

The Chronicle of
Ibn al-Athir for the
Crusading Period
from *al-Kamil*
fi'l-Ta'rikh. Part 2



The Years

541 – 589/1146 – 1193:

The Age of Nur al-Din
and Saladin

An **Ashgate** Book

Translated by D.S. Richards



CRUSADE

TEXTS IN

TRANSLATION

CRUSADE TEXTS IN TRANSLATION

About the volume:

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr (1160–1233 AD), entitled *al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rikh*, is one of the outstanding sources for the history of the mediaeval world. It covers the whole sweep of Islamic history almost up to the death of its author and, with the sources available to him, he attempted to embrace the widest geographical spread; events in Iraq, Iran and further East run in counterpoint with those involving North Africa and Spain. From the time of the arrival of the Crusaders in the Levant, their activities and the Muslim response become the focus of the work.

While continuing with the aim of comprehensive coverage, the years in this part are dominated by the careers of Nur al-Din and Saladin, the champions of the Jihad, sometimes called the “counter-crusade”. Of special interest is the historian’s partiality for the House of the former and his perceived hostility to Saladin.

About the series:

The crusading movement bequeathed to its future historians a legacy of sources unrivalled in their range and variety. *Crusade Texts in Translation* presents these sources document in fascinating detail as well as the motivations and viewpoints, military efforts and spiritual lives, of the participants in the crusades. They narrate the internal histories of the states and societies which crusaders established or supported in the many regions where they fought. Some sources have been translated in the past but the vast majority have been available only in their original language. *Crusade Texts in Translation* provides a wide ranging corpus of texts, most of them translated for the first time, which illuminate the history of the crusades and the crusader-states from every angle, including that of their principal adversaries, the Muslim powers of the Middle East.

About the author:

D.S. Richards retired as Lecturer in Arabic at the Oriental Institute, Oxford, in 2000. He is an Emeritus Fellow of St Cross College, University of Oxford, UK.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Crusade Texts in Translation

Editorial Board

Malcolm Barber (Reading), Peter Edbury (Cardiff),
Bernard Hamilton (Nottingham), Noran Housley (Leicester),
Peter Jackson (Keele)

Titles in the series include:

Colin Imber

The Crusade of Varna, 1443–45

Carol Sweetenham

Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade
Historia Iherosolimitana

Thomas A. Fudge

The Crusade against Heretics in Bohemia, 1418–1437
Sources and Documents for the Hussite Crusades

Helen J. Nicholson

The Chronicle of the Third Crusade
The *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*

Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach

The *Gesta Tancredi* of Ralph of Caen
A History of the Normans on the First Crusade

D.S. Richards

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for The Crusading Period from *al-Kāmil fī'l-Ta'rikh*. Part 1

The Years 491–541/1097–1146: The Coming of the Franks and the
Muslim Response

Janet Shirley

The Song of the Cathar Wars
A History of the Albigensian Crusade

Damian Smith and Helena Buffery

The Book of Deeds of James I of Aragon
A Translation of the Medieval Catalan *Llibre dels Fets*



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr
for the Crusading Period

from

al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rīkh



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

The Chronicle
of Ibn al-Athīr
for
the Crusading Period
from
al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rīkh

Part 2

The Years 541–589/1146–1193
The Age of Nur al-Din and Saladin

Translated by

D.S. Richards

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2007 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2007 D.S. Richards

D.S. Richards has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the translator of this work.

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.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Ibn al-Athir, Izz al-Din, 1160–1233

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil i'l-Ta'rikh

Part 2: The Years 541–589/1146–1193: The Age of Nur al-Din and Saladin. –

(Crusade Texts in Translation; 15)

1. Crusades – Early works to 1800. I. Title II. Richards, D. S. (Donald Sidney), 1935–.

940.1'82

Library of Congress Control Number: 2006926785

ISBN 9780754640783 (hbk)

ISBN 9780754669517 (pbk)

Contents

Preface	vii
Introduction	1
The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir	5
The Year 541 [1146-1147]	7
The Year 542 [1147-1148]	13
The Year 543 [1148-1149]	18
The Year 544 [1149-1150]	27
The Year 545 [1150-1151]	35
The Year 546 [1151-1152]	39
The Year 547 [1152-1153]	42
The Year 548 [1153-1154]	56
The Year 549 [1154-1155]	67
The Year 550 [1155-1156]	74
The Year 551 [1156-1157]	76
The Year 552 [1157-1158]	87
The Year 553 [1158-1159]	95
The Year 554 [1159-1160]	103
The Year 555 [1160]	112
The Year 556 [1161]	120
The Year 557 [1161-1162]	132
The Year 558 [1162-1163]	138
The Year 559 [1163-1164]	144
The Year 560 [1164-1165]	156
The Year 561 [1165-1166]	161
The Year 562 [1166-1167]	163
The Year 563 [1167-1168]	168
The Year 564 [1168-1169]	171
The Year 565 [1169-1170]	183
The Year 566 [1170-1171]	190
The Year 567 [1171-1172]	196
The Year 568 [1172-1173]	203

The Year 569 [1173-1174]	217
The Year 570 [1174-1175]	229
The Year 571 [1175-1176]	241
The Year 572 [1176-1177]	249
The Year 573 [1177-1178]	253
The Year 574 [1178-1179]	260
The Year 575 [1179-1180]	264
The Year 576 [1180-1181]	270
The Year 577 [1181-1182]	276
The Year 578 [1182-1183]	281
The Year 579 [1183-1184]	291
The Year 580 [1184-1185]	299
The Year 581 [1185-1186]	304
The Year 582 [1186-1187]	313
The Year 583 [1187-1188]	318
The Year 584 [1188-1189]	344
The Year 585 [1189-1190]	360
The Year 586 [1190-1191]	372
The Year 587 [1191-1192]	384
The Year 588 [1192-1193]	396
The Year 589 [1193]	408
Bibliographical References	411
Index	419

Preface

This volume comprises the second part of a planned three-volume translation of the later parts of *al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rīkh*, Ibn al-Athīr's major chronicle of Islamic history. The first part of the translation contained the period from the year 491/1097 up to 541/1146. Since these volumes appear in the series Crusader Texts in Translation, it is only reasonable that the divisions imposed on the material should refer to dates that have a relevance for the history of the Crusades. Thus the first part began with the year in which the chronicle first refers to the coming Frankish expedition to the Levant. It ended with the murder of Emir Zankī, the Atabeg of Mosul and Aleppo, whose career marked the end of one stage of the Muslim response to the Crusades.

This second part, which is now offered, has an even greater inner consistency from the viewpoint of Crusading history as it takes a crucial span of years that covers the careers of Nūr al-Dīn, son of Zankī, and his one-time subordinate Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb, whom we shall throughout refer to as Saladin. That is to say that it covers the period 541-589/1146-1193. These are years that saw the growth of the spirit of Jihad, which in this case we may call a Counter-Crusade, an altogether more concentrated effort to recover the lands lost to Latin Christendom, especially Jerusalem. A leading role in this may be credited to Nūr al-Dīn whose example was followed by Saladin (with whatever reservations might be made concerning the totality of his career). It was Saladin who achieved the major victories, although he then had to face the bitter challenges of the Third Crusade.

Even though events in Syria and Palestine take up a major share of this volume and, as we have seen, define its limits, it must not in any way be forgotten that Ibn al-Athīr wished to write a work that dealt as comprehensively as possible with what he envisaged as the Islamic world. This wider narrative has other themes that proceed according to their own separate rhythms. This means that we still have many pages that concern themselves with Muslim Spain (Andalusia) and North Africa (the Maghrib and Ifrīqiya), mainly with the developing power of the Almohad dynasty. There are many other pages that look eastwards from Ibn al-Athīr's centre of gravity, towards Persia and the lands beyond the Oxus, even across the Indus into the realms of the Hindu kings. In these pages we read of the modest revival of the political power of the Abbasid caliphate, the steady decline of the Saljuq sultanate and the constant disputes of the great emirs and atabegs, the disruptive influence of Oghuz tribesmen, the more organized challenge to the Saljuqs posed first by the Qarakhanids, a Muslim Turkish dynasty, and secondly

by the Qarakhitay, the pagan Sinified dynasty of the Western Liao, and then their mutual rivalry in Central Asia, and finally the rise of the Ghurid sultanate at the expense of the later Ghaznavids and their expansion into India.

Once again I thank the editors for accommodating these translated volumes in their series on Crusader Texts and also the publishing house of Ashgate for making it possible. My warmest thanks go to my former colleagues at Oxford University's Oriental Institute, especially to Professor Geert Jan van Gelder and Dr Emilie Savage-Smith, whose assistance has been greatly appreciated. I also acknowledge with gratitude the helpful suggestions of Dr Peter Jackson who read through my typescript. As always I owe a great deal to the constant support of my wife.

Introduction

The historian, Ibn al-Athīr or, to give him his personal name, ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī al-Jazarī, was born on 4 Jumādā I 555/13 May 1160 at Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar (the modern Cizre), north of Mosul on the River Tigris. His father Muḥammad served in the administration of the then ruling dynasty of the Zankids, a successor state of the Saljuq sultanate. His older brother, Majd al-Dīn Mubārak, also followed a career in government service for the Zankids. This background provided Ibn al-Athīr with the pro-Zankid sentiment which is a feature of his relevant historical writings and which has so often been remarked on. There is no clear evidence that he was himself a paid servant of the Zankid regime. He records that he was an ‘associate’ of the ruling house’s prominent vizier, Jamāl al-Dīn, using a rather imprecise expression, which could mean that he was a personal friend or that he was part of the vizier’s cultural circle or, indeed, that he was a member of his paid staff. It seems more likely that our author followed his scholarly and literary bent, while living on rents from family estates and perhaps benefiting from the commercial operations that the family clearly carried on. Perhaps it may be allowed to refer the reader to the introduction to the first part¹ of this translation for further details of Ibn al-Athīr’s life and his writings and for editions and translations of the latter.

This second part has followed the lines laid down in the first as far as translation and editorial practice are concerned. They shall be set out here in summary fashion. For the translation the Beirut edition published by Dār Ṣādir² remains the basic text and, to facilitate reference to the original Arabic, its pagination has been recorded in bold within square brackets. For technical reasons this original pagination has also been used for internal cross-referencing. An accurate delivery of the original text’s meaning has quite naturally been the prime aim but readability has followed hard on its heels. The passages where the text has presented problems of interpretation, not to speak of basic intelligibility (especially in the poetic excerpts), will no doubt declare themselves to the reader. Alternative readings or emendations have been explained in footnotes. Comment and identification in footnotes have been kept to what is hoped to be a moderate, yet sufficient, level. The range of the material is such that footnotes could easily proliferate and extend beyond measure. The translator can only ask indulgence for any shortcomings and, more particularly, for cases where identification proved impossible.

