Abu al-Sa'adāt ibn Qarāyā, and put his death on 24th Ramaḍān 574/5th Mar. 1179; al-Muntaẓam, X, pp. 285-6; see also ibn Kathīr, XII, p. 300; and ibn al-'Imād, IV, p. 246.

²Sibt, pp. 246-7.

³See below, pp.

Meanwhile, this influence of Ibn al-Ṣāhib aroused the alarm of al-Nāṣir, who tried to find some backing from the common people of Baghdād by associating himself with the Futuwwa order in 578/1182-3.¹ Even Ibn Jubāir says about the Caliph, "He [al-Nāṣir] was very fond of appearing to the common people and making himself popular with them".² However, it seems that al-Nāṣir finally found some support and was able to remove Ibn al-Ṣāhib from office. In Rabi' I 583/May-June 1187 the Caliph ordered Ibn al-Ṣāhib to be killed, and all his wealth was confiscated by the government.³ According to Ibn al-Athīr, the final blow to Ibn al-Ṣāhib came through the intrigues of one of his close associates called Ibn Yūnus, in whom, perhaps, the Caliph found the effective supporter to undermine the power of Ibn al-Ṣāhib and to bring about his downfall.⁴

However, it seems likely, on the one hand, that Ibn Yūnus, the Hanbalite, had formed the Sunnī bloc in the court, and took the intrigues as a means of reaction against Ibn al-Ṣāhib and his Shī'ite policy; and, on the other hand, the Caliph profited from this situation and arranged with him the overthrow of Ibn al-Ṣāhib. Nevertheless, the appointment of Ibn Yūnus as Wazīr in Shawwāl (December)⁵ in the same year, might have

¹See below, pp. 113 ff.

²Ibn Jubāir, p. 229.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 372; also Ibn Khaldūn, III, p. 529; Ibn Khallikān says that Ibn al-Ṣāhib was killed on 19 Rabi' I 583/29 May 1187, see Wafayat, II, p. 334.

⁴Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 372; and Ibn Khaldūn, III, p. 529.

⁵See below, p. 106.

some connection with this plot.

With the death of Ibn al-Ṣāhib the first period of al-Naṣir's religious policy came to an end. This period was marked by the extreme Shī'ite policy undertaken by the Caliph as a result of the influence of the Shī'a community through their powerful representative in the court, Ibn al-Ṣāhib. However, this policy clarifies al-Naṣir's reasons for taking harsh measures in 579/1183-4 against employing the Dhimīs in the Dīwān.¹

2. The second period between 583/1187 and 590/1194.

With the appointment of Ibn Yūnus to the Wazīrate the second stage of al-Naṣir's religious policy started, which, according to al-Muwaffaq, was marked by an extreme Sunnism.² This seems quite true, since the new Wazīr was a Ḥanbalite.³ However, appointing a Ḥanbalite Wazīr was a clear shift in the Caliph's tendency. Whether this shift in his religious policy came as a result of the Sunnī's discontent, or not, nevertheless the real reasons for this shift remain, with the lack of evidence, obscure.

Ibn Yūnus was installed as Wazīr in Shawwāl 583/Dec. 1187,⁴ and

¹ See below, p. 155-6

² Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 11; see also above, p. 99.

³ Ibn Rajab, Dhayl Tabaqāt al-Ḥanābila, ed. H. Laoust and S. Dahan, Damascus (1951), I, p. 153; Ibn al-ʿImad, IV, p. 313; Ibn Taghribardī, VI, p. 142; see also H. Laoust, "La Ḥanbalism sou la Califat de Baghdad", R.E.I. (1959), p. 114.

⁴ Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 372; Ibn Kathīr, XII, p. 328.

to be sure he followed a pro-Hanbalite policy. He installed his co-religionists in many offices, such as 'Abd al-Wahhāb, the son of the celebrated Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī, who was appointed in charge of the Mazālim (investigation of grievances¹), and others.²

The rule of Ibn Yūnus was short for, in 584/1188-9, he led an army against Tughrīl II, but was defeated and taken prisoner.³ He was released after a while and returned to Baghdād, where the Caliph assigned to him the treasury (al-Makhzan) and the Dīwan and, afterwards, appointed him as Ustādh al-Dār.⁴ On his return Ibn Yūnus resumed his anti-Shī'ite tendency. In 588/1192-3 the Caliph, on the advice and intrigues of Ibn Yūnus, discharged and imprisoned the Shī'ite Amīr of the Hajj caravan, Mujīr al-Dīn Tashtakīn.⁵

The last blow came to Ibn Yūnus and his party in 590/1194, after Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb had been promoted from deputy Wazīr to Wazīr.⁶ Ibn Yūnus

¹Ibn al-Imād, IV, p. 314.

²Ibid., pp. 339-40.

³See Chapter I, pp. 45-6

⁴Sibt, p. 281; Abū Shāma, p.12.

⁵Sibt, pp. 266 and 343; see also Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 61. Although Tashtakīn was an extreme Shī'ite (see Ibn al-Sa'ī, p. 186), yet the charge against him was "Ibn Yūnus envied him and said to the Caliph that he corresponds with Saladin, and he [Ibn Yūnus] fabricated a letter [to this effect/...." See sibt, p. 343; also Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 190.

⁶Sibt, p. 281; according to Ibn al-Athīr, in Sha'ban 590/July-Aug. 1194 Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb was invested with the vestment of the Wazirate; al-Kāmil, XII, pp. 70-71.

was expelled from all his posts and arrested with all his Ḥanbalite followers in the Court,¹ such as the Shaykh Ibn al-Jawzī, who was arrested and exiled to Wasīṭ.²

Although Sibṭ mentions that Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb was a "Shī'ite", yet it seems that Sibṭ is quite prejudiced against Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb, who prosecuted his beloved grandfather, Ibn al-Jawzī;³ and thus tried to represent this action of the Wazīr as a Shī'ite reaction. Moreover, the available evidence suggests that the government, in removing Ibn Yūnus and his followers, aimed by this act to remove the extreme Ḥanbali element and was not against all the sect, because even the grandson of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī, 'Abd al-Salām, was among those who helped Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb to prosecute Ibn Yūnus and his followers.⁴ Moreover, after the arrest of Ibn al-Jawzī, another Ḥanbalite shaykh took his place as preacher [Wā'iz].⁵

¹Sibṭ, pp. 281-2, and p. 289; Abū Shāma, p. 9; see also Ibn al-Imād, IV, pp. 339-40.

²Sibṭ, pp. 281-2; Ibn al-Jawzī returned from Wasīṭ in 595/1198-9, and died in 597/1200-1; see Sibṭ, p. 310; see also H. Laoust, in R.E.I. p. 115; for further studies on Ibn al-Jawzī and his position in the Ḥanbalite school, see idem, La Profession de foi d'Ibn Baṭṭa, Damascus (1958), pp. CXXI ff.

³See Sibṭ, p. 281; Abū Shāma, pp. 55-6; cf. M. Jawād, who suggests that Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb was not a Shī'ite, see his appendix to al-Dhahabī's al-Mukhtaṣar al-Muhtaṣaj...., p. 30 n. (i).

⁴Sibṭ, pp. 281-2; Abū Shāma, pp. 55-6; also Ibn al-Imād, V, pp. 45-6. But it seems that the hostility of 'Abd al-Salām to Ibn Yūnus was based on personal motive, because he, previously, suffered prosecution by Ibn Yūnus, who accused him of following the doctrine of the Greek philosophers, see Ibn al-Qifṭī, ed. J. Lipper, Leipzig, (1903), pp. 228-9.

⁵Ibn al-Imād, V, p. 48.

3. The third period between 590/1194 and 622/1225.

This was al-Nāṣir's most active period and, in fact, he followed in it several lines of religious policy.

When al-Nāṣir came to the Caliphate he saw his subjects divided in the issue of their religious beliefs - Sunnīs against Shī'a and Ḥanbalīs against the rest of the Sunnī schools. Their rivalries were so deep rooted that no one could bridge the gap easily or quickly. When he, by the aid of the Shī'a, came to power, he favoured them and allowed them the utmost freedom to practice their religious rituals; perhaps he tried to explore the real power of this community in Baghdād and 'Irāq; but it seems that they could not provide him with the power he required. He, therefore, turned to the other extreme group, the Ḥanbalite, who, perhaps, could aid him to remove Ibn al-Ṣāḥib from office; but again he could not find what he required of power and support.

Now he realized that neither the Shī'a, nor the Ḥanbalīs, alone, could help him to achieve his wide vision and dreams. But, to be sure, all the people of his kingdom, whether Shī'a or Sunnīs, could form a strong power to back him in order to fulfil his ambitions, because he realised that favouring one sect or another would lead him nowhere but to the increase of the disorders and resentments. But how could he bring all the people of his principality, with their different attitudes and beliefs, together? This aim could be achieved by adopting a moderate religious policy and by the reconciliation of the different sects and groups. In fact, this is exactly what he had done; he tried to reconcile the claim of the 'Alīds and the 'Abbāsids in his person, the Shī'ite and

Sunnīs and finally the notables and the common people, by adopting the Futuwwa¹ and transmitting the tradition. All this for one purpose and one goal: to strengthen the position and prestige of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate within his principality, as well as without, and to make out of a worn shabby image a real power, if not possible in the real sense of the word 'power' at least to "create a kind of state of the Church for the Caliphate in Baghdād and 'Irāq".² However, he tried to reconcile in his person both the 'Alīds and 'Abbāsīds by proclaiming himself, on several occasions, as the "Sayyid of the family of the prophet".³ Moreover, he had defended the rights of 'Alī to the Caliphate; see, in the following letter how he expressed his sentiment:

"When al-Afdal, the son of Saladin, had been defeated by his uncle al-'Adil and his brother al-'Azīz, he wrote a letter to the Caliph, in which he mentioned the following verse:-

Oh, My Master, Abū Bakr and his comrade
'Uthmān have taken the light of 'Alī
by the power of the sword.
Then look at this name / 'Alī, referring to
himself / how he was illtreated by the
later, like it was treated by the earlier."

He refers to his uncle by Abū Bakr, and to his brother by 'Uthmān. Al-Nāṣir answered him by the following verse:

¹F. Taeschner, "Islamischen Orden...", W. G., IV, (1938), p. 403.

²E.I./II, s.v. 'Abbāsīds (by B. Lewis).?

³al-Kazirūnī, fol. 88.

"Your letter, which reveals truly your pure origin,
has been received.

They have usurped the rights of 'Alī because he
had, after the death of the prophet, in
Yathrib no helper.

Be-thou-patient, tomorrow I will judge them, and
be pleased for your helper is the Imam the
Aider /al-Nasir/.¹

Furthermore he displayed his pro-'Alīd sentiment by appointing the
Naqīb of the 'Alīd, Ibn Mahdī,² as deputy Wazīr in 597/1200.³ He
was honoured by the vestment and title of Wazīr on 8th Dhu al-Hijja
502/16th July 1206.⁴ However it seems that he exercised wide authority,
which enabled him to install his son, Rukn al-Dīn Abu 'Abd Allah Muḥammad,
as Ṣadr al-Makhzan - in charge of the treasury.⁵ He was deposed from
office on 12⁶ or 22⁷ Jumāda II in 604/3 or 13 Jan. 1208, after his son
was expelled a day earlier.⁸ However, according to Sibṭ and Ibn al-
Athīr, this Wazīr was expelled for his increasing power, and for the
discontent of the people of Baghdād with his rule.⁹

¹ Bar-Hebraeus, Mukhtasar, pp. 413-4; see also Shafā' al-Jalab,
B.M. MS. n.71.

² Sibṭ, p. 371; Abū Shāma, p. 85.

³ Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 44; Sibṭ, p. 307; but Ibn al-Athīr puts his appoint-
ment in 592/1195-6, al-Kamil, XII, p. 81; see also below p.

⁴ Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 168-9; Sibṭ, p. 342; Abū Shāma, pp. 52-3.

⁵ Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 143-4.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 220-21.

⁷ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 182.

⁸ Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 220.

⁹ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 182-3; see also Sibṭ, pp. 347-9; Abū Shāma,
p. 60; see also below pp. 189 ff.

Although in 590/1194 the Caliph turned against the extreme Ḥanbalīs yet after the deposition of Ibn Mahdī the Ḥanbalīs regained their position in the court, and some of them were appointed to the highest posts. In 604/1207-8 Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn al-Jawzī was appointed Muḥtasib¹ of Baghdād.² In the same year Aḥmad ibn Bakrūs, the Ḥanbalite Shāhid 'Adl, was appointed to control the police force in the Nūbī Gate /Niyābat Bāb al-Nūbī/.³ In 605/1208-9 the Caliph installed another Ḥanbalī Abū 'Al-Qāsim ibn Anushtakīn, as the agent of the Caliph over Bāb Tīrād.⁴ Al-Nāṣir's personal estates were put under the management of a Ḥanbalite official, Ismā'īl ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusain (died in 610/1213-4).⁵ Moreover the Caliph appointed a Mushrif /Inspector/ over all his agents - those in charge of his properties - a Ḥanbalite Faqīh, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Makī, who died in 622/1225-6.⁶

¹Censor, or an official in charge of the markets and public morals; see E.I./I, s.v. Muḥtasib (by R. Levy) and Ḥisba (by E. Zambour).

²Muḥyī al-Dīn remained as Muḥtasib till 609 A.H., and was reappointed to the same office in 615 and dismissed in 617; see Sibṭ, pp. 326, 347, 366 and p. 389; Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 231; Abū Shāma, p. 26; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 49; and H. Laoust in R.E.I. (1959), p. 117.

³Sibṭ, p. 373; Abū Shāma, pp. 87-8; Ibn al-'Imād, V, pp. 39-40.

⁴Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 261; but Ibn al-'Imād named this man as Ibn Abī Sukāin, see Shadharāt, V, p. 31.

⁵Sibṭ, pp. 369-70; Abū Shāma, p. 84; Ibn al-'Imād V, 40-41.

⁶Ibn al-'Imād, V, p. 103.

The Futuwwa of al-Nāṣir.¹

Although "the origins of the Futuwwa are extremely obscure" yet its closer association with the Sufī order and the craft guilds is remarkable.² However, it seems that the Futuwwa associated with Sufī order since early periods, and the teaching of both orders were exchanged between them.³ What is more curious is the close association between the Futuwwa and Shī'a in regarding 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib as the Head and founder of this order.⁴ Thus al-Nāṣir, by adopting this order and then by reforming it, placed under his command an immense power.

Al-Nāṣir entered the Futuwwa⁵ organisation in 578/1182-3 merely as a simple member. He was initiated by the chief of the Futuwwa,

¹The following remarks are not intended to present a complete picture of al-Nāṣir's Futuwwa, but only to present a certain aspect of the close relations between Futuwwa, Shī'ism, and Sharī'a law. For more detailed studies on the Futuwwa in general and the Futuwwa of al-Nāṣir in particular, see the studies of F. Taeschner on this subject.

²B. Lewis, "The Islamic guilds", E.H.R., VIII/II 1937, p. 27.

³F. Taeschner, "Der Anteil des sufismus an der Formung des Futuwwaideals", D.I., XXIV (1937), pp. 43 ff; see also Aḥmad al-ʿAlāʾ Afīfī, Al-Malamatiyya wa al-Sufiyya wa ahl al-Futuwwa, Cairo (1945), pp. 24 ff; and A. A. Durī, "Nusḥū' al-Aṣṇaf...etc." B.C.A., 1 June 1959, pp. 161-2.

⁴L. Cahen, "Mouvements populaires et Autonomisme urbain", Arabica, VI, 1959, pp. 233-4.

⁵"The Futuwwa is a group of young men, bound together by an ethical and religious code of duties and an elaborate ceremonial. They are under obligation to practise certain virtues and usually to render military service to the cause of Islam. The Futuwwa, as will thus be seen constitutes in a certain sense a Muslim parallel to the European conception of chivalry." B.Lewis, op. cit., p.27.
The member of this order is called Fata(pl. Fityān).

'Abd al-Jabbār ibn Yūsuf ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Baghdādī.¹ Although the only source known to Taeschner,² who mentions this date (578) is Ḥajjī Khalīfa,³ yet al-Sakhawī (died in 902/1496-7) in Tuhfat al-Aḥbāb mentions this date also; and, according to him, al-Nāṣir joined the Futuwwa order at the suggestion of his boon companions Nudamā' and they arranged a meeting between the Caliph and 'Abd al-Jabbār in one of the Gardens of the Caliphal palaces, where the Shaykh bestowed on al-Nāṣir the Futuwwa trousers.⁴

Apart from all the virtues of the Futuwwa⁵ the most important basic element in it was its close connection with 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib as its head and founder.⁶ To be sure, there was no Muslim, whether

¹F. Taeschner, "Islamischen Orden...etc." W.G., IV, 1938, p. 393; idem, "Das Futuwwa - Rittertum des islamischen Mittelalters", B.A.S.I., Leipzig 1944, p. 354; P. Kahle, "Ein Futuwwa-Erlass des Kalifen an-Nāṣir aus dem Jahre 604 (1207)", Festschrift Max Freiherrn von Oppenheim, Berlin 1933, p. 58; G. Salinger, "Was Futuwwa an Oriental form of Chivalry?" Pro. Ame. Philo. Society, 94 (1950), pp. 490-91; see also L. Cahen, "Note sur les Debuts de la Futuwwa d'an-Nāṣir", Oriens, VI, (1953), pp. 18 ff.

²F. Taeschner, in W.G., IV, 1938, p. 393; idem in B.A.S.I., p. 354, etc.

³Taqwīm al-Tawārīkh, Istanbul 1146/1733, p. 73.

⁴Tuhfat al-Aḥbāb, Cairo ed. 1356/1937, pp. 16-7; see also M. Jawād, in his introduction to Kitāb al-Futuwwa of Ibn al-Mi'mar, Baghdad (1958) pp. 52-3, where M. Jawād ~~was~~ cited another quotation from a contemporary chronicle called al-Ta'rikh al-Nizaffari of al-Qādī Shihāb al-Dīn ibn Abī al-Damm al-Ḥamawī (died in 642/1244-5) supported the evidence of Ḥajjī Khalīfa.

⁵See B. Lewis, "The Islamic guilds", E.H.R., VIII/II, 1937, p. 27.

⁶Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 223.

Sunnī or Shī'ī, could do anything but respect 'Alī for his good qualities and his highly esteemed character and, from this, al-Nāṣir derived advantage, in order not to be reproached, at least openly, by the Sunnī people for his association with this order.

Before he ordered its reform in 604/1207 he had practiced its rituals, especially by looking after the carrier-pigeons, which was one of its basic military and sporting characteristics. In 590/1193-4, according to al-Qādisī, as cited by Sibṭ,

"The Caliph ordered that all the old carrier-pigeons were to be slaughtered and all traces of them to be removed. He looked after the young ones, and sent them to the Mashhads to fly back to Baghdād. He put these pigeons under the supervision of the chief judge, Ibn al-Bukhārī, and Yūsuf al-'Uqāb, the chief of the Fityān. He classified them [the pigeons] into twelve categories, and named them after the Twelve Imams. Then he named them: al-'Alawīyat, al-Ḥasanīyat, al-Muhammadiyat, al-Faṭimīyat, al-Hashimīyat, al-Baqirīyat, al-Sadawīyat, al-Zihāt¹(?), al-Mahdīyat, al-Ṣadiqīyat and al-'Abidīyat..."

This narrative indicates al-Nāṣir's pro-Shī'ite tendency and that, until 590/1193-4, the Caliph was not the Chief of the Fityān but Yusuf al-'Uqāb; the latter is mentioned again in 599/1202-3 when the Caliph sent him to invest al-'Adil, the Ayyūbid ruler of Syria, with the Futuwwa trousers.² Thus it seems that up to 604/1207 the Caliph was

¹Sibṭ, p. 280; L. Cahen observes that there are eleven names in the list, not twelve, as the narrative says at its beginning, and that the chain was also broken in order to insert in it the names of some of the family of the prophet, who were acceptable to the Sunnīs. Oriens, 6, 1953, p. 19. But this narrative suggests that after the Caliph had classified the pigeons into 12 groups, he then renamed each group by the above-mentioned names: { وجعلها اثني عشر صنفًا باسم الأئمة الاثني عشر ثم سماها فقال... }

²Sibṭ, p. 333; Abū Shāma, p. 33; see also L. Cahen, Oriens, 6, p. 19.

still a simple member of the Futuwwa.¹ Judging from the frequent occurrence of fights between the various quarters of Baghdād - Sunnī against Shī'ī² - and between the Sunnī quarters themselves,³ and from the frequent attacks on the government officials,⁴ it seems that whatever al-Nāṣir sought by adopting the Futuwwa order failed to give him the stability he had wanted in Baghdād.

In 604/1207 the Caliph took action to reorganize the Futuwwa because the extent of the disorder permitted no further delay. Ibn al-Sā'ī preserved the document reforming this organization;⁵ this document is dated 9th Ṣafar 604/4 Sept. 1207. According to Ibn al-Sā'ī's introduction to this decree,

"In this year [604/1207] the old Futuwwa was abolished and the Commander of the Faithful, al-Nāṣir li-Dīn-Allah (May God be content with him) was made the QIBLA [the direction towards Mecca] therein and the one who is to be referred to."⁶

¹L. Cahen, Oriens, 6, pp. 19-20.

²Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 148-9, 200-201; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 133.

³Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 146-8; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 133.

⁴Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 46, and p. 148; Cf below pp. 234.

⁵Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 221 ff; this decree also edited by Kurd 'Alī in al-Mukṭabar, 1908, pp. 98-100; P. Kahle edited it with a German translation in his article, "Ein Futuwwa - Erlass des Kalifen en Nāṣir aus dem Jahre 604 (1207)", Festschrift Max Freiherrn von Oppenheim, Berlin 1933, pp. 52-58; G. Salinger translated extracts of it into English in "Was Futuwwa...", Proc. Ame. Phil. Society. 94, 1950, pp. 485 ff.

⁶Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 221; G. Salinger, p. 485.

Thus it is evident that al-Nāṣir up to 604/1207 was still not the Head of the organization¹ but he became the Qibla after he issued this decree; otherwise there was no need to re-invest upon the Muslim rulers the trousers after this date. For, according to Abu 'l-Fidā, in 607/1210-11, the messengers of the Caliph came to the Muslim rulers to the effect that these rulers should wear the trousers and drink the cup of the Futuwa (كَأْسُ الْفِتْوَى) to the Caliph, and to make him their pattern in shooting with the Bunduq and to refer to him in doing so.²

According to Ibn al-Sa'ī this decree was issued because -

"It happened that the 'Alīd al-Fākhīr was a Rafīq of the Wazīr Nāṣir ibn Maḥdī, and he himself also had rafīqs. Then one of his rafīqs quarreled with a rafīq of 'Izz al-Dīn Najāḥ al-Sharabī and a great fight occurred at Maḥallat Quṭufta with the result that they fought with swords. And this was known by the Imam al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allah (May God be content with him) and he disapproved of it. And he ordered the Wazīr to convoke the chiefs of groups and to have a decree written on this matter, compelling them to maintain orderly behaviour and accord and prohibiting them from mutual hatred. And the decree was to be read in their presence and in its contents submitted to them before witnesses. And those who disobeyed it would be deprived of their trousers, their Futuwa would be abolished, and a punishment deemed appropriate would be applied to them."³

¹ Cf. F. Taeschner, "Islamischen Ordenritartum..." W.C., IV, 1938, p. 394, n. 3; idem, "Das Futuwa-Ritterertum...", B.A.S.I., pp. 354, ed. 370; see also P. Kahli, in Festschrift Max F. Oppenheim, p. 58.

² Abu 'l-Fidā, III, p. 119; see also al-Maqrīzī, Sulūk, I/I, p. 172.

³ Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 221-2; it is cited also in G. Salinger, op.cit., pp. 485-6.

From this it seems that even among the Futuwwa followers there was sectarian rivalry between the Rafīqs of Ibn Mahdī, the Shī'ite, and al-Sharābī, the Sunni, which caused fights and bloodshed; in order to stop the disorder the Caliph issued his decree. This intention of al-Nāṣir is clearly illustrated by Ibn al-Mi'mār, in Kitāb al-Futuwwa,¹ which was probably written for al-Nāṣir or during his reign, where Ibn al-Mi'mār describes the Futuwwa thus: "The Futuwwa of the distinguished [people] is to respect the opinion; and the Futuwwa of the common people is to obey orders".² Ibn al-Mi'mār also reproached those people who joined this order and directed their main attention and concern to attacking and killing the police members and the security men, and describes the behaviour of this group as "This is the behaviour of ignorance [Jahiliya] the sediment, the vulgar"³ and, "[Some of the ignorant people] intended by associating themselves in the Futuwwa to be aided in attacking and looting the people and their

¹This book was edited by M. Jawād, M. T. al-Hilālī et. Baghdad 1958. The name of the author of this work appears on the manuscript as: Abū 'Abdullah Muḥammad al-Sharīm (?) Ibn al-'Ammār al-Faqīh al-Ḥanbalī al-Baghdādī; see P. Kahle, Festschrift G. Jacob, p. 112. In fact, under the name "Ibn al-'Ammār" this work is quoted by P. Kahle, and F. Taeschner in B.A.S.I., p. 349, n.11, and pp. 350 ff. and p. 359. But one of the editors of this book, M. Jawād, identified the author thus: Abū 'Abdullah Muḥammad ibn Abī al-Makarīm who was known as Ibn al-Mi'mār al-Baghdādī al-Ḥanbalī (died in 642/1244-5), see M. Jawād's second introduction to this book, pp. 118-9. P. Kahle also translated into German chapters 6 and 7 of this book in Opera Minra, Leiden, 1956.

²Ibn al-Mi'mār, Kitāb al-Futuwwa, p.155.

³Ibid., p. 289.

properties, and they considered anyone who helped them in doing so as the best Fata, while their duty should have been to restrain each other from doing so in order to remove the cause of disturbance".¹

However, al-Nāṣir in reforming the Futuwwa did not only try to be the qibla of this organization² but endeavoured to gain control over the Fityān association in order to strengthen the position of the authority in dealing with these groups.³

In the introduction of his decree, al-Nāṣir emphasizes that 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was "the origin and source of the Futuwwa and its honourable virtues....., and on the pattern of his brotherhood with the prophet the Fityān based their relations".⁴ Although this is clearly a pro-'Alīd sentiment, yet there is no objection by the Sunnī to it. And, "In accordance with the perfection of his Alī's Futuwwa and the abundance of his wisdom applied all the limits of the Shar' with its various aspects of punishment provided by this law, without being culpable in applying it. He did so for obedience to the order of God Almighty".⁵ By this not only, as Salinger suggests, did al-Nāṣir strike at the Fityān with their own weapons,⁶ but also tried to satisfy the

¹Ibn al-Mi'mār, p. 290.

²Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 221.

³See G. Salinger, p. 490.

⁴Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 223; about the relation between 'Alī and the prophet and their position in the Futuwwa tradition see F. Taeschner, "Das Futuwwa - Rittertum..." B.A.S.I., pp. 362-3; and H. Ritter, "Zur Futuwwa", D.I., X, 1920, p. 245.

⁵Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 223, cited also in G. Salinger, p. 490.

⁶G. Salinger, p. 490.

various Muslim groups and associations, whose main purpose in their teaching and revolts was to demand from the authority the application of the Shar'. Then the decree reads,

"He ('Alī) did so (applied the Shar') before the pious ancestors of the chosen companions [of the prophet] without being reproached by any one of the community for that. Thus it is obligatory on whom God has given the rank of 'Alī (referring to al-Nasir), who has been entrusted with the religious law (Shari'a) and who had associated himself with the good qualities and deed [of 'Alī], to follow the same pattern in his own deeds and to apply what God has designed in 'Alī of good example, without being reproached for that, and also should be obeyed in every issue he orders."¹

This indicates that there was some objection among the Muslims, probably the Sunnis, to the association of the Caliph with the Futuwwa organization; therefore, in order to persuade those people of his good intentions, he stressed that he was just following the pattern of 'Alī in applying the religious law.

Moreover, Ibn al-Mi'mar, in the fourth chapter of his work, states the conditions on which a person is eligible to be a member of the Futuwwa by saying,

"The fourth condition is the religion, because the religion is the origin and the Futuwwa is a branch of it. There is no Futuwwa to him who has no religion,² it [the Futuwwa] does not disagree with the Shari'a."

¹Ibn al-Sa'i, pp. 223-4.

²Kitāb al-Futuwwa, p. 167; moreover, Ibn al-Mi'mar emphasized this idea in several places of his work, see pp. 172, 175, 243, 287.

