

# The Annals of the Saljuq Turks

Selections from al-Kāmil fī'l-Ta'rīkh of 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr

Translated and annotated by

D. S. Richards

THE ANNALS  
OF THE SALJUQ TURKS

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF IRAN AND TURKEY  
1000–1700 AD

**Edited by**

Carole Hillenbrand  
*University of Edinburgh*

This series publishes important studies dealing with the history of Iran and Turkey in the period 1000–1700 AD. This period is significant because it heralds the advent of large numbers of nomadic Turks from Central Asia into the Islamic world. Their influence was felt particularly strongly in Iran and Turkey, territories which they permanently transformed.

The series presents translations of mediaeval Arabic and Persian texts which chronicle the history of the mediaeval Turks and Persians, and also publishes scholarly monographs which handle themes of medieval Turkish and Iranian history such as historiography, nomadisation and folk Islam.

# THE ANNALS OF THE SALJUQ TURKS

*Selections from al-Kāmil fī'l-Ta'rīkh  
of 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr*

translated and annotated by  
D. S. Richards

First published 2002  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada  
by Routledge  
270 Madison Ave, New York NY 10016

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group*

Transferred to Digital Printing 2010

© 2002 D. S. Richards

Typeset in StempleGaramond by LaserScript Ltd, Mitcham, Surrey

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*  
A catalogue record of this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*  
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN10: 0-700-71576-2 (hbk)

ISBN10: 0-415-58313-6 (pbk)

ISBN13: 978-0-700-71576-3 (hbk)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-58313-8 (pbk)

#### **Publisher's Note**

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original may be apparent.

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	1
The Author	1
The Literary Works of Ibn al-Athīr	2
The <i>Kāmil</i>	4
The Period of the Great Saljuqs and the Sources of the <i>Kāmil</i>	5
The Translation	8
<b>THE ANNALS</b>	
The Year 420 [1029]	13
The Year 429 [1037–38]	25
The Year 430 [1038–39]	28
The Year 431 [1039–40]	30
The Year 432 [1040–41]	30
The Year 433 [1041–42]	45
The Year 434 [1042–43]	47
The Year 435 [1043–44]	53
The Year 436 [1044–45]	57
The Year 437 [1045–46]	58
The Year 438 [1046–47]	60
The Year 439 [1047–48]	62
The Year 440 [1048–49]	67
The Year 441 [1049–50]	71
The Year 442 [1050–51]	76
The Year 443 [1051–52]	79
The Year 444 [1052–53]	83
The Year 445 [1053–54]	89
The Year 446 [1054–55]	92

## *Contents*

The Year 447 [1055–56]	96
The Year 448 [1056–57]	103
The Year 449 [1057–58]	114
The Year 450 [1058–59]	118
The Year 451 [1059–60]	129
The Year 452 [1060–61]	132
The Year 453 [1061]	134
The Year 454 [1062]	137
The Year 455 [1063]	141
The Year 456 [1063–64]	146
The Year 457 [1064–65]	157
The Year 458 [1065–66]	157
The Year 459 [1066–67]	160
The Year 460 [1067–68]	163
The Year 461 [1068–69]	164
The Year 462 [1069–70]	166
The Year 463 [1070–71]	168
The Year 464 [1071–72]	173
The Year 465 [1072–73]	176
The Year 466 [1073–74]	183
The Year 467 [1074–75]	185
The Year 468 [1075–76]	190
The Year 469 [1076–77]	192
The Year 470 [1077–78]	195
The Year 471 [1078–79]	196
The Year 472 [1079–80]	199
The Year 473 [1080–81]	202
The Year 474 [1081–82]	203
The Year 475 [1082–83]	206
The Year 476 [1083–84]	209
The Year 477 [1084–85]	213
The Year 478 [1085–86]	220
The Year 479 [1086–87]	223
The Year 480 [1087–88]	232
The Year 481 [1088–89]	235

## *Contents*

The Year 482 [1089–90]	238
The Year 483 [1090–91]	245
The Year 484 [1091–92]	248
The Year 485 [1092–93]	251
The Year 486 [1093–94]	265
The Year 487 [1094–95]	271
The Year 488 [1095]	277
The Year 489 [1096]	285
The Year 490 [1096–97]	289
<i>Bibliographical References</i>	296
<i>Index</i>	299

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Introduction

## The Author

The historian and scholar of Prophetic Tradition (*Hadīth*), whom we know by his family name, Ibn al-Athīr, lived in momentous times. His early manhood had seen the growth and the major successes of the Muslim moral, political and military response to the Crusades in Greater Syria and Mesopotamia (*al-Jazīra*) and he lived into the first few decades of the thirteenth century A.D., long enough, for sure, to hear vivid evidence of and to fear, even if he did not experience directly, the dreadful destruction caused by the first Mongol incursion into the central lands of Islam.

‘Izz al-Dīn Abū’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī (to give him his full personal name) was born in the town of Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar (the modern Cizre) on the Tigris north of Mosul on 4 Jumādā I 555/13 May 1160. His family was of some local standing. They owned lands in the Mosul area and had some trading interests. His father Muḥammad served the ruling Zangid dynasty as a local official. Whether Ibn al-Athīr himself ever had any employment, official government employment or otherwise, is not known, but his two brothers, apart from their activities in the fields of religious and literary studies, did follow their father’s footsteps as government servants. His elder brother, Majd al-Dīn Mubārak (born 544/1149, died 606/1210) served as a Zangid official (both he and his father were sources of information for Ibn al-Athīr when the latter came to write his monograph on the dynasty) and he was also the author of philological and religious works. The third and youngest son, Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn Naṣr Allāh (born 558/1163, died 637/1239) had a more brilliant, though chequered, political career, serving Saladin late in his reign and becoming vizier of Saladin’s son, al-Afdal ‘Alī. Apart from his professional correspondence, which was preserved as a guide to good style, Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn wrote several noteworthy books on literary criticism.<sup>1</sup>

The middle brother, our author, studied in his home town and in nearby Mosul. From scattered comments in his own writings we know of his whereabouts from time to time, but this information does not add up to a

<sup>1</sup> For Majd al-Dīn and Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn, their lives and works and further references, see *EI*, 2nd ed., vol. iii, 723–725.

coherent picture of his formative, or his mature, years. He went on Pilgrimage to Mecca in 576/1181, and returned via Baghdad where he studied further. He was back in Mosul by 581/1185–86 when Saladin besieged the city for the second time. After the great military successes of Saladin that led to the reconquest of Jerusalem, Ibn al-Athīr spent some time in Syria. During 584/1188–89 he was present at Saladin's sieges of Krak des Chevaliers and Bourzey, and we find him in Damascus in 590/1194 undergoing a siege that was the result of an internal Ayyubid dispute. Although he mentions that he was again in Mosul in 622/1225, the well-known historical biographer Ibn Khallikān met him in Aleppo in 626/1229 and described him as being "perfect in accomplishments, of generous character and very modest." In his later years he enjoyed the patronage of the Atabeg of Aleppo Shihāb al-Dīn Ṭughril and also that of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu', the former emir of the Zangids who had taken over power in Mosul. It was in Mosul that Ibn al-Athīr died during the month of Sha'bān 630/June 1233, aged seventy-three.

### The Literary Works of Ibn al-Athīr

The major work for which Ibn al-Athīr is best known in modern times is his large-scale chronicle of Islamic history. He gave it the title *al-Kāmil fī'l-Ta'rikh*, which one may translate as *The Perfect* or *The Complete [Work] of History*. This is the work from which the present translation has been made. A fuller description of it will be given below. It was, however, not the only literary production of Ibn al-Athīr.