¹ *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr (1)*.

² Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī’l-ta’rikh*, 13 vols, Dār Ṣādir, Beirut, 1965–7.

Dates according to the Hijrī calendar have been converted into those of the Christian era according to the table given by Grenville.³ If an ‘equals’ sign (=) precedes an AD date, this signifies that the day of the month has been adjusted to achieve a congruence of the day of the week.

The question of transliteration has been treated in Part 1 and the same practice has been followed here. Among other things this means that certain toponyms and terms have been given in an anglicized form, where such exists.

The introduction to Part 1 ended with some explanatory comment on the way that certain commonly occurring terms were to be translated. Broadly speaking, the same list will apply in this present volume. One further term deserves comment. It is a military term, that is to say, *yazak*. It lacks precision, as is so often the case, and can in different circumstances imply an advanced guard, a small tactical force operating independently, or a screening or picketing force. Variations on all of these will be met with.

A question that always looms around discussion of Ibn al-Athīr’s *Kāmil* is the identification of the sources for his wide-ranging narrative – or, to be more pertinent, the problem that Ibn al-Athīr routinely fails to specify his sources. It is not the case that he neglects absolutely to name informants. In fact, he indicates a source, sometimes left as an anonymous oral source, more often than one might think, but usually for a very limited and specific item. His family, because of their connection with the Atabeg house, was a source of information for him and it may have been through them that he was able to claim that he saw a letter of Saladin in his own hand. What he fails to do is to state clearly which accounts he has relied on to give him his fundamental narrative.

It is, however, abundantly clear from even a cursory comparison of the texts that for events at Baghdad and the general milieu of caliph and sultan he relied greatly on the chronicle of Ibn al-Jawzī,⁴ which comes to an end in the year 574/1177. For the history of lands further to the east in the orbit of the Ghaznavids, the Ghurids and the Qarakhitay Ibn al-Athīr’s sources are far from obvious. In one passage he names Ibn Funduq,⁵ but unfortunately in connection with events that date from after Ibn Funduq’s death. One assumes therefore that what Ibn al-Athīr had access to at this point was in fact a continuation, by an unspecified hand, of Ibn Funduq’s work. This does not in any way rule out the decided probability that Ibn al-Athīr used Ibn Funduq’s own writings for earlier matters. These particular later events are further set out in the *Kāmil* in a different version which is anonymous and which Ibn al-Athīr is unable to reconcile with the so-called Ibn Funduq account. In short, the historiography of this period and this area is limited and would have been even more limited for Ibn al-Athīr, if one accepts that he was

³ See G. S. P. 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*, Oxford, 1963.

⁴ As a source Ibn al-Jawzī is expressly mentioned s.a. 569 p. [410].

⁵ See s.a. 568 p. [386].

unable to consult Persian works. Bosworth has made a useful survey of the historical writings from the eastern Iranian world.⁶

If one moves to the western Islamic world, the question of Ibn al-Athīr's sources has not, to my knowledge, been systematically investigated. However for events in Ifrīqiya (modern Tunisia) one can be fairly certain that Ibn al-Athīr used the history of Emir 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Shaddād, a member of the Zīrid house, who after its fall moved to Syria and entered Saladin's service. Ibn al-Athīr refers directly to his history only once and that for an earlier period.⁷ However, Ibn Shaddād's account of the depredations inflicted upon Ifrīqiya by the Almoravid from Majorca, 'Alī ibn Ishāq, has much in common with *Kāmil's* account under the year 581/1185–6.⁸ There is also a significant resemblance between *Kāmil's* account of the Almohad capture of Tunis and Mahdiyya, given under the year 554/1159, and that attributed to Ibn Shaddād.⁹

For the events in Syria and Palestine the question of Ibn al-Athīr's sources is not such a problem, because we possess enough of the historical writings of Ibn al-Qalānisi and 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī to show that they were the ones mainly utilized by Ibn al-Athīr.¹⁰ Ibn al-Qalānisi's work on the history of Damascus,¹¹ his *Dhayl* (Continuation), ends at 555/1160, the year of the author's own death. 'Imād al-Dīn was the author of two important histories. One survives in full, namely *al-Faṭḥ al-qussī*, a history of Saladin's career from 583/1187, the year of the battle of Ḥaṭṭīn, until the year of his death. The other, *al-Barq al-shāmī* (Syrian Lightning), which traces the author's own career alongside those of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin, is extant only in two parts, covering the years 573–5/1177–9 and 578–80/1182–4. However the thirteenth-century historian al-Bundārī made an abbreviated version of it, which he entitled *Sanā al-barq al-shāmī*, and another thirteenth-century historian Abū Shāma incorporated much of 'Imād al-Dīn's writings (and incidentally also Ibn al-Athīr's) in his *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn* (the Book of the Two Gardens) on the reigns of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin.

The study of Arabic historiography of the Crusades and the position of Ibn al-Athīr owes much to H.A.R. Gibb, who tried to establish not only the sources Ibn al-Athīr used but also how faithfully and accurately he had used them.¹² He gave

⁶ Bosworth, 'Arabic, Persian and Turkish historiography'.

⁷ See *Kāmil*, viii, 27.

⁸ Ibn Shaddād's work, which is not directly extant, is quoted by an early fourteenth-century traveller (Tijānī, *Riḥla*, 14).

⁹ Quoted in Tijānī, *Riḥla*, 346–8.

¹⁰ Ibn al-Qalānisi is in fact expressly quoted s.a. 523 p. [560] and 'Imād al-Dīn s.a. 586 p. [56].

¹¹ Ibn 'Asākir (died 571/1176) is another historian of Damascus, whose work is quoted by Ibn al-Athīr s.a. 543 p. [131].

¹² H.A.R. Gibb, 'Notes on the Arabic Materials for the History of the Early Crusades,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. vii, 1935, 739–54; idem, 'The Arabic sources for the Life of Saladin', *Speculum*, xxv, 58–72.

an unfavourable verdict and attributed the shortcomings in Ibn al-Athīr's use of his sources to his pro-Zankid and anti-Saladin sentiments. There is a difficulty in establishing beyond any doubt that the rearrangement of material and the inaccuracies that Gibb identified were really intentional and motivated in this way and that they were not the result of editorial confusion. The historian's attitude to Saladin is complex and far from being wholly negative. There are indeed passages where Saladin is criticized but these can be balanced by passages where admiration is expressed. When explicit blame is attached, for instance over Saladin's notorious failure to deal with Tyre to prevent its becoming a future threat, we know that Ibn al-Athīr was benefiting from a large dose of hindsight but nevertheless in Ibn al-Athīr's account there is also some implicit excusing of Saladin in the recognition that Saladin was limited by the means and institutions that he was working with.

Abū Shāma portrayed Nūr al-Dīn as the first genuine proponent of the Jihad against the Frankish invaders, whose religiously inspired action marked a significant change in the depth of dedication and commitment to the struggle. In Abū Shāma's view Saladin followed in the footsteps of Nūr al-Dīn and in due course, as the model *mujāhid*, outstripped his achievements by his own victories and the reconquest of Jerusalem. This view rather puts on one side the events of the Third Crusade and the disappointing end to Saladin's career, the military stalemate and the growing exhaustion and discontent of the Muslim armies.

Ibn al-Athīr's narrative in this part certainly supports the idea of Nūr al-Dīn as a model Islamic ruler and exponent of the Jihad. This is hardly surprising owing to Ibn al-Athīr's close family ties with the Atabeg dynasty. His pious gratitude is amply revealed in his monograph dedicated to the dynasty, *al-Ta'rikh al-bāhīr*. On the other hand his portrayal of Saladin is mixed, as has been said. There are indications that he saw him as a usurper, motivated by his dynastic ambitions, but the picture is not wholly bad and the final judgment is generous.

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr

The Age of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Account of how Zankī's two sons, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī and Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, took power

After Atabeg Zankī was killed,¹ Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, his son, took his signet ring from his hand, for he was present with him, and set out for Aleppo which he took possession of. At that time Zankī's administration was being carried on, and authority in his state exercised, by one of the turbanned classes [113], Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī,² who monopolized the government. His associate was the Emir-Chamberlain Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Yaghīsiyānī.³ They agreed to preserve the dynasty. At the Martyr Atabeg's court was the Prince Alp Arslān ibn Sultan Maḥmūd.⁴ He rode forth that day and troops gathered around him. Jamāl al-Dīn and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn came to him and encouraged him to occupy himself with drinking, singers and slave girls. They got him to enter Raqqa, where he remained for several days, making no public appearance. He then travelled to Māksīn which he entered. He stayed there for some days, while Jamāl al-Dīn was taking oaths of support for Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Atabeg Zankī, from the emirs and sending them to Mosul.

From Māksīn Alp Arslān went to Sinjār, after Sayf al-Dīn had already arrived at Mosul. After reaching Sinjār Jamāl al-Dīn sent to the governor of the citadel, telling him to send the following message to the Sultan's son: 'I am your servant but I am subject to Mosul. If and when you take it, I shall deliver Sinjār to you.' He therefore set off for Mosul but Jamāl al-Dīn seized him and took him to the town of Balad. Few of the troops remained with him. He advised him to cross the Tigris. He crossed over to the east with a small band.

Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī had been in the town of Shahrazūr, which was his fief. His father's deputy in Mosul, Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī Kūchuk,⁵ sent to summon him to Mosul, where he arrived before the Prince. When Jamāl al-Dīn learnt that Sayf al-Dīn had

¹ Zankī was killed in Rabī' II 541/September 1146. He was the eponymous founder of a dynasty, for a general account of which see *EI*(2), xi, 452–5, s.v. Zangids.

² This prominent servant of the Zankid dynasty, also known as al-Jawād al-Isfāhānī (see *EI*(2), ii, 489), died in 559/1164.

³ Muḥammad ibn Ayyūb al-Yaghīsiyānī, whose other *nisba* al-'Imādī alludes to his service with 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī, was later governor of Homs and died in Dhū'l-Qa'da 552/December 1157 (Ibn Qal., 347).

