boustism and saint-worship of those regions, but the firm organisation of the order gave these enthusiasm lasting effect and purpose. Expectations of a coming Mahdi, who would restore the supremacy of pristine Islam, were also rife, as events in Dongola were to show in the Mahdiyya movement there of the eighteen-eighties and nineties. The Sanūsīs hoped for a reunion and regeneration of all Islamic peoples, and the Ottoman sultan 'Abd-al-Ḥamīd II hoped to recruit their support as part of a Pan-Islamic crusade. The Sanūsīs were, indeed, enthusiastic propagators of their ideas, and zāwiyas were founded in the Hijāz, Egypt, the Fezzān, and as far south as Wadai and Lake Chad, the faith following in this case the trans-Saharan caravan routes.

The Sanūsīs were in the forefront of Muslim opposition to the French advance into the central Sudan, and for some thirty years were to provide the spiritual and military driving-power for resistance to the invading Italians in Libya, especially in Cyrenaica. Italy's entry into the First World War in 1915 on the Allied side inevitably inclined the Sanūsīs towards the Turkish cause, and the head of the order, Sayyid Ahmad, held on in Cyrenaica till 1918, departing then for Istanbul; the military direction of the Muslim cause in Cyrenaica was thereafter left largely to local Sanūsī leaders. During the Second World War, the British government recognised Muhammad Idris, who had been an exile in Egypt for twenty years, not merely as a spiritual chief but also as Amir or political and military leader of the Sanūsīs of Cyrenaica. In 1941-1943 he became king of the federated kingdom of Libya, comprising Cyrenaica, Tripoli- tania and the Fezzān; in 1943-1963 it became a unitary state. Thus the process of the Sanūsī family's development from being heads of a religious movement to the headship of a modern Arab state is somewhat reminiscent of the Wahḥābiyya and the Al Saʿūd in Ṣaʿūdī Arabia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zamburt, 89; El 'al-Sanūsī.

THREE

THE FERTILE CRESCENT: EGYPT
SYRIA AND IRAQ

(17)
The Tūlūnids
254-92/868-905
Egypt and Syria

254/868 Ahmad b. Tūlūn
270/884 Khumārāwayh
282/896 Jaysh
283/896 Hārūn
292/905 Shaybān

Conquest by the caliphal general
Muḥammad b. ʿUbaydān

The Tūlūnids represent the first local dynasty of Egypt and Syria to secure autonomy from Baghdad. Ahmad b. Tūlūn (Tūlūn < Turkish dolan 'full [moon]') was a Turkish soldier, whose father had been sent in the tribute from Bukhara in the early ninth century. Ahmad first came to Egypt as deputy of the ʿAbbasīd governor there, but then acquired the governorship himself, extending his power into Palestine and Syria also. His ambitions were facilitated by the preoccupation of al-Muwaffaq—the caliphal Mu'tamid's brother and virtual ruler in the caliphate—with the Zanj rebels in Lower Iraq, which meant that Ahmad could not be dislodged from the west. Under Ahmad's son Khumārāwayh, the Tūlūnids' fortunes continued to be high. The new caliph, al-Mu'tamid, had on his accession in 279/892 to grant to Khumārāwayh and his heirs for thirty years Egypt, Syria to the Taurus Mts. and al-Jazīra (i.e. northern Mesopotamia) with the exception of Mosul in
return for a tribute of 300,000 dinars. The treaty was later revised in a form less favourable to the Tūlūnids, but it was not until Khumārāwayh’s death in 282/896 that the fabric of their empire, weakened by Khumārāwayh’s reckless extravagances, began to crack. The inability of the last Tūlūnids to keep the Qarmāṭī religious sectaries of the Syrian desert in check led the caliph to despatch an army which conquered Syria and then seized the Tūlūnīd capital of Fustāṭ or Old Cairo, carrying off the remaining members of the family to Baghdad.

For the Egyptian historians, the age of the Tūlūnids was a golden one. Ahmad held power by means of a large slave army, in which Turks, Greeks and black Nubians predominated, but the ensuing financial burden was alleviated for the people of Egypt by the ending of governmental malpractices; only under Khumārāwayh did administrative chaos and insubordination in the army appear. Since Syria can best be held from Egypt by sea, Ahmad also built a strong fleet. He was a great builder in his capital Fustāṭ, laying out there the military quarter of al-Qaṭā’i’ and constructing his famous mosque to accommodate all those troops who could not find room in the mosque of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 68; Zambaur, 93.
B1 ‘Tūlūnīd’ (H. A. R. Gibb).

THE IKHSĪDĪDS

(18)
The Ikhsīdīds
323-58/935-69
Egypt and Syria

323/935 Muhammad b. Tughj al-Ikhsīd
334/946 Onūjīr [On Uyghur]
349/961 ‘Ali
353/966 Kāfūr, originally regent for ‘Ali
357-8/968-9 Ahmad
Conquest of Egypt by the Fatimid general Jawhar

Muhammad b. Tughj came of a Turkish military family which had already been in the ‘Abbāsīd’s service for two generations. He was appointed governor of Egypt in 323/935, and secured from the caliph ar-Rādī the title of Ikhsīd. The Arab sources are unclear about the meaning of this title, but it is obvious that Muhammad b. Tughj knew that it was a designation of honour in the Central Asian homeland of his forebears (it is in fact an Iranian title meaning ‘prince, ruler’, and had been borne by the local Iranian rulers of Soghdia and Farghāna). Muhammad b. Tughj defended himself against the caliph’s Amīr al-Umara’ or Commander-in-Chief, Muhammad b. Rā’īq, and against the Hamdānīs in Syria, holding on to Damascus. His two sons were, however, mere puppets, and real power passed to his Nubian slave Kāfūr (Kāfūr = ‘camphor’, a reference by antiphrasis to his black colour), whom he appointed regent for his sons just before he died. On ‘Ali’s death in 353/966, Kāfūr became unrestricted ruler. To Kāfūr belongs the credit of holding up the threatened Fatimid advance along the North African coast and of containing the Hamdānīs in northern Syria; it was only after his death in 357/968 that a weak and ephemeral grandson of Muhammad b. Tughj was installed in Fustāṭ, to go down almost immediately before the Fatimid invasion. Kāfūr was famed as a liberal patron of literature and the arts, and it was at his court that the poet al-Mutanabbi spent some time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 69; Zambaur, 93.
The Fāṭimids
297-367/909-1171
North Africa, and then Egypt and Syria

The Dā’ī Abū’-Abdallāh ash-Shāhī, completed his preparatory work in 298/910
297/909 ʿUbayyīdallāh al-Mahdī
322/934 al-Qāʾim
343/954 al-Manṣūr
341/953 al-Muʿizz
355/977 al-Izz
366/976 al-Ḥākim
411/1021 az-Ẓāhir
427/1036 al-Mustansīr
487/1094 al-Mustaʿīl
495/1101 al-Amīr

524/1130 interregnum; rule by al-Ḥāfīz as Regent but not as Caliph

525/1131 al-Ḥāfīz
544/1149 az-Ẓāhir
549/1154 al-Fāʾiz
555-67/1160-71 al-ʿĀṣīd

Ayyūbid conquest

The Fāṭimids claimed Ālīd descent and derived their name from Fāṭima, daughter of the Prophet and wife of the fourth caliph ʿAlī; but Sunnī opponents usually referred to them as the ʿUbayyīyīn, descendants of ʿUbayyīdallāh al-Mahdī, explicitly denying any Ālīd connection. Some enemies amongst their contemporaries even accused the Fāṭimids of being Jewish in origin (to be accused of Jewish antecedents was, however, a common form of calumny in mediaeval Islam). Their connection with the seventh Imām Ismāʿīl has never been fully elucidated, but it is clear that the Fāṭimid caliphate represents the most successful and enduring political achievement of the Ismāʿīlī radical Shiʿī movement.

The first Fāṭimid caliph ʿUbayyīdallāh came from Syria to North Africa, where the dissemination of Shiʿī propaganda had already made conditions propitious for his arrival. With the support of the sedentary Kūṭāma Berbers, he overthrew the Aghlabīd governors of Iṣrāʿīyya and the Khārijī Rustamīds of Tāhāt, and made the Idrīsīds of Fez his tributaries. Sicily was occupied, and naval operations undertaken against the Byzantines. From their Iṣrāʿīyyan base of al-Mahdīyya, the Fāṭimids amassed supplies and treasure in preparation for an advance eastwards, and in 358/969 their general Jawhar entered Old Cairo or Fustāṭ, removing the last Idrīsīd. As they had done in the case of al-Mahdīyya in Iṣrāʿīyya, the Fāṭimids began to build for themselves a new capital in Egypt, that of New Cairo (al-Qāhirah ‘the Victorious’).

From Egypt, the Fāṭimids extended into Palestine and Syria, and took over the guardianship of the Holy Places in the Hijāz. During the long reign of al-Mustansīr (427-87/1036-94), they reached the zenith of their power. After initially clashing with the Greeks over Syria, the caliphs generally enjoyed peaceful relations with Byzantium; later in the eleventh century, the common threat of the Seljuqs and the Türkmen adventurers in Syria and Anatolia further drew them together. The Ismāʿīlī dāʿī or missionaries of the Fāṭimids worked as far afield as the Yemen and Sind, and in 451/1061 Baghdad was temporarily held in al-Mustansīr’s name. The appearance of the First Crusade at the end of the century was more of a threat to the Turkish rulers of Syria than to the Fāṭimids, for by then the latter held virtually no territory north of Ascalon in Palestine. Certain Muslim historians allege that the Fāṭimids encouraged the Franks to land, but this is improbable. The Fāṭimid viziers of the middle twelfth century co-operated with the Zangī Nūr-ad-Dīn of Aleppo and Damascus against the Crusaders, but nevertheless lost Ascalon to them (486/1153). Soon afterwards, the Fāṭimid kingdom began to crumble internally; the caliphs had now lost much of their power, and the viziers had assumed much of the executive and military leadership. Accordingly, it was not difficult for Saladin to end Fāṭimid rule altogether in 567/1171 as the last caliph lay dying.

In rivalry with the ʿAbbāsīds, the Fāṭimids had proclaimed themselves the true caliphs, yet the majority of their subjects remained Sunnīs and kept most of their religious liberty. Many of the dāʿīs trained at the newly-founded college of al-Azhar in Cairo went to work outside the Fāṭimid dominions. Except
during the first part of the unbalanced Caliph al-Ḥākim's reign, the Christians and Jews were comparatively well-treated, and some of them occupied high offices in the state. It was during al-Ḥākim's reign that the extremist Shi'i religious movement of the Druzes became implanted in southern Syria and Lebanon; because of al-Ḥākim's encouragement of the founder, the da'ī ad-Daraż, the Druzes came to revere that caliph as an incarnation of God. On the death of al-Mustaṣir, there was a serious split in the Ismā'ili movement, with two parties ranged behind his two sons Nizār and al-Mustaṣir. The partisans of the former, the more activist and extremist of the two groups, became the Assassins or Ismā'ili of Syria and Persia (see below, pp. 127-8), whilst al-Mustaṣir's more moderate followers are the spiritual ancestors of the modern Bohra Ismā'ili community of Bombay. Al-Mustaṣir retained the caliphate, but the spiritual basis of the Fatimid movement was at some extent impaired, above all after a further religious-political crisis on the death of al-Amir in 525/1130.

Egypt and Cairo enjoyed under the Fatimid s an economic prosperity and cultural vitality which eclipsed those of contemporary Iraq and Baghdad. Trade links were maintained with the non-Islamic world, including India and the Christian Mediterranean countries; in this commercial activity, Jews seem to have played an important rôle. It is from the workshops of Egypt at this time, too, that some of the finest products of Islamic art were turned out.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 70-3; Zambaur, 94-5.

Lit. ‘Fatimid’ (M. Canard), Husayn Faydallāh al-Hamdānī and Ḥasan Sulaimān Mahāmīd al-Juhānī, as-Sulayhiyyūn wa-l-baraka al-Fātimiyyya fi-l-Yaman (min sanat 203 ilā sanat 626 h.) (Cairo 1955), with a very detailed table at p. 343.

The Hāmdānīs were from the Arab tribe of Taghlib, long settled in al-Jazīrah (although certain authorities allege that they were only mawla' or clients of Taghlib). The founder of the family's fortunes, Hāmdūn, Hāmdūn, appears in the later years of the ninth century as an ally of the Khārijis of al-Jazīra, in rebellion against caliphal authority; later, the Hāmdānīs followed the Shi'ī faith of the majority of Arab tribes on the Syrian Desert fringes. However, Hāmdūn's son al-Husayn became a commander in the service of the 'Abbāsid, and distinguished himself against the Qarāmīta of the Syrian Desert. Another son, Abū-l-Hayāt 'Abdallāh, was in 293/905 appointed governor of Mosul, and 'Abdallāh's own son, al-Ḥasan, eventually succeeded there as Nāṣir-ad-Dawla, behaving as an independent ruler and extending his power westwards from the Hāmdānīs' original centre of Diyar Rabi'a into Syria. His son
Abū-Taghlib, called al-Ghadafar ‘the Lion’, was unfortunate enough to confront the great Büyid Amir ‘Aṣūd-ad-Dawla at the height of the latter’s power, when he had just in 369/978 taken over Iraq from his cousin ‘Īzz-ad-Dawla. ‘Aṣūd-ad-Dawla marched northwards and drove out Abū-Taghlib, who fled to the Fātimids in a vain search for help. His two brothers were afterwards restored in Mosul by the Büyids, and reigned there for a while until another family of Arab amirs, the ‘Uqaylids (see below, pp. 55-6), took over the city.