Thus al-Nāṣir attempted to present his Futuwwa to all Muslims: a chivalrous order with a strong basis of religion. Moreover combining together the virtues of the Futuwwa, 'Alī and the Sharī'a means assembling together many ideas, which also have a certain appeal to the Muslims. In fact, on this combination the power of al-Nāṣir's Futuwwa, as well as his success in propagating it, rested. For the application of the Sharī'a was the aim of the various Islamic movements and groups, especially the oppressed ones among them. And 'Alī was the cousin of the prophet, the first of the Shi'a Imāms, the fourth of the Rashidīn Caliphs and finally, by lapse of time, he had become a symbolic figure of justice and righteousness. Moreover, 'Alī was, for the Fitṭan, the head and founder of the order. Thus al-Nāṣir in adopting this order and reforming it became the successor of 'Alī to the leadership of the Futuwwa, as well as being already the successor of the great 'Abbāsids.

If his goal was to achieve the unity of Islam, why did he not try to adopt the principle of the Holy War (Jihād) instead of the Futuwwa? Although the idea of the Holy War was already established firmly in Islamic soil¹ yet it seems that the appeal of this idea to the Muslims of the period was not strong enough to achieve this unity. Moreover, Nur al-Dīn and, later on, Saladin, adopted, sincerely, the Jihād principle, and did their best to liberate Syria from the Crusades² but did

¹F. Taeschner, in W.G., IV, 1938, p. 402; see also G. Salinger, p. 487; see also below pp. 134-5.

²H.A.R. Gibb, "The achievement of Saladin", B.J.R.L., 35, 1952, pp. 44 ff.

they succeed in restoring the unity of Islam to face the danger of the Crusades? The answer is simply no. The disintegration of the Muslim world still existed and the local rivalries between the Muslim princes continued.

However, al-Nāṣir realized that unless he adopted a new idea, one may call it a revolutionary idea, in which he could combine the glorious past with the necessary requirements of the moment, he would be unable to achieve his dreams of uniting all the Muslims and restoring the prestige of his Caliphate, the glorious past of the Rashidīn Caliphate, with its justice and righteousness, by setting 'Alī as his pattern and putting himself as his successor. And the requirements of the moment of adopting an idea which could unite all the Muslims, whether Sunnīs or Shī'īs, rich or poor, notables or commoners, together and to attach them to his person.

Thus al-Nāṣir started his campaign to attach the Muslim princes to his person by investing them with the Futuwwa trousers, in other words, enlisting them in the membership of this order and, as a result, make it an obligation on them to obey him, not only because he was a Caliph but because he was the head of the Futuwwa order.¹ Moreover, it seems that he was so successful in making this association popular that many people and rulers joined it. According to Ibn al-Sa'ī, the Caliph, prior to his reformation of the Futuwwa, had

"Honoured 'Abd al-Jabbār by accepting the Futuwwa

¹F. Taeschner in W.G., IV, 1938, p. 405.

from him and the latter was an ascetic Shaykh. Then all the people entered nobles and commoners and the Kings of the remote countries asked for the Futuwwa. So he sent to them messengers and men who were to invest them with the Futuwwa trousers by way of the delegation [of the Caliph]. And this spread through Baghdād and the younger ones received the Futuwwa from the older ones."¹

This evidence is supported by Ibn al-Athīr, who says,

"And he gave his utmost attention to shooting with the Bunduq, to the carrier pigeons and to the Futuwwa trousers. So he abolished the Futuwwa in the whole country except for those who donned the trousers bestowed by him and who referred to him. And many kings put on the Futuwwa trousers bestowed by him. And he also forbade others [to have] carrier pigeons, except for the carrier pigeons which he gave. He also forbade anyone [who did not refer to him] to shoot with the Bunduq [without referring to his authority]. People in 'Irāq and elsewhere obeyed him in this with the exception of one man whose name was Ibn al-Sift of Baghdād, for this one fled from 'Irāq and reached Syria (al-Shām, probably Damascus). Then he (al-Nāṣir) sent him a message to arouse his greed for great riches in order that he might shoot in his name and refer to him in shooting. But [the man] did not do it. I was told that a friend of his disapproved of him because of his refusal to accept the riches. But he replied 'It was sufficient for my glory that except for me there is nobody in the world to shoot except in the name of the Caliph'."²

As it is suggested by Ibn al-Sā'ī and Ibn al-Athīr this movement widely spread among the population of 'Irāq and elsewhere and probably people of different sects (Sunnī and Shī'a mainly) joined it. Furthermore, many rulers were invested with its trousers, with the right to act

¹Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 221-2; cited also by G. Salinger, p. 486.

²Ibn al-Athīr (XII, pp. 286-7) as translated by G. Salinger, p. 484.

as agents to the Caliph in bestowing the Futuwwa trousers on their subjects.¹

Al-Nāṣir, out of his desire to show off his pious qualities, and to make it clear to the people that his policy of adopting the Futuwwa did not contradict religion, undertook to transmit the tradition. In 607/1210-11 the Caliph accepted the diploma of the shaykhs of Bagh-dād, in which they had granted the Caliph the right to transmit the Hadīth through them.² These shaykhs, some thirty-two in number, granted him the Ījāza. They were drawn from all the Sunni schools and especially from the Ḥanbalite school.³ Moreover, he composed a work in the tradition called Ruh al-ʿArifīn (the spirit of sages), in which he wrote seventy Hadīths with complete chains of transmission back to the prophet.⁴ By granting diplomas (Ījāzas) he authorised four shaykhs representing the four Sunni schools, to recite this work to their students.⁵ He also authorized deputies to recite it to the public, and he recompensed them for doing this. Meanwhile he sent envoys with diplomas to the rulers of many parts of the Muslim world to this effect.⁶

¹About the granting of the Futuwwa trousers to the Muslim rulers see: Sibṭ, p. 333; Abū Shama, p. 33; al-Maqrīzī I/I, p. 172; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 261; Abu 'al-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, fol. 135a; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 11a; and also Cl. Cahen in Oriens, VI, p. 20.

²Out of 23 shaykhs identified by G. Vajda there are 7 Ḥanbalite, see G. Vajda, "Une liste d'Authorities du Calife al-Nāṣir", Arabica, VI, 1959, p. 173 ff.

³Sibṭ, p. 354; Abū Shama, p. 69; and Cl. Cahen, op.cit., p. 21, n. 1.

⁴Al-Kazirunī, fol. 87b-88a; ibn Ḥammād, Qut al-Arwāḥ, fol. 91a; see also al-Maqrīzī, I/I, p. 218. A copy of Ruh al-ʿArifīn is in the British

Furthermore, al-Nāṣir commissioned four Ḥanbālī shaykhs to teach his son and heir, al-Zāhir, the ḥadīth, by means of the Ijāza from him.¹

Most of the seventy traditions of Rūḥ al-ʿArafīn had a moral purpose: to promote justice and abolish oppression, to propagate religion and to detest heresy, and to praise generosity and to despise meanness.² Thus it seems that the main aim of this work of al-Nāṣir was to propagate the noble virtues among the Muslims. Furthermore, it seems that al-Nāṣir transmitted much more serious Ḥadīths, in which he propagated the refutation of the doctrines of the Greek philosophers, which had been favoured and developed by the Ismāʿīliya. These ḥadīths were probably directed, as propaganda, against the Assassins and their creed. ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī wrote a book entitled Rashf al-Naṣāʾih al-

1(cont.)

Museum, No. Or. 6332. This copy was written in 614/1217-8 and consists of 25 fols. and is accompanied from fol. 30 to 82 by another work called Futūḥ al-Waqt, which is a commentary on Rūḥ al-ʿArafīn, composed by al-Muwaffaq ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baḡhdādī. See A. G. Ellis, A descriptive list of the Arabic Manuscripts..., London, 1912, pp. 16-18; see also G. Vajda, op.cit., p. 173.

⁵Sibt, p. 354; Abū Shāma, p. 69; Ibn Abī ʿAl-Wafāʾ, al-Jawāhir al-Muḍīʾa, II, pp. 125-6; see also Nakhjavani, Tajārīb al-Salaf, p. 324; and Cl. Cahen, Oriens, VI, p. 21.

⁶Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 13a.

¹Ibn Al-Kazirūnī, fol. 90b; see also Ibn al-Imād, V, pp. 184-5; see below, pp. 143.

²See the MS. of B.M. OR. 6332, fols. 2 ff.

Imāniya wa Kashf al-Faḍā'ih al-Yunaniya which was based on traditions related by al-Nāṣir.¹

However, it seems that many shaykhs transmitted the tradition from the Caliph, and even this practice spread beyond the limits of 'Irāq. Ibn al-Dubā'ithī (died in 637/1239-40) describes this undertaking of the Caliph thus:

"His [al-Nāṣir's] noble virtues and his generous manners are beyond account.... but his most noble virtue, by which he ornamented the community [Milla], is relating the traditions of his cousin [the Prophet]."

He also says that the Caliph composed Rūḥ al-'Arifīn which was widespread in many directions over the Muslim world and that it was recited in every mosque in Baghdād and that, by reciting this work, "the Hadīth houses were reinhabited, and their people were honoured by hearing and relating it".²

Moreover, the Caliph tried the transmission of tradition as a means to settle the religious rivalry between the Ḥanbalites and the Shi'a, a rivalry which led, on several occasions, to widespread rioting. According to Sibṭ,

"In this year (608/1211-2) the Caliph ordered the Musnad of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal to be recited in the sanctuary of Musa ibn Ja'far, by a diploma from him... The first chapter of the Musnad, which was recited was that which concerns Abū Bakr and Faḍak..."³

¹H. Ritter, "Autographs in Turkish libraries", Oriens, VI, 1953, p. 88, see also below pp. 132 ff.

²See the Appendix of M. Jawād to al-Dhahabī's al-Mukhtaṣar al-Muhtāj..., pp. 366 ff.

³Sibṭ, p. 363.

This indicates that al-Nāṣir tried to settle some of the main differences between the two sects. Thus al-Nāṣir attempted to associate himself with the intelligentsia class which was well represented by the traditionists, as he had done before with the Futtuwa, by which he aimed to centralize these shaykhs, in their different schools, around himself to back him politically as well as morally. Moreover, mentioning his name as an authority in tradition would give him the reputation of being a good Muslim on the one hand and strengthen his position in the eyes of the common people, whose affection for the religious men was very great, on the other. It might be suggested that al-Nāṣir tried to benefit from the Shī'ite conception of the Imām's capacity, a conception which regards the Caliph - or Imām - as the sole authority in the determination, precision and interpretation of the Sharī'a¹ and not only, as the Sunnī stress, the guardian of the religious law.

Furthermore al-Nāṣir undertook another policy to manifest the resemblance between his capacity and the Shī'a's conception of the Imām's capacity and that is his increasing the efficiency of the espionage system of the state. Many historians describe him as being very alert, watchful and very careful; and he was very anxious to know the details and particulars of the things which were done, not only in his own dominions,

¹Cl.Cahen, in Oriens, VI, 1953, p. 21.

but also in the dominions of the rulers of the other countries.¹ Al-Muwaffaq 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī relates the following interesting anecdotes:

"...when the messenger of Mazendarān reached Baghdād, he stayed there for several days. He received daily a slip of paper recording everything he had done on the previous night.. One certain night a woman came to him in great secrecy, but the paper delivered to him the next morning, in which was recorded what had happened /even described the blanket they slept under/. This messenger was amazed and left Baghdād fully believing that the Caliph knew the invisible, because the Shī'a believe that the Imām knows what is behind the wall and what is in the womb of the pregnant."²

And,

"One day an envoy of Khwarizm-shāh reached Baghdād with a message kept in secret and sealed; but he was told, before he delivered it, that the Caliph knew his message. Therefore this messenger returned to his master with the strong conviction that they knew the invisible."³

Al-Muwaffaq relates also,

"Another person came from India with a parrot taught to recite the Sūra (say God is one), as a present to the Caliph. But when this man reached Baghdād his parrot died. While the man was sitting sadly because of his loss, a servant of the Caliph came to him and asked him about his parrot. The man told him that it had died. The servant told the man 'We know already, but what reward did you expect for it from the Caliph?'. The man answered, 'Five hundred Dīnārs'. The servant gave him the exact amount, and told him, 'Take it,

¹ See Bar-Hebraeus, Chronography, I, p. 337; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 288-9; Ibn al-Ṭiqṭāqa, pp. 52-3, and pp. 433-4; al-Yafī'ī, Mir'at al-Jamān, IV, p. 50; al-Maqrīzī, I/I, pp. 217-8; ~~al-Maqrīzī II, fol. 32-3~~; and Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 10 ff.

² Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 12a.

³ Ibid.

the Caliph sent this amount for you, because he knew your intentions and your condition since you have left India."¹

If al-Muwaffaq is to be believed the Caliph used the espionage system to collect information, and this enabled him to pretend to know everything to impress the people by his unique knowledge of everything, especially the strangers, to affect them in order that they might return to their countries and recite what they had seen of his ability and understanding.² No doubt, if the story of the man with a parrot is true, this man would have made excellent propaganda for al-Nāṣir. To be sure, according to al-Muwaffaq, the Caliph was quite successful in this aim and, even more, he was able, in some cases, to turn the messengers of many rulers into spies against their previous masters by his temptation and presents.³ Moreover, al-Muwaffaq says about his own experience and observation,

"When I was attending meetings of Kings and notables, in Syria and Egypt, and the name of al-Nāṣir was mentioned they used to lower their voices out of respect and awe to this Caliph. He has filled the hearts with fear and respect, he was feared by the people in India, Egypt, as well as the people of Baghḍād."⁴

Whether al-Nāṣir deliberately tried to inspire the idea that he knew the invisible, or this impression was just due to his great efforts and

¹Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 12b.

²Al-Nāṣir must have had some more practical use for his spies than merely to impress casual visitors - though this would, no doubt, have had some value too in projecting the charismatic image of himself.

³Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 12a.

⁴Ibid., fol. 13b.

activities to strengthen the temporal power of the Caliphate, there is no doubt he had left a very deep impression of respect and fear among the Muslims of his time.

Alongside the Futuwwa, al-Nāṣir showed a special interest in Sufism because of the close relation between Sufism and Futuwwa. Moreover, out of his desire to make every effort to restore the Caliphal power and prestige, he leaned heavily upon the scholars and shaykhs in general to propagate his cause inside and outside Baghdād. He, therefore, built Ribāṭs¹ (Sufi convents) and assigned endowments (وقف) to allow them to carry out their functions of teaching religion and Fiqh. Although these Ribāṭs were the centre of Sufism and its teaching, yet they were also residences for the poor students and the visiting scholars who came to Baghdād to teach or study.² The Caliph appointed famous scholars and Sufis to look after these Ribāṭs, such as the famous Sufi 'Umar al-Suhrawardī who was given several Ribāṭs to look after (see below). Moreover, al-Nāṣir used these shaykhs and their reputation to confirm his position in the eyes of the Muslim princes, by sending them as his ambassadors and envoys. His ambassador to the Ayyubid al-'Adil was the above mentioned 'Umar al-Suhrawardī,³ who went to Syria on several oc-

¹ For the development of Ribāṭ in Islamic history from fortified frontier posts to Sufi monastery, see E.I./I, s.v. Ribāṭ (by G. Marcais).

² al-Kazirūnī, fol. 87b; ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 37, and 284; Sibṭ, p. 419, and pp. 384-5; and also Ibn al-'Imad, V, pp. 38-9.

³ Sibṭ, p. 348; Abū Shāma, pp. 63, 64-5, and 89.

casions to deliver the vestments and the patent of ruling; and in fact each time he went there he made a speech, in which he mainly declared the pious qualities of his master. He also went to Qonia, to Kayqobadh, the Seljuqid ruler of the Rūm.¹ Umar also led the delegation of the Caliph to Muḥammad Khwarizm-Shāh to negotiate peace with the latter when he prepared his forces to conquer Baghdād.² His ambassador to the Ghaznawīd sultans was Majd al-Dīn Yahya ibn al-Rabī,³ the Shafi'ite professor of al-Nizamiyya college. He went several times to Ghaznin to deliver the patent of ruling and negotiate alliance against the Khwarizm-Shāh, Takash, and his son.⁴ The ambassador to India was Abū al-Faḍā'il al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣaghānī, the Ḥanafite shaykh (died in 650/1252-3).⁵ Moreover, al-Nāṣir favoured the orthodox Sūfī order of the Suhrawardīya, whose chief was the above mentioned Umar al-Suhrawardī. Umar was born in 539/1145 at Suhraward. He studied mysticism under his uncle Abū al-Najīb and under the celebrated shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī. He settled in Baghdād, where his fame and career were established. He died in 632/1234.⁶ In Baghdād he established himself as a preacher

¹See Ritter, *op.cit.*, p. 88.

²Sibt, p. 382; Abū Shāma, pp. 100-101; Nasawī, pp. 12-13, and pp. 20-21; see also Ibn Taghārī-Bardī, VI, pp. 219-220; see also above, pp. 62-3.

³He died in 602/1205-6. Ibn al-Sa'ī, p. 187.

⁴Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 45, 83, 143; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 145-6. See also *Tabakat-i-Nāṣiri*, Minhāj-i-Sirāj. En. tr. I, p. 243.

⁵See ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 262 ff; see also H. Ritter, p. 88.

⁶Ibn Khallikān, ed. de Slane, I, pp. 529 ff; Yaqut al-Ḥamawī, *Mu'jam al-Buldan*, ed. Wüstenfeld, III, p. 204; H. Ritter, "Philologika IX", *D.I.*, XXV, 1939, pp. 36 ff. See also *E.I./I*, s.v. Suhrawardī (by S. Van Den Bergh).

(wā'iz) in several quarters of the city; then he became the chief of the Sūfīs and the Caliph assigned to him several Ribāts to teach and propagate Sūfism. He became something like a spiritual adviser to the Caliph.¹ His distinguished position among the Sūfīs, and his close relation with the Caliph, caused the latter to choose him in every important mission to represent him at the courts of the Ayyūbids of Syria, the Seljuqids of Qonia, and, once, to Muḥammad Khwarizm-Shāh, when the latter marched to conquer Baghdād in 614/1217-8.² Moreover, the Caliph built for him a Ribāt in the Ma'mūniya quarter in 599/1202-3,³ and later on built another Ribāt for him in al-Murzabaniya quarter to which was attached a large house with a bath built in a large garden for the personal use of the shaykh.⁴

Al-Suhrawardī composed many works but the most interesting among them are 'Awārif al-Ma'ārif, which was one of the most popular treatises in Sūfism, and Rashf al-Naṣā'ih al-Imamiya wa Kashf al-Faḍā'ih al-Yunaniya; based on traditions related by the Caliph himself, in which

¹H. Ritter, "Autographs...", Oriens VI, 1953, p. 88; see also L. Cahen, "Mouvements populaires...", Arabica, VI, 1959, p. 242.

²See above pp. 62-3

³Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 99.

⁴Ibn al-Fuwatī, p. 74.

the author directed this work to refuting the Greek philosophy and its adherents.¹

Thus al-Nāṣir, by patronizing the religious people and associating himself with them, could direct some of their activities towards propagating his policy, and succeeded remarkably in making their religious foundations - Ribāṭs and mosques - instruments in his hand. For it was clear that his traditions, which were directed to refuting the Greek philosophy, and the books which were written for this purpose were, in fact, propaganda against the Ismā'īlīs, who favoured and developed this philosophy.² Moreover, this campaign against the beliefs of the Ismā'īlīs succeeded in 608/1211-12 in making Ḥasan III, the Master of Alamūt, declare his conversion to orthodox Islam. Whether Ḥasan was sincere in his declaration or not, nevertheless he paid allegiance to the Caliph and acknowledged his overlordship. Al-Nāṣir received this conversion with delight and joy, for this action of Ḥasan gave him an ally in the east who could help him in checking the increasing menace of the Khwarism-Shāh Muḥammad.³

¹ H. Ritter, "Autographs...", Oriens VI, 1953, p. 88; idem in D.I., XXV, 1939, pp. 36 ff; see also E.I./I, s.v. Suhrawardī.

² See H. Ritter in Oriens VI, 1953, p. 88.

³ For further details about the conversion of Ḥasan III and the circumstances which led to it, see Chapter I above, pp. 56 ff.

Although al-Nāṣir tried several methods to restore the unity of Islam, nevertheless the Jihād principle played no role in his religious policy. Wittek suggests that al-Nāṣir became the supreme head of the Futuwwa in order to organise a front against the Crusaders; and that by this means tried to unite the fighters of the Holy War under his command, because the Ghazi corporations in Khorasān, as early as the ninth and tenth centuries, followed the Futuwwa. Thus the Caliph, by placing this order under his leadership, aimed to unite the Ghazis under his banner.¹ But this suggestion of Wittek is based on no documentary evidence.² Moreover Taeschner shows without doubt that al-Nāṣir disassociated himself from the Holy War /Jihād/, and it was not the idea of a Holy War which caused the Caliph to occupy himself with the Futuwwa. Taeschner also points out that although Saladin devoted his time and energy to the struggle against the Crusaders, and he was practically in great need of the material and moral aid of al-Nāṣir, yet the Caliph stayed far away from the battlefield sending very little aid with some words of encouragement. Moreover the Caliph's lack of interest in the Holy War is clearly reflected in a negative manner in the Futuwwa books, in which there is found no word about the Jihād.³ In spite of all the zest and

¹P. Wittek, "Deux Chapitres de l'histoire du Turks de Roum", Byzantion XI, 1936, pp. 306-7; see also G. Salinger, pp. 486-7.

²G. Salinger, p. 487.

³Ibid., p. 487.

devotion of Saladin to restoring the unity of Islam under the direction of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate,¹ and his previous record of abolishing a rival state - Faṭimīd Caliphate - and restoring the moral power of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate over the Faṭimīd kingdom, nevertheless al-Nāṣir desisted from rendering him what he had need of: moral and material support. This negative attitude of the Caliph towards Saladin and his struggle with the Crusaders,^{was} due either to the fact that the 'Abbāsid Caliphate was not affected by the menace of the Crusaders, or to al-Nāṣir's suspicion of Saladin. In fact, al-Nāṣir showed his suspicion of every strong ruler throughout his reign, and Saladin was no exception.

However, al-Nāṣir might have realized that there was a power vacuum in the Muslim world as a result of the absence of a strong Sulṭān, a vacuum which could be easily filled by an ambitious ruler who could gain the confidence and the moral support of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate. ^{that} Saladin was the most eligible one to be/ Sulṭān, for he had established his career and reputation as the defender of Islam against infidels on the one hand, and he had enough power to endanger the safety of the Caliphate on the other. Thus it seems that the Caliph aimed, by withholding moral support from Saladin, to check his ambition and not to give him the power which might be used against the Caliphate itself.

¹ H. A. R. Gibb, "The achievement of Saladin", B.J.R.L., 35, 1952, pp. 53 ff.

Furthermore, al-Nāṣir's struggle with Tughrīl II and the Khwarizm-shāh was an outcome of his refusal to grant them the title of Sulṭān, in other words, he refused to acknowledge their control over the Caliphate.¹

It seems that he did not adopt the Jihād principle because he could neither practice it personally nor gain any advantages from it. The enemies of Islam were far away from his territories and did not form any menace against him. But his main enemies were the Muslim rulers themselves, against whom it was impossible to declare the Holy War.

Moreover al-Nāṣir's lack of interest in the Holy War lasted to the end of his rule. Abū 'l-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī illustrates the disappointment of the Muslims of Egypt in the following quotation:

"In this year (615/1218-9) the son of Shaykh al-Shujukh with the envoy of the Caliph al-Nāṣir reached al-Kāmil at Damietta. The people hoped and expected every good from the Caliph (i.e. they expected some assistance against the Franks, who occupied Damietta). But he (the envoy) explained (the purpose of his visit) that it was for shooting the Bunduq, and he (the Caliph) wanted to be its Qibla (i.e. to shoot in his name) not Yazdajard (?). Thus the people were amazed at the Imām of the time and his ambition."²

There was another aspect of the Caliphal interest in religious matters and that is the preparing of the pilgrims' caravan, and sending with this caravan the Ka'ba clothing. Al-Nāṣir took a deep interest in

¹See above Chapter I, pp.

²Abū 'l-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, fol. 135 a.

this matter, he even **established** a guest house (Dār al-Diyāfa) for the pilgrims when they arrived in Baghdād on their way to Mecca. He also provided the needy pilgrims with food and money.¹ In 579/1183-4 he built a bridge in al-Hilla for the convenience of the pilgrims.² Moreover he appointed guards on all the roads between Hilla and Baghdād to guard and regulate the crossing of the caravan over the canals in that crowded area of agriculture.³

The Caliph usually appointed an Amīr to lead the caravan who was accompanied by some number of soldiers to protect the caravan from the Beduins;⁴ this Amīr also carried with him money for charity purposes.⁵ When the caravan reached Mecca, the Amīr encamped outside the holy city and, from there, he sent the clothing of the Ka'ba with the Chamberlain of the holy sanctuary (Hājib al-Bayt).⁶

The Qādi of Mecca was also appointed by the Caliph,⁷ which indicates the spiritual influence of the Caliph.

¹ Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 258-59; Sibt, p. 351; and Abū Shama, p. 64.

² Ibn Jubair, p. 215.

³ Ibid., p. 216.

⁴ Sibt, p. 372; Abū Shama, pp. 85-6; Ibn Taghri-Bardī, VI, p. 209; see E.I./II, s.v. Amīr al-Hajj (by J. Jomier).

⁵ Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 74, n (II); see also Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p.6.

⁶ Ibn Jubair, pp. 176-7, and p. 181.

⁷ Ibid., p. 180.

However, it seems that the Amīr of the caravan exercised a big influence in the Holy cities, for Ibn Jubāir states how in the year 579/1183-4 a dispute resulted on the matter of seeing the new moon to identify the month of Dhu 'al-Hijja, in order to undertake the usual rituals on 'Arafāt. The judge was not satisfied with all the witnesses who said that they saw the new moon, but the judge was satisfied with the statement of Amīr al-Hajj.¹

According to Ibn Jubāir nobody could spend any sum of money for the purpose of establishing or repairing any place or building in the holy cities unless he obtained the permission of the Caliph;² the latter usually appointed some officials to look after the repairing of the holy buildings.³

Al-Nāṣir showed his favour to the Shī'a by appointing an Amīr al-Hajj from among them, for Tashtakīn (died in 602/1205-6) held this post for twenty six years.⁴

Furthermore the Caliph used the caravan as a means of displaying his favour to the Muslim rulers, by ordering the standard of the favoured ruler to be carried in front of the others. When Ḥasan III was con-

¹Ibn Jubāir, p. 172.

²Ibid., p. 126.

³See Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 18.

⁴Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 159-60; Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 186; see also Sibṭī, pp. 309-10, and p. 343; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 190.

verted to orthodox Islam, he sent a Sabīl on the pilgrimage, in order to make his conversion widely known. The Caliph commanded his standard to be carried in front of that of Sultān Muḥammad Khwarizm-shāh, who was much distressed and offended by this action of al-Nāṣir.¹

Al-Nāṣir's authority over the Hijāz was nominal and spiritual rather than factual, and his attempt to extend his control over the holy cities was met with a strong resistance from its ruler, the Hasanid Sharīf Qutada. In 608/1211-12, after Hasan III declared his conversion to orthodox Islam, certain Ismā'īlis went with the 'Irāqi caravan to Mecca and, on the day of 'Arafāt, they attacked and killed a noble from the family of Qutada. In fact they aimed at the latter. Qutada understood this and seized the opportunity to plunder and sack the caravan of the 'Irāqi pilgrims. Thus al-Nāṣir's attempt to control Hijāz failed and, furthermore, the 'Irāqi caravan of pilgrims often met with a very unfriendly reception at Mecca, as had happened in 618/1221-2 and in 619/1222-3.²

Among the buildings known from inscriptions to have been built by al-Nāṣir is the Talisman Gate in Baghdād (618/1221-2). This gate is interesting for its inscription and decoration. In the inscription,

¹Juvaini, II, p. 391; Nasawī, p. 12; also Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 206; see also above Chapter I, p. 66-7.

²For further details about the relation between al-Nāṣir and Mecca rulers see above Chapter I, pp. 80 ff.

according to Van Berchem, al-Nāṣir used an innocuous-sounding formula to express his devotion, naming al-Da'wa al-Hādīya "the true-guiding summons", as his leading principle. "But this happens to be the standard Ismā'īlī phrase for the Ismā'īlī Da'wa."¹ But according to the reproduction of this inscription in R.C.E.A. the formula is not al-Da'wa al-Hādīya but Da'watihi al-Hidāya (دَعْوَتِهِ الْهِدَايَةُ not الدَّعْوَةُ الْهَادِيَّةُ)² and if it is so there is no need to confuse it with the alleged Ismā'īlī formula al-Da'wa al-Hādīya. Moreover it seems that even the formula al-Da'wa al-Hādīya was not completely Ismā'īlī and confined to their use only; for Abū Shāma, in Kitāb al-Rauḍatayn, describes the 'Abbasid Caliphate by this formula. He says under the year 575/1180 at the succession of al-Nāṣir the following, "... and al-Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Shaykh al-Shuyūkh went to Pehlāwān and ordered him to introduce the Khutba in the name of al-Nāṣir, and Pehlāwān did so, thus al-Da'wa al-Hādīya covered the whole of Khurasān".³ Therefore even if Bab al-Ṭallism had borne this formula, it does not imply any Ismā'īlī tendency nor any significance.

