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INTRODUCTION

The precursor of this present book, *The Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Handbook*, was published by Edinburgh University Press in 1967 as no. 5 in the *Islamic Surveys* series, and speedily established itself as a convenient reference work for the chronology of Islamic dynasties of the Middle Eastern and North African heartlands and of Central and South Asia and for their historical backgrounds. It has proved useful not only for Islamic historians but also for Islamic art historians and numismatists. Nevertheless, all these groups of scholars remain much less well provided with such Hilfsmittel as chronologies of events, genealogical tables, historical atlases, etc., than their colleagues in the fields of British or European history.\(^1\) Some of the subsequent writers of general histories of the Islamic world or its component regions and peoples, and writers of reference works covering the world in general or the Islamic lands in particular, who have given lists of dynasties and rulers, have obviously drawn upon the original *Islamic Dynasties* – sometimes with due acknowledgement,\(^2\) sometimes not.

To my knowledge, four translations into East European and Middle Eastern languages have been made. In 1971, there appeared in Moscow an authorised translation by P. A. Gryaznevich, under the overall editorship of I. P. Petrushevskiy, *Musulmanskie dynastii. Spravochnik po khronologii i genealogii*, Izdatel’stvo «Nauka» Glavnaya Redaktsiya Vostochnoi Literaturi, 324 pp., to which I contributed a Preface. The text is a straight translation, but the bibliographical indications at the end of each dynasty’s entry have been enriched by references to works in Russian, obviously valuable for such regions as the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Iranian world in general. In 1980, there appeared in Istanbul *İslâm devletleri tarihi (kronoloji ve soykütügüelkitabi)*, Oğuz Press, xxvii + 385 pp., an authorised Turkish translation by Erdoğan Merçil and Mehmet İpşirli. This has additional material in that Dr Merçil appended an additional, eleventh chapter ‘Anadolu beylikleri’ dealing in detail with the principalities of Anatolia
during the interim between the decay of the Rūm Seljuqs and the rise of the Ottomans. I have, in fact, drawn upon this useful additional chapter for my own, widely expanded Chapter Twelve ‘The Turks in Anatolia’. In 1371/1982 there appeared Silsilahā-yi Islāmī, an unauthorised Persian translation by one Farīdūn Badra’ī, Mu’assasa-yi Mutāla’at wa Tahqīqāt Farhangī, 358 pp. In 1994, there appeared at Kuwait an authorised Arabic translation by the late Husayn ‘Alī al-Lubūdī, under the general supervision of Dr Sulaymān Ibrāhīm al-‘Askarī, al-Usar al-hākima fī ’l-Islām. Dirāsa fī ’l-ta’rīkh wa ’l-ansāb, Mu’assasat al-Shirā‘ al-‘ Arabī, 293 pp.

The original book is thus still proving useful in these parts of the world through translations, although the Edinburgh University Press original is now out of print in both the original hardback and the paperback versions (the latter, of 1980, contained some slight corrections, all that the process of largely verbatim reproduction allowed). But well before the book became finally out of print, I had been noting corrections and gathering fresh information for a new, considerably expanded version. It would be strange if the explosion of knowledge over the last thirty years had not brought much fresh information for the Islamic chronologist and genealogist, from such disciplines as historical research, epigraphy and numismatics. Much of the relevant information is, however, scattered, and, in regard to epigraphy and numismatics in particular, often appears in the local publications of the countries concerned and is not easily accessible in Britain and Western Europe. I have nevertheless endeavoured, with assistance and advice from specialist colleagues and friends (who are detailed and appropriately thanked at the end of this Introduction), to incorporate as much of this new information as possible, though certain periods and areas remain – and perhaps always will remain – dark.

Most obvious to the reader of this present book will be the fact that it is much bigger than the 1967 book. There are now seventeen chapters, covering 186 dynasties, whereas the original Islamic Dynasties had only ten chapters, covering 82 dynasties. The new or vastly expanded chapters include ones dealing with Muslim Spain, with much more detailed coverage of the Mulfūk al-Tawā’if (Chapter Two); the Arabian peninsula, again with much greater detail (Chapter Six); West Africa, and East Africa and the Horn of Africa, both entirely new chapters (Chapters Seven and Eight); the Turks of Anatolia, now with detailed coverage of the Beyliks there (Chapter Twelve); Central Asia after the Mongols, a substantially new chapter which includes
the Khanates arising there out of the Turco-Mongol domination of Inner Asia and persisting until the extension of Russian imperial power through Central Asia (Chapter Fifteen); Afghanistan and the Indian Subcontinent, with increased coverage of, for example, the Sultanates of the Deccan and the Indian dynasties of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Chapter Sixteen); and South-East Asia and Indonesia, again dealing with an entirely new region (Chapter Seventeen). But apart from these ones specifically mentioned, virtually all chapters are enlarged to some extent or other.

Thus the coverage of the new book approaches much more closely to coverage of the whole Islamic world, from Senegal to Borneo, than did the 1967 book, since it has often in the past been noted that works purporting to deal with Islam or the Islamic world have tended to concentrate on the Arab-Persian-Turkish heartlands to the neglect of the fringes, even though such peripheral regions as South and South-East Asia and Indonesia now contain the majority of Muslim peoples. Yet somewhat in extenuation of this concentration in the past on the heartlands, it must be admitted that the historian and chronologist of the peripheries is on much shakier ground. The heartlands have been long Islamised; many of their lands possess ancient historiographical traditions, with reliable dynastic histories and clearly-dated coins inscribed with a plethora of information on names and titulature. Whereas in regions far from the heartlands such as sub-Saharan Africa, South-East Asia and Indonesia, there may well be a care for local tribal or dynastic traditions, their recording in clearly-dated written form has nevertheless been patchy, and the task of making such records has often been complicated by attempts, of a mythic nature, to prove the ancient reception of the Islamic faith by families and classes ruling over lands and subjects which remained largely pagan for lengthy periods subsequently. The coinage of such ruling strata is nearly always much less complete in dated series, and in actual information on the coins, than for the Islamic heartlands and the Indian Subcontinent. The difficulties involved in constructing king-lists and chronologies in such circumstances may be discerned below, with reference to, for example, the kings of Songhay (no. 59), the rulers of Kanem and Bornu (no. 60), the Sultans of Kilwa (no. 62) and the Sultans of Brunei (no. 186).

Even so, the position in such a region, comparatively near to the heartlands, as early Islamic Central Asia is far from crystal-clear. Zambaur confessed seventy years ago regarding the Qarakhanids of Transoxania and eastern
Turkestan that this was ‘la seule grande dynastie musulmane dont la généalogie est restée obscure’ (Manuel, 206 n. 1). Much elucidation has meanwhile come from such scholars as Omeljan Pritsak and Elena A. Davidovich, but significant problems remain, the substantially increased numbers of coins now finding their way from Central Asia and Afghanistan to the West since the demise of the USSR may possibly resolve some of these remaining obscurities.

In the Introduction to the 1967 book, I traced the development of Islamic chronological and genealogical studies and listings from Stanley Lane-Poole’s seminal The Mohammadan Dynasties (1893), through the more specific work of F. Justi in his Iranisches Namenbuch (1895) and the expansions and improvements upon Lane-Poole by W. Barthold in his Musulmanskiy dynastii (1899), E. Sachau in his ‘Ein Verzeichnis Muhammedanischer Dynastien’ (1923), and Khalīl Ed’hem in his Düwel-i Islāmiyye (1345/1927), to E. de Zambaur’s almost entirely new and monumental Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l’histoire de l’Islam (1927). It does not seem necessary to repeat here all these details, except to note that no-one has attempted since the publication of Zambaur’s work to update it as a whole; although a stupendous work for its time, its inaccuracies and erroneous renderings of names appear more and more obvious with the lapse of time.

I opined in 1967 that such an updating and rewriting could probably only be done as a cooperative effort by historians who are specialists in various sectors of the Islamic world, aided by epigraphists and numismatists. The prospects of such a collaboration seem no nearer in 1995 than they did twenty-nine years ago. Hence my New Islamic Dynasties, here presented to the scholarly world, does not aim at such overall completeness as Zambaur essayed (although he did not in fact achieve it; his attempts at covering dynasties in sub-Saharan Africa, the Indian Ocean islands and Indonesia were fragmentary and feeble to the point of uselessness); but I think I may venture to say that it represents as extensive a coverage of Islamic dynasties as one person is likely to achieve in our present day. I have endeavoured to cover what might be termed the first, second and third ranks of dynasties and to give as up-to-date and accurate information on them as possible. There remains the fourth rank and beyond, and readers may well have pet dynasties and ruling houses in which they are especially interested and which they consider ought to have been included. I can only plead that one must draw the
line somewhere, and that I have left plenty of opportunities for other researchers; such readers might, for instance, care to get their teeth into elucidating the Sudūr of Bukhara, the Wālīs of Badakhshān, the Khāns of Sibir, the sultans of the Sulu archipelago and the Moro rulers of Mindanāo in the southern Philippines, etc. Moreover, an extensive field remains open for future scholars, one which Zambaur tackled valiantly and to some extent successfully, namely that of elucidating the lines of viziers to the rulers of such dynasties as the Abbāsids, the Fātimids, the Būyids, the Great Seljuqs and their related branches, and the Ottomans. Zambaur also set forth the series of provincial governors in the amsar or military concentration-points of the Arab caliphate, and he tentatively envisaged a second edition of his Manuel (which never appeared, although the author did not die until 1941) in which he would tackle the local governors of a host of other cities of the east, such as Tabriz, Isfahan, Hamadhan, Marw, Bukhara and Samarkand. Certainly, in regard to the viziers, our increased knowledge of the ‘Abbāsid and Seljuq vizierates, for instance, and the chronological researches of such Turkish scholars as İsmail Hami Danişmendli in his İzahlı Osmanlı tarihi kronolojisi, Istanbul 1947–71, in regard to the Ottoman viziers, should enable fuller and more accurate lists to be compiled, above all, of the innumerable, rapidly-changing Ottoman viziers. Similarly, the publication of many texts out of the rich genre of local histories, which has flourished in the Iranian and Central Asian lands from classical times virtually until the present day, would enable us to reconstruct the history and chronology of the ruling strata in many of the cities mentioned above by Zambaur.

A feature of Lane-Poole’s The Mohammadan Dynasties was the short historical account of each dynasty prefixed to its relevant entry, accounts which, he said,

> do not attempt to relate the internal history of each dynasty: they merely show its place in relation to other dynasties, and trace its origin, its principal extensions, and its downfall; they seek to define the boundaries of its dominions, and to describe the chief steps in its aggrandisement and in its decline, (p. vi)

Zambaur agreed that ‘Il eût été agréable de trouver, en tête de chaque dynastie, un aperçu succinct de ses origines, de son développement et de sa fin’, but, for reasons of space and economy, renounced ‘ses introductions qui forment un attrait séduisant du livre de M. St. Lane-Poole’ (Manuel, p. vii). Nevertheless, the accounts here of Lane-Poole were most useful, especially in
pre-Encyclopaedia of Islam days, and have still seemed to me eminently desirable for a work on Islamic dynastic chronology. A bare list of rulers and their dates would admittedly be of use to specialist Islamic historians and numismatists, who would know where to look for historical information on the dynasties in question (though this might well take them down some obscure pathways). But historical introductions to the dynasties seem to me essential for students and non-specialists. My own aim, as in 1967, has been similar to that of Lane-Poole: not so much to give a potted history as to place the dynasty in the broad context of Islamic history; to outline some of the major trends of its period; and, where relevant, to indicate some of the dynasty’s achievements. I have tried to make the bibliographical references at the end of each section fuller than in the 1967 book. As well as including works specifically useful for illuminating the chronology and titulature of the dynasty, I have given references to a series of general works dealing with the dynasty concerned, and to a selection at least of specific studies, where such general works and special studies exist. But the references here are not meant to be in any way exhaustive, nor are they meant to replace the detailed information available in the bibliographies to the various dynasties in the new edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam entries, or set forth in the latest French version [Introduction à l’histoire du monde musulman médiéval VIIe-XVe siècle. Méthodologie et éléments de bibliographie, Paris 1982] of the late Claude Cahen’s refonte, expansion and updating of Jean Sauvaget’s Introduction à l’histoire de l’Orient Musulman: éléments de bibliographie (with additions and corrections, Paris 1946) (English version, unfortunately with rather more cursory bibliographical references, Introduction to the History of the Muslim East: A Bibliographical Guide, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1965). Also, there has very recently appeared États, sociétés et cultures du monde musulman médiéval XVe-XVIe siècles, Tome 1, Paris 1995, written by a team of specialists (Jean-Claude Gargin, Michel Ballivet, Thierry Bianquis, Henri Bresc, Jean Calmard, Marc Gaborieau, Pierre Guichard and Jean-Louis Triaud) and containing a very extensive section Les outils de travail with up-to-date bibliographical references, maps and genealogical tables (pp. vii-ccxi). For the more recent history of the Islamic lands, there are also bibliographical references in general histories such as Ira Lapidus’s A History of Islamic Societies (Cambridge 1988) and in such encyclopaedic works as Francis Robinson, Atlas of the Islamic World since 1500, Oxford 1982; Trevor Mostyn and Albert Hourani (eds), The Cambridge
Encyclopedia of the Middle East and North Africa, Cambridge 1988; Francis Robinson (ed.), The Cambridge History of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Cambridge 1989; and John L. Esposito (ed.), The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World, Oxford 1995. These are all recently published and contain presumably up-to-date bibliographical information. For the classical period of Islamic history, however, such works mentioned above as those of Lapidus, and of Robinson in his Atlas of the Islamic World (whose timespan covers both the later mediaeval and the modern periods), can profitably be consulted, but it is a matter of alphabetical chance whether the entry in the new edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam dates from the late 1940s or 1950s, when the second edition was conceived and first published (as in the case of, for example, the ‘Abbasids and the Büyids), or from the last few years (as in the case, for example, of the Mamlūks, the Mughals, the Ottomans and the Safawids). If the former, then the bibliographical references are distinctly out of date, and I have endeavoured here to supply some more recent ones.

Since various numismatic colleagues have, over the years, told me how useful they have found the 1967 book, it has seemed to that more information might be included in this new book for the numismatist. The study of coins, and the information which their legends yield on titulature, accession dates, periods of power, extent of territories ruled over, etc., have long been recognised as constituting an invaluable ancillary discipline for the Islamic dynastic and political historian (and equally, for different reasons, for the economic and social one).

I have tried to use, wherever possible, numismatic evidence in compiling the present lists of rulers and their dates, and have listed significant numismatic sources in the bibliographies for each dynasty where such sources exist. Also, as an innovatory feature of the present book, in the dynastic lists I have marked those rulers who issued coins, following the convention established by Zambaur in his Manuel of prefixing a small circle to their dates and name, in the hope that this will be a worthwhile extra feature for the numismatist and historian alike. In general, I have disregarded the numismatic information given by Zambaur, which was not free from coin misattributions, and have derived my own information, where possible, from coin catalogues, the various studies on the coinages of specific dynasties, such as exist, for example, for the Idrīsids, the Spanish Muslim dynasties, the Fāatimids, the Ayyūbids and the Mamlūks, and from the monthly lists of coins offered for sale by Mr Stephen Album of Santa Rosa, California. I am
aware of the difficulties involved in deciding whether a specific dynasty or ruler issued its or his own coins, with personal names and titles on them, or whether a ruler was content to issue coins in the name of his suzerain, as were, for example, the Beys of Tunis up to the later nineteenth century, the Qaramānlī governors of Tripoli, and the rulers from the house of Muhammad ‘Alī in Egypt until the early twentieth century, all of which rulers for long minted coins in the names of their suzerains (however nominal this suzerainty might ultimately become), the Ottoman Sultan-Caliphs. On the whole, I have tended to regard only those coins with the full names and titles of the actual minting authority as evidence for the independent issue of coins by the dynasty or ruler in question, but am conscious that some inconsistencies may have crept in here.

Following Lane-Poole, I have given dates in both the Muslim Hijrī and the Christian eras. It should be noted by those unfamiliar with the Muslim system of dating that the pre-Islamic Arabs used a lunar calendar of twelve months (because observation of the moon’s phases was the only possible basis for time-reckoning in a desert environment) with intercalation (nasī‘) of an extra month every two or three years in order to keep some relation with the solar year and with the rhythm of the agricultural seasons, and in order to fix the great annual fairs of Arabia at the same time each year. The Prophet Muhammad introduced a lunar year, forbidding intercalation and thus throwing the old Arabian system out of gear. It was the second caliph ‘Umar b. al-Khattāb who tactfully regulated the system. He decreed that the lunar year of twelve months should continue, beginning it now, however, on the first day of the Arabian year in which Muhammad had made his Hijra or migration from Mecca to Medina, namely 16 July AD 622. Furthermore, ‘Umar added days to the alternate lunar months, and also an additional day to the final month of the year every three years (such a leap year being called a sana kabīsa). Thus the lunar year normally consisted of 354 days grouped into twelve months alternately of twenty-nine and thirty days, but, in a kabīsa year, it consisted of 355 days. The Hijrī months therefore do not correspond with the four seasons of the year, as do the Christian Gregorian or the Jewish months, but begin slightly earlier, by approximately eleven days each solar year. For instance, the month of Ramadān 1387 began on 3 December 1967. Because of the eleven days’ disparity, the next Ramadān began on 22 November 1968. It is taking about thirty-two and a half Christian-era years before Ramadān will begin again in early December (in fact, 9 December
1999 = 1 Ramadān 1420). In this way, the 100 years in a Muslim-era century are approximately equal to ninety-seven Christian years.

It has been difficult and tedious to convert quickly from Christian to Hijrī dates and vice versa by arithmetical means, so recourse has traditionally been made to conversion tables.\(^5\) (The present availability of instantaneous computer programs for converting dates now makes this easy for the scholar sitting in his study with a computer, but tables in book form will doubtless continue to be the most convenient way of finding equivalents for the traveller or the worker in the field viewing such epigraphic texts as inscriptions on tombstones or dedications on buildings.) In fact, a shifting lunar calendar has obvious disadvantages for the fixing of recurrent agricultural operations or financial transactions, and solar calendars soon came into use in the Islamic world for these practical purposes. Today, most of the Islamic world follows the European Gregorian calendar for purely secular and everyday purposes. Iran and Afghanistan, however, have since the earlier decades of the twentieth century used a solar Hijrī year, namely one having as its starting point the year of Muhammad’s Hijra (AD 622) but calculated thereafter on a solar basis. However, the primary records for Islamic history up to the nineteenth century (and, in certain regions, into the twentieth century), whether written in manuscripts and produced in the shape of early printed or lithographed books, or in numismatic and epigraphic legends, are almost invariably dated in the Hijrī system, so that dates of accessions, deaths, durations of reigns, etc., are here given in it.

Since the Christian and Muslim years hardly ever correspond, it follows that it is impossible to give equivalent Christian dates for historical events in the Islamic world with complete accuracy unless the month and day of the Hijrī year are known (strictly speaking, one needs also to know the exact time of day for an event, given the fact that Muslims, like Jews, calculated the beginning of a day not from midnight but from sunset on the previous evening). But although some mediaeval Islamic historians were remarkably accurate over the pinpointing of events, others were not, and might give only the year of an occurrence; inscriptions are usually exactly dated, but coins only occasionally give the month of their minting. Hence in this book, I have followed two basic principles in giving the Christian equivalent of Muslim dates (and in a very few cases – see below -when giving the Muslim equivalent of Christian dates).

First, where possible I have ascertained from my sources the exact day, or
at least the month, of the event during the year in question, and have converted to the Christian era on this basis. Zambaur gave only Muslim-era dates, with citation of the exact day and month where possible, and did not give Christian-era equivalents; Lane-Poole gave dates in both eras, and explained that his basic principle was to cite the Christian year in which the Hijrī year in question began, except that when the Hijrī year began towards the close of a Christian year he gave the following AD year (*The Mohammadan Dynasties*, p. vii n. *), and this he regarded as adequate for practical purposes. Second, where exact information on the day or month is lacking in my sources, I have simply taken the equivalent Christian year as the one in which the greater part of the Muslim year fell; and if the Muslim year began halfway through the Christian year (i.e. at the end of June or the beginning of July), I have taken the Christian year as the one in which the first half of the Muslim year fell. As with Lane-Poole’s system, the equivalents arrived at this way are clearly not always going to be right, but this procedure seems to me in the present context preferable to the cumbersome citation of two Christian years. Thus I have written 741/1340 instead of the more exact 741/1340–1.

The difficulties of correctly setting forth the Christian- and Muslim-era dates are one thorny aspect of Islamic chronology. Another one arises from the often confused circumstances of rulers’ succession to power. The great Arabic chroniclers, such as al-Tabarī and Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr (on the latter of whom Zambaur relied heavily for his dating of pre-thirteenth-century dynasties of the Middle Eastern heartlands – cf. his *Manuel*, pp. v-vi), were often wonderfully exact in recording dates, on occasion down to the very time of day when events occurred; but, when one goes out beyond the major dynasties of the heartlands, sources often grow sparse and at times barely exist. Sometimes the literary evidence contradicts that of coin legends and of inscriptions; in this connection, it is well known that such monetary and epigraphic texts do not always reflect reality but might be struck or carved for tendentious, propaganda purposes, and hence be at variance with what was really happening. Even when all the relevant dates are known, it may be difficult to decide which one to choose as an exact accession date. In mediaeval Christendom, the actual accession of a monarch was usually followed by a formal coronation. In mediaeval England, it came to involve both the secular and religious sealing of approval (the Recognition and the Anointing, followed by the Crowning), and the whole act might take place
several months after actual accession (in regard to Edgar of Mercia during Anglo-Saxon times, fourteen years later!). The Islamic equivalent of such a ceremony was the official offering by the great men of state and representatives of the religious institution of the bay’ā, literally ‘hand clasping’ (cf. the mediaeval European manumissio), by which fealty was pledged (the act of mubāya’ā). Or such pledging might take place at the formal ceremony of julūs, the ruler’s ‘seating’ on his throne (‘arsh, sarīr), often accompanied by his publicly taking up and flourishing such insignia of royalty as a sword (al-taqlīd bi ʿl-sayf, in Ottoman Turkish qīlīc qushanmasi), or a sceptre/rod (qadīb, khayzurān) or staff (ʿasā), in the case of the Umayyad and ‘Abbāsid caliphs, with whom the rod or staff in question was assumed to be a legacy from the Prophet Muhammad himself. The date when a claimant first seized power, occupying the capital or a major part of the kingdom, would obviously be anterior to such ceremonies; is this, then, to be considered as the start of a reign? Also, among the early Ottomans, up to c. AD 1600, for instance, there was often a slight interregnum between the death of a sultan, during which the throne was technically unoccupied, and the new incumbent taking the throne. The demise of the previous ruler was meanwhile concealed from the public until the heir to the throne, the walīʾl’ahd, could return from his provincial governorship and assume power in the capital, the great fear being of an outbreak of disorder and civil strife between rival claimants. Moreover, a first julūs might be followed by a second ceremony, as sometimes happened among the Il Khānids of Persia, when the Great Khān in distant Qaraqorum or Peking signified his approval and assent to the succession to power of the provincial Khāns, his theoretical subordinates; thus the Il Khān Arghun was enthroned in 683/1284 after the execution of his uncle Ahmad Tegüder, but a second ceremony took place twenty months later in 685/1286 when a yarligh or document containing the Great Khan Qubilay’s agreement had arrived.

Nor can one always rely on having Hijrī dates available for constructing a dynastic chronology. Several of the dates of the Nasrid kings of Granada during the last century of that dynasty’s existence, the fifteenth century, are known only from Castilian Spanish chronicles, coins being known for only a few of the rulers of that time. For the chronology of some of the minor states of the Indian Ocean shores, peninsular India, Malaysia and Indonesia, Portuguese and then Dutch and British historical information is important. West African dynasties like Mali, Songhay and the sultans in Hausaland
often handed down king-lists which have to be correlated, as far as possible, with the Hijrī dates.

Yet another difficulty in setting down the names of rulers in a consistent yet intelligible form arises from the complex system of Arabic and Islamic nomenclature, especially where rulers and great men of state were concerned. As well as the given name (ism) - these names being rather limited in number – all Muslims (even children, before they could biologically become fathers or mothers) could have a patronymic (kunya), composed of Abū ‘father of …’ or Umm ‘mother of …’. They might further have a nisba, indicating profession, religious or legal affiliation, place of origin of the holder or of his family, etc., for example al-Sarrāj ‘the saddler’, al-Hanafī ‘follower of the law school of Abū Hanīfa’, al-Dimashqī ‘the man from Damascus’, etc. Any Muslim might also have a nickname (nabaz, laqab), such as Ta’abbata Sharran ‘he who carries an evil under his arm’, or al-Akhtal ‘having a fleshy and pendulous ear, a cauliflower ear’. Additionally, as time went on, the ruler himself, and members of the ruling classes, military or civilian, would almost certainly have an honorific title or nickname, also called a laqab, for example Dhu ‘1-Riyāsatayn ‘possessor of the two functions [civil and military]’ or Jalāl al-Dawla ‘exalted one of the state’. Any one or other of all these elements might be the one by which a person was generally or best known (his or her shuhra), and the shuhras of mediaeval times might not always be the ones by which a person is best known today; thus classical Arabic sources more often refer to the poet al-Mutanabbī by his kunya of Abu ‘1-Tayyib.

From the tenth century AD onwards, honorific titles of this type began to proliferate among the holders of power, eventually extending to religious scholars and literary figures, with an inevitable cheapening of their significance. The study of this titulature is a fascinating one for the historian or epigrapher or numismatist, and can often throw significant light on historical events and trends. But the piling-up of increasingly grandiloquent honorifics in the titulature of a single ruler poses problems for the Islamic chronologer. Not infrequently, these titles become so long-winded and numerous that a choice has to be made: which one(s) to include in a book such as the present one? One factor involved is the question of the names by which a ruler was and still is best known. In some instances, the choice is easy; thus Mahmūd of Ghazna is best known as holder of the laqab Yamīn al-Dawla. For others, the choice is less obvious. In the 1967 *Islamic Dynasties*, I tended to give simplified versions of long strings of titles, setting
down the one or ones which seemed to me the most familiar and the most significant for identification and differentiation purposes. In the *New Islamic Dynasties*, I have been more generous in recording honorifics; and, as well as giving the *ism* in the first place, I have always added the *kunya*, where known, and have endeavoured to display the *nasab* or string of filiation for at least one generation back, for example Ahmad b. al-Hasan, or for more than one generation back when this is necessary for clarity or identificatory purposes, for example Ahmad b. al-Hasan b. Ja‘far. This should in many cases enable the construction of a *nasab* for a dynasty, always assuming that there is father-son or grandfather-son or ruler-brother, etc., succession. Of course, such neat succession is far from general in Islam, and questions of succession might frequently be settled by the interposition of the sword. Also, at the outset of the new faith and society, there still survived the feeling that the inheritance of power should be by any capable male relative within a clan or family; only with the ‘Abbāsid caliphs did father-son succession become more usual, though by no means universal. When Turkish and then Turco-Mongol dynasties appeared in later mediaeval times, tribal customs and a patrimonial conception of the sharing of power often led to succession not necessarily by a son but possibly by other members of the ruling family. When this occurred within a dynasty, I have tried to indicate the relationship of the new ruler to his predecessor by giving the kin connection, where this is known.

Clearly, the ideal would be to have genealogical tables, as had Lane-Poole, Barthold, Zambaur and Khalīl Ed’hem. Alas, the days when publishers were willing to lavish space and to swallow the typographical complications involved in the construction of genealogical stemmas, let alone to countenance hand-inserted fold-out tables, are now past. The attempt which I have made to show genealogical filiation by giving two or more terms in a *nasab* represents a second-best compared with the provision of spaciously set-out tables, but I hope that my practice here will go some way to obviate the sort of criticism made, with some justice, of the 1967 book, that it was a chronological handbook but not a genealogical one.

The Arabic-type names of the early lines of rulers in the Arabic heartlands of the Middle East and North Africa present the problems of arrangement and choice touched upon above. The Iranian names found among many of the Kurdish, Daylamī and Caucasian dynasties which rose to prominence during what the late V. Minorsky called ‘the Iranian intermezzo’ of the tenth to the
twelfth centuries AD at times present problems where dialectical and hypocoristic forms of names are involved; here, recourse to such a work as Justi’s *Iranisches Namenbuch* is available. From the eleventh century onwards, dynasties of Turkish military slave or tribal origin, followed by Turco-Mongol ones from the thirteenth century onwards, rapidly spread across the northern tier of the Islamic world of Western and South Asia and of North Africa, so that rulers of Turkish origin eventually ruled most of the Islamic lands between Algiers in the west and Bengal and Assam in the east, extending as far south as Yemen in the Arabian peninsula and the Deccan in South India. The rendering of the Turkish names by which many of these holders of power were known involves yet more problems, for these names often appear in Arabic script in deformed, at times barely recognisable, versions. I have set down the correct Turkish and Mongol forms where this has been ascertainable; but, where there is considerable divergence between them and the Arabic orthography, this last is noted in parentheses, thus Hülegü (Hūlākū), Öljeytü (Ūljāytū), Negūbey (Nīkpāy). However, I have left the familiar transliteration of the Turkish name Tīmūr as applied to the great conqueror, although the more correct rendering Temūr is used for other possessors of this name, as in, for example, Toqay Temūrids. Where Ottoman Turkish pronunciation of Arabic names produced forms somewhat divergent from the standard Arabic pronunciation of these names, these are likewise noted in parentheses, thus Muhammad (Mehemmed), ‘Uthmān (‘Othmān), Bāyazīd (Bāyezīd), Sulaymān (Süleymān). For the dynasties of sub-Saharan West and East Africa, the renderings of Arabic names in the indigenous languages have often been followed, thus Bukaru for Abū Bakr, Alīyu for ‘Ālī. A similar procedure for the names of some of the Malaysian and Indonesian dynasties has been adopted.

I have attempted to make the indexes as full as possible, in order to facilitate identifying rulers, with cross-referencing where necessary; and I have further given standard, Europeanised forms such as Saladin and Tamerlane.

There remains the pleasant task of thanking various colleagues who have patiently answered queries or provided information from their own special fields in Islamic history. They include Professor Barbara Watson Andaya (Indonesia and Malaysia); Dr Mohamed Ben Madani (the Beys of Tunis); Professor A. D. H. Bivar (West Africa); Dr Peter Carey (Java); Dr E. van Donzel (Harar); Professor Antonio Fernández-Puertas (Muslim Spain); Dr
Greville Freeman-Grenville (East Africa); Dr Peter Jackson (the Delhi Sultanate); Professor Irfan Habib (the Nawwābs of Bengal); Professor Alexander Knysh (post-Mongol Central Asia); Dr David Morgan (the Mongols); Professor Giovanni Oman (Sicily); Dr C. E. R. Pennell (Indonesia and Malaysia); Dr Muhammad Yusuf Siddiq (Bengal); and Professor G. Rex Smith (the Arabian peninsula). For help on numismatics, I am equally indebted to Mr Stephen Album, Mrs Helen Mitchell Brown, Dr J. Leyten and Mr William F. Spengler. Such libraries as the John Rylands University Library at Manchester, the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, the Indian Institute Library, Oxford, and the Heberden Coin Room Library in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, have provided much of the background literature. Dr Freeman-Grenville has also provided much wisdom in the thorny field of eras and chronology. Finally, it is a pleasure to have this new version of an old book, which was part of the Islamic Surveys series, appear from Edinburgh University Press, and I am grateful for much general encouragement from the series adviser, Dr Carole Hillenbrand and for the skill of the Press staff and their typesetters in coping with such a complex manuscript.

NOTES

1. See *The Islamic Dynasties*, Introduction, p. xi and n. 1.


Dr Freeman-Grenville has pointed out to me that, at Kilwa in East Africa (see below, no. 62), the formal Recognition was by mention in the Friday *khutba*.


See *Elr*, art. ‘Argūn Khan’ (Peter Jackson).

An excellent survey of the Arabic name and its component parts was begun by L. Caetani and G. Gabrieli in their *Onomasticon arabicum ossia repertorio alfabético dei nomi di persona e di luogo contenuti nelle principali opere storiche, biografiche e geografiche, stampate e manoscritto, relative all 'Islām. I Fonti – Introduzione*, Rome 1915, but unfortunately the project lapsed for over half a century. It has now happily been taken up again by an international team based in Paris, under the direction of Mme Jacqueline Sublet, who are producing fascicules of the new *Onomasticon* and a series of *Cahiers d'onomastique arabe*. For the most up-to-date, detailed and scholarly treatment of the name in Arabic, including the cultural, literary and historical aspects, see now Jacqueline Sublet, *Le voile du nom. Essai sur le nom propre arabe*, Paris 1991, and, in a rather briefer compass, Annemarie Schimmel, *Islamic Names*, Edinburgh 1989. For the laqab in particular, see the article s.v. in *Elr*² (C. E. Bosworth).

Thus P. Guichard has recently suggested that the form of the favoured *laqab* of the ‘Āmirid ḥājib Ibn Abī Amir in late tenth-century Muslim Spain, al-Manṣūr *tout court*, and of the similar honorifics of the members of the ‘Āmirid family who followed him (see below, Chapter Two, no. 4), reflects their limited pretensions to fully legitimate sovereignty in the Umayyad caliphate; the later Spanish Umayyads, like their rivals the ‘Abbāsids, used honorifics of this type, but with such complements expressing divine help or dependence on God as bi ʿllāh or alā ʿllāh. See his ‘Al-Mansūr ou al-Mansūr bi ʿllāh? Les laqab/s des ‘Āmirides d’après la numismatique et les documents officiels’, *Archéologie Islamique*, 5 (1995), 47–53.

Post-scriptum

A French translation of the original *Islamic Dynasties* by Yves Thoraval, *Les
*dynasties musulmanes*, has recently appeared from Editions Sindbad, Paris 1996, 340 pp., with some slight updating of the entries on dynasties surviving into the last third of the present century and some new bibliographical references, mainly intended for a Francophone readership.
On the Prophet Muhammad’s death at Medina in 11/632, four of his Companions, all closely related to him either through marriage or through blood, succeeded him as temporal leaders of the infant Muslim umma or community. They assumed the title of Khalīfa or Caliph (literally, ‘he who follows behind, successor’), with responsibility for the upholding and spreading of the new faith and the well-being of Muḥammad’s people, and – at least in the case of the first three of these caliphs – general recognition as the interpreters of the faith and religious leaders of the community.

Abū Bakr was the father of the Prophet’s virgin wife and favourite, ‘Ā’isha, and was one of his oldest and most trusted supporters. It was he who imposed the authority of the capital Medina over the outlying parts of the Arabian peninsula, such as Najd, Baḥrayn, Oman (‘Umān) and Yemen, after many of
the Bedouin tribes had renounced their personal allegiance to Muḥammad (the *Ridda Wars*). ‘Umar’s daughter Ḥafṣa was also a wife of the Prophet, and it was under ‘Umar’s vigorous direction that the martial energies of the desert Arabs were turned outside the peninsula against the Byzantine territories of Syria, Palestine and Egypt and against the Sāsānid Persian ones of Iraq and Persia. ‘Umar was also a capable organiser, and both the introduction of a rudimentary civil administration for the conquered provinces and the invention of the register or *dīwān* system for paying the Arab warriors’ stipends are attributed to him. It was he who abandoned the increasingly clumsy title of ‘Successor of the Successor of the Messenger of God’ in favour of the simple term ‘caliph’ and who further adopted the designation of *Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn* ‘Commander of the Faithful’, perhaps implying a spiritual as well as a purely secular, political element in his leadership.

‘Uthmān was, through his wife Ruqayya, the Prophet’s son-in-law, and was elected caliph after ‘Umar’s murder by a small council (*shūrā*) of the leading Companions, but his reign ended in a rebellion by discontented elements and his death in 35/656. This assassination inaugurated a period of strife and counter-strife (*jitna*, literally ‘temptation, trial [of the believer’s faith]’), and for this reason it was later often referred to as *al-Bāb al-mafṭūḥ* ‘the door opened [to civil warfare]’. The last of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, ‘Alī, was doubly related to Muḥammad as his cousin and, through his marriage to Fāṭima, as his son-in-law, and as a child had been brought up with the Prophet. Thus in the eyes of certain pious circles, those who later formed the nucleus of the *shī‘at ‘Alī* or ‘party of ‘Alī’ (or simply, the Shī‘a), he was particularly well fitted to succeed to the Prophet’s heritage. But he was never able to enforce his authority all though the Islamic lands, for Syria and then Egypt were controlled by Mu‘āwiya, governor of Syria (see below, no. 2). ‘Alī moved his capital out of the Arabian peninsula to Kūfa in Iraq, and attempted to rally the Arab tribesmen of Iraq to his side. He confronted Mu‘āwiya in battle at Ṣiffīn on the upper Euphrates in 37/657, but had no decisive success. He was murdered in 40/661 by one of the Khārijīs, a radical, egalitarian group which had seceded from ‘Alī’s army; his son al-Ḥasan half-heartedly succeeded to the caliphate in Iraq, but was speedily bought out by Mu‘āwiya and renounced his rights to the caliphate, which now passed to the Umayyads (see below, no. 2).

In later centuries, the age of the first four caliphs came to be regarded,
through a somewhat romantic and pious haze, as a Golden Age when faith, justice and the pristine Islamic virtues flourished. Hence the title ‘rightly-guided’ was applied to them, thereby distinguishing them from their successors the Umayyads, who in the eyes of the religious classes came to be regarded as impious and worldly *mulūk* ‘kings’ rather than religiously-inspired leaders of the community.

Lane-Poole, 3–5, 9; Zambaur, 3.


THE UMAYYAD CALIPHS
41–132/661–750

1. The Sufyānids

⊙ 41/661  Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Mu‘āwiya I b. Abī Sufyān
60/680  Abū Khālid Yazīd I b. Mu‘āwiya
64/683  Mu‘āwiya II b. Yazīd I

2. The Marwānids

⊙ 64/684  Abū ‘Abd al-Malik Marwān I b. al-Ḥakam
⊙ 86/705  Abu ‘l-‘Abbās al-Walīd I b. ‘Abd al-Malik
⊙ 96/715  Abū Ayyūb Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Malik
⊙ 99/717  Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar (II) b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz
⊙ 101/720  Abu Khālid Yazīd II b. ‘Abd al-Malik,
⊙ 105/724  Abu ‘l-Walīd Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik
⊙ 125/743  Abu ‘l-‘Abbās al-Walīd II b. Yazīd II
⊙ 126/744  Abū Khālid Yazīd III b. al-Walīd I
⊙ 126/744  Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd I, k. 132/750
⊙ 127–32/744—Abū ‘Abd al-Malik Marwān II b. Muḥammad, al-Jaʿdī al-
50  Ḥimār
132/750  ‘Abbāsid caliphs

Mu‘āwiya followed ‘Alī and al-Ḥasan as caliph of the Muslims, having adopted the cry of ‘Vengeance for ‘Uthmān’ against ‘Alī and his regicide
supporters (Mu‘āwiya and ‘Uthmān were kinsmen, both of them belonging to the Meccan clan of Umayya or ‘Abd Shams). Mu‘āwiya had governed Syria for twenty years, and had led the warfare by land and sea against the Byzantines; he consequently had a disciplined and well-trained army to set against the anarchic Bedouins of Iraq who formed the bulk of ‘Alī’s support. He thus inaugurates the first branch of the Umayyads, the Sufyānids; on the death of the ephemeral caliph Mu‘āwiya II, the caliphate passed – after a period of crisis when it seemed that leadership of the community might go to the Zubayrids, the family of another of Muḥammad’s most prominent Companions – to Marwān I, belonging to a parallel branch of the Umayyads, from whom all the subsequent caliphs of the dynasty (and also the Spanish Umayyads: see below, no. 4) descended.

The three greatest caliphs of the dynasty, Mu‘āwiya, ‘Abd al-Malik and Hishām, each reigned for some twenty years from their capital Damascus, and proved first-class administrators of the empire which the Arabs were conquering. With no precedents for a theory of Islamic government over vast territories and ethnically and confessionally heterogeneous populations, but with a dynamic leadership and a system of society which moved from early rigidity to a more flexible form, the Umayyads were necessarily innovators here. Among other things, they were concerned to adapt and to incorporate within their system of government the administrative practices of the Greeks and Persians whose former lands they now ruled over; the later Umayyad period seems to witness the introduction of several Sāsānid techniques and manners, a process which was to accelerate under the ‘Abbāsids. Military expansion proceeded apace, above all, in the reign of al-Walīd I, even though the easiest conquests had now been made and the Arab troops had to campaign in remote, often mountainous regions and in harsh climatic conditions; nor did plunder come in so easily as in the first stages of Arab conquest. All of North Africa west of Egypt was occupied, and Muslim raiders passed across the Straits of Gibraltar into Spain, subsequently surmounting the Pyrenees and raiding into late Merovingian and Carolingian France. From Egypt, pressure was exerted against the Christian kingdoms of Nubia. Beyond the Caucasus, contact was made with the Turkish Khazars, and the Greek frontiers in south-eastern Anatolia and Armenia were harried. On the eastern Persian fringes, Khwārazm was invaded and Transoxania gradually conquered for Islam against the strenuous opposition of native Iranian rulers and their Turkish allies. Finally, an Arab governor penetrated
through Makrān into Sind, implanting Islam for the first time on Indian soil. All these conquests not only increased the taxative resources of the empire but also brought in large numbers of slaves and clients; the use of this labour enabled the minority of Arabs in the empire to live off the conquered lands as a rentier class and to exploit some of the economic potential of regions like the Fertile Crescent.

Yet territorial expansion and economic and administrative progress did not prevent the fall of the Umayyad régime. Within the heartlands, the caliphs faced the unceasing opposition of the Arab tribesmen of Iraq and of sectarian activists like the Khārijīs. The formation of a religious institution centred on Medina made the two Holy Cities of Arabia centres of pious opposition, especially as some of these elements favoured the claims to headship of the community of ‘Alī’s descendants, the Ahl al-Bayt or ‘House of the Prophet’, who regarded themselves as the Imāms or divinely-designated inheritors of the prophetic charge. It was not, as anti-Umayyad views which emerged under their supplanters, the ‘Abbāsids, were later to allege, that the Umayyad caliphs were mere kings, hostile to Islamic religion and introducers of the foreign practice of hereditary succession in the state. We can now discern that the Umayyads had an exalted view of the religious nature of their charge, not just as successors of the Prophet but as God’s own deputies, implied by their title Khalīfat Allāh ‘God’s Caliph’, and considered themselves fully competent to form and to interpret the nascent Islamic doctrine. But social tensions appeared within the caliphate at large. New classes, such as the Mawālī or clients, converts to Islam from the formerly subject populations, began to seek a more satisfactory social and political role within the umma commensurate with their numbers and their skills. Various discontents were skilfully exploited by members of a rival Meccan clan to the Umayyads, that of the descendants of the Prophet’s uncle al-‘Abbās. Hence after 128/746 there began in the Khurasan or eastern Persia a revolutionary movement led by an agitator of genius, Abū Muslim. The anti-Umayyad forces gained military victory and, with the claims of the ‘Alids to the imamate speedily elbowed aside, the ‘Abbāsids succeeded to the caliphate in 132/750 (see below, no. 3). In a general massacre of the defeated Umayyads, one of the few members of the family to survive was Hishām’s grandson ‘Abd al-Rahmān; he escaped to North Africa and eventually founded in Spain a fresh, much longer-lived line of Umayyads (see below, no. 4).
Lane-Poole, 4–6, 9; Zambaur, 3 and Table F; Album, 7–11.

EI1 ‘Umayyads’ (G. Levi Della Vida).

H. Kennedy, The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates. The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century, 82–123, with genealogical table at p. 403.


1. The caliphs in Iraq and Baghdad 132–656/749–1258

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Caliph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132/749</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Imām, Abu ’1-‘Abbās al-Saffāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136/754</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Imām, Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158/775</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Manṣūr, Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Mahdī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169/785</td>
<td>Mūsā b. al-Mahdī, Abū Muḥammad al-Hādī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170/786</td>
<td>Hārūn b. al-Mahdī, Abū Ja’far al-Rashīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193/809</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Rashīd, Abū Mūsā al-Amīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189/813</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh b. al-Rashīd, Abū Ja’far al-Ma’mūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201–3/817–19</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī, in Baghdad, d. 224/839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218/833</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Rashīd, Abū Ishāq al-Mu’taṣīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227/842</td>
<td>Hārūn b. al-Mu’taṣīm, Abū Ja’far al-Wāthiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232/847</td>
<td>Ja’far b. al-Mu’taṣīm, Abu ’l-Faqīl al-Mutawakkil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247/861</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Mutawakkil, Abū Ja’far al-Muntaṣīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248/862</td>
<td>Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Abu ’l-‘Abbās al-Musta‘īn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252/866</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Mutawakkil, Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Mu’tazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255/869</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Wāthiq, Abū Ishāq al-Muhtadī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256/870</td>
<td>Aḥmad b. al-Mutawakkil, Abu ’l-‘Abbās al-Mu’tamīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279/892</td>
<td>Aḥmad b. al-Muwaffaq, Abu ’l-‘Abbās al-Mu’taqīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289/902</td>
<td>‘Alī b. al-Mu’taqīd, Abū Muḥammad al-Muktafī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295/908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ja‘far b. al-Mu‘tадid, Abu ’l-FaҐl al-Muqtadir, first reign

296/908 Ibn al-Mu‘tazz al-MurtaҐl al-MuntaҐif, in Baghdad

Ø 296/908 Ja‘far al-Muqtadir, second reign

317/929 MuҐhammad b. al-Mu‘tадid, AbГ ManŞur al-QГhир, first reign, in Baghdad

317/929 Ja‘far al-Muqtadir, third reign

Ø 320/932 MuҐhammad al-QГhир, second reign, d. 339/950

Ø 322/934 Aھmad b. al-Muqtadir, Abu ’l-‘AbbГs al-RГдГ

Ø 329/940 IbrГhГm b. al-Muqtadir, AbГ IshГq al-MuttaҐГ, d. 357/968

Ø 333/944 ‘AbdallГh b. al-MuktaҐФ, Abu ’l-QГsГm al-MustakҒ, d. 338/949

Ø 334/946 al-FaҐl b. al-Muqtadir, Abu ’l-QГsГm al-MuГ, d. 364/974

Ø 363/974 ‘Abd al-KarГm b. al-MuГ, Abu ’l-FaҐl al-ҬГ‘i’, d. 393/1003

Ø 381/991 Aھmd b. IshГq, Abu ’l-‘AbbГs al-QГdГ

Ø 422/1031 ‘AbdallГh b. al-QГdГ, AbГ Ja‘far al-QГ’im

Ø 467/1075 ‘AbdallГh b. MuҐhammad, Abu ’l-QГsГm al-Mu.qtГdГ

Ø 487/1094 Aھmd b. al-Mu.qtГdГ, Abu ’l-‘AbbГs al-MuطاГhГr

Ø 512/1118 al-FaҐl b. al-MustaГhГr, AbГ ManŞur al-MustarshГd

Ø 529/1135 al-ManŞur b. al-MustarshГ, AbГ Ja‘far al-RГшГd

Ø 530/1136 MuҐhammad b. al-MustaГhГr, AbГ ‘AbdallГh al-Mu.qtaГГ

Ø 555/1160 YusГf b. al-Mu.qtaГГ, Abu ’l-Mu.zГfГr al-Mu.stanjiГd

Ø 566/1170 al-Гsan b. al-Mu.stanjiГd, AbГ MuҐhammad al-Mu.qtaГ‘Г

Ø 575/1180 Aھmd b. al-Mu.qtaГ‘Г, Abu ’l-‘AbbГs al-NГшГr

Ø 622/1225 MuҐhammad b. al-NГшГr, AbГ Na@(r al-ГhГr

Ø 623/1226 al-ManŞur b. al-ГhГr, AbГ Ja‘far al-Mu.stanГشГr

Ø 640– 56/1242–58 ‘AbdallГh b. al-Mu.staГšГr, AbГ Aھmd al-Mu.qtaГ‘Гm

Ø 656/1258 Mongol sack of Baghdad

2. The caliph in Aleppo, ھarrГn and northern Syria 659–60/1261

Ø 659–60/1261 Aھmd b. al-Гsan, Abu ’l-‘AbbГs al-ГhkГm I
### Transfer to Cairo

3. The caliphs in Cairo 659–923/1261–1517

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>659–60/1261</td>
<td>Aḥmad b. al-Ẓāhir, Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Mustanṣir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661/1262</td>
<td>Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan, Abu ’l-ʿAbbās al-Ḥākim I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701/1302</td>
<td>Sulaymān b. al-Ḥākim I, Abū Rabīʿa al-Mustakfī I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740/1340</td>
<td>ʿĪbrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Mustamsik, Abū Isḥāq al-Wāthiq I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741/1341</td>
<td>Aḥmad b. al-Mustakfī I, Abu ’l-ʿAbbās al-Ḥākim II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753/1352</td>
<td>Abū Bakr b. al-Mustakfī I, Abu ’l-Fatḥ al-Muʿtaḍid I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763/1362</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. al-Muʿtaḍid I, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Mutawakkil I, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779/1377</td>
<td>Zakariyyāʾ b. al-Wāthiq I, Abū Yaḥyā al-Muʿtasim, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779/1377</td>
<td>Muḥammad al-Mutawakkil I, second reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785/1383</td>
<td>ʿUmar b. al-Wāthiq I, Abū Hafṣ al-Wāthiq II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788/1386</td>
<td>Zakariyyāʾ al-Muʿtasim, second reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791/1389</td>
<td>Muḥammad al-Mutawakkil I, third reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808/1406</td>
<td>‘Abbās or Yaʿqūb b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abu ’l-Faḍl al-Mustaʿīn (also in 815/1412 proclaimed sultan, see below, no. 31, 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816/1414</td>
<td>Dāwūd b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abu ’l-Fatḥ al-Muʿtaḍid II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845/1441</td>
<td>Sulaymān b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abū Rabīʿa al-Mustakfī II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855/1451</td>
<td>Ḥamza b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abū Bakr al-Qāʾim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859/1455</td>
<td>Yūsuf b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abu ’l-Maḥāsin al-Mustanjid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884/1479</td>
<td>ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. al-Mustaʿīn, Abu ’l-ʿIzz al-Mutawakkil II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903/1497</td>
<td>Yaʿqūb b. al-Mutawakkil II, Abu ’l-Ṣabr al-Mustamsik, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914/1508</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil III b. al-Mustamsik, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922/1516</td>
<td>Yaʿqūb al-Mustamsik, second reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923/1517</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil III, second reign, d. in Istanbul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘Abbāsids acquired the caliphate through what might be considered from one aspect as a power-struggle between rival Meccan families, since they
stemmed from the family of the Prophet’s uncle al-‘Abbās, of the Meccan clan of Hāshim; and because of this descent they were able to claim a legitimacy in the eyes of the orthodox Sunnī religious classes which the Umayyads had lacked. Even so, during the first century of their power the ‘Abbāsids had to contend with frequent revolts of the ‘Alids, descendants of the two sons of ‘Alī, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, who were grandsons of Muḥammad and whom their partisans the Shī’a considered as having a better title to the caliphate and imamate, one based on a specific act of divinely-inspired designation by the Prophet. In self-defence, the apologists of the ‘Abbāsids stressed the superiority of descent through males over descent through females (since the ‘Alid claim was through Muḥammad’s daughter Fāṭima), and the caliphs themselves soon adopted a system of honorific titles (alqāb, sing. laqab) when they each ascended the throne, a practice unknown to their Umayyad predecessors; these titles proclaimed dependence on God and claimed divine support for ‘Abbāsid rule. The theocratic nature of the new dynasty’s power was gradually emphasised in other ways, and the orthodox religious institution enlisted as far as possible on the side of the ‘Abbāsids. Spreading into the sphere of practical government, there were also influences from the older Persian traditions of divine rulership and statecraft; for the ‘Abbāsid Revolution, while in origin an Arab movement, began on Persian soil and took advantage of certain Persian discontents. The shifting of the capital from Damascus in Syria to Iraq, eventually to Baghdad, symbolised the new eastward orientation of the caliphate, and over the next centuries Persian material and cultural practices and influences became increasingly evident within it.

The Islamic empire had virtually reached its full extent under the Umayyads, and, under the early ‘Abbāsids, the borders of the Dār al-Islām were almost static. Only a few of the caliphs distinguished themselves as military commanders in the field – al-Ma’mūn and al-Mu’taṣim led successful expeditions into Anatolia against the Byzantines – and in the tenth and early eleventh centuries it was the Muslims who were forced on to the defensive by the vigorous Greek emperors of the Macedonian dynasty. Already in the ninth century, the political unity of the caliphate began to dissolve. A branch of the Umayyads, a priori hostile to the ‘Abbāsids, ruled in Spain (see below, no. 4), and North Africa was in general too distant to be controlled properly. Such lines of governors as the Ṭūlūnids in Egypt (see below, no. 25) and the Ṭāhirids and Sājids in Persia (see below, nos 82, 70)
still behaved as faithful vassals of Baghdad, but their existence nevertheless paved the way for largely autonomous dynasties on the far eastern fringes of the Persian world, like the Sāmānids of Transoxania and the Ṭaffārids of Sistan (see below, nos 83, 84), who forwarded taxation to Baghdad only rarely or not at all. The effective authority of the ‘Abbāsids became reduced to central Iraq, above all, in the tenth century, when an aggressive political Shī‘ism triumphed temporarily over a large part of the central and eastern lands of the caliphate. The Fāṭimids seized first North Africa and then Egypt and southern Syria (see below, no. 27), setting themselves up in Cairo as rival caliphs. In Iraq and western Persia, the Daylamī Būyids rose to power (see below, no. 75), entering Baghdad in 334/945 and reducing the ‘Abbāsids to the status of puppets, with almost nothing left save their moral and spiritual influence as heads of Sunnī Islam.

The situation was saved for the ‘Abbāsids and for Sunnī orthodoxy in general by the appearance in the Middle East in the eleventh century of the Turkish Seljuqs (see below, no. 91), but the Seljuqs, while upholders of the Sunna from the religious point of view, did not intend to let the political power of the caliphs revive to the detriment of the sultanate which they had just established. It was only in the twelfth century, when the family solidarity of the Great Seljuqs was impaired and their authority thereby enfeebled, that the fortunes of the ‘Abbāsids began to rise under such vigorous caliphs as al-Muqtafī and al-Nāṣir. This recovery in the effective power and moral influence was, however, cut short by the Mongol cataclysm, and in 656/1258 Hülegü’s Mongol troops murdered the last ‘Abbāsid caliph to rule in Baghdad (see below, no. 133).

The first three centuries of ‘Abbāsid rule (eighth to eleventh centuries AD) saw the full flowering of mediaeval Islamic civilisation. Literature, theology, philosophy and the natural sciences all flourished, with fertilising influences coming in from Persia and the Hellenistic and Byzantine cultures. Economic and commercial progress was widespread, above all in the older, long-settled lands of Persia, the Fertile Crescent and Egypt, and trade links were established with outside regions like the Eurasian steppes, the Far East, India and black Africa. Despite political breakdown at the centre and tribal and sectarian violence during the tenth and eleventh centuries, this progress in the material and cultural fields continued, and it was in this regard apt for the Swiss orientalist Adam Mez to designate the tenth century that of the ‘Renaissance of Islam’. Within the northern tier of the Middle East, incoming
Turkmen nomads and subsequently-established Turkish dynasties brought extensive changes in such spheres as land utilisation and economic life, but were largely absorbed into the cultural and religious fabric of Islam; it was the Mongols, for several decades fierce enemies of Islam and bringers of a steppe way of life alien to the settled agricultural economies of the Middle East, who dealt more serious blows to the economic and social stability of Iraq and the Persian lands.

The Baghdad caliphate was thus extinguished by the Mongols, but soon afterwards the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt, Baybars (see below, no. 31, 1), himself decided to install a caliph, and invited Aḥmad al-Mustanṣir, an ostensible uncle of the last ʿAbbāsid of Baghdad, who had been held prisoner there but had been then released by the Mongols, to Cairo (659/1261). This caliph led an army in an unsuccessful bid to reconquer Baghdad, possibly dying in the attempt and certainly disappearing from further mention. Meanwhile, a further ʿAbbāsid, who seems genuinely to have been a descendant of al-Mustarshid, had in this same year been proclaimed caliph at Aleppo, with the backing of the Amīr Aqqush, as al-Ḥākim, subsequently installed in Cairo in 661/1262. The establishment of a caliph in Cairo served to legitimise Mamlūk rule and to increase Mamluk prestige in places as far apart as North Africa and Muslim India, and it was a moral weapon in the warfare against the Crusaders and the Mongols; furthermore the caliphs continued, as they had done in late ʿAbbāsid Baghdad, to act as heads of the Futuwwa or chivalric orders. But they had no practical power in the Mamlūk state, and there was certainly no idea of a division of power with the sultans. The last caliph, al-Mutawakkil III, was carried off to Istanbul in 923/1517 by the Ottoman conqueror Selīm the Grim, but the story that he then transferred his rights in the caliphate to the Turkish sultans is a piece of fiction originating in the nineteenth century.

The advent of the ʿAbbāsids in 132/749 saw a general elevation of the ruler’s status and a formalising of the court ceremonial surrounding him, possibly as a reflection of the increased permeation of Persian cultural influences into ʿAbbāsid society mentioned above. Whereas the Umayyad caliphs had been content with their simple names as ruling designations, from the accession of al-Manṣūr onwards, the ʿAbbāsid caliphs adopted honorific titles expressing divine support for their rule, for example al-Mahdī ‘the divinely-guided one’ or emphasising the ruler’s leading role in implementing God’s plan for His world, for example al-Qā’im ‘he who arises, undertakes
“something” or al-Ẓāhir ‘he who makes prevail’, usually with a complement such as li-dīn Allāh ‘to/for God’s religion’ or bi-amr Allāh ‘in the furtherance of God’s affair/command’. Once the unity of the caliphate began to dissolve and provincial dynasties arose, lesser, local rulers began to emulate the caliphs and adorn themselves with high-flown, sonorous titles of this type, not infrequently ludicrously at variance with the actual significance of the bearers of them.

Lane-Poole, 6–8, 12–13; Zambaur, 4–5 and Table G; Album, 11–13.
EI² ‘Abbāsids’ (B. Lewis).
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THE SPANISH UMAYYADS
138–422/756–1031

The Iberian peninsula, excepting the Christian kingdoms of the north

Ø 172/788  Hishām I b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān I, Abu ʿl-Walīd
Ø 180/796  al-Ḥakam I b. Hishām I, Abu ʾl-ʿĀṣ
Ø 206/822  ‘Abd al-Raḥmān II b. al-Ḥakam I, Abu ʾl-Muṭarrif al-Mutawassīṭ
Ø 238/852  Muḥammad I b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān II, Abū ʿAbdallāh
Ø 273/886  al-Mundhir b. Muḥammad I, Abu ʾl-Ḥakam
Ø 275/888  ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad I, Abū Muḥammad
Ø 300/912  ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III b. Muḥammad, Abu ʾl-Muṭarrif al-Nāṣir
Ø 366/976  Hishām II b. al-Ḥakam II, Abu ʾl-Walīd al-Mu‘ayyad, first reign
Ø 399/1009  Muḥammad II b. Hishām II, al-Mahdī, first reign
Ø 400/1009  Sulaymān b. al-Ḥakam, al-Musta‘īn, first reign
Ø 400/1010  Hishām II, second reign
Ø 403/1013  Sulaymān, second reign
Arab and Berber troops crossed over the Straits of Gibraltar from Morocco to Spain in 92/711 and speedily overthrew the Visigoths, the Germanic military aristocracy who had ruled Spain until then. Over the next decades, the Muslim forces drove the remnants of the Visigoths into the Cantabrian Mountains of the extreme north of the Iberian peninsula, and even penetrated across the Pyrenees into Frankish Gaul, until Charles Martel defeated them just to the north of Poitiers, in the battle called by the Arabs that of Balāṭ al-Shuhadā’, in 114/732. During these early years, Spain was ruled by a succession of Arab governors sent out from the east, as the most westerly province of the Islamic empire, called in the Arabic sources al-Andalus (almost certainly not from *Vandalicia, the land of the Vandals, whose passage through Spain over two centuries before had left virtually no traces, but more probably from a Germanic expression meaning ’share, parcel of land’). But in 138/756, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān I, later called al-Dākhil ‘the Incomer’, and one of the few Umayyads to have escaped slaughter in the ‘Abbāsid Revolution, appeared in Spain and founded the Umayyad amirate there.

In a peninsula where the facts of geography militated against central control and firm rule, the establishment of the Umayyad state was an achievement indeed. The amirate was based on Seville (Ishbīliya) and Cordova (Qurṭuba), but the Amīrs’ hold on the outlying provinces was less secure. Although a good proportion of the Hispano-Roman population became Muslim (the Muwalladūn), a substantial number remained Christian (the Musta‘rabūn, Mozarabs), and looked to the independent Christian north for moral and
religious support. In particular, Toledo (Ṭulayṭila), the ancient capital of the
Visigoths and the ecclesiastical centre of Spain, was a centre of
rebelliousness. Among the Muslims, there were many local princes whose
military strength as marcher lords enabled them to live virtually
independently of the capital Cordova; these flourished above all in the Ebro
valley of the north-east, the later Aragon and Catalonia (e.g. the Tujībids of
Saragossa and the Banū Qasī of Tudela). In the later ninth century, there were
two centres of prolonged rebellion against the central government by its own
Muslim subjects, one around Badajoz under Ibn Marwān the Galician, and
the other in the mountains of Granada under Ibn Ḥafṣūn.

Despite these weaknesses, and despite the continued existence of the petty
Christian kingdoms of the north, the Spanish Umayyads made Cordova a
remarkable centre of craft industries and trade, and as a home for Arabic
culture, learning and artistic production it was inferior only to Baghdad and
Cairo. The tenth century was dominated by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III, called al-
Nāṣir ‘the Victorious’, who reigned for fifty years (300–50/912–61). He
raised the power of the monarchy to a new pitch; court ceremonial was made
more elaborate, possibly with Byzantine practice in mind, and ‘Abd al-
Raḥmān countered the pretensions of his enemies the Fāṭimids by himself
adopting the titles of Caliph and Commander of the Faithful in place of the
simple previous designation of Amīr. In this way, the rather vague
ideological basis of the state, which had prevailed for over 150 years – in
which the Umayyads had never been able to decide whether they were still a
part, albeit peripheral, of the Islamic oecumene, or whether they were ruling
over a localised, Iberian principality, Muslim in faith but turned inwards
politically – was relinquished. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān now clearly set aside the
doctrine of orthodox religious theory that the caliphate was one and
indivisible. No longer relying primarily on the Andalusian Arab jundsor
territorially-based military contingents, the Caliph built up the army‘s
strength with fresh Berber tribesmen from North Africa and with slave troops
brought from various parts of Christian Europe (the Ṣaqāliba). The Christians
of the north were humbled and an anti-Fāṭimid policy pursued in North
Africa. But after the death of al-Hakam II in 366/976, the succession
devolved on minors and weaker candidates, so that real power in the state
passed to the Ḥājibor chief minister Ibn Abī ‘Amir, called al-Manṣūr ‘the
Victorious‘ (the Almanzor of Christian sources); it was he who captured
Barcelona and who on one occasion sacked the shrine of St James of
Compostella in Galicia.

Yet early in the eleventh century, the ‘Āmirid Ḥājibs lost control and the Umayyad caliphate fell apart. Possible reasons for this have been much discussed by historians. It has been argued, for instance, that the numbers of Muslims in al-Andalus had increased by conversion from Christianity in ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III’s reign so that the Muslims were perhaps for the first time a majority there and felt a new confidence from this strength and a greater feeling of control over the land; hence they no longer saw the necessity of a strong, central government as vital for the preservation of Islam in the Iberian peninsula. If this was the case, such confidence was misplaced. The last, ephemeral Umayyads could not maintain the primacy in the state of the old Andalusian Muslims, essentially Arabs and Muwalladūn, in face of the military strength of the Berbers and Ṣaqāliba. Their short reigns alternated with periods of rule by the Berberised Arab Ḥammūdīds, local rulers in Malaga, Ceuta, Tangier and Algeciras (see below, no. 5, Taifas nos 1, 2). The Umayyads finally disappeared in 422/1031, and Muslim Spain fell into a period of political fragmentation, in the course of which various local chiefs and ethnic groups held power (the age of the Mulūk al-Ṭawā’if Reys de Taifas: see below, no. 5); not until the coming of the Almoravids (see below, no. 14) at the end of the century did al-Andalus experience unity again.

Lane-Poole, 19–22; Zambaur, 3–4 and Table F; Album, 13–14.
EI ‘Umaiyyads. II’ (E. Lévi-Provençal).
THE MULŪK AL-ŢAWĀ’IF OR REYES DE TAIFAS IN SPAIN
Fifth to early seventh century/eleventh to early thirteenth century
Central and southern Spain, Ceuta and the Balearic Islands

The seventy or eighty years or so between the end of the line of ʿĀmirid Ḥājibs and the coming of the Almoravids saw the final collapse of the Umayyad dynasty and the formation of local principalities across Muslim Spain; yet, as has not infrequently happened in world history, political fragmentation was accompanied by great cultural brilliance.

The process began in the post-ʿĀmirid period of fitna or chaos, well before the disappearance of the Umayyads in 422/1031, with the main Taifa principalities firmly established by then. The former capital Cordova was never able to establish more than a local authority during these decades of the Taifas. Instead, there arose a mosaic of local powers, whose geographical centres David Wasserstein has listed as amounting to in effect thirty-nine, as follows (in alphabetical order):

1. Algeciras/al-Jazīra al-Khaḍrāʾ (the Ḥammūdīds)
2. Almería/al-Mariya (the Banū Ṣumādīḥ)
3. Alpuente/al-Bunt (the Banū ’l-Qāsim)
4. Arcos/Arkush (the Banū Khazrūn)
5. Badajoz/Baṭalyaws (the Afṭasīds)
6. Baza/Baṣṭa
7. Calatayud/Qalʿat Ayyūb (the Hūdīds)
8. Calatrava/Qalʿat Rabāḥ
9. Carmona/Qarmūna (the Banū Birzāl)
10. Ceuta/Sabta (the Ḥammūdīds)
11. Cordova/(Qurṭuba (the Jahwarids)
12. Denia/Dāniya (the Banū Mujāhid)
   Majorca/Mayūrqa and the Balearic Islands/al-Jazā’ir al-Sharqiyya (the
   Banū Mujāhid and then governors for the North African dynasties and
   independent rulers of the Banū Ghāniya: see below, no. 6)
13. Granada/Gharnāṭa (the Zīrids)
14. Huelva/Walba or Awnaba and Saltes/Shaltīsh
15. Huesca/Washqa (the Hūdids)
16. Jaén/Jayyān
17. Lérida/Lārida (the Hūdids)
18. Majorca/Mayūrqa (the Banū Mujāhid)
19. Málaga/Mālaqa (the Ḥammūdids)
20. Medinaceli/Madīnat Sālim
21. Měrtola/Martula
22. Morón/Mawrūr (the Banū Nūḥ)
23. Murcia/Mursiya (various rulers, including the Ṭāhirids)
24. Murviedro/Murbayṭar
25. Niebla/Labia and Gibraleón/Jabal al-‘Uyūn (the Yaḥṣubids)
26. Ronda/Runda
27. La Sahla or Albarracin/al-Sahla (the Banū Razín)
   Santa Maria de Algarve/Shantamariya al-Gharb or
   Ocsonoba/Ukshūnuba (the Banū Hārūn)
28. Saragossa/Saraqusṭa (the Tujībids and then Hūdids)
29. Segura/Shaqūra
30. Seville/Ishbīliya (the ‘Abbādids)
31. Silves/Shīlb (the Banū Muzayn)
32. Toledo/Ṭulayṭūa (the Dhu ’l-Nūnids)
33. Tortosa/Ṭurṭūsha
34. Tudela/Tuṭīla (the Hūdids)
35. Valencia/Balansiya (the ‘Āmirids)
36. Vilches/Bilj
37. Ḫiṣn al-Ashrāf
Some of these, especially in the more prosperous and settled south, south-east and east, were little more than city states, but others, like the Afṭasids of Badajoz in the south-west of the peninsula, the Dhu ’l-Nūnids of Toledo, on the far northern edge of Muslim territory, and the Hūdids in the Ebro valley, ruled large tracts of territory. The dynasties were of varying official background and race, reflecting the trends of later Umayyad times and of the ethnic rivalries of the various groups. Several sprang out of the old ‘Āmirid military élite and their clients. Some were from long-established Arab families, like the ‘Abbādids of Seville, the Banū Qāsim of Alpuente and the Hūdids of Saragossa. Others were Berber, like the Mīknāsa Afṭasids and the Ḥawahāra Dhu ’l-Nūnids (whose original name was the Berber one of Zennun), or were Berberised Arabs like the Ḥammūdids (ultimately of Idrīsid origin) of Algeciras, Ceuta and Málaga; in several cases, these Berber Taifas sprang from the great influx of troops from North Africa brought about by Ibn Abī ‘Āmir towards the end of the tenth century, such as the Sanhāja Zīrīds in Granada. In certain towns of the south-east and east, Ṣaqlabī commanders seized power, such as the initial rulers in Almeria, Badajoz, Murcia, Valencia and Tortosa, although the role of the Ṣaqlabī in Spain tended to fade out after the mid-eleventh century.

The larger Taifas pursued aggressive policies at the expense of their neighbours. The ‘Abbādids expanded almost to Toledo, and to further their designs at one stage resuscitated a man who claimed to be the last Umayyad caliph, Hishām III, thought to have died in obscurity after his deposition. Several of the Taifas were quite content to intrigue with or even to call in the Christians against their fellow-Muslims; the last Afṭasid, ‘Umar al-Mutawakkil, was ready, after the arrival in Spain of the Almoravids, to cede his possessions in central Portugal to Alfonso VI of Léon and Castile in return for help against the threatening Berber power.

Towards the end of the eleventh century, the tide was clearly flowing against the Muslims in Spain, a complete reversal of the situation a century or so before when the weak, petty kingdoms of northern Spain had paid tribute to the mighty Cordovan caliphate; now many of the Taifas were paying tribute, parias, to the Christian states and were in varying relations of vassalage to them. Toledo fell to Alfonso in 478/1085 as much through internal dissensions as through external attack. Appeals to the greatest Muslim power in the West, the Almoravids of Mauritania and Morocco, both from Taifa rulers and from the religious classes in Spain, seemed to be the
only way out, but the victory of the Almoravids at Sagrajas or al-Zallāqa in 479/1086 proved to be the prelude to the sweeping-away of almost all the Taifas within a few years, the Hūdids in Saragossa alone preserving a tenuous independence until 503/1110.

In the interval between the collapse of Almoravid power in Spain and the assertion of Almohad control there after 540/1145 (see below, nos. 14, 15), shortlived Taifas were constituted in some places, e.g. at Valencia, Cordova, Murcia and Mértola; and after the decline of Almohad authority in Spain, local commanders were able to seize power in certain places, for example at Valencia, Niebla and, somewhat more enduringly, Murcia, until these towns were recovered by the Christians.

1. The Ḥammūdids of Málaga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>404/1014</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405/1015</td>
<td>‘Alī b. Ḥammūd, al-Nāṣir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408/1017</td>
<td>al-Qāsim b. Ḥammūd, al-Ma’mūn, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412/1021</td>
<td>Yahyā I b. ‘Alī, al-Mu’talī, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413/1022</td>
<td>al-Qāsim I, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417/1026</td>
<td>Yahyā I al-Mu’talī, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427/1036</td>
<td>Idrīs I b. ‘Alī, al-Muta’ayyad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431/1039</td>
<td>Yahyā II b. Idrīs, al-Qā’im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431/1040</td>
<td>al-Ḥasan b. Yāhyā I, al-Mustanṣir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434/1043</td>
<td>Idrīs II b. Yahyā I, al-‘Alī, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438/1046</td>
<td>Muḥammad I b. Idrīs, al-Mahdī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444/1052</td>
<td>Idrīs III b. Yāhyā II, al-Sāmī al-Muwaffaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445/1053</td>
<td>Idrīs II al-‘Alī al-Zāfīr, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? to 448/1056</td>
<td>Muḥammad II b. Idrīs, al-Musta‘lī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main Ḥammūdīd line in Málaga extinguished by the Zīrids of Granada, the branch in Alcegiras being extinguished also in 446/1054 or 451/1059 by the ‘Abbādīds of Seville.

2. The Ḥammūdids of Ceuta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400/1010</td>
<td>‘Alī b. Ḥammūd, al-Nāṣir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by 453/1061 Governors for the Ḥammūdids and then independent rulers from the Barghawāṭa Berbers

3. The ‘Abbādids of Seville

414/1023 Muḥammad I b. Ismā‘īl Ibn ‘Abbād, Abu ’l-Qāsim, initially as member of a triumvirate


∅ 461–84/1069–91 Muḥammad II b. ‘Abbād, Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Muʿtamid, d. 487/1095

484/1091 Almoravid conquest

4. The Banū Birzāl in Carmona

414/1023 Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Birzālī, Abū ‘Abdallāh

434/1043 Ishāq b. Muḥammad

444–59/1052–67 al-‘Azīz or al-‘Izz b. Ishāq, al-Mustaẓhir

459/1067 ‘Abbādid annexation

5. The Banū Khazrūn in Arcos

402/1012 Muḥammad Ibn Khazrūn, Abū ‘Abdallāh ‘Imād al-Dawla

? ‘Abdūn Ibn Khazrūn

448–58/1056–66 Muḥammad b. ‘Abdūn
459/1067  ‘Abbādid annexation

6. The Zīrids of Granada

403/1013  Zāwl b. Zīrī al-Ṣanhājī
410/1019  Ḥabbūs b. Māksan
429/1038  Bādīs b. Ḥabbūs, al-Muẓaffar al-Nāṣir
483/1090  Almoravid conquest

7. The Banū Ṣumādīḥ of Almería

c. 403/c. 1013  Khayrān al-Ṣaqlabī
419/1028  Zuhayr al-Ṣaqlabī
429/1038  Governors from the Banū Ṣumādīḥ for the ‘Āmirids of Valencia
433/1042  Ma‘n b. Muḥammad Ibn Ṣumādīḥ
443–68/1045–76  ‘Alī b. Ṣumādīḥ, Iqbāl al-Dawla, died in exile
484/1091  Almoravid conquest

8. The Banū Mujāhid of Denia and Majorca

468/1076  Annexation by the Hūdīds

9. The rulers in Majorca during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries

405–68/1015–76  Governors of the Banū Mujāhid of Denia
10. The Jahwarids of Cordova

422/1031 Jahwar b. Muḥammad Ibn Jahwar, Abu ’1-Ḥazm, formally as member of a triumvirate
435/1043 Muḥammad b. Jahwar, Abu ’1-Walīd al-Rashīd
461/1069 ‘Abbādid conquest

11. The rulers in Cordova of the Almoravid-Almohad interregnum

538/1144 Ḥamdīn b. Muḥammad, al-Manṣūr, first reign
539/1145 Aḥmad III b. ‘Abd al-Malik, Sayf al-Dawla, Hūdid, d. 540/1146
540/1146 Ḥamdīn b. Muḥammad, second reign
541/1146 Yaḥyā b. ‘Alī, Ibn Ghāniya
543/1148 Almohad conquest

12. The Afṭasids of Badajoz

403/1012–13 Sābūr al-Šaqlabī
413/1022 ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Afṭas, Abū Muḥammad al-Manṣūr
437/1045 Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh, Abū Bakr al-Muẓaffar
460/1068 Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad
87/1068–94 487/1094 or 488/1095
487/1094 Almoravid conquest

13. The Dhu ’1-Nūnids of Toledo
c. 403/c. 1012  Ya‘ish b. Muḥammad, Abū Bakr al-Qāḍī

Ø 409/1018  Ismā‘īl b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Dhi ’1-Nūn, Abū Muḥammad Dhu ’1-Riyāsatayn al-Zāfir

Ø 435/1043  Yaḥyā I b. Ismā‘īl, Abu ’1-Ḥasan Sharaf al-Dawla al-Ma’mūn Dhu ’1-Majdayn

Ø 467/1075  Yaḥyā II b. Ismā‘īl b. Yaḥyā I, al-Qādir, first reign

472/1080  Occupation by the Aftasid ‘Umar al-Mutawakkil

Ø 473–8/1081–5  Yaḥyā II al-Qādir, second reign, k. 485/1092

478/1085  Conquest by Alfonso VI of León and Castile, with Yaḥyā installed in Valencia as a puppet ruler

14. The ‘Āmirids of Valencia

401/1010–11  Mubārak al-Ṣaqlabī and Muẓaffar al-Ṣaqlabī

408 or 409/1017–18  Labīb al-Ṣaqlabī

Ø 411/1020

or 412/1021  ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (Sanchuelo) Ibn Abī ‘Āmir, al-Manṣūr

Ø 452/1060  ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Niẓām al-Dawla al-Muẓaffar

457–68/1065–76  Dhu ’1-Nūnid occupation

468/1076  Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, al-Manṣūr

478/1085  ‘Uthmān b. Abī Bakr, al-Qāḍī

478–85/1085–92  Dhu ’1-Nūnid Yaḥyā b. Ismā‘īl al-Qādir installed as puppet ruler by Alfonso VI

487–92/1094–9  Valencia occupied by the Cid

495/1102  Almoravid conquest

15. The rulers in Valencia of the Almoravid-Almohad interregnum

539/1144  Manṣūr b. ‘Abdallāh, Qāḍī
Abū‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Sa‘d, Ibn Mardanlsh, *Rey Loboor Lope*

Hilāl b. Muḥammad, Ibn Mardanīsh, submitted to the Almohads

16. The Tujībids in Saragossa

*al-Mundhir I b. Yaḥyā al-Tujībī, governor for the Umayyads*

Yaḥyā b. al-Mundhir I, al-Muẓaffar

al-Mundhir II b. Yaḥyā, Mu‘izz al-Dawla al-Manṣūr

‘Abdallāh b. al-Ḥakam, al-Muẓaffar

17. The Hūdids in Saragossa, Huesca, Tudela and Lérida, and, subsequently, Denia, Tortosa and Calatayud


Sulaymān b. Yūsuf, Tāj al-Dawla

Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, ‘Aḍud al-Dawla, in Calatayud

? al-Mundhir b. Sulaymān, in Tudela)

Aḥmad I b. Sulaymān, Sayf al-Dawla ‘Imād al-Dawla al-Muqtadīr

Yūsuf b. Aḥmad I, al-Mu’tamin


Aḥmad II b. Yūsuf, Sayf al-Dawla al-Musta‘īn

Sulaymān b. al-Mundhir, Sayyid al-Dawla, in Denia and
1090–c. 1099 then Tortosa)

503/1110 ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥmad II, ‘Imād al-Dawla, after this same year in Rueda de Jalón/Rūṭa

503/1110 Almoravid occupation of Saragossa

512/1118 Christian occupation of Saragossa

524–40/1130–46 Ḥmad III b. ‘Abd al-Malik, Sayf al-Dawla, in Rueda and then in central Spain

540/1146 Former Hūdid territories in central Spain taken over by Alfonso I el Batallador and Ramiro II of Aragon

18. The rulers of Murcia, including the Ṭāhirids and Hūdids

403/1012–13 Khayrân al-Ṣaqlabī of Almería

419/1028 Zuhayr al-Ṣaqlabī of Almería


436/1045 Mujāhid b. ‘Abdallāh al-‘Āmirī of Denia
c. 440/c. 1049 Ḥmad, Abū Bakr Ibn Ṭāhir

455/1063 Muḥammad b. Ḥmad Ibn Ṭāhir

471/1078 Governors on behalf of the Abbādids of Seville

484/1091 Almoravid conquest

489–90/1096–7 Abū Ja‘far ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Ṭāhir, Abū Ja‘far Resumption of Almoravid control

540/1145 Ṣabdallāh b. ‘Iyāḍ and Ṣabdallāh b. Faraj al-Thaghrī as rivals for power

543/1148 Muḥammad b. Sa‘d, Abū ‘Abdallāh Ibn Mardanīsh, Rey Loboor Lope, of Valencia

567/1172 Almohad occupation

Muḥammad b. Yūsuf Ibn Hūd, Abū ‘Abdallāh al-

625/1228 Mutawakkil, also in Valencia till the Christian reconquest of Valencia in 636/1238

635/1238 Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, Abū Bakr al-Wāthic, first reign
636/1239  al-‘Azīz b. ‘Abd al-Malik, Diyā‘ al-Dawla
638/1241  Muḥammad Ibn Hūd, Abū Ja‘far Bahā‘ al-Dawla
660/1262  Muḥammad b. Abī Ja‘far Muḥammad
662/1264  Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, Abu Bakr, second reign
(664/1266  Aragonese conquest)

Zambaur, 53–8 and Map 1; Lane-Poole, 23–6; Album, 14–15.
A. Prieto y Vives, Los Reyes de Taifas, estudio histórico-numismático de los Musulmanes españoles en el siglo V de la Hégira (XI de J.C.), Madrid 1926.
EI1  art. ‘Tuḏīb (Banū), ‘Zīrīds’ (E. Lévi-Provençal)
The founder of this petty Ṣanhāja Berber dynasty, which controlled the Balearic Islands for eighty years and also played a significant role during the period of later Almohad rule in the eastern Maghrib, was an Almoravid descendant on the female side, deriving his name Ibn Ghāniya from the name of an Almoravid princess, the wife of ‘Alī b. Yūsuf. ‘Alī’s son Yaḥyā defended the Almoravid possessions in Spain against the incoming Almohads (see below, no. 15), and then remnants of the Ibn Ghāniya family withdrew to the Balearic Islands. There they founded their own independent line as a post-Almoravid principality which grew rich on, *inter alia*, piracy against the Christians. One member of the family, ‘Alī b. Ishāq, decided to leave the Balearics and carry on the struggle against the Almohads in the eastern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520/1126</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Yūsuf al-Massūfī, Ibn Ghāniya, governor of the Balearios for the Almoravids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550/1155</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550/1155</td>
<td>Abū Ibrāhīm Ishāq b. Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579/1183</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. Ishāq, under Almohad suzerainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580/1184</td>
<td>‘Alī b. Ishāq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600/1187–1203</td>
<td>‘Abdallāhb. Ishāq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600/1203</td>
<td><em>Almohad occupation of the Balearics, and Almohad governors</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627–8/1230–1</td>
<td><em>Aragonese conquest of Majorca</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maghrib. He and his successor there, Yaḥyā b. Ishāq, were for several decades destabilising influences in the affairs of Iṣrāqiya and what is now eastern Algeria until ‘Alī’s defeat and death in 633/1227 and Yaḥyā’s loss of Iṣrāqiya and subsequent death in 635/1236; the activities here of the Banū Ghāniya were a potent factor in the decline of Almohad power in the eastern Maghrib. Meanwhile, the Almohad caliph al-Nāṣir had invaded Majorca and installed his own governor there, ending the rule of the Banū Ghāniya in the Balearics; the Almohads and their epigoni held the islands for nearly thirty years until James I of Aragōn conquered Majorca, with Ibiza and Minorca following it into Christian hands by 686/1287.

Zambaur, 57.

EI² ‘Ghāniya, Banū’ (G. Marçais); ‘Mayūrka’ (J. Bosch-Vilá).
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THENASRIDS OR BANU 'L-AHMAR
629–897/1232–1492

Granada

- 629/1232: Muḥammad I b. Yūsuf, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Ghālib or al-Shaykh, called Ibn al-Aḥmar
- 671/1273: Muḥammad II b. Muḥammad I, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Faqīh
- 701/1302: Muḥammad III b. Muḥammad II, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Makhlūʿ
- 708/1309: Naṣr b. Muḥammad II, Abu ʿ1-Juyūsh, after 713/1314 governor in Guadix
- 713/1314: Ismāʿīl I b. Faraj, Abu ʿ1-Walid
- 725/1325: Muḥammad IV b. Ismāʿīl, Abū ʿAbdallāh
- 733/1333: Yūsuf I b. Ismāʿīl I, Abu ʿ1-Hajjāj al-Muʿayyad
- 755/1354: Muḥammad V b. Yūsuf I, Abū ʿAbdallāh, first reign
- 760/1359: Ismāʿīl II b. Yūsuf I, Abu ʿ1-Walid
- 761/1360: Muḥammad VI b. Ismāʿīl, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Ghālib (el Bermejo in Christian chronicles)
- 763/1362: Muḥammad V, al-Ghani, second reign
- 793/1391: Yūsuf II b. Muḥammad V, Abu ʿ1-Ḥajjāj al-Mustaghnī
- 794/1392: Muḥammad VII b. Yūsuf II, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Mustaʿīn
- 817/1417: Muḥammad VIII b. Yūsuf III, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Mutamassik (al-Ṣaghīr/el Pequeño), first reign
- 819/1419: Muḥammad IX b. Naṣr, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Ghālib (al-
Aysar/el Zurdo), first reign
1427 Muḥammad VIII, second reign
1429 Muḥammad IX, second reign
1432 Yūsuf IV, Abu ’1-Ḥajjāj (Ibn al-Mawl/Abenalmao)
1432 Muḥammad IX, third reign
1445 Muḥammad X b. ‘Uthmān, Abū ‘ Abdallāh (al-Ĥnaf/el Cojo), first reign
1445 Yūsuf V b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad V, Abu ’1-Ḥajjāj (Ibn Ismāʿīl/Aben Ismael), first reign
1446 Muḥammad X, second reign
1447–53 Muḥammad IX, fourth reign (1451–3 in association with Muḥammad XI)
1451–5 Muḥammad XI b. Muḥammad VIII, (el Chiquito) (1454–5 in competition with Saʿd)
⊘ 1464 ‘Alī b. Saʿd, Abu ’1-Ḥasan (Muley Hácen), first reign
⊘ 887/1482 Muḥammad XII b. Abī ’1-Ḥasan ‘Alī, Abū ‘ Abdallāh al-Zughūbī (Boabdil el Chico), first reign
1483 ‘Ali b. Saʿd, second reign
1485 Muḥammad b. Saʿd, al-Zaghal, from 1486 in competition with his nephew Muḥammad XII’s second reign
8967/1490–2 Muḥammad XII, third reign, d. 940/1533
897/1492 Spanish reconquest

After the Almohads (see below, no. 15) were defeated in Spain, most of the Muslim towns fell speedily into Christian hands: Cordova fell in 633/1236 and Seville in 646/1248. One Muslim chief, Muḥammad (I) al-Ghālib, who claimed descent from a Medinan Companion of the Prophet, managed to gain control of the mountainous and thus defensible extreme south of the Iberian peninsula covering the present provinces of Granada, Málaga and Almería with parts of Cádiz, Jaén and Murcia. He made Granada his capital and its citadel, known as the Alhambra (al-Ĥamrā ‘the Red [fortress]’), his centre,
agreeing to pay *pañasar* tribute first to Ferdinand III of Castile and León and then to his successor Alfonso X. The Naṣrid sultans were rivals with the Marmids of Morocco (see below, no. 16) for control of the Straits of Gibraltar, and Muḥammad I and Muḥammad V actually controlled Ceuta during 705–9/1305–9 and 786–9/1384–7, minting coins there. But they eventually had to seek help from the Marīnids against pressure from the Christian kingdoms of Castile and Aragón; yet Muslim hopes of successful Marīnid intervention in the Iberian peninsula were dashed when the Marinīd sultan Abu ’l Hasan ‘Alī and the Naṣrid sultan Yūsuf I were defeated by the Castilians and Portuguese at the battle of Tarifa (known in Christian sources as that of the Rio Salado) in 741/1340.

Despite its precarious position, partly because of instability and disturbances within the kingdom of Castile-Léon, the Naṣrid sultanate remained for two and a half centuries a centre for Islamic civilisation, attracting scholars and literary men from all over the Muslim West. The historian Ibn Khaldūn served as a diplomat for Muḥammad V on a mission to Pedro I of Castile at Seville, and in the vizier Lisān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb, whose history of Granada is a source of prime importance, Naṣrid Granada produced a major literary figure. But in the fifteenth century the internal unity of Granada was impaired by internecine rivalries among the ruling family, aided and abetted by powerful families like that of the Banu ’l-Sarrāj (the ‘Abencerrajes’). The marriage of Ferdinand II of Aragón (subsequently Ferdinand V of Castile-Aragon) to Isabella of Castile in 1469 brought about the unification of the greater part of Christian Spain under one crown, and the prospects for the sultanate’s survival darkened. Dynastic strife grew worse under the last Naṣrids, until in 897/1492 Granada was handed over to the Christians by Muḥammad XII (Boabdil), who remained as lord of Mondújar and the Alpujarras for one year and some months before crossing over to Morocco.

The history and the chronology of the last Naṣrid amīrs are extremely confused; where Christian era dates alone are given in the above list of rulers, this indicates that the chronology has to be constructed from Christian sources alone and that regnal dates are not provided by the Arabic ones.

Lane-Poole, 28–9; Zambaur, 58–9; Album, 15.
The lists of Lane-Poole and Zambaur are, in our present state of knowledge, very inaccurate and misleading. See now *EI²* ‘Nasrids’ (J. D. Latham), with a much more accurate chronology, utilising the standard histories of Rachel Arié, *L’Espagne*

F. Codera y Zaydin, Tratado de numismática arábigo-española, Madrid 1879.
A. Vives y Escudero, Monedas de las dinastías arábigo-españolas, Madrid 1893.
H. W. Hazard, The Numismatic History of Late Medieval North Africa, 84–5, 228, 279, 285 (for coins minted by the Naṣrids at Ceuta).
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THE IDRĪSIDS
172–375/789–985
Morocco

.mysql truncated
The Idrīsids were the first dynasty who attempted to introduce the doctrines of Shi‘ism, albeit in a very attenuated form, into the Maghrib, where the most vigorous form of Islam, – in a region where there was still much paganism and Christianity surviving – was that of the radical and egalitarian Khārijism. Idrīs I was a great-grandson of al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, hence connected with the line of Shi‘ī Imāms. He took part in the ‘Alid rising in the Ḥijāz of his nephew al-Ḥusayn, the ṣāḥib Fakhkh, against the ‘Abbāsids in 169/786, and was compelled to flee to Egypt and then to North Africa, where the prestige of his ‘Alid descent led several Zanāta Berber chiefs of northern Morocco to recognise him as their leader. There he settled at Walīla, the Roman Volubilis, but it seems that he also began the laying-out of a military camp, Madīnat Fās, nucleus of the later city of Fez. This last soon grew populous, attracting emigrants from Muslim Spain and Ifrīqiya, the eastern Maghrib, and became the Idrīsids’ capital. Its role as a holy city, home of the Shorfā (<shurafā’ ‘noble ones’), privileged descendants of the Prophet’s grandsons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, also begins now, and henceforth these Shorfā play an important role in Moroccan history (see below, nos. 20, 21).

The Idrīsid period is also important for the diffusion of Islamic culture over the recently-converted Berber tribesmen of the interior.

However, during the reign of Muḥammad al-Muntaṣir, the Idrīsid dominions became politically fragmented as a result of his decision to divide out the family’s various towns – the Idrīsids’ hold on Morocco was essentially urban-based rather than on the countryside – as appanages for several of his numerous brothers. The Idrīsids thus fell prey to attacks from their Berber enemies, but in the early tenth century a more determined and dangerous foe appeared in the shape of the radical Shi‘ī Fāṭimids of Ifrīqiya. Yaḥyā IV had to recognise the suzerainty of the Mahdī ‘Ubaydallāh, and much of his territory was detached and given to the Miknāsa Berber chief Mūsā b. Abī ’l-Afiya. The Idrīsids were subsequently driven to the peripheries of Morocco, so that there were minor branches at places like Tamdult in the south, but the main line was established among the Ghumāra Berbers in the Rīf of northern Morocco. These last gave their allegiance
variously to the Spanish Umayyads, who were now, under their caliph ‘Abd al-Rahmān III, attempting to extend their influence in North Africa, and to the Fāṭimidids. In 353/974, the Idrīsid al-Ḥasan had to surrender to the Umayyads and was carried off to Cordova. Some years later, he managed to reappear, with Fāṭimid support, but was killed by Umayyad forces and the Idrīsid dynasty in North Africa ended.

However, during the period of Umayyad decadence in the early eleventh century, a distant branch of the Idrīsids, the Ḥammūdids, succeeded in establishing Taifa principalities in Málaga and Algeciras (see above, no. 5, Taifas nos 1, 2).

Lane-Poole, 35; Zambaur, 65 and Table 4; Album, 15.
D. Eustache, Corpus de dirhams idrīsides et contemporains. Collection de la Banque du Maroc et autres collections mondiales, publiques et privées, Rabat 1970–1, with a list of rulers and genealogical tables at pp. 3ff. and with notes at pp. 17–24.
The Rustamids have an importance for the history of Islam in North Africa disproportionate to the duration and limited extent of their political power. In the eighth century, the majority of the Berbers of North Africa adopted the radical, egalitarian religio-political sect of Khārijism, perhaps as an expression of their own ethnic solidarity against domination by their orthodox Sunnī Arab masters. Whereas in the east, except for certain areas of concentration, Khārijism tended to be an extremist, savagely violent minority faith, in North Africa, though equally violent, it was more of a mass movement. The Khārijī sub-sect of the ʿIbāḍiyya, the followers of one ʿAbdallāh b. ʿIbāḍ of Baṣra, had their original North African centre among the Zanāta Berbers of the Jabal Nafūsa in modern Tripolitania; and, after a
temporary capture of Kairouan (Qayrawān) in central Ifrīqiya or Tunisia, the bastion of Arab religious orthodoxy and military power, these Ibāḍīs controlled a vast region from Barca to the fringes of Morocco. When Arab dominion was largely re-established, a group of the Ibāḍīs under the leadership of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Rustam (whose name would indicate Persian descent; he was later provided with a doubtless fictitious genealogy back to Sāsānid royalty) fled to what is now western Algeria.

Here, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān in 144/761 founded a Khārijī principality based on the newly-founded town of Tahert (Tāhart) (near modern Tiaret), and some fifteen years later he was offered the imamate of all the Ibāḍiyya of North Africa. This nucleus in Tahert was linked with Ibāḍī communities in the Aurès, southern Tunisia and the Jabal Nafūsa, and groups as far south as the Fezzān oasis acknowledged the spiritual headship of the Ibāḍī Imāms. Surrounded as they were by enemies, including the Shī‘ī Idrīsids (see above, no. 8) to the west and the Sunnī ‘Abbāsid governors and then the Aghlabids to the east, the Rustamids sought the alliance of the Spanish Umayyads, and received subsidies from them. But the rise of the messianic Shī‘ī Fāṭimid dā‘ī or propagandist Abū ‘Abdallāh; many of the Rustamids were massacred, and the rest fled southwards to the oasis of Ouargla (Wargla).

Tahert under the Rustamids enjoyed a great material prosperity, being one of the northern termini, like Sijilmāsa, of the trans-Saharan caravan routes, and it acquired the name of ‘the Iraq of the Maghrib’. It attracted a cosmopolitan population, among whom were appreciable Persian and Christian elements, and was a centre of scholarship. Its great historical role was as a rallying-point and nerve-centre for Khārijism throughout North Africa; although Tahert succumbed to the Fāṭimids, Ibāḍī doctrines long remained potent in the Maghrib, and have indeed survived to this day in a few places like the Mzāb oasis in Algeria, the Tunisian island of Djerba (Jarba) and in the Jabal Nafūsa.

It is somewhat remarkable that no coins of the Rustamids have yet been found.
Sachau, 24–5 no. 55; Zambaur, 64.

EI¹ ‘Tāhert’ (G. Marçais), EI² ‘Ibāḍiyya’ (T. Lewicki), ‘Rustamids’ (M. Talbi).

The Banū Mīdrār were a Berber family from the Miknāsa tribe who arose in the town of Sijilmāsa on the Sahara fringes of Morocco, either at roughly the same time as the town was founded (or refounded) or shortly afterwards, in the second half of the eighth century. The town, which seems originally to have been a settlement of Ṣufrī Khārijīs, now flourished as the northern terminus of trans-Saharan caravan trade coming from West Africa; the Mīdrārids came to levy transit dues and taxes on the products of the mines of
southern Morocco and Mauritania (we know virtually nothing, however, of any corresponding cultural activity in the town under their rule). The chiefs of the Midrārid family had become prominent there, but it is difficult to pin down the date of the actual dynasty’s beginning. A convenient date, however, is 208/823, when Abū Mālik al-Muntaṣir, called Midrār (‘copiously flowing’ [with milk, largesse, etc.]), achieved power.

At first, the Midrārids were nominal vassals of the ‘Abbāsid caliphs, but had some connections with the Rustamids of Tahert (see above, no. 9), who were also Khārijī in faith. But in the early tenth century, following a prediction according to which the expected Mahdī or Divinely-Guided One of the Shī‘a was to appear at Sijilmāsa, the partisans of the future founder of the Fāṭimid dynasty (see below, no. 27), ‘Ubaydollāh al-Mahdī, took over Sijilmāsa in 296/909. The Midrārids were henceforth generally vassals of the Fāṭimids. But Muḥammad b. Wāsūl’s repudiation of Ṣufrī Khārijīsm and adoption of Mālikī Sunnism involved adherence to the cause of the Spanish Umayyads, and this change of loyalties, plus his assumption, like the Umayyads, of the exalted title of caliph, provoked a Fāṭimid reconquest of Sijilmāsa. The Midrārids returned to control the town briefly, but their dominion was ended around 366/977 or shortly thereafter, when Khazrūn, the chief of the Berber Maghrāwa tribe, which was allied with the Spanish Umayyads, killed the last Midrārid and put an end to the dynasty (the descendants of Khazrūn were in the early eleventh century to establish a Taifa principality at Arcos in Spain: see above, no. 5, Taifa no. 5).

Sachau, 25 no. 56; Zambaur, 64–5, 66; Album, 16.
EI¹ ‘Sidjilmāsa’ (G. S. Colin); EI² ‘Midrār, Banū’ (Ch. Pellat).
Ibrāhīm b. al-Aghlab’s father was a Khurāsānian Arab commander in the ‘Abbāsid army, and in 184/800 the son was granted the province of Ifrīqiya by Hārūn al-Rashīd in return for an annual tribute of 40,000 dinārs. The grant involved considerable rights of autonomy, and the great distance of North Africa from Baghdad ensured that none of the Aghlabids was much disturbed by the caliphal government, itself increasingly racked by succession disputes and internal strife after the mid-ninth century. Nevertheless, the Aghlabids always remained theoretical vassals of the caliphs, retaining the caliphs’ names in the khutba or Friday sermon though never on Aghlabid coins after...
the time of Ibrāhīm I. The first Aghlabids suppressed outbreaks of Berber Khārijism in their territories; and then, under Ziyādat Allāh I, one of the most capable and energetic members of the family, the great project of the conquest of Sicily from the Byzantines was begun in 217/827. An extensive corsair fleet was launched, making the Aghlabids masters of the central Mediterranean and enabling them to harry the coasts of southern Italy, Sardinia, Corsica and even that of the Maritime Alps. Malta was captured before 256/870 and occupied by the Muslims for over two centuries until the Norman reconquest. It is probable that the conquest of Sicily was begun in order to divert religious bellicosity into jihād against the infidels, for the early Aghlabid amīrs had to cope with strong internal opposition in Ifrīqiya from the Mālikī fiqhā’ or religious lawyers in Kairouan. By the opening of the tenth century the conquest of Sicily was virtually complete, and the island remained under Muslim rule, at first under governors appointed by the Aghlabids and then under those of the Fāṭimids, including the Kalbids (see below, no. 12), until the Norman reconquest of the later eleventh century, forming an important centre for the diffusion of Islamic culture to Christian Europe.

However, the Aghlabids’ hold on Ifrīqiya became loosened towards the end of the ninth century. The Shī‘ī propaganda of the dā‘ī Abū ‘Abdallāh had a powerful effect among the Kutāma Berbers of the mountainous region of what is now north-eastern Algeria. Kutāma forces inflicted several defeats on the Aghlabid army, and the last of the line, Ziyādat Allāh III, was compelled in 296/909 to abandon the capital al-Raqqāda, founded by his grandfather Ibrāhīm II, and fled to Egypt after fruitless attempts to secure help from the ‘Abbāsids, subsequently dying in the East. Ifrīqiya now became the nucleus of the Fāṭimids’ North African possessions, where they constructed their capital al-Mahdiyya, which then replaced al-Raqqāda.

Lane-Poole, 36–8; Zambaur, 67–8; Album, 15–16.
EI² ‘Aghlabids’ (G. Marçais).
M. Vonderheyden, La Berbérie orientale sous la dynastie des Benoû Aṭlāb 800–909, Paris 1927, with genealogical table at p. 332.
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THE KALBIDS
337–445/948–1053

Governors in Sicily

342/953  Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan, Abu ’l-Ḥusayn
359/970  ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan, Abu ’l-Qāsim
372/982  Jāhir b. ‘Alī
373/983  Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī
375/985  ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī
379/989  Yūsuf b. ‘Abdallāh, Abu ’l-Futūḥ Thiqat al-Dawla
388/998  Jaʿfar b. Yūsuf, Tāj al-Dawla
410/1019  Aḥmad al-Akḥal b. Yūsuf, Abū Jaʿfar Taʿyīd al-Dawla, d. 429/1038

Disintegration of Arab Sicily into various principalities, with the Norman conquest beginning from 452/1060 onwards


The Byzantine province of Sicily was conquered by Arab forces sent by the Aghlabids of Ifrīqiya (see above, no. 11) over a period of more than seventy years from 212/827 onwards, culminating in the capture of Taormina in 289/902. The Aghlabids appointed their own governors to the island, as did their successors in North Africa after 296/909, the Fāṭimids (see below, no. 27). The lengthy period of rule by the Kalbid governors began with the caliph al-Mansūr’s nomination of al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī al-Kalbī, although their
succession was not recognised as implicitly hereditary until al-Muʿizz’s caliphate in 359/970. The Fāṭimids’ transfer of their centre of power to Egypt meant, in practice, more freedom of action for the Kalbids, who nevertheless remained firmly loyal to their masters, receiving from them honorific titles and, latterly, resisting pressure from the Zīrids (see below, no. 13) in North Africa. In the early decades of their rule, the Kalbids combated the Byzantines and led frequent raids on Calabria and other parts of the Italian mainland, reaching as far as Naples. After c. 421/c. 1040, however, the power of the Kalbids was in decline, with attacks from the Byzantines and from Italian city-states like Pisa. All these led to a period of disintegration of Arab rule in Sicily into a series of tawā’ if resembling those in Spain (see above, no. 5), paving the way for the first appearance of the Normans in 1060 and the subsequent reincorporation of Sicily into Christendom.