Nevertheless, the Ḥamdānids still had their lands in Syria, ruled by Abū-Taghlib’s uncle, the famous Sayf-ad-Dawla, who had captured Aleppo, Ḥims (Homs) and other towns from the Ikshidids. The establishment of the Ḥamdānids in Syria coincided with a great recovery of Byzantine fortunes under the energetic Macedonian emperors, and much of Sayf-ad-Dawla’s reign was occupied in defending his lands against the Greeks. His son Sa’d-ad-Dawla was unable to prevent the Byzantines from several times invading Syria and temporarily capturing Aleppo and Ḥims, although these were left to the Ḥamdānids as tributaries; moreover, a fresh threat arose in southern Syria from the expansionist policies of the Fātimids. Finally, Sa’d-ad-Dawla’s son Sa’d-ad-Dawla was killed, probably at the instigation of the slave general Lu’lu’, who at first ruled as regent for the Ḥamdānids’ two sons, but later assumed power independently as a vassal of the Fātimids.

The Ḥamdānids achieved renown as munificent patrons of Arabic literature, above all for Sayf-ad-Dawla’s encouragement of the poet al-Mutanabbi. Yet although they came to rule over a prosperous region, with many centres of urban trade and activity, the Ḥamdānids still retained something of the irresponsibility and destructiveness of Bedouins. Syria and al-Jazira inevitably suffered from the ravages of warfare but the geographer Ibn-Ḥawqal further records that the amirs’ capacity aggravated the distress there.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, III-13; Zambaur, 133-4. 
ET2 ‘Ḥamdānids’ (M. Canard).
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The Mazyadids

C. 350/956-1150

Hilla and central Iraq

C. 350/c. 961 Sa’d-ad-Dawla ‘Ali b. Mazyad
408/1018 Nūr-ad-Dawla Dubays b.
474/1081 Bahl-al-Dawla Manṣūr
479/1086 Sayf-ad-Dawla Šaḍaqa b.
501/1108 Nūr-ad-Dawla Dubays b.
530/1135 Sa’d-ad-Dawla Šaḍaqa b.
532/1138 Muḥammad

Conquest by Seljuk troops

The Mazyadids belonged to the Asad tribe, and were strongly Shi‘ī in sympathy. The family acquired a hold on the region between Hit and Kufa when lands there were conveyed to them during the reign of the Büyid Amir Mu‘izz-ad-Dawla at some date between 345/956 and 352/965. The beginnings of ‘Ali b. Mazyad’s reign must therefore be put back, according to Makdisi, to well before the date in the early eleventh century usually given in western sources. It seems also that the Mazyadid capital Hilla was already in the early eleventh century a permanent settlement and not a mere encampment, and that it gradually merged with and replaced the former Jami‘ ayn; under the great Šaḍaqa b. Manṣūr, the town was enclosed by a strong wall and became the fortified centre of Mazyadid power in Iraq.

Despite their Bedouin origins, the Mazyadids showed themselves skilful organisers and diplomats, making themselves a significant power in the shifting patterns of alliances in the Iraq of the Seljuk period. Their early rivals were the ‘Uqaylids of Mosul and al-Jazira, who in the reign of Dubays b. ‘Ali supported Dubays’s brother Muṣallad in the latter’s bid for the Mazyadid throne. When Togrul and the Seljuqs appeared in Iraq, Dubays feared the Turkish invaders and supported the pro-Fātimid, Shi‘ī general Arslan Baṣṣārī in Baghdad. During the troubled reign of the Seljuk Berk-yaruq, Šaḍaqa b., the so-called ‘King of the Arabs’, acquired a position of great influence, but once Sultan Muḥammad b. Malik-Shīh was firmly on the
throner, he moved against his overmichty vassal, and in 501/ 1108 defeated and killed Ṣadaqa in battle. The later Mazyadids allied with various Turkish amirs against Sultan Mas'ud b. Muhammad, and Hilla was occupied on various occasions by Seljuq and caliphal troops. Ṣadaqa’s son Dubays II achieved great fame amongst the Crusaders, *inter alios*, and was a great patron of the Arabic poets of his time, but was murdered by one of the Assassins at the same time as the caliphal-Mustarahsid was killed. After the last Mazyadid, ‘Ali II b. Dubays, died in 545/1150, Hilla was granted out by Mas’ud to one of his generals, and a few years later, the Mazyadids’ troops and supporters in Hilla were finally scattered by an incoming caliphal army.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Lane Poole, 119-20; Zambaur, 137.

El ‘Mazyadis’ (K. V. Zetterstéen).

---

The Marwānids of Diyārbakr, Khilāt and Malāzgird were Kurdish in origin. The founder Bādh was a Kurdish chief who seized various strongholds on the frontiers of Armenia and Kurdistan; taking advantage of the decline in the Būyids’ influence there after the death in 372/983 of ‘Aḍud-ad-Dawla, he took over Diyārbakr, held Mosul for a time and even threatened Baghdad in 373/983. His nephew Ibn-Marwān (Naṣr-ad-Dawla) ruled for over fifty years and raised the Marwānid principality to a high level of power and affluence. The strategic position of Diyārbakr, commanding as it did the routes from Iraq and the east to Syria and Anatolia, meant that Ibn-Marwān needed a skilful diplomatic policy to survive between powerful neighbours, all struggling for influence in the area. He recognised the ‘Abbāsids caliph at the outset, but he also had the Fāṭimid as neighbours in northern Syria, and Fāṭimid cultural influence was strong in Diyārbakr. For a time, he had to pay tribute to the ‘Uqaylids of Mosul and cede to them Niṣţabān in 423/1030. He had amicable relations with the Byzantines, and the Emperor Constantine X used Ibn-Marwān’s good offices to get the captured Georgian prince Liparit freed by the Seljuq sultan Toghril. The Oghuz nomads and their flocks were ejected from Diyārbakr in 433/1041-2, and Toghril himself did not appear there until 448/1056, when Ibn-Marwān recognised him as suzerain. Internally, the towns of Aṣīd, Mayyāfārīqīn,
and Ḫisn Kayfā enjoyed much material prosperity and there was a vigorous cultural life; the local historian of Mayyāfārīqīn, Ibn-al-Azraq, describes how Ibn-Marwān lightened taxes and did many public and charitable works there.

On his death in 453/1061, his territories were divided between his sons Naṣr and Saʿīd, but the power of the Marwānid was now waning. The cupidity of the caliphal vizier, Fakhr-ad-Dawla b. Jāhīr (who had previously been in Ibn-Marwān's service), was now aroused, although the Marwānids had done the Seljuqs no harm. Fakhr-ad-Dawla and his son 'Amid-ad-Dawla secured permission from Sultan Malik-Shāh to invade the Marwānid territories with a Seljuq army, and in 478/1085, after stiff fighting, they conquered them and incorporated them into the Seljuq empire. The last Marwānid, Mānṣūr, lived on in Jazīrat ibn-ʿUmar till 489/1096, but over the next centuries, Dīyārbakr was to be predominantly under the control of Turkmen dynasties.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 118; Zambaur, 136.

El 'Marwānids' (K. V. Zetterstéen), 'Naṣr al-Dawla' (H. Bowen).

H. F. Amedroz, 'The Marwānid dynasty at Mayyāfārīqīn in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D.', JRAS (1903), 123-54.

THE 'UQAYLIDS

<23>

The 'Uqaylids

C. 380-489/990-1096

Al-Jazīra, Iraq and northern Syria

1. Line in Jazīrat ibn-ʿUmar, Niṣibin and Balad

C. 380/c. 390 Muhammad
390/996 Janāḥ-ad-Dawla 'Alī
400/1010 Sinān-ad-Dawla al-Ḥasan
403/1013 Nūr-ad-Dawla Muḥammad

2. Line in Mosul and later in Jazīrat ibn-ʿUmar, Niṣibin and Balad

C. 382/c. 392 Muhammad
386/996 Ḥusayn-ad-Dawla al-Muqallad
391/1001 Muʿṭamid-ad-Dawla Qirwāsh
442/1050 Zaʿīm-ad-Dawla Baraka
443/1052 ʿAlam-ad-Din Qurayshī
453/1061 Sharaṣ-ad-Dawla Muslim
478/1085 ʿIbrāhīm
486-9/1093-6 ʿAlī

*Conquest by the Seljuq Tutush*

3. Line of Maʾn b. al-Muqallad in Takrit

Rāḥi
427/1036 Khamis
435/1044 Abū-Ghashshām
444/1052 ʿIsā
448/1056 Naṣr
449/1057-60 ʿAbū-l-Ghanāʾim, governor on behalf of ʿIsā's widow

4. Other minor branches at Ḥan and al-Ḥaditha, Qalʿat Jaʿbar, ʿUkbara and Ḥir; for details, see Lane Poole and Zambaur, loc. cit.

The 'Uqaylids came from the great Bedouin tribal group of Ḍir b. Saʿād, which also included the Khafāja and Muntafiq of lower Iraq. With the decay of the last Hamdānids in Mosul,
the city passed to the 'Uqaylid Muḥammad, who held it under the nominal suzerainty of the Bāyūd Bahā‘-ad-Dawla. After Muḥammad’s death, there were internecine struggles for power amongst his sons, but control over Mosul and the other Uqaylid towns and fortresses in al-Jazīra eventually came to Qirwāsh b. al-Muqallad. Qirwāsh’s main problem was to preserve intact his dominions in face of the Oghuz invaders of western Persia and Iraq during the third and fourth decades of the eleventh century, and this defence necessitated alliances with another threatened power in Iraq, the Mazyadids of Hilla.

Under Muslim b. Quraysh, the ‘Uqaylid dominions stretched almost from Baghdad as far as Aleppo. Being Shi‘ī, Muslim’s natural inclination was to support the Fāṭimid against the Seljuqs, but he allied with Sultans Alp-Arslan and Malik-Shāh in order to secure the Mirdāsid territories in northern Syria. But a further switch back to the Fāṭimids brought Seljuq armies to Mosul, forcing Muslim to flee to Amid and Aleppo, where he was eventually killed fighting the Seljuq rebel Sulaymān b. Qutalmish (478/1085). ‘Uqaylids survived in Mosul as governors on behalf of the Seljuqs until Tutush extinguished them; but other ‘Uqaylids persisted in al-Jazira as local lords, the branch in Raqqā and Qal‘at Ja‘bar lasting down to 564/1169 when Nūr-ad-Dīn Zangi took over from them.

It seems that the ‘Uqaylids were not entirely a predatory Bedouin dynasty, but had introduced some features at least of the standard pattern of ‘Abbasid administration into their territories; it is mentioned that Muslim b. Quraysh had a postmaster or local intelligence officer (ṣāḥib al-khobar) in every village. The passing of the ‘Uqaylids and of the Mazyadids soon afterwards marks the end of the period during which Arab amirates held power over large stretches of Iraq and Syria, maintaining themselves between the great powers of the Fāṭimids, Bāyūds and Seljuqs. The Shi‘ī sympathies of these amirates, and their strategic positions commanding the routes westwards into Diyarbakr and Anatolia, inevitably brought them up against the expansionists, Sunnis Seljuqs. Henceforth, political and military leadership in Iraq, al-Jazira and Syria was to be almost exclusively in Turkish hands.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 116-17; Zambaur, 135.
confronted the Mirdasids with a new situation. Mahmud b. Naṣr found it expedient to transfer his allegiance from the Fāṭimids to the Sunnī 'Abbāsids and to submit to the Seljuq sultan Alp-Arslan. Latterly, Mirdasid authority in Aleppo was undermined by the disputes between their Turkish mercenaries and the Kilâbî tribesmen, and in 468/1076 a civil war broke out between the two Mirdasid brothers Sābiq and Wahthâb. Pressure on Aleppo from Tutush, who was carving out for himself a Seljuq principality in Syria, drove Sābiq in 472/1079 to hand over the city to the Uqaylid Muslim b. Quraysh, the surviving members of the Mirdasid family being compensated by the grant of various towns in Syria.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lanc Poole, 114-15; Zambaur, 133, 135. Ru 'Ṣallîh b. Mirdâs, ' Ḥalab' (M. Soberheim).
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The Ayyûbids

564-end of the 9th century/1169-end of the 15th century

Egypt, Syria, Diyarbakr, the Yemen

1. In Egypt

564/1169 al-Malik an-Nâṣir 1 Šalâh-ad-Dîn (Saladin)
589/1193 al-Malik al-'Azîz 'Imâd-ad-Dîn
595/1198 al-Malik al-Manṣûr Nâṣir-ad-Dîn
596/1200 al-Malik al-'Aḍîl 1 Sayf-ad-Dîn
615/1218 al-Malik al-Kâmil 1 Nâṣir-ad-Dîn
635/1238 al-Malik al-'Aḍîl 11 Sayf-ad-Dîn
637/1240 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣâliḥ Najm-ad-Dîn Ayyûb
647/1249 al-Malik al-Mu'azzam Tûrân-Shâh
648-50/1250-2 al-Malik al-Ashtar 11 Muẓaffar-ad-Dîn

Bahri Manlik

2. In Damascus

582/1186 al-Malik al-Afdal Nûr-ad-Dîn 'Alî
592/1196 al-Malik al-'Aḍîl 1 Sayf-ad-Dîn
615/1218 al-Malik al-Mu'azzam Sharaf-ad-Dîn
624/1227 al-Malik an-Nâṣir Šalâh-ad-Dîn Da'ûd
626/1229 al-Malik al-Ashtar 1 Muẓaffar-ad-Dîn
634/1237 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣâliḥ 'Imâd-ad-Dîn, first reign
635/1238 al-Malik al-Kâmil 1 Nâṣir-ad-Dîn
635/1238 al-Malik al-'Aḍîl 11 Sayf-ad-Dîn
636/1239 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣâliḥ Najm-ad-Dîn Ayyûb,

first reign
637/1239 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣâliḥ 'Imâd-ad-Dîn,

second reign
643/1245 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣâliḥ Najm-ad-Dîn Ayyûb,

second reign
647/1249 al-Malik al-Mu'azzam Tûrân-Shâh

(with Egypt)

648-58/1250-60 al-Malik an-Nâṣir 11 Šalâh-ad-Dîn

Mongol conquest

3. In Aleppo

579/1183 al-Malik al-'Aḍîl 1 Sayf-ad-Dîn
7. Minor branches of the family in Ba’labak, Hims, Karak, Hamah, Baniyas and Subayba, and Buza: see Zambaur, 98-9 for details

Ayyūb, the progenitor of the dynasty, was from the Hadhbāni tribe of Kurds, although the family seems to have been considerably Turkicised from their service at the side of Turkish soldiers. The Turkish commander of Mosul and Aleppo, Zangi b. Aq Sonqur, recruited large numbers of the bellicose Kurds into his service, including in 532/1138 Ayyūb, and soon afterwards, his brother Shirkūh entered the service of Zangi’s son Nūr-ad-Dīn. In 564/1169 Shirkūh gained control of Egypt, but died almost immediately, and his nephew Śalāh-ad-Dīn (Saladin) was recognised by the troops as his successor.