¹M. van Berchem, "Baghdad Talismanter", Archaeologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet, ed. by F. Sarre and E. Harezfeld (Berlin 1911), I, p. 34; M. G. Hodgson, pp. 222-3; see also E.I./I, s.v. al-Nāṣir lī Dīn Allah (by F. Taeschner); F. Taeschner in B.A.S.I., p. 378.

²R.C.E.A., No. 3873, X, pp. 185-7.

³Abū Shāma, al-Rauḍatayn, II, p. 15.

The decoration of this gate shows a human figure seated between two dragons, and tearing their jaws apart and grasping their tongues. According to Berchem's interpretation, this was al-Nāṣir represented as victorious over two enemies, who had disputed his spiritual power: the Grand Master of the Assassins, Ḥasan III, and the Khwarizm-shāh.¹ This interpretation may not be taken for granted, because, as is shown by the date of the inscription, the Talisman Gate was built in 618/1221-2, and by this time the Khwarizm-shāh was dead. His death as a fugitive made it unexpected from a Caliph, who devoted most of his time and energy to propagating the Futuwwa and its chivalrous virtues, to celebrate his victory over his fellow believer, who had been defeated by the mutual enemy of all Muslims. Although some historians record that al-Nāṣir was secretly in alliance with the Mongols against the Khwarizm-shāh, yet it seems that this allegation was fabricated by the last Khwarizm-shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn Mangubarti, who, perhaps, invented this charge as an excuse to attack the Caliph's principality.² Moreover, Ḥasan's adoption of orthodox Islam could be regarded as a victory for al-Nāṣir, but Ḥasan did so by his own choice, not by force. His friendly

¹Van Berchem, op.cit., I, p. 34; E.I./I, s.v. al-Nāṣir lī-Dīn-Allah (by F. Taeschner); M. G. Hodgson, pp. 222-3, n.31, where he states another interpretation; he says, "It is more likely to be a simple astrological figure: a child between the nodes of the Dragon, i.e. the points at which sun and moon can pass and may be eclipsed".

²See above pp. 69-70, 77.

relations with al-Nāṣir were built on equal ground as an ally and he hardly could be represented as a subdued enemy. Therefore this interpretation could easily be replaced by another and more likely one. This decoration represented al-Nāṣir's success in his reconciliation policy; who could bring together, around his person, the Sunnī and Shī'ite communities. Moreover, grasping the tongues of the two dragons may suggest that the Caliph could finally put an end to their verbal sectarian controversy, which had led on several occasions to wide spread rioting and disorder.

To conclude al-Nāṣir's religious policy, one must admit that all his activities and enterprises to revive the prestige of the Caliphate, were of short success and duration; in fact one can not draw a clear line between his success and failure. Although he favoured the Shī'ite community throughout his reign, nevertheless it seems unlikely either that he was a Shī'ite himself, or that he opposed the Sunnī openly. The 'Abbāsid Caliphate remained a Sunnī state dominated mainly by the Shāfi'ī and Ḥanafī schools.¹ This fact is indicated by the appointment of the Qādī of Qādīs from among these two schools.²

Al-Zāhir (622/1225-623/1226):-

Although al-Zāhir ruled for a short period, nine months and a half, yet the Muslim historians bestow the highest praise on him for his

¹ Ibn Jubāir, pp. 100-102.

² According to Ibn al-Fuwaṭī (pp. 86-7), the only occasion on which a Ḥanbalite person was installed as chief judge was during the reign of al-Zāhir, see also below, p. 143.

high moral qualities. He was regarded as just and pious as 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, the Umayyad Caliph, and "In his justice he had revived the tradition /Sunna/ of the two 'Umars".¹ He followed a Sunnī policy with a special leaning on the Ḥanbalīs.² This, perhaps, due to the effect of the Four Ḥanbalī shaykhs, who were commissioned by his father to teach him the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal; these shaykhs were: Abū Ṣāliḥ Naṣr ibn 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī, 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Dulaf, Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn al-Jawzī, and Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Shāfi'.³ These shaykhs had played a leading role in the Caliphate when al-Zāhir came to power. Immediately after his succession to the Caliphate, al-Zāhir installed Abū Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Jīlī [died in 633/1236-7] as chief judge [Qaḍī of Qaḍīs]. Abū Ṣāliḥ accepted the office on the condition that he would be allowed to give the inheritance to its legal heir.⁴ This chief judge was, according to Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, "the only Ḥanbalī appointed as Chief Judge".⁵

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 288-9; Sibṭ, p. 423; Abū Shāma, p. 149; Dhahabī, Tarīkh al-Islam, XIX, fols. 33-5; idem Duwal al-Islam, II, pp. 96-7; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, pp. 112-3; E.I./I, s.v. al-Zāhir; and H. Laoust, in R.E.I., 1959, p.117.

²See H. Laoust, p. 117.

³Al-Kazirūnī, fol. 90b; Ibn al-'Imād, V, pp. 184 ff; and H. Laoust, p. 120.

⁴Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 265; Ibn al-'Imād, V, pp. 161-2; Ibn Rajab, Dhayl, II, pp. 189-92; see also H. Laoust, p. 117; ~~cf.~~ below, pp 240.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 86-7.

The Caliph also appointed 'Abd al-'Aziz ibn Dulaf (died in 637/1239-40) in charge of "Diwān al-Tarikāt al-Hashariya".¹

Muhyī al-Dīn ibn al-Jawzī (died in 656/1258) became the ambassador of the Caliph to the Ayyūbids of Syria.² Although al-Zāhir followed this extreme Sunnī policy, nevertheless he did not turn against the Shī'a community, but on the contrary he treated them with respect. Even when the sanctuary of Mūsā ibn Ja'far caught fire, and was partly destroyed, he ordered it to be repaired, but this was not completed during his reign but during al-Mustansir's.³

Al-Mustansir (623/1226-640/1242):-

Al-Mustansir is considered by the historians to be as pious as his father and as active as his grandfather, al-Nāṣir.⁴ Although some of the historians emphasized that he was, unlike his grandfather, a pure Sunnī in his beliefs,⁵ nevertheless he did not stand against the Shī'a community, but on the contrary he tried to satisfy both the sects.

¹Ibn al-'Imād, V, pp. 184-5; Dhayl, II, pp. 217-20; also Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 288; and M. Laoust, p. 120.

"Diwān al-Tarikāt al-Hashariya" was in charge of the properties of dead people who had left no relatives to inherit them, see al-Qalqashandī III, p. 464; for more details see below pp. 238 ff.

²Sibt, p. 326; Abū Shāma, p. 26 and p. 147; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 263; Maqrīzī, I/I, p. 219; Abū 'l-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, fol. 153a; see also H. Laoust, pp. 120-21.

³Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa, pp. 443-4; see also R.C.E.A. X, pp. 251-2.

⁴Sibt, p. 424 and pp. 489-90; Bar-Hebraeus, Mukhtasar, p. 442; Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa, p. 445 ff; Abū 'l-Fidā, III, p. 179; Ibn Ḥammād, fols. 92 ff; Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 222 ff; idem Duwal al-Islām, II, pp. 110-111; Ibn al-Furāt, fols. 21-2; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, pp. 345-6; see also E.I./I, s.v. al-Mustansir (by K. V. Zetterstéen).

⁵Ibn al-Furāt, fol. 20b; see also Abū 'l-Fidā III, p. 144.

In 634/1236-7 he established a water fountain [مَزْنَلَة] near the tomb of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, for the convenience of the visitors to this place.¹ In the same year he visited the shrine of Mūsā ibn Ja'far, and gave 3000 Dīnārs to the Naqīb al-Ṭalibīyīn to distribute among the needy persons of the 'Alīds.² In 640/1243-3 the Mashhad of 'Alī al-Ḥadī and Ḥasan al-'Askarī - the two Shī'a Imāms - in Samarā', caught fire and, as a result, nearly all the shrine was destroyed. He ordered its reconstruction.³

However it seems that al-Mustansir had a very liberal mind towards religious matters, even Sibṭ describes him thus, "He has not any prejudice for a certain Madhhab (sect or religion)".⁴ This fact is clearly reflected by the establishment of al-Mustansiriyya College in 631/1233-4. This college, apart from being a religious and educational centre, was made for the Four Sunnī schools of Fiqh;⁵ thus, for the first time in Islamic history, the Four Sunnī schools combined together in one College. Moreover the Caliph, after the opening of this school,

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 91-2; see also al-Kazirūnī, fol. 92b.

² Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 95.

³ Ibid., p. 152.

⁴ Sibṭ, p. 489.

⁵ For further details about this school see: Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 53 ff; Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 243-4; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, pp. 139-40; Ibn Ḥammad, fols. 92 ff; al-Kazirūnī, fol. 92; Ibn al-Furāt, fols. 20b-21a; the most recent and detailed studies on the establishment of this school are to be found in: Ḥusain Amīn, al-Madrasa al-Mustansiriyya, Baghdad 1959; and Najī Ma'rūf, Tarikh 'Ulama' al-Mustansiriyya, Baghdad 1960. See also H. Laoust, in R.E.I., 1959, pp. 117-8.

ordered seating accommodation to be provided in the Mosque of the Caliphate Palace [Jāmi' al-Qaṣr] for the Imāms of the Four Schools to deliver their speeches, sermons and debates after the Friday prayer.¹ By this policy, no doubt, the Caliph aimed at centralizing all the Sunnī people around himself to back him politically and morally. Furthermore, he established many charitable and religious foundations such as: hospitals [Maristāns],² Ribāts for the Ṣūfīs³ and soup-kitchens for the poor people to take their meals in Ramaḍān.⁴

Al-Mustanṣir treated the Shī'a community with respect and sympathy. He visited their holy sanctuaries such as Mashhad 'Alī, Mashhad al-Ḥasan al-Ḥusain, and he was very generous to them.⁵ He also assigned some posts to the 'Alīds, such as 'Alā' al-Dīn Abu Ṭālib ibn al-Amīr al-'Alawī, who was appointed the pay master of the troops ['Arid al-Jaysh] in 630/1232-3.⁶ And appointed the Shī'ite ibn al-'Alqamī as Ustādh al-Dār in 629/1231-2.⁷

¹ Ibn al-Furāt, fol. 21.

² Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 222b.

³ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 2.

⁴ Ibid., p. 44; also Sibṭ, p. 490; and al-Kazirūnī, fol. 92b.

⁵ Sibṭ, p. 489.

⁶ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 50.

⁷ Ibid., p. 35. As a part of the responsibility of Ustādh al-Dār to look after the construction of the Caliphal charitable foundations, Ibn al-'Alqamī was in charge of building al-Mustanṣiriyya College. See Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 53-4; see also Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 140.

Al-Mustansir, like his grandfather, adopted and practised the Futuwwa. He received his trousers from an 'Alīd Naqīb of the Futuwwa called Jalāl al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Mukhtār al-'Alawī; the latter persuaded the Caliph to wear these trousers in Mashhad 'Alī. The Caliph went there and received the trousers from this Naqīb near the holy tomb of 'Alī.¹ In 626/1228-9, the Caliph authorized the 'Adl Ibn al-Danghanī to act as his deputy in granting the Futuwwa trousers.² He also practised the sporting phase of the Futuwwa, such as shooting the Bunduq³ and long distance running.⁴ Moreover he offered the Futuwwa trousers to some of the notables of Baghdād,⁵ on the one hand, and to several Muslim rulers on the other. He bestowed these trousers on Jalāl al-Dīn Mangabartī, the last Khwarizm-shāh, in 626/1228-9.⁶ And on Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh, the Zangid ruler of Shahrazūr, in 634/1236-7, when the latter visited Baghdād.⁷ In 637/1239-40 the Futuwwa trousers

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 256-7.

²Ibid., p. 5. See also F. Taeschner, in B.A.S.I., p. 357.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 143.

⁴Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 234a.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 90-91.

⁶Ibid., pp. 5 and 14; also Dhahabī,^{xxx} fol. 223a. See also F. Taeschner in B.A.S.I., p. 357.

⁷Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 89.

were bestowed upon Prince Shīḥa, the ruler of Madīna, when he came to Baghdād to pay his homage to the Caliph.¹

During the reign of this Caliph, the Caliphate was no longer confronted with Muslim enemies, as it was during al-Nāṣir's reign /by the Seljuqs and later on by the Khwarizm-shāh/; but now the Mongols emerged as a very serious danger to the Caliphate. This fact explains why al-Mustanṣir, unlike his grand-father,² adopted the Jihād principle. In 634/1236-7, when the Mongols penetrated into the frontiers of 'Irāq, the Caliph obtained a religious Fatwa from the Faqīhs and shaykhs of Baghdād to the effect that in such a circumstance to prosecute the Holy War was more necessary than to prepare the pilgrimage caravan. Therefore he ordered all the Ṣufīs, Faqīhs, and Shaykhs to practise shooting and warfare, in order that they would be able to perform the Jihād against the infidels.³ According to Ibn al-Najjār, a contemporary 'Irāqī chronicler, "al-Mustanṣir exercised the Jihād as best he could, and he collected troops to defend Islam and to guard the frontier posts".⁴ In his days there was comparative peace at Baghdād and the disorders which are recorded by Ibn al-Fuwaṭī are very few; in fact there were

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 126.

²See above pp. 134 ff.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 98.

⁴Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 222b.

only two disorders, one occurred in 629/1231-2 between Bāb al-Azaj (Sunni) and al-Mukhtāra (Shī'a), and as a result several were killed and injured. The Caliph ordered the army to march to these quarters; they did so and were able to settle the dispute.¹ The other disorder took place in 635/1237-8 and by appointing the Amīr 'Imād al-Dīn Ṭuḡhrīl as Shihna of Baghdād he stopped the disorders.²

Al-Musta'sim (640/1242-656/1258):-

He was described as "pious, religious, and the repository of the Sunni beliefs, following the pattern of his father and grand-father - al-Zāhir".³ Although he had favoured the Shī'a during his reign by appointing a Wazīr, Ibn al-'Alqamī, from among them in 642/1244-5,⁴ and visited several of their holy shrines,⁵ yet it seems that he tried to make a balance of power between the Shī'a and the Ḥanbalīs by appointing at the same time a Ḥanbalite Ustādh al-Dār, Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn al-Jawzī.⁶

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 31.

²Ibid., p. 102.

³Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 161; see also Ibn al-Furāt, fol. 24b.

⁴Ibn al-Furāt, fol. 46a; Dhahabī, XIX, 256b; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 164; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 279 ff.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 185 and pp. 187-8. See also H. Laoust in R.E.I., p. 118.

⁶Sibt, p. 494; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 164; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 256b. See also H. Laoust, in R.E.I., 1959, pp. 120-21. Muḥyī al-Dīn played a leading part as ambassador of al-Musta'sim to the Ayyubid of Syria and Egypt (see Sibt, pp. 499-500, and Ibn al-Furāt, fol. 46a) and to the Seljuqid of Rum, Kaykhusru, see Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 185-6.

But during his reign the liberty of the Shī'a in undertaking their traditional practice of reading the story of the death of al-Husain came under a certain restriction; for, in 641/1243-4, the Caliph ordered the Muhtasib of Baghdād, 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Jawzī, not to permit the recitation of this story on the day of 'Āshurā', except in Mashhad Mūsā ibn Ja'far.¹ This was probably done to avoid the disorder which usually took place between the Shī'a and the Sunnī people on this occasion. This prohibition was repeated in 648/1250-51 and Ibn al-Fuwaṭī states the reason for this prohibition clearly by saying, "The Caliph did so for fear of the disturbances which accompanied this celebration".²

This Caliph also practised the Futuwwa, especially the sporting side of it. In 641/1243-4 he visited the tomb of Salīm al-Fārisī, who was, to the Fityān, one of the earlier heads of the Futuwwa.³ In 643/1245-6 he ordered that the carrier-pigeons should be classified into four groups, and called them al-Yamānīyāt, al Qādisīyāt, al-'Askariyāt and al-Ghanawīyāt, and these pigeons were much praised by the poets.⁴

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 183-4.

² Al-Hawādith al-Jāmi'a, p. 248.

³ Ibid., p. 185.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 203-5.

The notables of Baghḍād indulged in the sport of pigeon racing; in 644/1246-7 the Cup-bearer of the Caliph and Naqīb al-Ṭalibīyīn sent their pigeons to 'Abadan and Khashabāt to fly back to Baghḍād and the result was that the Cup-bearer won the race.¹ However it seems that, during this period, the high society of Baghḍād with the Caliph were over-indulged in practising this sport which led later historians, who did not understand the merit of the Futuwwa, to criticize the Caliph; such as Bar-Hebraeus, who says about al-Musta'sim, "This man possessed a childish understanding, and was incapable of distinguishing good from bad; and he occupied his time in playing with doves, and in amusing himself with games with birds".²

Long-distance running was another sport for which the Caliph showed a certain enthusiasm. In 643/1245-6 a certain man called Ma'tūq of Mosul ran from Daquq to Baghḍād, and when he succeeded in this he was given a big sum of money.³ In 646/1248-9 the same distance was run by 'Alī of Irbil, who was able to break the record of Ma'tūq by half an hour; he was also granted money and presents.⁴ During the reign of al-Musta'sim many fights and disorders took place in Baghḍād between

¹Al-Hawāḍith al-Jamī'a, p. 212-3.

²Chronography, I, p. 409, and Mukhtaṣar, p. 445.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 291.

⁴Ibid., p. 234.

the various quarters of the city, and especially between the Sunnī and Shī'a quarters.

In 640/1242, shortly after his succession, a fight took place between the Ma'muniya and Bāb al-Azaj quarters, which involved the Nizamiya market, and between Mukhtāra and Sūq al-Sulṭān quarters, and between Qutūfta and Qurayya quarters. Many were killed and shops pillaged. Moreover the common people openly derided the government and its officials.¹ Thus the disorders increased for lack of government control. In 653/1255 fights took place between Ruṣāfa (Sunnī) and Khuḍayriyyin (Shī'a) and soon people of Bāb al-Baṣra supported Ruṣāfa while Karkh supported the others.² Furthermore the authorities could not rely on the soldiers to settle the disorders because, on several occasions, these soldiers sided with the Sunnī people and attacked the Shī'a. In Muḥarram 653/Feb.-Mar. 1255, a fight took place between Karkh and Bāb al-Baṣra; the soldiers were sent to stop it, but instead they pillaged Karkh and that made the situation worse.³ The climax came in 654/1256, when someone was killed by the people of Karkh, and the soldiers sent to keep order were joined by crowds of the common people and pillaged Karkh, burnt several places in it, killed many and took away women.⁴ Thus the Caliph was not able to

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 175-7; cf. Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīd, II, p. 554, see also E.I./II, s.v. Baghdād (by A. A. Dūrī).

² Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 298-9, A. A. Dūrī, op.cit.

³ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 276-7.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 314-5; also E.I./II, s.v. Baghdād (by A. A. Dūrī).

hold the balance between the two communities, and this was due to the weakness of the government. Although the Wazīr, Ibn al-'Alqamī, was a Shī'ite, yet it seems neither had he enough power to stop the disorders,¹ nor was he able to persuade the Shī'a of Karkh to cease their attacks on the Sunnī quarters. Moreover Ibn al-Fuwaṭī openly puts the main responsibility of these disorders on the Shī'a.²

The court was divided into two groups, the group of the Shī'ite Wazīr, and the group of the young Dawādār, the most powerful Amīr in Baghdād, who was aided by the eldest son of the Caliph. The rivalry between the Wazīr and the Dawādār came to boiling point in 653/1255-6, when the Wazīr accused him of making a plot to install the eldest son of the Caliph in his place. The Dawādār, on hearing this slander, was outraged and collected his troops around himself to fight the Wazīr. The Wazīr for his part did the same. The clash between them was avoided by the mediation of the Caliph, who took great pains to settle the dispute.³ This split in the authority, was not without response from the common people, who had already supported the side they preferred; the Sunnīs sided with the Dawādār and the elder son of the Caliph, and the Shī'a sided with the Wazīr.⁴

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 322; Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī, II, pp. 139-90; see also Dhahabī, XX, fols. 163-4.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 304-5.

³Ibid., pp. 294-8; see also below pp. 201-2.

⁴Abū 'l-Fidā III, p. 202; and al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl Mir'āt al-Zamān, I, p. 86.

The atrocities which were committed in Karkh by the soldiers of the Dawādār gave, to many historians, the impression that the Wazīr, Ibn al-'Alqamī, would have been a traitor to the Caliphate, and would have helped the Mongols to conquer Baghdād, in revenge on the Dawādār and the eldest son of the Caliph for what they had done in Karkh.¹

Thus the sectarian rivalries played a considerable role in the weakness of the Caliphate and finally in its downfall. As a result of the fall of Baghdād both the communities lost their position as citizens of the seat of the Caliphate, which was, spiritually and traditionally, the centre of the Muslim world.

¹ Al-Yunīnī, I, p. 86, Abū 'l-Fida III, p. 202; Ibn al-'Amīd, fol. 261b; Dhahabī, XX, fols. 163-4 and 210-11; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VII, pp. 47-8; Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī, II, pp. 189-90; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 196; al-'Umari, X, p. 529; and Ibn Khaldūn, III, pp. 536-7; cf. below pp. 200 ff.

Chapter III

THE DHIMMIS.

The Jewish and Christian Communities who lived in the Islamic Empire were called Ahd al-Dhimma.¹ When the Dhimmis are, individually, mentioned by name in the works of Arab historians, the reason should be sought in their particular importance for the public life of their period. They were mentioned either for their services to the government, or were merely mentioned for their position among their own communities, such as the head of the Jews and the head of the Christians.

The Dhimmis played a leading part in the economic and administrative life of the Caliphate, and continued to play their role to the end of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate.²

Shortly after his succession to the Caliphate, al-Naṣir issued in 579/1183-4 a strict order against employing the Dhimmis in the Dīwān.³ When somebody enquired from the Caliph about Ibn Zaṭṭīna - the Christian - who was well acquainted with the art of clerkship, the Caliph answered angrily "Ibn Zaṭṭīna is dead; what are we going to do?". The problem

¹See E.I./II, s.v. Dhimma (by L. Cahen).

²About the part played by the Jews see W. J. Fischel, Jews in the Economic and Political Life of Mediaeval Islam, London (1937); A. A. Duri, Studies on the economic life of Mesopotamia in the 10th century, Baghdad (1948); D.S. Sassoon, A History of the Jews in Baghdad (Letchworth, 1949).

³On the reason for this order see above p. 106.

was solved by the conversion of this clerk to Islam.¹ However, it seems that this policy was of short duration, for there are many indications which prove that the Dhimmīs continued to play their part in the Dīwān.² Moreover, judging from the complaints of some of the Muslim jurists it seems that al-Nāṣir did not only employ the Dhimmīs but he treated them with tolerance and respect.³ Ibn Faḍlān, the chief judge (died in 631/1233-4) says in a letter⁴ submitted to the Caliph, "They (the Dhimmīs) have never had better conditions, higher respect and dignity, in any other country, than they have (now) in Baghdād".⁵

In the social and economic life of the Abbāsīd Caliphate, the Dhimmīs established their position long before the reign of al-Nāṣir. But towards the 12th and 13th centuries they penetrated into nearly every field of activity especially the industrial and commercial ones.⁶ In the different crafts they held leading positions, and Ibn Faḍlān, in his letter, distinguishes the various crafts and occupations held by the

¹Sibt, VPE, 241 p. 378; Cf. Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 161-2.

²Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 162-3; 166, 219-20.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 63-70; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 142.

⁴The full letter is recorded in Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 64-70. A. Ben-Jacob translated this letter into Hebrew with comments in his article, "New sources with regard to the history of the Jews in Babylon in the 12th and 13th centuries". Zion, XV (1950), pp. 62-5.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 66.

⁶Cf. S. D. Goitein, Jews and Arabs, New York (1955), p.7.

Dhimīs in Baghdād. He says "...some of them in the service of the Dīwān, ... others physicians, ... some of them shopkeepers as druggists ...etc., others craftsmen and artisans like goldsmiths... and others Bankers (Jahābidha) and money-changers (Sayārifa)".¹

Dīwān al-Jawālī was in charge of collecting the poll-tax from the Dhimīs.² It seems very likely that, during al-Nāṣir's reign, this tax was collected with laxity, and also that the revenue from it was not high; for in 626/1228-9 al-Mustansir discharged Muḥyi al-Dīn ibn al-Jawzī from his post as the head of this Dīwān and appointed Ibn Faḍlān to this post. The Caliph ordered the new official to "apply the Shar'" in collecting the poll-tax. Ibn Faḍlān, therefore, increased the tax on those who paid less than one Dīnār to one Dīnār.³ Moreover, Ibn Faḍlān followed strict method in collecting this tax judging from the following narrative:

"At the beginning of Muḥarram (of the year 627/1228) Muḥyi al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Faḍlān sat in Dīwān al-Jawālī and demanded the poll-tax from the Dhimīs. One of these stood before him and waited till his poll-tax had been weighed and a receipt given to him. This was humiliating and they suffered greatly therefrom. There was an Abū 'Alī ibn al-

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 64-68; also cited by A. A. Dūrī, "Nushu' al-Aṣnāf... etc.", B.C.A., I, June (1959), p. 145.

² See below pp. 241-2.

³ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 7-8; see also below p. 241-2.

Masihi, the chief of the physicians. He enjoyed privileges and free access to the house of the Caliph. He pretended that he was sick, excused himself (to the Diwan) and, therefore, applied to have his poll-tax paid by his son. That was not permitted and he appeared and paid it. Once there came Ibn al-Shuwaikh, the head of the Academy of the Jews, to his house (i.e. that of the chief of the Diwan) at night, and requested him to receive his poll-tax from him then. But the other would not accede, explaining, 'It is unavoidable for you to come to the Diwan by day and pay the poll-tax'. He was very strict regarding this and would not respond to any wish."¹

This anecdote indicates that the notables of the Dhimmis used to pay their poll-tax, at least during the reign of al-Nasir, through their representatives, in order to avoid complying with the humiliating procedure accompanying the payment of this tax.² Moreover, Ibn Faḍlān observed this in his letter, where he says,

"And now some of them (the Dhimmis) do not come personally before the 'Amil (of Diwan al-Jawālī) to pay their poll-tax, but send it with their followers."³

Although the non-Muslim communities received harsh treatment under the Muslim rulers in various parts of the Islamic world, and were forced to wear distinctive dress, or colour of dress,⁴ yet in 'Irāq, under al-

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 13; also cited by Fischel, Jews in the economic...., pp. 129-30; see also Rafā'īl Babu Ishāq, Ta'rikh Naṣara al-'Iraq, pp. 72-3; and S. W. Baron, A social and religious history of the Jews, 2nd ed., III, p. 167 and p. 311 n. 53.

² See Fischel, p. 130.

³ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 69.

⁴ E. Strauss, "The social isolation of Ahl adh-Dhimma", E.O., Ala Memoire de Paul Hirschler, pp. 73 ff.

Naṣir and his successors, it seems that they enjoyed better conditions and more liberty, for there is no evidence to show that any Caliph of this period forced them to wear any distinctive colour, to distinguish them from the Muslims. Moreover, Ibn Faḍlān, in his letter, discussed how al-Muqtadī (476-487/1075-1094) ordered that the Jews should put on yellow caps and the Christians should wear black dresses, and also forbade them to ride horses but only mules and donkeys;¹ but "Now they (the Dhimīs) are free from all these restrictions, therefore, does not this (liberty) justify doubling their poll-tax!"² Nevertheless the Caliph did not respond to this request of Ibn Faḍlān.³

The Jewish Community:-

At the end of the reign of al-Mustanjid, the Jewish traveller Benjamin of Tudela visited Baghḍād - between 1166 and 1171 A.D.⁴ He

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 68-9; also E. Strauss, op.cit., pp. 78-9.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 69.

³Ibid., p.70.