His studies as an *ālim*, a scholar of Islamic religious sciences, resulted in a biographical dictionary of the Companions of Muḥammad who were transmitters of Prophetic Tradition (*al-Ḥadīth*), to which he gave the somewhat fanciful title *The Lions of the Thicket concerning Knowledge of the Companions* (*Usd al-Ghāba fī Ma'rifat al-Ṣaḥāba*). This work is a compilation from earlier authorities between whose works there were discrepancies. The names of the Companions are arranged in alphabetical order and *sigla* indicate in which of the earlier authorities the names appear. The author's introduction has some rather conventional explanations of his original plan to write such a dictionary, how unspecified obstacles prevented him and how scholars encouraged him during his visit to Jerusalem to make a start. The final revision was carried out back home in Mosul.<sup>2</sup>

2 See 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr, *Usd al-Ghāba etc.*, Cairo, 1285–7 A.H., i, 4 ff. There are three modern editions: i) ed. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Bannā et al., Dār al-Sha'b, Cairo, 1970–3, ii) ed. A. M. Mu'awwad et al., Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1994, iii) ed. Khalīl Shihā, Beirut, 1997.

Another work of his is the reference book containing identifications and explanations of relative adjectives, the so-called *nishbas*. The title is *al-Lubāb fī Tahdhīb al-Ansāb* and it is what the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* calls a “successful, improved” version of the well-known dictionary of *nishbas* by al-Samʿānī. Ibn al-Athīr’s work was the basis for the later and shorter version made by al-Suyūṭī.<sup>3</sup>

The only other strictly historical work which he produced was the monograph on the dynasty with which his family had been closely identified, that of the Zangids. This was the dynasty effectively founded by the Saljuq general and provincial administrator, Zangī, although, as will be seen in this present volume, Ibn al-Athīr traces their fortunes back to Zangī’s father, Āqsunqur, who had served the Sultan Malikshāh. This monograph, entitled *al-Taʾrīkh al-Bāhir fī al-Dawla al-Atābakiyya*<sup>4</sup> (*The Resplendent History of the Atabeg Dynasty*) has a close and rather complicated relationship with Ibn al-Athīr’s larger chronicle. The monograph was written between the dates 609 and 615 A.H., that is between 1212 and 1218 A.D. This was after the completion of a first version of the larger chronicle, to which the title *al-Mustaḡṣā fī l-Taʾrīkh* was originally given, a title one might translate as *History Closely Examined*. The *Taʾrīkh al-Bāhir* contains cross references to the work under that name, and subsequently the larger chronicle, revised and re-named after 1218, itself refers the reader to the existing monograph. The *Taʾrīkh al-Bāhir* is a work written to honour the Zangid dynasty and reveals most strongly the author’s partiality or sense of obligation. As a work of history it is markedly selective in the presentation of material, what it emphasises and what it omits.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, in all Ibn al-Athīr’s writings that concern the relations of the Ayyubids and the Zangids in the period of the Crusades Sir Hamilton Gibb criticized him for manipulation of his sources, lack of accuracy and prejudice.<sup>6</sup> Whether certain implications that arise from the ordering of some material are always deliberately intended or whether they are sometimes the result of an awkward handling and abbreviating of his sources remains an open question.

3 *al-Lubāb* etc., ed. Cairo, 1356–69 A.H., 3 vols; partial ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen, 1835. See *EI*, 2nd ed., vol. iii, 724, and for the later version, al-Suyūṭī, *Lubb al-Lubāb*, ed. P. J. Veth, Brill, Leiden, 1851.

4 Ed. by A. A. Tolaymat, Cairo, 1962. There is an earlier edition with French translation, *Histoire des Atabecs de Mosul*, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, historiens orientaux*, vol. ii, Paris 1876.

5 A preliminary study of the two historical works will be found in D. S. Richards, “Some consideration of Ibn al-Athīr’s *al-Taʾrīkh al-Bāhir* and its relationship to the *Kāmil*,” in *Actas XVI Congreso UEAI*, eds C. Vazquez de Benito & M. A. Manzano Rodriguez, Salamanca, 1995, 443–6.

6 H. A. R. Gibb, “The Arabic Sources for the Life of Saladin,” *Speculum*, 1960, 58–72; “Notes on the Arabic Materials for the History of the Early Crusades,” *BSOAS*, vii, 1935, 739–54. See also the preface and various footnotes in Sir Hamilton Gibb, *The Life of Saladin*, Oxford, 1973.

## The *Kāmil*

The *Kāmil* is a chronicle of the Islamic world, which starts from the Creation and has sections on Persian and Roman history and also history derived from the Hebraic tradition, before arriving at the mission of the Prophet Muḥammad. It then continues in annalistic fashion up to the year 630/1233, just a couple of years before the historian's death. For all the years covered by the chronicle of al-Ṭabarī, which ended at the year 302/915, that historian is Ibn al-Athīr's principal source,<sup>7</sup> although in his introduction he claims that he was able to supplement it from other chroniclers whom he does not name. Indeed, the main modern criticism of Ibn al-Athīr is that in the body of his text he rarely indicates his sources. In some cases over the whole range of years covered it is possible to compare the *Kāmil* with certain extant historical works and form a notion of the likely sources and the use that was made of them. However, one must always be aware of the possibility that Ibn al-Athīr had only indirect access to certain works through some intermediary text.

It has already been mentioned that Ibn al-Athīr revised, re-named and continued his chronicle after the completion of his shorter monograph on the Zangid dynasty. An attempt to disentangle the progress of the composition from internal evidence and from the surviving manuscripts has been made by the present translator and will not be repeated here.<sup>8</sup> In the same study some of the historian's methods, aims and attitudes were examined, and in that connection the author's unusually extended introduction is of especial interest.<sup>9</sup> Like many a mediaeval chronicler, Ibn al-Athīr held that God was an active agent in the affairs of men through the working-out of His divinely ordained plan. This belief sits awkwardly with another commonly held notion, namely that history provides a store of *exempla*, moral and practical examples fit both to be imitated and avoided, and that by studying these a person's conduct can be improved. This is illustrated by an anecdote in the *Kāmil*,<sup>10</sup> in which Maḥmūd of Ghazna, having taken advantage of the rather naive policy of the Buyid Majd al-Dawla of Rayy, asks him whether he has read the *Shāh-nāme*, "the history of the Persians", or the *History* of al-Ṭabarī, "the history of the Muslims", because he has not acted as though he had.

7 For a study of the two historians, see C. Brockelmann, *Das Verhältnis von Ibn-el-Athīrs Kāmil fi-t Tarīkh zu Ṭabarīs Abbār ar-rusul wal-muluk*, Strasburg, 1890.

8 See D. S. Richards, "Ibn al-Athīr and the later parts of the *Kāmil*: a study of aims and methods," in D. O. Morgan ed., *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds*, London, 1982, 76–108.

9 Extracts from this introduction have been translated in *Muslim Historiography*, 298–300.

10 *al-Kāmil*, vol. ix, 371–2.

It is the old dilemma, where is the power to choose and where is moral responsibility if one's actions are fore-ordained? Where too is reasoned historical explanation if all that the historian can say is "This happened so that God's decree might be fulfilled"? In fact, Ibn al-Athīr not infrequently starts a paragraph with something that literally means "The reason for this was that etc." (*kān al-sabab fī dhālika anna ...*), but he does not then attempt an analytical explanation of events but merely gives a chronological exposition. The translation just given has been generally avoided and replaced with "This came about as follows", or something similar.