⁴ i.e. the Saljuq prince for whom Zankī acted as regent/guardian (atabeg). As Zankī met his death on campaign, he was called 'the Martyr' (*al-shahīd*).

⁵ Turkoman in origin, Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Baktakīn was called Kuchuk (Turkish: small) because of his stature (*Wafayāt*, iv, 114).

arrived at Mosul, he sent to tell him how few were the men with the Prince, so he dispatched some of his troops, who arrested him. He was imprisoned in the citadel of Mosul. Sayf al-Dīn's control of the lands became well established, but his brother, Nūr al-Dīn, remained in Aleppo, which he held. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Yāghīsiyānī joined him to administer his affairs and to undertake to maintain his rule. We have given a complete exposition of these events in our *The Resplendent History of the Atabeg Dynasty (al-Ta'riḫ al-bāhir)*.⁶

[114] Account of the rebellion of Edessa after the death of the Atabeg

Joscelin the Frank, who had been lord of Edessa, was in his dominion, that is, Tell Bāshir and the neighbourhood. He wrote to the people of Edessa, the generality of whom were Armenians, and urged them to rebel, resist the Muslims and surrender the city. They agreed to do this and he appointed a day on which he would come to them. He proceeded to Edessa with his troops and conquered the city but the citadel and the Muslims who were within held out against him, despite his attacks on them. News of this reached Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, while he was at Aleppo. He set out with his army on forced marches. When he drew near, Joscelin departed in flight back to his own land. Nūr al-Dīn entered the city and at that time sacked it and enslaved its populace.

This was the occasion when the city was plundered and became devoid of inhabitants. Only a small number remained there. Many people think that it was plundered when the Martyr conquered it but this is not so.

The news about the rising at Edessa reached Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī. He sent troops there but they heard, while they were on the way, of Nūr al-Dīn's seizure of the city and his allowing it to be sacked, so they turned back.

A remarkable thing that is related is that Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī, who was the deputy in the citadel of Mosul for the Martyr and his sons, received a present which Nūr al-Dīn sent to him from this conquest. It included a slave girl. After he had been with her and left after his ablutions, he said to those with him, 'Do you know what has happened to me on this day?' 'No,' they replied. 'When we conquered Edessa,' he continued [115], 'with the Martyr, part of the plunder that fell into my hands was a splendid girl, whose beauty delighted me. My heart inclined to her. Then all of a sudden the Martyr made a proclamation ordering the return of captives and plundered property. He was held in awe and fear, so I gave her back, although my heart was attached to her. Just now a gift from Nūr al-Dīn came to me, consisting of several girls, that girl being one of them. I have had my way with her for fear that I might have to hand her back as before.'

⁶ See *Bāhir*, 84–86. Sultan Mas'ūd readily recognized Sayf al-Dīn's position because of their long-standing friendship.

How ‘Abd al-Mu’min gained control of Andalusia

In this year ‘Abd al-Mu’min⁷ sent an army to Andalusia and took control of the lands of Islam there. This came about because, when ‘Abd al-Mu’min besieged Marrakech, a group of notables of Andalusia, one of whom was Abū Ja’far Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥamdīn, came to him, bearing a letter that contained the submission of the people of their towns to ‘Abd al-Mu’min, their entry into the ranks of his followers, the Almohads, and their support for his cause.⁸ ‘Abd al-Mu’min accepted this with thanks and put their minds at rest. They asked him for assistance against the Franks, so he equipped a large force and sent it with them. He prepared a fleet and sent it to sea. The fleet arrived at Andalusia and they attacked the city of Seville, reaching it by its river. An army of the Veiled Ones⁹ was there. The attackers besieged it by land and by water and took it by assault. Several were killed there. The population sought terms and stayed quiet. The troops took control of the country and the people there became [subjects] of ‘Abd al-Mu’min.

[116] Account of the killing of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān [ibn] Ṭuḡhāyuruk and ‘Abbās, the lord of Rayy

During this year Sultan Mas‘ūd killed Emir-Chamberlain ‘Abd al-Raḥmān [ibn]¹⁰ Ṭuḡhāyuruk, who was the lord of Khalkhāl and part of Azerbaijan and the effective ruler of the sultan’s state. Alongside him the sultan had no authority.

The reason for his being killed was that, after ‘Abd al-Raḥmān had so severely limited the sultan, he remained with him rather like a captive with no authority in the country. In the end ‘Abd al-Raḥmān singled out a page who belonged to the sultan, namely Arslān Beg, known as Khāṣṣ Beg ibn Balankirī,¹¹ whom the sultan had raised and taken as an intimate, and removed him, so that the sultan could no more see him. Khāṣṣ Beg had intelligence, resourcefulness, an excellent mind and the ability to achieve what he wanted to do. When ‘Abd al-Raḥmān assembled the troops, among whom was Khāṣṣ Beg, the latter and Sultan Mas‘ūd had already agreed between them that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān should be killed. Khāṣṣ Beg summoned a group of men whom he trusted and discussed this with them. Each of them feared

⁷ ‘Abd al-Mu’min ibn ‘Alī, a Zanāta Berber, who succeeded the Mahdi Ibn Tumart as ruler (1130–63) of the Almohads in the Maghrib (Abun-Nasr, *Maghrib*, 106–8).

⁸ Ibn Ḥamdīn, governor of Cordoba, had along with other local rulers rebelled against the Almoravids.

⁹ *al-mulaththamīn*, i.e. the Almoravids.

¹⁰ See Bundārī, index.

¹¹ A Turkoman emir whose high position under Sultan Mas‘ūd won him his soubriquet, Khāṣṣ Beg (special lord). An ‘overmighty subject’, he was executed in 548/1153. See *EI*(2), iv, 1097.

to take this step against him, except for a man called Zankī, who was a life-guard (*jāndār*). He offered on his own initiative to be the first to strike. A group of emirs conspired with Khāṣṣ Beg to support his plan. While ‘Abd al-Raḥmān was parading in the retinue, Zankī the Life-Guard struck him on the head with an iron mace he had in his hand. He fell to the ground and Khāṣṣ Beg despatched him. The emirs with whom he had conspired to this end helped him to protect Zankī and his associates. His killing took place outside Ganja.

News of this came to Sultan Mas‘ūd when he was at Baghdad with Emir ‘Abbās, lord of Rayy. The latter’s troops were more numerous than the sultan’s. Although disapproving of this and vexed by it, the sultan handled him with blandishments and gentleness. He summoned Emir Alḡqush Kūn Khar from al-Liḡf¹² [117] and also Tatar, who was a chamberlain. Backed by these two, he called ‘Abbās to him in his palace. As he entered, his men were prevented from entering with him. They turned him aside into a chamber and said to him, ‘Take off the brigandine.’ He said, ‘I have oaths and undertakings from the sultan.’ They punched him and some mamlukes, prepared for this purpose, emerged to deal with him. Thereupon he made his confession of faith, took off his brigandine and cast it down. They struck him with their swords, then cut off his head and threw it to his followers. Later they threw out his corpse. His baggage train and his tents were plundered and this put the city in a turmoil.

‘Abbās was one of Sultan Maḡmūd’s mamlukes, of excellent conduct, just towards his peasants and a great warrior for the Faith against the Bāṡīnīs, of whom he killed very many and built a beacon from their heads at Rayy. He besieged the castle of Alamut and entered one of their villages, which he set fire to and burnt everyone there, men, women and children, and all else besides. After he was killed, he was buried on the West Bank. His daughter later sent and had him carried to Rayy, where she buried him. His murder took place in Dhū’l-Qa‘da [April 1147].

It was a strange coincidence that al-‘Ibādī was preaching one day when ‘Abbās attended. One of those present at the session voiced objection and dashed towards Emir ‘Abbās, whose followers beat him and restrained him, fearful for ‘Abbās because he was extremely wary of Bāṡīnī attacks. He always wore a brigandine and his valiant mamlukes were ever at his side. Al-‘Ibādī said to him, ‘O Emir, how long this caution? By God, if some fate had been decreed for you, with your own hand would you loose the buttons of your brigandine, for your fate to be fulfilled.’ What he said came to pass.

The sultan had appointed as his vizier Ibn Dārust, the vizier of Būz-Aba, though unwillingly, as has been mentioned before. At this present time he dismissed him, as he preferred to be dismissed and to return to his master Būz-Aba. After

¹² According to Yāqūt, iv, 353, ‘a well-known district in the Baghdad area ... containing several strong castles.’ Bandanījīn was in the Liḡf district, ‘the Foot-hills’ of the Kurdistan Mountains (Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 63).

dismissing him, he arranged with him to bring about Būz-Aba's reconciliation with him and remove any apprehension he might have by reason of the killing of 'Abd al-Raḥmān and 'Abbās. The vizier departed, hardly believing his escape, and came to Būz-Aba. What happened we shall relate later.

[118] Miscellaneous events

During this year Sultan Mas'ūd imprisoned his brother, Sulaymān Shāh, in the citadel of Takrit.¹³

This year Emir Jāwulī al-Ṭughrilī, lord of Arrāniyya and part of Azerbaijan, died. He had made moves towards rebellion. His death was sudden; when stringing a bow, he suffered a haemorrhage and died.¹⁴

The Chief Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Ismā'īl ibn Abī Sa'd al-Ṣūfī died at Baghdad and was buried outside the Zawzanī Hospice at the Basra Gate. He was born in the year 464 [1071-2].¹⁵ His son, Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥīm took his post as chief shaykh.

There died this year the Chief Syndic Muḥammad ibn Ṭirād al-Zaynabī, the brother of Sharaf al-Dīn, the vizier.¹⁶

This year Mas'ūd ibn Bilāl was appointed to the post of prefect of Baghdad and the sultan left the city.

In Iraq there was a plague of locusts which ruined the crops of most of the country.

This year al-'Ibādī, the preacher, arrived as an ambassador of Sultan Sanjar to the caliph. He gave sermons at Baghdad and was very well received there. Sultan Mas'ūd and lesser persons attended his sessions. The common people neglected their occupations to attend his sessions and get as close to him as possible.¹⁷

After the killing of the Martyr Zankī ibn Āqsunqur this year, the lord of Damascus attacked the castle of Baalbek and put it under siege. Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb ibn Shādhī¹⁸ was there acting as the governor. He feared that Zankī's sons would not be able to send him help in time, so he made terms and surrendered the citadel, receiving a fief and a sum of money. Ayyūb was also given ownership of several villages in Damascus territory. He moved to Damascus and took up permanent residence there.