⁴The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, tr. by M. N. Adler, London (1907), p. 2; while E. H. Haddad, in his Arabic tr., suggests that this travel took place between 1165 and 1173 A.D. See the Arabic tr., pp. 28-30.

gives a detailed account of the position of the Jewish community there. He says, "They (the Jews) dwell in security, prosperity, and honour under the great Caliph".¹ He estimated the number of this community at one thousand living in Baghdād,² and that there were twenty eight synagogues situated either in the eastern side or in al-Karkh.³ Benjamin describes this community thus: "Many of the Jews of Baghdād are good scholars and very rich".⁴ This seems very likely because of the participation of this community in the economic life of Irāq. It is evident that the Jews continued to hold their economic position and participation in the financial administration; even Benjamin was aware of this fact and says, "This great Abbāsīd is extremely kind towards the Jews, many of his officers being of that nation".⁵ There are several examples of officials from this community, such as: Abū Tahir ibn Shibr, the Jahbadh (Banker) of the Dīwān, he was also the chief of the Jews and died at the end of the month Ramaḍān in 601/1205.⁶ In the same year his son, Abū Ghālib ibn

¹ Adler's tr., p.39; Asher's tr. (London 1840) p.100: Arabic tr. p.135.

² Asher's tr. p.100; however, Adler's tr. has 40,000 Jews living in Baghdād, p.39, see also the Arabic tr. p.135. Although the figure of Asher's tr. is mentioned by Petachia of Ratishon, who visited Baghdād shortly after Benjamin, yet Petachia says, when he mentions the head of the Academy, "The head of the Academy has about 2000 disciples at once, and more than 500 sit around him". See A. N. Adler, Jewish Travellers, p.70.

³ B. of T. Asher's tr. p.104; Adler's tr. p.42; Arabic tr. p.139. But Petachia mentions three synagogues only; see Jewish Travellers, p.76.

⁴ Asher's tr. p.104; also the Arabic tr. p.139; while Adler's tr. (p.42) reads "The Jews of the city (Baghdād) are learned men and very rich".

⁵ Asher's tr. p.94; Arabic tr. p.132.

⁶ Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 162-3; cited by Fischel, p.133.

Abī Ṭahir ibn Shibr, also died. He was in charge of the Mint (ʿĀmil Dar al-Darb).¹ Thus, it seems that the Shibr family had a dominant position in the financial administration at Baghdād. The other example is Ibn Karam who held the post as ʿĀmil of the Mint, probably during al-Nāṣir's reign.² Ibn al-Fuwaṭī refers to Ibn Karam as one of the chieftains of the Dhimīs, when he mentions the death of Abū ʿl-Ṭulaīq (under the year 639/1241-2), he says "When Abū ʿl-Ṭulaīq... met one of the leaders of the Christians or the Jews riding, he made him dismount and insulted him. He did so with the physician Ibn Toma' and later with his son, and also with Ibn Karam the Jew".³ Al-Dhahabī recorded the following interesting story about Ibn Karam, which shows how highly he was respected by the Muslim personages:

"Nāṣir ibn ʿAbd al-Razzāq, the chief judge (died in 631/1233-4), said, 'One day while I was sitting in the house of the Wazīr al-Qummī, with a group of people, a distinguished looking man entered the house. All the company stood in respect for him, I did the same. But then I was told that this person "is Ibn Karam, the Jew, who is in charge of the Mint". When I heard that I became very angry and I called him before me, and I told him, "Look, you do not deserve any respect from me, and I have stood for you because I thought that you were one of the Muslim jurists, sit there far from us".'"⁴

¹Ibn al-Sāʿī, p. 166; Fischel, p. 133.

²Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 142a. The Karam family was an influential family in Baghdād Jewry: see Fischel, p. 134.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 150; also cited by Fischel, p. 134.

⁴Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 142a.

The Caliph usually appoints both the Exilarch and the Catholicus to their offices.¹ According to Benjamin of Tudela the Caliph appoints the Exilarch, and the latter appoints the heads of the Academy.² It seems that later on - during the reign of al-Nāṣir - the Caliph also appoints the chiefs of the Academy, for there are several items of information in Ibn al-Sā'ī³ and Ibn al-Fuwaṭī⁴ respecting the appointment of Ra's Mathība⁵ to his office.

Although there is a lot of information about the heads of the Academy and their appointment to their offices in Ibn al-Sā'ī and Ibn al-Fuwaṭī yet, unfortunately, there is nothing, in these two chronicles, concerning the Exilarch.⁶ However, Benjamin of Tudela and Petachia of Ratesbon furnish some information in regard to the Exilarch.

According to Petachia the appointment of the Exilarch took place as a result of the recommendation of the principal men among the Jews.⁷

Benjamin describes the ceremony of the installation of the Exilarch

¹ See E.I./II s.v. Dhimma (by Cl. Cahen).

² B. of T. Asher's tr. p.104; Adler's tr. pp. 41-2; Arabic tr. pp. 135-6. Benjamin mentions 10 Academies in Baghdad; see Asher's tr. p. 100; Adler's tr. p.39.

³ Al-Jāmi' al-Mukhtaṣar, pp. 266-9.

⁴ Al-Ḥamādith al-Jāmi'a, pp. 218, 224, 248-9.

⁵ The Head of the Academy, his Jewish title was "Resh Methibta".

רִישׁ מֵתִיבְתָּא

⁶ The head of the Captivity

רִישׁ גְּזֵרְתָּא

⁷ Jewish Travellers, p.64

as follows:

"At the time of the installation of the Prince of the Captivity he spends considerable sums in presents to the King, or Caliph, his princes and nobles. The ceremony is performed by the act of the laying on of the hands of the King, or Caliph, after which the Prince rides home from the King's abode to his own house, seated in a royal state carriage and accompanied by the sounds of various musical instruments; he afterwards lays his hands on the gentlemen of the university."¹

The authority of the Exilarch extended over all the Jews who lived within the Muslim world and without,² for Benjamin says,

"The authority of the Prince of the Captivity extends over the following countries viz. over Mesopotamia, Persia, Khorasan, S'ba which is Yemen, Diarbakh (Diyār Baker), all Armenia..., over the country of the Aranians (Adharbayjān)..., over Sikbia³ and all the provinces of the Turkmans... and the country of the Georgians unto the river Oxus, and as far as the frontiers of the provinces and cities of Tibet and India. Permission is granted by the Prince of the Captivity to all the Jewish congregations of these different countries to elect Rabbis and ministers, all of whom appear before him in order to receive consecration and the permission to officiate, upon which occasion presents and valuable gifts are offered to him even from the remotest countries."⁴

This shows that the Exilarch exercised a wide authority over the Jews, who lived inside and outside 'Irāq. Thus, it seems, this very special

¹ B. of T., Asher's tr. p. 104; cf. Adler's tr. pp. 41-2; see also Arabic tr. p. 138.

² Cf. S. D. Goitein, "The unity of the Mediterranean World in the 'Middle' Middle Ages", S.I. XII (1960), pp. 33-4.

³ E. H. Haddād, in his Arabic tr., p. 138, translates this to Siberia.

⁴ B. of T., Asher's tr. pp. 102-3; Arabic tr. pp. 137-8.

position of the Exilarch made the active Caliph al-Muqtafī, soon after he was able to liberate his capital from the yoke of the Seljuq's authority,^{to} restore the old 'Abbāsid tradition of appointing the Exilarch to his post with all the ceremonies accompanying ¹ it. This act of the Caliph would give him a special position in the eyes of all the Jews everywhere and, moreover, make Baghdād the seat of their Head and their scholars. It might enable the government of Baghdād to use the Jewish financial resources and commercial abilities to gain some economic support to carry out the ambitious policy of the Caliph to restore his temporal rule. Nevertheless, appointing the Exilarch was, no doubt, a role of the 'Abbāsid Caliphs, when they were in complete control of their affairs, so its revival meant the revival of a phase of a lost authority which, since the reign of al-Muqtafī, all the Caliphs had been longing to practice and pursue. Al-Muqtafī appointed as Exilarch the rich Baghdāḍian merchant Sulāimān (or Solomon) ibn Ḥisdai, and provided him with a decree respecting his appointment. After the death of Sulāimān his son Daniel succeeded him; during the reign of the latter Benjamin of Tudela visited Baghdād² and he describes Daniel as follows:

¹ See the Arabic tr. of B. of T. p. 136 n (6). For the position of the Exilarch in the early Muslim rule see S. D. Goitein, Jews and Arabs, pp. 120-21.

² E. Haddad's article "The Gaonim of Baghdād..." which supplemented his Arabic translation of the Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, pp. 200-201; and p. 136 n (6).

"The city (Baghdād) contains ten colleges (and he states the presidents of these colleges)... The principal of all these, however, is Rabbi Daniel Ben Chisdai,¹ who bears the titles of: Prince of the Captivity and Lord and who possesses a pedigree, which proves his descent from King David. The Jews call him "Lord Prince of the Captivity" and the Muhammadans "Saidna Ben Daoud" noble descendant of David, and he holds great command over all Jewish congregations under the authority of the Emīr al-Mumenin (Commander of the Faithful) the Lord of the Muhammadans, who has commanded to respect him (sic), and has confirmed his power by granting him a seal of office."²

After the death of Daniel in the year 1174 A.D. there was a serious crisis in the history of the Exilarchate. The deceased Exilarch left no son, and consequently the Jews of Baghdād looked elsewhere for a member of the Davidic Dynasty. Such a family existed in Mosul. Here lived two descendants of this family, namely Daniel and Samuel.³ However, it seems that Samuel was installed as Exilarch.⁴

After the death of the Exilarch Samuel in 1190 A.D. the Gaon Samuel (Ibn al-Dastūr) tried to put an end to the dignity of the Exilarchate. According to him there was no need for such an institution. Not worldly but spiritual leadership was the need of the Jews in the

¹Adler's tr. (p.39) reads Hisdai.

²B. of T.; Asher's tr. pp. 101-2; Adler's tr. p. 39; Arabic tr. pp. 136-7.

³D. S. Sassoon, p. 67; also E. Haddad, op.cit., pp. 200-1, and p. 136 n (6). But the traveller Petachia, who visited Baghdad "A year after the death of R. Daniel", mentions Eleazar as the Exilarch; see Jewish Travellers, p. 70.

⁴D. S. Sassoon, p. 69.

Diaspora. It was a waste of money to keep up an expensive Exilarchate instead of combining all forces for the material and spiritual well-being of the Academy, which is really the Throne of the Torah.¹ However, it seems that R. Samuel the Gaon succeeded in his project of abolishing the Exilarchate. Thus all the rights vested in the Exilarch was, later on, transferred to the Gaon. And the Gaonim concentrated all the religious as well as political privileges in their hands.² Moreover, it is very clear from the sense of the unique document of the installation of Danyāl ibn al-'Azar ibn Hibat Allah as the Head of the Academy, which is preserved in Ibn al-Sā'ī, that the Head of the Academy was considered as the sole leader and representative of the Jewish community.³ About the ceremony of appointing the Head of the Academy, Ibn al-Fuwaṭī gives two examples in regard to the appointment of both Danyāl ibn Shamu' īl ibn Abī al-Rabī' (appointed in 645/1247-8), and 'Alī ibn Zakhariya of Irbil (appointed in 648/1250-51); about the latter he says:

"In the year 648/1250-51 'Alī ibn Zakhariya of Irbil requested to be appointed Ra's Mathiba - Head of the Academy - he was given the approval by the Wazīr, who had sent him before the chief Judge. The Chief Judge let him take a place before him and spoke to him:
'I have appointed thee leader of the folk of they

¹D. S. Sassoon, p. 69; but E. Haddad says that as early as the death of the Exilarch R. Daniel in the year 1174 R. Samuel ibn al-Dastūr was able to combine the Exilarchate to himself, and thus he became the spiritual and temporal leader of the Jews. See Haddad's Appendix, op.cit. pp. 200-201, and p. 136 n (6).

²D. S. Sassoon, pp. 90-91.

³See the complete document in Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 266-9; cited by Fischel, pp. 128-9; see also A. Ben-Jacob in Zion, XV (1950), p. 66; D. S. Sassoon, pp. 73-4.

community, over the folk of thy faith which hath been abolished by the law of Islam... that thou mayst lead them within the boundaries of their religion. Thou shalt order them regarding those things commanded by their religion and those things forbidden by their religion.¹ Then he left for the corridor, where he put on his Tarha (Pallium). Then he walked out with a company consisting of a band of Jews and a band of police force from Bab al-Nūbī. He carried with him the official statement of his appointment which was issued by the Diwān.¹

Although Benjamin mentioned only the religious duty of the Head of the Academy as his sole occupation,² yet it seems that the Gaon exercised wider authority over his community inside and outside 'Irāq, for Petachia gives the following information about Rabbi Samuel (1160-1208). He says:

"In all the land of Assyria and Damascus, in the cities of Persia and Media, as well as in the land of Babel, they have no judge that has not been appointed by Rabbi Samuel, the head of the Academy. It is he that gives licence in every city to judge and to teach. His authority is acknowledged in all countries, and also, in the land of Israel. They all respect him."³

This explains why the government of Baghdād, in this period, was much concerned in appointing the Heads of the Academy. Petachia adds,

"Every Jew in Babel pays a gold florin annually to the head of the Academy as a poll-tax. For the monarch requires no taxes, but only the head of the Academy."⁴

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 248-9; cited by Fischel, pp. 131-2.

²Asher's tr. p. 101; the Arabic tr. p. 136.

³Jewish Travellers, pp. 71 and 85. Goitein says, "The Head of the Academy regarded by Jews all over the world as the highest authority in all religious matters," see Jews and Arabs, p.121.

⁴Jewish Travellers, p. 71; see also D. S. Sassoon, p.64.

If this is to be believed, the head of the Academy was a representative of his community, especially in collecting the poll-tax from them to deliver it to the government, and this duty, no doubt, beyond the religious one.

Petachia also says that the head of the Academy gave him

"a document with his seal, directing that he should have safe conduct whithersoever he should go.... Rabbi Petachia carried the seal of Rabbi Samuel with him, and the people did all that he required, and they feared him."¹

And,

"The head of the Academy has many servants. They flog anyone not immediately executing his orders; therefore people fear him. He, however, is righteous, humble, and full of knowledge of the law. He is clothed in golden and coloured garments like the King; his palace is hung with costly tapestry like that of the King."²

Although the Jews were treated with tolerance and respect by the government of Baghdād, and "they lived in peace" as Petachia says;³ yet sometimes, as individuals, received rather harsh treatment from some of the people in Baghdād, especially during the reign of al-Musta'ṣim, when the government was too weak to keep order inside Baghdad. For there are few examples of individual attacks on Jews recorded by Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, but the government did not tolerate this aggressive

¹Jewish Travellers, p. 73 and p. 78.

²Ibid., p. 81. For the full list of the Gaonim of this period see Fischel, pp. 126 ff; and D. S. Sassoon, pp. 72 ff.

³Jewish Travellers, p. 71.

attitude and, indeed, punished the offenders severely. However, it seems that the rarity of these attacks attracted the attention of Ibn al-Fuwaṭī to record them in his chronicle. They are as follows: After the installation of Danyāl ibn Shamu'īl ibn Abī al-Rabī', in 645/1247-8, as head of the Academy, he left the Diwān with his procession, which consisted of a band of Jews and some officials. On the way to his house a number of the common people ('Awām) tried to insult him, they were prevented from doing so, and several of them were imprisoned and punished.¹ In 648/1250-51 Ḥusain Tāj al-Dīn, a relative of the Wazīr Ibn al-'Alqamī, committed suicide, because he insulted a Jewish shop-keeper, and the latter made a complaint to the government about it. When the Wazīr sent for him to be questioned about this offence, Tāj al-Dīn refused to go there and hanged himself.²

The Christians

The members of this community also participated in the social and economic life of the Caliphate principality. They practiced nearly all fields of hand-crafts, as well as participating in the financial and administrative life of 'Irāq. Some of the Christians reached a high position in the service of the Diwān, such as Ibn Sāwa, who was killed in 604/1207-8

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 218.

² Ibid., p. 248; for more examples see also pp. 255-6, and p. 318; and Dhahabī, XX, fol 96a.

According to Ibn al-Sā'ī, Naṣr ibn Sāmā was the controller (Nazir) of the provinces of Dujā'il and Dāquq. He was accused of poisoning the Muqta' of these provinces; therefore he was killed, although he tried to ransom himself for 10,000 Dīnārs.¹ But Sibṭ gives a detailed account of the death of Ibn Sāwā; he says:

"Ibn Sāwā - the Christian - was in charge of administering Dujā'il and Dāquq provinces, he was appointed in this office by the Wazīr ibn Mahdī. He acted with dignity and he even appeared riding in a procession like that of the Head of the Diwan (Ṣāhib al-Diwan). He used to bring the revenue of these districts before the Wazīr to take whatever he liked and the rest was given to the Caliph. Then the Caliph gave these two districts as fiefs to the Amīr Tutāmush; the latter went there and discovered the falsification and extortion of the Wazīr and his agent Ibn Sāwā. The Wazīr tried to keep the secret, arranged with Ibn Sāwā to poison Tutāmush, and Ibn Sāwā did so. The Caliph discovered what the two parties did to Tutāmush, therefore, he ordered Ibn Sāwā to be handed over to the followers of the Amīr to kill him. The Wazīr tried to save Ibn Sāwā, wrote to the Caliph to the effect that the Christians of Baghdad agreed to pay 50,000 Dīnārs as ransom to save Ibn Sāwā;² but the Caliph refused that. And Ibn Sāwā was killed."

From this narrative it is evident that Ibn Sāwā participated in the administering of the Caliphate principality as the financial administrator of Dāquq and Dujā'il provinces; moreover he took part in the intrigues of the Court, sided with the Wazīr against the interest of the Caliph.

¹Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 219-20.

²Sibṭ, pp. 348-9; also cited by Ibn al-'Imād, V, p.9.

Some of the Christians held the post of Wakīls (agents) of some of the personages in Baghdād.¹

They continued to monopolize medicine, especially in the Court.² There is nearly a complete list of the physicians of the Court preserved in the historical works. These physicians held some administrative posts beside their medical occupation; they are:

It is recorded that in 591/1194-5 Ṣā'id ibn Hibat-allah ibn al-Mu'ammil, who was the chief physician of the Court, died.³

In 608/1211-2 Abū 'l-Baqā' al-Nīlī died. He was the physician of al-Nāṣir, and reached a high position in the Court. He was awarded great wealth, but this wealth was spent by his unwise son, Abū 'Alī. Although he followed the pattern of his father's profession he was young and lived a life of pleasure and spent his wealth in merry-making. He even committed adultery with several Muslim women, and as a result he was fined 6,000 Dīnārs.⁴

In 620/1223-4 Abū 'l-Karam Ṣā'id ibn Tomā' was killed; it seems that the latter was a gifted person, because he held besides his post as a physician of the Court, several posts: He acted as private secretary

¹See Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 121; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 94, 198.

²For the early Christian physician see Rafā'il Babū Ishāq, Ta'rikh Naṣara al-'Iraq, pp. 80-4; idem, Aḥwāl Naṣara Baghdad, pp. 100 ff.

³Ibn al-'Ibrī, p. 416; Ibn al-Qiftī, Ta'rikh al-Hukamā', ed. J. Lippert (Leipzig 1903), p. 214; see also Ishāq, Ta'rikh, p. 103; idem, Aḥwāl, pp. 209-10.

⁴Ibn al-'Ibrī, pp. 419-20; al-Qiftī, pp. 332-3; Ishāq, Aḥwāl, pp. 220-21.

to al-Nāṣir to carry the correspondence between the Caliph and his Wazīr.¹ He was also given a certain administrative authority over some districts.² Moreover he acted as agent of the Dīwān to deliver the salaries of some retired officials.³ However, it seems, he established an influential family in Baghdād, for his son, later on, served the young Dawādār (al-Duwaydār al-Ṣaghīr) as an agent.⁴ According to Bar-Hebraeus Ibn Tomā' was killed as a result of a court intrigue worked up against him by two servants of al-Nāṣir. One of them was a woman who served the Caliph as a secretary to write his correspondence and orders, because the Caliph's eyes were too weak to enable him to write himself. She, with the aid of another servant, forged the signature of al-Nāṣir. Ibn Tomā' had discovered the treachery of these servants and revealed it to the Wazīr. Therefore, they planned his death, to keep their secret. The Caliph was much grieved by Ibn Tomā's death and punished the offenders severely.⁵ But Ibn Shakir al-Kutubī states another story for the death of Ibn Tomā'. He says that Ibn Tomā' was given some provinces to serve in as financial administrator and, one day, several soldiers came to him to receive their salaries, but he treated them roughly. Therefore,

¹Ibn al-ʿIbrī, p. 421.

²Ibn Shakir al-Kutubī, I, p. 244.

³Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 142b.

⁴Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 94.

⁵Mukhtaṣar, pp. 421-2; al-Qifṭī, pp. 212-4; also Iṣḥāq, Aḥwāl, pp. 206-8.

they harboured hatred for him, and two of them waited for him at night and killed him. The Caliph ordered his wealth, which amounted to 813,000 Dīnārs, to be forfeited to the Treasury.¹

In 643/1245-6 the physician Shams al-Dawla Abū 'l-Khayr ibn Tomā' died. He held a high position in the court: acted as a secretary to al-Mustanṣir, as well as being financial administrator. On his death his hereditament, which amounted to 600,000 Dīnārs, was confiscated by the government, but later on it was returned to his brothers, who were also appointed in the service of the Dīwān: Fakhr al-Dawla Mary was given all the posts of his deceased brother, and Tāj al-Dawla was appointed agent of Bāb 'Anbar.²

In 656/1258 the physician of the last 'Abbāsīd Caliph, Mas'ūd ibn al-Qass al-Baghdādī died. He reached a high position during the reign of al-Musta'ṣim, and when Baghdād was conquered by the Mongols and al-Musta'ṣim was killed, he confined himself to his house without serving anybody until his death which occurred in the above mentioned year.³

The chief of the Christian community, the Catholicus, was also appointed to his office by the Caliph.⁴

¹ Fawāt al-Wafayāt, I, p. 244.

² Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 198.

³ Ibn al-'Ibrī, p. 478.

⁴ For the persons who held this title in the first half of the 13th century see Iṣḥāq, Ta'rīkh, pp. 110-11; idem, Aḥwāl, pp. 47, 83-4, 228-9; and Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 300.

Ibn Ḥamdūn preserved in his Tadhkira a patent of appointment of the Nestorian Catholicus at Baghdād. It is addressed to Ebd Jesu (or 'Abd Yashū'), Catholicus and Patriarch, who in 533/1138-9 received his patent of appointment and the Ṭarḥa (Pallium) in the presence of the Wazīr, and was conducted by the head of the police and other officials to the church in Sūq al-Thalāthā'. This being the first occasion on which a Patriarch had been thus honoured. Ebd Jesu died in 542/1147-8.¹ This document runs as follows:

"This patent is issued by the order of our lord, the Commander of the Faithful, to 'Abd Yashū', the Catholicus, the Patriarch..., after the Caliph was assured of your exemplary life, and of your possessing the most deserving qualities, which your co-religionists were agreed distinguished you from them,.... and according to their persistent need for a Catholicus to look after their affairs; they, therefore, agreed to choose you as their leader to watch over their concerns, to manage their charitable foundations, and to deal equally between weak and strong as a just arbitrator.... Thus thereby, the Caliph ordered you to be appointed Catholicus of the Nestorian Christians both at Baghdād and over the rest of Islamic territory; and to be the representative of the members of that and of the other communities, whether Rūm, Jacobite or Melkite, wherever they might be. You have to be singled out from your community by wearing the vestments appertaining to the office at divine worship, neither sharing the name with anyone else nor permitting any Patriarch, Bishop, or Deacon to assume the same to the prejudice of your office and dignity. In case any of these should enter the gate of disputation, and interfere with or disregard

¹ H. F. Amedroz, "Tales of Official life from the Tadhkira of Ibn Ḥamdūn", J.R.A.S., 1908. I, pp. 449-50. For further description of the procession of Catholicus' appointment to his office see Ishāq, Aḥwāl, pp. 48-50.

your authority, punishment would surely follow as a warning to others and as a safeguard to your ordinance. However, you should be escorted in state according to the precedents applicable to your predecessors, as also to you and to your successors; and protection should be extended to you and your co-religionists in your life and property, by good management, and to establish usage in the matter of the burial of your dead, and to protect your churches and monasteries, in accordance with the practice of the first Caliphs (Rashidīn Caliphs) towards your forefathers, and the care for your sacred and inviolable rights on the part of those Imāms of the past. In regard to the payment of the poll-tax, you should confine yourself to exacting it from persons of sound mind and of sufficient substance, from the men and not from the women, nor from non-adults, its collection to take place once a year, according to the approved legal method. You are to be at liberty to intervene in all disputes between the Christian sects, to obtain justice for the weak against the strong, to redress equitably any deviation in the direction of violence or injustice, and to manage the charitable foundations on the basis of justice and good faith, in conformity with the ordinances and their plain course. Therefore, you should requite this favour which has encompassed you, and which has fulfilled your wishes and secret hopes, by prayers such as should indicate and make manifest your sincere gratitude. And all Patriarchs, Priests, and Bishops of the above mentioned sects are to punctually obey the foregoing directions.... etc."¹

¹ Amedroz, "Tales of Official Life.... etc.", J.R.A.S., 1908, pp. 447-9 and pp. 467-70; cf. Ishāq, Aḥwāl, pp. 52-4.

Chapter IV

- 1 -

THE 'ABBĀSID WAZIRATE.

(575/1180 - 656/1258)

Although the late 'Abbāsid administrative institutions were the continuation of the Seljuqid ones, yet there were some changes and development in these institutions. The changes, however, mainly occurred in the terminology rather than in the nature of the administration. The Wazirate was one of those institutions which underwent a change. Towards the reign of al-Nāṣir the holder of this office, usually, was called Wazīr, but sometimes this office was assigned to an official called Nā'ib Wazīr¹ (Deputy Wazīr, or rather acting Wazīr) who, in fact, exercised the same authority as a full Wazīr, but without the dignity of the title and the vestments of this office. Furthermore, the contemporary chronicles, sometimes, call the Nā'ib Wazīr: al-Nā'ib 'An Dīwān al-Majlis (The Deputy of Dīwān al-Majlis).² This acting Wazīr occupied a certain room (office) in the House of the Wazirate.³

¹ The first one mentioned by this title was Ibn al-'Attār, who was appointed as Nā'ib Wazīr in 567/1171-2 by the caliph al-Mustaḍī; see Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muhtazam, X, pp. 237-8; *see above p. 100.*

² Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 114, 251, 287; see also Ibn al-Dubā'ithī as quoted by M. Jawād in his appendix to Dhahabi's al-Mukhtasar...etc., p. 32. The Fatimid Dīwān al-Majlis was the central Bureau of the government; see E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān (by A. A. Dūrī).

³ Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 221; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 34.

When al-Qummī was appointed as Nā'ib Wazīr on 12 Rabī' II 606/14 Oct. 1209, the decree issued by al-Nāṣir on this occasion describes him as, "The representative (or deputy of the Caliph) over the lands and the population".¹ However, this position was not, always, enjoyed by the Nā'ib Wazīr. In the period between 575/1180 and 583/1187, when all powers were held by the Ustādh al-Dār, Ibn al-Ṣāhib, the Caliph appointed four Nā'ib Wazīrs successively, but they played a very limited role in the affairs of the state. In the words of Ibn Jubāir, who visited Baghdād in 580/1184, the sole occupation of the acting Wazīr was to supervise and to manage the finance of the Caliphate. He says, "Nowadays he (the Caliph) has no Wazīr, but he has a servant (employee) known as Nā'ib al-Wizāra, who attends the Dīwān which embraces the finance of the Caliphate (to handle its affairs)".² This indicates that the rule of this official, in this period, was confined to the financial matters only.

During the long reign of al-Nāṣir, 13 Nā'ib Wazīrs were appointed, of whom only two were promoted to full Wazīrs; and only two men were appointed as Wazīrs from the beginning (see below). However, it seems that, out of al-Nāṣir's desire to revive the prestige of the Caliphate, he preferred to handle everything in his Caliphate rather

¹Ibn al-Tiqṭāqa, pp. 205-6.

²Ibn Jubāir, p. 227.

than appoint Wazīrs to share with him, morally at least, the management of his affairs.

By the reign of al-Mustanṣir the distinction between Wazīr and Nā'ib Wazīr had disappeared, as in the case of the appointment of Abū al-Azhar ibn al-Nāqid in 629/1232, who according to some historians was appointed as Nā'ib Wazīr¹ and, according to others, was appointed Wazīr.² Although Ibn al-Fuwaṭī mentions that he was installed as Nā'ib Wazīr,³ yet elsewhere in his chronicle he mentions the following titles bestowed upon this official, "Al-Malik al-Wazīr al-Aḥḡam...etc."⁴ This example, however, indicates that the distinction was not clear between Wazīr and Nā'ib Wazīr. Furthermore, even during al-Nāṣir's reign, usually the Nā'ib Wazīr acted as Wazīr, and the following summary of the biographies of the Wazīrs and Nā'ib Wazīrs of this period will show some of their activities and authorities in the 'Abbāsid Caliphate.