The celebrated Saladin was accordingly the real founder of the dynasty. He extinguished the last vestiges of Fāṭimid rule in Egypt and promoted in their former territories a strongly Sunni religious and educational policy. The Ayyūbid victory in the old Fāṭimid lands thus completes the trend of orthodox Sunni reaction which had already under the Seldjuqs brought about the overthrow of political Shi’ism in the former Buyid territories furthest east. Another aspect of Saladin’s policy was the vigorous prosecution of ḵāhād against the Crusaders, a policy which unified Islamic enthusiasm behind him and enabled him to weld together armies of Turks, Kurds, and Arabs in the common cause. With the victory of Ḫaṭṭā in 583/1187, the holy city of Jerusalem again became Muslim after eighty years, and the Franks were driven, albeit only temporarily, from almost all their possessions except for a few coastal towns.

Before his death in 589/1193, Saladin granted out various parts of the Ayyūbid empire, including the cities of Syria, al-Jazira, and the Yemen, as appanages for various members of his family. Nevertheless, some sense of family solidarity and central control was maintained under al-ʿAdil and al-Kāmil until the latter’s death. Under these two sultans, Saladin’s activist policy gave place to one of détente and peaceful relations with the Franks, especially as the northern Ayyūbids in Diyarbakr...
and al-Jazira were feeling pressure from the Rûm Seljuqs and the Khwarazm-Shâhs. The culmination of this new policy was al-Kâmil’s return of Jerusalem to the Emperor Frederick II, and the period of peace brought extensive economic benefits to Egypt and Syria, including a revival of trade with the Christian powers of the Mediterranean.

After al-Kâmil’s death in 635/1238, the Ayyûbid dynasty was rent by internal quarrels. The Sixth Crusade was mastered and its leader, the French King St Louis, captured, but soon after as-Sâlih’s death, the Turkish Baḥri slave troops seized power in Egypt, making their leader Ayybak first Atabeg and then Sultan in 648/1250. Al-ʿAdîl had in 612/1215 sent out his young grandson al-Muṣṭafâr Sayf-ad-Dîn with an Atabeg to rule the Yemen, but the Ayyûbids were unable to maintain themselves there and the land passed to their former servants the Turkish Rashûuls.

Most of the northern Ayyûbids were swept away by the Mongols, and only the branch at Hamâ survived, because of its obscurity and docility, down to 742/1342. However, in Diyarbâkîr, a local Kurdish principality around Ḥîşn Kayfâ survived the Timûrîds, and this line of Ayyûbids was only ended by the Aq Qoyumî.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 74-9; Justi, 463.
Sachau, 19 (branches in Ba’l bakk, Karak and Ḥîșn Kayfâ).
Zambur, 97-101 and Table 11; an “Ayyûbîd” (Cl. Cahen).
al-Hamûdî and al-Julâni, as-Sudâyhiyûn wa-l-haraqa al-Fâtimiyûn fî-l-Yaman, with a table of the Yemen Ayyûbids at p. 347.
The Mamluks succeeded to the rich heritage of the Ayyubids in Egypt and Syria. Like most major Islamic dynasties of their age, the Ayyubids had found it necessary to support themselves with professional slave guards, and the Mamluks (literally, ‘those possessed, slaves’) arose from the Turkish soldiery of al-Malik as-Salih Najm-ad-Din Ayyub. Within the two and a half centuries of independent Mamluk rule, two lines of sultans are somewhat artificially distinguished: the Bahri ones, so-called because theseguards originally had their barracks on the island of ar-Rawda in the Nile (al-Bahr), and the Burji ones, thus named because Sultan Qalâ’în had quartered his guards in the citadel (al-Burj) of Cairo. Family succession generally prevailed amongst the Burjis, but no hereditary succession was ever permitted amongst the Burjis, and something like the old Turkish system of the seniorate existed. Ethnically, the Bahris were mainly Qipchaqs from South Russia, with an admixture of Mongols and Kurds; the Burjis were primarily Circassians from the Caucasus. Down to the end of the Mamluks in the early nineteenth century, Circassia provided most of their manpower. Pace the assertion of some authorities that the Mamluks failed to perpetuate themselves more than two or three generations, it seems that Mamluk families reproduced themselves all right, but that succeeding generations no longer followed a military career; replenishments were accordingly necessary. The Mamluks had a complex, hierarchical system, with the sultan’s own mamluks at the top of the structure. Slave status was essential for success in the power structure, for the free elements, including the sons of former mamluks, had only an inferior place in the army (a similar position existed in the Ottoman Turkish slave institution, where the Çaplar had superior opportunities for advancement). The sultans’ arbitrary power was checked by the chief amirs and the bureaucracy, and the instability of the sultanate is seen in the rapid turnover of rulers and the three separate reigns of a sultan like al-Nasir Muhammad b. Qalâ’în. The Mamluks continued the strongly Sunni policy of the Ayyubids, and their maintenance in Cairo of a line of šâbûnāt ‘Abbâsid caliphs (see above, pp. 8, 10) is almost certainly to be connected with this.

The strengths and achievements of the Mamluk state were impressive. Qutuz defeated Hulagu’s Mongols at ‘Ayn Jâlût in
658/1260, and his successor Baybars consolidated the victory and set the régime on its feet, although the threat from the Mongols continued for several decades after this. By the end of the thirteenth century, the Crusader towns of the Syro-Palestine littoral had been mopped up, and in the next century the Rupenid kingdom of Little Armenia or Cilicia was ended. The Mamluks thus acquired great prestige in the Islamic world as hammers of the pagan Mongols and the Christians. Their territories extended to Cyrenaïca in the west, to Nubia and Massawa in the south and to the Taurus Mts in the north, and they protected the Holy Cities of Arabia. In the fifteenth century, the Ottomans were recognised as the Mamluks' main enemies. The Turkmen principality of the Dulghadlar Oghullari was maintained in western Diyarbakr as a buffer-state, and the Qaramanids were supported. But the superior élan and vigour of the Ottomans, and their well-developed use of artillery and firearms, worked in their favour. The last Mamluk sultan of real significance, Qānsūh al-Ghawri, was killed in battle at Marj Dābiq near Aleppo in 922/1516, and after this, Selim the Grim occupied Syria and Egypt. These now became pashaliks of the Ottoman empire, although the military caste of the Mamluks continued virtually to control Egypt until Muhammad 'Ali destroyed their power in 1226/1811.

Under Mamluk rule, Egypt and Syria enjoyed economic prosperity and a great cultural and artistic efflorescence, with especial achievements in such fields as architecture, ceramics and metalwork; the origins of the science of heraldry seem to go back to Mamluk times. There were close commercial links with the Christian powers of the Mediterranean; thus Baybars, despite a strongly anti-Christian military policy in the Near East, made trade treaties with James I of Aragon and Charles of Anjou, King of Sicily. Only towards the end did the Portuguese circumnavigation of Africa threaten Mamluk prosperity by diverting the transit trade through the Near East from their territories; it was these fears which lay behind Qānsūh's attempt to garrison points on the coasts of Arabia, to launch fleets on the Indian Ocean and to bar the Portuguese from Indian waters.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Lane Poole, 80-3; Zambaur, 103-6.

---


---

**MUHAMMAD 'ALI'S LINE**

| 1220/1805 | Muhammad 'Ali Pasha |
| 1264/1848 | Ibrahim Pasha |
| 1264/1848 | 'Abbās i Pasha |
| 1270/1854 | Sa'id Pasha |
| 1280/1863 | Isma'il (assumed title of Khedive in 1284/1867) |
| 1296/1879 | Tawfiq |
| 1309/1892 | 'Abbās ii Hīmī |
| 1333/1914 | Ḥusayn Kāmil (assumed title of Sultan) |
| 1335/1917 | Aḥmad Fu'ād i (assumed title of King in 1340/1922) |
| 1355/1936 | Fārūq |
| 1371-2/1952-3 | Fu'ād ii |

*Republican régime established*

Muhammad 'Ali (1182-1265/1769-1849) was an Albanian soldier in the Ottoman army. He first came to Egypt as part of the Turkish force sent to dislodge the occupying French, and stayed there as de facto ruler of the country, forcing the sultan to recognise him as governor or pasha, and getting rid of the old governing class of the Circassian Mamluks. Muhammad 'Ali's chief claim to fame was his realisation that his province, Egypt, could only flourish and progress if the technical discoveries, the military practices and the educational systems evolved in the West were introduced there; he therefore ranks with his contemporaries, the Ottoman sultans, Selim ii and Mahmud ii, as a pioneer westerniser in the Middle East. A newly-raised conscript army was now used to subjugate the Sudan, a rich
source of slaves; higher educational institutions were set up, with European staff and advisers; fiscal policy was reformed and modified to meet the increased demands for revenue. Externally, Muḥammad ‘Alī and his capable son ʿĪbrāhīm intervened in the Greek War of Independence, maintained their autonomy vis-à-vis the sultan in Istanbul, and carried on a series of fairly inconclusive wars with the Wahhābī rulers of central Arabia.

By the end of Muḥammad ‘Alī’s reign, Egypt was already acquiring a weight of indebtedness, and this was accentuated by the extravagance and desire to imitate European royal standards of such rulers as ʿĪbrāhīm’s son Ismāʿīl. He was the first of his line to secure from the sultan the title of khedive, a title of ancient Iranian origin, and also the promise of his descendants’ hereditary succession, both indications of the virtual independence of the line. It was under Ismāʿīl that work on the Suez Canal was completed, but imperialist Egyptian ventures in Ethiopia and the Sudan shattered Egypt’s financial stability. Like Turkey itself, Egypt now came under the control of European creditor nations; and after the revolt of ‘Urābī Pasha in 1898/1882, Britain assumed control of the Egyptian finances and stationed a permanent garrison there. Not until 1914 did the British Protectorate end.

The reigns of the last two significant members of the dynasty, Fuḥād and Fārūq, were dominated internally by struggles with the majority political party of the Wāḥād, and externally, by attempts to throw off the remaining vestiges of British control. Just before the end of the monarchy, Naḥşūb Pasha abrogated the Condominium Agreement over the Sudan, and proclaimed Fārūq ‘King of Egypt and the Sudan’. But discontent mounted, especially after the Arab-Israeli dābqec of 1948. The monarchy had never been felt as truly Arab, and in 1952 Fārūq was forced to abdicate; in the following year, the monarchy was abolished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 84–5; Zambaur, 107.
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The Qarāmīṭḥ or Carmathians
281-end of 5th century/894-end of 11th century
Eastern and central Arabia, with their centre in Bahrayn

281/894 Abū-Saʿīd al-Ḥasan al-Jannābī
300/913 Abū-l-Qāsim Ṣaʿīd
311/923 Abū-Ṭāhir Sulaymān
322/934 Abū-Ḥanīfah Ahmad
361–6/972–7 Abū-Yaʿqūb Yūsuf
Rule by a Council of Elders

The Qarāmīṭḥ or Carmathian movement had its roots in the Messianic ideas of radical Shi‘ism, and was probably inspired in the first place by Ismāʿīl’s propaganda disseminated amongst the Beduins of the Syrian and Arabian Deserts. In the opening years of the tenth century, Zikrayth had led a Qarāmīṭḥ revolt in the Syrian Desert until it was suppressed in 293/906. But the greatest centre of Qarāmīṭḥ activity was in Bahrayn, the coastal region of eastern Arabia to the south of Iraq. Taking advantage of local social discontent and of the chaos left behind in Lower Iraq by the Ṣuṭṭī or black slave rebellion, the Qarāmīṭḥ built up a vigorous, economically prosperous and enduring state. Abū-Saʿīd, the dāʿī or agent of the rather shadowy figure of the Qarāmīṭḥ founder, Ḥamādān Qarām, built up this principality, and more than a century later, the Qarāmīṭḥ of Bahrayn were still known by the general designation of Abū-Saʿīdīs.

The organisation of the principality was in some respects communistic, with taxes collected and shared out amongst the members of the community according to their needs, although
it rested on a foundation of black slave labour. Influenced as they were by Ḯṣmʿlism, with its tendencies towards intercon-

fessionalism and contempt for the outward forms of religion, the religious practices of the Qarāmīta were informal, thus 

scandalising the orthodox. The dynasty of Abū-Saʿid acted as 

leaders in war and diplomacy, and the affairs of the community 

were directed by a Council of Elders, the ʿIqdāniyya.