¹³ Or in the citadel of Sarjahān in the Daylam mountains (*Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 221). See Krawulsky, 308-9, s.v. Sar-i Jahān, 5 leagues east of Sultaniyya.

¹⁴ Jāwulī and the Emirs Būz-Aba and 'Abbās had formed an alliance against Sultan Mas'ūd but failed to cooperate effectively. Jāwulī died at Zanjan in Jumādā I/9 October-7 November 1146 (*Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 221-22).

¹⁵ According to *Muntaẓam*, x, 121, he was born in 465/1072-3. He died in Jumādā I/October-November 1146.

¹⁶ Born in 462/1069-70, died 23 Sha'bān/28 January 1147 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 123).

¹⁷ The final phrase is a speculative translation of *wa'l-musābaqa ilayhi*.

¹⁸ i.e. Saladin's father.

In Rabī' II of this year [September 1146] 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Alī ibn Aḥmad, Abū Muḥammad al-Muqrī, the grandson of Shaykh Abū Manṣūr, died. He was born in Sha'bān of the year 464 [May 1072]. He was a teacher of the Koran (*muqrī*), a grammarian and a scholar of Ḥadīth and also the author of several works on the Koran recensions.¹⁹

¹⁹ He died Monday 18 Rabī' II/=30 September 1146. Ibn al-Jawzī studied Koran and Ḥadīth under him and writes of him with affection and respect (*Muntaẓam*, x, 122).

Account of the killing of Būz-Aba

When the killing of ‘Abbās reached the ears of Emir Būz-Aba, he gathered his troops from Fars and Khūzistān and marched to Isfahan, which he put under siege. He sent a second force to Hamadhan and a third to the fortress of Māhkī, in the territory of al-Liḥf. As for his troops in Māhkī, Emir Alpqush Kūn Khar marched against them and drove them out of those regions, which were his fief. Then Būz-Aba moved away from Isfahan, seeking Sultan Mas‘ūd. The sultan made overtures to him about peace but he did not respond to them. He made a forced march and the two met in pitched battle at Qarātakīn’s Meadow.¹ After both armies had engaged, the right and the left wings of Sultan Mas‘ūd were routed. Both centres fought very fiercely and strongly and both sides held firm. The battle continued between them and then Būz-Aba fell from his horse, hit by an arrow. Another account says, no, his horse fell and brought him down. He was made prisoner, taken to the sultan and put to death before him. After he had been taken prisoner his followers fled the field.

The rout of the right and left wings of the sultan’s army took them as far as Hamadhan. Large numbers were slain from both sides. This battle was one of the greatest that took place between the ‘Ajamīs.²

[120] How the people of Gabès submitted to the Franks and how the Muslims then conquered it

Before this year the lord of the city of Gabès was a man called Rushayd.³ He died and left some sons. A freedman of his, whose name was Yūsuf, turned to the youngest son, called Muḥammad, and made him ruler, expelling the oldest son, called Mu‘ammar. Yūsuf took charge of the city and exercised authority over Muḥammad because of his young age.

Certain incidents, molestation of his [former] master’s womenfolk, occurred. The responsibility for this report rests on its source. One of the women was a

¹ For this location (‘a day’s march from Hamadhan’ according to *Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 225), the site of many battles, see *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), [331].

² ‘Ajamī (plural: A‘ājim) denotes a non-Arab, here Turks or more generally a person from the eastern lands of Islam.

³ For the events of this section, see Idris, *La Berbérie*, 353–5. For the spelling Rushayd (rather than Rashīd), see op. cit., 353, note 277. Ma‘mar is a possibility, rather than Mu‘ammar.

woman of the Banū Qurra. She sent to her brothers complaining of her situation. When her brothers came to take her, Yūsuf stopped them and said, 'This is the harem of my master,' and refused to hand her over. The Banū Qurra and Mu'ammār ibn Rushayd went to al-Ḥasan, the lord of Ifrīqiya⁴ and complained to him about what Yūsuf was doing. Al-Ḥasan wrote to him about this but Yūsuf paid no attention. He said, 'If al-Ḥasan does not leave me alone, I shall surrender Gabès to the king of Sicily.' Al-Ḥasan prepared an army to attack him and when Yūsuf heard of this, he sent to Roger the Frank, king of Sicily, and offered him his allegiance. He said to him, 'I want you to give me a robe of honour and appoint me governor of Gabès to be your deputy, just as you did with the Banū Maṭrūḥ in Tripoli.' Roger sent him robes and a diploma. He donned the vestments and the diploma was read at an assembly of the leading men.

Thereupon al-Ḥasan exerted himself to equip his troops to go to Gabès. They set out and put it under siege. The citizens rose against Yūsuf because of his policy of submitting to the Franks and they delivered the town to al-Ḥasan's army. Yūsuf fortified himself in the citadel but they assailed it until they overcame it. Yūsuf was taken prisoner. Mu'ammār ibn Rashīd and the Banū Qurra set about torturing him. They cut off his penis and inserted it into his mouth. He was subjected to a variety of tortures.

Mu'ammār became ruler of Gabès in place of his brother Muḥammad and the Banū Qurra took away their sister. 'Īsā, the brother of Yūsuf, and Yūsuf's son fled and made their way to Roger, king of Sicily. They sought protection [121] with him and complained of their treatment from al-Ḥasan. This made Roger angry and the sequel, the conquest of al-Mahdiyya, we shall mention under the year 543 [1148-9], God willing.

Account of an incident, the like of which any wise man ought to be wary of

This same Yūsuf, lord of Gabès, had sent an envoy to Roger in Sicily. He and the envoy of al-Ḥasan, lord of al-Mahdiyya, met before Roger and a dispute occurred between the two envoys. Yūsuf's envoy spoke of al-Ḥasan and the trouble he had caused and blamed his conduct. They both returned at the same time, each one sailing in his own ship. Al-Ḥasan's envoy wrote a report to his master by pigeon post, telling him of Yūsuf's envoy's behaviour. Al-Ḥasan sent some of his men to sea, who captured Yūsuf's envoy and brought him before al-Ḥasan. He berated him, saying, 'You have given the Franks control of Muslim lands and let your unbridled tongue censure me!' He mounted him on a camel, with a pointed cap with bells on his head, and paraded him through the city. A crier proclaimed, 'This is the reward of anyone who strives to make the Franks masters of Muslim lands.' When he reached the centre of al-Mahdiyya, the common people rose up and stoned him to death.

⁴ i.e. al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Yaḥyā ibn Tamīm of the Zirid dynasty (ruled 515-43/1121-48).

How the Franks took Almeria and other places in Andalusia

In Jumādā I of this year [October 1147] the Franks besieged Almeria in Andalusia and pressed it hard by land and by sea. They took it by force of arms and carried out much killing and plundering. [122] They also conquered the city of Baeza and the province of Jaen, both in Andalusia. Then later on the Muslims recovered these places, as we shall relate, God willing.

Account of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī's taking of several places in Frankish territory

During this year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, lord of Aleppo, entered Frankish territory and took by the sword and plundered the town of Artāḥ, the fortress of Mābūla,⁵ Baṣarfūt⁶ and Kafarlāthā.⁷ After the murder of his father Zankī, the Franks had become ambitious and thought that, now that he was dead, they would regain what he had taken. When they saw such zeal from Nūr al-Dīn at the beginning of his reign, they realized that what they had hoped for was remote.

How al-Ḥilla was taken from 'Alī ibn Dubays and then restored to him

In this year the followers of 'Alī ibn Dubays⁸ caused considerable disturbance in al-Ḥilla and neighbouring places. There were many complaints about this. Sultan Maṣ'ūd assigned al-Ḥilla to Emir Salārḳurd, who set out there from Hamadhan with an army. A detachment of the troops of Baghdad was seconded to him. When they started out for al-Ḥilla, 'Alī assembled and organized his forces. The two armies met at Maṭīrābād and 'Alī was defeated. Salārḳurd took al-Ḥilla and put 'Alī's family under guard. The troops went home and he remained in al-Ḥilla with his mamlukes and followers.

'Alī ibn Dubays went to join Alpquš Kūn Khar, who was at his fief in al-Liḥf, claiming that the sultan had wronged him. When 'Alī asked Alpquš for aid, he went with him to Wāsiṭ. He and al-Ṭurunṭā'ī made an agreement and they all attacked al-Ḥilla and recovered it from Salārḳurd in Dhū'l-Ḥijja [22 April-20 May 1148]. Salārḳurd abandoned it and returned to Baghdad.

⁵ In Elisséeff, 409, with no comment: Māmūla.

⁶ *Kāmil* has Buṣrafūn. For Baṣarfūt, an outlying fort of Aleppo, north of al-Bāra [*EI*(2), i, 1024-5], see Le Strange, *Palestine*, 421; Elisséeff, 215, 410.

⁷ On the slopes of Jabal 'Āmila, a day's journey from Aleppo (Le Strange, *Palestine*, 470).

⁸ A member of the Mazyadid dynasty (see *EI*(1), vi, 965-6), whose main support came from the Arabs of the Banū Asad. 'Alī had driven his brother Muḥammad from Ḥilla and defeated an earlier force sent from Baghdad (*Muntaẓam*, x, 116, s.a. 540/1145-60).

[123] Miscellaneous events

In Jumādā I [October 1147] al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh Yūsuf, son of al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh, was proclaimed in the khutbah as heir apparent.

This year 'Awn al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Hubayra was appointed chief secretary of the Bureau of Control in Baghdad and Za'im al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Ja'far was put in charge of the Storeroom.

In Rabī' I [August 1147] Abū'l-Qāsim Ṭāhir ibn Sa'īd ibn Abī Sa'īd ibn Abī'l-Khayr al-Mīhanī, the shaykh of the Bistāmī Hospice at Baghdad, died.⁹

In Rabī' II [September 1147] there died the Lady Fatima, daughter of Sultan Muḥammad and wife of al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh.¹⁰

In Rajab [December 1147] the death occurred of Abū'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn al-Muzaffar ibn 'Alī ibn al-Muslima, Ibn Ra'īs al-Ru'asā'. He was born in the year 484 [1091-2]. He had become a sufi and he made his residence in the palace a hospice for sufis.¹¹

This year Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Zankī marched to the castle of Dārā, which he took, as he did other castles in the territory of Mardin. He then went to Mardin, besieged it and ruined and ravaged its land. The reason for this was that, after Atabeg Zankī was killed, the lords of Mardin and Ḥiṣn [Kayfā] presumed to claim those lands of theirs that he had conquered and they duly seized them. After Sayf al-Dīn came to the throne and gained power, he marched to Mardin, besieged it and perpetrated dreadful acts in its territory. Seeing what he was doing in the land, its lord, who was at this time Ḥusām al-Dīn Timurtāsh, said, 'We used to complain of Atabeg Zankī. Where are his days now! They were festive days. He besieged us more than once but neither he nor anyone in his army took a bag of straw without paying for it. Neither he nor his troops injured the revenue of the sultan. However, I see this man plundering and ruining the land.'