The ceremony of the appointment of Wazīr was still conducted in a dignified manner. The person on whom the choice fell was summoned to the Caliphal Palace. He would come in a large procession to the Door

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 34 ff., and p. 156; al-Kazirūnī, fol. 93a; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 241b.

² Ibn Kathīr, p. 132; Ibn al-Tiḡṭaqa, pp. 446 ff.

³ Al-Hawādith al-Jami'a, pp. 34 ff and p. 156.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 34-5.

of the Cabinet (Bāb al-Ḥujra),¹ where the Caliph bestowed on him the symbols of the office and provided him with a decree of this appointment. The vestment consisted of a robe, a garment and a turban. Then he would leave the Door of the Cabinet for his office, mounted on a horse given to him as a gift from the Caliph, and all the dignitaries of the State walking around him.² In this procession the decree of this appointment would be carried in front of the Wazīr, as well as a huge ink-pot.³ As soon as he entered his office (the Wazirate House) he would write a statement, stating his obedience to the Caliph and his anxiety to serve him with all his power and sincerity. Then the Caliph would reply to him in a decree sent by the hand of one of the close servants of the Caliph, and this would be read to the assembly of the dignitaries of the State gathered in the Wazirate House to witness this ceremony.⁴

The Caliph also bestowed on his Wazīr titles of honour which were long and very dignified, such as the following titles offered to the Na'ib Wazīr Ibn al-Nāqid (appointed by al-Mustansir in 629/1232,

¹Bāb al-Ḥujra was a large building affiliated to the Caliphal Palaces; it was constructed by the Caliph al-Mustashid (512-529/1118-1135). It was used as an office by the Caliphs to summon their Wazirs there for consultation and to invest them with their office, as well as receiving them in time of feasts; see Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, Mu'jam al-Buldān, I, p. 444.

²Sibt, p. 371; Abū Shāma, p. 35; Dhahabī, XVIII, fol. 215.

³Sibt, p. 342; Abū Shāma, pp. 52-3.

⁴Ibn al-Sā'i, pp. 168-9; Ibn al-Fuwaṭi, p. 34 and pp. 280-81.

and these titles, remarks Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, were the titles of the Wazīr Ibn Maḥdī al-ʿAlawī):

"Al-Mawla al-Wazīr al-ʿAzam, al-Ṣāhib al-Kabīr al-Muʿazzam, al-ʿĀlim al-ʿĀdil, al-Muʿayyad al-Muzaḥḥar, al-Mujāhid, Naṣīr al-Dīn, ʿImād al-Mulk, Ikhtiyār al-Khilāfa al-Muʿazzama, Muḥyi al-Imāma al-Mukarrama, Taj al-Muluk wa Sayid Sudur al-ʿĀlamīn, Malik Wuzarāʾ al-Sharq wa ʿl-Gharb, Ghīyath al-Wara, Abū ʿl-Azhar Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Naqīd Zāhīr Amīr al-Muʿminīnetc."¹

The position of the Wazīr was still the highest one in the state, that is to say ^{after} that of the Caliph; and, in fact, this authority depended largely upon the personality of the Wazīr and the strength of his master, the Caliph. He controlled the central bureau of the government,² which by now was called al-Dīwān al-ʿAzīz.³ He was also considered as the Head of the administrative staff, and therefore called "Kātib al-Kuttāb" (the Clerk of the Clerks).⁴ However, the close connection between the Wazirate and clerkmanship⁵ is remarkably clear, for even one of the insignia of this office is the "ink-pot".⁶ And the closing, by an order of the Caliph, of this ink-pot of the Wazīr was a sign of his dismissal.⁷

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 34-5; however, the practice of offering such pompous titles was an old established practice; see A. Mez, Die Renaissance Des Islams, Arabic tr. (1940), pp. 155-6; on the Seljuqid Wazīr's titles see A. Iqbal, Wuzarat, pp. 25-6, 163, 251.

²E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān (by A.A.Dūrī).

³Ibid.; see also below pp. 223-4.

⁴Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, IV, p. 138; cf. Mez, op.cit., p. 144.

⁵On the relation between the Wazirate and clerkmanship, in the first ʿAbbāsid epoch, see A. A. Dūrī, al-Muḥḥar al-Islamiyya, pp. 213 ff. and D. Sourdel, Le Vizirat ʿAbbāsid, Damascus (1959), Vol. I, pp. 41 ff.

⁶Sibt, p. 342; see also E.I./II, s.v. Dawādār (by D. Ayalon).

He also controlled the military organizations and, in times of war, he led the army of the Caliphate, as did the Wazīrs Ibn Yūnus, Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb and al-Qummī (see below).

During al-Nāṣir's reign it seems that the Wazirate kept its supremacy over the military element of the state. Although there was some strife between the Wazīr Ibn Maḥdī and the Amīrs of Baghdād, yet this strife did not play any part in the dismissal of this Wazīr, but because he became dangerously strong the Caliph expelled him.¹ Thus the military personnel could not establish their authority under the powerful Caliph al-Nāṣir.

The situation was quite changed during the reign of al-Musta'ṣim where most of the power passed to the hands of the Amīrs of the Caliphate and, in particular, to the hands of the Young and Great Dawādār, who became the strongest Amīrs. These two Amīrs did not, even, attend the ceremony of the appointment of the Wazīr Ibn al-'Alqamī,² no doubt because they were too great persons to attend it. In 650/1252-3 the Great Dawādār, 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ṭubrisī, died,³ and by his death all the influence and power passed to the Young Dawādār, Mujāhid al-Dīn. How-

(cont.)

⁷See Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 102; Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, p. 430.

¹See below pp. 189 ff.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 279-80.

³Ibid., pp. 264 ff.

ever, the rivalry between Ibn al-'Alqāmī and the Young Dawādār caused a lot of harm to the internal stability of the Caliphate,¹ and played a considerable part in the destruction of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate.²

When al-Nāṣir came to power he kept Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, the acting Wazīr of his father, in office for several days only - about one week - and dismissed him.³

In the period between 575/1180-583/1187 four Nā'ib Wazīrs succeeded Ibn al-'Aṭṭār. The first Nā'ib Wazīr appointed by al-Nāṣir was Abū Dāwūd (or Da'ūd) Sulāimān ibn Shāwūsh⁴ who was kept in office for two months only.⁵

Then the Caliph appointed Muḥammad ibn Hibat Allah ibn al-Bukhārī, who held this office for four years until his death which occurred in Muḥarram 580/April-May 1184.⁶ The third was Abū 'Al-Faṭḥ Ṣadaqa ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, who was appointed on 15 Muḥarram 580/28 April 1184 and was dismissed on 13 Rabī' II of the same year (24 July 1184).⁷ The fourth was Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Bāqī, who held this

¹See above pp. 153-4.

²See below pp. 200 ff.

³On his dismissal see Chapter II above, pp. 100-103.

⁴According to Ibn Qanīnū al-Arbillī, the name of this official was Sulāimān ibn Sawars, see Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 60, n.1.

⁵Ibn al-Kāzīrūnī, fol. 89a.

⁶Ibid.; see Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 60.

⁷Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 60-61; according to Ibn al-Kāzīrūnī (fol. 89a) this deputy Wazīr held this office six months.

office for three years, and was dismissed in 583/1187.¹

In fact very little is recorded about these four Na'ib Wazirs and this was, no doubt, due to their insignificant role in the affairs of the Caliphate, where all the power and influence were exercised by the Shi'ite Ustadh al-Dar, Ibn al-Ṣāhib.² However, it seems that their sole occupation was, as observed by Ibn Jubair, supervising the financial affairs of the state.³ This limited power of the acting Wazir indicates the jurisdiction of the office he held, at least during this period. On the other hand Ibn al-Ṣāhib played the role of a real and powerful Wazir.

Ibn Yunus.

Abu 'Al-Muzaffar 'Abd Allah ibn Yunus was the first full Wazir appointed by al-Nāṣir. Prior to his installation he had served the government in several departments, such as managing the Diwan of the buildings (Diwan al-Abniya) and as Ṣāhib Diwan.⁴ He was Hanbalite in belief,⁵ and it seems that the Caliph appointed him Wazir as a reward for his active part in plotting the dismissal of Ibn al-Ṣāhib.⁶

¹ Ibn al-Kaziruni, fol. 89a.

² For his position in the Caliphate, see Chapter II, pp. 103-5.

³ Ibn Jubair, p. 228; see above p. 177.

⁴ Abū Shama, p. 12.

⁵ Ibn al-Imād, IV, p. 313.

⁶ See Chapter II, pp. 105.

He was appointed as Wazīr in Shawwāl 583/Dec. 1187 and honoured by the title of "Jalāl al-Dīn".¹ Apart from his religious activities² the only significant role he played during his short term in office was that he led the Caliphate army in Ṣafar 584/April 1188 into 'Iraq 'Ajam to fight the last Seljuqid Sultān, Tuḡhril II. This expedition was defeated and he was taken prisoner.³ Thus he held this office for about six months only.⁴ He was kept in captivity for a while⁵ and then he was set free. He returned to Baghdād where the Caliph assigned to him the treasury (al-Makhzan) and for a time he became Nā'ib Wazīr (for several months)⁶ and then he was appointed Ustādh al-Dār.⁷ The last blow came to Ibn Yūnus at the hand of Ibn al-Qaṣṣab in 590/1194 on the charge of being responsible for the defeat of the Caliphate army in 584/1188.⁸ Ibn Yūnus, however, died in prison in 593/1196-7.⁹

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XI, p. 372; cf. Ibn Kathīr, XII, p. 328.

²See Chapter II, pp. 106ff.

³On this expedition see Kafesoglu, pp. 111-2; and above, Chapter I, pp. 45-6

⁴Ibn al-Kazirūnī, fol. 89.

⁵Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, pp. 435-6; according to Nekhjavānī, Ibn Yūnus was kept in captivity several months. See Tajarib al-Salaf, p. 329.

⁶Ibn al-Kazirūnī, fol. 89.

⁷Abū Shāma, p. 12; Nekhjavānī, p. 329.

⁸Abū Shāma, p. 12; Ibn al-Imād, IV, p. 314.

⁹Ibid.; see also Nekhjavānī, p. 329; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 142.

When Ibn Yūnus was captured in 'Irāq 'Ajam the Caliph assigned the office of deputy Wazīr to the chief judge, Abū Ṭalib 'Alī ibn 'Alī ibn Hibat Allah ibn Muḥammad al-Bukhārī;¹ the latter held this office several months only and then was dismissed.²

Ibn Ḥadīda.

Then the Caliph appointed Abū 'l-Ma'āly Sa'īd ibn 'Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥadīda as a full Wazīr and invested him with the full investiture of the Wazirate in 584/1188-9. According to Sibṭ this investiture consisted of: a shirt, a robe, and dark blue turban - made of linen and embroidered with gold - and given a sword, and then offered a special horse - mare - from the Caliph's stable.³

Ibn Ḥadīda was a rich man and one of the notables of Baghdād.⁴ He held this office for about one year,⁵ and it seems that his role was not significant.

Although he was quite sympathetic towards the Shi'a, and even when he died (died in 610/1213-4) he was buried in Mashhad 'Alī,⁶ nevertheless, it seems that his close relations with the Ḥanbalite

¹ Ibn al-'Imād, IV, pp. 314-5.

² Ibn Al-Kazirūnī, fol. 89.

³ Sibṭ, p. 371; cited in Abū Shāma, p. 85.

⁴ Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, p. 436.

⁵ Ibn Al-Kazirūnī, fol. 89.

⁶ Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, p. 436; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, XII, p. 198.

Shaykh, Ibn al-Jawzi, was the cause of Ibn Mahdī al-ʿAlawī, then the Naqīb of the ʿAlids, to slander him before the Caliph and to cause his deposition.¹ When he was deposed he was fined a large sum of money. The enmity of Ibn Mahdī did not stop at this point, but when he became Wazīr in 602/1205-6 he imprisoned Ibn Ḥadīda, but the latter was able to flee and to take refuge in Adharbayjan. He stayed there until the deposition of Ibn Mahdī, which occurred in 604/1207-8, and then he was able to return to Baghdad, where he lived for the rest of his life.²

Ibn al-Qaṣṣab.

Abū ʿAbd Allah Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Qaṣṣab. In Ramaḍān 584/Oct.-Nov. 1188 he was appointed in charge of Diwān al-Inshāʾ and, after a while, he was given charge of all the other government departments (Dīwāns) and called Naʿīb Wazīr.³ He was promoted to complete Wazīr in Rajab 590/Jun.-July 1194 and the Caliph bestowed on him the vestments of Wazirate.⁴ Ibn al-Qaṣṣab came from a poor family and his father was a butcher in Baghdad, but his talent and ability as a scribe and his knowledge in clerkmanship enabled him to attract the

¹Sibt, p. 371; Abū Shāma, p. 85.

²Sibt, p. 342 and pp. 371-2; Abū Shāma, p. 85.

³Dhahabī, al-Mukhtaṣar..., the appendix p. 29; see also Sibt, p. 289; and Abū Shāma, p. 9.

⁴Dhahabī, op.cit., p. 29; cf. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 70.

attention of the government, and subsequently entered the service
of the government.¹

Apart from his role in oppressing Ibn Yunus and his Hanbalite followers,² his achievement as Na'ib Wazir and Wazir in Baghdad was not significant; but his reputation rested on his military qualities and achievements. He emerged as an able general and a gifted leader.³ The Caliph, for his part, took advantage of this and assigned to him the leadership of his army, and deputed him to lead several expeditions to Khūzistān and into 'Iraq 'Ajam. Ibn al-Qaṣṣab was able to conquer Khūzistān and to restore it to the 'Abbāsid Caliphate; and he was able to conquer a large part of 'Iraq 'Ajam, but only for a short period.⁴ However, his sudden death on 4 Shā'ban in 592/3 July 1196 near Hamadān⁵ was a great loss to his expedition, which intended to conquer Persia, and to the Caliphate, for it deprived al-Naṣir of the service of a great general. Ibn al-Najjār, the contemporary historian, made the following obituary note on the death of this Wazir: "If the life of Ibn al-Qaṣṣab had been lengthened, he might have possessed (conquered) Khurāsān."⁶

¹Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, p. 437; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 12.

²See Chapter II. above, pp. 107-8.

³Sibt, p. 289; Abū Shāma, p. 9.

⁴For further details on these military operations see above pp. 50 ff. ; and see also Kafesoglu pp. 126 ff.

⁵Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 81; Dhahabī, op.cit., appendix p. 30 and text, p. 96; cf. Sibt, p. 289; Abū Shāma, p. 9; Ibn Taghri Bardī, VI, p. 139; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 12; and al-Kazirunī, fol. 89.

⁶Dhahabī, al-Mukhtaṣar..., appendix p. 31.

Ibn al-Bukhārī.

After the death of Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb, al-Nāṣir appointed the chief judge, Ibn al-Bukhārī - for the second time - as Na'ib Wazīr; the latter occupied this office for two years¹, until his death, which occurred in 593/1196-7.²

Ibn al-Nāqid.

Then al-Nāṣir assigned the office of Na'ib Wazīr to his treasurer (Ṣāhib al-Makhzan), Abu al-Qasim al-Ḥasan ibn al-Nāqid, in 594/1197-8. Ibn al-Nāqid occupied this office until Ṣafar of the year 597/Nov.-Dec. 1200. Although he was just acting Wazīr, nevertheless he was given the right to supervise all the Dīwāns of the state plus his original post as treasurer. He was given a free hand to manage this office and, subsequently, he dismissed many officials and appointed others in their place; he also invested al-Qasim ibn al-Shahrazūrī with the office of chief judge.³ However, this is the first Na'ib Wazīr who exercised the semi-Wazīr jurisdiction in appointing and dismissing the high officials of the state. According to Sibṭ this official was of a bad character, a tyrant and very corrupt.⁴ He died on 9 Ramaḍān 604/28 Mar. 1208.⁵

¹Al-Kazirūnī, fol. 89.

²Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 15.

³Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 250-51.

⁴Sibṭ, pp. 349-50; cited by Abū Shāma, p. 62.

⁵Ibn al-Sa'ī, p. 251.

Ibn Mahdī.

Abu 'l-Ḥasan Naṣir ibn Mahdī ibn Ḥamza al-'Alawī. He was originally from ^{al-}Ray, came to Baghdād with the Wazīr Ibn al-Qaṣṣāb after the latter had conquered al-Ray (in 590-591/1194-5).¹ On his arrival he was appointed Naqīb of the 'Alids in Baghdād.² On 19 Ṣafar 597/29 Nov. 1200 he was appointed as Nā'ib Wazīr.³ Then he was honoured by the vestment and title of Wazīr on 8 Dhu 'l-Ḥijja 602/16 July. 1206.⁴

However it seems that this Wazīr exercised wide authority, which enabled him to install his son, Rukn al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allah Muḥammad, as Ṣadr al-Makhzan - in charge of the treasury.⁵ He was deposed from office on 12⁶ or 22⁷ Jumada II in 604/3 or 13 Jan. 1208, after his son was expelled a day earlier.⁸

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 72-3; and p. 81.

²Abū Shāma, p. 85; Sibṭ, p. 371.

³Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 44; Sibṭ, p. 307; however ibn al-Athīr puts his appointment as Nā'ib Wazīr in 592/1195-6 (al-Kāmil, XII, p. 81) which is a mistake.

⁴Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 168-9; Sibṭ, p. 342; Abū Shāma, pp. 52-3; Dhahabī, XVIII, fol. 215. See above, p. 180 for the titles offered to him by al-Naṣir.

⁵Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 143-4;

⁶Ibid., pp. 220-21.

⁷Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 182.

⁸Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 220.

Although Ibn al-Athīr and Sibṭ give a variety of reasons for his deposition, nevertheless it seems that he was expelled either for his increasing power, or as a result of the reaction of the Sunnī people against the 'Alīd Wazīr.

According to Ibn al-Athīr the Wazīr was expelled because he ill-treated the Amīrs of the Caliph, an act which resulted in the departure of some of those Amīrs from Baghdād, such as Qush-Temur, who had left for Kurrestān (in Fars),¹ and Wajh al-Sabu', the Amīr of the Haj caravan, who had departed the caravan on his way back in 603/1206-7 to Syria. Wajh al-Sabu' wrote a letter to the Caliph explaining his departure from the service of the Caliph due to, "Ibn Maḥdī does not want to leave any Mamluk to the Caliph, and no doubt he wants the Caliphate for himself".² Sibṭ confirms the enmity of the Wazīr with the Amīrs of Baghdād in his story of the death of Amīr Tutmush at the hand of Ibn Sawa, the Christian.³

About his claim to the Caliphate, Sibṭ listed it as one of the reasons for his deposition. He says,

"Al-Makīn al-Qummī, the scribe of Diwān al-Inshā', slandered the Wazīr before the Caliph and told him that the Wazīr was covetous of the Caliphate, and

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 170.

²Ibid., pp. 182-3; for the departure of this Amīr see also: Ibn al-Sa'i, p. 192; Sibṭ, p. 344; Abū Shama, p. 55; and Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, pp. 191-2; where all of them recorded that Wajh al-Sabu' left the service of the Caliph for fear of the Wazīr.

³Sibṭ, pp. 348-9; see Chapter III, above, p. 169-70.

that the Wazir used to say 'I am 'Alawī, and we /the 'Alīds/ have more right in the Caliphate /than anybody else/. And that the Wazir was sending money in date boxes to al-'Ajam (Iran, probably he means al-Ray, the native town of Ibn Mahdī), and asking the people there to recruit an army and to set up a King, in order to come to Baghḍad to conquer it."¹

The story of sending money to Persia is mentioned with more detail

by Abū 'Al-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, who says,

"The motive of the Caliph to expel his Wazir Naṣir al-Din al-'Alawī, was that this Wazir sent 300 mound-loads carrying boxes of dates, in which he hid 1000 Dīnars in every load. When this caravan had reached a certain post, one of the Caliph's officials of that district asked for some dates to eat, but the guards of this caravan would not allow him to have anything. He insisted on that and, by force, took two loads and opened one of the boxes and distributed the dates among his followers. When he had done so he found the gold. He opened another box and he also found the same amount /of money/ in it. He, therefore, confiscated all the loads, and sent to the Caliph telling him what he had found. For this reason the Caliph expelled the Wazir and put him, with all his sons, in custody..."²

However, it seems that the deposition of this Wazir was an outcome of the discontent of the Sunnī people of Baghḍad, who expressed their resentment of the rule of this Wazir by composing poems and, probably, by spreading rumours, such as the dates story and his claims to the Caliphate. According to Sibṭ, "When the fame and influence of the Wazir became very high, the people of Baghḍad satirized him, and

¹Sibṭ, pp. 348-9; Abū Shāma, p. 60.

²Al-Ta'rikh al-Mansūrī, fols. 132b-133a.

composed poems to this effect and sent them to the Caliph."¹ Ibn al-Athīr gives one example of those poems: in it the poet warns the Caliph from his Wazīr and his claims to the Caliphate.² Abū Shāma records a very curious anti-Shī'ite poem in which the poet clearly praises Yazīd ibn Mu'awiya (the accursed one to the Shī'a) and describes him as a very powerful man and able to remove all his enemies with ease.³ If this poem, as Abū Shāma says, was truly written and sent to the Caliph, it reveals that the Sunnī discontent reached its peak during the Wazirate of Ibn Mahdī. Thus al-Nāṣir, under this pressure, found himself in a very critical position; he, therefore, took a positive step to abolish this discontent by removing the figure who had become the main goal - and cause - of this discontent. Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa says, "The Caliph, against his own will, arrested Ibn Mahdī, for reasons demanded this".⁴ Moreover, the Caliph

¹Sibt, p. 348; cited by Abū Shāma, p. 60. On the deposition of this Wazīr see Ibn 'Utba (or 'Unba), *Umdat al-Talib fi Ansab Al Abī Talib*, ed. Nijaf (1961), pp. 77-8; where this 'Alid author relates the following inaccurate story: he says that al-Nāṣir expelled his Wazīr as a result of a threat sent to him by Saladin (sic); the latter asked the Caliph to dismiss his Wazīr otherwise he would set up another Caliph, because ibn Mahdī did not pay his respect to Saladin.

²Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 183; see also Abū Shāma, p. 60.

³Abū Shāma, p. 60.

⁴Al-Fakhrī, p. 439.

treated him well afterwards and granted him the full freedom to depart wherever he wished, but Ibn Mahdī preferred to be kept under arrest because, "in order not to make his enemies able to kill him".¹ This good treatment lasted till the death of Ibn Mahdī, which occurred in 617/1220-21, and even after his death the Caliph ordered the Mosque of the Palace to be opened for praying for him, and all the notables of the state attended the procession of his burial.²

Ibn Amsīnā.

After the deposition of Ibn Mahdī, al-Nāṣir assigned the office of Deputy Wazirate to Sadr Dīwān al-Zimām (in charge of Dīwān al-Kharaj), Fakhr al-Dīn Abū al-Badr Muḥammad ibn Amsīnā, on 12 Jumada II 604/ 3 Jan. 1208.³ Although Ibn al-Athīr remarks that this official was not in full control of his office,⁴ yet it seems that ibn Amsīnā exercised his duty well within the jurisdiction of his office, by receiving the ambassadors of the Ayyubids and the Khwarizm-shah, as well as bestowing on them the vestments offered to them by the Caliph.⁵

¹ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 183.

² Ibid., p. 261; Ibn al-Tiqṭāqa, p. 439; Abū Shāma, p. 124; but Abū al-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī (fol. 143a) puts the death of this Wazīr in 619/1222-3.

³ Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 221.

⁴ Al-Kāmil, XII, p. 183.

⁵ Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 259-60, and p. 262.

Furthermore on 6 Ramaḍān 605/14 Mar. 1209 he was commissioned to inspect Khūzistān and investigate the rumours about the intentions of its governor to revolt against the central authority of the Caliphate.¹ Ibn Amsīnā was deposed on 10 Rabī' I 606/12 Sept. 1209 and detained in prison.²

Al-Qummi.

After Ibn Amsīnā, al-Nāṣir assigned the office of Na'ib Wazir to the scribe of Diwān al-Inshā', Makīn al-Dīn Abu 'Al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Karīm al-Qummi on 12 Rabī' II 606/14 Oct. 1209. He was granted the title of "Mu'ayyid al-Dīn".³ According to Ibn al-Dubaiṭhi, the contemporary chronicler, al-Qummi was appointed as Na'ib Diwān al-Majlis (synonym of Na'ib Wazir - see above p. 176), and was given charge of all the affairs of the central Diwān.⁴ Al-Qummi was the last Na'ib Wazir appointed by al-Nāṣir, for he held this office until 629/1232; in other words he stayed as Na'ib Wazir for 23 years and witnessed the reign of three Caliphs: al-Nāṣir, al-Zāhir and al-Mustansir.⁵ Throughout the long reign of al-Nāṣir many Wazirs and

¹Ibn al-Sa'ī, p. 265.

²Ibid., p. 285; see also Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 189; cf. al-Kazirūnī, fol. 89.

³Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 286-7; al-Kazirūnī, fol. 89; cf. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 189-90.

⁴The appendix of M. Jawād to the Dhahabī's al-Mukhtaṣar..., p. 32.

⁵Abu al-Faḍā'il al-Hamawī, fol. 143a. Although Ibn al-Sa'ī, Ibn al-Athīr, and Ibn al-Dubaiṭhi (see above n.3 and n.4) describe al-Qummi as Na'ib Wazir, yet Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa, alone, describes him as Wazir, see al-Fakhri, pp. 205 ff. and 439 ff.

Nā'ib Wazirs came to power, but only few of them played a real role in the affairs of the state; their main function was simply to execute the orders of the Caliph. Perhaps this decline of this institution was brought about deliberately by al-Nāṣir himself in order to keep the upper hand in fulfilling his ambitions, without having any strong person sharing this power with him. This attitude of the Caliph, probably, resulted from his earlier experience with Ibn al-Ṣāḥib.¹

But with the appointment of al-Qummi it seems that this attitude of al-Nāṣir changed and, now, he tried to restore the dignity and prestige of this office for, on the occasion of this appointment, the Caliph issued the following decree to be recited to the dignitaries and notables who gathered in the Diwan,

"In the name of God the Compassionate the Merciful, Muhammad ibn Buraz al-Qummi is our representative (Nā'ib) in the lands and over the people. Whosoever obeys him obeys us. Whosoever obeys us obeys God. Whosoever obeys God, He will cause him to enter Paradise. Whosoever disobeys him, disobeys us. Whosoever disobeys us, disobeys God. Whosoever disobeys God, He will cause him to enter Hell."

Thus, according to ibn al-Ṭiqṭāqa, by this decree al-Qummi was ennobled in the eyes of the people and his position was strengthened.²

¹See Chapter II above, pp. 103-5.

²Al-Fakhrī, pp. 205-6, (English tr. p. 146).

Al-Qummi played an important role in subduing the rebel governor of Khuzistan in 607/1210-11 by leading a strong army to this province.¹ However, it seems that this Na'ib Wazir was able to revive the prestige of his office; he became angry because the chief judge appointed a judge to Wasit without his consent and subsequently ordered his dismissal.² This event, clearly, shows that al-Qummi was outraged because the chief judge overlooked consulting him in this appointment.

In 628/1230-31 he ordered a special window to be constructed in the Wazirate House for him to review the troops at the feast of Ramaḡan.³

This power and influence, however, aroused the alarm of al-Mustanṣir who, therefore, planned his overthrow. The Caliph commissioned the two strong personalities in his court to arrange the removal of al-Qummi from office; the first one was Ustādh al-Dār Ibn al-Nāqid, and the second was the supervisor of Diwān al-Tashrifāt Ibn al-'Alqamī. These two planned the plot carefully and, on 17 Shawwal 629/6 Aug. 1232, they executed it; they captured al-Qummi with all his sons and followers.⁴ This elaborate plan which was adopted to remove him indicates his power and influence.

¹See Chapter I above, p. 83.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 32.

³Ibid., p. 24.

⁴Ibid., pp. 33-4; ibn Kathir, XIII, p. 132; see also Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 241b; al-Kazirūnī, fol. 93a.

On this occasion the poets composed poems, and the example which is recorded by Ibn al-Fuwaṭī compares this incident to that of Abū Muslim al-Khorasānī; at the same time the poet requested the Caliph to kill the deposed Nā'ib Wazīr in order to remove any harm that might be caused by him.¹

The two officials who were involved in this plot were rewarded for their service: Ibn al-Nāqid was appointed Nā'ib Wazīr,² and Ibn al-'Alqamī was appointed as Ustādh al-Dār.³

As for the beliefs of al-Qummī, it is not clear whether he was Shī'ite or not, for Ibn al-'Imād describes him as a Shī'ite⁴ and, on the other hand, the Shī'ite Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa showers on him the highest praises and esteemed him highly;⁵ no doubt this attitude of Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa was due either to the fact that this Nā'ib Wazīr was sympathetic towards the 'Alīds,⁶ or because he was of Shī'ite beliefs.