Ibn al-Athīr has been greatly praised for the comprehensiveness of his treatment of Islamic history, for his judicious choice of material (even though being criticized for failure to identify his sources), for his clarity of exposition and for certain rare historical insights, his taking a wider view of historical processes, for example, the "global" threat of the Franks to the interests of Islam in Spain, Sicily and the Levant. This last aspect has perhaps been a little over-exaggerated. He was certainly not the first to make the particular point about the widespread Frankish threat, which one finds already in the little tract of al-Sulamī on the Jihād,<sup>11</sup> written in the early twelfth century A.D. The fact that Ibn al-Athīr also ignores the strict limits of an annalistic form, although that year-by-year progression is the basic structure of his work, is also mentioned in his special praise. Although no doubt admirable for the sake of a smoother narrative, elements of a more extended, topical approach are found in earlier historians and cannot be considered some special merit of Ibn al-Athīr.

### The Period of the Great Saljuqs and the Sources of the *Kāmil*

Those parts of the *Kāmil* that are translated in this volume cover the period of Islamic history during which the Saljuq state, that is the loose political structure dominated by Turks of the Oghuz tribal grouping under the leadership of the Saljuq family, rose with the Sultans Ṭughril Beg and Alp Arslān, and developed to its fullest extent in the reign of Sultan Malikshāh, guided by the powerful presence of the Vizier Nizām al-Mulk. The death of the last two figures in the same year, 485/1092, and the succession dispute and the bids for local autonomy in the few years immediately following create a natural break, which happens to coincide more or less with the end of the fifth century A.H., that is, the eleventh century A.D. The following century is characterized by greater complexity, more diffuse and competing power structures and, as one may perhaps maintain, a steady decline in the power and significance of the Saljuq state. At the same time, what has been

11 Selections published in E. Sivan, "Genèse de la Contre-Croisade, un traité damasquin du début du XIIe siècle," *JA*, 1966, 197-224.

called 'a natural break' also coincides with the appearance on the Middle Eastern scene of the Crusaders. Although as an historical phenomenon the *gesta Francorum* in the Levant may not have been of over-riding importance for the Islamic world as a whole, the struggle with the Crusaders from the end of the fifth/eleventh century onwards gave the historian Ibn al-Athīr a new focus for his narrative, which certainly rivals the record of events in the Saljuq world at large. One may hope that a later volume will pursue his narrative into the sixth/twelfth century.

When Ibn al-Athīr was born, the rump of the Saljuq state was still in existence and the last sultan, Ṭuḡhril III, was not to meet his death until 590/1194. However, the earlier Saljuq history of this volume was well beyond any first-hand experience of our author. He obviously relied on written sources, and the question is which. It is worth noting that the period itself produced little dynastic historiography, to which the ruling Turkish elite might give its patronage. The one exception is the *History of Kirmān*, written in Persian by Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm, which celebrates the separate branch of the family which ruled in that region. Even the famous *Siyāsat-nāme* or *Book of Policy* by the Vizier Niẓām al-Mulk gives little evidence of contemporary history alongside its prescriptive advice, and takes many of its historical examples from previous regimes.

To attempt to trace the sources used by Ibn al-Athīr for the first two centuries of Saljuq history is to wander into a fog of surmise and supposition. Claude Cahen published a valuable article dealing with the sources for the Saljuq period in general,<sup>12</sup> but uncertainties inevitably remain. For the semi-legendary and the early history of the dynasty, a prime source was the *Malik-nāme*, which, we are told, was written for the Sultan Alp Arslān from information supplied by an aged Turkish emir, Inānj Beg. Ibn al-Athīr undoubtedly relies on this work (whether directly or indirectly cannot really be known) for his composite account given under the year 430 A.H. Ibn al-Athīr and the author of the first section of the *Zubdat al-Tawārikh* (possibly an 'Alī ibn Nāṣir al-Ḥusaynī) are assumed by Cahen to have used the *Malik-nāme* in an Arabic version, since the late thirteenth-century historian Abū'l-Faraj Bar Hebraeus describes it as 'a certain Persian book,' and Cahen consistently argues, rightly or wrongly, that Ibn al-Athīr had no Persian. One may wonder, however, about the significance of the fact that Mirkhwond, the fifteenth-century historian, who was the first who wrote in Persian to make extensive use of the *Malik-nāme*, refers to its author as *nāẓim-e kitāb-e Malik-nāme* (compiler [?]) of the book *Malik-nāme*, and as *mutarjim-e kitāb-e Malik-nāme*, that is, its 'translator.'<sup>13</sup>

12 Claude Cahen, "The Historiography of the Seljuqid Period," in *Historians of the Middle East*, 59–78.

13 See Mirkhwond, *Rawḍat al-Ṣafā*, ed. Sabuhi, Tehran 1338–9 A.H., iv, 235, 258. Of the two occurrences of the book's title on page 258 one appears as *Malik-Nāṣir*, a misreading or a misprint.

Does this mean that the work was at that time only available in the Arabic version assumed to have been used by such as Ibn al-Athīr, and that Mirkhwond was having to put it back into Persian? Or may one understand that Mirkhwond was quoting from the Persian translation of a book that was actually originally in Arabic?<sup>14</sup>

For the continuation of Saljuq history up to the year 480/1087 a source of prime importance is the history of Ghars al-Ni'ma Muḥammad ibn Hilāl al-Ṣābī, who died at the end of the Hijrī year 480, that is, in January–February 1088. He was the last member of the Ṣābī family, whose successive chronicles had begun in the Buyid period. In fact, very little of this important series of histories survives in original form. Ghars al-Ni'ma's work, which picked up that of his father Hilāl from the beginning of the year 448/1056, survives quite substantially in the later chronicle of Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī (i.e. Yūsuf ibn Qizoghlu, born 582/1186, died 654/1257, known as 'the grandson of Ibn al-Jawzī'), which is entitled *Mir'āt al-Zamān fī Ta'rikh al-A'yān* (*The Mirror of Time concerning the History of Eminent Men*).<sup>15</sup> It is a moot point whether Ibn al-Athīr had direct access to Ghars al-Ni'ma's work or whether he utilised it through the medium of the *Kitāb al-Muntaẓam* of Ibn al-Jawzī (born 510/1116, died 597/1201), whose text has much in common with what remains accessible of Ghars al-Ni'ma. It is of course quite clear that Ibn al-Athīr was aware of Ibn al-Jawzī's writing because he names him among the rare acknowledgments that he makes.<sup>16</sup> For the purposes of comparing or clarifying Ibn al-Athīr's narrative this present translation will make much use of both these histories, the *Kitāb al-Muntaẓam* and the *Mir'āt al-Zamān*, in its notes. Ali Sevim's edition of the latter work was a partial one and on a few occasion therefore the passages adduced will be taken from manuscript.

Both Ghars al-Ni'ma and Ibn al-Jawzī manifest a point of view that is largely Iraqi- and Baghdad-centred. Information over a wider sphere may have been available to Ibn al-Athīr from another lost work, the *Mashārib al-Tajārib* of Ibn Funduq al-Bayhaqī (died in 565/1169), who wrote in Arabic although he was from Khurasan where that language was falling out of use. Once again it is possible that Ibn al-Athīr knew the *Mashārib al-Tajārib* only through an intermediary, who also wrote a continuation of the work, as Ibn al-Athīr, through an error, one assumes, attributes to Ibn Funduq an account of events in Khwarizm which cover the period 568–595/1172–1198.

When discussing the historiography of the Saljuq period Claude Cahen commented on the central position held by the *Kāmil* of Ibn al-Athīr. It is

14 For the problems concerning, and the importance of, this source, see Cahen, "Le Malik-Nameh et l'Histoire des Origines Seljukides," *Oriens*, ii, 1949, 31–65.