[124] Ḥusām al-Dīn later made contact and reached a settlement, arranging his daughter's marriage to him. Sayf al-Dīn retired and returned to Mosul. Ḥusām al-Dīn prepared a retinue for his daughter and sent her to Sayf al-Dīn. When she arrived, he was ill and on the point of death. The marriage was not consummated but she remained with him until his death. Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd succeeded and took her as his wife, as we shall relate, God willing.

This year there was a famine in Ifrīqiya, which lasted a long time. It had begun in the year 537 [1142-3]. It had a terrible effect on the population, who even resorted to cannibalism. Because of starvation the nomads sought out the towns and the townspeople closed the gates against them. Plague and great mortality

⁹ Died Monday 12 Rabī' I/11 August (*Muntaẓam*, x, 128).

¹⁰ According to *Muntaẓam*, x, 128, she died in Rabī' I/October 1147, at Baghdad.

¹¹ Muḥammad, the grandson of the caliph's vizier killed by Basāsīrī in 450/1059 (see Richards, *Annals*, 121-4) died the eve of Friday 9 Rajab/=5 December 1147 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 129).

followed. The country was emptied and from whole families not a single person survived. Many people travelled to Sicily in search of food and met with great hardship.

Account of the Franks' capture of the city of al-Mahdiyya in Ifrīqiya

Under the year 541 [1146–7]¹ we have already mentioned how the family of Yūsuf, lord of Gabès, went to Roger, king of Sicily, and begged his assistance. This angered Roger, between whom and al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Yahyā ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu'izz ibn Bādīs al-Ṣanhājī, ruler of Ifrīqiya, there were treaties of peace for several years. He knew that he had missed the chance to conquer the land during the present hardship which afflicted them. The hardship was the continuation of the famine throughout all the Maghrib from the year 537 [1142–3] until this present year. It was at its worst in the year 542 [1147–8]. The people abandoned their towns and villages and the majority emigrated to a city of Sicily. There were cases of cannibalism and large-scale mortality. So Roger took advantage of these hard times and built a fleet which he made very large. It amounted to about 250 galleys, full of men, weapons and supplies.

The fleet sailed from Sicily and came to the island of Pantelleria, lying between al-Mahdiyya and Sicily. They came across a ship there which had come from Mahdiyya. The crew were seized and brought before George, the commander of the fleet.² He questioned them about the state of Ifrīqiya and found on board a cage of pigeons, so he asked them whether they had dispatched any of them. They swore that they had not sent any. [126] He then ordered the man who had the pigeons with him to write in his own hand: 'When we arrived at the island of Pantelleria, we found ships from Sicily there. We questioned them about their God-forsaken fleet and were told that it had sailed to the islands of Constantinople.'

The pigeon was released and came to Mahdiyya. Emir al-Ḥasan and the people were delighted. George's plan was to arrive by surprise. He set sail and intended to reach Mahdiyya at dawn to invest it before any people left. Had he managed that not one of them would have survived. However, God Almighty decreed that He sent against them a dreadful wind which checked them. They were only able to make headway under oars and on 2 Ṣafar this year [22 June 1148] day broke before they arrived. The people caught sight of them and when George realized this and that his cunning plan had failed, he sent to Emir al-Ḥasan, saying, 'I have come with this fleet merely to seek revenge for Muḥammad ibn Rushayd, lord of Gabès, and to restore it to him. As for you, there are treaties and a compact between us to last a while yet. We want an army from you to join us.'

¹ Actually under the year 542/1147–8; see above pp. [120–21].

² That is the Greek, George of Antioch, since 1132 the Sicilian grand admiral.

Al-Ḥasan gathered the leading lawyers and notables and consulted them. They said, 'Let us fight our enemy, for our city is strong.' He replied, 'I fear that he will disembark and beleaguer us by land and by sea and cut us off from our supplies. We do not have enough to feed us for a month. We shall then be taken by force. I consider that to save Muslims from captivity and death is better than to continue to rule. He has demanded an army from me against Gabès. If I comply, then it is not lawful for me to aid infidels against Muslims, and if I refuse, he will say, "The peace treaty between us has been broken." He simply wishes to distract us until he can cut us off from the land. We do not have the power to fight him. The right course is for us to leave with our wives and children and to abandon the city. Anyone who wants to act as we do, let him hurry to join us.'

[127] He ordered an immediate departure and took with him whoever presented himself and whatever was light to carry. The people left in blind panic with their wives and children and any light possessions and furnishings. There were some people who hid with the Christians and in the churches. The fleet remained at sea, held back by the wind from reaching Mahdiyya, for two-thirds of the day. Of those who planned to leave not one still remained. Then the Franks arrived and entered the city without opposition. George entered the palace and found it untouched, as al-Ḥasan had taken only the portable royal treasures. Several of his concubines were still there. George saw storerooms full of precious treasures and every rare object, the like of which is seldom to be found. He sealed it all and assembled al-Ḥasan's concubines in his palace.

Those of the line of Zīrī ibn Manād who reigned, down to al-Ḥasan, were nine in number. The period of their rule was 208 years, from the year 335 [946] until 543 [1148]. One of his commanders had been sent by al-Ḥasan to Roger with a message and he took a safe-conduct for himself and his family and did not leave with the others. When the city was taken, it was sacked for two hours and then a general safe-conduct was proclaimed. Those who had hidden themselves emerged. On the morning of the following day George sent to the Arabs who were nearby. When they came to him, he treated them generously and gave them handsome sums of money. He also sent out several of the troops of Mahdiyya who had remained behind with a guarantee of security for the people of Mahdiyya who had left and with mounts on which they could carry their infants and their women. They had come close to perishing from hunger, although they had hidden wealth and deposits in Mahdiyya. When the guarantee reached them, they returned and before a week had passed most of the inhabitants had come back.

Al-Ḥasan, however, continued with his family and children, of whom there were twelve sons apart from the female members, and his personal retainers, making his way to Muḥriz ibn Ziyād,³ who was at La Malga.⁴ He was met on the

³ Abū Maḥfūz Muḥriz was emir of the Riyāḥ Arabs (see *EI*(2), v, 59-61, s.v. Banū Khurāsān).

⁴ In Arabic: al-Mu'allāqa (between Tunis and Carthage). See Idris, *La Berbérie*, 234-5.

road by an Arab emir, called Ḥasan ibn Tha'lab, who demanded money from him that was due to him for [128] his administration. Al-Ḥasan could not produce any money lest it [all] be seized. He handed over his son Yaḥyā as a pledge and continued on his way. On the second day he came to Muḥriz, whom he had favoured over all the Arabs and treated generously, having given him much of his wealth. Muḥriz gave him a handsome welcome and expressed his pain at what had befallen him. For several months al-Ḥasan remained with him, although he was not content with his stay. He wanted to travel to Egypt, to the Caliph al-Ḥāfiẓ the Alid, and purchased a ship for his journey. George the Frank heard of this and deployed galleys to seize him. Therefore al-Ḥasan gave up this plan and determined to go to 'Abd al-Mu'min in the Maghrib. He sent his older sons, Yaḥyā, Tamīm and 'Alī to Yaḥyā ibn al-'Azīz, one of the Banū Ḥammād, who were cousins, asking permission to come to him, renew his acquaintance and travel on from there to 'Abd al-Mu'min. Yaḥyā gave his permission, so he set out. When he arrived, Yaḥyā would not meet him but sent him and his sons to Jazā'ir Banī Mazghannān.⁵ He appointed men to guard him and deprive all of them of freedom of action. They remained in this state until 'Abd al-Mu'min conquered Bougie in the year 547 [1152–3]. He came before him then and under that year we have told what happened to him.

After George had become established in Mahdiyya, a week later he sent a fleet to the city of Sfax and another one to Susa. When the population of Susa heard the news of Mahdiyya, the governor, 'Alī the son of Emir al-Ḥasan, left to go to his father. The people left at the same time and the Franks entered without a fight on 12 Ṣafar [2 July 1148]. On the other hand, the people of Sfax were joined by many Arabs and, strengthened by them, when the Franks attacked them, they sallied forth against them. The Franks feigned flight and the people pursued until they were far from the city. The Franks then wheeled around to meet them. Some fled back to the city and some into the open country. Many were killed. The Franks entered the city after fierce fighting with many slain. The surviving men were taken prisoner and the women enslaved. This was on 23 Ṣafar [13 July]. Guarantees were then proclaimed and the populace returned to the city and ransomed their womenfolk and children. They and the people of Susa and Mahdiyya were treated mildly. Later on, letters came from Roger to all the population of Ifrīqiya, [129] with guarantees of life and property and fair promises.

When the state of the country became settled, George proceeded with a fleet to the castle of Kelibia,⁶ which is a strong castle. After his arrival the Arabs heard this news and assembled there. The Franks disembarked to attack and in a battle they were defeated and a large number of them killed. They withdrew discomfited to Mahdiyya. The Franks now held from Tripoli to close to Tunis and the Maghrib almost up to Qayrawan. God knows best!⁷

⁵ The text has Jazīrat etc., but cf. below p. [159]. This is modern Algiers.

⁶ In Arabic: Iqlībiya, a fortress on the peninsula of Cape Bon.

⁷ See Idris, *La Berbérie*, 355–61 (fall of Mahdiyya), 361–3 (flight of al-Ḥasan).

