

ART. V. — *The Marwānīd Dynasty at Mayyāfāriqīn in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries A.D.* By H. F. AMEDROZ.

THE following narrative is derived from a MS. of the History of Mayyāfāriqīn by Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqī, B.M. Or. 5,803, of which I have already given some account; see J.R.A.S., 1902, p. 785.

The history of the dynasty opens, at fol. 121*a*, with the account of Bād the Kurd—Abu ‘Abd Allah al-Ḥusain b. Dūstak al-Ḥārbukḥti¹—a native of the Bahasma hills near Ḥizān. So long as ‘Aḍud al-Daula lived he prudently kept to the mountains (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 25), but in 374, after his death, he seized Mayyāfāriqīn and held it with the rest of Diyār Bakr against the generals of Ṣamṣām al-Daula the Buwaihid, and against the sons of Nāsīr al-Daula the Ḥamdānid.² But the latter, with the Oqailids, were too strong for him at Mosul, and it was in an attempt against that city that he met his death in battle near Ṭūr ‘Abdīn, in 380 (fol. 122*a*). Bād had a sister married to Marwān b. Lakak al-Ḥārbukḥti, a native of Kurmās, a populous village between Qal‘at Is‘ird and al-Ma‘dan, where he owned a mill.

¹ Ibn al-Athīr writes the name Bādḥ, and suggests, on the authority of a Kurdish informant, that his name was Abu Shujā‘, and that Abu ‘Abd Allah al-Ḥusain was his brother (vol. ix, 26). A brother, Abu’l-Fawāris al-Ḥusain, is mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq as appointed by Bād in 374 Governor of Mayyāfāriqīn (fol. 121*a*). He predeceased Bād, being killed in battle against the troops of Bahā al-Daula, the Buwaihid, near Naṣībīn (fol. 122*a*). The name Ḥārbukḥti occurs again on fol. 122*b*. There was a Kurdish tribe called Bukḥti in Diyār Bakr; see “Chéref Nāneh,” F. B. Charmoy, St. Petersburg, 1868, vol. i, pt. 1, pp. 58 and 61 (No. 39).

² Evidence of Bād’s success is afforded by a letter written in the name of Ṣamṣām al-Daula in 375 A.H. to the Chief Ḥājib at Naṣībīn enjoining him to assist in withstanding Bād, and also to forward to the capital

الوثيقة المكتوبة على باد الكردي

presumably the document defining his rights and liabilities. The letter is one of a batch contained in the MS. Paris, 3,314 (at fol. 214*a*) which purport to be from the pen of Ibrāhīm al-Ṣābi. But at this date Ibrāhīm’s political life was over, though he lived until 384 A.H.

They had four sons, of whom three are named, viz., Abu 'Ali al-Ḥasan, Sa'īd, and Aḥmad. (The fourth was named Kaka, see fols. 137*b* and 156*a* in Or. 6,310, the earlier version of the history, at fol. 91*a*, written "Kuk.") The eldest of them, Abu 'Ali, who was present at Bād's death, after putting to flight the Ḥamdānid force, retired to Ḥuṣn Kayfā; hastened thence with his uncle's widow (a Dailamite whom he afterwards married) to Mayyāfāriqīn, which he seized, together with the strong places around; and so established himself as the first of the Marwānid dynasty in Diyār Bakr.¹

The course of the dynasty was short, even according to Eastern standard; it lasted just under a century. Of its five sovereigns, Abu 'Ali was followed by his brothers Sa'īd and Aḥmad, whose reign of over fifty years—402 to 453 A.H.—formed its culminating point, and was followed by the reigns of his son and grandson. The latter, after being ousted by Ibn Jahīr in 479, regained power for a short period in 486, during the uncertainty in the succession to the Saljuq throne which followed on the death of Malik Shāh (fol. 151*b*), and this, on Ibn al-Azraq's calculation, sufficed to complete the hundred years (fol. 154*a*).

Abu 'Ali al-Ḥasan b. Marwān, 380–386 A.H.

The Amīr Abu 'Ali began his reign by successfully resisting a Greek attack on Akhlāt, Manāzjird, Arjīsh, and Barkari in 382 A.H. His authority, which had the support of his brothers, was undisputed, and he had an able governor at Mayyāfāriqīn, the Chamberlain Mammā. Nevertheless he felt himself insecure, for, as he told Mammā, the people, and especially the lighter sort, were wholly in favour of the Ḥamdānids.² The Clothes Market, he said, was a centre

¹ Bād's dominions extended also into Diyār Rabi'a, as he held Naṣībīn, Jazīrat ibn 'Omar, and, later, Tūr 'Abdīn (fols. 121*a–b*).

² The historian says that the rulers of Mayyāfāriqīn were in general benevolent, especially the Ḥamdānid Saif al-Daula. Only the Dailamites under 'Aḍud al-Daula and his successors were cruel, and this was the cause of their being massacred by the inhabitants in the time of Ṣamṣām al-Daula (fol. 120*b*).

of mischief; no one might enter it mounted, and when one of his relatives did so it led to a collision with the people. Moreover, if a soldier or Kurd were insolent, he was beaten well-nigh dead, without leave of Amīr or governor. Now his ideal for the governed was, he said, passive obedience.¹ Mammā advised the following plan. On the festival of the Adhā, when the population had gone beyond the town limits, the Amīr had the gates closed, threw one leading citizen from the wall, murdered others, and pillaged the place, and then, after proclaiming a general banishment, made exceptions in favour of those persons whom he chose should remain in the city. This was in 384 (fol. 123*b*). In 386 the Amīr contracted to marry the daughter of Sa'd al-Daula, the Hamdānid, paying down a dowry of 200,000 dirhams. The marriage was to take place at Āmid.² The bride's escort included a granddaughter of the celebrated Khatīb 'Abd al-Rahīm b. Nubāta,³ and on reaching their camping-ground near al-Ruhā, the bride heard at night-time mysterious and disquieting utterances which her companion

¹ His words are—

نفس الامارة نفس شريفة لا تؤثر غير الاستماع او امرها والانتها
الى من اسمها وان لا تخالف في شئ ابداً

² The phrase is—

نقد لها النقد مايتى الف درهم وشرط ان يدخل بها في آمد

Compare Dozy, Supp., *sub* نقد.

³ Ibn Nubāta was one of the literary Court of Saif al-Daula. Discourses delivered by him between 348 and 353 A.H. are mentioned on fols. 114*b* and 115*a*, and he is described on fol. 113*b* as unapproachable in his art. On fol. 121*a*, in the notice of his death in 374, aged 39 years, it is stated that he claimed to have seen Ṣāliḥ b. al-Muthanna and Ṣāliḥ b. abi'l-Ḥujja, and that he handed down traditions from the latter. Ibn al-Azraq adds that the interval between Ibn Nubāta's birth (335 A.H.) and the entrance of al-Ḥujja (the twelfth Imam who disappeared) into the cistern was 60 years on the assumption that that event occurred in 275, but that some put it in 262, which would make the interval between the two events 73 years. Ibn Khalikān, in his life of Ibn Nubāta (Sl. Eng., ii, 110), quotes Ibn al-Azraq's history for the dates of his birth and death, and again in his life of Muḥammad al-Ḥujja (ib., p. 581) for the alternative dates of his birth and disappearance. The latter passage occurs in Or. 5,803, 103*b*, with some curious traditions relating to al-Ḥujja. For Ibn Nubāta, see Brockelm., *Gesch. Arab. Lit.*, i, 92. The family was of great importance at Mayyāfāriqin, and members of it are frequently mentioned in the M.S. as holders of office there.

made light of, but within two days the news came that the Amīr was dead. His death happened thus:—Accompanied by Sharwa, the son of Mammā, he had proceeded by Hāni (where the difficulty in getting across the river Hauw caused his brother Abu Naṣr Aḥmad to say that if he ever came to rule he would build a bridge there) on to Āmid. Its leading Shaikh, ‘Abd al-Barr, met him outside, and was warned by Sharwa, who was friend to the next brother Sa‘īd and false to the Amīr, that the inhabitants must be on their guard remembering what had befallen the people of Mayyāfāriqīn. The Shaikh, in turn, warned his fellow-townsmen, who left themselves in his hands. He accordingly laid a plan whereby the Amīr, on entering the town, was to be put off his guard by money being flung in his face, and then whoever killed him was to rule in Āmid. The plan succeeded, the murderer being Abu Ṭāhir Yūsuf b. Damna. Tumult and slaughter followed, and the gates were closed. Sharwa, on approaching the city wall for news, was thrown the Amīr’s head and corpse, and he and Sa‘īd retired with the troops to Mayyāfāriqīn (fols. 124–5).¹

Mumahhid al-Daula Abu Mansūr Sa‘īd, 386–401 A.H.