The relations of the Qarāmīta with the Ḯṣmʿlī Fātimids in 

North Africa are obscure; the present tendency is to minimise 

the likelihood of concerted action by the two movements in the 

first part of the tenth century. The Qarāmīta sacked Kūfa from 

Baḥrayn, attacked pilgrim caravans, occupied Oman and in 

317/929 sacked Mecca and carried off the Black Stone from the 

Kaʿba, regarding it as an object of superstitious reverence; they 

only replaced it twenty years later at the Fātimid caliph al-

Manṣūr’s request. The Qarāmī state evolved into something 

like a republic, and flourished down to the end of the eleventh 

century; even two or three centuries later, Qarāmī doctrines 

were still prevalent in Baḥrayn.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambaur, 116.
M. J. de Goeje, Mémoires sur les Carmathes du Bahraín et les 

Fatimides (Leiden 1886).
W. Madelung, ‘Fatimid und Bahrainionarten’, Der Islam, 

XXXIV (1919), 34-88.

THE ZAYDI IMĀMS OF THE YEMEN

The Zaydi Imāms of the Yemen or Rassids

Early 3rd century- /early 9th century-

Seat in ʿṢaʿda or ʿṢanʿa’

1. Early period (Rassid line)

? Tarjumān-ad-Dīn al-Qāsim ar-Rassī, 

d. 246/860
246/860 al-Ḥusayn

280/893 Yahyā al-Hādī-ilā-h-Ḥaqq 1

298/911 Muhammad al-Murtaḍā

301/914 Ahmad an-Nāṣir

? al-Ḥusayn al-Muntakhab

? al-Qāsim al-Mukhtar

? Yūsuf al-Manṣūr ad-Dāʾī

? al-Qāsim al-Manṣūr

393/1003 al-Ḥusayn al-Mahdi

? Jaʿfar

426/1035 al-Ḥasan

430/1039 Abū-ʾl-Fāṭḥ an-Nāṣir ad-Daylamī

454/1062 capture of ʿṢaʿda by the ʿṢulayhīds

480/1087 Ṣulayḥīd governors

492/1099 rule in ʿṢaʿda by the ʿHamādānī line of 

Ḥātim b. ʿGhasīm

545/1150 Ṭāhīl al-Mutawakkil

556/1161 rule of the ʿHamदānīds restored

569/1174 Ayyūbīd conquest of the Yemen

594/1198 ʿAbdallāh al-Manṣūr

614/1217 Yahyā al-Hādī-ilā-h-Ḥaqq 11 (in ʿṢaʿda)

614/1217 Muhammad an-Nāṣir (in the southern 

districts, till 623/1226)

646/1248 ʿAlīnād al-Mahdī al-Mūṭiʿ1

656/1258 Shams-ad-Dīn ʿAlī al-Mutawakkil

c. 680/c. 1281 Dāʾīl al-Munṭaṣīr

2. Modern period (Qāsimid line)

c. 1000/c. 1592 al-Qāsim al-Manṣūr

1029/1620 Muhammad al-Muʿayyad 1

1054/1654 Ḯṣmʿlī al-Mutawakkil

1087/1676 Muhammad al-Muʿayyad 11

77
The Yemen remained the centre of the Zaydi da'wa or religious propaganda, with missionaries going out to the Caspian provinces and to other parts of the Islamic world. Šan‘a’ was taken by the Sulayḥids in the second half of the eleventh century, and in the next century it was held by Arab chiefs of the Banū Hamdān for fifty years; only briefly were Zaydi fortunes restored under Ahmad al-Mutawakkil, a descendant of the tenth-century Imām Ahmad an-Nāṣir. The Ayyūbid conquest of the Yemen in 569/1174 considerably restricted the authority of the imāms; they revived somewhat under the first Rasīlids, until internal disputes and civil strife brought about the eclipse of their power in the Yemen.

After this time, the names of various imāms are known, but the succession seems to have been interrupted by the intrusion of several imāms from other Ḥasanid lines and of various rival claimants or anti-imāms. The Ottoman Turks occupied the Yemen from 923/1517 to 1045/1635, and in the sixteenth century, more than one imām was carried off to Istanbul by the Turkish authorities. It was not until the Turks left the Yemen and Šan‘a’ was re-occupied by the Zaydis, that a fresh line of imāms, stemming from the Rasid Imām Yūsuf al-Manṣūr ad-Dā‘ī, began to rule there. It is this line which has persisted in the Yemen, despite a second Ottoman occupation of Šan‘a’ from 1289/1872 till 1308/1890, down to the present time.

**Bibliography.** Sachau, 22; Zambaur, 122-4 and Table 11. e1 ‘Zaidiya’, ‘Šan‘a’ (R. Strothmann).
THE ARABIAN PENINSULA

439-532/1047-1138

Yemen

439/1047 'Ali b. Muḥammad
459/1067 al-Mukarram ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAli
477/1084 al-Mukarram al-Maʿṣūlfar
500/1099-1138 as-Sayyida Arwā

under the supreme rule of as-Sayyida Arwā

Power assumed by the Zura'yids or Banū-l-Karam of Aden

After the early Arab conquests, the Arabian peninsula became a backwater politically and culturally. It has been already noted that the Yemen, because of its remoteness from the seat of the ʿAbbāsid caliphate in Iraq, soon became a centre of Shiʿī heterodoxy, especially of the Zaydis. It was also fertile ground for the reception of the exoteric propaganda of Severen or Ismāʿīlī Shiʿism, and once the Fatimid caliphate in Egypt towards the end of the tenth century, with the Holy Places in the Ḥijāz acknowledging the Fatimid caliph, connections between Egypt and the Yemen became close.

The Ṣulayḥids ruled in the Yemen as adherents of the Ismāʿīlī ʿaṣba wa and as nominal vassals of the Fatimids. ʿAli b. Muḥammad, a member of the South Arabian tribe of Ḥamdān and the son of a local qāḍī or judge, became the deputy of the chief Fatimid ʿaṣba in the Yemen, Sulaymān az-Zawāḥi, and was then able to set up a principality in the mountains. He defeated the Abyssinian slave dynasty of the Najāḥids of the Yihām or coastlands, in 455/1065 he captured Ṣanʿa′ from the Zaydi imāms and invaded the Ḥijāz, and in the next year he took Aden from the Banū-Maʿn. Under his son al-Mukarram ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAli, the Ṣulayḥiids dominions reached their maximum extent, yet these conquests could not be held beyond the eleventh century. The Najāḥids revived, Aden was usually independent, and the

Zaydi imāms remained at Ṣaʿdā north of Ṣanʿa′. From the latter part of Ahmad’s reign until her own death in 92 in 532/1138, effective authority was exercised by his capable consort, the Queen as-Sayyida Arwā, who moved the Ṣulayḥiids capital from Ṣanʿa′ to Dhib-Jībla. Towards the end, power passed to the Zura'yids, who were to hold it till the advent in 566/1174 of the Ayyūbid Turān-Shāh (see above, p. 63), although odd Ṣulayḥiids princes held fortresses in the Yemen down to the end of the twelfth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 94, Zambour, 118-19 (both very inaccurate).
RI ʿṢulayḥids (F. Krenkow).
Najm-ad-Dīn ʿUmāra al-Yamani, Taʾrikh al-Yaman, in H. C. Kay, Yaman, its early mediaeval history (London 1892), 19-64.
al-Hamdānī and al-Juhānī, as-Ṣulayḥiyyūn wa-l-baraka al-Fāṭimiyā fi-l-Yaman, with a detailed table at p. 335.
The Yemen was, in 569/1174, conquered by the Ayyūbid Tūrin-Shāh, Saladin’s brother, and ruled by Ayyūbid princes down to 626/1229, when al-Malik al-Kāmil’s son, Šalāl-ad-Dīn Yūsuf, was forced to abandon the province. Their successors, the Rasūlids, nevertheless continued Ayyūbid policy in the Yemen, imitating Ayyūbid titulature and promoting the cause of Sunnī Islam in this region where, in the mountainous interior at least, there was a long-established Shi’ī tradition. Although the historian of the Rasūlids al-Khażrajī gives Rasūl a genealogy going back to Qaḥṭān, progenitor of the South Arabs, he was in fact a Turkmen of Oğuz origin who had been employed as an envoy (rasūl) by the ‘Abbāsid caliph, and a certain number of Turkish features are discernible in the dynasty’s history.
The Al Bū-Sa’īd, Sultans of Muscat and then of Zanzibar

1154-1741

**Oman and Zanzibar**

1. United Sultanate

1154/1741  Ahmad b. Sa’īd
1198/1783  Sa’īd b. Ahmad
1200/1786  Hāmid b. Sa’īd
1206/1792  Sūlān b. Ahmad
1220/1806  Sālim b. Sūlān
1220/1806  Sa’īd b. Sūlān

**Division of the sultanate on Sa’īd’s death**

2. In Oman

1273/1856  Thawaynī b. Sa’īd
1282/1866  Sālim b. Thawaynī
1285/1868  ‘Azzān b. Qays
1287/1870  Turki b. Sa’īd
1305/1888  Faysal b. Turki
1331/1913  Taymūr b. Faysal

1350-1932  Sa’īd b. Taymūr

3. In Zanzibar

1273/1856  Majdī b. Sa’īd
1287/1870  Barghash b. Sa’īd
1305/1888  Khalīfa b. Barghash
1307/1890  ‘Ali b. Sa’īd
1310/1893  Ḫāmid
1314/1896  Ḥammūd
1320/1902  ‘Ali b. Ḥammūd
1329/1911  Khalīfa

1380-4/1960-4  Abdallāh b. Khalīfa

**Revolution and incorporation in the Republic of Tanzania**

The Bū-Sa’īdīs succeeded to the heritage of the preceding line of Ya’rubīd imāms in both Oman and the East-African coastslands. Ahmad b. Sa’īd began as governor of Ṣuḥār in Oman, and then made himself master of the whole region. He adopted the title of imām (sc. of the Iḥādhī, who comprise three-quarters of the Omani population; see on the Iḥādhī sect, above, p. 22), possibly in 1163/1749, but his son Sa’īd was the last to use this title, and later rulers simply called themselves sayyids, or sultans to foreigners. Muscat, which eventually became the capital of the Bū-Sa’īdīs, had long been a port of international significance and had played an important rôle in the struggles of the Portuguese and then the Dutch for the commercial control of the Persian Gulf. Sayyid Sulṭān (1206-20/1792-1806) pursued an expansionist policy as far as Bahrayn Island and Bandar Abbas, Hormuz, and Kishm on the southern coasts of Persia. However, the position of the sayyids in the early nineteenth century was menaced by the aggressive Wahhābs of Najd; they countered this threat by an alliance with Britain, which was concerned that the port of Muscat, lying as it did near the route to India, should be in friendly hands. In 1212/1798 the first treaty with the East India Company was made, and agents of the Company were later stationed at Muscat; in subsequent decades of the nineteenth century, Britain used her influence at Muscat to control and then end the slave trade in the Gulf.

The Ya’rubīd possessions on the East African coast had been largely lost in the wars with Persia of the late eighteenth century, with virtually only Zanzibar, Pemba, and Kilwa remaining to the Bū-Sa’īdīs. But Sa’īd b. Sulṭān during his long reign extended his suzerainty over all the Arab and Swahili colonies from Mogadishu in the north to Cape Delgado in the south. After his death in 1273/1856, the Bū-Sa’īdī dominions were divided into two separate sultanates, based on Muscat and Zanzibar respectively. In 1307/1890 the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba became a British protectorate; the sultanate achieved independence once more in December 1965, but in January 1964 a coup d’État ended the sultan’s rule, and in April 1964 Zanzibar became linked with Tanganyika in the republic of Tanzania. As for Oman, from c. 1319/c. 1901 onwards, it has been politically disturbed by a separatist movement in the interior, the region behind the Jebel Akhar Mountains. The present imām of these dissidents, Ghālib, has been financed by Egypt, and in 1957 he attempted an armed uprising against the sultan.
in Muscat, who still remains closely linked diplomatically with Britain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambaur, 129 and Table M.
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The Wahhābiyya began as a religious and spiritual reform movement in central Arabia or Najd. The founder was Muhammad b. 'Abd-al-Wahhāb (died 1206/1791), whose beliefs as set forth in his 'Aṣlāt or creed (preserved in a local history of Najd, the 'Unwān al-najd fi ta'rīkh Najd' of 'Uthmān b. 'Abdullāh b. Bishur) show him as a follower of the conservative and literalist legal and theological ideas of Ahmad b. Hanbal and Ibn Ṭayyibiyya. The unity and transcendence of God is stressed, and great hostility shown to heretical innovations, bīda', above all, to popular saint-worship and the survivals of
pre-Islamic veneration of sacred sites and objects. Hence when the Wahhabiyah achieved political and military power in Arabia, they systematically destroyed such things as saints’ tombs.

Muhammad b. 'Abd-al-Wahhab was protected by the Najdi chief Muhammad b. Sa'ud of Dar'iyya, and his reforming enthusiasm became the driving force behind the political expansion of the Sa'udi family. By the end of the eighteenth century, the whole of Najd had been conquered and Iraq was being raided, culminating in the sack of Karbala' by the Wahhabis in 1218/1803 as a centre of Shi'i superstition; and the Holy Cities of the Hijaz were seized and purged. The Ottomans were naturally provoked into a reaction, and the Sultan authorised the governor of Egypt Muhammad 'Ali to deal with the Wahhabis; hence in 1233/1818 the latter’s son Ibrahim took Dar'iyya and razed it to the ground, deported the Sa'udi amir to Istanbul for execution and occupied the Hijaz. The Sa'udis revived somewhat under Turki and especially under Faysal I, but then became hard pressed, especially as Najd was, in the last years of the nineteenth century, dominated by the rival Rashid family of Ha'il, with the Sa'udis compelled to take refuge in Kuwait.