How the Franks besieged Damascus and what Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Zankī did

This year the king of the Germans⁸ came from his lands with a great host and large following of Franks, aiming to attack Islamic territory and not doubting that he would conquer it with the easiest of fighting because of the great multitude of his following and the abundance of his money and equipment. On his arrival in Syria, the Franks there sought him out and waited upon him, obeying his every command and prohibition. He ordered them to march with him to besiege and take Damascus, as he asserted. They duly set out with him, came to the city and put it under siege. The ruler there was Mujīr al-Dīn Abaq ibn Būrī ibn Ṭuġtakīn, although he had no authority at all. All power in the city belonged to Mu‘īn al-Dīn Unur, a mamluke of his grandfather, Ṭuġtakīn, and he it was who had installed Mujīr al-Dīn. Mu‘īn al-Dīn was intelligent, just, charitable and of excellent conduct. He gathered the troops and defended the city.

The Franks maintained their siege and then on 6 Rabī‘ I [25 July 1148] they launched an assault with both their cavalry and infantry. The populace and the regular troops went out to meet them and held firm against them. Among those who went forth to fight was the lawyer, Proof of the Religion (Ḥujjat al-Dīn) Yūsuf ibn Dirbās al-Findalāwī al-Maghribī.⁹ He was a great shaykh and a learned lawyer. When Mu‘īn al-Dīn saw him, [130] as he marched on foot, he went to him, greeted him and said, ‘Shaykh, you are excused because of your great age. *We* will undertake the defence of the Muslims,’ and he asked him to retire. He refused and said, ‘I sold and He bought from me. By God, I shall not back out nor ask Him to cancel.’ He alluded to the words of God Almighty: ‘Verily God has purchased from the believers their lives and goods in return for Paradise.’¹⁰ He advanced and fought the Franks and was in the end killed at al-Nayrab¹¹ about half a league from Damascus.

The Franks grew strong while the Muslims weakened. The German emperor advanced and camped at the Green Hippodrome.¹² The people were convinced that he would conquer the city. Mu‘īn al-Dīn had sent to Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Atabeg Zankī, calling on him to come to the aid of the Muslims and to drive the enemy from them. Accordingly he gathered his troops and set out for Syria, taking with him his brother, Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, from Aleppo. They camped at Homs

⁸ This section contains Ibn al-Athīr’s account of the Second Crusade. The Emperor Conrad III is intended. There is no special mention of the French king, Louis VII.

⁹ A Mālikī lawyer, whose father’s name is given as Dī Nās in *Kāmil*, as Dhūnās in *Rawḍatayn*, i, 190 (ostensibly quoting Ibn al-Athīr), Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 200–201, and *Wāfi*, xxix, 195–6. Dirbās is supplied by *Wafayāt*, ii, 452.

¹⁰ Koran, ix, 111.

¹¹ A suburb north-east of Damascus (Elisséeff, 252).

¹² Arabic: *al-maydān al-akhḍar*, situated about 1 km west of the NW corner of the city between the rivers Baradā and Bānyās.

and he sent to Mu‘īn al-Dīn, saying, ‘I have come, bringing with me all who bear arms in my lands. I want my deputies to be in Damascus, so that I may come and confront the Franks. If I am defeated, I and my troops can enter the city and protect ourselves within. If I am victorious, the city is yours and I shall not dispute it with you.’

He also sent to the Franks, threatening them if they did not withdraw from the city. The Franks slackened their attacks, fearing the large number of wounded and because of the possibility that they would be obliged to fight Sayf al-Dīn. They spared themselves with the result that the populace became stronger for their defence of the city and also had a respite from continuous warfare. Mu‘īn al-Dīn wrote to the newly-arrived Franks, ‘The ruler of the East has come. If you do not withdraw, I shall surrender the city to him and then you will be sorry.’ On the other hand, he sent to the Franks of Syria, to say to them, ‘By what reasoning do you aid these men against us? You know that, if they take Damascus, they will seize the coastal lands that you have in your hands. For myself, if I see that I am too weak to hold the city, I shall surrender it to Sayf al-Dīn, and you know that, if he controls Damascus, he will not allow you to retain any foothold in Syria.’ They agreed with him to withdraw cooperation with the German emperor [131] and Mu‘īn al-Dīn offered to hand over to them the castle of Bānyās.

The Levantine Franks met with the German emperor and warned him against Sayf al-Dīn, his large forces and his constant supply of reinforcements. ‘Possibly he would take Damascus and you will be too weak to resist him.’ They continued to press him until he withdrew from the city. They then received the surrender of Bānyās and the Germans returned to their own lands beyond Constantinople. Thus God saved the believers from their evil.

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū’l-Qāsim ibn ‘Asākīr has mentioned in his *History of Damascus* that one of the ulema related to him that he saw al-Findalāwī in a dream. He asked him, ‘How has God treated you? Where are you?’ He replied, ‘He has forgiven me. We are in the Gardens of Eden, face to face on couches.’¹³

How Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī took the fortress of al-‘Urayma

After the Franks had withdrawn from Damascus, Nūr al-Dīn marched to the fortress of al-‘Urayma,¹⁴ which was held by the Franks, and took it.

The reason for this was that, when the German emperor set out for Syria, he had with him the son¹⁵ of Alfonso, a scion of Frankish princes, whose grandfather was the one who took Syrian Tripoli from the Muslims. He took and gained control of the fortress of al-‘Urayma and declared openly that he intended to take Tripoli

¹³ Reading *innā* rather than *ana*. A slightly altered version of Koran, xxxvii, 44.

¹⁴ Situated north of the Homs/Tripoli gap, it is sometimes called Arima (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 68-73).

¹⁵ Bertrand, illegitimate son of the Count of Toulouse Alfonso-Jordan, son of Raymond I.

from the Count.¹⁶ The latter sent to Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who had met with Mu‘īn al-Dīn Unur in Baalbek, saying to him and Mu‘īn al-Dīn that they should attack al-‘Urayma and take it from the son of Alfonso. They both set out with their troops on forced marches and sent to Sayf al-Dīn, who was at Homs, asking for his aid. [132] He reinforced them with a large force under Emir ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dubaysī, lord of Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar and elsewhere. They camped about the fortress and put it under siege. Alfonso’s son was within and he mounted a strong defence. The Muslims attacked more than once. The sappers went forward and mined the wall. Then the Franks there surrendered and the Muslims took possession, seizing all within, cavalry and infantry, male and female, including the son of Alfonso. They demolished the fortress and returned to Sayf al-Dīn. For Alfonso’s son the following saying is appropriate: ‘The ostrich went out, seeking two horns and returned minus both ears.’

The disagreement between Sultan Mas‘ūd and several emirs, their coming to Baghdad and what they did in Iraq.

During this year a group of senior emirs broke with Sultan Mas‘ūd, namely from Azerbaijan İldikiz al-Mas‘ūdī, lord of Ganja and Arraniyya, and Qayşar; from the Uplands Alpquş Kūn Khar and Tatar the Chamberlain,¹⁷ another of Mas‘ūd’s mamlukes, and Ṭurunṭāy al-Maḥmūdī, the prefect of Wāsiṭ, and İldikiz, Qurqūb and the son of Ṭughāyuruk.

The reason for this was the sultan’s preference for Khāṣṣ Beg and his neglect of them. They feared that he would treat them as he treated ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, ‘Abbās and Būz-Aba, so they broke with him and set out for Iraq. When they reached Ḥulwān, the people in Baghdad and the districts of Iraq became fearful and prices rose. The [Caliph] Imam al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh ordered the city wall to be repaired and restored. He also sent al-‘Ibādī the Preacher to them but they paid no attention to his words. They came to Bagdad in [133] Rabī’ II [19 August–16 September 1148], accompanied by Prince Muḥammad, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, and camped on the East Bank. Mas‘ūd Bilāl, the prefect of Baghdad,¹⁸ left the city, fearful of the caliph, and went to Takrit, which was held by him. The situation was serious for the people of Baghdad. ‘Alī ibn Dubays, lord of al-Ḥilla, came to them and camped on the West Bank. The caliph raised troops for his own protection.

Fighting broke out between the emirs and the Baghdad populace and local troops. They fought several times and one day the ‘Ajāmī emirs fled from the mob

¹⁶ Raymond II.

¹⁷ According to *Zubdat al-tawārīkh*, 225, Khāṣṣ Beg, using his dominant position, arrested and killed Tatar in Rabī’ I/20 July–18 August 1148.

¹⁸ Bundārī, 234, calls him Mas‘ūd al-Bilālī. He was Sultan Mas‘ūd’s appointee and represented Saljuq military power in Baghdad.

as a trick and strategem. The mob pursued them but when they had gone some distance the emirs turned to face them and some troops appeared behind them. They were put to the sword and a great crowd of the populace were slain. Neither young nor old were spared. Great slaughter was done and the people of Baghdad suffered an unparalleled disaster. The dead and wounded were numerous and many were captured, of whom some were later killed and some publicly pilloried. Those known to people were buried but those unknown were left lying out in the open country. The troops scattered throughout the western quarters and looted much property from their inhabitants. They sacked the town of Dujayl and others and seized women and children.

Later the emirs gathered and camped opposite the Tāj, where they kissed the earth and made their apologies. Until the end of the day envoys went back and forth between them and the caliph. They returned to their tents and set out for Ḥulwān, plundering the countryside and doing wicked deeds. Mas'ūd Bilāl, the prefect of Baghdad, returned to Baghdad from Takrit. The emirs then broke up and left Iraq. Emir Qayṣar died in Azerbaijan. All this happened while Sultan Mas'ūd remained in the Uplands, with envoys constantly going between him and his uncle, Sultan Sanjar. The latter had sent, blaming him for his advancement of Khāṣṣ Beg and ordering him to send him away, threatening that, if he did not do so, he would come against him [134] and remove him from the sultanate. Mas'ūd was prevaricating and not obeying, so Sultan Sanjar set out for Rayy. When Sultan Mas'ūd learnt of his arrival,¹⁹ he went to him, begged for his good pleasure and persuaded him not to carry out his intention. Thus the situation was calmed. They met in the year 544 [1149–50] as we shall relate, God willing.

Account of the Franks' defeat at Yaghrā

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī defeated the Franks at a place called Yaghrā²⁰ in Syria. They had mustered with the aim of raiding the districts of Aleppo. He learnt about them and marched against them with his army. They met at Yaghrā and fought a fierce battle which ended with the defeat of the Franks. Many of them were slain and several of their commanders taken prisoner. Only a few of this host escaped. Some of the booty and the captives were sent to his brother Sayf al-Dīn, to the caliph at Baghdad, to Sultan Mas'ūd or to others.