It does not seem that the Kalbid governors ever minted coins in Sicily on behalf of their suzerains, but a puzzling point is the large number of glass weights of their period which have been found in Sicily, these being far more numerous than would have been needed for weighing out small quantities of precious metals. It has accordingly been suggested that these glass weights may have served as a purely local currency for minor transactions.

Sachau, 26 no. 64; Zambaur, 67–9.
EI² ‘Kalbids’ (U. Rizzitano); ‘Sikilliya’ (R. Traini, G. Oman and V. Grassi).
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THE ZĪRIDS AND ḤAMMĀDIDS
361–547/972–1152

Tunisia and eastern Algeria

1. Zīrid governors of the Maghrib for the Fāṭimids

after 336/947  Zīrī b. Manād
361/972  Yūsuf Buluggīn I b. Zīrī
373/984  al-Manṣūr b. Buluggīn I
386/996  Bādīs b. al-Manṣūr, Nāṣir al-Dawla

Division of authority

2. Zīrids of Kairouan

405/1015  Bādīs
Ø 406/1016  al-Muʿizz b. Bādīs
454/1062  Tamīm b. al-Muʿizz
501/1108  Yaḥyā b.Tamīm
509/1116  ‘Alī b. Yaḥyā
515–43/1121–48  al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī

Norman and then Almohad conquest, with al-Ḥasan as Almohad governor until 558/1163, d. 563/1168

3. Ḥammādids of Qalʿat Banī Ḥammād

405/1015  Ḥammād b. Buluggīn I
419/1028  al-Qāʿid b. Ḥammād, Sharaf al-Dawla
446/1054  Muḥsin b. al-Qāʿid
The Zīrids were Ṣanhāja Berbers inhabiting the central part of the Maghrib, who early identified themselves with the Fāṭimid cause in North Africa, bringing military relief to the Fāṭimid capital of al-Mahdiyya when in 334/945 it was besieged by the Khārijī rebel Abū Yazīd al-Nukkarī ‘the Man on the Donkey’. Accordingly, when the Fāṭimid caliph al-Mu‘izz left for Egypt, he appointed Buluggīn I b. Zīrī, whose family had already served the dynasty as governors, to be viceroy of Ifrīqiya. Buluggīn kept up the traditional enmity of his people with the nomadic Zanāta Berbers, and overran all the Maghrib as far west as Ceuta. A branch of the family under another son of Zīrī, Zāwī, took service in Spain under the Ḥājib al-Muẓaffar b. al-Manṣūr Ibn Abī ‘Amir, and after 403/1013 was able to found a Taifa in Granada (see above, no. 5, Taifa no. 6).

Buluggīn’s grandson Bādīs entrusted the more westerly part of his governorship to his uncle Ḥammād b. Buluggīn I, and the latter built a capital for himself and his family at Qal‘at Banī Ḥammād, in the upland plain of the Hodna near Msila in the central Maghrib. After discord broke out in 405/1015 between Ḥammād and Bādīs, in which the former temporarily transferred his allegiance to the ‘Abbāsids, there was a diviso imperii: the Zīrid main branch of North Africa remained in Ifrīqiya, with its capital at Kairouan, while Ḥammād’s line took over the lands further west.

The rich resources and wealth of Ifrīqiya tempted the Zīrid al-Mu‘izz b. Bādīs to rebel against his Fāṭimid overlords, and in 433/1041 he gave his allegiance to the ‘Abbāsids (the Ḥammādīd al-Qā’id, after temporarily recognising the Baghdad caliphs, returned to Fāṭimid allegiance). Hence shortly afterwards, the Fāṭimids in Egypt released against the Zīrids bands of unassimilated, barbarian Bedouins of the Hilāl and Sulaym tribes, who migrated from Lower Egypt to the Maghrib. These Arabs gradually worked their way across the countryside, terrorising the towns and forcing the Zīrids
to evacuate Kairouan for al-Mahdiyya on the coast and the Ḥammādids to withdraw to the less accessible port of Bougie (Bijāya), renamed al-Nāṣirīyya after its founder al-Nāṣir b. ‘Alannās. Having lost control of the land, the two sister lines turned to the sea and built up a fleet; it is, indeed, this period which inaugurates the age of the Barbary corsairs. But they were unable to prevent Muslim Sicily from falling to the Normans, even though peaceful commercial relations were later established with the Norman kings. By the twelfth century, the Zīrids were hard pressed; Roger II of Sicily captured al-Mahdiyya and the Tunisian coast, forcing the Zīrid al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī to pay tribute. Also, within the Maghrib, the Almohads (see below, no. 15) were now advancing relentlessly eastwards. The Ḥammādids were overrun, and the last ruler, Yaḥyā, surrendered at Constantine and ended his days in exile in Morocco. The last Zīrid, al-Ḥasan, was at one point reinstated as Almohad governor of al-Mahdiyya, functioning there until the Almohad sultan ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s death in 558/1163, but died also in Morocco eight years later.

Lane-Poole, 39–40; Zambaur, 70–1; Album, 16.
EI¹ ‘Zīrids’ (G. Marçais); EI² Ḥammādids’ (H. R. Idris).
H. R. Idris, La Berbérie orientale sous les Zīrīdes Xe–XIIe siècles, 2 vols, Paris 1962, with detailed genealogical and chronological tables at II, 830ff., making many corrections to Zambaur.
The Almoravids arose from one of the waves of spiritual exaltation which have from time to time in the history of the Maghrib come over the Berber peoples there. In the early part of the eleventh century, the Ṣanhāja chief Yahyā b. Ibrāhīm of the Gudāla tribe, whose territories extended over parts of what became in modern times the Spanish Sahara and Mauritania, made the Pilgrimage to Mecca. Fired with enthusiasm, he came back to his own people with a Moroccan scholar, ‘Abdallāh b. Yāsīn, with the intention of propagating a strict form of Mālikī Sunnism. The militant and expansionist ideology which ‘Abdallāh b. Yāsīn now brought into being was, according to later local historians, given impetus by the community of murābiṭūn, dwellers in a ribāṭ or hermitage situated near the mouth of the Senegal River or along the Mauritanian coast; but if this dār al-murābiṭūn did in fact exist,
its importance may well have been exaggerated. At all events, the term for these warriors, *murābiṭūn* ‘those dwelling in a hermitage or frontier fortress’, was to yield the Spanish form *Almorávides* by which the subsequent dynasty was to be called, and also the French word *marabout* ‘holy man, saint’, a figure especially characteristic of North African Muslim piety. These Berber warriors of the Sahara wore veils over their faces against the sand and wind (as do their modern descendants the Tuaregs), hence were also known as *al-mutalaththimūn* ‘the veiled ones’.

Led by the Lamtunā chiefs Yahyā and Abū Bakr and then by the latter’s lieutenant Yūsuf b. Tāshufīn, the Almoravids moved northwards against Morocco and conquered North Africa as far as the central part of what is now Algeria. With Abū Bakr now deflected southwards into the western Sahara, Yūsuf founded Marrakech (Marrākush) as his capital in 454/1062; from this event may be dated the formal beginning of the Almoravid dynasty in Morocco, explicitly designated on some coins, after Yūsuf’s death, as the Banū Tāshufīn. The Almoravids recognised the ‘Abbāsid caliphs as spiritual heads of Islam and followed the conservative Mālikī law school, dominant in Spain and North Africa after the virtual demise of Khārijism.

Muslim Spain was at this time in the fragmented condition of the age of the *Mulūk al-Tawā’if* (see above, no. 5), and, now that the Christian Reconquista was gathering momentum, it became clear that only the rising power and enthusiasm of the Almoravids could save the divided and squabbling princelings there. Yūsuf b. Tāshufīn crossed over from Africa in 479/1086 and won a great victory over Alfonso VI of Léon and Castile at Zallāqa near Badajoz. Much Muslim territory was recovered or made secure in the western marches, although the recently-lost city of Toledo remained in Christian hands. Over the next few years, Yūsuf suppressed almost all the Taifas, only the Hūdids being allowed to remain in Saragossa (see above, no. 5, Taifa no. 17), and a fierce form of puritanical Islam, in which the works of the great theologian of eastern Islam, al-Ghazālī, were publicly burned, was introduced into Spain.

But in the early years of the twelfth century, the Almoravid position in the Maghrib was threatened by the rise there of a fresh religio-political movement, that of the Almohads and their Masmūda supporters in southern Morocco (see below, no. 15). It was because of this pressure in their rear that the Almoravids were unable to save Saragossa from the Christians in 512/1118. In 541/1147, the last Almoravid ruler in Marrakech, Ishāq b. ‘Alī,
was killed by ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s troops, and the Almohads now began crossing into Spain. When the last Almoravid governor there, Yaḥyā b. Ghāniya al-Massūfī, whose family was related by marriage to the Almoravid ruling house, died in 543/1148, Almoravid power was ended. However, the post-Almoravid line of this Berber family, the Banū Ghāniya, continued, and held power in the Balearic Islands until the beginning of the thirteenth century (see above, no. 6).

The Almoravids of Morocco, and the Maghrib in general, rapidly assimilated Andalusian culture at this time. Abu Bakr b. ‘Umar and Yūsuf b. Tāshufīn came to disclaim their Berber origins and instead pretended to a Qaḥṭānī, South Arabian, royal pedigree. The dominance of Mālikism in North Africa was given a great fillip by their patronage, and the study of Mālikī legal manuals was exalted above that of the Qur’ān and Hadīth, while kalām, scholastic theology, was regarded as positively inimical to the faith. Perhaps the most lasting legacy, however, of the Almoravid movement was the impetus which it gave to the spread of Islam, and of Almoravid religious doctrines in particular, southwards across the Sahara to the Sāḥil and Savannah zones of West Africa, namely to modern Senegal, Niger, Mali and northern Nigeria.

Lane-Poole, 41–4; Zambaur, 73–4; Album, 16.
EI² ‘al-Murābiṭūn’ (H. T. Norris and P. Chalmeta).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>524/1130</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. Tūmart (d. 524/1130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558/1163</td>
<td>'Abd al-Mu’min b. ‘Alī al-Kūmī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580/1184</td>
<td>Yūsuf I b. 'Abd al-Mu’min, Abū Ya‘qūb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595/1199</td>
<td>'Abd al-Mu’min b. Ya‘qūb, Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Nāṣīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610/1213</td>
<td>Yūsuf II b. Muḥammad, Abū Ya‘qūb al-Mustanṣīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621/1224</td>
<td>'Abd al-Wāḥid b. Yūsuf I, Abū Muḥammad al-Makhlū‘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621/1224</td>
<td>'Abdallāh b. Ya‘qūb, Abū Muḥammad al-‘Ādil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624-33/1227-35</td>
<td>Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad, Abū Zakariyyā’ al-Mu‘tasīm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>633/1235</td>
<td>'Abd al-Wāḥid b. Idrīs I, al-Rashīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640/1242</td>
<td>'Alī b. Idrīs I, Abu ’l-Ḥasan al-Sa‘īd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646/1248</td>
<td>‘Umar b. Isḥāq, Abū Ḥafṣ al-Murtaḍā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665-8/1266-9</td>
<td>Idrīs II b. Muḥammad, Abu ’l-'Ulā Abū Dabbūs al-Wāthiq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian conquest of all mainland Spain, except Granada, by the mid-seventh/thirteenth century; the Almohad North African territories divided among the Ḥafṣids, ‘Abd al-
The Almohads (an originally Spanish form from *al-Muwahhidūn* ‘those who proclaim God’s unity’) represented, intellectually and theologically, a protest against the rigidly conservative and legalistic Mālikism prevalent in North Africa and against the social laxity of life under the later Almoravids (see above, no. 14). Their founder, the Maṣmūda Berber Ibn Tūmart, had studied in the East and had acquired ascetic, reformist views. On returning to Morocco, he was in 515/1121 hailed by his followers as the Mahdī or promised charismatic leader who would restore and cause to triumph the true and universal Islam. For his fellow-Berbers of southern Morocco, he made available in their own language Muslim creeds and other theological and legal works, so that one aspect of his mission may have been to express the religious feelings of the mountain Berbers against the essentially urban attitudes of the Mālikī lawyers who were the mainstay of Almoravid religious authority. His lieutenant ‘Abd al-Mu’min assumed leadership of the movement on Ibn Tūmart’s death; he carried on the war against the Almoravids, gradually taking over Morocco from them, and after 542/1147 he made the Almoravid capital of Marrakech his own.

In Spain, there was a vacuum of power after the decline of the Almoravids there, in which some local groups like the Taifas of the previous century reappeared, for example at Valencia, Cordova, Murcia and Mértola (see above, no. 5, Taifas nos 11, 15, 18). Then, in 540/1145, ‘Abd al-Mu’min despatched an army to Spain and soon occupied the greater part of the Muslim-held territory there. A powerful Almohad kingdom, with its capital at Seville, was now constituted on both sides of the Straits of Gibraltar. The countryside of the central and eastern Maghrib had become economically disrupted, and socially and politically disturbed, by influxes of nomadic Arabs from the East, and the coastlands were being harried by Norman Christian raiders. With his highly effective military and naval forces, ‘Abd al-Mu’min conquered as far as Tunis and Tripoli, thus uniting the whole of North Africa under Almohad rule; the Ayyūbid sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn or Saladin (see below, no. 30) sought – in vain, as it proved – Almohad ships for his war against the Frankish Crusaders. The Almohad rulers now assumed the lofty titles of caliph and ‘Commander of the Faithful’.

The structure of the Almohad state reflected the messianic, authoritarian nature of Ibn Tūmart’s original teaching, and was built around a closely-knit
hierarchy of the caliphs’ advisers and intimates. Their court was a splendid centre of art and learning, above all, for the last flowering of Islamic philosophy associated with such scholars as Ibn Ṭufayl (Abubacer) and Ibn Rushd (Averroes), both of whom acted as court physicians to the Almohad rulers; and the Almohad period saw a remarkable florescence of a simple but monumental style of architecture in North Africa and at Seville. Intellectual speculation was nevertheless confined to the narrow court circles, and elsewhere in the Almohad empire a rigid and repressive orthodoxy prevailed. The Dhimmīs or ‘Protected Peoples’, Jews and Christians, suffered extreme hostility and persecution, seen in the massacres of Jews in Spain and Morocco, which triggered an exodus of Jews to Christian Europe and to the Near East; those to the latter destination included the physician and philosopher Maimonides, who fled from Cordova and settled in Cairo.

Abū Yūsuf Ya’qūb won a victory over the Christians of Spain at Alarcos (al-Arak) in 591/1195, and his successor freed the eastern Maghrib as far as Libya and the Balearic Islands from the control of the Banū Ghāniya (see above, no. 6). But Muḥammad al-Nāṣir’s catastrophic defeat in 609/1212 at Las Navas de Tolosa (al-‘Iqāb), at the hands of most of the Christian kings of the peninsula, led to a decline of Almohad authority in Spain and Morocco, with internal revolts and dynastic quarrels, and with Idrīs al-Ma’mūn repudiating the Almohad doctrine. Spain was abandoned, to face alone the impetus of the Reconquista, and the Almohad grip on North Africa began also to loosen. In 627/1230, the Ḥafṣid governor of Ifrīqiya proclaimed his independence (see below, no. 18), and a decade later the rising of Yaghmurāsan b. Zayyān or Ziyān in the central Maghrib led to the formation of the ‘Abd al-Wādid kingdom based on Tlemcen (Tilimsān) (see below, no. 17). Within Morocco, the Marīnids (see below, no. 16) began to wear down what remained of Almohad authority, culminating in their capture of Marrākush in 668/1269 and of Tinmallal, cradle of the Almohad movement, eight years later; the capital of Morocco now moved to Fez.
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EI² ‘al-Muwahhidūn’ (M. Shatzmiller).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614/1217</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Ḥaqq I al-Marīnī, Abū Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618/1220</td>
<td>‘Uthmān I b. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq I, Abū Saʿīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638/1240</td>
<td>Muḥammad I b. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq I, Abū Maʿrūf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642/1244</td>
<td>Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq I, Abū Yaḥyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656/1258</td>
<td>Yaʿqūb b. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq I, Abū Yūsuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685/1286</td>
<td>Yūsuf b. Yaʿqūb, Abū Yaʿqūb al-Nāṣir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706/1307</td>
<td>‘Amr b. Yūsuf, Abū Thābit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708/1308</td>
<td>Sulaymān b. Yūsuf, Abu ’l-Rabī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710/1310</td>
<td>‘Uthmān II b. Yaʿqūb, Abū Saʿīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731/1331</td>
<td>‘Alī b. ‘Uthmān II, Abu ’l-Ḥasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749/1348</td>
<td>Fāris b. ‘Alī, Abū ‘Inān al-Mutawakkil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759/1358</td>
<td>Muḥammad II b. Fāris, Abū Zayyān or Ziyān al-Saʿīd, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759/1358</td>
<td>Abū Bakr b. Fāris, Abū Yaḥyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760/1359</td>
<td>Tāshufīn b. ‘Alī, Abū ‘Amr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762/1361</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alī, Abū Sālim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763/1362</td>
<td>Muḥammad II b. Fāris, al-Muntaṣir, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(763/1362</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Ḥalīm b. ‘Umar, Abū Muḥammad, in Sijilmāsa only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Marīnids succeeded to the heritage of the Almohads (see above, no. 15) in Morocco and much of the lands of the Maghrib lying to the east. The Banū Marīn were a tribe of Zanāta Berbers who nomadised on the north-western fringes of the Sahara, where there now runs in a north-east to south-west direction the modern border between Algeria and Morocco. It seems that they were sheep herders and that they gave their name to the fine-quality merino wool exported from an early date via mediaeval Italy to Europe. The cultural level of the Banū Marīn was probably low; they were uninspired in their bid for power by any of the religious enthusiasms which had given impetus to the movements of the Almoravids and Almohads, and may not have been long converted to Islam. These facts, combined with what seem to have been comparatively restricted numbers, doubtless account for the protracted nature of their struggles in the mid-thirteenth century with the later Almohads. They first invaded Morocco from the Sahara in 613/1216, but were halted by the Almohad rulers, and did not capture the latter’s capital Marrakech until 668/1269 and Sijilmāsa until four years later.

Once established in their capital at Fez, the Marīnids acquired a strong
sense of being heirs to the Almohads, and attempted, with considerable success, to rebuild their empire in the Maghrib. They further nurtured the spirit of *jihād* and utilised popular religious fervour in the Maghrib for a desired reconquest of Spain. Several Marīnid sultans fought personally in the Iberian peninsula. Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb crossed over in answer to an appeal from the Naṣrids of Granada (see above, no. 7) and won the battle of Ecija in 674/1275. After the Christian capture of Gibraltar in 709/1309, Marīnid troops again appeared in Spain, but Abu ’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī was routed at the Rio Salado in 741/1340 by the forces of Alfonso XI of Castile and his brother-in-law Alfonso IV of Portugal, and the Marīnids never again tried to intervene directly in Spain. Within North Africa, the Marīnids wore down their neighbours the ‘Abd al-Wādids (see below, no. 17), occupying their capital Tlemcen in 737/1337 and 753/1352 and temporarily dislodging the Ḥafṣids from Tunis in 748/1347, for a while controlling the whole Maghrib. These years of the later thirteenth and the first two-thirds of the fourteenth century also saw a remarkable cultural and artistic efflorescence in Morocco, seen in the extensive building of mosques, madrasas and other public buildings which gave concrete expression to the strength of a restored Mālikism and an increased trend towards popular Sūfism and maraboutism.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century, the decline of the Marīnids began to be apparent. In 803/1401, Henry III of Castile attacked Tetouan (Tiṭṭāwīn) and in 818/1415 the Portuguese took Ceuta (Sabta), and this extension of the Reconquista to North Africa provoked a further wave of religious sentiment and calls for *jihād* in the Maghrib against the infidels. Within the Marīnid sultanate, there was a prolonged series of succession crises, with Marīnid princes placed on the throne for short reigns by palace coups or by Arab and Berber tribal revolts. After the assassination of sultan Abū Sa‘īd ‘Uthmān III in 823/1420, *de facto* power in the western Maghrib was assumed by a family related to the Marīnids, the Banū Waṭṭās (see below, no. 19), acting at first as regents for the infant Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq II; but after the latter’s murder in 869/1465, the Waṭṭāsids shortly afterwards succeeded in form as well as name to the heritage of the Marīnids in Morocco.
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*EI*¹ ‘Merīnids’ (G. Marçais); *EI*² ‘Marīnids’ (Maya Shatzmiller), with detailed genealogical table, correcting and replacing that of Zambaur. 
THE ‘ ABD AL-WĀDIDS OR ZAYYĀNIDS OR ZIYĀNIDS
633–962/1236–1555
Western Algeria

633/1236 Yaghmurāsan b. Zayyān or Ziyān, Abū Yaḥyā
681/1283 ‘Uthmān I b. Yaghmurāsan, Abū Saʿīd
703/1304 Muḥammad I b. ‘Uthmān, Abū Zayyān or Ziyān
707/1308 Mūsā I b. ‘Uthmān, Abū Hammū
718/1318 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān I b. Mūsā I, Abū Tāshufīn

737/1337 First Marīnid conquest
749/1348 ‘Uthmān II b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān I, Abū Saʿīd
753/1352 Second Marīnid conquest

760/1359 Mūsā II b. Yūsuf, Abū Ḥammū
791/1389 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān II b. Mūsā II, Abū Tāshufīn
796/1394 Yūsuf I b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān II, Abū Thābit
796/1394 Yūsuf II b. Mūsā II, Abū ‘l-Ḥajjāj

797/1395 Muḥammad II b. Mūsā II, Abū Zayyān or Ziyān
802/1400 ‘Abdallāh I b. Mūsā II, Abū Muḥammad
804/1402 Muḥammad III b. Mūsā II, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Wāthiq
813/1411 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III b. Muḥammad III, Abū Tāshufīn
814/1411 Saʿīd b. Mūsā II
814/1411 ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Mūsā II, Abū Mālik, first reign
827/1424 Muḥammad IV b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III, Abū ‘Abdallāh
831/1428 ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Mūsā II, second reign
833/1430 Aḥmad I b. Mūsā II, Abu ’l-‘Abbās
The ‘Abd al-Wādids or Zayyānids or Ziyānids were originally from the Wāsīn tribe of Zanāta Berbers, hence kin to the Marīnids (see above, no. 16). They rose to prominence in what is now north-western Algeria through their support to the Almohads, so that their chief, Yaghmurāsan (? Yaghamrāsan), was able to found a principality of his own based on Tlemcen (Tilimsān). The decay of his Almohad suzerains left him exposed to attack by the Marīnids of Fez, and after his death the latter were twice to occupy Tlemcen. The ‘Abd al-Wādīd princes endeavoured to stem Marīnid ambitions against Tlemcen through alliances with Christian Castile and the Naṣrīds of Granada (see above, no. 7), common foes of the Marīnids, although, having inherited lands which had been devastated by the incoming nomadic Arabs of the Banū Hilāl and Banū Sulaym, their economic and military resources were limited. The only direction in which the ‘Abd al-Wādīd princes could themselves contemplate expansion was eastwards, although their raids here were generally checked by the Ḫafṣīds (see below, no. 18). The ‘Abd al-Wādīd principality never fully recovered from the Marīnid occupations, although the decline of the Marīnid rulers of Fez and their replacement by the less formidably aggressive Waṭṭāsīds (see below, no. 19) relieved pressure from the direction of Morocco. It was the Ḫafṣīds who were the main threat to Tlemcen in the fifteenth century, at one point successfully attacking the town and imposing
vassal ‘Abd al-Wādid princes on the throne there; but this threat was succeeded in the sixteenth century by ones from the Spaniards in Oran and the Turkish pashas in Algiers, and it was from the pressure of these last two powers that the ‘Abd al-Wādids finally succumbed in 962/1555, the son of the last ruler, al-Ḥasan, becoming a Christian convert under the name of Carlos.

Tlemcen owed much of its mediaeval florescence and splendour to the ‘Abd al-Wādids. It lay on the main east-west route through Algeria to Morocco, with a caravan route southwards to the Sahara and with its own port at nearby Hunayn, which traded with the Christian powers of the western Mediterranean. The fine public buildings of Tlemcen attest the encouragement of learning and enlightened patronage of its princes.
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EI¹ ‘Tlemcen’ (A. Bel); EI² ‘Abd al-Wādids’ (G. Marçais).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>627/1229</td>
<td>Yaḥyā I b. ‘Abd al-Wāḥid, Abū Zakariyyā’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647/1249</td>
<td>Muḥammad I b. Yaḥyā I, Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Mustanṣir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675/1277</td>
<td>Yaḥyā II b. Muḥammad I, Abū Zakariyyā’ al-Wāthiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678/1279</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm I b. Yaḥyā I, Abū Isḥāq, k. 682/1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681/1282</td>
<td>Usurpation of Aḥmad b. Abī ‘Umāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683/1284</td>
<td>‘Umar I b. Yaḥyā I, Abū Ḥafṣ (after 684/1285 in Tunis only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684/1285</td>
<td>Yaḥyā III b. Ibrāhīm I, Abū Zakariyyā’ al-Muntakhab (in Bougie and Constantine until 689/1299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694/1295</td>
<td>Muḥammad II b. Yaḥyā II, Abū ‘Abdallāh (or Abū ‘Aṣīda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709/1309</td>
<td>Abū Bakr I b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Abū Yaḥyā al-Shahīd (after 709/1309 in Constantine and after 712/1312 in Bougie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709/1309</td>
<td>Khālid I b. Yaḥyā III, Abu ‘l-Baqā’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711/1311</td>
<td>Zakariyyā’ I b. Aḥmad, al-Liḥyānī, Abū Yaḥyā (in Tunis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718/1318</td>
<td>Abū Bakr II b. Yaḥyā III, Abū Yaḥyā al-Mutawakkil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747/1346</td>
<td>‘Umar II b. Abī Bakr II, Abū Ḥafṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748/1348</td>
<td>First Marīnid occupation of Tunis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750/1350</td>
<td>Aḥmad I b. Abī Bakr II, Abu ’l-‘Abbās al-Faḍl al-Mutawakkil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750/1350</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm II b. Abī Bakr II, Abū Isḥāq al-Mustanṣir, first reign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ḥafṣids, the most important dynasty in the history of later mediaeval Ifrīqiya, derived their name from Shaykh Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar al-Hintātī (d. 571/1176), a disciple of the founder of the Almohad movement, Ibn Tūmart (see above, no. 15), and one of ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s commanders. His offspring filled various important offices under the Almohads, including the governorship of Ifīqiya, and, once established as a separate dynasty, the early
Ḥafṣids were to continue Almohad traditions in many ways. One of these Ḥafṣid governors, Abū Zakariyyā’ Yaḥyā I, in 627/1229 threw off the authority of the Almohad caliph, alleging that the latter had abandoned the true Mu’minid traditions, and proclaimed himself an independent amīr. He now expanded westwards into the central Maghrib, taking Constantine, Bougie and Algiers, making the ‘Abd al-Wādids of Tlemcen (see above, no. 17) his tributaries, compelling the Marīnids of Morocco to acknowledge him and receiving appeals for help from the beleaguered Muslims of southern Spain. He further began the tradition of close commercial relations in the western Mediterranean with such powers as Angevin Sicily and Aragon. The power of the Ḥafṣids was equally great under his son Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad I, who repelled the attacks of Louis IX of France and Charles of Anjou (the Crusade of 668/1270), and assumed the titles of caliph and ‘Commander of the Faithful’ plus the grandiose honorific of al-Mustanṣir, obtaining these titles from the Sharīf of Mecca and claiming to be the heir of the recently-defunct Baghdad ‘Abbāsids (see above, no. 3, 1).

Towards the end of the thirteenth century, however, the unity of the Ḥafṣid amirate became loosened, with Bougie and Constantine, in particular, tending to fall under the authority of separate rulers from the Ḥafṣid family, and with southern Tunisia and the Djerid region also throwing off the control of Tunis during periods of weak rule. At times, there were several contenders for the throne in Tunis, with claimants ruling in various towns, and during the course of the fourteenth century the Ḥafṣid capital was twice occupied temporarily by the Marīnids (see above, no. 16). The dynasty rallied in the fifteenth century under such strong rulers as Abū Fāris ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Mutawakkil and his grandson Abū ‘Umar ‘Uthmān, but in the early sixteenth century the establishment of the Turks in Algiers and other ports and the inability of the Ḥafṣids to curb corsair depredations in the western Mediterranean invited attacks and reprisals by the Christians. A Turkish occupation of Tunis in 941/1535 drove out the Ḥafṣid ruler, who was only restored after the Emperor Charles V had planted a Spanish garrison at La Goletta later in that year. The last Ḥafṣids retained a precarious authority with Spanish help against the Turks; in 981/1573 Don John of Austria took Tunis, but in the following year the Ottoman commander Sinān Pasha recaptured it and carried off the last Ḥafṣid captive to Istanbul.

Tunis under the Ḥafṣids enjoyed a great resurgence of prosperity. Before the disruptive activity of the Barbary pirates caused a deterioration in
relations, the Ḥafṣids had fruitful commercial treaties with Anjevin Sicily, with the Italian and southern French cities and with Aragon. Both the economy and the culture of the land also benefited from the influx of Spanish Muslim refugees (among whom were the forebears of the historian Ibn Khaldūn). Tunis became a great artistic and intellectual centre, and it was the Ḥafṣids who in the thirteenth century introduced the madrasa system of education already flourishing in the central and eastern lands of Islam.

Lane-Poole, 49–50, 52–3; Zambaur, 74–6; Album, 17.
EI2 ‘Ḥafṣids’ (H. R. Idris).
R. Brunschvig, La Berbérie orientale sous les Ḥafṣides des origines à la fin du XVIe siècle, 2 vols, Paris 1940–7, with genealogical tables at II, 446.
Yaḥyā I b. Zayyān al-_WALLĀSĪ, Abū Zakariyyā’, at first regent for the Marīnid rulers and then as de facto ruler for them

852/1448 ʿAlī b. Yūsuf, de facto rulers for the Marīnids
863/1458–9 Yahyā II b. Yahyā I, de facto rulers for the Marīnids

Direct rule of the Marīnid ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq II

Rule of the Idrīsid Shorfā in Fez

Muḥammad I b. Yaḥyā I, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Shaykh

Muḥammad II b. Muḥammad I, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Burtuqālī

ʿAlī b. Muḥammad II, Abu ʿl-Ḥasan or Abū Ḥassūn, as rival ruler, first reign

Aḥmad b. Muḥammad II, first reign

Muḥammad III b. Aḥmad, al-Qaṣrī, Nāṣir al-Dīn

Aḥmad b. Muḥammad II, second reign

Saʿdid Sharīfs
The decline of the Marīnids (see above, no. 16) facilitated the rise of the Banū Waṭṭās, a collateral branch of the Berber Banū Marīn from which the family of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq I, founder of the Marīnid fortunes, had sprung. The Banū Waṭṭās settled in north-eastern Morocco and the Rīf as virtually autonomous governors for their Marīnid kinsmen, with whose rule they were always closely linked, receiving high offices and other favours from the sultans.

When Morocco fell into anarchy in the 1420s, with extensive Christian attacks on its coasts and with the murder of the Marīnid Abū Saʿīd ‘Uthmān III, the Waṭṭāsid Abū Zakariyyā’ Yaḥyā, governor of Salé (Salā), proclaimed a young son of the dead sultan as the new ruler (as events proved, the last of the Marīnid line), ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq II, with himself acting as regent. This regency of the Waṭṭāsids in fact lasted until well after the Marīnid reached his majority, and only latterly did ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq manage to throw off their tutelage. However, the Waṭṭāsids returned to power at Fez in 876/1472, now as independent rulers; under them, the city’s splendour to some extent continued as under the Marīnids, and it was during their time that Leo Africanus visited Fez.

Pressure from the Christian powers of the Iberian peninsula was meanwhile growing apace, and the fall of Granada in 897/1492 aroused a fresh wave of Islamic fervour in Morocco, spearheaded by the Saʿdid Shorfā from southern Morocco (see below, no. 20), who moved northwards and seized Marrakech in 929/1523 and Fez in 956/1549. The Waṭṭāsids even tried, in vain, to get help from the Emperor Charles V and from the Portuguese, but were unable to check the Saʿdid advance. A revanche with Ottoman Turkish help from Tlemcen achieved only a momentary success, with its ultimate failure sealing the fate of the dynasty permanently; some of the last Waṭṭāsids left for the Iberian peninsula and became converts to Christianity.

Lane-Poole, 58; Sachau, 26 no. 62; Zambaur, 79–80; Album, 18.  
EI1 ‘Waṭṭāsids’ (E. Lévi-Provençal).  
H. De Castries (ed.), *Les sources inédites de l’histoire du Maroc de 1530 à 1845, Série 1, Dynastie saadienne 1530–1660*, vol. IV, part I, Paris 1921, with detailed genealogical
tables of the Waṭṭāsids at pp. 162–3.
THE SA’ID SHARIFS
916–1069/1510–1659
Morocco

6/1510 Muḥammad I b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Qā’im al-Mahdī, in the Sūs

3/1517 Aḥmad al-A‘raj b. Muḥammad al-Mahdī, north of the Atlas, then in Marrakech after 930/1524 until 950/1543
     Maḥammad al-Shaykh b. Muḥammad al-Mahdī, Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Mahdī al-Imām, in the Sūs, then in Marrakech
     after 950/1543, and then in Fez after 956/1549 as sole Sa‘dī ruler in Morocco
     ‘Abdallāh b. Maḥammad al-Shaykh, Abū Muḥammad al-

4/1557 Ghālib

0 1/1574 Muḥammad II b. ‘Abdallāh, al-Mutawakkil al-Maslūkh

0 3/1576 ‘Abd al-Malik b. Maḥammad al-Shaykh, Abū Marwān

0 6/1578 Aḥmad b. Maḥammad al-Shaykh, Abu ’l-‘Abbās al-Manṣūr al-

Manṣūr al-Dhahabī

0 1012/1603 Zaydān, Abu ʿl-Maʿālī al-Nāṣir, in Fez until 1013/1604, then in the Sūs, then in Marrakech after 1018/1609 until his death in 1036/1627

0 ‘Abdallāh, Abū Fāris al-Wathiq, in Marrakech until 1015/1606, then in Fez until his death in 1018/1609

0 Maḥammad al-Shaykh al-Maʿmūn, in Fez from 1015/1606; killed in 1022/1613

sons of Ahmad al-Manṣūr, in rivalry for the sultanate
‘Abdallāh b. Maḥammad al-Shaykh al-Maˈmūn, al-Ghālib, at first in Marrakech, then after 1018/1609 in Fez until his death in 1032/1623

‘Abd al-Malik b. Maḥammad al-Shaykh, al-Muˈtaṣim, in Fez until 1036/1627

‘Abd al-Malik b. Zaydān al-Nāṣir, Abū Marwān, successor to his father in Marrakech until his death in 1040/1631

Aḥmad b. Zaydān al-Nāṣir, Abu ’l-‘Abbās, claimant

Muḥammad al-Walīd b. Zaydān al-Nāṣir, in Marrakech

Muḥammad al-Shaykh al-Aṣghar or al-Ṣaghīr b. Zaydān al-Nāṣir, in Marrakech

Aḥmad al-‘Abbās b. Muḥammad al-Shaykh al-Aṣghar

Power in Morocco divided between the Filālī or ‘Alawī Sharīfs of Tafilalt and the Dilāˈī marabouts of the Atlas

From mediaeval times onwards, the Shorfā of Morocco (classical form Shurafā’, sing. Sharīf) have played an outstanding part in the country’s history. The Maghrib has often been receptive to the leadership of messianic or charismatic figures, and some of the most characteristic forms of popular Islam there have been the cult of holy men, saints and marabouts (<murābit: see above, no. 14) and the formation of religious fraternities organised round the religio-military centres of the zāwiyas. The strength of maraboutism and the rise to social preeminence of the Shorfā have been especially characteristic of Moroccan Islam, for Morocco, with its Mediterranean and Atlantic seaboards and its proximity to Spain and Portugal, bore the brunt of crusading Christian naval and military attacks from the thirteenth century onwards, provoking a Muslim reaction of commensurate intensity.

The Sharīfs are the descendants in general of the Prophet Muḥammad, but in Morocco most of the lines of Shorfā have traced their descent from the Prophet’s grandson al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī, and the Saˈdids and their successors the ‘Alawīs or Filālīs (see below, no. 21) claimed descent thus, specifically via al-Ḥasan’s grandson Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh, called al-Nafs al-Zakiyya ‘the Pure Soul’ (killed at Medina in 145/767). The Idrīsids (see above, no. 8) were
the first line of Sharīfs to achieve power in Morocco, but in ensuing centuries various Berber dynasties from the Midrārids and Almoravids onwards (see above, nos 10, 14) dominated the history of the land. However, the chance of the Shorfā came in the sixteenth century when the power of the Berber Waṭṭāsids of Fez (see above, no. 19) was clearly waning. From a base in the Sūs of southern Morocco, the Sa‘did line of Shorfā – who had been quietly consolidating their position in southern Morocco for some two centuries – gradually extended northwards, seizing Marrakech in 930/1524 and Fez from the last Waṭṭāsids in 956/1549.

The full titles of the founder of the line’s fortunes, Sīdī Muḥammad al-Mahdī al-Qā’im bi-amr Allāh, show how messianic expectations in Morocco and feelings of religious exaltation and jihād against the Christians were utilised by the early Sa‘dīs. Their authority was now imposed over almost the whole of Morocco, and the Bilād al-Makhzan, or area where the sultan’s writ ran and from which taxation and troops were raised, reached its maximum extent. In the east, the Sa‘dīs had a determined enemy in the Turks of Algiers, who aimed at extending Ottoman suzerainty over as much of the Maghrib as possible. Hence the Sa‘dīs did not hesitate in the sixteenth century to ally with powers like Spain and Navarre against the Turks, but a long-term aim of theirs was ejection of the Portuguese from their presidios or garrison towns on the Atlantic coast. Under the greatest ruler of the dynasty, Mawlāy Aḥmad al-Manṣūr, trading relations were established with Christian powers as far afield as England, with the Barbary Company receiving commercial privileges within Morocco. But his greatest achievement was a vast expansion southwards in 999/1590 through the Sudan to the Niger valley, defeating the local ruler or Askia of Gao (in modern Mali) and extending Moroccan dominion over the Sāhil and Savannah belt of West Africa from Senegal to Bornu. The gold which now accrued to al-Manṣūr from the Sudan earned him his further honorific of al-Dhahabī ‘the Golden One’, while control of the salt-pans of the Western Sahara brought further economic benefits to Morocco. The social and fiscal privileges of the Shorfā were now further consolidated and confirmed by each new sultan on his accession, and it was the Shorfā also who, at this time, played a leading role in the formation of a Moroccan feeling, strongly xenophobic and imbued with feelings of jihād, and concerned to preserve the land against Christian and Turkish encroachments.

However, in the early seventeenth century the Sa‘dīs were rent by
succession disputes, with anarchy over much of Morocco and with various local adventurers and marabouts striving for power. The last Sharīfs tended to be confined to the Marrakech region, and, despite help at times from outside powers like the English and Dutch, the Saʿdīs disappeared in 1069/1659 as the authority of the ‘Alawī or Filālī Sharīfs of Tafilalt (see below, no. 21) rose pari passu with their decline and finally displaced them.

It should be noted that the honorific title Mawlāy ‘My Lord’ was frequently borne by and prefixed to the names of the Sharīfī sultans, both Saʿdī and Filālī, with the exception of those who were called Muḥammad and were therefore called Sayyīdī/Sīdī (with the same meaning), although the variant form Maḥammad (colloquial form M’ḥammed, used in the Maghrib with a hope of sharing in the baraka or charisma attached to the Prophet’s name without risk of the original form Muḥammad being profaned in any way) did not exclude the usage of Mawlāy.

Lane-Poole, 60–2; Zambaur, 81 and Table C; Album, 18.
EI1 ‘Shorfā’ (E. Lévi-Provençal); EI2 ‘Hasanī’ (G. Deverdun), with a genealogical table; ‘al-Maghrīb, al-Mamlaka al-Maghribiyya II. History’ (G. Yver*), ‘Saʿdīs’ (Chantal de La Véronne), with a genealogical table.
THE ‘ALAWID OR FILĀLĪ SHARĪFS
1041—/1631–
Morocco

1041/1631 Muḥammad I al-Sharīf, in Tafilalt, died 1069/1659

1045/1635 Muḥammad or Muḥammad II b. Muḥammad I al-Sharīf, in eastern Morocco, k. 1075/1664

⊘ 1076/1666 al-Rashīd b. Muḥammad I al-Sharīf, in Fez, originally in Oujda (Wajda)

⊘ 1082/1672 al-Ismā‘īl b. Muḥammad I al-Sharīf, al-Samīn, governor in Meknès (Miknāsa), then sultan in Fez

Aḥmad b. Ismā‘īl, al-Dhahabī, reigned on two occasions, died, at the end of the second reign, in 1171/1757; his power contested by several of his brothers, immediately in 1139/1727 by ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ismā‘īl, and subsequently by phé ‘Abdallāh (reigned on five occasions, beginning 1141/1729 and ending with his death in 1171/1757); ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Abidīn (reigned on two occasions); Muḥammad b. al-‘Arabiyya, al-Mustafī‘; etc.

⊘ 1171/1757 Muḥammad III b. ‘Abdallāh
⊘ 1204/1790 Yazīd b. Muḥammad III
⊘(1205–9/1790–4) Ḥusayn, in Marrakech)
⊘ 1206/1792 Hishām b. Muḥammad III
⊘ 1207/1793 Sulaymān b. Muḥammad III
⊘ 1238/1822 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Hishām
As the two Saʿdid makhzans based on Marrakech and Fez crumbled in the middle years of the seventeenth century (see above, no. 20), Morocco was rent by internal factions, usually with strong religious, maraboutic bases. It was the ‘Alawids or Filālī Shorfā, of the same Hasanī descent as the declining Saʿdīs, who finally succeeded in imposing order from an original centre in Tafilalt, the valley of the Wādī Zīz in south-eastern Morocco (whence the name Filālī). Mawlāy al-Rashīd was the first of the family to assume the title of sultan. He began the work of pacification and attempted a restoration of central authority throughout Morocco, but this proved an extremely lengthy process, so deep-rooted had become provincialism and anarchy. A strong figure like Mawlāy Ismāʿīl tried in vain to solve these problems by recruiting, in addition to the gīsh (<Class. Ar. jaysh) or the sultans’ military guard of Arabs, a standing army which included among other elements black slave troops, the ‘abīd al-Bukhārī (colloquially known as the Bwākher), descendants of black slaves imported by the Saʿdīs; it was also Ismāʿīl who developed Meknès as the capital and the favoured place of residence for himself and his eighteenth-century successors. But he failed to dislodge the Christians from the ports held by them, and, after his death, Morocco was plunged into its nadir of anarchy and brigandage, with a succession of rival, ephemeral rulers.

Some degree of order and prosperity was restored towards the end of the century; the last foothold of the Portuguese on the Atlantic coast at Mazagan (al-Jadīda) was taken over in 1182/1769, but the Spanish could not be dislodged from Ceuta and Melilla. Morocco was opened up to a limited extent for trade with Europe, and the new town of Mogador or Essouaira (al-Suwayra) was founded to accommodate and isolate the infidel merchants and
consuls whom the sultans were compelled reluctantly to admit. However, with an essentially mediaeval polity, hardly touched by the influences which during the course of the nineteenth century affected such Islamic lands as those of Egypt, the Ottoman empire and Persia, Morocco was ill-prepared for the two disastrous wars which she fought with France (1260/1844) and Spain (1277/1859–60). By the end of the century, the ‘Alawid dynasty was tottering, with the sultans’ power challenged by various pretenders and the country forming the locale for such international incidents as that of Agadir (1911). The French Protectorate proclaimed in 1330/1912 saved the ‘Alawid dynasty itself from disappearing and Morocco from disintegration and possible dismemberment by outside powers, although the work of pacification and restoration of the sultan’s authority took twenty years; it was 1930 before the makhzan was fully in control and before the modernisation of Morocco’s infrastructure could proceed properly. Sīdī Muḥammad V in 1934 aligned himself with the growing Moroccan nationalism of the Istiqlāl or Independence Party. After the end of the Second World War, friction between Moroccan nationalism, eager for independence, and the more cautious attitude of the French Protectorate authorities, grew. Conservative, traditionalist Moroccan forces lent support to the decision in 1953 to depose Muḥammad V, but it was soon apparent that the overwhelming mass of Moroccan opinion was behind the sultan and the desire for full independence, and he had to be restored two years later. Morocco became independent in 1956, and in 1957 Sīdī Muḥammad assumed the title of king, so that Morocco under his son and successor al-Ḥasan II is one of the few monarchies surviving today in the Arab world.

Lane-Poole, 60–2; Zambaur, 81 and Table C; Album, 18–19.
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THE ḤUSAYNID BEYS
1117–1376/1705–1957
Tunisia

1117/1705  al-Ḥusayn I b. ‘Alī al-Turki, k. 1152/1746
1148/1735  ‘Alī I b. Muḥammad
1170/1756  Muḥammad I b. al-Ḥusayn I
1172/1759  ‘Alī II b. al-Ḥusayn I
1196/1782  Ḥam(m)ūda Pasha b. ‘Alī II
1229/1814  ‘Uthmān b. ‘Alī II
1229/1814  Maḥgūd b. Muḥammad I
1239/1824  al-Ḥusayn II b. Maḥmūd
1251/1835  Muṣṭafā b Maḥmūd
1253/1837  Aḥmad I b. Muṣṭafā

⊘

1271/1855  Muḥammad II b. al-Ḥusayn II
⊘

1276/1859  Muḥammad III al-Ṣādiq b. al-Ḥusayn II
⊘

1299/1882  ‘Alī III b. al-Ḥusayn II
⊘

1320/1902  Muḥammad IV al-Hādī b. ‘Alī III
⊘

1324/1906  Muḥammad V al-Nāṣir b. Muḥammad II
⊘

1341/1922  Muḥammad VI al-Ḥabīb b. Muḥammad V
The Ḥusaynīd Beys arose out of the Turkish garrison for the Ottomans in Algiers. The commander al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī was raised to the Beylicate after the military defeat and deposition of the previous Bey of Tunis in 1117/1705. While the suzerainty of the Ottomans was to be acknowledged, with the sultans in their turn regarding the Ḥusaynids as provincial governors or beylerbeyis, al-Ḥusayn and his descendants were granted by the local Ottoman commanders hereditary succession by male primogeniture. In practice, this form of succession did not always happen, and latterly the succession tended to go to elderly collateral members of the family who were no longer fully competent to deal with affairs. But the Ḥusaynids were nevertheless to rule for two and a half centuries, though latterly under French protection. In an absence of Turkish interference, the Beys were able to make diplomatic agreements with European powers like France, England and the Italian states, and their power within Tunisia became somewhat firmer once Ḥam(m)ūda Pasha had suppressed the local corps of Janissaries in 1226/1811.

During the nineteenth century, there were signs that the Beys aimed at a policy more independent of their suzerains in Istanbul. The relationship, with the possibility of Ottoman diplomatic and military protection, still had advantages for Tunis, as in 1259–60/1843–4 when there was tension with Sardinia. Tunisian contingents joined the Ottoman forces during the Greek Revolt and the Crimea War, but in 1261/1845 Aḥmad I Bey managed, with French diplomatic backing, to throw off the obligation to send tribute to Istanbul. The Porte still regarded the Ḥusaynids as linked with themselves, as local müshīrs, marshals of the army, and wālīs, governors, but the link was
largely symbolic and was in any case ended in 1298/1881. Reckless spending by the Beys, abolition of the lucrative slave trade, an increased European commercial penetration of Tunisia plus administrative malpractices, brought Muḥammad Ṣādiq Bey to the verge of bankruptcy in 1286/1869, leading to the imposition of an international financial commission in order to regulate Tunisia’s debt. French pressure led to a military occupation of Tunisia in 1298/1881 followed by a Protectorate in 1300/1883, so that subsequent Beys functioned under a French Resident-General. At times, the Beys were able to give some impression of representing Tunisian national interests, despite their foreign origin; but in the twentieth century the nationalist movements of the Destour or Constitutionalists and then the Néo-Destour Parties became strong. In 1956, France agreed to the full independence of Tunisia, but the last Ḥusaynid, who was hailed as King of the Tunisians at Kairouan, ruled for only two months before he was forced out of his homeland by the Néo-Destour Party led by Habib Bourgiba (Ḥabīb Bū Ruqayba) and a republic was proclaimed.

The Beys displayed their dependence on the Ottoman by minting coins at Tunis only in the names of the Ottoman sultans, until in 1272/1856 Muḥammad II b. Ḥusayn II started the practice of adding his own name to that of the sultan; with the French occupation, the Beys and, later, the kings issued their own coins.

Zambaur, 84–5.

*El* 1 ‘Tunisia. 2. History’ (R. Brunschvig); *El* 2 ‘Ḥusaynids’ (R. Mantran).


The Qaramānlīs were a line of Turkish soldiers apparently arising out of the Qulughlīs or products of mixed marriages between the Turkish Janissary units in North Africa and local women. In the prevailing chaos and internal strife characterising early eighteenth-century Ottoman Tripolitania, Aḥmad Qaramānlī (whose name may derive from the fact that he or his forebears came originally from Qaramān in Anatolia) seized power, eventually receiving from the sultan in Istanbul the titles of Beylerbey or governor and Pasha and establishing what was virtually an independent line. From Tripoli (Ṭarābulus al-Gharb), he extended his control over most of what is now Libya. He and his sons managed to control the local factions of the Turks and the Arabs, and, despite the fact that Tripoli was notoriously a base of the Barbary corsairs, concluded trade agreements with countries like Britain and France. In the early nineteenth century, various rivals for the succession within the ruling family were to seek support from one or other of these two powers. But the appearance of the French in Algeria after 1830 alarmed the Sublime Porte and, taking advantage of Qaramānlī dissensions, sultan
Maḥmūd II sent an expedition against Tripoli which removed the Qaramānlīs and imposed a rule from Istanbul which lasted until the Italian seizure of Libya in the early twentieth century.

The Qaramānlīs used only coins in the names of the Ottoman sultans issued by the Tripoli mint.

Zambaur, 85.

*EI*¹ ‘Karamānlī’ (R. Mantran).
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THE SANūSĪ CHIEFS AND RULERS
1253–1389/1837–1969
Eastern Sudan and Libya

Sayyid Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, al-Idrīsī al-Sanūsī al-Kabīr, founder of the Sanūsiyya dervish order, d. 1275/1859

Sayyid Muḥammad al-Mahdī b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Sanūsī

Sayyid Aḥmad al-Sharīf b. Muḥammad al-Sharīf (in 1336/1918 gave up military and political leadership, but retained spiritual primacy until his death at Medina in 1351/1933)

Sayyid Muḥammad Idrīs b. Muḥammad al-Mahdī (initially as military and political leader; 1371/1951 King of Libya), d. 1401/1982

Ø 1336–89/1969 Republican régime

Muḥammad b.‘Alī, known as the ‘Great Sanūsī’, was born in Algeria towards the end of the eighteenth century. While studying in Fez, he was much influenced by Moroccan Ṣūfīsm, especially that of the Tijāniyya order; and later, while further studying in Ḥijāz, he joined several dervish orders himself and became an adherent of the Moroccan Ṣūfī and Sharīf Aḥmad b. Idrīs. In addition to this inclination towards mysticism, he developed reformist and innovatory ideas, and, after Aḥmad b. Idrīs’s death in 1253/1837, organised in Mecca his own tarīqa or order, the Sanusiyya. Finding his homeland Algeria in the process of being taken over by the French, he settled in Cyrenaica, where direct Ottoman Turkish rule had recently been imposed in place of the local line of Qaramānlī Pashas (see above, no. 23). Moving
into the desert interior rather than the coastlands, several zāwiyas or religious, educational and social centres for the Sanūsiyya were now founded there, including in 1272/1856 that of Jaghbūb near the Egyptian border. This was to be the headquarters of the order until 1313/1895, when it was moved southwards to the less accessible oasis of Kufra and, soon afterwards, to what is now northern Chad. The Sanūsī message appealed to the desert-dwellers of North Africa and the eastern Sudan. Veneration for the person of the Great Sanūsī accorded with the maraboutism and saint-worship of those regions, but the firm organisation of the order gave these enthusiasms effect and purpose. Expectations of a coming Mahdī, who would restore Islam to its pristine simplicity, were also rife, as events in Dongola were to show in the Mahdiyya movement there of the late nineteenth century. The Sanūsīs hoped for a reunion and regeneration of all Islamic peoples, and the Ottoman sultan ʿAbd al-Hamīlī II (see below, no. 130) hoped to recruit their support for his Pan-Islamic policies. The Sanūsiyya did, in fact, have a strong missionary zeal, and zāwiyas were founded in Ḥijāz, Egypt, Fezzān and as far south as Wadai and Lake Chad, the faith in this case following the trans-Saharan caravan routes.

The Sanūsīs were in the forefront of opposition to the French advance into Chad and the central Sudan, and for some twenty years after 1911 provided the driving power behind local Libyan resistance to the Italian invaders, especially in Cyrenaica. Italy’s entry into the First World War on the Allied side in 1915 inevitably inclined the Sanūsiyya to the Turkish cause, and the head of the order, Sayyid Aḥmad, had to leave for Istanbul in 1918; thereafter, the military struggle in Cyrenaica was left largely to local Sanūsī leaders. During the Second World War, the British government recognised Muḥammad Idrīs, who had been in exile in Egypt for twenty years, not merely as a spiritual head but also as Amīr or political head of the Sanūsīs of Cyrenaica. In 1371/1951 he became ruler of the independent federated kingdom of Libya, comprising Cyrenaica, Tripolitania and Fezzān; in 1382/1963 it became a unitary state. So far, the process of the Sanūsī family’s development from being heads of a religious movement to the headship of a modern Arab state had been somewhat reminiscent of the development of the Suʿūdī state in Arabia (see below, no. 55) out of the Wahhābiyya, but the Idrīsid monarchy of Libya was destined to have only a short life. The new state failed to develop a political system which could accommodate the aspirations of the new classes and a social one which could cope with the
new stresses resulting from the unprecedented Libyan oil boom of 1955 onwards. In 1969, King Idrīs was deposed by an army coup, and Libya became a republic under Colonel Mu‘ammar Gaddafī (Qadhdhāfī).

Zambaur, 89; EI² ‘al-Sanūsī, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, ‘Sanūsiyya’ (J.-C. Triaud). 
The Ṭūlūnids represent the first local dynasty of Egypt and Syria to secure some degree of autonomy from the caliphate in Baghdad. Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn (Ţūlūn < Turkish dolun ‘full [moon]’, the equivalent of Ar. badr) was a Turkish soldier whose father had been sent in the tribute from Bukhara in the early ninth century. Aḥmad first came to Egypt as deputy of the ‘Abbāsid 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, – brother of the caliph al-Mu‘tamid (see above, no. 3, 1) and virtual ruler – with the Zanj rebels in Lower Iraq, which
meant that Aḥmad could not be dislodged militarily from the west. Under Aḥmad’s son Khumārawayh, the Ṭūlūnīds’ fortunes continued to be high. The new caliph al-Muʿtadid (see above, no. 3, 1) had on his accession in 279/892 to grant to Khumārawayh and his heirs for thirty years Egypt, Syria up to the Taurus Mountains and Jazīra (northern Mesopotamia) with the exception of Mosul (Mawsil), in return for an annual tribute of 300,000 dinars. The treaty was later revised in a form less favourable to the Ṭūlūnīds, but it was not until Khumārawayh’s death in 282/896 that the fabric of the Ṭūlūnid empire, weakened by Khumārawayh’s luxurious living and extravagance – he left behind an empty treasury – began to crack. The inability of the last Ṭūlūnīds to keep the Carmathian radical religious sectaries of the Syrian desert in check led the caliph to despatch an army which conquered Syria and then seized the Ṭūlūnid capital of Fustāt or Old Cairo, carrying off the remaining members of the family to Baghdad and imposing a direct ʿAbbāsid rule over Egypt which was to last for thirty years.

For the mediaeval Egyptian historians, the age of the Ṭūlūnīds was a golden one. Ahmad held power by means of a large multi-ethnic army, which included Bedouins, Greeks and black Nubians, but the resultant financial burden was alleviated for the people of Egypt by the ending of governmental malpractices, only under Khumārawayh did administrative chaos and insubordination in the army appear. Since Syria can best be held from Egypt by sea, Aḥmad also built a strong fleet. He was a great builder in his capital Fustāṭ, laying out there the military quarter of al-Qataʿiʿ and constructing his famous mosque in order to accommodate all those troops who could not find room in the mosque of the conqueror of Egypt ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ.

Lane-Poole, 68; Zambaur, 93; Album, 20.
EI1 ‘Ṭūlūnīds’ (H. A. R. Gibb)
Z. M. Hassan, Les Tulunides; étude de l’Egypte musulmane à la fin du IXe siècle, Paris 1933.
Muḥammad b. Ṭughj came of a Turkish military family which had already been in the service of the ‘Abbāsids for two generations. He was appointed governor of Egypt in 323/935 and remained a faithful vassal of the caliphs. He also secured from al-Rādī (see above, no. 3, 1) the title of al-Ikhshīd. The Arabic sources are unclear about the meaning of this title, but it is obvious that Muḥammad b. Ṭughj knew that it was a title of honour in the Central Asian homeland of his forefathers (it is in fact an Iranian title meaning ‘prince, ruler’, and had been borne by the local Iranian rulers of Soghdia and Farghāna). Muḥammad b. Ṭughj defended himself against the caliph’s Amīr al-Umarāʾ or Commander-in-Chief, Muḥammad b. Rāʾīq, and against the Hamdānids in Syria (see below, no. 35, 2), holding on to Damascus. The two sons who succeeded him were, however, mere puppets, and real power in the
state passed to Muhammad b. Tughj’s 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 ‘Alī’s death in 355/966, Kāfūr became unrestricted ruler. To him belongs the credit for holding up the threatened Fāṭimid advance along the North African coast (see below, no. 27) and for containing the Hamdānids in northern Syria. It was only after his death that a weak and ephemeral grandson of Muhammad b. Ṭughj was installed in Fustāt, to go down almost immediately before the Fātimid invasion, this time successful. Kāfūr was famed as a liberal patron of literature and the arts, and it was at his court that the poet al-Mutanabbī spent some time.

Lane-Poole, 69; Zambaur, 93; Album, 20.

*EI*¹ ‘Ikshīdids’ (C. H. Becker); *EI*² ‘Kāfūr’¹ (A. S. Ehrenkreutz), ‘Muhammad b. Ṭughdi’ (J. L. Bacharach).
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THE FĀTIMIDS
297–567/909–1171

North Africa, then Egypt and southern Syria

Thedā‘ī or propagandist Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Shī‘ī, active in North Africa preparing the way for:

- 297/909 'Abdallāh (or ‘Ubaydallāh) b. Husayn, Abū Muhammad al-Mahdī
- 322/934 Muḥammad b. (?) al-Mahdī, Abu Ḥ-l-Qāsim al-Qā’im
- 334/946 Ismā‘īl b. al-Qā’im, Abū ‘Ṭāhir al-Manṣūr
- 341/953 Ma‘add b. al-Manṣūr, Abū Tamīm al-Mu‘izz
- 365/975 Nizār b. al-Mu‘izz, Abū Manṣūr al-‘Azīz
- 386/996 al-Manṣūr b. al-‘Azīz, Abū ‘Alī al-Hākim
- 411/1021 ‘Alī b. al-Ḥākim, Abu l-Ḥasan al-Ẓāhir
- 427/1036 Ma‘add b. al-Ẓāhir, Abū Tamīm al-Mustansir
- 487/1094 Ahmad b. al-Mustansir, Abu ‘l-Qāsim al-Musta‘lī
- 495/1101 al-Manṣūr b. al-Musta‘lī, Abū ‘All al-Āmir

- 524/1130 Interregnum; rule by al-Ḥāfiẓ as regent but not yet as caliph; coins in the name of al-Muntazar ‘the Expected One’

- 544/1149 Ismā‘īl b. al-Hāfiẓ, Abu l-Manṣūr al-Ẓāfir
- 549/1154 ‘Isa b. al-Ẓāfir, Abu Ḥ-l-Qāsim al-Fā’iz

- 555–67/1160–71 ‘Abdallāh b. Yūsuf, Abū Muhammad al-‘Ādid Conquest by the Ayyūbid Salāh al-Dīn (Saladin)
The Fāṭimids claimed ‘Alid descent, and their name derives from Fāṭima, daughter of the Prophet and wife of the fourth caliph ‘Alī (see above, no. 1). Sunnī and mainstream Shī‘ī opponents usually referred to them as the ‘Ubaydiyyūn, descendants of ‘Abdallāh (or ‘Ubaydallāh, as they termed him) al-Mahdī, explicitly rejecting any ‘Alid connection; it is unclear whether the Fāṭimid caliphs ever in fact referred to themselves as ‘the Fāṭimids’. Some of the Fāṭimids’ enemies even accused them of Jewish origins (this being, however, a standard form of calumny in mediaeval Islam). A connection with the main line of ‘Alid Imāms, through Ismā‘īl, son of the Sixth Imām Ja‘far al-Sādiq, certainly seems dubious, and it is more likely that the forebears of ‘Abdallāh al-Mahdī stemmed either from ghulāt or extremist Shī‘ī circles in Kūfa or else from ‘Alī’s half-brother ‘Aqīl b. Abī Ṭālib. At all events, the constituting of the Fāṭimid state represents the most successful and enduring political achievement of radical, Ismā‘īlī Shi‘īsm at this time.

The first Fāṭimid caliph came from Salamiya in Syria to North Africa, where the dissemination of Shī‘ī propaganda had already made conditions propitious for his arrival. With the support of the sedentary Kutāma Berbers, his agent, the dā‘ī Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Shī‘ī, overthrew the Aghlabid governors of Ifrīqiya (see above, no. 11) and the Khārijī Rustamids of Tahert (see above, no. 9); subsequently, the Idrīsids of Fez (see above, no. 8) became tributaries of the Fāṭimids. In 297/909 the Mahdī was proclaimed caliph, in rivalry to the ‘Abbāsids of Baghdad, at al-Raqqāda in Ifrīqiya. Subsequently, Sicily was occupied and naval operations were undertaken against the Byzantines. From their Ifrīqiyan base of al-Mahdiyya, the Fāṭimids amassed supplies and treasure in preparation for an advance eastwards, and in 358/969 their general Jawhar entered Old Cairo or Fuṣṭāṭ, removing the last Ikhshīdid (see above, no. 26). As they had done in the case of al-Mahdiyya in Ifrīqiya, the Fāṭimids began to build for themselves a new capital in Egypt, that of New Cairo (al-Qāhira ‘the Victorious’).

From Egypt, the Fāṭimids extended into Palestine and Syria. During the long reign of al-Mustanṣir, spanning much of the eleventh century, they reached the zenith of their power. After initially clashing with the Byzantines over Syria, the caliphs in general enjoyed peaceful relations with the Greeks; later in the century, the common threat of the Seljuqs and the Turkmen adventurers in Syria and Anatolia further drew them close together. The Ismā‘īlī dā‘īs of the Fāṭimids worked as far afield as the Yemen and Sind, and in 451/1059 Baghdad was temporarily held in the name of al-Mustanṣir.
The appearance of the First Crusade at the end of the century brought about the wresting of Jerusalem from its Fāṭimid governor, but by then the Fāṭimid presence in Palestine and Syria had become essentially one in only the coastal towns there; yet on the whole, the Crusaders posed a greater threat to the various Turkish rulers of Syria than to the Fāṭimids. Certain Sunni Muslim historians allege that the Fāṭimids encouraged the Franks to land in the Levant, but this is improbable. The Fāṭimid viziers of the mid-twelfth century cooperated with the Zangid Nūr al-Dīn of Aleppo and Damascus (see below, no. 93, 2) against the Crusaders, but nevertheless lost Ascalon (‘Asqalān) to them in 548/1153. Soon afterwards, the Fāṭimid caliphate began to crumble internally; the caliphs had by now lost much of their power, and the viziers had assumed much of the executive and military leadership. Accordingly, it was not difficult for the Ayyūbid Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (see below, no. 30) to end Fāṭimid rule altogether in 567/1171 as the last caliph lay dying.

In rivalry with the ‘Abbāsids, the Fāṭimids had proclaimed themselves the true caliphs and had assumed regnal titles which expressed the messianic nature of their original movement and the theocratic nature of their established rule, for example al-Mahdī, al-Qā’im and al-Zāfīr. Yet the majority of their subjects remained Sunnīs and, under the Fāṭimids’ generally tolerant rule, retained most of their religious liberty. Many of the dā’īs who were 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 up to the level of the vizierate. It was during al-Ḥākim’s reign that the extremist Shī‘ī religious movement of the Druzes became implanted in southern Lebanon and Syria; because of al-Ḥākim’s encouragement of the dā‘ī al-Duruzī, the Druzes came to revere that caliph as an incarnation of God. On the death of al-Mustansir, there was a serious split in the Ismā‘īlī movement, with two opposing parties ranged behind his sons Nizār and al-Musta‘lī. The partisans of the former, the more activist and extreme of the two groups, became the Assassins or Ismā‘īlīs of Syria and Persia (see below, nos 29, 101), while al-Musta‘lī’s more moderate followers are the spiritual ancestors of the modern Bohrā Ismā‘īlīs of Bombay and Gujarāt. Al-Musta‘lī retained the caliphate, but the spiritual basis of the Fāṭimid movement was to some extent impaired, above all after a further religio-political crisis on the death of al-Āmir in 525/1130
(the split of the Ṭayyibi Ismāʿīlīs, who were subsequently influential in Yemen and India).

Egypt and Cairo enjoyed under the Fāṭimids 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, Jewish merchants seem to have played an important role, as also perhaps the forerunners of the Muslim Kārimī merchants known from subsequent Ayyūbid and Mamlūk times. It is from the workshops of Egypt at this time, too, that some of the finest products of Islamic art – metalwork, ceramics, textiles and glassware – were produced, while the architectural heritage of the Fāṭimids is still visible in both North Africa and Egypt.

Lane-Poole, 70–3; Zambaur, 94–5; Album, 20–1.
EI¹ ‘Fātimids’ (M. Canard).
The Mirdāsids were part of the North Arab tribe of Kilāb, who in the early years of the eleventh century migrated from the lands along the Euphrates in northeastern Syria to Aleppo, which their leader Šāliḥ b. Mirdās captured in 415/1024, thereby succeeding substantially to the heritage of the Ḥamdānids (see below, no. 35, 2). The Mirdāsid migration formed part of a general movement of Bedouins – many of them (although not the Mirdāsids) at least
nominally Shī‘ī in faith into the settled fringes of Iraq and Syria during the
tenth and early eleventh centuries; it is possible that the unsettled conditions
in the Syrian Desert brought about by the Carmathian risings there were one
of the stimuli to this process.

Once established in Aleppo, Sālih and his sons Nasr and Thimāl had to
defend themselves on one side against the Fāṭimid governor of Damascus, Anūshtigin, and on a second occasion
Thimāl was obliged to abandon Aleppo and exchange it for towns on the
Syro-Palestinian littoral, on account of pressure from undisciplined Kilābl tribesmen on his position within Aleppo. The westward advance of the Seljuqs, and the appearance in northern Syria of bands of Turkmens and various military adventurers, together with the waning of Fāṭimid influence there, confronted the Mirdāsids with a new situation. They found it expedient
to transfer allegiance from the Fāṭimids to the Sunnī ‘Abbāsids and to submit
to the Seljuq sultan Alp Arslan. Latterly, Mirdāsid influence in Aleppo was undermined by disputes between the Turkish mercenaries whom the amīrs had been compelled to recruit and the Kilābī tribesmen, and in 468/1076 a
civil war broke out between the two Mirdāsid brothers Sābiq and Waththāb. Pressure on Aleppo from the Seljuq Tutush, who was trying to carve out a principality for himself in Syria (see below, no. 91, 2), drove Sābiq in
472/1080 to offer the city to the ‘Uqaylid Muslim b. Quraysh (see below, no.
38). The surviving members of the Mirdāsid family were compensated by the
grant of various towns in Syria, and they played some part in the affairs of
the region up to the arrival of the First Crusade.

Lane-Poole, 114–15; Zambaur, 133, 135; Album, 22.
EI² ‘Mirdās, Banū’ (Th. Bianquis).
Th. Bianquis, Damas et la Syrie sous la domination fatimide (359–468/969–1076). Essai
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THE CHIEF DĀ’IS OF THE NIZĀRĪSMĀ’ĪLĪS OR ASSASSINS IN SYRIA
Early sixth/twelfth century to the mid-eighth/fourteenth century
The mountains of western Syria

c. 493/c. 1100  al-Ḥakīm al-Munajjim, d. 496/1103
  496/1103  Abū Ṭāhir al-Ṣā‘īgh, d. 507/1113

c. 507/c. 1113  Bahrām, leader of the Syrian Ismāʿīlī community, d. 522/1128
  522/1128  Ismāʿīl al-‘Ajamī, d. 524/1130
  524/1131  Abu ’l-Fatḥ
     ?  Abū Muḥammad
     ?  Khwāja ‘Alī b. Masʿūd
  557/1162  Sinān b. Salmān or Sulaymān al-Basrī, Abu ’l-Hasan Rashīd al-Dīn, d. 588/1192 or 589/1193
  589/1193 or 590/1194  Abū Mansūr b. Muhammad or Nasr, al-‘Ajamī
     al-Ḥasan b. Masʿūd, Kamāl al-Dīn, together with Majd al-Dīn; Muẓaffar b. al-Ḥusayn, Sirāj al-Dīn; Abu ’l-
     620–56/1223–58  Futūḥ b. Muḥammad, Tāj al-Dīn; and Abu ’l-Maʿāl, Radi ’l-Dīn
  660/1262  Shams al-Dīn b. Najm al-Dīn

Submission of the Ismāʿīlī fortresses to the Mamlūk
Baybars by 671/1273
The Nizārī da’wa arose out of a split within the Fāṭimid caliphate at the death in 487/1094 of al-Mustanṣir, when his heir Nizār was set aside in a putsch in favour of his brother, who became the caliph al-Musta’lī and continued the Fāṭimid line (see above, no. 27). Nizār’s cause was taken up by the dā’ī Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ, who had already towards the end of al-Mustanṣir’s lifetime established Ismāʿīlī power in certain regions of Persia (see below, no. 101, for the heads of this da’wa, the subsequent Grand Masters and the history of the movement in Persia). The now independent Nizārī da’wa jadīda or ‘new mission’ was then implanted in Syria by agents from Alamūt, and Ismāʿīlīsm henceforth played a role in the tortuous political rivalries and strife of the Syrian cities, although it was not until the mid-twelfth century that the Syrian Ismāʿīlīs succeeded in acquiring fortresses, as in Persia, but here in the mountains of western Syria, the later Jabal Ansāriyya.

These garrisons and communities at times played a role in the struggles of the Crusaders and the Muslim principalities. Under their greatest head, the Iraqi dā’ī Rashīd al-Dīn Sinān, they achieved in effect independence from the Persian Ismāʿīlī leadership which normally controlled the Syrian movement. The leaders of the latter tended to have friendly relations with the Ayyūbids (see below, no. 30). They survived the Mongol onslaught on Syria but became tributary to the Mamlūks, and their fortresses were gradually reduced by Baybars, that of Kahf surrendering in 671/1273. Nevertheless, the Syrian Ismāʿīlī community itself survived largely intact, though with its centre subsequently at Salamiya to the east of the Syrian mountains, maintaining its cohesion and traditions through the succeeding centuries, whereas the Persian Ismāʿīlī communities never really recovered from the violence of the Mongol invasions.

Zambaur, 103.
EI² ‘Ismāʿiliyya’ (W. Madelung).
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THE AYYŪBIDS
564 to end of the ninth century/1169 to end of the fifteenth century
Egypt, Syria, Diyār Bakr, western Jazīra and Yemen

1. The line in Egypt

Ø 564/1169

Ø 589/1193
al-Malik al-‘Azīz I ʿUthmān b. al-Nāṣir I Šalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf, Abu ’l-Fath ʿImād al-Dīn

Ø 595/1198
al-Malik al-Manṣūr Muḥammad b. al-ʿAzīz ʿImād al-Dīn ʿUthmān, Šalāḥ al-Dīn

Ø 596/1200
al-Malik al-ʿĀdil I Muḥammad or Aḥmad b. Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb, Abū Bakr Sayf al-Dīn, of Damascus
al-Malik al-Kāmil I Muḥammad b. al-ʿĀdil I Muḥammad or Aḥmad Sayf al-Dīn, Abu ’l-Maʿālī Nāṣir al-Dīn, of Damascus

Ø 615/1218
al-Malik al-ʿĀdil II Abū Bakr b. al-Kāmil Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Sayf al-Dīn, of Damascus, d. 645/1248

Ø 635/1238
al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ II Ayyūb b. al-Kāmil Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Najm al-Dīn, of Damascus

Ø 637/1240

Ø 648–50/1250–2
Power seized by the Mamlūk Aybak, but with al-Malik al-
Ashraf II’s name retained in the khudba until 652/1254

2. The line in Damascus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>582/1186</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Afḍal ‘Alī b. al-Nāṣir Yūsuf Śalāḥ al-Dīn I, Abu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>’l-Ḥasan Nūr al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592/1196</td>
<td>al Malik al-‘Ādil I Muḥammad or Ḥmād b. Ayyūb Najm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Dīn, Abū Bakr Sayf al-Dīn, of Egypt and Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(597–615/1201–18</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muʿazzam Īsā, Sharaf al-Dīn, as governor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615/1218</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muʿazzam Īsā b. al-ʿĀdil I Muḥammad or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥmād Sayf al-Dīn, Sharaf al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624/1227</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Nāṣir II Dāwūd b. al-Muʿazzam Īsā Sharaf al-Dīn, Śalāḥ al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626/1229</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ashraf I Mūsā b. al-ʿĀdil II Abū Bakr Sayf al-Dīn,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abu ’l-Fath Muẓaffar al-Dīn, of Diyar Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635/1237</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ I Ismāʿīl b. al-ʿĀdil II Abū Bakr Sayf al-Dīn,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Imād al-Dīn, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635/1238</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Kāmil I Muḥammad b. al-ʿĀdil I Muḥammad or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥmād Sayf al-Dīn, Abu ’l-Maʿālī Nāṣir al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635/1238</td>
<td>al-Malik al-ʿĀdil II Abū Bakr b. al-Kāmil Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636/1239</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ II Ayyūb b. al-Kāmil Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Najm al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637/1239</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ I Ismāʿīl, ‘Imād al-Dīn, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643/1245</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ II Ayyūb, Najm al-Dīn, of Egypt, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647/1249</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muʿazzam Tūrān Shāh b. al-Ṣāliḥ II Ayyūb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Najm al-Dīn, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, together with Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648–58/1250–60</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Nāṣir II Yūsuf b. al-ʿAzīz Muḥammad Ghiyāth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Dīn, Śalāḥ al-Dīn, of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temporary Mongol conquest, followed by rule of the
658/1260 Mamlûk Baybars

3. The line in Aleppo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>579/1183</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Zâhir Ghâzî b. al-Nâṣîr I Yûsuf Şalâḥ al-Dîn, Abu ’l-Fath or Abû Manşûr Ghiyâth al-Dîn I, as governor for his father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579/1183</td>
<td>al-Malik al-‘Ădíl I Muḥammad or Aḥmad b. Ayyûb Najm al-Dîn, Abû Bakr Sayf al-Dîn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582/1186</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Zâhir Ghâzî b. al-Nâṣîr I Yûsuf Şalâḥ al-Dîn, Abu’l-Fath or Abu Manşûr Ghiyâth al-Dîn I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613/1216</td>
<td>al-Malik al-‘Azîz Muḥammad b. al-Ţâhir Ghâzî Ghiyâth al-Dîn I, Ghiyâth al-Dîn II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

574–58/1178–60 Regency of Dayâfa Khâtûn bt. al-Malik al-‘Ădíl I Muḥammad or Aḥmad Sayf al-Dîn


658/1260 Mongol and then Mamlûk conquests

4. The line in Ḥimṣ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Direct rule by the Mamlûks

5. The line in Ḥamât

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

617/1221 al-Malik al-Nāṣir Qilij Arslan b. al-Manṣūr, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn

al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd b. al-Manṣūr I Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Taqī ’l-Dīn

642/1244 al-Malik al-Manṣūr II Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar II Mahmūd Taqī ’l-Dīn, Sayf al-Dīn

658/1260 Mongol and then Mamlūk occupations; the subsequent Ayyūbids of Ḥamāt as vassals of the Mamlūks

683/1284 al-Malik al-Muẓaffar III Mahmūd b. al-Mansūr II Muḥammad Sayf al-Dīn, Taqī ’l-Dīn

698/1299 Direct rule by amīrs of the Mamlūk al-Nāṣir Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn


al-Malik al-Afḍal Muḥammad b. al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl ’ Imād al-Dīn, removed by the Mamlūks shortly afterwards and died in 742/1342

6. The line in Diyār Bakr (Mayyāfāriqīn and Jabal Sinjār)


617/1221 al-Malik al-Nāṣir Qilij Arslan b. al-Manṣūr, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn

al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd b. al-Manṣūr I Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Taqī ’l-Dīn

642/1244 al-Malik al-Manṣūr II Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar II Mahmūd Taqī ’l-Dīn, Sayf al-Dīn

658/1260 Mongol and then Mamlūk occupations; the subsequent Ayyūbids of Ḥamāt as vassals of the Mamlūks

683/1284 al-Malik al-Muẓaffar III Mahmūd b. al-Mansūr II Muḥammad Sayf al-Dīn, Taqī ’l-Dīn

698/1299 Direct rule by amīrs of the Mamlūk al-Nāṣir Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn


al-Malik al-Afḍal Muḥammad b. al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl ’ Imād al-Dīn, removed by the Mamlūks shortly afterwards and died in 742/1342


617/1221 al-Malik al-Nāṣir Qilij Arslan b. al-Manṣūr, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn

al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd b. al-Manṣūr I Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Taqī ’l-Dīn

642/1244 al-Malik al-Manṣūr II Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar II Mahmūd Taqī ’l-Dīn, Sayf al-Dīn

658/1260 Mongol and then Mamlūk occupations; the subsequent Ayyūbids of Ḥamāt as vassals of the Mamlūks

683/1284 al-Malik al-Muẓaffar III Mahmūd b. al-Mansūr II Muḥammad Sayf al-Dīn, Taqī ’l-Dīn

698/1299 Direct rule by amīrs of the Mamlūk al-Nāṣir Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn


al-Malik al-Afḍal Muḥammad b. al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl ’ Imād al-Dīn, removed by the Mamlūks shortly afterwards and died in 742/1342


617/1221 al-Malik al-Nāṣir Qilij Arslan b. al-Manṣūr, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn

al-Malik al-Muẓaffar II Maḥmūd b. al-Manṣūr I Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Taqī ’l-Dīn

642/1244 al-Malik al-Manṣūr II Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar II Mahmūd Taqī ’l-Dīn, Sayf al-Dīn

658/1260 Mongol and then Mamlūk occupations; the subsequent Ayyūbids of Ḥamāt as vassals of the Mamlūks

683/1284 al-Malik al-Muẓaffar III Mahmūd b. al-Mansūr II Muḥammad Sayf al-Dīn, Taqī ’l-Dīn

698/1299 Direct rule by amīrs of the Mamlūk al-Nāṣir Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn


al-Malik al-Afḍal Muḥammad b. al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl ’ Imād al-Dīn, removed by the Mamlūks shortly afterwards and died in 742/1342

628/1231 Temporary Mongol conquest

617/1220 al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Ghāzī b. al-‘Ādil I Muḥammad or Aḥmad Sayf al-Dīn, Shihāb al-Dīn

(628/1231 Temporary Mongol conquest)


Definitive Mongol conquest
7. The line in Diyar Bakr (חיש Kayfa, Āmid and Akhlāṭ)

629/1232
al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ II Ayyūb b. al-Kāmil I Mahmūd Nāṣir al-Dīn, Najm al-Dīn

636/1239
al-Malik al-Muʿaẓẓam Tūrān Shāh b. al-Ṣāliḥ II Ayyūb Najm al-Dīn

647/1249
al-Malik al-Muwaḥḥid ʿAbdallāh b. al-Muʿaẓẓam Tūrān Shāh, Taqi ʿl-Dīn

beginning
Mongol conquest of Diyar Bakr; the remaining Ayyūbids in Ḥiṣn Kayfā under the suzerainty of the Mongol Il Khānids and then of the Turkmen dynasties

657/1259
al-Malik al-Kāmil III Muḥammad b. al-Muwaḥḥid ʿAbdallāh Taqi ʿl-Dīn, Abū Bakr

682/1283
al-Malik al-ʿĀdil III Muḥammad b. al-Kāmil III Muḥammad, Mujīr al-Dīn

al-Malik al-ʿĀdil IV Ghāzi b. al-ʿĀdil III Muḥammad Mujīr al-Dīn, Shihāb al-Dīn

al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ III Abū Bakr b. al-ʿĀdil IV Ghāzī Shihāb al-Dīn

780/1378
al-Malik al-ʿĀdil V Sulaymān I b. al-ʿĀdil IV Ghāzī Shihāb al-Dīn, Fakhr al-Dīn

828/1425
al-Malik al-Ashraf II Aḥmad b. al-ʿĀdil V Sulaymān, Sharaf al-Dīn

836/1433
al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ IV Khalīl b. al-Ashraf II

856/1452
al-Malik al-Kāmil or al-ʿĀdil Aḥmad b. al-Ṣāliḥ IV Khalīl, Nāṣir al-Dīn

866/1462
al-Malik al-ʿĀdil VI Khalaf b. Muḥammad b. al-Ashraf II

866/1462
al-Malik al-Kāmil Khalīl II b. Sulaymān I b. al-Ashraf II (?)

Sulaymān II b. Khalīl II

al-Husayn b. Khalīl II

Conquest in the later fifteenth century by the Aq Qoyunlu

8. The line in Yemen

569/1174
al-Malik al-Muʿaẓẓam Tūrān Shāh I b. Ayyūb Najm al-
Dīn, Shams al-Dīn


Ø 593/1197 Ismā‘īl b. al-‘Azīz Tughtigin, Mu‘izz al-Dīn

Ø 598/1202 al-Malik al-Nāṣir Ayyūb b. al-‘Azīz Tughtigin


Ø 612–26/1215–29

Succession of the Rasūlids, apparently maintaining during

627/1229 628/1230 at least the nominal authority of the Ayyūbids, including mention of them on coins

9. The minor branches of the family in Ba‘lbakk, Karak, Bāniyās and Subayba, and Busrā (for details, see Zambaur, 98–9)

Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb and Asad al-Dīn Shīrkūh b. Shādhī, the progenitors of the dynasty, were from the Hadhbānī tribe of Kurds, although the family seems to have become considerably Turkicised from their service at the side of Turkish soldiers. The Turkish commander of Mosul and Aleppo, Zangī b. Aq Sonqur (see below, no. 93, 1) recruited large numbers of bellicose Kurds into his following, including in 532/1138 Ayyūb, and soon afterwards his brother Shīrkūh entered the service of Zangi’s famous son Nūr al-Dīn. In 564/1169, Shīrkūh gained control of Egypt on the demise of the last Fāṭimid caliph al-‘Ādid (see above, no. 27) but died almost immediately, and his nephew Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn b. Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb (Saladin) was recognised by his troops as Shīrkūh’s successor.

The celebrated foe of the Frankish Crusaders, Saladin, was accordingly the real founder of the dynasty. He extinguished the last vestiges of Fāṭimid rule in Egypt and replaced the Ismā‘īlī Shi‘ism which had prevailed there for two centuries by a strongly orthodox Sunnī religious and educational policy; the great wave of Ayyūbid mosque- and madrasa-building in Egypt and Syria was one aspect of this. The Ayyūbids were in this way continuing the policy of the Zangids in Syria and were acting in a parallel manner to the Great Saljuqs before them, who had inaugurated a Sunnī reaction in the Iraqi and Persian lands taken over from the Shī‘ī Būyids (see below, no. 75). Although
the Ayyūbids were in fact less enthusiastic pursuers of jihād than the Zangids had been, Saladin is associated in Western scholarship with his successes in Palestine, for his enthusiasm enabled him to weld together armies of Kurds, Turks and Arabs in a common cause. With his victory at Ḥaṭṭīn in 583/1187, the holy city of Jerusalem again became Muslim after eighty years in Christian hands; the Franks were driven back essentially to the cities and fortresses of the Syro-Palestinian littoral, and, apart from their briefly restored rule in Jerusalem and the other lost districts, mentioned below, were unable to recover most of their losses.

Before his death in 589/1193, Saladin granted out various parts of the Ayyūbid empire, including the cities of Syria, Diyār Bakr, western Jazīra and Yemen, as appanages for various members of the family, the intention being that the supreme sultan should normally reside in Egypt. A reasonable sense of family solidarity was maintained under al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Sayf al-Dīn Muḥammad or Aḥmad and his son al-Kāmil Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad until the latter’s death in 635/1238. Under these two sultans, Saladin’s activist policies gave place to ones of detente and peaceful relations with the Franks, especially as the northern branches of the Ayyūbids in Diyār Bakr and Jazīra were now feeling pressure from the Rūm Seljuqs and the Khwārazm Shāhs (see below, nos 107, 89). The culmination of these new policies was al-Kāmil’s offer of Jerusalem and the territories conquered by Saladin a generation before to the Emperor Frederick II (626/1229); in fact, the Crusaders recovered only the Holy City and one or two other towns, including Nazareth, and ten years later al-Nāṣir Dāwūd b. al-Muʿazzam ʿIsa of Damascus was to regain it. The period of peace did, however, bring economic benefits to Egypt and Syria, including a revival of trade with the Christian powers of the western Mediterranean.

After al-Kāmil, internal quarrels among the Ayyūbids intensified. The supreme sultan in Egypt had never been an autocrat, and the Ayyūbid empire was more a confederation of local principalities, those in Syria and Diyār Bakr often with unstable and shifting borders; these principalities resisted attempts by the supreme sultans to impose a more centralised authority. The Franks’ Sixth Crusade was mastered and its leader, the French King St Louis (IX), captured, but soon after al-Ṣāliḥ Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb’s death the Turkish Bahrī slave troops seized power in Egypt, making their leader Aybak first Atabeg and then sultan in 648/1250. Al-ʿĀdil I Sayf al-Dīn Muḥammad or Aḥmad had sent out his young grandson al-Masʿūd Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf
with an Atabeg or tutor to continue Ayyūbid rule over Yemen, but the dynasty were unable to maintain themselves there and the region passed to their former servants, the Turkish Rasūlids (see below, no. 49).

The appearance of the Mongol armies of Hülegü (see below, no. 133) was disastrous for the northern petty lines of Ayyūbids, and the Il Khān personally killed the prince of Mayyāfārīqīn and his brother. In Syria, only the branch at Ḥamāt survived, because of its obscurity and docility, until the mid-fourteenth century, although it did produce, as its penultimate amir, the historian and geographer Abu 'l-Fidā'ī. However, in Diyār Bakr a local Kurdicised Ayyūbid principality around Ḫiṣn Kayfā survived the Il Khānids and Tīmūrids, and these amīrs were only extinguished by the ‘White Sheep‘ Turkmens in the later fifteenth century.

A striking feature of Ayyūbid titulature was the rulers’ adoption of titles comprising al-Malik ‘prince, ruler‘ plus a qualifying adjective expressing such qualities as power, honour, piety, justice, etc., hence al-Malik al-Mu‘aẓẓam, al-Malik al-Kāmil, etc. These usually appear on the coins minted by ruling princes, but the use of such titles extended to distinctly minor members of the Ayyūbid family also. This practice was inherited, together with much other Ayyūbid administrative and ceremonial practice, by their successors the Mamlūks (see below, no. 31).

Justi, 462–3; Lane-Poole, 74–9; Sachau, 19 nos 36–8 (branches in Ba‘lbakk, Karak and Ḫiṣn Kayfā); Zambaur, 97–101 and Table H; Album, 22–3. 
### 31

**THE MAMLÜKS**

648–92/1250–1517

*Egypt and Syria*

1. The Baḥrī line 648–792/1250–1390

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>648/1250</td>
<td><em>al-Malik al-Ashtraf Mūsā,</em> Ayyūbid nominal sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652/1254</td>
<td>Aybak, ‘Izz al-Dīn, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Qutuz al-Mu‘izzī, Sayf al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658/1260</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Baybars I al-Bunduqdārī, Rukn al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676/1277</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Saʿīd Baraka or Berke Khān b. Baybars I Rukn al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678/1279</td>
<td>al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Salāmish or Süleymish b. Baybars I Rukn al-Dīn, Badr al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678/1279</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn al-Alfī, Abu ‘l-Maʿālī Sayf al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(678–9/1279–80)</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Kāmil Sunqur al-Ashqar, Sayf al-Dīn, rebel in Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678/1279</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ashtraf Khalīl b. Qalāwūn Sayf al-Dīn, Ṣalāḥ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
689/1290 al-Dīn

693/1293 (? ) al-Malik al-ʿĀdīl Baydarā, Badr al-Dīn
693/1293 al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad I b. Qalāwūn Sayf al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn first reign
694/1294 al-Malik al-ʿĀdīl Kitbughā, Zayn al-Dīn

al-Malik al-Manṣūr Lāchīn or Lājīn al-Ashqar, Ḥusām al-Dīn

698/1299 Muḥammad I b. Qalāwūn, Nāṣir al-Dīn, second reign
708/1309 al-Malik al-Muzaffar Baybars II al-Jāshnakīr, Rukn al-Dīn (Burjī)
709/1310 Muḥammad I b. Qalāwūn, Nāṣir al-Dīn, third reign
741/1341 al-Malik al-Manṣūr Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Sayf al-Dīn
742/1342 al-Malik al-Nāṣir Aḥmad I b. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Shihāb al-Dīn
746/1345 al-Malik al-Kāmil Shaʿbān I b. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Sayf al-Dīn
748/1347 al-Malik al-Nāṣir al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn, first reign
752/1351 al-Maiik al-Ṣāliḥ Ṣāliḥ b. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn
755/1354 al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn, second reign
762/1361 al-Malik al-Manṣūr Muḥammad II b. Hājjī I Sayf al-Dīn, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn
764/1363 al-Malik al-Ashraf Shaʿbān II b. al-Malik al-Amjad Ḥusayn, Nāṣir al-Dīn
2. The Burji line 784–922/1382–1517

- **784/1382**: al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Barquq al-Yalbughāwī, Sayf al-Dīn, first reign
- **791/1389**: Hājjī II b. Sha'bān II Nāṣir al-Dīn (Bahrī), second reign
- **792/1390**: Barquq, Sayf al-Dīn, second reign
- **801/1399**: al-Malik al-Nāṣir Faraj b. Barquq Sayf al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn, first reign
- **808/1405**: Faraj b. Barquq Sayf al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn, second reign
- **(809/1407)**: al-Malik al-‘Ādil ‘Abdallāh Jakam, rebel in Aleppo
- **815/1412**: al-Malik al-Mu‘ayyad Shaykh al-Mahmūdī al-Ẓāhirī, Sayf al-Dīn
- **824/1421**: al-Malik al-Mużaffar Aḥmad II b. Shaykh Sayf al-Dīn
- **824/1421**: al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Tāṭār, Sayf al-Dīn
- **824/1421**: al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Muḥammad III b. Tāṭār Sayf al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn
- **825/1422**: al-Malik al-Ashraf Barsbay, Abu ‘l-Nasr Sayf al-Dīn
- **841/1438**: al-Malik al-‘Azīz Yūsuf b. Barsbay Sayf al-Dīn, Jamāl al-Dīn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>842/1438</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Chaqmaq or Jaqmaq, Sayf al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857/1453</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Manṣūr ‘Uthmān, Fakhr al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857/1453</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ashraf Ināl al-ʿAlāʾī al-Ẓāhirī, Abu ’l-Naṣr Sayf al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865/1461</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muʿayyad Aḥmad III b. Ināl Sayf al-Dīn, Shihāb al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865/1461</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Khushqadam, Sayf al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872/1467</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Yalbay, Sayf al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872/1467</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Timurbūghā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872/1468</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ashraf Qāyit Bay al-Ẓāhirī, Abu ’l-Nasr Sayf al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901/1496</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad IV b. Qāyit Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904/1498</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Qānṣawh I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905/1500</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ashraf Jānbūlāt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906/1501</td>
<td>al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Ṭūmān Bay I, Sayf al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906/1501</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Ashraf Qānṣawh II al-Ghawrī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mamlūks succeeded to the dominant position formerly held by the Ayyūbids in Egypt and Syria. Like most major Islamic dynasties of the age, the Ayyūbids had found it necessary to buttress their power with professional slave soldiers inherited from the Zangids (see below, no. 93) and other local powers of the Fertile Crescent, and the Mamlūks (mamlūk, literally ‘one possessed, slave’) arose from the Turkish troops of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb of Egypt and Damascus (see above, no. 30, 1–2). Within the two and a half centuries of independent Mamlūk rule, two lines of sultans are somewhat artificially distinguished: the Baḥrī ones, so-called because these guards of the Ayyūbids originally had their barracks on the island of al-Rawda in the Nile (al-Bahr), and the Burjī ones, thus named because Sultan Qalāwūn had quartered his guards in the citadel (al-Burj) of Cairo. Various of the Baḥrī sultans, such as Baybars I and Qalāwūn (whose descendants managed to succeed him over three generations), tried to establish personal, hereditary dynasties, but not with much success, and in the last fifty years or
so of Baḥrī rule a dozen sultans followed in rapid succession. Within the Burjīs, the pattern of rule tended to be that a great Mamlūk commander would usurp the throne and then at his death pass it on to his son; but within a few years another usurper would take it over. These leading commanders came mostly from the military households of previous sultans, with the followings of Barqūq and Qāyit Bay being especially productive of subsequent rulers.

Ethnically, the Baḥrīs were mainly Qïpchaq Turks from the South Russian steppes, with an admixture of other races, including from the Wāfidiyya, Kurds, other Turks and even Mongols arriving from the East to join the Mamlūk army. The Burjīs, on the other hand, were primarily Circassians (Charkas, Jarkas) from the Christian areas of the northern Caucasus. Up to the end of the Mamlūks as a social group in Egypt in the early nineteenth century, Circassia provided most of their manpower. Pace the assertions of some earlier historians of the Mamlūks that this class failed to perpetuate itself more than two or three generations, it seems that Mamlūk families reproduced themselves all right but that succeeding generations from them no longer followed a military career; instead, they fell back into civilian life, seeking careers in the ranks of groups like the 'ulamā‘ and religious lawyers and the administrators of awqāf or charitable endowments. Fresh importations of slave soldiers were accordingly necessary to maintain the ruling élite of Mamlūk military leaders.

The slave origins of the Mamlūks were reflected in the rather complex system of nomenclature which evolved for them, the sultans included. The mamlūk fresh from the South Russian steppes started off with simply a personal name, generally a Turkish one, such as Azdamur/Özdemür, ‘choice iron’ = ‘best-quality iron’, or Mankūbars/Mengü-bars ‘eternal tiger’, or Taghrībirdī/Tangrï-verdi ‘God gave’. But once within the Islamic military hierarchy, he could acquire a nisba relating to the slave merchant who had imported him into Egypt, such as al-Mujīrī, from the name Mujīr al-Dīn, or the circumstances of his purchase, such as al-Alfī ‘bought for 1,000 [dinars]’; then a nisba relating to the amīr of whose household or nexus of clientage he formed part, such as al-Sayfī, from Sayf al-Dīn, or al-Ṣaliḥī, from al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ‘ and finally, if he rose to eminence, a laqab or honorific of his own, such as Ḥusām al-Dīn ‘sword of religion’ or Badr al-Dīn ‘full moon of religion’.

This ruling institution was a hierarchical construction, with the sultan’s
own mamlûks at the apex of the structure. An origin in the non-Muslim lands of the north and slave status were essential for success in the power struggle, for the free elements, including the progeny of former mamlûks, had only an inferior place in the armed forces (a similar position obtained regarding the Ottoman Turkish slave institution, where in the heyday of the empire the Qapî Qullarî or ‘Slaves of the Porte’ had superior opportunities for advancement compared with free elements). The sultans’ arbitrary power was checked by the chief amîrs and the bureaucracy, and the basic instability of the sultanate is seen in the rapid turnover of rulers at most periods and the three separate reigns of a sultan like Nāṣîr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Qalâwûn.

The Mamlûks continued the strongly Sunnî policy of the Ayyubids, with sultans, governors and amîrs founding numerous mosques, madrasas and other religious and charitable buildings in Cairo, Damascus, Aleppo and other towns. They derived great prestige from their role as defenders of Islam against the infidel Mongols, against the remnants of the Frankish Crusaders (see below) and against heterodox Muslims like the Nuṣayrîs and Ismā‘îlîs of the mountains of western Syria. The Mamlûks’ maintenance in Cairo of a line of fainéant ‘Abbâsid caliphs (see above, no. 3, 3) is probably to be connected with this zeal for the Sunna.

The might and the achievements of the Mamlûk state were impressive and were lauded by contemporary historians, who stressed the role of the Turks as a people sent by God to preserve the fabric of the Dâr al-Islâm. Qutuz defeated Hülegü’s Mongols at ‘Ayn Jâlût in Palestine in 658/1260, and his successors consolidated the victory and set the new régime on its feet, although the threat from the Mongol Il Khânïds did not recede until early in the fourteenth century. By the end of the thirteenth century, the last Crusader fortresses of the Syro-Palestinian coast had been mopped up; in the next one the Rupenid kingdom of Little Armenia or Cilicia was ended; and in the fifteenth century the Christian kingdom of Cyprus was made tributary for a time. The territories of the Mamlûks extended to Cyrenaica in the west, to Nubia and Massawa (Masawwa’) in the south and to the Taurus Mountains in the north, while in Arabia they claimed to be protectors of the Holy Cities. In the course of the fifteenth century, however, the Ottomans emerged as the Mamlûks’ main enemies in place of the Mongols. Foes of the Ottomans like the Qaramânîds (see below, no. 124) were supported and the Turkmen principality of the Dulghadîr Oghullarî or Dhu ’l-Qadrîs (see below, no. 129) maintained in western Diyâr Bakr as a buffer-state. But the superior élan
and vigour of the Ottomans, and their well-developed use of artillery and hand-guns, worked in their favour, while the Mamlūks were still wedded to the ideal of the armed cavalryman with his lance and sword. The penultimate Mamlūk sultan, Qānṣawh II al-Ghawrī, died in battle with the Ottomans at Marj Dābiq near Aleppo in 922/1516, and in the next year Sultan Selīm I defeated the last Mamlūk ruler in Egypt. Syria and Egypt now became governorates of the Ottoman empire, although the military and social caste of the Mamlūks continued virtually to control Egypt internally until Muḥammad ‘All Pasha (see below, no. 34) destroyed their power in 1226/1811.

Certainly until the economic and demographic crisis of the fifteenth century, Egypt and Syria under the Mamlūks enjoyed considerable prosperity, and there was a great cultural and artistic efflorescence, with special achievements in the fields of architecture, ceramics and metalwork; the development of the science of heraldry goes back to Ayyūbid and especially Mamlūk times. There were close commercial links with the Christian powers of the Mediterranean, such as Aragon, Sicily and other Italian states, despite strongly anti-Christian policies in the Near East, so that the Mamlūk period as a whole saw a distinct worsening of the position of the Dhimmīs in Egypt, above all, of the Christians. However, the reckless spending and ambitious building policies in Cairo of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn overstretched the state’s resources for the future, and the Black Death affected Egypt and Syria particularly severely. Under the later Baḥrī and then the Circassian sultans, the revenue from land taxation shrank, while public security declined in the face of Bedouin depredations. The Mamlūks had further to bear expenses in the Arabian Sea and Indian Ocean region in a fruitless endeavour to check Portuguese expansion there and to preserve Mamlūk trade connections with India and the lands beyond, so that the failure of the once mighty Mamlūk state to withstand the onslaught of Ottoman imperialism becomes understandable.

Lane-Poole, 803; Zambaur, 103–6; Album, 23–6.

EI² ‘Mamlūks‘ (P. M. Holt).

idem, Supplement to The Coinage of the Mamlūk Sultans of Egypt and Syria, in ANS Museum Notes, 16 (1970), 113–71.