The resurgence of the family in the twentieth century is connected with the great figure of 'Abd-al-'Aziz b. Sa'ud. He overthrew the Al Rashid (who had supported the Turkish cause in the First World War), prevented the Sharif Husayn from establishing himself in Mecca as caliph, and in 1930 had himself crowned in Mecca as king of the Hijaz and Najd, thus establishing the modern Sa'udi Arabian kingdom firmly in control of the greater part of the peninsula.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Zambaur, 124 and Table L.

1. 'Ibn Sa'ud' (J.H. Mordtmann), 'Wahhabiya' (D.S. Margoliouth).

R. Hartmann, 'Die Wahhabiten', ZDMG, LXXVIII (1924), 176-213.


were also often referred to as Mušik al-Jibāl 'Lords of the mountains', for although they at times lost their foothold on the plains, they managed to hold on to some authority in the mountains.

The first line, that of the Kā'ūsiyya, were in the tenth century linked by marriage with the Būyids and Ziyārids, and latterly fell under the control of the Ziyārid Qābūs b. Vushmagīr; but they survived into the next century in the mountains, when the Caspian coasts were overrun by the Seljuqs. In the ensuing years, the second or Ispahbadīyya line of the Bāwandīds successfully prevented the Great Seljuqs from extending their direct authority into Tūbaristān; they sheltered various Seljuq claimants to the throne and made several high-level marriages with the Seljuqs. The decline of Seljuq power permitted the vigorous and ambitious Shāh Ghausī Rustam I to become a major figure in the politics of northern Persia; he pursued an independent policy aimed at the expansion of his principality south of the Elburz. However, the pressure of the Ismā'īlīs of the Elburz and then of the Khwārazm-Shāh brought this line to an end in 606/1210, and Māzandarān passed briefly under Khwārazmian control. Even so, the resilient Bāwandīs reappeared thirty years later as a third line, that of the Kīnkhwāhiyya. They ruled as vassals of the Mongols, until in 750/1349 another local Māzandarān family, that of Kīyā Afsāsyāb Chulābī, overthrew them and ended their rule for ever.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 431–2; Sachau, 5–7; Zambur, 187–9.

The Caspian coasts of Gilân and Tābaristān and the hills inland, protected as they are by the mighty barrier of the Elburz Mts, have always been a refuge area for peoples and ideas. Ethnic splinters, aberrant religious beliefs, ancient languages, scripts, and social ways have often survived there long after they have disappeared from the more accessible parts of Persia. For many centuries after the coming of Islam to Persia, these regions sheltered various petty dynasties whose roots lay in the Šābanī past; one of these, the Bā-htmlāns, persisted right down to the time of the Safavid Shāh 'Abbās I (i.e. the end of the sixteenth century), when the line was suppressed and the Caspian provinces fully integrated with the rest of Persia.

The most significant of these local Iranian dynasties was perhaps that of the Bāwandīs of Tābaristān (a region which from the late eleventh century is generally called Māzandarān), whom circumstances in the twelfth century allowed to play a rôle in Persia outside the immediate Caspian region. The survival of this dynasty for 700 years until Il-Khānīd times well shows how the region's isolation allowed a degree of family continuity unusual in the Islamic world at large. The Bāwandī rulers had the Iranian title of Ispahbad or 'Military leader', and
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The Muṣāfirids or Sallārizids or Kangarids

C. 304-483/916-1090

Daylam and Azerbajyan

before 304/916 Muḥammad b. Muṣāfir, lord of Taḥrīm in Daylam
330/941 Marzubān I b. Muḥammad (in Azerbajyan and Arrān)
330/941 Wahsūdān b. Muḥammad (in Azerbajyan)
346/957 Jūstān I b. Marzubān (in Azerbajyan)
349/960 Ibrāhīm I b. Marzubān (in Azerbajyan till d. 373/983)
387/997 Ibrāhīm II b. Marzubān II (re-established at Taḥrīm, still alive 420/1029)
* Justi I b. Ibrāhīm (reigning 437/1045)
* Muṣāfir b. Ibrāhīm (reigning 454/1062)
* Dynasty extinguished by the Ismāʿīlīs of Alamūt

The history of north-western Persia in the period between the rule of such Arab governors as the Ṣājdīs of Azerbajyan and the Yazīdīs of Darbān (the latter Sharvān-Shāhī), and that of the incoming Turkish Seljuqs, is spanned by the upsurge there of indigenous Iranian peoples. Whereas the Daylamī Ziyārids and Būyids directed their efforts at the rich lands of western and southern Persia and Iraq, the Daylamī Muṣāfirīds expanded northwards into Azerbajyan, where the collapse of the Ṣājdīs had left a power vacuum. The name ‘Sallārizīd’ is also found for the Muṣāfirīds, but the Persian scholar Kasravī claimed plausibly that the family’s original name was that of the Kangarids. Muḥammad b. Muṣāfir (Muṣāfir probably < Persian Asfār/ Arvār) held the key fortresses of Taḥrīm and Salmān in Daylam, and from these he increased his power at the expense of the older Daylamī dynasty of the Jūstānīs. After Muḥammad’s death in 330/941, the family split for a time into two branches. One under Wahsūdān remained in Daylam, whilst the other under his brother Marzubān moved northwards and westwards into Azerbajyan and Arrān and even to Darbān on the Caspian coast. This latter branch failed, however, to maintain itself in face of the growing power of the Rawwāūds of Tabrīz, and the last Muṣāfirīd territories in Azerbajyan were lost by 374/984. Furthermore, the Taḥrīm branch was hard pressed by the Būyīd Fakhr-ad-Dawla of Ray, and for a time lost Salmān to him. Their fortunes revived after his death, and they were able to occupy Zanjān and other towns to the south of Daylam. But the dynasty’s history now becomes obscure and fragmentary. Ibrāhīm II b. Marzubān was briefly dispossessed of Taḥrīm in 420/1029 by the Ghaznavids; later, the family became vassals of the Seljuq Toghril Beg. After this, comes only silence, but it is probable that the last obscure Muṣāfirīds were extinguished by the aggressive Ismāʿīlīs of Alamūt.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 441 (linking the Muṣāfirīds with the Rawwāūds under the common designation of Wahsūdānīs). Sachau, 14; Zambaur, 180.

1 ‘Muṣāfirīd’ (V. Minorsky).


Sayyid Ahmad Kasravī, Shahrūyūrān-i gum-nāmā (Tehran 1335/1957), 1, 52-120.

Although Daylamis were most prominent in the upsurge in northern Persia of Iranian peoples in the tenth century, the rôle of other races was not negligible. The Shaddāids of Arrān were probably of Kurdish origin, whilst the Rawwādids of Tabrīz and Azerbayjan were in the tenth century accounted Kurdish. In reality, it seems that the family were originally Arabs from the Yemenī tribe of Azd. In the early 'Abbāsid period, members of the Rawwādī family had been governors of Tabrīz, but over the next century or so, the family became thoroughly Kurdishised, and such names as 'Mamlān' and 'ʿAljmadīl' are characteristic Kurdish deformations of the familiar Arabic names 'Muḥṣanīd' and 'ʿAljmad'.

Like their Musāfīrid neighbours, the Rawwādids took advantage of the confused state of post-Sījīd Azerbayjan. Despite help from the Būyīds, that branch of the Musāfīrids which had installed itself in Azerbayjan was gradually driven out by ʿAbd-Ḥayjī Mamlān, so that by 374/984 all the region was in Rawwādī hands. In the eleventh century, the most outstanding member of the dynasty was Waḥṣūdān b. Mamlān. With the help of Kurdish neighbours, he successfully coped with the first incursions of Oghuz Turkmen, but in 466/1074 submitted to Toghrīl. Thereafter, the Rawwādids ruled as Seljūq vassals, until in 463/1071, Alp-Arslān returned from his Anatolian campaign and deposed Mamlān b. Waḥṣūdān. However, at
The Shaddādīds were another of the dynasties which arose in northern Persia during the 'Daylamī interlude', and it is probable that they were of Kurdish origin. The northwestern corner of the Iranian world and the adjoining Caucasus region have for much of recorded history been a most confused region ethnically and linguistically. The Shaddādīds' need to find a place for themselves between the Daylamīs of Azerbāijān on one side, and the Christian Armenians and Georgians on the other, doubtless explains why Daylamī names like Lashkārī and Armenian ones like Ashot are found in the Shaddādīds' genealogy.

In the middle years of the tenth century, the Kurdish adventurer Muḥammad b. Shaddād established himself at Dvīn (near modern Erivan in the Georgian SSR), a town at that time in the possession of the Musāfīris. Despite an attempt to secure Byzantine aid, Muḥammad could not prevent the Daylamīs from regaining Dvīn, but in 360/971 his sons successfully ejected the Musāfīris from Dvīn in Arrān (the region of eastern Transcaucasia between the Kur and Araxes rivers), and Dvīn then became the capital of the main line of Shaddādīds for a century. They now undertook with vigour the defence of Islam in this region, fighting the Georgian Bagratids, various Armenian princes, the Byzantines, and the Alans or Ossetians and the Rūs from over the Caucasus. In particular, Abū-l-Asvār Shāvūr I, most eminent of the Shaddādīds, acquired a great contemporary renown as a fighter for the faith. The Shaddādīds submitted to Toghril and the Seljuqs when the latter first appeared in the Caucasus region, but in 468/1075 the Turkish slave general Sāvūqīn invaded Arrān and compelled Fadl or Fadlūn I to yield his ancestral territories. However, another branch was installed in Ānī, capital of the Armenian Bagratids, after its capture by Sultan Alp-Asrān in 465/1072, and it lasted through many vicissitudes down to the Georgian resurgence in the second half of the twelfth century; a scion of the Shaddādīds in Ānī is still mentioned as late as 595/1199.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 443; Sachau, 14; Zambaur, 184-5. (All incomplete).

En 'Bānt Shaddād' (Sir E. D. Ross).
Ahmād Kāsravī, Shahrīyārān-i gum-nām, 111, 270-332, with a table at pp. 328 and 329.
V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian history.
The Ziyārids
315-c.483/927-c.1090
Tabaristan and Gurgān

Mardawīj b. Ziyār
Zahīr-ad-Dawla Vushmagīr
Zahīr-ad-Dawla Bīṣūṭīn
Shams-al-Maʾāli Qābūs
Fālak-al-Maʾāli Manūșchihr
Anūshirvān
'Unūṣur-al-Maʾāli Kay Kāʾūs
?c.483?c.1090 Gīlān Shāh

In the early years of the tenth century, the backward and remote mountain region of Daylam at the south-western corner of the Caspian Sea sent forth large numbers of its menfolk as soldiers of fortune in the armies of the caliphate and elsewhere. The Ziyārids arose from one of the fercest of these Daylamī condottieri, Mardawīj b. Ziyār, who on the rebellion of one Asfār, a general in the Sāmānīd armies, took the opportunity to seize most of northern Persia. His power soon extended as far south as Isfahān and Hamadān, but in 323/935 he was murdered by his own Turkish troops and his transient empire fell apart. Only in the Caspian provinces did his brother Vushmagīr retain afoothold, acknowledging the Sāmānīds as his overlords. In the latter half of the tenth century, the Ziyārids played some part in the Būyid-Sāmānīd struggles for power in northern Persia, and in Qābūs b. Vushmagīr they produced a ruler of considerable literary taste and ability. A point which marks the Ziyārids off from almost all the other Daylamī dynasties was their adherence, at least latterly, to Sunnī and not Shiʿī Islam.