Concerning this battle, in his ode which begins, 'Would that the dam were blocked or not, and would that sleep were rejected,' Ibn al-Qaysarānī²¹ says the following verses about Nūr al-Dīn:

¹⁹ Sanjar came to Rayy in Sha'bān 543/15 December 1148–12 January 1149 (*Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 227).

²⁰ See Eddé, *Description*, 263: north-east of the Antioch Depression (al-'Amq) and east of Nahr al-Aswad (or Qarā Su, 'Black River').

²¹ Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Qaysarānī died at Damascus in 548/1153.

How should we not celebrate our praiseworthy (*maḥmūd*) life, when the sultan
 is praiseworthy,
 And the sword of Islam is only turned aside when the carcass of Unbelief is cut
 in slices.
 Virtuous deeds are only found where the Light of Religion (*Nūr al-Dīn*) is
 present.
 How many a battle has he, whose day is marked well by the infidel princes!

[135] How the Ghūr took Ghazna and then withdrew

During this year Sūrī ibn al-Ḥusayn, the ruler of the Ghūr,²² attacked Ghazna and conquered it. The reason was that his brother, the ruler of the Ghūr before him, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn, became the brother-in-law of Bahrām Shāh Mas‘ūd, the ruler of Ghazna and a member of the house of Sabuktakīn.²³ On account of this marriage-relationship his importance grew and his ambition expanded. He gathered many groups and marched to Ghazna to seize it. It has been reported that he set out claiming that he was making a visit of homage, although he was intending trickery and treachery. Bahrām Shāh heard about him and, having seized him, put him in prison, then killed him. The Ghūr were outraged at his killing but were unable to take revenge.

After he was killed, his brother Sām ibn al-Ḥusayn succeeded but he died of smallpox and his brother Prince Sūrī ibn al-Ḥusayn became the next ruler of the lands of the Ghūr. His position became powerful and his rule well established. He raised an army of horse and foot and marched to Ghazna, seeking blood-revenge for his slain brother and also to conquer Ghazna. He arrived and took it in Jumādā I of the year 543 [17 September-16 October 1148].

Bahrām Shāh departed for India. He gathered large forces and returned to Ghazna, with his advance guard commanded by al-Salār, al-Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm al-‘Alawī, the emir of Hindūstān. The hearts of the Ghazna army, who had remained with Sūrī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghūrī and entered his service, were still with Bahrām Shāh; their loyalty to Sūrī was only superficial. When Sūrī and Bahrām Shāh met in battle, the army of Ghazna turned to Bahrām Shāh, joined him and handed over Sūrī, the Ghūr ruler. Bahrām Shāh took Ghazna in Muḥarram of the year 544 [11 May-9 June 1149]. Also in Muḥarram of that year Prince Sūrī was crucified along with al-Sayyid al-Māhiyānī.

²² Ghūr refers to a mountainous area in central Afghanistan, the main town of which was Firūzkūh, and to the region’s inhabitants (see *EI(2)*, ii, 1096). For the dynasty that arose in this area, the Ghurids, see *EI(2)*, ii, 1099-1104, and the general account below s.a. 547/1152-3. The ruins of Firūzkūh are at Jām on the middle Hari Rūd about 200 km. east of Herat (see Jackson, *Delhi Sultanate*, 6).

²³ Sabuktakīn, the leading emir of the Samanids (died 387/997) and father of Maḥmūd of Ghazna (born 361/971, died 421/1030).

[136] Sūrī was a man of outstanding worth, possessed of abundant generosity and great virtue. For the poor he used to throw [purses of] dirhams in slings to fall into the hands of whoever were the lucky ones.

Later the Ghūr returned to take Ghazna which they razed. We have mentioned this under the year 547 [1152–3], where we have related the beginning of the Ghūrid state because it was at that time that their standing became great. They abandoned the mountains and came into Khurasan. Their importance grew. There is some disagreement about this,²⁴ as we have mentioned. God knows best!

How the Franks took some cities in Andalusia

In Andalusia this year the Franks took Tortosa²⁵ and along with it they took all its castles and the fortresses of Lérida and Fraga. In those parts there was nothing the Muslims held that was not seized by the Franks because of the internal dissensions of the Muslims and all has remained in their hands until now.

Miscellaneous events

This year Abū Bakr al-Mubārak ibn al-Kāmil ibn Abī Ghālib al-Baghdādī, whose father was known as al-Khaffāf, died. He studied much Ḥadīth and was the scholar of Baghdad from whom many benefitted.²⁶

[137] This year prices in Iraq rose very high and foodstuffs were impossible to obtain because of the army that came. The people from the surrounding countryside came to Baghdad as refugees, having been robbed of their possessions, and they perished hungry and naked. Throughout most lands there was a similar dearth, in Khurasan, the Uplands, Isfahan and Fars, the Jazīra and Syria. In the Maghrib, however, the famine and high prices were worse because of the interruption of the rains and the invasion of the enemy.

There died in this year:

Ibrāhīm ibn Nabahān al-Ghanawī al-Raqqī, who was born in the year 459 [1066–7]. He was a pupil of al-Ghazālī and al-Shāshī and transmitted the digest of *The Two Genuine Collections*²⁷ by al-Ḥumaydī, direct from the author.²⁸

The Imam Abū'l-Faḍl al-Kirmānī, the Ḥanafī lawyer and leading scholar of Khurasan, in Dhū'l-Qa'da [13 March–11 April 1149].

²⁴ Reading *fī-hi ba'd al-khulf* as in Ms Pococke 346, fol. 109a, rather than *fī ba'd al-khulf*.

²⁵ See *EI*(2), x, 738–9, s.v. Ṭurtuṣha.

²⁶ Born 495/1101–2; died Jumādā I/September–October 1148 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 137).

²⁷ For Sunni Islam the two most important collections of Ḥadīth, the *Ṣaḥīḥān* of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

²⁸ Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Nabahān, died the eve of Thursday 4 Dhū'l-Ḥijja/= 14 April 1149 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 134).

The death of Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Atabeg Zankī, some account of his life and the accession of his brother Quṭb al-Dīn

This year the lord of Mosul, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Atabeg Zankī, died there of a feverish illness. When his illness grew serious, he sent to Baghdad and summoned Awḥad al-Zamān. When he attended him, he saw how serious his illness was. He treated him but his medicines had no healing effect. Ghāzī died towards the end of Jumādā II [ended 3 November 1149]. His reign lasted three years, one month and twenty days. He was handsome and youthful and had been born in the year 500 [1106–7]. He was buried in the madrasah that he built in Mosul. He left a single male child whom his uncle Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd raised and brought up well, marrying him to the daughter of his brother Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd. He did not live long but died in the prime of his youth. Thus Ghāzī's line came to an end.

He was a generous, brave and intelligent man. Twice every day he used to provide a large meal for his regular troops, in the morning and the evening. The morning one would consist of a hundred head of prime sheep. He was the first person to have his banner carried over his head and he ordered his soldiers not to ride without a sword at the waist and a mace beneath the knee. After he introduced this practice, all the provincial rulers imitated him. He built the old Atabakiyya Madrasah in Mosul, one of the most handsome of madrasahs, which he endowed [139] for Ḥanafī and Shāfi'ī lawyers, and also a hospice for Sufis, again in Mosul, at the Wharf Gate. His reign did not last long enough to allow him to do all the good in his heart. He had high aspirations. An example of his generosity is that Shihāb al-Dīn Ḥayṣa Bayṣa¹ came to his court and praised him with an ode which began:

How long will glory see you in a poet's garb,
After the pulpits' tops have pined away with longing?

Ghāzī rewarded him with a thousand dinars in cash, apart from robes of honour and other things.

When Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī died, his brother Quṭb al-Dīn was dwelling in Mosul. Jamāl al-Dīn, the vizier, and Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī, the commander of the army, agreed

¹ 'Dire Straits', the nickname of the poet Abū'l-Fawāris al-Tamīmī (died 574/1179), see *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, i, 279. For the verses that follow, see Ḥayṣa Bayṣa, *Dīwān*, ii, 316.

to make him the successor. They fetched him and took sworn oaths from him and themselves swore to him. They brought him on horseback to the palace of the sultanate with Zayn al-Dīn holding his stirrup. All the lands of his brother Sayf al-Dīn, such as Mosul, the Jazīra and Syria, gave him allegiance.

After his accession he married the Lady, daughter of Ḥusām al-Dīn Timurtāsh, whom his brother Sayf al-Dīn had married, only to die before consummating the marriage. She was the mother of Quṭb al-Dīn's children, Sayf al-Dīn [Ghāzī II], 'Izz al-Dīn and others.

How Nūr al-Dīn took control of Sinjār

When Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd² came to rule in Mosul after his brother Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, his older brother Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd was in Syria, in possession of Aleppo and Hama. A number of emirs wrote to him, asking for him, among them al-Muqaddam 'Abd al-Malik, the father of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad,³ who was at that time [140] governor of Sinjār. He sent to him, inviting him to come, so that he could take over Sinjār. Nūr al-Dīn set out lightly equipped, leading seventy mounted men, emirs of his state.

He came to Māksīn with a handful of men, having outstripped his companions. It was a day of heavy rain. The person in command of the gate did not recognize them and informed the prefect that a band of Turkomans, the auxiliary troops, had entered the town. Hardly had he finished his report before Nūr al-Dīn entered the palace into the prefect's presence, who rose to his feet and kissed his hand. The rest of his company caught up with him and he travelled on to Sinjār.

He sent to al-Muqaddam to tell him of his arrival. His messenger saw that he had gone to Mosul and left his son, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad, in the citadel. The latter told him that his father had set out for Mosul and he organized someone to catch up with his father on the road and tell him of Nūr al-Dīn's arrival. So al-Muqaddam returned to Sinjār and handed it over to Nūr al-Dīn, who made his entry and sent for Fakhr al-Dīn Qarā Arslān, lord of Ḥisn [Kayfā], asking him to join him because of the friendship that existed between them. He came to him with his troops. When Atabeg Quṭb al-Dīn, Jamāl al-Dīn and Zayn al-Dīn in Mosul heard of this, they gathered their troops and marched towards Sinjār. When they had come as far as Tell Ya'far, envoys went to and fro between them. They had planned to attack Nūr al-Dīn in Sinjār. Jamāl al-Dīn said to them, 'It is not sound sense to take issue with him and fight him. We have built him up in the eyes of the sultan and made much of his role in the Jihad. We have presented ourselves as subordinate to him. Meanwhile he shows the Franks that he respects us⁴ and that

² See an account of his career in *EI*(2), vi, 870-71.