His first act was to confirm Sharwa and his father in office. He then married his brother’s intended bride, and interred his corpse at Arzan, where his father Marwān—now blind—with his wife, took up their abode near the tomb. Āmid alone did not submit to the new Amīr; Ibn Damna was practically the ruler there, and terms were come to under which the Amīr was to receive 200,000 dirhams

¹ Ibn Shaddād makes this episode, in error, to be part of the murder of the Dailamite garrison at Mayyāfāriqīn under Ṣamsām al-Daula, and the person killed to be Abu ‘Ali al-Ḥasan b. ‘Ali al-Tamīmi, appointed governor in 369 by ‘Aḍud al-Daula. And he makes the accession of Mumahhid al-Daula the consequence of Abu ‘Ali’s expulsion of the inhabitants of Mayyāfāriqīn (fols. 80a and 81b of Bodl. Marsh 333, as to which see J.R.A.S., 1902, p. 786, n. 2).

yearly with the rights of the Khuṭba and Sikka.¹ Ibn Damna next proceeded to get rid of 'Abd al-Barr. He was in the habit of performing his duties as Qāḍi in the abode of Ibn Damna, who was his son-in-law. The latter now got his assent to a banquet; by this means introduced his partisans, who were recruited from the provision market; murdered the Qāḍi in his daughter's presence, and rejoined the company bearing his victim's head with him. The banquet then proceeded to its close. Later Ibn Damna addressed the populace. After protesting his single-minded devotion to their interest and his natural kindness, he told them that 'Abd al-Barr meditated handing over the town to the Amīr and becoming his vizier, and that he had forestalled his intention by killing him. They might obey him or not, as they pleased.² The people submitted to him; his rule proved beneficent and popular; and by gaining over Sharwa he induced the Amīr to appoint him successor to 'Abd al-Barr. He now built himself a palace on the Tigris, where he held great state; he exchanged letters and gifts with the Caliphs of Baghdād and of Cairo, and with the Emperor Basil; his Court was much resorted to; poets praised him, amongst others al-Tihāmi,³ who, whilst at the Court of Naṣr al-Daula, composed three poems in Ibn Damna's honour. Yet he had begun life as a porter, and a story was current that one hot day, when resting a load of grain in the space between the walls, he reflected that they required to be raised, and vowed that if Allah ever made him ruler of Āmid he would raise them by a cubit. Fortune, says Ibn Shaddād, brought about its wonted exalting of the humble,⁴ and the vow was now performed

¹ By the probable omission of some words in Ibn al-Aṭhīr (ix, 51) it is made to appear that the Khuṭba and Sikka were the only rights retained by the Amīr in Mayyāfāriqīn.

² The words are—

فمن طاعني كنت له ومن عصاني فالامر اليه وهو اخير

³ 'Ali b. Muḥammad al-Tihāmi, died 416. See his life by Ibn Khallikān (Sl. Eng., ii, 316) and Brock., *Gesch. Arab. Lit.*, i, 92.

⁴ فضرب الدهر ضربانه وجرى على عادته في انزال اسافل طغامة

منازل ساداته (op. cit., 65b).

(fols. 125*b*–126*b*). But fortune's wheel was not stayed. In 415, during the reign of Naṣr al-Daula, there came to Mayyāfāriqīn one Martaj, with gifts from Ibn Damna. He, in turn, was now a father-in-law, Martaj having married his daughter. Martaj was wealthy; his wealth aroused his father-in-law's envy and his own alarm; and he now offered Āmid to the Amīr on certain terms to be guaranteed by him and by his vizier, al-Maghribi. Returning to Āmid, he laid his plans. Four trusty partisans gained admission to Ibn Damna on the pretence of asking for a money grant, and murdered him. The single Farrāsh present roused the guards and the people. They accused Martaj of the deed, and he was suddenly sprung on and killed by the Farrāsh, who fled to Naṣr al-Daula. Disorder and pillage followed, which were terminated by the arrival of Naṣr al-Daula, who gained admission to Āmid only by surrendering the Farrāsh for execution. This he was persuaded to do by his vizier, who asked whether the town was not worth buying at the price, added to which, he said, the Farrāsh's victim, Martaj, had been acting on the Amīr's behalf. Ibn Damna had ruled twenty-eight years.¹

Resuming the story of Mumahhid al-Daula (fol. 126*b*), we are told of the marks of honour which reached him from Baghdād² and from Cairo, and of his public works at the capital. Sharwa continued to be his chief adviser; he was in high favour, and was admitted even into the Amīr's ḥarim. But he had a favourite, Ibn Falyūs, who was

¹ Ibn Shaddād (op. cit., 81*a*) quotes this statement, and adds that, according to Ibn al-Athīr, he had ruled twenty-three years, but this does not appear in Tornberg's edition, where the only mention of Ibn Damna occurs vol. ix, p. 52.

² A contemporary Baghdad historian, Hilāl al-Ṣābi, mentions Mayyāfāriqīn under 392 A.H. (B.M. Add. 19,360, 100*a*). 'Amīd al-Juyūsh being then engaged in repressing the chronic rioting of the hostile sects, an Alīde ringleader fled to Mayyāfāriqīn. Anyone murdering him was promised 100 dinars, guaranteed by the sum being paid down to a trader at Baghdād, and by a bill drawn on him for the amount, *مفتاحه*, being sent off to Mayyāfāriqīn. But news came of the Alīde's death, whereupon 'Amīd al-Juyūsh laughingly said that, as they had gained their object gratis, the sum would serve to rid them of some other evildoer. Of the score of lines which Sibṭ b. al-Jauzi, in the *Mir'āt al-Zamān*, devotes to the year 392 (B.M. Or. 4,619, 192*b*), four are given to this incident, so it may fittingly find place here. It shows that regular business relations existed between the capital and the frontier city.

hated by the Amīr, and who, in turn, was ever warning Sharwa not to trust his master. He even advised his murder. Sharwa pleaded the favours he had received, but was told to reflect that life was the first consideration. In the end Sharwa was persuaded. He tried poison, but it failed, so he turned to other methods. The stronghold of al-Hattākh was his by grant from the Amīr; it bordered on meadows, and in springtime, at the season of flowers, he was often visited by his master. They were there together in 401, and one day, as they were drinking, Ibn Falyūs, by arrangement with Sharwa, posted men at the gates to prevent any of the Amīr's supporters from entering, and as those of his relatives and friends who were present succumbed in turn to intoxication, they were led off by Sharwa as though to repose, but were, in fact, put under arrest on a pretended order of the Amīr. At length the Amīr felt the need of repose, and retired with a single attendant. Now, said Ibn Falyūs, was the time. Sharwa left him to act; he went in with a naked sword; the Amīr told him to be gone, and, on his delaying, closed with him and shouted to Sharwa for the sword which he had always at hand. Sharwa took it, and struck him on the shoulder. The Amīr exclaimed: "What, Sharwa, you are in the plot against me, and are abetting Ibn Falyūs! you will never more prosper,"¹ and then died.

The two murderers rode off to Mayyāfāriqīn and gained admittance to the town, the watch believing the Amīr to be with them. Not seeing him they attempted to stop Sharwa, but he managed to reach the palace, seized the treasury, and with the aid of the troops made himself obeyed. His first care was to send horsemen to Is'ird to seize Abu Naṣr, the surviving brother of the deceased Amīr, who during some part of his reign had lived in Mayyāfāriqīn, but having imprudently divulged a dream of the moon entering his

يا شروة عملتها علي اتبعمت عرض ابن فليوس والله لا افلحت¹

بعدها

chamber, or, according to another story, the sun alighting on his head, his brother interpreted it to mean that he would bear rule, and told him never to let him see his face again. He was given Qal'at Is'ird with its mill, and the brothers never again met. (Another account was that it was the Amīr who saw in a dream the sun enter his chamber, and his brother seize it from him, and that he thus became odious in his sight.)

We are told that this year was one of drought and scarcity—the jarīb of grain costing ten dinars—and that Abu Naṣr had made a vow that if he came to rule he would make a dole of grain daily in the mosque. The time was now at hand for the fulfilment of the vow. Sharwa, by using the Amīr's seal, had procured the submission of all the fortresses in the district, with the exception of Arzan, which had long been governed by a native of Iṣpahān, al-Khwāja Abu'l-Qāsim. He temporized with Sharwa's envoy, and whilst out hunting with him came across a hurrying rider, who told him Sharwa had murdered the Amīr and had sent to seize Abu Naṣr, whom he was on his way to warn. Abu'l-Qāsim hastened home, gave open expression of his grief at the news, and sent off an urgent message to Abu Naṣr to come to him. The next day saw his arrival, and Sharwa's cavalry returned empty-handed. Abu'l-Qāsim next summoned Abu Naṣr's parents from their son's grave, and before them and the leading inhabitants took an undertaking from him that he would rule justly and be guided by his advice. They then assembled their troops, who promised free service until Sharwa was slain, met and defeated him, and returned with much booty. This Abu Naṣr ceded to the troops, whilst Abu'l-Qāsim distributed among them the contents of the state granaries. Their numbers increased and they advanced on Mayyāfāriqīn. Sharwa was persuaded by Ibn Falyūs that the only escape for them was to surrender the town to the Greeks, and the people, suspecting this, called down curses on them both. Their suspicions were increased by Sharwa despatching his treasure to Ibn Damna at Āmid for safe custody; they

rose; Sharwa's Georgian soldiery discharged arrows at them, whereupon they murdered Ibn Falyūs. Sharwa took refuge in a fort, and the city Sheikhs guaranteed his life. But they failed to control the people, who pillaged the city and called in Abu Naṣr. He drew near and demanded the surrender of Sharwa, and on this being refused cut off supplies from the city. After withdrawing to Arzan for a time during the extreme cold, he resumed the siege, and the people were persuaded to give way and to trust Sharwa to the Amīr's clemency. On the next day, in the last month of 401, he entered the city. His conduct was wise and forbearing, and his vizier, Abu'l-Qāsim, promptly cleared the city of criminals and recovered much of the stolen property. Sharwa was strangled and his body crucified on the scene of his crime; his supporters were expelled from the city; and his victim was interred beside his brother at Arzan (fols. 126-130).

Naṣr al-Daula Abu Naṣr Aḥmad, 401-453 A.H.

Thus opened the longest and most brilliant of the Marwānid reigns. The palace being in ruins, the Amīr's first care was to erect a new one, for which, by his vizier's advice, he chose a site on high ground, adjoining one of the town forts, which he thus incorporated in the edifice, and so guarded against its being held apart from the city and against himself. A convent and church of the Virgin had formerly stood on the site, and its shrines were now removed to the Melkite church. The walls and ceilings of the new palace were gilt, and water was brought thereto from Ra's al-'Ain to supply its basins and baths. It was begun and completed in the course of the year 403 A.H.