THE MA’N AMĪRS OF LEBANON
Tenth century to 1109/sixteenth century to 1697
Southern Lebanon

‘Uthmān Ma‘n b. al-Hājj Yūnus, Fakhr al-Dīn I, d. 912/1506

Yūnus Ma‘n b. ? ‘Uthmān Fakhr al-Dīn, d. 917/1511

? Qorqmaz I b.? Yūnus Ma‘n

Ma‘n, ‘Alam al-Dīn

Ma‘n, Zayn al-Dīn

Ottoman suzerainty

Ma‘n, Zayn al-Dīn

? Qorqmaz II b. Fulān b. ? Qorqmaz I, d. 993/1585

993/1585 Fakhr al-Dīn II b. Qorqmaz II

1042/1633 Mulḥīm b. Yūnus

1068– 1108/1658–97 Aḥmad b. Mulḥim

1108/1697 End of the direct Ma‘nid line and succession of the Shihāb family

The Banū Ma‘n were an Arab Druze family of feudal chiefs in the Shūf region of southern Lebanon who were prominent in political life under the Ottomans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Ma‘nids replaced the Buḥtur family of the Gharb when the Ottomans took over Syria in 922/1516, and members of the family now begin to have firm historical attestation. Fakhr al-Dīn II was a tax-farmer for the Ottomans and governor of the sanjaqs of Sidon-Beirut and of Safad. Through skilful political manoeuvring, in which he enlisted the help of the Maronites of Kisrawān and even of an external power like the Medici Dukes of Tuscany (he spent several years in exile in Italy), he eventually became master of most of Syria as far east as Palmyra and as far north as the fringes of Anatolia. These ambitions
inevitably provoked an Ottoman reaction, leading to his military defeat and execution. Although a bloody tyrant, Fakhr al-Dīn II did improve agriculture and trade, with the aim of raising more revenue, and his inauguration of a tradition of Druze-Maronite cooperation was a factor in the subsequent formation of a Lebanese national identity, so that Lebanese have come to regard him, somewhat anachronistically, as the founder of their modern country.

After his death, his descendants retained what was in effect autonomy in Mount Lebanon by acting as governors there for the Ottomans, but the direct line of the Ma‘nids ended with Aḥmad b. Mulhim in 1108/1697, their power in the region being replaced by that of their kinsmen, the Banū Shihāb (see below, no. 33).

Zambaur, 109.
EI² ‘Fakhr al-Dīn’, ‘Ma‘n, Banū’ (K. S. Salibi).
The Shihāb family of Sunnī Muslim notables rose to power as amīrs of Lebanon when the main line of the Maʿns (see above, no. 32) came to an end in 1109/1697, Bashīr I Shihāb being a maternal grandson of Aḥmad Maʿn b. Mulḥim. The amirate which the Shihābs ruled was in fact largely controlled by Druze feudal lords, increasingly rent by rival factions, while from the later eighteenth century onwards the numbers and strength of the Maronites increased; a reflex of these processes was the adoption of Christianity by Mulḥim’s sons and the accession of Yūsuf b. Mulḥim as the first Maronite Shihāb amīr. The Shihābs managed to maintain themselves in Mount Lebanon against Aḥmad Jazzār Pasha, the Ottoman governor of Sidon and the coastal towns. Bashīr II operated within the increasingly complex politics...
of the Near East after the Napoleonic invasion and carefully conciliated Muḥammad ‘Alī Pasha (see below, no. 34), but became isolated in his own land by 1840 and fell from power when the Egyptian cause in Syria was lost; after a brief interlude, Ottoman direct rule in Lebanon was restored in 1257/1842.

Zambaur, 108 and Table K.
EI¹ ʿBaṣhīr Shihāb IF (A. J. Rustum).
P. M. Holt, Egypt and the Fertile Crescent 1516–1922: A Political History, with a genealogical table at p. 312.
Muḥammad ‘Alī (b. c. 1180/late 1760s) was a commander from Kavalla in Macedonia who went with local forces as part of the Ottoman-Albanian army sent by the Porte to dislodge the occupying French from Egypt. With great adeptness he contrived to stay there as de facto ruler, forcing the sultan to recognise him as governor or pasha and bloodily disposing of the old ruling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1220/1805</td>
<td>Muḥammad ‘Alī Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264/1848</td>
<td>ʻAbbās Ḥilmī I Pasha b. Ṭūsūn Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264/1848</td>
<td>Muḥammad Saʿīd Pasha b. Muḥammad ʻAlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280/1863</td>
<td>Ismāʿīl Pasha b. Ibrāhīm (assumed the title of Khedive in 1284/1867), d. 1312/1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296/1879</td>
<td>Muḥammad Tawfīq b. Ismāʿīl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309/1892</td>
<td>ʻAbbās Ḥilmī II b. Tawfīq, d. 1364/1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333/1914</td>
<td>Hūsayn Kāmil b. Ismāʿīl (assumed the title of Sultan), d. 1335/1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335/1917</td>
<td>Aḥmad Fuʿād I b. Ismāʿīl (assumed the title of King in 1340/1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355/1936</td>
<td>Fārūq b. Fuʿād I, d. 1384/1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371–2/1952–3</td>
<td>Aḥmad Fuʿād II b. Fārūq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371/1953</td>
<td>Republican régime established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class of the Circassian Mamlûks (see above, no. 31, 2). Muḥammad ʿAlî was thus one of a type which had been not uncommon in the eighteenth-century Ottoman empire, that is, a governor who tried to establish the hereditary rule of his family in his governorship; but he was unusual in successfully founding an autonomous and hereditary dynasty, with an increasingly centralised administration, in a century when the Porte was successfully reasserting its authority in many other parts of the Turkish and Arab lands of the empire. Once firmly in power, Muḥammad ʿAlî realised that Egypt could best flourish and progress if the military and technical advances of the West, and its educational practices, could be emulated; he therefore ranks with his contemporaries the Ottoman sultans Sellim III and Maḥmūd II as a pioneer westerniser in the Middle East. A newly-raised conscript army was raised to subjugate the Sudan and tap the rich slave markets there; higher educational institutions were set up, with European staff and advisers; fiscal policy was reformed and modified to meet the increased revenue needs. Externally, Muḥammad ʿAlî and his capable son Ibrāhîm intervened on the Ottoman side in the Greek War of Independence and carried on successful campaigns against the Wahhābī rulers in eastern and central Arabia, overthrowing the first Suʿūdī state and almost annihilating the Suʿūd dynasty (see below, no. 55) there.

But by the end of Muḥammad ʿAlî’s reign, Egypt was already acquiring a burden of indebtedness, despite his immediate successors’ abandonment of attempts to maintain the pace of reform. This burden was accentuated by extravagance and the desire of rulers in the mid-nineteenth century to imitate European royal standards. Ismāʿîl was the first of his family to secure from the sultan the title of khedive, one of ancient Iranian origin, and also the promise of his descendants’ hereditary succession in Egypt. It was under Ismāʿîl also 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 financial control of European creditor nations. After the proto-nationalist revolt of ʿUrābī Pasha in 1299/1882, Britain assumed control of Egyptian finances and installed a permanent garrison there; not until 1340/1922 did the British Protectorate end.

The reigns of the last two significant members of the dynasty, Fuʿād I and Fārūq, were dominated internally by struggles with the majority political party of the Wafd and, externally, by the struggle to throw off the remaining
vestiges of British control. Just before the end of the monarchy, Naḥḥās Pasha abrogated the Condominium Agreement over the Sudan and proclaimed Fārūq ‘King of Egypt and the Sudan’. Nevertheless, discontent mounted, especially after the Arab-Israeli débâcle of 1947, widely attributed to royal corruption and incompetence. The monarch had always been felt as more Turkish than truly Arab, and in 1952 Fārūq was forced by the Free Officers’ movement under Muḥammad Najib (Neguib) and Jamāl ‘Abd al-Nāṣir (Nasser) to abdicate. His infant son remained nominally on the throne under a regency, until the monarchy was finally abolished in June 1953.

Muḥammad ‘Alī and his descendants minted Ottoman coins in Egypt, with the names on them of their suzerains the sultans alone, right up to the First World War and the final severing of all constitutional links with Istanbul, after which Husayn Kāmil and his successors placed their own names on the Egyptian coinage.

Lane-Poole, 84–5; Zambaur, 107.
P. M. Holt, Egypt and The Fertile Crescent 1516–1922: A Political History, with a genealogical table at p. 312.
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Iraq and Jazīra before the Seljuqs
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THE HAMDĀNIDS
293–394/906–1004

Jazīra and northern Syria

1. The line in Mosul and Jazīra

- c. 254/868
  Hamdān b. Hamdūn al-Taghlibī, chief in Mārdīn and the Mosul region

- 282–303/895–916
  al-Husayn b. Hamdān, caliphal governor in Jibāl and Diyār Rabi‘a, d. 306/918

- 293/906

- 317/929

- 356/967
  Fadl Allāh b. al-Hasan, Abū Taghlib ‘Uddat al-Dawla al-Ghadanfar

- 369/979
  Būyid conquest

- 379–87/981–9

- 387/989
  Conquest of Mosul by the ‘Uqaylids and of Diyār Bakr by the Marwānids

2. The line in Aleppo and northern Syria
The Hamdânids came from the Arab tribe of Taghlib, long settled in Jazîra (although certain authorities alleged that they were only mawâlî or clients of the Banû Taghlib). The founder of the family’s fortunes, Hamdân b. Hamdûn, appears in the later years of the ninth century as an ally of the Khârijîs of Jazîra, in rebellion against caliphal authority; later, the Hamdânids tended to follow the Shi‘î inclinations of the majority of Arab tribes on the Syrian Desert fringes at that time. However, Hamdân’s son al-Husayn became a commander in the service of the f Abbâsids, and distinguished himself against the Carmathians or Qarāmita of the Syrian Desert (see below, no. 40). Another son, Abu ’l-Hayjâ’ ʿAbdallâh, was in 293/905 appointed governor of Mosul, and ‘Abdallâh’s own son, al-Hasan, eventually followed him there as Nâsir al-Dawla, behaving as an independent ruler and extending his power westwards from the Hamdânids’ original centre of Diyâr Rabfa into northern Syria. His son Abû Taghlib, called al-Ghadanfar ‘the Lion’ was unfortunate enough to confront the great Bûyid amîrîf Adud al-Dawla at the height of the latter’s power, when he had just in 376/978 taken over Iraq from his cousin ‘Izz al-Dawla (see below, no. 75). ‘Adud al-Dawla marched northwards and drove out Abû Taghlib, who fled to the Fâtimids in a vain search for help. His two brothers were afterwards restored in Mosul by the Bûyids, and reigned there for a while until another family of Arab amîrs, the ‘Uqaylîds (see below, no. 38), took over the city.

Nevertheless, the junior branch of the Hamdânids remained in Syria, with Abû Taghlib’s famous uncle, Sayf al-Dawla, ruling there in the middle decades of the tenth century after capturing Aleppo, Hims and other towns from the Ikhshîdîds (see above, no. 26). The establishment of the Hamdânîd amirate in Syria coincided with a great resurgence of Byzantine fortunes under the energetic Macedonian emperors, and much of Sayf al-Dawla’s
reign was occupied in defending his territories from the Greeks. His son Safd al-Dawla was unable to prevent the Byzantines from several times invading Syria and temporarily capturing Aleppo and Hims, although these were left to the Hamdānids as tribute-payers; moreover, a fresh threat arose in southern Syria from the appearance of the Fātimids and their expansionist policies. Finally, Saʿīd al-Dawla’s son Sarl al-Dawla was killed, probably at the instigation of the former slave general of Sayf al-Dawla’s, Luʾlu’. Luʾlu’ at first ruled as regent for Saʿīd al-Dawla’s two sons, but later assumed power independently as a vassal of the Fātimids; his own son and successor Murtadāʾ l-Dawla Mansūr had to flee and ended his days as a refugee in Byzantium.

The Hamdānids achieved renown as patrons of Arabic literature, above all for Sayf al-Dawla’s encouragement of the poet al-Mutanabbī; and this last amīr also secured a great contemporary reputation – though he was as often unsuccessful as successful in war – as a leader in the holy war against the Greeks. Yet although they came to rule over prosperous regions, with many centres of urban commercial activity, the Hamdānids still retained a considerable admixture of the irresponsibility and destructiveness of Bedouins. Syria and Jazīra inevitably suffered from the ravages of war, but these were aggravated by their tyranny and rapacity, as recorded by the traveller and geographer Ibn Hawqal, and the latter years of the Hamdānids were ones of decline and impotence.

Lane-Poole, 111–13; Zambaur, 133–4; Album, 21.

EI2 ‘Hamdānids’ (M. Canard).


The Mazyadids belonged to the North Arab Asad tribe, and were strongly Shī‘ī in sympathy. The family acquired a hold on the region between Hīt and Kūfā when lands there were conveyed to them during the reign of the Būyid amīr Mu‘izz al-Dawla at some date between 345/956 and 352/963. The beginnings of ‘Alī b. Mazyad’s reign there must be put back, according to George Makdisi, to well before the date in the early eleventh century usually given in older 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 Sadaqa I b. Mansūr, 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 diplomatists, making themselves a significant power in the shifting pattern of alliances in the Iraq of the Seljuq period. Their early rivals were the ‘Uqaylids of Mosul and Jazīra (see below, no. 38), who in the reign of Dubays I b. ‘All supported Dubays’s brother Muqallad in the latter’s bid for the Mazyadid amirate. When Toghril and the Seljuqs appeared in Iraq, Dubays feared the Turkish invaders and supported the pro-Fātimid, Turkish general Arslan Bašsîrî in Baghdad. During the troubled reign of the Seljuq Berk-yaruq, Sadaqa I, the so-called ‘King of the Arabs’ (Rex Arabum in the Latin Crusader sources), acquired a position of great influence; but once sultan Muhammad b. Malik Shah (see below, no. 91, 1) was firmly on the throne, he moved against his overmighty vassal, and in 501/1108 defeated and killed Sadaqa in battle. The later Mazyadids allied with various Turkish amīrs against sultan Mas‘îd b. Muhammad, and Hilla was occupied on various occasions by Seljuq and caliphal troops. Sadaqa’s son Dubays II achieved great fame in the eyes of the Frankish Crusaders, among others, and was a great patron of the Arabic poets of his time, but was murdered by one of the Assassins (see above, no. 29 and below, no. 101) at the same time as the caliph al-Mustarshid was killed.

‘Alī II b. Dubays II died in 545/1150, and seems to have been succeeded in Hilla by his son Muhalhil. But the latter is a shadowy figure, and nothing is known of his reign in Hilla or of the length of this tenure of power; the town was in 558/1163 definitively incorporated in the territories of the resurgent ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Mustanjid, and the power there of both the Mazyadids and the Banū Asad ended.

The Mazyadids do not appear to have minted coins of their own.

Lane-Poole, 119–20; Zambaur, 137.
El‘Asad’ (W. Caskel), ‘Mazyad, Banū’ (C. E. Bosworth).
The Marwānids of Diyār Bakr, 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 of Būyid influence there after ‘Adud al-Dawla’s death in 372/983 (see below, no. 75), he took over Diyār Bakr from the Hamdānids (see above, no. 35), held Mosul for a time and even threatened Baghdad at one point.

His nephew al-Hasan b. Marwān firmly based the dynasty in the captured towns of Mayyāfārīqln and Āmid, but it was his younger brother Nasr al-Dawla Ahmad, Ibn Marwān, who ruled for over fifty years and who raised the Marwānid principality to a height of splendour and affluence. The strategic position of Diyār Bakr, commanding as it did the routes from Syria and Anatolia to Iraq and the east, meant that Ibn Marwān needed a skilful diplomatic policy to survive between powerful neighbours, all struggling for influence in the area. He recognised the ‘Abbāsid caliph at the outset, but he...
also had the Fātimids as neighbours in northern Syria; Fātimid cultural influence was strong in his domains, and he may for a while have acknowledged the Fātimid caliph al-Mustansir (see above, no. 27) as his suzerain. Before this, he had been forced for a time to pay tribute to the ‘Uqaylids of Mosul (see below, no. 38) and in 421/1030 to cede to them Nisībīn. Reigning as he did over a numerous Christian population in Diyār Bakr, he had amicable relations with the Byzantines, and the Emperor Constantine X Ducas used Ibn Marwān’s good offices to get the captured Georgian prince Liparit freed by the Seljuq sultan Toghrīl. The Oghuz nomads and their flocks were ejected from Diyār Bakr in 433/1041–2, and Toghrīl himself did not appear there until 448/1056, when Ibn Marwān became his vassal. Within his lands, such towns as Āmid, Mayyāfāriqīn and Hisn Kayfā enjoyed much prosperity under Marwānid rule and there was a vigorous cultural life; the local historian of Mayyāfāriqīn, Ibn al-Azraq, describes how Ibn Marwān lightened taxes and carried out many public and charitable works there.

On his death in 453/1061, his territories were divided between his sons Nasr and Sa’īd, but the power of the Marwānids was now waning. The cupidity of the caliphal vizier Fakhr al-Dawla Ibn Jahīr (who had previously been in Ibn Marwān’s service) was now aroused; although the Marwānids had done the Seljuqs no harm, Fakhr al-Dawla and his son ‘Amīd al-Dawla secured permission from the sultan, Malik Shah, to invade the Marwānid lands with a Seljuq army. In 478/1085, after stiff fighting, the attackers were victorious and the Marwānid principality was incorporated in the Seljuq empire. The last Marwānid, Mansūr b. Nasr, lived on in Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar for another decade or so, but over the next centuries Diyār Bakr was to be predominantly under the control of Turkmen dynasties and to become increasingly Turkicised.

Lane-Poole, 118; Zambaur, 136; Album, 21.
EI² ‘Djahīr (Banū)’ (Cl. Cahen), ‘Marwanids’ (Carole Hillenbrand), ‘Nasr al-Dawla’ (H. Bowen).
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THE ‘UQAYLIDS
c. 380–564/c. 990–1169
Iraq, Jazīra and northern Syria

1. The line in Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar, Nisībīn and Balad of Muhammad b. al-Musayyab al-‘Uqaylī

⊙ c.380/c. 990  Muhammad b. al-Musayyab, Abu ’l-Dhawwād
⊙ 386/996  ‘All b. Muhammad, Abu ’l-Hasan Janah al-Dawla
⊙ 390/1000  al-Hasan b. Muhammad, Abū ‘Amr Sinān al-Dawla
⊙ 393/1003  Mus‘ab b. Muhammad, Abū Marah Nūr al-Dawla

2. The line in Mosul and later in Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar, Nisībīn and Balad, also of the al-Musayyab line

c. 382/c. 992  Muhammad b. al-Musayyab, Abu ’l-Dhawwād
⊙ 386/996  al-Muqallad b. al-Musayyab, Abū Hassān Husām al-Dawla
⊙ 391/1001  Qirwāsh b. al-Muqallad, Abu ’l-Manī‘ Mu‘tamid al-Dawla
442/1050  Baraka b. al-Muqallad, Abū Kāmil Za‘im al-Dawla
443/1052  Quraysh b. Abī ’l-Fadl Badrān, Abu ’l-Ma‘āl ‘Alam al-Din
⊙ 453/1061  Muslim b. Quraysh, Abu ’l-Makārim Sharaf al-Dawla
478/1085  Ibrahim b. Quraysh, Abū Muslim
486–9/1093–6  ‘Alīb. Muslim
489/1096  Seljuq conquest

3. The line in Takrīt of Ma‘n b. al-Muqallad’s descendants

?  Rāfī‘ b. al-Husayn b. |Ma‘n, Abu ’l-Musayyab
427/1036  Khamīs b. Taghlib, Abu Man‘a
435/1044  Abū Ghashshām b. Khamis
444/1052  Īsā b. Khamīs
448/1056  Nasrb. Īsā

449–?/1057–  Rule of Abu ‘1-Ghana‘im as governor on behalf of ‘Isa’s widow, and then Seljuq occupation

4. The line in Hit

487/1094  Tharwān b. Wahb, Bahā’ al-Dawla
       ?  Kathīrb.Wahb
       ?  al-Mansūr b. Kathīr

5. The line in ‘Ukbarā of Ma‘n b. al-Muqallad’s descendants

っております  401/1011  Gharīb b. Muhammad, Abū Sinān Sayf al-Dīn Kamāl al-Dawla

6. The other minor branches at Āna and al-Hadītha and at Qal‘at Ja‘bar (for details, see Lane Poole and Zambaur, he. cit.)

The ‘Uqaylids came from the great North Arab Bedouin tribal group of ‘Āmir b. Sa‘sa‘a, which also included the Khafāja of the Iraq desert fringes and the Muntafiq of the Batā‘ih or marshlands of lower Iraq. With the decay of the last Hamdānids of Mosul (see above, no. 35, 1), the town passed to the ‘Uqaylid Muhammad b. al-Musayyab, who held it as a nominal vassal of the Būyid amīr Bahā’ al-Dawla. After Muhammad’s death, there were internecine struggles for power among his sons, but control over Mosul and the other ‘Uqaylid towns and fortresses in Jazīra eventually came to his nephew Qirwāsh b. al-Muqallad. At a time when Būyid influence in Iraq was weakening, Qirwāsh’s main problem was to preserve intact his dominions in face of the new threat from the Turkmen invaders of western Persia and Iraq during the third and fourth decades of the eleventh century, and this work of defence necessitated alliances with another threatened power in Iraq, the
Mazyadids of Hilla (see above, no. 36).

Under Qirwāsh’s great-nephew Muslim b. Quraysh, the ‘Uqaylid dominions reached their greatest extent and stretched almost from Baghdad as far as Aleppo. As a Shī‘ī, Muslim’s natural inclination was to support the Fātimids against the strongly Sunnī Seljuqs, but he allied with the Seljuq sultans Alp Arslan and Malik Shah in order to secure the Mirdāsid territories in northern Syria (see above, no. 28). But a further switch to the Fātimids brought Seljuq armies to Mosul, forcing Muslim to flee to Āmid and Aleppo, where he was eventually killed fighting the Seljuq rebel Sulaymān b. Qutalmīsh (478/1085). ‘Uqaylids survived in Mosul as governors on behalf of the Seljuqs until Tutush b. Alp Arslan in 486/1093 imposed on the town his own ‘Uqaylid nominee, and shortly afterwards the line there was extinguished. Other branches of the ‘Uqaylids persisted, however, as local lords in central Iraq and Diyār Mudar for several more decades, the branch at Raqqā and Qal‘at Ja’bar lasting up to 564/1169 under a descendant of Badrān b. al-Muqallad, when Nūr al-Dīn Mahmūd b. Zangi (see below, no. 93) took over there. After the general loss of their power in Iraq, the Banū ‘Uqayl moved southwards to their former eastern Arabian pasture grounds in Hajar and Yamāma, and established there a line of the Shaykhs of the Banū ‘Usfūr.

It seems that the ‘Uqaylids were not entirely a predatory Bedouin dynasty, but had introduced some features at least of the standard pattern of ‘Abbāsid administration into their land; thus it is mentioned that Muslim b. Quraysh had a postmaster or intelligence officer (sahib al-khabar) in every village of his principality. Several members of the dynasty were famed as poets. The passing of the ‘Uqaylids and the Mazyadids marks the end of a period during which Arab amirates had held power over large stretches of Iraq and Syria, maintaining themselves between the great powers of the Fātimids, the Būyids and the Seljuqs. The generally Shī‘ī sympathies of these amirates, and their strategic positions commanding the routes westwards into Diyār Bakr and Anatolia, inevitably brought them up against the expanding Sunnī Seljuqs and their Turkmen followers needing pasture land for their herds. Henceforth, political and military leadership in Iraq, Jazīra and Syria was to be almost exclusively in Turkish hands.

Lane-Poole, 116–17, with a genealogical table; Zambaur, 37, 135; Album, 21. EI I ‘Okailids’ (K. V. Zetterstéén).

The Numayrids were a line of amīrs who flourished during the late tenth and the eleventh centuries in several towns of Diyār Mudar: briefly at Edessa, more continuously at Harrān, Sarūj, Qal‘at Ja’bar and Raqqa. Their name derives from the North Arab tribal group to which they belonged, hence their origins were parallel to those of the Mirdāsids of Aleppo (see above, no. 28). Tribesmen of Numayr were early involved in the fighting in northern Syria and Jazīra as auxiliaries of such powers as the Hamdānids, until Wathṭāb in 380/990 made himself independent of the Hamdanids at Harrān, from where he conquered other fortresses of the region. The first Numayrids found themselves forced to pay tribute to the Greeks on their western borders, and were unable to hold on to Byzantine Edessa, which they had temporarily captured. As the Fātimids expanded into northern Syria, Shabīb b. Wathṭāb in 430/1038 recognised the Fātimid caliph al-Mustansir, although after the Fātimid attempt to hold Baghdad, made by Arslan Basāsīrī, failed in
452/1060, the Numayrids probably changed allegiance to the ‘Abbāsids. But the advent of the Seljuqs was fatal for the Numayrids, as for other petty principalities of the region, like that of the Marwānids (see above, no. 37). The names of the last Numayrid rulers in Harrān are unknown to us. Their town fell in the end to the Seljuqs’ allies, the ‘Uqaylids (see above, no. 38), although members of the family were still to be found holding fortresses into the next century.

Zambaur, 138 (vague and inaccurate); Album, 22.
The Carmathian or Qarmati movement was one of the manifestations of messianic, radical Shi‘ism arousing out of the Ismā‘īlism which took shape in the later eighth and ninth centuries, towards the end of which period a dā‘ī or missionary called Harndān Qarmat allegedly worked in Iraq. At the opening of the tenth century, the Syrian Desert fringes were agitated by the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>273/886 or 281/894</td>
<td>al-Ḥasan b. Bahrāin al-Jannābī, Abū Sa‘īd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301/913</td>
<td>Sa‘īd b. Abī Sa‘īd al-Jannābī, Abu 1-Qāsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305/917</td>
<td>Sulaymān b. Abī Sa‘īd, Abū Tahir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332/944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(by 351/962)</td>
<td>four sons of Abū Sa‘īd al-Ḥasan, ruling jointly with Sābūr b. Abī Tāhir Sulaymān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361/972</td>
<td>Yūsuf, Abū Ya‘qūb, d. 366/977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366/977</td>
<td>joint rule of six of Abū Sa‘īd al-Ḥasan’s grandsons, al-sāda al-ru’ asā’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470/1078</td>
<td>Conquest of al-Ḥsā by the ‘Uyūnid family of the Banū Marra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Carmathian or Qarmatī movement was one of the manifestations of messianic, radical Shi‘ism arousing out of the Ismā‘īlism which took shape in the later eighth and ninth centuries, towards the end of which period a dā‘ī or missionary called Harndān Qarmat allegedly worked in Iraq. At the opening of the tenth century, the Syrian Desert fringes were agitated by the
revolutionary movement of Zakaruya or Zakrawayh until it was suppressed in 293/906. This Carmathian daʿwa had split from the main Ismāʿīlī group in Syria in 186/899, unwilling to recognise the claims of the Fāṭimids (see above, no. 27), with the ‘Old Believer’ Carmathians now claiming to represent the claims of Ismāʿīl, son of the Sixth Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, as conveyed through Ismāʿīl’s son Muḥammad; the split with the Fāṭimid s was never to be really healed.

Instead, the Carmathians established themselves in lower Iraq, where the Zanj or black slave rebellion of the later ninth century had left behind much social and religious discontent, and among the Bedouin of north-eastern Arabia, in the region of al-Aḥsā or Bahrayn. Here, Abū Saʿīd al-Jannābī built up an enduring principality, often described later as that of the Abū Saʿīdīs. The organisation of the Carmathian community there was sufficiently different from the norm of Islamic states at that time to excite the deep suspicion of orthodox Sunnī observers. It seems that there were tentative experiences with the communal ownership of property and goods, soon abandoned; in any case, the economic foundation of the Carmathian principality rested on black slave labour. The rulers of Abū Saʿīd’s family were backed by a council of elders, the ‘Iqdāniyya ‘those who have power to bind [and loose]’; contemporary travellers and visitors to al-Aḥsā praised the justice and good order prevailing there.

The relations of the Carmathians, in their earlier, activist phase, with the Fāṭimids continued to be tense. They raided into Iraq and as far as the coast of Fars (Fārs) and harried the fringes of Syria and Palestine; they had adherents in Yemen, and at one point conquered Oman (‘Umān). Their greatest coup of all was in 317/930 carrying off the Black Stone from the Kaʿba in Mecca, considering it to be a mere object of superstitious reverence, it was twenty years later before, at the Fāṭimid caliph al-Manṣūr’s pleading, they agreed to replace it. Towards the end of the tenth century, the Carmathians grew more moderate in tone, and their principality evolved into something like a republic, with a council of elders in which the house of Abū Saʿīd al-Jannābī was still notable. It seems to have lasted thus until the later eleventh century and the end of the Carmathian state as an independent entity through joint operations by a Seljuq-Abbāsid army from Iraq and a local Bedouin chief, founder of the subsequent line of ‘Uyūnids in eastern Arabia. The surviving Carmathians probably then gave their adherence to the Fāṭimid s, but descendants of Abū Saʿīd, called sayyids, were to be found in
al-Aḥṣā two or three centuries later.

Ismāʿīlism has long disappeared from eastern Arabia, but it may have left a distant legacy in the present existence there, within modern Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Bahrayn Island, of significant Twelver Shīʾī communities.

Coins of the Carmathians are extant from the second half of the tenth century, but seem to have been minted by their governors and commanders on the borders of Palestine and Syria rather than in al-Aḥṣā.

Zambaur, 116; Album, 20.
EI2 ‘Ismaʿiliyya’, ‘Ḳarmati’ (W. Madelung).
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THE ZAYDĪMĀMS OF YEMEN
284–1382/897–1962

Generally in Highland Yemen, with seats in Ṣa‘da or Ṣan‘ā‘; in the twentieth century uniting all Yemen

1. The early period: the Rassid line

al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥasanī al-Rassī, d. 246/860 in Medina
al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim, also resident in Medina

Ø 284/897 Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn, al-Hādī ilā ‘l-Ḥaqq, in Ṣa‘da
298/911 Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā, al-Murtaḍā, d. 310/922

Ø 301/913 Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā, al-Nāṣīr
322/934 Yaḥyā b. Aḥmad, d. 345/956
358/968 Yūsuf b. Yaḥyā, al-Manṣūr al-Dāī, d. 403/1012

Ø 389/998 al-Qāsim b. ‘Alī al-‘Iyānī, Abu l-Ḥusayn al-Manṣūr, d. 393/1003
401/1010 al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim, al-Mahdī, d. 404/1013
413/1022 Ja‘far b. al-Qāsim
426/1035 al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Abū Hāshim d. 431/1040
437/1045 Abu l-Fath b. al-Ḥusayn, al-Daylamī al-Nāṣīr

Period of weakness for the Zaydī Imāms, with the Sulayhids capturing Ṣan‘ā‘ in 454/1062 and the Hamdānid line of Ḥātim h. al-Ghashīm ruling there in 492/1099

Ø 458/1066 Ḥamza b. Abī Hāshim, d. 458/1067
460/1068 al-Fāḍil b. Ja‘far, d. 460/1068
Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar, d. 478/1085
511/1117 Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad, Abū Ṭālib
531/1137 ‘Alīb. Zayd
532/1138 Aḥmad b Sulaymān, al-Mutawakkil, d. 566/1171
566/1171 Hamdānid occupation of Ṣanʿā’

569–626/1174–1229 Ayyūbid conquest and occupation of Yemen

 Ø 583/1187 ‘Abdallāh b. Ḥamza, al-Manṣūr, d. 614/1217
 614/1217 Yaḥyā b. Ḥamza, Najm al-Dīn al-Hādī ilā ‘l-Ḥaqq, in Ṣaʿda

626–11229–Rasūlid rule established in Ṣanʿā’

 Ø 646–56/1248–58 Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn, al-Mahdī al-Mūtī’

The Zaydī imamate held by members of a collateral branch

2. The more recent period: the Qāsimid line

c. 1000/c. 1592 al-Qāsim b. Muhammad, al-Manṣūr
 Ø 1029/1620 Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim, al-Muʿayyad
 Ø 1054/1644 Ismāʿīl b. al-Qāsim, al-Mutawakkil
 Ø 1087/1676 Aḥmad b. al-Hasan, al-Mahdī
  (al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad, al-Muʿayyad, rival Imam in southern Yemen)
 Ø 1092/1681 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, al-Mutawakkil
 Ø 1097/1686 Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, al-Nāṣir al-Hādī al-Mahdī
 Ø 1128/1716 al-Qāsim b. al-Ḥusayn, al-Mutawakkil
 Ø 1139/1726 al-Ḥusayn al-Manṣūr
 Ø 1160/1747 al-ʿAbbās b. al-Ḥusayn, al-Mahdī
 Ø 1189/1775 ‘Alī b. al-ʿAbbās, al-Manṣūr
 1221/1806 Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn, al-Mahdī
The Zaydīs are a moderate branch of the Shīʿa, and they held that the caliph ʿAlī had been designated by the Prophet Muḥammad as Imām of the Community of the Faithful through his personal merits rather than through a divine ordinance or nass, and also that the Fifth Imām of the Shīʿa should rightfully have been not Muḥammad al-Bāqir but his brother Zayd, martyred during the reign of the Umayyad caliph Hishām (see above, no. 2). The descendants and partisans of Zayd later won over by their propaganda the Persian peoples of Daylam and the south-western coastlands of the Caspian Sea, a region sufficiently inaccessible (and, indeed, hardly at that time Islamised) for this work to be carried out without impediment.

The region of Yemen in the south-western corner of the Arabian peninsula was likewise remote from control by the ʿAbbāsid caliphhs, and here Tarjumān al-Dīn al-Qasīm b. Ibrahim Ṭabāṭabā, a descendant of the Second ʿAlīd Imām al-Ḥasan, came from Medina and established himself during al-Ḥāʾim al-Māʾmūn’s caliphate; it was he who founded the legal and theological school of the Zaydiyya. The name ‘Rassids’, conveniently used by Western scholars to designate the ensuing line of Imāms, is geographical in origin and derived from al-Rass, a place in the Hijāz; the term is not commonly used by indigenous Yemeni historians.

The Rassids thus settled at Ṣaʿda in northern Yemen, and maintained themselves there against the local Khārījīs, Qurmaṭīs and other opponents of
their rule. As well as possessing Ṣa‘da, they frequently held Ṣan‘ā’ also. Over the next century, Yemen remained the centre of the Zaydi da‘wa, with missionaries going to the Caspian provinces and to other parts of the Islamic world. Ṣan‘ā’ was taken by the Sulayhids (see below, no. 45) in the second half of the eleventh century, and in the next century it was held by Arab chiefs of the Banū Hamdān (see below, no. 47) for fifty years; only briefly were Zaydī fortunes restored under Aḥmad b. Sulaymān, al-Mutawakkil, a descendant of the tenth-century Imām Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā, al-Nāsir. The Ayyūbid conquest of Yemen in 569/1174 and their domination there for over half a century (see above, no. 30, 8) considerably restricted the authority of the Imāms; they revived somewhat under the first Rasūlid rulers of Yemen (see below, no. 49), until internal disputes and civil strife brought about the eclipse of their power in 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 claimants and counter-Imāms. A more definitely-known sequence appears after around 1000/1592 with the line of al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad. Before this, Yemen had been conquered by the Turks, with Özdemir Pasha entering San‘ā’ in 954/1547, after which Yemen became a province of the Ottoman empire, with the Zaydī Imāms recognising Ottoman suzerainty and left with considerable internal freedom of action. But the Turkish yoke was thrown off by 1045/1635, the Imāms having been reinstalled at San‘ā’ after 1038/1629. The internal history of Yemen over the next two and a half centuries continued to be confused until the Ottomans returned in the later nineteenth century to ‘Aṣir, the region immediately to the north of Yemen, and then in 1288/1871 took San‘ā’. The hold of the Zaydī Imāms on the countryside of highland Yemen remained, however, firm, and on occasion they occupied San‘ā’ temporarily. The Turks left Yemen at the end of the First World War, and the Imāms were able to impose their authority over the whole country and enjoy an internationally-recognised independence. But a closed society and a traditional type of autocratic rule became increasingly difficult to maintain after the Second World War, and in 1962 a military coup brought with it the proclamation of a republic. A protracted and bloody civil war followed, until in 1970 the rule of the Hamid al-Dīn family was replaced by a coalition republican régime.

Sachau, 22 no. 45; Zambaur, 122–4 and Table B.
EL¹ ‘Zaidīya’ (R. Strothmann); EL² ‘Ṣan‘ā’” (G. R. Smith).
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THE ZIYĀDIDS
203–409/818–1018

Yemen, with their capital at Zabīd

203/818  Muḥammad b. Ziyād
245/859  Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad
283/896  Ziyād b. Ibrāhīm
289/902  (Ibn) Ziyād
299/911  Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm, Abu ’l-Jaysh
371/981  ‘Abdallāh or Ziyād (?) b. Isḥāq
402–9/1012–18  Ibrāhīm or ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Abdallāh
409/1018  Succession of the Ziyādids’ slave ministers, including the
Najāḥids, in the northern territories of the Ziyādids

The founder of this line, Muḥammad b. Ziyād, claimed descent from the
great Umayyad governor of Iraq, Ziyād b. Abīhi, but such a connection is
speculative. He was appointed by the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Ma’mūn as governor
of Yemen, in the hope of restraining Shf I dissent there, and the Ziyādids
always recognised the overlordship of Baghdad. Muḥammad’s centre of
power was Zabid in Tihāma or coastal lowlands of Yemen, and he managed
to extend his authority eastwards into Hadramawt and over some parts of
highland Yemen, although the Yuʿfirids (see below, no. 43) eventually
established themselves in Ṣanʿā’. The subsequent Ziyādids were threatened
by the Yuʿfirids and other local potentates, and only with the long reign of
Abu ’l-Jaysh Isḥāq did Ziyādid fortunes revive somewhat. The last Ziyādids,
whose dates are uncertain, were really faïnéants, and in the early eleventh
century power passed in Zabīd to their black Habashī slave ministers, one of
whom was to found the dynasty of the Najāḥids (see below, no. 44).

Lane-Poole, 90–1; Zambaur, 115; Album, 26.
EI₁ ‘Ziyādis’ (R. Strothmann).
THE YU‘FIRIDS OR YA‘FURIDS
232–387/847–997

Yemen, with their centres at Ṣan‘ā’ and Janad

258/872 Muḥammad b. Yu‘fir, d. 269/882
(Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad, Abū Yu‘fir, as deputy ruler)
269/882 Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad, as sole ruler, d. 273/886
273/886 Period of confusion
c. 285/c. 898 As‘ad b. Ibrāhīm, Abū Ḫasan, first reign

Period of confusion, with power in Ṣan‘ā’ seized at times by the Zaydī Imāms and pro-Fāṭimid chiefs

borah 303/915 As‘ad b. Ibrāhīm, second reign
332/944 ? Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm
344–87/955–97 ‘Abdallāh b. Qahtān, with his power disputed
387/997 The Yu‘fīrids reduced to the status of petty, local chiefs

In the mid-ninth century, Yu‘fir b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān asserted his independence of the ‘Abbāsid governors in the Yemen highlands, occupying Ṣan‘ā’ and Janad and becoming the first local dynasty to achieve power there. His family came from Shibām to the north-west of Ṣan‘ā’, and claimed a distant descent from the Tubba‘ kings of pre-Islamic times. Yu‘fir was still, however, careful to maintain his own allegiance to the ‘Abbāsid caliphs. Subsequent members of the family became involved with rival powers in confused struggles for the control of Ṣan‘ā’ and northern Yemen; a new element here was the arrival in
284/897 of the Zaydī Imāms (see above, no. 41) and, shortly afterwards, the appearance of the Qarmatis, supporters of the Fātimids (see above, nos 27, 40). Relative stability was achieved under Asʿad b. Ibrāhīm, but after his death the family was rent by dissensions and by 387/997 lost their ruling power, though apparently surviving in Yemen as obscure, local lords.

Lane-Poole, 91; Zambaur, 116;
EI1 ‘Yaʿfur b. Abd al-Rahmān’ (R. Strothmann).
With the demise of the Ziyādids (see above, no. 42), one of their black Ḥabashī viziers, Najāḥ, managed to kill a rival and establish himself in Zabīd as an independent ruler, acquiring honorifics from the ‘Abbāsid caliph, whom he acknowledged, and extending his dominion northwards through Tihāma. Najāḥ and his successors, like the Ziyādids before them, imported into Yemen contingents of Abyssinian military slaves to support their power, thereby contributing to the mixture of races to be found until today in lowland Yemen. Saʿīd b. Najāḥ was on more than one occasion dispossessed by the Sulayhids (see below, no. 45), and al-Manṣūr b. Fātik I reigned as one of their vassals. The Najāḥids of the twelfth century ruled amid growing
confusion and under increasing pressure, latterly from the Mahdids (see below, no. 48), and despite the deposition of Fātik III b. Muḥammad as the price of military help from the Zaydī Imām Aḥmad b. Sulaymān al-Mutawakkil, the Mahdids entered Zabīd in 554/1159.

Lane-Poole, 92–3; Zambaur. 117–18; Album, 26.
EI² ‘Naḍjāḥids‘ (G. R. Smith).
As well as becoming, because of its remoteness from the centre of the caliphate in Iraq, a centre for Zaydī Shi‘ism (see above, no. 41), Yemen also proved fertile ground for the Ismā‘īlī Shi‘ī da‘wa, and Carmathian or Qarmaṭī activity (see above, no. 40) is mentioned there from the early tenth century onwards. Once the Fatimids became established in Egypt in the second half of the tenth century (see above, no. 27), with the Holy Cities of the Hijāz acknowledging the new caliphs in Cairo, relations between Egypt and Yemen became close.

The Ṣulayhids ruled in Yemen as adherents of Ismā‘īlīsm and as nominal vassals of the Fātimids.ʿ Alī b. Muḥammad, a member of the South Arabian tribe of Harndan and the son of a local Shāffi‘ī qādī or judge, became the khalīfa or deputy of the chief Fātimid dīfī in Yemen, Sulaymān b.‘ Abdallāh al-Zawahl, and was thus able to set up a principality in the Yemen highlands. He defeated the Abyssinian slave dynasty of the Najāḥids of Tiharna (see
above, no. 44); by 455/1063 he had captured Ṣan‘a’ from the Zaydī Imāms and invaded the Hijāz; and in the next year, he took Aden from the Banū Ma‘n. Under his son al-Mukarram Aḥmad, the Ṣulayhid 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 Zaydī Imāms remained at their centre of Sa‘da in northern Yemen. From the latter part of Aḥmad’s reign until her own death in 532/1138, effective authority was exercised by his capable and energetic consort, al-Sayyida Arwā. It was she who moved the Ṣulayhid capital to Dhū Jibia, controlling from there southern Yemen and Tihāma in a reign of some brilliance as the ‘Second Bilqis’.

After her death at the advanced age of 92, power passed to the Zuray‘ids, who were to hold it until the advent in 569/1174 of the Ayyūbid Turan Shāh (see above, no. 30, 8), although some Ṣulayhid princes continued to hold fortresses in Yemen down to the end of the twelfth century.

Lane-Poole, 94; Zambaur, 118–19 (both very inaccurate); Album, 26.
EI² ‘Ṣulayḥids’ (G. R. Smith).
H. C. Kay, Y aman: Its Early Mediaeval History, 19–64, with a detailed genealogical table at p. 335.
THE ZURAY‘IDS OR BANU ‘L-KARAM
473–571/1080–1175
Southern Yemen, with their capital at Aden

al-‘Abbās b. al-Mukarram or al-Makram or al-Karam b. al-Dhi‘b and al-Mas‘ūd b. al-Mukarram, joint vassals of the Ṣūlayhids

477/1084
al-Mas‘ūd b. al-Mukarram and Zuray‘ b. al-‘Abbās, joint rulers

Confused period of rivalry between the two branches of the family, the sons of al-Mas‘ūd and the sons of Zuray*: rule at unspecified dates of Abu ‘l-Su‘ūd b. Zuray‘ and Abu ‘l-Ghārāt b. al-Mas‘ūd, ⊘ Saba‘ b. Abi ‘l-Su‘ūd and Muḥammad b. Abi ‘l-Ghārāt, and then ‘Alī b. Muḥammad

c. 532/c. 1138
Saba‘ b. Abi ‘l-Su‘ūd, sole ruler in Aden, d. 533/1139

533/1139

⊘ 534/1140
Muḥammad b. Saba‘, al-Mu‘azzam

⊘ c. 548/c. 1153
‘Imrān b. Muḥammad, d. 561/1166

561/1166
Rule of ḫabashi viziers, including fawhar al-Mu‘azzami as regent for ‘Imraris young sons

571/1175
Ayyūbid conquest of Aden

The Zuray‘ids belonged to the Jusham branch of the Banū Yarn, and were, like the Ṣūlayhids (see above, no. 45), partisans of the Ismā‘īliyya,
acknowledging the overlordship of the Fāṭimids. Their fortunes came from the Ṣulayhid Aḥmad al-Mukarram’s driving out the Banū Ma’n from Aden and his then installing the two brothers al-‘Abbās and al-Mas‘ūd as joint rulers there in return for their services to the Fāṭimid cause. They paid tribute to the Ṣulayhid queen, al-Sayyida Arwā, until, when she was distracted by internal problems after al-Mukarram Aḥmad’s death in 484/1091, the two cousins Abu ‘1-Ghārāt and Zuray‘ (after whom the dynasty is usually named, though some Yemeni historians use the designation Banu ‘1-Karam for the family) threw off Ṣulayhid control. Henceforth, the Zuray ‘ids ruled over their principality around Aden as, in effect, an independent power, while still under the distant overlordship of the Fāṭimids.

The ensuing decades were, however, filled with dispute and civil warfare between the two branches of the family, the descendants of al-Mas‘ūd on one side and those of al-‘Abbās and Zuray‘ on the other. The names of successive rulers are known, but not the exact dates when they exercised power. It was not until c. 532/c. 1138 that Saba‘ b. Abi ‘1-Su‘ūd b. Zuray‘ managed to impose a unified authority over the region of Aden, and this authority henceforth remained within his branch of the family. A marriage alliance with al-Sayyida Arwā brought to the Zuray‘ids various Ṣulayhid towns and fortresses, but when Tmrān, head of the dynasty and chief da‘i in Yemen, died, his young sons came under the tutelage of Abyssinian slave viziers. The Ayyūbids occupied Aden in 5 71 /1175 (see above, no. 30, 8) and effectively ended the independent power of the Zuray‘ids.

Lane-Poole, 97; Zambaur, 117; Album, 26.
THE HAMDĀNIDS
492–570/1099–1174
Northern Yemen, with their capital at Ṣanʿā’

1. The first line of the Banū Ḥātim

492/1099 Hātim b. al-Ghashim al-Hamdānī
502/1109 ‘Abdallāh b. Hātim
504–10/1111–16 Maʿn b. Hātim

2. The line of the Banū ‘L-Qubayb

510/1116 Hishām b. al-Qubayb b. Rusaḥ
518/1124 al-Humās b. al-Qubayb
527–33/1132–9 Ḥātim b. al-Ḥumās

3. The second line of the Banū Ḥātim

533/1139 Ḥātim b. Aḥmad, Hamid al-Dawla
556–70/1161–74 ‘Alī b. Ḥātim, al-Waḥīd
570/1174 Ayyūbid conquest of Ṣari ā‘

This dynastic title includes three short lines, all stemming from the tribe of Hamdān, the first two of which were probably adherents of the Fāṭimids and the third line certainly so. Hātim b. al-Ghashim, a powerful tribal chief, took over Ṣanʿā‘ when in 492/1099 the Ṣulayhids lost effective control of the city (see above, no. 45). Subsequently, Hamdānī tribal discontent led to the deposition of Maʿn and the end of the first line, and the coming to power of the sons of al-Qubayb, forming the second line.
However, when the sons of Hātim b. al-Humās fell into dissension after his death, the tribal leaders of Hamdān raised to power Hātim b. Aḥmad, who became the greatest leader of the dynasty, defending Ṣan‘ā‘ against the Zaydī Imām Aḥmad b. Sulaymān al-Mutawakkil. His line succeeded in retaining control of much of northern Yemen and in 569/1174 drove back the Mahdids (see below, no. 48) from Aden. Like other Yemeni lines, they were however threatened by the arrival of the Ayyūbids, who entered Ṣan‘ā‘ in 570/1174 and took it over (see above, no. 30, 8), although Hamdāni tribal elements continued to be a factor in the military history of northern Yemen for at least the next twenty years.

Lane-Poole, 94; Zambaur, 119.
EI² ‘Hamdānids‘ (C. L. Geddes).
THE MAHDIDS
554–69/1159–73
Yemen, with their capital at Zabīd


Mahdi b. ‘Alī (?) jointly with his brother ‘Abd al-Nabi

‘Abd al-Nabi b. ‘Ali, k. 571/11762

Ayyūbid capture of Zabīd

‘Alī b. Mahdi traced his ancestry back, like so many other Yemeni leaders, to the pre-Islamic Tubba‘ kings. He acquired a reputation in Tihāma as the preacher of an ascetic and rigorist Islamic message, although it does not seem correct to describe him – somewhat anachronistically, anyway – as a Khārīji. ‘Alī designated his followers Ansar and Muhājirūn, and with them he began a series of violent attacks, including on the by now declining Najāḥids (see above, no. 44), finally capturing Zabīd and toppling the older dynasty. The expansionary ambitions of ‘Alī and his sons led them into a series of attacks in both lowland Yemen, including on Aden, and in the southern part of the highlands, including Ta‘izz. Mahdid excesses may have been one of the factors inducing the Ayyūbid Turan Shāh to intervene in Yemen (see above, no. 30, 8). At all events, the Ayyūbid army speedily defeated the Mahdids, and in 571/1176 ‘Abd al-Nabi and one of his brothers were executed by the Ayyūbids after an apparent Mahdid attempt to regain Zabīd.

Lane-Poole, 96; Zambaur, 118; Album, 26.
EI² ‘Mahdids‘ (G.R. Smith).

THE RASŪLIDS
626–858/1228–1454
Southern Yemen and Tihāma, with their capital at Ta‘izz

Ø 647/1250  al-Malik al-Muzaffar Yūsuf I b. ‘Umar I, Shams al-Dīn
Ø 694/1295  al-Malik al-Ashraf ‘Umar II b. al-Muzaffar, Abu ‘1-Fath Mumahhid al-Dīn
Ø 696/1296  al-Malik al-Mu‘ayyad Dāwūd b. Yūsuf I, Hizabr al-Dīn
Ø 764/1363  al-Malik al-Afdal al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī, Dirghām al-Dīn
Ø 778/1377  al-Malik al-Ashraf Ismā‘īl I b. al-‘Abbās
Ø 803/1400  al-Malik al-Nāsir Aḥmad b. Ismā‘īl I, Salāh al-Dīn
Ø 827/1424  al-Malik al-Manṣūr ‘Abdallāh b. Aḥmad
Ø 830/1427  al-Malik al-Ashraf Ismā‘īl II b. ‘Abdallāh
Ø 831/1428  al-Malik al-Zāhir Yaḥyā b. Ismail II
842/1439  al-Malik al-Ashraf Ismail III b. Yaḥyā
845–58/1442–54  al-Muzaffar Yūsuf II b. ‘Umar
846/1442
Obliging historians and genealogists concocted for the Rasūlids a descent from the royal house of the pre-Islamic Ghassānids and, ultimately, from Qahtān, progenitor of the South Arabs. But it is more probable that they came from the Menjik clan of the Oghuz Turks, who had participated in the Turkish invasions of the Middle East under the Saljuqs, and that the original Rasūl had been employed as an envoy \( \text{[rasūl]} \) by the ‘Abbāsid caliphs.

A number of amirs from the Rasūlīd family accompanied the first Ayyūbids to Yemen (see above, no. 30, 8), and, when the last Ayyūbid, al-Malik al-Kāmil’s son al-Malik al-Masʿūd Salāh al-Dīn Yūsuf, left Yemen for Syria in 626/1229, he left Nūr al-Dīn ‘Umar al-Rasūlí as his deputy. In the event, no Ayyūbid ever reappeared in Yemen, so the Rasūlīds now began to rule independently in Tihāma and the southern highlands, acknowledging the Ayyūbids and the ‘Abbāsid caliphs as their overlords; Ayyūbid traditions remained strong in the new state, seen for example in their royal titulature. Very soon, the strongly Sunni Rasūlīds were able to extend their power and to capture Ṣanʿā’ from the Zaydī Imāms, holding it for a few decades, and as far eastwards in Hadramawt and Zufār as modern Sālala in the southern part of the sultanate of Oman. The later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries saw the zenith of Rasūlīd political power and cultural splendour. The sultans were great builders in such cities as Taʿizz and Zabīd, and were munificent patrons of Arabic literature, with not a few of the sultans themselves proficient authors. From Aden, a far-flung trade was conducted to India, South-East Asia, China and East Africa, and an embassy from Yemen to China is recorded, doubtless stimulated by these trade links with the Far East. But after the death of Salāh al-Dīn Aḥmad in 827/1424, the Rasūlīd state began to show signs of disintegration, with indiscipline among the Rasūlīds’ slave troops, a series of short-reigned rulers and internecine warfare among several pretenders. Thus when the Rasūlīd amir of Aden, al-Ḥusayn b. Tahir,
surrendered his city to the Tāhirids (see below, no. 50) and Salāh al-Dīn b. Ismāʿīl III left for Mecca, the rule of the family came to an end after more than two centuries.

Lane-Poole, 99–100; Zambaur, 120; Album, 27.

EI² ‘Rasūlids’ (G. R. Smith).


idem, in W. Daum (ed.), Yemen: 3000 Years of Art and Civilisation in Arabia Felix, 1367, 139, with a list of rulers at p. 139.
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THE TĀHIRIDS
858–923/1454–1517

Southern Yemen and Tihāma, with their capitals at al-Miqrāna and Juban

858/1454
al-Malik al-Zāfīr ʿĀmir I
b. Tāhir, Shams al-Dīn
al-Malik al-Mujāhid ʿAlī
b. Tāhir, Shams al-Dīn

864/1460
al-Malik al-Mujāhid ʿAlī b. Tāhir, Shams al-Dīn, as sole ruler

⊘ 883/1478

⊘ 894–923/1489–1517
al-Malik al-Zāfīr ʿĀmir II b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, Salāh al-Dīn

923/1517
Conquest of the Yemen by the Egyptian Mamlūks

(924–45/1518–38)
Persistence of some Tāhirid princes in fortresses of the highlands of Yemen; five of them are mentioned, from Aḥmad b. ʿĀmir II to ⊙ ʿĀmir III b. Dāwūd)

The Tāhirids were a native Yemeni, Sunnī family who rose to prominence in the last days of the Rasūlids (see above, no. 49) and took over the Rasūlid lands in southern Yemen and Tihāma on the demise of that dynasty. Four sultans ruled jointly or succeeded each other, maintaining the administrative traditions of their former patrons. They also inherited the Rasūlids’ role as great builders: in such towns as Zabīd, the religious centre of Yemeni Sunnism, they erected mosques and madrasas; in Aden, the principal port of Yemen and bastion against the Egyptian Mamlūks and the Portuguese (it was first besieged by Afonso d‘Albuquerque in 919/1513), they built commercial premises and fortifications. In highland Yemen, they extended their power
against the Zaydī Imāms and captured Ṣanʿā‘. But the Egyptian Mamlūks wished to control Yemen as a base for operations in the Indian Ocean against the Portuguese, and after 921/1515 Egyptian attacks began, leading to the Mamlūks ‘occupation of much of Yemen and the end of the Tāhirids. Only a few Tāhirid chiefs seem to have survived in the highland zone until the Ottoman governor Süleymān Pasha executed the last one, ‘Āmir III b. Dāwūd, in 945/1538.

Lane-Poole, 101; Zambaur, 121; Album, 27.
G. R. Smith, in W. Daum (ed.), *Yemen: 3000 Years of Art and Civilisation in Arabia Felix*, 137–9, with a list of rulers at p. 139.
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THEĀL AL-JULANDĀ
First to second/seventh to eighth centuries
Oman

Saʿīd and Sulaymān b. ʿAbbād b. ʿAbd b. al-Julandā, joint rulers, abandoned Oman during the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik
131–3/748–51
al-Julandā b. Masʿūd b. Jaʿfar b. al-Julandā, first Ibāḍī Imām in Oman
Rashīd b. al-Nazr and Muḥammad b. Zāʿida, joint rulers on behalf of the ʿAbbāsids
? –177/? –793
End of the second century/beginning of the ninth century
Decline of Julandi power in Oman

The Āl al-Julandā were a line of obvious importance in the pre-Islamic and early Islamic history of Oman, but one for which it seems impossible to construct a firm chronology of rule, since they impinged on the Islamic historical sources at only a few key points in their history. The line was of Azdi origin, and must have arrived in Oman as part of the general migrations of the Azd from Hijāz in pre-Islamic times, reaching there at a time when the coastlands at least of Oman were controlled by Sāsānid Persia. After the extension of Arab-Muslim control over eastern Arabia, the Julandā chiefs became representatives of the Medinan government. But Oman’s role as a refuge area for Khārijīs and other dissidents provoked an expedition during al-Hajjāj b. Yūsuf’s governorship of Iraq and the East which ejected the Julandi brothers Saʿīd and Sulaymān and forced them to flee to East Africa.

Al-Julandā b. Masʿūd was won over by the local Ibāḍī Khārijīs (see on the Ibādiyya, above, no. 9) and became their first Imām in Oman (the beginning
of what was to be a tradition of allegiance to Ibāḍī doctrines there which has lasted to this day), but he was killed in 133/751 by a punitive expedition sent by the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Saffāh (see above, no. 3, 1). Thereafter, the Āl al-Julandā seem to have abandoned leadership of the Ibādiyya, but the joint rulers Rashid and Muḥammad were overthrown in a tribal revolt in 177/793, and Julandi power then declined, after having been influential in Oman for three centuries; only odd members of the family are mentioned in the ninth century.

Zambaur, 125–6.
The Mukramids were presumably a local Omani family, who around the beginning of the eleventh century were appointed governors in coastal Oman, with their capital at Ṣuḥār, by the Būyids of Persia (see below, no. 75). The interior of Oman must have been held by the Imāms elected by the Ibāḍī Khārijī community there. The Mukramid Abū Muḥammad I al-Ḥusayn subsequently served the Būyid Amirs in Fars. The end of this brief line of hereditary governors came after a revolt against his suzerain by Abū Muḥammad II, so that in 433/1042 a Būyid prince was installed as governor in Oman.

The Ya‘rubī chiefs rose to prominence as Imāms of the Ibāḍīs at a time when coastal Oman was threatened by the Portuguese and when interior Oman had been largely taken over by other, non-Ibāḍī Arab groups like the Nabhānīs and immigrants from Bahrayn and Persia. In the two or three decades after Nāṣir b. Murshid’s accession in 1034/1625, the Ya‘rubīs secured their power against external enemies like the Portuguese and the Persian Ṣafawīs. But in the early eighteenth century, the succession of a minor, Sayf II b. Sulṭān II, led to internal disputes between the tribal groups of the Ḥināwīs and the Ghāfirīs, with rival candidates for the Imamate and intervention by the Persians at Muscat (Masqat) and Ṣuḥār. It now fell to the rising power of the
Āl Bū Sa‘īdīs to eject the intruders, replace the quarrelling last Ya‘rubīds and make firm their own authority in both Oman and the East African coast (see below, nos 54, 65).

Zambaur, 128.

EI\(^1\) ‘Ya‘rub‘ (A. Grohmann).


1. The united sultanate

- c. 1167/c. 1754: Ħamd b. Saʿīd, elected Imām of the Ibādiyya
- 1198/1783: Saʿīd b. Ħamd, Imām
- c. 1200/c. 1786: Ħāmid b. Saʿīd, Sayyid, regent
- 1206/1792: Sulṭān b. Ħamd
- 1220/1806: Sālim b. Sulṭān, jointly with Saʿīd b. Sulṭān until the former’s death in 1236/1821
- 1236/1821: Saʿīd b. Sulṭān, sole ruler

2. The line of sultans in Oman

- 1273/1856: Thuwaynī b. Saʿīd
- 1282/1866: Sālim b. Thuwaynī
- 1285/1868: ‘Azzānb. Qays
- 1287/1870: Turkī b. Saʿīd
- 1305/1888: Fayṣal b. Turkī
- 1331/1913: Taymūr b. Fayṣal
- 1350/1932: Saʿīd b. Taymūr
- 1390-
3. The line of sultans in Zanzibar (see below, no. 65)

The Bū Saʿīdīs succeeded to the heritage of the preceding line of Yaʿrubid Imāms (see above, no. 53) in both Oman and the East African coastlands. Aḥmad b. Saʿīd began as governor of Ṣuḥār in coastal Oman when the last Yaʿrubids were embroiled in their family quarrels, and soon became de facto ruler of Oman. Hence the Ibāḍī ‘ulamā’ formally elected him Imām in c. 1167/c. 1754. His son and successor Saʿīd also had the title of Imām, but thereafter the Bū Saʿīdī rulers styled themselves Sayyids, while being generally known to the outside world as Sultans.

Muscat, which eventually became the Bū Saʿīdī capital, had long been a port of international significance and had played an important role in the struggles of the Portuguese and then the Dutch for the commercial control of the Persian Gulf. Sulṭān b. Aḥmad pursued an expansionist policy there as far as Bahrayn island and as far as Bandar ‘Abbās, Kishm and Hurmuz along the southern coasts of Fars. However, the Sayyids’ position was menaced in the early nineteenth century by the aggressive Wahhābīs of Najd. They countered this by an alliance with Britain, which was concerned that Muscat, lying as it did near the route to India, should remain in friendly hands. In 1212/1798, the first treaty with the East India Company was made; later, in the nineteenth century, Britain used her influence at Muscat to control and then end the slave trade in the Gulf.

The Yaʿrubid 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 Saʿīdīs. But Saʿīd 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, effectively ruling in Zanzibar from 1242/1827 onwards. After his death in 1273/1856, the Bū Saʿīdī dominions were divided into two separate sultanates, with Thuwaynī ruling over Oman from Muscat and his brother Mājid ruling over Zanzibar and the East African coastland respectively; for this last branch of the family, see below, no. 65.

Oman itself was then racked by family discord, and in the early twentieth century the rigorist Ibāḍī ‘ulama’ of the interior dissociated themselves from what they regarded as the corrupt rule of the Bū Saʿīdīs in the coastal regions.
They restored the Imāmate in 1331/1913 and erupted into rebellion against the Sultan and what they regarded as his British protectors. But confined as it was to the interior, and with a totally backward-looking aspect which contrasted with the adaptability to new conditions of the Su‘ūdīs and their Wahhābī followers, the Īmāmate represented a last stand of tribal elements. The armed insurrection of the 1950s, in which the Imām Ghālib b. ‘Alī had Su‘ūdī and Egyptian backing, was largely extinguished by the end of the decade; and the deposition of the reactionary and parsimonious Sa‘īd b. Taymūr by his son Qābūs in 1390/1970 at last opened up Oman to the world around it and, eventually, led to a reconciliation of elements within the country.

Zambaur, 129 and Table M.

EI² Bū Sa‘īd (C. F. Beckingham), with a genealogical table which corrects Zambaur’s list in several places; ‘Maskat’ (J. C. Wilkinson).

The Āl Su‘ūd (Sa‘ūd)

Originally in south-eastern Najd; in the twentieth century kings of Hijāz and Najd and then of Su‘ūdī (Saudi) Arabia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1148/1735</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. Su‘ūd b. Muḥammad, amir of Dir‘iyya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1179/1765</td>
<td>‘Abd al-‘Azīz I b. Muḥammad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218/1803</td>
<td>Su‘ūd I b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229/1814</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh Ib. Su‘ūd I, k. 1234/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1233–8/1818–22  
**First Turco-Egyptian occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1237/1822</td>
<td>Turkī b. ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249/1834</td>
<td>Mushārī b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249/1834</td>
<td>Fayṣal I b. Turkī, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1254–9/1838–43  
**Second Turco-Egyptian occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1254/1838</td>
<td>Khālid b. Su‘ūd I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257/1841</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh II b. Thunayyān as vassals of Egypt b. Su‘ūd b. Muḥammad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259/1843</td>
<td>Fayṣal I, second reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282/1865</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh III b. Fayṣal I, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288/1871</td>
<td>Su‘ūd II b. Fayṣal I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291/1874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(? 1288/1871) ‘Abdallāh III b. Fayṣal I, second reign

1305/1887  
Muḥammad b. Su‘ūd II  
*Conquest of Riyadh by Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh Ibn*
Suʿūd b. Muḥammad b. Muqrin (d. 1148/1735), from the ‘Anaza tribe, was amir of Dirʿiyya in the Wādī Hanīfa district of Najd, and Dirʿiyya remained the seat of the Suʿūd family until its destruction by Ibrāhīm Pasha in the early nineteenth century and the end of the first Suʿūdī state. The rise of the family was connected with the movement of Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, a puritanical reformer in the conservative legal tradition of Ḥanbalism and the thirteenth-fourteenth-century religious leader in Damascus, Ibn Taymiyya. He stressed the unity and transcendence of God and the duty of avoiding all forms of shirk, associating other persons or things with God, one practical effect of this being hostility to such aspects of popular religion in Arabia as the cult of saints and their shrines; when the Suʿūdī-led Wahhābīs extended their power through much of the peninsula, they systematically destroyed such manifestations of (to them) bidʿa, heretical innovation. It seems that the Suʿūdī amirs saw the material advantages of harnessing Wahhābī enthusiasm for their plans of political expansion in Najd. By the end of the eighteenth century, all Najd was controlled by them, and raids were made against Ottoman Syria and Iraq, culminating in the sack of the Shīʿī holy city of Karbalāʾ in 1218/1803, regarded as an object of superstitious veneration; and the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina were seized and purged of idolatrous features.
The collapse of this power and of the first Su‘ūdī state came as a result of these Su‘ūdī provocations of the Ottomans. The sultan deputed the governor of Egypt, Muḥammad ‘Alī Pasha (see above, no. 34), to deal with the Arabian situation. Hence in 1233/1818 the latter’s son Ibrāhīm took Dir‘iyya and destroyed it utterly, carrying off the Su‘ūdī amīr for execution in Istanbul. The second Su‘ūdī amirate revived cautiously in eastern Arabia during the middle years of the century. From his capital Riyāḍ, Fayṣal I extended his power over al-Ahsā in the eastern Arabian coastland, but a second Turco-Egyptian occupation took place in 1254–9/1838–43, with Fayṣal carried off to Egypt and Su‘ūdī vassals of the Ottomans placed on the throne. Fayṣal escaped from captivity, and in 1259/1843 successfully regained power in his homeland, with this second reign marking a high point in Su‘ūdī fortunes. But after his death, the family was rent by internal disputes; al-Ahsā was occupied by the Ottoman governor of Iraq, Miḏḥat Pasha; and the second Su‘ūdī state came to an end in 1305/1887 when the Su‘ūdīs’ rival Muḥammad Ibn Rashīd of Hā’il (see below, no. 57) occupied Riyāḍ, so that the Su‘ūdis had to take refuge in Kuwait.

The establishment of the third, and present, Su‘ūdī state in the twentieth century is connected with the long-lived and remarkable figure of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ibn Su‘ūd, who, with tacit British support, eventually subdued the pro-Ottoman Āl Rashīd, annexed ‘Asīr, prevented the Sharif Ḥusayn from setting himself up as caliph in 1924 (see below, no. 56), took over Hijāz shortly afterwards, and became King of Hijāz and Najd and then of Su‘ūdī Arabia, controlling by then nearly three-quarters of the peninsula. The large-scale exploitation of oil in eastern Arabia, begun in Ibn Su‘ūd’s time, has transformed what was originally a desert state into a power of international economic significance, especially after the 1970s’ oil-price boom, but has also brought to the country internal religious and social tensions.

Zambaur, 124 and Table L.
EI¹ ‘Ibn Saʿud’ (J. H. Mordtmann); EI² ‘Suʿūd, Āl’ (Elizabeth M. Sirriyyeh).
Naval Intelligence Division, Geographical Handbook series, Western Arabia and the Red Sea, London 1946, 265–70, 283–6, with a genealogical table at p. 286.
### The Hashimite Sharīfs of Mecca from the ‘Awn Family

1243–1344/1827–1925

Mecca and Hijāz latterly, with branches in the Fertile Crescent countries

1. The original line in Western Arabia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1243/1827</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib b. Ghālib, of the Zayd branch of Sharīfs, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243/1827</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Mu‘īn b. ‘Awn, first Sharīfian amīr in Mecca of the ‘Abādila branch of the ‘Awn family, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1267/1851</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib b. Ghālib, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272/1856</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Mu‘īn, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274/1858</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294/1877</td>
<td>al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1297/1880</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib b. Ghālib, third reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299/1882</td>
<td>‘Awn al-Rafīq b. Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323/1905</td>
<td>‘Ali b. ‘Abdallāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326/1908</td>
<td>Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī, until 1335/1916 Sharīf of Mecca and Hijāz, thereafter King of Hijāz, assumed the title of caliph in 1343/1924, d. 1350/1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343/1925</td>
<td>‘Alī b. Ḥusayn, d. 1353/1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344/1925</td>
<td>Conquest of Hijāz by ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ibn Suʿūd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The post-First World War branches of the Ḥashimite family in the Fertile Crescent countries
   (a) The line in Syria
Fayṣal b. Ḫusayn b. ʿAlī, elected King of Greater Syria, subsequently King of Iraq

French Mandate imposed on Syria

(b) The line in Iraq

Fayṣal I b. Ḫusayn, appointed King of Iraq

Ghāzī b. Fayṣal

Fayṣal lib. Ghāzī

Overthrow of the monarchy and its replacement by a republican régime

(c) The line in Transjordan and then Jordan

‘Abdallāh b. Ḫusayn, declared Amīr of Transjordan, and in 1365/1946 King of Transjordan, later Jordan

Ṭalāl b. ‘Abdallāh, d. 1392/1972

Ḥusayn b. Talāl

The Hāshimite Sharīfs (‘noble ones’) of Mecca traced their descent directly back to the Prophet Muḥammad and his clan in Mecca of Hāshim. The Sharīfs held power in the Holy City from the tenth century onwards, in later times under Mamlūk and then Ottoman protection. In the early nineteenth century they were subjected to attacks by the Wahhābs of Najd under the amīr Suʿūd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who captured Mecca in 1218/1803 (see above, no. 55). Liberated in 1228/1813 by Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad ʿAlī of Egypt’s army, the Sharīfate alternated during the nineteenth century between the Zayd and ‘Awn branches, not finally settled in favour of the ‘Abādila of the ‘Awn until 1299/1882, by which time the Ottomans had for some four decades been controlling Ḥijāz as a province of their empire.

With Turkey’s involvement in the First World War on the side of the Central Powers, the Sharīf Ḫusayn became caught up in the Arab Revolt of 1916 which cleared all Ḥijāz except Medina of Ottoman troops and which, in concert with the British army advance from Egypt, eventually freed Greater Syria from Turkish control. Early in the Revolt, Ḫusayn proclaimed himself
'King of the Arab lands', but the Allies would only recognise him as King of Ḥijāz. After 1918 his authority was confined to Ḥijāz, where he came to arouse much Arab hostility by an ill-judged attempt in 1924 to assume the caliphate personally after Muṣṭafa Kemāl’s abolition of that institution in Turkey. His eldest son and successor ‘Alī had to abandon Ḥijāz to the Su‘ūdī invader ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b Su‘ūd, who soon afterwards formed his united kingdom of Ḥijāz and Najd (see above, no. 55).

In the post-First World War arrangements for the Arab lands of the former Ottoman empire, other sons of Ḥusayn were, however, to play a prominent role. The third son Fayṣal from 1918 onwards endeavoured to assume power in the Greater Syria region, and in 1920 was elected King of a united Syria by the Second Syrian General Arab Congress, but had to leave there shortly afterwards when Syria passed under French Mandatary tutelage. Instead, in 1921 and with British support, he became King of Iraq, under a British Mandate; the Hāshimites had no particular connection with Iraq, but no more suitable candidate presented himself. The Ḥashimite monarchy in Iraq, although ruling the first Arab country to free itself from Mandatary control, never put down deep roots, and in 1958 was overthrown by a bloody army coup led by ‘Abd al-Karlm al-Qāsim in which Fayṣal II was killed. More successful and enduring was the establishment of Ḥusayn’s second son ‘Abdallāh as amīr of the Trans Jordanian lands separate from Mandatary Palestine, which after the Second World War became the independent Hāshimite Kingdom of Jordan, still ruled until today by one of the great survivors of Middle Eastern politics, ‘Abdallāh’s grandson King Ḥusayn.
The Rashid family were chiefs of the ‘Abda clan of the Shammar tribal confederation in the Jabal Shammar region of northern Arabia, with their centre at Ḥā’il. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Alī achieved power in Ḥā’il with the support of Fayṣal b. Turkī of the Suʿūdī rulers of Riyāḍ (see above, no. 55), displacing his kinsmen of the Āl Ibn ‘Alī, and he was, like the Suʿūdīs, an adherent of Wahhābism, but in its religious rather than political aspect. The Rashīdī
shaykhdom reached a peak of prosperity in the mid-nineteenth century, with a prosperous caravan trade based on Ḥā‘īl, and Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh extended his authority northwestwards through the Wādī Sirḥān and as far as Palmyra in Syria, and south-eastwards to Qašim in the heart of Najd. He temporarily captured Riyāḍ from the Su‘ūdīs and expelled them altogether from Najd to Kuwait in 1309/1891; the port of Kuwait was itself coveted by the Rashīdīs for the import of arms into their landlocked principality.

The whole history of the Āl Rashīd was marked by violence and fratricidal strife (the great majority of the amīrs died either by assassination or in battle), and after Muḥammad’s death their power declined because of savage internal quarrels plus pressure from the renascent power of the Su‘ūdīs under ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Su‘ūd. The general backing of the Ottomans, including the despatch of regular Turkish troops to support them in Najd, did not save them, and Ibn Su‘ūd was finally able to capture Ḥā‘īl in 1340/1921. The Rashīdī territories were incorporated into what now became the united principality of Najd and, soon afterwards, the Su‘ūdī kingdom of Ḥijāz and Najd (see above, no. 55), and the members of the Āl Rashīd were exiled to Riyāḍ.

None of the amīrs of the Āl Rashīd issued coins.

Zambaur, 125–6.
EI² ‘Ḥāyū‘ (J. Mandaville); ‘Rashīd, ĀF (Elizabeth M. Sirriyyeh).
Naval Intelligence Division, Geographical Handbooks Series, Western Arabia and the Red Sea, 269ff., with a genealogical table at p. 286.
SEVEN

West Africa
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THE KEITA KINGS OF MALI

Early seventh century to mid-ninth century/early thirteenth century to mid-fifteenth century

The central and western parts of modern Mali; northern Guinea; Gambia; and Senegal

627/1230  Mari Sun Dyāta (Mārī Jāṭa) I, son of Nare fa Maghan
653/1255  Mansā Ulī or Ule, son of Mari Sun Dyāta
668/1270  Mansā Wāṭī, son of Mari Sun Dyāta
672/1274  Mansā Khalīfa, son of Mari Sun Dyāta
  Mansā Abū Bakr I, called Bata-Mande-Bori, grandson of
673/1275  Mari Sun Dyāta by one of his daughters and adopted son of Mari Sun Dyāta
684/1285  Sabakura or Sākūra, freed slave of the royal family
699/1300  Mansā Gaw or Qū, son of Mansā Ulī
704/1305  Mansā Mamadu or Muḥammad, son of Mansā Gaw, d.
    712/1312
709/1310  Mansā Abū Bakr II, descendant of Sun Mari Dyāta I’s
    brother Bakari or Abū Bakr
712/1312  Mansā Mūsā I, son of Abū Bakr II
737/1337  Mansā Maghan or Maghā I, Muḥammad, son of Mūsā I
742/1341  Mansā Sulaymān, brother of Mūsā I
761/1360  Mansā Kamba or Qanba or Qāsā, son of Sulaymān
Mansā Mari Dyāta or Mārī Jāṭa II, son of Maghan I
Mansā Mūsā II, son of Mari Dyāta II
Mansā Maghan II, son of Mari Dyāta II
Usurpation of the Sandigi or Ṣandiki, i.e. vizier
Mansā Maghan III, Maḥmūd, descendant of Gaw

Succession strife and chaos, ended by the ascendency of the Songhay kingdom in the mid-ninth/mid-fifteenth century

Mali was the successor, as dominant power in West Africa, to the Soninke kingdom of Ghana, which lay mainly in the Sāḥil to the north of the upper Niger (in the western part of modern Mali and in the south-eastern corner of Mauritania), with its capital, Ghana, possibly to be identified with Kumbi Ṣāliḥ (in the extreme south of modern Mauritania). Ghana had been famed among the Muslim geographers and historians since the eighth century as a prime source of gold. It does not seem that, as was earlier thought, Ghana was directly conquered in the later eleventh century by the Berber Almoravids (see above, no. 14), but it may have been other Berbers from the direction of the Sahara who, in collusion with indigenous Black African opposition elements, brought about the undoubted decline of Ghana in the twelfth century and the spread of Islam in this originally totally pagan land. At the beginning of the next century, the pagan Soninkes of Soso captured the capital of Ghana. The rule of the Soso represented an anti-Islamic reaction in the upper Niger region, but it was followed by a successful Malinke or Mandinka struggle against Soso domination led by Sun Mari Dyāta, a chief of the Keita clan, who then became head of all the Malinke with the title of Mansā.

It was Sun Dyāta’s successors who made Mali into a powerful kingdom, with its capital probably located at Nyane on the Sankarani, a right-bank affluent of the upper Niger (although the site of the capital of Mali apparently varied at different times). It developed strong cultural and religious links with the Islamic lands of North Africa and Egypt, with diplomatic and religious connections with the Marīnids of Morocco (see above, no. 16) and the Mamlūks of Egypt (see above, no. 31). Several of the kings of Mali made the Pilgrimage to Arabia, with that of Mansā Mūsā I (in whose reign Mali was visited by the Moroccan traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa) achieving special fame. Even
so, animist concepts remained strong beneath the veneer of official and ruling-class Islam, and the local form of Islam developed clear syncretist elements within it. There was a flourishing trans-Saharan commerce in such items as gold and slaves, with Timbuktu, near the northernmost point of the Niger bend and probably in origin a Touareg settlement, developing in the fourteenth century as a terminus for the caravan traffic and as a significant intellectual centre of Islamic learning.

In the later fourteenth century, Mali was weakened by succession disputes, Early in the next century, it lost Timbuktu and much of the Sāḥil zone to the Touaregs, and was threatened by the rise of Songhay (see below, no. 59), which stripped Mali of its eastern and central lands, so that it became confined to the Malinke heartland in approximately what is now western Mali and Guinea, where it survived as a power of only local significance; it withstood Moroccan pressure at the end of the sixteenth century, but by 1081/1670 it was eclipsed by the rising Bambara states of Segu and Karta.

EI¹ ‘Soso’ (Maurice Delafosse); EI² ‘Ghāna’ (R. Cornevin), ‘Mali’ (N. Levtzion).
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THE KINGS OF SONGHAY
? third century to 1000/? ninth century to 1592
*The Savannah zone of Mali along the Niger bend and to its west*

1. The Zas or Zuwas of Gao

? third/ninth century
Alyaman

fifth/eleventh century
Kosoy or Kosay Muslim Dam.

Some fourteen or sixteen further rulers, often with divergent names, enumerated in the Arabic chronicles, that by the family of Maḥmūd al-Kātī, the *Taʿrīkh al-Fattāsh*, and that by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Saʿdī’s *Taʿrīkh al-Sūdan*, ending with the Za Bisi Baro or Ber.

2. The Sis or Sonnis

? c. 674/c. 1275  ‘Alī Golom or Kolon

? Salmān Nari

? Ibrāhīm Kabayao

c. 720/c. 1320  ‘Uthmān Gifo or Kanafa

Some twelve or fifteen successive rulers, often with divergent names, enumerated in the *Taʿrīkh al-Fattāsh* and the *Taʿrīkh al-Sūdan*, but both ending with:

? Sulaymān Dama or Dandi
868 or 869/
1464 or 1465  ‘Alī, son of Si Ma Gogo or Maḥmūd Da’o, called Ber ‘the Great’
897–8/1492–3  Abū Bakr or Bakari or Baru, son of ‘Alī Ber

3. The Askiyas

898/1493  Muḥammad Ture, son of Abū Bakr, called Askiya or Sikiya, d. 945/1538
934/1528  Mūsā, son of Muḥammad Ture
937/1531  Muḥammad II Benkan, son of ‘Umar Kamdiagu
943/1537  Ismā‘īl, son of Muḥammad Ture
946/1539  Ishāq I
956/1549  Dāwūd, son of Muḥammad Ture
990/1582  Muḥammad III
994/1586  Muḥammad IV Bani, son of Dāwūd
996/1588  Ishāq II
999/1591  Moroccan conquest

999–1000/1591–2  Muḥammad Gao or Kawkaw, killed by the Moroccans, who then set up puppet Askiyas

The Songhay (a name of unknown origin) are a group of peoples of mixed origins living along the shores of the northern part of the Niger bend, where a town, possibly on the right bank of the river, and a principality of Gao or Kawkaw are mentioned in Arabic historical sources of the ninth century. Al-Saʿdī relates a tradition that it was the fifteenth Za, Kosoy, who in the eleventh century became the first convert to Islam, being called Muslim Dam ‘the voluntary Muslim’. After c. 674/c. 1275 there came a new line of the Sis or Sonnis, begun by ‘Alī Golom, who freed Gao from the domination of Mali (see above, no. 58). However, when Ibn Baṭṭūṭa was in Kawkaw in 754/1353, he implied that it came within the political sphere of Mali at that time; it seems from his account that in Kawkaw, as elsewhere it was the ruling classes and the merchants who were Muslim, while the mass of people were still animists.

At the end of the fourteenth century, Songhay became completely independent of Mali, and a powerful empire, with both military and naval
forces, was built up by Sonni ‘Alī the Great, penultimate ruler of the Si line and the real founder of the Songhay empire. Shortly after Sonni ‘Alī’s death, his commander Muḥammad Ture, of Soninke origin, seized the throne and founded a new dynasty of his own, that of the Askias. Under him, Islam became the imperial cult, and Timbuktu developed as a centre of Islamic learning. Like the rulers of Mali, Muḥammad Ture made the Pilgrimage to Mecca in 901–2/1496–7, and there received from the Sharīf ‘Abbās investiture as ruler of Takrūr (stricto sensu, a region on the Senegal River, but extensively used also in mediaeval Islamic usage for the western Sudan, bilād al-Takrūr, in general). He extended Songhay power westwards to Senegal and the old lands of Ghana, and in the east raided Hausaland, and set up a flexible, decentralised provincial administration for his empire. His successors proved quarrelsome and less capable. After the reign of his son Dāwūd, the kingdom fell victim to the disciplined army, using its firearms to good effect, sent against Gao by the Sa‘did sultan of Morocco Aḥmad al-Manṣūr al-Dhahabi (see above, no. 20), covetous of the famed wealth of the Sudan (999/1591). The three main towns of Gao, Timbuktu and Jenne fell to the invaders. The middle Niger region fell into political fragmentation and disorder. The Moroccan pashas or governors of Timbuktu ruled over only a limited area, and after c. 1070/c. 1660 direct Moroccan authority there seems to have lapsed.

EI² ‘Songhay’ (J. O. Hunwick).
Nehemia Levtzion, Ancient Ghana and Mali, 84–93.
THE RULERS OF KANEM AND BORNU OR BORNO
third century-/? ninth century-
East-central Sudan

1. The ‘red’ (i.e. white) Sayfī (Sefuwa) or Yazanī rulers of Kanem

c. 478/c. 1085 Hume or Ume Jilmi son of Selema, the first Muslim ruler of his line, according to the Bornu King List
490/1097 Dunama Umemi Muḥammad, son of Hume
546/1151 ‘Uthmān Biri, son of Dunama
569/1174 ‘Abdallāh Bikur b. ‘Uthmān
590/1194 ‘Abd al-Jalīl (Jīl) or Selema b. ‘Abdallāh
618–57/1221–59 Dunama Dibalemi, Muḥammad, son of Selema, the first Muslim ruler of his line according to al-Maqrīzī

2. The ‘black’ Sultans of Kanem

Kade b. Dunama
Biri, Ibrāhīm or ‘Uthmān, Kachim Biri b. Dunama
Jalīl or Jil b. Dunama
Dirke Kelem b. Dunama
689/1290 Ibrāhīm Nikale b. Biri
711/1311 ‘Abdallāh b. Kade
722/1322 Selema b. ‘Abdallāh
726/1326 Kure Gana b. ‘Abdallāh
727/1327 Kure Kura b. ‘Abdallāh
728/1328 Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh
729/1329  Idrīs b. Ibrāhīm Nikale
754/1353  Dāwūd b. Ibrāhīm Nikale
764/1363  ‘Uthmān b. Dāwūd
767/1366  ‘Uthmān b. Idrīs
769/1368  Abū Bakr b. Dāwūd
770/1369  Idrīs b. Dāwūd and/or Dunama b. Ibrāhīm
778/1376  ‘Umar b. Idrīs
789/1387  Sa‘īd b. Idrīs
790/1388  Muḥammad b. Idrīs
791/1389  Kade Afunu b. Idrīs
792/1390  ‘Uthmān b. Idrīs
825/1422  ‘Uthmān Kalinumuwa b. Dāwūd
826/1423  Dunama b. ‘Umar
828/1425  ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Umar
836/1433  Ibrāhīm b. ‘Uthmān
844/1440  Kade b. ‘Uthmān
848/1444  Biri b. Dunama
849/1445  Dunama b. Biri
853/1449  Muḥammad
854/1450  Ume or Amer or Amarma
855/1451  Muḥammad b. Kade
860/1456  Ghāzī
865/1461  ‘Uthmān b. Kade
870/1466  ‘Umar b. ‘Abdallāh
871–6/1467–72  Muḥammad b. Muḥammad

3. The new line of Sultans in Bornu, the Mais or rulers, claiming Sayfī descent

875/1470  ‘Alī Ghāzī Kanuri b. Dunama
908/1503  Idrīs Katagarmabe b. ‘Alī, with suzerainty over Kanem also
931/1525  Muḥammad b. Idrīs
951/1544  ‘Alī b. Idrīs
953/1546  Dunama Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, brother of ‘Alī
970/1563  ‘Abdallāh b. Dunama Muḥammad (? initially with ‘Alī Fannami b. Muḥammad as regent)
Idrīs Alawma b. ‘Alī, in Kanem also (? initially with
977/1569  ‘Ā’isha (Aisa) Kili Ngirmarama, as Magira or Queen-Mother)
c. 1012/c. 1603  Muḥammad b. Idrīs
1055–95/1645–84  ‘Alī

1027/c. 1618  Ibrāhīm b. Idrīs
1034/c. 1625  ‘Umar b. Idrīs

c. 1120/1665  Muḥammad Ergama b. Ḥamdūn
1126/1710  Dunama Gana b. ? Muḥammad
1160/1747  ‘Alī b. Ḥamdūn
1223/1808  Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, dispossessed from Bornu by the Fulani jihād 1223/1808, fled to Kanem and restored with Kanemi help
1226/1811  Dunama Lefiami b. Aḥmad, under Kanemi suzerainty, first reign
1229/1814  Dunama Lefiami, second reign
1232/1817  Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad, k. by the Kanemis 1262/1846
1262/1846  ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm, k. in battle, last of the Sayfī Mais

4. The Kanembu line of Shaykhs or Shehus of Bornu and Dikwa

(Muḥammad Aḥmān al-Kānemī, Shehu Laminu, de facto ruler in Bornu from Dunama Lefiami of Bornu’s reign onwards, d. 1251/1835)
1251/1835  ‘Umar b. Muḥammad Aḥmān, first de jure Shehu of Bornu, first reign
1269/1853  ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad Aḥmān
1270/1854  ‘Umar b. Muḥammad Amīn, second reign
1297/1880  Abū Bakr or Bukar I Kura b. ‘Umar
1301/1884  Ibrāhīm b. ‘Umar
1302/1885  Hāshim b. ‘Umar, k. 1311/1893
1311/1893  Muḥammad Amīn Kiari b. Bukar Kura, k. 1311/1893
1311/1893  Sanda Limanambe Wuduroma b. Bukar Kura, k. 1311/1893

1311–19/1893–1901  *Conquest of Bornu and Dikwa by Rābiḥ b. Faḍl Allāh, k. 1319/1901*

(a) The Shehus in Bornu, reinstated by the British

1320/1902  Bukar Garbai b. Ibrāhīm (previously, Shehu of Dikwa)
1340/1922  ‘Umar Sanda Kura b. Ibrāhīm
1354-?/1937-?  ‘Umar Sanda Kiarimi b. Muḥammad Amīn Kiari (previously, Shehu of Dikwa)

(b) The Shehus and Mais in Dikwa, reinstated by the French

1318/1900  Shehu ‘Umar Sanda Kura b. Ibrāhīm, first reign
1319/1901  Shehu Bukar Garbai b. Ibrāhīm (later, Shehu of Bornu)
1320/1902  Shehu ‘Umar Sanda Mandarama b. Bukar I Kura, first reign
1323/1905  Shehu Ibrāhīm b. Bukar I Kura
1324/1906  Shehu ‘Umar Sanda Mandarama b. Bukar I Kura, second reign
1335/1917  Shehu ‘Umar Sanda Kiarimi b. Muḥammad Amīn Kiari (later, Shehu of Bornu)
1356/1937  Mai Abba Muṣṭafā I or Masta b. Muḥammad Amīn Kiari
1369/1950  Mai Bukar b. Shehu ‘Umar Sanda Kiarimi
           Mai Abba Muṣṭafā II or Masta b. Shehu Sanda
During Islamic times, the histories of Kanem and Bornu have been intertwined, but together they have formed one of the oldest and certainly the most enduring of Muslim states in West Africa. Kanem lay to the east of Lake Chad, in what is now the Republic of Chad, while Bornu lay to the south-west of the lake, in what is now north-eastern Nigeria.

Already in Umayyad times, Arab raiders are reputed to have penetrated to Fezzan in southern Libya and to Tibesti and the region of the Tubu people in what is now northern Chad, but Kanem seems to have been founded by the Saharan nomadic people of the Zaghāwa. Islam was probably introduced into Kanem from the north by the Tubu during the eleventh century, when we find a dynasty ruling there which apparently claimed a spurious descent from the pre-Islamic Ḥimyarite prince of South Arabia, Sayf b. Dhī Yazan. There were connections across the Sahara with Egypt and North Africa, with a traffic in black slaves, and Dunama Dabalemi in 655/1257 sent a famed present of a giraffe to the Ḥaḍrīd ruler in Tunis (see above, no. 18).

By the end of the fourteenth century, these Sayfī rulers of Kanem had been forced to move to Bornu by the ascendancy in Kanem of a rival clan, the Bulālas (? Bilālīs). The Sayfīs, now in Bornu, were refounded as the Mais or rulers by ‘Alī Ghāzī, with their new capital at N’gazargamu (Qaṣr Gomo) to the west of Lake Chad, and this remained the capital until 1811. The rulers of Bornu subsequently regained Kanem, and extended their power westwards into Hausaland, north-westwards to the Aïr and north-eastwards against the Tubu. In the later sixteenth century they discovered the value in warfare of firearms, and imported Turkish musketeers, and they also began to make their state more consciously Islamic by introducing the prescriptions of the Sharī‘a in certain spheres. Over the next two centuries, however, Bornu remained either static or in a state of decline, under pressure from the Hausas and the Touaregs of the Sahara. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Fulani jihād (see below, no. 61) affected Bornu adversely, with the Mais being denounced as inadequate Muslims, so that in 1224/1809 Aḥmad b. ‘Alī had to appeal to Muḥammad Amīn al-Kānemī for help against the Fulbe. Al-Kānemī’s intervention marked the reduction of the Sayfīs of Bornu to the status of fainéants, and after 1262/1846 the line of the Kanembu Shaykhs or
Shehus, religious scholars in origin, assumed legitimate power there. Bornu was occupied by the invader from Wadai, Rābiḥ, for several years, but soon after the restoration of the Kanembus in Bornu and the sister-sultanate of Dikwa after Rābiḥ’s death in 1318/1900, its territory was divided between the colonial powers of Britain, Germany and France. The Shehus of Bornu and the Mais of Dikwa still survive as local potentates within the Northeastern State of the present Nigerian Republic, which has its administrative centre at Maiduguru.

Complete harmonisation of the lists of Bornu kings, prepared by various Western scholars (German, French and British, starting with Barth in the 1850s) from the records of court scribes in Bornu, is not easy, although there is a remarkable degree of agreement as to names of rulers, if not of lengths of their rule. The list and dates given above follow such sources as those in the Bibliography below, with especial use of the work of Hogben and Kirk-Greene and of the concordance of dates and names prepared by Cohen.

*EI*¹ ‘Bornū’ (G. Yver); *EI*² ‘Bornū’ (C. E. J. Whitting), ‘Kanem’ (G. Yver*).
THE FULANI RULERS IN HAUSALAND, AS SULTANS AND CALIPHS OF SOKOTO
1218–1804–
Northern Nigeria and the adjacent Niger valley

1218/1804
‘Uthmān b. Fūdī (Usumanu dan Fodio), proclaimed his hijra and jihād in this year, d. 1232/1817

1223/1808
‘Abdallāh (Abdallah) b. Fūdī, as vizier of his brother, in the western part of Hausaland, with his capital at Gwandum
Muhammad Bello b. ‘Uthmān, as vizier of his father, in the eastern part, with his capital at Sokoto

1232/1817
Muḥammad Bello, called Mai Wurno, with ‘Abdallāh, d. 1243/1828, as co-ruler

1253/1837
Abū Bakr ‘Atīq (Atiku) b. ‘Uthmān, called Mai Katuru

1258/1842
‘Ali (Aliyu) Babba b. Muḥammad Bello, called Mai Cinaka

1275/1859
Aḥmad (Ahmadu) or Zaraku b. Abī Bakr ‘Atīq, called Mai Cimola

1283/1866
‘Alī Karām (Aliyu Karami) b. Muḥammad Bello

1284/1867
Aḥmad (Ahmadu Rafaye) b. ‘Uthmān b. Fūdī

1290/1873
Abū Bakr ‘Atīq (Atiku na Rabah) b. Muḥammad Bello

1294/1877
Mu‘ādh (Mu’azu, Moyasa) Ahmadu b. Muḥammad Bello

1298/1881
‘Umar (Umaru) b. ‘Alī Babba

1308/1891
‘Abd al-Raḥmān (Danyen Kasko) b. Abū Bakr ‘Atīq

1320/1902
Muḥammad Ṭāhir I b. Aḥmad ‘Atīq

1321/1903
Muḥammad Ṭāhir II b. ‘Alī Babba

(1322/1904 British capture of Sokoto)

1333/1915
Muḥammad b. Aḥmad ‘Atīq, called Mai Turare
Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad ‘Atīq, called
From the later eighteenth century, the position of Islam in West Africa began to be transformed by the appearance of militant, puritanical movements, sometimes with millenarian elements, among the Fulani or Fulbe of western Sudan, in the Futa Jallon plateau region where the Niger and Senegal Rivers rise. This reviviscence was taken up by the Tokolors of Futa Toro, to the south of the Senegal River, where various Imāms or almamis of the Tokolor religious classes established their secular power until the arrival of the French at the end of the nineteenth century; notable among these were Ḥamadu Bari of Masina on the upper Niger and al-Ḥājj ʿUmar b. Saʿīd Tal in the upper Niger–upper Senegal region. Within these religious movements, the motivating power of Ṣūfī orders, such as the Qādiriyya and the Tijāniyya, was notable.

From Gobir in Hausaland there arose the Tokolor religious leader ʿUthmān b. Fūdī (fodio ‘learned, holy man’), who began to preach jihād against those whom he regarded as lax Muslims, those compromised, in his view, with the surrounding paganism, and against the animist majority of black Africans. He assumed the ancient title implying political and religious leadership of the Muslim community, ‘Commander of the Faithful’, Amīr al-Muʾminīn, in Hausa Sarkin Musulmi, a title still born by his descendants in Sokoto (who have been also known as ‘caliphs’, following ‘Uthmān’s designation of himself as ‘Commander of the Faithful’, and sultans). With his Fulani followers, ‘Uthmān wore down the uncoordinated resistance of most of the Hausa states, and individual Fulani leaders carved out for themselves principalities as far east as the Adamwa plateau of northern Cameroons, often adopting the title of amīr or lamidu.

His descendants, beginning with Muḥammad Bello, erected a states system which was inevitably based on the old Hausa ones which they had dispossessed, but with new centres of power such as Sokoto or Sakwato, founded in 1224/1909, and where ‘Uthmān’s tomb became a noted place of pilgrimage. The original religious impetus of the jihād was gradually lost, and Fulani rule degenerated into an undisguised slave-raiding economy, causing devastation, depopulation and misery. With power in the hands of
local governors, only the religious authority of the rulers in Sokoto was acknowledged. At the end of the nineteenth century, the colonial powers Britain, France and Germany converged on Hausaland and divided it up. British troops entered Sokoto without resistance in 1322/1904, and it thereafter came within the Protectorate of Northern Nigeria which had been set up four years previously. The line of sultans in Sokoto continued, however, under the British policy of indirect rule, namely maintenance of the ruling structures in Nigeria, and into the present Republican period. Sokoto is now the administrative capital of the North-western State of the Nigerian Republic.

EI² ‘Sokoto’ D. M. Last, ‘Fulbe’ (R. Cornevin).
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THE SULTANS OF KILWA
? fourth century to c. 957/? tenth century to c. 1550
The modern Tanzanian coastland

1. The Shīrāzī dynasty

Ø ? c. 346/? c. 957  ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī
  ? Muḥammad b. Alī
  386/996  ‘Alī b. Bashat b. ‘Alī
  389–93/999–1003 Dāwūd b. ‘All
  395/1005 al-Ḥasan b. Sulaymān
  433–93/1042–1110  ‘Alī b. Dāwūd

  499/1106 al-Ḥasan b. Dāwūd
  523/1129 Sulaymān
  525/1131 Dāwūd b. Sulaymān
  565/1170 Sulaymān b. al-Ḥasan b. Dāwūd
  585/1189 Dāwūd b. Sulaymān
  586/1190 Tālūt b. Sulaymān
  587/1191 al-Ḥasan b. Sulaymān
  612/1215 Khālid b. Sulaymān
Transfer of power to the Mahdalis

2. The Mahdali Sayyids

Ø 676/1277 al-Ḥasan b. Ṭālūt
Ø 693/1294 Sulaymān b. al-Ḥasan
    708/1308 Dāwūd b. Sulaymān, first reign
Ø 710/1310 al-Ḥasan b. Sulaymān, Abu ’l-Mawāhib
Ø 733/1333 Dāwūd b. Sulaymān, second reign
    757/1356 Sulaymān b. Dāwūd
    757/1356 al-Ḥusayn b. Sulaymān
    763/1362 Ṭālūt b. al-Ḥusayn
Ø 765/1364 Sulaymān b. al-Ḥusayn
    767/1366 Sulaymān b. Sulaymān b. al-Ḥasan
    791/1389 al-Ḥusayn b. Sulaymān
Ø 815/1412 Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, al-‘Ādil
    824/1421 Sulaymān b. Muḥammad
    46/1442 Ismāʿīl b. al-Ḥusayn b. Sulaymān
    858/1454 Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. Sulayman, al-Maẓlūm
    859/1455 Aḥmad b. Sulaymān b. Muḥammad
    860/1456 al-Ḥasan b. Ismāʿīl, al-Khaṭīb
    870/1466 Saʿīd b. al-Ḥusayn
    881/1476 Sulaymān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn
    882/1477 ‘Abdallāh b. al-Ḥasan
    883/1478 ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan
    884/1479 al-Ḥasan b. Sulaymān, first reign
    890/1485 Sabḥat b. Muḥammad b. Sulaymān
    891–4/1486–9 al-Ḥasan b. Sulaymān, second reign
    895/1490 Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad
900/1495  Muḥammad b. Kiwāb, brother of Sulaymān b. Muḥammad, usurper

900–4/1495–9  Fuḍayl b. Sulaymān

_Six further rulers, either usurpers or Portuguese appointees, until c. 957/c. 1550_

The island of Kilwa (the Quiloa of the Portuguese seafarers, modern Kilwa Kisawani), off the east coast of modern Tanzania and some 140 miles south of Dar es Salaam, was the seat of a series of Muslim sultans who came to control much of the trade along the East African coast until the coming of the Portuguese in the sixteenth century. The first, so-called Shīrāzī line of these (any origin for them in the Persian city of Shiraz is, however, very improbable) may have begun to rule in the tenth century, but they emerge more clearly into the light of history during the twelfth century. They were succeeded towards the end of the thirteenth century by a line of Mahdali Sayyids, who continued until the decline of Kilwa and its trade as the Portuguese assumed control of the East African coastland trade. This latter line in Kilwa included rulers of what the Kilwa Chronicle calls ‘the family of Abu’l-Mawāhib’. Obscure sultans continued in Kilwa as vassals of the Portuguese and then of the Omanis, until the Bū Sa‘īdīs of Zanzibar (see below, _no. 65_) deposed the last one in 1843.

A good number of the coins of the sultans, and especially of the Mahdalis, have come to light through discoveries of hoards and through archaeological investigation. But dates are sparse, and the genealogy and chronology of the sultans remain distinctly obscure; the dates given in the table above, reckoned from the regnal years given in the Kilwa Chronicle, are in all cases only approximate.