In the early eleventh century, the Ziyārids had to acknowledge Ghaznavid suzerainty, the two families being linked by marriage alliances, but their history after 421/1030 is extremely obscure. The Seljuqs took over the Caspian coastlands of Gurgān and Tabaristan, but members of the Ziyārid dynasty seem to have survived in the less accessible inland mountain regions; one of the last amirs, Kay Kāʾūs, is famous as the author of a celebrated 'Mirror for Princes' in Persian, the Qābūs-nāma. His son Gīlān Shāh was the last known member of the line to rule; he was apparently overthrown by the Ismāʿīlīs of the Elburz Mts, and after him, the dynasty disappears from history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 136-7; Justi, 441.
Zambaur, 210-11; El 'Ziyārids' (Cl. Huart).
(All four confused and unreliable on the chronology of the later Ziyārids).
The Būyids or Buwayhids
330-454/932-1062
Persia and Iraq

1. Line in Fārs and Khūzistān
322/934 'Imād-ad-Dawla 'Ali
338/949 'Aḍūd-ad-Dawla Fāna-Khusraw
372/983 Shiraf-ad-Dawla Shirzil
380/990 Šamsām-ad-Dawla Marzubān
388/998 Bahā-'ad-Dawla Fīrūz
403/1012 Sulṭān-ad-Dawla
412/1021 Musharraf-ad-Dawla Ḥasan
415/1024 'Imād-ad-Dīn Marzubān
449/1048 al-Malik ar-Rahīm Khusraw-Fīrūz
447-54/1055-62 Fūlād-Sutūn (in Fārs only)
Power in Fārs seized by the Shāhānshāh's Kurdīsh chief Fadlīya

2. Line in Kirmān
324/936 Muʿizz-ad-Dawla Aḥmad
338/949 'Aḍūd-ad-Dawla Fāna-Khusraw
372/983 Šamsām-ad-Dawla Marzubān
388/998 Bahā-'ad-Dawla Fīrūz
403/1012 Qiwām-ad-Dawla
419-40/1028-48 'Imād-ad-Dīn Marzubān
Seljuq line of Qāwurd

3. Line in Jībāl
320/932 'Imād-ad-Dawla 'Ali
335-66/947-77 Rukan-ad-Dawla Ḥasan
(a) Branch in Hamadān and Isfahān
366/977 Muʿayyid-ad-Dawla Būya
373/983 Fakhr-ad-Dawla 'Ali
387/997 Šams-ad-Dawla
412-419/1021-1028 Samāʾ-ad-Dawla (under Kākūyid suzerainty)

(8) Branch in Ray
366/977 Fakhr-ad-Dawla 'Ali
387-420/997-1029 Majīd-ad-Dawla Rustam
Ghānīvīd conquest

4. Line in Iraq
334/945 Muʿizz-ad-Dawla Aḥmad
356/967 'Izz-ad-Dawla Bakhtīyār
367/978 'Aḍūd-ad-Dawla Fāna-Khusraw
372/983 Šamsām-ad-Dawla Marzubān
376/987 Shiraf-ad-Dawla Shirzil
379/989 Bahā-'ad-Dawla Fīrūz
403/1012 Sulṭān-ad-Dawla
412/1021 Musharraf-ad-Dawla Ḥasan
416/1025 Jalāl-ad-Dawla Shirzil
435/1044 'Imād-ad-Dīn al-Marzubān
440-7/1048-55 al-Malik ar-Rahīm Khusraw-Fīrūz
Seljuq occupation of Baghdad

The Būyids were the most powerful and territorially extensive of those dynasties flourishing during what Vladimir Minorsky has called ‘the Daylamī interlude’ of Iranian history, sc. the tenth and early eleventh centuries, before the arrival of the Seljuqs. For reasons which are unclear, but which were probably social and religious rather than political, the early years saw the beginning, or perhaps only the intensification, of a great migration of Daylamīs from their homeland. One of their successful military leaders, Mardawīj b. Ziyār, founded the line of the Ziyārids, and it was in his armies that the Būyids first achieved fame.

The eldest of the three Būyid brothers, ‘Ali, held Isfahān at the time of Mardawīj’s assassination, and shortly afterwards, he seized the whole of Fārs, whilst Ḥasan held Jībāl and Ahmad Kirmān and Khūzistān. In 334/945 Ahmad entered Baghdad, and the ‘Abbasids began a 110 years’ period of tutelage under Būyid amirs (these last normally held the title of Amīr al-Umarā‘ ‘Supreme commander’). In the third quarter of the century, Ahmad’s son ‘Aḍūd-ad-Dawla united under himself all the Būyids possessions in Iraq, southern Persia, and even
Oman, and under this ruler the Būyids dynasty achieved its greatest measure of unity and effectiveness. 'Aḍud-ad-Dawla pursued a vigorously expansionist policy, both in the west against the Ḥamdānids of al-Jazira, and in the east against the Ziyārids of Tabaristan and the Sāmānids of Khurasan. However, a patrimonial conception of power, doubtless stemming from the tribal past in Daylam, normally prevailed amongst the Būyids, and political fragmentation resulted. Whilst a strong ruler like 'Aḍud-ad-Dawla headed the family, a certain sense of solidarity prevailed, but after his death there was much civil strife within the dynasty. This disunity in the first place facilitated Mâhâmûd of Ghazna’s annexation of Ray and Jibâl from the Būyids in 420/1031, and then left them weakened in the face of the westwards drive of the Seljuq Toghrîl, who was able to utilise orthodox Sunní sentiment and to claim that he was liberating Iraq and western Persia from the heretics. Baghdad was occupied in 447/1055, but the Būyid Amir of Fârs retained power for seven more years, till his lands were seized by the local Shâbânikârî Kurds, only to fall into the Seljuqs’ hands shortly afterwards.

Like most of the Daylamîs, the Būyids were Shi‘îs of the moderate Twelver or Ithnâ‘-Ashariyya persuasion. The traditional Shi‘î festivals were introduced into their territories, and during their time, a certain systematisation and intellectualisation of Shi‘î theology, previously somewhat vague and emotional in content, took place. Yet their Shi‘ism was probably also a manifestation of anti-Arab, Iranian national feeling; in this connection, the attempts to provide them with a respectable genealogy back to the Sâsânids and their adoption in Persia of the old imperial title of Shâhanshâh should be noted. The caliphs’ political power and material resources were inevitably circumscribed, yet the Būyids made no attempt to extinguish the caliphate, and they showed themselves hostile to their political rivals, the Ismâ‘îlî Shi‘î Fatîmids. Culturally, the Būyids of the second and subsequent generations became highly appreciative of Arabic and Persian literature, and some of the greatest scholars of the age, including the poet al-Mutânâbî and the anthologist Abî-l-Fârâb al-İşfahânî, worked under their protection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 139-44; Justi, 442.
Zambaur, 212-13 and Table 9.
Eî ‘Buwayhids’ (Cl. Cahen).

The Kâkûyids or Kâkwayhids
398-443/1008-51 independent rulers;
thereafter, feudatories of the Seljuqs
Central and western Persia

398/1008 ʿAlâ‘-ad-Dawla Muḥammad b.
          Dushmanziyâr
433-43/1041-51 Abî-ʿAbd Allâh Farâmûr (in Isfâhân)
433-c.440/1041-c.1048 Abî-ʿAbd Allâh Kâlîjûr Garshâsp I
          (in Hamadân and Nîhâwând)
488-488/1095-96 Abî-ʿAbd Allâh ʿAlî (in Yazd)
488-c.513/1095-c.1119 Abî-ʿAlî Garshâsp II (in Yazd)

The Kâkûyids were a Daylamî dynasty who flourished in western Persia during the decline of the Būyids, only to lose their independence and be reduced to vassalage by the rising power of the Seljuqs. Dushmanziyâr was a Daylamî who received the town of Shahriyâr from the Būyids of Ray and Jibâl. His son ʿAlâ‘-ad-Dawla Muḥammad was known as ʿImād Kâkûiya, and the sources explain that kâkû means in Daylamî dialect 'maternal uncle', for Muḥammad was the Būyid Amir Majd-ad-Dawla’s maternal uncle. In 398/1008 he became governor of Isfâhân, and soon took over Hamadân and other towns of western Persia; with the rich revenues of this region, he built up an effective mercenary army and made the Kâkûyids a power of some significance for a while. At his court, he encouraged poets and scholars, and the philosopher Ibn-Sînâ (Avicenna) served as his vizier till his death. When Mâhâmûd of Ghazna conquered Ray in 420/1029, ʿImād Kâkûiya was forced to submit; but the Ghaznavids found it difficult to retain these distant acquisitions, and at one point, ʿImād Kâkûiya himself occupied Ray.
The invasions of the Oghuz and their flocks changed the whole political situation in Persia and forced the Kākūyids, like the other Daylami powers, on to the defensive. When Ibn-Kākūya died in 433/1041, his son Farāmūrz succeeded in Isfahān, but was forced to recognise the Seljuqs as masters; when Toghril finally captured Isfahān in 443/1051 and made it his capital, Farāmūrz received in exchange Abarquh and Yazd. His brother Garshāsp had followed his father in Hamadān and Nihāwand, but was unable to withstand the Oghuz and fled to the Būyids of Fārs. The last Kākūyids seem to have adapted themselves well to the Great Seljuq régime. ‘Ali b. Farāmūrz succeeded his father in Yazd and married a daughter of Chaghār Bāg; the last member of the family to be mentioned in the sources, Garshāsp b. ‘Ali, married the sister of Sultans Muḥammad and Sanjar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 145; Justi, 445.
Zambaur, 216-17; ed1 'Kākūyids' (Cl. Huart).
G. C. Miles, 'The coinage of the Kākwayhid dynasty', Iraq, v (1938), 89-104.
ency of Khurasan. In this last, however, they failed. The last Tāhirid to rule in Khurasan, Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir II, was inferior in ability to his predecessors, and in 259/873 he lost Nishapur to Yaʿqūb b. Layth. He was re-appointed to the governorship in 271/885, but was never able to take up the job properly, and he died in the early tenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 128; Justi, 436; Sachau, 19-20. Zambaur, 197-8 (N.B. the Ṭāhir II b. Muḥammad listed by Zambaur as the last member of the dynasty to rule in Khurasan is attached by R. Veeser, ‘Über die Münzen der Ṣaffāriden und ihrer Gegner in Fārs und Ḥurāsān’, Numismatische Zeitschrift, LXIII [1930], 147-52, to the Ṣaffārids).

1 ‘Ṭāhirids’ (W. Barthold).
Saʿīd Nafṣī, Taʾrīkh-i khāndān-i Ṭāhirī. I Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn (Tehran 1335/1956), with a detailed genealogical table at the end.

The founder of the Sāmānī line was one Sāmān-Khudā, a dīhāḥ or local landowner in the Balkh district of northern Afghanistan, although the dynasty later claimed descent from the old Sāmānī emperors of Persia. Sāmān-Khudā embraced Islam, and his four grandsons served the caliph al-Maʿmūn in Khurasan. For their faithful service, Nūḥ was appointed governor of Samarqand, Aḥmad of Farghāna, Yabīyá of Shāsh, and Ilyās of Herat. They thereby acquired a good foothold in Transoxania, so that in 263/877 Naṣr b. Aḥmad received from the caliph, al-Muʿtamid, the governorship of the whole of that province. This rich region became the core of the Sāmānīs’ empire, and they took over also the duties of defending Transoxania’s political integrity and its commercial interests from attack by the pagan Turks of the steppes. The northern fringes of Transoxania and Farghāna were definitely secured for Islam, and in 280/893 Ismāʿīl b. Aḥmad attacked the Qarluq in the steppes beyond the Syr Darya, sacking their capital Talas. By
making their military might feared in the steppes and by keeping the caravan routes across Central Asia open, the Sāmānids assured the economic stability of their territories; it was through the Sāmānīd lands that most of the Turkish slaves, almost universally employed in the armies of Muslim princes from the ninth century onwards, were imported. On this foundation of prosperity, the Sāmānīd amīrs made their court of Bukhārā a centre not only of the traditional Arabic learning, but also of the renaissance of New Persian language and literature; it was under Sāmānīd rule that Firdausī began his version of the Iranian national epic, the Shāh-nāma.

In 827/900 Ismā‘īl earned the gratitude of the ‘Abbāsid caliph by defeating and capturing the Ṣaffārid ‘Amr b. Layth, and was rewarded with the governorship of Khurasan in succession to the Tāhirids and Ṣaffārids. The Sāmānīds were now the greatest power in the Iranian east, exercising suzerainty over outlying regions like Khwārazm and over the Ṣaffārids in Sīstān, and extending their authority over local dynasties in Afghanistan as far as the borders of India. In northern Persia, they clashed with the Būyids; here, caliphal and Sunni support was useful, for the Sāmānīds were strong Sunnis, and in Khurasan and Transoxania they ruled over regions which were strongholds of orthodoxy.

In the middle years of the tenth century, ominous signs of instability appeared in the Sāmānīd state. A series of palace revolutions showed that the military and landed classes, opposed to the amīrs’ policy of administrative centralisation, were gaining control; rebellions in Khurasan abstracted that province from the direct authority of Bukhārā. It was not therefore difficult for the Qarakhanids and Ghaznavids to take over the Sāmānīd territories in the last decade of the century, and the last fugitive Sāmānīd, Ismā‘īl al-Muntasir, was killed in 395/1005.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
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W. Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion² (London 1928).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>652/1254</td>
<td>Naṣr-ad-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728/1328</td>
<td>Nusrat-ad-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731/1331</td>
<td>Qutb-ad-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747/1346</td>
<td>Tāj-ad-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751/1350</td>
<td>Māmūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760/1360</td>
<td>'Izz-ad-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784/1382</td>
<td>Qutb-ad-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788/1386</td>
<td>Tāj-ad-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805/1403</td>
<td>Qutb-ad-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822/1421</td>
<td>Shams-ad-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842/1441</td>
<td>Niẓām-ad-Dīn Yahyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885-7/1480-2</td>
<td>Shams-ad-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ṣaffārīd brothers derived their name from their founder Ya'qūb's trade of coppersmith (gaffar). Under Ya'qūb and 'Amr, their native province of Sīstān became the centre of a vast but transient empire which covered almost all Persia except for the north-west. Sīstān in the ninth century was much disturbed by sectarian strife and social discontent; it had been a refuge for various malcontents and schismatics fleeing eastwards through Persia, especially for the Khārijis, defeated and dispersed by the Umayyad governors. It may be that Ya'qūb had originally been a Khārij himself; the nucleus of his army lay in the bands of local vigilante formed to defend the cause of Sunni orthodoxy in Sīstān, but his troops came to include many Khārijis. Having assembled this army, Ya'qūb expanded eastwards through Afghanistan to Kabul, then a pagan region on the fringe of the Indian world, overthrowing native rulers there. In the west, he attacked the Tāhirids, wresting from them their lands in Khurasan and in 939/973 capturing their capital Nishapur. Whereas the Tāhirids and Sāmānids represented the interests of religious orthodoxy and the social asset qua, the Ṣaffārid chiefs were plebeian in origin and behaved like bandits, whilst their forces included many heterodox and radical elements. With the defensive barrier of the Tāhirids swept away, the Abāsids' caliph in Baghdad had no alternative but to recognize 'Amr as his governor in Sīstān, Khurasan and Fārs. Not content with these extensive territories, 'Amr coveted Transoxania, which had been nominally under Tāhirid oversight. But the actual holders of power in Transoxania, the Sāmānids, proved more than a match for the Ṣaffārids, and the amīr Ismā'īl b. Ahmad defeated and captured 'Amr. Being the personal creation of military conquerors, the Ṣaffārid empire now collapsed, and in the early years of the tenth century Sīstān passed under Sāmānīd control.