Just previous to the festival of the Adhā, arrived an envoy from the Caliph, together with a chamberlain from Sulṭān al-Daula, the Buwaihid, bearing seven robes of honour and a complimentary letter, with a grant to the Amīr of the whole of Diyār Bakr, التشریف المنشور بديار بكر, under the title of Naṣr al-Daula, and the patent, توقيع, was read

out before the leading inhabitants. That very evening came an envoy from the Fatimide al-Ḥākīm, bringing likewise the grant of a title, and next day came an envoy from the Emperor Basil, the Slavonian. All of them were received with great marks of honour, and on the day of the festival the Amīr sat in state with the Baghdād envoys on his right and the Fatimide and Byzantine envoys on his left. The patents were again read, complimentary poems recited, and honours conferred on the envoys (fols. 131*a-b*).

The rule of the Amīr, with Abu'l-Qāsim as his vizier, was exemplary. He lightened the taxes, repaired and settled endowments on the city walls, and, in pursuance of his vow to give one jarib of corn daily in charity, he now (407-8 A.H.) gave orders to purchase an estate of the approximate yield of 360 jaribs, to be settled on this charitable object. This was done, and the produce was distributed in the mosque down to the time of the author, who invokes the curse of Allah, angels, and men on whomsoever should touch or alter the same (fol. 132*a*). Here follows (fol. 133*b*) the account of the recovery of Āmid and the Amīr's journey there, when he appointed his eldest son, Abu'l-Ḥasan, to be governor, with one Ibn al-Khammār as his secretary—a name which, before the historian's time, had been changed to al-Nakhwār, presumably because it suggested fermented liquor. He also caused an excellent bridge of twenty arches to be built at the spot where he met his son on his arrival.¹ The Qādi of Mayyāfāriqīn was appointed to act also at Āmid, and his journeys to and fro by moonlight on the 14th of each month, and the festivities on the way, are described (fols. 133*b-134a*).

In this year, 415 A.H., occurred the death of the vizier, Abu'l-Qāsim, to the great grief of the Amīr.² His successor was the eminent man of letters Abu'l-Qāsim

¹ The bridge is mentioned only in Or. 6,310, 42*b*—the earlier version of Ibn al-Azraq's history.

² The MS. Or. 5,803 puts his death in 410 A.H. (last line of fol. 134*b*), but this must be an error for 415 A.H., for in Or. 6,310, 42*b*, the event is made to happen on the return of the Amīr from his journey to take possession of Āmid.

al-Husain b. 'Ali al-Maghribi. We are told (fol. 134*b*) that on his arrest in Egypt by the Fatimide al-Hākim he was imprisoned in the *Khizānat al-Bunūd*, and escaped (which no one besides had ever done) and joined his father in Irāq, remaining with him till his death.¹ He then served the Oqailid Qirwāsh until he was arrested together with Sulaimān b. Fahd (in 411 A.H., Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 226). Being set at liberty, they both started for Diyār Bakr, but were met on the way by Badrān, the brother of Qirwāsh, who reconveyed them to Mosul, telling Qirwāsh that they were devourers of his substance; and they were again imprisoned. Later they obtained their freedom by bribery, and got to Mayyāfariqīn. And the Amīr steadily refused to give them up to Qirwāsh. He now appointed al-Maghribi to be his vizier, with the fullest powers, and he proved himself as wise, cautious, and efficient as any vizier who ever served Caliph or Sultan. His close friend, Sulaimān b. Fahd, remained for a time as a guest at Court, until Qirwāsh relented, and he returned to his relatives at Mosul.² The vizier is described (fol. 135*b*) as having carried

¹ Three generations of the Maghribi family attained the rank of vizier. The grandfather, Abu'l-Qāsim al-Husain, is mentioned (fol. 116*a*) as assisting in 355 to negotiate a truce between Saif al-Daula and the Greeks, "with whom he was then residing." Why he was there is explained by Ibn al-Adīm in the *Zubdat al-Halab* (Paris, 1,666, 38*b*), namely, that in 354, when Saif al-Daula ransomed those Moslem prisoners for whom he could not find exchanges, his secretary, Abu'l-Qāsim, "the grandfather of the vizier," went hostage for the payment. The vizier's father, Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Ali, was Saif al-Daula's last vizier (ib., 41*a*), and continued to serve his successor, Sa'd al-Daula (ib., 46*a*). He next served the Fatimide al-'Aziz, but for how long a time is uncertain, for Ibn al-Azraq has told us (fol. 121*a*) that in 377 he was in command of troops sent by Ṣamsām al-Daula against Bād, and he now says (134*b*) that he served al-Hākim, whose reign began only in 386. And his further statement that, whilst his post in Egypt was filled by his son Abu'l-Qāsim, he served first Qirwāsh and then, during ten months, the Buwaihid Sharaf al-Daula, is true, not of him, but of his son; see Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 233-5), who dates the Buwaihid service in 414 A.H. The account in Or. 6,310, 43*a*, is equally confusing. Again, both Ibn al-Athīr (loc. cit.), Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (B.M. Or. 4,619, 216*a*), and Ibn Khallikān (Sl. Eng., i, 450) say that Abu'l-Qāsim's father was put to death by al-Hākim, and on this De Slane refers us to De Sacy's "Exposé de la religion des Druzes," i, cccl. But the father is not there mentioned among those put to death, and he is mentioned (ib., p. cccix) as in the service of al-'Aziz as late as 384, i.e. after the campaign against Bād.

² Ibn al-Athīr's story (loc. cit.) is that on their arrest Sulaimān pleaded poverty in answer to Qirwāsh's demand of money, and was therefore put to death; and that al-Maghribi fraudulently evaded payment and got away, and he quotes some poetry on the subject. His estimate of the vizier's character is unfavourable.

on the government in the grand style of Egypt or 'Irāq.¹ In 428 his health failed, whereupon he devised a scheme for ensuring his burial in the Mashhad at al-Ghariyya (the tomb of 'Ali, see Yāqūt, iii, 790). In procuring the consent of the Naqīb of the shrine, he announced that a purse of 1,000 dinars would be placed in his coffin as a means of identification, and when near his end he directed this to be done. His death took place in Ramaḍān, 428 A.H.² He had previously announced that a favourite concubine of his was going to be conveyed to Kūfa for burial, and in accordance with his injunctions the bearers now hurried his coffin on to Kūfa by way of Ḥuṣn Kayfā and Jazīra before the news of his death reached the successive halting-places.³ At the shrine of 'Ali his identity was established by the purse. He was interred there; an inscription placed over him expressed the hope that he might be numbered among the happy believers who had found grace.

The Amīr now remained for a time without a vizier. He was much engaged in public works, such as a hospital

¹ By Ibn Shaddād (op. cit., 88a) the vizier is credited with a bequest of books to the Mosques of Mayyāfāriqīn and Āmid, but this is probably an error on his part, for in both the MSS. (Or. 5,803, 134b-135a, and Or. 6,310, 44a) the bequest is attributed to Al-Shaiḫ Abu Naṣr al-Manāzi (Aḥmad b. Yūsuf al-Sulaiki), a learned and accomplished state secretary who was employed on missions to Constantinople. His life is given by Ibn Khalikān (Sl. Eng., i, 126), where the story of the bequest seems to be copied from this history.

² All the later historians, excepting Ibn Shaddād (loc. cit.), put his death in 418 A.H. Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (Or. 4,619, 217a) and Ibn Khalikān (Sl. Eng., i, 454) give the alternative date, 428, the latter saying that 418 was the more correct. This is not the view of Ibn al-Azraq, for in Or. 6,310, 46b, he deals expressly with the point, saying that he had come across many works which gave 428, and a single work which gave 418, which was an error on the scribe's part, inasmuch as from the year 420 to about 425 or 426 it was beyond doubt that the vizier was in Mayyāfāriqīn. This passage does not appear in Or. 5,803, but the date 428 is repeated therein more than once. And it is rendered probable by other dates. According to Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 236) the vizier entered the service of Naṣr al-Daula in 415, which was the year of the death of Abu'l-Qāsim, whom he succeeded. According to both Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (Paris, 1,506, 78b) and Dhahabi (B.M. Or. 50, 44b) he served two terms of office, for which three years scarcely suffice. His successor, Ibn Jahīr, was appointed only in 430 A.H. (Or. 5,803, 137b), and although there was an interval, the office can scarcely have remained vacant for so long a space as twelve years.

³ The vizier's scheme is related by Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 255), who probably derived the story from the "Muntazam" of Ibn al-Jauzi, for Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi relates the same in the Mir'at al-Zamān (Or. 4,619, 216b) on that authority, and in similar terms, and then gives the story of the purse on the authority of the "History of Mayyāfāriqīn."