Zambaur, 309 (very fragmentary); Album, 28–9.
El2‘Kilwa’ (G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville).
G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, _The Medieval History of the Coast of Tanganyika, with Special Reference to Recent Archaeological Discoveries_, London 1962, with genealogical tables at the end.
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THE NABHĀNĪ RULERS OF PATE
600–1312/1203–1894

The island of Pate, off the modern Kenyan coastland

600/1203  Sulayman b. Muẓaffar
628/1227  Muḥammad b. Sulaymān
650/1252  Aḥmad b. Sulaymān
670/1272  Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sulaymān
705/1305  Muḥammad b. Aḥmad
732/1332  Umar b. Muḥammad
749/1348  Muḥammad b. ʿUmar
797/1395  Aḥmad b. ʿUmar
840/1436  Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad
875/1470  Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr
900/1495  Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad
945/1538  Bwana Mkuu I b. Muḥammad
973/1565  Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr
1002/1594  Bwana Bakari I b. Bwana Mkuu I
1011/1602  Abū Bakr Bwana Gogo b. Muḥammad
1061/1651  Bwana Mkuu II b. Bwana Bakari I
1100/1689  Bwana Bakari II b. Bwana Mkuu II
1103/1692  Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr
1111/1699  Bwana Tamu Mkuu, Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad Bwana Mtiti
1152/1739  Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad
1160/1747  Bwana Tamu Mtoto, Abū Bakr
1187/1773  Bwana Mkuu b. Shehe b. Abī Bakr Bwana Tamu Mkui
1191/1777  Bwana Fumo Madi, Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr Bwana Tamu Mtoto
1224/1809  Aḥmad b. Shehe b. Fumo Luti
1230/1815  Fumo Luti Kipanga b. Bwana Fumo Madi
1236/1821  Fumo Luti b. Shehe b. Fumo Luti
1236/1821  Bwana Shehe b. Muḥammad Bwana Fumo Madi, first reign
1239/1824  Aḥmad, Bwana Waziri b. Bwana Tamu b. Shehe, first reign
1241/1826  Bwana Shehe, second reign
1247/1831  Aḥmad, Bwana Waziri, second reign
1250/1835  Fumo Bakari b. Bwana Shehe
1262/1846  Aḥmad b. Shehe b. Fumo Luti
1273/1857  Aḥmad Simba b. Fumo Luti b. Shehe
1306/1889  Fumo Bakari b. Aḥmad, d. 1308/1891, ruler in Witu
1308/1890  Bwana Shehe b. Aḥmad b. Shehe
1308–12/1890–4  Fumo Omari b. Aḥmad b. Shehe, last ruler in Pate
1312/1894  British rule
1312-after 1326/
1894-after 1908  Omar Madi, under British suzerainty

This line of rulers apparently stemmed from the same tribal group as the Nabhānīs ruling in Oman before the Ya’rubids (see above, no. 53), though probably not from the Nabhānī ruling family. They ruled the island of Pate in the Lamu archipelago off the Kenyan coast from the thirteenth century onwards under Omani suzerainty, after 1109/1698 (the date when the Omanis took Mombasa from the Portuguese) paying customs dues to Zanzibar. The rulers of Pate also controlled Witu on the mainland, but came under British control at the end of the nineteenth century. A remarkably full list of the rulers of Pate is to be found in the Swahili oral traditional history of the
family, only written down at the end of the nineteenth century (see the bibliography below); the dates in it, followed *faute de mieux* in the above table, should obviously be regarded as very approximate.

*EI*² ‘Lamu’, ‘Pate’ (G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville).
G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville (tr. and introd.), *Habari za Pate: the History of Pate*..., unpublished paper.
Mombasa and Pemba island in the East African coastland

c. 1109/c. 1698 Nāṣir b.‘Abdallāh Mazrū‘ī
  1141/1729 Muhammad b. Sa‘īd al-Ma‘āmirī | non-Mazrū‘ī governors
  1142/1730 Šāliḥ b. Muhammad al-Hadramī | governors
  1146/1734 Muḥammad b. ‘Uthmān b. ‘Abdallāh
  1159/1746 Sayf b. Khalaf, non-Mazrū‘ī governor
  1160/1747 ‘Alī b. ‘Uthmān
  1167/1754 Mas‘ūd b. Nāṣir
  1193/1779 ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Uthmān
  1196/1782 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Uthmān
  1227/1812 ‘Abdallāh b. Aḥmad
  1238/1823 Sālim b. ‘Alī
  1240/1825 Sālim b. Aḥmad
  1253/1837 Assertion of authority by the Bū Saʿīdīs

The Mazrū‘ī family (Swahili Wamazrui) originally stemmed from eastern Arabia, having migrated from Oman at the end of the seventeenth century. Over nearly a century and a half, they provided an almost unbroken line of governors (Swa. liwali < Ar. al-wālī) in Mombasa, with branches on Pemba island and elsewhere. At times they were strong enough to attack the Bū Saʿīdīs in Zanzibar (see below, no. 65), and they intervened in the affairs of Pate (see above, no. 63). The Bū Saʿīdī ruler of Zanzibar Saʿīd b. Sultān nevertheless suppressed the Mombasa line in 1253/1837, but members of the Mazrū‘ī family continued to hold positions of power and of religious and
intellectual eminence on the coastland, and the family has remained influential to this day. As with the rulers of Kilwa and Pate, a local chronicle exists for the Mazrūʿīs, but this was compiled as recently as c. 1946.

*EL*² Mazrūʿī, ‘Mombasa’ (G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville).
As noted in no. 54 above, the Āl Bū Sa‘īd of Oman came, like their predecessors the Ya‘rubids (see above, no. 53) to control either directly or indirectly much of the East African coastland. The vigorous and forceful Sa‘īd b. Sulṭān divided his time in the 1830s equally between Muscat and Zanzibar, but in 1256/1840 settled permanently in Zanzibar, primarily for commercial reasons. He introduced the cultivation of cloves on Zanzibar and the neighbouring island of Pemba as an export crop, so that he became very
rich from this trade; it was during these years that Western European powers and the USA established consulates in Zanzibar. After his death, the Bū Saʿīdī dominions became permanently divided into two separate sultanates, one in Oman based on Muscat and the other based on Zanzibar.

In 1307/1890, Zanzibar and Pemba became a British protectorate, one lying off the coast of German East Africa. The Bū Saʿīdī sultanate achieved a momentary independence once more in December 1963. But in January 1964 a coup d’état ended Sultan Jamshīd’s rule, and in April 1964 Zanzibar was linked with Tanganyika in what was at first called the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and then the Republic of Tanzania.

See the bibliography to no. 54 above, to which should be added EI² ‘Saʿīd b. Sulṭān’ (G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville).
THE SULTANS OF HARAR  
912–1304/1506–1887  
*Harar, in south-eastern Ethiopia*

1. The line of Ahmad Grāñ in Harar and Ausa

912/1506  Ahmad Grāñ b. Ibrāhīm, Imām, Ṣāḥib al-Fatḥ

950/1543  (Bat‘iah) Dël Wanbarā, Aḥmad Grāñ‘s widow, and his son  
‘Alī Jarād, jointly

959/1552  Nūr b. Mujāhid, nephew of Aḥmad Grāñ, Ṣāḥib al-Fatḥ al-
Thānī, d. 975/1567

975/1567  ‘Uthmān

977/1569  Ṭalḥa b. ‘Abbās al-Wazīr, with the title of sultan

979/1571  Nāṣir b. ‘Uthmān

980/1572  Muḥammad b. Nāṣir, k. 985/1577  
Muhammad Jāsā, Imām, transferred his capital to Ausa,  
leaving his brother in Harar as his vizier there, k.  
991/1583

993/1585  Sa‘d al-Dīn

1022/1613  Ṣabr al-Dīn b. Ādam, d. 1034/1625 or 1041/1632

1041/1632  Ṣādiq

1056/1646  Malāq Ādam b. Ṣādiq

1057/1647  Aḥmad b. al-Wazīr Abrām

1083-?/1672-?  Imam ‘Umar Dīn b. Ādam, overthrown by the ‘Afar at an  
unknown date

2. The line of ‘Alī b. Dāwūd in Harar, independent of Ausa
1057/1647  ‘Alī b. Dāwūd
1073/1662  Hāshim b. ‘Alī
1081/1671  ‘Abdallāh I b. ‘Alī
1111/1700  Ṭalḥa b. ‘Abdallāh
1134/1721  Abū Bakr I b. ‘Abdallāh
1144/1732  Khalaf b. Abī Bakr
1146/1733  Ḥāmid b. Abī Bakr
1160/1747  Yūsuf b. Abī Bakr
1169/1755  Aḥmad I b. Abī Bakr
Ø 1197/1782  ‘Abd al-Shakūr Muḥammad I b. Yūsuf
Ø 1209/1794  Aḥmad II b. Muḥammad
1236/1820  ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad
Ø 1240/1825  ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr
Ø 1250/1834  Abū Bakr II b. Aftal Jarād
Ø 1268/1852  Aḥmad III b. Abī Bakr
Ø 1272–92/1856–75  Muḥammad II b. ‘Alī
1292–1302/1875–85  Egyptian occupation
1304/1887  Conquest by the Emperor Menelik of Ethiopia

Harar has been an ancient centre for Islam and its diffusion within the interior of the Horn of Africa, mainly among the Galla and Somali there, whereas the coastal areas have been Islamised from such maritime centres as Maqdishū (Mogadishu). (The names of many sultans of Mogadishu are known from coins, but their genealogical connections and their chronology are almost wholly obscure.) The Walashma‘ (Amharic, Walasma) sultanate of If at transferred itself to Harar in the early sixteenth century, and it was one of the commanders of the Walasma, Ahmad Grāñ (Amharic, ‘left-handed’), who upheld the Muslim cause in Ethiopia until his death in battle with Christian Ethiopian and Portuguese forces in 950/1543. Thereafter, various of his descendants ruled in Harar and Ausa until the mid-seventeenth century, when a new line of sultans, that of ‘Alī b. Dāwūd, took over power at Harar for over two centuries. The connection of the last sultans of this line, from ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr onwards, with the original line of ‘Alī Dāwūd is
uncertain.

A Turco-Egyptian force occupied Harar in 1292/1875 and executed its sultan, and in 1304/1887 the Emperor Menelik captured Harar and incorporated it into the Ethiopian kingdom.

Zambaur, 89, 309 (fragmentary).

EL²‘Harar’ (E. Ullendorff).
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THE SHARWÂN SHĀHS
83 to early eleventh century /799 to early seventeenth century

Sharwân in eastern Transcaucasia, with their original centre at Yazīdiyya

1. The first line of Yazīdī Shahs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>183/799</td>
<td>Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī</td>
<td>governor of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Arrān, Sharwān and Bāb al-Abwāb, d. 185/801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⊘ 205/820</td>
<td>Khālid b. Yazād</td>
<td>d. 228/843 or 230/845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230/845</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Khālid</td>
<td>governor of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Arrān and Sharwān, resident in Arrān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247/861</td>
<td>Haytham b. Khālid</td>
<td>independent in Sharwān as the Sharwā Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Haytham</td>
<td>in Layzān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⊘ ?</td>
<td>Haytham b. Muhammad</td>
<td>in Layzān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 300/913</td>
<td>ʿAlī b. Haytham</td>
<td>in Layzān, deposed 305/917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304/916</td>
<td>Yazīd b. Muhammad b. Yazīd</td>
<td>Abū Tāhir, in Sharwān, latterly also in Bāb al-Abwāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337/948</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Yazīd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345/956</td>
<td>Ahmad b. Muhammad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370/981</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Ahmad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381/991</td>
<td>Yazīd b. Ahmad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418/1028</td>
<td>Manuchihr I b. Yazīd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425/1034</td>
<td>‘Alī b. Yazīd, Abū Manṣūr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435/1043</td>
<td>Qubādh b. Yazīd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441/1049</td>
<td>Bukhtnaṣṣar ‘Alī b. Ahmad b. Yazīd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>445/1053</strong></td>
<td>by Sallār b. Yazīd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>455/1063</strong></td>
<td>by Farīburz b. Sallar b. Yazīd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 487/c. 1094</td>
<td>Farīdūn I b. Farīburz, d. 514/1120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 c. 487/c. 1094</td>
<td>Manūchihr II b. Farīburz, immediate predecessor or successor of Farīburz, or contemporaneous ruler of Sharwān during Farīdūn’s time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. 514/c. 1120</strong></td>
<td>by Manūchihr III b. Farīdūn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. 555/c. 1160</strong></td>
<td>by Akhsitan I b. Manūchihr III, d. between 593/1197 and 600/1204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. 575/c. 1179</strong></td>
<td>by Shāhanshāh b. Manūchihr III, ? contemporaneous ruler with Akhsitan, to c. 600/c. 1204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>583/1187</strong></td>
<td>by Farīdūn II b. Manūchihr III, ? also a contemporaneous ruler with his brothers, to c. 600/c. 1204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>after 583/after1187</strong></td>
<td>by Farīburz II b. Farīdūn II, ? also a contemporaneous ruler with his father and/or uncles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>after 583/after187</strong></td>
<td>by Farrukhzād I b. Manūchihr III, ? also a contemporaneous ruler with his nephew and/or brothers, to before 622/122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>after 600/after1204</strong></td>
<td>by Garshāsp I b. Farrukhzād I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. 622/c. 1225</strong></td>
<td>by Farīburz III b. Garshāsp I, to ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, 641/1243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>653/1255</strong></td>
<td>by Akhsitan II b. Farīburz III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>656/1258</strong></td>
<td>by Garshāsp II or Gushnāsp b. Akhsitan II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 663/c. 1265</td>
<td>by Farrukhzād II b. Akhsitan II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

………………  …………………
The title of Sharwān Shāh may well go back to Sāsānīd times. The Islamic line of Arab Sharwān Shāhs began with the governor Yazīd b. Mazyad, among whose extensive territories in Armenia, north-western Persia and eastern Transcaucasia was the region of Sharwān between the south-eastern spur of the Caucasus mountains and the lower Kur river valley.

Haytham b. Muhammad is said to have been the first governor specifically of Sharwān, one by now in effect independent and succeeding hereditarily, to assume the actual title of Sharwān Shāh. From the early fourth/tenth century, the Shāhs had their capital in Yazidiyya, perhaps the earlier Shammakhi, but
they were also often to intervene in, and at times control, Bāb al-Abwāb or Darband on the Caspian coast (see below, no. 68). Over the decades, the Shāhs had to fight off the Georgians to their west, and, in the fifth/eleventh century, incursions from northern Persia of the Turkmens. After the notable reign of Fariburz I b. Sallār, the chronology and nomenclature of the succeeding Shāhs become somewhat fragmentary and tentative, for the detailed source for the history of the earlier period, a local history of Sharwān and Bāb al-Abwāb preserved in a later Ottoman historian, comes to an end; for subsequent rulers, we depend largely on literary references from the lands outside Sharwān and the evidence from coins. These Shahs seem to have been known as the Kasrānids (it has been suggested that this was a name or title of Faridūn I b. Fariburz), though clearly connected with their predecessors; already, as is apparent from their onomastic, these original Arabs had by now become profoundly Iranised, and in fact claimed descent from Bahrām Gūr.

The line came to an end at the time of Tīmūr’s conquests, but the later Ottoman historian Münejjim Bashī supplies details of what he calls the second line of Sharwān Shāhs, carrying these up to the late sixteenth century, and coins are known from several of these rulers. During that century, possession of Sharwān oscillated periodically between Safawids and Ottomans, until by the early seventeenth century the indigenous Shāhs had finally disappeared and Sharwān became for some two centuries a governorate of the Safawid empire.

Justi, 454; Sachau, 12 no. 18; Zambaur, 181–2; Album, 53.
EI² ‘al-Kabk’ (C. E. Bosworth); ‘Shīrwān Shāhs (W. Barthold and Bosworth).
Hāshim b. Surāqa al-Sulamī, governor for the ‘Abbāsids, proclaimed himself independent

271/884 ‘Umar b. Hāshim

272/885 Muḥammad b. Hāshim

303/916 ‘Abd al-Malik b. Hāshim

327/939 Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Malik, first reign

(327/939 Haytham b. Muḥammad of Sharwān, first reign)

339/941 Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Malik, second reign

(330/941 Haytham b. Muḥammad, second reign)

(330/942 Aḥmad b. Yazīd of Sharwān)

(342/953 *Khashram Aḥmad b. Munabbih, of Lakz)

342/954 Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Malik, third reign

366/976 Maymūn b. Aḥmad

387/997 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad

390/1003 Manṣūr b. Maymūn, first reign

(410/1019 Yazīd b. Aḥmad of Sharwān, first reign)

412/1021 Manṣūr b. Maymūn, second reign

(414/1023 Yazīd b. Aḥmad of Sharwān, second reign)

415/1024 Manṣūr b. Maymūn, third reign

425/1034 ‘Abd al-Malik b. Manṣūr, first reign

(425/1034 ‘Ali b. Yazīd of sharwān)
Bāb al-Abwāb or Darband commanded the very narrow coastal route between the western shore of the Caspian and the mountains of Dāghistān, and thus enjoyed a very important strategic position. Hence it was a well-fortified bastion of Islam, a *thaghr*, against such steppe peoples to the north as the Turkish Khazars. It was furthermore a busy port, and this Caspian Sea trade plus the traffic in slaves from the South Russian steppes combined to make it highly prosperous.

The origins of the line of Hāshimids (who may have been clients of the Banū Sulaym rather than pure-born Arabs) go back to Umayyad times, when they seem first to have been appointed governors in Darband. With the internal chaos of the ‘Abbāsid caliphate in the mid-ninth century, Hāshim b. Surāqa was able to make himself independent in Darband, and his descendants exercised power, with frequent interruptions, for over two centuries. The fortunes of Darband were indeed closely intertwined with those of neighbouring Sharwān, whose Shāhs (perhaps with the cachet of superior social status: see above, no. 67) intervened in Darband on numerous occasions. A basic cause, however, of the instability of Hāshimid rule was the strength within Darband of a strong and influential body of notables, forming an urban aristocracy, who frequently and often successfully challenged the amīrs’ authority. The line was finally brought to an end, it seems, when the Seljuq sultan Alp Arslan awarded the Transcaucasian lands to his slave commander Sāwtigin, after which the Hāshimids apparently disappeared.

However, in the twelfth century, we have some sketchy knowledge of another line of Maliks of Darband (who may possibly have claimed descent
from the previous dynasty), mainly from their coins. This line seems to have come to an end in the opening years of the thirteenth century when Darband came under the rule of the Sharwān Shāhs.

Sachau, 13–14 no. 21; Zambaur, 185.

EI\(^1\) ‘Derbend’ (W. Barthold); EI\(^2\) ‘Bāb al-Abwāb’ (D. M. Dunlop); ‘al-Kabk’ (C. E. Bosworth)

V. Minorsky, *A History of Sharwān and Darband*.


The Justānids appear as ‘Kings of Daylam’ towards the end of the eighth century, with their centre in the Rūdbār of Alamūt, running into the valley of the Shāh Rūd, to become notorious two centuries or so later as the main
centre of the Nizārī Ismā‘īlīs in Persia (see below, no. 101); but they may well have been ruling in Daylam before this. They appear in Islamic history as part of an upsurge of the hitherto submerged indigenous peoples of north-western Persia – Daylamīs, Kurds, etc. The ‘Daylamī intermezzo’, of which the Justānids and several other dynasties, culminating in the Būyids (see below, no. 75), formed part, spanned the history of western and central Persia between the disintegration of the Abbāsid caliphate’s unity and their Arab governors in western Persia and the constituting of the Great Seljuq empire (see below, no. 91, 1) across the Middle East.

After Marzubān b. Justān (I) became a Muslim in 189/805, the fortunes of the ancient family of Justānids then became connected with the Zaydī Alids of the Daylam region, and they seem to have adopted Shi‘ism. In the tenth century, they tended to be eclipsed by the vigorous and expanding sister Daylamī dynasty of the Musāfirids or Sallārids of Ṭārum (see below, no. 71, 2), with whom the Justānids had close marriage ties, although they preserved their seat at Rūdbār in the highlands of Daylam as allies of the Būyids. In the eleventh century, the Justānids are sporadically mentioned as recognising the suzerainty of the Ghaznavids and then of the incoming Seljuqs, but thereafter they fade from history.

Justi, 440; Zambaur, 192 (both of them fragmentary and defective).

EI² ‘Daylam’ (V. Minorsky).
W. Madelung, in The Cambridge History of Iran, IV, 208–9, 223–4.
The Sājids were a line of caliphal governors in north-western Persia, the family of a commander in the ‘Abbāsid service of Soghdian descent which became culturally Arabised. Abu ’1-Sāj Dīwdād I was governor in Baghdad and Khūzistān, but with his son Muḥammad’s appointment to Azerbaijan in 276/889, the family acquired what was to be its power-base for some forty years. During their tenure of power, the Sājids led numerous campaigns against such Armenian princes as the Bagratids and the Ardzrunids of Vaspurakan and extended their suzerainty over them. After the murder of Abu ’1-Musāfir Fath, however, their rule in Azerbaijan ended, and control of the region passed to various Daylamī and Kurdish chiefs.

Sājid rule was thus important for the extension of Arab political and cultural influence over the Armenian provinces of eastern Transcaucasia; but, like the Tāhirids (see below, no. 82), the Sājids always remained faithful to their ‘Abbāsid masters and must be considered as autonomous but not independent of Baghdad.

Lane-Poole, 126; Zambaur, 179; Album, 33.
EI² ‘Sādjids’ (C. E. Bosworth). Eir ‘Banu Saj’ (W. Madelung).
W. Madelung, in The Cambridge History of Iran, IV, 228–32.
THE MUSĀFIRIDS OR SALLĀRIDS

Before 304–c. 483/before 916–c. 1090

Daylam, with their centres at Ṭārum and Samīrān, and then in Azerbaijan and Arrān also

before 304/before 916

Muḥammad b. Musāfir

Division of the family into two branches

1. The line in Azerbaijan

Ø 330/941 Marzubān I b. Muḥammad, d. 346/957
Ø 346–9/957–60 Justān I b. Marzubān I
Ø 349/960 Ismāʿīl b. Wahsūdān
Ø 351–7/962–83 Ibrāhīm I b. Marzubān I
Ø 355/966 Nūḥ b. Wahsūdān, Abū ’1-Hasan, in Ardabīl, thereafter in Samīrān until c. 379/c. 989
373/983 Conquest of the greater part of Azerbaijan by the Rawwādids

Marzubān II b. Ismāʿīl b. Wahsūdān, ruled over a small part of Azerbaijan (? Miyāna) until dispossessed by the Rawwādids

2. The line in Daylam

Ø 330/941 Wahsūdān b. Muḥammad, Abū Manṣūr, first reign
The Daylamī Musāfirids were a sister-dynasty of the Justānids and were closely linked with them (see above, no. 69), but, as a newer and, it seems, more vigorous family, were to direct their energies outside Daylam as well as within it. Whereas the Ziyārids and Būyids (see below, nos 81, 75) strove to control the rich lands of northern Persia and, in the case of the latter family, southern Persia and Iraq also, the Musāfirids expanded westwards into Azerbaijan and the eastern fringes of Armenia, where the collapse of the line of Sājid governors (see above, no. 70) had left a vacuum. ‘Musāfir’ is apparently an attempt to Arabise Persian Asfār/Asvār, but other names for the dynasty are found in the sources: Sallarids (< Pers. sālār ‘military commander’) and Langarids (probably from a personal name, this form being more probable, it appears, than that of Kangarids).

Muhammad b. Musāfir, the first member of the line to appear in history, held the key fortresses of Ṭārum and Samīrān in the Safīd Rūd valley of Daylam, and from these he increased his power at the expense of the older dynasty of the Justānids. After the imprisonment of Muhammad by his sons in 330/941, the family split into two branches, with Wahsūdān remaining in Ṭārum while his brother Marzubān extended his power northwards and westwards into Azerbaijan, Arrān, some districts of eastern Armenia and as far as Darband on the Caspian coast. Around this time, the Musāfirids seem to have espoused Ismāʿīlī Shīʿī doctrines, which were spreading within Daylam. The two branches frequently squabbled, and the latter failed to maintain itself in face of the growing power of the Rawwādids of Tabrīz (see below, no. 72). The Daylam branch was also for a while hard pressed by the Būyids, and for a time lost Shamīrān to Fakhr al-Dawla of Rayy. Their fortunes subsequently revived, and they were able to expand as far south as Zanjan. But the dynasty’s history now becomes obscure and fragmentary. It
survived confrontation with the Ghaznawids (see below, no. 158) and later submitted to the Seljuq Ṭoghrîl Beg. After this comes only silence, but it is probable that the last obscure Musāfirids were ended by the Ismā‘īlîs of Alamūt (see below, no. 101).

Justi, 441 (linking the Musāfirids with the Rawwādids under the common designation of Wahsūdānids); Sachau, 14 no. 23; Zambaur, 180 (defective); Album, 33–4.

EI² ‘Musafirids’ (V. Minorsky).


Sayyid Ahmad Kasravî, Shahriyârân-i gum-nām, I, 52–120, with a genealogical table at p. 112.


THE RAWWĀDIDS
Early fourth century to 463/early tenth century to 1071
Azerbaijan, with their centre at Tabriz (Tabrīz)

? Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn al-Rawwādī
344/955 Ḥusayn I b. Muḥammad, Abu ‘1-Hayjā’
Ø 378/988 Mamlān or Muḥammad I b. Husayn, Abu ‘1-Hayja’
391/1001 Ḥusayn II b. Mamlān I, Abū Naṣr
416/1025 Wahsūdān b. Mamlān I, Abū Manṣūr
451/1059 Mamlān or Muḥammad II b. Wahsūdān, Abū Naṣr
(463/1071 Seljuq occupation of Azerbaijan)
? Ahmadīl b. Ibrāhīm b. Wahsūdān, died in Marāgha
510/1116
510/1116 Āḥmadīl Atabegs of Marāgha

Although Daylamīs were most prominent in the upsurge in northern Persian of Iranian peoples in the tenth century, the role of other races was not negligible. The Shaddādids of Arrān (see below, no. 73) were probably of Kurdish origin, while the Rawwādids (the form ‘Rawādi’ later becomes common in the sources) were in the tenth century accounted Kurdish. In reality, the family was probably Arab in origin, from the Yemeni tribe of Azd, and in the early ‘Abbāsid period they had been governors of Tabriz; but, just as the Yazīdī Sharwān Shāhs became Iranised (see above, no. 67), so the Rawwādids became Kurdicised, with such names as ‘Mamlān’ and ‘Ahmadīl’ being characteristic Kurdish versions of the familiar Arabic names ‘Muhammad’ and ‘Ahmad’.

Like their Musāfiṣirid neighbours, the Rawwādids took advantage of the
confused state of post-Sājid Azerbaijan. Despite help from the Būyids, that branch of the Musāfirids which had installed itself in Azerbaijan (see above, no. 71, 1) was gradually driven out by Abu ‘l-Hayjā’ Mamlān I, so that by 374/984 all the region was in Rawwādid hands. In the next century, the most outstanding member of the dynasty was Wahsūdān b. Mamlān I. With the help of Kurdish neighbours, he successfully coped with the first incursions of the Oghuz Turkmens, but in 446/1054 submitted to Ṭoghrīl Beg. Thereafter, the Rawwādids ruled as Seljuq vassals until Alp Arslan returned from his Anatolian campaigns and deposed Mamlān II b. Wahsūdān. However, at least one later member of the family is known, Aḥmadīl of Marāgha, and his name was perpetuated in the twelfth century by a line of his Turkish ghulāms, called after him the Aḥmadīlīs see below, no. 98).

Justi, 441; Zambaur, 180 (like Justi, erroneously taking the Rawwādids to be a branch of the Musāfirids); Album, 34.
EI¹ ‘Tabrīz’ (V. Minorsky); EI² ‘Rawwādids (C. E. Bosworth).
V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History, 167–9, with genealogical table at p. 167.
C. E. Bosworth, in The Cambridge History of Iran, V, 34–5.
W. Madelung, in ibid., IV, 239–43.
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THE SHĀDĀDĪDS

C. 340–570/C. 951–1174

Arrān and eastern Armenia

1. The main line in Ganja and Dvīn

C. 340/C. 951  Muḥammad b. Shaddād b. Q.r.t.q, in Dvīn

360/971  ‘Alī Lashkarī b. Muḥammad, in Ganja

368/978  Marzubān b. Muḥammad

Ø 375/985  Faḍl I b. Muḥammad

422/1031  Mūsā b. Faḍl I, Abu ‘l-Fatḥ

425/1034  ‘Alī Lashkarī II b. Mūsā

440/1049  Shāwur I b. Faḍl I, Abu ’l-Aswār, from 413/1022 in Dvīn,
from 441/1049 in Ganja also

459/1067  Faḍl II b. Abu ’l-Aswār Shāwur I

466–8/1073–5  Faḍl III (Faḍlūn) b. Faḍl II

468/1075  Occupation of Arrān by the Seljuq commander Sāwtīgin

2. The line in Ānī

C. 465/C. 1072  Manūchihr b. Abi ’l-Aswār Shāwur I, Abū Shuj‘

C. 512/C. 1118  Shāwur II b. Manūchihr, Abu ’l-Aswār

518/1124  Georgian occupation

C. 519/C. 1125  Faḍl IV (Faḍlūn) b. Abi ’l-Aswār Shāwur II, d. 524/1130

C. 525/C. 1131  Khūshchīhr b. Abi ’l-Aswār Shāwur II

?  Maḥmūd b. Abi ’l-Aswār Shāwur II

?  Shaddād b. Maḥmūd, Fakhr al-Dīn, ruling in 549/1154
The Shaddādids were another of the dynasties which arose in north-western Persia during the ‘Daylami interlude’, and it is probable that they were of Kurdish origin. In such a linguistically and ethnically confused region as north-western Persia and the adjacent Caucasus, onomastic was also varied; the Shaddādids’ need to find a place for themselves between the Daylamīs of Azerbaijan on one side, and the Christian Armenians and Georgians on the other, doubtless explains why Daylamī names like Lashkarī and Armenian ones like Ashūṭ/Ashot are found in the Shaddādids’ genealogy.

In the middle years of the tenth century, the Kurdish adventurer Muḥammad b. Shaddād established himself at Dvīn (near Erivan in the modern Armenian Republic), a town at that time in the possession of the Musāfīrids (see above, no. 71). 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 Musāfīrids from Ganja in Arrān (the region of Transcaucasia between the Kur and Araxes rivers), and Ganja (the later Imperial Russian Elizavetapol, now in the Azerbaijan Republic) then became the capital of the main line of Shaddādids for a century. They now undertook with vigour the defence of Islam in this region, fighting the Georgian Bagratids, various Armenian princes, the Byzantines, the Alans or Ossetians, and the Rūs from beyond the Caucasus; in particular, Abu ’l-Aswār Shāwur I, most eminent of his house, acquired a great contemporary renown as a fighter for the faith. The Shaddādids submitted to the Seljuq Ṭoghrīl Beg when he first appeared in the Transcaucasian region, but in 468/1075 Alp Arslan’s general Sāwtigin invaded Arrān and forced Faḍl III or Faḍlūn to yield up his ancestral territories. However, another branch was installed in Ānī, capital of the Armenian Bagratids, after its capture by the Seljuqs in 465/1072, and it lasted through many vicissitudes up to the Georgian resurgence in the second half of the twelfth century; a Shaddādid is still mentioned in a Persian inscription from Ānī at the end of the century.
Justi, 443; Sachau, 14 no. 22; Zambaur, 184–5 (all incomplete); Album, 34.

EI² ‘Shaddādids’ (C. E. Bosworth).


V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History, with genealogical tables at pp. 6, 106.

C. E. Bosworth, in The Cambridge History of Iran, V, 34–5.

W. Madelung, in ibid., IV, 239–43.
Abū Dulaf came of ancient Arab tribal stock, and from a family with a tradition of service to the ‘Abbāsids. Hārūn al-Rashīd appointed him governor of Jibāl or Media, and he served subsequent caliphs there, acquiring a reputation both as a brave military commander and as a littérateur and maecenas. His centre of power became the fief, an īghār or hereditary, tax-free concession, centred on Karaj between Hamadan (Hamadhān) and Isfahan (Iṣfahān), a place which henceforth became known as Karaj Abī Dulaf. His son ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and the latter’s sons, all functioning as governors for the ‘Abbāsids and exercising their military skills, succeeded him in succession, confirmed by the caliphs (to whom they remained firmly loyal) but minting their own coins, until al-Ḥārith b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was killed in battle in 284/897. The district then reverted to direct ‘Abbāsid control, although descendants of the Dulafīds continued to be prominent in the public affairs of the caliphate for well over a century.
Lane-Poole, 125; Zambaur, 199; Album, 32.

EI² ‘Dulafids’ (E. Marin); ‘al-Kāsim b.‘Īsa’ (J. E. Bencheikh); EI'r ‘Abū Dolaf ‘Ejlī’ (F. M. Donner).

THE BŪYIDS OR BUWAYHIDS
320–454/932–1062

Northern, western and southern Persia and Iraq

1. The line in Jibāl

Ø320/932  ‘Alī b. Būya, Abu ’1-Ḥasan ‘Imād al-Dawla

(a) The branch in Hamadan and Isfahan

Ø 366/977  Būya b. Rukn al-Dawla Ḥasan, Abū Manṣūr Mu’ayyid al-Dawla
Ø 373/983  ‘Alī b. Rukn al-Dawla Ḥasan, Abu ’1-Ḥasan Fakhr al-Dawla
Ø 412–c. 419/1021–c. 1028  Fulān b. Shams al-Dawla, Abu ’1-Ḥasan Samā’ al-Dawla, under Kākūyid suzerainty

(b) The branch in Rayy

Ø 366/977  ‘Alī b. Rukn al-Dawla Ḥasan, Abu ’1-Ḥasan Fakhr al-Dawla
420/1029  Ghaznavid conquest
2. The line in Fars (Fārs) and Khūzistān


Ø 380/990  Marzubān b. Fanā Khusraw ‘Aḍud al-Dawla, Abū Kālijār Ṣamṣām al-Dawla

Ø 388/998  Fīrūz b. Fanā Khusraw ‘Aḍud al-Dawla, Abū Naṣr Bahā’ al-Dawla

Ø 403/1012  Abū Shujā‘ b. Fīrūz Bahā’ al-Dawla, Sultān al-Dawla


454/1062  *Power in Fars seized by the Shabānkāra ʿī Kurdish chief Faḍlūya*

3. The line in Kirman (Kirmān)

Ø 324/936  Aḥmad b. Būya, Abu ’l-Ḥusayn Muʿizz al-Dawla

Ø 338/949  Fanā Khusraw b. Ḥasan Rukn al-Dawla, Abū Shujā‘  ‘Aḍud al-Dawla

Ø 372/983  Marzubān b. Fanā Khusraw ‘Aḍud al-Dawla, Abū Kālijār Ṣamṣām al-Dawla

Ø 388/998  Fīrūz b. Fanā Khusraw ‘Aḍud al-Dawla, Abū Naṣr Bahā’ al-Dawla

Ø 403/1012  Abu ’l-Fawāris b. Fīrūz Bahā’ al-Dawla, Qawām al-Dawla


440/1048  *Seljuq line of Qāwurd*
4. The line in Iraq

- 334/945 Aḥmad b. Būya, Abu ’l-Ḥusayn Muʿizz al-Dawla
- 356/967 Bakhtiyār b. Aḥmad Muʿizz al-Dawla, Abū Manṣūr Ἰzz al-Dawla
- 367/978 Fanā Khusraw b. Ḥasan Rukn al-Dawla, Abū Shujā‘ ʿAḍud al-Dawla
- 372/983 Marzubān b. Fanā Khusraw ʿAḍud al-Dawla, Abū Kālījār Ṣamṣām al-Dawla
- 376/987 Shīrzīl b. Fanā Khusraw ʿAḍud al-Dawla, Abu ’l-Fawāris Sharaf al-Dawla
- 379/989 Fīrūz b. Fanā Khusraw ʿAḍud al-Dawla, Abū Naṣr Bahā’ al-Dawla
- 403/1012 Abū Shujā‘ b. Fīrūz Bahā’ al-Dawla, Sulṭān al-Dawla
- 412/1021 Ḥasan b. Fīrūz Bahā’ al-Dawla, Abū ‘Alī Musharrīf al-Dawla
- 416/1025 Shīrzīl b. Fīrūz Bahā’ al-Dawla, Abū Ṭāhir Jalāl al-Dawla


5. The rulers of the dynasty acknowledged by local chiefs in Oman

- by 361/972 Fanā Khusraw, Abū Shujā‘ ʿAḍud al-Dawla
- 380/990 Marzubān, Abū Kālījār Ṣamṣām al-Dawla
- 388/998 Fīrūz, Abū Naṣr Bahā’ al-Dawla
- 403/1012 Abū Shujā‘ Sulṭān al-Dawla
- 415–42/1024–50 Marzubān, Abū Kālījār ʿImād al-Dīn

442/1050 Power seized by a leader of the local Ibāḍīs

Out of the Daylamī dynasties which formed in the Persian world as the ‘Abbāsid grip over the provinces of the caliphate weakened, the Būyids were
the most powerful and ruled over the greatest extent of territories. They began modestly enough as commanders in the army of the successful Daylami condottieri, Mardāwīj b. Ziyār, founder of the Ziyārid dynasty (see below, no. 81). The eldest of the three sons of Būya, ‘Ali, held Iṣfahān at the time of Mardāwīj’s assassination, and shortly afterwards seized the whole of Fars, while Ḥasan held Jibāl and Aḥmad held Kirman and Khūzistān. In 339/945 Aḥmad entered Baghdad, and the ‘Abbāsids began a 110-year period of tutelage under Būyid amīrs (who normally held the title in Iraq of Amīr al-Umarā’ ‘Supreme Commander’), during which the caliphate was to reach its lowest ebb. In the third quarter of the tenth century, Muʿizz al-Dawla Aḥmad’s son ‘Aḍud al-Dawla united under his rule what had originally been the three Būyid amirates, comprising southern and western Persia and Iraq, even extending his power across the Persian Gulf to Oman, where his successors were acknowledged as suzerains by such local chiefs as the Mukramids (see above no. 52); his reign marks the zenith of Būyid power. ‘Aḍud al-Dawla pursued a vigorously expansionist policy, utilising his armies of Daylamī infantry and Turkish cavalry, in the east against the Ziyārids of Ṭabaristān and Gurgān and against the Sāmānids of Khurasan, and in the west against the Ḥamdānids of Jazīra.

However, a patrimonial conception of power, doubtless stemming from the tribal past of the Daylamis, was strong among the various Būyid princes, with tendencies towards fragmentation apparent when strong rule was relaxed. After ‘Aḍud al-Dawla’s death, there was much civil strife within the dynasty. This disunity allowed petty Kurdish and Daylamī principalities to constitute themselves within the Zagros mountains and in Jibāl, and facilitated Maḥmūd of Ghazna’s annexation of Rayy and much of Jibāl from the Būyids in 420/1029. It then left them weakened in the face of incursions of the Turkmen Oghuz and the westward drive of the Seljuq Ṭoghril Beg, who was able to arouse orthodox Sunnī religious and constitutional feeling and claim that he was liberating the western lands or Persia and Iraq from Shī‘ī heretics. Baghdad was occupied in 447/1055, but the Būyid prince in Fars retained power for seven more years until his lands were seized by local Shabānkāra’ī Kurds, only to fall into the Seljuqs’ hands shortly afterwards.

Like most of the Daylamīs, the Būyids were Shī‘īs, probably Zaydīs to begin with and then Twelvers or Ja’farīs. The traditional Shī‘ī festivals and practices were introduced into their territories, and Shī‘ī scholars laboured at the systematisation and intellectualisation of Shī‘ī theology and law,
previously somewhat vague and emotional in content. This Shi‘ism may have been in part a manifestation of anti-Arab, pro-Iranian national feeling, with which attempts to provide the Būyids with a respectable genealogy going back to the Sāsānids and the adoption of an ancient Persian imperial title like Shāhānshāh may be connected. The Baghdad caliphs’ material power and resources were inevitably circumscribed by their alleged protectors, yet the Būyids made no attempt to extinguish the caliphate and they showed themselves hostile to their rivals in the west, the Ismā‘īlī Fāṭimids. Culturally, the domination of Shi‘ism in the Būyid territories was accompanied by a wide tolerance of other faiths like Christianity, Judaism and Zoroastrianism, allowing their communities to flourish and bringing about a lively intellectual ferment in the various Būyid provincial capitals; this learning was nevertheless essentially Arabic-centred, and the Būyids evinced little interest in or encouragement of the New Persian literary and cultural renaissance which was beginning in the eastern Persian lands.

Justi, 442; Lane-Poole, 139–44; Zambaur, 212–13 and Table Q; Album, 35–6.

EI² ‘Buwayhids’ (Cl. Cahen); EIr ‘Buyids’ (Tilman Nagel).


H. Busse, Chali fund Großkönig, die Buyiden im Iraq (945–1055), Beirut and Wiesbaden 1969, with genealogical tables at p. 610.

idem, ‘Iran under the Būyids’, in The Cambridge History of Iran, IV, 250–304.

C. E. Bosworth, in ibid., V, 36–53.
The Ḥasanūyids or Ḥasanawayhids
C. 350–406/C. 961–1015
Southern Kurdistan

Hasanawayh b. Husayn al-Barzikani, Abu ’1-Fawaris, d. 369/979
Badr b. Hasanawayh, Abu ’1-Najm Nāṣir al-Dīn, d. 405/1014
Ṭāhir or Zahir b. Hilāl b. Badr, in Shahrazūr
Hilāl b. Badr
Ṭāhir b. Hilāl

Conquest by the ‘Annāzids

Hasanawayh was a chief of the Kurdish Barzikani tribe who built up for himself a principality in the region round Qarmasīn (the later Kirmānshāh). He and his son Badr skilfully maintained their power as vassals of the Būyids (see above, no. 75) by supporting various contenders for power in the struggles between Fakhr al-Dawla of the northern Būyid amirate on the one hand and ‘Aḏud al-Dawla and his successors in Fārs and Iraq on the other. They also achieved contemporary reputations for their just and beneficent rule among a Kurdish people whose very name was synonymous with violence and rapacity. Latterly, however, the Ḥasanūyids were overshadowed by a rival family of Kurdish chiefs, the ‘Annāzids (see below, no. 77), who killed Ṭāhir b. Hilāl and generally replaced the Ḥasanūyids in central Kurdistan. The family only managed to hold on to a few fortresses like that of Sarmaj near Bīsutūn until a descendant of Badr’s died there in 439/1047.
Lane-Poole, 138; Zambaur, 211; Album, 36.
\( EI^2 \) ‘Hasanawayh’ (Cl. Cahen).
The ‘Annāzids were another Kurdish line, like the Ḥasanūyids (see above, no. 76), with their power-base in the Shādhanjān tribe. The founder, Abu ’l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad, ruled from Ḥulwān, but his three sons and successors ruled in various other parts of southern Kurdistan, maintaining themselves against the Būyids and the Kākūyids (see below, no. 78), but with their dominions suffering increasingly from Oghuz Türkmen incursions led by the Seljuq Ibrāhīm Inal. The history of the ‘Annāzids in these decades is confused and chaotic, for the family had several branches and the territorial extent of their rule was often shifting. After Ṭoghrīl Beg came to Iraq in 447/1055, the sources are largely silent on the ‘Annāzids, except for occasional references which indicate that some members of the family retained a certain amount of power in Kurdistan and Luristān until some time
after 570/1174.

Zambaur, 212.

EI² ‘Annāzids (V. Minorsky); EIr ‘‘Annāzids’ (K. M. Aḥmad).
THE KĀKŪYIDS OR KĀKAWAYHIDS

c. 398–443/c. 1008–51 independent rulers; thereafter, feudatories of the Seljuqs until the mid-sixth/mid-twelfth century

_Jibāl and Kurdistan_

Ø before 398/before 1008 Muḥammad b. Rustam Dushmanziyār, Abū Jaʿfar ‘Alā’ al-Dawla, in Isfahan
Ø 433–43/1041–51 Farāmurz b. Muḥammad, ʿAbū Manṣūr Zahīr al-Dīn Shams al-Mulk, in Isfahan, d. after 455/1063

Succession of the Atabegs of Yazd

The Kākūyids were one of the petty Kurdish and Daylamī dynasties of the Zagros region which arose when the grip of the Būyids (see above, no. 75) was becoming relaxed, only to lose their independence and be reduced to vassalage by the rising power in Persia of the Seljuqs. Dushmanziyār had been in the service of the Būyids of Rayy, and his son Muḥammad (known as Ibn Kākūya in the sources, explained as being from a Daylamī dialect word for ‘maternal uncle’, since Muḥammad was the maternal uncle of the Būyid Amīr Majd al-Dawla) was by 398/1008 governor of Isfahan. Soon he expanded to Hamadan and into Kurdistan, building up a principality which was of some political significance for a while and forming a court circle which included the philosopher Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), who functioned as his
Ghaznawid expansion into Jibāl after 420/1029 forced him temporarily to submit, but when the Ghaznawids found it difficult to retain these distant conquests he resumed his independence and even occupied Rayy for a while.

The invasions of the Turkmen Oghuz and their flocks changed the political and economic situation of northern Persia and forced the Kākūyids, like other Daylamī and Kurdish powers, on to the defensive. Farāmurz b. Muḥammad was obliged to yield Isfahan to Ṭoghrīl, who after 443/1051 made it the Seljuq capital but awarded Abarqūh and Yazd in compensation for the Kākūyids. His brother Garshāsp I fled from Kurdistan to the Būyids in Fars. With their little niche in central Persia, the later Kākūyids adapted themselves comfortably to the Great Seljuq régime, being frequently linked by marriage to the ruling sultans. After Garshāsp II, the history of the family becomes obscure, but Garshāsp’s daughter was to be linked through marriage to the line of Turkish Atabegs which succeeded in Yazd and lasted until the thirteenth century and the time of the II Khānids (see below, no. 133).

Justi, 445; Lane-Poole, 145; Zambaur, 216–17; Album, 36.
EI² ‘Kākūyids’ (CE. Bosworth).
C. E. Bosworth, ‘Dailamīs in central Iran: the Kākūyids of Jibāl and Yazd,’ Iran, JBIPS, 8 (1970), 73–95.
The Caspian coastlands of Gīlān and of Māzandarān (in earlier Islamic times, Ṭabaristān), and the massive barrier of the Elburz Mountains which separates them from the central plateau of Persia, have always been a region of Persia with a very distinct character of their own. In particular, they have been a refuge area for peoples and ideas, so that ethnic splinter-groups, old or aberrant religious beliefs, ancient languages and scripts, and social ways, have often survived there after they have disappeared from the more accessible and open parts of Persia. Islam was late arriving in the Caspian region, and for several centuries after this time various petty dynasties lingered on there, some with roots in the late Sāsānid past. One of these, the Bāwandids, endured for six or seven centuries until II Khānid times (see...
and the Bāduspānids (see below, no. 100) persisted from Seljuq times until the reign of the Ṣafawid Shāh ‘Abbās I (i.e. until the end of the sixteenth century: see below, no. 148), when the line was suppressed and the Caspian provinces were fully integrated into the rest of the kingdom.

The Dābūyids were a line of Ispahbadhs (lit. ‘military chief, here ‘local prince’) who apparently arose in the south-western Caspian highlands region of Gīlān in late Sāsānid times. They were local governors for the Emperors, and themselves claimed Sāsānid descent, but from the time of Farrukhān I they moved eastwards and also controlled Ṭabaristān at the south-eastern corner of the Caspian lands, residing now at Sārī. The history of the dynasty is largely known from the historian of the Caspian lands, Ibn Isfandiyār, and his information on the succession and chronology of the early Dābūyids must be regarded as only semi-historical. Arabic raids into Ṭabaristān began in the caliphate of ‘Uthmān, but that of the governor of Iraq and the East, Yazid b. al-Muhallab, in 98/716, was the first serious attack. The Dābūyid Khurshīd II aided Abū Muslim against the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Manṣūr and then the Zoroastrian rebel in Khurasan, Sunbādh. Hence in the caliph undertook the definitive conquest of Ṭabaristān, successfully drove out Khurshīd II and ended the dynasty of the Dābūyids (who, as Zoroastrians, had never accepted Islam; they are included here as precursors of the local Caspian dynasties who did, during the years shortly afterwards, accept the new faith, and as being historically involved with the Islamic caliphs).

Justi, 430; Zambaur, 186.
EI²‘Dābūya’ (B. Spuler); EIR ‘Dabuyids’ (W. Madelung).
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THE BĀWANDID ISPAHBADHS
45–750/665–1349

The highlands of Tabaristan and Gilan

1. The line of the Kawusiyya (Tabaristan), with their centre at Firrim

   45/665  Bāw, Ispahbadh of Tabaristan
   60/680  Interregnum of Walash
   68/688  Surkhāb I b. Bāw
   98/717  Mihr Mardān b. Surkhāb I
  138/755  Surkhāb II b. Mihr Mardān
  155/772  Sharwīn I b. Surkhāb II

before 201/before 817

   210/825  Shahriyār I b. Qārin

210–24/825–39

Seizure of power by Māzyār b. Qārin b. Wandād-Hurmuzd

   224/839  Qārin I b. Shahriyār I, Abu ʿ1-Mulūk
   253/867  Rustam I (? b. Surkhāb) b. Qārin
   282/895  Sharwīn II b. Rustam I
   318/930  Shahriyār II b. Sharwīn II

Ø c. 353–69/c. 964–80

   358/969  Dārā b. Rustam II

Ø c. 376/c. 986

   Shahriyār III b. Dārā

396/1006  Rustam III b. Shahriyār III
449–66/1057–74 Qārin II b. Shahriyār III
466/1074 Disappearance of their rule

2. The line of the Ispahbadhiyya (Ṭabaristān and Gīlan), with their centre at Sārī

Ø c. 466/c. 1074 Shahriyār b. Qārin, Husām al-Dawla
c. 508/c. 1114 Qārin b. Shahriyār, Najm al-Dawla
511/1117 Rustam I b. Qārin, Shams al-Mulūk
Ø 511/1118 ‘Alī b. Shahriyār, ‘Alā’ al-Dawla
Ø c. 536/c. 1142 Shāh Ghāzi Rustam b. ‘Alī, Nuṣrat al-Dīn
568/1173 Ardashīr b. Ḥasan, Ḥusām al-Dawla
602–6/1206–10 Rustam II b. Ardashīr
606/1210 Khwārazmian and then Mongol rule in Ṭabaristān

3. The line of the Kīnkhwāriyya (vassals of the Il Khānids), with their centre at Āmul

635/1238 Ardashīr b. Kīnkhwār, Ḥusām al-Dawla
after 647/after 1249 Muḥammad b. Ardashīr, Shams al-Mulūk
c. 669/c. 1271 Yazdagird b. Shahriyār, Tāj al-Dawla
c. 700/c. 1300 Shahriyār b. Yazdagird, Nāṣir al-Dawla
c. 710/c. 1310 Kay Khusraw b. Yazdagird, Rukn al-Dawla
728/1328 Sharaf al-Mulūk b. Kay Khusraw
734–50/1334–49 Ḥasan b. Kay Khusraw, Fakhr al-Dawla
750/1349 Succession in Māzandaran of the Afrāsiyābids

The Bāwandids were the longest-lived of the petty Caspian dynasties, with a history extending over some six or seven centuries, a remarkable demonstration of how the region’s isolation from the mainstreams of Islamic Persian life allowed a degree of family continuity unusual in the Islamic
world. They claimed descent from one Bāw and traced their genealogy back beyond this to the Sāsānid emperor Kawādh. Their original centre was at Firrīm in the eastern section of the Elburz chain running through Ṭabaristān.

That part of the dynasty’s history which can be reasonably well documented only begins with the Arab invasions of Ṭabaristān in the opening years of the ‘Abbāsid caliphate. This was the time when the Bāwandids and the rival house of the Qārinids were vying for power there, a rivalry which in the ninth century was to end spectacularly in the rebellion and fall of Māzyār b. Qārin (224/839). It was also at this last juncture that the Ispahbadhs at last became definitively Muslim. Subsequently, they opposed the Zaydi Imams in lowland Ṭabaristān, and were involved during the tenth century in the struggles of the Būyids and the Ziyārids (see above, no. 75, and below, no. 81) for control of northern Persia, being linked with both these houses through marriage; it was during the times when they became vassals of the Būyids that the Bāwandids adhered to Twelver Shī’īs.

This first line faded out, and the affiliation to it of the subsequent line is not certain. These Ispahbadhiyya were firmly Twelver Shī’īs. Within a framework of vassalage to the Great Seljuqs, they managed to preserve their local authority; at times they sheltered Seljuq claimants and made high-level marriages with the Seljuqs. The decline of Great Seljuq power in the mid-twelfth century allowed the vigorous and assertive Shāh Ghāzī Rustam to become a major, independent figure in the politics of northern Persia; he combated the Ismā’īlīs of Alamūt (see below, no. 101) and pursued an independent policy aimed at extending his principality south of the Elburz. However, the rising power of the Khwārazm Shāhs (see below, no. 89) in the early years of the thirteenth century brought this line to an end, with direct power exercised in Māzandarān (as Ṭabaristān becomes generally called after the twelfth century).

The Bāwandids were restored after an interval of three decades in the shape of a collateral branch, the Kīnkhwāriyya, who ruled as vassals of the Mongol Il Khānids, with their capital at Āmul, until another local family of Māzandarān, that of Kiyā Afrāsiyāb Chulābl, overthrew them and ended Bāwandid rule for ever.

Justi, 431–2; Sachau, 5–7 nos 3–5; Zambaur, 187–9; Album, 34–5.
EI² ‘Bāwand’ (R. N. Frye); EIr ‘Āl-e Bāvand’ (W. Madelung).
G. C. Miles, The coinage of the Bāwandids of Ṭabaristān’ in C. E. Bosworth (ed.), Iran
In the early years of the tenth century, the backward and remote highland 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 out of one of the fiercest of these
condottieri, Mardāwīj b. Ziyār, who was descended from the royal clan of Gīlān. On the rebellion of the commander Asfār b. Shīrūya, a general in the Sāmānid armies, Mardāwīj took the opportunity to seize most of northern Persia. His power soon extended as far south as Iṣfahān and Hamadān, but in he was murdered by his own Turkish slave troops and his transient empire fell apart. Only in the eastern Caspian provinces did his brother Wushmgīr retain a foothold, acknowledging the Sāmānids as his overlords, and in the ensuing decades the Ziyārids were closely involved with the Sāmānid-Būyid struggle for control of northern Persia. In Qābūs b. Wushmgīr, the dynasty produced an outstanding figure of the florescence of Arabic learning in Khurasan and the East, which his seventeen-year exile in Nishapur, while the Būyids occupied his lands, facilitated. A point which marks off the Ziyārids from almost all the other Daylamī dynasties of the time was their adherence, at least latterly, to Sunnī and not Shi‘ī Islam.

In the early eleventh century, the Ziyārids had to recognise the overlordship of the new and vigorous power of the Ghaznawids (see below, no. 158), and the two families became linked by marriage alliances. The incoming Seljuqs appeared in Gurgān in and took over the coastlands, but the Ziyārids seem to have survived, in obscure circumstances as vassals of the Seljuqs, in the highland region. One of the last amirs, Kay Kāwūs b. Iskandar, achieved fame as the author of a celebrated ‘Mirror for Princes’ in Persian, the Qābūs-nāma, named after his illustrious grandfather. His son Gīlān Shāh was the last known member of his line to rule. He was apparently overthrown by the Nizārī Ismā‘īlīs, who were spreading their power through the Elburz region (see below, no. 101), and with him the dynasty disappears from history.

Justi, 441; Lane-Poole, 136–7; Justi, 441; Zambaur, 210–11; Album, 35.
EI¹ ‘Ziyārids’ (Cl. Huart); EI² ‘Mardāwīdj’ (C. E. Bosworth). (The earlier accounts of the dynasty are all confused and unreliable in their chronology of the later Ziyārids.)
W. Madelung, in The Cambridge History of Iran, IV, 212–16.
The governors in Khurasan and its administrative dependencies

205–59/821–73

- 205/821 Ṭāhir I b. al-Ḥusayn b. MuṢʿab b. Ruzayq al-Khuzāʿī, Abu ’l-Ṭayyib Dhu ’l-Yamīnayn
- 207/822 Ṭalḥa b. Ṭāhir I
- 213/828 ‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir I, Abu l-ʿAbbās
- 230/845 Ṭāhir II b. ‘Abdallāh
- 248–59/862–73 Muhammad b. Ṭāhir II
- 259/873 Ṣaffārid occupation of Nishapur (Nīshāpūr)

Khurasan disputed by the Ṣaffārids and various military
261-1875- adventurers

2. The military governors (Aṣḥāb al-Shurṭa) in Baghdad and Iraq
   207–78/822–91

205/820  Ṭāhir I b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muṣ‘ab
207/822  Ishāq b. Ibrahīm b. Muṣ‘ab
235/849  Muḥammad b. Ishāq
236/850  ‘Abdallāh b. Ishāq
237/851  Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir I
253/867  ‘Ubaydallāh b. ‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir I, first governorship
255/869  Sulaymān b. ‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir I
264/879  ‘Ubaydallāh b. ‘Abdallāh, second governorship
271/884  Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir II
276–8/890–1 ‘Ubaydallāh b. ‘Abdallāh, third governorship
278/891  The Turkish slave commanders Badr al-Mu‘taṣidī and Mu‘nis al-Khādīm
   c. 297/c. 910  Muḥammad b. ‘Ubaydallāh, deputy Ṣāhab al-Shurṭa for Mu‘nis

Ṭāhir b. al-Husayn was probably of Persian mawld or client origin, though
eulogists of the Tāhirids endeavoured to give them a direct lineage from the
aristocratic Arab tribe of Khuzā’ā. Ṭāhir rose to favour under al-Ma’mūn as
commander of the latter’s forces in the fratricidal war against al-Amin in
194/810, and after the fall of Baghdad became governor of that city and of
Jazira. Finally, he was appointed governor of the East. Just before his death
shortly afterwards, he had started to omit al-Ma’mūn’s name from the Friday
khutba or sermon, this being tantamount to a renunciation of allegiance or
declaration of independence. Nevertheless, the caliph handed on the
governorship to his son Talha, being unable to find anyone more reliable for
this important office. Henceforth, the Tāhirids ruled from Nishapur as a
hereditary line of governors but remained faithful vassals of the ‘Abbāsids,
continuing to forward tribute regularly to Iraq (the Turkish military slaves in
this tribute became one of the mainstays of the caliphs’ professional armies),
although ‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir was careful never to leave Khurasan for
Baghdad. Hence the Táhirids may be considered as a virtually autonomous line of governors but not as a separate, independent dynasty, as were their rivals the Saffárids. The family’s strong Sunnī orthodoxy and their favour towards the established Arab and Persian landed and military classes assured them of top-level support, while they also had a reputation for protecting the interests of the masses, of encouraging agriculture and irrigation, and of patronising scholars and poets.

In Khurasan, the main political and military efforts of the Táhirids were first aimed at suppressing rebels like the Qárinid Mázyár (see above, no. 80) and keeping in check, also in the Caspian provinces, the Zaydi Shīfīs; but latterly, their position was threatened by the rising power of the Saffārids in Sistan (Sístán) (see below, no. 84, 1), an administrative dependency of Khurasan, and this they failed to withstand. Muhammad b. Táhir II lost Nishapur to Ya‘qūb b. al-Layth in 259/873, and eventually escaped to Iraq. The caliph reappointed him to the governorship of Khurasan, but he was never able to take this up, and for the next twenty years the province was disputed by the Saffārids and several local commanders.

Khurasan was, however, only one of the governorships held by the house of Mus‘ab b. Ruzayq, for other members functioned as military governors in Baghdad and Iraq until the end of the ninth century, a longer tenure of office than their kinsmen in Khurasan. After Táhir I left for the East, his command in Baghdad was at first given to the parallel branch of the Mus‘abids, but then after 237/851 the descendants of Táhir I took over. The Táhirids’ position in Baghdad was based on their great wealth and estates there, in particular, their Harīm, a complex of buildings and markets to the north of al-Mansūr’s Round City. The governors in Baghdad were renowned as patrons of Arabic culture, and some of them, like ‘Ubaydalláh b.‘Abdalláh, themselves enjoyed contemporary reputations as litterateurs.

Justi, 436; Lane-Poole, 128; Sachau, 19–20 no. 39; Zambaur, 197–8; Album, 32.

EI² Táhirids’ (W. Barthold).
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THE SĀMĀNIDS
204–395/819–1005
Transoxania and Khurasan

⊘ 204/819 Aḥmad I b. Asad b. Sāmān Khudā, originally governor of Farghāna and then of Soghdia
⊘ 250/864 Naṣr I b. Aḥmad I, ruler in Samarkand
⊘ 279/892 Ismā‘īl b. Aḥmad I, Abū Ibrāhīm al-Amīr al-Mādī
⊘ 295/907 Aḥmad II b. Ismā‘īl, Abū Naṣr al-Amīr al-Shahīd
⊘ 301/914 Naṣr II b. Aḥmad II, al-Amīr al-Saʿīd
⊘ 331/943 Nūḥ I b. Naṣr II, al-Amīr al-Ḥamīd
⊘ 350/961 Mansūr I b. Nūḥ I, Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Amīr al-Sadīd
⊘ 365/976 Nūḥ II b. Mansūr I, al-Amīr al-Radī
⊘ 387/997 Mansūr II b. Nūḥ II, Abu ’l-Ḥārith
⊘ 389/999 ‘Abd al-Malik II b. Nūḥ II, Abu ’l-Fawāris

395/1005 Definitive division of the Sāmānid territories between the Qarakhanids and the Ghaznavids

The founder of the Sāmānid line was one Sāmān Khudā, a dihqān or local landowner in the Balkh district of what is now northern Afghanistan, although the dynasty later claimed descent from the pre-Islamic Sāsānid emperors of Persia. Sāmān Khudā became a Muslim, and his four grandsons served the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Ma’mūn as sub-governors for the Tāhirids of
Khurasan (see above, no. 82, 1): Nūḥ was appointed governor of Samarkand (Samarqand), Aḥmad of Farghāna, Yahyā of Shāsh (the later Tashkent) and Ilyās of Herat (Harāt). The branch south of the Oxus did not prosper, but the others acquired a good foothold in Transoxania so that in 263/875 Naṣr b. Aḥmad received from al-Mu’tamid the governorship of that complete province. This rich region became the core of the Sāmānids’ empire, and they took over also the duties of defending Transoxania’s territorial 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 expeditions mounted into the steppes against the Qarluq and other Turkish tribes. By making their military might feared within the steppes and by keeping caravan routes across Inner Asia open, the Sāmānids assured the economic well-being of their lands; it was through their agency that many of the Turkish slaves, employed from the ninth century onwards very extensively in the armies of Muslim princes of the central and eastern lands, were imported. Backed by this prosperity, the Amīrs made their court at Bukhara not only a centre of Arabic learning but also of the renaissance of New Persian language and literature, and it was under Sāmānid rule that Firdawsī began his poetic version of the Persian national epic, the Shāh-nāma. In 287/900, Ismāʿīl b. Aḥmad earned the caliph’s gratitude by defeating and capturing the Ṣaffārid ‘Amr b. al-Layth (see below, no. 84, 1), and was rewarded with the governorship of Khurasan in succession to the Ṣaffārids and Ṣaffārids. The Sāmānids were now the greatest power in the east, strong proponents of Sunnī orthodoxy there, and exercising suzerainty over outlying regions like Khwārazm, the upper Oxus lands and Sistan, while in northern Persia they were rivals of the Būyids (see above, no. 75). But in the middle years of the tenth century, ominous signs of instability appeared in the Sāmānid state. A series of palace revolutions showed that the military classes, opposed to the Amīrs’ policies of centralisation, were gaining control, while revolts in Khurasan abstracted that province from the direct authority of Bukhara. It was therefore not difficult for the Turkish Qarakhanids and Ghaznawids (see below, nos 90, 158) to take over the Sāmānid territories, and the last fugitive Sāmānid, Ismāʿīl al-Muntasir, was killed in 395/1005. The downfall of the dynasty meant that all the hitherto Iranian lands north of the Oxus passed under Turkish control, and there now began there a process of ethnic and linguistic Turkification, substantially completed – except in what is now the Tajikistan Republic and to a lesser
extent in Uzbekistan – by modern times.

Justi, 440; Lane-Poole, 131–3; Zambaur, 202–3; Album, 33.
EI² ‘Sāmānids’ (C. E. Bosworth).
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THE SAFFĀRIDS
247–393/861–1003
Centre of their power in Sistan, with an empire extending at times into Persia and eastern Afghanistan

1. The Laythid branch

Ø 247/861 Yaʿqūb b. al-Layth al-Ṣaffār, Abū Yūsuf
Ø 265/879 ‘Amr b. al-Layth, Abū Ḥafṣ
(261–8/875–82 Aḥmad h. ‘Abdalldh Khujistāni, Abū Shujā‘, rebel in Nishapur)
Ø (268– Rāff b. Harthama, rebel and caliphal governor in Nishapur and then Rayy)
Ø 300–1/912–14 Second Sāmānid occupation
297–98/911–12 Revolt of o Muḥammad b. Hurmuz
300–1/912–14 Seizure of power by the local commanders Aḥmad Niyā,

2. The Khalafid branch
The Ṣaffārid brothers derived their name from their founder Ya‘qūb’s trade of coppersmith (saffār). Under Ya‘qūb and ‘Amr, their native province of Sistan became the centre of a vast but transient empire which covered almost all Persia except for the north-west and the Caspian region and which stretched to the frontiers of India. In the ninth century, Sistan was much disturbed by social and sectarian unrest; it had long been a refuge area for various malcontents and schismatics fleeing eastwards through Persia, including the Khārijīs, defeated and dispersed by the Umayyad governors. It may be that Ya‘qūb had been a Kharījī himself; the nucleus of his forces lay in the bands of local vigilantes defending the cause of Sunnī orthodoxy in Sistan, but his troops came to include many former Kharījīs also. With this army, Ya‘qūb expanded eastwards to Kabul (Kabul), then a pagan region on the fringe of the Indian world, and overturned the native dynasty there. In the west, he attacked the Ṭāhirids (see above, no. 82) in 259/873, wresting from them their capital Nishapur and ending their governorship over Khurasan. He was bold enough to invade Iraq and mount an attack on the heart of the caliphate itself, but this was halted on the banks of the Tigris in 262/876.

Whereas the Ṭāhirids and Sāmānids (see above, nos 82, 83) represented the interests of religious orthodoxy and the social status quo, the Ṣaffārid chiefs were plebeian in origin and proud of it, and they openly proclaimed their contempt for the ‘Abbāsids. Thus they effectively demolished the ‘caliphal fiction’ whereby provincial governors and rulers derived legitimacy for their authority from an ostensible act of delegation by the head of the Islamic community. ‘Amr b. al-Layth was recognised by the ‘Abbāsid ruler as his governor in several Persian provinces and, eventually, in Khurasan. However, not content with these extensive territories, ‘Amr coveted Transoxania also, which had been nominally under Ṭāhirid oversight. But the actual holders of
power there, the Sāmānids, proved more than a match for the Ṣaffārids; ‘Amr overreached himself and was disastrously defeated. Being a personal creation of military conquerors, the Ṣaffārid empire lost its Khurasanian provinces, and in the early tenth century, after a series of weaker, ephemeral amīrs, passed temporarily under Sāmānid control.

Despite this severe check, the Ṣaffārids were to revive, and it is clear that they to some extent represented the interests and aspirations of the people of Sistan from whom they had sprung. From 311/923, the Ṣaffārids reappear as local rulers in Sistan and adjacent regions. The two amirs of this line, from a collateral branch of the family, achieved widespread reputations as Maecenases and, in the case of Khalaf b. Aḥmad, as a scholar in his own right. In 393/1003, the aggressive and expansionist Mahmūd of Ghazna (see below, no. 158) incorporated Sistan into his empire, an event which the patriotic anonymous author of a local history, the Ta’rīkh-i Sīstān, regards as a disaster for the land.

It should be noted that the convenient division of the Ṣaffārids into ‘Laythids’ and ‘Khalafids’ corresponds to the ‘first line’ and ‘second line’ in Zambaur’s listing of the Ṣaffārids, but that his third and fourth lines have no demonstrable connection with the Ṣaffārid ruling house; for these, the so-called Maliks of Nimrūz, see below, no. 106.

Justi, 439; Lane-Poole, 129–30 (ignores all but the very first Ṣaffārids); Sachau, 11 no. 16; Zambaur, 199–201 (see the remarks above); Album, 32.
EI² Ṣaffārids’ (C. E. Bosworth).
Milton Gold (tr.), The Tārikh-e Sistān, Rome 1976.
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THE BĀNJŪRIDS OR ABŪDĀWŪDIDS

c. 233–c. 295/c. 848–c. 908

Balkh and Ṭukhāristān

? Hāshim b. Bānljūr, in Khuttal, d. 243/857

⊘ Dāwūd b. al-‘Abbās b. Hāshim, in Balkh, d. 259/873

⊘ 233/848

Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Bānjūr, Abū Dāwūd, previously governor of Andarāba and Panjhīr, still ruling in 285/898 or 286/899

⊘ 260/874

? Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, in Balkh and Andarāba until c. 295/c. 908

The Bānjūrids were a line of local rulers, vassals of the Sāmānids (see above, no. 83), who ruled at Balkh and Andarāba in the region of Ṭukhāristān to the south of the middle Oxus, and generally also at Panjhlīr in the Hindu Kush, famed for its silver mines. They were most probably of Iranian origin. Their ancestor Bānljūr, a contemporary of the first ‘Abbāsid caliphs, had connections with Farghāna, but both the affiliations and the chronology of his line are extremely obscure. From the early tenth century, other local chiefs seem to have controlled Ṭukhāristān, but it is possible that a line of local princes to the north of the Middle Oxus, in Khuttal, were kinsmen of the Bānjūrids.

Zambaur, 202, 204; Album, 33.

EI² Suppl. ‘Bānījūrids’ (C. E. Bosworth).
Muḥammad Abū-l-Faraj ‘Ush, ‘Dirhams Abu Dāwūdides (Banū Bānijūrī)’, Revue
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THE SĪMJŪRIDS
300–92/913–1002
Governors in Khurasan and feudatories in Quhistān

300–1/913–14 Sīmjūr al-Dāwatī, Abū ‘Imrān, governor for the Sāmānids in Sistan, d. between 318/930 and 324/936

310–14/922–6 Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr, Abū ‘Alī, first governorship in Khurasan

333–4/945–6 Ibrahim b. Sīmjūr, second governorship, d. 336/948

345–9/956–60 Muḥammad I b. Ibrāhīm, Abu ’l-Hasan, first governorship in Khurasan

350–71/961–82 Muḥammad I b. Ibrāhīm, second governorship, d. 378/989


385/995 Muḥammad II, second governorship, d. 387/997

? ‘Alī b. Muḥammad I, Abu ’l-Qāsim, commander in Khurasan until 392/1002, d. at some point thereafter

The Sīmjūrids began as Turkish military slaves of the Sāmānids (see above, no. 83), Sīmjūr being the ceremonial ink-stand bearer (dawātī) of Isma’il b. Aḥmad. He rose to prominence when the Sāmānids temporarily drove out the Ṣaffārids (see above, no. 84) and occupied Sistan. Thereafter, the family were prominent throughout the tenth century in the warfare of the Sāmānids with their enemies in northern and eastern Persia, often as governors in Khurasan and with a territorial base in their Quhistān estates, and were finally involved
in the chaos there as the Sāmānid amirate broke up, after which the family largely drops out of mention.

Sachau, 11 no. 15; Zambaur, 205.

EI² ‘Simdjürıds’ (CE. Bosworth).

Muḥammad b. Ilyās was a commander, of Soghdian origin, in the service of the Sāmānid Naṣr II b. Aḥmad (see above, no. 83), who, after the failure of the rebellion of the Amīr’s brothers at Bukhara in 317/929, eventually withdrew southwards to Kirman, where there was something of a power vacuum after the waning of ‘Abbāsid control in southern Persia. There he successfully established himself, fighting off the Daylamī commander Mākān and acting nominally as governor for the Sāmānids but in practice independent. He was compelled by his sons to abdicate after a reign of thirty-six years, but it was at this point that the powerful Būyid Amīr ‘Adud al-Dawla turned his attention to Kirman, and this proved fatal for the short-lived line of the Ilyāsids, with Ilyasa‘ driven out to Transoxania. Various Ilyāsids attempted revanches, but Kirman was to remain generally under Būyid control until the advent of the Seljuqs (see below, no. 91, 3).

Sachau, 10–11 no. 14; Zambaur, 216. 
EI² ‘Ilyāsids’ (C. E. Bosworth).
The Muḥtājids
321–43/933–54

Governors in Khurasan and Amīrs of Chaghāniyān

321/933  Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar b. Muḥtāj, Abū Bakr, governor in Khurasan, d. 329/941
327/939  Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Abū ‘Alī, first governorship in Khurasan
333/945  Governorship of Ibūrahīm b. Sīmjūr
335/946  Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, second governorship
335/947  Governorship of Manṣūr b. Qaratigin
340–3/952–4  Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, third governorship, d. 344/955

The Muḥtāj family were hereditary lords of the principality of Chaghāniyān on the north bank of the middle Oxus, but whether they were descendants of the indigenous, presumably Iranian, Chaghān Khudās from the time of the Arab invasions, or possibly Persianised Arabs, is unknown. They appear as commanders for the Sāmānids, and then as governors and commanders-in-chief in Khurasan for the Amīrs, in the second quarter of the tenth century. Abū ‘Alī Aḥmad was a dominant figure there, but eventually died in exile. It seems, however, that the Muḥtājids retained their local base in Chaghāniyān, possibly into the eleventh century, since local princes there are mentioned, although their affiliation to the original line is uncertain.
Zambaur, 204; Album, 33.

EI² ‘Muḥtājīds’ (C. E. Bosworth); Elr ‘Āl-e Moḥtāj’ (Bosworth).

## THE KHWAΖAM SHĀHS
Pre-Islamic times to the seventh/thirteenth century

### Khwārazm

1. The Afrīghids of Kāth (pre-Islamic times to 385/995)

Sixteen Shāhs are listed by al-Bīrūnī, the tenth, Arthamūkh b. Būzkār, being allegedly a contemporary of the Prophet Muḥammad. The first Shāh with an Islamic name is the seventeenth:

- ‘Abdallāh b. T.r.k.s.bātha, ? early third/ninth century
- Mansūr b. ‘Abdallāh
- ‘Iraq b. Manṣūr, reigning in 285/898
- Muḥammad b. ‘Irāq, reigning in 309/921
- ‘Abdallāh b. Ashkam, not listed by al-Bīrūnī but ruling c. 332/c. 944
- Ḍ Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Abū Saʿīd, ruling in 356/967
- Ḍ Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, Abū ‘Abdallāh, d. 385/995

Ma’mūnīd conquest

2. The Ma’mūnids of Gurgānj (385–408/995–1017)

| 385/995 | Ma’mūn I b. Muḥammad, Abū ‘Alī |
| 387/997 | ‘Alī b. Ma’mūn I, Abu ’l-Ḥasan |
| 399/1009 | Ma’mūn II b. Ma’mūn I, Abu ‘l-‘Abbās |
| 407–8/1017 | Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, Abu ’l-Ḥārith |
| 408/1017 | Ghaznavid conquest |

3. The Ghaznavid governors with the title of Khwārazm Shāh (408–32/1017–41)

| 408/1017 | Altuntash Ḥājib, Ghaznavid commander |
Hārūn b. Altuntash, lieutenant of the nominal Khwārazm Shāh, Saʿīd b. Masʿūd of Ghazna, later independent of Ghazna, probably then himself assuming the title Khwārazm Shāh

Ismāʿīl b. Khāndān b. Altuntash, independent of Ghazna, styling himself Khwārazm Shāh

Conquest of Khwārazm by the Oghuz Yabghu, Shāh Malik b. ‘Alī, Abu ’l-Fawāris, of Jand, probably receiving the title Khwārazm Shāh from Masʿūd of Ghazna

4. The line of Anūshtigin Shiḵna, originally as governors for the Seljuqs with the title of Khwārazm Shāh, from towards the mid-twelfth century often in practice largely independent rulers in Khwārazm and, at times, in Transoxania and Persia (c. 470–628/c. 1077–1231)

490/1097  Ekinchi b. Qochqar, Turkish governor with the title Khwārazm Shāh

490/1097  Arslan Tigin Muḥammad b. Anūshtigin, Abu ’l-Fatḥ, Quṭb al-Dīn, Khwārazm Shāh

521/1127  Qızīl Arslan Aṭsīz b. Muḥammad, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar ‘Alā’ al-Dīn

551/1156  Il Arslan b. Aṭsīz, Abu ’l-Fatḥ

567/1172  Tekish b. Il Arslan, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Tāj al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn

567/1172  Mahmūd b. Il Arslan, Abu ’l-Qāsim Sultān Shāh, Jalāl al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, rival ruler in northern Khurasan, d. 589/1193

596/1200  Muḥammad b. Tekish, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn

Mengūbirti (one of the usual renderings of this cryptic Turkish name; a further possibility suggested recently by Dr Peter Jackson is Mingīrinī ‘having a thousand men’ = the familiar Persian name Hazārmard) b. Muḥammad, Jalāl al-Dīn

Mongol conquest of Transoxania and Persia

Khwārazm, the classical Chorasmia, 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 steppeland and desert, it was isolated geographically, and this isolation long enabled it to maintain a separate political existence and a distinctive Iranian language and culture. Khwārazm may well have been an early home of the Iranians; certainly, the local historian and antiquary al-Bīrūnī (d. 440/1048) 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 this 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, it is reported, to the indigenous civilisation there. It thus came vaguely under Muslim suzerainty, but it was not until the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth century that an Afrīghid was first converted to the new faith, appearing with the traditional convert’s name of ‘Abdallāh. The Islamic names of subsequent Shāhs are henceforth attested, though not their exact chronology, since al-Bīrūnī provides no dates.

In the course of the tenth century, the city of Gurgānj 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 the Volga and Russia. A local family, the Ma’mūnids, in 385/995 violently overthrew the Afrīghids of Kāth (which lay on the right bank of the river), and themselves assumed the traditional title of Khwārazm Shāh. The rule of the Ma’mūnids was brief but quite glorious; great scholars like the philosopher and scientist Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna) and the littératuer al-Tha‘ālibí flourished under their patronage. Khwārazm had been theoretically under Sāmānid suzerainty, although in practice this had meant little; but in 408/1017, Maḥmūd of Ghazna, heir to the Sāmānids’ power in Khurasan, resolved to add Khwārazm to his empire, and Ma’mūnid rule was ended there. For the next decade or so, the province was governed by Ghaznawid military commanders, and then fell into the hands of Shāh Malik, the Oghuz Turkish Yabghu or ruler of Jand at the mouth of the Syr Darya. However, very soon, in 432/1041, Shāh Malik was overthrown by his rivals from the Seljuq family of the Oghuz (see below, no. 91, 1), and soon afterwards Khwārazm passed under Seljuq control.

The Great Seljuq sultans appointed their own governors to Khwārazm, and in Malik Shah’s reign his Turkish slave commander Anūshtigin Gharcha’ī,
who was keeper of the royal washing-bowls (ṭasht-dār) received the nominal title of Khwārazm Shāh, although he never seems to have gone there. His successors, however, became hereditary governors in Khwārazm, with the practical title of Shāh; this line of Anūshtigin was strongly Turkish in ethos, seen by the prevalence among them of Turkish names, and close connections, including by means of marriage alliances, were kept up with the Inner Asian steppes. Anūshtigin’s grandson Atsïz, while remaining nominally a vassal of the sultans, had ambitions of striking out on a more independent policy. This became possible after Sanjar’s disastrous defeat of 535/1141 by the Qara Khitay (see below, no. 90), but the Shāhs were in turn forced to acknowledge the suzerainty of these new invaders from the Far East. In effect, the Qara Khitay left the Shāhs largely to themselves, and the last decades of the twelfth century were taken up with a prolonged struggle for hegemony in Khurasan and the whole of the Iranian East between the Shāhs and the Ghūrids of Afghanistan (see below, no. 159). By the opening years of the thirteenth century, the Shāhs were triumphant, and were able to expand right across Persia, clearing away from there the last remnants of Great Seljuq rule and even daring to confront the ‘Abbāsid caliphs in Baghdad. They thus became masters of an empire stretching from the borders of India to those of Anatolia. Yet this impressive achievement proved transitory. In 617/1220, Chingiz Khān’s Mongols conquered Transoxania, and the reign of the last Khwārazm Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, was spent in heroic but futile attempts to stem the Mongol influx into the Middle East.

In subsequent centuries, Khwārazm came under the rule of various Turco-Mongol and Turkish Central Asian steppe peoples, and its original Iranian character was completely overlaid, although the prestigious title of Khwārazm Shāh seems to have been borne by the governors there for the Tīmūrids as late as the fifteenth century.

Justi, 428; Lane-Poole, 176–8 (the Anūshtiginids only); Sachau, 12no. 17 (the Ma’mūnids); Zambaur, 208–9; Album, 38–9.
E. Sachau, ‘Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwārazm’, SBWAW, 73 (1873), 471–506; 74 (1873), 285–330 (includes a list of the Afrīghids as given by al-Bīrūnī).
W. Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion, 3rd edn, 144–55,185,275–9,323ff.
C. E. Bosworth, in The Cambridge History of Iran, V, 140ff., 181ff., 185–95 (on the Anūshtiginids).
AMI, N.F., 9(1976), 179–205.
THE QARAKHĀNIDS
382–609/992–1212
Transoxania, Farghāna, Semirechye and eastern Turkestan

‘Alī b. Mūsā b. Satuq Bughra Khān (d. 388/998) and ∅
Hārūn or Ḥasan b. Sulaymān b. Satuq Bughra Khān, Ilig,
Bughra Khān, Shihāb al-Dawla (d. 382/992), joint
founders of the Qarakhānid confederation in Transoxania

1. The Great Qaghans of the united kingdom

∅ 388/998 Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, Arslan Qara Khān, Toghan Khān, Nāṣir al-Haqq Qutb al-Dawla
∅ 408/1017 Manṣūr b. ‘Alī, Arslan Khān, Nūr al-Dawla
∅ 415/1024 Muḥammad or Aḥmad b. Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān, Toghan Khān
∅ 417–24/1026–32 Yūsuf b. Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān, Qadîr Khān, Nāṣir al-Dawla Malik al-Mashriq wa ’l-Ṣīn

2. The Great Qaghans of the western kingdom (Transoxania, including Bukhara and Samarkand, and Farghāna at times), with its centre at Samarkand

∅ after c. 411/c.
1020, in control of Soghdia ‘Alī Tigin b. Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān, d. 425/1034
425/1034  Ø Yūsuf and Arslan Tigin b. ‘Alī Tigin, their Father’s successors in Soghdia)

Ø c. 433/c. 1042  Muḥammad b. Naṣr b. ‘Alī, Arslan Qara Khān  
Mu’ayyid al-‘Adl ‘Ayn al-Dawla  
Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr b. ‘Alī, Abu Ishāq Bōri Tigin,  
Ø c. 444/c. 1052  Tamghach or Tabghach Bughra Khān, victor over the sons of ‘Alī Tigin  

460/1068  Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm, Abu ’l-Ḥasan Shams al-Mulk Malik al-Mashriq wa ’l-Ṣīn  
472/1080  Khīḍr b. Ibrāhīm, Abū Shujā’  
?473/1081  Aḥmad b. Khīḍr  
482/1089  Ya’qūb b. Sulaymān b. Yūsuf Qadīr Khān  
488/1095  Mas‘ūd b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm  
Ø 490/1097  Sulaymān b. Dāwūd b. Ibrāhīm, Qadīr Tamghach or Tabghach Khān  
Ø 490/1097  Mahmūd b. … Mansūr b. ‘Alī Abu ’l-Qāsim Arslan Khān  
Ø 492/1099  Jibrā‘īl b. ‘Umar, Qadīr Khān  
Ø 495/1102  Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, Arslan Khān  
?523/1129  Naṣr b. Muḥammad  
Ø ?523/1129  Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Qadīr Khān  
524/1130  Ḥasan b. ‘Alī, Jalāl al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn  
?526/1132  Ibrāhīm b. Sulaymān, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Rukn al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn  
526/1132  Mahmūd b. Muḥammad (later, ruler of Khurāsān after the Seljuq Sanjar: see below, no. 91, 1)  
536/1141  Occupation of Transoxania by the Qara Khitay  
536/1141  Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad, Tamghach or Tabghach Khān  
551/1156  ‘Alī b. Ḥasan, Chaghri Khān  
Ø 556/1161  Mas‘ūd b. Ḥasan, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Tamghach or Tabghach Khān, Rukn al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn  
566/1171  Muḥammad b Mas‘ūd, Tamghach or Tabghach Khān, Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, d. 569/1174
574/1178  Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn, Arslan Khān Ulugh Sultān al-Salāṭīn Nuṣrat al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn (before 574/1178 in Farghāna, therafter in Samarkand also)
‘Uthmān b. Ibrāhīm, Ulugh Sultān al-Salāṭīn, vassal on various occasions of the Qara Khitay and the Khwārazm Shāhs

600–9/1204–12  Occupation of Transoxania by the Khwārazm Shāhs

609/1212 3. The Great Qaghans of the eastern kingdom (Īlāq, Talas, Shāsh, at times Farghāna, Semirechye, Kāshghar and Khotan), with its centre at Balāsāghūn, later Kāshghar

423/1032  Sulaymān b. Yūsuf, Abū Shujā‘ Qadīr Khān, Arslan Khān, Sharaf al-Dawla
448/1056  Muḥammad b. Yūsuf Qadīr Khān, Bughra Khān, Qawām al-Dawla
449/1057  Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad
451/1059  Maḥmūd b. Yūsuf Qadīr Khān, Ṭoghrīl Qara Khān, Niẓām al-Dawla
467/1074  ‘Umar b. Maḥmūd, Ṭoghrīl Tigin
467/1075  Hārūn or Ḥasan b. Sulaymān, Abū ‘Alī Tamghach or Tabghach Bughra Qara Khān, Nāṣir al-Haqq
496/1103  Aḥmad or Hārūn b. Hārūn or Ḥasan, Nūr al-Dawla
522/1128  Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad or Hārūn
553/1158  Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, Arslan Khān

? 601/1205  Yūsuf b. Muḥammad, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Arslan Khān
607/1211  Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, Abu ’l-Faṭḥ, d. 607/1211
607/1211  Occupation of Semirechye and Farghāna by the Nayman Mongol Küchlüg

4. The Qaghans in Farghāna, with their centre in Uzgend

The Turkish dynasty of the Qarakhānids acquired this name from European orientalists because of the frequency of the word *qara* ‘black’ > ‘northern’ (the basic orientation of the early Turks) > ‘powerful’ in their Turkish titulature; they have also been called the Ilek (properly Ilig) Khāns, again from one of the terms in the hierarchy of this titulature, and Āl-i Afrāsiyāb ‘House of Afrāsiyāb’ because of a fancied connection with the ruler of Tūrān in Firdawsī’s *Shāh-nāma*. It has been suggested by a leading authority on the dynasty, Omeljan Pritsak, that the Qarakhānids sprang from the Qarluq, a tribal group which had been formerly connected with the Uyghur confederation and as such had played an important role in earlier steppe history; another scholar, Elena Davidovich, has suggested a connection with the Yaghma or Chigil tribes, which were in any case components of the Qarluq.

The Qarakhānids became Muslim in the middle years of the tenth century, and their then head Satuq Bughra Khān assumed the Islamic name of ‘Abd
al-Karim. His grandson Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān was attracted southwards by the unsettled condition of Transoxania caused by the decline there of the Sāmānids, and in 392/992 temporarily occupied Bukhara. A few years later, the Ilīg Khān Naṣr and Maḥmūd of Ghazna finally extinguished the authority of the Sāmānids and divided their lands. The Oxus became the boundary between the two empires, and for the next two centuries the territories of the Qarakhānids stretched from Bukhara and the lower Syr Darya in the west to Semirechye and Kashgharia in the east. The Qarakhānids formed a loose confederation rather than a monolithic, unitary state, with various members of the family holding appanages which, if they held more than one, were not necessarily contiguous. Internal quarrels soon appeared, and after c. 432/c. 1041 there were two main parts of the Qarakhānid dominions, a western Khānate centred on Samarkand in Transoxania and at times including Farghāna, while an eastern one included the lands of the middle Syr Darya valley, at times Farghāna, Semirechye, and Kashgharia in eastern Turkestan, with a military capital, the Khāns’ ordu or encampment, near Balāsāghūn, but with Kāshghar as its religious and cultural centre. Farghāna was a substantial appanage which often had its own hereditary branch of subordinate Khāns. In general, the descendants of the Great Qaghan ‘Alī b. Mūsā (the‘Alid branch, in Pritsak’s convenient terminology) ruled in the west, while those of his cousin Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān b. Sulaymān (the Ḥasanid branch) ruled in the east. The boundary between these was not hard and fast, and members of each might rule in the other parts of the Qarakhānid lands; in the later twelfth century, the Ḥasanids were ruling in Samarkand. The western Khānate flourished under such rulers as Ibrāhīm Tamghach or Tabghach Khān, but in the later eleventh century fell under the suzerainty of the Seljuqs. However, after Sanjar’s disastrous defeat in the Ḥaṭwān Steppe in 536/1141, control over the whole of Turkestan west of the T’ien Shan mountains passed to the Buddhist Qara Khitay or Western Liao from northern China. The last western QaraKhānids continued as vassals of the Qara Khitay but failed to maintain their position against the Khwārazm Shāh‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad (see above, no. 89, 4), who in 609/1212 killed the last ruler there, ‘Uthmān, while the eastern Khānate fell to the Mongol Küchlüg just before Chingiz Khān’s hordes arrived in Central Asia.

Whereas the originally Turkish Ghaznavid sultans built up a strongly centralised state on the familiar Perso-Islamic pattern, the QaraKhānids
remained closer to their tribal and steppe past and had a more diffused system
of authority, with members of the ruling family allocated their own
appanages and the greater part of their tribesmen remaining probably
nomadic. Within the ruling family there prevailed the system, common
among other Altaic peoples, of Great Qaghans and co-Qaghans, with lesser
Khāns beneath them, each with his own suitable Turkish title, often combined
with a totemistic title taken from the names of animals, birds, etc., for
example *aislan* ‘lion’, *bughia* ‘camel’, *toghrīl* and *chaghri* ‘falcon, hawk’,
etc. Since members of the family were continually moving up in the
hierarchy of power and acquiring new names and titles, the task of
elucidating the genealogy and chronology of the QaraKhānids is exceedingly
difficult; the historical sources are not numerous, and, while large numbers of
Qarakhānid coins are extant, these last also present a bewildering array of
names and titles. As remarked in the Introduction, Zambaur noted over
seventy years ago that this was the only major Islamic dynasty whose
genealogy remained obscure, and confessed that his own attempts at
constructing a genealogy were necessarily sketchy; many obscurities still
remain despite much recent research and many coin finds within Central
Asia, the contents of which are increasingly ending up in the West. The tables
given above follow the researches of Pritsak supplemented by those more
recent ones of Elena Davidovich.

Zambaur, 206–7; Album, 34.
*EI*² *‘Ilek Khans’* (C. E. Bosworth).
Reşat Genç, *Kaiahanî devlet teşkilatî (XL yüzyl)* (Türk hâkimiyet anlayısı ve
Karahanhlâyi), Istanbul 1981.
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THE SELJUQS
431–590/1040–1194
Persia, Iraq and Syria

1. The Great Seljuqs in Persia and Iraq 431–590/1040–1194

 özellik (Tughril) I Beg Muḥammad b. Mīkāʿīl b. Seljuq,
Abū Ṭālib Rukn al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, Malik al-Mashriq
wa ’l-Maghrib, ruler in northern, western and southern
Persia, and supreme Sultan, d. 455/1063

Chaghri Beg Dāwūd b. Mīkāʿīl b. Seljuq, Malik al-Mulūk,
ruler in Khurāsān, d. 452/1060

Muḥammad Alp Arslan b. Chaghri Beg Dāwūd, Abū
Shujāʿ ‘Aḍud al-Dawla, Ḍiyāʿ al-Dīn

MalikShāh I b. Alp Arslan, Abu’l-Fatḥ Muʿizzal-Dīn Jalāl
al-Dawla

Maḥmūd I b. Malik Shāh, Nāṣir al-Dunya wa ’l-Dīn

Berk Yaruq (Barkiyāruq) b. Malik Shāh, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar
Rukn al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn

Malik Shāh II b. Berk Yaruq, Rukn al-Dunya wa ’l-Dīn,
Jalāl al-Dawla

Muḥammad I Tapar b. Malik Shāh, Abū Shujāʿ Ghiyāth al-
Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn


52/1118–57 511–552/1097–1157 Power in Khurasan seized by various Ghuzz and Turkish slave commanders

In Iraq and western Persia only:

Maḥmūd II b. Muḥammad I, Abu ’l-Qāsim Mughīth al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn Jalāl al-Dawla

Dāwūd b. Maḥmūd II, Abu ’l-Fāṭḥ Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, in Azerbaijan and Jībāl, d. 538/1143

Ṭoghrīl II b. Muḥammad I, Rukn al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, d. 529/1134

Masʿūd b. Muḥammad I, Abu ’l-Fāṭḥ Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn

Malik Shāh III b. Maḥmūd II, Muʿīn al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn Muḥammad II b. Maḥmūd II, Rukn al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, d. 554/1159

Sulaymān Shāh b. Muḥammad I, Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, d. 556/1161

Arslan (Shāh) b. Ṭoghrīl II, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Muʿizz al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn

Ṭoghrīl III b. Arslan (Shāh), Rukn al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn Khwārazmian conquest

2. The Seljuqs of Syria 471–511/1078–1117

Tutush I b. Alp Arslan, Abū Saʿīd Tāj al-Dawla

Riḍwān b. Tutush, Fakhr al-Mulk, in Aleppo, d. 507/1113

Duqaq b. Tutush I, Abū Naṣr Shams al-Mulūk, in Damascus, d. 497/1104
497/1104  Tutush II b. Duqaq, in Damascus, died shortly after his accession

507/1113  Alp Arslan al-Akhras b. Ridwan

\( \varnothing \) 508–17/1114–23  Sultan Shâh b. Ridwan  in Aleppo

Succession of the Bönd Atabeg  Ţughtigin in Damascus;

517/1123  succession of the Artuqid Nur al-Dawla Balak and then Aq Sunqur al-Bursuqî in Aleppo

3. The Seljuqs of Kirman 440–c. 584/1048–c. 1188

\( \varnothing \) 440/1048  Aḥmad Qāwurd b. Chaghri Beg Dāwūd, Qara Arslan Beg, ‘Imād al-Dīn wa ’l-Dawla

\( \varnothing \) 465/1073  Kirmān Shâh b. Qāwurd

\( \varnothing \) 467/1074  Ḥusayn b. Qāwurd

\( \varnothing \) 467/1074  Sultan Shâh Ishāq b. Qāwurd, Rukn al-Dīn wa ’l-Dawla

\( \varnothing \) 477/1085  Tūrān Shâh I b. Qāwurd, Muḥyi ’l-Dīn ‘Imād al-Dawla

\( \varnothing \) 490/1097  Īrān Shâh b. Tūrān Shâh I, Bahā’ al-Dīn wa ’l-Dawla

\( \varnothing \) 494 or 495/1101  Arslan Shâh I b. Kirmān Shâh, Muḥyi ’l-Islām wa ’l-Muslimīn, d. ? 540/1145

\( \varnothing \) 537/1142  Muḥammad I b. Arslan Shâh I, Mughīth al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn

\( \varnothing \) 551/1156  Ṭoghrīl Shâh b. Muḥammad I, Muḥyi ’l-Dunya wa ’l-Dīn

\( \varnothing \) 565/1170  Bahrām Shâh b. Ṭoghrīl Shâh, Abū Manṣûr, first reign

\( \varnothing \) 565/1170  Arslan Shâh II b. Ṭoghrīl Shâh, first reign

C. 566/c. 1171  Bahrām Shâh b. Ṭoghrīl Shâh, second reign

C. 568/c. 1172  Arslan Shâh II, second reign

C. 571/c. 1175  Bahrām Shâh b. Ṭoghrīl Shâh, third reign

C. 571/c. 1175  Muḥammad Shâh b. Bahrām Shâh, first reign

C. 571/c. 1175  Arslan Shâh II, third reign, d. 572/1177

\( \varnothing \) 572/1177  Tūrān Shâh II b. Ṭoghrīl Shâh, d. 579/1183

C. 579/c. 1183  Muḥammad Shâh, second reign

C. 584/c. 1188  Ghuzz occupation

The Seljuqs were originally a family of chiefs of the Qïnïq clan of the Oghuz
or Ghuzz Turkish people, whose home was in the steppes north of the Caspian and Arab Seas. Becoming Muslims towards the end of the tenth century, they entered the Islamic world in Khwārazm and Transoxania in the same fashion as so many barbarian peoples all over the Old World, namely as auxiliary troops in the service of warring powers, in this case, as participants in the struggles of the last Sāmānids, the Qarakhānids and the Ghaznawids. Deflected into Khurasan, the Seljuqs, their bands of nomadic followers and their herds, gradually took over that province from the Ghaznawids, seizing the capital Nishapur temporarily in 429/1038, where their leader Ṭoghrīl Beg proclaimed himself sultan. Leaving his brother Chaghrī Beg as ruler of Khurasan, Ṭoghrīl began deliberately to associate his authority with the cause of Sunnī orthodoxy and the freeing of the ‘Abbāsid caliphs from the Shī‘ī Būyids’ tutelage, a policy which enabled him to enlist orthodox sympathy as the Seljuqs advanced through Persia and swept aside the local Daylamī and Kurdish princes. In 447/1055, Ṭoghrīl entered Baghdad and had his title of sultan confirmed by the caliph; a few years later, the line of Būyids was finally extinguished in Fars (see above, no. 75).

The sultanate of the Great Seljuqs now evolved towards a hierarchically-organised state on the Perso-Islamic monarchic pattern, with the supreme sultan supported by a Persian and Arab bureaucracy and a multi-national army directed by Turkish slave commanders, this nucleus of professional soldiers being supplemented by the tribal contingents of the Türkmen begs or chiefs; but the continued importance within the sultanate of the Turkish elements was to mean that the Seljuq sultanate never developed into such a despotic, monolithic state as that of the Ghaznawids, much more completely cut off from the rulers’ original steppe background. During the reign of Alp Arslan and his son Malik Shāh, who both depended to a great extent on their supremely able Persian minister, Niẓām al-Mulk, the empire of the great Seljuqs reached its apogee. In the east, Khwārazm and what is now western Afghanistan had been wrested from the Ghaznawids, and towards the end of his reign Malik Shāh invaded Transoxania and humbled the Qarakhānids, receiving at Uzgend the homage of the Khān of the eastern branch in Kāshghar and Khotan. In the west, the offensive was taken against the Christian Armenian princes and Georgian kings in Transcaucasia. Fāṭimid influence was excluded from Syria and Jazīra, while minor, Shī‘ī-tinged dynasties like the ‘Uqaylids of northern Iraq and Jazīra (see above, no. 38) were overthrown and reliable Turkish governors installed in Syria. Alp
Arslan’s victory over the Byzantine emperor Romanus Diogenes at Mantzikert (Malāzgird) in 463/1071 further opened up Anatolia to Turkmen incursions, and these intensified raids laid the foundations for various Turkish principalities in Asia Minor, including that of a branch of the Seljuqs in Konya (Qūnya) (see further below, Chapter Twelve). 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 Yemen and Baḥrayn. In Kirman in south-eastern Persia, Chaghri Beg’s son Qāwurd established a local Seljuq dynasty which endured for nearly a century and a half until Oghuz tribesmen from Khurasan took over the province in c. 584/c. 1188. On the cultural and intellectual plane, notable was an acceleration in the programme of the foundation of orthodox Sunnī madrasas or colleges in Iraq and the Persian lands, and the encouragement of the sultans and their servants of a synthesis of traditional theological and legal studies with the more free-ranging spirit of Ṣūfīsm, exemplified in the life and work of scholars like ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Qushayrī (d. 465/1072) and Muḥammad al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111).

Centrifugal tendencies were always likely to appear within an empire like that of the Great Seljuqs, in which old Turkish patrimonial ideas about rulership and the division of territories among various members of the ruling family were still strong, once firm control from the centre was relaxed. After Malik Shāh’s death, the Seljuq lands of Iraq and western Persia were racked by dissension and civil strife, although an element of continuity and stability continued in Khurasan, where Malik Shāh’s son Sanjar was first governor and then, after the death in 511/1118 of his brother the supreme sultan Muḥammad, was acknowledged as senior member of the dynasty and supreme sultan. In Iraq, Seljuq authority was adversely affected by the reviving political and military power there of the ‘Abbāsid caliphs, and after 547/1152 this authority was permanently excluded from Baghdad. In the Persian lands, Transcaucasia, Jazīra and Syria, the rise of local lines of Atabegs reduced the sultans’ freedom of action and their revenues which they needed for paying their troops. The Atabegs were slave commanders of the Seljuq army, who were in the first place appointed as tutor-guardians (Turkish Atabeg ‘father-commander’) to young Seljuq princes sent out as provincial governors; but in many instances they soon managed to arrogate effective power to themselves and to found hereditary lines in the provinces (see, for example, below: the Bōrids, Zangids, Eldigüzids, Salghurids, etc.,
nos 92ff.).

The entry of the Seljuqs and their nomadic followers began a long process of profound social, economic and ethnic changes to the ‘northern tier’ of the Middle East, namely the zone of lands extending from Afghanistan in the east through Persia and Kurdistan to Anatolia in the west; these changes included a certain increase in pastoralisation and a definitely increased degree of Turkicisation. Within the Seljuq lands there remained significant numbers of Turkish nomads, largely unassimilated to settled life and resentful of central control and, especially, of taxation. The problem of integrating such elements into the fabric of state was never solved by the Seljuq sultans; when Sanjar’s reign ended disastrously in an uprising of Oghuz tribesmen whose interests had, they, felt, been neglected by the central administration, the Oghuz captured the Sultan, and, on his death soon afterwards, Khurasan slipped definitively from Seljuq control. The last Seljuq sultan in the west, Ṭoghril III, struggled to free himself from control by the Eldigüzid Atabegs, but unwisely provoked a war with the powerful and ambitious Khwārazm Shāh Tekish (see above, no. 89, 3) and was killed in 590/1194. Only in central Anatolia did a Seljuq line, that of the sultans of Rûm with their capital at Konya, survive for a further century or so (see below, no. 107).