15 The appropriate section of this work, covering the years 448–80/1056–86, has been edited by Ali Sevim, Ankara, 1968.

16 See *Kāmil*, xi, 333.

worth quoting his words, noting the touch of ruefulness in them: 'We have been brought back time after time to Ibn al-Athīr. The intelligent way in which this author recasts his sources, which he rarely names, makes it difficult to assess the precise value of his information ... no author has gathered such a wide documentation ...'<sup>17</sup> A translator (into Russian) of passages from the *Kāmil* concerned with the history of Azerbaijan, only a few of which are relevant to this present volume, has some harsh comments to make about Ibn al-Athīr: '[He] yields to his predecessors in both literary crafting and exposition of historical material; his style and language often suffer from major unevennesses, obscurities, unnecessary repetitions and even gross errors.' The same translator does add: 'However, despite these negative aspects it is difficult for the historian of the Near East to do without Ibn al-Athīr's work ...'<sup>18</sup> These words may be compared with the qualified praise given to the total work by Franz Rosenthal: 'On the whole, the *Kāmil*, informative as it is, is not very reliable, but it remains a great and remarkable achievement.'<sup>19</sup>

## The Translation

The full chronicle of the *Kāmil* was first edited by C.J. Thornberg as *Ibn-el-Athiri Chronicon quod Perfectissimum Inscibitur* at Leiden, 1851–1876. That was followed by a Cairo edition in 1303/1886. In the years 1965–1967 the Thornberg edition was re-set and reprinted, with Thornberg's original *apparatus criticus* in Latin and with some additional notes, by the Dar al-Šādir publishing house in Beirut. For convenience and for ease of access this is the edition presently used. The translation indicates within square brackets the corresponding page of the appropriate volume of the Arabic text (either volume 9 or 10).

Sections that deal with events and personalities that lie outside the area influenced by the Saljuq Turks have been omitted, hopefully with appropriate sensitivity. Where there is an omission it has been clearly marked in the text and a brief description of the missing material given in a footnote.

The hope is that this translation will serve several aims. It will allow students of Islamic history who have no Arabic to taste in some degree this important and comprehensive source for knowledge of the Saljuq world. Those who have access to Arabic may, according to the degree of their expertise in the language, welcome the support this translation gives to

17 Cahen, in *Historians of the Middle East*, 72.

18 *Materialy po istorii Azerbaidzhana iz Tarikh-al-Kamil Ibn-al-Asira*, Baku, 1940, 7–8.

19 *Muslim Historiography*, 147.

attain their own appreciation and exploitation of this text. It is also hoped that the translation of parallel and illustrative material from other Arabic histories will be found particularly useful.

Ibn al-Athīr's language is rather sober and straightforward, perhaps at times even pedestrian. To the relief of the translator there are none of the verbal pyrotechnics and little of the striking imagery that one finds in the writing of his younger contemporary, 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī. However that may be, no English translation of Ibn al-Athīr's Arabic prose can hope to remain faithful to the syntax and rhythms of the original and at the same time be in any way acceptable to the reader. A literal and over-faithful 'crib' of the old-fashioned variety would be completely intolerable and hardly comprehensible. However, since it is not the aim to produce such a 'crib' but to produce something that is as easy and as pleasant to read as possible (while, of course, remaining true to the basic sense and spirit of the original), I have allowed myself liberties. I have changed much of the sentence structure to allow the narrative to proceed, syntactically speaking, with a good deal of subordination, rather than with the relentless paratactical structures so typical of Arabic.

Another problem concerns the many technical terms for a multitude of things, such as offices and institutions. I have chosen often to use terms from English, feeling that it is unsatisfactory to employ a stream of transliterated words. Naturally one is aware that certain English terms may themselves be unsatisfactory because they are so loaded with meaning from another culture and another time. The prime example of that is the decision, for sheer convenience's sake, to translate *iqṭā'* as 'fief.' It is hoped that any student of Islamic history with prior understanding of the history and nature of the indigenous institution will read 'fief,' wherever it occurs, with all appropriate mental reservations, and that similar adjustments of understanding will be made when necessary.

There is still, of course, the problem of transliteration for names of people and places. It must be admitted that in general a precise and scholarly transliteration is lost on readers who do not have Arabic and is mostly unnecessary for those that do. If time-honoured English versions of words exist, in other words, if they are found in good dictionaries, I have used them. I have taken this so far as to write 'cadi' rather than *qāḍī*. This also has the merit of allowing one to avoid 'judge.' Otherwise, the practice of this volume is to avoid all diacritical points and macrons in the main text and in substantial translated passages in the footnotes, apart from the undifferentiated indication of a letter 'ayn or a hamza by a simple superscript comma, but not at the beginning or the end of a word, however. On the other hand, a fuller transliteration will be employed in the generality of footnotes. This is a compromise that will probably please no-one.

*Ibn* in Arabic means 'son,' and it will often be found preceding a personal name, in which case a genitive relationship is to be understood, so that

*ibn Aḥmad* means ‘the son of Ahmad.’ On occasions it has been judged more elegant and appropriate to translate such a phrase. When a long string is met with (i.e. *ibn X ibn Y ... etc.*), indicating a genealogy, it is left untranslated. In the footnotes *ibn* has often been abbreviated to ‘b.’ The plural of *ibn* is *banū*, which may be found before the name of an eponymous ancestor or founder, denoting a tribal group or a dynasty. Another element in a person’s name is the *kunya*, which is formed from *Abū*, meaning ‘Father of ...,’ and, in theory, at least, the personal name of the first-born son, e.g. *Abū Muḥammad*. The *Abū* element is in Arabic subject to declension, but I have disregarded this and written, for example, *Ibn Abu Hashim* (the son of Abu Hashim), rather than the strict *Ibn Abi Hashim*. Note also the Arabic relative adjective (*nisba*), ending in a long ‘i’, which denotes a relationship or connection of some kind. Thus, for example, ‘Baghdadi’ means ‘of Baghdad’, ‘Baghdadian’ in a range of possible senses (such as ‘born in Baghdad’, ‘whose family came from Baghdad’, or ‘resident in Baghdad’ and so forth), and ‘Mu‘tazilī’ denotes adherence to the particular religious and philosophical beliefs of the Mu‘tazila.

All the original dates, expressed, of course, in the Muslim Hijrī calendar, have been converted using the tables published by Freeman-Grenville.<sup>20</sup> Owing to the uncertain length of the lunar months every converted date is subject to a few days’ error, either forwards or backwards. A date is only precise when the day of the week is also specified, and the converted A.D. date is found to fall on that same day of the week. Sometimes, when that match is not made, it may be necessary to adjust the basic mathematical equivalent produced by the tables to ensure that the day of the week coincides. If such an adjustment has been required in any case, this will be indicated by an ‘equals’ sign (=) immediately following the particular day. In the main text and in sizeable passages translated in the footnotes the equivalent A.D. dates are given in square brackets, while in the bulk of the footnotes a Hijrī date is given first, followed by the A.D. date after an oblique slash.

20 G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, *The Muslim and Christian Calendars being tables for the conversion of Muslim and Christian dates from the Hijra to the year A.D. 2000*, O.U.P., 1963.

# The Annals

*This page intentionally left blank*

[Vol. 9]

The Year 420 [1029]

[377] ACCOUNT OF HOW YAMIN AL-DAWLA AND THEN HIS SON  
AFTER HIM TREATED THE OGHUZ

In this year Yamin al-Dawla<sup>1</sup> dealt severely with the Oghuz Turks and scattered them throughout his lands, because they had caused trouble there. These were the followers of Arslan ibn Saljuq the Turk,<sup>2</sup> who had been in the desert around Bukhara. When Yamin al-Dawla crossed the river [Oxus] to march on Bukhara, Alitegin,<sup>3</sup> lord of that place, fled, as we shall relate, and Arslan ibn Saljuq presented himself before Yamin al-Dawla who arrested and imprisoned him in the land of India. He made a night attack on Arslan's tents and slew many of his followers, but a large number of them survived and fled from him, coming to Khurasan, where this year they caused disturbances and indulged in pillage. Yamin al-Dawla sent against them [378] an army which took them captive or expelled them from Khurasan. The tribesmen of two thousand tents departed and went off to Isfahan.