(133*b*); a mosque (135*b*) with an hourglass¹ therein (136*b*); and a palace to lodge himself and his relatives, on the bank of the river Sātīdamā, from which it was irrigated by a water-wheel. In the spring season the Court moved thither, spending two nights on the way at halting stations of which traces remained in the author's time. The Amīr further settled endowments on various bridges, and, in pursuance of the vow made on his way to Āmid with his brother Abu 'Ali, he had one constructed over the river Ḥaww (137*a*). His rule was prosperous and beneficent; his Court was resorted to by poets from all quarters² who sang his praises, and served as a safe asylum for those in need of a refuge. One of these was the Buwaihid al-Malik al-'Azīz, son of Jalāl al-Daula, who on his father's death in 435 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 353) settled at Qal'at Is'ird, and died there. From him the Amīr acquired two objects, each of great though diverse value—the red ruby called the Jabal Yāqūt, weighing seven mithqāls, which became known as the Marwānid gem (and which, according to the Mir'āt al-Zamān, Paris, 1506, 78*b*, he gave later to Tuḡhril Beg the Saljuq); and a copy of the Qur'ān in the handwriting of 'Ali. For these the Buwaihid received the sum of 10,000 dinars (fol. 149*b*), and he told the Amīr that he had brought him both this world and the world to come (fol. 136*b*). Another eminent refugee was the infant grandson of the Caliph al-Qā'im, who succeeded him in 467 with the title of al-Muqtadi. He was conveyed by his mother to Āmid on the revolt of al-Basāsiri at Baghdād in 450. The fugitives were met by the Amīr in person, who lodged them in the palace at Āmid with an ample allowance for their maintenance. The Qādi, Ibn al-Baḡhī, begged to be allowed

¹ بنكام, the Persian پينگان. See Dozy, Supp., sub مناجاة.

² The MS. mentions al-Tihāmi (*supra*, p. 127, n. 3), Abu'l-Riḍā b. al-Ṭarīf, Ibn al-Sūdāwi, and Ibn al-Ghaḍīri (the earlier version, 45*b*, has Ibn al-Maṭīri). Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 52) mentions also Abu 'Abd Allah al-Kāzarūni, through whom the Shafēite doctrine was spread throughout Diyār Bakr. (Muḥammad b. Bayān b. Muḥammad, died 455 A.H., see Dhahabi, Ta'rīkh al-Islām, B.M. Or. 50, 53*b*.)

to defray the charge; the Amīr said that a descendant of the Caliph could only be at his Court as his own guest, but eventually he yielded to the Qāḍī's request (fol. 138*b*). On the Caliph's restoration to Baghdād by Ṭuḡhril Beg they returned there with gifts of the value of 200,000 dinars. This redounded greatly to the credit of the Amīr (fol. 139*a*, cf. Ibn al-Athīr, x, 6-7).

The popularity and influence of the Qāḍī, Ibn al-Baḡhl, at Āmid, ended by awakening the distrust of Ibn Jahīr, who had now succeeded al-Maḡhribi as vizier. He reminded the Amīr of the career of Ibn Damna, and by his advice a son of Ibn Baḡhl was appointed in 449 to the post of Qāḍī of Mayyāfāriqīn, as hostage there for his father. Two years later Ibn Baḡhl was arrested and died in prison (fol. 142*a*).

But mischief to the Marwānid line was to come, not from the Qāḍī, but from the vizier, Fakhr al-Daula Ibn Jahīr (see his life by Ibn Khallikān, Sl. Eng., iii, 280). Born of a good family in Mosul, he was allied to a leading man there named Ibn Abī'l-'Aqārib. Rivalry between the two developed into hostility, and Qirwāsh, under a threat from Ibn Jahīr's rival and family of quitting the place, transferred Ibn Jahīr to an official post at Ḥalab, of which he had lately become master. Enemies procured his dismissal, whereupon he sought the permission of Naṣr al-Daula to come to his territory as a private individual. This was refused on the ground that had he been a man of integrity he would not have quitted Mosul. But the want of a vizier at Mayyāfāriqīn was making itself felt (fol. 137*b*). The Christians gained in strength, and a military 'Ārid, having broken a man's head at chess, took refuge with a cousin of the Amīr, who refused to give him up. In his anger the Amīr went in person to enforce obedience, and was received with a taunt of having gone forth against a cousin as if to attack *Kharshana*,¹ or some such Greek stronghold. This led the Amīr to summon Ibn Jahīr; he was received

¹ Near Malaṭīyya (Yāqūt, ii, 423).

with great honour, and appointed vizier with the fullest powers¹ and with the title of Kāfi al-Daula, in 430 A.H.²

Once only was the Amīr's territory attacked by a hostile force, namely, by two Saljuq officers, sent by Tuğhril Beg with 10,000 horse to invade Diyār Bakr, which he granted them as a fief. (The date given for this in both the MSS., 434 A.H., must be an error for some later date.) On their approach the city gates were closed; a large sum was offered to induce them to withdraw, but was refused. One night, however, in a drunken quarrel, they stabbed each other dead, and the Amīr sallied out with his troops, pillaged their camp, and took many prisoners (fol. 139a).³

About this time also occurred a miscarriage of justice (fol. 139b). The Amīr being at enmity with Qirwāsh—possibly in 440 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 375) — the Qāḍi at Mayyāfāriqīn, Abu'l-Murajjā Abu Bakr, having occasion for a certain lawbook, told his secretary to write to a friend at Mosul to procure him a copy, and the secretary entrusted the letter to a man who was going to Mosul (with ten dinars for the copy, Or. 6,310, 53b). The commission was overheard by a soldier and reported to the Amīr. The Qāḍi denied on oath that he had written, whilst the secretary admitted the letter, and stated its object.

¹ The words are (Or. 5,803, 138a, corrected by Or. 6,310, 49b) : رتّ اليه

الامر والنهي وحصل اليه الحل والعقد و فوضت اليه جميع الاشغال

These terms imply a vizier 'of delegation' as distinct from the more restricted vizier 'of execution.' See "Al-Aḥkam al-Sultāniyya" by al-Māwardi, transl. Ostrorog, Paris, 1901, i, 197.

² Ibn al-Athīr (x, 121) makes this happen later. He says that Ibn Jahīr was in the service of a concubine of Qirwāsh, and that after the latter's deposition (i.e. in 442) his brother Baraka employed him as envoy to the Greeks, when he successfully claimed precedence over the Marwānid envoy; that later he fled to avoid arrest, and entered the service of the Mirdāsīd ruler of Ḥalab; that from there he went to Malaṭīyya, and then entered the Amīr's service. Ibn al-'Adīm (op. cit., 73b) says that he came to Ḥalab as vizier in 445, and that in 446 he resigned and entered the Amīr's service. Dhahabi, in the Ta'rikh al-Islām, Or. 50, 188a, puts the event in 440, "towards the close of the Amīr's reign," on the authority of a quotation by Ibn al-Najjār from the History of Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Hamadhāni, who died in 521, i.e. thirty-eight years after Ibn Jahīr.

³ Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi says of the Amīr (Paris, 1,506, 78b) that he was in the habit of warding off hostile attacks by money payments. See also Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 411 and 433.

But the Qādi's denial caused doubt; he was imprisoned in a fort, and the door of his cell plastered up, طُيِّنَ عَلَيْهِ, so that he died (fol. 139*b*).

The improvements to the town continued. Walls were repaired, baths built, and a surplus from charitable endowments was applied in bringing water from Ra's al-'Ain through the walls into the city. One conduit was made by a wealthy citizen, a brokèr, at his own cost, by which water from a number of springs was collected and brought through the centre of the city. And though the pipe passed by his door, he refused to divert a single drop for his own use. Until then the city had depended on wells, the first pipe having been laid by Saif al-Daula to supply the palace (fol. 140*a*).

A fine (مصادرة), and the solitary one under the Amīr's rule, was inflicted, sad to relate, on this beneficent broker. He was intimate with the ruler of the neighbouring tribe of Sunāsuna¹ (on whose confines the Amīr had constructed a fort to keep them in check), and an enemy of his suggested to the Amīr that he might betray the city to them. His house was searched and weapons discovered, whereupon he was fined 400,000 dinars: 80,000 dinars, besides property in kind, remained for his heirs; still the Amīr was deceived into acting as he did (fol. 140*b*).

Trade flourished and wealth increased under the Amīr's rule. A broker who had bought up an entire caravan load

¹ The tribe was attacked by Saif al-Daula the Ḥamdānid in 328 A.H. (J.R.A.S., 1902, p. 797). The Amīr Abu 'Alī was married to a daughter of Saṅkhārīb, their ruler (fol. 125*a*), who is probably the Sénékérim-Johannes of the Armenian house of Ardzrouni; see Collect. d'Hist. Arméniens by M. Brosset, St. Petersburg, 1874, vol. i, p. 248. Ibn al-Aṭhīr (ix, 306), in relating how Nāṣr al-Daula had to check the tribe's attacks on the pilgrims from Āḍharbijān, says they were Armenians who lived in the neighbourhood of Akhlāt, and that they held their strongholds under treaty until 580 A.H., after which they fell gradually to the Moslems. The tribe were evidently regarded as dangerous neighbours (see *post*, p. 149), and under al-Ruzbaki, the Saljuq governor at Mayyāfāriqīn, 509-512 A.H., whose weak rule led to the appointment of 'Il Ghāzi, the first of the Ortoqid dynasty, the tribe was said to have annexed as many as thirty villages in the neighbourhood of 'Ādiljīwāz (fol. 160*a*).

of raw hides, resold them that same day at a profit of 500 dinars of 'Romanos,' i.e. of Byzantine issue. The Amīr, hearing of this, sent for the man, who attended bringing the money, admitted his profit, and tendered it to the Amīr, who refused it, protesting that his sole motive was to ascertain the fact of such a profit having been made in his territory. A contest of self-denial followed, which ended in the broker applying the sum in purchasing an endowment for the garrisons of certain fortresses (fol. 140*b*).¹

The Amīr's long reign was nearing its close; the historian compares it to a continual festival. His wives were four in number, viz., a daughter of Faḍlūn b. Manūchihir, the ruler of Arrān and Upper Armenia,² and the mother of his son Sa'īd; a daughter of Qirwāsh of Mosul; a daughter of Sankhārīb, ruler of the Sunāsuna tribe, the widow of his brother 'Ali; and a fourth, a slave girl from Egypt, whose owner refusing to sell her on the ground that he had a son by her he had perforce to marry. But to his first-mentioned wife this course seemed neither necessary nor tolerable, and she departed on a visit to her father, leaving her son Sa'īd with the Amīr, and never returned. The Amīr's ḥarīm numbered 360, and he was always prepared to add an

¹ Ibn Shaddād (op. cit., 85*b*) makes the broker son of the victim of the unjust fine. Ibn al-Azraq's narrative does not confirm this; but, if true, the man's evident expectation of being deprived of his gain may have been based rather on family experience than on general usage.