Justi, 452–3; Lane-Poole, 149–54; Zambaur, 221–2 and Table R, Album, 22, 37–8.
This Atabeg dynasty derived from Ṭughṭigin, Atabeg to the Seljuq Amīr of Damascus Duqaq b. Tutush I (see above, no. 91, 2), who after the early death of the child Tutush II b. Duqaq became himself sole ruler in Damascus, founding a line which endured there for half a century. Ṭughṭigin and his son Böri managed to maintain their power through skilful diplomacy with the Fāṭimids and timely agreements with the Frankish Crusaders, but these balancing policies were regarded with disfavour by the ‘Abbāsid caliphs and the Great Seljuq sultans in Iraq. Hence the later Börids came under increased pressure from the bellicosely Sunnī orthodox Zangids of Mosul and Aleppo (see below, no. 93), who attacked Damascus in 529/1135, and in 549/1154 the last Börid Abaq had to abandon his capital to Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Zangī.

Lane-Poole, 161; Zambaur, 225; Album, 22.
EI² ‘Būrīds’ (R. Le Tourneau); ‘Dimashḳ’ (N. Elisséeff).
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THE ZANGIDS
521–649/1127–1251
Jazīra and Syria

1. The main line in Mosul and Aleppo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler and Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>521/1127</td>
<td>Zangī I b. Qasīm al-Dawla Aq Sunqur, Imād al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541/1146</td>
<td>Ghāzī I b. Zangī I, Sayf al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544/1149</td>
<td>Mawdūd b. Zangī I, Quṭb al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565/1170</td>
<td>Ghāzī II b. Mawdūd, Sayf al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589/1193</td>
<td>Arslan Shāh I b. Masʿūd, Abu ’l-Ḥārith Nūr al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607/1211</td>
<td>Masʿūd II b. Arslan Shāh, al-Malik al-Qāhir ‘Izz al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615/1218</td>
<td>Arslan Shāh II b. Masʿūd II, Nūr al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616/1219</td>
<td>Maḥmūd b. Masʿūd II, al-Malik al-Qāhir Nāṣir al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631/1234</td>
<td>Rule in Mosul by the vizier Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The line in Damascus and then Aleppo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler and Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>541/1147</td>
<td>Maḥmūd b. Zangī, Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Malik al-‘Ādil Nūr al-Dīn, in Aleppo and then Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579/1183</td>
<td>Conquest by the Ayyūbid Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf (Saladin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The line in Sinjār

566/1171 Zangī II b. Mawdūd, 577–9/1181–3 lord of Aleppo also
594/1197 Muḥammad b. Zangī II, Quṭb al-Dīn
616/1219 Shāhānshāh b. Muḥammad, ‘Imād al-Dīn
616–17/1219–20 Mahmūd b. Muḥammad, Jalāl al-Dīn
joint rulers
617/1220 Ayyūbid domination

4. The line in Jazīra

576/1180 Sanjar Shāh b. Ghāzī II b. Mawdūd, Muʿizz al-Dīn
605/1208 Maḥmūd b. Sanjar Shāh, al-Malik al-Muʿazzam Muʿizz al-
Dīn
648/1250 Ayyūbid domination

5. The line in Shahrazūr

?–630/?–1233 Zangī III b. Arslan Shāh II, ‘Imād al-Dīn

Zangī was the son of Aq Sunqur, who was a Turkish slave commander of the
great Seljuq Sultan Malik Shāh and governor of Aleppo from 479/1086 to
487/1094 (the origin of the name Zangī is unclear; an obvious meaning
would be ‘black African’, possibly relating to a swarthy complexion, but this
would be unusual for a Turk). In 521/1127, Sultan Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad
appointed Zangī governor of Mosul and Atabeg of his two sons. The
unsettled conditions within the Seljuq sultanate of the west, and the
appearance of other, semi-independent Atabeg and Turkish principalities,
such as those of the Börids and the Artuqids (see above, no. 92, and below,
no. 96), facilitated the rise of the Zangids. From his base at Mosul, Zangī was
well placed for expansion westwards through Jazīra into Syria and
northwards into eastern Anatolia and Kurdistan. At various times, he defied
the Seljuq sultan and clashed with the local Arab and Türkmen amīrs. He also
fought the Byzantines and Franks, and his capture in 539/1144 of Edessa or Urfa from Count Jocelyn II, which spelt the end of the Crusader County of Edessa, made him a hero of the Sunnī world.

When Zangī died, his dominions were divided between his sons Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī I, the elder, who inherited Mosul and its dependencies Sinjār, Irbil and Jazīra, and Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who took over Zangī’s Syrian conquests. Later, a third branch of the family ruled in Sinjār for some fifty years, a fourth line continued in Jazīra after Masʿūd b. Mawdūd in Mawṣil had become an Ayyūbid vassal (see below), while a fifth line ruled briefly at Shahrazūr in Kurdistan. Nūr al-Dīn’s policy in Syria and Palestine against the Crusaders and the declining Fāṭimids paved the way for Saladin’s career there and for the constituting of the Ayyūbid empire. The Syrian branch of the Zangīds was later absorbed by the Mosul one, and the Zangīds then inevitably came up against the Ayyūbids, who were pursuing an expansionist policy in Jazīra and Diyārbakr. Saladin twice failed to capture Mosul in 578/1182 and 581/1185, but Masʿūd I b. Mawdūd was compelled to make terms and to recognise the Ayyūbid as his suzerain.

The end of the Zangīds came with the ascendancy in Mosul of Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’, the former slave of Arslan Shāh II b. Masʿūd II, who after that ruler’s death became regent for the principality. When the last Zangīd Maḥmūd b. Masʿūd II died in 631/1234, probably murdered, Lu’lu’ became Atabeg of Mosul, and he and his sons formed a short-lived line there (see below, no. 95) until the advent of Hülegū’s Mongols.
THE BEGTIGINIDS
Before 529–630/before 1145–1233
North-eastern Iraq and Kurdistan, with a centre at Irbil, and at Ḫarrān in northern Syria

Before 539/before 1145
‘All Küchük b. Begtigin, Zayn al-Dīn, governor of Mosul

563/1168
Yūsuf b. ‘Alī Küchük, Nūr al-Dīn, in Irbil, d. 586/1190

Ο 563/1168
Gökböri b. ‘Alī Küchük, Abū Saʿīd Muẓaffar al-Dīn, in Ḫarrān until 586/1190, thereafter in Irbil, d. 630/1233

630/1233
Succession of the ‘Abbāsid caliphs in Irbil

Like the Lu’lu’ids of Mosul (see below, no. 95), the Begtiginids arose out of the Turkish military entourage of the Zangids, in the case of ‘Alī Küchük, that of Zangī b. Aq Sunqur. ‘Alī already controlled extensive lands on the Kurdish fringes of northern Iraq, with his capital in Irbil, when Zangī in 539/1145 gave him the governorship of Mosul also. ‘Alī remained faithful to the Zangids, and secured from them the right to transmit his territories hereditarily. Hence after his death in 583/1168, his sons succeeded at Irbil and Shahrazūr and also in his northern Syrian territories, Gökböri eventually falling sole heir to all of them. He pursued an astute policy of supporting Saladin and the Ayyūbids against the ambitions of Lu’lu’, and, on his death without sons, bequeathed his lands to the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Mustanṣir. The Begtiginids thus never functioned as a completely independent principality, but nevertheless enjoyed considerable local authority, within the framework of the surrounding greater powers, for almost a century.

Lane-Poole, 165; Zambaur, 228; Album, 41.
$Ei^2$ ‘Begteginids’ (Cl. Cahen).
Lu’lu’ was a freedman of the Zangids of Mosul (see above, no. 93), apparently of Armenian servile origin. Originally regent for the last Zangid prince there, he became officially recognised, with the approval of the ‘Abbāsid caliph, as ruler of the city in 631/1234. In the ensuing years, he extended his authority into Jazīra as Ayyūbid power there waned, but latterly was forced to flee the growing pressure of Mongol raids on Iraq. Lu’lu’ and the local Ayyūbid princes became tributary to the Mongols, and Lu’lu’’s later rule was increasingly subordinate to them, whose overlordship he explicitly acknowledged on his coins in 652/1254. He tried to pass on his power to his sons, dividing up his dominions between them, but when after his death the Il Khān Hülegü invaded as far as Syria (658/1260), Lu’lu’’s sons fled for asylum with the Mamlūks in Egypt, and Iraq and Jazīra now passed firmly under Mongol control.

Lane-Poole, 162–4; Sachau, 27 no. 72; Zambaur, 226; Album, 41.
El² ‘Lu’lu’, Badr al-Dīn’ (Cl. Cahen).
THE ARTUQIDS
C. 494–812/C. 1101–1409
Diyār Bakr

1. The line in Ḫiṣn Kayfā and Āmid 495–629/1102–1232

Artuq b. Ekseb or Eksek, Ṣahīr al-Dawla, Seljuk commander, d. 483/1090

495/1102 Sökmen I b. Artuq, Muʿīn al-Dawla, in Ḫiṣn Kayfā and then Mārdīn

498/1104 Ibrāhīm b. Sökmen I, in Mārdīn

502/1109 Dāwūd b. Sökmen I, Rukn al-Dawla, in Ḫiṣn Kayfā and then Khartptert

⊘ 539/1144 Qara Arslan b. Dāwūd, Fakhr al-Dīn, in Ḫiṣn Kayfā and Khartptert

⊘ 562/1167 Muḥammad b. Qara Arslan, Nūr al-Dīn, also in Āmid

⊘ 581/1185 Sökmen II b. Muḥammad, al-Malik al-Masʿūd Quṭb al-Dīn

⊘ 597/1201 Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Nāṣir al-Dīn


629–30/1232–3 Ayyūbid conquest of Ḫiṣn Kayfā and Āmid

2. The line in Khartptert 581–631/1185–1234

⊘ 581/1185 Abū Bakr b. Qara Arslan, ʿImād al-Dīn

600/1204 Ibrāhīm b. Abī Bakr, Niẓām al-Dīn
620/1223  Aḥmad Khiḍr b. Ibrāhīm, ʿIzz al-Dīn
631/1234  Artuq Shāh b. Aḥmad, Nūr al-Dīn
631/1234  Seljuq conquest

3. The line in Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn c. 494–811/c. 1101–1408

c. 494/c. 1101  Yāqūṭī b. Alp Yaruq b. Artuq
497/1104  ʿAlī b. Alp Yaruq
497/1104  Sökmen I b. Artuq, Muʿīn al-Dīn
507/1114 or  Il Ghāzī I b. Artuq, Najm al-Dīn, established in Mārdīn
508/1115  and 512/1118 in Mayyāfāriqīn
⊘ 516/1122  Temūr Tash b. II Ghāzī I, al-Malik al-Saʿīd Ḫusām al-Dīn
⊘ 548/1154  Alpī I b. Temūr Tash, Najm al-Dīn
⊘ 572/1176  Il Ghāzī II b. Alpī, Quṭb al-Dīn
⊘ 580/1184  Yūlük Arslan b. II Ghāzī II, Ḫusām al-Dīn, lost Mayyāfāriqīn in 581/1185
⊘ 599/1203  Artuq Arslan b. II Ghāzī II, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Nāṣir al-Dīn
⊘ 637/1239  Ghāzī I b. Yūlük Arslan, al-Malik al-Ẓāhir or al-Saʿīd Najm al-Dīn
691/1292  Dāwūd I b. Qara Arslan, al-Malik al-Saʿīd Shams al-Dīn
⊘ 693/1294  Ghāzī II b. Qara Arslan, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Najm al-Dīn
712/1312  ʿAlī Alpī b. Ghāzī II, al-Malik al-ʿĀdil ʿImād al-Dīn
⊘ 712/1312  Maḥmūd b. Ghāzī II, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Shams al-Dīn
⊘ 765/1364  Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Ḫusām al-Dīn
⊘ 769/1368  Dāwūd II b. Maḥmūd, al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Fakhr al-Dīn
⊘ 778/1376  ʿĪsā b. Dāwūd II, al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Majd al-Dīn, killed 809/1407
⊘ 809–12/1407–9  Aḥmad b. ʿĪsā, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Shihāb al-Dīn
The Turkish Artuqids of Diyar Bakr stemmed from Artuq b. Ekseb, a chief of the Döger tribe of the Oghuz. He is first heard of fighting against the Byzantines in Anatolia, and then the Great Seljuq sultan Malik Shāh (see above, no. 91, 1) sent him, like other Turkmen begs or chiefs, to fight on the peripheries of his empire – in Baḥrayn, Syria and Khurasan. He ended up as governor of Palestine and died in Jerusalem, but his sons were unable to maintain themselves there against the Fāṭimids and Crusaders, and settled instead in Diyar Bakr around Mārdīn and at Ḥiṣn Kayfā. Gradually, 11 Ghāzī I b. Artuq took over Seljuq territories in that region; he was an energetic opponent of the Franks in the County of Edessa, and in 515/1121 (var. 516/1122) he also acquired Mayyāfāriqīn. There were henceforth two main branches of the family, the descendants of Sökmen I in Ḥiṣn Kayfā and later Āmid, and the descendants of his brother Il Ghāzī I in Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn, with a third, subordinate branch at Khartpert which succumbed, however, after half a century of existence to the Seljuqs of Rūm.

As a Turkish dynasty in a region strongly settled by Turkmen begs and their followers, the Artuqid state retained many distinctively Turkish features, seen for example in the personal nomenclature of its princes, with such names as Alp/Alpī ‘warrior, hero’. Yet Diyar Bakr was still strongly Christian also. The Artuqids, however, seem to have been tolerant towards their Christian subjects, with the Patriarch of the Syrian Jacobites periodically resident in Artuqid territory. Much attention has been focused on the distinctive artistic and iconographical features of Artuqid culture, seen for instance in the rulers’ figural coinage, with its apparent classical and Byzantine motifs and representations.

The rise of the Zangids (see above, no. 93) halted the Artuqids’ expansionist plans, and they had to become vassals of Nūr al-Dīn. Then the Ayyūbids whittled their power down further, and they lost Ḥiṣn Kayfā, Āmid and Mayyāfāriqīn to them. In the early thirteenth century, they were for a time vassals of the Rūm Seljuqs and of the Khwārazm Shāh Jalāl al-Dīn Mengübirti. Eventually, only the Mārdīn line survived, with Qara Arslan submitting to the Mongol Il Khān Hūlegū. 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 Tīmūrid invasions. The last Artuqids were enveloped by the Qara Qoyunlu confederation, and in 812/1409 Aḥmad b.
‘Īsī was forced to abandon Mārdīn to the Qara Qoyunlu chief Qara Yūsuf (see below, no. 145).

Lane-Poole, 166–9; Zambaur, 228–30; Album, 40.

İA ‘Artuk Oğulları’ (M. F. Köprülü); EI² ‘Artuḳids’ (Cl. Cahen).

O. Turan, Doğa Anadolu Türk devletleri tarihi, Istanbul 1973, 133–240, with list and genealogical table at 244, 281.


In 493/1100, the Turkish slave commander Sökmen took over the town of Akhlāṭ or Khilāṭ on the north-western shore of Lake Van, it having passed from Armenian control to that of the Seljuqs after the battle of Malāzgird or Mantzikert. As heirs to the local Armenian princes, Sökmen and his descendants over three generations assumed the title of Shāh-i Arman. They soon made Akhlāṭ into a base for warfare against the Armenians and Georgians, and the family acquired links with neighbouring dynasties like...
that of the Artuqid in Mayyafariqin (see above, no. 96, 3), becoming part of a nexus of Turkish principalities in Jazira and eastern Anatolia which formed a protective screen on the western fringes of the Great Seljuq empire. However, Sokmen II was childless, and on his death in 581/1185 Akhlath was seized by a series of the Sokmenids’ slave commanders. But the Ayyubids in Diyar Bakr and Jazira had long coveted the town, and in 604/1207 it was taken over by Najm al-Din Ayyub of Mayyafariqin (see above, no. 30, 6).

EI² ‘Shäh-i Armanids’ (C. Hillenbrand).
O. Turan, Doğu Anadolu Türk devletleri tarihi, 83–106, with list and genealogical table at pp. 243, 279.
**THE AḤMADĪLĪS**  
C. 516 to after 617/c. 1122 to after 1220  
*Marāgha and Rūʿīn Diz in Azerbaijan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 516/1122</td>
<td>Aq Sunqur I Aḥmadīlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 528/1134</td>
<td>Aq Sunqur II or Arslan Aba b. Aq Sunqur I, Nuṣrat al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 570/1175</td>
<td>Falak al-Dīn b. Aq Sunqur II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 584/1188</td>
<td>Körp Arslan, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604/1208</td>
<td>? b. Körp Arslan, d. 605/1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605/1209</td>
<td><em>Eldigūzid occupation of Marāgha</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sulāf a Khātūn, granddaughter of Körp Arslan, ruling in Marāgha and Rūʿīn Diz in 617/1220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This line of Turkish Atabegs ruled in the restricted area of the town of Marāgha and the nearby fortress of Rūʿīn Diz for almost a century, maintaining itself against much more powerful neighbours like the Eldigūzid Atabegs controlling the rest of Azerbaijan (see below, no. 99). Marāgha had been held in the early twelfth century by the Kurdish commander of the Seljuqs, Aḥmadīl b. Ibrāhīm, possibly a descendant of an earlier family in Azerbaijan, the Rawwādīds (see above, no. 72), and Aq Sunqur Aḥmadīlī was presumably his freedman. This last became the Atabeg of the Seljuq prince Dāwūd b. Maḥmūd II, and supported him during his brief bid for the sultanate (see above, no. 91, 1). In the later decades of the century, the Aḥmadīlīs were drawn into the complex politics of Azerbaijan, involving the
last Seljuqs, the Eldiguzids and other adjoining powers. Notices in the
chronicles of this localised line of Atabegs are only sporadic, and numismatic
evidence apparently non-existent, so that it is particularly difficult to
reconstruct their chronology and genealogy; but they seem to have held
Maraga until 605/1209 and Rū’īn Diz somewhat longer, and a female
member of the family, Sulāf a Khātūn, was again ruling in these places when
the Mongols sacked Maraga in 618/1221.

EI2 Aḥmadīlīs’ (V. Minorsky); EIr ‘Atābakān-e Maragā’ (K. A. Luther).
C. E. Bosworth, in The Cambridge History of Iran, V, 170–1, 176–9.
The Elgigüzids or Ildegizids were a Turkish Atabeg dynasty who controlled most of Azerbaijan (apart from the region round Marāgha held by another Atabeg line, the Aḥmadīlīs: see above, no. 98), Arrān and northern Jibāl during the second half of the twelfth century when the Great Seljuq sultanate of western Persia and Iraq was in full decay and unable to prevent the growth of virtually independent powers in the provinces.

Eldigüz (the Arabic-Persian sources write 'y.l.d.k.z, but Armenian and Georgian transcriptions of the name seem to indicate a rendering like this) was originally a Qipchaq military slave of the Seljuq vizier Simirumī, and then passed to Sultan Masʿūd b. Muḥammad, who made him governor of Arrān. An adroit marriage to the widow of the Seljuq Sultan Ṭoghril II b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 530/c. 1136</td>
<td>Eldigüz, Shams al-Dīn, effectively independent in Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571/1175</td>
<td>Jahān Pahlawān Muḥammad b. Eldigüz, Abū Jaʿfar Nuṣrat al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582/1186</td>
<td>Qızīl Arslan ʿUthmān b. Eldigüz, MuẒaffar al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587/1191</td>
<td>Qutlugh Inanch, stepson of Jahān Pahlawān Muḥammad, in Arrān and then governor of Jibāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587/1191</td>
<td>Abū Bakr b. Jahān Pahlawān Muḥammad, Nuṣrat al-Dīn, from 582/1186 ruler in Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622/1225</td>
<td>Khwārazmian conquest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Muḥammad enabled him to champion the accession to the throne in 556/1161 of her son Arslan (Shāh), of whom he had been *de facto* Atabeg, and during Arslan’s reign the Eldigüzids were the power behind the throne and effectively controlled the Great Seljuq sultanate. Their territories now stretched as far south as Iṣfahān, in the west to Akhlāṭ and in the north to the borders of Sharwān and Georgia. Sultan Ṭoghrīl III b. Arslan was for many years held in close tutelage by the Eldigüzids, who at one point claimed the sultanate for themselves, until in 587/1191 he turned the tables on Qutlugh Inanch and was able to pursue an independent policy for the last three years of his life.

In their last phase, the Eldigüzids were once more local rulers in Azerbaijan and eastern Transcaucasia, hard pressed by the aggressive Georgians, and they did not survive the troubled early decades of the thirteenth century. They continued for a while to rule in Azerbaijan, and managed to overthrow their rivals the ʿĀḥmadīlīs, but could not withstand the superior élan of the Khwārazm Shāhs, and in 622/1225 Jalāl al-Dīn Mengübirtī finally deposed Özbeg b. Jahān Pahlawān Muḥammad. The historical significance of these Atabegs thus lies in their firm control over most of north-western Persia during the later Seljuq period and also in their role in Transcaucasia as champions of Islam against the resurgent Bagratid Georgian kings.

Justi, 461; Lane-Poole, 171; Zambaur, 231; Album, 41–2.

EI² ‘Ildeñizids or Eldigüzids’ (C. E. Bosworth); EIr ‘Atābakān-e Ādarbayjān’ (K. A. Luther).


THE BĀDŪSPĀNIDS

1. The rulers of the united principality

∅ ? Naṣr b. Şahrīwash (Shahrnūsh), Sharaf al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dawla, ruling in 502/1109
∅ ? Şahrīwash b. Hazārasp, ruling c. 553/1168
∅ ? Kay Kāwūs b. Hazārasp, d. c. 580/c. 1184

610–20/1213–23
610–20/1213–23
∅ ? Bīsutūn b. Zarrīn Kamar, d. 620/1223

∅ c. 580–1/c. 1184–5
∅ c. 580–1/c. 1184–5
∅ Hazārasp b. Şahrīwash

640/1242
640/1242
640/1242
640/1242
∅ Ardashīr b. Nāmāwar, Ḥusām al-Dawla, in Daylam, d. 640/1242
∅ Iskandar b. Nāmāwar, in Rūyān
∅ Shahrāgīm b. Nāmāwar, in Daylam and Rūyān, d. 671/1273
∅ Nāmāwar Shāh Ghāzī b. Shahrāgīm, Fakhr al-Dawla
∅ 701/1302 Kay Khusraw b. Shahrāgīm
∅ 712/1312 Muḥammad b. Kay Khusraw, Shams al-Mulūk
∅ 717/1317 Shahriyār b. Kay Khusraw, Nāṣir al-Dīn
∅ 725/1325 Ziyār b. Kay Khusraw, Tāj al-Dawla
734/1334  Iskandar b. Ziyār, Jalāl al-Dawla
761/1360  Shāh Ghāzī b. Ziyār, Fakhr al-Dawla
781/1379  Qubād b. Shāh Ghāzī, ‘Aḍud al-Dawla, d. 783/1381

783–92/1381–90  Rule in Rūyān by the Marʿashī Sayyids
792/1390  Ṭūs b. Ziyār, Saʿd al-Dawla, d. 796/1394

857/1453  Division of the kingdom into two branches

2. The rulers in Kujūr (with the title of Malik)

c. 858/c. 1454  Iskandar b. Kayūmarth
881/1476  Tāj al-Dawla b. Iskandar
897/1492  Ashraf b. Tāj al-Dawla
915/1509  Kāwūs b. Ashraf
950/1543  Kayūmarth b. Kāwūs
963/1556  Jahāngīr b. Kāwūs
975/1568  Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Jahāngīr
998–1004 or 1006/
1590–1596 or 1598  Direct rule by the Ṣafawids

3. The rulers in Nūr (with the title of Malik)

c. 858/c. 1454  Kāwūs b. Kayūmarth
871/1467  Jahāngīr b. Kāwūs
904/1499  Bīsutūn b. Jahāngīr
913/1507  Bahman b. Bīsutūn
957/1550  Kayūmarth b. Bahman, d. after 984/1576
?  Sulṭān ‘Azīz b. Kayūmarth
?–1002/?–1594  Jahāngīr b. ‘Azīz
1002/1594  Power assumed by the Ṣafawids
The line of the Bādūspānids in the Caspian region claimed a connection, which cannot however be demonstrated with any certainty, with earlier rulers of Rūyān; these last had asserted their descent from the semi-legendary Bādūspān, a contemporary of the Dābūyids of Gīlān (see above, no. 79), hence going back to late Sāsānid times. The Bādūspānids, who are known from the late eleventh century onwards, bore the historic, local title of Ustāndār, and later that of Malik or king, but they seem to have been unconnected with the immediately preceding line of Ustāndārs. They first appear as vassals of the Seljuqs, and within the Caspian region they were neighbours and kinsmen by marriage of the Bāwandids (see above, no. 80) and other petty rulers there, including, latterly, the Marʿashī Sayyids of Māzandarān. They survived the Mongols and Tīmūrids, but after the mid-fifteenth century they split into two parallel branches, ruling in Kujūr and Nūr respectively, until their lands were incorporated by Shāh ʿAbbās I into the Ṣafawīd empire.

Justi, 433–5; Sachau, 8–9 nos 8–10; Zambaur, 190–1, both these latter being unreliable. *EI* 2 ʿBādūsbānīds’ (B. Nikitine); *EIr* ʿBādūspānīds’ (W. Madelung), the most reliable account, on which the above is based.

Various mountainous regions of Persia, with their main centre at Alamūt

483/1090  Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ (al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. al-Ṣabbāḥ), Fāṭimid and then Nizārī dāʿī in northern and western Persia

518/1124  Kiyā Buzurg Ummīd b. Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ

532/1138  Muḥammad I b. Kiyā Buzurg Ummīd

557/1162  Ḥasan II b. Muḥammad I, ‘Alā Dhikrihi ’1-Salām

561/1166  Muḥammad II b. Ḥasan II, Nūr al-Dīn

607/1210  Ḥasan III b. Muḥammad II, Jalāl al-Dīn

618/1221  Muḥammad III b. Ḥasan III, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn


654/1256  Mongol capture of Alamūt

As noted above concerning the Syrian Ismāʿīlīs (no. 29), the Nizārī daʿwa arose from a split within the Fāṭimid caliphate. Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ had already been spreading Ismāʿīlī teachings in Persia before the death of the caliph al-Mustanṣir in 487/1094 and the al-Mustaʿli-Nizār split over succession to the imamate of the Ismāʿīlīs. The Persian devotees acknowledged Nizār, and Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ became their leader with the title, in the absence of the Imām, of Ḥujja ‘Proof, demonstration of the truth’. Ḥasan secured the mountain fortress of Alamūt in Daylam, in north-western Persia, where there
was a long tradition of heterodoxy and sympathy for Shi‘ism. From here, Ḥasan also organised the Syrian da‘wa (see above, no. 29), and within Persia, from the Caspian region fortresses and those in the Iṣfahān region, a series of attacks on the Great Seljuq state. Given the comparatively small numbers of the Ismā‘īlīs, these were necessarily more like guerilla actions than full-scale campaigns, and the weapon of religious and political assassination was also used, creating an atmosphere of fear and suspicion within orthodox Sunnī circles which almost certainly exaggerated the real power of the Ismā‘īlīs. Hence these last became in the popular mind the so-called Assassins of the Crusader sources (<Ḥashīshiyūn or Ḥashshāshūn ‘hashish eaters’, reflecting a belief that the Ismā‘īlī agents were inspired to their daring feats of assassination through the use of hallucinatory drugs).

The Fourth Grand Master in Alamūt, Ḥasan II, assumed the more exalted religious function of Imām, but in the thirteenth century Ismā‘īlī extremism began to moderate somewhat, and the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Nāṣir secured a great propaganda success in the contemporary Sunnī world by achieving the return of Ḥasan III to orthodoxy. However, the last Grand Master, Khwurshāh, was unable to withstand Hülegü’s Mongols; Alamūt was stormed in 654/1256 and Khwurshāh seems to have been killed by the victors. Ismā‘īlism survived in some of the remoter parts of Persia in a modest and diminished fashion, but the history of the continuing imamate in Persia is very obscure until the eighteenth century.

Justi, 457; Sachau, 15 no. 26; Zambaur, 217–18 (inaccurate); Album, 42.
EI² ‘Ismā‘īliyya’ (W. Madelung).
Farhad Daftary, The Isma‘īlīs: Their History and Doctrines, 324–434, with a table at p. 553.
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THE HAZĀRASPIDS
543–827/1148–1424
Luristān

543–56/1148–61 Abū Ṭāhir (? b. ‘Alī) b. Muḥammad, d. 556/1161
626/1229 or 650/1252 ⌜rulers if the earlier date
before 655/before ⌜for their father’s death
1257 is correct
159/1257 Tekele or Degele b. Hazārasp, killed c. 657/c. 1259
159/1257 C. 657/c. 1259 Alp Arghu(n) b. Hazārasp, Shams al-Dīn
673/1274 Yusuf Shāh I b. Alp Arghu(n)
696/1296 Afrāsiyāb I b. Yusuf Shāh I, d. 695/1296
696/1296 Aḥmad b. Alp Arghu(n), Nuṣrat al-Dīn
730 or 733/1330 or 1333 Yusuf Shāh II b. Aḥmad, Rukn al-Dīn
740/1339 Afrāsiyāb II Aḥmad b. Yusuf Shāh II (or b. Aḥmad),
756/1355 Muẓaffar al-Dīn
756/1355 Nawr al-Ward b. Afrāsiyāb II
756/1355 Pashang b. ? Yusuf Shāh II, Shams al-Dīn
780/1378 Pīr Aḥmad b. Pashang, challenged early in his reign by
his brother Hūshang
811/1408 Abū Saʿīd b. Pīr Aḥmad
820/c. 1417 Shāh Ḥusayn b. Abī Saʿīd
This line of the so-called Atabegs of Luristān ruled in Lur-i Buzurg, namely the eastern and southern parts of Luristān in western Persia from a centre at Īdhaj or Mālamīr. They were ultimately of Kurdish stock, and the founder Abū Ṭāhir traced his ancestry back to the Shabānkāra’ī chief Faḍlūya of early Seljuq times. Abū Ṭāhir himself was a commander of the Salghurid Atabegs of Fars (see below, no. 103) who eventually made himself independent in Luristān of his masters, extended his territories almost as far east as Iṣfahān and assumed the by that time prestigious Turkish title of Atabeg. Subsequent Hazāraspids ruled under the aegis of the Il Khānids, to whose army they had at times to send troops, but were later involved in the civil wars of the Muẓaffārids of Fars (see below, no. 140). When Tīmūr overran this region of south-western Persia, he confirmed them in power, but his grandson Ibrāhīm b. Shāh Rukh ended their power in 827/1424.

It should be further noted that another line of Lurī so-called Atabegs ruled in Lur-i Kūchik, that is northern and western Luristān, from the later twelfth century until the time of the Ṣafawid Shāh ‘Abbās I.

Justi, 460–1; Lane-Poole, 174–5; Zambaur, 234–5.
The Atabeg dynasty of the Salghurids ruled in Fars for over a century as vassals first of the Seljuqs and then, in the thirteenth century, of the Khwārazm Shāhs and Mongols. They were of Türkmen origin, possibly from the Salur or Salghur tribe which had formed part of the Oghuz and which had come westwards at the time of the Seljuq invasions, playing a significant part in the establishment of the Sultanate of Rūm (see below, no. 107). The founder of the Fars line, Sunqur, took advantage of the warfare and disputes which disturbed the reign of the Great Seljuq sultan Masʿūd b. Muḥammad in 543/1148–681/1282. The Salghurids, 543–681/1148–1282, Fars  

\[543/1148\] Sunqur b. Mawdūd, Muẓaffar al-Dīn  

\[556/1161\] Zangī b. Mawdūd, Muẓaffar al-Dīn  

\[570/1175\] or \[574/1178\] Tekele or Degele b. Zangī  

\[594/1198\] Saʿd I b. Zangī, Abū Shujāʿ Muẓaffar al-Dīn  

\[623/1126\] Qutlugh Khān b. Saʿd I, Abū Bakr Muẓaffar al-Dīn  

\[658/1260\] Saʿd II b. Qutlugh Khān, Muẓaffar al-Dīn  

\[658/1260\] Muḥammad b. Saʿd II, ‘Aḍud al-Dīn  

\[661/1262\] Muḥammad Shāh b. Salghur Shāh b. Saʿd I, Muẓaffar al-Dīn  

\[661/1262\] Seljuq Shāh b. Salghur Shāh, Muẓaffar al-Dīn  

\[662/1263\] Ābish Khātūn b. Saʿd II, Muẓaffar al-Dīn  

\[663–81/1264–82\] Ābish Khātūn and her husband Mengü Temür b. Hülegü, jointly  

\[681/1282\] Direct Il Khānid rule
order to consolidate his position in southern Persia, after Fars had already been under the control of another Turkish Atabeg, Boz Aba. With the decline of the Great Seljuqs, the Salghurids could then enjoy uninterrupted possession of Fars, campaigning against the local Shabānkāra’ī Kurds and intervening in succession disputes among the neighbouring, last Kirman Seljuqs (see above, no. 91, 3).

Fars enjoyed considerable prosperity under Saʿd I b. Zangī, although he had latterly to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Khwārazm Shāhs and to link his family with them by means of marriage alliances. The Persian writer Saʿdī dedicated his Bustān and Gulistān to Saʿd I and his short-reigning son Saʿd II respectively, and it was from the latter that he derived his pen-name. In the reign of Saʿd I’s son and successor Abū Bakr, Fars came under the suzerainty of the Mongol Great Khān Ögedey and then under that of the Il Khānid Hülegū (see below, no. 133), and it was from the Mongols that Abū Bakr acquired his title of Qutlugh Khān. After a series of ephemeral Salghurids, Saʿd II’s daughter Ābish Khātūn was made Atabeg of Fars by Hülegū, with her husband, the II Khān’s son Mengü Temür, taking over de facto power shortly afterwards, until Salghurid power was ended completely at Mengü Temūr’s death and Fars was incorporated directly into the Il Khānid realm.

Justi, 460; Lane-Poole, 172–3; Zambaur, 232; Album, 42.  
EI² ‘Salghurids’ (C. E. Bosworth); EIir ‘Atābakān-e Fārs’ (B. Spuler).  
B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, 4th edn, 117–21.  
Erdoğan Merçil, Fars Atabegleri Salgurlular, Ankara 1975, with a genealogical table at p. 146.
This line of local rulers in the central Persian town of Yazd succeeded the branch of the Kākūyids there (see above, no. 78). From the names of their earlier members at least, it seems that they were ethnically Persian, but, like the Hazāraspids (see above, no. 102), they adopted the Turkish title of Atabeg. This came about because the Great Seljuq sultan Sanjar appointed the founder of the line, Sām b. Wardānrūz, Atabeg to the daughters of the deceased last Kākūyd, Abū Kalījār Garshāsp II, in c. 536/c. 1141. Sām’s successors were at first vassals of the Seljuqs and then, in the next
century, tributary to the Mongols; the Atabeg Ṭogha(n) Shāh b. Salghur Shāh had to send troops to the Mongol army attacking Alamūt and other Ismā’īlī fortresses of northern Persia in 654/1256. The penultimate Atabeg, Yūsuf Shāh, fell into arrears of tribute, and had to flee to Sistan before an army sent out by the I1 Khānid Ghazan, after which a Mongol darugha or police commander was appointed over Yazd. A son of his was reappointed over Yazd in c. 715/c. 1315, but was overthrown three years later by local rivals and the town soon afterwards passed under the control of the MuẒaffarīdīs (see below, no. 140) as vassals of the I1 Khānīds.

Sachau, 27 no. 66; Zambaur, 231.
EIr ‘Atābakān-e Yazd’ (S. C. Fairbanks).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619/1222</td>
<td>Baraq Ḥājib b. K.l.d.z, Abu ’1-Fawāris Qutlugh Sulṭān, Nāṣir al-Dunya wa ’1-Dīn</td>
<td>Kirman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632/1235</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. ? Khamītūn, Abu ’1-Fatḥ Quṭb al-Dīn, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633/1236</td>
<td>Mubārak b. Baraq, Rukn al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650/1252</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. ? Khamītūn, second reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655/1257</td>
<td>Qutlugh Terken, Quṭb al-Dīn II ‘Īṣmat al-Dunyā wa ’1-Dīn, regent for Muḥammad b. ? Khamītūn’s son Ḥajjāj Sulṭān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681/1282</td>
<td>Soyurghatmīsh b. Muḥammad, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Jalāl al-Dīn, killed 693/1294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691/1292</td>
<td>Pādishāh Khātūn bt. Muḥammad, Safwat al-Dīn, killed 694/1295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695/1296</td>
<td>Muḥammad Shāh Sulṭān b. Ḥajjāj Sulṭān, Abu ’l-Ḥārith Muẓaffar al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703/1304</td>
<td>Shāh Jahān b. Soyurghatmīsh, Quṭb al-Dīn, deposed 704/1305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706/1306</td>
<td>Mongol governor appointed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These local rulers in Kirman sprang from a commander in the service of the Buddhist Qara Khitay, who had migrated from the northern fringes of the Chinese empire and had overrun Transoxania in the mid-twelfth century (see above, no. 90). This founder of the Qutlughkhānid line, Baraq, whose title of Qutlugh Sulṭān was bestowed on him by the ‘Abbāsid caliph, had in fact only recently been converted to Islam. He was awarded Kirman, and this became
the centre of the line’s power for nearly a century. His kinsmen and successors were closely connected with the Mongols, serving them in their far-flung empire and latterly governing Kirman as vassals of the Il Khānids. Notable is the role among them of two forceful women, the regent Qutlugh Terken and Pādishāh Khātūn. The last Qutlughkhānid, Shāh Jahān b. Soyurghatmīsh, fell into arrears with the tribute due to the Il Khānids, and was deposed by Öljeytū. His daughter later married Mubāriz al-Dīn Muḥammad, the real founder of Muẓaffarid power in Fars (see below, no. 140), who subsequently took possession of Kirman.

Lane-Poole, 179–80; Zambaur, 237.
EI² ‘Kirmān. History’ (A. K. S. Lambton); ‘Kutlugh-Khānids’ (V. Minorsky).
THE MALIKS OF NĪMRŪZ
421–c. 949/1030–c. 1542
Sistan

1. The Naṣrids

421–2/1030–1,
425–7/1034–6,
429–65/1038–73
    Naṣr b. Aḥmad, Abu ’l-Faḍl Tāj al-Dīn I
    465/1073  Ṣāḥib b. Naṣr Tāj al-Dīn I, Bahā’ al-Dawla
    480/1088  Abu ’l-‘Abbās b. Naṣr Tāj al-Dīn I, Badr al-Dawla
    482/1090  Khalaf b. Naṣr Tāj al-Dīn I, Bahā’ al-Dawla
∅ 499/1106  Naṣr b. Khalaf, Abu ’l-Faḍl Tāj al-Dīn II
∅ 559/1164  Muḥammad or Aḥmad b. Naṣr Tāj al-Dīn II, Shams al-Dīn
∅ 564/1169  Ḥarb b. Muḥammad ‘Īzz al-Mulūk b. Naṣr, Tāj al-Dīn III
    610/1213  Bahrām Shāh b. Ḥarb Tāj al-Dīn III, Yamīn al-Dīn
∅ 618–  Nuṣrat or Naṣr b. Bahrām Shāh Yamīn al-Dīn, Tāj al-Dīn
19/1221–2  IV
    618/1221  Maḥmūd b. Ḥarb Tāj al-Dīn III, Shihāb al-Dīn
∅ 618–  Maḥmūd b. Bahrām Shāh Yamīn al-Dīn, Rukn al-Dīn
19/1221–2
∅ 619/1222  ‘Alī b. Ḥarb Tāj al-Dīn III, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar
    620/1223  Aḥmad b. ʿUthmān Nāṣir al-Dīn b. Ḥarb Tāj al-Dīn III,
        ‘Alā’ al-Dīn
    622/1225  ʿUthmān Shāh b. ʿUthmān Nāṣir al-Dīn
2. The Mihrabānids


653/1255 Muḥammad b. Abī 'l-Fath Mubāriz al-Dīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn

718/1318 Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, Nuṣrat al-Dīn

731/1330 Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd Rukn al-Dīn, Quṭb al-Dīn I

747/1346 Tāj al-Dīn b. Muḥammad Quṭb al-Dīn I

751/1350 Maḥmūd b. Maḥmūd Rukn al-Dīn, Jalāl al-Dīn

753/1352 ‘Īzz al-Dīn Karmān b. Maḥmūd Rukn al-Dīn

782/1380 Quṭb al-Dīn II b. ‘Īzz al-Dīn

788/1386 Shāh-i Shāhān Abu ‘l-Faṭḥ b. Maṣʿūd Shīhna, Tāj al-Dīn

806/1404 Muḥammad b. ‘Alī Shams al-Dīn, Quṭb al-Dīn III

822/1419 ‘Alī b. Muḥammad Quṭb al-Dīn III, Shams al-Dīn or ‘Alā’ al-Dīn

842/1438 Yaḥyā b. ‘Alī Shams al-Dīn or ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Niẓām al-Dīn, d. 885/1480


? 900/1495 or 906/1501 Sulṭān Maḥmūd b. Yaḥyā Niẓām al-Dīn, d. in Shāh Ṭahmāsp I Șafawī’s reign, possibly as late as 949/1542

Incorporation of Sīstān into the Șafawid realm

Zambaur considered that these Maliks of Nīmrūz (an ancient name for Sistan which was revived and became increasingly used at this time) formed third and fourth lines of the earlier Șaffārids (see above, no. 84). However, the anonymous author of the almost contemporary local history, the Taʾrīkh-i Sīstān, considered that the true Șaffārids came to an end with the Ghaznawid occupation of his province in 993/1003. From the pages of his continuator(s) and from those of the other, later, local history of Sistan, Malik Shāh Ḩusayn’s Iḥyāʾ al-mulūk, it is clear that we are now dealing with two entirely separate lines of Maliks, the Naṣrids and the Mihrabānids, with no apparent connections with earlier rulers; both must have stemmed from the local
landowning families of Sistan.

The Naṣrids rose to power as discontent in Sistan with alien Ghaznavid rule increased in the early decades of the eleventh century. Content with only a local authority, the Naṣrids skilfully exchanged Ghaznavid suzerainty for that of the incoming Seljuqs, and during the twelfth century the Maliks at times provided troop contingents for the Seljuq armies. They also managed to ward off incursions by the Ismāʿīlīs of neighbouring Quhistān. To Tāj al-Dīn II Abu ’1-Faḍl Naṣr is attributed the building of the fairly recently-collapsed Mīl-i Qāsimābād in Sīstān. Towards the end of the twelfth century, Sistan fell under the shadow of the Ghūrids (see below, no. 159), then in the early thirteenth century briefly under that of the Khwārazm Shāhs, but the appearance of the Mongols in Sistan in 619/1222 and the resultant destruction there spelt the end for the Naṣrids.

The first Mihrabānīds were vassals of the Mongol Great Khāns and then of the Il Khānīds, whose protection, in return for tribute, they needed against the expansionist policies of the Kart Maliks of Herat (see below, no. 139) and against the depredations of anarchic, plundering bands of Turco-Mongol freebooters, such as the Negūders or Nīkūdārīs. The Mihrabānīds were, in any case, rarely free from internal challenges by members of rival leading families of Sistan. For these Maliks, the Iḥyāʾ al-mulūk (see above) becomes virtually the only source after c. 718/c. 1318, for Sistan now began to sink into the obscurity and the social and economic decline which have characterised it until recent times. This decay was aggravated by the ravages at the end of the fourteenth century of Tīmūr and his troops, with devastation to Sistan’s irrigation system. The province was tributary to the Tīmūrids of Herat and then under pressure from the Aq Qoyunlu (see below, no. 146), and finally passed into the Ṣafawīd orbit. The last decades of the Mihrabānīds are obscure, but the increased threat to the Ṣafawīds’ eastern frontiers from the Özbegs seems to have persuaded Shāh Ṭahmāsp I to appoint his own Qīzīl Bash amīrs over Sistan. Because of the paucity of source material, both literary and numismatic, much in the succession and genealogical connections of the Mihrabānīds still remains obscure.

Justi, 439 (the Naṣrids only); Zambaur, 200–1 (sketchy and unreliable); Album, 50.
EI² ‘Sīstān’ (C. E. Bosworth).
TWELVE
The Turks in Anatolia

107
THE SELJUQS OF RÜM
473–707/1081–1307

Originally in west-central Anatolia, with their capital at Konya; later, in most of Anatolia except the western fringes

473/1081 Sulaymān b. Qutalmīsh (Qutlumush) b. Arslan Yabghu
(478/1086 Alp Arslan b. Sulaymān, in Nicaea)
485/1092 Qīlīch Arslan I b. Sulaymān, in Nicaea, k. 500/1107
502/1109 Malik Shāh or Shāhānshāh b. Qīlīch Arslan I, in Malatya
⊘ Masʿūd I b. Qīlīch Arslan I, Rukn al-Dīn, in Konya
510/1116 Qīlīch Arslan II b. Masʿūd I, ʿIzz al-Dīn, c. 581/c. 1185
551/1156 divided his kingdom among his ten sons
⊘ Kay Khusraw I b. Qīlīch Arslan II, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, first reign
588/1192
⊘ Sulaymān II b. Qīlīch Arslan II, Rukn al-Dīn
593/1197
⊘ Qīlīch Arslan III b. Sulaymān II, ʿIzz al-Dīn
600/1204 Kay Khusraw I, second reign
601/1205
⊘ Kay Kāwūs I b. Kay Khusraw I, ʿIzz al-Dīn
608/1211
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>634/1237</td>
<td>Kay Khusraw II b. Kay Qubādh I, Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663/1265</td>
<td>Kay Khusraw III b. Qilīch Arslan IV, Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681/1282</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd II b. Kay Kāwūs II, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683/1284</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd II, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692/1293</td>
<td>Kay Qubādh III, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693/1294</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd II, third reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700/1301</td>
<td>Kay Qubādh III, third reign, k. 702/1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702/1303</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd II, fourth reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707/1307</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd III b. Kay Qubādh III, Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707/1307</td>
<td>Mongol domination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soon after the Great Seljuq sultan Alp Arslan’s victory over the Byzantine emperor at Mantzikert, we hear of the activities in Anatolia of the four sons of another member of the Seljuq family, Qutalmişh or Qutlumush, and it was the descendants of one of these sons, Sulaymān, who were to establish a local...
Seljuq sultanate in Anatolia based on Iconium or Konya. Sulaymān reached Nicaea or Iznik in the far north-west of Asia Minor, but the emergent Byzantine dynasty of the Comneni, aided by the First Crusaders, began to re-establish the Greek position in the west, and the seat of the Seljuq sultanate was eventually fixed at Konya in west-central Anatolia as the capital of what was for long to remain a landlocked principality. Sulaymān’s son Qīlīch Arslan I had ambitions in Diyār Bakr and Jazīra, but after his death his successors were left alone in Anatolia by the Great Seljuqs further to the east. The Little Armenian kingdom of Cilicia and the Franks in the county of Edessa were now attacked, and, from their base at Konya, Mas‘ūd I and Qīlīch Arslan II gained the preponderance over the rival amirate of the Dānishmendids (see below, no. 108). A Byzantine attack on Konya was avenged by Qīlīch Arslan II’s victory over the Greeks in 572/1176 at Myriocephalon near Lake Eğridir, after which the latter’s hopes of reconquering Anatolia faded; but in his old age, the sultan lost control over his sons, his territories became fragmented and in 586/1190 the emperor Frederick Barbarossa and the Third Crusaders temporarily occupied Konya.

The Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 afforded the Seljuqs an opportunity to re-establish their power. From being essentially a power of the Anatolian interior, they extended to the Mediterranean, and the port of Alanya or ‘Alā’īyya (thus named after ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kay Qubādh I) was constructed. With this and the northern coastlands in Turkish hands, a flourishing transit trade between Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean, across Anatolia to the Black Sea, the Crimea and the lands of the Mongol Golden Horde (see below, no. 129), grew up after c. 1225, and commercial relations were begun with the Italian trading cities. The internal prosperity of the Rūm sultanate in these decades is shown by the architectural and cultural glories of Konya and other parts of Anatolia at this time. Thereafter, decline set in, with internal discontent marked by the rebellion of a charismatic dervish leader, Baba Ishāq, in 638/1240; and, when the Mongols invaded eastern Anatolia, the Seljuqs were defeated at Köse Dagh to the east of Sivas in 641/1243. Thereafter, the Rūm sultanate became a client, tribute-paying state of the Mongol Il Khāns (see below, no. 128). After 676/1277, Mongol governors took direct control. The names of the Seljuqs continued to appear on coins up to 702/1303, but they had no real authority; the last ones may have reigned in Alanya, where Ottoman chronicles mention a Seljuq descendant in the fifteenth century. A new period in the history of Anatolia begins after
707/1307, one of fragmentation into a series of petty principalities or *beyliks* (see below, nos 106–24).

Lane-Poole, 155; Sachau, 16 no. 30; Khalīl Ed’hem, 216–17, 219; Zambaur, 143–4; Album, 29.

EI²‘Saljūḵids. III. 5, IV. 2, V. 2, VII. 2’ (C. E. Bosworth).


### The Dānishmandids

**Before 490–573/before 1097–1178**

*Originally in north-central Anatolia, later also in eastern Anatolia*

1. The line in Sivas ?–570/?–1175

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>497/1104</td>
<td>Dānishmand Ghāzī, first mentioned in 490/1097, d. 497/1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529/1134</td>
<td>Amīr Ghāzī Gümüşhtigin b. Dānishmand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536/1142</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. Amīr Ghāzī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537/1142</td>
<td>Dhu ’l-Nūn b. Muḥammad, ‘Imād al-Dīn, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538/1142</td>
<td>Malik Yaghībasan b. Amīr Ghāzī Gümüşhtigin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559/1164</td>
<td>Malik Mujāhid Ghāzī b. Yaghībasan, Abu ’l-Maḥāmid Jamāl al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562/1166</td>
<td>Malik Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad, Shams al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562/1166</td>
<td>Malik Ismāʿīl b. Ibrāhīm, Shams al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567–70/1172–4</td>
<td>Malik Dhu ’l-Nūn b. Muḥammad, now with the title Nāṣir al-Dīn, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570/1174</td>
<td><em>Conquest by the Seljuqs of Rūm</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The line in Malatya and Elbistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 537/c. 1142</td>
<td>Ismāʿīl b. Amīr Ghāzī Gümüşhtigin, ‘Ayn al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The centre of power of the Dānishmendids was originally in north-central Anatolia and Cappadocia, as far west as Ankara and around such centres as Tokat, Amasya and Sivas; they thus controlled the northerly route of Türkmen penetration across Asia Minor, while the Seljuqs of Rûm controlled the more southerly one. The Turkmen founder Dānishmend (Persian, ‘wise, learned man, scholar’) is an obscure figure who appears as a ghāzī or fighter for the faith in Anatolia, clashing in Cappadocia with the First Crusaders but also, in some degree, as a rival to the Seljuq Qïlïch Arslan I. He is the central figure of an epic romance, the Dānishmend-nāme, a mixture of genuine traditions and legendary elements written down over two centuries after the events described in it, in which he is identified with the earlier Arab frontier warrior of Malatya, Sîdî Baṭṭāl. It is accordingly difficult to disentangle fact from fiction in the elucidation of Dānishmendid origins. The Dānishmendids were at least as powerful as the Seljuqs in the early twelfth century, and Amīr Ghâzî Gümüşhtigin fought the Armenians in Cilicia and the Franks in the County of Edessa, and in 521/1127 captured Kayseri and Ankara; because of his warfare against the Christians, the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Mustarshid bestowed on him the title of Malik ‘king’, making the Amīr a legitimate Muslim sovereign prince.

However, internal disputes among the sons and brothers of the dead Malik Muḥammad brought disunity, and after 536/1142 the Dānishmendid dominions were in effect partitioned between Yaghībāsan in Sivas, his brother ‘Ayn al-Dawla Ismāʿīl in Malatya and Elbistan and Dhu ’l-Nūn in Kayseri. After Yaghībāsan’s death, the Seljuq Qïlïch Arslan II intervened several times in the affairs of the Sivas branch, finally killing Dhu ’l-Nūn in 570/1174 and seizing his lands. At Malatya, the last Dānishmendid Muḥammad had to reign as a Seljuq vassal until Qïlïch Arslan II took over there himself in 573/1178; according to the historian Ibn Bībī, the surviving Dānishmendids entered the service of the Seljuqs.
Justi, 455; Lane-Poole, 156 (both very fragmentary); Sachau, 15 no. 27; Khalîl Ed’hem, 220–3; Zambaur, 146–7; Album, 29.

EI² ‘Dânishmendids’ (Irène Mélikoff); İA ‘Dânîşmendliler’ (M. H. Yınanç), with a genealogical table.

CI. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, 82–103.
O. Turan, Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye, 112–90.
THE MENGÜJEKIDS
Before 512 to mid-seventh century/before 1118 to mid-thirteenth century
Northern Anatolia, with centres at Erzincan, Divriği and Kemakh

? Mengüjek Aḥmad, in Kemakh
before 512/before 1118  Isḥāq b. Mengüjek

\*c. 536/c. 1142 Division of the Mengüjekid territories

1. The line in Erzincan and Kemakh

c. 536/c. 1142 Dāwūd I b. Isḥāq
Ø 560/1165 Bahrām Shāh b. Dāwūd, al-Malik al-Saʿīd Fakhr al-Dīn
625/1228 Assumption of control by the Seljuqs of Rūm

2. The line in Divriği

c. 536/c. 1142 Sulaymān I b. Isḥāq
Ø by 570/by 1175 Shāhānshāh b. Sulaymān, Abu ʾl-Muẓaffar Sayf al-Dīn
625/1228 Sulaymān II b. Shāhānshāh

Ø by 570/by 1175 Shāhānshāh b. Sulaymān, Abu ʾl-Muẓaffar Sayf al-Dīn

c. 593/c.1197 Sulaymān II b. Shāhānshāh

626/c. 1229 Aḥmad b. Sulaymān II, Abu ʾl-Muẓaffar Ḥusām al-Dīn

after 640/after 1242 Malik Shāh b. Aḥmad, ruling in 650/1252

Conquest by the Seljuqs of Rūm

This obscure ghāzī dynasty is not heard of until 512/1118, when Isḥāq b. Mengüjek, a relative by marriage of the Dānishmendids (see above, no. 108),
menaced Malatya from his fortress at Kemakh near Erzincan. The Mengüjkid principality came to lie between those of the Dānishmendids on the west and of the Saltuqids (see below, no. 110) on the east, and included besides Kemakh and Erzincan the towns of Divriği and Kughūniya or Seben Karahisar. After Ishāq’s death in 536/1142 his possessions were divided, in accordance with the old Turkish patrimonial concepts, between his sons, so that there were thenceforth two branches of the family. Bahrām Shāh of the Erzincan branch made his court there something of a cultural centre, and he was the mamdūḥ or dedicatee of works by the great Persian poets Niẓāmī and Khāqānī, while the rulers in Divriği have left behind there a remarkable mosque. The Mengüjkids clashed with the Rūm Seljuqs, and sought allies in such powers as the Byzantine rulers of Trebizond, but the power of the Konya sultans prevailed, and the last ruler in Erzincan, Dāwūd II, yielded up Erzincan and Kemakh to Kay Qubādh I in 625/128, exchanging them for lands at Akşehir and İlgin. The Divriği branch lasted rather longer and apparently persisted until the middle of the thirteenth century, their end being probably linked with the appearance in eastern Anatolia of the Mongols.


EI² ‘Mengüček’ (Cl. Cahen); İA ‘Mengücükler’ (F. Sümer), with a genealogical table.

O. Turan, Doğu Anadolu Türk devletleri tarihi, 55–79, 242 (list), 278 (genealogical table).
The origins of this family are obscure, but Saltuq was apparently one of the Turkmen commanders operating in Anatolia in the last decades of the eleventh century. His son ‘Alī appears in history controlling a principality based on Erzurum and other towns in the district, including at times Kars (Qarṣ); the Saltuqids were to embellish Erzurum, a flourishing centre of the transit trade across northern Anatolia, with fine buildings. From ‘Alī onwards, these begs enjoyed the title of Malik. The Saltuqids’ main role in the political and military affairs of the time was in warfare with the Georgians, expanding southwards from the time of their king David the Restorer (1089–1125), often as allies of the Shāh-i Armanids (see above, no.
but in a curious episode, Muḥammad b. Saltuq II’s son offered to convert to Christianity in order to marry the celebrated Queen T‘amar of Georgia. The last years of the family are unclear, but in 598/1102 the Rūm Seljuq Sulaymān II, while en route for a campaign against the Georgians, put an end to the Saltuqids; and for some thirty years after this, Erzurum was to be ruled by two Seljuq princes as an appanage before Kay Qubādh I in 627/1230 incorporated it into his sultanate.

EI² ‘Saltuḳ Oghulları’ (G. Leiser).
Cl. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, 106–8.
O. Turan, Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye, 251–4.

This line of Begs established itself in the classical Mysia, namely the coasts and hinterland along the Asian coast of the Dardanelles and along the territory to the south, with centres at Balıkesir and Bergama. A connection of the Qarasî Begs with the Dānishmendids (see above, no. 108) is almost certainly legendary. The family probably constituted their principality in the early fourteenth century, becoming a naval power in the Aegean and the Sea of Marmora, putting pressure on Byzantium across the Dardanelles and thus paving the way for the Ottomans’ crossing into Europe. After annexation by the Ottomans – the first stage in the territorial aggrandisement of that family – at least one Qarasî Beg seems to have retained some power, perhaps as a vassal, since several of the Qarasî commanders rallied to the Ottoman side; but in the absence of any inscriptions, and with few coins, much about this short-lived dynasty remains obscure.

EI² ‘Karasi’ (Cl. Cahen); İA ‘Karasi-Oğulları’ (İ. H. Uzunçarşılı).

The Şarukhān family of begs ruled over the agriculturally rich coastal province of classical Lydia, Şarukhān Beg having conquered Magnesia or Manisa in c. 713/ c. 1313. From there his family became, together with the neighbouring begs of Aydı̇n (see below, no. 113), a naval power in the Aegean, involved with the Genoese and Byzantines, and also, after the middle years of the century, acquiring a common frontier with the Ottomans after the latter’s annexation of the principality of Qarasî (see above, no. 111). The Ottoman Bāyazīd I annexed the Şarukhān principality, but it was restored by Tīmūr immediately after his victory at Ankara in 804/1402 over the sultan, only to be definitively re-annexed by the Ottomans eight years later, after which Manisa became the residence of one of the Ottoman...
princes.


EI² ‘Ṣarūkhān’ (Elizabeth A. Zachariadou); İA ‘Saruhan-Oğulları’ (M. Çağatay Uluçay).
The family of Aydın Oghlu Muḥammad Beg, who had been a commander in the army of the Germiyan Oghullarī (see below, no. 116), had their principality on the coasts and in the hinterland of western Anatolia, the classical Maeonia, with their centre at Aydın or Tralleia, the later Güzel Hisar, a region through which ran the lower course of the Büyük Menderes river. Thus it lay between the amirates of Sharukhan to the north and Menteshe to the south. Umur I Beg captured Izmir or Smyrna and made the Aydın Begs an important naval power against the Latin Christians in the Aegean, so that he became the hero of a destān or epic. The principality was annexed by Bāyazīd I but restored by Tīmūr. The last amīr, Junayd, supported the Ottoman counter-sultan Düzme Muṣṭafā (see below, no. 130),
but was defeated by Murād II, and Aydîn was incorporated into the Ottoman empire.


EI2 ‘Aydin-Oghlu’ (Irène Mélikoff); ĞA ‘Aydîn’ (Besim Darkot and Mükrimin Halil Yınanç).


This family occupied the coasts and hinterland of south-western Anatolia, the classical Caria, with their centres at Milas or Mylasa, Pechin, Balâṭ or Miletus, etc. Menteshe Beg’s father may have been amīr-i sawāḥil or ruler of the coastlands for the later Seljuqs of Rūm, but the family emerges into history only towards the end of the thirteenth century. During the next century, the Menteshe amīrs were involved in maritime and land operations against the Venetians and the Knights Hospitaller in Rhodes, including a struggle over possession of Smyrna. Their principality was taken over by the Ottoman sultan Bāyazīd I after its eastern neighbours, the principalities of the
Germiyān and Ḥamīd Oghulları, had already passed into Ottoman hands, but was restored by Tīmūr. However, Ilyās Beg was forced to recognise the suzerainty of the Ottoman Muḥammad I, and in 827/1424 Murād II finally annexed Menteshe to his empire.

EI² ‘Menteše Oğulları’ (E. Merçil); İA ‘Menteše-Oğulları’ (İ. H. Uzunçarşılı).
İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, Anadolu beylikleri, 70–83.
E. A. Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin.
Deñizli in south-western Anatolia

659/1261 Muḥammad Beg, k. 660/1262
660/1262 ‘Alī Beg, k. 676/1278
675/1277 Occupation by the Şāhib Atā and Germiyān Oghullārī

? Inanj Beg b. ‘Alī, Shujā‘ al-Dīn, ruling in 714/1314, d. after 734/1334
 Ø c. 735/c. 1335 Murād Arslan b. Inanj Beg
 Ø by 761–by 770/
 by 1360–by 1369 İsḥāq Beg b. Murād Arslan
 Ø 2 Rule of the Germiyān Oghullārī

The town of the interior of south-western Anatolia, Lādīq or Ladik, classical Laodicea, in the fourteenth century replaced by the nearby foundation of Toñuzlu/Deñizli, was a frontier post between the amirates of Menteshe and Germiyān. It had passed into Seljuq hands from the Byzantines in 657/1259, and in the following century a local Turkmen beg, Muḥammad, made it the centre of a small beylik. Coming under the control of the Germiyān Oghullārī, it was granted to their kinsman Inanj Beg and held by his descendants for two more generations until the Germiyān Oghullārī took it into their own hands again shortly before their own principality was annexed by the Ottomans in 792/1390.

EI2 ‘Deñizli’ (Mélíkoff).
The Germiyān were originally a Turkish tribe first heard of in the service of the Seljuqs of Rūm at Malatya. But in the late thirteenth century they moved into western Anatolia and founded a beylik based on Kütahya as vassals of the Seljuqs and of the latter’s suzerains the Il Khanids. The decay of the Seljuqs allowed the founder of the Germiyān Oghullarī, Yaʿqūb I, to form the most extensive and powerful Turkish principality of its time in western Anatolia, embracing the greater part of classical Phrygia and taking advantage of the trade routes through the Menderes basin. Also, he exercised suzerainty over neighbouring amīrs, such as those of Aydīn (see above, no. 113), and had the Emperor of Byzantium as his tributary. However, in the second half of the fourteenth century Germiyān was cut off from access to the
Aegean by the growth of the maritime beylik along the coast, and became squeezed between the Ottomans to the north and the Qaramānids to the south-east. The last amīr, Yaʿqūb II, lost his principality to Bāyazīd I in 792/1390, but was restored by Tīmūr after the battle of Ankara; eventually, however, he bequeathed his lands to the Ottomans, so that after his death, Murād II took over Germiyān.

EI² ‘Germiyān-Oghullari’ (Irène Mélikoff); İA ‘Germiyan-Oğulları’ (İ. H. Uzunçarşılı).
The Şāḥib Aṭā Oghullarī ruled a small principality centred on Afyon Karahisar and lying between the beyliks of the Germiyān Oghullarī and the Ḥamīd Oghullarī. They derived their name from the vizier of the Rūm Seljuqs Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī, called Şāḥib Aṭā (d. 687/1288), whose two sons received various march towns, including Kütahya and Akşehir, and then, more permanently, Ladik and Afyon Karahisar. Their descendants were latterly only strong enough to survive under the protection of the Germiyān Oghullarī, who towards the middle of the fourteenth century incorporated their lands into their own beylik.

EI² ‘Şāḥib Aṭā Oghullarī’ (C. H. Imber).
İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, Anadolu beylikleri, 150–2.
Cl. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey.
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THE ḤAMĪD OGHULLARĪ AND THE TEKKE OGHULLARĪ

West-central Anatolia and the south-western coastland

1. The Ḥamīd Oghullarī line in Eğridir

c. 700/c. 1301 Dündār Beg b. Ilyās b. Ḥamīd, Falak al-Dīn
724–8/1324–7 Occupation by the Il Khānid governor Temūr Tash b. Choban
728/1327 Khiḍr Beg b. Dündār
728/1328 Ishāq b. Dündār, Najm al-Dīn
by 745/by 1344 Muṣṭafā b. Muḥammad b. Dundar, Muẓaffar al-Dīn
? Ilyās b. Muṣṭafā, Ḥusām al-Dīn

c. 776–93/c. 1374–91 Ḥusayn b. Ilyās, Kamāl al-Dīn
793/1391 Ottoman annexation

2. The Tekke Oghullarī line in Antalya

721/1321 Yunus b. Ilyās b. Ḥamīd
? Maḥmūd b. Yunus, d. 724/1324
727/1327 Khiḍr b. Yunus, Sinān al-Dīn
by 774/by 1372 Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, Mubāriz al-Dīn, d. after 779/after 1378
? ‘Uthmān (‘Othmān) Chelebi b. Muḥammad, first reign
c. 793/c. 1391 Ottoman annexation
805–26/1402–23 ‘Uthmān Chelebi, second reign
Ilyās b. Ḥamīd was, like his father, a Turkish frontier commander of the Seljuqs, who carved out for himself a principality based on Eğridir in the classical interior region of Pisidia and also in the southern coastal regions of Lydia and Pamphylia, in the latter regions based on Antalya. The Ḥamīd Oghulları thus came to control an important north–south trade route across western Anatolia. Two sons of Ilyās established themselves in the northern Ḥamīd principality and the southern Tekke one respectively. The first was definitively annexed by Bāyazīd I in c. 793/ c. 1391, but Tekke, likewise absorbed by the Ottomans, was restored by Tīmūr, only to be finally ended in 826/1423 when the Ottomans defeated and killed the last ruler, ‘Uthmān Chelebi.

The port of Alanya received its earlier name of ‘Alā’iyya from the Seljuq sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kay Qubādh I, who conquered it in 617/1220. After 692/1293, it was controlled by the Qaramānids (see below, no. 124), whose representatives there bore at times the title of amīr al-sawāḥil ‘commander of the coastlands’, but on one occasion in the later fourteenth century it was controlled by the Lusignan kings of Cyprus. In the early fifteenth century it was for a while in the hands of the Mamlūks of Egypt, then governed by a descendant of the Rūm Seljuqs until in 876/1471 it was conquered by the Ottomans.

EI² ‘Alanya’ (F. Taeschner).
Sulaymān I b. Ashraf (Eshref), Sayf al-Dīn, regent in Konya 684/1285, d. 702/1302

Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, Mubāriz al-Dīn 702/1302

Sulaymān II Shāh b. Muḥammad 720–6/1320–6

Il Khānid annexation 26/1326

Sulaymān Ashraf Oghlu was a commander in the service of the Seljuqs who, in the period of decay of the sultans in Konya, built up a small principality centred on Beyşehir in the classical Pisidia. His successors extended to other towns in the region, such as Akşehir and Bolvadin, but the beylik was brought under Il Khānid obedience by the Mongols’ governor for Anatolia Temür Tash b. Choban, who killed the last ruler in Beyşehir. After Temür Tash’s own death, the lands of the principality were divided between the Ḥamīd Oghullarï and the Qaramānids.


EI² ‘Ashraf Oghullari’ (İ. H. Uzuncaşılı).
The founder of this line of beys, Shams al-Dīn (?) Yaman b. Jāndār, seized power in Kastamonu and held it under the aegis of the Il Khānids, establishing an extensive principality along the Black Sea coastland and in its hinterland, the classical Paphlagonia. After the mid-fourteenth century, the Jāndār Oghullarī threw off Il Khānid suzerainty and extended to Sinop, but lost their territories to the Ottoman sultan Bāyazīd I. The dynasty at this point
also takes its additional name of Isfandiyār (İsfendiyār) Oghulları from one of the beys of the period, Isfandiyār (and in the sixteenth century, the family were to claim the name also of Qızıl Aḥmadlı). Restored by Tīmūr, the principality had nevertheless gradually to cede territory to the Ottomans, and was finally annexed by Muḥammad II. Under subsequent sultans, the Jāndār family were nevertheless to enjoy much favour and power in the state.

EI² ‘Ḳasṭamūnī’ (C. J. Heywood), ‘İsfendiyār Oğlu’ (J. H. Mordtmann†). İ. H. Üzunçarşılı, Anadolu beylikleri, 121–47.
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THE PARWĀNA OGHULLARĪ
676–722/1277–1322

Sinop, on the Black Sea coast

676/1277
Muḥammad b. Sulaymān Muʿīn al-Dīn Parwāna, Muʿīn al-Dīn

696/1297
Masʿūd b. Muḥammad, Muhadhdhib al-Dīn

700–722/1301–1322
Ghāzī Chelebi b. Masʿūd

722/1322
Annexation by the Jāndār Oghullarī

This short-lived line was made up of the descendants of Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān, who had been the virtual ruler in the weakened Seljuq sultanate of Rūm after the Seljuq defeat of Köse Dagh at the hands of the Mongols in 641/1243 (see above, no. 107), his title of Parwāna meaning ‘personal aide to the sultan’. After his execution in 676/1277, his descendants established a small beylik in Sinop and Tokat, in the Black Sea coast and in its hinterland, where the Parwāna had his personal domains, and this existed until after the death in 722/1322, when the last of the line died without male heir and Sinop passed to the Jāndār Oghullarī (see above, no. 121).

Khalīl Ed’hem, 272; Zambaur, 147; Bosworth–Merçil–İpşirli, 316–18.
EI² ‘Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān Parwāna’ (Carole Hillenbrand).
Cl. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, 312–13.
THE CHOBĀN OGHULLARĪ

by c. 624/c. 1227

Chobān, Husām al-Dīn

? Alp Yūrūk b. Chobān, Ḥusām al-Dīn

before 679/1280

Yülük Arslan b. Alp Yūrūk, Muẓaffar al-Dīn

691–c. 709/1292–c. 1309

Maḥmūd b. Yülük Arslan, Nāṣir al-Dīn

Annexation by the Jāndār Oghullarī

c. 709/c. 1309

Chobān, apparently from the Qayī tribe of the Oghuz, was a commander in the service of the Seljuqs who became governor of Kastamonu, probably from 608/1211 onwards, and was entrusted by ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kay Qubādh I with command of an expedition against the Crimea in 622/1225. His successors seem to have enjoyed a sporadic and limited authority in Kastamonu under Seljuq and then Il Khānid suzerainty, the latter exercised through their representative Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān Parwāna (see above, no. 122), but the region eventually passed to the Jāndār Oghullarī (see above, no. 121).

EI² ‘Ḳasṭamūnī’ (C. J. Heywood).
Cl. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, 243–4, 310–12.
c. 654/c. 1256 Qaramān b. Nūr al-Dīn or Nūra Şūfī
660/1261 Muḥammad I b. Qaramān, Shams al-Dīn
677/1278 Güneri Beg b. Qaramān, with Maḥmūd b. Qaramān as his subordinate ruler
699/1300 Maḥmūd b. Qaramān, Badr al-Dīn
707/1307 Yakhshī b. Maḥmūd
Ibrāhīm I b. Maḥmūd, Badr al-Dīn, vassal of the
between
745/1344
and 750/1349 Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm I, Fakhr al-Dīn, d. by 750/1349
Ø by 750/by 1349
753/1352 Sulaymān b. Khalīl b. Maḥmūd b. Qaramān
800/1398 Ottoman annexation
Ø 804/1402 Muḥammad II b. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, first reign
Ø 822/1421 Muḥammad II, second reign
Ø 826/1423 ‘Alī, second reign
The Qaramānids were the most powerful and enduring of the Turkish dynasties of Anatolia which grew up alongside the Ottomans but were eventually absorbed by them. It seems that they arose from the Afshār tribe of Turkmens and that the father of Qaramān, Nūr al-Dīn, was a well-known Ṣufī shaykh; the dynasty would thus resemble certain other Anatolian lines which sprang from dervish origins. Their original centre was in the Ermenek-Mut region in the north-western Taurus Mountains, where they were somewhat rebellious vassals of the Seljuq sultan of Konya, Rukn al-Dīn Qīlīch Arslan IV, and then tenacious opponents of the Mongol Il Khānid attempts to dominate Anatolia. These endeavours continued into the fourteenth century, and by then the Qaramānids, definitely an independent power which, as heir to the Seljuqs, controlled much of southern and central Anatolia, at one point acknowledged the suzerainty of the Mamlūks of Egypt and Syria, who were their neighbours on the east after the Mamlūk reduction of the Little Armenian kingdom of Sis. Larande or Karaman (Qaramān), the original capital of the Qaramānids before their acquisition of Konya, became an important centre of literary and artistic activity, and, in modern Turkish eyes at least, the Qaramānids have achieved some fame for their encouragement of Turkish instead of Persian as the language of administration.

Relations with the Ottomans were inevitably uneasy, and after ‘Alā’ al-Dīn b. Khalīl was defeated and killed by Bāyazid, the Qaramānīd territories fell to the Ottomans. However, they were restored by Tīmūr, and after the Ottomans’ absorption of the Germiyān Oghullarī of north-western Anatolia in 832/1428 and the Jāndār or Isfandiyār Oghullarī of the Black Sea coastlands in 866/1462 (see above, nos 116, 121), they formed the Ottomans’ most serious rivals for power in Anatolia. The last great Qaramānīd ruler, Tāj al-Dīn Ibrāhīm II, was drawn into the nexus of Mediterranean powers, Christian
and Muslim, opposing Ottoman expansionism. The alliance of the ‘Grand Caraman’ was sought by Venice and the Papacy and by their eastern neighbours, the Aq Qoyunlu of Uzun Ḥasan (see below, no. 146), and the Ottoman pretender Prince Jem was later supported. But internal disputes favoured Ottoman intervention, with Sultan Muḥammad II’s goal being the absorption of the Qaramānid lands, and this was achieved by 880/1475, when the dynasty was extinguished.

It should be noted that, from 692/1293 onwards, a branch of the Qaramānids controlled Alanya or ‘Alā’iyya (see above, no. 114).

Lane-Poole, 184; Khalīl Ed’hem, 296–302; Zambaur, 158, 160.

EI² ‘Karamān-Oghullari’ (F. Sümer); ĪA ‘Karamanhlar’ (M. C. Sihâbeddin Tekindağ).
Cl. Cahen, Pie-Ottoman Turkey.
Ȋ. H. Uzunçarşih, Anadolu beylikleri, 1–38.
Eretna (whose name has been explained as possibly stemming ultimately from Sanskrit *ratna* ‘jewel’) was a commander of Uyghur origin (hence from eastern Turkestan), probably in the service of the Chobanids and their suzerains the last II Khānids. After the fall of Temür Tash b. Chobān (see above, no. 120), Eretna was able to assemble an extensive principality stretching from Ankara in the west and Samsun (Ṣāmsūn) in the north to Erzincan (Erzinjān) in the east, with its capital first at Sivas (Sīwās) and then at Kayserī (Qayşariyye), and under the protection of the Mamlūks of Egypt and Syria. After his death, however, the lands of Eretna were nibbled away by the Ottomans in the west and the Aq Qoyunlu in the east, and authority in their lands was effectively exercised by Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn, who in 782/1380 ended the line of Eretna and instituted his own short-lived beylik based on Sivas (see below, no. 126).
Qâdî Burhân al-Dîn stemmed from an originally Oghuz family settled in Kayseri, and became vizier and atabeg to the weak, later rulers of the Eretna Oghullarî (see above, no. 125) until, shortly after the demise of the last of that line, he personally assumed power in their dominions. In the midst of a life spent in ceaseless military activity, defending his beylik against the Ottomans, Qaramânîds and other local rivals, and also against the Mamlûks and Aq Qoyunlu, he found time to function actively as a scholar and poet. However, after his death at the hands of the Aq Qoyunlu, the notables of Sivas eventually handed over the city to the Ottoman Bâyazîd I.

EI² ‘Sîwâs’ (S. Faroqhi); İA ‘Kadi Bûrhaneddin’ (Mirza Bala).
İ. H. Uzunçarşih, Anadolu beylikleri, 162–8.
Yaşar Yücel, Kadi Bûrhaneddin ve devleti (1344–1398), Ankara 1970.
The region of Canik (Jānīk), in the hinterland of the Black Sea coast

c. 749–c. 1348
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THE TĀJ AL-DĪN OGHULLARĪ

The region of Canik lay to the south of Samsun, and it was at Niksar, on the southern slopes of the Pontic range, that the Türkmen beg Tāj al-Dīn, whose father Doghan Shāh had been influential under the Il Khānids in eastern Anatolia, established a small principality on his father’s death. He contracted a protective marriage alliance with the Byzantine kingdom of Trebizond on his eastern borders, but was unable to fend off the attacks of Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn of Sivas (see above, no. 126), and his son submitted to the Ottomans. Tāj al-Dīn’s grandsons were restored by Tīmūr, but eventually handed over their principality to Sultan Murād II.

800/1398 Ottoman annexation

805–31/1402–28

831/1428 Definitive Ottoman annexation

The region of Canik lay to the south of Samsun, and it was at Niksar, on the southern slopes of the Pontic range, that the Türkmen beg Tāj al-Dīn, whose father Doghan Shāh had been influential under the Il Khānids in eastern Anatolia, established a small principality on his father’s death. He contracted a protective marriage alliance with the Byzantine kingdom of Trebizond on his eastern borders, but was unable to fend off the attacks of Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn of Sivas (see above, no. 126), and his son submitted to the Ottomans. Tāj al-Dīn’s grandsons were restored by Tīmūr, but eventually handed over their principality to Sultan Murād II.

Ramaḍān Beg, mentioned in 754/1353
by 780/by 1378  Ibrāhīm I b. Ramaḍān Beg, Ṣārīm al-Dīn
785/1383  Aḥmad b. Ramaḍān Beg, Shihāb al-Dīn
819/1416  Ibrāhīm II b. Aḥmad, Ṣārīm al-Dīn
821/1418  Ḥamza b. Aḥmad, ‘Īzz al-Dīn
832/1429  Muḥammad I b. Aḥmad
         ?  Eylük, d. 843/1439
in 861/1457  Dündār
         ?  ‘Umar
885/1480  Khalīl b. Dāwūd b. Ibrāhīm II, Ghars al-Dīn
916/1510  Maḥmūd b. Dāwūd
922/1516  Ottoman suzerainty imposed
922/1516  Selīm b. ‘Umar
922/1516  Qubādh b. Khalīl
c. 923/c. 1517  Pīrī Muḥammad b. Khalīl
976/1568  Darwīsh b. Pīrī Muḥammad
977/1569  Ibrāhīm III b. Pīrī Muḥammad
994/1586  Muḥammad II b. Ibrāhīm III
1014–17/1605–8  Pīrī Maṣūr b. Muḥammad II
1017/1608  Ottoman annexation
The eponym Ramaḍān Beg is said to have been from the Oghuz, but this line of rulers in Cilicia, with its capital at Adana, only comes into historical focus with Ramaḍān Beg’s son Ṣārim al-Dīn Ibrāhīm I, who helped the Dulghadīr Oghullarī and Qaramānids (see below, no. 129, and above, 124) against the Mamlūks. Subsequently, the Ramaḍān Oghullarī oscillated between support for the Mamlūks and the Qaramānids but with generally a pro-Mamlūk policy, and they formed a buffer-state between the Mamlūks and the Ottomans. But the Ottoman sultan Selīm I, en route for his campaign against Mamlūk Syria in 922/1516, brought the Ramaḍān Oghullarī into submission, and the later rulers of the family functioned as governors for the Ottomans in Adana, until at the opening of the seventeenth century Adana was fully incorporated into the Ottoman empire as an eyālet or province, with a governor appointed from Istanbul.

EI² Adana’ (F. Taeschner), ‘Ramada Oghullari’ (F. Babinger*); İA ‘Ramazan-Ogullari’ (F. Sümer).
The founder of this line of rulers in the Taurus Mountains and upper Euphrates region, with its centres at Maraş (Mar’ash) and Elbistan (Albistān), was an Oghuz chief, Qaraj b. Dulghadîr (the latter Turkish name, of uncertain meaning, being later Arabised or rendered by folk etymology as Dhu ’l-Qadr ‘Powerful, mighty’), who led Turkmen bands into the region of Little Armenia. His successors maintained their position, at times as vassals of the Mamlûks, and survived the attacks of Tîmûr. In the fifteenth century they maintained good relations with both the Ottomans, as enemies of the Qaramānîds, and the Mamlûks, and resisted pressure from the Aq Qoyunlu
ruler Uzun Ḥasan (see below, no. 146). The potentates of Istanbul and Cairo struggled for influence in this region of south-eastern Anatolia and supported rival candidates for power in Elbistan and Maraş. But Selīm I’s victories over the Mamlūks in 922–3/1516–17 tipped the scales decisively in favour of the Ottomans, who ended the Dulkhaḍīr line shortly afterwards and transformed their beylik into the Dhu ’l-Qadriyya governorate.

Sachau, 15–16 no. 28; Khalīl Ed’hem, 308–12; Zambaur, 158; Bosworth–Merçil-İpşrli, 294–6.

EI² ‘Dhul-Kadr’ (J. H. Mordtmann and V. L. Ménage); İA ‘Dulkadirhlar’ (J. H. Mordtmann and Mükrimin Halil Ymanç).

I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Anadolu beylikleri, 169–75.
THE OTTOMANS OR OSMANLIS
Late seventh century to 1342/late thirteenth century to 1924
Original nucleus in north-western Anatolia, subsequently rulers of an empire embracing all Anatolia, the Balkans and the Arab lands from Iraq to Algeria and southwards to Eritrea

? Ertogrul, d. c. 679/c. 1280
Ø 680/1281 ʿUthmān (ʿOthmān) I b. Ertogrul, Ghāzī
Ø 724/1324 Orkhan b. ʿUthmān I
Ø 761/1360 Murād I b. Orkhan
Ø 791/1389 Bāyazīd (Bāyezīd) I b. Murād I, Yīldīrīm (‘the Lightning shaft’)
Ø 804/1402 Timūrid invasion
Ø 805/1403 Muḥammad (Meḥmmed) I Chelebi b. Bāyazīd I, at first in Anatolia only, after 816/1413 in Rumeli also
Ø 806/1403 Sulaymān (Süleymān) I b. Bāyazīd I, in Rumeli only until 814/1411
Ø 814/1411 Mūsā Chelebi b. Bāyazīd I, counter-sultan in Rumeli until 816/1413
Ø 824/1421 Murād II b. Muḥammad I, first reign
Ø 824/1421 Muṣṭafā Chelebi b. Muḥammad I, Dūzme, counter-sultan in Rumeli until 825/1422
Ø 848/1444 Muḥammad II b. Murād II, Fātih (‘the Conqueror’), first reign
Ø 850/1446 Murād II, second reign
Ø 855/1451 Muḥammad II, second reign
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sultan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>886/1481</td>
<td>Bāyazīd II b. Muḥammad II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918/1512</td>
<td>Salīm (Selīm) I b. Bāyazīd II, Yavuz (‘the Grim’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926/1520</td>
<td>Sulaymān II b. Selīm I, Qānūnī (‘the Lawgiver’; also called, in Western usage, ‘the Magnificent’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974/1566</td>
<td>Salīm II b. Sulaymān II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982/1574</td>
<td>Murād III b. Selīm II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003/1595</td>
<td>Muḥammad III b. Murād III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012/1603</td>
<td>Aḥmad (Aḥmed) I b. Muḥammad III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026/1617</td>
<td>Muṣṭafā I b. Muḥammad III, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1027/1618</td>
<td>‘Uthmān II b. Aḥmad I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031/1622</td>
<td>Muṣṭafā I, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032/1623</td>
<td>Murād IV b. Aḥmad I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049/1640</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058/1648</td>
<td>Muḥammad IV b. Ibrāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099/1687</td>
<td>Sulaymān III b. Ibrāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102/1691</td>
<td>Aḥmad II b. Ibrāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1106/1695</td>
<td>Muṣṭafā II b. Muḥammad IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115/1703</td>
<td>Aḥmad III b. Muḥammad IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143/1730</td>
<td>Maḥmūd I b. Muṣṭafā II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1168/1754</td>
<td>‘Uthmān III b. Muṣṭafā II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1171/1757</td>
<td>Muṣṭafā III b. Aḥmad III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1187/1774</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (‘Abd ūl-Hamīd) I b. Aḥmad III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203/1789</td>
<td>Salīm III b. Muṣṭafā III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1222/1807</td>
<td>Muṣṭafā IV b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223/1808</td>
<td>Maḥmūd II b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255/1839</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Majīd (‘Abd ūl-Mejīd) I b. Maḥmūd II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277/1861</td>
<td>‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Maḥmūd II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293/1876</td>
<td>Murād V b. ‘Abd al-Majīd I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293/1876</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Ḥamīd II b. ‘Abd al-Majīd I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327/1909</td>
<td>Muḥammad V Rashād (Reshādj b. ‘Abd al-Majīd I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336/1918</td>
<td>Muḥammad VI Wahīd al-Dīn b. ‘ Abd al-Majīd I, last sultan 1341–2/1922–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The beginnings of the Ottomans are shrouded in legend, and few firm historical facts are known before 1300. Numismatic evidence now seems to show that Ertoghrul actually existed, but the name ‘Uthmān or ‘Othmān, which gave its designation to the dynasty, may well be an adaptation to the prestigious name of the third Rightly-Guided Caliph (see above, no. 1) from an originally Turkish name like Atman. According to one tradition, the family stemmed from the Qayi clan of the Oghuz and led a nomadic group in Asia Minor. Whatever their exact origins, they were clearly part of the prolonged wave of Turkmens who came in from the east and gradually pushed the Byzantines back. The Ottomans had been loosely attached to the Seljuq sultans of Konya, but the appearance in Anatolia of the Mongol Il Khānids and the consequent decline of the Seljuqs during the later thirteenth century probably impelled various Turkmen groups to move westwards into the remaining lands in north-western Asia Minor of the Byzantines, who had been desperately weakened by the Latin occupation of Constantinople. An older view, embodying the views of the Austrian scholar Paul Wittek, was that the Ottomans, whose lands were in the classical Bithynia (the later Ottoman province of Hüdavendigâr (Khudāwendigār)), acquired a particular dynamism from their role there as frontier ghāzīs, so that this superior élan and zeal for the spreading of the Islamic faith enabled them eventually to triumph over all the other beyliks of Anatolia and to put an end to the Byzantine empire. But the Ottomans seem rather to have been just the most successful of several beyliks of Turkmen origin established in western Anatolia and involved in the intricate politics of the region, inspired more by secular love of plunder than by Islamic fervour.

At all events, they were able to expand against the Greeks and Italians of the Aegean and Marmara seas region, and from a base at Gelibolu or Gallipoli, captured in 755/1354, the Ottomans began the conquest of south-eastern Europe, taking advantage of the disunity of the Balkan Slavs and the religious enmities there of Orthodox and Catholics. Soon they had overrun a large part of the Balkans, and these conquests were eventually formed into the province of Rūmeli or Rumelia. Indicative of the Ottomans’ new concentration on Europe rather than on Asia was the removal of their capital
from Bursa to Edirne or Adrianople in 767/1366. Militarily, they came to depend less and less on their Türkmen followers, whose religious sympathies were often heterodox. There arose a feudal cavalry element which was allotted estates off which to live, but most important in creating an image for Christian Europe of Ottoman ferocity and invincibility were the Janissaries (Yeñi Cheri ‘New Troops’), who were recruited from the children of the subject Christian population of the Balkans, converted to Islam and trained as an élite military force. In 796/1394, Bāyazīd I secured from the fainéant ‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, al-Mutawakkil I (see above, no. 3), the title of Sultan of RūBm, thereby formally making himself heir to the Seljuqs in Anatolia; but his Asiatic empire was suddenly shattered by the onslaught of Tīmūr and his Turco-Mongol forces, who defeated the sultan at Ankara in 805/1402. Tīmūr restored many of the beyliks recently swallowed up by Bāyazīd, and it was some decades before the Ottoman empire in Anatolia was reconstituted, the Qaramānids (see above, no. 124) being the last major rival to be absorbed; meanwhile, Muḥammad II the Conqueror had finally captured Constantinople in 857/1453.

The sixteenth century was the golden age of the empire. In 922–3/1516–17, Salīm I the Grim conquered Syria and Egypt from the decadent rule of the Mamlūks; after the victory of Mohács in 932/1526, Sulaymān the Magnificent brought most of Hungary under Turkish rule for over a century and a half; footholds were secured in southern Italy, and corsair principalities established in Tunis and Algiers. On the eastern borders, the Shī‘ī Ṣafawids, bitter rivals of the Ottomans (see below, no. 148), were defeated at Chāldirān in north-western Azerbaijan in 920/1514 and Azerbaijan itself invaded; in the Indian Ocean, Turkish naval forces operated from South Arabian bases against the incoming Portuguese.

The Ottomans ruled over a multi-ethnic empire, and at the peak of their strength they maintained an attitude of detached tolerance towards the millets or religious and ethnic minorities within their lands, so that Jews, for instance, resorted thither from persecution in Christian Central Europe and the Iberian peninsula. It was only towards the end of the seventeenth century that the tide began to turn definitely against the Turks in eastern Europe. They had failed to take much advantage of the European powers’ preoccupation with the Thirty Years’ War, and their only major success at this time was the capture of Crete from Venice. Yet the Ottomans were only just repulsed from Vienna in 1094/1683, and the losses of Hungary and
Transylvania still left them in control of the Slav, Greek, Albanian and Rumanian parts of the Balkans. European political and diplomatic divisions and jealousies masked the Ottomans’ decline and preserved their empire for two more centuries, at a time when European technical skills had by then given them a clear military and naval superiority. The sultans endeavoured tentatively to modernise their forces, but it was not until 1241 /1826 that Maḥmūd II was able to break the power of the Janissaries, by now an undisciplined force hostile to all military reform. Economically, the Turkish and Arab lands began to suffer from the competition of western manufactured goods and superior commercial techniques; indigenous production declined, internal sources of revenue decreased and, in the nineteenth century, as the sultans contracted expensive European-type tastes, the empire at times tottered on the edge of bankruptcy.

Russian expansionism was an especial threat, for by the end of the eighteenth century the Russians had subdued the Ottomans’ allies, the Crimean Tatars (see below, no. 135, 1), so that the Black Sea was no longer a Turkish lake, and the Tsars were anxious to gain control of Istanbul and the Straits, thus acquiring access to the Mediterranean. In the opening years of the nineteenth century, the commander Muḥammad ‘Alī became governor and virtually autonomous ruler in Egypt (see above, no. 34); the Greeks revolted and by 1829 had their independence recognised; and Algeria was lost to the French. The growth of nationalist and ethnic sentiment engendered by the French Revolution and its aftermath led the Balkan peoples to rebel against Turkish rule, and, by the end of the Second Balkan War of 1912–13, Turkey in Europe was reduced to its present region of eastern Thrace. Turkey’s ill-advised participation in the First World War on the side of the Central Powers caused the loss of the Arab provinces, so that the terms of the Treaty of Sévres (1920) brought about a major redrawing of boundaries in the Near East. Also, European powers were tempted to make claims on what was genuinely ethnic Turkish territory, and a Greco-Turkish War was provoked. All these events brought about a reaction of Turkish national feeling, one aspect of which was a weariness with the Ottoman ruling house, by now largely dominated by the European powers’ control in Istanbul; the dynasty was increasingly felt by those Turkish Nationalists who rallied in Ankara, away from the cosmopolitan atmosphere of the capital, as a bar to progress and as inextricably bound up with the reverses and humiliations of the previous two centuries. Under the stimulus of the Nationalist leader Muṣṭafā
Kemal (the later Atatürk ‘Father of the Turkish nation’), first the Ottoman sultanate was abolished in 1922 and then, in 1924, the caliphate was ended and the last Ottoman, ‘Abd al-Majid II, deposed and exiled.

Lane-Poole, 186–97; Khalil Ed’hem, 320–30; Zambaur, 160–1 and Table O.
EI² ‘Othmānlī. 1. Political and dynastic history’ (C. E. Bosworth, E. A. Zachariadou and J. H. Kramers*).
THIRTEEN
The Mongols and their Central Asia and Eastern European Successors

THE MONGOLS OR CHINGIZIDS

The recorded history of the Mongols begins only at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries, for it is only with the thirteenth-century *Secret History of the Mongols* and some Persian and Chinese sources of that time that any historical records become available. It seems, however, that the Mongols were originally a forest people, inhabiting the Siberian and Outer Mongolian forest fringes around Lake Baikal and the river basins to the south-east of it, rather than steppe nomads, even though it is as steppe conquerors, moving swiftly on horseback across vast distances, that they first appear in history. It also seems that the Mongols were, from the outset, intermingled and intermarried with the Turkish tribes of what is now Mongolia, so that the whole of the movements and conquests of the Mongols ought more properly to be described as those of the Turco-Mongols.

The father of Chingiz (in Mongolian, Chinggis), Yesügey, was the minor chieftain of a Mongol clan. Chingiz was perhaps born around 1167, and originally had the name Temüjin (= ‘blacksmith’). He rose to prominence in Mongolia through the patronage of a chief of the Turkish Kereyt tribe, Toghrïl, Wang or Ong Khān (Qa’an) (the Prester John of Marco Polo). Later, Temüjin quarrelled with Toghrïl, and defeated in battle first Toghrïl and then a Mongol rival Jamuqa. He had already acquired the title of Chinggis (?

Turkish *tengiz* ‘sea’ = ‘Oceanic, Universal [Qa’an or Khān]’), and at a *Quriltay* or assembly of Turco-Mongol chiefs in 1206 was acclaimed as Supreme Chief of all the Turco-Mongol peoples. He now expanded beyond
the confines of Mongolia, and undertook campaigns against the Tibetan Tanguts of the Kansu and Ordos regions of north-western China, and in 1213 invaded China proper, sacking the northern capital of the Chin Emperors in 1215 and undermining their position. Turning westwards now, an invasion of Semirechye in 1218 gave Chingiz a common frontier with the territories of the Islamic Khwārazm Shāhs (see above, no. 89, 4). There had already been peaceful diplomatic contacts, but the incident at Utrār on the Syr Darya in 615/1218, when the Khwārazmian governor there massacred Chingiz’s envoys and a whole caravan of Muslim merchants accompanying them, precipitated the Mongol invasion of the Islamic lands. In 616–17/1219–20, Transoxania was conquered; Chingiz’s son Toluy was sent into Khurasan, and, after a momentary reverse at Parwān in Afghanistan, the last Khwārazm Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, was pursued into India (618/1221). Meanwhile, two other sons, Jochi and Chaghatay, were operating in the region of the lower Syr Darya and Khwārazm, destroying the homeland of the Shāhs; for the last years of his life, Jalāl al-Dīn was a fugitive, fleeing ever westwards before the Mongols.

It was the custom of Mongol chiefs to distribute sections of their territories to other members of their families, and this Chingiz had done before his death in 624/1227, allotting each of them a stretch of pasture ground (a yurt or nuntuq) for their followers and herds. The territories which the Mongols had already overrun were too vast to be ruled as a centralised state, and the Mongols themselves were politically and administratively quite unsophisticated; the Mongol language was not yet at this time a written one. Hence a bureaucracy had to be hastily improvised for the conquered lands, if only to divide up booty and to collect taxation for the khāns. The official classes of these lands, Khitan, Uyghur, Chinese and Persian, were drawn upon, and the Buddhist Uyghur Turkish secretaries, the bitikchis, were especially noteworthy. It is from two Persian Muslims in the Mongol service, ‘Aṭā’ Malik Juwaynī and Rashīd al-Dīn Fadl Allāh, that much of our knowledge of the early Mongols and their history comes.

Chingiz’s lands were accordingly divided among his four sons or their heirs in the following way.

(1) The eldest, Jochi, in fact died just before his father; it was the traditional steppe nomad practice to grant the pasture grounds farthest away from the home camp to the eldest son. Jochi’s inheritance now passed to his own son Batu. Jochi’s allocation had been of western Siberia and the Qipchaq steppe,
extending into southern Russia and including also Khwārazm, which had always been linked culturally and commercially with the lower Volga lands. His son Batu founded the Blue Horde in South Russia, nucleus of the later Golden Horde, while Jochi’s eldest son, Orda, founded the White Horde in western Siberia, these two groups being united in the fourteenth century. At a later date, various khanates in Russia and Siberia evolved from the Hordes (see below, nos 136–8), while in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the descendants of another of Jochi’s sons, Shīban, namely the Shībānids or Özbegs, made themselves masters of Khwārazm and Transoxania (see below, no. 153).

(2) The second son, Chaghatay, was given the Central Asian lands to the north of Transoxania, roughly those which had been held by the Qara Khitay and which came to be known now as Mogholistan, and extending into Eastern or the later Chinese Turkestan; to these were added Transoxania itself during Ögedey’s reign. The western branch of Chaghatay’s descendants in Transoxania soon came within the Islamic religious and cultural sphere of influence, but was brought under the control of Tīmūr Lang; the eastern branch in Semirechye, the Ili basin and across the T’ien Shan mountains in the Tarim basin, was more resistant to Islam. However, the eastern descendants of Chaghatay eventually helped to spread Islam in Eastern Turkestan, and they ruled there until the later seventeenth century (see below, no. 132).

(3) The third son Ögedey had been favoured by Chingiz during his lifetime as his future successor as Great Khān, and this was confirmed in 627/1229 by a Quriltay of Mongol chiefs. But within a generation the Supreme Khanate fell into the hands of the descendants of Toluy, although Ögedey’s grandson Qaydu retained his territories in the Pamirs and T’ien Shan, was recognised by the Chaghatayids and remained hostile to the Tolu‘id Great Khan Qubilay until Qaydu’s death in 703/1304.

(4) The youngest son Toluy had received, following traditional steppe practice as otchigin ‘guardian of the hearth’, the heartland of the empire, Mongolia itself. His sons Möngke and Qubilay followed Ögedey’s line as Great Khāns, but only Möngke retained the newly-built centre of Qaraqorum in Mongolia as his capital. The Great Khāns’ possessions included the Chinese conquests, where the Mongols became known as the Yuan dynasty and reigned until the second half of the fourteenth century. The cultural and religious attractions of Chinese civilisation proved strong for the Great Khāns
in their northern Chinese capital of Peking; they became Buddhists, and their adherence to this faith, which was to become the dominant one in Mongolia itself, gradually opened up a breach with the subordinate Mongol khāns in western Asia and Russia, who adopted Islam in varying stages. It was one of Qubilay’s brothers, Hülegü, who launched a fresh wave of conquest upon the Islamic world and who founded the Il Khānid line in Persia; thus the khanates of western Asia ceased, for all practical purposes, to acknowledge the authority of the Great Khāns back in Mongolia and in Peking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602/1206</td>
<td>Chinggis (Chingiz), son of Yesügey, d. 624/1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626/1229</td>
<td>Ögedey Khān, son of Chingiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639/1241</td>
<td>Töregene Khātūn, widow of Ögedey, as regent 644/1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646/1246</td>
<td>Güyük, son of Ögedey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646/1248</td>
<td>Oghul Ghaymish, widow of Güyük, as regent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649/1251</td>
<td>Möngke (Mengü), son of Toluy, d. 657/1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658/1260</td>
<td>Qubilay, son of Toluy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693/1294</td>
<td>Temür Öljeytū, son of Chen-chin (Jim Gim) and grandson of Qubilay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706/1307</td>
<td>Qayshan Güllük (Hai-shan), son of Darmabala, son of Chen-chin, and great-grandson of Qubilay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711/1311</td>
<td>Ayurparibhadra (Ayurbarwada) or Buyantu, son of Darmabala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720/1320</td>
<td>Suddhipala Gege’en or Gegen (Shidebala), son of Buyantu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ögedey’s reign was one of resumed, triumphal conquest. That of northern China and what is now Manchuria, with the overthrow of the Chin dynasty and the annexation of Korea, was achieved, though it was not until 1279 that the Sung rulers of southern China were finally extinguished. At the other end of the Old World, Batu was raiding the South Russian steppes and central Europe, terrorising mediaeval Christendom (see below, no. 134, 1). Although Ögedey’s son Güyük had numerous offspring, the supreme khanate passed on Güyük’s death in April 1248 eventually to another line, that of Möngke and the descendants of Toluy. When Möngke’s brother Qubilay was hailed as Great Khān by a Quriltay in Mongolia which rival branches of the family did not attend, the descendants of Ögedey broke out in revolt, and under Qaydu and his son Chapar were for long an embarassment to the Great Khāns. They submitted in the end to the family of Toluy, but in later times various members of the house of Ögedey were raised to power in periods of revolution and unrest, and the great Tīmūr (see below, no. 144) set up two of these in Transoxania, Soyurghatmīsh and his son Maḥmūd, to replace the Chaghatayids there.

The Great Khāns in Qaraqorum and, after Möngke’s time, in Peking or Khān baliq (= ‘City of the Khāns’) led a life of a certain barbarian splendour, as the accounts of travellers and vistors from Western Europe like Marco Polo and from the Near East like the Armenian king Hayton show. Material wealth and plunder gained from the Mongol conquests flowed into the capital; artisans and craftsmen were gathered there; scholars, writers and
religious leaders made their way to the khāns’ encampment. The Mongols displayed the traditional steppe tolerance of religions, or indifference to them, and were willing to give a hearing to the arguments of Latin and Nestorian Christians, Muslims, Buddhists and Confucianists. Inevitably, in Mongolia and northern China, the original animistic shamanism of the Mongols gave way to one of the higher religions, in fact to Buddhism in the Tibetan Lamaist form. This became and has remained the dominant religion of the Mongols of Eastern Asia, and was even carried westwards to the Volga and Kuban river regions by the Oyrot Mongols or Kalmucks in their great migration of the early seventeenth century.