Yamin al-Dawla wrote to Ala al-Dawla,<sup>4</sup> instructing him to send back either them or their heads. The latter ordered his deputy to prepare a feast and invite them, then kill them. He duly sent to inform them that he wished to record their names so that he could enlist them, but he positioned his Daylamis in ambush in the gardens. They attended in great numbers, but a Turkish mamluke of Ala al-Dawla met them and apprised them of the situation, so they withdrew. The deputy of Ala al-Dawla tried to prevent their withdrawal, but they would have none of that. A commander of the Daylamis, himself a Daylami, attacked one of them, so this Turk shot him dead with an arrow. This caused a great commotion. The Daylamis turned out and were joined by the townsfolk. In the ensuing battle, they drove off the Turks, who struck their tents and departed, plundering every village they passed, until they eventually came to Wahsudān<sup>5</sup> in Azerbaijan. He received them obligingly and saw to their wants.

More remained in Khurasan than had gone to Isfahan. These moved to Mount Balkhan,<sup>6</sup> near which is ancient Khwarizm. Many of them came

1 Lit. "The Right-hand of the State", the honorific title (*laqab*) of Maḥmūd of Ghazna, son of Sabukteḡīn (see *EI*, 2nd ed., ii, 1050).

2 The son of the eponymous founder of the dynasty, brother of Mīkhā'īl, and uncle of Tuḡhrīl Beg. He was also called Isrā'īl. See *EI*, 2nd ed., i, s.v. Arslān b. Saldjuk, and below pp. 31–33.

3 Qarākhānīd rebel in Bukhārā, defeated in 416/1025.

4 'Alā' al-Dawla Muḥammad (d. 433/1041–42), member of the Kākūyīd dynasty of Daylamī origin (see *EI*, 2nd ed., iv, 465–7).

5 Abū Maṣṣūr Wahsudān b. Mamlān (c. 410–46/1019–54), one of the dynasty of the Rawwādīds (see *EI*, 2nd ed., viii, 469–70).

6 In Turkmeniya, east of Krasnovodsk; its nearness to Khwarizm is strictly relative! Correct, both here and below, the Arabic text's reading (Baljān).

down from the mountain into the [neighbouring] regions, where they plundered and wreaked havoc and murder. Then Mahmud ibn Sabuktegin despatched Arslan the Chamberlain,<sup>7</sup> the emir of Tus, against them. He marched to meet them and then for about two years was in continuous pursuit of them with large bodies of troops. On account of them Mahmud was compelled to make an expedition to Khurasan. He chased them from Nishapur to Dihistan, but when they went to Jurjan, he broke off his pursuit and placed his son, Mas'ud, in Rayy, as we have mentioned,<sup>8</sup> where the latter took some of them, led by Yaghmur, into his service.

When Mahmud ibn Sabuktegin died,<sup>9</sup> his son Mas'ud went to Khurasan, accompanied by these men. After he had gained control of Ghazna, they asked him about their fellows who had remained in Mount Balkhan, and he allowed them to return on [379] condition that they were loyal and behaved well.

Later when Mas'ud marched to India at the time of Ahmad Yinaltegin's rebellion,<sup>10</sup> they resumed their trouble-making. Mas'ud sent Tash Farrash with a large force to Rayy to take it from Ala al-Dawla. When he reached Nishapur and saw the evil conduct of the Oghuz, he summoned their leaders and put some fifty or more of them to death, including Yaghmur, but they did not change their ways and moved to Rayy. Mas'ud heard of their wickedness and their depredations, and took their encampments and moved them to India. He cut off the hands and feet of many whom he then gibbeted.<sup>11</sup>

This is the history of Arslan ibn Saljuq's tribal following. As for the history of Tughril Beg and Da'ud<sup>12</sup> and their brother Payghu,<sup>13</sup> who were in Transoxania, we shall relate in due course what became of them, God

7 The Arabic text has *al-jādhīb*, a mistake for *al-ḥājib* (chamberlain).

8 See *Kāmil*, ix, 372.

9 According to Gardīzī, 92, (cf. *Muntazam*, viii, 54) he died on Thursday, 23 Rabī' II 421/30 April 1030. The *Kāmil*, ix, 398, mentions only the month.

10 He was Maḥmūd's deputy in India whom Mas'ud confirmed. He rebelled there before Rajab 424/June 1033. In 425/1033–34 Mas'ud returned from India to fight the Oghuz and Aḥmad rebelled again. Tricked by a local ruler, Aḥmad's army was defeated and he committed suicide (see *Kāmil*, ix, 428–9, 434, 441–2).

11 See *Kāmil*, ix, 442 (s.a. 426/1034–35):

When Mas'ud returned from India and expelled the Oghuz, having defeated them, he marched to Jurjan and took possession of it.

*Muntazam*, viii, 83, mentions a letter of Mas'ud's, received in Baghdad in Sha'bān 426/June–July 1035, reporting his Indian conquests and that he had returned to deal with the Oghuz and had taken Jurjan and Tabaristan.

12 Tughril Beg's adopted Muslim name was Muḥammad, and Dā'ud's Turkish name was Chaghri Beg.

13 In the Arabic form: Bayghū. For the easy confusion in manuscripts between Bayghū and Yabghū, the former a totemic name and the latter a princely title, and a discussion of who used which at this period, see C. Cahen, "A propos de quelques articles du *Köprülü Armağn*," *JĀ*, ccxlii (1954), 271–5.

willing, for they became princes, whose history will be told in subsequent years of this chronicle.

When Tash Farrash, Sultan Mas'ud's chamberlain, had punished the Oghuz severely, they moved to Rayy, claiming that Azerbaijan was their destination and that they wished to join up with their fellows who had gone there earlier. They were dubbed 'the Iraqis', and the names of the leaders of this group were Goktash, Buqa, Qizil, Yaghmur and Nasoghlu. When they reached Damghan, the local garrison and the populace came out to deny them the town, but they were unable to manage this, so they climbed the hill to defend themselves there. The Oghuz entered the town and, having plundered it, moved on to Simnan, where they did the same. They entered Khwar Rayy<sup>14</sup> and again did the same, and they also plundered Ishaqabad and the neighbouring villages. Then they went to Mushkuwaih in the district of Rayy, which they plundered.

Abu Sahl al-Hamduni<sup>15</sup> and Tash Farrash made their military preparations and wrote to King Mas'ud and the ruler of Jurjan and Tabaristan, reporting the situation and asking for reinforcements. Tash Farrash took 3,000 horsemen and such elephants and armaments as he had, and moved to attack the Oghuz. They received intelligence of his move, [380] left their womenfolk, their treasure, and the booty they had gained from Khurasan and the towns mentioned above, and took the field unencumbered by any baggage train. The two sides met, Tash mounted his elephant and battle commenced between them. At first it was in Tash's favour, but then the Oghuz captured the chief of the Kurds who were with Tash. They were about to kill him, when he said to them, 'Spare me, so I can order the Kurds with Tash to give up the fight.' So they let him live and undertook to release him. He then sent to the Kurds, saying, 'If you go on fighting, I shall be killed'. They then had no stomach for the fight.