² This Faḍlūn is mentioned as Amīr of Janzah (Gandza) under the Bagratid Gaḡic, who reigned 989-1020 A.D. (Brosset, "Histoire de la Géorgie," i, 299, who gives a pedigree of the family taken from Fraehn, ib., p. 344). In 496 A.H. Manūchihir, brother of Faḍlūn al-Rawādi, was ruler of Ana (Ibn al-Athīr, x, 247*a*), and a later Faḍlūn is connected with the grandfather of Saladin. On fol. 181*b*, in reference to the revolt of the priests at Ana in 550 A.H., when Faḍlūn was substituted as Amīr for his brother Shaddād—an event mentioned also by Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 133—we are told that the latter went to Syria and joined Saladin's uncle, Asad al-Dīn Shīrkūh, whose father, Shādhi, had been a retainer of Faḍlūn's family, which had been long established in the district under the name of Bait ibn abi'l-Asāwir b. Manūchihir as owners of Arrān, Janzah, and its neighbourhood. Later, Shaddād took service under the Ortoqid Najm al-Dīn Īl Ghāzi of Māridīn, who granted him the castle which Naṣr al-Daula had built on the Sunāsuna frontier. Ibn al-Azraq says that when on his way to Tiflis in 548 he met him at Mayyāfāriqīn and at Ana.

inmate regardless of price. We are given very precise details as to his distribution of time between his duties and his pleasures (fols. 140*b*–141*a*); and after his death a courtier humorously remarked that he had reigned, not 53, but 106 years : لان لياليها كانت احسن من ايامها . Other rulers, says Ibn al-Azraq, may have possessed greater dominions and wealth : none surpassed him in prosperity and enjoyment. And he instances his good fortune in having been served by two viziers of the first rank—al-Maghribi and Ibn Jahīr. So bright a picture in the present suggested a dark vision of the future, and such a vision was duly disclosed by an Indian astrologer, who predicted to the Amīr that later his sovereignty would pass to one who had been high in his favour, who in turn would soon be deprived of it. The Amīr said this must refer to his vizier, Ibn Jahīr, and, addressing him, he commended his issue to his care. The historian adds that Ibn Jahīr told his grandfather, when Nāzīr of Ḥuṣn Kayfā, that from that time forth until the event happened he nursed the project of acquiring Diyār Bakr (fol. 141*b*).¹

In 453 the Amīr died, and was buried at Mayyāfāriqīn (fol. 142*b*). The biographies of him given by Ibn Khallikān (Sl. Eng., i, 157), by Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (Paris, 1506, 78*b*), and by Dhahabi (Or. 50, 44*b*) are largely derived from this history, with some additions from other sources. Ibn al-Athīr's brief narrative of his accession (ix, 52) and of his death (x, 11) are not apparently so derived, and his history contains matter not to be found herein relating to events outside Mayyāfāriqīn. Such are the Amīr's dealings with al-Ruhā and its owner, 'Uṭair al-Numairi (ix, 244, 281–2 *bis*,

¹ The historian records a presentment on the part of a sister of Saif al-Daula, who, surveying the Maidān with some 20,000 horsemen thereon from one of the city towers, exclaimed that it might well happen that the race of Ḥamdān would pass away :

يوشك ان تقوم الساعة على آل حمدان

And within sixty or seventy years there was not one of the race remaining (fol. 116*b*). A prediction of misfortune to come was also made to the Amīr's successor, see *infra*, p. 145, n. 2.

and 305); his quarrels with the Oqailids of Mosul (ib., 249, 257, 280, and 375), one, late in his reign, occasioned by the murder of his son Sulaimān¹ at Jazīra (ib., 416); his quarrels with the Greeks and the Sunāsuna tribe (ib., 301–2 and 306); and his successful appeal to Ṭugh̄ril Beg in 441 to allow the ransom of Liparit,² the king of the Abkhāz, who had been captured the year before by Ṭugh̄ril's brother Ibrāhīm Yanāl, and who was thereupon generously set at liberty without a ransom (ib., 372, 380).

Ibn al-Athīr relates too that he sent cooks to Egypt to learn their art, and that he forbade catching the birds which came down from the hills in winter, providing them with grain from the granaries. Dhahabi too, in his notice of Ibn Jahīr in the *Ta'rikh al-Islām* (Or. 50, 188*b*), gives an interesting anecdote of the Amīr on the authority of al-Humaidi (Brock., *Gesch. Arab. Lit.*, i, 338), who derived it from the historian Ghars al-Ni'ma Muḥammad (the son of Hilāl al-Ṣābi), who, in turn, was told it by Ibn Jahīr. The Amīr offered a Kurdish freedman of his a roast partridge, at which the man laughed, and, when the Amīr insisted on knowing the cause, said that it had reminded him of a merchant whom in his youth he had robbed, and, in spite of his entreaties, had killed. The victim, seeing he was doomed, appealed to two partridges to testify to his unjust fate. And the partridge had reminded him of this foolish appeal. At this the Amīr was convulsed with laughter, and told him that the partridge had indeed borne witness, and moreover before one who would bring him to account. And he had him put to death forthwith. Ibn Jahīr added that, strangely enough, the same story, word for word, was to be found in the *Kitāb al-Nishwān* of al-Tanūkhī.³ The scribe

¹ I can find no mention of this son in the MSS.

² In Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 372) the name is written قاريط, and in one MS. فاربط. An account of this Saljuq invasion of Armenia under Ibrāhīm in 1048 A.D. will be found in Brosset's "Histoire de la Géorgie," vol. i, add. pp. 222–226.

³ Died 384 A.H. (Brock., *Gesch. Arab. Lit.*, i, 155, and Ibn Khallikān, *Sl. Eng.*, ii, 564). There is a MS. of this work in Paris, No. 3,482, but I was unable to find this story therein.

adds a note that he had read in a work called the *Kitāb al-Imtinā' wal-Mu'ānasa* a story of a philosopher who was waylaid and murdered by thieves on his way to an assemblage of the learned, and who had adjured some birds—but whether partridges or not he could not say for certain—to acquaint the assemblage of his fate. The thieves attended the gathering, and whilst there saw the birds, whereupon one said to the other: “Do you think these are the birds come to announce the murder?” He was overheard; they were brought before the king, confessed, and were executed. This story is evidently the Greek tale contained in the Anthology and popularized by Schiller's lay “Die Kraniche des Ibykus.”¹

Nizām al-Dīn Abu'l-Qāsim Naṣr, 453–472 A.H.

His ability caused him to be designated as successor by his father in preference to his elder brother Sa'īd, and he was now peaceably acknowledged as Amīr by his kindred and subjects. But Sa'īd soon gave trouble. He sought the protection of the Sultan, Ṭughril Beg, who in 455 sent to his aid a body of troops who encamped outside Mayyāfāriqīn. But Ibn Jahīr told Sa'īd plainly that he was not the man to overthrow a sovereign, and he was induced to accept a territorial grant, whilst the troops retired on receiving 50,000 dinars (fol. 143a). Still, Sa'īd was not satisfied, and the vizier advised his being given Āmid as a residence.² On his way there he visited his brother at Mayyāfāriqīn, and as they were sleeping in the private apartments Sa'īd was roused by a slave of his who suggested he should kill the Amīr and usurp his place. But Sa'īd asked indignantly whether his brother, the son of a slave girl, should keep faith, whilst he,

¹ The story of Ibycus is told by Ælian in his “Various History,” where the birds appealed to are said to have been crows. See *Encycl. Metrop.*, 1845, *Hist. and Biogr.*, i, 260. There is also a Persian version (see the forty-sixth story in the *Kitāb-i-Šad Hikāyāt*, Bombay, 1881), where the victim is a Ḥākīm named *Inkash* (qy. Ibkush, i.e. Ibykus) under Firdaus, king of Greece, and the birds are vultures.

² What follows of the story has got transposed in Or. 5,803 to fol. 145a. It should follow on here, as it does in Or. 6,310, 59b.

descended from Faḍlūn, should play the traitor, and the brothers parted in amity. Soon, however, the Amīr regretted Āmid, and having procured an attractive slave girl as a gift to his brother, he tempted her, by a promise of marriage, to give Saʿīd, when they were alone together, a handkerchief.¹ She did this, and within three days he was dead. The Amīr at once seized Āmid, married himself Saʿīd's murderess, and married his widow to his own son and successor, Maṣṣūr (fols. 145*a-b*).² The Amīr was now to lose the services of Ibn Jahīr. In 455 the Caliph al-Qā'im applied to have him as his vizier, and he was sent off by his master with great marks of honour to take up the post;³ and the historian mentions the elation of the people at the thought of the eminence attained by their two viziers al-Maghribi and Ibn Jahīr. His successor was Abu'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Anbāri, who had been in the service of Qirwāsh at Mosul (fol. 143*b*). He died in 458, and was succeeded by his son Abu Ṭāhīr Salāma 'Ain al-Kufāh, who, though young, proved competent (fol. 144*a*). His life will be traced to its tragic close.

In this same year Diyār Bakr was attacked by an emissary from Ṭughril Beg,⁴ one Sallār Khurāsāni, who encamped

¹ The episode breaks off here in Or. 1,583, 145*b*; the continuation is supplied from the earlier version, fols. 60*a-b*, and from Bodl. Marsh 333, 90*a*.