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 35-6.

²Ibid., pp. 34-5; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p.132.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 35; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 241b.

⁴Shadharāt, V, p. 43.

⁵Al-Fakhri, pp. 439 ff.

⁶Ibid., p. 443.

Aḥmad ibn al-Nāqid.

In the very day of the deposition of al-Qummi (17 Shawwal 629/ 6 Aug. 1232) al-Mustansir promoted the Ustadh al-Dar, Shams al-Din Abū 'l-Azhar Aḥmad ibn al-Nāqid, to the position of Nā'ib Wazīr, with the privilege of being called by the titles of the Wazīr Ibn Maḥdī, which include, of course, the title of Wazīr.¹ However this indicates that by this time the distinctions between Wazīr and Nā'ib Wazīr were abolished. Furthermore, Ibn al-Fuwaṭī contradicts himself in dealing with the title of this official. When ibn al-Nāqid was appointed, he mentions that he was appointed Nā'ib Wazīr,² and confirms this when he mentions the biography of al-Mustansir by saying, "He (the Caliph) did not appoint a Wazīr during his Caliphate, but he kept al-Qummi in the Deputy Niabat Wazirate until he dismissed him, then he deputed Naṣir al-Dīn Abū 'l-Azhar Aḥmad ibn al-Nāqid [who was] promoted from Ustadh al-Dar, until the end of his (the Caliph's) life".³ Then he describes Ibn al-Nāqid as Wazīr in the biography of this official.⁴

Ibn al-Nāqid came from a rich family, and one of his uncles served al-Nāṣir as Nā'ib Wazīr (between 594-597 A.H., see above p. 188).

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 34-5; also mentioned as Nā'ib Wazīr by al-Kazirūnī, fol. 93a; and by Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 241; but he was mentioned by the title of Wazīr by: Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 132; Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, p. 446 ff; and by Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīd, Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, IV, p. 41. See above pp. 178-9.

² Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 34-5.

³ Ibid., p. 156.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 291 ff.

His father was one of the wealthy merchants of Baghḍād, who served the court as agent for the endowments of the mother of al-Nāṣir. He succeeded his father in holding this post and, in 627/1229-30, al-Mustansir appointed him as Ustādh al-Dār. Then in 629/1232 he was installed as Wazīr (or Nā'ib Wazīr). Although in 634/1236-7 his health deteriorated and he could no longer walk, nevertheless he was kept in office for the rest of his life. He died on 6 Rabi' I 642/12 Aug. 1244. He was described as a religious man, pious and very honest.¹ After his death a great honour was done to him by the Caliph in preparing the procession of his burial, where all the notables of the state attended the prayer for him in the Palace Mosque.²

Ibn al-'Alqamī.

Mu'ayyad al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-'Alqamī, the Shī'ite. He was the last Wazīr of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate. He played a leading part in the overthrow of the Nā'ib Wazīr al-Qummī and, as a result of this he was appointed as Ustādh al-Dār in 629/1232. He held this office till 642/1244 and, when Ibn al-Nāqid died, the Caliph al-Musta'ṣim appointed him as Wazīr on 8 Rabi' I 642/14 Aug. 1244.³

¹For his biography see Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 291 ff; ibn al-Ṭiqṭāqa, pp. 446 ff. Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 165; Dhahabī, XX, fol. 13; and ibn al-Furāt, fols. 47-8.

²Dhahabī, XX, fol. 13b; and ibn al-Furāt, fol. 47.

³Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 164; Dhahabī, XX, fol. 256b; Ibn al-Furāt, fol. 46a; cf. Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 279 ff.

Ibn al-'Alqamī is described as a man of letters and very able scribe, his enthusiasm for literature led him to establish a library in the Wazirate House¹ and to patronize many scholars who wrote several works and dedicated them to him.²

The attitude of al-Musta'ṣim towards this Wazīr was a favourable one,³ and the Caliph used to send him presents and gifts.⁴ Although all historians who mention the biography of Ibn al-'Alqamī state that he was an able Wazīr and a very good scribe, yet all of them, except Ibn al-Fuwaṭī and Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa, denounced him in bitterest terms as a betrayer to the Mongols in assisting them to conquer Baghḍād and to abolish the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate.

Before questioning the authenticity of this allegation, it is appropriate to establish the picture these historians tried to give of Ibn al-'Alqamī and of his motives and methods behind this treachery.

His motives are: the first was his eagerness to wreak vengeance on the Duwayḍār al-Ṣaghīr /Young Dawāḍār/, the strongest Amīr in Baghḍād, and the eldest son of the Caliph, for what they had committed, on several occasions, of atrocities against the Shī'a people of al-Karkh.⁵ The second motive was also his desire to avenge himself on

¹ Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 172; cf. Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 209.

² Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa, p. 456; cf. E.I./I, s.v. Ibn al-'Alqamī (by T. H. Weir).

³ Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa, p. 457.

⁴ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 219-20, 249-50, and p. 259.

⁵ Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 196; al-Kutubī, II, pp. 189-90; cf. Dhahabī, Duwal al-Islām, II, p. 122. For further details on the sectarian quarrels in Baghḍād see Chapter II above, pp. 151 ff.

the Dawādār because the Wazīr lost all his authority and influence to this Amīr.

Concerning his position in Baghdād, it seems that he did not enjoy much power and influence,¹ while the Dawadar became his strong rival and opponent and subsequently held the most powerful position in the state.

The following couplet, ascribed to Ibn al-'Alqamī, indicates his weak stand and his powerless position.

(himself)

Wazīr contented with folding sheets (of paper) full
of poems and prose, instead of (exercising) his
power and influence.

Like the singing of the ringed one, and she is a dove,
but she has not an obeyed word or order.²

And he composed the following couplet when Hūlagū marched towards Baghdād:

How could goodness be expected for people, who have
lost the prudence in their (affairs) what a loss!
(For) who is obeyed is not wise, and he who has wise
judgment is not obeyed.³

However the rivalry between the Wazīr and the Dawādār came to boiling point in 653/1255-6, when the Wazīr accused him of making a plot to

¹Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, p. 449.

²Dhahabī, XX, fol. 164a; and al-Kutubī, II, p. 189.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 322.

install the eldest son of the Caliph in his place. The Dawādar, on hearing this slander, was outraged and collected his troops around himself to fight the Wazīr. The Wazīr for his part, did the same. The clash between them was avoided by the mediation of the Caliph, who took great pains to settle this dispute. Furthermore the great anxiety shown by the Caliph towards the anger of the Dawādar and then the great courtesy and honour showered upon him after the settlement of the dispute, indicate clearly the influence and power of this Amir.¹

This state of affairs gave the impression to al-Dhahabī that this loss of power was one of the motives for Ibn al-'Alqamī to invite the Mongol to conquer Baghdad.²

The last motive is that he wanted to transfer the Caliphate to the 'Alīds after abolishing the 'Abbāsid Caliphate.³

Concerning the methods he followed to fulfil his ambition, some historians mentioned the following. Firstly, by sending letters and dispatches to Hulāgū, encouraging him to march on Baghdad.⁴ According to al-Maqrizī, as early as 654/1256-7 the Mongol spies came to

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 294 ff.

² Ta'rīkh al-Islām, XX, fol. 164a.

³ Ibid., fol. 213a; see also ibn Taghri-Bardī, VII, p. 47. However, according to al-Yuninī, this Wazīr intended to set up a Fatimid (sic) Caliph, see Dhayl Mir'āt al-Zamān, I, p. 90; and ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 202.

⁴ Abu 'l-Fidā, III, p. 202; Dhahabī, XX, fol. 163; Ibn Daqmaḡ, Kitāb al-Jawhar al-Thamīn, p. 69; ibn al-'Amīd, fol. 261; Tabaqāt Naṣīrī, English tr. II, p. 1232.

Baghdād and made contact with Ibn al-'Alqamī, and they tried to seduce some of the Amīrs of the Caliphate to side with them.¹

Al-Kutubī recorded the following fantastic story how the Wazīr, for once, could forward his dispatch to Hūlagū by:

"He (the Wazīr) took a man and shaved his head very close, and he wrote (on the scalp) what he wanted by needles and put on the writing antimony (i.e. tattooing the head of the man with writing). He kept the man until his hair had grown and covered the writing. Then he sent him to Hūlagū...etc."²

The second method he followed to enable the Mongol to conquer Baghdad was that of reducing the number of the Caliphate troops.³ In short, this is the picture of the alleged treachery of Ibn al-'Alqamī, as it was recorded by several historians.

Before, however, passing judgment on all these allegations, one must admit that this allegation was mentioned in contemporary sources, such as Abū Shāma,⁴ and Tabaqat-i-Nasirī⁵ and, if their statements are to be dismissed it is because these two historians were extreme Sunnis and might have had some religious motives for fabricating this accusation.

¹Sulūk, I/I, p. 400.

²Fawat al-Wafayat, II, p. 190. See also Subkī, V, pp. 110.

³Tabaqat-i-Nasirī, II, p. 1232; see also ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VII, p. 48; see also al-Subkī, V, p. 110; ibn Ḥabīb, Durat al-Aslāk fī Dawlat al-Atrak, II, fol. 16a.

⁴Dhayl, p. 199.

⁵Minhaj-i-Siraj of Juzjān (p. 1232) completed his history in 1260, see E. G. Browne, A Lit. His. of Persia, II, p. 470.

But this accusation also appeared in a neutral chronicle, neither Sunni showering Ibn al-'Alqamī with his curses, nor a Shī'ite trying to exonerate him, like Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa,¹ but a Christian historian, Ibn al-'Amīd, whose sentiment is supposed to be pro-Mongol, or, at least, because he wrote his chronicle in Arabic and in Egypt, he could drop the whole matter all together, if this allegation was not well established then, like Bar-Hebraeus, who did not report anything concerning the treachery of this Wazīr.

Ibn al-'Amīd says,

"And the reason (for Hulagu to conquer Baghḍād) is that the Caliph al-Musta'ṣim Billah ordered the pillage of al-Karkh, and all of it (its inhabitants) were the Shī'a of 'Alī ibn Abi Ṭalib; the common people pillaged it and took all their properties, riches with their women, and their children, and even they sold their daughters. And this atrocity was too much for the Wazīr, whose inclination is that with the 'Alids, to bear /therefore/ he wrote to Hulawwān (sic. i.e. Hulagū) to come to Baghḍād and to possess it; and this is a famous matter."²

Although one is not in a position to dismiss or confirm all these historians, yet many questions arise concerning this matter. If Ibn al-'Alqamī was an innocent man, why did these historians, bluntly, record this accusation? Did they record the rumours spread among the people only? If so, why did these people accuse him? Did they accuse

¹ Al-Fakhrī, pp. 457-8.

² Ibn al-'Amīd, fol. 261b, ed. L. Cahen, B.E.O. XV, 1955-7, p. 167.

him because he was a Shī'ite? Or did they do so because the Orthodox 'Abbāsid Caliphate was abolished during the term of his office? And thus he was a bad omen on it! Or just these historians, or people, as their custom was to find a person responsible for every mishap, found Ibn al-'Alqamī and let him be the scapegoat, and let everybody shower him with curses!

Or just because he was spared by the Mongol and kept in office under their rule, as well as his house, with those who took refuge in it spared from any harm¹ gave the impression to the common people that the Wazīr must have been a betrayer to them. However, on the other hand, the houses of Ṣāhib al-Dīwān, ibn al-Damghānī, and Ḥājib al-Bāb, ibn al-Dawāmī were also spared by the Mongols,² but no one accused these two high officials of any treachery.

However, it seems very likely that this charge was made against him prior to the fall of Baghdād by his opponents at court, especially by the Dawādār. For the Wazīr was against the idea of fighting the Mongols; instead he had offered the council to the Caliph to satisfy the Mongols by bribing them to keep out of Baghdād by presents and valuable gifts, instead of preparing the army. When the Caliph tried to fulfil this advice, the Dawādār and others restrained him from doing

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 329-30.

² Ibid., p. 330.

so and pointed out to him, "The purpose of the Wazīr is to arrange his own affairs with the Sultān (Hūlagū)". As a result of this the Caliph dropped the advice of his Wazīr.¹ This statement, however, indicates this allegation. The Wazīr, no doubt, offered this advice because he was quite aware of the weak stand of the Caliphate, and its incapability to defend itself by force against the mighty power of the Mongol. Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqawarmly defends him against this charge and puts the following reasons for Hūlagū's sparing him:

"The people accused him of conspiracy, but that was incorrect. And one of the strongest proofs that he was no conspirator is his secure position in this Empire, for when the Sultān Hūlagū conquered Baghdād and put the Caliph to death, he entrusted the town to the Wazīr, treated him well and gave him authority. Had he conspired against the Caliph he would not have been trusted."²

He says also that when Ibn al-'Alqamī went to Hūlagū to negotiate the terms of surrender, the Sultān was impressed by his appearance and address and, as a result of the recommendation of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭusi, the Shī'ite Wazīr of Hūlagū, the latter took him into his favour and when the town was conquered it was put under his management with a Mongol Shihna.³

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 319; Ibn al-'Ibrī, Mukhtasar, pp. 471-2; see also ibn Kathīr, p. 200.

² Al-Fakhrī, p. 457 (English tr. p. 325); cf. E. G. Browne, op.cit., II, p. 464.

³ Al-Fakhrī, p. 458. For further details on the role of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭusi in saving his co-religionist, ibn al-'Alqamī, see E.G. Browne, op.cit., pp. 464-5.

However, it seems very likely that Hūlagū kept the Wazīr with the rest of the civil staff in charge of the administration of 'Irāq because there is no doubt that the Mongol were in need of their experience and knowledge in everything concerning this country.¹ But, on the other hand, Hūlagū ordered the execution of the Caliph with his household as well as all the Amīrs of the Caliphate.²

If Ibn al-'Alqamī was guilty, then to what extent did his requests and letters to the Mongol participate in the actual surrender of Baghdād?

His part, however, was very little, for the Mongol had tested the strength of the Caliphate on several occasions. For over twenty years they repeated their raids on the frontiers of 'Irāq and, even, penetrated many times into it and reached the outskirts of Baghdād without facing serious opposition.³ Therefore, even if Ibn al-'Alqamī wrote to them about the weakness of the Caliphate, they had tested it practically. Furthermore, when Hūlagū made his final arrangement and marched on Baghdād, he marched with a huge army,⁴ which indicates his belief that he would meet great resistance in 'Irāq.

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 331-3.

² Ibid., pp. 327 ff.

³ See above pp. 89 ff.

⁴ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 325.

About the dismissing of the troops, it seems that the decline of the finance of the state made it necessary to reduce their number.¹ Moreover, some historians accused the Caliph himself of reducing the number of the troops, and not the Wazīr.²

Finally, although one is not in a position to dismiss all the statements of the historians who recorded the treachery of Ibn al-'Alqamī, yet, as Browne observes, "the matter is doubtful, and will, in all probability, never now be certainly cleared up".³

¹See below pp. 220-222.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 320-21; Abu 'l-Fidā, III, p. 202; cf. Dhahabī, XX, fol. 211a.

³A Literary History of Persia, II, p. 465.

Chapter V

THE FINANCE OF THE CALIPHATE

I

The Revenue

By the middle of the 12th century, when the 'Abbāsid Caliphate had finally liberated itself from the Seljūq domination, the Caliphate controlled Baghdād with the southern part of 'Irāq. By his active policy al-Nāṣir was able to extend his small territory northwards to Takrīt, north eastwards by conquering Dāquq and westwards to Ḥadīthat 'Āna. Lastly Khūzistān was restored to the Caliphate. These territories were the full extent of the Caliphate during al-Nāṣir's reign.¹ In 630/1233 Irbil was also annexed to the 'Abbāsid principality.² No doubt with this small dominion the revenue of the Caliphate was limited also.

The Kharāj, however, constituted the bulk of the revenue of the state, with some other resources such as: Mukūs, poll-tax of the non-Muslim communities living under the Caliphate and escheated properties.³

¹ See above, Chapter I, pp. 42, 51.

² Ibid., p. 88-9.

³ See below, "Financial administration", pp. 223 ff.

It seems that the Caliph al-Nāṣir in his policy of strengthening his Caliphate and creating an aggressive power out of it, followed a certain financial policy to provide him with the amount of money necessary to carry out all his ambitions. There was no solution but to increase the taxes imposed on his subjects. This method was, in fact, the only one available then to increase the revenue of the state.

Although there is not any clear idea concerning the government's agricultural policy, yet Ḥamd Allah Mustawfī of Qazwīn mentioned the following concerning al-Nāṣir, "in matters connected with agriculture and farming, (things) had reached such a pitch that it was forbidden any more to slaughter cattle".¹ This was to increase the production, no doubt.

However it seems that agriculture was quite flourishing, and the irrigation system was that of the early 'Abbāsid period, except that some of the canals had been destroyed earlier, such as the Nahrawān canal;² but most of the other canals were still in existence, such as Nahr 'Isa, Nahr al-Malik, Nahr Ṣarṣar and Nahr Kut̤ha, all of which took their water from the Euphrates and flowed into the Tigris southwards of Baghdād, irrigating the central part of 'Irāq. There

¹The geographical part of the Nuzhat al-Qulub, English tr. by G. le Strange, p. 36.

²Yāqūt, Mu'jam al-Buldan, IV, pp. 846-7.

were some other canals which took their course from the Tigris river.¹
The traveller Ibn Jubāir, who visited 'Irāq in 580/1184 describes in detail the central province between Kūfa, Ḥilla and Baghdād, and how this province was crowded with villages and canals, and that its agriculture was prosperous.²

Although no one mentioned the percentage of the Kharāj, yet it seems that during al-Nāṣir's reign this tax was high, for Ibn al-Athīr remarks that the village of Ba'qūba used to yield, in the old days, about 10,000 Dīnars, but when al-Nāṣir came to power it was usual to collect from it 80,000 Dīnars yearly.³ Although one may suspect the validity of this statement of Ibn al-Athīr, because this historian was quite prejudiced against al-Nāṣir, yet this information is supported by Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīd, the Baghdādī and the pro-'Abbāsīd writer, who says,

"I heard that Abū Muḥammad ibn Khulā'id who was the controller (Ṣāhib) of Dīwān al-Kharāj in the days of al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh says to any who inquired from him, 'It was said about you that Wāsiṭ and Baṣra were destroyed because of the harshness committed against their inhabitants to obtain money (from them)'. Then Abū Muḥammad said, 'As long as this river (referring to the Tigris) stays as it is and the palm-trees still planted, Wāsiṭ and Baṣra can not be destroyed'."⁴

¹For further detail on the irrigation system see Ja'far Khaṣṣbāk, "Aḥwāl al-'Irāq al-Iqtisādiyya", B.C.A. IV, 1961, pp. 117 ff.

²Ibn Jubāir, pp. 214 ff.

³Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 287; see also Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 107; Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 34.

⁴Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, IV, p. 136.

Furthermore Ibn 'Utba (or 'Unba) recorded the following interesting story of how the Wazīr Ibn Mahdī farmed out Qusān - a dependancy of Wasīt - to Jalāl al-Dīn, the Naqīb of the 'Alīds in Baghdād and how, when the latter refused to accept the contracted sum, because it was several fold higher than the usual yield of this district, the Wazīr obliged him to accept it. Jalāl al-Dīn, therefore, treated the peasants of this district harshly and collected most of their agricultural produce and crops and brought it to Baghdād and stored it there. He requested the Wazīr to close down all the grain stores in order to make the price go up; the Wazīr did so and the Naqīb was able to sell all his crops and collect the 120,000 Dīnars, the contracted sum, with an extra sum as a profit for himself.¹ From this one may presume that the tax rate (Kharāj) was very high, and that the government used to help the tax farmers to collect as much as possible from the peasantry.

The Kharāj, however, seems to have been collected in kind rather than in cash. Even the treasury was called al-Makhzan which indicates the proportionate increase of presentation in kind rather than in cash.²

Some parts of the Kharāj lands were administered directly by the central government at Baghdād, and some other districts were farmed out to Dāmins (tax farmers) to levy their taxes, in return for a con-

¹ Umdat al-Talib, Najaf ed. 1961, pp. 166 ff.

² E.I./II, s.v. Bayt al-Māl (by Cl. Cahen) I, p. 1145/II.

tracted sum of money to be paid to the government.¹ The rest of the Kharāj lands were assigned to military personnel as Iqtā's, as the equivalent of their salary and without any attached condition except for their military service to the state.²

The government also adopted the following unorthodox method in getting indirect taxes; the Makhzan used a heavier Ṣanja (منية = scale of weight) than the ordinary one which was used by the public, in receiving money from the tax-payers; and when the government paid any sum, it used the ordinary Ṣanja which was less in weight. The gain from this operation yearly was 35,000 Dīnars. This practice was abolished by al-Ẓahir.³ Although there is no detailed information about the exact revenue of the 'Abbasid Caliphate in this period yet, according to Ḥamd Allah Mustawfī, "Further, at the time when I myself was at Baghdād in charge of the tax office there, I saw an official copy of the assessment drawn up in the reign of the Caliph Naṣir, and herein the province of Arabian 'Irāq was set down as yielding above 30 million currency dīnars".⁴ However, one may suspect the validity of

¹ See below pp. 229-30.

² E.I./II, s.v. Bayt al-Mal (by Cl. Cahen). For further detail on the nature of the Iqtā' of this period see Cl. Cahen, "L'évolution de l'iqṭa' du IX au XIII siècle". Annales E.S.C., 8 (1953) pp. 25 ff; and Ja'far Khaṣbak in B.C.A. IV, 1961, pp. 126 ff.

³ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 288; cf. Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 107.

⁴ Nuzhat al-Qulūb, English tran. by G. le Strange, p. 36; and the same author remarks that the revenue of this province in the year 1335 A.D. amounted to some 3 million dinars only.

this statement, for the figure is incredible, in comparison with earlier figures about the assessment of the revenue of the Sawād. In the time of 'Umar I the amount of the revenue of the Sawād was 128,000,000 Dirhams,¹ which was equivalent to some 10,666,666 Dinars;² while in the list of 'Alī ibn 'Isa of 306/918 the assessment of the Sawād was set down as about 1,500,000 Dīnārs.³ And the assessment of the year 358/968 was about 42,000,000 Dirhams,⁴ which was equivalent to some 2,800,000 Dīnārs.⁵

From the following figures of the yield of the provinces of Wasīṭ and Baṣra, the only figures which are available so far of the assessment of the provinces of the Caliphate, one can judge that the figure of Ḥamd Allah was rather exaggerated. In Rajab 597/April-May 1201 the Damān of Baṣra was given to the Amīr 'Imād al-Dīn Ṭuḡhrīl for a contracted sum of 115,000 Dīnārs.⁶ And about 592/1195-6 Ibn Ra'īs al-Ru'asā' was the Nāẓir of Wasīṭ and his duty was to provide the government at Baghdād with 30,000 Dīnārs monthly,⁷ that is to say

¹Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī, Mu'jam al-Bulḍān, III, p. 178.

²The rate of exchange during 'Umar's time 1 Dīnār = 12 Dirhams, see A. A. Dūrī, Ta'rīkh al-'Iraq al-Iqtisādī, p.222, n.1.

³Dūrī, op.cit., pp. 193-4.

⁴Ibid., pp. 194-5.

⁵The rate of exchange in 358/968 was 1 Dīnār = 15 Dirhams, see Dūrī, p. 222.

⁶Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 46-7.

⁷Ibn Khallikān, II, pp. 334-5.

360,000 Dinars annually.

Whether the statement of Ḥamd Allah is correct or otherwise, al-Nāṣir pressed hard on his subjects to provide him with a great amount of money to fulfil his policy; and this explains why some of the historians describe him as greedy, a tyrant and of bad character.¹ Even Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa, who shows a great admiration for this Caliph, says,

"Al-Nāṣir's benefactions and foundations exceeded computation. He built soup-kitchens, mosques and Ribāṭs, of which the number passed all limit, yet, despite this, he was parsimonious. His time was spent in organizing the affairs of his kingdom, in appointing and dismissing officials, in levying fines and acquiring wealth. It is said of him that he filled a cistern with gold, and one day saw that there remained something lacking in it to fill it full, so he said, 'May you see me live to fill it', but he died before doing so. It is said that al-Mustansir saw that cistern, and said, 'May you see me live to empty it'."²

However, it seems that this attitude of these historians was the same towards every ruler - or Caliph - who adopted a sound financial policy. This policy of al-Nāṣir, no doubt, resulted in a certain surplus in the finance of the government; he was able to save a lot of money, which enabled his successor, al-Ẓāhir, to follow an exactly contradictory policy. Al-Ẓāhir followed a pious policy and had some laxity in the matter of assessing the revenue. According to Ibn al-Aṭṭar, he adopted the following fiscal measures to bring relief to his subjects.

¹See Ibn al-Aṭṭar, XII, p. 286; Ibn al-ʿAmīd, fol. 227b; Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 13-4.

²Al-Fakhrī, p. 434, (English tr. p.310).

Ibn al-Athīr begins his statement by the customary formula that this Caliph abolished the Mukūs in all his domains, as well as ordering the old scale of taxation to be returned to, and all the increases, which had been introduced during the reign of his father, to be abolished.

"Ba'quba village used, in the old times, to pay 10,000 dīnārs, but when al-Naṣīr li-Dīn Allah came to power, (he) collected from it 80,000 dīnārs annually, so its population came (to al-Zāhir) with a complaint and mentioned that their properties were taken in order to provide this amount of money. He (the Caliph) ordered the original Kharāj, which is 10,000 dīnārs, to be levied from it... and of his pious deeds he ordered the exaction of the original Kharāj from the rest of the lands. Many of the people of Irāq came and mentioned that most of the properties, which used to be taxed by the original Kharāj in the old days, are now dried up and denuded, and if the original Kharāj is to be demanded from them, the income of the rest (of the properties) is not enough to provide it. He (therefore) ordered that the Kharāj should be exacted from every good tree (or sound grove) and that the destroyed one was not to be taxed."¹

He also ordered that the scale of weight of the treasury (Sanjat al-Makhzan which was used for weighing gold and silver money) should be exactly, in weight, like that of the city - the ordinary one.² Thus al-Zāhir followed a mild economic policy and a very pious one. However, it seems that the surplus of wealth accumulated during the long

¹ Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 287-8; see also Ibn Kathīr, XIII, p. 107; Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 34 ff; cf. Abu 'l-Fida, III, pp. 143-4.

² Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 288; see also above p. 113. For further fiscal reforms ordered by al-Zāhir see below pp. 235, 240.

reign of his father, helped him in adopting these fiscal reforms.

Al-Mustanşir also adopted the policy of his father, al-Zāhir; this is indicated by the praise of the historians for his good and pious character. He was described as a good spender and a very just Caliph.¹ Ibn al-Ṭiqṭqaq describes him thus,

"Al-Mustanşir was energetic, most lavish, rivalling the wind in generosity and charity. His gifts and presents were too well known to need mention, and too great to be reckoned. If it were said that there were none among the 'Abbāsid Caliphs like him, the sayer would be speaking truly. His are noble monuments, the greatest of which is the Mustanşiriyya which is too great to be described, and too well known to need description.... His reign was good, in his time the world was at peace, good deeds abounded, and the provinces were populous."²

From a glance at his expenditure, one can presume that this caliph was indeed very generous (within the limited means of his Caliphate). For instance the establishment of al-Mustanşiriyya College, no doubt, cost him a great deal of money.³ According to al-Dhahabī the endowment (waqf) which was assigned to this college exceeded 138,000 Jarībs of agrarian lands, which was worth about 900,000 dīnars, and the income of this endowment exceeded 70,000 dīnars yearly.⁴ He established

¹Sibt, p. 424, and pp. 489-90; Ibn al-ʿIbrī, Mukhtaṣar, pp. 424-5; Abu 'l Fida, III, p. 172; Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 222b ff; Ibn al-Furāt, fol. 21b ff; Ibn Taghri-Bardī, VI, p. 345.

²Al-Fakhri, p. 445 (English trans. p. 317).

³Ibn Ḥammad, fols. 92 ff.