The Oghuz, who were 5,000 strong, charged Tash Farrash and his troops. The Kurds fled, but Tash and his men held firm. The Oghuz killed the elephant that was carrying Tash, who fell and was killed, cut to pieces by the Oghuz in revenge for their comrades he had slain. Along with him were killed a large number of Khurasanians and senior commanders. The Oghuz seized the remaining elephants and the army's baggage as booty. They went to Rayy, where they fought Abu Sahl al-Hamduni and the troops and townspeople who were with him. He and his men went up into the citadel of Tabarak,<sup>16</sup> while the Oghuz entered the town and sacked a number of quarters in a way that was very destructive of property. The Oghuz and Abu Sahl met in battle again, and a nephew of Yaghmur, the Oghuz emir,

14 A district comprising many villages in N. Persia, on a plain south of Damavand (see *EI*, 2nd ed., iv, 1029).

15 Ghaznavid commander and Mas'ud's governor in the Uplands (Rayy).

16 Yāqūt, iii, 507: 'a citadel on the top of a hill near the city of Rayy.' Sultan Ṭughril III destroyed it in 588/1192.

and also one of their great chiefs were taken prisoner. In return for the two of them they offered to restore what they had taken from Tash's army, to free their prisoners and to pay 30,000 dinars. Abu Sahl replied, 'I can only do what the sultan commands.'

After the Oghuz had left the town, a force arrived from Jurjan. As they drew near Rayy the Oghuz went to meet them and caught them in an ambush. They captured the commander and also made prisoners of about 2,000 men. The rest withdrew, routed. This occurred in the year 427 [November 1035–October 1036].

[381] ACCOUNT OF ALA AL-DAWLA'S COMING TO RAYY, HIS  
AGREEMENT WITH THE OGHUZ, AND THEIR RENEWAL OF  
HOSTILITY TOWARDS HIM

When the Oghuz left Rayy for Azerbaijan, Ala al-Dawla, apprised of that, went there and entered the city, putting out that he was subject to Sultan Mas'ud [ibn Mahmud] ibn Sabuktegin. He sent to Abu Sahl al-Hamduni asking him to recognize his position by paying tribute, but the latter refused to agree, because he feared Ala al-Dawla who then sent to the Oghuz inviting them to come so that he could give them grants of land and use their support against al-Hamduni. About 1,500 of them returned, led by Qizil, but the rest went to Azerbaijan.

When the Oghuz came to Ala al-Dawla, he treated them well and placed his confidence in them, so they stayed with him. Later it emerged that one of the Khurasanian generals in his service had urged the Oghuz to conspire with him to rebel against Ala al-Dawla. The latter sent for him to be brought before him and, having arrested him, imprisoned him in the citadel of Tabarak. This alienated and estranged the Oghuz. Ala al-Dawla strove to placate them, but they would not comply. They resumed their evil ways of pillage and brigandage. Once again Ala al-Dawla made contact with Abu Sahl al-Hamduni, who was in Tabaristan, and settled the question of Rayy with him, on condition that he himself be subject to Mas'ud. Abu Sahl accepted that and went to Nishapur, while Ala al-Dawla remained in Rayy.<sup>17</sup>

ACCOUNT OF WHAT THE OGHUZ IN AZERBAIJAN DID AND  
OF THEIR DEPARTURE FROM THERE

We have related<sup>18</sup> that a group of the Oghuz came to Azerbaijan, where Wahsudan received them with honour and made marriage ties with them, in

<sup>17</sup> Under the year 427/1035–36, *Kāmil* ix, 446–7, reports that 'Alā' al-Dawla attacked a Ghaznavid foraging force led by Abū Sahl, and then raided Isfahan but was defeated 'betrayed by the Turks.'

<sup>18</sup> P. 13 above, and see below *sub anno* 429.

the hope of gaining their support and restraining their mischief. [382] The names of their leaders were Buqa, Goktash, Mansur and Dana. What he had hoped for was a remote chance, for they did not give up their mischief and trouble-making, their murdering and pillaging. They went to Maragha, which they entered in the year 429 [October 1037–October 1038], burnt the main mosque and slaughtered many of the ordinary inhabitants, and likewise many of the Hadhbani Kurds. The situation was terrible and there was great suffering.

When the Kurds saw what had befallen them and the local population, they began to patch up their differences and to come to an agreement to stop the Oghuz's evil ways. Abu'l-Hayja ibn Rabib al-Dawla<sup>19</sup> and Wahsudān, the ruler of Azerbaijan, made peace and formed a united front, and the local population flocked to join them. They sought just revenge on the Oghuz who, when they saw that the populace had united to fight them, left Azerbaijan, it being impossible for them to remain there. They split up, some, under the leadership of Buqa, going to join those who were at Rayy, and others, led by Mansur and Goktash, going to Hamadhan which they besieged. In Hamadhan was Abu Kalijar<sup>20</sup> ibn Ala al-Dawla ibn Kakuya. He and the townsfolk agreed to fight the Oghuz and to defend themselves and their city. A large number on both sides were killed, as the siege of Hamadhan lasted a long time. In these circumstances Abu Kalijar ibn Ala al-Dawla, realising he was too weak to withstand them, sent to Goktash, made peace with him and a marriage alliance.

Those who had made Rayy their destination besieged the city, which was held by Ala al-Dawla ibn Kakuya. Fanakhusro ibn Majd al-Dawla<sup>21</sup> and Kamro al-Daylami, the lord of Saveh, joined with the Oghuz whose forces grew and whose military might greatly increased. It was clear to Ala al-Dawla that every time there was trouble with them they grew stronger and he weaker. He feared for his own life and so abandoned the city at night during Rajab [9 April–8 May 1035], fleeing to Isfahan. The population panicked and lost all cohesion. They abandoned resistance and made efforts to find a way to escape. The Oghuz renewed their attack on them the next day, and, as the defenders gave way, [383] they entered the city, sacked it foully, enslaved women and continued so for five days, so that the womenfolk took refuge in the main mosque. The populace scattered in every direction and to every bolt-hole. Fortunate was the man who escaped with his life! This disaster, coming after the one already mentioned, meant total ruination. It was even said that some Fridays there were only fifty souls in the main mosque.

19 He was a Hadhbani Kurd, lord of Irbil and other places, and nephew of Wahsudān.

20 'Alā' al-Dawla Abū Kālījār Garshasp succeeded his father, the Kākūyid ruler 'Alā' al-Dawla Muḥammad, in 437/1045–46 and died in 443/1051–52.

21 The Buyid prince, Abū Kālījār Fanākhusro b. Majd al-Dawla Rustam

When Ala al-Dawla abandoned Rayy, a body of Oghuz pursued but failed to catch him. They turned aside to Karaj which they sacked and perpetrated abominable deeds there. Another group, with Nasoghlu as their chief, went to Qazwin, the population of which resisted them but then came to terms on payment of 7,000 dinars and recognized Nasoghlu's authority.

There were some Oghuz in Urmiya, who invaded the territory of the Armenians and inflicted a bloody defeat on them, killing many and taking booty and captives. When they had returned to Urmiya and the districts of Abu'l-Hayja al-Hadhvani, the local Kurds fought them because they objected to their bad behaviour as neighbours. A large number were killed, so the Oghuz then plundered the productive lands there and slew many of the Kurds.