Despite this severe check, the Ṣaffārid family persisted in Sīstān for nearly six more centuries, and it is clear that they represented the national interests and aspirations of the people of Sīstān, from whose ranks they themselves had sprung. It is difficult otherwise to explain the tenacity with which the Ṣaffārids survived successive waves of conquest in Sīstān. The yoke of the Sāmānīds was light enough, and the Ṣaffārids soon reappeared as governors and local rulers; one of the tenth century amirs, Khalaf b. Ahmad, attained fame as a munificent patron of learning. In 993/1003 Māmūd of Ghazna overran the province and incorporated it in his empire, an event which the patriotic author of the Tarikh-i Sīstān (see below) regards as a disaster for the land. Yet once more, the Ṣaffārids held on, and in the Ghaznavid-Seljuq fighting of the middle years of the eleventh century, strengthened their position, ruling first as Seljuqs and then as Gūrīd vassals. Even after the invasions of the Mongols and of Tūmār, events so cataclysmic for most of the eastern Islamic world, they managed to survive down to the end of the fifteenth century.

Zambaur in his lists distinguishes four separate dynasties of the Ṣaffārids in Sīstān, the dividing lines between them being the Sāmānīd, Ghaznavid and Mongol occupations, but this division is an arbitrary one, since the same Ṣaffārid family continued to rule off and on during the whole period. The lists given here differs in several places from that of Zambaur, and takes into account the numismatic corrections of Walker, and the historical information of the anonymous local history, the Tarikh-i Sīstān, not available for earlier writers on the chronology of the Ṣaffārids. For the post-Mongol Ṣaffārids, Zambaur depended on the list (which does in fact tally with the available numismatic evidence) given in another local history of Sīstān, the Iḥyāʾ al-muḍārik of Shīh Ḥusayn b. Malik Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad; this list is reproduced in Codrington's article (see below).
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THE KHWAIRAZM-SHĀHS

(44)
The Khwārazm-Shāhs

1. Afrighids of Kūth (AD 305-385/95)
2. Ma’mūnis of Gurgānj (385-408/95-1017)
3. Ghaznavid governors (408-25/1017-34)

4. Line of Anūshtrīgin (c.470-628/c.1077-1231, originally
as governors for the Seljuqs, latterly as independent rulers
in Central Asia and Persia

409/1007 Turkish governor Ekinchi b. Qochqar
521/1127 ‘Alā’-ad-Dīn Atsīz
551/1156 Il-Arslan
567/1172 ‘Alā’-ad-Dīn Tekish
567-89/1172-93 Sulān Shāh b. Il-Arslan, rival ruler in
northern Khurasan
596/1200 ‘Alā’-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
Khwārazm was the well-irrigated, rich agricultural region on the lower Oxus, in later times the Khanate of Khiva. Surrounded as it was on all sides by steppe and desert, it was isolated geographically, and this isolation long enabled it to maintain a separate political existence and a distinctive Iranian culture. Khwārazm may well have been an early home of the Indo-Iranians; certainly, the local historian and antiquary Bīrānī traced the beginnings of political life there beyond the first millennium BC. He placed the beginning of the Iranian Afrīghid dynasty in c. AD 305, and listed twenty-two Shāhs of that line, down to its extinction in 385/995. Khwārazm first came into the purview of Islamic history in 93/712, when the Arab governor of Khurasan, Qutayba b. Muslim, invaded Khwārazm and wrought considerable destruction to the indigenous civilisation. It thus came under Muslim suzerainty, but it was not until the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century that a Khwārazm-Shāh was first converted to the new faith, assuming the traditional convert's name of 'Abdullāh.

In the course of the tenth century, the city of Gurgān on the left bank of the Oxus grew in economic and political importance, largely because of its position as the terminus for the caravan trade across the steppes to Siberia and South Russia. A local family, the Ma’mūnids, in 385/995 overthrew the Afrīghids of Kūt (which lay on the right bank of the river), and themselves assumed the traditional title of Khwārazm-Shāhs. The rule of the Ma’mūnids was brief, but was not without its achievements; great scholars like the philosopher Ibn-Sinā (Avicenna) and the littérateur Thā’alibī flourished under their patronage. Khwārazm had been theoretically under Sāmānid suzerainty, although this had meant little in practice; but in 408/1017, Mahmūd of Ghazna, heir to Sāmānid power in Khurasan, resolved to add Khwārazm to his empire, and Ma’mūnid rule was ended there. For some twenty years, the province was ruled by Turkish slave governors of the Ghazna-vids, and then fell into the hands of Shāh Malik b. 'Alī, the Oguz Turkish Yabghu or ruler of Jand at the mouth of the Syr Darya. But almost immediately, Shāh Malik was overthrown by his Seljuq rivals (432/1041) and Khwārazm now passed into Seljuq control.

The Seljuq sultans appointed their own governors, and in Malik-Shāh's reign the governor was the Turkish slave, Anūshīrin Gharbā'ī, who had been keeper of the royal washing-bowls (Tashr-dār). His successors became hereditary governors and acquired the title of Khwārazm-Shāhs. Anūshīrin's grandson Ata'ī, whilst remaining nominally a vassal of the Seljuqs, had the ambition of making himself independent of them. This was not difficult to achieve after Sanjar's disastrous defeat of 535/1141 at the hands of the Qara Khitay, but the Shāhs were in turn forced to acknowledge the power of these new invaders from the Far East. In practice, the Qara Khitay left the Shāhs largely to themselves, and the last decades of the twelfth century were taken up with a great struggle for hegemony in Khurasan and the whole of the Iranian east between the Shāhs and the Ghūrids of Fīrūzshāh and Ghazna. In the opening years of the thirteenth century the Shāhs were triumphant, and found themselves masters of an empire stretching from the borders of India to those of Anatolia, for they had meanwhile cleared away the last remnants of Seljuq rule in western Persia and had marched against the 'Abbāsid caliphs in Baghdad. However, this impressive achievement was transitory; in 617/1220 Chingiz Khan's Mongols conquered Transoxania, and the reign of the last Khwārazm-Shāh, Jalāl-ad-Dīn, was spent in heroic but futile attempts to stem the Mongol inrush into the Middle East.

In subsequent centuries, Khwārazm came under the rule of various central Asian steppe peoples and its original Iranian character was completely overlaid, although the title of Khwārazm-Shāh seems to have been borne by the governors for the Timurids as late as the fifteenth century.
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The Qarakhānids
382-607/992-1211

Transoxiana and eastern Turkistan

1. Great Qaghan of the united kingdom

? 'Ali b. Mūsā
388/998 Alḥmad I Arslan Qara Khan or Toghan Khan
406/1015 Maḥṣūr Arslan Khan
415/1024 Alḥmad II Toghan Khan
417-24/1026-32 Yūsuf I Qādir Khan

2. Great Qaghan of the western kingdom (Transoxiana, including Buhārā and Samarkand and western Farghāna)

433/1041 Muḥammad 'Ayn-ad-Dawla
444/1052 Ibrāhīm I Būrītīgīn Tanghā Khan
460/1068 Naṣr I
472/1080 Khiḍr
547/1151 Alḥmad I
482/1089 Ya'qūb
488/1095 Maṣʿūd I
490/1097 Sulaymān
490/1097 Muḥammad I
492/1099 Jibrāʾīl
495/1102 Muḥammad II

523/1129 Naṣr II
523/1129 Alḥmad II
524/1130 Hasan
526/1132 Ibrāhīm II
526/1132 Muḥammad II (later, ruler of Khurasan, after the Seljuq Sanjar)

536/1141 Ibrāhīm III
551/1156 'Alī
556/1161 Maṣʿūd II
574/1178 Ibrāhīm IV (before 574/1178 in Farghāna only, thereafter in Samarkand also)

600-7/1204-11 'Uṯmān

Occupation of Transoxiana by the Khwârazm-Shāhs
The Qarakhanids were given this name by European orientalists because of the frequency of the word qara 'black > powerful' in their titulature; they have also been called the Ilek (properly Ilyg) Khans, again from a characteristic title, or Al-i Afrasiyab 'House of Afrasiyab' because of a fancied connection with the prince of Turan in Firdausi's Shah-nama. Our foremost authority on the dynasty, Omeidan Prisats, has asserted that the Qarakhanid dynasty sprang from the ruling house of the Karluq Turkish people, a group which had played an important role in earlier steppe history; the affiliation is not entirely proven, but seems likely.

The Qarakhanids became Muslim in the middle years of the tenth century, and their head Satuq Bughra Khan assumed the Islamic name of "Abd-al-Karim. His grandson Härin or Hasan Bughra Khan was attracted southwards by the vacuum of power caused by the decline of the Sāmānids of Transoxania; in 582/992 he occupied Buxhārā, and a few years later, he and Mahmūd of Ghazna finally extinguished the authority of the Sāmānids. The Oxus became the boundary between the two empires, and for the next two centuries the territories of the Qarakhanids stretched from Buxhārā and the lower Syr Darya in the west to Semirechye and Kashgharia in the east. Already in 407/1016 there is mentioned interincine warfare amongst members of the Qarakhanid family, and after c.433/c.1041 the unified Khanate split into two parts, a western Khanate centred on Buxhārā and comprising Transoxania and western Farghāna as far as Khojand, and an eastern Khanate comprising Talas, Isfījāb, Shāsh, eastern Farghāna, Semirechye and Kashgharia, with Bābāşāhān as its political and military capital but with Kashghar as its religious and cultural centre. In general, the descendants of the Great Qghan 'Alī b. Muśā (the 'Alid branch, in Prisats's terminology) ruled in the west, and those of his cousin Härin or Hasan Bughra Khan (the 'Hasānids') in the east. Towards the end of the eleventh century, there was a crisis in Buxhārā when the Qghan Aḥmād I b. Khīđr is said to have embraced Isma'īlī Shi'ism; the Seljuqs had intervened before in Malik-Shāh's reign, and the Qarakhanids now passed definitely under Seljuq suzerainty. But after Sanjar's disastrous defeat in the Qatwan steppe in 536/1141, control over the whole of Turkestan north of the Oxus passed to the pagan Qara Khitay or Western Liao from northern China. The last Qarakhanids managed to throw off Qara Khitay control, but the last western Qaghan, 'Uthman of Samarqand, was in 607/1211 killed by the Khwārizm-Shāh 'Alā'-ad-Din Muḥammad, and the eastern Khanate was for a brief while occupied by the Mongol Küčülgū.

Whereas the Turkish Ghaznavids built up a strongly centralised state on the Perso-Islamic pattern, the Qarakhanids remained much closer to their tribal and steppe past. It is from the Qarakhanid period that two of the earliest works of written Turkish stem, the Qutadḫu bīliğ of Yusuf Khāqān Hājjīb and the Dīvān lugār at-Tūr of Mahmūd Kāshgharī. The Qarakhanid territories were organised in a loose tribal confederation, with the greater part of the Karluq tribesmen remaining nomadic. The ruling family became highly fragmented, since there prevailed a system, common to other Altaic peoples, of a Great Qaghan with a Co-Qaghan at his side; beneath these were Under-Qaghans. Since members of the family were continually moving up in the hierarchy and acquiring new names and titles, the task of elucidating the genealogy and chronology of the Qarakhanids is an exceedingly difficult task. Zambīrī noted that this was 'the only major Islamic dynasty whose genealogy has remained obscure' and confessed that the genealogy given by himself (pp. 206-7) was only a sketch. The table given above...
follows that worked out by Pritsak from his extensive researches on the dynasty.


*idem*, 'Die Karachaniden', *Der Islam*, XXXI (1954), 17-68 = iA, Art. 'Karahanlilar'.

### SIX

**SELJUQS AND ATABEGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>429/99</td>
<td>The Seljuqs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429/99</td>
<td>Great Seljuqs</td>
<td>(Iraq and Persia) 429-590/1038-1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429/99</td>
<td>- Rukn-ad-Dunya- wa-d-Din Tughril</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455/1063</td>
<td>'Adud-ad-Dawla Alp-Arsalan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465/1072</td>
<td>Jalâl-ad-Dawla Malik-Shâh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485/1092</td>
<td>Nâsir-ad-Din Mahmûd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487/1094</td>
<td>Rukn-ad-Din Berke-yarug (Barkiyâruq)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498/1105</td>
<td>Mu'izz-ad-Din Malik-Shâh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498/1105</td>
<td>Ghiyâth-ad-Din Mu'âammad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511-52/1118-57</td>
<td>Mu'izz-ad-Din Sanjar (ruler in eastern Persia 490-552/1097-1157; after 511/1118 supreme Sultan of the Seljuq family)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Iraq and western Persia only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>511/1118</td>
<td>Mughîth-ad-Din Mahmûd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525/1131</td>
<td>Ghiyâth-ad-Din Dâ'ûd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526/1132</td>
<td>Rukn-ad-Din Tughril</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529/1134</td>
<td>Ghiyâth-ad-Din Mas'ûd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547/1152</td>
<td>Mu'in-ad-Din Malik-Shâh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548/1153</td>
<td>Rukn-ad-Din Mu'âammad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555/1160</td>
<td>Ghiyâth-ad-Din Sulaymân Shâh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556/1161</td>
<td>Mu'izz-ad-Din Arslân</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571-90/1176-94</td>
<td>Rukn-ad-Din Tughril</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Khwârzm-Shâhs*
policy helped him to enlist orthodox sympathy as the Seljuqs advanced against the Daylami powers of western Persia. In 447/1055 Toghril entered Baghdad and had his title of sultan confirmed by the caliph; a few years later, the line of the Büyids was finally extinguished.