² Saʿīd died in 455 (Ibn al-Athīr, x, 19). Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (Paris, 1,506, 89*b*) says that on his death the people at Amid wished his infant son to succeed, and the Qāḍi Ibn al-Baḡhī (who had lately ceased to be Qāḍi of Mayyāfāriqīn, Or. 5,803, 143*b*) sought the aid of the Ghuzz against the Amīr. But the latter gained the day by offering marriage to the infant's mother, and the Qāḍi was arrested and fined.

³ All the other accounts describe Ibn Jahīr's promotion as due to his own efforts, and his departure as effected by stealth, and in concert with the Caliph's envoy, whom he affected to be speeding homewards: see Bundari's Abridgment of 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahāni, ed. Houtsma, ii, 24; Ibn al-Athīr, x, 14; Ibn Khallikān, Sl. Eng., iii, 280; and Dhahabi, Or. 50, 188*a-b*. Their accounts are possibly all derived from al-Hamadhāni's history (see note *ante*, p. 137, n. 2). Dhahabi suggests that his departure was brought about by hostility between the Amīr and his brothers Saʿīd and Abu'l-Fawāris. As to the latter, the MS. mentions no brother of this name. One, named Ibrāhīm, had a son named Abu'l-Fawāris (fol. 155*b*).

⁴ This must be an error, as Ṭughril Beg died in 455, but the MS. gives 459 as the date of his death (144*a*). The dates of the Saljuq Sultans as given by Ibn al-Azraq often differ from those given elsewhere, as is pointed out more than once by Ibn Khallikān. Moreover, in Or. 5,803, the attack by Sallār is inserted before the death of Abu'l-Faḍl al-Anbāri, whereas in Or. 6,310, 61*b*, it is made to occur when his son Abu Ṭāhīr was already vizier.

outside Mayyāfāriqīn with 5,000 horse and began making raids. The vizier promised him money if he departed, and sent him as hostage al-Ḥasan, brother to the Amīr. Sallār then approached the city gate, but when about to enter held back in doubt. The vizier, perceiving this, at once ordered two more of the Amīr's brothers, Faḍlūn and Māmak, to be handed over. This reassured Sallār, and he proceeded to the palace. The vizier advised the Amīr to make him a prisoner, and disposed of his misgivings as to his brothers' fate by telling him that they were his foes, and might well serve as the price of Diyār Bakr. The Amīr inclined towards paying the agreed sum, but the vizier said this would open the door to other such claims. So Sallār was seized, exclaiming he was betrayed, whereupon his troops pillaged his tent, beheaded two of the Amīr's brothers, and tied the third (Faḍlūn) to the tail of an untamed colt, whom they turned loose. After running for two days the animal was stopped by a peasant, and Faḍlūn was brought home and cured.¹ Sallār and his men were executed, and the body of al-Ḥasan received a solemn burial (fols. 143*b*–144*a*).

The visit to the city of the vizier Niẓām al-Mulk is next related (fol. 144*a*). He came on the occasion of Alp Arslān's campaign against the Greeks in 463 A.H. The Amīr was alarmed; he entertained the vizier sumptuously; and two of his sisters and his wife implored the good offices of their powerful guest, who assured them that he would turn their brother "from an Amīr into a Sultan." The Amīr was, in fact, received by Alp Arslān with much favour on his attending him with costly gifts, and Niẓām al-Mulk, referring to his promise, said there could be but one Sultan, but that he should be "Sultān al-Umarā," and he was given that title (Or. 6,310, 63*a*–*b*).²

¹ This incident anticipates the story of Mazepa.

² In Or. 5,803, 144*b*, Sa'īd is made to accompany the Sultan, who hesitates to give effect to his vizier's promises because of his word given to Sa'īd. The vizier said that if the Sultan would go out hunting he would arrange matters. Sa'īd was arrested, and on his resisting was bound with a chain and carried on a mule to al-Hattākh. As above stated, the narrative of Sa'īd's death follows later, and is not brought to a conclusion. The MS. adds that the Amīr was in great straits for money until supplied by his sister Zubaida. Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi

The story of Alp Arslān's victory over the Greek Emperor Romanos follows.¹ One of its results was the enriching of Akhlāt from the booty taken; and we are told that this town, with Manāzjird, ceased from henceforth to be subject to the Marwānids, being treated as fiefs by the Sultan (fol. 145*b*).

The remainder of the Amīr's reign was uneventful. Some public works of his are recorded, amongst them a bridge over the Dujaila river at Āmid. He died in 472 A.H., as predicted by a Baghdād astrologer,² and is described as a mild and just sovereign, under whose rule Mayyāfāriqīn attained to a high pitch of prosperity. By the care of the vizier, al-Anbāri, the succession passed peaceably to his eldest son (fols. 146*a-b*).

(Paris, 1,506, 126*b*) mentions the Amīr's fear at the Sultan's arrival, and his gifts which he had wrung from his subjects, and which the Sultan returned, saying "he did not want the peasants' money." See also Ibn al-Athīr, x, 43. Dhahabī, in the Ta'rikh al-Islām (B.M. Or. 50, 98*a*), mentions the Sultan's visit in 463, and the Amīr's gift of 100,000 dinars, on the authority of a certain "Abd al-Wāhid b. al-Ḥuṣain" (*sic*).

¹ The following anecdote I have not met elsewhere. Ibn Mahlabān, who had come as envoy from the Sultan, being asked by the Greek Emperor which was the pleasanter of Iṣfahān or Hamadhān, answered the former, as Hamadhān was very cold. Then, said the Emperor, we shall winter ourselves at Iṣfahān and our beasts at Hamadhān. The envoy replied that the beasts would indeed do this, but as for them he felt less certain. The mission of Ibn Mahlabān is mentioned by Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (Paris, 1,506, 129*b*). He says the Emperor had distributed among the patricians, in anticipation of victory, fiefs situate in Egypt, Syria, Khurāsān, and 'Irāq, reserving Baghdād for himself, and that he meant to pass the Winter in 'Irāq and the Summer in 'Ajam. His account of the battle is very full, covering four folios, and is based in part on the history of Abu Ya'la ibn al-Qalānisi (al-'Amīd Hamza b. Asad), author of a continuation of the history of Damascus, of which an imperfect copy at Oxford—Bodl. Hunt. 125—covering 362–555 A.H., gives a brief account of the battle, and also of a General History in continuation of that by Hilāl al-Ṣābi, i.e. from 447 A.H. onwards (see Ibn Khallikān, Sl. Eng., iv, 484).

² This astrologer, Ibn 'Ayshūn, was ten years in the Amīr's service. One moonlight night, as they were admiring the prospect of the city and its gardens, he predicted that after the Marwānid dynasty had passed away it would be desolate and oppressed for over eighty years; and this happened, for it was taken by the Turks, passed from one governor to another, and was greatly oppressed. To this day, says the historian (572 A.H.), it is not what it was under Nizām al-Dīn (fols. 147*a-b*).

Nāṣir al-Daula Abu'l-Muzaffar Maṣṣūr, 472–478 A.H.

For a time the government was ably conducted by the vizier, who bore the title of Za'im al-Daula 'Amid al-Mulk, but soon the Amīr took into his favour a physician named Abu Sālim, whose wife was equally in favour with his consort, Sitt al-Nās, and this couple procured the arrest and imprisonment of the vizier, and took his place. This sole recorded political act of the Amīr proved fatal to the dynasty, for Ibn Jahīr, who since his dismissal by the Caliph had been in the service of Niẓām al-Mulk, on hearing of what was going on at Mayyāfāriqīn, conferred with Niẓām al-Mulk, and advised him to seize the Marwānid territory and treasures. He in turn gave similar advice to his master Malik Shāh, and in the result troops were sent in 477 A.H. against Diyār Bakr under Ibn Jahīr. He advanced on Mayyāfāriqīn, leaving his son Abu'l-Qāsim Za'im al-Daula to attack Āmid. The Amīr, leaving Abu Sālim in charge of the capital, retired to Jazīra. The invader wintered at Qal'at Is'ird, and in 488 renewed his attack on Mayyāfāriqīn, aided by reinforcements which had arrived under Ortoq,¹ the ancestor of the future rulers of the district. But at the Sultan's Court voices were being raised on behalf of the Amīr, and a partition was proposed under which he was to retain Mayyāfāriqīn and Āmid, and the Sultan to have Jazīra, the remaining territory being divided between them according to the Amīr's selection. He asked time for reflection. Next day came a message from Abu Sālim telling him to be under no anxiety, as they could hold out for ten years, the place being strong and the inhabitants

¹ On his way Ortoq had attacked the Oqailid Muslim (whose aid Nāṣir al-Daula had purchased by the cession of Āmid), and had defeated his Arab force near that town (Ibn al-Athīr, x, 86). Two passages in Or. 5,803 (fol. 145, 466 A.H., and 146b, 472 A.H.) seem to refer to this event, but the Oqailid is there wrongly called Qirwāsh. Muslim's defeat is mentioned by Ibn al-'Adīm (Paris, 1,666, 106a) and by Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (Paris, 1,506, 183b), who says that Ibn Jahīr and Ortoq quarrelled over the latter's treatment of Muslim; as to which see also Ibn al-Athīr, loc. cit.

resolute.¹ Thus encouraged the Amīr rejected the Sultan's offer. An adviser such as Abu Sālīm, says the historian, was bound to bring a dynasty to perdition (fols. 147*b*–148*a*). And the end was at hand. Reinforcements arrived from the Sultan under al-Kūhiyāri,² so skilled in the use of the bow that no one dared show himself on the wall; then one of the forts fell, and in Jumāda I, 478, the city submitted. It was pillaged, the Marwānid treasure seized, and Abu Sālīm made prisoner. Āmid had in the meantime fallen to Ibn Jahīr's son Za'im al-Daula, and the whole of Diyār Bakr submitted to Ibn Jahīr.³ He now sent home all the troops except 300 horse, who remained under the Amīr Jabuq, on whom was conferred the fief of Ḥuṣn Ziyād, viz. Khartapirt.⁴

¹ The letter also urged on the Amīr not to give up to Diyār Rabī'a the fortress of معربین (Or. 6,310, 69*b*, مهربین), which Naṣr al-Daula had always refused to give up to Qirwāsh, saying it was the bar (حد) between Diyār Bakr and Diyār Rabī'a. It were preferable to surrender the fortress of Bālūsā, which lay on their boundary (تخم) at the head of the Hirmās river (which flowed past Naṣībīn). These two fortresses do not seem to be noticed by the Arab geographers.