#### ACCOUNT OF THE CAPTURE OF HAMADHAN BY THE OGHUZ

We have already mentioned that the Oghuz besieged Hamadhan and that they made peace with the ruler, Abu Kalijar ibn Ala al-Dawla ibn Kakuya. Now, when the Oghuz had taken Rayy, they resumed the siege of Hamadhan, going there from Rayy, except for Qizil and his following, and meeting with those Oghuz that were there. When Abu Kalijar heard about them, he realised that he did not have the strength to resist them, so he left Hamadhan, accompanied by the leading [384] merchants and the notables of the city, and fortified himself in Kinkiwar.<sup>22</sup>

During the year 430 [October 1038–September 1039] the Oghuz entered Hamadhan. Of their chiefs the following assembled there, Goktash, Buqa, and Mansur<sup>23</sup>, accompanied by Fanakhusro ibn Majd al-Dawla ibn Buya at the head of a large number of Daylamis. On entering the city, they plundered it in an atrocious fashion that they had not used with other cities, because they were angry and vindictive towards the inhabitants on account of their initial resistance, and they seized the womenfolk. Parties of their horsemen were despatched to Asadabadh<sup>24</sup> and the villages of Dinawar,<sup>25</sup> which regions were given over to pillage and rapine. The Daylamis were the worst. The lord of Dinawar, Abu'l-Fath, son of Abu'l-Shawk,<sup>26</sup> came out to meet them and gave battle, in which he was victorious and took several of

22 Between Kirmanshāh and Hamadhān (see *EI*, 2nd ed., v, 123–4).

23 The edition has Qizil here, but he has just been explicitly excepted. Qizil was residing in Rayy at his death in 432/1040–41 (see below pp. 19 and 45). I have read Manṣūr here following a Ms. variant.

24 In the Uplands, 54 km. southwest of Hamadhān.

25 Important town in the Uplands, ruined in the time of Tamerlane (*EI*, 2nd ed., ii, 299).

26 Abū'l-Shawk (d. 437/1045–46) was Husām al-Dīn Abū'l-Shawk Fāris b. Abī'l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. 'Annāz, a ruler of the Kurdish 'Annāzid dynasty (see *EI*, 2nd ed., i, 512–3).

them prisoner. Their commanders sent envoys to secure their release, which he refused to agree to unless peace was made and undertakings given. When they agreed, he came to terms with them and released the prisoners.

Subsequently the Oghuz in Hamadhan sent envoys to Abu Kalijar ibn Ala al-Dawla and made peace with him, demanding that he leave his castle to take control of their affairs and guide their policy. They sent his wife to him, one of their own kind whom he had married. He came down to them and on their meeting, they attacked him, but he ran away. They plundered his possessions and the horses and other animals he had with him. His father heard [of this] and marched from Isfahan to his lands in the Uplands to inspect them. He fell in with a large group of Oghuz, got the upper hand and killed a good many of them, and took a like number prisoner. He entered Isfahan in triumph.

ACCOUNT OF THE KILLING OF THE OGHUZ IN THE  
CITY OF TABRIZ AND THEIR LEAVING AZERBAIJAN  
TO GO TO THE HAKKARIS

In the year 432 [September 1040–August 1041] Wahsudan ibn Mamlan<sup>27</sup> killed a large gathering of the Oghuz in the city of Tabriz.

[385] This came about because he invited a large gathering of them to a banquet he had prepared for them. After they had eaten and drunk, he seized thirty of them, their chiefs. The rest were left powerless and many of them were killed. The Oghuz residing in Urmiya gathered together and moved to the lands of the Hakkaris in the Mosul area. The local Kurds resisted them and a great battle was fought, in which the Kurds were defeated and their encampments and their flocks, their women and their children seized by the Oghuz. The Kurds took refuge in the mountains and the passes, but the Oghuz followed in their tracks and brought them to battle. However, the Kurds were victorious over them and killed 1,500, and took a number of prisoners, including seven of their chiefs and a hundred of their leading men. They seized their weapons and mounts as booty, and recovered the booty that the Oghuz had with them. The Oghuz took the route to the Uplands and were wholly broken and scattered. Ibn Rabib al-Dawla<sup>28</sup> heard this news and sent men in pursuit to annihilate the survivors.

Qizil, the Oghuz commander residing in Rayy, died and Ibrahim Yinal, the brother of Sultan Tughril Beg, set out for Rayy. When the Oghuz living there got news of him, they fled from his approach and abandoned the Uplands for fear of him. They made their way towards Diyar Bakr and Mosul in the year 433 [August 1041–August 1042].

27 The text has *Mahlān* here.

28 This is *Abū'l-Hayja' al-Hadhbānī*.

ACCOUNT OF THE ENTRY OF THE OGHUZ INTO DIYAR BAKR

In the year 433 [1041–1042] the Oghuz abandoned Azerbaijan.

This came about because Ibrahim Yinal, the brother of Tughril Beg, came to Rayy. When [386] the Oghuz who were there got news of this, they fled from his approach and abandoned the Uplands in fear. They set out for Azerbaijan, but could not settle there, because of what they had done to the inhabitants and because Ibrahim Yinal was behind them. They feared him because they were subjects of his and of his two brothers, Tughril Beg and Da'ud. They seized a certain Kurd, who told them the route. He took them through difficult mountains by way of Zawzan, and they emerged at Jazirat Ibn Umar.<sup>29</sup> Buqa, Nasoghlu and others went to Diyar Bakr and plundered Qarda, Bazabda,<sup>30</sup> Hasaniyya,<sup>31</sup> and Fishabur.<sup>32</sup>

Mansur ibn Ghuzoghlu remained at Jazirat [Ibn Umar] to the eastern side. Sulayman, son of Nasr al-Dawla ibn Marwan,<sup>33</sup> resident in Jazira, wrote to him about coming to terms and his remaining in the Jazira region until the end of the winter, when he would move on with the rest of the Oghuz to Syria. They reached an agreement and swore mutual oaths, but Sulayman harboured thoughts of treachery towards him. He gave him a feast, for which he made great preparation and to which he invited him. When Mansur entered Jazira, Sulayman arrested and imprisoned him. His followers broke up and scattered in every direction.

When Qirwash<sup>34</sup> heard of that he sent against them a substantial army, which was joined by the Bashnawi Kurds, the lords of Fanak,<sup>35</sup> and by the army of Nasr al-Dawla. They pursued the Oghuz, and, when they had caught them, brought them to battle. The Oghuz offered all the booty they had taken for a guarantee of safe passage, but they would not have that. The Oghuz fought like men in fear of death.<sup>36</sup> They wounded many of the Arabs,<sup>37</sup> and then they scattered.

29 I.e. the modern Çizre.

30 Qardā is a district in Upper Mesopotamia, and Bazabdā a district west of the Tigris near Jazirat Ibn 'Umar (see *EI*, 2nd ed., iv, 639).

31 Yāqūt, ii, 270: 'a town two days journey east of Mosul, towards Jazirat Ibn 'Umar.'

32 Yāqūt, iii, 931: 'small town in the Mosul region in the direction of Jazirat Ibn 'Umar.'

33 A member of the Marwānid dynasty (see *EI*, 2nd ed., vi, 626–7). He was killed in 447/1055–56 (see *Kāmil*, ix, 606–7). His father, Naṣr al-Dawla Abū Naṣr Aḥmad, lord of Mayyafariqin and Diyar Bakr, ruled from 401/1010 until his death in 453/1061 (see *EI*, 2nd ed., vii, 1017–8).

34 Qirwāsh (Mu'tamid al-Dawla Abū'l-Māni' b. al-Muqallad), a member of the Uqaylid dynasty, ruled from 391/1001 till 442/1050. He died in 444/1052.

35 Yāqūt, iii, 920: 'strong castle belonging to the Bashnawī Kurds about 2 *farsakhs* [c. 12 km.] from Jazirat Ibn 'Umar.' *EI*, 1st ed., ii, 1138b, has 'Finik.'

36 In the edition a negative particle is supplied ("like men who do not fear death"), but there is adequate sense without it, i.e. they fought desperately to save themselves from likely death.

37 I.e. the Bedouin troops of Qirwāsh, the 'Uqaylid prince.

Some Oghuz had advanced on Nisibis and Sinjar to raid. They returned to Jazira and besieged it. The Arabs set out for Iraq to winter there, while the Oghuz devastated Diyar Bakr, plundering and murdering. Nasr al-Dawla took Mansur, the Oghuz commander, from his own son, Sulayman, and made contact with the Oghuz, offering them money and the release of Mansur to depart from his lands. They agreed, so he released Mansur and sent some money, but they deceived him and increased their mischief. Some went to [387] Nisibis, Sinjar and Khabur, and after plundering there they returned. Some others went to Juhayna<sup>38</sup> and the districts of al-Marj,<sup>39</sup> which they plundered. For fear of them Qirwash took refuge in Mosul.