⁴Ta'rikh al-Islām, XIX, the margins of fols. 243b-244a, which was written in the same hand-writing.

also many other pious foundations such as Ribāts, mosques and inns for the travellers.¹ However, it seems that this pious financial policy of al-Mustanṣir resulted in peace in Baghdād and the stability of economic life and even the sectarian rivalries were very few and limited during his reign.² He spent huge sums of money on his army, no doubt to meet the increasing danger to the Caliphate from the Mongols, and to stop their frequent attacks on his frontiers. His army exceeded, in number, 100,000 troops.³

Many rulers of the Muslim world visited Baghdād during his reign⁴ and huge sums were lavishly spent on them. In 628/1230-31 Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökborī came to Baghdād to pay the Caliph his respects; the Caliph, in his turn, welcomed him well and made many feasts for him and, when Muẓaffar al-Dīn left Baghdād, the Caliph provided him with robes of honour and 50,000 dīnārs as travel expenses for the journey, and another 10,000 dīnārs for the expenditure of his courtiers.⁵

Judging from this large expenditure of al-Mustanṣir, the revenue of the state, at his time, must have been very great, or the surplus of

¹See Ibn Ḥammād, fol. 94a; Ibn al-Ṭiqṭāqa, p. 445, al-Kazirūnī, fol. 92b; ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VI, p. 345.

²See Chapter II, pp. 148-9.

³Dhahabī, Duwal al-Islām, II, p. 111; Ibn al-Furāt, fol. 21b; Maqrīzī, I/II, pp. 311-2.

⁴See above Chapter I, pp. 92-3.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 22.

his grandfather, al-Nāṣir, still existed, or at least the economic situation of his Caliphate was quite stable and flourishing; otherwise he could not have afforded all these expenses unless he returned to the oppressive method in collecting extra taxes. However, it seems that he had adopted, partially, the last resolution, for although at his succession he had abolished the Ma'una - the taxation of the production and transactions - he had imposed it again at the middle of his reign,¹ and he had increased the poll-tax also.²

No doubt with this generous policy and attitude the treasury must have suffered a lot and, perhaps, by his death his treasury was empty or even in deficit, which made it quite hard for his successor to follow a clear line of financial policy. During al-Musta'ṣim's reign the decline occurred clearly in the finance of the government, whether this decline was due to the incapability of this caliph to handle his affairs, as some historians emphasised,³ or because of the bad intentions of the Shī'ite Wazīr Ibn al-'Alqamī,⁴ no doubt the consequences of this decline were very prejudicial.

¹See below, pp. 233 ff.

²See below, pp. 241-2.

³Abu 'l-Fidā, III, p. 203; Ibn Tagh̄rī-Bardī, VII, p. 48; Dhahabī, XX, fol. 211.

⁴See chapter IV, pp. 200 ff.

However, it seems that al-Musta'sim came to power and his treasury was empty; this is clearly indicated by the following incident. In Sha'ban 640/Jan.-Feb. 1243 the Mamluks of his father and grandfather (al-Mamalik al-Zahiriyya wa 'l-Mustansiriyya) demanded an increase in their pay, but the government refused this demand. Therefore these troops rioted and went to the outside of the walls of Baghdad; they continued this ~~mutiny~~ for seven days until the dispute was settled peacefully but without fulfilling the demand of the troops.¹

As a result of the instability of the government, and the quarrel between the military and civil authorities, the disorders were repeated in Baghdad and affected the economic life of the Caliphate.² What worsened the financial position of the government was the repeated climatic crises such as floods and storms. In 641/1243 floods reached Nizamiyya and ruined some quarters.³ In 645/1247-8 a violent storm took place and caused a lot of harm to agriculture, as well as breaking a lot of palm-trees.⁴ In 646/1248-9 Baghdad was flooded, and great destruction happened to many of its quarters.⁵ In 651/1253-4

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 168-70.

² See above Chapter II, pp. 151-3.

³ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 186-7.

⁴ Ibid., p. 224.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 229 ff.

the Tigris river flooded and a large area of agrarian land was destroyed by this flood.¹ In 652/1254-5 another flood took place and caused a lot of harm to agriculture.² In 653/1255-6 both the Euphrates and Tigris rivers flooded. The Euphrates caused much harm to 'Āna, Ḥadītha, Hīt, Ḥilla and Kūfa, this flood spoiled about 70,000 palm-trees. It was followed by a storm which uprooted 3,000 palm-trees in Kūfa alone. The Tigris flooded Baghdād and destroyed about 12,370 houses, and as a result of this flood the rents of houses were doubled and the prices of foodstuffs were increased.³ In 654/1256-7 Baghdād suffered the worst flood, both the eastern and western parts of the city were covered with water; ships and boats were used as means of communication on the streets of the city. Many offices, public buildings, and houses were destroyed, and prices went up.⁴ With these climatic crises and bad weather, no doubt, agriculture must have been affected, and in its turn affected the revenue of the government and limited its income. Thus with this financial decline the Caliph could not but reduce his expenditure. He, therefore, reduced the number of the troops.

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 267-8.

²Ibid., p. 273.

³Ibid., p. 277 and p. 303.

⁴Ibid., pp. 317-9; cf. Sibṭī, p. 528; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VII, p. 35.

Although some historians ascribe this action to the bad intentions of the Wazīr, Ibn al-'Alqamī,¹ and others ascribe it to the Caliph himself and his anxiety to accumulate wealth,² yet Ibn Khaldūn describes the situation brilliantly by saying,

"The circumstances became difficult to al-Musta'sim, [therefore] he reduced the number of the troops, and ordered the pay of the rest [of the troops] to be imposed on the [taxes of] sold articles, on the markets and on the other [means of] livelihood. [Thus] the people were disturbed, and conditions became unbearable, and the disorders increased in Baghdād."³

This state of affairs, undoubtedly, participated noticeably in the economic decline of the country. Therefore the prices of food-stuffs were increased and fluctuated.⁴ This instability of the economic life, in fact, resulted in the increase of the disorders in Baghdād during the reign of al-Musta'sim.⁵

¹See Chapter IV, pp. 203, 208.

²See Maqrīzī, Suluk, I/II, p. 412; Ibn Taghrī-Bardī, VII, p. 64; al-'Umārī, Masalik, XXVII, fol. 129a; cf. Abu 'l-Fidā, III, p. 202.

³Al-'Ibar, III, p. 537.

⁴See Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 193-4, 202, 218, 226, 303; see also Dhahabī, XIX, fol. 263a.

⁵Cf. Chapter II, pp. 151-3.

II

Financial Administration

Although the volume of wealth and revenue was decreased by the dismemberment of the 'Abbāsid empire, which by now consisted of 'Irāq 'Arab (al-Sawād) and Khūzistān only, the administrative machine still operated and continued to exist on the same scale as in the 10th century. The late 'Abbāsid administrative departments (Dīwāns) were basically related to the early 'Abbāsid Dīwāns, but in this period many changes and developments occurred in this machine. The developments, however, occurred mainly in its terminology rather than in its nature. In spite of the fact that the information about these institutions, of this period, is scarce and lacks detail, nevertheless there are some clues which enable one to form a concise, but quite useful, idea. Below are the departments which mainly dealt with the finance of the state.

Al-Dīwān.

The Dīwān was the central bureau of the government, which was also called al-Dīwān al-'Azīz (the mighty Dīwān).¹ It was headed by the Wazīr or the acting Wazīr (Nā'ib Wazīr).² Al-'Umārī specified

¹ Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 17, 24, 35, 41, 42, 43 etc. See also E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān (by A.A. Dūrī).

² See above Chapter IV, p. 180 ; cf. E.I./II, op.cit.

the term al-Diwan al-'Aziz thus,

"The Caliph is addressed, in writing, by al-Diwan al-'Aziz.... and the reason for addressing (him) by al-Diwan al-'Aziz is the submissiveness (which required not) to address the Caliph himself, but to address the Diwan, which means Diwan al-Insha'." ¹

The same sense is expressed by de Slane, who describes this term thus:

"This term designed (sic) the government of the Khalif of Baghdad, and, in the time of Saladin, it was applied to the Khalif himself." ²

Since the reign of al-Nasir up to the fall of Baghdad, however, the simple term al-Diwan means the Diwan of the Zimam. Diwan al-Zimam in this period, in fact, lost its identity as a department of control and audit, and took on another function. It replaced Diwan al-Kharaj. ³ For in 606/1209-10 Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ibn Mas'ūd ibn Khulaid was appointed in charge of Diwan al-Zimam al-Ma'mur, as is described by Ibn al-Sa'i; ⁴ but the same official is described by Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, the contemporary writer, as "Sahib Diwan al-Kharaj". ⁵ Judging from the following examples, one may point out that both the terms al-Diwan

¹Al-Ta'rif bi'llmustalah al-Sharif, p. 5.

²Ibn Khallikan, English tr. by de Slane, III, index; see also Dozy, Sup. I, p. 479.

³E.I./II, s.v. Diwan (by A.A.Durī).

⁴Al-Jami'al-Mukhtasar, p. 287.

⁵Sharḥ Nahj al-Balagha, IV, p. 136.

and Dīwān al-Zimām, in this period, were synonymous, and, perhaps this was done by the historians for reasons of abbreviation. In 603/1206-7 al-Ṣafī al-Armawī was appointed as Mushrif¹ Dīwān al-Zimām, as ibn al-Sā'ī says,² but under the year 604/1207-8 the same author mentioned this official by the title of Mushrif al-Dīwān al-'Aziz.³

Ibn al-Fuwaṭī did the same: in 627/1229-30 Fakhr al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn al-Damghānī was appointed as Mushrif al-Dīwān,⁴ in the year 630/1232-3 he mentioned him by the same office,⁵ but under the year 631/1233-4 he mentioned the same official as Mushrif Dīwān al-Zimām.⁶

Abu 'l-Ma'ālī Hibat Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Dawāmī, who died in 646/1248-9, was appointed as Ṣāhib Dīwān to al-Nāṣir, according to Ibn al-Fuwaṭī,⁷ but according to al-Dhahabī this official was appointed as Ṣadr Dīwān al-Zimām.⁸

In 633/1235-6 Fakhr al-Dīn ibn al-Mukḥarramī was appointed in charge of Dīwān al-Zimām,⁹ but the same author (pp. 101, 184, and pp.

¹Inspector, according to A. A. Dūrī, "Ishraf replaces the old Zimām." See E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān.

²Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 201.

³Ibid., p. 285.

⁴Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 15.

⁵Ibid., p. 43.

⁶Ibid., p. 62.

⁷Ibid., p. 227.

⁸Dhahabī, XX, fol. 64a.

⁹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 82.

196 ff) mentioned this official as Ṣāhib al-Diwan only. Then in p.202 he mentioned the same official as "Ṣadran bi Diwan al-Zimam" (صدرأ بديوان الزمام) (in charge of Diwan of the Zimam).¹

This Diwan looked after the assessing of the revenue and the expenditure of the government.² This explains why it was a central bureau, which caused some historians to call it al-Diwan only. This naming was, in fact, old because Diwan al-Kharaj during the Umayyad period was usually called al-Diwan to indicate its importance;³ furthermore, during the Buwayhid period the central bureau for finance was called al-Diwan also.⁴ But in the Seljuqid administration the Diwan al-Zimam wa'l-Istifa' was concerned with finance and the keeping of accounts.⁵

The head of this bureau was called "Ṣāhib Diwan al-Zimam",⁶ or "Ṣadr Diwan al-Zimam".⁷ This Diwan, as Durī pointed out, had two sections; the main Diwan under its superintendant (Ṣadr or Ṣāhib), and

¹ See also Uzunçarşili, Osmanlı Devleti Taşkilatına Medhal, pp. 7-8; M. Jawad comments on this Diwan "Katib al-Salla (the clerk of the basket), is a clerk in Diwan al-Zimam, and this Diwan was the head of all the Diwans and called al-Diwan /only/." Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 147, n.1.

² Nasawī, p. 191.

³ E.I./II, s.v. Diwan (by A.A.Durī).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ A.K.S.Lambton, Contribution to the study of Seljuq Institutions (Ph.D. Thesis, London University, 1939), p. 56; Uzunçarşili, op.cit., p. 43 and pp. 45-6; cf. A. Iqbal, Wizarat, p. 31.

⁶ Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 98-9.

⁷ Ibid., p. 119.

the other section headed by a Mushrif (supervisor) who supervised the work of this department and the revenue.¹

The position of the controller of this department was very high, for in 653/1255-6 the people of al-Nīl killed their Shihna because he was a tyrant, they had "complained to the Caliph, the Wazīr and to the Ṣāhib al-Dīwān" but without any response to them, therefore they killed this Shihna.² However, Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, in putting these high ranking personages in this sequence, indicates that the office of Ṣāhib al-Dīwān came next to that of Wazīr.

There was a deputy to the head of this Dīwān.³ The Ṣadr and Mushrif of this department, sometimes, went to the districts to collect revenues.⁴ This department looked after preparing the Hajj caravan, as well as clearing the wells of the posts of the Hajj route to Hijāz.⁵

Each district of the 'Abbāsid principality had such a Dīwān in charge of its revenue.⁶ Some of these districts were administered

¹E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 302.

³Ibid., p. 184.

⁴Ibid., pp. 178-9 and pp. 151-2, cf. p.82.

⁵Ibid., p. 173.

⁶E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān (by A. A. Dūrī).

directly by Ṣāhib Dīwān al-Zimām, and he used to appoint a Nāẓir and Mushrif to their Dīwāns.¹ But the important districts, however, it seems, had a certain independence from this Dīwān judging from the following examples; and the Dīwāns of these districts were administered by Ṣadr.

1. The district of Nahr 'Isa, Nahr al-Malik, Hīt and al-Anbār; in other words, the district of central 'Irāq westwards of Baghdād. This district, sometimes, was administered by Ṣadr, who used to have "Dīwān Mufrad" (Dīwān of the special bureau).² Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī ibn al-Būrī was appointed by al-Nāṣir (after 618/1221-2) as Ṣadr of this district and he was given a free hand to administer this district without any interference of Dīwān al-Zimām.³
In 635/1237-78 the Ṣadr of the Dīwān Mufrad of this district was deposed, and the affairs of this district were returned to Ṣāhib al-Dīwān, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Mubārak ibn al-Mukharrazī.⁴
2. The district of Wasīt had a Dīwān which was headed by a Ṣadr.⁵

¹Cf. E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān (by A. A. Dūrī); see also Ibn al-Sa'ī, p. 285.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 63.

³Ibid., pp. 145-6.

⁴Ibid., p. 101.

⁵Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 126-7; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 244.

3. Khūzistān, after it had been restored to the Caliphate, usually was administered by a Diwān with a Ṣadr dealing with its financial affairs.¹

4. After Irbil was acquired in 630/1232-3 its financial affairs were assigned to a Ṣadr to its Diwān.²

But the rest of the 'Abbāsid principality was administered by Nāzirs assisted by Mushrifs.³

Ibn al-Sā'ī, however, points out clearly that Ṣadr of Diwān is quite a different thing from Nāzīr of Diwān. He says, "Abū 'l-Shukur Mahmūd ibn Aḥmad ibn Sa'āda (died in 600/1203-4)... was Nāzīr in the districts of Wasiṭ and Ṣadran (سدران) of its Diwān...".⁴ Judging from the following example, it seems that the only occupation of the Nāzīrs was to collect the revenue of their districts. Ibn al-Sā'ī says,

"Aflaḥ ibn Aflaḥ (died in 595/1198-9) the Nāzīr of Qusān (a dependency of Wasiṭ) had the courage and ability to take the wealth (revenues) for himself. He was several times in prison for that, but when he was released and appointed to any post he used to do the same. The Hajib Qaysar said, 'Al-Nāzīr al-Sāmīrī, the Mushrif of Diwān al-Zimam al-Ma'mur, told me an astonishing story about the above mentioned (man i.e. Aflaḥ), he said, "They (the author-

¹Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 60; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 168.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 71-2, 141-2, 168, 106-7.

³Cf. E.I./II, s.v. Diwān; see Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 44, 76, 78, 130, 115, 213, 219-20, 260-61, 278, 285...etc.

⁴Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 126.

ity) sent me with him (with Aflah) to Qusan, and by then I was one of the 'Adls in the city of Peace (i.e. Baghdād) in order to evaluate and assess the revenue of this district. As soon as we reached it he oppressed the people there and collected 10,000 Dinars, nothing of it (this sum) was with the clerk or the Mushrif. I said to him, 'What is this money which you have collected? It is not mentioned in the record!' He said, 'This money is for me and for you and for the Mushrif and for the Katib (as well as) for the bribes and for the subsistence of prison.' I said, 'What is the meaning of this talk?' He said, 'This district is farmed out to me by so many thousands of Dinars. I want to (get quickly) for myself ten thousand Dinars; to give you a thousand, and to the Mushrif a thousand and to the scribe a thousand; and to bribe with a thousand and to spend on myself, in prison, another thousand; and (thus) will remain 5,000 Dinars to my family. If I lose, at the end of the year, this ten thousand the case will be easy. If it is more than that (at least) I have already got this amount.'etc."¹

This statement indicates that this district was farmed out to the Nāzir to levy its revenue - Kharāj - in return for a certain amount of money to be paid to the government. Thus in this case, the Nāzir acted exactly like a Dāmin.²

The government, in fact, adopted the method of farming out most of the districts to Dāmins to levy their taxes.³ Sometimes, the authority

¹Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 16-7.

²Cl. Cahen defines the tax-farmer (Dāmin) thus, "An individual who, often for one or more provinces and for a number of years, pays annually to the state a contracted sum, less than the calculated revenue from the tax, and afterwards undertakes its recovery on his own account, which will, of course, reimburse him with profit." E.I./II, s.v. Bayt al-Māl, I, p. 1144/II.

³See Ibn al-Sa'ī, p. 40, 46-7, cf. p. 22; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 129.

obliged certain notables to accept a heavy Daman on certain districts. By this method, no doubt, the government could secure a high assessment; but it would result in much abuse, tyranny and oppression on the part of the tax-farmers, and the people would be its victims.¹

Al-Makhzan (the treasury).

Al-Makhzan or al-Makhzan al-Ma'mur, as it is usually called by Ibn al-Sa'i, ² was the treasury, and the main department for keeping all the revenues of the state. The term al-Makhzan, in fact, replaced the term of Bayt al-Mal.³ Cahen remarks about this bureau, "... the general term of Makhzan appears to have almost replaced, in the administration of the late Caliphate, the term of Bayt al-Mal, the change reflecting, undoubtedly, the proportionate increase of presentation in kind and the diminution of fiscal receipts in hard cash".⁴

The superintendent of this bureau was called Ṣadr al-Makhzan.⁵ However, it seems that al-Makhzan took over some functions of Dīwān al-Nafaqāt (the Dīwān of expenditure which does not exist in this period); for the expenditure on the pious purposes was carried over from this

¹ Ibn 'Utba (or 'Unba), 'Umdat al-Talib, ed. Najaf 1961, pp. 166-8.

² Al-Jami' al-Mukhtasar, pp. 2, 15, 40, 43, 81...etc.

³ E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān (by A. A. Dūrī).

⁴ Ibid., s.v. Bayt al-Mal (by Cl. Cahen), I, p. 1145-/II.

⁵ Ibn al-Sa'i, pp. 88, 143, 227-8, 229-30, 250-51, 220, 260; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 86, 84, 99, 203, 287; but the head of this department was mentioned by the name Ṣāhib al-Makhzan by: Sibṭī, p. 349; Abū Shāma, pp. 62, 120; Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 187, 275; Abū 'l-Faḍā'il al-Ḥamawī, fol. 142b. See Uzuncarsili, p. 12.

bureau.¹ It was also responsible for paying the pensions to the retired poor officials of the state.² Furthermore the expenditure on public purposes, however, was the direct concern of the head of this department, for when al-Nāṣir intended to establish the soup-kitchens for the needy people of Baghdād in 604/1207-8 the Ṣadr of the Makhzan, Qawām al-Dīn Naṣr ibn Nāṣir, was commissioned to establish these houses, and, no doubt, supervise their function.³ Moreover, the expenditure on the celebration on the arrival of a great visitor to Baghdād was also provided by this bureau,⁴ and also the robes of honour - Khila' - which were offered by the Caliph were usually brought from the Makhzan,⁵ where there was a tailor to make them.⁶

The position of the Ṣadr of the Makhzan was very high, for in 573/1177-8 Ibn al-ʿAṭṭār, who was in charge of al-Makhzan, was appointed as acting Wazīr (Nāʾib Wazīr),⁷ and in 594/1197-8 the Ṣadr of this bureau, Abu ʿl-Qāsim al-Ḥasan ibn al-Nāqid, was given authority over all Dīwāns, and called Deputy Wazīr.⁸ Furthermore, it seems that the position of

¹Ibn al-Saʿī, pp. 18, 289.

²Ibid., p. 43; see also Ibn Khallikān, II, p. 26.

³Ibn al-Saʿī, pp. 229-30.

⁴Ibid., p. 264.

⁵Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 77.

⁶Ibn al-Jawzī, X, p. 233.

⁷Ibid., p. 275.

⁸Ibn al-Saʿī, pp. 250-1; see also Chapter IV, p. 188; E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān.

the Şadr of the Makhzan was very important, and perhaps profitable also, which caused Abū Ja'far Aḥmad ibn Ja'far to offer money in order to be appointed in charge of this bureau.¹

Sometimes the Şadr of this bureau was given the right to administer, directly, certain districts of the Caliphate, besides his work as treasurer.² There was a deputy to the controller,³ and a Mushrif to supervise the work of this bureau.⁴

However, it seems that during al-Naṣir's reign the controller of this department was in charge of collecting the Mukūs.⁵ The Mukūs constituted another source of revenue for the state. The Mukūs, or the illegal taxes - according to the Muslim jurists - were the taxes imposed on industrial and agricultural production, or in general all the taxes imposed on transactions.⁶ The term Mukūs was still in use now, but sometimes it was replaced by the term Ma'ūna (pl. Mu'an).⁷

¹Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 127.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 287.

³Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 265-6; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 217.

⁴Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 265; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 62, 82, 95, 119; A. A. Dūrī remarks that the Ishraf replaced the old Zimam (the department of control and audit), see E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān.

⁵Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 227-8.

⁶Cl. Cahen, "L'Histoire Economique et Sociale de l'Orient Musulman Medieval", S.I., III, 1955, p. 110.

⁷In the early 'Abbasid period Ma'ūna was a regular support of officials, who had their expenses covered by it, and it was imposed on the tax payers. See F. Lokkegaard, Islamic Taxation, pp. 186-7. According to 'Abbas al-'Azzawī, the Mu'an was gift in origin, but it was increased in the late 'Abbasid period and took on the nature of a fixed tax. Ta'rikh al-Dara'ib al-'Iraqiyya, Baghdad, 1959, p. 23.

Al-Nāṣir abolished this tax on 17 Rajab 604/6 Feb. 1208. Ibn al-Sā'ī says that on 17 Rajab 604 the Caliph al-Nāṣir ordered the abolition of, "What was collected of al-Mu'an by the Bā'a on the commodities of every kind". The Caliph commissioned Qiwām al-Dīn Abū Firas Naṣr ibn Naṣir, the Ṣadr of the Makhzan, to summon all the Bā'a - the officials in charge of levying this tax - and to tell them what the Caliph had ordered. The amount of this tax reached 200,000 Dinārs yearly.¹ Thus from this evidence, one may understand the Ma'una was the tax imposed on every kind of transaction, and that the term of Bā'a designated the officials who were in charge of collecting this tax.

However, it seems that this tax bore heavily upon the means of the populace of Baghdād, who expressed their discontent by rebelling against the government on 17 Rajab 604/6 Feb. 1208 and attacked the police force of Bab al-Nūbī and Atbā' al-Bā'a and were able to kill and injure many of them.² This incident, probably, caused the Caliph to announce the abolition of this tax the same day. But Ibn al-Athīr gives another reason for the Caliph to abolish this tax; he says,

"A daughter of 'Izz al-Dīn Najāḥ al-Sharābī (the cup-bearer of the Caliph) died; they bought cows to be slaughtered and to give the flesh as alms for her (for the deceased woman), they listed on the bill of the

¹Ibn al-Sā'ī, pp. 227-8; cf. Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 183-4; but al-Maqrīzī puts the figure as 3,000,000 Dinārs, see Sulūk, I/I, p. 167.

²Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 228.

price the Ma'una of the cows (i.e. the tax due on these cows) and it was great (amount), the Caliph noticed that (the heavy dues), he¹ (therefore) ordered the abolition of all the Ma'una."

However, it seems that this abolition was of short duration because when al-Zāhir (622-23) came to power he ordered the abolition of all the Mukūs,² this indicates its existence on his accession. During the reign of al-Mustansir this tax was introduced again. In 635/1237-8 the Caliph appointed Taj al-Dīn 'Alī ibn al-Dawāmī, the Ḥajib of Bāb al-Nūbī and the superintendent of the police force, in charge of Hujar al-Bay'³ - the posts of the Ba'a in Baghdad. When al-Musta'sim was declared Caliph after the death of his father he ordered the abolition of this tax. The Wazīr ordered Ibn al-Dawāmī, who was in charge of assessing this tax, to be protected with his house from the anger of the common people, "for fear on his behalf from the common people, because he was in charge of assessing the Mu'an and the deputies (who collected it) belonged to him, and in his time it was introduced (sic)."⁴

However, it seems that this tax constituted a good source of revenue to the last 'Abbāsid Caliph, for one notices, for the first time, that this tax was given to a special official called "Nāzir Hujar al-Bay'".⁵

¹Ibn al-Athīr, XII, pp. 183-4.

²See Sibṭī, p. 419; Dhahabī, Duwal al-Islām, II, p. 97; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, pp. 112-3; Ibn al-'Ibrī, p. 428.

³Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 100.

⁴Ibid., pp. 162-3.

⁵Ibid., p. 270.

The mint was under the supervision of the treasury [al-Makhzan].¹ The mint, no doubt, yielded a certain income to the government.² The bimetallic system of currency was still in usage in the 'Abbasid Caliphate until the fall of Baghdād. But at this period the gold coins - Dīnārs - were used more than the silver dirhams. The people had used the Dīnār and its subdivisions, as well as clippings from it - فراضه - in their daily life,³ and the clipped dīnārs were used largely.⁴ It seems that the quality and fineness of the dirhams was deteriorated, in this period, which made the people use instead of it the clippings of the Dīnārs. This, perhaps, resulted from the shortage of the silver supply, which made it disappear from the market and, subsequently, its price went up.⁵

The gold of al-Naṣīr was, in general, below the standard of the early 'Abbasid period; and from the specimens studied by Ehrenkreutz the fineness of al-Naṣīr's dīnārs fluctuated between 90% and 93%.⁶ The weights of his dīnārs also fluctuated between 1.32 gms. and 18.38 gms.⁷

¹E.I./II, s.v. Dīwān (by A. A. Dūrī).

²Ibid., s.v. Dār al-Darb.

³Ibn Jubāir, p. 218.

⁴Ibn Khallikān, I, p. 561.

⁵P. R. Blake, "The circulation of silver in the Moslem East down to the Mongol Epoch." H.J.A.S., 2 (1937), pp. 291 ff; cf. E.I./II, s.v. Dirham (by G. C. Milles).

⁶Andrew S. Ehrenkreutz, "Monetary History of the Near East in the Middle Ages". J.E.S.H.O., II/2 (May 1959), pp. 145 ff.

⁷Cf. Ibid., pp. 147-8; see N. Naqshabandi, The Islamic Dīnār in the Iraq Museum, Baghdad, 1953, pp. 178 ff., and p. 203. See also S. Lane Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, I, pp. 163 ff.

However, it seems that the peace and the prosperity of the trade during the reign of al-Mustansir, had encouraged the flow of silver into 'Irāq. The Caliph, therefore, tried to reform the coinage system in order to bring more stability into the economic life of his Caliphate. He issued a new silver Dirham, with better quality than the existing Dirhams, and fixed its rate of exchange, every dīnār to be worth 10 Dirhams. The people were happy with this action of the government.¹ This high rate of exchange of the new dirham, no doubt, indicates that the price of silver was still high.

Furthermore, the standard of fineness of the Dīnars of al-Mustansir was also high, in comparison with the standard of al-Nāsir's Dīnars.²

During the reign of the last Caliph the condition and standard of fineness of the Dirham deteriorated, and this is indicated by the decrease in its value. This was, no doubt, due to the bad quality of the Dirhams of this Caliph. The government, it seems, in its desperate need of money issued bad Dirhams to meet its deficit. But the result was that the numbers of Dirhams increased while the Dīnars disappeared.

¹ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 70-71; al-Yāfi'ī, IV, p. 75; Dhahabī, XIX, fols. 244b-245a. A number of these Dirhams are in the British Museum (see tray No. 36), see S. Lane Poole, I, pp. 169 ff.

² A. S. Ehrenkreutz, op.cit., pp. 145 ff; For examples of al-Mustansir Dīnars, see Naqshabani, pp. 53, 185, and plate (8). See also S. Lane Poole, I, p. 167.

This state of affairs led al-Musta'sim to issue a new Dirham in 645/1247-8, with a better standard of fineness, at the rate of exchange of 12 per Dīnār.¹ The Dīnār of al-Musta'sim was, more or less, stabilized, and its fineness was not too low, it fluctuated between 91% and 94%.²

Dīwān al-Tarikāt al-Hashariyya.