The Mongol Great Khāns gradually settled down to being yet another Chinese dynasty of barbarian origin, the Yüan, considered in traditional Chinese historiography as the Twentieth Official Dynasty and as ruling from 1280 onwards. They ruled in China until in 1368 they were replaced by the native Ming, but well before that they had ceased to have much influence over the Mongol khanates of central and western Asia. Only in Mongolia did the descendants of the Great Khāns survive with some independence, though under the general suzerainty of the Ming emperors.

Lane-Poole, 201–16; Zambaur, 241–3; Album, 43.
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### THE CHAGHATAYIDS, DESCENDANTS OF CHAGHATAY
624–764/1227–1363
*Transoxania, Mogholistan including Semirechye, and eastern Turkestan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>624/1227</td>
<td>Chaghatay, son of Chingiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642/1244</td>
<td>Qara Hülegü, son of Mö’etüken, son of Chingiz, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644/1246</td>
<td>Yesü Möngke, son of Chaghatay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649/1251</td>
<td>Qara Hülegü, second reign 0 650/1252 Orqina Khätün, widow of Qara Hülegü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650/1252</td>
<td>Orqina Khätün, widow of Qara Hülegü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658/1260</td>
<td>Alughu, son of Baydar, son of Chaghatay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664/1266</td>
<td>Mubarak Shāh, son of Qara Hülegü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664/1266</td>
<td>Mubārak Shah, son of Qara Hülegü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.664/c. 1266</td>
<td>Baraq, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, son of Yesūn Du’a, son of Mö’etüken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670/1271</td>
<td>Negübey (Nīkpāy), son of Sarban, son of Chaghatay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 681/c. 1282</td>
<td>Du’a (Duwa), son of Baraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706/1306</td>
<td>Könchek, son of Du’a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taliqu, son of Qadaqchi Sechem and great-grandson of
708/1308  Mö‘etüken
709/1309  Kebek (Kopek), son of Du‘a, first reign
  ⎷  Esen Buqa, son of Du‘a
  ⎷  c. 720/c. 1320  Kebek, second reign
  ⎷  Eljigedey, son of Du‘a
726/1326  Du‘a Temür, son of Du‘a
  ⎷  Tarmashirīn, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, son of Du‘a
734/1334  Buzan, son of Du‘a Temür
  ⎷  Changshi, son of Ebügen, son of Du‘a
  ⎷  c. 739/c. 1338  Yesün Temür, son of Ebügen
  ⎷ (742–4/1341–3)  ‘Alī Khalīl (Allāh), descendant of Ögedey
  ⎷  c. 743/c. 1342  Muhammad, son of Pūlād, son of Könchek
744/1343  Qazan, son of Yasa‘ur, son of Du‘a, k. 747/1347
  ⎷  747/1346  Dānishmendji, son of ‘Ali Sulṭān, descendant of Ögedey
  ⎷  749/1358  Buyan Quli, son of Surughu Oghul, son of Du‘a, k.
  ⎷  760/1359  Shāh Temür b. ‘Abdallāh b. Qazghan

Domination of Timūr Lang over the Western Chaghatay Khanate, with the Eastern Khanate remaining in power until the later seventeenth century
After Chingiz’s death, Chaghatay had great prestige as the oldest surviving son and as an acknowledged expert on the Mongol tribal law, the *Yasa*; he was, indeed, strongly anti-Muslim and insisted on enforcing those prescriptions of the *Yasa* which ran counter to the Muslim *Shari‘a*, for example over the slaughtering of animals for meat and over ablutions in running water. Chaghatay’s appanage straddled the T’ien Shan mountains from the Uyghur lands in the east to Soghdia in the west, but the Chaghatay khanate was not really founded until after Chaghatay’s own death. His sons and grandsons quarrelled among themselves and conspired against the Great Khān Möngke, and according to William of Rubruck, the Flemish friar who travelled to the Mongol court at Qaraqorum, the whole Mongol empire was divided c. 1250 between Möngke and Batu, son of Jochi. The real founder of the Chaghatay khanate was Chaghatay’s grandson Alughu, who took advantage of the civil war between Möngke’s sons Qubilay and Arīgh Böke to seize Khwārazm, western Turkestan and Afghanistan, nominally for Arīgh Böke but in fact for himself. These territories became the nucleus of the khanate, which continued now in a slightly reduced form, nominally subject to the Great Khāns but in fact until the end of the thirteenth century sharing influence in Central Asia with Qaydu, the grandson of Ögedey, until the latter’s death in 702/1303.

From their geographical position, the Chaghatayids were less directly under the influence of Islam than their relatives in Persia, the Il Khānids (see below, no. 133), and preserved their tribal and nomadic ways much longer. These facts may have contributed to the general decline of urban life and agriculture in Central Asia outside the oases of Transoxania and Eastern Turkestan. The short-reigned Mubārak Shāh (664/1266) was the first Chaghatay id definitively to adopt Islam, but from c. 681/c. 1282 Du’a and his descendants were fiercely pagan and resided in the eastern territories of the khanate. Kebek was the first to return to Transoxania, where he built a palace at Nakhshab or Qarshi (< Mongol ‘palace’). Tarmashīrīn (whose name in this Persianised form enshrines a Buddhist Sanskrit one like Dharmasila ‘Having the habit of the Dharma or Buddhist law’) became a Muslim, but the strongly anti-Islamic nomadic Mongols of the eastern part of the khanate rose against him and killed him in 734/1334.

The unity of the Chaghatayids began to disintegrate soon after this, as Tīmūr Lang rose to power in Transoxania. Various Chaghatayids were placed on the throne in Transoxania by the Turkish amīrs, and then after 764/1363
some descendants of Ögedey were set up by Tīmūr. The Chaghatayids nevertheless survived, and after Tīmūr’s death their fortunes revived in Mogholistan and endured there until the mid-fifteenth century under Esen Buqa II b. Uways Khān (r. 833–67/1429–62), a dangerous enemy of the later Tīmūrids; but the Chaghatayids’ Transoxanian territories fell to the Shībānids (see below, no. 153) by the beginning of the sixteenth century. Only the eastern branch persisted in Semirechye, with its capital at first at Almaligh in the upper Ili region, and in the Tarim basin, where it expanded towards Turfan and shared power in Kāshghar with the Dughlat tribe of Turks until the final extinction of the Chaghatayids in 1089/1678 and their replacement in Eastern Turkestan by a line of local Naqshbandī religious leaders, the Khōjas.

Lane-Poole, 241–2; Sachau, 30 no. 77; Zambaur, 248–50; Album, 43–4.
EI2 ‘Čaghatay Khān’, ‘Čaghatay Khānate’ (W. Barthold and J. A. Boyle); Eir ‘Chaghatayid dynasty’ (P. Jackson).
L. Hambis, Le chapitre CVII du Yuan Che, 56–64.
J. A. Boyle, The Successors of Genghis Khan, with a genealogical table at p. 345.
THE IL KHĀNIDS, DESCENDANTS OF QUBILAY’S BROTHER HŪLEGŪ
654–754/1256–1353
Persia, Iraq, eastern and central Anatolia

- Hülegū (Hūlākū), son of Toluy, 654/1256
- Abaqa, son of Hülegū, d. 680/1282, 663/1265
- Ahmad Tegüder (Takūdār), son of Hülegū, 681/1282
- Arghun, son of Abaqa, 683/1284
- Gaykhatu, son of Abaqa, 690/1291
- Baydu, son of Taraqay, son of Hülegū, 694/1295
- Maḥmūd Ghazan (Ghāzān) I, son of Arghun, 694/1295
- Muḥammad Khudābanda Öljeytü (Üljāytū), Ghiyāth al-Dīn, son of Arghun, 703/1304
- Abū Saʿid, ‘Alāʾ al-Dunyā waʾl-Dīn, Bahādur, son of Öljeytü, 716/1316
- Arpa Keʾün (Gawon), descendant of Arigh Bōke, son of Toluy, 736/1335
- Mūsā, son of ʿAlī, son of Baydu, 736/1336

∅ 737–
The Great Khan Möngke entrusted his brother Hülegü with the task of recovering and consolidating the Mongol conquests in Western Asia, for in the interval since Ögedey’s death direct control of much of the Islamic world south of the Oxus had slipped out of Mongol hands. Hülegü accordingly came westwards. He overcame the resistance of the Ismā’īlīs or Assassins of northern Persia (see above, no. 101) (654/1256); routed a caliphal army in Iraq and murdered the last ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Musta’ṣim (656/1258); and advanced into Syria where, however, the Mongols were defeated and halted at ‘Ayn Jālūt in Palestine by the Mamlūks of Egypt and Syria (see above, no. 31) (658/1260). Even so, Hülegü now became ruler on behalf of the Great Khān of all the regions of Persia, Iraq, Transcaucasia and Anatolia, and assumed the title of II Khān, namely territorial khān, implying subordination to the Great Khān.

The II Khānid kingdom was now definitely constituted, but it had many external enemies, including the Mamlūks, who had destroyed the popular belief in Mongol invincibility and were now the standard-bearers of Islam against the scourge of the pagans. The other Mongol houses of the Chaghatayids (see above, no. 132) and the Golden Horde (see below, no. 134) were also hostile over disputed territories in the Caucasus region and on the north-eastern Persian fringes respectively. It was common hostility towards the II Khānids that brought about a political and commercial alliance
of the Mamluks and the Golden Horde, whereas the Il Khânids for their part sought to conclude an anti-Muslim coalition with the European Christian powers, with the surviving Crusaders in the Levant coastal towns and with the Little Armenian kingdom in Cilicia. Hülegü’s wife Doquz Khâtün was a Nestorian Christian, and the first Il Khânids were favourably inclined towards Christianity and Buddhism.

The Il Khânids managed to hold their own against external foes, but, after the Great Khan Qubilay’s death in 693/1294, links with the senior members of the Mongol family in Mongolia and China became very loose, especially as the cultural and religious pressures of the Persian environment brought about the conversion to Islam of Ghazan (his short-reigned predecessor Ahmad Tegüder had also been converted) and his successors. Abū Saʿīd was the last great Il Khânid. He made peace with the Mamluks in 723/1323 and thus ended the fighting over possession of Syria, but relations with the Golden Horde and disputes over the Caucasus region continued throughout his reign. It was unfortunate that he died without an heir and, indeed, without any close relations to succeed him. The two decades after his death were filled with a succession of ephemeral khans, raised to the throne by the rival Jalāyirid and Chobanid Amīrs, until finally the Il Khânid empire fell apart and was replaced by local dynasties across Persia. It was left to Tīmūr Lang a generation later to reunite the Persian lands under one sovereign.

Despite much warfare and internal disturbance, the Il Khânid period was a prosperous one for Persia. After Ghazan became a Muslim, there began tentatively a reconciliatory process between the Mongol-Turkish military and ruling class and their Persian subjects. The Il Khânid capitals of Tabrīz and Marāgha in Azerbaijan became centres of learning, with the natural sciences, astronomy and historical writing especially flourishing. After 707/1307, Öljeytü planned a new capital at Sulṭāniyya near Qazwin; artists, architects and craftsmen were encouraged, and distinctive styles of, for example, Il Khânid architecture and painting emerged. The internationalist attitudes of the Mongols and their connections with such ancient cultures as the Chinese brought fresh intellectual, commercial and artistic influences into the Persian world. Colonies of Italian traders now appeared in the capital Tabrīz, and the Il Khânid empire played a significant connecting role in trade with the Far East and India.

Lane-Poole, 217–21; Zambaur, 244–5; Album, 45–8.
El² ‘Ilkhāns’ (B. Spuler).
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THE KHĀNS OF THE GOLDEN HORDE, DESCENDANTS OF JOCHI
624–907/1227–1502

Western Siberia, Khwārazm and South Russia

1. The line of Batu’ids, Khāns of the Blue Horde in South Russia, Khwārazm
and the western part of the Qīpchaq steppe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Khan/Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>624/1227</td>
<td>Batu, son of Jochi, d. ?653/?1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654/1256</td>
<td>Sartaq, son of Batu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655/1257</td>
<td>Ulaghchi, son or brother of Sartaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655/1257</td>
<td>Berke (Baraka), son of Jochi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665/1267</td>
<td>Möngke (Mengü) Temür, son of Toqoqan, son of Batu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679/1280</td>
<td>Töde Möngke (Mengü), son of Toqoqan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687/1287</td>
<td>Töle Buqa, son of Tartu, son of Toqoqan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690/1291</td>
<td>Toqta, son of Möngke Temür, Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713/1313</td>
<td>Muḥammad Özbeg, son of Toghrīlcha, son of Möngke Temür, Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742/1341</td>
<td>Tīnī Beg, son of Özbeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743/1342</td>
<td>Jānī Beg (Jambek), son of Özbeg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

758–82/1357–80 | Period of anarchy, with several rival claimants, including |
82/1357–80 | Muhammad Berdi Beg, Qulpa, Muhammad Nawrūz Beg, Khidr, Murad, Muhammad Bolaq, etc. |
2. The line of Orda, Khāns of the White Horde in western Siberia and the eastern part of the Qipchaq steppe, and, after 780/1378, of the Blue and White Hordes united into the Golden Horde of South Russia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Khan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>623/1226</td>
<td>Orda, son of Jochi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679/1280</td>
<td>Köchü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701/1302</td>
<td>Buyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708/1309</td>
<td>Sāsibuqa (?) Sarīgh Buqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 715/c.</td>
<td>Ilbasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720/1320</td>
<td>Mubārak Khwāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745/1344</td>
<td>Chimbay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776/1374</td>
<td>Urus, son of Chimbay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778/1376</td>
<td>Toqtaqiya, son of Urus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778/1377</td>
<td>Temūr Malik, son of Urus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toqtamīsh, son of Toli Khwāja or descendant of Orda’s brother Toqa Temūr, Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778/1377</td>
<td>Temūr Qutlugh, son of Temūr Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797/1395</td>
<td>Shādī Beg, son of Temūr Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803/1401</td>
<td>Pūlād (Bolod) Khān, son of Temūr Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810/1407</td>
<td>Temūr, son of Temūr Qutlugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813/1410</td>
<td>Jalāl al-Dīn, son of Toqtamīsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815/1412</td>
<td>Karīm Berdi, son of Toqtamīsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815/1412</td>
<td>Kebek, son of Toqtamīsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817/1414</td>
<td>Yeremferden (?) Jabbār Berdi, son of Toqtamīsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820/1417</td>
<td>Ulugh Muḥammad, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dawlat Berdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rival khāns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822/1419</td>
<td>Baraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823/1420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chingiz’s eldest son Jochi had been allotted as his appanage western Siberia and the Qipchaq Steppe, and on his death in 624/1227 the eastern part of all this, namely western Siberia, fell to his eldest son Orda, who became titular head of the descendants of Jochi and who founded in his territories the White Horde. Little is known about the early White Horde khâns, but the forceful and energetic Toqtamîsh (d. 809/1406) is a figure of major importance in steppe and eastern European history. He united the Batu’id Blue Horde (by now known as the Golden Horde) with the White Horde, and once more made the Golden Horde a power of importance in Russia, sacking Nizhniy Novgorod and Moscow in 784/1382. However, he had the misfortune to come up against Timûr Lang, who drove him out of his capital Saray on the Volga, so that Toqtamîsh was forced to flee into exile with Vitold (Vitautas),
Grand Duke of Lithuania.

The western half of Jochi’s appanage, Khwārazm and the Qıpchaq Steppe of South Russia, went to his second son Batu. Batu ravaged Russia almost as far as Novgorod, captured Kiev and attacked Poland and Hungary. Christian Europe was only saved from further molestation after Batu’s Liegnitz victory of 638/1241 and the pursuit of the Hungarian King Béla IV to the shores of the Adriatic by the news of the Great Khan Ögedey’s death. Based on the capital Saray, Batu’s Blue Horde became the nucleus of the Golden Horde (a name apparently given to them by the Russians, Zolotaya Orda, although Russian and Polish-Lithuanian sources most usually refer to it simply as ‘the Great Horde’). From Özbeg onwards (d. 742/1341), the khāns of the Golden Horde were all Muslims, and this meant that there was a religious gulf fixed between the ruling Golden Horde and the mass of their Orthodox Christian Russian subjects, although Latin Christian missionaries continued to work for some time in the Qıpchaq Steppe. The Horde had important commercial links with Anatolia and the Mamlūk empire in Syria and Egypt; slave replenishments were sent to the Mamlūks, while the culture of the Horde received a definite Islamic-Mediterranean impress, in contrast to the Persianised Il Khānids. However, the growth of Ottoman Turkish power and the Ottoman control of the Dardanelles after 755/1354 cut the Horde off from the Mediterranean and contact with the Mamlūks and made them purely a power within Russia.

After Toqtamīsh’s death, real power in the Golden Horde was held by the capable ‘Mayor of the Palace’ Edigü, but after the latter’s death in 822/1419 a process of disintegration, involving much internal discord, set in. Already in the later fourteenth century, the rise of Poland-Lithuania and the Princedom of Muscovy had seriously checked the authority of the khāns, and the Ottomans and their allies the Crimean Tatars were also hostile. It was, indeed, the Crimean khān, Mengli Giray, who in 907/1502 defeated the leader of the Horde and incorporated the major part of its manpower into his own forces. But before that date, other khanates had split off from the Golden Horde, under various descendants of a third son of Jochi, Toqa Temür; these included the khanates of Astrakhan (until the Russian conquest of 961/1554: see below, no. 136), of Kazan (until the Russian conquest of 959/1552: see below, no. 137); of Qāsimov (around Ryazan, until c. 1092/1681: see below, no. 138); and of the Crimea (see below, no. 135).
Lane-Poole, 222–31 and table at p. 240; Zambaur, 244, 246–7 and Table S; Album, 44.
1. The Khans of the Crimea

early ninth/fifteenth century

Dawlat Birdi Giray (Kerey) b. Tash Temür and, after 830/1427, Hājjī Giray b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn b. Tash Temür, rulers in the Crimea under the Golden Horde khāns

⊘ 853/1449
Hājjī Giray I b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn b. Tash Temür, independent ruler, first reign

860/1456 Haydar Giray b. Hājji I
860/1456 Hājjī Giray I, second reign
⊘ 870/1466 Nūr Dawlat Giray b. Hājjī I, first reign
⊘ 871/1467 Mengli Giray b. Hājjī I, first reign
879/1474 Nūr Dawlat, second reign
880/1475 Mengli Giray, second reign
881/1476 Nūr Dawlat Giray, third reign
883/1478 Mengli Giray, third reign
⊘ 920/1514 Muhammad Giray I b. Mengli
931/1523 Ghāzī Giray I b. Muhammad I
⊘ 932/1524 Saʿādat Giray I b. Mengli
939/1532 Islām Giray I b. Muhammad I
⊘ 939/1532 Şāḥib Giray I b. Mengli
⊘ 958/1551 Dawlat Giray I b. Mubārak b. Mengli
985/1577  Muḥammad Giray II b. Dawlat I
992/1584  Islām Giray II b. Dawlat I
998/1588  Ghāzī Giray II b. Dawlat I, first reign
1005/1596  Fath Giray I b. Dawlat I
1006/1596  Ghāzī Giray II, second reign
1016/1608  Toqtamīsh Giray b. Ghāzī II
1017/1608  Salāmat Giray I b. Dawlat I
1019/1610  Muhammad Giray III b. Saʿādat b. Muhammad II, first reign
1019/1610  Jānī Beg Giray b. Mubārak b. Dawlat I, first reign
1032/1623  Muḥammad Giray III, second reign
1033/1624  Jānī Beg Giray, second reign
1033/1624  Muḥammad Giray III, third reign
1036/1627  Jānī Beg Giray, third reign
1044/1635  'Ināyat Giray b. Ghāzī II
1046/1637  Bahādur Giray I b. Salāmat I
1051/1641  Muḥammad Giray IV b. Salāmat I, Şofu, first reign
1054/1644  Islām Giray III b. Salāmat I
1064/1654  Muḥammad Giray IV, second reign
1076/1666  ‘Ādil Giray b. Dawlat b. Fath I
1082/1671  Salīm Giray I b. Bahādur, first reign
1089/1678  Murād Giray b. Mubārak b. Salāmat I
1094/1683  Ḥājjī Giray II b. Qīrīm b. Salāmat I
1095/1684  Salīm Giray I, second reign
1103/1691  Saʿādat Giray II b. Qīrīm b. Salāmat I
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1103/1691</td>
<td>Şafâ’ Giray b. Şafâ’ b. Salâmat I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104/1692</td>
<td>Şalîm Giray I, third reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110/1699</td>
<td>Dawlat Giray II b. Salîm I, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114/1702</td>
<td>Salîm Giray I, fourth reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116/1704</td>
<td>Ghâzi Giray III b. Salîm I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119/1707</td>
<td>Qaplan Giray I b. Salîm I, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120/1708</td>
<td>Dawlat Giray II, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125/1713</td>
<td>Qaplan Giray I, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1128/1716</td>
<td>Dawlat Giray III b. ‘Ādil b. Salâmat I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129/1717</td>
<td>Sa‘âdat Giray III b. Salîm I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137/1724</td>
<td>Mengli Giray II b. Salîm I, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143/1730</td>
<td>Qaplan Giray I, third reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1149/1736</td>
<td>Fatîh Giray II b. Dawlat II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150/1737</td>
<td>Mengli Giray II, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152/1740</td>
<td>Salâmat Giray II b. Salîm I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156/1743</td>
<td>Salîm Giray II b. Qaplan I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161/1748</td>
<td>Arslan Giray b. Dawlat II, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169/1756</td>
<td>Ḥalîm Giray b. Sa‘âdat III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172/1758</td>
<td>Qîrîm Giray b. Dawlat II, first reign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salīm Giray III b. Faḍḥ II, first reign
1180/1767 Arslan Giray, second reign
1181/1767 Maqṣūd Giray b. Salāmat II, first reign
1182/1768 Qīrīm Giray, second reign
1182/1769 Dawlat Giray IV b. Arslan, first reign
1183/1769 Qaplan Giray II b. Salīm II
1184/1770 Salīm Giray III, second reign
1185/1771 Maqṣūd Giray, second reign
1186/1772 Ṣāḥib Giray II b. Salīm III
1189/1775 Dawlat Giray IV, second reign
1191/1777 Shāhīn Giray b. Aḥmad b. Dawlat II, first reign
1196–7/1782/-3 Bahadur II Giray b. Aḥmad b. Dawlat II
1197–1201/1783–7 Russian annexation of the Crimea

2. The Khāns of the Tatars of Bujaq or Bessarabia, as Ottoman nominees

1201/1787 Shāhbāz Giray b. Arslan
1203–6/1789–92 Bakht Giray

Among the descendants of Jochi’s son Toqa Temür, one branch established itself in the Crimea during the course of the internecine strife which convulsed the Golden Horde after 760/1359. At first they were vassals of Toqtamishly, but then in the early fifteenth century they gradually became independent under the progeny of Tash Temür, with Ḥājjī Giray formally
declaring himself ruler of Qirim in 853/1449. The family name Giray derives possibly from that of the Kerey, a component clan of the Golden Horde which had supported Ḥājjī Giray. The Crimean khanate now became one of the most enduring states to arise under the descendants of Chingiz Khān, and by the end of the fifteenth century it also controlled the lands of the Noghays on the northern Black Sea coast as far west as Bujaq or Bessarabia.

The Ottomans were the natural allies of the Girays, at first against the Golden Horde, whose khans continued to regard the Crimea as one of their own dependencies, and then, from the sixteenth century onwards, against the Russians. The Girays claimed to be heirs of the Golden Horde after they had defeated its leader and incorporated the greater part of its fighting manpower into their own forces (see above, no. 134), and did for part of the sixteenth century rule at Kazan (see below, no. 137). Their increased military strength after 907/1502, and the fact that the pasture grounds of the Girays were nearer to Moscow than the Golden Horde’s more usual centre on the lower Volga, now meant increased military pressure on Muscovy, with attacks and raids continuing until the eighteenth century. From the later sixteenth century, the khans ruled from their capital at Baghche Saray (Simferopol) over much of the southern part of the Ukraine and the lower Don-Kuban region, acting as a buffer-state between the Ottomans and the Christian powers of Eastern Europe; in fact, during the early seventeenth century they were at times allied with Poland-Lithuania against the Russian Tsars. The Ottomans regarded the Crimean Tatars as their dependents, requiring the presence of a hostage Giray prince at their court, although rarely intermarrying with the Girays; there was a vague feeling that, should the Ottoman dynasty die out (as seemed not impossible at one point in the seventeenth century), the Girays would have a claim on the succession in Turkey.

Russian expansionism southwards brought about Peter the Great’s capture of Azov in 1699, which cut the lands of the Crimean Tatars in two. In the eighteenth century, Russian pressure increased, with the enfeebled Ottoman empire unable to help, and by 1197/1783 Catherine the Great’s troops had occupied and annexed the Crimea. Two of the Girays were, however, appointed by the Porte to head the Tatars in Bessarabia for a few years.

Lane-Poole, 235–7 and table at p. 240; Zambaur, 247–8 and Table S; Album, 44–5. 
İA ‘Giray’ (Halil İnalcik), with a genealogical table; EI ‘Giray’ (idem), ‘Ḳirim’ (B. Spuler), with a list of rulers.
During the decline of the Golden Horde (see above, no. 134), there arose at Astrakhan near the mouth of the Volga (a town long important from its position on the trade route down the Volga to the Caspian Sea and beyond) a line of Noghay Tatar khāns stemming from Orda’s White Horde through Toqtamīsh. The lands of the first khāns extended as far as the Kazan khanate (see below, no. 137) in the north, to Orenburg or Chkalov in the east and the lands of the Crimean Tatar khāns in the west. By the 1530s, ‘Abd al-Rahmān Khān was being pressed by the khāns of Crimea and the Noghays, and appealed for help to the Russian Tsar; but in 961/1554 Ivan IV (‘The Terrible’) conquered Astrakhan, and three years later deposed the puppet Darwīsh ‘Alī Khān when he began seeking support from his Tatar Muslim
neighbours, and Astrakhan was incorporated into the Russian empire.

Lane-Poole, 229 and table at p. 240; Zambaur, 247 (fragmentary) and Table S. İA ‘Astırhan, Astraḫan’ (R. Rahmeti Arat); EI¹ Astrakhān’ (B. Spuler).
1. The line of Ulugh Muhammad

840/1437  Ulugh Muhammad b. Jalāl al-Dīn b. Toqtamīsh
849/1445  Maḥmūd (Mahmūdak) b. Ulugh Muḥammad
866/1462  Khalīl b. Mahmūd
871/1467  Ibrāhīm b. Maḥmūd
884/1479  ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm, first reign
889/1484  Muḥammad Amīn b. Ibrāhīm, first reign
890/1485  ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm, second reign
892/1487  Muḥammad Amīn b. Ibrāhīm, second reign
(900/1495  Mamūq b. Ibaq, Khān of the Tatars of Siberia)
901/1496  ‘Abd al-Laṭīf b. Ibrāhīm
907–24/1502–18  Muḥammad Amīn b. Ibrāhīm, third reign

2. Khāns from various outside lines

925/1519  Shāh ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, from the Khāns of Qāsimov, first reign
927/1521  Şāḥib Giray (I) b. Mengli I, from the Khāns of Crimea
930/1524  Şafā’ Giray b. Fath, from the Khāns of Crimea, first reign
937/1531  Jān ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, from the Khāns of Qāsimov
939/1533  Şafā’ Giray b. Fath, second reign
953/1546  Shāh ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, second reign
953/1546  Ṣafā’ Giray b. Faṭḥ, third reign
956/1549  Ötemish b. Ṣafā’ Giray, from the Khāns of Crimea, regent for Süyün Bike
958/1551  Shāh ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, third reign
959/1552  Yādigār Muḥammad b. Qāsim, from the Khāns of Astrakhan

959/1552  Russian conquest

The Kazan khanate was another of the groupings founded by a Jochid epigone. Toqtamīsh’s grandson Ulugh Muhammad rose to power in what later became eastern Russia as the Golden Horde decayed, and his son Maḥmūd in 849/1444 seized the actual town of Kazan from a local prince, possibly of Bulghār descent, ‘Alī Beg. It was likewise around this time that the sister khanate of Qāsimov (see below, no.138) emerged. The khanate spanned the middle Volga basin around the confluence of the Volga and Kama rivers and in the south bordered on the khanate of Astrakhan (see above, no.136). It thus covered a region which had been exposed to Islamic influences since the constituting of the Bulghār kingdom towards the opening of the tenth century. Kazan’s position gave it a considerable commercial importance, not least as a mart for slaves.

All through the khanate’s life, its history was bound up with that of the Princedom of Muscovy, its western neighbour, now reasserting itself after some two centuries of thraldom to the Golden Horde and its successors. From the outset, the Princes interfered in succession disputes within Kazan. This intervention intensified after the end of the family of Ulugh Muhammad, and the last three decades or so of the khanate saw rulers installed at Kazan from various outside Chingizid lines, with internal tensions between the partisans of an accommodation with Muscovy and those hoping to preserve Kazan’s independence through links with the Crimean Tatars and the Noghay Horde. Finally, the army of Tsar Ivan IV captured Kazan in 959/1552, and a systematic Russian occupation and colonisation of the lands of the former khanate began. A considerable proportion of the Muslim Tatar population has nevertheless survived over the centuries, and a reduced part of the khanate formed under the Soviets the Tatar Autonomous SSR.

Lane-Poole, genealogical table at p. 240; Zambaur, 249 and Table S.  
İA ‘Kazan’ (Reşid Rahmati Arat), with a genealogical table; EI² ‘Ḳazān’ (W. Barthold and A. Bennigsen).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Ruler Name</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 856/c.1452</td>
<td>Qasirn b. Ulugh Muhammad</td>
<td>The Khāns from the line of rulers of Kazan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873–91/1469–86</td>
<td>Dāniyār b. Qasirn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891/1486</td>
<td>Nūr Dawlat Giray b. Ḥājjī I</td>
<td>The Khāns from the line of the rulers of the Crimea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 905/c. 1500</td>
<td>Satīlghan b. Nūr Dawlat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912/1506</td>
<td>Jānay b. Nūr Dawlat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918/1512</td>
<td>Sayyid Awliyār b. Bakhitiyar Sulṭān b. Küchük Muhammad</td>
<td>The Khāns from the line of the rulers of Astrakhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922/1516</td>
<td>Shāh ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925–38/1519–32</td>
<td>Jān ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944–58/1537–51</td>
<td>Shāh ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, second reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959/1552</td>
<td>Shāh ‘Alī, third reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974/1567</td>
<td>Sayīn Bulāt b. Bik Bulāt (Simeon Bekbulatovich), d. 1025/1616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>981–1008/1573–1600</td>
<td>Muṣṭafa ‘Alī b. Aq Köbek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Kazakh Khān

1008–19/1600–10  Uraz Muḥammad

(1019–23/1610–14  the throne vacant in Qāsimov)

5. The Khāns from the line of the rulers of Siberia

1023/1614  Arslan or Alp Arslan b. ‘Alī b. Kuchum
1036/1627  Sayyid Burhān b. Arslan (Vassili)
1090–2/1679–81  Fāṭima Sulṭān Bike, widow of Arslan
1092/1681  Annexation to Russia

The khanate of Qāsimov was another of the distant successors to the ulus of Jochi and Batu. It was founded by a member of the ruling family in Kazan, Qāsirn, who had fled to Moscow for protection. The Grand Prince Vassili I granted to him the town of Gorodets or Gorodok Meshchevskiy, later named after its ruler Qāsimov, on the Oka river to the south-east of Moscow. This became the centre of a principality which has been described as ‘a historical curiosity’ but which survived for over two centuries as a petty state, with ill-defined frontiers. The khāns bore in Russian the titles of Tsar and Tsarevitch, and were, in effect, feudal vassals of the Grand Princes and Emperors. Qāsimov was often a refuge for dissident Chingizids and was ruled at different times by members of the various Jochid lines. Latterly, some of the ruling family in Qāsimov became Christian and entered Russian service, and the khanate was eventually annexed to the Russian crown.

Lane-Poole, 234–5 and genealogical table at p. 240; Zambaur, 249 and Table S. İA ‘Kasim hanhği’ (Reşid Rahmeti Arat); EI2 ‘Kasimov’ (A. Bennigsen).
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THE KARTS OR KURTS
643–791/1245–1389
Eastern Khurasan and northern Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>643/1245</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr Rukn al-Dīn b. ‘Uthmān Marghānī, Shams al-Dīn I, k. 676/1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676/1277</td>
<td>Rukn al-Dīn or Shams al-Dīn II b. Muḥammad Shams al-Dīn I, d. 705/1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694/1295</td>
<td>Fakhr al-Dīn b. Rukn al-Dīn or Shams al-Dīn II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707/1308</td>
<td>Ghiyāth al-Dīn I b. Rukn al-Dīn or Shams al-Dīn II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729/1329</td>
<td>Shams al-Dīn III b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730/1330</td>
<td>Ḥāfiẓ b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732/1332</td>
<td>Pīr Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn I, Muʿizz al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/1370–89</td>
<td>Pīr ‘Alī b. Pīr Ḥusayn Muḥammad Muʿizz al-Dīn, Ghiyāth al-Dīn II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791/1389</td>
<td>Annexation by Tīmūr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Karts (a presumably Iranian name of unknown significance) were an indigenous line of Maliks of Afghan stock, from the clan or family of the Shansabānīs of Ghūr (see below, no. 159); the founder, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad I, had married a Ghūrid princess, so that the Karts could claim to be, in some measure, heirs of the Ghūrids, ruling also as they did from the former centres of the Ghūrids, Herat and fortresses within Ghūr.
The incoming Mongols allowed Shams al-Dīn I Muḥammad to retain his lands as a vassal prince, and, ensconced in their nucleus of territories in Herat and the inaccessible mountains of Ghūr, the Karts generally remained loyal allies of the II Khāns. The decay of II Khānid power in Khurasan after Abū Sa‘īd’s death enabled Mu‘izz al-Dīn Pīr Ḥusayn Muḥammad to raise his principality, which now reached to western Khurasan and the Sarbadārid territories (see below, no. 143), to new heights of power and splendour. But the rise of Tīmūr cut short Kart power, and, on the death of his tributary Ghiyāth al-Dīn II Pīr ‘Alī, Tīmūr annexed the Kart territories to his empire.

Lane-Poole, 252; Zambaur, 256–7; Album, 50.

EI² ‘Kart’ (T. W. Haig and B. Spuler); EI r Āl-e Kart’ (B. Spuler).


The Muṣaffarids, distantly of Khurasanian Arab origin, rose to power in Kirman, Fars and ʿIrāq-i ʿAjam or Jibāl as the Il Khānid empire declined. Sharaf al-Dīn Muṣaffar was in the service of the Mongols, and was appointed
by the Il Khān Ghazan to be commander of 1,000, with military and police
duties in southern Persia. His son Mubāriz al-Dīn Muḥammad was the
second founder of the dynasty. From a base at Yazd, during the chaos
attendant on Abū Saʿd’s death he expanded his possessions into Fars after
protracted struggles with the Injuʿid Abū Isḥāq (see below, no. 141).
A marriage to the daughter of the last Qutlug Khānid ruler of Kirman (see
above, no. 105) brought that province to him. By 758/1356 he was
undisputed master of Fars and Iraq, and was tempted into invading
Azerbaijan, where he captured Tabriz (Tabrīz) but was unable to hold on to
it. Muḥammad was deposed by his own son Shāh-i Shujāʿ, but Shāh Shujaʿ was
involved in disputes with his brother Shāh Maḥmūd, governor in Iṣfahān, until the latter’s death. Shāh Maḥmūd had sought the help of the
Muẓaffarids’ old enemies, the Jalāyirids (see below, no. 142), and, when he
had at last secured Iṣfahān, Shāh-i Shujāʿ led an expedition into Azerbaijan
against the Jalāyirid Ḥusayn b. Uways. But the shadow of Tīmūr was now
falling across Persia. Shāh-i Shujāʿ hastened to submit to the great conqueror.
His successors, however, were less circumspect. Before his death in 786/1384
Shāh-i Shujāʿ had divided his Kirman and Fars dominions among his
relatives, and dynastic disputes were now fatally to weaken the dynasty. In
Fars, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn ʿAlī submitted at first to Tīmūr, but Tīmūr later sacked
Iṣfahān after his tax-collectors there had been killed in a popular uprising.
The last Muẓaffarid, Shāh Maḥṣūr, was ruler over all Fars and Iraq when
Tīmūr in 795/1393 resolved to extinguish the independent powers of western
Persia; Shāh Maḥṣūr was killed in battle and most of the surviving
Muẓaffarids massacred.

Although much of the Muẓaffarid period was racked by family strife, they
were nevertheless patrons of such great figures as the poet Ḥāfīz and the
theologian ʿAḍud al-Dīn Ḥijī, so that their cultural significance well
outweighs their mediocre political aptitudes.

Justi, 460; Lane-Poole, 249–50; Zambaur, 254; Album, 48–9.
EI2 ‘Muẓaffarids’, ‘Shāh-i Shudīa’ (P. Jackson).
The Injuids derived their name from the fact that the founder of this short line, Sharaf al-Dīn Maḥmūd, was sent to Fars by the Il Khan Öljeytū to administer the royal states there (called in Turkish, and thence in Mongolian, injū). During Abū Saʿīd’s reign, he consolidated his power at Shiraz and made himself virtually the independent ruler of Fars before being executed by the new Il Khan, Arpa Keʿūn (see above, no. 133). His sons squabbled over possession of Fārs, and when the last one, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Isḥāq, tried to extend his power to Yazd and Kirman, he came up against the Muẓaffarids (see above, no. 140), who captured Shiraz in 754/1353, the fugitive Abū Isḥāq being killed shortly afterwards.

Sachau, 28 no. 73; Zambaur, 255; Album, 48.
EI² ‘Indṳ’ (J. A. Boyle).
B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, 4th edn, 122.
The Jalāyirids were one of the successor-states to the II Khānids, succeeding to their territories in Iraq and Azerbaijan. The Jalāyir were, it seems, originally a Mongol tribe in Hülegü’s following. The founder of the dynasty’s fortunes was Ḥasan-i Buzurg (called ‘Great’ to distinguish him from his enemy and rival from the Chopanid family of Amīrs, Ḥasan-i Kūchik ‘the Small’), who had been governor of Anatolia under the II Khān
Abū Saʻīd. He eventually prevailed over the Chopanids and made Baghdad the centre of his power; nevertheless, he continued to recognise various Il Khānid fainéants up to 747/1346, and it was left to his son Shaykh Uways to assume full personal sovereignty.

Shaykh Uways at first recognised the dominion of the Golden Horde (see above, no. 134) over Azerbaijan, but then in 761/1360 conquered it for himself. He also imposed his overlordship in Fars on the disputing Muîtreaffarids (see above, no. 140), but his successors had to cope with the rising power of the Qara Qoyunlu Türkmen in Diyār Bakr (see below, no. 145) and an invasion through the Caucasus into Azerbaijan of the Golden Horde Khāns. Shaykh Uways’s son Sulṭān Aḥmad opposed Tīmūr when the latter appeared in northern Persia and Iraq, and had to flee into exile with the Mamlūks in Syria, and he only returned permanently to his capital Baghdad after Tīmūr’s death in 807/1405. However, the shock of the Tīmūrid invasions had much weakened the Jalāyirids’ position. Azerbaijan quickly fell to the Qara Qoyunlu, and Baghdad itself was captured by them in 814/1411. Only in Lower Iraq, at Wāsit, Basra and Shushtar, did minor Jalāyirid princes survive as vassals of the Tīmūrid Shāh Rukh, until Ḫusayn II was killed at Ḫilla in 835/1432.

The Jalāyirids, on the evidence of their preferences for personal names, may have had some Shī‘ī sympathies, although this evidence is not in general strong. Their rule and patronage in Baghdad and Tabriz was of considerable cultural significance, especially in such spheres as architecture and miniature painting, traditions which were regrettably uprooted by the devastations and deportations of Tīmūr.

Lane-Poole, 246–8; Zambaur, 253; Album, 49.
EI² ‘Djalāyir, Djalāyirid’ (J. M. Smith Jr).
H. R. Roemer, in The Cambridge History of Iran, VI, 5–10, 64–7.
### THE SARBADĀRIDS

737–88/1337–86

*Western Khurasan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>737/1332</td>
<td>'Abd al-Razzāq b. Faḍl Allāh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738/1338</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd b. Faḍl Allāh, Wajīh al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743/1343</td>
<td>Muḥammad Ay Temūr, k. 747/1346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748/1347</td>
<td>'Alī b. Shams al-Dīn Chishumī, Khwāja Tāj al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752/1351</td>
<td>Yaḥyā Karāwī, k. 759/1357</td>
<td>Confused period, with various rivals for power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763/1362</td>
<td>Khwāja ‘Alī b. Mu’ayyad, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778/1376</td>
<td>Rukn al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781–8/1379–86</td>
<td>Khwāja ‘Alī, second reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788/1386</td>
<td><em>Division of territories among several commanders of the Tīmūrids</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sarbadārīds (roughly interpretable as ‘reckless ones’) ruled in the Bayhaq or Sabzawār district of Khurasan during the period between the death of the Il Khānid Abū Sa‘īd and the steep decline of his dynasty’s power (see above, [no. 133](#)) and the rise of Tīmūr. Rather than being a ‘bandit state’ or a millenarian Shī‘ī movement, the Sarbadārīds represented an attempt by the
local populations of western Khurasan to preserve some order and security there in the aftermath of Mongol rule over Persia; thus in some ways they form a later, and shorter-lived, counterpart to the earlier constituting of the Kart Maliks’ principality in eastern Khurasan (see above, no. 139).

The Sarbadārids movement began as a rising in 737/1332 against fiscal oppression under the Chingizid Toqay Temūr. The rebels soon afterwards made an uneasy alliance with local Shī‘ī shaykhs. In 754/1353 they succeeded in overthrowing and killing Toqay Temūr, the last of his line. Leadership within the Sarbadār movement was unstable and often contested. Under the last leader, Khwāja ‘Alī, Shī‘īsm was explicitly adopted, but Khwāja ‘Alī also submitted to Tīmūr. When the former died in 788/1386, the Sarbadārids lands were divided among several commanders who also served Tīmūr.

Lane-Poole, 251; Zambaur, 258; Album, 50.
EI² ‘Sarbadārids’ (C. P. Melville).
1. The rulers in Samarkand

- 771/1370 Tīmūr-i Lang (Tamerlane) b. Taraghay Barlas, Küreken
- 811/1409 Shāh Rukh b. Tīmūr, in Khurasan only
- 811/1409 Shāh Rukh, in Transoxania, eastern and central Persia and then western Persia
- 850/1447 Ulugh Beg b. Shāh Rukh, in Transoxania and Khurasan
- 853/1449 ʿAbd al-Laṭif b. Ulugh Beg, in Transoxania
- 854/1450 ʿAbdallāh b. Ibrāhīm b. Shāh Rukh, in Transoxania
- 855/1451 Abū Saʿīd b. Muḥammad b. Mīrān Shāh, in Transoxania, eastern, central and western Persia as far as ʿIrāq-i ʿAjam
2. The rulers in Khurasan after Ulugh Beg’s death

Ø 851/1447 Bābur b. Baysonqur, Abu ’l-Qāsim
Ø 861/1457 Shāh Maḥmūd b. Bābur
Ø 861/1457 Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alā’ al-Dawla b. Baysonqur
Ø 863/1459 Abū Saʿīd b. Muḥammad b. Mīrān Shāh
Ø 873/1469 Ḥusayn b. Manṣūr b. Bayqara b. ‘Urnar Shaykh b. Tīmūr, first reign
Yādgār Muḥammad b. Sultān Muḥammad b. Baysonqur, protégé of the Aq Qoyunlu Uzun Ḥasan in Herat, k.
Ø 875/1470 Ḥusayn b. Manṣūr b. Bayqara, second reign
911/1506 ○ Bādī’ al-Zamān b. Husayn, d. 923/1517 co-rulers
913/1507 Özbek conquest of Herat

3. The rulers in western Persia and Iraq after Tīmūr

810/1408
807–12/1404–9 Pīr Muḥammad b. ‘Umar Shaykh b. Tīmūr, in Fars
812/1409 Khalīl Sultān b. Mīrān Shāh, in Rayy, d. 814/1411
812/1409 Bayqara b. ‘Umar Shaykh, in Fars
Tīmūr arose from the Barlas clan of Turkicised Mongols which had nomadised within the Chaghatayid ulus (see above, no. 132). Although his family may subsequently have claimed Chingizid descent, Tīmūr personally never did, and always contented himself with the Arab-Islamic title of Amīr, and not the Turkish one of Khān. He did, however, acquire the title güregen/küreken, in Mongolian ‘royal son-in-law’, by virtue of his marriage to a Chingizid princess. He put together a vast military empire in central, western and southern Asia. But Tīmūr’s interests were in the settled lands of ancient Islamic or Indian culture rather than in the steppes and mountains of Inner Asia, thus marking him off from the earlier Mongol steppe conquerors. He eventually built himself a permanent capital, Samarkand; and though clearly not a religious man, he found the religious ideology of Islam a useful aid in his campaigns into such regions as the Caucasus and India.

Tīmūr’s rise to power took place in a fragmented Transoxania, weakened by the decay of the Chaghatayids of the west, during which various attempts from Mogholistan to re-establish the ulus failed. There was still a certain feeling, however, for the legitimacy of Mongol rule, and when Tīmūr first came to power he installed puppet Chingizid khāns in Transoxania, including a descendant of the Great Khan Ögedey, Soyurghatmīsh, and his son.

His first campaigns were in Khwārazm and Khurasan, after which he began the conquest of Persia in earnest. During the ‘Five Years’ War’ beginning 797/1395, the Muḥaffārids of Fars were destroyed and the Jalāyirid Aḥmad b. Shaykh Uways driven from Iraq. Tīmūr’s northern frontier was an open one, and his great rival in the steppes was Toqtamīsh, Khān of the White Horde, by now supreme across the whole Qïpchaq steppe of South Russia and south-western Siberia (see above, no. 134). Tīmūr accordingly invaded Qïpchaq in 797/1395, penetrating as far as Astrakhan and Muscovy. But his main efforts were directed against the Islamic heartlands, where his campaigns had a cataclysmic effect on the political structures of the time. During the Indian campaign of 800/1398–9, Delhi was sacked and the end of the Tughluqids hastened (see below, no. 160, 3), facilitating in the fifteenth century the rise of independent provincial sultanates such as those of
Jawnpūr, Gujarāt, Mālwa and Khāndesh (see below, Chapter Sixteen). In the west, Tīmūr’s defeat of Sultan Bāyazīd I at Ankara in 805/1402 meant the restoration for a few decades longer of many of the Anatolian beyliks absorbed by the Ottomans (see above, Chapter Twelve).

Before his death, which occurred just as he was about to leave for China, Tīmūr had divided up his territories among his sons and grandsons. The steppe tradition that an empire was not the personal property of the supreme ruler, but belonged to all male members of the ruling family, meant the parcelling-out of the Tīmūrid empire among its numerous princes, and in the absence of a clear succession principle left the field open for disputes and fragmentation. Three lines of Tīmūrids are listed above, but there were several other members of the family ruling either with varying degrees of independence or as vassals of other Tīmūrids in regions as far apart as the Caspian provinces, Kirman, and Kabul and Kandahar in eastern Afghanistan. And although possession of Tīmūr’s old capital Samarkand conferred prestige within the dynasty, it did not automatically entail headship or supremacy; thus Ḥusayn b. Manṣūr Bayqara was, in his time, the greatest ruler among the later Tīmūrids, but reigned at Herat and not Samarkand.

Once the terror inspired by Tīmūr was gone, the later Tīmūrids eventually sank to the status of local rulers in Khurasan and Transoxania, with the western lands abandoned to the rising power of Türkmen dynasties like the Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu (see below, nos 145, 146). At first, there were two great kingdoms, in western Persia and Iraq, and in Khurasan and Transoxania, these latter two regions being first united by Tīmūr’s son Shāh Rukh and then with his suzerainty extended over the western lands as well. Shāh Rukh’s great-nephew Abū Saʿīd was, next to the Ottoman Muḥammad the Conqueror, the most powerful monarch of his age, although he was unable to prevent the Özbegs, the ultimate destroyers of Tīmūrid power, from raiding across the Oxus (see below, no. 153), and his campaign of 872/1468 to help the Qara Qoyunlu against the rising power of the Aq Qoyunlu leader Uzun Ḥasan, with the hope also of regaining the former western territories of the Tīmūrids, ended in disaster.

The Tīmūrids were the last great Islamic dynasty of steppe origin. After their time, the rise of powerful settled states like those of the Ottomans, the Ṣafawids and the Mughals, all employing firearms and more advanced military techniques, tilted the balance against any further large-scale invasions by horsemen from the Inner Asian steppes. The Tīmūrid period of
Transoxanian and Persian history, essentially the fifteenth century, was also one of the most glorious ones of mediaeval Islamic art and culture, with outstanding schools of Persian and Chaghatay Turkish literature and of architecture, painting and book production, and with a final flowering at the court in Herat of Ḥusayn b. Manṣūr b. Bayqara, where the poets Jāmī and ‘Alī Shīr Nawā’ī and the painter Bihzad worked.

Justi, 472–5; Lane-Poole, 265–8; Sachau, 30–1, nos 78–83; Zambaur, 269–70 and Table T; Album, 50–3.


Bayram Khōja, vassal of the Jalāyirids in northern Iraq and eastern Anatolia
Qara Muḥammad b. Türemish, nephew of Bayram Khōja, after 784/1382 independent of the Jalāyirids, k. 791/1389
Qara Yūsuf b. Qara Muḥammad, Abū Naṣr, first reign

Invasion of Timūr

Qara Yūsuf, second reign, d. 823/1420
Pīr Budaq b. Qara Yūsuf, governor of Azerbaijan under his father’s regency
Iskandar b. Qara Yūsuf, k. 841/1438

Abū Sa‘īd b. Qara Yūsuf, vassal of the Tīmūrids in Azerbaijan
Ispan (?) b. Qara Yūsuf, Tīmūrid vassal in Iraq
Jahān Shāh b. Qara Yūsuf, Tīmūrid vassal in eastern Anatolia
Jahān Shāh b. Qara Yūsuf, up to 853/1449 as a Tīmūrid vassal
Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Jahān Shāh

Abū Yūsuf b. Jahān Shāh, ruler in Fars only

Aq Qoyunlu conquest
The confederation of the Qara Qoyunlu ‘[those with] black sheep’ arose out of Türkmen elements pushed westwards by the Mongol invasions. Their ruling family seems to have come from the Yiwa or Iwa clan of the Oghuz, and the seats of their power in the fourteenth century lay to the north of Lake Van and in the Mosul region of northern Iraq.

The confederation was in many ways similar to that of the Jalāyirids (see above, no. 142), and came to think of itself as the successor to the Jalāyirids, with their traditions and connections going back to Chingizid times. The first Qara Qoyunlu leaders were vassals of the older Türkmen line, until in 784/1382 Qara Muḥammad made himself independent of the Jalāyirids, basing his power on Tabriz in Azerbaijan and on eastern Anatolia. The greatest ruler of the dynasty, Qara Yūsuf, opposed Tīmūr, and had to flee first to the Ottomans and then to Mamlūk Syria, only returning in 809/1406 and then ending the power of the Jalāyirids in Azerbaijan and Iraq. Qara Yūsuf now undertook warfare against his Aq Qoyunlu rivals (see below, no. 146) in Diyār Bakr, against the Georgians and the later Shīrwān Shāhs (see above, no. 67, 2) in the Caucasus, and against the Tīmūrid suzerains in western Persia. Once the forceful Shāh Rukh was dead, Jahān Shāh extended his rule to Fars, Kirman and even Oman, and made the Qara Qoyunlu an imperial power, adopting for himself such titles as khān and sulṭān. Finally, he attacked the redoubtable Aq Qoyunlu ruler Uzun Ḥasan, but was defeated and lost his life. His son Ḥasan ‘Alī was unable to secure his position as leader of the Qara Qoyunlu, and killed himself in 873/1469, so that all the Qara Qoyunlu territories passed into the hands of the Aq Qoyunlu.

The constituting of the Qara Qoyunlu confederation was part of the interlude of Türkmen domination over the central part of the northern tier of the Middle East, from Anatolia to Khurasan, during the period between the decay of the Il Khānids and the rise of the Ottomans, Șafawids and Özbegs. Ethnically, the rule of Türkmen accelerated the process, already well advanced, whereby Azerbaijan and parts of Fars became strongly Turkish in race and speech. As to the religious affiliations of the Qara Qoyunlu, although some of the later members of the family had Shī‘ī-type names and there were occasional Shī‘ī coin legends, there seems no strong evidence for definite Shī‘ī sympathies beyond possible influences from a general climate of such sympathies among many Türkmen elements of the time.

Lane-Poole, 253; Zambaur, 257; Album, 53.
‘Kara-Koyunlular’ (Faruk Sümer), with a detailed genealogical table; ‘Karā-Ḳoyunlu’ (F. Sümer), with a detailed genealogical table.


THE AQ QOYUNLU
798–914/1396–1508
Diyâr Bakr, Eastern Anatolia, Azerbaijan and, later, western Persia,
Fars and Kirman

c. 761/c. 1360
Qutlugh b. Ṭūr ‘Alī b. Pahlawân, Fakhr al-Dîn

791/1389
Aḥmad b. Qutlugh, nominal head of the confederation until 805/1403

805/1403
Qara Yoluq ‘Uthmân b. Qutlugh, Fakhr al-Dîn, de facto head of the confederation since 798/1396

839/1435
‘Alî b. Qara ‘Uthmân, Jalâl al-Dîn, in dispute with his brothers Ḥamza and Yaʿqûb

841/1438
Ḥamza b. Qara ‘Uthmân, Nûr al-Dîn, in dispute with Yaʿqûb and Jaʿfar b. Yaʿqûb

848/1444
Jahângîr b. ‘Alî, Muʿizz al-Dîn
(Qilîch Arslan b. Aḥmad b. Qutlugh, in eastern Anatolia)

861/1457
Uzun Ḥasan b. ‘Alî, Abu ʾl-Naṣr

882/1478
Ṣulṭân Khalîl b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu ʾl-Faṭḥ

883/1478
Yaʿqûb b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu ʾl-Muṣaffar

896/1490
Baysonqur b. Yaʿqûb, Abu ʾl-Faṭḥ, in dispute with Masīḥ Mîrzâ b. Uzun Ḥasan, k. 896/1491

898/1493
Rustam b. Maqṣûd b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu ʾl-Muṣaffar

902/1497
The Aq Qoyunlu ‘[those with] white sheep’ were a nomadic confederation of Türkmens centred on Diyār Bakr, with their ruling stratum drawn from the ancient Oghuz clan of the Bayundur. Already in the mid-fourteenth century they were raiding the Byzantine principality of Trebizond and were able to force marriage alliances on the Greek rulers. It was from the Türkmen-Byzantine marriage of 753/1352 that there arose the real founder of the confederation’s fortunes, Qara Yoluq ‘Uthmān, and relations between the two powers remained close for a century. Unlike their rivals the Qara Qoyunlu (see above, no. 145), the Aq Qoyunlu submitted to Tīmūr, and Qara ‘Uthmān fought for him against the Ottoman Bāyazīd I at Ankara, being rewarded by the grant of Diyār Bakr. Expansion eastwards was blocked first by the Jalāyirids (see above, no. 142) and then by the Qara Qoyunlu, but Uzun Ḥasan, a military commander and statesman of genius, at last crushed Jahān Shāh in 872/1467 and incorporated many of the Qara Qoyunlu sub-tribes into his own horde, and after defeating the Tīmūrid Abū Saʿīd was able to extend his rule as far as Khurasan and down to Iraq and the Persian Gulf shores.

Uzun Ḥasan’s prime enemy in the west was, however, the Ottomans, who were at this time mopping up the remaining beyliks of Anatolia (see above, Chapter Twelve) and pressing eastwards. Anti-Ottoman common interest made him ally with the Qaramānids (see above, no. 124), and he also tried to save Trebizond, to whose rulers he was related through his Byzantine wife Despina, from the attacks of Muḥammad the Conqueror. The Aq Qoyunlu were now a power of international significance. In 868/1464, diplomatic relations were opened up with the Ottomans’ Venetian enemies, and arms and munitions were despatched from Venice via southern Anatolia. Yet Uzun Ḥasan’s cavalrymen were no match for Ottoman firepower at Tercan (Terjān) in 878/1473, and the Aq Qoyunlu leader was crushingly defeated. His son
Ya'qūb carried on the struggle, but the dynasty went into a terminal period of division, internecine strife and succession disputes. The Qaramānids had fallen to the Ottomans, and, despite the fact that there had been a marriage link between Uzun Ḥasan and the head of the Ṣafawiyya order, Shaykh Junayd (see below, no. 148), Shīʿī propaganda was being spread among the Sunnī Aq Qoyunlu’s Türkmen followers in eastern Anatolia. In 906/1501, Alwand was defeated by the Ṣafawid Shāh Ismāʿīl I, and the last Aq Qoyunlu, Sulṭān Murād, was forced to flee to the Ottomans. The dynasty’s rule was now finished everywhere, but had left behind in such places as Uzun Ḥasan’s capital at Tabriz a distinguished tradition of cultural and literary patronage.

Lane-Poole, 254; Zambaur, 258–9; Album, 53–4.

İA ‘Aḳ Ḳoyunlular’ (M. H. Yınanç), with a genealogical table; EI² ‘Aḳ Ḳoyunlu’ (V. Minorsky).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>839/1435</td>
<td>Sayyid Muḥammad b. Falāḥ b. Haybat Allāh, wali of the Mahdī or Twelfth Imām, d. 870/1466, first period of rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861/1457</td>
<td>Sayyid Muḥammad b. Falāḥ, second period of rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870/1466</td>
<td>Sayyid Sulṭān Muḥsin b. Muḥammad, d. 905/1500 or c. 914/c. 1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920/1514</td>
<td>Sayyid Badrān b. Falāḥ, Shujāʿ al-Dīn, d. soon after 988/1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 988/c. 1580</td>
<td>Sayyid Sajjād b. Badrān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>992/1584</td>
<td>Sayyid ‘Alī b. Sajjād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>992/1584</td>
<td>Sayyid Zunbūr ‘Alī b. ‘Alī, in Khūzistān until 998/1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995/1587</td>
<td>Sayyid Mubārak b. (‘Abd al-) Muṭṭalib b. Badrān, in Ḥuwayza, with the additional title of Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025/1616</td>
<td>Sayyid Naṣir b. Mubārak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025/1616</td>
<td>Sayyid Rāshid b. Salīm b. Muṭṭalib, k. shortly after his appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030/1621</td>
<td>Sayyid Maṃṣūr b. Muṭṭalib, first governorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033/1624</td>
<td>Sayyid Muḥammad b. Mubārak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Musha‘sha‘ī movement arose in the fifteenth century in southern
Khūzistān, in the region which in more recent times has come to be known as ‘Arabistān. Although this region at the head of the Persian Gulf was ethnically Arab, it became the home of a typically Persia extremist Shī‘ī millenarian movement; and the Musha‘sha‘ family, throughout nearly 500 years of its existence, was always linked politically with the rulers of Persia rather than with those in Iraq (latterly, in fact, the Ottomans). Sayyid Muḥammad b. Falāḥ proclaimed his ẓuhūr or manifestation as the ḥijāb or ‘shield ’ of the Expected Imām, in opposition to the Qara Qoyunlu rulers of Iraq (see above, no. 145); the name Musha‘sha‘ seems to have connotations (cf. shu‘ā‘ ‘ray of light’) of illuminationism, a perceptible strain within Shī‘ism as it was to develop in Ṣafawid Persia.

During the fifteenth century, the Musha‘sha‘ were independent local rulers based on Ḥuwayza or Ḥawāza, and this was their heyday as a religio-political movement. Once the Ṣafawid Shāh Ismā‘īl I (see below, no. 148) had extended his power into Khūzistān in 920/1514, the Musha‘sha‘ were reduced to submission, and over the next centuries generally functioned as walls or governors for the Persian monarchs. At the end of the nineteenth century, their local influence was overshadowed by the rise of the rulers of Muḥammara from the Arab Banū Kalb, but the Musha‘sha‘ family nevertheless managed to survive up to the time of Riḍā Shāh Pahlawi (see below, no. 152).

Album, 54.
EI² ‘Musha‘sha‘’ (P. Luft).
idem, ‘Die Wall’s von Ḥuwēzeh’, Islamica, 6 (1934), 415–34, with a genealogical stem and list at pp. 424–32.
THE ṢAFAWIDS
907–1135/1501–1722, thereafter as fainéants and pretenders until 1179/1765
Persia

Ø 907/1501 Ismā‘īl I b. Haydar b. Junayd, Abu ’l-MuZaffar
Ø 930/1524 Ṭahmāsp I b. Ismā‘īl I
Ø 984/1576 Ismā‘īl II b. Ṭahmāsp I
Ø 985/1578 Muḥammad Khudābanda b. Ṭahmāsp I, d. 1003/1595 or 1004/1596
Ø 995/1587 ‘Abbās I b. Muḥammad Khudābanda
Ø 1038/1629 Ṣafī I, Sām Mīrzā b. Ṣafī Mīrzā
Ø 1052/1642 ‘Abbās II, Sulṭān Muḥammad Mīrzā b. Ṣafī I
Ø 1077/1666 Ṣafī II b. ‘Abbās II, re-enthroned in 1078/1668 as Sulaymān I
Ø 1105/1694 Ḥusayn I b. Sulaymān I, Mulla

1135/1722 Afghan invasion
Ø 1135/1722 Ṭahmāsp II b. Ḥusayn I, k. 1153/1740
Ø 1145/1732 ‘Abbās III b. Ṭahmāsp II, k. 1153/1740

1148/1736  
Nādir Shāh Afshār 1161/1748 Shāh Rukh, Afshārid, first reign

Ø 1163/1750 Sulaymān II, Sayyid Muḥammad, grandson of Sulaymān I, at Mashhad

1163/1750 Shāh Rukh, second reign, in Khurāsān
Ø 1163–  Ḥusayn III b. Sayyid Murtadā, Abū Turāb, in Iṣfahān as a puppet of the Zands, d. 1187/1773

79/1750–65
The origins of the Ṣafawids are obscure, and their elucidation is not helped by the production, by at least the first half of the sixteenth century, of an ‘official’ version of Ṣafawid genealogy and early history. It does, however, seem probable that they hailed from Persian Kurdistan, and, as Turkish speakers, they seem to be part of the Türkmen resurgence of post-Mongol times. The family headed a Ṣūfī order, the Ṣafawiyya, based on Ardabīl in Azerbaijan, originally orthodox Sunnī in complexion, but in the mid-fifteenth century the leader of the order, Shaykh Junayd, embarked on a campaign for material power in addition to spiritual authority. In the atmosphere of heterodoxy and Shi‘ī sympathies among the Türkmen of Anatolia and Azerbaijan, the Ṣafawiyya gradually became Shi‘ī in emphasis.

The political ambitions of the first Ṣafawids brought them up against the other Türkmen powers of eastern Anatolia, Iraq and Persia, but in 905/1501 Ismā‘īl I defeated the Aq Qoyunlu (see above, no. 146), seized Azerbaijan and brought the whole of Persia under his control during the ensuing ten years, and thus established the Ṣafawid theocracy, for not only did Ismā‘īl and his successors claim to be lineal descendants of ‘Alī through the Seventh Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim, but Ismā‘īl, at least, on the evidence of his poetry, also claimed divine status in the extremist Shi‘ī ghulāt tradition. Their Türkmen tribal followers, the so-called Qïzïl Bash or ‘red heads’ (from the red caps which they wore) thus owed a spiritual as well as a political allegiance. Shi‘ism was imposed as the state religion on a country which up until then had been, at least officially, predominantly Sunnī. The Ṣafawid period is thus of supreme importance in Persian history because of this consolidation of Shi‘ism there; in the process, Persia acquired a new sense of solidarity and nationhood which enabled her to survive into modern times with her national spirit and the integrity of Persian territory substantially unimpaired.

Militarily, the early Ṣafawids had to face the strenuous hostility of their Sunnī neighbours, the Ottomans in the west and the Özbegs in the north-east. On the north-eastern frontier, the Shāhs just managed to hold their own, with cities like Herat, Mashhad and Sarakhs frequently changing hands; but Türkmen incursions for plunder and slaves continued well into the nineteenth century. The Ottomans were especially dangerous, being at the peak of their military strength in the sixteenth century. Sultan Selīm I’s victory over the Ṣafawids at Châldirān in 920/1514 was a triumph of logistics and superior firepower for the Ottomans (like the Mamlûks of Egypt, the Ṣafawids were slow to adopt artillery and handguns), and also impaired the Ṣafawids’
supporters’ beliefs in the divine invincibility of their masters. Soon afterwards, Kurdistan, Diyār Bakr and Baghdad passed into Ottoman hands, and Azerbaijan was frequently invaded; later, the Ṣafawid capital was moved from vulnerable Tabriz to Qazwīn and then to Iṣfahān.

The reign of Shāh ‘Abbās I, near-contemporary of such great rulers as Elizabeth I of England, Philip II of Spain, Ivan IV (‘The Terrible’) of Russia and the Mughal emperor Akbar, marks the apex of Ṣafawid military power and also Ṣafawid culture and civilisation, some of whose manifestations are visible in the architectural glories of Iṣfahān. During his reign, the Ottomans were ejected from Azerbaijan, and Persian control over the Caucasus and the Gulf strengthened. Diplomatic contacts with Europe were established (although a Ṣafawid-Euro-pean grand alliance against the Ottomans never materialised), and commercial and cultural contacts grew. In order to counteract the influence in the state of the Qīzīl Bash, ‘Abbās recruited Georgian and Circassian converts as slave guards, and favoured the formation of a group of Türkmen owing allegiance to himself personally and not to the tribal chiefs (the Shāh seven or ‘Lovers of the Shāh’).

After the death of Shāh ‘Abbās II in 1077/1666, there was a perceptible decline in the personal qualities of the rulers. Ṣafawid authority had at times stretched as far as eastern Afghanistan, but Sunnī Afghan sentiment was opposed to the strongly Shī‘ī policies of the Shāhs, and in the early eighteenth century the governor for the Ṣafawids there, Mīr Uways, declared himself independent. In 1135/1722, his son Maḥmūd invaded Persia; Ṣafawid resistance collapsed, and for several years until the rise of Nādir Shāh Afshār (see below, no. 149), the Ghilzay Afghans occupied much of Persia. The subsequent holders of power in Persia at times felt a need to nominate Ṣafawid descendants or claimants as puppet rulers, but the effective rule of the dynasty disappeared with Ṭahmāsp II.

Justi, 479; Lane-Poole, 255–9; Zambaur, 261–2; Abum, 54–7.

EI² ‘Ṣafawids. 1. Dynastic, political and military history’ (R. M. Savory).
Roger Savory, Iran under the Ṣafavids, Cambridge 1980.
Nadr or Nādir was a chieftain of the Afshār, a Türkmen tribe settled in northern Khurasan; it was in this home territory that he later constructed his stronghold and treasury, the Qal‘at-i Nādirī. In this period of Šafawid decay, when much of Persia was in the hands of the Ghilzays, the national unity of Persia, which had been built up by the earlier Šafawids, seemed likely to disintegrate. It was to be Nādir’s achievement temporarily to restore the territorial integrity of Persia, albeit at the price of leaving the country financially and economically exhausted. His ascent to power began through service with the ineffective Šafawid Shāh Ţahmāsp II (whence the name
which he adopted, ‘slave of Ṭahmāsp’). He began systematically to clear the Afghan invaders from Persia, and when by 1140/1727 this had been achieved, the Shāh rewarded him with the governorship of Khurasan, Kirman, Sistan and Māzandarān. With such extensive lands under his personal control, Nādir began to act like an independent ruler, now minting his own coins. Turning to external enemies, he drove the Ottomans out of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan, and penetrated through the Caucasus as far as Dāghistān. Ṭahmāsp’s conclusion of a treaty with Turkey and Russia unfavourable to Persia’s interests provided Nādir with a pretext to depose him, setting up another Ṣafāwī prince as puppet ruler, until in 1148/1736 he was himself proclaimed Shāh. Nādir seems at this point to have sought an end to the ancient Shī‘ī-Sunnī hostility between Persia and Turkey, and he announced the abandonment of Twelver Shī‘īsm as the state religion and the establishment instead of much-attenuated form of Shī‘ism whose spiritual head was to be the Sixth Imām, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq; in practice, this conciliatory move pleased no-one and did not bring about détente with the Ottomans.

The expense of continual warfare drove Nādir into his brilliantly successful Indian campaign of 1151–2/1738–9, as a result of which the Mughal emperor Muḥammad Shāh (see below, no. 175) had to cede all his provinces north and west of the Indus and to pay an enormous tribute; because of this last, Nādir declared the people of Persia exempt from taxation for three years. An assassination attempt on him in 1154/1741, in which Nādir suspected the complicity of his son Riḍā Qulī, caused a deterioration in his character, so that his policies became more and more cruel and erratic. Rebellions broke out in the provinces against his exactions, and in 1160/1747 a group of Afshār and Qājār Türkmen chiefs finally murdered him. Two of his nephews reigned briefly, and then his blinded grandson Shāh Rukh ruled as a puppet of military commanders in Khurasan, until Agha Muḥammad Qājār (see below, no. 151) extended his power eastwards from northern Persia in 1210/1796 and ended what remained of the authority of the Afšārids.

Lane-Poole, 257–9; Zambaur, 261; Album, 57–8.
EI² ‘Nādir Shāh Afšār’ (J. R. Perry).
In the chaos which followed Nādir Shāh’s death, various military chiefs seized power in the provinces of Persia. His Afghan commander Aḥmad Abdālī founded in Kandahar an important Afghan state, whose territories included Nādir’s conquests in north-western India (see below, no. 175). In Khurasan, the Afshārid Shāh Rukh retained a precarious power as the puppet of local commanders. In the Caspian provinces, the Qājārs maintained their power-base (see below, no. 151), while in Azerbaijan another of Nādir’s Afghan generals, Āzād, established himself. In southern Persia, the main force was initially the Bakhtiyārī leader ‘Alī Mardān, who had taken Isfahan and raised to the throne there a fainéant Ṣafawī, Ismāʿīl III (1163/1750) (see above, no. 148). ‘Alī Mardan’s lieutenant and sardār or commander of the forces was Muḥammad Karīm Zand, from a minor tribe of Lurs in the central
Zagros Mountains; and when ‘Alī was murdered, Muḥammad Karīm made himself sole ruler in southern Persia.

He still had a lengthy struggle with the Qājār Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān before his authority over the greater part of Persia outside Khurasan was made firm. Muḥammad Karīm never himself assumed the title of Shāh, but reigned from Shiraz as wakīl al-dawla or regent for Ismā‘īl III. His reign of almost thirty years was one of clemency and moderation, and the land flourished under his enlightened rule; among other things, commercial relations with Britain via Bushire (Būshahr) on the Persia Gulf were encouraged. But his death was the signal for disastrous succession disputes to break out within the Zand family. ‘Alī Murād finally secured the throne, but died soon afterwards, and in the reign of Ja‘far the power of the Zands’ rivals the Qājārs grew until the Zands had to abandon Iṣfahān to them. The last Zand, Lutf ‘Alī Khān, a popular ruler and an able general, took up arms against the Qājārs and was successful for a while. But in 1209/1794 he was captured at Kirmān by Agha Muḥammad Khān Qājār and brutally murdered; the whole of Persia now became united under one monarch for the first time since the brief career of Nādir Shāh and the heyday of the Ṣafawids.

Lane-Poole, 260, 262; Zambaur, 261, 264; Album, 58–9.
The Qajars of the Turkmen tribe had probably been settled near Astarabad in the Caspian coastlands since Mongol times; later, they were one of the seven great Turkmen tribes supporting the early Safawids and comprising the Qizil Bash. With the disintegration of the Safavid empire in the early eighteenth century, the Qajars began to play a more-than-local part in Persian affairs. The chiefs of the Qoyunlu clan of the Qajars expanded across northern Persia in an endeavour to take over Nader Shah's western territories, but it was not until 1209/1794 that Agha Muhammed was finally victorious over the Zands.
(see above, no. 150); soon afterwards, Persian suzerainty was re-established, albeit temporarily, over Georgia, and the last Afshārid removed from Khurasan (see above, no. 149). The frightful Agha Muḥammad, whose excesses are doubtless in part explicable by the fact that, as a boy, he had been castrated by Nādir’s nephew ‘Ādil Shāh, was thus the founder of the dynasty under which Persia was to move definitely into the modern world, acquiring an important strategic and economic rôle in the international state-system. It was also under the first Qājār Shāh that Tehran (Tihrān), previously a town of only modest importance, became the capital (1200/1786); in this way began the movement of all life towards the centre which has characterised modern Persia.

Regular diplomatic relations with the European powers date from Fath ‘Alī Shāh’s reign, when Persia was courted by Britain on one side and by Napoleonic France on the other on account of her strategic position across the routes to the East. A by-product of this attention from the West was the introduction of European techniques and training into the Persian army. This was all the more necessary for Persia in that, during the nineteenth century, Imperial Russia, advancing now into the Caucasus and into Central Asia, was a continuing threat; by the humiliating Treaty of Turkmanchay in 1243/1828, Persia had had to relinquish all claims to territories in eastern Armenia and the Caucasus and had had to facilitate Russian commercial penetration of Persia. For their part, the Qājārs were for long reluctant to renounce the heritage of eastern conquests made by the Ṣafawids and by Nādir, and disputes with Afghanistan continued until the later nineteenth century (see below, no. 180).

Through the mutual rivalries of the European powers and the astuteness of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, the geographically-compact land of Persia was much more successful than the disparate Ottoman empire in maintaining its territorial integrity. Nevertheless, the cost of warfare and royal extravagance were plunging the nation deeply into foreign indebtedness, thereby increasing the economic stranglehold of the European creditor nations. During the reign of Muḥaffar al-Dīn Shāh, there arose a movement demanding some degree of political liberalism and the granting of a constitution, demands which had to be met in 1906. The prestige and power of the Qājārs were now perceptibly failing. During the First World War, Persia remained officially neutral, but despite this, Turkish, Russian and British troops fought over her soil, and, at the end of the war, various local rebellions and separatist movements arose in
the provinces. Accordingly, it was not difficult for a decisive military leader like Riḍā Khān to get the National Assembly to depose the Qājārs in 1925 (see below, no. 152).

Lane-Poole, 260; Zambaur, 261–3; Album, 59–61.
EI² ‘Kādjār’ (A. K. S Lambton).
Riḍā Khān was a soldier in the Persian army who had participated in the coup d’état of 1921 which began the process of the ousting of the Qājārs (see above, no. 151). In December 1925, the Majlis or National Assembly voted him in as Shāh in succession to Aḥmad Qājār, who had left the country two years previously; Riḍā had already assumed the family name of Pahlawī, redolent of ancient Persian glories.

Riḍā’s sixteen-year rule in many ways resembled other military dictatorships which emerged in both the Middle East (such as that of Muṣṭafā Kemāl Atatürk in Turkey) and Europe. His driving aim was the modernisation of his country so that it could stand on its own feet against outside pressures, and this involved the centralisation of power and the bureaucratisation of many aspects of Persian life. During his reign, the country made immense strides in industrialisation, the provision of modern communications and the introduction of modern, secular educational and legal systems; but all this was at the price of individual liberty and freedom of expression. Riḍā Shāh’s pro-German stance in the early part of the Second World War led to his deposition under British and Russian pressure and his replacement by his son Muḥammad. Muḥammad wished to continue his father’s policies, but was involved in disputes with his Majlis and with both
nationalist and communist factions. Educational and land reforms were nevertheless successful while Persia was benefiting from rising oil revenues, but after 1975 lower oil prices brought inflation and economic hardship to the country. Popular discontent was utilised by a wide spectrum of opposition forces, including the Shīʿī clergy, and, unwilling to use military force against his own people, the Shāh, already very sick, left his throne for exile in January 1979. The Pahlawī monarchy was then replaced by an Islamic Republic hostile to virtually everything which the Pahlawīs had sought to achieve.

### Central Asia after the Mongols
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**THE SHĪBĀNIDS (SHAYBĀNIDS) OR ABU ‘L-KHAYRIDS**

906–1007/1500–99

*Transoxania and northern Afghanistan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>906/1500</td>
<td>Abu ‘1-Fath, Shāh Beg Özbeg, conqueror of Transoxania, k. 916/1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918/1512</td>
<td>Köchkunju Muḥammad b. Abi ’l-Khayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937/1531</td>
<td>Abū Saʿīd b. Köchkunju, Muʿaffar al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940/1534</td>
<td>‘Ubaydallāh b. Maḥmūd b. Shāh Budaq, Abu ’l-Ghāzī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946/1539</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh I b. Köchkunju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947/1540</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Laṭif b. Köchkunju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959/1552</td>
<td>Nawrūz Ahmad or Baraq b. Sunjuq b. Abi ’l-Khayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963/1556</td>
<td>Pīr Muḥammad I b. Jānī Beg, great-grandson of Abu ḏl-Khayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968/1561</td>
<td>Iskandar b. Jānī Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991/1583</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh II b. Iskandar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006/1598</td>
<td>‘Abd al-Muʿmin b. ‘Abdallāh II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Succession in Bukhārā of the Toqay Temürids or Janīds, descendants of the Khāns of Astrakhan

When Toqtamïsh and his White Horde moved westwards and united with the Golden Horde in South Russia, Western Siberia fell to the descendants of Jochi’s youngest son Shīban. Later, these descendants came to be known as the Shībānids (Arabised, perhaps with a hope of suggesting a fictitious connection with the ancient Arab tribe of Shaybān of Bakr, as Shaybānids). One branch of them remained in Siberia as Khāns of Tura or Tūrenen (Tiumen) until extinguished in the late sixteenth century, but much of the Horde of Shīban moved into Transoxania, where its members acquired the name of Özbegs (presumably after the famous Golden Horde Khan Muhammad Özbeg, 713–42/1313–41, see above, no. 134), becoming the progenitors of the greater part of the indigenous inhabitants of the present-day Uzbek Republic.

Abu ’l-Khayr took over northern Khwārazm and unsuccessfully attacked the Tīmūrids (see above, no. 144) in Transoxania, but his grandson Muhammad conquered Transoxania by 906/1500 from the last Tīmūrids and temporarily occupied Khurasan also. This last was retaken by Shāh Ismā‘īl Ṣafawī (see above, no. 148), but for much of the sixteenth century the Sunnī orthodox Shībānids carried on warfare against the Shī‘ī Ṣafawids of Persia, and their alliance was courted by other Sunnī empires such as those of the Ottomans and the Mushtals of India. The Shībānīd khanate in fact formed a loose family confederacy, with powerful appanages granted out by the ruling supreme khān to various junior members. These appanages were centred upon Balkh, Bukhara, Tashkent and Samarkand, and these local centres became the capital of the whole khanate when their holders moved up and became recognised as supreme ruler.

Abu ’l-Khayrid’s power reached its peak under ‘Abdallāh II b. Iskandar, effective ruler for nearly forty years, under whom Transoxania experienced much cultural and commercial progress. This Shībānīd clan ruled until 1007/1599, when its last member, Pīr Muḥammad II, was killed by his rival for control of Transoxania, Bāqī Muḥammad b. Jāni Muḥammad, a descendant of Jochi’s son Orda and a connection of the Shībānids in the female line. The family of Bāqī Muḥammad, the Toqay Temūrids or Jānīds, then assumed power in Bukhara (see below, no. 154).
However, a collateral line of Shībānids, the ‘Arabshāhids, ruled in Khwārazm during this period. These were the descendants of ‘Arabshāh b. Pūlād, Pūlād being the great-grandfather of Abu ’1-Khayr. One of them, Ilbars b. Büreke, became khān at Ürgeńch in 917/1511. The ‘Arabshāhids soon controlled the whole of Khwārazm as far south as northern Khurasan. In c. 1008/c. 1600 the khāns moved their capital to Khiva (Khīwa), and thus there began the khanate of that name which was to endure until the early twentieth century; the ‘Arabshāhid line itself seems to have ended around the end of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Lane-Poole, 238–40, 270–3; Zambaur, 270–1, 274–5; Album, 62–3.
EI 'Shābānī Khān’ (W. Barthold), EI² ‘Shībānids’ (R. D. McChesney); EIr ‘‘Arabshāhf (Y. Bregel), ‘Central Asia. VI. In the 10th–12th/16th–18th centuries’ (Robert D. McChesney), with a genealogical table of the Abu ’1-Khayrīds.
THE TOQAY TEMÜRIDS OR JÂNIDS OR ASHTARKHÂNIDS
1007–1160/1599–1747
Transoxania and northern Afghanistan

⊙ 1007/1599 Jānī Muḥammad b. Yār Muḥammad
⊙ 1012/1603 Bāqī Muḥammad b. Jānī Muḥammad
⊙ 1014/1605 Walī Muḥammad b. Jānī Muḥammad

Imām Qulī b. Dīn Muḥammad b. Jānī Muḥammad as
⊙ 1020/1611 Great Khān in Transoxania, with Nadhr Muḥammad
b. Dīn Muḥammad as lesser Khān in Balkh

1055–61/1645–51 Nadhr Muḥammad, as ruler of the reunited khanate,
then in Balkh only
‘ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Nadhr Muḥammad, Khān in
∂ 1061/1651 Transoxania only, after Great Khān, with Ṣubḥān
Qulī b. Nadhr Muḥammad as lesser Khān in Balkh

1092/1681 Șubḥān Qulī as ruler of the reunited khanate
1114/1702 ‘Ubaydallāh b. Șubhān Qulī
⊙ 1123–60/1711–47 Abu ʿl-Fayḍ b. Șubhān Qulī

1160/1747 De facto transfer of power to the Mangīts
(1160–c. 1163/
1747–c. 1750
1164–5/1751–2
⊙ after 1172/1758
ʿAbd al-Muʾmin b. ʿAbī ʿl-Fayḍ, nominal
ʿUbaydallāh b. ʿAbī ʿl-Fayḍ, khāns
Abu ʿl-Ghāzī b. ʿAbd al-Muʾmin, under the
deposed shortly after 1203/1789, Mangīts
It was a Toqay Temürid force which killed the last Abu ’l-Khayrid Pîr Muḥammad (see above, no. 153). This group, under the leadership of Jānī Muḥammad, descendant of a prince from the ruling house of Astrakhan (see above, no. 131) (whence the name of Ashtarkhānids given to the family which was now to rule in Transoxania and the lands along the upper Oxus), then assumed the khanate for itself, with the general acquiescence of the Özbeg amīrs of Transoxania and Balkh, who regarded its members as being suitable continuers of the Chingizid system. Members of the Jānī Begid family of the Abu’l-Khayrids were elbowed aside. As in previous régimes, appanages were distributed to princes of the new ruling family; but for two considerable stretches during the seventeenth century, there was something like a double khanate system, with one brother in Transoxania as Great Khān and another brother in Balkh as lesser Khān. The Khāns in Bukhara had to preserve their authority against internal elements such as the Qazaqs and external powers like the ‘Arabshāhids of Khwārazm (see above, no. 153), activist and aggressive in the mid-seventeenth century under Abu ’l-Ghāzī and his son Anūsha Muḥammad, while those in Balkh were involved in relations with the Šafawids and the Mughals.

Latterly, the rise of powerful Özbeg chiefs and the ravages of the Qazaqs led to a serious decline in order and prosperity in Transoxania. After the death of the last powerful and significant Jānid ruler, Šubḥān Quılı, real political power at Bukhara fell more and more into the hands of the Khāns’ Atalīq or Chief Minister Muḥammad Ḥakim Biy Mangït and his son, and it was from the Mangïts that the ultimate line of Khāns of Bukhara was to arise (see below, no. 155). But at least two puppet khāns from the Jānid family were retained by the Mangïts after Abu ’l-Fayd b. Subḥān Quılı’s time (sc. after 1160/1747), and such fainéants seem to have continued on the throne at Bukhara until almost the end of the eighteenth century.

Lane-Poole, 274–5; Zambaur, 273; Album, 63.
EI² ‘Djânids’ (B. Spuler); EIʳ ‘Central Asia. VI. In the 10th–12th/16th–18th centuries’ (Robert D. McChesney). ‘VII. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries’ (Y. Bregel).
The Mangïts of Bukhara arose from an Özbeg tribe of the same name which became influential under the Toqay Temürids or Jānids (see above, no. 154), so that in the early eighteenth century Khudāyār Biy Mangït became Atalïq or Chief Minister to Abu ’l-Fayḍ Khān, being followed in this office by his son Muḥammad Ḥakīm and his grandson Muḥammad Raḥīm. Very soon the family became the real rulers in Bukhara, although they continued to
enthrone puppet khāns from the Jānids until the end of the eighteenth century. Shāh Murād, however, ended this pretence and himself reigned as fully sovereign Amīr; this last title was borne by all the remaining members of his line, indicating that they saw themselves as Islamic monarchs par excellence and not as khāns in the Turkish steppe tradition.

The greatest single event in the history of Central Asia during the nineteenth century was, of course, the territorial and military advance of Imperial Russia. The Amīr Muẓaffar al-Dīn was crushingly defeated by the Russians, lost some of his territory and in effect lost his independence (1285/1868). The Khanate survived, within somewhat shrunken boundaries, with little Russian interference in its internal affairs, so that the Amīrs remained as despotic and capricious and the religious classes as fanatical and ignorant as before. But in September 1920 the Amīr’s rule was overthrown and a ‘People’s Republic of Bukhara’ set up, soon to be replaced by a forcibly imposed Bolshevism; the last ruler, ‘Ālim Khān, fled to exile in Kabul.

Lane-Poole, 276–7; Zambaur, 273–4; Album, 63.
EI² ‘Mangits’ (Y. Bregel); EIR ‘Central Asia. VII. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries’ (Yuri Bregel).
Hélène Carrère d’Encausse, Islam and the Russian Empire, with a list of rulers at p. 193.
Edward A. Allworth, Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance, 3rd edn, Durham NC and London.
By the mid-eighteenth century, power in the Khānate of Khiva, covering essentially the older province of Khwārazm, was disputed by two powerful families of the Qazaq Chingizids. In 1176/1763, the leader of the Qungrat...
tribe of the Özbegs, Muḥammad Amīn Īnaq (the old title īnaq ‘trusted adviser [of the ruler]’ was by now given to tribal chiefs), became chief of all the local Özbeg tribal chiefs. As Atalīq of Khiva, he subdued the Yomud Turkmens and became virtual ruler, installing puppet khāns from the Qazaq Chingizids. He and his son ‘AwaẒ nevertheless did not themselves assume the title of Khān, but Eltüzer b. ‘AwaẒ felt strong enough to dispense with Chingizid puppets and proclaim himself Khān, founding a new, and the ultimate, line of rulers in Khiva. As in the other two Central Asian khanates, the rulers were by now able to behave more despotically through a declining reliance on Özbeg and other tribal forces and the use of their own personal forces of guards. The Khāns of Khiva were for a while able to expand as far south as Merv (Marw); they continually raided Persian territory in northern Khurasan; and they expanded northwards into the Qazaq Steppe.

But the Khāns were totally unable to withstand Russian pressures. In 1290/1873, a Russian army occupied Khiva with minimal resistance, and stringent peace terms were imposed on what now became a vastly-reduced khanate. The Russians did not interfere internally at Khiva, but the Khāns had no independent status and were far more circumscribed than their fellow-Khāns of Bukhara. In April 1920 the last Khān Saʿīd ‘Abdallāh was deposed and a ‘People’s Republic of Khiva’ proclaimed, to be replaced a year later by a Bolshevik regime.

Lane-Poole, 278–9; Zambaur, 275–6; Album, 64.
EI² ‘Khīwa’ (W. Barthold and M. M. Brill), Suppl. ‘naīḳ’ (Y. Bregel); EIR ‘Central Asia.
VII. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries’ (Yuri Bregel).
Edward A. Allworth, Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance, 3rd edn.
During the later eighteenth century, a third Özbeg khanate, in addition to those of Bukhara and Khiva (see above, nos 155–6), emerged under leaders of the Ming tribe in Farghāna. The rise of the ruling family is usually traced back to Shāh Rukh Atalïq (d. between 1121 and 1133/1709–21). His son ‘Abd al-Karim Biy in 1153/1740 founded the town of Khokand, which was to become the capital of his family’s khanate. His grandson Nārbūta united Farghāna under Ming rule, so that his son and successor ‘Ālim could assume
the title of Khān and formally begin the dynasty. His brother and successor Muḥammad ‘Umar went even further and claimed the title of Amīr al-Mu’minīn on his coins. The Mings soon came to control very extensive territories, beginning with the capture of Tashkent, of great strategic and commercial importance, in 1224/1809, and continuing with expansion northwards into the Qazaq Steppe and across the T’ien Shan into Eastern Turkestan, where the Khāns controlled customs duties from the so-called ‘six towns’ there, and into the Pamirs region. Khokand thus became greater in territory than its two fellow-khanates, if not in population.

Like the other khanates, Khokand was racked by internal tribal and other feuds, and was at one point briefly occupied by Bukhara. It was also threatened by Russian imperial expansion. In 1282/1865, Tashkent was captured and a commercial treaty imposed by Russia on Khokand. In 1292/1875, an internal rebellion brought the Russian army into the Khanate, and early in the next year it was suppressed and its territories annexed to the governorate-general of Turkestan as its Farghānan province.

Lane-Poole, 280; Zambaur, 276; Album, 64.
EI² ‘Khokand’ (W. Barthold and C. E. Bosworth); EIR ‘Central Asia. VII. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries’ (Yuri Bregel).
Edward A. Allworth, Central Asia: 120 Years of Russian Rule, 3rd edn.
### SIXTEEN

**Afghanistan and the Indian Subcontinent**

158

**THE GHAZNAWIDS**

366–582/977–1186

*Afghanistan, Khurasan, Baluchistan and north-western India*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>366/977</td>
<td>Sebüktigin b. Qara Bechkem, Abū Manṣūr Nāṣir al-Dīn wa ’l-Dawla, governor in Ghazna for the Sāmānids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387/997</td>
<td>Ismā‘īl b. Sebüktigin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388/998</td>
<td>Maḥmūd b. Sebüktigin, Abu ’l-Qāsim Sayf al-Dawla, Yamīn al-Dawla wa-Amīn al-Milla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421/1030</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, Abū Aḥmad Jalāl al-Dawla, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421/1031</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd I b. Maḥmūd, Abū Sa‘īd Shihāb al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432/1040</td>
<td>Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432/1041</td>
<td>Mawdūd b. Mas‘ūd, Abu’l-Fath Shihāb al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd II b. Mawdūd, Abū Ja‘far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>‘Alī b. Mas‘ūd, Abu’l-Ḥasan Bahā’ al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440/1049</td>
<td>ʻAbd al-Rashīd b. Maḥmūd, Abū Mansūr ʻIzz al-Dawla wa-Zayn al-Milla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443/1052</td>
<td>Usurpation in Ghazna of the slave commander Abū Saʻīd Ṭoghrīl, Qiwām al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492/1099</td>
<td>Masʻūd III b. Ibrāhīm, Abū Saʻd Abu’l-Mulūk ʻAlāʼal-Dawla wa-l-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508/1115</td>
<td>Shīrzād b. Masʻūd III, ʻAdud al-Dawla, Kamāl al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509/1116</td>
<td>Malik Arslan or Arslan Shāh b. Masʻūd III, Sultān al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510/1117</td>
<td>Seljuq occupation of Ghazna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545/1150</td>
<td>Ghūrid occupation of Ghazna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547/1152</td>
<td>Bahrām Shāh b. Masʻūd III, Abu’l-Muẓaffar Yamīn al-Dawla wa-Amīn al-Milla, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552/1157</td>
<td>or after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582/1186</td>
<td>Ghūrid conquest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the death in 350/961 of the Sāmānid Amīr ʻAbd al-Malik (see above, no. 83), the Turkish slave commander of the Sāmānid army in Khurasan, Alptigin, attempted to manipulate the succession at Bukhara in his own favour. He failed, and was obliged to withdraw with some of his troops to Ghazna in what is now eastern Afghanistan. Here on the periphery of the Sāmānid empire, and facing the pagan subcontinent of India, a series of Turkish commanders followed Alptigin, governing nominally for the Sāmānids, until in 366/977 Sebüktigin came to power. Under him, the Ghaznavid tradition of raiding the plains of India in search of treasure and
slaves was established, but it was his son Maḥmūd who became fully independent and who achieved a reputation throughout the eastern Islamic world as hammer of the infidels, penetrating down the Ganges valley to Muttra (Mat‘hurā) and Kanawj and into the Kathiawar (Kāflāār) peninsula to attack the famous idol temple there of Somnath (Sūmanāt). In the north, he set up the Oxus as his frontier with the rival power of the Qarakhanids (see above, no. 90), and annexed Khwārazm. The former Sāmānid province of Khurasan was taken over and, towards the end of his life, Maḥmūd’s armies marched into northern and western Persia and overthrew the Būyid amirate there (see above, no. 75, 1).

Maḥmūd’s empire at his death was thus the most extensive and imposing edifice in eastern Islam since the time of the Ṣaffārids (see above, no. 84), and his army the most effective military machine of the age. With the adoption of Persian administrative and cultural ways, the Ghaznawids threw off their original Turkish steppe background and became largely integrated with the Perso-Islamic tradition. But under his son Mas‘ūd I, Maḥmūd’s empire – essentially a personal creation – could not be maintained in the west against the Seljuqs (see above, no. 91), and Khwārazm, Khurasan and northern Persia were lost to the incomers. The middle years of the eleventh century were largely spent in warfare with the Seljuqs over possession of Sistan and western Afghanistan. At the accession of Ibrahim b. Mas‘ūd in 451/1059, a modus vivendi was worked out with the Seljuqs, and peace reigned substantially for over half a century.

Reduced as it now was to eastern Afghanistan, Baluchistan and north-western India, the Ghaznawid empire was still an imposing and powerful one. It inevitably acquired a more pronounced orientation towards India, but the courts of the sultans of the twelfth century were centres of a splendid Persian culture, with such luminaries as the mystical poet Sanā‘ī. In the early part of that century, the Ghaznawid Bahrām Shāh became tributary to the Seljuqs, for Sanjar had helped Bahrām Shāh secure his throne. Towards the end of the latter’s reign, the capital Ghazna suffered a frightful sacking by the ‘World Incendiary’, the Ghūrid ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Husayn (see below, no. 159). The rise of the Ghūrids in fact reduced the power of the last Ghaznawids, and their rule was latterly confined to the Punjab (Panjāb) until the Ghūrid Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad finally extinguished the line in 582/1186.

Justi, 444; Lane-Poole, 285–90; Zambaur, 282–3; Album, 36–7.
EI² ‘Ghaznavids’ (B. Spuler); EIr ‘Ghaznavids’ (C. E. Bosworth).


1. The main line in Ghūr and then also in Ghazna

- 401/1011 until
- the 420s/1030s
- after 451/1059

? Muḥammad b. Sūrī Shansabānl, chief in Ghūr

Abū ‘Alī b. Muḥammad, Ghaznavid vassal

‘Abbās b. Shīth

Muḥammad b. ‘Abbās

? Ḥasan b Muḥammad, Quṭb al-Dīn

Ḥusayn I b. Ḥasan, Abu ’1-Mulūk ‘Izz al-Dīn

Sūri b. Husayn I, Sayf al-Dīn, in Flrūzkūh as Malik al-Jibāl

Sām I b. Husayn I, Bahā’ al-Dīn

Ø (569–99/1173–1203)

Ø 599/1203

Muḥammad b. Sām I, Shihāb al-Dīn, Mu‘izz al-Dīn, ruler in Ghazna)

Ø 602/1206

Ø (602–)

Yıldız Mu‘izzī, Tāj al-Dīn, governor in Ghazna for

---

THE GHŪRIDS
Early fifth century to 612/early eleventh century to 1215 Ghūr, Khurāsan and north-western India

---

Muḥammad b. Sām I, supreme sultan in Ghūr and India

Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Ghiyāth al-Dīn

Ø (602–)
The remote, mountainous region of what is now Afghanistan, called Ghūr, was almost wholly \textit{terra incognita} to the early Islamic geographers, known only as a source of slaves and as the home of a race of bellicose mountaineers who remained pagan until well into the eleventh century. At this time, the Ghaznawids (see above, no. 158) led raids into Ghūr and made the local chiefs of the Shansabānī family their vassals; but in the early twelfth century, the fortunes of the Ghaznawids waned and Seljuq influence now spread through Ghūr, so that ‘Izz al-Dīn Husayn, the first fully historical figure of the family, paid tribute to Sultan Sanjar (see above, no. 91, 1). Attempts by Sultan Bahrām Shāh to reassert Ghaznawid influence led to the Ghūrids’ sack of Ghazna in 545/1150 and the eventual acquisition by them of all the Ghaznawid possessions on the Afghan plateau. In the west, Ghūrid expansionist policies were at first checked by Sanjar, but the collapse of Seljuq power in Khurasan allowed the Sultans to establish an empire, centred on Firūzkūh in Ghūr, stretching almost from the Caspian Sea to northern India, where the Ghaznawid traditions of \textit{jihād} against the infidels were inherited and kept up.

The joint architects of this achievement were the two brothers Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad and Muʿizz al-Dīn Aḥmamad, the former campaigning
mainly in the west and the latter in India. Bāmiyān and the lands along the upper Oxus were ruled by another branch of the Ghūrid family. Ghiyāth al-Dīn contested possession of Khurasan with the Khwārazm Shāhs and the latter’s suzerains, the Qara Khitay (see above, no. 89, 4); at one point he invaded Khwārazm itself, and by his death held all Khurasan as far west as Bīṣṭām.

Yet it seems that the Ghūrids’ resources of manpower were inadequate for holding this empire together, whereas their Khwārazmian adversaries could draw freely on the Inner Asian steppes for troops. After Muʿizz al-Dīn Aḥammad’s death in 602/1206, the dynasty was rent by internal squabbles. A group of their Turkish soldiers made themselves independent in Ghazna under Tāj al-Dīn Yıldız, and could not be dislodged by the sultans in Fīrūzkūh and Bāmiyān. The Khwārazm Shāh Jalāl al-Dīn was therefore able to step in and incorporate the Ghūrid lands into his own empire. But this Khwārazmian domination was only of brief duration, for the whole eastern Islamic world was shortly afterwards overwhelmed by Chingiz Khān’s Mongols (see above, no. 131). Moreover, the Turkish generals of Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad continued to uphold Ghūrid policies and traditions in northern India, where Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak was installed as ruler in Lahore (Lāhawur) by one of the last Ghūrids (see below, no. 160, 1).

The coinage of the Ghūrids is particularly interesting, in that Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad minted coins for his Indian lands with the Islamic shahāda and its proclamation of tawhīd, the indivisible unity of God, on one side, and on the other side Sanskrit inscriptions and the likeness of the Hindu goddess Lakṣmi.

Justi, 455–6; Lane-Poole, 291–4; Zambaur, 280–1, 284; Album, 39–40.
EI² ‘Ghūrids’ (C. E. Bosworth); ELR ‘Ghurids’ (C. E. Bosworth).
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THE DELHI SULTANS
602–962/1206–1555
Northern India and, at times, the northern Deccan

1. The Mu‘izzī or Shamsī Slave Kings

602/1206 Aybak, Qutb al-Dīn, Malik of Hindūstān in Lahore for the Ghūrids
607/1210 Ārām Shāh, protégé, dubiously the son, of Aybak, in Lahore
607/1211 Iltutmish b. Ham Khān, Shams al-Dīn, sultan in Delhi (Dihlī)
633/1236 Fīrūz Shāh I b. Iltutmish, Rukn al-Dīn
634/1236 Radiyya Begum b. Iltutmish, Jalālat al-Dīn
637/1240 Bahrām Shāh b. Iltutmish, Mu‘izz al-Dīn
639/1242 Mas‘ūd Shāh b. Fīrūz Shāh I, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn
644/1246 Maḥmūd Shāh I b. Nāṣir al-Dīn b. Iltutmish, Nāṣir al-Dīn
664/1266 Balban, Ulugh Khān, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, already viceroy [nā‘ib-i mamlakat] in the previous reign
689/1290 Kayūmarth b. Mu‘izz al-Dīn Kay Qubādh, Shams al-Dīn

2. The Khaljīs

689/1290 Fīrūz Shāh II Khaljī b. Yusquhrush, Jalāl al-Dīn
695/1296 Ibrāhīm Shāh I Qadīr Khān b. Fīrūz Shāh II, Rukn al-Dīn
3. The Tughluqids

- **715/1316** ‘Umar Shāh b. Muḥammad Shāh I, Shihāb al-Dīn
- **716–20/1316–20** Mubārak Shāh b. Muḥammad Shāh I, Qutb al-Dīn
- **720/1320** Usurpation of Khusraw Khan Barwāri, Nāsir al-Dīn

- **720/1320** Tughluq Shāh I b. ? Ghāzī, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
- **725/1325** Muḥammad Shāh II b. Tughluq Shāh I, Abu ‘l-Mujāhid Ulugh Khan Jawna Ghiyāth al-Dīn
- **789/1387** (752/1351) Muḥammad Shāh III b. Fīrūz Shāh III, Nāṣir al-Dīn, as co-ruler with his father
- **790/1388** Tughluq Shāh II b. Fath Khan b. Fīrūz Shāh III, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, k. 791/1389
- **(? 791/1389** ? Fīrūz Shāh Zafar b. Fīrūz Shāh III; identical with the next ruler?)
- **791–6/1389–94** Muḥammad Shāh III b. Fīrūz Shāh III, Nāsir al-Dīn, in the provinces and then Delhi
- **796/1394** Sikandar Shāh I b. Muḥammad III, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn
- **796/1394** Maḥmūd Shāh II b. Muḥammad III, Nāṣir al-Dīn, first reign
- **(797/1395** Nuṣrat Shāh b. Fath Khan, in Fīrūzābād, d. 801/1399)
- **804/1401** Maḥmūd Shāh II b. Muḥammad III, second reign

**Succession of Dawlat Khan Lodi**

4. The Sayyids
Islam was first implanted in the lower Indus valley by the Arab governors of the East for the Umayyad caliphs; in 92/711, Sind was conquered by the commander Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim al-Thaqafī. This foothold was retained during the next three centuries, a period in which some of the Muslim communities there were affected by the propaganda of Ismāʿīli Shīʿī missionaries, who were working intensively on behalf of the Fāṭimids (see above, no. 27) in many parts of the Islamic world, from North Africa to Yemen and the fringes of India. There were also trade contacts between Arabia and the Persian Gulf region and the coastlands of peninsular India, namely Gujarāt, Bombay and the Deccan coasts, just as there had been in classical times; but these sporadic and superficial contacts hardly affected the interior, the overwhelming land mass of the subcontinent.