The Seljuq sultanate now speedily evolved into a hierarchically-organised state on the Perso-Islamic pattern, with the supreme sultan supported by a Persian bureaucracy and a multi-national army directed by Turkish slave commanders, this military nucleus being supplemented by tribal contingents under Turkmen beggs or chiefs. In the reigns of Alp-Arslan and his son Malik-Shāh, who both depended to a great extent on their supremely able Persian minister, Nizām-al-Mulk, the empire of the Great Seljuqs reached its apogee. In the east, Khwārazm and western Afghanistan had already been wrested from the Ghaznavids, and towards the end of his reign Malik Shāh invaded Transoxania and humbled the Qarakhanids, receiving at Uzkend the homage of the Khan of Kāshghar. In the west, the offensive was taken against the Christian Georgians in the Caucasus; Fāṭimid influence was excluded from Syria and al-Jazira, minor Shi‘i-tinged dynasties like the ‘Uqaylids overthrown and reliable Turkish governors installed in Syria. In Anatolia, the defeat of the Byzantines at Malazgird (Mantzikert) in 463/1071 opened up Asia Minor to Turkmens incursions, and these raiders laid the foundations of various Turkish principalities there. Malik-Shāh’s brother Tutush and the latter’s sons and grandsons founded a short-lived minor Seljuq line in Aleppo and Damascus. Seljuq arms even penetrated into the Arabian peninsula as far as the Yemen and Bahrayn. In Kirmān, Toghril’s nephew Qāwurd established a local dynasty which endured for a century and a half until Oghuz tribesmen from Khurasan took over the province in 582/1186. On the intellectual plane, the efforts of the vizier Nizām-al-Mulk and scholars like the theologian al-Ghazālī consolidated the defeat of Shi‘ism on the political level and strengthened the orthodox Sunni reaction.

Centrifugal tendencies were always likely to appear in an empire where there still prevailed old Turkish patrimonial ideas about the division of territories amongst various members of the dynasty, once firm control from the centre was relaxed.
After Malik-Shāh’s death, the Seljuqs of Iraq and Persia were rocked by dissension and civil strife, although an element of stability was perpetuated in Khurasan, where Malik-Shāh’s son Sanjar was first governor and then sultan for over sixty years; after the death in 511/1118 of his brother Muḥammad, Sanjar was acknowledged as the senior member of the family and as supreme sultan. In Iraq, Seljuq power was adversely affected by the revived political influence of the ‘Abbāsid caliphs, and in Persia, al-Jazira and Syria the rise of local Atabegs reduced the sultans’ sphere of action. These Atabegs play an important role in the history of the Islamic Near East at this time. They were Turkish slave commanders who were in the first place appointed as tutor-guardians (Atabeg = ‘father-commander’) to Seljuq princes sent out as provincial governors; but in many cases they soon managed to arrogate effective power to themselves (see below, s.v. Zangids, Eldigüzids, Salghurids). The problem of assimilating the nomadic, less cultured Turkmens into the settled Seljuq state was never properly solved, and Khurasan slipped from Seljuq control when Sanjar’s reign ended disastrously in an uprising of Oghuz tribesmen whose interests had been neglected by the central administration. The last Seljuq sultan in the west, Toghril b. Arslan, struggled to free himself from Eldigüzid control, but unwisely provoked a war with the powerful Khwārazm-Shāh Tekish, and was killed in 590/1194. Only in Anatolia did a Seljuq line survive for a further century (see below, s.v. Seljuqs of Rûm).
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1. Ḥisn Kayfā and Āmid branch 491-629/1098-1232

491/1098 Muʾīn-ad-Dīn Sūkmenī 1
498/1105 Ibrāhīm
502/c.1109 Rukn-ad-Dawlā Dāʾūd
539/1144 Fakhr-ad-Dīn Qara Arslan
562/1167 Nūr-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
581/1185 Qutb-ad-Dīn Sūkmenī 11
597/1201 Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Māḥmūd
619/1222 Rukn-ad-Dīn Māḥmūd
629/1232 al-Malik al-Masʿūd

Ayyūbīd conquest

2. Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn branch 497-811/1104-1408

497/1104 Najm-ad-Dīn Il Ghāzī 1
516/1122 Hūsām-ad-Dīn Temīr Tāsh
547/1152 Najm-ad-Dīn Alpī
572/1176 Qutb-ad-Dīn Il Ghāzī 11
580/1184 Hūsām-ad-Dīn Yūlūk Arslan

C. 597/c.1201 Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Artuq Arslan
637/1239 Najm-ad-Dīn Ghāzī 1
658/1260 Qara Arslan al-Muẓaffar
691/1292 Shams-ad-Dīn Dāʾūd
693/1294 Najm-ad-Dīn Ghāzī 11
712/1312 ʿImād-ad-Dīn ʿAlī Alpī
712/1312 Shams-ad-Dīn Śāliḥ
765/1364 Ahmad al-Mansūr
769/1373 Māḥmūd as-Ṣāliḥ
769/1378 Dāʾūd al-Muẓaffar
778/1376 Majd-ad-Dīn ʿĪsā as-Zāhir
809-11/1406-8 as-Ṣāliḥ

Qara Qoyunlu conquest

The Artuqids of Diyārbakr were the descendants of Artuq b. Eksel, a chief of the Döğer tribe of the Oghuz. He is first heard of fighting against the Byzantines in Anatolia, and then we find...
the Seljuq sultan, Malik-Shâh, sending him, like other Turkmen begs, to fight on the peripheries of the empire—in Balârây, Syria, and Khurasan. He ended up as governor of Palestine, but his sons were unable to maintain themselves there against the Fâtimids and Crusaders, and settled instead in Diyarbâk, around Mardin and Hisn Kayfâ. Gradually, Il Ghâzî b. Artuq took over the Seljuq territories in that region; he was an energetic opponent of the Franks in Edessa, and in 515/1121 also acquired Mayyâfâriqin. There were henceforth two main branches of the dynasty, the descendants of Il Ghâzî in Mardin and Mayyâfâriqin, and the descendants of his brother Sükkmen in Hisn Kayfâ and later Amed, with a subordinate branch at Kharptep or Kharput.

Being a Turkmen dynasty in a region strongly settled by Turkmens, the Artuqids state retained many distinctively Turkmen features; cf. the appearance of the typical Turkmen ghâzî designation Alp/Alpî ‘warrior, hero’, in their titulature. However, as well as relying on the Turkmen elements, the Artuqids seem also to have conciliated the numerous Christians among the population of Diyarbâk. The rise of the Zangids halted the Artuqids’ expansionist plans, and they had to become vassals of Nûr-ad-Dîn. Then the Ayyûbids whittled their power down, and they lost Hisn Kayfâ, Amed and Mayyâfâriqin to them. In the thirteenth century, they were for a time vassals of the Rum Seljuqs and of the Khwarazm-Shâh Jalâl-ad-Dîn Mingburnu; and eventually, only the Mardin branch survived, Qara Arslan al-Muqaffar submitting to the Mongol Khan Hülegü. The end of the dynasty a century and a half later was connected with the fresh wave of Turkmen nomads brought in the wake of the Tîmûrid invasions. The last Artuqids were enveloped by the Qara Qoyunlu confederation, and in 811/1408 aš-Šâlih was forced to abandon Mardin to the Qara Qoyunlu leader Qara Yûsuf.
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1A, ‘Artuk Oğulları’ (M. F. Köprülü).  
1B ‘Artuqids’ (C. L. Cahen).
When Zangi died, his dominions were divided between his sons Nūr-ad-Dīn Māḥmūd, who took over Zangi's Syrian conquests, and Saint-ad-Dīn Ghiṣār in al-Jazīra. Later, a third branch of the family ruled separately in Sīnjār for some fifty years. Nūr-ad-Dīn's policy in Syria and Palestine against the Franks and declining Fāṭimids paved the way for Saladin's career and for the constituting of the Ayyūbīd empire. The Syrian branch of the Zangids was later absorbed by the Mosul one, and the Zangids then inevitably came up against the Ayyūbīds, with their expansionist policy in Dīvārībakr and al-Jazīra. Saladin twice failed to capture Mosul in 578/1182 and 581/1185 but Masʿūd I b. Mawdūd was compelled to make terms and recognize the Ayyūbīd as his suzerain.

The end of the Zangids came with the ascendency in Mosul of Bāḍr-ad-Dīn Luʾluʾ, the former slave of Arslān Shāh 1, who after that ruler's death became regent for the kingdom. When the last Zangīd Nāṣīr-ad-Dīn  Māḥmūd died, Luʾluʾ became Atabeg of Mosul with the title of al-Malik ar-Raḥīm, and reigned there till his death in 657/1259, shortly before the Mongols took over.
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Özbeg b. Pahlavân Muhammad. The historical significance of the family thus lies in their control of north-western Persia during the later decades of the period of the Great Seljuqs, and also in their rôle of Muslim champions against the resurgent power of the Georgian Bagratid rulers.
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SELJUQS AND ATABEGS

Ögedey and then Hülêgii, and it was from the Mongols that
Abû-Bakr acquired the title Qutlugh Khan. Finally, the last
Salghurid princess, Qutlugh Khan’s granddaughter, married
Hülêgii’s son Mengi Temür, and in the end, the latter took over
the Salghurid territories himself.
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THE ISMĀ'ILIS

〈51〉
The Ismā’ils or Assassins
483–653/1090–1256, Persia; c.493–671/c.1100–1273, Syria
Principal line at Alamût in the Elburz Mts of Persia;
subsidiary branch in Syria

Grand Masters at Alamût
483/1090 Hasan-i Sabbāb
518/1124 Kiyā Buzurg-Ummid
532/1140 Muhammad I
537/1142 Hasan II ‘Alâ-Dhikrihi-s-Salām
561/1166 Nūr-ad-Dīn Muhammad II
607/1210 Jašâ-ad-Dīn Ḥasan III
618/1221 ‘Alâ’-ad-Dīn Muhammad III
653–54/1255–6 Rukn-ad-Dīn Khūrshāh
Mongol capture of Alamût

In mediaeval Islamic times, the extremist Shi‘i Ismā’ils were
regarded with fear by the orthodox Sunnis. Since the Ismā’ils
appealed to a wide range of intellects and interests, their hand
was suspected in many of the outbreaks of social and political
discontent. The Nizârī branches in Persia and Syria used the
weapon of religious assassination (a practice familiar from
ancient times in the East), and launched raids from their
mountain fortresses; by these means, an atmosphere of terror
was created, so that the numerosness and apparent ubiquity
of the assassins were unduly magnified in popular imagination.
The founder of the Ismā’îl groups in northern Persia and
Syria was one Ḥasan-i Sabbāb, a Persian da’i who worked to
spread the cause in his own land. When the Fâtimid movement
was split doctrinally on al-Mustanṣîr’s death in 487/1094 (see
above, p. 48), the eastern Ismā’îls acknowledged Nizâr, the
elder son and the dead caliph’s own choice as heir, although the
vizier Bâdâl Jamâlî succeeded in placing al-Mustâ’ilî on the
throne. Already in 483/1090, Hasan had secured the castle of
Alamût in the Elburz Mts, in a region adjacent to Daylam and
Azerbaijan, where heterodox had long flourished. From this
centre, Ismâ’îl risings were organised in various parts of the
Great Seljuk empire. Another Nizârî da’i wa was established in
the mountains of Syria, under the leadership of emissaries from
Alamūt, and the Syrian Isma'īlis played a significant rôle in a three-cornered struggle with the Franks and the Sunni Muslims. Since the Isma'īlis were comparatively few in number, assassination of prominent people often served as a substitute for direct military action, and their supposed victims included the vizier Niẓām-al-Mulk, the caliph al-Mustarshid and the crusader Conrad of Montferrat. The story related by Marco Polo and others, that hallucinatory drugs were used to stimulate the assassins to bolder efforts (whence the name 'Assassins' <Hashshāshīn or Hashshāshin 'Hashish-eaters') is unconfirmed in any of the genuine Isma'īli sources. According to Isma'īli tradition, Nizār and his son were murdered in Egypt, but an infant grandson was smuggled out to Persia. Whereas Hasan-i Sabbāh and his two successors claimed only to be emissaries of the Nizārī imāms, the fourth Grand-Master Hasan 11 himself claimed to be the imām in a spiritual sense.

In the thirteenth century, the extremism and violence of the Assassins began to moderate slightly. The 'Abbāsid caliph an-Nāṣir scored a great propaganda success in the contemporary Muslim world by securing the Grand Master Hasan 11’s return to the fold of Sunni orthodoxy. Continuing this pro-caliphal policy, the Isma'īlis of Persia opposed the imperial designs of the Khwarazm-Shahs. But the last Grand Master, Khūrshīd, was unable to withstand Hülegü's Mongols; Alamūt was captured in 654/1256, and in the next year Khūrshīd seems to have been killed by the conquerors. The Syrian Isma'īlis had become an accepted part of the local political scene, becoming tributary to the Christian Knights Hospitaller in 624/1227, but their continued existence was later regarded by the sultan Baybars as intolerable, and by 671/1273 the last Assassin stronghold, al-Kalīj, had fallen to the Mamluks.
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M. G. S. Hodgson, The order of Assassins, the struggle of the early Niẓārī Isma'īlis against the Islamic world (The Hague 1955).