Heirless property was another source of revenue to the government, which was administered by Dīwān al-Tarikāt al-Hashariyya. Qalqashandī defines the heirless property thus,

"Al-Mawārith al-Hashariyya is the property of a deceased who has no special heir through relationship, by way of marriage, or Wala'; or the residue of the property of a dead person who has an heir who is not entitled to all the heritage...etc."³

The early jurists differed in their view of the heritage and to whom it should belong; some argue that the only immediate and legal heirs of the dead person should have the right to this heritage, and if this kind of relationship does not exist, the property should accrue to the state; while the other argue that the heritage should be given to all the relations, whether they were direct or indirect heirs of the

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 223-4.

²Ehrenkreutz, pp. 145 ff., see also E.I./II, s.v. Dīnār (by G.C.Milles). See also Naqshandī, pp. 53, 186 ff; S. Lane Poole, I, p. 168.

³Subḥ al-'Asha, III, p. 464.

dead person and the government should not have the right to any proportion of the heritage.¹

However, it seems that the 'Abbāsid government followed the first argument, and acquired those properties which had not direct heirs, no doubt for the benefit of getting a lot of revenue from such a source. This practice was first introduced during the reign of al-Mu'tamid (256-279/870-892).² During the reign of al-Nāṣir the state followed the same method in getting this kind of property and, in fact, there was a special Dīwān which administered this revenue and assessed it. This bureau was headed by Nāṣir,³ who was usually one of the Shuhūd 'Adl of Baghdād.⁴ The duty of this official was also to make a list of the wealthy persons who had not direct heirs in order that, on receipt of the news of their death, he could go and collect their heritage.⁵ As well, he was to provide the state with statistics of the number of deaths in Baghdād.⁶ Furthermore, sometimes, this Nāṣir collected the property before the death of the person, if he was sick.⁷

¹See the full argument in A. ADURĪ, Ta'rikh al-'Irāq al-Iqtisādī, pp. 198 ff.

²Ibid., p. 198.

³Ibn al-Sa'i, nn. 35, 259; see Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, nn. 229, 269, 305-6. Fuwaṭī, p. 114. Shāhid 'Adl, witness of good

⁴Subs Ibn al-Sa'i, p. 107. E.I/II, s.v. 'Adl (by E. Tyān) 259; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 107. E.I/II, s.v. 'Adl (by E. Tyān). Shuhūd, notary; cf.

⁵Ibn al-Sa'i, p. 107.

⁶Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 229.

⁷Ibid., pp. 305-6.

However, it seems that the revenue of this department was considerable, for in 602/1205-6 this department acquired 2600 Dinars from a dead person.¹ In 651/1253-4 200 Dinars entered this Diwan.² And in 653/1255-6 a worker in a public bath died and his property which consisted of 7 Ratls of gold and 12 Ratls of silver, were found and taken to this Diwan.³

When al-Zāhir came to power, he appointed 'Abd al-'Aziz ibn Dulaf, the Ḥanbalite Shaykh, as the Nāzir of this Diwan, the latter refused to accept this office unless the Caliph would allow him to "give the inheritance to the uterine kindred", (يورث ذري الدحام), the Caliph agreed to that and gave him a free hand to follow the just policy in managing this Diwan.⁴ The new Nāzir, subsequently, returned many legacies to their legal heirs.⁵ But it seems that this just policy in levying the heirless property disappeared after the short reign of al-Zāhir; and his successors, al-Mustanṣir and al-Musta'ṣim followed the policy of al-Nāzir in levying the heirless property.⁶ This practice

¹Ibn al-Sā'ī, p. 180.

²Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 269.

³Ibid., pp. 305-6.

⁴Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 288; see also Ibn al-'Imād, V, pp. 184-5; *cf.* above, p. 143. n.

⁵Ibn al-'Imād, V, pp. 184-5.

⁶See Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 229, 269, 305-6, 114.

was still in existence after the fall of Baghḍād in 1258, until it was abolished by 'Aṭā' al-Mulk al-Juḡainī when he was appointed to the governorship of Baghḍād.¹

Diwān al-Jawālī.²

This Diwān was in charge of assessing and levying the poll-tax from the Dhimmīs. This bureau was administered by Nāẓir, who was usually appointed from amongst the religious men - Faqīhs, Qāḍis or Shuhūd 'Adl.³ The time of collecting the poll-tax was at the beginning of each Hijra year - at the beginning of Muḥarram.⁴ During the reign of al-Nāṣir, it seems that this tax was levied with laxity, and also that the revenue from it was not high. For in 626/1228-9 al-Mustanṣir discharged Muḥiy al-Dīn ibn al-Jawzī from his post as the Nāẓir of Diwān al-Jawālī and appointed the Shafi'ite Shaykh Ibn Faḍlān to this post. The Caliph ordered the new official to "apply the Shar'" in assessing the poll-tax. Ibn Faḍlān, therefore, increased the tax on those who paid less than one Dīnār. For according to the Shafi'ite school it was forbidden to collect less than one Dīnār, if the Dhimmī was poor, and if he was middle class levied from him two

¹Juvaini, I, p. 34.

²Jawālī (sing. Jaliya) originally meant a group of emigrants or refugees. The Dhimmīs were called Jaliya because the Caliph 'Umar I ordered them (sic) to leave Arabia. Later on this name served to identify all the protected subjects even though they have never left their homeland; see Ibn Manẓūr, Lisān al-'Arab, Beyrouth ed. XIV, p. 149. Later on Jawālī means a tax, more or less, a synonym of Jizya; see A.A.Dūrī, Ta'rikh al-'Irāq al-Iqtisādī, p. 196; E.I./II s.v. Djawālī (by Cl. Cahen); cf. R. Fattal, Le Statut des non-musulmans en pays d'Islam au Moyen Age, p. 265; also Uzunçarşılı, pp. 11-12.

Dīnārs, and in case that the Dhimmi was rich the amount should be four Dīnārs.¹ This indicates that during al-Nāṣir's reign there was a tolerance in the amount of this tax imposed upon the non-Muslim subjects.

Furthermore, Ibn Faḍlān followed a very strict method in levying this tax and treated the Dhimmis harshly.² However, it seems that the Dhimmis paid this tax in gold.³

Dīwān al-Muqāṭa'at.

Concerning the administration of the lands of the Caliphate principality, there was a new Dīwān called Dīwān al-Muqāṭa'at, which was administered by a Nāṣir,⁴ and a Katib.⁵

Cl. Cahen defines the term Muqāṭa'a thus, "...the state was content with a contracted tribute, without concerning itself with a theoretical scheme of taxation: equivalent to the primitive 'Ahd... etc."⁶ This kind of land, no doubt, paid far less than the ordinary

(cont.)

³Ibn al-Sa'ī, pp. 259, 281; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 7-8, and 13.

⁴Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 13; see A. A. Dūrī, op.cit., p. 196.

¹Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, pp. 7-8.

²For further details see above Chapter III, pp. 157-8; and Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 13.

³See above p. 167.

⁴Ibn Khallikān, II, pp. 333-4; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, p. 178.

⁵Ibn al-Sa'ī, p. 282; Ibn Khallikān, II, p. 25.

⁶E.I./II, s.v. Bayt al-Māl; for the nature of this kind of land see F. Lokkegaard, Islamic taxation, pp. 102 ff.

Kharāj lands; for, according to Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqa al-Mustanjid - the grand-father of al-Nāṣir - committed a horrible act, "He abolished all the Muqāṭa'at estates and returned them to the Kharāj system, a thing which bore hardly on the 'Alids in al-Kūfa and the sacred shrines..."¹ Al-Mustanjid, no doubt, did so to increase the income of the state as a part of his fiscal reform.

Thus it seems that this new Dīwān was formed to look after and administer these estates, which returned to the Kharāj system.

¹
Al-Fakhri, p. 425.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I Classical Works:

Abu 'l-Faḍā'il al-Hamawī,
Muḥammad ibn 'Alī

al-Ta'rikh al-Mansūrī, Moscow, 1960.

Abu 'l-Fida,
'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'īl

Mukhtaṣar Ta'rikh al-Bashar, 4 vols.,
Istanbul, 1286/1869.

Abū Ḥamid,
Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm

"Dhayl Seljūq-nama Zāhir-i-Nishapurī",
Mihr, II, 1313, Shamsī, Teheran.

Abū Shāma,
'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ismā'īl

1. Kitab al-Rawḍatayn fī Akhbār al-Dawlatayn, Cairo, 1287/1870.
2. Tarajim Rijāl al-Qarnayn al-Sādis wa 'l-Sabi', Cairo, 1947.

Bar-Hebraeus,
Gregory Abū 'l-Faraj

1. Mukhtaṣar Ta'rikh al-Duwal, ed.
A. Ṣaliḥani, Beirut 1890.
2. The Chronography of Gregory Abū 'l-Faraj, ed. and tr. by E.A.Wallis
Budge, Oxford 1932.

Benjamin of Tudela,

The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, ed. and tr. into English by
A. Asher, London 1840-42; second tr.
by M. N. Adler, London 1907; Arabic
tr. by Ezra H. Haddad, Baghdad 1945.

al-Dhahabī,
Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad

1. Ta'rikh al-Islām, vols. 18, 19
and 20, Aya Sofya (Istanbul) MSS.
No. 3011-3013.
2. Duwal al-Islām, 2 vols. Hyderabad
1337/1919.
3. Al-Mukhtaṣar al-Muhtāj ilaihi min Ta'rikh ibn al-Dubaiṭhi, Vol. I ed.
M. Jawad, Baghdad 1951.

Ḥajji Khalīfa,

Taqwīm al-Tawārikh, Istanbul 1146/1733.

Ḥamd Allah Mustawfī,
al-Qazmīnī

1. The Geographical part of the Nuzhat al-Qulub, tr. by G. le
Strange, (G.M.S., Old series,
XXIII/2) London 1919.
2. Tarikh-i-Guzida, ed. E.G.Browne.

- Husaini,
Sadr al-Dīn
- Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir,
- Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd,
'Abd al-Ḥamid
- Ibn Abi 'l-Wafā',
Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad
- Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a
- Ibn al-'Amīd,
al-Makīn
- Ibn al-Athīr,
'Izz al-Dīn
- Ibn al-Dubā'ithī al-Wasīṭī,
Muḥammad b. Sa'īd
- Ibn al-Furāt,
Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥīm
- Ibn al-Fuwaṭī,
'Abd al-Razzaq
- Ibn Duqmāq,
Ibrahim b. Muḥammad
- Ibn Ḥabīb,
Hasan b. 'Umar
- Ibn Ḥammad,
- Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalanī,
- Ibn al-'Ibrī
- Zubdat al-Tawārīkh, ed. M. Iqbal with
the title Akhbar al-Dawla 'l-Saljuqiyya
Lahore, 1933.
- Sīrat al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars, Fatih
MS. No. 4367.
- Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, 4 vols. Cairo
1329/1911.
- al-Jawahir al-Muḍī'a fi Tabaqāt al-
Ḥanafiyya, Hyderabad, 1332/1914.
- Tabaqat al-Atibā', ed. A. Müller,
2 vols. 1884.
- "La Chronique des Ayyoubides" ed.
Cl. Cahen in B.E.O., XV, 1955-7.
- al-Kāmil fī 'l-Ta'rīkh, ed. Tornberg,
Leiden 1851-76.
- Dhayl Ta'rīkh Madīnat al-Salam, Ṣahid
'Alī Paşa (Istanbul) MS. No. 1870.
- Tārīkh ibn al-Furāt, Vols. VII, VIII
and IX ed. Q. Aurayq; the volumes con-
tain the years 639-659 A.H. Vatican
MS. Arab 726.
- Al-Hawādith al-Jamī'a, ed. M. Jawād,
Baghdad 1932.
- Al-Jawhar al-Thamīn fī Sīrat al-Mulūk
wa'l-Salāṭīn, Aya Sofya MS. No. 3172.
- Durrat al-Aslāk fī dawlat al-Atrāk,
Vol. II, Yeni Cami (Istanbul) MS.No.849.
- Qūt al-Arwāḥ wa Yaqūt al-Arbāḥ, As'ad
(Istanbul) MS. No. 2202.
- Al-Durar al-Kāmīna, 4 Vols. Hyderabad
1348-50/1929-32.
- Mukhtaṣar Ta'rīkh al-Duwal, ed. A.
Ṣalīḥani, Beirut 1890. See also Bar-
Hebraeus.

- Ibn al-ʿImād,
ʿAbd al-Ḥay b. Aḥmad
Shadharāt al-Dhahab, 8 Vols. Cairo
1350-51/1932-3.
- Ibn al-Jawzi,
ʿAbd al-Raḥman b. ʿAlī
Al-Muntazam, ed. Hyderabad, 1938-43.
- Ibn Jubāir,
Muḥammad b. Aḥmad
The Travels of Ibn Jubāir, ed. W.
Wright, second ed. revised by M. J.
De Goeje, Leiden 1907.
- Ibn Kathīr,
Ismaʿīl b. ʿUmar
Al-Bidāya wa-ʿl-Nihāya, Cairo 1351/1932
- Ibn Khaldūn,
ʿAbd al-Raḥmān
Al-ʿIbar wa-Diḥwān al-Mubtada wa-ʿl-
Khabar, Cairo, 1284-1867.
- Ibn Khallikān,
Aḥmad b. Muḥammad
Wafayat al-Aʿyān, 2 vols. Cairo
1299/1882.
- Ibn Manẓūr,
Lisān al-ʿArab, Beirut ed. 1955-6.
- Ibn al-Miʿmār,
Muḥammad b. Abī ʿl-Makārim
Kitāb al-Futuwwa, ed. M. Jawād and
M. Hilālī...etc. Baghdad, 1958.
- Ibn Nubāta,
Shams al-Dīn b. Muḥammad
Kitāb al-Iktifā min Taʾrīkh al-Khulafā,
Aya Sofya MS. No. 2973.
- Ibn al-Qiftī,
Taʾrīkh al-Ḥukamāʾ, ed. Lippert,
Leipzig 1903.
- Ibn Rajab,
Dhayl Tabaqāt al-Ḥanābila, 2 Vols.
Cairo 1953 ; Vol. I ed. H. Laoust
and S. Dahan, Damascus 1951.
- Ibn al-Saʿī,
ʿAlī b. Anjab al-Khāzin
Al-Jamīʿ al-Mukhtaṣar fī ʿUnwān al-
Tawārīkh wa ʿUyun al-Siyar, ed. M.
Jawād, Baghdad 1934.
- Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī,
Muḥammad
Fawāt al-Wafayāt, Cairo 1283/1866.
- Ibn Taghrī-Bardī,
Abū ʿl-Maḥāsīn
Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira, Cairo 1929-39.
- Ibn al-Tiqṭaqa,
Jalāl al-Dīn Abū Jaʿfar
Kitāb al-Fakhri, ed. Derenbourg, Paris
1895; Eng. tr. by C.E.J. Whitting,
London, 1947.
- Ibn ʿUnba (or ʿUtba) al-ʿAlawī,
Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad
ʿUmdat al-Ṭalīb fī Ansab Āl Abī Ṭalīb,
Najaf 1961.

Juvaini,
'Ala' al-Din 'Aṭa-Malik

Tarikh-i-Jahan-Gusha, ed. M.M. Qazvini,
3 vols., London 1912, 1916 and 1937;
Eng. tr. by J. A. Boyle with the title
The History of the World Conqueror,
2 vols. Manchester 1958.

Juzjānī,
Minhaj-i-Siraj

The Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri, tr. by
H. G. Raverty, London 1881.

al-Kazirūnī,
Zahīr al-Dīn

Mukhtasar al-Ta'rikh min Awwal al-
Zaman ila Muntaha Dawlat Bani 'l-'Abbas
Jarullah (Istanbul) MS. No. 1625.

al-Kutubī (see Ibn Shākir)

al-Maqrizī,
Ahmad b. 'Alī

Kitab al-Sulūk li-Ma'rifat Duwal al-
Muluk, ed. M. Zyada, vol. I, Cairo 1934

Nakhjavani,
Hindu-shāh b. Sanjar

Tajārib al-Salaf, ed. A. Iqbal, Teheran
1313 Shamsi.

al-Nāsir li-Dīn Allah,
the Caliph

Ruh al-'Arifin, British Museum MS.
OR. 6332.

al-Nasawī,
Muḥammad al-Munshi'

Sirat Jalāl al-Dīn Mangubarti, ed. tr.
by O. Houdas, Paris 1891.

al-Nuwairī,
Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb

Nihayat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab, Vol.
XXIX, B.N. MS. Sup. Ar. 739.

al-Qalqashandī, ^{Alī}
Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah

Subh al-A'sha, 14 vols. Cairo, 1913-18.

Qazwīnī,
Zakariyya b. Muḥammad

Athar al-Bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld,
1848-9.

al-Qiftī (see Ibn al-Qiftī)

Rashid al-Dīn,
Faḍl Allah

Jamī' al-Tawārikh, ed. M.T. Danesh-
Pajuh, Teheran 1960.

Rawandī,
Muḥammad b. 'Alī

Rahat al-Sudūr wa-Ayat al-Surūr, ed.
M. Iqbal, London 1921.

al-Sakhawī,
Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān

Tuhfat al-Aḥbāb, Cairo ed. 1356/1937.

Sibt ibn al-Jawzī,
Yūsuf b. Qizughlū

Mir'at al-Zaman, ed. J. R. Jewett,
Chicago 1907.

al-Subkī,
Taj al-Dīn

Tabaqat al-Shafi'iya al-Kubra,
6 vols. Cairo 1324/1906-7.

al-Tūsī,
Naṣir al-Dīn

Kayfiyyat Waqi'at Baghdad, ed. M.
Qazvini, as a Dhayl to Vol. 3 of
Jahan-Gusha, London 1937; tr. with
comment by J. A. Boyle in J.S.S.,
VI/2 1961.

al-'Umari,
Ibn Faḍl Allah

1. al-Ta'rif bil-Mustalah al-Sharif,
Cairo 1312/1894.
2. Masalik al-Absar fi Mamalik al-
Amsar, 25 vols. Aya Sofya
MSS. Nos. 3415-3439.

al-Yafi'i,
'Abd Allah B. As'ad

Mir'at al-Janan, 4 vols. Hyderabad,
1337-9/1919-1921.

Yaqut al-Rumi,
al-Hamawi

Mu'jam al-Buldan, 6 Vols. ed. Wustenfel
1866-1873.

al-Yūnīnī,
Qutb al-Dīn

Dhayl Mir'at al-Zaman, 2 Vols. Hyderabad
1954-5.

II Modern Works:

Abu 'l-'Ala 'Afīfī,

Al-Malamatiyya wa 'l-Sufiyya wa ahl al-
Futuwwa, Cairo 1945.

Adler, E. N.

Jewish Travellers, London 1930.

Amedroz, H. F.

"Tales of Official Life from the
'Tadhkira' of Ibn Hamdun", J.R.A.S.
1908, 409-470.

Amin, Husain

Al-Madrasa al-Mustansiriyya, Baghdad,
1959.

Ayalon, D.

"Studies on the Transfer of the
'Abbāsid Caliphate' from Baghdad to
Cairo", Arabica, VII, 1960.

al-'Azzawī, 'Abbās

1. Ta'rikh al-Dara'ib al-'Iraqiyya,
Baghdad 1959.
2. Al-Ta'rif bil-Mu'arrikhin, Baghdad
1957.

Baron, S. W.

A Social and Religious History of the Jews, 2nd ed. Columbia University Press 1957.

Barthold, W.

1. Turkestan Dawn to the Mongol Invasion, 2nd ed. London 1928.
2. Histoire des Turks de Asie Central, Paris 1945.

Ben-Jacob, A.

"New Sources with Regard to the History of the Jews in Babylon in the 12th and 13th Centuries," Zion, XV (1950), pp. 56-69.

Berchem, Max van

1. "Epegraphie des Assassins de Syrie" J.A. IX (1897), pp. 473-501.
2. "Baghdad Talismantor" in Archaeologische Reize im Euphrat-un-Tigris-Gebiet, ed. F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, vol. I, Berlin 1911.

Blake, R. P.

"The circulation of silver in the Moslem East down to the Mongol epoch." H.J.A.S. II (1937), pp. 291-328.

Boyle, J.A.

"The death of the last 'Abbasid Caliph" J.S.S. VI/2 (1961), pp. 145-61.

Bretschneider, E.

Medieval Research from Eastern Asiatic Sources, London 1910.

Brockelmann, Carl

Geschichte der Arabischen litterature, Erster Band, Leiden 1898. Zweiter Band, Leiden 1902. Erster Supplement band, Leiden 1937, Zweiter Supplement band, Leiden 1938, Dritter Supplement band, Leiden 1942.

Browne, E.G.

A literary History of Persia, 4 Vols. Cambridge (1909-1930).

Cahen, Cl.

1. "Note sur les debuts de la Futuwwa d'al-Nasir", Oriens VI (1953), pp. 18-22.
2. "Un traite d'armurerie compose pour Saladin", B.E.O. (1947-8), pp. 103-163.
3. "Les chroniques arabes concernant la Syrie, l'Egypte et la Mesopotamie de la conquete arabe a la conquete ottomane dans les bibliotheques d'Istanbul." R.E.I., X (1936) pp. 333-362.

Cahen, Cl.

4. "L'évolution de l'iqta' du IXe au XIIIe siècle." Annales E.S.C., VIII (1953), pp. 25-52.
5. "L'histoire économique et sociale de l'Orient musulman médiéval", S.I. III (1955), pp. 93-115.
6. "Mouvements populaires et autonomisme urbain dans l'Asie musulmane au Moyen Âge." Arabica, V and VI, 1958-9.

Cohen, M. etc.

Ed. Repertoire Chronologique d'Épigraphie Arabe, 15 Vols. Cairo, Institut Français D'Archéologie Orientale, 1931-1956.

Dozy, R.

Supplément aux Dictionnaires arabes, 2 vols. 2nd ed. 1927

Durī, 'Abd al-'Azīz

1. Ta'rikh al-'Iraq al-Iqtisādī Fī 'l-Qarn al-Rabi' al-Hijrī, Baghdad, 1948.
2. Al-Nuzum al-Islāmiyya, Baghdad, 1950.
3. "Nushu' al-Aṣnāf wa 'l-Ḥiraf fī 'l-Islām," B.C.A., I, (June 1959), pp. 133-169.

Ehrenkreutz, A.S.

"Monetary History of the Near East in the Middle Ages." J.E.S.H.O., II/2, (1959).

Encyclopaedia of Islam
1st edition.

Encyclopaedia of Islam
2nd edition.

Fattal, R.

Le Statut des non-musulmans en pays d'Islam au Moyen Âge, 1959.

Fischel, W. J.

Jews in the Economic and Political Life of Mediaeval Islam, London, 1937.

Gibb, H. A. R.

1. "Notes on the Arabic materials for the history of the early Crusades." B.S.O.A.S., VII (1933-5), pp. 739-754.
2. "The achievement of Saladin", B.J.R.L., 35 (1952), pp. 44-60.
3. "The Arabic sources for the life of Saladin." Speculum, 25 (1950), pp. 58-72.

Goitein, S. D.

1. Jews and Arabs, New York, 1955.
2. "The Unity of the Mediterranean World in the 'Middle' Middle Ages" S.I., XII (1960), pp. 29-43.
3. "Glimpses from the Cairo Geniza on naval warfare in the Mediterranean and on the Mongol invasion." Studi Orientalistici in onore di Levi della Vida, I, 1956, pp. 393-408.

Ḥasan al-Baḥḥā

Al-Alqab al-Islamiyya fi 'l-Ta'rikh wa 'l-Watha'iq wa 'l-Athar, Cairo, 1957.

Hodgson, M. G. S.

The Order of the Assassin, The Hague, 1955.

Houtsma, M. Th.

"Some remarks on the History of the Saljuks", A.O. III (1924), pp. 136-152.

Iqbāl, 'Abbas

Wizārat Dar 'Ahd-i Salāṭin Buzurg Seljuqi, Teheran, 1959.

Ishāq, Rafa'il Babu

1. Ta'rikh Naṣāra 'l-'Iraq, Baghḍād, 1948.
2. Aḥwāl Naṣāra Baghḍād, Baghḍād, 1960.

Kafesoğlu, İbrahim

Harezmşahlar Devleti Tarihi (485-617/1092-1229). Ankara, 1956.

Kahle, P.

1. "Die Futuwa-Bündnisse des Kalifen en-Nāṣir (622-1225)." Festschrift Georg Jacob, 1932, pp. 112-127.

Kahle, P.

2. "Ein Futuwwa-Erlass des Kalifen en-Nasir aus dem Jahre 604(1207)." Festschrift Max Freiherrn von Oppenheim, Berlin, 1933.

Khasbak, Ja'far H.

"Ahwal al-'Iraq al-Iatishadiyya fi 'Ahd al-Ilkhaniyyin al-Maghul." B.C.A., IV (1961), pp. 117-172.

Kurd, 'Ali

"Ta'rīkh ibn al-Sā'ī." al-Muqtabas, Vol. III, 1908, pp. 95-101.

Lambton, Ann K. S.

Contribution to the Study of Seljuq Institutions, Ph. D. Thesis, June 1939 (University of London).

Lacoust, H.

1. La Profession de Foi d'ibn Batta, Damascus 1958.
2. "Le Hanbalisme sous le Califat de Baghdad (241/855-656/1258), R.E.I. 1959, part I - Memoires, pp. 67-128.

Lewis, B.

1. "The sources for the History of the Syrian Assassins." Speculum, XXVII (1952), pp. 475-489.
2. "The Islamic Guilds", E.H.R. VIII (1937), pp. 20-37.
3. "The Isma'ilites and the Assassins in A History of the Crusades, ed. K. M. Setton, I, 1955, pp. 99-132.

Lokkegaard, F.

Islamic Taxation in the Classic Period Copenhagen, 1950.

Ma'ruf, Najī

Ta'rīkh 'Ulamā' al-Mustansiriyya, Baghdad, 1960.

Mez, A.

Die Renaissance Des Islams, Arabic tr. Cairo 1940.

al-Naqshabandī, N. M.

al-Dīnār al-Islāmī fī 'l-Mathaf al-'Irāqī, Vol. I, Baghdad, 1953.

Nicholson, R. A.

A literary history of the Arabs, Cambridge 1953.

Poole, S. Lane

Catalogue of Oriental coins in the British Museum, Vol. I, London. 1875.

- Ritter, H.
1. "Zur Futuwwa", Der Islam, X (1920) pp. 244-246.
 2. "Autographs in Turkish libraries." Oriens, VI, (1953), pp. 63-90.
 3. "Philologika IX." Der Islam, XXV (1939), pp. 35-86.
- Rosenthal, F.
- A History of Muslim Historiography,
Leiden 1952.
- Salinger, G.
- "Was the Futuwwa an Oriental form of chivalry?" Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc. 94 (1950), pp. 481-493.
- Sassoon, D. S.
- A History of the Jews in Baghdad,
Letchworth, 1949.
- Sauvaget, J.
- Introduction a l'Histoire de l'Orient Musulman, 2nd ed. Cl. Cahen, Paris 1961.
- Setton, Kenneth M.
1. ed. A History of the Crusades, Pennsylvania, Vol. I, 1955, Vol. II, 1962.
 - 2.
- Sourdel, D.
- Le Vizirat 'Abbasid, 2 Vols. Damascus 1959-60.
- Storey, C. A.
- Persian literature, Section II/I,
London (1935).
- le Strange, G.
1. The lands of the Eastern Caliphate Cambridge 1930.
 2. "The story of the death of the last 'Abbasid Caliph, from the Vatican MS. of Ibn al-Furat." J.R.A.S. 1900, pp. 293-300.
- Strauss, Eli
- "The social isolation of Ahl adh-Dhimma." Etudes Orientales. a la Memoire de Paul Hirschler, Budapest 1950, pp. 73-94.
- Taeschner, F.
1. "Das Futuwwa-Rittertum des islamischen Mittelalters." Beit. z. Arabistik, Semistik und Islamwis. Leipzig 1944, pp. 340-385.

Taeschner, F.

2. "Islamisches Ordensrittertum zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge." Welt als Geschichte IV, (1938), pp. 382-408.
3. "Der Anteil des Sufismus an der Formung des Futuwwaideals." Der Islam, XXIV (1937), pp. 43-74.

Uzunçarşili, İsmail Hakkı

Osmanlı Devleti Tashkilatına Medhal, Turk Tarih Kurumu Yagınlarından VIII, Serie. No. 10. Istanbul, Maarif Matbassı, 1941.

Vajda, G.

"Une liste d'Autorités du Calife al-Nāṣir", Arabica, VI, 1959, p. 173-174.

Witteck, P.

"Deux chapitres de l'histoire des Turcs de Roum." Byzantion, XI, 1936.