It was the Turkish Ghaznavids who first brought the full weight of Muslim
military power into northern India, overthrowing powerful native dynasties like the Hindūshāhīs of Wayhind, reducing many of the Rājput rulers to tributary status and raiding as far as Somnath and Benares (Baāaras, Varanasi), although most of those rulers who submitted threw off their obligations as soon as the Ghaznawid armies went back. Maḥmūd of Ghazna became an Islamic hero for his attacks on infīdel Hindustan, but it is clear that the sultan was not a fanatical zealot, bent on the conversion or extermination of the Hindus - a palpably impossible task – since he used Indian troops in his own armies, and it does not seem that conversion to Islam was a condition of recruitment. The Ghaznawids interest in India was primarily financial, the subcontinent being regarded as an almost inexhaustible reservoir of slaves and treasure; but they did take over the Punjab and make it a permanent base for the extension of Muslim power through northern India, and towards the end of the dynasty’s life Lahore became the sultans’ capital (see above, no. 158).

Hence there existed there a springboard for the Indian conquests of Muʻizz al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī and his Turkish slave generals in the last years of the twelfth century and at the beginning of the thirteenth. After eliminating the last Ghaznawids, he expanded into the Gangetic plain, attacking local Rājput princes, such as the Chāhamāna or Chawhān king of Ajmer and Delhi (Dīhlī) and then the Gāhadavāla king of Benares and Kanawj. Among Muʻizz al-Dīn’s commanders, Qutb al-Dīn Aybak was placed in charge of the Indian conquests during his master’s lifetime, when the sultan was involved in Khurasan and elsewhere. Aybak held on to the Ghūrid conquests in the Punjab and the Ganges-Jumna Doʻāb, and raided as far as Gujarat. Another general, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Muḥammad Khaljī, penetrated into Bihār and Bengal (Bangāla), making Gawr or Lakhnawatī his base there, and he even attacked Assam (see below, no. 161, 1). It is thus in the period of the Ghūrids and their commanders that the permanent establishment of Islam in northern India begins: long-established Hindu dynasties were humbled and the foundations of various Muslim sultanates laid. On the other hand, throughout the period of the Delhi Sultanate and after, many local Hindu chiefs retained their power, especially away from the main centres of Turco-Afghan military concentration, and Hindus always played important roles in the administrations and armies of Muslim potentates.

When Muʻizz al-Dīn died in 602/1206, Aybak assumed power in Lahore as Malik or ruler on behalf of the Ghūrid sultan in Fīrūzkūh. Henceforth,
Ghazna and the Afghan provinces of the Ghūrid empire were severed from India, falling briefly to the Khwārazm Shāhs and then to the Mongols, but Ghūrid traditions of both civil authority and military organisation lived on in northern India under the succeeding Muslim rulers there. Aybak and his successors up to 689/1290 are often called the Slave Kings, although only three of them, Aybak, Iltutmish and Balban, were of servile origin and all had in any case been manumitted by their masters before achieving power. Nor did these rulers belong to a single line, but to three distinct ones. Under Iltutmish, the real architect of an independent sultanate in Delhi, Sind, formerly in the hands of the Muʿizzī general Nāṣir al-Dīn Qabācha, was added to the Delhi Sultanate. He also managed to keep the Khwārazmians out of his dominions, but the Mongols overran the Punjab in 639/1241, sacking Lahore and advancing as far as Uch (Uucch). A succession of weaker sultans brought internal discord, and the unity of the Sultanate was only assured first by the regency and then by the independent rule of the capable Balban, who had been originally one of the famous band of Turkish military slaves, the *Chihilgān* (in the surmise of Dr Peter Jackson, so called because they each themselves commanded forty military slaves) of Iltutmish. Balban continued the work of his master, placing the Sultanate on a firm military and governmental basis by his reforms, and exalting the authority of the sovereign on traditional Perso-Islamic lines. Spiritual links with the rest of the Islamic world were strengthened. Already, Iltutmish had sought investiture from the Ṭabbāsid caliph al-Mustansir; after the demise of the last caliph in Baghdad, al-Mustaʿsim, the Muʿizzī sultans long continued to keep his name on their coins. In this way, one can discern the motif of identification with the wider world of Sunnī Islam and acknowledgement of the moral leadership of the caliphate; such threads run through much of the history of Indian Islam and reflect its struggle to maintain its identity against the pressures of the enveloping Hindu environment. Important, too, as a fertilising influence in the culture of this period were the waves of refugees – scholars and religious figures – from Transoxania and Persia, who fled before the Mongols and found their way to India during such reigns as those of Iltutmish and Balban; and in later times also, such as the reign of Muḥammad II b. Tughluq, infusions of fresh blood continued to revitalise Indo-Muslim religious life and culture.

In 689/1290, the Muʿizzī sultans were succeeded by the line of Jalāl al-Dīn Firūz Shāh II Khaljī. The Khalaj were originally a Turkish people (or perhaps
a Turkicised people of a different ethnic origin) inhabiting eastern Afghanistan; it seems likely that the later Ghilzay Afghans were descended from them. During the reign of Mu‘izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī, the Khalaj had played a prominent part in the invasions of India, with Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Muḥammad Khaljī especially notable for bringing Islam to eastern India and Bengal (see above). The pressing task for Fīrūz Shāh II was to keep out the Mongols; it was, nevertheless, during his reign that large numbers of Mongols converted to Islam were allowed to settle in the Delhi area. The outstanding figure of the dynasty is undeniably ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad Shāh I, who considered himself a second Alexander the Great and had grandiose dreams of assembling a vast empire. In actuality, he had to cope with the threat from the Chaghatayid Mongols, who several times raided as far as Delhi, but his ambitions found their main outlet in South India, the rich area south of the Vindhya Mountains as yet untouched by Muslim arms. An attack in 695/1296 on Deogir or Devagiri in the north-western Deccan, capital of the Yādavas, brought him the wealth which he afterwards used to win the sultanate for himself, and when he was firmly established on the throne he sent further armies to the southernmost tip of the Deccan. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad continued to use the traditional designation of Nāṣir Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Helper of the Commander of the Faithful’; the first and last Indo-Muslim ruler to appropriate for himself the caliphal title of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn was his son Qutb al-Dīn Mubarak Shāh I.

The Khaljī line collapsed when Khusraw Khān, a Gujarātī convert from Hinduism and favourite of the last Khaljī sultan, possibly apostatised from Islam and certainly briefly usurped the throne in Delhi. Muslim control was reestablished by the Turco-Indian Tughluq Shāh I and his son Muḥammad Shāh II, who in 720/1320 inaugurated the reign of the Tughluqid sultans. The first did much to restore the stability of the Sultanate and to reimpose Muslim control over the Deccan. Muḥammad Shāh II is an enigmatic figure: a skilful general whose behaviour was nevertheless often erratic and his judgement poor. Increases of taxation necessary to run the sultanate and to finance warfare made him unpopular, but his decision of 727/1327 to transfer the capital from Delhi southwards to Deogir, now renamed Dawlatābād, proved disastrous. On the other hand, he did successfully repel a Chaghatayid invasion from Transoxania, but his project for taking advantage of Chaghatayid weakness, perhaps in concert with the II Khānids, and for invading Central Asia via the Pamirs (if such really was his intention, the
sources being vague over this), was a chimera. Muḥammad Shāh II had diplomatic relations with the Islamic world outside India, including with the Mamlūks of Egypt (see above, no. 31), and sought investiture from the ‘Abbāsid puppet caliph in Cairo (see above, no. 3, 3). The diversion of energies to unrealistic military projects on the northern frontiers of the subcontinent led to a weakening of the Tughluqid hold over the Deccan. An independent Muslim sultanate arose in Ma‘bar or Madura in the extreme south (see below, no. 166), and in 748/1347 the Bahmanid kingdom of the central Deccan was founded by Alā’ al-Dīn Ḥasan Bahman Shāh (see below, no. 167, 1). Later, Fīrūz Shāh III restored sultanal authority in Sind and Bengal, but made no attempt to touch the Deccan. The last Tughluqids were weaklings, so that Tīmūr was able to invade India in 801/1398–9 and wreak great devastation; as a result, the political unity of the Sultanate was dissolved, and various Muslim leaders seized independent power in the provinces.

For rather less than forty years, power was in the hands of the line of Khīḍr Khān, former governor of Multan (Multān), first for the last Tughluqids and then for Tīmūr. Khīḍr Khan ruled in the names of Tīmūr and his son Shāh Rukh, contenting himself with the title Rāyat-i A’la ‘Exalted Banner’; because of their claim to a fictitious descent from the Prophet, his line acquired the name of Sayyids. The effective authority of the Sayyids was reduced to a small area round Delhi, and with their initial dependence on the Timūrids they were unpopular with the Turkish and Afghan military classes in the capital. In 855/1451, their line was replaced by that of Bahlūl Khān, a chief of the Afghan tribe of the Lōdīs and formerly governor of Sirhind and Lahore. Bahlūl was the equal in vigour of the great Tughluqī sultans, and did much to restore Muslim prestige in India; the authority of Delhi was imposed over much of Central India, and the Sharqī rulers of Jawnpur (see below, no. 164) overthrown in 881/1477. His son Sikandar II conducted operations against the Rājput princes with some success, and moved his capital to Agra as being a better base for these attacks. However, the last Lōdī, Ibrahīm II, alienated many of his nobles and commanders, and certain of these invited the Chaghatayid Mughal Bābur, then in Kabul, to intervene.

Bābur’s victory at the first battle of Pānīpat, to the north of Delhi, in 932/1526 resulted in Ibrahīm’s death, the end of the Lōdī line and the first appearance of the dynasty of the Mughals in India. But this did not mean the permanent establishment yet of Bābur’s line, for his son Humāyūn’s reign was
interrupted by the fifteen-year restoration of Afghan rule in India by Shir Shāh Sur. Operating from Bihar, Shir Shāh defeated Humāyūn at Kanawj, thus negating all Bābur’s work. As well as being a fine general, Shir Shāh introduced important fiscal and land reforms. But for his premature death, a strong Afghan sultanate might have been implanted in India; discouraging Humāyūn from trying his fortunes once more; as it was, the weakness of Shīr Shāh’s ephemeral successors facilitated a successful Mughal revanche.

Justi, 464–5; Lane-Poole, 295–303; Sachau, 32 no. 87 (Khaljīs), 33 no. 93 (Sūrīs); Zambaur, 285–8.
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1. The governors for the Delhi Sultans, often ruling as independent sovereigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>594/1198</td>
<td>Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, conqueror of Bihār and Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603/1206</td>
<td>ʿAlī Mardān, first term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603/1207</td>
<td>Muḥammad Shirān Khān, ʿIzz al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604/1208</td>
<td>ʿIwad, Husām al-Dīn, first term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607/1210</td>
<td>ʿAlī Mardān, ruling title ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, second term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610/1213</td>
<td>ʿIwad, Husām al-Dīn, ruling title Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624/1227</td>
<td>Maḥmūd b. Iltutmish, Nāsir al-Dīn, Malik al-Sharq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626/1229</td>
<td>Bilge Khan b. Mawdūd, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, ruled as Dawlat Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629/1232</td>
<td>Masʿūd Jānī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, first term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630/1233</td>
<td>Aybak Khitāʿī, Sayf al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633/1236</td>
<td>Aʿor Khan Aybak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633/1236</td>
<td>Toghrīl Toghan Khān, ʿIzz al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642/1244</td>
<td>Temūr Qirān Khān, Qamar al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645/1247</td>
<td>Masʿūd Jānī b. Masʿūd Jānī, Jalāl al-Dīn, first term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649/1251</td>
<td>Yuzbak, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, with the ruling title Abu ʿ1-Muzaffar Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The governors, and then independent rulers, of Balban’s line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Ruler(s) and Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>655/1257</td>
<td>Balban Yuzbakī, ‘Izz al-Dīn, first term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>Mas‘ūd Jānī b. Mas‘ūd Jānī, second term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>Balban Yuzbakī, second term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>Muḥammad Arslan Khān Sanjar, Tāj al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663/1265</td>
<td>Tātār Khān b. Muḥammad Arslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666/1268</td>
<td>Shīr Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670–80/1272–81</td>
<td>Toghrīl, with the ruling title Mughlth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Ruler(s) and Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>681/1282</td>
<td>Bughra b. Balban, Nāṣir al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690/1291</td>
<td>Kay Kāwūs b. Bughra, Rukn al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701–22/1302–22</td>
<td>Fīrūz Shāh, Shams al-Dīn, latterly in Bihār only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 709/c. 1309</td>
<td>Maḥmūd b. Fīrūz Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, in Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 717–18/c. 1317–18</td>
<td>Bughra b. Fīrūz Shāh, Shihāb al-Dīn, in Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722/1322</td>
<td>Bahādur b. Fīrūz Shāh, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, also a provincial ruler during his father’s lifetime, first term of office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724/1324</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Fīrūz Shāh, NāṢīr al-Dīn, governor for the Delhi Sultan in Lakhnawatī, d. after 728/1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726–39/1326–38</td>
<td>Pindar or Bīdar Qadïr Khan, in Lakhnawatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726–41/1326–40</td>
<td>Yahyā, ‘Izz al-Dīn, in Sātgā’on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727–39/1327–39</td>
<td>Bahrām, Tātār Khān, in Sonārgā’on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727–8/1327–8</td>
<td>Bahādur b. Fīrūz Shāh, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, in Sonārgā’on jointly with Tātār Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739–50/1339–49</td>
<td>Mubārak Shāh, Fakhr al-Dīn, in Sonārgā’on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750–3/1349–52</td>
<td>Ghāzī Shāh (?) b. Mubārak Shāh, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, in Sonārgā’on until its conquest by Ilyās Shāh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The line of Ilyās Shāh

740/1339 Ilyās Shāh, Shams al-Dīn, originally in Sātgā‘on
759/1358 Sikandar Shāh I b. Ilyās Shāh
792/1390 A‘zam Shāh b. Sikandar Shāh I, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
813/1410 Hamza Shāh b. A‘zam Shāh, Sayf al-Dīn
815/1412 Bāyazid Shāh b. A‘zam Shāh, Sayf al-Dīn
817/1414 Fīrūz Shāh b. Bāyazīd Shāh

4. The line of Rājā Ganeśa (Ganesh)

817/1414 Jadu, son of Rājā Ganeśa, first reign under the regency of his father
819/1416 Rājā Ganeśa, as Danūj Mardan Deva
821/1418 Mahendra Deva, son of Rājā Ganeśa
821/1418 Jadu, now Muḥammad Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, second reign
836–40/1433–7 Aḥammad Shāh b. Muḥammad Shāh

5. The line of Ilyās Shāh restored

841/1437 Maḥmūd Shāh, descendant of Ilyās Shāh, Abu ‘l-Muẓaffar Nāṣir al-Dīn
864/1460 Barbak Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh, Rukn al-Dīn
879/1474 Yūsuf Shāh b. Barbak Shāh, Shams al-Dīn
886/1481 Sikandar Shāh II (b) b. Yūsuf Shāh
886–92/1481–7 Husayn Fath Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn

6. The domination of the Habashis

892/1487 Sulṭān Shāhzāda Barbak Shāh
892/1487 ‘Andil, ruled as Aḥammad Firūz Shāh Sayf al-Dīn
895/1490 Maḥmūd Shāh (?) b. Aḥammad Firūz Shāh, Nāṣir al-Dīn
896–8/1491–3 Dīwāna, ruled as Muẓaffar Shams al-Dīn
7. The line of Sayyid Husayn Shāh

Ø 898/1493 Sayyid Husayn Shāh, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn
Ø 925/1519 Nusrat Shāh b. Husayn Shāh, Nāṣir al-Dīn
Ø 940–4/1534–7 Maḥmūd Shāh b. Husayn Shāh, Ghiyāth al-Dīn

8. The Sūrīs

944/1537 Shir Shāh Sūr
Ø 952/1545 Muḥammad Khan Sur, Shams al-Dīn, independent in 960/1553
Ø 962/1555 Khḍr Khān Bahadur Shāh b. Muḥammad Khan Sūr, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
Ø 968–71/1561–4 Jalāl Shāh b. Muḥammad Khan Sūr, Abu’ l-Muzaffar

9. The Kararanis

971 /1564 Sulaymān Kararānī
980/1572 Bāyazīd Kararāni b. Sulaymān
Ø 980–4/1572–6 Dāwūd Kararānī b. Sulaymān

984/1576 Mughal conquest

The conquest of the easternmost provinces of India, Bihār and Bengal, was the achievement of Mu‘izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī’s commander Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī, who raided as far as the mountain barrier beyond which lay Tibet, and founded a capital at Lakhnawati or Gawr in the frontier zone between Bihar and Bengal. Subsequently, governors of the Delhi Sultans made other towns into centres of government, Sātgā’on in south-western Bengal and Sonārgā’on in the east (near modern Dacca or Dhākā), until Ilyās Shāh integrated all these into the independent Bengal sultanate. Because of the province’s richness and its distance from Delhi, Bengal had always been difficult for the Sultans to administer, and central
government control was often sporadic. In the first half of the fourteenth century, Muslim troops penetrated across the Brahmaputra into Sylhet (Silhet) and Assam and to Chittagong on the Bay of Bengal, and it was from this time that a steady process of conversion to Islam of low-caste Hindus began, leading to the eventual preponderance of Muslims over much of Bengal.

In the time of Muḥammad b. Tughluq, Bengal came to be ruled by Fakhr al-Dīn Mubārak Shāh at Sonārgā‘on in the east and ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘All at Lakhnawatī in the west, and henceforth for over two centuries independent sultans controlled Bengal. Under the Ilyāsids, the Islamic arts and sciences flourished, and commerce in Bengal’s textiles and foodstuffs was encouraged. In the first decade of the fifteenth century, Ghiyāth al-Dīn A‘zam Shāh renewed old diplomatic and cultural links with China, and the growth of the port of Chittagong probably reflects increased trade with the lands farther east. The reign of the Ilyāsids was interrupted for over twenty years by the seizure of power by Rājā Ganeśa, a local Hindu landlord of Bengal; his son became a Muslim and ruled as Jalāl al-Dīn Aḥammad, and despite their Hindu origins the family was able to rule with some Muslim support. Under the restored Ilyāsids, the influence of Habashī or black palace guards grew, until in 892/1487 their commander, the eunuch Sulṣān Shāhzāda, murdered the last Ilyāsid and seized power for himself.

Order was eventually restored by Sayyid ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Husayn Shāh, whose enlightened rule came opportunely after the chaos of the Habashi period. Bihār was annexed; asylum given to the Sharqī ruler of Jawnpur, dispossessed by the Lōdīs of Delhi (see below, no. 164, and above, no. 160, 5), and the Jawnpur troops added to the Bengal army. The growth of a vernacular Bengali literature was a process continuing during these centuries, and royal encouragement is seen in Nuṣrat Shāh b. Sayyid Ḥusayn’s patronage of a Bengali translation of the Mahābhārata. The line of Sayyid Ḥusayn was ended by the meteoric rise of the Afghan chief Shīr Shāh Sūr, who took over Bengal and used it as a base from which to eject the Mughal Humāyūn from India (see above, no. 160, 6, and below, no. 175). But once the Mughals were firmly re-established in Lahore and Delhi and the Afghans defeated, Mughal influence began to be felt in Bengal. Sulaymān Kararānī, the former governor of southern Bihār, acknowledged the suzerainty of Akbar, and in 984/1576 Bengal was overrun and incorporated in the Mughal empire, becoming one of its ṣūbas or provinces.
Lane-Poole, 305–8; Zambaur, 286, 289.
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THE SULTANS OF KASHMĪR
739–996/1339–1588

1. The line of Shāh Mīr Swātī

739/1339  Shāh Mīr Swātī, Shāms al-Dīn
743/1342  Jamshīd b. Shāh Mīr
755/1354  Shirāshāmak b. ‘Alī Shīr, Shihāb al-Dīn
775/1374  Hindal b. ‘Alī Shīr, Quṭb al-Dīn
792/1390  Sikandar b. Hindal, But-shikan, until 795/1393 under the
regency of his mother Sura
⊘ 813/1410  ‘Alī Mīr Khān b. Sikandar, ruled as ‘Alī Shāh
⊘ 823/1420  Shāhī Khān b. Sikandar, ruled as Sultan Zayn al-‘Ābidīn,
called Bud Shāh ‘Great King’
⊘ 875/1470  Ḥājji Khān b. Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, ruled as Haydar Shāh
⊘ 876/1472  Ḥasan Shāh b. Ḥaydar
889/1484  Muḥammad Shāh b. Ḥasan, first reign
⊘ 892/1487  Fatḥ Shāh b. Ad‘ham Khān b. Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, first reign
⊘ 904/1499  Muḥammad b. Ḥasan, second reign
910/1505  Fatḥ Shāh b. Ad‘ham Khān, second reign
922/1516  Muḥammad Shāh b. Ḥasan, third reign
934/1528  Ibrāhīm Shāh b. Muḥammad, first reign
935/1529  Nāzūk or Nadir Shāh b. Fatḥ
⊘ 936/1530  Muḥammad Shāh b. Ḥasan, fourth reign
943/1537  Shams al-Dīn b. Muḥammad
Because of its geographical position, separated by high mountain barriers from the plains of northern India, Kashmir was long sheltered from Muslim raids. It remained under its own dynasty of Hindu rulers long after most of northern India had passed under Muslim control. Mahmūd of Ghazna (see above, no. 158) made two attempts to invade Kashmir from the south, but was held up on both occasions by the fortress of Lohkot. However, Muslim Turkish mercenaries [Turuška] began to be employed by the Hindu kings of Kashmir, and the process of Islamisation, which has given the province today an overwhelmingly Muslim population, must have tentatively begun.

In 735/1335, the throne there was seized by Shāh Mīr Swātī, a Muslim adventurer who was probably of Pathan origin and who had been minister to Rājā Sinha Deva. The régime of Shāms al-Dīn (this being the honorific which Shāh Mīr adopted) was tolerant and mild towards the majority Hindus, but his grandson Sikandar was a Muslim zealot who patronised the ‘ulamā’ and scholars and who persecuted the Hindus, destroying their temples and earning for himself the epithet But-shikan Idol-breaker’. Already before this, the Kubrawī Šūfī saint ‘All Hamadhānī and many Sayyids had arrived in
Kashmīr, and during Sikandar’s reign the group of Bayhaqī Sayyids, who were to play a prominent role in the religious and intellectual life of the province, migrated from Delhi to Kashmīr. However, his son Zayn al-‘Ābidīn reversed this rigorist policy, and his long and enlightened reign was something of a Golden Age for Kashmīr; under his patronage, the Mahābhārata and Kalhana’s twelfth-century metrical chronicle of Kashmīr, the Rājataranginī, were translated into Persian. Unfortunately, his descendants were lesser men, and much internecine strife now followed; various provincial chiefs took advantage of the mountainous and difficult terrain and established a virtual independence. In particular, the influence of the powerful Chak tribe, originally immigrants from Dardistān, grew, its leaders serving as ministers and commanders for the last feeble fainéant rulers of Shāh Mīr’s line. The Mughal prince Ḥaydar Dughlat invaded Kashmīr in 947/1540, and ruled in Srinagar for ten years on behalf of his kinsman Humāyūn, until he was killed in an uprising. The Chak family was now again in the ascendant, and after 968/1561 they ruled as sovereigns themselves, assuming the title Pīdishāh ‘Monarch’ in imitation of the Mughals; their religious inclinations were towards Shī‘ism. However, the last two Chaks had to rule as vassals of Akbar until they were finally deposed and Kashmīr fully incorporated into the Mughal empire.

Justi, 478; Sachau, 32–3 nos 89 and 90; Zambaur, 293–4.
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THE SULTANS OF GUJARĀT
806–980/1403–1573
Western India

(793/1391) Žafar Khān b. Wajīh al-Mulk, governor with the title of Muẓaffār Khān

806/1403 Tātār Khān b. Muẓaffar, proclaimed himself Sultan with the title of Muḥammad Shāh (I)

810/1407 Muẓaffār Khān, proclaimed Sultan with the title of Muẓaffār Shāh (I)

⊘ 814/1411 Aḥmad Shāh I b. Muḥammad b. Muẓaffār, Shīhāb al-Dīn
⊘ 846/1442 Muḥammad Shāh II Karīm b. Aḥmad
⊘ 855/1451 Jalāl Khān b. Muḥammad II, succeeded as Aḥmad Shāh (II) Quṭb al-Dīn

862/1458 Dāwūd Khān b. Aḥmad I
⊘ 862/1458 Fatḥ Khān b. Muḥammad II, succeeded as Maḥmūd Shāh I, Begrā, Sayf al-Dīn

0917/1511 Khalīl Khān b. Maḥmūd, succeeded as Muẓaffār Shāh II

932/1526 Sikandar b. Muẓaffār II

932/1526 Nāṣir Khān b. Muẓaffār II, succeeded as Maḥmūd Shāh (II)
⊘ 932/1526 Bahādur Shāh b. Muẓaffār II, first reign

942–2/2535–6 Mughal occupation

942–3/1536–7 Bahādur Shāh, second reign
⊘ 943/1537 Maḥmūd Shāh III b. Latif Khān b. Muẓaffār II
The mediaeval province of Gujarāt on the western coastland of India comprised both a mainland section lying to the east of the Rann of Cutch (Kachchh) and also the peninsula of Kathiawar. Because of its commercial and maritime connections with the other shores of the Indian Ocean, Gujarāt was a particularly rich province; but although Maḥmūd of Ghazna had marched through it en route for Somnath (see above, no. 158), permanent Muslim conquest was quite long delayed. Only in 697/1298 did the troops of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad Khalji defeat the main local Hindu dynasty, the Vāghelās of Anahilwāra. During the fourteenth century, Gujarāt was ruled by governors appointed by the Delhi Sultans, until in 793/1391 the Tughluqid Muḥammad III sent out Ẓafar Khān. As the Tughluqids fell into palpable decline, Ẓafar Khān became in effect independent, and his son and he claimed the insignia of royalty and the title of Shāh. The new sultanate was consolidated by the founder’s grandson Aḥmad I, much of whose reign was occupied by warfare against the Hindu Rājās of Gujarāt and Rājputānā and against his fellow-Muslim sovereigns of Mālwa, Khāndesh and the Deccan. It was he who built for himself the new capital of Aḥmadābād, which replaced that of Anahilwāra. The fifty-five years of Maḥmūd Begrā’s reign (862–917/1458–1511) were the greatest in the history of the Gujarāt Sultanate. Campaigns against the Hindu princes led, among other things, to the capture of the fortress of Chāmpānēr, now renamed Maḥmūdābād and made the sultan’s capital; indeed, during his reign the Sultanate attained its greatest extent before the subsequent annexation of Mālwa (see below, no. 165).

A new factor in the politics of western and southern India appeared before the end of Maḥmūd’s reign, namely the Portuguese. After Vasco da Gama appeared at Calicut (Kalikat) in 1498, the Portuguese began to divert much of the Indian Ocean commerce into their own hands, thus bypassing the traders of Egypt and Gujarāt. Hence in 914/1508 Maḥmūd allied with the Mamlūk Sultan Qānṣūḥ al-Ghawrī (see above, no. 31, 2), but despite the initial Muslim naval victory near Bombay over Dom Lourenço de Almeida, the
Portuguese captured Goa from the neighbouring ‘Ādil Shāhīs of Bījapur (see below, no. 170) and Maḥmūd was compelled to make peace. The last great sultan of Gujarāt was Maḥmūd’s grandson Bahādur Shāh, who assumed the offensive against the Hindus and also conquered Mālwa, only to lose it and part of his own dominions to the Mughal Humāyūn. The menace from the Portuguese revived, and despite the grant to them of Diu (Dīw) they treacherously killed Bahādur Shāh in 943/1537. The unity of Gujarāt now crumbled; dynastic quarrels broke out, and the kingdom began to split up among various nobles. In despair, the Mughals were called in so that Akbar took over Gujarāt in 980/1572–3 and made it into a province of his empire, although the last sultan of Gujarāt, Muẓaffar III, made several attempts at a revanche up to his death in 1001/1593.

Justi, 476; Lane-Poole, 312–14; Zambaur, 296.
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Jawnpur lies on the Gumtī river to the north of Benares, between what were later the provinces of Bihār and Oudh (Awadh), hence in what is now the eastern part of Uttar Pradesh State, and is traditionally said to have been founded in 762/1359 by the Tughluqid Fīrūz Shāh III and named after his cousin and patron Muḥammad b. Tughluq, one of whose names was Jawna (<Yāvana ‘foreigner’) Shāh. In the fifteenth century it became the centre of a powerful Muslim state, situated between the Sultanates of Delhi and Bengal, and the Sultans of Jawnpur played a significant role in developing the Islamic culture of the region; Jawnpur, indeed, became known as ‘the Shīrāz of the East’.

The dynasty was founded by one Malik Sarwar, the eunuch slave minister of the last Tughluqid Maḥmūd Shāh II, who conquered Oudh on behalf of his master in 796/1394 and then remained there as virtual ruler, persuading the
sultan to grant him the title of Malik al-Sharq ‘King of the East’, whence the name of the dynasty. Helped by the chaos which followed Tīmūr’s invasion of India, his adopted son Mubārak Shāh behaved as a fully independent ruler, minting his own coins and having the bidding prayers in the *khūṭba* or Friday sermon made in his own name alone. His brother Ibrāhīm was the greatest of the Sharqīs, and during his reign of nearly forty years the dynasty reached a peak of affluence and power. A particularly fine school of Indo-Muslim architecture developed in Jawnpur, and, being himself a man of culture, Ibrāhīm encouraged scholars and literary men at his court. His successors were drawn into warfare with the Lōdī Sultans of Delhi and raided Gwalior (Gwāliyār), but were most successful in attacking Orissa (Uṛīsā). According to Muslim chronicles, Jawnpur had at this time one of the largest armies in India. The last Sharqī sultan, Ḥusayn Shāh, reached the gates of Delhi on one occasion, but Bahlūl and Sikandar Lōdī were in the end too much for him. Sikandar defeated Ḥusayn, who fled to Bengal and lived out his life in a small district granted to him by the Bengal Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ḥusayn Shāh (see above, no. 161, 7). Jawnpur thus passed under the control of the Lōdī Sultan, who deliberately destroyed the city’s fine buildings left by the Sharqīs. Ḥusayn Shāh’s descendants had irredentist hopes of regaining the kingdom, hopes which the Mughals were not disposed to satisfy, although Bābur and Humāyūn did permit them to style themselves sultans.

Lane-Poole, 309; Zambaur, 292.
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THE SULTANS AND RULERS OF MĀLWA
804–969/1402–1562
Central India

1. The line of the Ghuns

(793/1391) Dilāwar Khān Ḥasan Ghūrī, governor for the Delhi Sultans
804/1402 Dilāwar Khān, as ‘Amīd Shāh Dāwūd
Ø 809/1406 Alp Khān b. Dilāwar, succeeded as Hūshang Shāh
838/1435 Ghāznī Khān b. Alp, succeeded as Muḥammad Shāh Ghūrī
839/1436 Masʿūd Khān b. Muḥammad

2. The line of the Khaljīs

Ø 839/1436 Maḥmūd Khān, succeeded as Maḥmūd Shāh (I) Khaljī
Ø 873/1469 Ghiyāth al-Dīn Shāh b. Maḥmūd
Ø 917–37/1511–31 Maḥmūd Shāh II b. Nāṣir al-Dīn, after 924/1518 as a vassal of the Sultans of Gujarāt
937–41/1531–5 Occupation by Gujarāt

3. Various governors and independent rulers

939/1533 Mallū Khān, governor for Gujarāt in 939/1533 and then independent as Qādir Shāh
Mediaeval Indian Mālwa was the plateau region of western Central India, which formed a triangle with the Vindhya range as its base, hence it corresponded to what is now largely within the westernmost part of Madhya Pradesh State. Muslim rule was only established there after long and bloody struggles with the local Rājput rulers of Chitōr and Ujjain. In 705/1305, the Delhi Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khaljī despatched an army which subjugated Mālwa, and thereafter governors were sent out to the region from Delhi. The Afghan governor Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī sheltered the refugee Tughluqid Maḥmūd Shāh II during Tīmūr’s invasion of northern India in 801 /1398–9, but the shock to the fabric of the Delhi Sultanate at this time permitted Dilāwar Khān shortly afterwards to declare his independence and assume the insignia of royalty. The circumstances of Mālwa’s achievement of independence thus parallel those of the rise of the Sharqīs in Jawnpur (see above, no. 164). The Mālwa Sultans made their capital the inaccessible and heavily-defended fortress of Māndū, and adorned the city which grew up there with many splendid buildings.

At one point, the Ghūrī sultans undertook a raid as far as Hindu Orissa, but most of their military activity was against nearby Rājput chiefs and neighbouring Muslim rulers, including the Sharqīs, the Gujarāt Sultans, the Sayyid Sultans of Delhi and the Bahmanids of the Deccan; in this warfare against Muslim rivals, they did not hesitate to ally with Hindu princes. In 839/1436, the chief minister Maḥmūd Khān took over the throne in Mālwa (the last Ghūrī sultan fleeing to Gujarāt) and began the line of the Khaljīs there. Maḥmūd I Khaljī was the greatest of the Mālwa Sultans, and despite several setbacks in his campaigns against the Rājputs of Chitōr and the Bahmanids he expanded his territories considerably. His fame spread beyond the subcontinent; he received a formal investiture of power from the fainéant
‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo al-Mustanjid (see above, no. 3, 3), and embassies were exchanged with the Tīmūrid sultan in Herat, Abū Sa‘id (see above, no. 144, 1). But during the reign of his great-grandson Maḥmūd II, there arose an ascendancy of Rājput ministers and courtiers in the state, such as that of the sultan’s vizier Mēdinī Rā‘ī, and tensions between Muslim and Hindu elements grew. At one point, Maḥmūd was captured by the Rājā of Chitōr, and, though he was restored in Mālwa, his kingdom fell in 93 7/1531 to Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt (see above, no. 163).

During the next three decades, there were several governors acting for the Gujarat Sultans and then the Delhi Sultans, some of whom managed to make themselves at times independent, until the last such ruler, Bāz Bahādur, was defeated by Akbar’s forces and Mālwa was incorporated into the Mughal empire as one of its provinces.
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The region known to the mediaeval Islamic geographers as Ma‘bar covered the lower south-eastern coastland of the Deccan, roughly corresponding to the later Coromandel. Madura, which became its capital, was conquered by an army sent by the Delhi Sultan Muḥammad b. Tughluq in 723/1323, and the governor installed there began some years later an independent line of Sultans of Ma‘bar. The Moroccan traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa stayed there in 743/1342 after being at the Tughluqid court in Delhi, en route for China, and married a princess of the Ma‘bar ruling family. By the mid-fourteenth
century, the Sultans seem also to have controlled the southern tip of the Deccan round westwards as far as Cochin. The Sultanate was always under threat from powerful Hindu neighbours, in particular, from the early 1350s onwards, from the kingdom of Vijayanagara situated to its north, and this last seems to have overwhelmed the Sultanate by 779/1377 or shortly afterwards.
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THE BAHMANIDS
748–934/1347–1528
The northern Deccan

1. The rulers at Aḥsanābād-Gulbargā

(746/1346) Ismā’īl Mukh, elected king as Abu ’l-Fatḥ Ismā’īl Shāh Nāṣir al-Dīn

(Op. 748/1347) Zafar Khān, elected king as Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Ḫasan Gangu ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Bahman Shāh


780/1378 Dāwūd I Shāh, cousin of Mujāhid

(Op. 780/1378) Muḥammad II Shāh, grandson of Ḫasan Gangu Bahman Shāh


(Op. 800/1397) Fīrūz Shāh, son-in-law of Muḥammad II, Tāj al-Dīn

2. The rulers in Aḥmadābād-Bīdar


Dissolution of the Bahmanid Sultanate into five local sultanates of the Deccan

As the authority of Muḥammad b. Tughluq waned in the second half of his reign, the recently-conquered parts of the Deccan began to fall away from the control of Delhi. The governor of Ma‘bar in the extreme south proclaimed himself independent and founded the Sultanate of Ma‘bar or Madura (see above, no. 166). Much more powerful and enduring was the state founded on the table-land of the northern Deccan by the Amīr Ḥasan Gangu. Ḥasan’s origins are very obscure, but they seem to have been humble ones; the claim to Persian descent, seen in his assumption of the old Iranian name of Bahman (in the Iranian national epic, son of Isfandiyār), should not be taken seriously. After his successful rebellion in Dawlatābād, Ḥasan transferred his capital southwards to Gulbargā, and for over eighty years this remained the Bahmanid capital.

The rise of the Bahmanids meant that a strong and aggressive Muslim power now confronted the two chief Hindu kingdoms of the southern Deccan, Warangal and Vijayanagar. For the next century or so, warfare was frequent, ending in the case of Warangal by its overthrow in 830/1425 by Aḥmad Shāh I and its incorporation into the Bahmanid Sultanate; Vijayanagar, on the other hand, which had already overwhelmed the Sultanate of Ma‘bar or Madura (see above, no. 166), was never conquered at this time.

A point of note in this warfare was the use from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards of artillery and firearms, knowledge of these weapons being acquired through South India’s connections with lands further
west. After the conquest of Warangal, Aḥmad moved his capital to the more central Bīdar, and he also carried the war northwards against the Muslim rulers of Gujarāt and Mālwa. The Bahmanid Sultanate was until the second half of the fifteenth century essentially a land-locked kingdom of the northern Deccan, but Muḥammad Shāh III’s energetic chief minister, the Khwāja-yi Jahān Maḥmūd Gāwān, who was of Persian origin, allied with Gujarāt against the Sultanate’s enemies, intervened successfully in Orissa and extended the kingdom’s eastern boundary to the Bay of Bengal, and extended its western one over the Western Ghats to Goa and the Arabian Sea coast.

The Bahmanids thus acquired considerable fame in the Islamic world at large, especially as they made their court a great centre of learning; it was also under them that a specific Deccani style of Indo-Muslim architecture evolved. The Bahmanids were the first power of the subcontinent to exchange ambassadors with the Ottomans (between Muḥammad Shāh III and Muḥammad II Fāṭiḥ). The Bahmanid state, as well as being militarily powerful, had an effective civil administrative system. There was, accordingly, a need for skilled personnel, and many Turks, Persians, Arabs, etc., entered the sultans’ service. It was through this influx that there arose in the fifteenth century tensions between the native Deccani Muslims (the Dakhnīs or Deshīs) and the ‘outsiders’ (the Āfāqīs or Gharībdn or Par deshīs). Mounting internal chaos in the state and increasing ineffectiveness of the rulers are in part explicable by these rivalries. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, after the unwise execution by the sultan of Maḥmūd Gāwān, signs of disintegration began to appear. The last four sultans were fainéants under the tutelage of the Turkish amīr ‘Alī Barīdī; the fourth of these, Kalīm Allāh, appealed unsuccessfully to the Mughal Bābur for help in throwing off the yoke of the Barīdīs, and finally had to abandon his dominions for exile in Bījapur.

From the ruins of the Bahmanid Sultanate there emerged in the Muslim Deccan five successor states, all sprung from the commanders or officials of the Bahmanids: the ‘Imād Shāhīs of Berār, the Band Shāhīs of Bīdar, the ‘Ādil Shāhīs of Bījapur, the Niẓām Shāhīs of Aḥmadnagar and the Quṭb Shāhīs of Golconda (Golkondā) (see below, nos 169–73). The ‘Imād Shāhīs were absorbed by the Niẓām Shāhīs in the later sixteenth century, but the other four sultanates continued into the seventeenth century, in two instances until the time of the Mughal Awrangzīb, all of them eventually forming part of that Emperor’s vast but ephemeral empire.
Justi, 470; Lane-Poole, 316–21; Zambaur, 297–9.
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Mediaeval Islamic Khândesh was essentially the region in the north-west of
the Deccan south of the Narbadā river and straddling the middle and upper basin of the Tāptī; its neighbours on the north were Gujarhāt and Mālwa, and on the south the Bahmanids and their successors. It owed its name ‘Land of the Khāns’ to its Fārūqī rulers, who were not admitted to the rank of Sultan by their more powerful neighbours but were known by the lesser title of Khān and often referred to by the other powers as hākim or wālī. Before the first Muslim conquest, the region had been held by the Yādavas or the Chawhāns.

The founder of the Muslim line, Malik Rājā Aḥmad, had a background of service with the Bahmanids, but then transferred to the court of the Delhi Sultan Fīrūz Shāh III and was appointed by the latter governor over certain districts in the northern Deccan. In the confusion of the declining years of the Tughluqids, Malik Rājā followed the example of his neighbour in Mālwa, Dilāwar Khān (see above, no. 165), and asserted his independence. Since he claimed descent from the second caliph ‘Umar b. al-Khattāb, who had the by-name al-Fārūq ‘the Just‘ (see above, no. 1), his successors called themselves the Fārūqīs. His son Nāṣir Khān captured the fortress of Asīrgaṛh from its Hindu chief, and built close by it the town of Burhānpur, henceforth the capital of the rulers of Khāndesh. Under ‘Ādil Khān II, Khāndesh flourished exceedingly; he failed to throw off the suzerainty of the Sultans of Gujarāt, but he did extend his power eastwards against the Hindu Rājās of Gondwāna and Jhārkand, and his exploits earned him the title Shāh-i Jhārkand ‘King of the Forest’.

In the early years of the sixteenth century, Khāndesh was racked by succession disputes, which conduced to the intervention of outside powers, especially of the Gujarāt Sultans and the successors of the Bahmanids in Aḥmadnagar, the Niẓām Shāhis of Berār (see below, no. 171). With limited manpower and economic resources available to them, the Fārūqīs only survived while they could pursue an adroit diplomatic policy between their mightier neighbours. This often involved conciliating the Sultans of Gujarāt, and at one point Mīrān Muḥammad I was designated heir-presumptive to the throne in Gujarāt; he died, however, before this claim could be consolidated. The first clash of the Fārūqīs with the Mughals came in 962/1555, and ten years later the Fārūqīs became vassals of Akbar. After c. 993/c. 1585, direct Mughal pressure grew. Bahadur Shāh offended the Mughals, and his fortress of Asīrgaṛh was in 1009/1600 captured by Akbar and the surviving Fārūqīs carried off into exile. Khāndesh now became a province of the Mughal empire, for a time renamed Dāndesh after Akbar’s son Dāniyāl.
Justi, 477; Lane-Poole, 315; Zambaur, 295.
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H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), History of Medieval Deccan, I, 491–516, with a genealogical table at p. 493.
Bīdar lay in the central Deccan, to the north-west of Hyderabad City, and is now just within the north-eastern tip of Karnataka State. Qāsim Barīd was originally a Turkish slave in the service of the Bahmanids, but towards the end of the fifteenth century rose to become one of the dominating influences in the decaying Sultanate. His family continued to recognise the last titular rulers of the Bahmanids, until ‘Alī Barīd finally proclaimed himself an independent prince. Bīdar had a strategically important situation, and the Bahmanids had adorned it with fine buildings, a process continued by the Barīd Shāhīs. The fortunes of these last – who remained, unlike some others of their fellow-princes of the Deccan, resolutely Sunnī in faith – declined
after ‘Ali’s death, and the ‘Ādil Shāhīs of Bījapur (see below, no. 170) seized Bīdar in 1028/1619 and ended the Band Shāhīs; thirty-seven years later, Bīdar fell to the Mughal Awrangzīb.

Lane-Poole, 318, 321; Zambaur, 298.


H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), History of Medieval Deccan (1295–1724), 1,289–394, with a genealogical table at p. 290, II, 446–7.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), The History and Culture of the Indian People. VII. The Mughul Empire (1526–1707 A.D.), Bombay 1974, ch. 14 V.
Bījapur was situated in the western part of the Bahmanid Sultanate, and is now near the northern boundary of Karnataka State. Like the founder of the ‘Imād Shāhīs, Daryā Khān (see below, no. 172), Yūsuf Khān was a commander and provincial governor for the Bahmanids, originally a slave in the service of Muḥammad III’s minister Maḥmūd Gāwān (see above, no. 167), who proclaimed his independence in 895/1489. He may well have been of Persian origin, though the story in historians partial to the ‘Ādil Shāhīs that he was of Ottoman royal blood is fanciful. He was certainly the first ruler to introduce Shī‘ism into South India, and this became the faith of three out of the five successor-states to the Bahmanids there.
The history of the ‘Ādil Shāhīs is one of almost continuous warfare with their Muslim neighbours and with the Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar. The capital Bījapur nevertheless became a splendid centre for learning and the arts, adorned with fine buildings erected by the Shāhs, while the florescence there of Persian literature accelerated the process whereby much of Muslim South India became culturally Persianised. By the mid-seventeenth century, Bījapur was under pressure from the militant Marāṭhās, and from 1046/1636 its rulers had to acknowledge Mughal suzerainty; then inl097/1686 Awrangzīb captured Bījapur, brought the line of Shāhs to an end and incorporated their dominions into his own empire.

Justi, 470; Lane-Poole, 318, 321; Zambaur, 298–9.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>895/1490</td>
<td>Ahmad Nizam Shah Bahrī b. Timma Bhat al-Mulk Hasan, minister of the Bahmanids, proclaimed his independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004–9/1595–1600</td>
<td>Bahadur b. Ibrāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009/1600</td>
<td>Mughal capture of Aḥmadnagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019/1610</td>
<td>Burhān III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041–3/1632–3</td>
<td>Ḥusayn III b. Murtaḍā II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aḥmadnagar is on the Deccan plateau to the east of Bombay in what is now Maharashtra State. It was founded as the capital of the Bahmanid successor
state by Aḥmad Niẓām, son of the vizier to Maḥmūd Bahman Shāh, and named after himself. Aḥmad asserted his independence at Aḥmadnagar during the years of the dynasty’s decline. His son Burhān adopted Shī‘ism, thus aligning his principality with those of the Ādil Shāhīs and Quṭb Shāhīs, and the ruling family was henceforth intermittently Shī‘ī. During the sixteenth century, the Niẓām Shāhīs were involved in fighting with their Muslim rivals and with Vijayanagar, but from the end of that century decline set in, there was a rapid turnover of rulers, and the Mughals captured Aḥmadnagar in 1009/1600. The last Niẓām Shāhīs ruled under the ascendancy of the Ḥabashī or black African slave commander Malik‘Ambar, under whose able direction the Niẓām Shāhī fortunes revived. But after his death in 1035/1626, Mughal pressure became intense, and in 1046/1636 the Emperor Shāh Jahān and Muḥammad ‘Ādil Shāhī, alarmed at the Marāṭhā threat, divided the Niẓām Shāhī territories between themselves.

Justi, 471; Lane-Poole, 318, 329; Zambaur, 298–9.
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R. C. Majumdar (ed.), The History and Culture of the Indian People. VII. The Mughul Empire, ch. 14 II.
The extensive district of Berār comprised the northern region of the Bahmanid Sultanate, now the easternmost part of Maharashtra State. The founder of the ‘Imād Shāhī principality there, Daryā Khān, was a Hindu convert in the service of the Bahmanids, who was made governor of Berār and who became latterly one of the powers behind the throne as the Sultanate became increasingly enfeebled. He eventually asserted his independence as ruler of Berār, with his capital at Elichpur. Together with that of the Band Shāhīs (see above, no. 169), Daryā Khān’s was the only Sunnī principality among the Deccani successor-states to the Bahmanids. The history of the ‘Imād Shāhīs during the eighty years or so of their independence was filled with warfare with their neighbours, such as the ‘Ādil Shāhīs and Niẓām Shāhīs. Eventually, the Niẓām Shāhīs absorbed the ‘Imād Shāhīs, but in the early seventeenth century Berār was conquered by Akbar and passed into Mughal hands.
Lane-Poole, 318, 320; Zambaur, 298.
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The Quṭb Shāhīs ruled over the east-central, largely Telugu-speaking part of the Deccan (now Andhra Pradesh State) from the ancient hill-fort of Golconda and then from their new city of Hyderabad (Haydarābād), which was adjacent to the fortress and planned by Muḥammad Qulī in 997/1589, and to which the state capital was moved some time afterwards.

The founder of the line, Sulṭān Qulī, was a Türkmen from western Persia who was descended from the Qara Qoyunlu (see above, no. 145) and who migrated to seek his fortune in South India soon after the fall of the Türkmen dynasty. He became one of Maḥmūd Shāh Bahmanī’s chief ministers and governor of Tilang Andhra or Telingana, the eastern part of the Bahmanid Sultanate and nucleus of the future Quṭb Shāhī principality. His successors turned what had been de facto independence into the reality of sovereign
Sultān Qūṭ Shāh had vigorously proclaimed his Twelver Shī‘ism, eventually recognizing the Safawīd Shāh ‘Īsmā‘īl I (see above, no. 148) as his spiritual suzerain, and the Quṭb Shāhī court became a vigorous centre for Persian literature and culture in general. The Quṭb Shāhīs were almost continuously involved in warfare with the other successor-states to the Bahmanīds, the ‘Ādil Shāhīs and the Niẓām Shāhīs (see above, nos 170, 171), and with Vijayanagar, until Shāh Jahān intervened in 1045/1636 and forced on the Quṭb Shāhīs their recognition of Mughal suzerainty, in the shape of tribute and a treaty of submission (inqiyād-nāma) which, inter alia, banned the public celebration of Shī‘ī practices and festivals. Some fifty years later, Awrangzīb ended the Shāhs’semi-independent status completely and incorporated their lands into his empire.

Justi, 471; Lane-Poole, 318, 321; Zambaur, 298–9.
H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), History of Medieval Deccan (1295–1724), I, 411–90, with a genealogical table at p. 413, II, 446–7.
Haroon Khan Sherwani, History of the Qutb Shāhī Dynasty, New Delhi 1974, with a genealogical table at the end.
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174
THE ARGHÛNS
926–99/1520–91

Multan and Sind

1. The line of Dhu ‘1-Nûn Beg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 880/c. 1475</td>
<td>Dhu ‘1-Nûn Beg Arghûn, governor of Kandahar and northeastern Baluchistan for the Tîmûrids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☠ (913/1507)</td>
<td>Shâh Beg b. Dhi ‘1-Nûn, governor in Kandahar for the Shîbânids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926/1520</td>
<td>Shâh Beg, now as ruler in Upper Sind and then the whole province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930–61/1524–54</td>
<td>Shâh Ḫusayn b. Shâh Beg, d. 963/1556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The line of Muḥammad ‘Īsâ Tarkhân

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>961/1554</td>
<td>Muḥammad ‘Īsâ Tarkhân b. ‘Abd al-‘Alî, in Lower Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975/1567</td>
<td>(Maḥmûd Gokaltâsh, in Upper Sind until 982/1574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993–9/1585–91</td>
<td>Muḥammad Bâqî b. Muḥammad Ḫsâa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999/1591</td>
<td>Jânî Beg b. Muḥammad Bâqî, d. 1008/1599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sind and the Indus valley as far up as Multan had been invaded and settled by the Arabs at the beginning of the eighth century (see above, no. 160). But even after the Ghaznawids and Ghûrîds had extended over much of north-western India, Sind remained a comparatively isolated region, cut off from
the major trends and events affecting Muslim India. In the eleventh century, Sind fell under the control of the Rājput tribe of the Sumerās. Their power was challenged in the early fourteenth century by the rival tribe of Sammās who, unlike the Sumerās, became firm Muslims and who emerged triumphant in the later part of the century. With the collapse of the Tughluqids (see above, no. 160, 3) and the shrinkage of the Delhi Sultans’ authority, the ruling Jāms of the Sammās were able to dominate Sind from their capital Thaffā in Lower Sind until the early sixteenth century.

The Arghūns were a Turkish or Turco-Mongol tribe prominent under the Il Khānids and then the Tīmūrids. Dhu ‘1-Nūn Beg Arghūn was appointed governor over what were later the eastern and southern parts of Afghanistan by the sultan in Herat, Ḥusayn b. Mansūr b. Bay qara (see above, no. 144, 2), and speedily became in effect independent there. The rise in the eastern Iranian world of powerful states like those of the Shībānids and the Safawids made the Arghūn’s base of Kandahar increasingly untenable, so Shāh Beg and his son continued Dhu ‘1-Nūn Beg’s process of expansion southwards, conquering Multan and eventually defeating the last Sammā Jam and taking over the whole of Sind. After 961/1554, the Tarkhāns, a senior branch of the Arghūns, took over, but Akbar first annexed Upper Sind and then, finally, Lower Sind, so that Sind became incorporated into the province of Multan in the Mughal empire.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>932/1526</td>
<td>Bābur b. ‘Umar Shaykh, Muḥammad Zahīr al-Dīn, ruler in Farghāna 899/1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(936–60/1530–53)</td>
<td>Kāmrān b. Bābur, in Kandahar, d. 964/1557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937/1530</td>
<td>Humāyūn b. Bābur, Nāṣir al-Dīn, first reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947–62/1540–55</td>
<td>Sūrī Sultans of Delhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962/1555</td>
<td>Humāyūn, second reign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963/1556</td>
<td>Akbar I b. Humāyūn, Abu ‘1-Fath Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037/1627</td>
<td>Dāwar Bakhsh b. Khurṣaw b. Jahāngīr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037/1628</td>
<td>Shāh Jahān I Khurṣaw b. Jahāngīr, Shīhāb al-Dīn, d. 1076/1666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1068/1657)</td>
<td>Murād Bakhsh b. Shāh Jahān, in Gujarāt, k. 1072/1661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1068–9/1657–9)</td>
<td>Sulṭān or Shāh Shujā‘ b. Shāh Jahān I, in Bengal, k. 1071/1660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1068–9/1657–9)</td>
<td>Darā Shikūh b. Shāh Jahān I, in Agra, k. 1069/1659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068/1658</td>
<td>Awrangzīb b. Shāh Jahān I, Abu ‘1-Muẓaffar Muḥammad ‘Ālamgīr I Muḥyī ‘l-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1118/1707)</td>
<td>A‘Ẓam Shāh b. Awrangzīb, in northern India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1118–20/1707–9)</td>
<td>Kām Bakhsh b. Awrangzīb, in the Deccan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shāh ‘Ālam I Bahādur b. Awrangzīb, Muḥammad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bābur, the founder of the Mughal dynasty, was a Chaghatay Turk of Central Asia, separated from Tīmūr by five generations on his father’s side and from Chingiz Khān on his mother’s. His father ‘Umar Shaykh b. Abī Sa’īd ruled a small Tīmūrid principality in the Central Asian region of Farghāna, but Bābur found that the rising power of the Shībānid Özbegs (see above, no. 151) made it difficult for him to retain a foothold there after his father’s death.
Accordingly, in 910/1514 he moved southwards and occupied Kabul, and very soon afterwards made his first raid into India as far as the Indus. It seems that Bābur only turned to India when his repeated attempts to regain power in his Central Asian homeland had failed, but eventually a discontented faction at the court of the Lōdī Sultans of Delhi (see above, no. 160, 5) invited him to intervene. He defeated Ibrāhīm II Lōdī at the first battle of Pānīpat in 932/1526 and, in the next year, a coalition of Rājput chiefs at Khānwa near Agra. Yet these victories were only a beginning. There was as yet no solid structure of Mughal power, and the strong reaction of the Afghan military leaders in India, led by Shir Shāh Sur (see above, no. 160, 6), caused Bābur’s son Humāyūn to flee from northern India to Sind, Afghanistan and Persia for fifteen years. Only the weakness of Shir Shāh’s successors allowed Humāyūn to return in 962/1555 and establish himself in Delhi and Agra.

The fifty-year reign of Akbar the Great now followed. The Mughal hold on northern and central India was made firm: Mālwa and the independent Rājput states, Gujarāt and Khāndesh, were secured, and by 984/1576 Bengal was restored once more to the control of Delhi. The north-western frontier, gateway to India for so many invaders, was secured by the acquisition of Kabul and Kandahar, although the latter town was to be a bone of contention with the rulers of Persia for a long time to come. In the Deccan, the princedoms of the northern tier of the Bahmanid successor-states were either directly annexed or made to acknowledge Akbar’s supremacy, but the military and administrative structures of the Empire were not yet strong enough for full authority to be established all through the Deccan; this was to be the work of Awrangzīb, in whose reign almost all India – with the exceptions of the parts of western India controlled by the Marāṭhās and the southernmost tip of peninsular India – passed under Mughal control. On the diplomatic level, the initially friendly relations with the Safawids were exchanged for an agreement with the Özbeg ‘AbdALLĀH KhĀN II (see above no. 153) over the demarcation of the respective territories of the Mughals and the Shībānids. There was also diplomatic contact with the Ottomans over the common threat to both empires from the Portuguese in the seas around Arabia and the Indian Ocean, but the distance between Delhi and Istanbul was too vast for a Sunnī Grand Alliance to emerge, and no concrete naval or military cooperation proved possible.

Akbar was thus undeniably a great general and statesman, but he is equally interesting as a wide-ranging thinker on religious questions. His syncretistic
Dīn-i Ilāhī or Divine Faith, though it was restricted in membership to an élite court circle, shows his deep intellectual curiosity about religions in general. Hindus participated to a greater extent than usual in the administration and direction of the empire. It was under Akbar that the governmental structure of the Mughal empire took shape, and he welded together into a governing class diverse ethnic elements, comprising Turks, Afghans, Persians and Hindus. This class formed the manṣabdārs, holders of official appointments who were obliged to provide a certain number of troops. Official salaries were in part paid by jāgīrs or assignments of the revenues from estates, which were not, however, hereditary like the īqṭd’s and soyurghals of the Islamic lands west of India. Although the ruler himself had theoretically unbridled secular authority, the early Mughals at least were benevolent rather than tyrannical despots; in any case, the very vastness of the empire made over-centralisation and the extension of the ruler’s autocracy into every corner of it difficult to achieve.

Akbar’s successors Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān continued the policy of enforcing obedience over outlying parts – over the Rājput rulers of Mēwār, the Shī‘ī sultanates of the Deccan, the Portuguese on the coasts of Bengal – but Shāh Jahān’s ambitions of uniting Central Asia and India in a grand Sunnī empire only ended in failure and loss of prestige (1057/1647). When he abdicated in 1068/1657, a savage succession struggle broke out among his four sons. In the course of this, Awrangzīb twice defeated and then executed his brother Dārā Shikūh, and began a fifty-year reign. An orthodox reaction against the liberal and eclectic attitudes of Akbar and his son, spearheaded by the increasingly influential Naqshbandl Ṣūfī order, had been gathering momentum during the preceding decades. Awrangzīb now espoused in large measure this rigorist programme, attacking lax social and religious practices which had grown up in Muslim India under the all-pervading influence of the surrounding Hindu majority society and attempting a reformation along the lines to be enunciated in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century by such figures as Shāh Walī Allāh of Delhi and Sayyid Aḥmad of Bareilly and his mujāhidīn. In part, Awrangzīb’s policy was a reaction against the renewed vigour, intellectual and material, of Hinduism; yet he continued to let Hindus form an integral part of the Mughal military and administrative structures. His military efforts were at first directed at strengthening the north-western frontier, where fierce fighting was necessary to exert control over the Pathan tribes. Latterly, he became increasingly concerned with the Deccan; the
remaining Shī‘ī sultanates, those of the ‘Ādil Shāhīs and the Quṭb Shāhīs, were extinguished, and the Marāṭhās curbed; yet this last check was only a temporary one, and the high point of Muslim power in the Deccan was never to be reached again.

Awrangzīb’s death in 1118/1707 began the agonising decline of the Mughals. A series of ephemeral rulers followed, and the longer reign of Muḥammad Shāh did not prevent the outlying provinces of the empire from falling into the hands of such groups as the Marāṭhās, the Jās, the Sikhs and the Rohilla Afghans. Nādir Shah’s invasion of India in 1151–2/1738–9 (see above, no. 149) and the sacking and occupation of Delhi, and the subsequent campaigns of Aḥmad Shāh Abdālī or Durrānī (see below, no. 180, I), dealt the empire material and moral blows from which it never recovered. On several sides, Hindu fortunes were reviving, and the factor of the British presence was now significant in the interior as well as in the coastlands. While the British were extending their power through Bengal to Oudh (see below, nos 176, 178), Central India and Rājputānā, the Mughals, whose practical authority reached little beyond Delhi, could only look on helplessly. Shāh ‘Ālam II and his successors were British pensioners, and in 1274/1858 the last Mughal was deposed and exiled to Rangoon for complicity in the Sepoy Mutiny.

Justi, 472–5; Lane-Poole, 322–9; Zambaur, 300 and Table U.
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R. C. Majumdar (ed.), The History and Culture of the Indian People. VII. The Mughul Empire, chs 2–3, 5–8, 10.
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THE NAWWĀB-VIZIERS AND NAWWĀB-NĀZIMS OF BENGAL
1116–1274/1704–1858

Bengal

1116/1704 Murshid Qulī Khān, Jaʿfar Khān ‘Alāʾ al-Dawla
1138/1725 Shujāʿ Khān, Shujāʿ al-Dawla, Murshid Qulī Khān’s son-in-law
1153/1740 ‘Alīwirdī Khān, Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī Mahābat Jang Hāshim al-Dawla
Mīr Jaʿfar Muḥammad Khān b. Sayyid Aḥmad Najafī,
1170/1757 Hāshim al-Dawla, nephew by marriage of ‘Alīwirdī Khān, first reign
1174/1760 Mīr Qāsim ‘Alī, son-in-law of Mīr Jaʿfar, d. 1191/1777
1177–8/1763–5 Mīr Jaʿfar ‘Alī, second reign

Incorporation of Bengal into British India; continuation of the line of Nawwabs in Murshidābād as local figures until the present day

The Nawwāb-Nāzims of Bengal arose, like the Niẓāms of Hyderabad (see below, no. 178) and the Nawwāb-Viziers of Oudh (see below, no. 177), out of the Mughal empire, and, until Britain formally took over Bengal (see below), ruled theoretically as governors for the Emperors in Delhi. Murshid Qulī Khān became dīwān or governor for Bengal under Awrangzīb, making
his capital at Makhsūsābād in West Bengal, which was now named after him Murshidābād; and his descendants, Shīʿī like himself, held on to the governorship of Bengal with the title Nawwāb. They managed to repel several Marāṯā raids and incursions, but lost Orissa to them.

The middle years of the eighteenth century were, however, the time of transition from the East India Company’s trading posts in Bengal to the acquisition of actual territory there. At the Battle of Plassey in 1170/1757, Clive defeated Sirāj al-Dawla and placed his own candidate, Mīr Jaʿfar, on the throne of Bengal. A final attempt by Mīr Qaṣīm and his allies, the Mughal Emperor Shāh ʿĀlam II and the Nawwāb-Vizier of Oudh Shujāʿ al-Dawla, to overthrow British power failed at the Battle of Buxar (Baksar) in 1178/1764. After the battle, Shāh ʿĀlam was compelled to make a formal grant of the revenues of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to the British, and there was then constituted out of them a Presidency with supreme powers of superintendence over the other two Presidencies of British India, Bombay and Madras. Mīr Jaʿfar’s son Mahābat Jang Najm al-Dawla and his descendants accordingly ruled only as petty local chiefs at Murshidābād in British Bengal. They became pensioners, first of the British Government of India, and then, after Partition, of the Government of the Indian Union.

Zambaur, 301.
R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VIII. The Maratha Supremacy*, ch. 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1134/1722</td>
<td>Sayyid Muḥammad Amīn Saʿadat Khān Bahādur, Burhān al-Mulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152/1739</td>
<td>Abū Manṣūr Khān, Safdār Jang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1167/1754</td>
<td>Haydar b. Šafdar Jang, Shujāʿ al-Dawla Jalāl al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1189/1775</td>
<td>Āṣaf al-Dawla b. Haydar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212/1797</td>
<td>Wazīr ‘Alī, adopted son of Āṣaf al-Dawla, d. 1232/1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213/1798</td>
<td>Saʿādat ‘Alī Khān b. Āṣaf al-Dawla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229/1814</td>
<td>Ḥaydar I b. Saʿādat ‘Alī, Ghāzī ‘l-Dīn, after 1234/1811 with the title of King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243/1827</td>
<td>Ḥaydar II Sulaymān Jāh b. Ḥaydar I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263–72/1847–56</td>
<td>Wājd ‘Alī b. Amjad, d. 1304/1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272/1856</td>
<td>Annexation to British India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1273/1857)</td>
<td>Barjis Qadīr b. Wājd ‘Alī, raised to the throne during the Sepoy Mutiny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The region of Oudh was part of the great Gangetic plain and comprised what is now the central region of Uttar Pradesh State, the Madhya Dēsa or ‘middle
land’ of Hindu epic times. In the Islamic period, its main cities were Lucknow (Lakhnaw) and Cawnpore (Kānpur).

The decline of the Mughal empire after Awrangzīb’s death in 1118/1707 allowed Sa‘ādat Khān, whose family stemmed from Khurasan in eastern Persia, and his successors as Nawwābs or governors, to assume virtual independence, although right to the end they acknowledged the theoretical suzerainty of the Mughal emperors in Delhi. During the eighteenth century, Oudh had a strategic importance in British eyes as a bulwark against Marātḥā encroachments from the west and south, and after 1178/1764 it was willy-nilly drawn into alliance with the East India Company in its base of Bengal. By the opening of the nineteenth century, however, Oudh was surrounded by British territory except for the frontier with Nepal on the north. The introduction of sound government was a proviso of the 1801 treaty with Oudh, and it was on grounds of misgovernment that the Governor-General Lord Dalhousie deposed Wājid ‘Alī in 1272/1856, thus putting an end to the kingdom of Oudh. Fears aroused by its annexation turned out, in fact, to be a major contributory cause of the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857–8.

Under its local rulers, Oudh, and especially the capital Lucknow, with its court circle, witnessed a burgeoning of Shī‘ī religiosity, Urdu literature and Indo-Muslim architecture, and Lucknow remains today an important centre of North Indian Shī‘ism.

Zambaur, 302.
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By the end of the seventeenth century, the Mughals had absorbed all the lands of the former South Indian sultanates (see above, nos 164–8). The whole of the Muslim Deccan – excepting those parts of it conquered by the Marāthās – was now formed into a single vast province of the Deccan under a şūbadār or governor.

In the confusion and decay within the Mughal empire after Awrangzīb’s death in 1118/1707, Chin Qīlīch Khān became governor of the Deccan in
1132/1720, and soon became independent at the former Quṭb Shāhī capital of Hyderabad. The Mughal emperor Muḥammad Shāh granted him the further title of Āṣaf Jāh, henceforth borne by all the members of Chin Qīlīch Khān’s line, together with that of Niẓām, derived from his honorific of Niẓām al-Mulk. By the early nineteenth century, Hyderabad State was surrounded by British territory and had become an ally of Britain, although the Niẓāms continued to acknowledge the puppet Mughal Emperors on their coins until the final demise of the latter. The theoretical suzerainty of the Mughals was nevertheless recognised until the final demise of the latter in 1274/1858 (see above, no. 175), and British sovereignty not explicitly acknowledged until 1926. At the time of the Partition of India in 1947, the Niẓām’s government opted for accession to Pakistan, but the state was forcibly integrated into the Indian Union in 1948 and the rule of the Niẓāms ended.

Zambaur, 303.
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THE MUSLIM RULERS IN MYSORE (MAHISUR, MAYSÜR)
1173–1213/1760–99

South India

ۓ 1173/1760 Ḥaydar ‘Alī Khān Bahādur b. Fatḥ Muḥammad, effective ruler in Mysore
ۓ 1197– 1213/1782–99 Tīpū Sulṭān b. Ḥaydar ‘Alī, sole ruler in Mysore after 1210/1796
1213/1799  Restoration of the line of Hindu Rājās

Mysore had been within the Hindu state of Vijayanagar, traditional foe of the Muslim sultanates of South India, in the extreme south of the Deccan, until the sultanates’ victory over Vijayanagar in 972/1565 at Tālīkotā. Descendants of the Rājās of Vijayanagar established themselves in Mysore as the Rama Rājā dynasty, managing to withstand the power of the ‘Ādil Shāhīs (see above, no. 170) and coming to a modus vivendi with the Mughal Awrangzīb. In the mid-eighteenth century, their Muslim general Ḥaydar ‘Alī, who claimed noble Arab descent, achieved fame for repelling the Marāṯhās and then seized real power in the state, retaining the Rājās only as figureheads. His hostility to the British and to the Niẓāms of Hyderabad drew him closer to the French, and this policy was continued by his son and successor Tīpū, who eventually dispensed with the Rājās, received French envoys at his capital Seringapatam and was admitted as ‘Citizen Tipu’ to membership of the French Republic. The forces of Britain and Hyderabad defeated Tīpū in 1213/1799, and he died in the fighting at Seringapatam. He had been a zealous enforcer of Islam on the Hindu majority of his subjects, including forcible conversions and circumcisions, and in the modern hagiography of Pakistan is revered as ‘the Martyr Sultan’. On his death, the old line of Hindu
Rājās was restored in Mysore under British protection.

EI² ‘Ṭīpū Sулţān’ (T. W. Haig), EI² ‘Ḥaydar Alī Khan Bahādur’ (Mohibbul Hasan), ‘Mahisur, Maysūr. 1. Geography and history’ (C. E. Bosworth).
R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VIII. The Maratha Supremacy*, chs 12–13.
1. The Sadōzays or Popalzays

1160/1747 Aḥmad Khān Abdālī b. Muḥammad Zamān Khān, in Kandahar and Kabul

1184/1773 Tīmūr Shāh b. Aḥmad, in Herat, after 1189/1775 in Kabul

1207/1793 Zamān Shāh b. Tīmūr, in Kabul and Kandahar, after 1211/1797 in Herat

1215/1800 Maḥmūd Shāh b. Tīmūr, in Kabul and Kandahar, first reign

(1218/1803 Qayṣar b. Zamān Shāh, in Kabul and Kandahar)

1218/1803 Shāh Shujāʿ b. Tīmūr, Shujāʿ al-Mulk, in Kabul and Kandahar, first reign, after 1233/1818 a pensioner of Britain in India

(1222–3/1807–8 Qayṣar, in Kashmir)

1224/1809 Maḥmūd Shāh, in Kabul and Kandahar, in Herat until 1245/1829, second reign

Period of civil war, with Bārakzay Sardārs in control and a series of puppet rulers in Kabul: Ḍal Shāh b. Tīmūr, Ayyūb Shāh b. Tīmūr, Habīb Allāh b. Aẓīm Khān

1233–41/1818–26 Kāmrān b. Maḥmūd Shāh, in Herat
The Ghilzay Afghans had played a leading part in Persian affairs during the declining years of the Ṣafawids, overrunning and occupying much of Persia during the third decade of the eighteenth century (see above, no. 148). Although Nādir Shāh ended this Afghan domination, he recruited large numbers of Afghans into his forces. One of his leading commanders was Aḥmad Khān of the Ṣadōzay section of the Abdālī tribe of Afghans, a tribe which was originally from the Herat region but which Nādir allowed to settle around Kandahar. After Nādir’s assassination in 1160/1747, the Afghan troops acclaimed Aḥmad as their leader and as Shāh, and he assumed the title...
Durr-i Durrān ‘Pearl of Pearls’, whence the name Durrani which then became applied to the Abdālīs in general and to the dynasty which he now proceeded to found in particular. It is roughly from this time, also, that, under the stimulus of Aḥmad’s imperial ambitions and conquests, the name and the concept of ‘Afghanistan’ comes into existence and, for the first time, into literary and historical usage.

Aḥmad Shāh regarded himself as heir to Nādir’s eastern conquests, and invaded India several times, clashing with the Mughals, the Marāṭhās and the Sikhs, and in 1170/1757 sacking Delhi and Agra. A great empire was built up in north-western India, including Sind, Baluchistan, much of the Panjab and Kashmir, and his victory at the third battle of Pānīpat in 1174/1761 checked the ambitions of the Marāṭhās and, among other things, indirectly enabled the British to consolidate their power in India from their Bengal base. In Khurasan, Aḥmad established a protectorate over Nādir’s descendant, the blind Shāh Rukh (see above, no. 149), although in the reign of Aḥmad’s grandson Zamān Shāh the Afghans were powerless to stem the Qājār annexation of Khurasan and the deposition of Shāh Rukh. The last years of the eighteenth century and the early decades of the nineteenth were, indeed, disastrous for the Durrani empire. The family was rent by internal feuds, with members of it at odds with each other from bases in the three key cities of the land, Kabul, Kandahar and Herat, and the Marāṭhās and Sikhs were able to eject the Afghans from most of their Indian possessions.

Meanwhile, the star of another branch of the Abdālīs, the Bārakzays or Muḥammadzays, was already rising. In 1233/1818, Dūst Muḥammad controlled Kabul, where he set up a puppet Sadōzay ruler, himself assuming the title of Amīr of Kabul some sixteen years later. With the loss of the Indian possessions, the Afghan kingdom was now a geographically compact unit, essentially one of mountains and plateaux, prolonged occupation of which by outside powers was extremely difficult to achieve, as British expeditions were to find during the course of the nineteenth century. Hence Afghanistan survived intact into the twentieth century, fighting off Persian ambitions regarding Herat, pressure from Imperial Russia in the north and two wars with Britain. Dūst Muḥammad resisted temptations to intervene in India, and remained indifferent to the rebels’ cause during the Indian Sepoy Mutiny. After the Second Afghan-British War, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Khān established careful and correct relations with the Great Powers, and this policy was only broken by the impetuousness of Aman Allāh in 1337/1919,
provoking the Third Afghan-British War. His later, over-hasty attempts at the modernisation of a profoundly conservative and traditionalist Islamic society led to his abdication. The throne passed to another branch of the family, which retained power until monarchical rule was replaced in 1393/1973 by a republican régime under the last king’s cousin Muḥammad Dāwūd b. Muḥammad ‘Azīz b. Muḥammad Yūsuf, the prelude to a Communist takeover of the country and its being plunged into a period of bloody warfare which still continues today.

Lane-Poole, 330–5; Zambaur, 304–5.

EI² ‘Afghanistan. V. History’ (M. Longworth Dames).
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THE RULERS OF MALACCA (MELAKA)
c. 805–1111/c. 1403–1699
The south-western coast of the Malay peninsula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>805/1403</td>
<td>Parameśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817/1414</td>
<td>Megat Iskandar Shāh b. Parameśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827/1424</td>
<td>Śri Maharājā Sultan Muḥammad Shāh, son of Megat Iskandar Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? 849/1445</td>
<td>Rājā Ibrāhīm, Śri Parameśvara Deva Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø 850/1446</td>
<td>Rājā Qāsirn, Sultan Muẓaffar Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863/1459</td>
<td>Rājā ‘Abdallāh, Sultan Manṣūr Shāh, son of Muẓaffar Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882/1477</td>
<td>Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ri‘āyat, Manṣūr Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø 893–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934/1488–1528</td>
<td>Sultan Maḥmūd Shāh b. Ri‘āyat Shāh, first reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø 916/1510</td>
<td>Sultan Aḥmad Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916–34/1510–28</td>
<td>Sultan Maḥmūd Shāh, second reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(917/1511)</td>
<td>Portuguese conquest of Malacca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuance of members of the Malaccan dynasty in the Riau-Lingga archipelago and in peninsular Malaysia, for
The origins of the kingdom of Malacca are obscure; it has been suggested that it was in existence well before the fifteenth century, but the majority view is that it was founded by Parameśvara (literally, ‘prince-consort’, i.e. he was the husband of a princess of the Hindu kingdom of Majapahit in Java) at the opening of the fifteenth century. It grew rapidly in importance as a trading centre and as a nest of corsairs, and from the ability of its rulers to levy transit dues on shipping through the Straits of Malacca. Parameśvara seems to have become a Muslim through a further marriage to a daughter of the Sultan of Pasè or Pasai in the northern tip of Sumatra, Muslim since the fourteenth century. The names of the subsequent rulers of Parameśvara’s line and their regnal dates are known partly from written sources and partly from their gravestones, but the dates in several cases must be regarded as only approximate. In the mid-fifteenth century, the rulers followed a lively expansionist policy, warding off Siamese attacks, extending their power within peninsular Malaya and across the Straits to Sumatra, and entertaining diplomatic relations with the Ming Emperors of China. At this time, Malacca became not only the chief trading-centre for South-East Asia but also the main diffusion-centre there for the Islamic faith. Thus local rulers within the Malay peninsula became vassals of Malacca and Muslims at the same time, while Brunei, in northern Borneo (see below, no. 186), came to accept the faith through its trading connections with Malacca, as did various ports along the north coast of Java.

The end of the line of Parameśvara came from the attacks of the Portuguese under Afonso de Albuquerque, so that Malacca passed into Portuguese hands in 917/1511 and became a centre for Portuguese trade in East Asia. But scions of the native Malayan dynasty continued in the islands to the south of Malaya, the kingdom of Riau-Lingga (whose last sultan reigned until as recently as 1911; now within Indonesia), and still survive on the Malayan mainland in the present-day sultanates of Johor, Pahang and Trengganu.

EI² ‘Malacca’ (Barbara Watson Andaya).
THE SULTANS OF ACHEH (ATJÈH, ACEH)
c. 901–1321/c. 1496–1903
The northern tip of Sumatra

- c. 854/c. 1450 ‘Ināyat Shāh
  - ? MuŻaffar Shāh, d. 902/1497
  - ? Shams al-Dīn Shāh
- c. 901/c. 1496 ‘Alī Mughāyat Shāh
  - ☒ c. 936/c. 1530 Śalāḥ al-Dīn b. ‘Alī
- ☒ 979/1571 ‘Alī or Ḥusayn Ri‘āyat Shāh
  - 987/1579 Sultan Muda
  - 987/1579 Sultan Śri ‘Ālam
  - 987/1579 Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn
- ☒ c. 994/c. 1586 ‘Alī Ri‘āyat Shāh or Rājā Buyung
- ☒ c. 996/c. 1588 Ri‘āyat Shāh, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn
- 1013/1604 ‘Alī Ri‘āyat Shāh or Sultan Muda
- ☒ 1016/1607 Iskandar Muda, posthumously called Makota ‘Ālam
  - ‘Crown of the World’
- ☒ 1046/1636 Mughāyat Shāh, Iskandar Thānī ‘Alā’ al-Dīn
\(\text{1051/1641}\) Šafīyyat al-Dīn Shāh bt. Iskandar Muda, Tāj al-ʿĀlam, 
queen, widow of Iskandar Thānī

\(\text{1086/1675}\) Naqīyyat al-Dīn Shāh, Nūr al-ʿĀlam, queen

\(\text{1089/1678}\) Zakiyyat al-Dīn Shāh, ‘Ināyat, queen

\(\text{1099/1688}\) Zināt al-Dīn Kamālat Shāh, queen

\(\text{1111/1699}\) Sharīf Hāshim Jamāl al-Dīn Badr al-ʿĀlam

\(\text{1114/1702}\) Perkasa ʿĀlam Sharīf Lamtuy b. Sharīf Ibrāhīm

\(\text{1115/1703}\) Badr al-Munīr, Jamāl al-ʿĀlam

\(\text{1138/1726}\) Amīn al-Dīn Shāh, Jawhar al-ʿĀlam

\(\text{1138/1726}\) Shams al-ʿĀlam or Wandi Tēbing

\(\text{1139/1727}\) Aḥmad Shāh or Maharājā Lela Mēlayu, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn

\(\text{1148/1735}\) Jahān Shāh or Pōtjut Auk, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn

\(\text{1173–95/1760–81}\) Maḥmūd Shāh or Tuanku Raja

(1177–8/1764–5) Badr al-Dīn

1187/1773 Sulaymān Shāh or Raja Udahna Lela)

1195/1781 Muḥammad Shāh or Tuanku Muḥammad, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn

\(\text{1209–39/1795–1824}\) Jawhar al-ʿĀlam Shāh, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn

(1230–5/1815–20) Sharīf Sayf al-ʿĀlam)

1239/1824 Muḥammad Shāh b. Jawhar al-ʿĀlam Shāh

\(\text{1252/1836}\) Manṣūr Shāh

1287/1870 Maḥmūd Shāh

1291/1874 Capture of the capital Kutaraja by the Dutch

1291–

1321/1874–1903 Muḥammad Dāwūd Shāh, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn

\(\text{1321/1903}\) Definitive Dutch conquest of Acheh

Acheh is the most northerly part of Sumatra, and it became the centre of a powerful Muslim sultanate which at times controlled much also of the
coastlands of Sumatra to the south. Sustained Islamic activity in the region, brought from western India, certainly dates from the thirteenth century. Marco Polo found a Muslim town Ferlec (Pĕrlak) on the north-eastern coast of Sumatra and along the Malaccan Straits; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa landed at Muslim ports there some forty years later; and the names of various Muslim rulers, for some of whom there are coins extant, are known from c. 1300.

When the sultanate of Acheh was established in the early sixteenth century, it rapidly gained control of much trade with Gujarāt and with China, and in this expansionist phase confronted the Portuguese in Malacca and such Malayan states as Johor and Pĕrlak, with its sultans soliciting and receiving aid from the Ottoman Turks. A three-cornered struggle ensued between the Portuguese, Acheh and Johor, complicated in the seventeenth century by the appearance of the Dutch and English. By then, the sultans of Acheh were dealing substantially with the Dutch over the export trade in tin from Pĕrak, but in the later seventeenth century Acheh declined in power under the nominal rule of a series of female rulers, with the real authority exercised by the great chiefs. Acheh nevertheless remained a strong religious and cultural centre for Indonesian Islam, with such famous scholars as Ḥamza Fanṣūri (flor, in the later sixteenth century) as proponents of an Indian-type Ṣūfī mysticism in Indonesia.

In the nineteenth century, tensions became acute with the Dutch government, by now controlling southern and central Sumatra, largely because of Achenese piracy and slave trading in the waters around northern Sumatra. These led to a lengthy and costly guerilla war extending from 1873 to 1903, by the end of which the Acheh sultanate was swept away and the last claimant to its throne exiled; members of the family still survive, however, in contemporary Indonesia.

Zambaur, 308.
EI² ‘Atjèh’ (Th. W. Juynboll and P. Voorhoeve).
Mataram was the third Muslim sultanate to arise in Java after those of Demak in north-central Java (917–57/1511–50) and Bantam at the extreme western end of the island (932–1228/1526–1813). It was centred on what is now Surakarta, and was founded by the father of Senepati (literally, ‘commander’, i.e. of his original overlord the Sultan of Pajang), around whose origins a cloud of legend grew up in an attempt to connect him, probably speciously, with earlier royal families such as those of Majapahit. With his grandson
Sultan Agung, the dynasty produced one of Indonesia’s greatest rulers, who captured the rival city of Surabaya and extended his power as far as the island of Madura and Borneo; in 1625 he assumed the title Susuhunan (literally, ‘royal foot’, i.e. placed on the head of a vassal paying homage, not very felicitously rendered by the Dutch as ‘emperor’, since the term has more a religious connotation, being associated with the legendary walīs or saints who are said first to have brought Islam to Java).

The Dutch in Batavia were in fact becoming a power in Java, and were opposed to Agung’s strongly Islamic policies of forging closer links with Arabia and of reviving the former Javanese empire of Majapahit. Agung’s weaker successors eventually came to terms with the Dutch, and a treaty of 1684 made the sultanate practically a dependency of the Dutch East India Company (VOC), which now controlled a block of territory in western Java cutting the island into two parts. In the early eighteenth century, the Dutch were called into the internal quarrels of Mataram, the so-called First and Second Javanese Wars of Succession (1116–17/1704–5 and 1133–4/1721–2), and further disputes led to apportionment of Mataram between rival claimants in 1168/1755, with two subsequent sultanates at Surakarta and Jogjakarta (see below, nos 184, 185).

EI1 ‘Java’ (A. W. Nieuwenhuis), ‘Surakarta’ (C. C. Berg).
184
THE SUSUHUNANS OF SURAKARTA
1168–1368/1755–1949
_Central Java_

1168/1755 Pakubuwana III, Swarga, of Mataram
1202/1788 Pakubuwana IV, Bagus
1235/1820 Pakubuwana V, Sugih
1238/1823 Pakubuwana VI, Bangun Tapa
1245/1830 Pakubuwana VII, Purbaya
1274/1858 Pakubuwana VIII, Angabehi
1277/1861 Pakubuwana IX, Bangun Kadaton
1310/1893 Pakubuwana X, Wicaksana
1358/1939 Pakubuwana XI
1363–/1944– Pakubuwana XII
_(1368/1949 Republic of Indonesia proclaimed)_

In the course of the Third Javanese War of Succession (1162–70/1749–57), a partition of the Mataram territories was made in 1168/1755. Pakubuwana III continued as ruler of the eastern half of the kingdom, with Surakarta as his capital and with himself and his descendants bearing the title of _Susuhunan_, one higher than that of Sultan. A portion of Mataram, Mangku-Negara, went to a third claimant, Mas Said, now styled Mangkunegara, the nephew of Pakubuwana II and his brother, Mangkubumi, this last now sultan in Jogjakarta. These were in effect vassal states of the VOC and then of the Dutch government, but the two rival states of Surakarta and Jogjakarta had to work out a system of living in harmony and administering the divided lands within a Javanese political tradition which had known only a sole ruler. Once
this understanding was achieved, both states survived the nineteenth century, with its bursts of violence such as the Javanese War of 1825–30, into the twentieth century, through the Japanese occupation of 1942–5 and into the constituting of the Indonesian Republic after the Second World War. The long-reigning Susuhunan Pakubuwana XII still retains his social position at Surakarta within contemporary Indonesia.

_El²_ ‘Surakarta’ (O. Schumann).
M. C. Ricklefs, _A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1300_, 2nd edn, 94–103, 110–11.
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana I, Swarga
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana II, Sepuh, first reign
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana III, Rājā, first reign
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana II, Sepuh, second reign
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana III, Rājā, second reign
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana IV, Seda Pesiyar
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana V, Menol, first reign
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana II, Sepuh, third reign
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana V, Menol, second reign
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana VI, Mangkubumi
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana VII, Angabehi
Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana VIII
The sultanate of Jogjakarta arose out of the partition of Mataram in 1168/1755 (see above, nos 183, 184). Relations with the sister state of Surakarta were at times strained, with the respective rulers endeavouring on occasion to use the Dutch and, in the early nineteenth century, the British, as their allies. Leadership in the Javanese War of 1825–30 came from a prince of the royal house of Jogjakarta, Dipanagara, who himself claimed the title of sultan and protector of Islam. Like its sister state, the sultanate of Jogjakarta has endured until the present day and the constituting of the Republic of Indonesia. Sultan Mangkubuwana IX played a role in resistance to the Dutch attempts at reimposing their colonial rule after the Second World War and was a member of the first Indonesian cabinet after independence; his son Mangkubuwana X has succeeded him, retaining his social position in Jogjakarta at the present time.

EI¹ ‘Djokyakarta’ (A. W. Nieuwenhuis).
D. G. E. Hall, A History of South-East Asia, 4th edn, 502ff., with a genealogical table at p. 973.
Muhammad, of the Bendahara family, became a Muslim in 920/1514
Ahmad, brother of Muhammad
Sharif Ali, Sultan Berkat, son-in-law of Ahmad
? Sulaiman b. Sharif Ali
? Bolkiah b. Sulaiman
? Abdul Kahhar b. Bolkiah, d. 986/1578
Saiful Rijal b. Abdul Kahhar, d. c. 998/c. 1590
Shah Brunei b. Saiful Rijal
Raja Ghafur b. Shah Brunei, under the regency of his uncle Muhammad Hasan
Muhammad Hasan b. Saiful Rijal
Abdul Jalilul Akbar b. Muhammad Hasan, posthumously called Marhum Tuha
Abdul Jalilul Jabbar b. Abdul Jalilul Akbar
Haji Muhammad Ali b. Muhammad Hasan
Abdul Hakk Mubin, grandson of Saiful Rijal
Muhyiddin, probably first acclaimed sultan in 1058/1648, d. c. 1081/c. 1670
Brunei, on the north coast of Borneo, is an old-established sultanate which has survived until today as the State of Brunei. It has been surmised that emigrants from the South-East Asian mainland may have founded Brunei as far back as the seventh century AD, and there are sporadic mentions of it in Chinese sources of the next few centuries, since there were clearly trade contacts with China. Official Brunei wisdom today holds that the Brunei sultanate has been perpetually Muslim, and official genealogies and lore place the first Muslim rulers in the fourteenth or early fifteenth century. In fact, while Islam was doubtless established along the north Borneo littoral from an early time as a result of commercial contacts with Malaysia,
Sumatra, etc., there is evidence that the sultans may not have been converted from the indigenous paganism until the early sixteenth century. The chronology for the Muslim rulers followed in the table above is essentially that of Robert Nicholl, what might be called a ‘shorter’ chronology; but, as noted above, official Bruneian historiography favours a ‘longer’ chronology going back 100 or 150 years earlier. It is nevertheless the case that only in the eighteenth century does the chronology becomes more or less certain.

The first Muslim sultans made Brunei the centre of a considerable empire, embracing most of Borneo itself, Celebes (modern Sulawesi) and the Sulu archipelago and even the southern Philippines. It was this empire which was first encountered by Spanish and Portuguese voyagers in South-East Asian waters; their reports and narratives, from those of Magellan’s expedition onwards, are a prime source for the history and chronology of the Brunei sultanate against which the indigenous tradition can be tested. The sultanate was torn by internal strife thereafter and became constricted by European pressures, with its authority confined now to northern Borneo. In 1841, much of this last had to be ceded to Sir James Brooke as Rajah of Sarawak, and in 1877 Brunei’s portion of northeastern Borneo was leased to British trading interests, eventually to the British North Borneo Company, reducing the sultanate to its present size. In 1888, Brunei became a British protectorate, and from 1906 a British Resident was installed. The exploitation of large reserves of oil and natural gas has revived the fortunes of Brunei in the twentieth century. It decided in 1973 not to join the Malaysian Federation; the sultanate became a constitutional monarchy under British protection, but since 1984 has been a fully-independent state known officially as Negara Brunei Darussalam.

The coins of the Sultans of Brunei are (like those of many other Indonesian dynasties) difficult to utilise as historical evidence, since dates are frequently not given on the coins, and titles of rulers are often recorded in an abbreviated or cursory manner, hence applicable to more than one ruler.

*EI*² Suppl. ‘Brunei’ (O. Schumann).
*idem*, *The Encyclopaedia of the Coins of Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei 1400–1986*.
Sylvia C. Engelen Krausse and Gerald H. Krausse, *Brunei*, World Bibliographical Series
no. 93, Oxford 1988, Introd., with a genealogical table at pp. xlii-xliii.
INDEXES

(A) PERSONAL NAMES

The listing and indexing of Islamic names present difficulties because of the frequent complexity of the complete name and titles of a ruler or other leading person (see Introduction, pp. xxii-xxiii). Also, a person may be best known by one particular element of the complete name, hence al-Mutawakkil rather than Ja’far b. Abī Ishāq al-Mu’taṣim, Sayf al-Dawla rather than ‘Alī b. ‘Abdallāh, and al-Malik al-Kāmil rather than Muḥammad b. Muḥammad or Aḥmad.

Faced with this problem – but on a much greater scale than in the present book – the two compilers of the standard works on Arabic biobibliography, Carl Brockelmann and Fuat Sezgin, opted in their extensive indexes to their respective Geschichte der arabischen Litterature and Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums for listing everyone under ism plus further isms of the nasab, patronymics and honorifics as required for distinguishing purposes. Ordering essentially by ism has seemed to be the best procedure here, but an endeavour has been made to give well-known honorifics also, hence al-Rashīd as well as Hārūn b. Muḥammad al-Mahdi and al-Malik al-Kāmil as well as Muḥammad b. al-‘Ādil I Muḥammad, and also to give conventional European forms like Boabdil and Saladin. Even so, as users of the GAL and GAS have always found, a certain amount of detective work may be necessary as the price of not excessively and tediously overloading an index of personal names.

The arrangement is in word-by-word alphabetical order, hyphens being treated as spaces but diacritics and other punctuation being ignored. The references are to the pages on which names appear in the dynastic lists.