² This name is variously spelt in the two MSS., and in Bodl. Marsh 333, but Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (Paris, 1,506, 189*a*) calls him Sa'd al-Daula, and he is therefore probably identical with Kūharā'in, the officer whose slave captured the Emperor in the victory of 463 (Ibn al-Athīr, x, 44) and who died in 493 (ib., 200). This spelling of the name is confirmed by the fine fourteenth-century MS. of Saljuq history, the Zubdat al-Tawārīkh, B.M. Stowe Or. 7, fol. 30*a*, and by Bundārī, *op. cit.*

³ Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi (Paris, 1,506, 188*b*) attributes the surrender of Āmid to the Christians having forced up the price of grain during the siege, whereupon the Moslems rose and admitted the besiegers. As regards Mayyāfariqīn (ib., 189*a*), he says that the siege dragged owing to a certain chamberlain, who was with Ibn Jahīr as resident agent (Shihna) of the district, taking bribes from the inhabitants. On his death this was discovered, whereupon the besiegers attacked resolutely and the place fell.

⁴ In 489 Jabuq was in the service of Tutush, who compelled his sister to surrender Abu Tāhīr al-Anbāri, who had fled to Khartapirt, by threatening to kill her brother (fol. 153*a*). Jabuq must have died before 500, for in that year his son Muḥammad is called by Ibn al-Athīr the owner of the town. He says that it belonged to a Greek named Apollidorus (افلادروس), who after the invasion of Ibn Jahīr was unable to hold it, and it was taken by Jabuq. And he tells a story how Jabuq and the Greek lord of a neighbouring stronghold aided each other in highway robbery. This begat mutual confidence, and Jabuq sent to ask some of his friend's men to meet him; these he bound and

The Amīr, who was at the Sultan's Court, heard the news of his downfall with indignation; the historian regards it as the natural result of his misguided obstinacy, highly unfitting in one so young. Asked what he would like as compensation, he ejaculated that the dart (Ḥarba) had pierced him through and through. Thereupon the Sultan was told that he was asking for Ḥarba, a place situate in Irāq above Baghdād, and producing a rental of 30,000 Amīriyya dinars, and there the Amīr abode until the death of Malik Shāh (fol. 148*b*).

Ibn Jahīr now proceeded to remove the traces of the siege. The late vizier, Ibn al-Anbārī, was set at liberty and sent to Ḥuṣn Kayfā, where one Yāqūt was governor, and the historian's grandfather, 'Ali b. al-Azraq, was Nāzīr. But Ibn Jahīr reflected that the vizier must have a full knowledge of the Marwānid treasure, and might make inconvenient disclosures to the Court, and he accordingly sent an order for his death. Yāqūt and 'Ali, however, devised a scheme by which Ibn al-Anbārī pretended illness and was declared to have died. A funeral followed, and a duly attested declaration of his death (محرر) was drawn up, which found credit everywhere, and he was kept in concealment until Ibn Jahīr had left the country. The latter now proceeded to seize the Marwānid treasure, and various costly objects are specified by the historian as having been shown to his grandfather by Ibn Jahīr, who explained to him how they had been the cause of the fall of the dynasty. For on the death of Naṣr al-Daula a certain string of pearls and a sword had been claimed, first by Alp Arslān and then by Malik Shāh, and in vain. But Ibn Jahīr said that on the second occasion he spoke strongly

conveyed to the stronghold, where he threatened to kill them unless it and its master were surrendered to him. Those within yielded and opened the gates. Jabuq then flayed his friend and seized his goods (x, 296). Jabuq's successors were deprived of Khartapirt by Nūr al-Daula Būlak b. Bahrām b. Ortoq, who held it against the Franks' attack in 517 A.H. (ib., p. 433). He was ousted by his cousin Shams al-Daula Sulaimān b. ʿĪl Ghāzi during his rule at Mayyāfāriqīn, 516-518 A.H., and on his death it passed to the Ortoqid Da'ūd o Ḥuṣn Kayfā. In Ibn al-Azraq's time it was still the abode of many of Jabuq's descendants (Or. 5,803, 162*b* and 177*a*).

to Nizām al-Mulk, and the expedition was decided on. Asked the value of the treasure, he said that whilst he was vizier to Naṣr al-Daula forty-five single pearls were procured at a cost of 65,000 dinars, and that the whole, exclusive of the Buwaihid gem, represented 215,000 dinars. 'Ali b. al-Azraq conveyed the treasure to Ḥuṣn Kayfā, and then handed it over to a member of the Abu'l-'Aqārib family of Mosul,¹ who conveyed it to 'Amīd al-Daula at Baghdād. In all Ibn Jahīr got in property to the value of one million dinars, and valuables besides. In two years time he was recalled.² He meditated revolt, but felt it was not feasible as his son 'Amīd al-Daula was vizier to the Caliph, so he remained quiescent³ and returned to the Sultan's Court (fol. 149b).

He was succeeded in Diyār Bakr by al-'Amīd Qawām al-Mulk Abu 'Ali al-Balkhi, whose excellent rule recalled the days of Nizām al-Dīn. His only recorded act, however, is the arbitrary conversion of a Nestorian monastery into a mosque in spite of an offer of 50,000 dinars by the Christians if he would desist.⁴ (It was said that a similar project on the part of Ibn Jahīr with regard to this monastery had been averted by a sum of 30,000 dinars.)

The rule of Ibn Jahīr was generally regretted, and a complaint by the people of Arzan against an oppressive governor put over them by Abu 'Ali was the occasion of a deputation of leading persons, including the historian's grandfather, proceeding to the Sultan's Court to procure Abu 'Ali's removal. At first the Sultan refused. But one of the deputies, in an audience with Nizām al-Mulk, whilst admitting the competency of Abu 'Ali, urged that his unpopularity was a source of danger, having regard to their proximity to the Sunāsuna tribe, and the minister seized the pretext of a dispute in the palace between two of the deputies which reached the Sultan's ears, to tell him that

¹ See note *ante*, p. 136.

² In 479 (Ibn al-Athīr, x, 105).

³ بقى يفاصح. This third form is not given in the dictionaries.

⁴ See J.R.A.S., 1902, p. 792, n. 1, where the date 580 should be read 480.

the disputants were men from Diyār Bakr exclaiming against Abu 'Ali. Then, said the Sultan, let him be removed. The vacant office was conferred by Nizām al-Mulk on Abu Ṭāhir al-Anbārī, whose brother, al-Sadīd Abu'l-Ghanā'im, had recently petitioned for his release, asserting that he was, in fact, alive and in prison at Ḥuṣn Kayfā. And he procured his removal thence to Iṣpahān. Abu Ṭāhir now prepared to take up his appointment, but in the meantime 'Amīd al-Daula, the son of Ibn Jahīr, offered to guarantee a revenue of one million dinars for three years' tenure of the office. It was accordingly conferred on him, and the deputation were told to travel home in his company. At this point we are given an example of a really popular wish and of its practical outcome. The party were given an allowance, presumably for the expense of their journey, of 10,000 dirhams, of which 4,000 were for the natives of Mayyāfāriqīn. They, however, being well assured that only the chiefs and the persons of importance would get any of the money, decided to ask the Sultan to remit instead the *مؤنة الغريب و البلدى*, an impost levied on the gardens and vines near the city, on the fruit and vegetable produce, as also on coal and wood. Such a concession (عطا) would benefit all classes alike. Their request was granted, and this new system still prevailed in the author's time throughout Diyār Bakr, Āmid, and Jazīra, whereas elsewhere remissions of taxation continued to benefit only the great (fol. 150a).

Late in the year 482 'Amīd al-Daula arrived in Mayyāfāriqīn, and proved himself to be a good and beneficent governor : اعطاهم المعاش والاعمال.¹ He at once set about getting in the various sums on deposit in the district which belonged to his father, and we are told that to be enabled to do this was his sole object in procuring the post of governor.²

¹ I take this to mean "he procured them means of livelihood and industries."