³ Shams al-Dīn ibn al-Muqaddam was to be an important supporter of Saladin.

⁴ This is the reading of the text's footnote, which the context demands.

he is our subject. He is always saying to them, "If you are not as you ought to be, I shall surrender the country to the lord of Mosul [141] and then he will deal with you." If we confront him and defeat him, the sultan will turn his ambitions towards us and say, "This person whom they were vaunting and hiding behind is weaker than they are. They have defeated him." However, if he defeats us, the Franks will turn their ambitions towards him and say, "Those whose support he relied on are weaker than he is. He has defeated them." And when all is said and done, he is the son of the great Atabeg.'

He advised peace and after a visit to Nūr al-Dīn an agreement was reached. Sinjār was handed to his brother Quṭb al-Dīn and Nūr al-Dīn took over⁵ Homs and al-Raḥba in Syria. Syria remained his and the regions of Jazīra his brother's. After reaching agreement, Nūr al-Dīn returned to Syria and took with him all the monies and stores that his father, the martyred Atabeg, had amassed, which were very extensive indeed.

Account of the death of al-Ḥāfiẓ, the accession of al-Zāfir and the vizierate of Ibn al-Salār

In Jumādā II of this year [October 1149] there died al-Ḥāfiẓ li-Dīn Allāh 'Abd al-Majīd, son of Emir Abū'l-Qāsim ibn al-Mustaṣhir bi-Allāh the Alid, ruler of Egypt, whose caliphate had lasted twenty years all but five months. He was about seventy-seven years of age. Throughout all these years he was dominated by his all-powerful viziers, so that in the end he appointed his son, Ḥasan, as vizier and heir apparent but he too dominated him and seized all power for himself. He murdered many emirs of the state and extorted money from many others. When al-Ḥāfiẓ saw this, he gave him poison to drink and he died, as we have already related.⁶

Of the Egyptian Alids who ruled there was none whose father was not caliph other than al-Ḥāfiẓ [142] and al-'Āḍid. We shall be giving an account of the genealogy of al-'Āḍid. Al-Ḥāfiẓ 'Abd al-Majīd's successor as caliph in Egypt was his son, al-Zāfir bi-Amr Allāh Abū Maṣṣūr Ismā'il,⁷ who appointed Ibn Maṣāl as vizier. For forty days the latter survived to administer the affairs of state and then al-'Āḍil ibn al-Salār marched against him from Alexandria and challenged him for the office of vizier. Ibn Maṣāl had left Cairo to hunt down some evil-doers from Sudan. Al-'Āḍil succeeded him in Cairo and became vizier.

'Abbās ibn Abī'l-Futūḥ ibn Yaḥyā ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu'izz ibn Bādīs al-Sanhājī, who was the step-son of al-'Āḍil, was sent with an army against Ibn

⁵ Reading *wa-tasallama*.

⁶ See *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr (I)*, pp. [22-3].

⁷ The twelfth Fatimid caliph, born 527/1133, reigned 544-9/1149-54; see *EI(2)*, xi, 382-3.

Maṣāl, whom he defeated and killed. He then returned to Cairo and al-‘Ādil became firmly established in power. Alongside him the caliph had no authority at all.

‘Abbās had come to Egypt because his grandfather Yaḥyā had expelled his father, Abū’l-Futūḥ, from Maḥdiyya and then, when Yaḥyā died and his son ‘Alī succeeded as ruler of Ifrīqiya, he expelled his brother Abū’l-Futūḥ, the father of ‘Abbās, from Ifrīqiya in the year 509 [1115–6]. He came to Egypt with his wife, Ballāra the daughter of al-Qāsim ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu‘izz ibn Bādīs, and his son, this ‘Abbās, when he was young and still being suckled. Abū’l-Futūḥ took up residence in Alexandria and was respected during the little time he remained there. After his death his wife Ballāra married al-‘Ādil ibn al-Salār.

‘Abbās grew up and gained favour with al-Ḥāfiẓ, so that eventually he became vizier after al-‘Ādil, for the latter was killed in Muḥarram of the year 548 [1153–4]. It is said that ‘Abbās instigated those who slew him. After the murder he took on the office of vizier and exercised it with firmness. He was a bold and determined man, but despite this it was during his days that the Franks took Ascalon. This was a cause of further weakening of the dynasty. During his days in office Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd took Damascus from Muḥīr al-Dīn Abaq and after that matters developed until Egypt was taken from the dynasty, as we shall later narrate, God Almighty willing.

[143] How several emirs returned to Iraq

In Rajab of this year [November 1149] Alpqush Kūn Khar, al-Ṭurunṭā’ī and Dubays, accompanied by Malikshāh, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, returned to Iraq and made contact with the caliph about making the khutbah for Malikshāh. The caliph paid them no attention, gathered his forces and fortified Baghdad. He also sent to Sultan Mas‘ūd to inform him of the situation. The latter promised to come to Baghdad but did not appear.

This was because of what we have related before, namely his uncle Sanjar’s coming to Rayy concerning the matter of Khāṣṣ Beg. When he arrived at Rayy, Sultan Mas‘ūd went to him, met and attempted to win his good pleasure. Sanjar declared his satisfaction with him. When Alpqush heard of the caliph’s correspondence with Mas‘ūd, he sacked al-Nahrawān and arrested Emir ‘Alī ibn Dubays in Ramaḍān [January 1150]. Hearing of this, al-Ṭurunṭā’ī fled to al-Nu’māniyya.

Sultan Mas‘ūd came to Baghdad in the middle of Shawwāl [15 February 1150]. Alpqush Kūn Khar departed from al-Nahrawān and freed ‘Alī ibn Dubays. When the sultan reached Baghdad, ‘Alī went to find him, threw himself at his feet and asked for forgiveness. He was accepted back into the sultan’s good graces. A certain historian mentioned this sequence of events under the year 544 [1149–50] and also mentioned the same under the year 543 [1148–9], thinking that they were

two separate occurrences. I think that it was a single one. However, I have followed him, while bringing attention to this matter.⁸

[144] Account of the killing of the Prince, lord of Antioch, and the defeat of the Franks

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī raided Frankish territory in the direction of Antioch. He marched to the fortress of Ḥārim, which belonged to the Franks, besieged it, destroyed its suburbs and ransacked its hinterland. He then left to go to the fortress of Inab, which he also besieged. The Franks gathered with the Prince, lord of Antioch, Ḥārim and those regions, and moved towards Nūr al-Dīn to force him to depart from Inab. However, he stayed to meet them and a fierce battle was fought. Nūr al-Dīn took a direct part in the fighting that day. The Franks suffered a very bad defeat and a great number of them were killed and a like number captured.

One of those killed was the Prince, lord of Antioch.⁹ He was one of the most intransigent of the Franks and one of their great leaders. After his death his son, Bohemond, who was still a child, succeeded. His mother married a second prince to rule the land until her son grew up. He remained with her in Antioch.¹⁰

Later Nūr al-Dīn carried out another raid against them. They mustered again and confronted him but were defeated, losing men killed or captured. Amongst those taken was the second prince, Bohemond's step-father.¹¹ Thereupon Bohemond took control in Antioch. The poets made much praise of Nūr al-Dīn in congratulation for this victory, as the killing of the Prince had a great effect on both sides. One of those poets was [Ibn] al-Qaysarānī in his celebrated ode which begins:

[145] These are the resolves, not what pens claim;
 These are the noble qualities, not what books mention.
 These are the ambitions, which, when they are sought,
 Poems and sermons stumble along in their tracks.
 O son of 'Imād al-Dīn, you have shaken hands with their highest
 With a hand fit for great endeavours, achieved with toil.
 Your forbear did not cease to build every lofty building
 Until he built a dome whose props¹² are meteors.

⁸ The historian in question is Ibn al-Jawzī. For his narrative under the year 543, see *Muntaẓam*, x, 131–3, and for 544, see op. cit., x, 137–8.

⁹ This was Raymond of Poitiers, who had married Constance, daughter of Bohemond II of Antioch. The battle was fought on 30 June 1149.

¹⁰ Constance married Reynald de Chatillon, who acted as regent for her son, Bohemond III.

¹¹ This can only refer to the much later capture of Reynald de Chatillon in November 1160.

¹² Literally 'tent-pegs'.

Your swords have produced in the Franks a shaking
 Which makes the heart of great Rome beat fast.
 You have struck their chief a crushing blow with them
 Which has destroyed his backbone and brought the crosses low.
 You have cleansed the enemy's land of their blood
 In a cleansing that has made every sword polluted.

Account of the dispute between the ruler of Sicily and the Byzantine emperor

During this year there was a disagreement between Roger the Frank, ruler of Sicily, and the emperor of Constantinople.¹³ Many battles took place between them which continued over several years. They distracted one another from the Muslims. Had that not been the case, Roger would have taken all the lands of Ifrīqiya.

The fighting between them took place on land and at sea. Victory in all of it went to the ruler of Sicily, so much so that in one year his fleet came to the city of Constantinople and entered the mouth of the harbour, where they captured several of the Byzantine galleys and took a number of prisoners. The Franks shot arrows at the windows of the imperial palace. The person who did these feats against the Byzantines and the Muslims too was George, the Sicilian ruler's vizier. He fell ill with a number of illnesses, including haemorrhoids and stones. He died in the year 546 [1151–2] and the discord abated. People found relief from his evil and mischief-making. The ruler of Sicily did not have anyone who could fill his place after him.

[146] Miscellaneous events

This year there was a serious earthquake. It is said that a mountain opposite Ḥulwān sank into the earth.

This year Abū'l-Muẓaffar Yaḥyā ibn Hubayra became the vizier of the Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh. Before that he had been head of the Bureau of Control. He showed great competence when the [besieging] troops camped outside Baghdad and with excellent management he turned them away. The caliph was eager for him and appointed him vizier on Wednesday 4 Rabī' II 544¹⁴ [=10 August 1149]. The Moon was quartiled¹⁵ with Saturn. Someone said to him, 'It would be

¹³ This is Emperor Manuel Comnenos.

¹⁴ In the year 543 on Wednesday 14 Rabī' II/1 September 1148, when the coalition of emirs threatened Baghdad, according to *Zubdat al-tawārīkh*, 226.

¹⁵ In Arabic *tarbī'* means, in connection with the relative positions of heavenly bodies, 'a quartile aspect', that is, a 90° separation, which, astrologically speaking, is very inauspicious.