#### HOW THE OGHUZ TOOK THE CITY OF MOSUL

When they came from Azerbaijan to Jazirat Ibn Umar, part of the lands of Nasr al-Dawla ibn Marwan, some went to Diyar Bakr with the chiefs mentioned above, and the rest went to al-Baq'a. They camped at Barqa'id.<sup>40</sup> Qirwash, the ruler of Mosul, sent men to observe them and to raid them. Seeing that, they advanced on Mosul. Qirwash sent to placate and soothe them, offering them 3,000 dinars, which they did not accept. He sent them envoys a second time, but they demanded 15,000 dinars. He pledged that sum, then summoned the citizens together and told them of the situation.

While they were collecting the money, the Oghuz arrived at Mosul and camped in al-Hasba' (the stony plain?). Qirwash, his troops and the townspeople, sallied forth and fought with them most of the day. Night overtook them and they separated. On the next day they resumed the battle, and the Arabs and the populace were defeated. Qirwash escaped in a boat, embarking from his palace. He left all his money except for an insignificant amount. The Oghuz entered the city and plundered much of it. They plundered all that Qirwash possessed, money, jewels, finery, clothes and furniture. Qirwash himself escaped in his boat with a small party. [388] He reached al-Sinn,<sup>41</sup> where he stopped and sent to the Prince Jalal al-Dawla<sup>42</sup> to inform him of the situation and to ask for assistance. He also sent to

38 A town to the south of Mosul, west of the Tigris.

39 The Arabic text here and a little below (*Kāmil*, ix, 390) reads al-Faraj. Probably one should emend this to al-Marj (lit. the Meadow), that is Marj Juhayna, an area of several villages below Mosul (see *Atlas du Monde Arabo-Islamique*, 20, and *Yāqūt*, iv, 488–9).

40 Barqa'id, a town on the road from Nisibis to Mosul, traversing the Baqā' (so spelt) district, about 80 miles from Mosul (See *EI*, 2nd ed., i, 1050).

41 A town at the confluence of the Tigris and the Lesser Zab (see *Yāqūt*, iii, 169).

42 The Buyid prince, Jalāl al-Dawla Abū Ṭāhir b. Bahā' al-Dawla, born in 383/993, ruled for over 16 years in Baghdad until his death in 435/1044.

Dubays ibn Mazyad<sup>43</sup> and other Arab and Kurdish emirs to ask them for support and to complain of what had befallen him.

The Oghuz committed some abominable acts against the population of Mosul, murdering, raping women and plundering property. A number of quarters escaped, such as Abu Najih Road, Jassasa, Jarsuk, Riverside and Butchers' Gate, because the inhabitants guaranteed sums of money, and so they were spared.

THE ATTACK BY THE POPULACE OF MOSUL ON THE  
OGHUZ AND WHAT THEY THEN DID

We have related how the Oghuz gained control of Mosul. When they were well established there, they imposed a levy of 20,000 dinars on the population. Having taken that, they then hounded the people and took much of their wealth, on the pretext that it was money of the Bedouin Arabs.<sup>44</sup> Later they exacted a further 4,000 dinars. A band of Oghuz came to Ibn Farghan al-Mosuli and in his presence demanded money from a man, behaving badly and using bad language. There was also a quarrel between one of the Oghuz and a Mosul man. The Oghuz tribesman wounded the man and scalped him.<sup>45</sup> The latter had a strong-minded mother, who spattered her face with his blood, took his hair in her hand and screamed, 'God and the Muslims come to aid! A son of mine is slain and this is his blood, and a daughter – this is her hair!' as she wandered through the markets. The people rose up and came to Ibn Farghan, killed the Oghuz who were with him and killed any of them they could lay hands on. They then besieged them in a house, and the Oghuz fought from the roof.<sup>46</sup> The populace burrowed through the walls of the house to get to them and slew them all, apart from seven who included [389] Abu Ali and Mansur. Mansur went to al-Hasba', where other survivors joined him.

Goktash had left Mosul with a large group. They now wrote to him to tell him what had happened. He returned and entered the city by force on 25 Rajab 435 [27 February 1044], drew the sword against the population, took many prisoners, and plundered property. They continued to plunder and kill for twelve days. The Abu Najih Road escaped, because the inhabitants had treated the Emir Mansur well and he repaid them that

43 A member of the Arab dynasty of the Mazyadids in central Iraq between Kūfa and Hit in the tenth–twelfth centuries A.D. He was Nūr al-Dawla Abū'l-A'azz Dubays b. 'Alī b. Mazyad, and ruled from 408/1017–18 until his death, aged 80, in 474/1082 (see *EI*, 2nd ed., vi, 965–6).

44 I.e. money of the Banū 'Uqayl, the tribe of the ruling dynasty in Mosul and its main manpower.

45 Lit. 'cut off his hair.'

46 Changing the text's *man bi-saṭḥihā*, which would give '[they fought] those on its roof', to *min saṭḥihā*.

favour. Any survivors took refuge there, while the dead lay in the streets and rotted because there was no one to bury them. Later they were cast in batches into pits. Meanwhile the Oghuz were making the khutbah in the caliph's name, followed by Tughril Beg's.

After they had remained a long time in the city and done what we have mentioned, Prince Jalal al-Dawla ibn Buya wrote to Tughril Beg informing him of the deeds that they were doing, and Nasr al-Dawla ibn Marwan wrote to him to complain of them. He replied to Nasr al-Dawla, saying, 'I have heard that our servants have attacked your lands and that you have bought them off with your offer of money. You are the lord of a major city who ought to give something that can help us<sup>47</sup> in the fight against the infidels,' and promising him that he would send to them to move them on from his territory.

They were carrying out raids on the lands of the Armenians, plundering and taking captives. Eventually the cost of a beautiful girl came down to five dinars and there was no demand for boys at all. Tughril Beg's letter to Jalal al-Dawla put forward excuses: 'These Turkomans were slaves and servants of ours, our subjects and dependants, who obeyed our command and served our princely state. When we undertook to manage the problems of the House of Mahmud ibn Sabuktegin and we were commissioned to deal with Khwarizm, they withdrew to Rayy and made mischief and created disturbances there. We marched with our troops from Khurasan against them, reckoning that they would seek refuge in our guarantees of their safety and seek asylum in our forbearance and forgiveness. They were overwhelmed with awe, and shame kept them away. Inevitably we shall again make them subservient to our banners and in our might make them taste the reward of rebels, be they near or distant, in the valleys or on the heights.'

[390] ACCOUNT OF THE VICTORY OF QIRWASH,  
LORD OF MOSUL, OVER THE OGHUZ

We have related how Qirwash went down to al-Sinn and wrote to all the provincial rulers, seeking assistance from them. Prince Jalal al-Dawla gave him no help because he had lost the loyalty of his Turkish troops. Dubays ibn Mazyad, however, went to help him and all the Uqayl joined him. Reinforcements from Abu'l-Shawk and Ibn Warram<sup>48</sup> and others also came to him, but missed the battle, for Qirwash, when the Uqayl and Dubays had joined him, marched to Mosul. The news reached the Oghuz, who

47 Amending the text to *nasta'in*.

48 I.e. Abū'l-Faḥ Ibn Warrām, a Kurdish chief, who, with a group called the Jāwāniyya, is mentioned under the year 432/1040–41 as an ally of Surkhāb, against the latter's brother, Abū'l-Shawk (see *Kāmil*, ix, 491).