² It would be interesting to know, not so much whether this was in fact so, but whether it was regarded as probable, and whether in the unchangeable East it would still be so regarded. A late Viceroy of India was preceded in that office, at a generation's interval, by his father. And a friend in practice at the Madras

His father, in the meantime, was engaged in bringing Diyār Rabī'a under obedience to the Sultan, who had named him governor there. He died at Mosul in 483. Late in 484 his son returned to the Sultan's Court at Iṣfahān, and was soon reappointed vizier to the Caliph Muḩtadi. He had left in his place his youngest brother, Kāfi al-Daula Abu'l-Barakāt Juhayyir, but in a few months he too was recalled, and left behind his son Abu'l-ḩasan. In this year, 485, occurred the death of Malik Shāh, which was caused, we are told here, by poison (fol. 151*a*). The arrival of the news caused much excitement at Mayyāfāriqīn. Abu'l-ḩasan at once quitted the residence,¹ and the people sent a letter to Barkiyārūq protesting their allegiance and asking him to come in person or send someone in his stead. But he was occupied with other matters, and the people, after deliberation, chose the Qāḩi Abu Sālim Yaḩya b. al-ḩasan b. al-Majūr, a man of great weight among them, to reside in the palace and govern on the Sultan's behalf. He refused, but they insisted, and forced the city keys on him. Time went on; neither Sultan nor deputy arrived, and at length a party raised their voice for the Marwānid Nāṣir al-Daula Maṣūr, who had left ḩarba and advanced towards Jazīra. Some rejoiced at this, but others, mindful of the beneficent rule of the Sultan and of Ibn Jahir, regretted it, and with the city and walls patrolled by the rabble under the leadership of a local poet, Abu Naṣr Ibn Asad, and no sign from the Sultan, an offer of allegiance was sent to his uncle and rival Tutush b. Alp Arslān, already master of the country as far as Naṣībīn, which he entertained favourably (fol. 151*b*). In the interval the Marwānid Maṣūr gained over Ibn Asad, who, in the absence of all the leading inhabitants, handed over the city to him and was named his vizier. But Tutush had now reached Āmid. On his advance Mayyāfāriqīn surrendered

Bar has told me that the people there readily explained the presence of the German Emperor at the funeral of Her late Majesty for reasons based on the descent, amongst themselves, of property through the female line, equally with the male.

¹ The historian says he saw him at Baghdād in 534, and that he was tall and dark-complexioned with a thin beard, and showed signs of age.

to him in Rabī' I, 486, and Maṣṣūr took refuge in the tent of his adversary's vizier, Abu'l-Munajjim, after five months' rule. Tutuṣh was clement, remitting taxes,¹ and conferring favours on the leading inhabitants. To both Kāfi al-Daula, the son of Ibn Jahīr, and to the late vizier, Abu Ṭāhir b. al-Anbāri, he sent offers of office, and the former arriving first, was appointed vizier, Ibn al-Anbāri being put in charge of Mayyāfāriqīn, and the Mamlūk Ṭuḡhtigīn² being appointed to reside in the palace. Tutuṣh now moved to Ḥarrān, accompanied by Būzān of al-Ruhā and Āq Sunqur of Ḥalab, on his way to encounter Barkiyārūq. At Ḥarrān Ibn Asad, who had been in hiding, approached him with a laudatory ode (one line of which is quoted). One of those present told Tutuṣh who he was, and he was beheaded. This was in 487. In 488 a revolt at Āmid against Ṭuḡhtigīn's deputy was severely repressed. Henceforth this town became politically separate from Mayyāfāriqīn, passing from Tutuṣh's son to the Turkoman Yanāl, and then to his son Fakhr al-Daula Ibrāhīm³ (fols. 152–153). The fate of Ibn Asad had roused the alarm of Ibn al-Anbāri at Mayyāfāriqīn, and he fled with his two sons and his nephew, the son of his brother

¹ The words are (fol. 152*b*):

اسقط عنهم المئونة والاعشار والاقساط والكف جميع البواقي

Sukman al-Quṭbi, of Akhlāt, also remitted taxes when he acquired Mayyāfāriqīn in 502 A.H. The terms used are similar, with the addition (fol. 158*b*):

واسقط دار الضرب واطلق الحشر للسور

Or. 6,310 has (fol. 97*b*) الحشري. And the Ortoqid Najm al-Dīn Īl Ghāzi acted likewise in 512 A.H. (fol. 161*a*):

ازال عنهم الاثقال والاقساط وانزال من دورهم

i.e. the quartering of troops, in Or. 6,310, fol. 101*b*, وزال النزل.

² The first of the line of Atābegs of Damascus; died in 522 (Ibn al-Athīr, x, 459).

³ In Or. 6,310, 95*b*, which is followed by Ibn Shaddād (op. cit., 121*b*), Āmid is said to have passed, on the death of Tutuṣh, to the Amīr Ṣādar, then to his brother Yanāl, then to Fakhr al-Daula Ibrāhīm, then to his son Sa'd al-Daula Īdari (died 536), and then to his son Jamāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who was still reigning in 560 A.H., the date of the work. Ibn al-Athīr (x, 296) says that Āmid was granted to Ibrāhīm by Tutuṣh when he seized Diyār Bakr.

Abu'l-Ghanā'im, to the fortress of al-Hattākḥ, his brother, who remained behind, being arrested by Ṭuḡhtigīn. Thence he fled to Ḥuṣn Ziyād, whose owner, Jabuq (*ante*, p. 147, n. 4), was in Tutuṣh's camp, and he, by threatening to kill Jabuq, forced his sister to hand over the fugitive and his eldest son to him at Shimshāt, near Malatīyya, where he had them both executed in Jumāda II, 489. Their heads were sent to Mayyāfāriqīn, where Abu'l-Ghanā'im was also executed, after refusing the offer of a cup of water so that he might die fasting. And for some time a light was observed at night-time on their grave.¹ The surviving son and nephew were conveyed to Baghdād, where the latter, Sadīd al-Daula Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Anbāri, attained to high official rank in the service of the Caliphate (see J.R.A.S., 1902, p. 788). In 492 he had his relatives' remains conveyed to Baghdād and buried near the shrine of the Straw Gate in the Quraish cemetery near the two Imāms.² It was from him that the historian, when at Baghdād in 534 A.H., derived his information about their fate.

Tutuṣh, in the meantime, having been compelled to retire before the army of Barkiyārūq owing to the defection of Būzān and Āq Sunqur, had returned to Syria (see Ibn al-Athīr, x, 151), where in the following year, 487, he wreaked his vengeance on them both (*ib.*, 157). But within a year (*ib.*, 157) he was himself killed in battle with Barkiyārūq at the gate of al-Rayy, and by the hand of one of Būzān's Mamluks.³ The death of the last ruler of the Marwānid dynasty soon followed. Manṣūr died at Jazīra in 489, according to Ibn al-Athīr (x, 184), though the date given in

¹ Whilst giving due weight to this phenomenon, it is permissible to remember that it was by the advice of this vizier, Ibn al-Anbāri, that Nizām al-Dīn entrapped his enemy, at the cost of the life of his brothers who had gone hostage for his word. See *ante*, p. 144.

² See "Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate," by G. Le Strange, p. 160.

³ In the text Tutuṣh is reported as saying to his prisoners: "I have done you no injury: I had Damascus, and you two had al-Ruhā and Ḥalab." In Ibn al-Athīr, as also in the biography of Āq Sunqur given by Ibn al-'Adīm in the *Buḡḥyat al-Talab* (Recueil Hist. Crois. Or., iii, 709), the dialogue is between Tutuṣh and Āq Sunqur only; the latter admits he would if victorious have killed his adversary, and is told that he has pronounced his own doom. And Tutuṣh is said to have been killed by a mamlūk of Āq Sunqur (see vol. x, 151, 157, 166-7).

Or. 5,803, 154*a*, and also in Or. 6,310, 83*b*, is 486. He was buried by his wife, the daughter of his uncle Sa'id, at Āmid, at a spot overlooking the Tigris.¹ The Marwānid dynasty had ruled from 380 down to the invasion of Ibn Jahir in 479, and the historian calculates that Manṣūr's five months rule in 486 completed the century.

But though the dynasty had passed away the stock was far from exhausted. No descendants of Manṣūr are mentioned,² but his brothers and uncles left issue, and there were also lines of cousins descended from Kaka b. Marwān, no doubt the fourth son of Marwān, whose name was omitted on fol. 122*a* (see p. 124). Their pedigrees are deduced by the historian (fols. 154–156); of some of them he gives particulars,³ and it is probable that at his date (572 A.H.) and long afterwards there were many who traced their descent from the aged couple whom we left spending their closing days at Arzan beside their murdered sons' grave.

¹ Ibn al-Athīr says that he had been seized by Jaqarmish, the ruler of Jazīra ibn 'Omar, and that he died there in the house of a Jew. He says, too, that Manṣūr was noted for his avarice (vol. x, 174).

² Ibn al-Athīr mentions a son of his as accompanying the Turkoman Mūsa from Ḥuṣn Kayfā to Mosul in 495 (vol. x, 235).

³ One of them, Aḥmad b. Niẓām al-Dīn, was, he says, skilled in horses, and the composer of well-known Maqāmāt. Whilst serving the Sultan Muḥammad at Mosul he fell a prisoner to the Franks. During his captivity he had a son born to him, Muḥammad al-Afrangi. On regaining his liberty he became ruler of Ṭanzah, and later of al-Hattākḥ, which he seized during the weak government of al-Ruzbaki at Mayyāfāriqīn, 516–518 A.H. (fol. 160*a*), and had other sons born to him. One day arrived his son Muḥammad with a token of identity which his mother had given him on attaining manhood, telling him who his father was. Later, an outburst of anger on the part of Aḥmad caused Muḥammad to wander away outside the place, and he was no more heard of. He had two sons who in the author's time were in the service of the Ortoqid ruler of Māridīn. Of Aḥmad's other sons, Bahrām, in 528, managed to oust his father, who then went and took service under Ḥusām al-Dīn Timurtāsh, the Ortoqid ruler of Māridīn. In 529 Bahrām was supplanted by a brother, 'Īsa, whereupon Aḥmad claimed to have al-Hattākḥ restored to himself, and on 'Īsa refusing, he made it over to Ḥusām al-Dīn, who, in 530, attacked and took it. 'Īsa removed to Āmid and entered the service of the Ortoqid of Ḥuṣn Kayfā, where he was still living in 572 (fols. 154*b*–155*a*). The capture of al-Hattākḥ is recorded also on fol. 168*a*, under 530. Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 43) mentions its capture in 532 as marking the disappearance of the last vestige of Marwānid rule.