Abaq, Börid, refl
Abaqa, II Khānid, refl
Abba Muṣṭafā I and II, Mais of Dikwa, refl
‘Abbād, ‘Abbādid of Seville, refl
‘Abbās
I, II and III, Šafawids, refl
(or Ya ‘qūb) b. al-Mutawakkil I, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, refl
Ghūrid, refl
‘Abbās Ḥilimī I and II, House of Muḥammad ‘Alī, refl
al-‘Abbās al-Mahdī, Zaydī Imām, ref1
al-‘Abbās al-Makarram, Zuray‘id, ref1
‘Abd al-‘Aḥad, Mangīd, ref1
‘Abd al-‘Aziz
I, Āl Su‘ūd, ref1, ref2
II, amīr in Riyāḍ, King of Ḥijāz and Najd, and King of Su‘ūdī Arabia, ref1
I and II, Marānīds, ref1
Āl Rashīd, ref1
‘Alawīd Sharīf, ref1
Dulafid, ref1
Ḥafṣid, ref1
al-Manṣūr ‘Āmirid, ref1
al-Manṣūr of Valencia and Almería, ref1, ref2
Ottoman, ref1
Toqay Temürīd, ref1
(‘Abd) al-Ḥafīz, ‘Alawīd Sharīf, ref1
‘Abd al-Ḥalīm, Marānīd, ref1
‘Abd al-Ḥamīd I and II, Ottomans, ref1
‘Abd al-Ḥaqq I and II, Marānīds, ref1, ref2
‘Abd al-Jalīl (Jīl) or Selema, ruler of Kanem, ref1
‘Abd al-Karīm
‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdād, ref1
Khān of Astrakhan, ref1
Sultan of Harār, ref1
‘Abd al-Laṭīf
‘Abd al-Laṭīf
Khān of Kazan, ref1
Shibānīd, ref1
‘Abd al-Majīd
I and II, Ottomans, ref1
Fāṭimid, ref1
‘Abd al-Malīk
I and II, Sāmānīds, ref1
‘Alawīd Sharīf, ref1
‘Āmirid, ref1
b. Hāshim, Hāshimid of Darband, ref1
b. Lashkari, Hāshimid of Darband, ref1
b. Maḥammad al-Shaykh, al-Mu‘taṣīm, ‘id Sharīf, ref1
b. Manṣūr, Hāshimid of Darband, ref1
b. Zaydān al-Nāṣir, Abū Marwān, Sa‘id Sharīf, ref1
‘Imād al-Dawla, Hūhid, ref1
Jahwarid of Cordova, ref1
Umayyad caliph, ref1
‘Abd al-Mu’min
Almohad, refl
Ḥafṣid, refl
Marūnīd, refl
Qarakhānīd, refl
Shībānīd, refl
Toqay Temürīd, refl
‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, Hāshmite Sharīf, refl
‘Abd al-Nabī, Mahdī, refl
‘Abd al-Raḥmān
I, II and III, ‘Abd al-Wādīds, refl
I–V, Spanish Umayyads, refl
‘Alawid Sharīf, refl
Bārakzay, refl
(Danyen Kasko), Fulani, refl
governor of Riyāḍ, Āl Su‘ūd, refl
Kanembug Shehu of Bornu, refl
Khān of Astrakhan, refl
Marūnīd, refl
Rustamīd, refl
Sultan of Harar, refl
‘Abd al-Raḥīd, Ghaznawīd, refl
‘Abd al-Razzāq, Sarbadārid, refl
‘Abd al-Shakūr Muḥammad I, Sultan of Harar, refl
‘Abd al-Wahhāb, Rustamīd, refl
‘Abd al-Wāḥid
‘Abd al-Wādīd, refl
b. Idrīs I, Almohad, refl
b. Yūsuf I, Almohad, refl
‘Abdallāh
I, ‘Abd al-Wādīd, refl
II, ‘Abd al-wādīd, refl
I and II, Aghlabids, refl
I and II, Shībānīds, refl
I and II, Sultans of Harar, refl
I, II and III, Su‘ūdīs, refl
(ʿAbdallahi), Fulani, refl
Abū Fāris al-Wāṭhiq, Saʿdid Sharīf, refl
Aftasīd Of Badajoz, refl
‘Alawid Sharīf, refl
Almohad, refl
b. Aḥmad, Mazrūʿī, refl
b. ‘Alī, Āl Rashīd, refl
b. ‘Ali, Ibn Ashqīlūla, ruler of Murcia, refl
b. Ashkam, Afīghid Khwārazm Shāh, refl
b. Faraj al-Thagrī, ruler of Murcia, refl
b. al-Ḥasan, Mahadali Sultan of Kilwa, refl
b. Ḫusayn, Amīr and later king of Transjordam, Hāshimite Sharīf, refl
b. Ishāq, Ṭāhirid Of Khurasan, refl
b. ‘Iyāḍ, ruler of Murcia, refl
b. Kade, Sultan of Kanem, refl
b. Maḥammad, al-Shaykh, Abū Muḥammad al-Ghālib, Sa’dīd Sharīf, refl
b. Maḥammad, al-Shaykh al-Ma’mūm, al-Ghālib, Sa’dīd Sharīf, refl
b. Muḥammad, Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Muqtadī, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, refl
b. Muḥammad, Hāshimite Sharīf, refl
b. Muḥammad, al-Imām, Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, refl
b. Muḥammad, Mazarū’ī, refl
b. Muḥammad, ruler of the Banū Ghāniya, refl
b. al-Muktafī, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, refl
b. al-Mustanṣīr, ‘Abbāsid caliph Baghdad, refl
b. Mut’ab II, Āl Rashīd, refl
b. al-Qādir, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, refl
b. al-Rashīd, ‘Abbāsid caliph Baghdad, refl
b. Ṭāhir I, Ṭāhirid of Khurasan, refl
b. T.r.k.s. bātha, Afrīghid Khwārazm, refl
b. ‘Umar, Sultan of Kanem, refl
b. Yūsuf, Fāṭimid, refl
Āl Bū Sa‘īd, refl
Bikur, ruler of Kanem, refl
Ḥamdānid, refl
Ḥamdānid, refl
Ishāq, ruler of the Banū Ghāniya, refl
Kalbid, refl
al-Mahdī, Zaydī Imām, refl
al Manṣūr, Zaydī Imām, refl
Marīnid, refl
Midrārid, refl
al-Murtuḍā, ruler of Majorca, refl
al-Muẓaffār, Tujībid, refl
Qungrat, refl
Quṭb Shāhī, refl
Sāmānid commander in Sīstān, refl
Sayfī of Bornu, refl
Spanish Umayyad, refl
Tīmūrid, refl
Abū ’l-Fatḥ al-Daylamī al-Nāṣir, Zaydī Imām,
Abū ’l-Fatḥ Ismā’īl Shāh Nāṣir al-Dīn (Ismā’īl Mukh), Bahmanid,
Abū ’l-Fawāris, Būyid in Kirman,
Abū ’l-Fayḍ, Toqay Temūrid
Abū ’l-Ghanā’im, ‘Uqaylīd,
Abū ’l-Ghārāt, Zuray’id,
Abū ’l-Ḥasan, Quṭb Shāhī,
Abū Ibrāhīm Iṣḥāq b. Muḥammad, ruler of the Banū Ghāniya,
Abū Ishāq, Jamāl al-Dīn Īnju’id,
Abū ’l-Jaysh, Mukramid,
Abū Kālījār Marzūbān ’Imād al-Dīn, Būyid in Fars and Khūzistān,
Abū ’l-Khayr, khān at Tura and ruler in northern Khwārazm,
Abū ’l-Ma’ālī, Raḍī ’l-Dīn, Nizārī Ismā’īlī,
Abū Manṣūr
‘Alā’ al-Dīn, or Malik Shāh, Saltuqid,
‘Annāzīd,
Nizārī Ismā’īlī,
Abū Manṣūr Khān, Nawwāb of Oudh,
Abū Muḥammad, Nizārī Ismā’īlī,
Abū Muḥammad II, Mukramid,
Abū ’l-Muẓaffar Ghāzī, Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn, Saltuqid,
Abū ’l-Muẓaffar Ghīyāth ai-Dīn (Yuzbak, Ikhtiyār ai-Dīn), governor of Bengal,
Abū ’l-Muẓaffar Ḥasan Gangu ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Bahman Shāh (Zafar Khān), Bahmanid,
Abū ’l-Rayyāān, ‘Uqaylīd,
Abū Saʿīd
Hazāraspid,
II Khānīd,
Muẓaffar al-Dīn, Shībānid,
Qara Qoyunlu,
Tīmūrid,
Abū Saʿīd al-Zaʿīm, ‘Abd al-Wādid,
Abū Saʿīd Ṭoghīrīl, Qiwām al-Dawla, slave commander of the Ghaznawids,
Abū Shujā’, Sulṭān al-Dawla, Būyid in Fars, Khūzistān, Iraq and Oman,
Abū ’l-Sūʿūd, Zuray’id,
Abū Ṭāhir, Hazāraspid,
Abū Ṭāhir al-Ṣā’īgh, Nizārī Ismā’īlī,
Abū Tāshufīn, ‘Abd al-Wādid,
Abū Yūsuf, Qara Qoyunlu,
al-ʿĀḍid, Fāṭimid,
ʿĀdil, Jāndār Oghullarī,
‘Adil Giray, Khān of the Crimea,
‘Ādil Khān II and III, Fārūqīs, ref1
‘Ādil Shāh, Sultan of Ma‘bar, ref1
Aflaḥ, Rustamīd, ref1
Afrāsiyāb I and II, Hazāraspids, ref1
Afīdūn, Dānishmendids, ref1
Agha Muḥammad, Qājār, ref1
al-Aghlab, Aghlabids, ref1
Aḥmad
I and II, ‘Abd al-Wādids, ref1
I-IV, Bahmanids, ref1
I, II and III, Ḥafṣids, ref1
I and II, Ḥūdids, ref1
I and II, Ḥusaynids Beys, ref1
I and II, Marīnids, ref1
II, Qaramānlū, ref1
I and II, Sāmānids, ref1
III, Sayf al-Dawla, Ḥūdid, ref1, ref2
I, II and III, Sultans of Harar, ref1
‘Abbāsid caliph in Aleppo, Ḥarrān and northern Syria, ref1
Abū Bakr Ibn Ṭāhir, ruler of Murcia, ref1
Abū Ja‘far, ruler of Murcia, ref1
Afrīghid Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Aghlabid, ref1
(Ahmadu) or Zaraku b. Abī Bakr ‘Aṭīq, called Mai Cimola, Fulani, ref1
(Ahmadu Rafaye) b. ‘Uthmān, Fulani, ref1
(Ahmed) I, II and III, Ottomans, ref1
‘Alā‘ al-Dīn, Naṣrīd Malik of Sistan, ref1
‘Alawid Sharīf, ref1
Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
al-A‘raj, Sa‘dīd Sharīf, ref1
b. Abd al-Malik, Ḥāshimid of Darband, ref1
b. Abī ‘Umāra, Ḥafṣīd usurper, ref1
b. ‘Alī, Qarakhānīd, ref1
b. al-Ḥasan, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
b. al-Ḥasan, Kalbid, ref1
b. al-Ḥasan, Zaydī Imām, ref1
b. al-Ḥusayn, Zaydī Imām, ref1
b. Isḥāq, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Ismā‘īl al-Dhahabī, ‘Alawid Sharīf, ref1
b. Khiḍr, Qarakhānīd, ref1
b. Maḥammad al-Shaykh, Sa‘dīd Sharīf, ref1
b. Muḥammad, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Muḥammad, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
b. Mulḫim, Maʿn Amīr, ref1
b. al-Muqtadī, ʿAbbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Mustaḍī, ʿAbbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Mustakfī I, ʿAbbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
b. al-Mutawakkil, ʿAbbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Muwaṭṭaq, ʿAbbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Qāsim, Abu ʿl-ʿAysh, Idrīsid at Aṣīlā, ref1
b. Qudām, commander in Sistan, ref1
b. Shehe b. Fumo Luti, Nabhānī of Pate (1224/1809), ref1
b. Shehe b. Fumo Luti, Nabhānī of Pate (1262/1846), ref1
b. Sulaymān, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
b. ʿUmar, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
b. al-Wazīr Abrām, Sultan of Harar, ref1
b. Yazīd of Sharwān, Ḥāshimid, ref1
b. al-Ẓāhir, ʿAbbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
b. Zaydān al-Nāṣir, Saʿdid Sharīf, ref1
Bānījūrid, ref1
Būyid in Iraq and Kirman, ref1
Bwana Waziri, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Carmathian, ref1
Dulafid, ref1
Fakhr al-Dīn, Qaramān Oghulları, ref1
Faṭimid, ref1
Golden Horde Khān, ref1
(Hārūn), Nūr al-Dawla, Qarakhānid, ref1
Ikshīdid, ref1
Imām of the Ibāḍiyya, ref1
Khalaṣid Ṣaffārid, ref1
Laythid Ṣaffārid, ref1
Mahdali, ref1
al-Malik al-Manṣūr Ḥusām al-Dīn, Artuqid, ref1
al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Shihāb al-Dīn, Artuqid, ref1
Marwānid, ref1
Mazrūʿī ref1
Mengüjekid, ref1
Menteshe Oghulları, ref1
Midrārid, ref1
(Muḥammad), Shams al-Dīn, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
(Muḥammad), Togha Khan, Qarakhānid, ref1
Muḥtajīd governor of Khurasan, ref1
Muʿizz al-Dawla, of the Banū Ṣūnādīḥ of Almería, ref1
al-Nāṣir, Zaydī Imām, ref1
Nuṣrat al-Dīn, Hazāraspid, ref1
Nuṣrat al-Dīn, Ṣāḥib Atā Oghullarī, ref1
Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Oghullarī, ref1
Qādir Khān, Qarakhānid, ref1
Qājār, ref1
Ṣāmānid commander in Sīstān, ref1
Sayf al-Īslām, Zaydī Imām, ref1
Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
Shihāb al-Dīn, Ramaḍān Oghullarī, ref1
Ṣulayḥid, ref1
Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Ṭūlūnid, ref1
Waṭṭāsid, ref1
(Yaʿqūb), Sökmenid, ref1
Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Aḥmad al-ʿAbbās, Saʿdid Sharīf, ref1
Aḥmad al-Akḥal, Kalbid, ref1
Aḥmad Bey I, Qaramānlī, ref1
Aḥmad Firūz Shāh Sayf al-Dīn (ʿAndil), ruler of Bengal, ref1
Aḥmad Fuʿād I and II, House of Muḥammad ʿAlī, ref1
Aḥmad Gövde, Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
Aḥmad Grāñ, Walashmaʿ Sultan in Harar, ref1
Aḥmad Khān Abdālī, Sadōzay, ref1
Aḥmad Khān Sikandar Shāh III, Sūrī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Aḥmad Khiḍr, ʿIzz al-Dīn, Artuqid, ref1
Aḥmad al-Mahdī al-Muṭiʿ, Zaydī Imām, ref1
Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil, Zaydī Imām, ref1
Aḥmad Niyā, Sāmānid commander in Sistan, ref1
Aḥmad Niẓām Shāh Baḥrī, minister of the Bahmanids and first Niẓām Shāhī, Burhān I, ref1
Aḥmad Qāwurd, Seljuq of Kirman, ref1
Aḥmad Sanjār, ʿAḍud al-Dawla, ruler in Khurasan and supreme Sultan of the Seljuqs, ref1
Aḥmad Shāh
I, II and III, Sultans of Gujarāt, ref1
Fārūqī, ref1
(Maharājā Lela Mēlayu), Sultan of Acheh, ref1
ruler of Bengal, ref1
Aḥmad Shāh Bahādur, Mughal, ref1
Aḥmad Simbā, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Aḥmad Tajuddin, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Aḥmad Tegüder (Takūdār), II Khānid, ref1
Aḥmadīl b. Ibrāhīm, Rawwādid, ref1
Ahmadu b. Abī Bakr ʿAtūq, called Mai Cimola, Fulani, ref1
Ahmadu Rafaye b. ʿUthmān, Fulani, ref1
'Ajlān Beg, Qarasī Oghullarï, ref1
Akbar I and II, Mughals, ref1
Akhsitān I and II, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāhs, ref1
‘Alā’ al-Dawla, Atabeg of Yazd, ref1
‘Alā’ al-Dīn
   Bahmanid, ref1
   'Imād Shāhī, ref1
   Qaramān Oghullarï, ref1
   Seljuq of Rūm, ref1
   Udayji, Sultan of Ma’bar, ref1
‘Ālam Khān of Aḥmadnagar, Fārūqī, ref1
‘Ālam Shāh, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Sayyid ruler in Delhi, ref1
‘Ālamgīr II, ‘Azīz al-Dīn, Mughal, ref1
Alfonso I el Batallador, ref1
Alfonso VI of León and Castile, ref1
‘Ālī
   I and II, ‘Ādil Shāhīs, ref1
   I and II, Ḥamdānids, ref1
   I, II and III, Ḥusaynid Beys, ref1
   I and II, Idrīsids, ref1
   I and II, Mazyadids, ref1
   I and II, Qaramānlīs, ref1
   ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
   Aḥmad, Ṣulayḥid, ref1
   (Aliyu) Babba, called Mai Cinaka, Fulani, ref1
b. ‘Abd al-Mu’min, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. ‘Abdallāh, Hāshimite Sharīf, ref1
b. Abī Ṭālib, ‘Rightly-Guided’ Caliph, ref1
b. Ardashīr, Bāwandīd Ispahbadh, ref1
b. Basḥa, Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
b. Būya, Abu ’l-Hasan ‘Imād al-Dawla, first of the Būyids, ref1
b. Dāwūd, Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa (433–93/1042–1110), ref1
b. Dāwūd, Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa (661–5/1263–7), ref1
b. Ḥamdūn, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
b. Ḥammūd, Āl Bū Saʿīd, ref1
b. Ḥammūd, al-Nāṣir, Ḥammūdid of Málaga, ref1
b. al-Ḥasan, Mahdālī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
b. Haytham, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
b. Ḫusayn, Hāshimite Sharīf, ref1
b. al-Ḫusayn, Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
b. Ibrāhīm, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
b. Idrīs, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
b. Masʿūd, Mihrābānid Malik of Sistan, ref1
b. Muḥammad, Abu ’l-Ḥasan Janāḥ al-Dawla, ‘Uqaylid, refl
b. Muḥammad, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Eretna Oghullarï, refl
b. Muḥammad, Mihrabānīd Malik of Sistan, refl
b. Muḥammad, Zurayʿid, refl
b. Muḥammad II, Abu ’l-Ḥasan or Abū Ḥassūn, Waṭṭāsid, refl
b. Muḥammad al-Ṣulayḥī, Ṣulayḥid, refl
b. Mūsā b. Satuq Bughra Khān, joint founder of the Qarakhānīd confederation, refl
b. Muslim, ‘Uqaylid, refl
b. Rukn al-Dawla Ḥasan, Būyid, refl
b. Saba’, al-A‘azz, Zurayʿid, refl
b. Saʿd, Abu ’l-Ḥasan (Muley Hācén), Naṣrid, refl
b. Saʿid, Āl Bū Saʿid, refl
b. Shahriyār, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, refl
b. ‘Uṭhmān, Mazrūʿī, refl
b. Yazīd, Abū Manṣūr, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, refl
b. Yazīd of Sharwān, Hāshimid, refl
b. Yūsuf, Almoravid, refl
b. Yūsuf, Waṭṭāsid, refl
b. Zayd, Zaydī Imām, refl
Duḥghadīr Oghullarī, refl
Fāṭimid, refl
Ghaznawid, refl
Ikhshīdid, refl
Justānid, refl
Kākūyid, refl
Kalbīd, refl
Luʿluʿīd, refl
Mahdīd, refl
al-Malik al-ʿĀdil ‘Imād al-Dīn, Artuqid, refl
al-Manṣūr, Zaydī Imām, refl
Marīnid, refl
Maʿmūnid Khwārazm Shāh, refl
Mukrānim, refl
al-Nāṣir, Ḥammūdīd of Ceuta, refl
Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, refl
Qarakhānīd, refl
Qaramān Oghullarī, refl
ruler of the Banū Ghāniya, refl
Saltuqid, refl
Sīmjūrid, refl
son of Si Ma Gogo or Maḥmūd Daʿo, King of Songhay, refl
Sultan of Harar, refl
Tīmūrid, refl
al-Waḥīd, Hamdānid, ref1
Zīrid of Kairouan, ref1
‘Alî Beg, Inanj Oghulları, ref1
‘Alî Chaghra Khan, Qarakhānid, ref1
‘Alî Fannami, Sayfî of Bornu, ref1
‘Alî Ghâzî Kanuri, Sayfî of Bornu, ref1
‘Alî Golom, King of Songhay, ref1
‘Alî Ibn Hammûd, al-Nâṣîr, Spanish Umayyad, ref1
‘Alî Iqbâl al-Dawla, Mujâhid of Denia and Majorca, ref1
‘Alî Jalâl al-Dîn, Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
‘Alî Jalâl al-Dîn, Ghûrid, ref1
‘Alî Jarâd, son of Ahmad Grâñ, joint ruler of Harar, ref1
‘Alî Karâm (Aliyu Karami), Fulani, ref1
‘Alî Khalîl (Allâh), Chaghatayid, ref1
‘Alî Khân of Kazan, ref1
‘Alî Khwâja Tâj al-Dîn, Sarbadārid, ref1
‘Alî Kolon, King of Songhay, ref1
‘Alî Küchük, Begtiginid, ref1
‘Alî Lashkarî I and II, Shaddâdids, ref1
‘Alî Malik al-Mulûk, Barîd Shâhî, ref1
‘Alî Mardân, governor of Bengal, ref1
‘Alî Mîr Khân (ruling title ‘Alî Shâh), Sultan of Kashmîr, ref1
‘Alî Mubârak, ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
‘Alî Mughâyat Shâh, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
‘Alâ Murâd, Zand, ref1
‘Alî or Ḥusayn Ri‘ayat Shâh, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
‘Alî Quîlî, Afshârid, ref1
‘Alî Ri‘ayat Shâh
(Râjâ Buyung), Sultan of Acheh, ref1
(Sultan Muda), Sultan of Acheh, ref1
‘Alî Sayfî of Bornu (1055–95/1645–84), ref1
‘Alî Shâh
(‘Alî Mîr Khân), Sultan of Kashmîr, ref1
Sadôzay, ref1
‘Alî Shîr, ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn, Sultan of Kashmîr, ref1
‘Alî Tigin, Qarakhānid, ref1
‘Alî Zayn al-‘Ābidîn
‘Alawîd Sharîf, ref1
Qâqî Burhân al-Dîn Oghulları, ref1
‘Āim, Ming, ref1
‘Alîwirdî Khân, Nawwâb of Bengal, ref1
Aliyu Babba, Fulani, ref1
Aliyu Karami, Fulani, ref1
Allāh (‘Alī Khalīl), Chaghatayid, ref1
Allāh Qulī, Qungrat, ref1
Alp Arghu(n), Shams al-Dīn, Hazāraspid, ref1
Alp Arslan
  al-Akhras, Seljuq in Aleppo, ref1
  Great Seljuq, ref1
  Seljuq of Rūm, ref1
  Tāj al-Dīn Oghullari, ref1
Alp Khan (ruling title Hūshang Shāh), Sultan of Mālwa, ref1
Alp Yūrük, Ḥusām al-Dīn, Chobān Oghullari, ref1
Alpī I, Najm al-Dīn, Artuqid, ref1
Altuntash Ḥājib, Ghaznawid commander, ref1
Alughu, Chaghatayid, ref1
Alwand, Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
Alyaman, King of Songhay, ref1
Aman Allāh, Bārakzay, ref1
Amangkurat I-IV, rulers of Mataram, ref1
Amarma, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Amer, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
‘Amīd Shāh Dāwūd (Dilāwar Khān), Ghūrī, ref1
al-Amīn, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Amīn al-Dīn Shāh, Jawhar al-‘Alam, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
al-‘Āmir, Fāṭimid, ref1
Amīr Barīd I and II, Barīd Shāhīs, ref1
Amīr Ghāzī Gümüshtigin, Dānishmendid, ref1
Amīr Walī, Sarbadārid, ref1
Amjad ‘Alī Thurayyā Jāh, Nawwāb of Oudh, ref1
‘Amr b. al-Layth, Laythid Ṣaffārid, ref1
b. Ya’qūb, Laythid Ṣaffārid, ref1
Marīnid, ref1
‘Andil (ruling title Aḥmad Fīrūz Shāh Sayf al-Dīn), ruler of Bengal, ref1
Anūshirwān, Ziyārid, ref1
Ā‘or Khan Aybak, governor of Bengal, ref1
Aq Kābek, Khīm of Astrakhan, ref1
Aq Sunqur
  I Aḥmadīlī, ref1
  II (Arslan Aba), Nuṣrat al-Dīn, Aḥmadīlī, ref1
  al-Bursuqī, ruler in Aleppo, ref1
  Hazārdīnārī, Badr al-Dīn, Sökmenid slave commander, ref1
Aragibag (Arigaba), Mongol Great Khan, ref1
Ārām Shāh, Mu‘izzī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Ardashīr
b. Ḥasan, Bāwandīd Ispahbadh, ref1
b. Kīkhwār, Bāwandīd Ispahbadh, ref1
Ḥusām al-Dawla, Bādūspānid, ref1
Arghun, Il Khānid, ref1
Arigaba (Aragibag), Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Ariq Böke, Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Arp Arslan (Arslan), Khān of Qāsimov, ref1
Arpa Keʾün (Gawon), Il Khānid, ref1
Arslan
(Alp Arslan), Khān of Qāsimov, ref1
(Aq Sunqur II), Nuṣrat al-Dīn, Ahmadīlī, ref1
Giray, Khān of the Crimea, ref1
Shāh I and II, Seljuqs of Kirman, ref1
Shāh I and II, Zangids, ref1
(Shāh), Great Seljuq, ref1
Shāh (Malik Shāh), Ghaznawid, ref1
Tigin, Qarakhānid, ref1
Tigin Muḥammad, Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Arthamūkh, Afrīghid Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Artuq, Zahīr al-Dawla, Seljuq commander, ref1
Artuq Arslan, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Nāṣir al-Dīn, Artuqid, ref1
Artuq Shāh, Nūr al-Dīn, Artuqid, ref1
Asʿad, Yuʿfirid, ref1
Āṣaf al-Dawla, Nawwāb of Oudh, ref1
Āṣaf Jāh (Chin Qīlich Khān), Niẓām, ref1
Ashraf, Bādūspānid, ref1
ʿAṭiyya, Mirdāsid, ref1
Atsīz, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, Ghūrid, ref1
ʿAwaẓ, Qungrat, ref1
ʿAwn al-Rafāq, Hāshimite Sharīf, ref1
Awrangzīb, Mughal, ref1
Ayyūb Shāh, Sadōzay, ref1
Aʿzam Shāh
Ghiyāth al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Mughal, ref1
ʿAẓīm al-Shaʾn Muḥammad ʿAẓīm, Mughal claimant, ref1
al-ʿAzīz
(al-ʿIzz), Birzāl of Carmona, ref1
b. ʿAbd al-Malik, Ḏiyāʾ al-Dawla, ruler of Murcia, ref1
Fāṭimid, ref1
Ḥammādid, ref1
‘Azzān, Āl Bū Saʿid, ref1

Bābur
   Abu ’l-Qāsim, Timūrid, ref1
   Mughal, ref1
Bachcha-yi Saqqa(w) (ruling title Ḥabīb Allāh II), usurper in Afghanistan, ref1
Bādh al-Kurdī, Kurdish chief and founder of the Marwānids, ref1
Badīʾ al-Zamān, Timūrid, ref1

Bādīs
   Ḥammādid, ref1
   al-Muẓaffar al-Nāṣir, Zīrid of Granada, ref1
   Zīrid of Kairouan, ref1
Badr
   al-Dīn, Sultan of Aceh, ref1
   al-Dīn Luʾluʾ, vizier, ruler in Mosul, ref1
   Ḥasanūyid, ref1
   al-Munīr, Jamāl al-ʿAlam, Sultan of Aceh, ref1
   al-Muʿtadidī, Turkish slave commander, ref1
   Ḥasanūyid, ref1
   Zaydī Imām, ref1

Bahādur
   I and II Giray, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
   Ghiyāth al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
   Niẓām Shāhī, ref1
   Shāh
      II, Mughal, ref1
      Fārūqī, ref1
         Sultan of Gujarāt, ref1
   Bahlūl, Lōdī, ref1
   Bahman, Bādūspānid, ref1
   Bahrām
      leader of the Syrian Ismāʿīlī community, ref1
   Shāh
      Ghaznawid, ref1
      Mengüjekid, ref1
      Muʿizz al-Dīn, Muʿizzī Delhi Sultan, ref1
      Seljuq of Kirman, ref1
      Yamīn al-Dīn, Naṣīrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
   Tātār Khān, ruler of Bengal, ref1
   Bakht Giray, Khān of the Tatars, ref1
   Bakhtiyār, Būyid in Iraq, ref1
   Balabān, ‘Izz al-Dīn, Sökmenid slave commander, ref1
Balban, Ulugh Khān, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Muʿizzī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Balban Yuzbakī, ‘Izz al-Dīn, governor of Bengal, ref1
Bandar, Āl Rashīd, ref1
Bāqī Muḥammad, Toqay Temūrid, ref1
Baraka
   (Berke), Batu’id, ref1
   ‘Uqaylid, ref1
Baraq
   Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Chaghatayid, ref1
   Golden Horde Khān, ref1
Baraq Ḥājib, Nāṣīr al-Dunya wa ’l-Dīn, Qutlughkhānid, ref1
Barbak Shāh, Rukn al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Barghash, Āl Bū Saʿīd, ref1
Bārī, Bōrid, ref1
Barjīs Qadīr, Nawwāb of Oudh, ref1
Barkiyāruq (or Berk Yaruq), Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, ref1
Bashīr I, II and III, Shihāb Amīrs, ref1
Bata-Mande-Bori, Keita of Mali, ref1
Bat’iah Dël Wanbarā, widow of Aḥmad Grāñ, joint ruler of Harar, ref1
Batu, Batu’id, ref1
Bāw of Ṭabaristān, Bāwandī Ispahbadh, ref1
Bāyazīd
   (Bāyezīd) I, Yıldırım (‘the Lightning shaft’), Ottoman, ref1
   II, Ottoman, ref1
   Jalāyirid, ref1
   Kararānī b. Sulaymān, ruler of Bengal, ref1
   Kōtōrūm, Jalāl al-Dīn, Jāndār Oghullarī, ref1
   Shāh, Sayf al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Baydu, II Khānid, ref1
Bay qara, Tīmūrid, ref1
Bayram, Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Bay ram Khōja, Qara Qoyunlu, ref1
Baysonqur
   Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
   Tīmūrid, ref1
Begtimur, Sayf al-Dīn, Sökmenid slave commander, ref1
Ber the Great, King of Songhay, ref1
Berk Yaruq (Barkiyāruq), Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, ref1
Berke (Baraka), Batu’id, ref1
Bhikan Khān (ruling title Muhammad Shāh), Sharqī, ref1
Bīdar Bakht, Mughal, ref1
Bīdar Qadīr Khān (or Pindar), ruler of Bengal, ref1
Bilge Khān, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, governor of Bengal, ref1
Biri
  b. Dunama, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
  Ibrâhîm, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Bīsūtūn
  Bādūspānid, ref1
  Ziyārid, ref1
Boabdil, Muḥammad XII, Naṣrid, ref1
Bolkiah, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Bolod (Pūlād) Khān, Golden Horde Khān, ref1
Bozqurd, ‘Alā’ al-Dawla, Dulghadir Oghullarī, ref1
Bud Shâh (or Shâh Khān or Zayn al-‘Ābidīn), ruler of Kashmīr, ref1
Bughra
  Nāṣir al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
  Shihāb al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Bukar
  I Kura, Kanembu Shehu of Bornu, ref1
  Garbai, Shehu of Dikwa and later Bornu, ref1
  Mai of Dikwa, ref1
Bukhtnassar ‘Alī, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Buluggīn II, Ḥammādid, ref1
Buqa (Toqa Temūr), Chaghatayid, ref1
Burhān
  I, II and III, Niẓām Shāhīs, ref1
  ‘Alī, Sharwān Shāh, ref1
  ‘Imād Shāhī, ref1
Būya b. Rukn al-Dawla Ḥasan, Būyid in Hamadan and Isfāhan, ref1
Buyan, White Horde Khān, ref1
Buyan Quli, Chaghatayid, ref1
Buyantu (or Ayurparibhadra or Ayurbarwada), Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Buzan, Chaghatayid, ref1
Bwana
  Bakari I and II, Nabhānīs of Pate, ref1
  Fumo Madi, Muḥammad, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Mkuu
  I and II, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
  b. Shehe, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Shehe
  b. Aḥmad, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
  b. Muḥammad Bwana Fumo Madi, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Tamu Mkuu, Abū Bakr, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Tamu Mtoto, Abū Bakr, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Chaghatay, Chaghatayid, ref1
Chaghrï Beg Dāwūd, Seljuq ruler in Khurāsān, ref1
Changshi, Chaghatayid, ref1
Charles V, Emperor, ref1
Chimtay, White Horde Khān, ref1
Chin Qīlīch Khān (ruling title Āṣaf Jāh), Niẓām of Hyderabad, ref1
Chinggis (Chingiz), Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Chobān, Ḥusām al-Dīn, Chobān Oghullarī, ref1
Dābūya b. Gāwbāra, Dābūyid Ispahbadh, ref1
Dādburzmīhr b. Farrukhān I, Dābūyid Ispahbadh, ref1
Dāniyāl Biy Atalīq, Mangīt, ref1
Dāniyār, Khān of Qāsimov, ref1
Dānūj Mardan Deva (Rājā Ganeśa), ruler of Bengal, ref1
Danyen Kasko, Fulani, ref1
Darā
  Bāwandid Ispahbadh, ref1
  Ziyārid, ref1
Darā Shikūh, Mughal, ref1
Darwīsh
  ‘Alī, Khān of AstraKhān, ref1
  Ramaḍan Oghullarī, ref1
Daryā, Imād Shāhī, ref1
Dāwar Bakhsh, Mughal, ref1
Dawlat Berdi, Golden Horde Khān, ref1
Dawlat Bīrdi Giray (Kerey), Khān of the Crimea, ref1
Dawlat Giray I-IV, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
Dawlat Khān Lōdī, Delhi Sultan, ref1
Dāwūd
  I and II, Artuqids, ref1
  I and II, Mengüjekids, ref1
  I and II Shāh, Bahmanids, ref1
  ‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
  Askīya of Songhay, ref1
    b. ‘Alī, Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
    b. Ibrāhīm Nikale, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
    b. Sulaymān, Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa (525/1131), ref1
    b. Sulaymān, Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa (585/1189), ref1
  Bānījūrid, ref1
  Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
  Rūkn al-Dawla, Artuqid, ref1
  Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, ref1
Dāwūd Kararānī b. Sulaymān, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Dāwūd Khān
Fārūqī, ref1
Sultan of Gujārāt, ref1
Đayā Khātūn, Ayyūbid regent in Aleppo, ref1
Degele (or Tekele)
Hazāraspid, ref1
Salghurid, ref1
Demir Khān, Qarasī Oghullarī, ref1
Dhu ‘l-Nūn, Imād al-Dīn, Dānishmendid, ref1
Dhu ‘l-Nūn Beg Arghūn, governor of Kandahar and first of the Arghūns, ref1
Dhu ‘l-Nūnid Yaḥyā, puppet ruler of Valencia, ref1
Dhu ‘l-Qarnayn, Dānishmendid, ref1
Dilāwar Khān Ḥasan Ghūrī, governor and then ruler of Mālwa, ref1
Dirke Kelem b. Dunama, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Dīwāna (ruled title Muẓaffar Shams al-Dīn), ruler of Bengal, ref1
Dīwdād II, Sājid, ref1
Don John of Austria, ref1
Du’a (Duwa), Chaghatayid, ref1
Du’a Temūr, Chaghatayid, ref1
Dubays I and II, Mazyadids, ref1
Dulaf, Dulafid, ref1
Dunama
b. ‘Alī, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
b. Bīrī, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. Ibrāhīm, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. ‘Umar, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Dunama Dibalemi, Muḥammad, ruler of Kanem, ref1
Dunama Gana, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
Dunama Lefiam, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
Dunama Muḥammad, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
Dunama Umēmī Muḥammad, ruler of Kanem, ref1
Dūndār, Ramaḍān Oghullarī, ref1
Dūndār Beg, Falak al-Dīn, Ḥamīd Oghullarī, ref1
Duqaq, Seljuq in Damascus, ref1
Dūst Muḥammad, Bārakzay, ref1
Ekinchi b. Qochqar, Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Eldigüz, Shams al-Dīn, Eldigüzid, ref1
Eljigedey, Chaghatayid, ref1
Eltüz, Quŋnat, ref1
Eretna, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Eretna Oghullarī, ref1
Eson Buqa, Chaghatayid, ref1
Eylūk, Ramaḍān Oghullarī, ref1
al-Fādil
   b. al-Muqtadir, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
   Carmathian ruler, ref1
   Zaydī Imām, ref1
Fādil Tora, Mangīt, ref1
Faḍl I-V, Shaddādīds, ref1
Faḍl Allāh, Ḥamdānid, ref1
Faḍlūya, Kurdish chief in Fars, ref1
Fahd, Āl Su‘ūd, ref1
al-Fā’iz, Fāṭimid, ref1
Fakhr al-Dīn
   II b. Qorqmaż II, Ma’n Amīr, ref1
   Kart, ref1
Falak al-Dīn, Ahmadīlī, ref1
Fanā Khusraw, ‘Adud al-Dawla, Būyid, ref1
Farāmurz, Kākūyid, ref1
Farīburz
   II and III, Yazidi Sharwān Shāhs, ref1
   b. Sallār of Sharwān, Hāshimid, ref1
   Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Fāridūn I and II, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāhs, ref1
Fāris
   ‘Annāzid, ref1
   Marīnid, ref1
FarKhānda ‘Alī Khān, Nāṣir al-Dawla, Niẓām of Hyderabad, ref1
Farrukh-siyar, Mughal, ref1
Farrukhān I and II, Dābūyid Ispahbadhs, ref1
Farrukhān, Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Farrukhzād
   I and II, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāhs, ref1
   Ghaznawid, ref1
Fārūq, House of Muhammad ‘Alī, ref1
Fatḥ, Sājid, ref1
Fatḥ ‘Alī Khān, Qājār, ref1
Fatḥ ‘Alī Shāh, Bābā Khān, Qājār, ref1
Fatḥ Allāh Daryā Khān, ‘Imād al-Mulk, first of the ‘Imād Shāhls, ref1
Fatḥ Giray I and II, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
Fatḥ Jang, Sadōzay, ref1
Fatḥ Khān (ruling title Mahmūd Shāh I, Begfā, Sayf al-Dīn), Sultan of Gujarāt, ref1
Fatḥ Shāh, Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Fāṭik I, II and III, Najāhids, ref1
Fāṭima Sultān Bike, Khān of Qāsimov, ref1
Fayšal
I b. Husayn b. ‘Ali, King of Greater Syria and subsequently of Iraq, ref1
II b. Ghāzī, Hāshimite King of Iraq, ref1
I and II, Su’ūdīs, ref1
Āl Bū Sa’īd, ref1
Ferdinand II of Aragon, ref1
Fīrūz, Būyid, ref1
Fīrūz Shāh
   III, Kamāl al-Dīn, Tughluqd Delhi Sultan, ref1
   I, Rukn al-Dīn, Mu’izzī Delhi Sultan, ref1
II Khaljī, Jalāl al-Dīn, Khaljī Delhi Sultan, ref1
   b. Bāyazīd Shāh, ruler of Bengal, ref1
   b. Husayn Shāh, Alā’ al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Qutb al-Dīn, Sultan of Ma’bar, ref1
Shams al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Tāj al-Dīn, Bahmanid, ref1
Ẓafar, Tughluqd Delhi Sultan, ref1
Fuḍayl, Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Fūlād Sutūn, Būyid in Fars, ref1
Fumo Bakari
   b. Aḥmad, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
   b. Bwana Shehe, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Fumo Luti b. Shehe, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Fumo Luti Kipanga, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Fumo Omari b. Aḥmad b. Shehe, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Garshāsp
   I and II, Kākūyids, ref1
   I and II, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāhs, ref1
Gawon (Arpa Ke’ūn), Il Khānid, ref1
Gaykhatu, Il Khānid, ref1
Gharib, ‘Uqaylīd, ref1
Ghāzān (or Maḥmūd Ghazan) I, Il Khānid, ref1
Ghāzī
   I and II, Najm al-Dīn, Artuqids, ref1
   I and II, Sayf al-Dīn, Zangīds, ref1
   Ḥashimite King of Iraq, ref1
Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Ghāzī Chelebi, Parwāna Oghullarī, ref1
Ghāzī Giray I, II and III, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
Ghāzī Khān Chak (ruling title Muḥammad Nāṣīr al-Dī n), Sultan of Kashmir, ref1
Ghāzī Shāh, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Ghaznī Khān
Fārūqi, ref1
Sultan of Mālwa, ref1
Ghiyāth al-Dīn
I and II, Karts, ref1
Hazāraspid, ref1
(‘Iwad, Husām al-Dīn), governor of Bengal, ref1
Kay Khusraw, Inju’id, ref1
Shāh, Khaljī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Tahamtan, Bahmanid, ref1
Gīl, Dābūyid Ispahbadh, ref1
Gīlān Shāh, Ziyārid, ref1
Gökbori, Begtiginid, ref1
‘Great Sanūsi’, the, Sayyid Muḥammad b. Alī, ref1
Güneri Beg, Qaramān Oghullarī, ref1
Gushnāsp or Garshāsp II, Yazīdī Sharwan Shah, ref1
Güyük, Mongol Great Khān, ref1

Ḫabbūs, Zīrid of Granada, ref1
Ḫabīb Allah
I Bārakzay, ref1
II, or Bachcha-yi Saqqā(w), usurper in Afghanistan, ref1
Sadōzay, ref1
Ḫabīb Shāh, Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
al-Hādi, Mūsā, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
al-Ḫāfiẓ, Fāṭimid, ref1
Ḫāfiẓ, Kart, ref1
Ḫai-shan (or Qayshan Gülük), Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Haji Muḥammad Ali, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Ḫajjāj Sultān, Qutlughkhānid, ref1
Ḫājji Giray I and II, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
Ḫājji Khān (ruling title Ḥaydar Shāh), Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Ḫājji Shāh, Atabeg of Yazd, ref1
al-Ḫakam I and II, Spanish Umayyads, ref1
al-Ḫakīm
I, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Aleppo and then Cairo, ref1
II, Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
Fāṭimid, ref1
al-Ḫakīm al-Munajjim, Nizārī Ismā’īlī, ref1
Ḫālīm Giray, Khān of the Crimea, ref1
Ḫamdān, chief in Mārdīn and Mosul, founder of the Hamdānids, ref1
Ḫamdūn, al-Mansūr, ruler in Cordova, ref1
Ḫamdūn, Sayf of Bornu, ref1
Ḫāmid
Āl Bū Saʿīd, ref1, ref2
Sultan of Harar, ref1
Ḥammād, Ḥammādīd, ref1
Ḥammūd, Āl Bū Saʿīd, ref1
Ḥam(m)ūda Pasha, Ḫusaynid Bey, ref1
Ḫamza
Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
ʿĪzz al-Dīn, Ṭāmaṭan Oghulları, ref1
Zaydi Imam, ref1
Ḫamza Shāh, Sayf al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Ḫarb, Tāj al-Dīn III, Nasrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
al-Hārith, Dulağ id, ref1
Ḫārūn
(Aḥmad), Nūr al-Dawla, Qarakhānīd, ref1
b. al-Mahdī, Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Muʿtaṣim, al-Rashīd, Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
(Ḫasan), joint founder of the Qarakhānīd confederation, ref1
(Ḫasan), Nāṣir al-Haqq, Qarakhānīd, ref1
Ḫwārazm Shāh, ref1
Ṭūlūnid, ref1
Ḫasan
II and III, Nizārī Ismāʿīlīs, ref1
b. Alp Arslan Muḥammad, Tāj al-Dīn Oghulları, ref1
b. Būya, Abū ‘Alī Rukan al-Dawla, Būyid in Jibāl, ref1
b. Kay Khusraw, Fakhr al-Dawla, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, ref1
Bāwandid Ispahbadh, ref1
Buy id in Iraq, ref1
Fulani, ref1
(Hārūn), joint founder of the Qarakhānīd confederation, ref1
Ḫusām al-Dīn, Tāj al-Dīn Oghulları, ref1
Jalāl al-Dunyā wa ‘l-Dīn, Qarakhānīd, ref1
al-Mustansir, Hammūdīd of Ceuta, ref1
Numayrid, ref1
Qutb al-Dīn, Ghūrid, ref1
Ṣāḥib Atā Oghulları, ref1
(Tīgin) b. ‘Alī, Qarakhānīd, ref1
Ṭīmūrid, ref1
al-Ḫasan
I and II, ‘Alawīd Sharīfs, ref1
ʿAbbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
ʿAbd al-Wādid, ref1
Abū ‘Alī al-Aʿṣam, Carmathian ruler, ref1
Abū Saʿīd, Carmathian ruler, ref1
b. ʿAbdallāh, Kalbid, ref1
b. Dāwūd, Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
b. Ismāʿīl, al-Khatīb, Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
b. Muḥammad, Idrīsid at al-Hajjām, ref1
b. al-Qāsim, Idrīsid at Ḥajar al-Nasr, ref1
b. Sulaymān
   Abu ʿI-Mawāhib, Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa (710/1310), ref1
   Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa (884/1479, 8914/1468–9), ref1
   Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
b. Ṭālūt, Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Ḥafṣid, ref1
Ḥamdānid, ref1
Kamāl al-Dīn, Nizārī Ismāʿīlī, ref1
Marwānid, ref1
al-Mustansir, Hammūdid of Málaga, ref1
Nāṣir al-Dīn, Bahṛī Mamlūk, ref1
al-Ṣamṣām, Kalbid, ref1
ʿUqaylid, ref1
Zaydī Imām, ref1
Zīrid of Kairouan, ref1
Ḥasan ʿAlī, Qara Qoyunlu, ref1
Ḥasan Dāmghānī, Sarbadārid, ref1
Ḥasan-i Sabbāh (al-Ḥasan), Fāṭimid agent and Nizārī Ismāʿīlī, ref1
Ḥasan Shāh, Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Ḥasanawayh, Ḥasanūyid, ref1
Hāshim
   b. Surāqa al-Sulamī, governor of Darband and first of the Hāshimids, ref1
   Bānijūrid, ref1
Kanembu Shehu of Bornu, ref1
Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Sultan of Harar, ref1
Hassanal Bolkiah, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Ḥātim
   Aḥmad, Hāmī;d al-Dawla, Hamdānid, ref1
   b. al-Ghashīm al-Hamdānī, Hamdānid, ref1, ref2
   b. al-Humās, Hamdānid, ref1
Ḥaydar
I and II, Nawwābs of Oudh, ref1
ʿAll Khān Bahadur, ruler in Mysore, ref1
Shihāb Amir, ref1
Shujāʿ al-Dawla Jalāl al-Dīn, Nawwāb of Oudh, ref1
Ḥaydar Giray, Khān of the Crimea, ref1
Haydar Qaṣṣāb, Sarbadārid, refl
Haydar Shāh (Hājjī Khān), Sultan of Kashmīr, refl
Haytham
  b. Muḥammad, Yazidi Sharwān Shāh, refl
  b. Muḥammad of Sharwān, Hāshimid, refl
Khālid, Yazidi Sharwān Shāh, refl
Hazārasp, Bādūspānid, refl
Hilāl
  Ḥasanūyid, refl
  Ibn Mardanish, ruler of Valencia, refl
Hindal, Qutb al-Dīn, Sultan of Kashmīr, refl
Hishām
  I, II and III, Spanish Umayyads, refl
    ‘Alawid Sharīf, refl
  Hamdānid, refl
    Umayyad caliph, refl
Hülegū (or Hūlākū), II Khānid, refl
al-Humās, Hamdānid, refl
Humāyūn, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Mughal, refl
Humāyūn Shāh, Bahmanid, refl
Hume or Ume Jilmi, first Yazanī ruler of Kanem, refl
Husayn
  I and II, Ghūrids, refl
  I and II, Jalāyirids, refl
  I, II and III, Nizām Shāhīs, refl
  I and II, Rawwādīs, refl
  I, Safawīd, refl
    ‘Alawid Sharīf, refl
  b. ‘Alī, Sharīf of Mecca and Hijāz and King of Hijāz, Hāshimite Sharīf, refl
  b. Talāl, Hāshimite King of Jordan, refl
Jalāl al-Dunyā wa ‘l-Dīn, Qarakhānid, refl
Kamāl al-Dīn, Ḥamid Oghulları, refl
al-Nasr, Ḥusaynīd Bey, refl
rebels against Khalafid Safārids, refl
Ṣāḥib Ata Oghulları, refl
Seljuq of Kirman, refl
Tīmūrid, refl
al-Husayn
  I and II, Ḥusaynīd Beys, refl
  b. Khalīl II, Ayyūbid in Diyar Bakr, refl
  b. al-Qāsim, Zaydī Imām, refl
  b. SulaVML (757/1356), Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, refl
  b. Sulaymān (791/1389), Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, refl
Hamdānid, ref1
Hāshimite Sharīf, ref1
Mukramid, ref1
Tāhirid, ref1
Husayn Fath Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Husayn Kāmil, House of Muḥammad ‘Alī, ref1
al-Husayn al-Mahdī, Zaydī Imām, ref1
al-Husayn al-Mansūr, Zaydī Imām, ref1
Husayn Quṭb, Qājār, ref1
Husayn Shāh
Nāṣir al-Dīn, Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Sharqī, ref1
Hūshang, Yazidi Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Hūshang Shāh (Alp Khān), Sultan of Mālwa, ref1
Ibn al-Mu’tazz al-Murtaḍā al-Muntaṣif, Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Ibrāhīm
I and II, Ādil Shāhīs, ref1
I and II, Aghlabids, ref1
I and II, Ḩafṣids, ref1
II, Lōdī Delhi Sultan, ref1
I and II, Musāfirids, ref1
I and II, Qaramān Oghullarī, ref1
I, II and III, Ramaqān Oghullarī, ref1
I and II, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāhs, ref1
‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
(‘Abdallāh) b. ‘Abdallāh, Ziyādid, ref1
Afshārid, ref1
Arslan Khān Ulugh Sulṭān al-Salāṭīn Nuṣrat al-Dunyā wa ‘I-Dīn, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. Abī Bakr, Almoravid ruler in Sijilmāsa, ref1
b. Abī Bakr, Nizām al-Dīn, Artuqid, ref1
b. Aḥmad, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
b. Aḥmad (Hārūn), Qarakhānid, ref1
b. Ḥusayn, Arslan Khān, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. Idrīs, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
b. al-Mahdī, Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Muḥammad (449/1057), Qarakhānid, ref1
b. Muḥammad, Ziyādid, ref1
b. al-Muqtadīr, Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Naṣr, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. Sökmen I, Artuqid, ref1
b. Sulaymān, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. Tāshuṭṭīn, Almoravid, ref1
b. ‘Uthmān, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Barīd Shāhī, ref1
Ghaznawid, ref1
Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Jāndār Oghullarī, ref1
Hamdānid, ref1
Kanembu Shehu of Bornu, ref1
Khān of Kazan, ref1
Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Marīnid, ref1
Menteshe Oghullarī, ref1
Mughal, ref1
Muhtājid, ref1
Nāṣir al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Nizām Shāhī, ref1
Ottoman, ref1
Pasha of Egypt, ref1
Quṭb Shāhī, ref1
Shams al-Dīn, Sharqī, ref1
Shehu of Dikwa, ref1
Sīmjūrid, ref1
Tāj al-Dīn, Jāndār Oghullarī, ref1
Tamghach (Tabghach) Bughra Khān, Ibrāhīm, Qarakhānid, ref1
Tamghach (Tabghach) Khān (536/1141), Qarakhānid, ref1
Timūrid, ref1
Umayyad caliph, ref1
‘Uqaylīd, ref1
Yuʻfirid, ref1
Ẓahir al-Dīn, Sökmenid, ref1
Ibrāhīm Kabayao, King of Songhay, ref1
Ibrāhīm Khān III, Sūrī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Ibrāhīm Nikale b. Biri, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Ibrāhīm Pasha, House of Muḥammad Ali, ref1
Ibrāhīm Shāh
I Qadïr Khān, Rukn al-Dīn, Khaljī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Idrīs
II, Almohad, ref1
I, disputant for authority in Morocco, ref1
I, II and III, Hammūdīds, ref1
I and II, Idrīṣīds, ref1
‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
b. Dāwūd, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. Ibrāhīm Nikale, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Idrīs Alawa, Sayfī of Bornu, refl
Idrīs Katagarmabe, Sayfī of Bornu, refl
II Arslan
   Khwārazm Shāh, refl
   Nūral-Dīn, Zangid, refl
II Ghāzī I and II, Artuqids, refl
Ilbasan, White Horde Khān, refl
Ilutmish, Shams al-Dīn, Muʿizzī Delhi Sultan, refl
Ilyās
   Fakhr al-Dīn, Sarukhān Oghullari, refl
   Ḥusām al-Dīn, Ḥamid Oghullari, refl
   Muzaffar al-Dīn or Shujāʿ al-Dīn, Menteshe Oghullari, refl
Ilyās Shāh, Shams al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, refl
Ilyasa’
   b. Muḥammad, Ilyāsid, refl
   Midrārid, refl
‘Imād al-Dīn, Hazāraspid, refl
Imām Qulī, Toqay Temürid, refl
Imām ‘Umar Dīn, Sultan of Harar, refl
Imrān b. Muḥammad, Zuray’id, refl
Inanj Beg, Shujāʿ al-Dīn, Inanj Oghullari, refl
‘Ināyat Giray, Khān of the Crimea, refl
‘Ināyat Shāh, Sultan of Acheh, refl
Irān Shāh, Seljuq of Kirman, refl
‘Iraq, Afrīghid Khwārazm Shāh, refl
Irinchinbal (Rinchenpal), Mongol Great Khān, refl
Īsā
   Aydīn Oghullari, refl
   Fāṭimid, refl
   al-Malik al-Zāhir Majd al-Dīn, Artuqid, refl
   ‘Uqaylid, refl
Īsā Khān, governor of Mālwa, refl
Isfahsālār, Atabeg of Yazd, refl
Isfandiyār
   (Isfendiyār), Mubāriz al-Dīn, Jāndār Oghullari, refl
   Qungrat, refl
Ishāq
   I and II, Askiyas of Songhay, refl
   Almoravid, refl
   Birzāl of Carmona, refl
   Luʾluʿid, refl
   Mengüjekid, refl
   Najm al-Dīn, Ḥamīd Oghullari, refl
Qaramān Orhullarï, ref1
Ṭāhirid in Baghdad and Iraq, ref1
Ziyādid, ref1
Isḥāq Beg, Inanj Orhullarï, ref1
Isḥāq Chelebi, Muẓaffar al-Dīn, Şarukhān Orhullarï, ref1
Isḥāq Mulla or Muḥammad Pūlād, Ming, ref1
Iskandar
  b. Kayūmarth, Bādūspānid, ref1
  b. Nāmāwar, Bādūspānid, ref1
  b. Ziyār, Jalāl al-Dawla, Bādūspānid, ref1
Qara Qoyunlu, ref1
Shībānid, ref1
Timūrid, ref1
Iskandar Muda, posthumously called Makota ‘Ālam (Crown of the World), Sultan of
  Acheh, ref1
Islām Giray I, II and III, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
Islām Shāh Sūr, Sūrī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Ismā‘īl
  I and II, Abu ’l-Walīd, Naṣrids, ref1
  I, II and III, Šafawids, ref1
  II b. Nūḥ ll, Sāmānid, ref1
  ‘Ādil Shāhi, ref1
al-‘Ajamī, Nizārī Ismā‘īlī, ref1
Askīya of Songhay, ref1
‘Ayn al-Dawla, Dānishmendid, ref1
  b. Aḥmad I, Sāmānid, ref1
  b. al-‘Azīz Tughtigin, Ayyūbid in Yemen, ref1
  b. al-Ḥāfiz, Fāṭimid, ref1
  b. al-Qā’im, Fāṭimid, ref1
Dhu ’l-Nūnīd of Toledo, ref1
Ghaznawid, ref1
Kamāl al-Dīn, Jāndār Orhullarï, ref1
Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Lu’lu’id, ref1
Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Musāfirid, ref1
al-Mutawakkil, Zaydī Imām, ref1
Najm al-Dīn, Nizārī Ismā‘īlī, ref1
Niẓām Shāhī, ref1
Shams al-Mulūk, Börid, ref1
‘Uthmān, Rasūlid, ref1
Zangid, ref1
Ismā‘īl Mukh (ruling title Abu ’l-Fath Ismā‘īl Shāh Nāṣir al-Dīn), Bahmanid, ref1
Ismāʿīl Pasha, House of Muḥammad ʿAlī, ref1
Ismāʿīl al-Samīn, ‘Alawid Sharīf, ref1
Ismāʿīl Shāh, Sultan of Kashmir, ref1
Ispan, Qara Qoyunlu, ref1
‘Iwad, Husām al-Dīn (ruling title Ghiyāth al-Dīn), governor of Bengal, ref1
‘Izz al-Dīn Karmān, Mihrabānid Malik, ref1

? Jabbār Berdi (or Yeremferden), Golden Horde Khān, ref1
Jadu, later Muẓaffar Shams al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Jaʿfar
   Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
   b. Muḥammad, Kalbid, ref1
   b. al-Muʿtaṣīd, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
   b. al-Muʿtaṣim, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Bāwandid Ispahbadh, ref1
Tāj al-Dawla, Kalbid, ref1
Zand, ref1
Zaydī Imām, ref1
Jahān Pahlawān Muḥammad, Eldigüzid, ref1
Jahān Shāh
   (Pōṭjut Auk), Sultan of Acheh, ref1
   Qara Qoyunlu, ref1
Jahāndār, Mughal, ref1
Jahāngīr
   Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
   b. ‘Azīz, Bādūspānid, ref1
   b. Kāwūs, Bādūspānid, ref1
   b. Muḥammad, Bādūspānid, ref1
Mughal, ref1
Jāhir, Kalbid, ref1
Jahwar, Jahwarid of Cordova, ref1
Jalāl al-Dīn, Golden Horde Khān, ref1
Jalāl Khān (ruling title Aḥmad Shāh (II), Quṭb al-Dīn), Sultan of Gujarat, ref1
Jalāl Shāh, Sūrī ruler of Bengal, ref1
Jalīl, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Jāmbek (Jānī Beg), Batuʿīd, ref1
Jamshīd
   Āl Bū Saʿīd, ref1
   Sultan of Kashmir, ref1
Jān ʿAlī, Khān of Kazan and Qāsimov, ref1, ref2
Jānay, Khān of Qāsimov, ref1
Jānī Beg
   Arghūn, ref1
(Jambek), Batu’id, ref1
Jānī Beg Giray, Khān of the Crimea, ref1
Jānī Muḥammad, Toqay Temūrid, ref1
Jawhar, Fāṭimid general, ref1
Jawhar al-‘Ālam Shāh, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
Jawhar al-Mu’azzamī, Ṣulayḥid regent, ref1
Jaysh, Ṭūlūnid, ref1
Jayyāsh, Najāḥid, ref1
Jibrā’il, Qarakhānid, ref1
Jijaghatu Toq Temūr, Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Jil, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
al-Julandā, first Ibāḍī Imām in Oman, ref1
Junayd, Aydīn Orhullari, ref1
Justān
II, III and IV, Justānids, ref1
I and II, Musāfirids, ref1

Kade
b. Dunama, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. Idrīs, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. ‘Uthmān, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Kāfūr al-Lābi, Ikhshīdid, ref1
Kalīm Allāh, Bahmanid, ref1
Kāmrān Bakhsh, Mughal, ref1
Kām Bakhsh, Mughal, ref1

Kāmrān
Mughal, ref1
Sadōzay, ref1

Kanafa, King of Songhay, ref1
Karīm Berdi, Golden Horde Khān, ref1
Kathīr, ‘Uqaylid, ref1
Kawkaw, Askiya of Songhay, ref1
Kāwūs
b. Ashraf, Bādūspānid, ref1
b. Kayūmarth, Bādūspānid, ref1

Kay Kāwūs, Bādūspānid, ref1
I and II, ‘Izz al-Dīn, Seljuqs of Rūm, ref1
Rukn al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Ziyārid, ref1

Kay Khusraw
I, II and III, Seljuqs of Rūm, ref1
b. Yazdagird, Rukn al-Dawla, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, ref1
Bādūspānid, ref1
Kay Qubādh
  I, II and III, Seljuqs of Rūm, ref1
  Mu'izz al-Dīn, Mu'izzī Delhi Sultan, ref1
  Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Kayūmarth
  b. Bahman, Bādūspānid, ref1
  b. Bīsutūn, Bādūspānid, ref1
  Shams al-Dīn, Mu'izzī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Kebek
  (Köpek), Chaghatayid, ref1
  Golden Horde Khān, ref1
Khalafr
  Bahā’ al-Dawla, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
  Khalafid Ṣaffārid, ref1
  Sultan of Harar, ref1
Khālid
  I and II, Ḥafsids, ref1
  ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Āl Su‘ūd, ref1
  Sulaymān, Shīrāzi Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
  Su‘ūd I, Āl Su‘ūd, ref1
  Yazīd, precursor of the Yazīdī Sharwān Shahs, ref1
Khalīfa
  b. Barghash, Āl Bū Sa‘īd, ref1
  Kharūb, Āl Bū Sa‘īd, ref1
Khalil
  I and II, Sharwān Shāhs, ref1
  Ghars al-Dīn, Dulghadīr Orhullarī, ref1
  Ghars al-Dīn, Ramaḍan Orhullarī, ref1
  Khan of Kazan, ref1
Khalīl Khān (ruling title Muẓaffar Shāh II), Sultan of Gujarat, ref1
Khalil Sulṭān, Timūrid, ref1
Khamīs, ‘Uqaylid, ref1
Khashram Aḥmad, ruler of Lakz, ref1
Khayr al-Dīn Barbarossa, ref1
Khayrān al-Ṣaqlabī, of Almería, ref1, ref2
Khīḍr
  Aydīn Orhullarī, ref1
  Batu’id, ref1
  Qarakhānid, ref1
  Sinān al-Dīn, Tekke Orhullarī, ref1
Khīḍr Beg, Ḥamūd Orhullarī, ref1
Khīḍr Khān
  Bahādur Shāh, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Sūrī governor and then ruler of Bengal, ref1
Rāyat-i A‘lā, Sayyid ruler of Delhi
Khiḍr Shāh, Ṣarukhān Orhullārī
tulunid
Khurshid I and II, Dābūyid Ispahbadhs
Khūshchihr, Shaddādīd
Khusraw Fīrūz
Būyid
Jūstānid
Khusraw Khān Barwārī, usurper in Delhi
Khusraw Malik, Ghaznavid
Khusraw Shāh
Jūstānid
Mu‘izz al-Dawla, Ghaznavid
Khwāja Ḥusnārī Ismā‘īlī
talbārī
Sarbādārid
Khwāja-yi Jahān Aḥmad Ayāz, Tughluqīd rebel
Khwurshāh, Rūk al-Dīn, Nizārī Ismā‘īlī
Kirmān Shāh, Seljuq of Kirman
Kiyā Buzurg, Nizārī Ismā‘īlī
Kōchkuṇju Muḥammad, Shībānīd
Kōchū, White Horde Khān
Kōnehk, Chaghatayīd
Kōpek (or Kebek), Chaghatayīd
Kōrp Arslān, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Aḥmadīlī
Kosoy (or Kosay) Mūsā Darkham, King of Songhay
Kūchku Muḥammad, Golden Horde Khān
Kure Gana, Sultan of Kanem
Kure Kura, Sultan of Kanem
Kuthayyir b. Aḥmad, commander in Sistan
Labīb al-Ṣaqlabī, ruler in Valencia
Langar, ‘Īzz al-Dīn, Atabeg of Yazd
Lashkārī, Hāshimīd of Darband
al-Layth, Layṭhid Ṣaffārid
Layth, Menteshe Orhullārī
Luqmān, Il Khānīd
Luṭf ‘Alī, Zand
Luṭf Allāh, Sarbadārīd
Luṭfī, Bey of Alanya
Lu’lu’
Lu’lu’īd Atabeg
regent in Aleppo and northern Syria for the Ħamdānīds
Ma‘add
Abu ’l-Ḥasan al-Zahir, Fāṭimid, refl
Abū Tamīm al-Mustansir, Fāṭimid, refl
Maḥāna I, Keita of Mali, refl
Maḥammad al-Shaykh
al-Aṣghar or al-Ṣaghīr, Sa’dīd Sharīf, refl
al-Ma‘mūn, Sa’dīd Sharīf, refl
b. Muḥammad al-Mahdi, Sa’dīd Sharīf, refl
Mahārājā Lela Mēlayu (or Aḥmad Shāh), Sultan of Acheh, refl
Mahdī
Justānid, refl
Mahdīd, refl
al Mahdī
‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, refl
Fāṭimid, refl
Mahendra Deva, ruler of Bengal, refl
Maḥmūd
I and II, Ottomans, refl
I and II, Seljuqs in Persia and Iraq, refl
b. Aḥmad, vassal of the Khwārazm Shāh and then of Küchlug, Qarakhānid, refl
b. Dāwūd, Ramaḍān Orhullarī, refl
b. Ḫusayn, Toghan Khān, Qarakhānid, refl
b. Zangī, Zangid ruler in Aleppo and then Damascus, refl
Badr al-Dīn, Qaramān Orhullarī, refl
Börid, refl
Ghaznawid, refl
Ghiyāth al-Dīn
Ghūrid, refl
Tughluqīd, refl
Ḫusaynīd Bey, refl
Jalāl al-Dīn
Mihrabānīd Malik of Sistan, refl
ruler of Bengal, refl
Zangīd, refl
Jalāl al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, Sultān Shāh, Anūstiginid Khwārazm Shāh, refl
Jalāyirīd, refl
(Maḥmūdak), Khān of Kazan, refl
Majd al-Dīn (Badr al-Dīn), Bey of Alanya, refl
al-Malik al-Mu’azzam Muʿīzz al-Dīn, Zangīd, refl
al-Malik al-Qāhir Nāṣir al-Dīn, Zangīd, refl
al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ
Nāṣir al-Dīn, Artuqīd, refl
Shams al-Dīn, Artuqīd, refl
Mirdāsid, refl
Nāṣir al-Dīn
   Chobān Orhullarī, refl
      Malik al-Shaṛq, governor of Bengal, refl
Qarakhānid, refl
Rukn al-Dīn, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, refl
Shaddādid, refl
Shihāb al-Dīn, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, refl
Tāj al-Dīn Orhullarī, refl
Tekke Orhullarī, refl
Tīmūrid, refl
Ťoghrīl Qara Khān, Niẓām al-Dawla, Qarakhānid, refl
Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, refl
Maḥmūd Dāmghān Shāh, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Sultan of Ma‘bar, refl
Maḥmūd Ghazan (Ghāzān) I, II Khānid, refl
Maḥmūd Gokaltāsh, Arghūn, refl
Maḥmūd Khān (ruling title Maḥmūd Shāh (I) Khaljī), Sultan of Mālwa, refl
Maḥmūd Shāh
   II, Khaljī Sultan of Mālwa, refl
      I, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Mu‘izzī Sultan of Delhi, refl
      II, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Tughluqīd Sultan of Delhi, refl
   I, II and III, Sultans of Gujurāt, refl
Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Nāṣir al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, refl
Atabeg of Yazd, refl
Bahmanid, refl
Ghiyāth al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, refl
Inju, Sharaf al-Dīn, Inju’id, refl
Nāṣir al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, refl
Sadūzay, refl
Sharqī, refl
Sultan of Acheh (1287/1870), refl
   (Tuanku Raja), Sultan of Acheh (1173–95/1760–81), refl
Mai Cimola, Fulani, refl
Mai Cinaka, Fulani, refl
Mai Katuru, Fulani, refl
Mai Turare, Fulani, refl
Mai Wurno, Fulani, refl
Majd al-Dīn' Muẓaffār, Nizārī Ismā‘īlī, refl
Majīd, Āl Bū Sa‘īd, refl
Mākān, Daylamī commander, refl
Makota ‘Ālam (Iskandar Muda), Sultan of Acheh, refl
Malāq Ādam, Sultan of Harar, refl
al-Malik al-‘Ādil
I and II, Ayyūbids in Damascus, ref1
I, III and IV, Ayyūbids in Diyar Bakr, ref1
II Abū Bakr, Ayyūbid in Egypt, ref1
VI Khalāf b. Muḥammad, Ayyūbid in Diyar Bakr, ref1
I Muḥammad or Ḥamāt, Ayyūbid in Aleppo and Egypt, ref1
V Sulaymān I, Ayyūbid in Diyar Bakr, ref1
al-‘Abbās or Yaḥṣūb, ‘Abbāsid caliph and Mamlūk sultan, ref1
‘Abdallāh Jakam, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Baydarā, Badr al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Kitbughā, Zayn al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Salāmish or Süleymish, Badr al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Ṭūmān Bay I, Sayf al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
al-Malik al-Aṭfal
al-‘Abbās, Rasūlid, ref1
‘Alī, Ayyūbid in Damascus, ref1
Muḥammad, Ayyūbid in Ḥāmāt, ref1
Muḥammad, Rasūlid, ref1
Malik al-Jibāl, Sūrī b. Ḥusayn I, Ghūrid, ref1
Malik al-Mulūk (‘Alī), Barīd Shāhī, ref1
Malik Arslan, Dulghadīr Orhullarī, ref1
Malik Arslan (or Arslan Shāh), Ghaznawid, ref1
al-Malik al-Ashraf
II Aḥmad, Ayyūbid in Diyar Bakr, ref1
I Mūsā, Ayyūbid in Damascus and Diyar Bakr, ref1
Barsbay, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Ināl al-‘Alāʾi al-Ẓāhirī, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Īsmāʿīl I, II and III, Rasūlids, ref1
Jānbulat, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Khalīl, Salāḥ al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Kūjūk, ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Mūsā, Ayyūbid in Ḥimṣ, ref1
Mūsā, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Qānṣawh II al-Ghawrī, Burj Mamlūk, ref1
Qāyit Bay al-Ẓāhirī, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Shaʿbān II, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Ṭūmān Bay II, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
‘Umar II, Rasūlid, ref1
al-Malik al-Awḥad Ayyūb, Ayyūbid in Diyar Bakr, ref1
al-Malik al-ʿAzīz
I ʿUthmān, Ayyūbid in Egypt, ref1
Muḥammad, Ayyūbid in Aleppo, ref1
Tughtigin, Ayyūbid in Yemen, ref1
Yūsuf, Jamāl al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Malik Dhu ’l-Nūn, Dānishmendīd, ref1
Malik Hazārāsp, Nuṣrat al-Dīn, Hazārāspīd, ref1
Malik Ibrāhīm, Shams al-Dīn, Dānishmendīd, ref1
Malik Ismā’īl, Shams al-Dīn, Dānishmendīd, ref1
al-Malik al-Kāmil
II and III, Ayyūbīds in Diyar Bakr, ref1
I Muḥammad, Ayyūbid in Damascus and Egypt, ref1
(al-‘Ādil Aḥmad), Ayyūbid in Diyar Bakr, ref1
Khalīl II, Ayyūbid in Diyar Bakr, ref1
Sha’bān I, Sayf al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Sunqur al-Ashqar, Sayf al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
al-Malik al-Manṣūr
I and II Muḥammad, Ayyūbīds in Ḥamāt, ref1
Abd al-‘Azīz, ‘Izz al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
‘Abd al-Wahhāb, Tāj al-Dīn, Ṭahīrid of Yemen, ref1
‘Abdallāh, Rasūlīd, ref1
Abū Bakr, Sayf al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
‘Ālī I and II, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūks, ref1
Ibrāhīm, Ayyūbid in Ḥims, ref1
Lāchīn or Lājīn al-Ashqar, Ḥusām al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Muḥammad II, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Muḥammad, Ayyūbid in Egypt, ref1
Qalāwūn al-Alfī, Abu ’l-Ma‘ālī Sayf al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
‘Umar I, Rasūlīd, ref1
‘Uthmān, Fakhr al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
al-Malik al-Mas‘ūd
Rasūlīd, ref1
Yūsuf, Ayyūbid in Yemen, ref1
al-Malik al-Mu’aṣyar
Aḥmad III, Shihāb al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Dāwūd, Rasūlīd, ref1
al-Ḥusayn, Rasūlīd, ref1
Shaykh al-Maḥmūdī al-Ẓāhirī, Sayf al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
al-Malik al-Mu’azzam
‘Īsā, Sharaf al-Dīn, Ayyūbid in Damascus, ref1
Sulaymān, Ayyūbid in Yemen, ref1
Tūrān Shāh, Ayyūbīds in Damascus, Diyar Bakr, Egypt and Yemen, ref1
al-Malik al-Mu’izz Aybak al-Turkumānī, ‘Izz al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
al-Malik al-Mujāhid
‘Alī, Rasūlīd, ref1
‘Alī, Shams al-Dīn, Ṭahīrid of Yemen, ref1
Sanjar, ‘Alam al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, ref1
Shīrkūh II, Ayyūbid in Ḥimṣ, refl
Malik Mujāhid Ghāzī, Dānishmandid, refl
al-Malik al-Muwaḥḥidʿ Abdallāh, Ayyūbid in Diyār Bakr, refl
al-Malik al-Muzaffar
    II and III Maḥmūd, Ayyūbids in Ḥamāt, refl
    I ʿUmar, Ayyūbid in Ḥamāt, refl
Aḥmad II, Burjī Mamlūk, refl
Baybars II al-Jāshnakīr, Rukn al-Dīn (Burjī), Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
Ghāzī, Ayyūbid in Diyār Bakr, refl
Ḥājjī I and II, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
Qutuz al-Muʿizzī, Sayf al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
Yūsuf I, Shams al-Dīn, Rasūlid, refl
al-Malik al-Nāṣir
    II Dāwūd, Ayyūbid in Damascus, refl
    I Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (Saladin), Ayyūbid in Diyār Bakr, refl
    I and II Yūsuf, Ayyūbids in Aleppo, Damascus and Egypt, refl
    Aḥmad I, Shihāb al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
    Aḥmad b. Ismāʿīl I, Rasūlid, refl
    Aḥmad b. Yahyā, Rasūlid, refl
Ayyūb, Ayyūbid in Yemen, refl
Fāraj, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, refl
al-Ḥasan, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
Muḥammad IV, Burjī Mamlūk, refl
Muḥammad I, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
Qilij Arslan, Ayyūbid in Ḥamāt, refl
al-Malik al-Qāhir Muḥammad, Ayyūbid in Ḥimṣ, refl
Malik Qaranful Mubārak Shāh, Sharqī, refl
Malik Rājā Aḥmad Fāruqī, Fāruqī, refl
al-Malik al-Saʿīd Baraka or Berke Khān, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ
    I and II, Ayyūbids in Damascus, refl
    III Abū Bakr, Ayyūbid in Diyār Bakr, refl
    II Ayyūb, Ayyūbid in Diyār Bakr and Egypt, refl, ref2
    IV Khalīl, Ayyūbid in Diyār Bakr, refl
    Iṣmāʿīl, ʿImād al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
    (al-Manṣūr Ḥājjī II), Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
    al-Muʿayyad Iṣmāʿīl, Ayyūbid in Ḥamāt, refl
    Muḥammad III, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, refl
    Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, Baḥrī Mamlūk, refl
Malik Sarwar, Khwāja-yi Jahān, Sharqī, refl
Malik Shāh
    I, II and III, Seljuqs in Persia and Iraq, refl
    (Abū Manṣūr, ʿAll al-Dīn), Saltuqid, refl
Mengüjekid, ref1
(Shāhānshāh), Seljuq of Rūm, ref1
Malik Yaghībīsanan, Dānishmendīd, ref1
al-Malik al-Ẓāfir ‘Āmir II, Ṣalāh al-Dīn, Ṭāhirīd of Yemen, ref1
al-Malik al-Ẓāhir
Barquq al-Yalbughāwī, Sayf al-Dīn, Mamlūk, ref1
Baybars I al-Bunduqdārī, Rukn al-Dīn, Bahṛī Mamlūk, ref1
Chaqmaq or Jaqmaq, Sayf al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Khushqadam, Sayf al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Qānṣawh I, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Ṭāṭār, Sayf al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Timurbūghā, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
Yaḥyā, Rasūlid, ref1
Yalbay, Sayf al-Dīn, Burjī Mamlūk, ref1
al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Ghāzī, Ayyūbid in Aleppo, ref1
Mallā, Ming, ref1
Mallū, ‘Ādīl Shāhī, ref1
Mallū Khān, governor of Mālwa, ref1
Mamā Khāṭūn, Saltuqid, ref1
Mamlān or Muḥammad I and II, Rawwādīds, ref1
al-Ma’mūn, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Ma’mūn I and II, Ma’mūnīds Khwārazm Shāhs, ref1
Mamūq, Khān of Kazan, ref1
Ma’n
‘Alam al-Dīn, Ma’n Amīr, ref1
Hamdānīd, ref1
of the Banū Ṣumādīḥ of Almería, ref1
Zayn al-Dīn, Ma’n Amīr, ref1
Manādhar, Justānīd, ref1
Manī’, Numayrid, ref1
Mansā Abū Bakr I and II, Keita of Mali, ref1
Mansā Gaw or Qū, Keita of Mali, ref1
Mansā Kamba or Qanba or Qāsā, Keita of Mali, ref1
Mansā Khalīfā, Keita of Mali, ref1
Mansā Maghan I, II and III, Keitas of Mali, ref1
Mansā Mamadu or Muḥammadd, Keita of Mali, ref1
Mansā Mari Dyāta or Mārī Jāṭa II, Keita of Mali, ref1
Mansā Mūsā I, II and III, Keitas of Mali, ref1
Mansā Qanba or Qāsā see Mansā Kamba
Mansā Sulaymān, Keita of Mali, ref1
Mansā Ulī or Ule, Keita of Mali, ref1
Mansā Wāṭī, Keita of Mali, ref1
Manṣūr
I and II, Sāmānids, ref1
Abū Naṣr Murtaḍā al-Dawla, Ḫamdānid, ref1
Afrīghid Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Arslan Khān, Nūr al-Dawla, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. ‘Abd al-Malik, Hāshimid of Darband, ref1
b. Maymūn, Hāshimid of Darband, ref1
Marwānid, ref1
Mazyadid, ref1
Muḥṭājid, ref1
Qāḍī, ruler of Valencia, ref1
Sharaф al-Dawla, Qarakhānid, ref1
Shihāb Amir, ref1
al-Manṣūr
‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Abī Amir, Almanzor, Ḫājib in Spain, ref1
b. al-‘Azīz, Fāṭimid, ref1
b. al-Musta‘ī, Fāṭimid, ref1
b. al-Mustarshid, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Ẓāhir, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Fāṭimid, ref1
Ḥammādid, ref1
Najāḥid, ref1
Saba’, Ṣulayḥid, ref1
‘Uqaylid, ref1
Zīrid governor of the Maghrib, ref1
Manṣūr Shāh
‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Sultan of Acheh (987/1579), ref1
Sultan of Acheh (1252/1836), ref1
Manūchihr
I, II and III, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāhs, ref1
Shaddādid, ref1
Ziyārid, ref1
Maqṣūd Giray, Khān of the Crimea, ref1
Mardāwīj, Ziyārid, ref1
Marhum Tuha (Abdul Jaliul Akbar), Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Mari Sun Dyāta (Mari Jāṭa) I, Keita of Mali, ref1
Marwān
I, Umayyad caliph, ref1
II, al-Ḥimār, Umayyad caliph, ref1
Marzūbān
I and II, Musāfirids, ref1
Abū Kālijār ‘Imād al-Dīn, Būyid, ref1
Abū Kālijār Šamšām al-Dawla, Būyid, ref1
b. Abī Shujāʿ Sulṭān al-Dawla, Būyid, refl
Justānid, refl
Shaddādid, refl
Mas Ngabehi Sutavijaya Senapati, ruler of Mataram, refl
Masīḥ Mīrzā, Aq Qoyunlu, refl
Masta
b. Muḥammad Amīn Kiari, Mai of Dikwa, refl
b. Shehu Sanda Mandarama, Mai of Dikwa, refl
Masʿūd
I, II and III, Ghaznawids, refl
I and II, ‘Īzz al-Dīn, Zangids, refl
I, II and III, Seljuqs of Rūm, refl
b. Ḥasan, Qarakhānid, refl
b. Muḥammad, Qarakhānid, refl
Fakhr al-Dīn, Ghūrid, refl
al-Malik al-Zāhir, Zangid, refl
Mazrūʿī, refl
Menteshe Orhullari, refl
Muhadhdhib al-Dīn, Parwāna Orhullari, refl
Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, refl
Tīmūrid, refl
Wajīh al-Dīn, Sarbadārid, refl
al-Masʿūd, Zurayʿid, refl
Masʿūd Jānī
‘Alāʾ al-Dīn, governor of Bengal, refl
Jalāl al-Dīn, governor of Bengal, refl
Masʿūd Khān, Sultan of Mālwa, refl
Masʿūd Shāh
‘Alāʾ al-Dīn, Muʿizzī, refl
Jalāl al-Dīn, Injuʿid, refl
Mawdūd
Ghaznawid, refl
al-Malik al-Masʿūd Rukn al-Dīn, Artuqid, refl
Quṭb al-Dīn, Zangid, refl
Maymūn
b. Aḥmad, Hāshimid of Darband, refl
b. Manṣūr, Hāshimid of Darband, refl
Ibn Thaqiyya, al-Amīr, Midrārid, refl
Māzyār, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, refl
Medemīn (Muḥammad Amīn, Abu ’l-Ghāzi), Qungrat, refl
Megat Iskandar Shāh, ruler of Malacca, refl
Meḥemmed see Muḥammad, Ottomans, refl
Menelik, Emperor of Ethiopia, refl
Mengli Giray, Khân of the Crimea, ref1
Mengü
(Möngke) Temür, Batu’id, ref1
(Töde Möngke), Batu’id, ref1
Mengü Temür, Salghurid, ref1
Mengübirti, Jalâl al-Dîn, Anûshtiginid Khwârazm Shâh, ref1
Mengüjek Âḫmad, Mengüjekid, ref1
Menteshe Beg, Menteshe Orhullarî, ref1
Midrâr (al-Muntaşîr), Midrârid, ref1
Mihr Mardân, Bâwandid Ispahbadh, ref1
?Mingûrinî see Mengübirti, Jalâl al-Dîn
Mîr ʿAlî Muḥammad Khân, Nawwâb of Bengal, ref1
Mîr ʿAlî ibn ʿAlî Aṭâ, Nawwâb of Bengal, ref1
Mîr Qâsim ʿAlî, Nawwâb of Bengal, ref1
Mîr ʿUthmân ʿAlî Khân Bahâdur Fathâ Jang, Niẓâm of Hyderabad, ref1
Mîr ʿAdîl Khân I, Fârüqî, ref1
Mîrān Muḥammad Shâh I and II, Fârüqîs, ref1
Mîrân Shâh, Jalâl al-Dîn, Timûrid, ref1
Mîrzâ ʿĀdîl Khân I, Fârüqî, ref1
Mîrzâ ʿAlî, Barîd Shâhî, ref1
Mîrzâ Ḥaydar Dughlat, Mughal prince in Kashmîr, ref1
Mîrzâ Maḥmûd, Nawwâb of Bengal, ref1
Mîrzâ Wâli Amîr Barîd III, Barîd Shâhî, ref1
Mitʿâb I and II, Âl Rashîd, ref1
Mîyân Bâyazîd, Bâz Bahâdur, ruler of Mâlwa, ref1
Mûʾetûken, son of Chingiz Khâh, ref1
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Mongol Great Khân, ref1
Temür, Batu’id, ref1
Moyasa Aḥmadu, Fulani, ref1
al-Muʿaddal, Laythîd Ṣaffârîd, ref1
Muʿādh (Muʿaz, Moyasa) Aḥmadu, Fulani, ref1
Muʿawiya I and II, Umayyad caliphs, ref1
Muʿaz (Muʿaẓ), Fulani, ref1
Mubârak
Qutlugkhânîd, ref1
Ṣârim al-Dîn, Nizârî Ismâʿîlî, ref1
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II, Fârüqî, ref1
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Chaghhatayîd, ref1
Fakhr al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Fakhr al-Dīn, Sultan of Ma‘bar, ref1
Quṭb al-Dīn, Khaljī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Mubashshir, Nāṣīr al-Dawla, ruler of Majorca, ref1
Mughāyat Shāh, Iskandar Thāni ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
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   I-V, Alawīd Sharīfs, ref1
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   I, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Eretna Orhullarī, ref1
   I-VI, Ģağṣīds, ref1
   I and II, Ǧammlūdīds of Málaga, ref1
   I-VIII, Ǧusaynīd Beys, ref1
   I-V, Marīnīds, ref1
   I, Mughīth al-Dunyā wa ‘1-Dīn, Seljuq of Kirman, ref1
   I-XII, Naṣīrīds, ref1
   I, II and III, Nizārī Ismāʿīlīs, ref1
   III-V and VI, Ottomans, ref1
   I and II, Qaramān Oghullarī, ref1
   I and II, RamaQādān Oghullarī, ref1
   I and II, Saʿdīd Sharīfs, ref1
   II, Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, ref1
   I and II, Śimjūrīds, ref1
   I, II and III, Spanish Umayyads, ref1
   II, Sultan of Harar, ref1
   I, II and III, Waṭṭāsīds, ref1
   II Benkan, Askīya of Songhay, ref1
   I Chelebi, Ottoman, ref1
   II Chelebi, Eretna Orhullarī, ref1
   V Mubāriz Khān ʿĀdil Shāh, Sūrī Delhi Sultan, ref1
   I, II and III Shāh, Bahmanīds, ref1
   I Tapar, Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, ref1
   ʿAbbāsīd caliph in Cairo, ref1
   Aḥṣāṣīd of Badajoz, ref1
(Aḥḥmad)
Shams al-Dīn, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
Toghan Khān, Qarakhānid, ref1
Amīr of Chaghāniyān, Ḍū Muḥtājid, ref1
Amīr of Dir‘iyā, Āl Su‘ūd, ref1
‘Annāzid, ref1
Arslan Khān, Qarakhānid, ref1
Arslan Qara Khān Mu‘ayyid al-‘Adl ‘Ayn al-Dawla, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. ‘Abbās, Ghūrid, ref1
b. ‘Abdallāh, Āl Rashīd, ref1
b. ‘Abdallāh, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. ‘Abdallāh, Ţāhirid of Khurasam, ref1
b. ‘Abdallāh Ibn Rashīd of Ḥā’il, conqueror of Riyāḍ, ref1
b. Abī Bakr, Nabhānī of Pate (875/1470), ref1
b. Abī Bakr, Nabhānī of Pate (973/1565), ref1
b. Abī Ja‘far Muḥammad, ruler of Murcia, ref1
b. Abī ‘l-Ghārāt, Zuray‘id, ref1
b. Aḥmad, Afrīghid Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
b. Aḥmad, Hāshimid of Darband, ref1
b. Aḥmad, Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
b. Aḥmad, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
b. Aḥmad ‘Āṭīq, called Mai Turare, Fulani, ref1
b. Aḥmad Ibn Tāhir, ruler of Murcia, ref1
b. ‘Alī b. Yūsuf al-Massūfī, Ibn Ghāniya, governor of the Balearics, ref1
b. Amīr Ghāzī, Dānishmendid, ref1
b. ‘Arafa, ‘Alawi Sharīf, ref1
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b. Hāshim, Hāshimid of Darband, ref1
b. Haytham, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
b. Ḥusayn al-Rawwādī, Rawwādī, ref1
b. Ibrāhīm, Yu‘fīrid, ref1
b. Ibrāhīm II, ‘Ādil Shāhī, ref1
b. Idrīs, Sayfī of Bornu (931/1525), ref1
b. Idrīs, Sayfī of Bornu (c.1012/c.1603), ref1
b. Idrīs, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. Idrīs II, al-Muntaṣir, Idrīṣīd, ref1
b. ‘Irāq, Afrīghid Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
b. Isḥāq, ruler of the Banū Ghāniya under Almohad suzerainty, ref1
b. Isḥāq, Ţāhirid of Khurasan, ref1
b. Ismā‘īl, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Dānishmendid, ref1
b. Ja‘far, Zaydi Imām, ref1
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b. Khamītūn, Qutlughkhānid, ref1
b. Kiwāb, usurper of Mahdali Sultanate of Kilwa, ref1
b. al-Manṣūr, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Maymūn, Midrārid, ref1
b. Muḥammad, called Tambari, Fulani, ref1
b. Muḥammad, ruler of Murcia, ref1
b. Muḥammad, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. Musāfīr, founder of the Musāfīrīds, ref1
b. al-Musayyab, Abu ’1-Dhawwād, ‘Uqaylid, ref1
b. al-Musayyab al-‘Uqaylī, ‘Uqaylid, ref1
b. al-Mustaṣhir, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Muṭaṣḥid, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Mutawakkil, Abu ‘Abdallāh al-Mu‘tazz, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Mutawakkil, Abū Ja‘far al-Muntashir, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Nāṣir, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Nāṣir, Sultan of Harar, ref1
b. Naṣr, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. Rāfī’, ‘Uqaylid, ref1
b. al-Rashīd, Abū Isḥāq al-Mu‘tasim, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. al-Rashīd, Abū Mūsā al-Amīn, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Sābah, al-Mu‘izz, Zuray’īd, ref1
b. Sa’d, Naṣrid, ref1
b. Sa’d, Rey Lobo or Lope, ruler of Murcia, ref1
b. Sa’id al-Ma’āmīrī, Mazrū’ī, ref1
b. Sām I, supreme sultan in Ghūr and India, Ghūrid, ref1
b. Sārū, Midrārid, ref1
b. Sulaymān, al-‘Ādil, Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
b. Sulaymān, Nabhāní of Pate, ref1
b. Sūrī Shansabānī, Ghūrid, ref1
b. Su‘ūd II, Āl Su‘ūd, ref1
b. Ţāhir II, Ţāhirid of Khurasan, ref1
b. Ţalāl, Āl Rashīd, ref1
b. Ţūmart, Almohad, ref1
b. ‘Ubaydallāh, Ţāhirid of Baghdad and Iraq, ref1
b. ‘Umar, Nabhāní of Pate, ref1
b. ‘Uthmān, Mazrū’ī, ref1
b. Wāsūl al-Fatḥ, al-Shākir, Midrārid, ref1
b. al-Wāthiq, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
b. Ya’qūb, Almohad, ref1
b. Yazīd, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
b. Yu’fir, Yu’fīrid, ref1
b. Yūsuf, Abu ’1-Fath, Qarakhānid, ref1
b. Yūsuf Ibn Hūd, ruler of Murcia, ref1
b. Ziyād, Ziyādid, ref1
Bānijūrid, ref1
Bāwandīd Ispâhbadh, ref1
Birzāl of Carmona, ref1
Bughra Khān, Qawām al-Dawla, Qarakhānid, ref1
Chaghfatayid, ref1
Doıyā’ al-Dīn, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, Ghūrid, ref1
Fatimid, ref1
Ghazzawid, ref1
Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Manṣūr, Zaydī Imam, ref1
Hāshimite Sharīf, ref1
II Khānid, ref1
Ilyāsid, ref1
Jahwarid of Cordova, ref1
Jalāyirid, ref1
Kākūyid, ref1
Khazrūn of Arcos, ref1
Laythīd Ṣaffārid, ref1
Mazyadīd, ref1
(Mamlān) I and II, Rawwādīds, ref1
Ma‘mūnīd Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Menteshe Orhullarī, ref1
al-Mu‘ayyad, Zaydī Imam, ref1
Mubāriz al-Dīn
Ashraf Orhullarī, ref1
Muẓaffārid, ref1
Tekke Orhullarī, ref1
Muhtājid governor of Khurasan, ref1
Mu‘īn al-Dīn, Parwānā Orhullarī, ref1
MuẒaffar al-Dīn, Salghurid, ref1
Nāṣir al-Dīn
Dulghadīr Orhullarī, ref1
Mihrbānīd Malik of Sistan, ref1
Nūr al-Dīn, Artuqīd, ref1
Nuṣrat al-Dīn, Mihrbānīd Malik, ref1
of the Banū Ṣumādīḥ of Almeria, ref1
of the Bendahara family, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Pahlawī, ref1
Qājār, ref1
Qaramānlī, ref1
Quṭb al-Dīn
I and III, Mihrbānīd Malik of Sistan, ref1
Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Zangid, ref1
Quṭb Shāhī, ref1
Rustamīd, ref1
Sājid, ref1
Sayf al-Dīn, Ghūrid, ref1
Shaddādid, ref1
Shams al-Dawla, Börid, ref1
Shams al-Dīn
   I, Kart, ref1
   Ghūrid, ref1
   Inju’id, ref1
   Mihrābānid Malik of Sistan, ref1
   Mu’izz al-Dīn, Ghūrid, ref1
   Şāhib Atā Orhulları, ref1
Shams al-Mulūk, Bāдушpānīd, ref1
Shī râzī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Sultan of Kanem (853/1449), ref1
Tamghach (Tabghach Khān), Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa ’l-Dīn, Qarakhānid, ref1
Ya’rubid, ref1
Muḥammad Abū Bakr al-Ikhshīd, Ikhshīdīd, ref1
Muḥammad ‘Aḍud al-Dawla, Hūdid, ref1
Muḥammad ‘Aḍud al-Dīn, Salghurīd, ref1
Muḥammad Aḍal, Bārakzay, ref1
Muḥammad ‘Alī
   Ming, ref1
   Muʿīn al-Dīn, Nawwāb of Oudh, ref1
   Pasha, ref1
   Qājār, ref1
   Zand, ref1
Muḥammad ‘Alī Shāh, Zahīr al-Dīn, Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Muḥammad Aliuddīn, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Muḥammad Alp Arslan, Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, ref1
Muḥammad Amīn
   Abu ’l-Ghāzi, called Medemīn, Qungrat, ref1
   Khān of Kazan, ref1
Muḥammad Amīn al-Kānemī, Shehu Laminu, Kanembu Shehu of Bornu, ref1
Muḥammad Amīn Kiari, Kanembu Shehu of Bornu, ref1
Muḥammad Arslan Khān Sanjār, Tāj al-Dīn, governor of Bengal, ref1
Muḥammad Ay Temür, Sarbadārid, ref1
Muḥammad A’zam, Bārakzay, ref1
Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, conqueror of Bihār and Bengal, ref1
Muḥammad Bāqī, Arghūn, ref1
Muḥammad Beg
   Inanç Orhullarï, ref1
Muḥammad al-Dīn Ghāzī, Aydı̇n Orhullarï, ref1
Muḥammad Bello, called Mai Wurno, Fulani, ref1
Muḥammad Bolaq, Batu’id, ref1
Muḥammad Chakhshâdan, Germiyan Orhullarï, ref1
Muḥammad Dâmghân Shâh, Ghiyâth al-Dîn, Sultan of Ma‘bar, ref1
Muḥammad Dâwūd Shâh, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
Muḥammad Ergama, Sayf of Bornu, ref1
Muḥammad Gao or Kawkaw, Askiya of Songhay, ref1
Muḥammad Giray I-IV, Khâns of the Crimea, ref1
Muḥammad Hasan
   Qājâr, ref1
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   Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Muḥammad Ibn Hûd, ruler of Murcia, ref1
Muḥammad Ibn Khazrûn, Khâzrûn of Arcos, ref1
Muḥammad ‘Isâ Tarkhân, Arghûn, ref1
Muḥammad ‘Izz al-Dîn al-Nāṣîr, Zaydî Imâm, ref1
Muḥammad Jamalul Alam
   b. Muhammad Tajuddin, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
   b. Omar Ali Saîfuddin II, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Muḥammad Jâsâ, Sultan of Harar, ref1
Muḥammad Kanzul Alam, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Muḥammad Karîm Khân, Zand, ref1
Muḥammad Khân Sûr, Shams al-Dîn, Sûrî ruler of Bengal, ref1
Muḥammad Khudâbânda
   Öljeytü (Uljâytû), Il Khânid, ref1
   Šâfawíd, ref1
Muḥammad Khudâyâr, Ming, ref1
Muḥammad al-Mażeli̇m, Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Muḥammad al-Murtaḍâ, Zaydî Imâm, ref1
Muḥammad al-Mustaḍî̇, ‘Alawîd Sharîf, ref1
Muḥammad al-Mutawakkîl, Zaydî Imâm, ref1
Muḥammad Nadîr, Bârâkzay, ref1
Muḥammad Nâṣîr al-Dîn (Ghâzî Khân Chak), Sultan of Kashmîr, ref1
Muḥammad al-Nâṣîr al-Hâdî al-Mahdî, Zaydî Imâm, ref1
Muḥammad Nawrûz Beg, Batu’id, ref1
Muḥammad Ngileruma, Sayfî of Bornu, ref1
Muḥammad Özbeg, Ghiyâth al-Dîn, Batu’îd, ref1
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Muḥammad Quûlî, Quṭb Shâhî, ref1
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   Qungrat, ref1
Muḥammad Sādiq, Zand, ref1
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Muḥammad Taṣuddin, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
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Muḥammad Yaʿqūb Khan, Bārakzay, ref1
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Muḥammad Zāhir, Bārakzay, ref1
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Muḥsīn, Ḥammādīd, ref1
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Mujāhid
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Mu‘nis al-Khādim, Turkish slave commander, refl
al-Muntasir, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, refl
al-Muntasir (Midrār), Midrārid, refl
al-Muqallad, ‘Uqaylid, refl
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  Marīnid, refl
  Menteshe Oghulları, refl
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‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, refl
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Ṣulayḥid, [ref]
Yūsuf II, Rasūlid, [ref]
Muẓaffar al-Dīn
  Mangīt, [ref]
  Qājār, [ref]
Muẓaffar al-Šaqlabī, ruler in Valencia, [ref]
Muẓaffar Husayn, Tīmūrid, [ref]
Muẓaffar Jang, Nizām of Hyderabad, [ref]
Muẓaffar Khān, Sultan of Gujarāt, [ref]
Muẓaffar Shāh
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Muẓaffar Shams al-Dīn
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Nadhr Muḥammad, Toqay Temürid, ref1
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Nādir Shāh Afshār, Ṣafawid, ref1
Nadr Quli, Nādir Shāh Afshār, Afshārid, ref1
Nāmāwar, Fakhr al-Dawla, Bādūspānid, ref1
Nāmāwar Shāh Ghāzī, Fakhr al-Dawla, Bādūspānid, ref1
Naqīyyat al-Dīn Shāh, Nūr al-ʿĀlam, Queen of Acheh, ref1
Nāṣīr
  Mazrūʿī, ref1
  Sultan of Harar, ref1
al-Nāṣīr
  ′Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
  ′Abd al-Raḥmān III, Spanish Umayyad in Spain, ref1
  Ḥammādid, ref1
  Muḥammad Nāsir al-Dīn, Mamlūk ruler of Ḫamāt, ref1
Nāṣīr al-Dīn Shāh, Qājār, ref1
Nāṣīr al-Dīn Shāh, Sultan of Mālwa, ref1
Nāṣīr Jang, Nizām of Hyderabad, ref1
Nāṣīr Khān
  Fārūqī, ref1
  Sultan of Gujarāt, ref1
Nāṣr
  I and II, Mirdāsids, ref1
  I and II, Sāmānids ref1
  b. Aḥmad, Nasrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
  b. Ibrāhīm, Qarakhānid, ref1
  b. Khalaf, Nasrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
  b. Muḥammad, Qarakhānid, ref1
  Marwānid, ref1
  Naṣrid, ref1
  (Nuṣrat), Tāj al-Dīn IV, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
  Qarakhānid, ref1
  Sharaf al-Dīn, Nāṣīr al-Dawla, Bādūspānid, ref1
  Tīgin, Ilīg Khān, Qarakhānid, ref1
  ′Uqaylid, ref1
Nāṣr al-Dīn, Ming, ref1
Nāṣr Allāh
  Bārakzay, ref1
  Mangīt, ref1
Nasruddin Husin Kamaluddin, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Nawr al-Ward, Hazārāspīd, ref1
Nawrūz Ahmad or Baraq, Shībānid, refl
Nawwāb Sālār Jang, regent for the Niżām of Hyderabad, refl
Nāzūk or Nādir Shāh, Sultan of Kashmīr, refl
Negüey (Nīkpāy), Chaghatayid, refl
Nīkpāy (or Negüey), Chaghatayid, refl
Nīkū-siyar Muḥammad, Mughal, refl
Niżām ‘Alī Khān, Niżām of Hyderabad, refl
Nizār, Fāṭimid, refl
Nūḥ
I and II, Sāmānid, refl
Musāfirid, refl
Sultan of Harar, refl
Nūr al-Dawlat Giray
Khān of Crimea, refl
Khān of Qāsimov, refl
Nuṣrat (Naṣr), Tāj al-Dīn IV, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, refl
Nuṣrat al-Dīn
Hazārapsid, refl
Ṣāḥib Atā Oghullarī, refl
Nuṣrat Shāh
ruler of Bengal, refl
Tughluqīd, refl

Ögedey, Mongol Great Khān, refl
Oghul Ghaymish, Mongol regent, refl
Omar Ali Saifuddin I, II and III, Sultans of Brunei, refl
Orda, White Horde Khān, refl
Orkhan
Ottoman, refl
Sarukhān Oghullarī, refl
Shujā‘ al-Dīn, Menteshe Oghullarī, refl
Orqina Khātūn, Chaghatayid, refl
Ötemish, Khān of Kazan, refl
‘Othmān (or ‘Uthmān)
Chelebi, Tekke Oghullarī, refl
Ghāzī, Ottoman, refl
Özbeg, Mużaffar al-Dīn, Eldigüzid, refl

Pādishāh Khātūn, Safwat al-Dīn, Qutlughkhānid, refl
Pakubuwana
I, II and III, rulers of Mataram, refl
III–XII, Susuhunans, refl
Panembahan Seda Krapyak, Mas Jolang, ruler of Mataram, ref1
Paramesvara, ruler of Malacca, ref1
Pashang, Shams al-Din, Hazaraspid, ref1
Perkasa ‘Álam Sharíf Lamtuy, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
Pindar or Bīdar Qadîr Khân, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Pîr Ahmad

  Hazaraspid, ref1
  Qaramân Oghullari, ref1
Pîr ‘Alî, Ghiyāth al-Dîn II, Kart, ref1
Pîr Budaq, Qara Qoyunlu, ref1
Pîr Ḥusayn Muḥammad, Kart, ref1
Pîr Manṣūr, Ramaḍān Oghullari, ref1
Pîr Muḥammad

  I and II, Shiḥbānids, ref1
  b. Jahāngīr, Tīmūrid, ref1
  b.'Umar Shaykh, Tīmūrid, ref1
Pîrī Muḥammad, Ramaḍān Oghullari, ref1
Pōţjut Auk or Jahān Shāh, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
Prabu Amangkurat I, Sunan Tegalwangi, ruler of Mataram, ref1
Pūlād (Bolod) Khân, Golden Horde Khân, ref1

Qābūs

  Āl Bū Sa‘īd, ref1
  Ziyārīd, ref1
Qādī Burhān al-Dîn, ref1
al-Qādir, ‘Abbāsid caliph of Baghdad, ref1
Qādir Khân, Jalāl al-Dunyā wa ‘l-Dîn, Qarakhānid, ref1
Qādir Shāh (formerly Mallū Khân), governor and then Sultan of Mālwa, ref1
al-Qāhir, ‘Abbāsid caliph of Baghdad, ref1
al-Qā´id, Ḥammādīd, ref1
al-Qā´îm

  ‘Abbāsid caliph of Baghdad, ref1
  ‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
  Fāṭimid, ref1
Qaplan Giray I and II, Khâns of the Crimea, ref1
Qara Arslan

  b. Dawūd, Artuqid, ref1
  b. Ghâzī, Artuqid, ref1
Qara Hūlegü, Chaghatayid, ref1
Qara Khitay, Qarakhānid, ref1
Qara Muḥammad, Qara Qoyunlu, ref1
Qara Yûsuf, Abû Naṣr, Qara Qoyunlu, ref1
Qaraj b. Dulghadir, founder of Dulghadīr Oghullari, ref1
Qaraja, al-Malik al-Ẓahir Zayn al-Dīn, Dulghadir Oghullarï,
Qaraj b. Dulghadir, founder of Dulghadir Oghullarï,
Qaramān
Bey of Alanya,
Menteshe Oghullarï,
Qaramān Oghullarï,
Qarasī Beg, Qarasī Oghullarï,
Qārin I and II, Bāwandid Ispahbadhs,
Qāsim
I Barīd, chief minister of the Bahmanid Sultan,
II, Barīd Shāhī,
b. Maḥmūd, Khān of Astrakhan,
Fakhr al-Dīn, Dānishmendid,
Khān of Qāsimov,
Qaramān Oghullarï,
(Qasay) b. Sayyid Aḥmad, Khān of Astrakhan,
al-Qāsim
b. ‘Ali al-‘Iyānī, Abu ’l-Ḥusayn al-Manṣūr, Zaydī Imām,
b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥasanī al-Rassī, Zaydī Imām,
Gannūn b. Muḥammad, Idrīsid,
governor of Jibāl and first of the Dulafids,
Ibn Ḥammūd, al-Ma’&mūn, Spanish Umayyad,
al-Mahdī, Zaydī Imām,
al-Ma’&mūn, Ḥammūdīd of Ceuta and Málaga,
al-Manṣūr, Zaydī Imām,
al-Mu’ayyad, Zaydī Imām,
al-Mutawakkil, Zaydī Imām,
Qawām, Numayrid,
Qaysar, Sadōzay,
Qayshān Gülıük (Hai-shan), Mongol Great Khān,
Qazan, Chaghatayid,
Qīlích Arslan
I-IV, Seljuqs of Rūm,
Aq Qoyunlu,
Bey of Alanya,
Qırım Giray I and II, Khāns of the Crimea,
Qirwāsh, ‘Uqaylid,
Qızıl Aḥmad, Jāndār Oghullarï,
Qızıl Arslan Aṣīz, Anūshtiginid Khwārazm Shāh,
Qızıl Arslan ʿUthmān, Eldigüzid,
Qorqmaz I and II, Ma’n Amīrs,
Qoshila Qutuqtu, Mongol Great Khān,
Qubād, ‘Adud al-Dawla, Bādūspānīd,
Qubādh
   Ramāḏān Oghullarī, ref1
   Yazidī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Qubilay, Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Qulpa, Batu’id, ref1
Quraysh, ‘Uqaylid, ref1
Qutb al-Dīn II, Mihrābānid Malik of Sistan, ref1
Qutlugh
   Fakhr al-Dīn, Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
   Shujā‘ al-Dīn, Sökmenid slave commander, ref1
Qutlugh Inanch, Eldigüzid, ref1
Qutlugh Khān, Salghurid, ref1
Qutlugh Murād, Qungrat, ref1
Qutlugh Terken, Qutlughkhānid regent, ref1

Rābiḥ b. Faḍl Allāh, conqueror of Bornu and Dikwa, ref1
al-Rāḏī, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Raḍiyya Begum, Jalālat al-Dīn, Mu’izzī queen in Delhi, ref1
Rāfi‘
   rebel and caliphal governor in Nishapur and then Rayy, ref1
   ‘Uqaylid, ref1
Rāfi‘ al-Darajāt, Shams al-Dīn, Mughal, ref1
Rāḥīm Qulī, Qungrat, ref1
Rājā ‘Abdallāh, Sultan Maṇṣūr Shāh, ruler of Malacca, ref1
Rājā ‘Ali Khān ‘Ādil Shāh IV, Fārūqī, ref1
Raja Api, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Rājā Buyung or ‘Alī Ri‘āyat Shāh, Sultan of Aceh, ref1
Rājā Ganesa (Danūj Mardan Deva), ruler of Bengal, ref1
Raja Ghafur, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Rājā Ibrāhīm, śri Parameśvara Deva Shāh, ruler of Malacca, ref1
Rājā Qāsim, Sultan MuZaffar Shāh, ruler of Malacca, ref1
Raja Udahna Lela or Sulaymān Shāh, Sultan of Aceh, ref1
Ramadān Beg, Ramadān Oghullari, ref1
Ramiro II of Aragon, ref1
Rashād al-Mahdī, King of the Tunisians, ref1
Rashīd, Āl al-Julandā, ref1
al-Rāshid
   ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
   ‘Alawid Sharīf, ref1
   Hārūn, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Ri‘āyat Shāh
   ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn, Sultan of Aceh, ref1
b. ‘Alī, ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn al-Qahhār, Sultan of Aceh, ref1
Riḍā Khān, later Shah, Pahlawī, ref1, ref2
Riḍā Khan, ref1
Riḍwān, Seljuq in Aleppo, ref1
Rinchenpal (Irinchinbal), Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Rukn al-Dīn
   Sarbadārid, ref1
   Shams al-Dīn II, Kart, ref1
Rustam
   I, II and III, Bāwandid Ispahbadhs, ref1
   Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
   b. Fakhr al-Dawla ‘Alī, Būyid in Rayy, ref1
   Tīmūrid, ref1
Saʿādat ‘Alī Khān, Nawwāb of Oudh, ref1
Saʿādat Giray I, II and III, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
Saba’ b. Abi ’l-Suʿūd, Zurayʿid, ref1
Sabakura or Sākūra, Keita of Mali, ref1
Sabhat, Mahdali Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Sābiq, Mirdāsid, ref1
Sabr al-Dīn, Sultan of Harar, ref1
Sābūr al-Saqlabī, governor of Badajoz, ref1
Saʿd I and II, Salghurids, ref1
Saʿd al-Dīn, Sultan of Harar, ref1
Sadaqa I and II, Mazyadids, ref1
Saʿdī, ‘Annāzid, ref1
Sādīq, Sultan of Harar, ref1
Safā’ Giray
   Khān of Kazan, ref1
   Khān of the Crimea, ref1
al-Saffāh, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Ṣafī I and II, Šafawīds, ref1
Ṣafīyyat al-Dīn Shāh, Tāj al-ʿĀlam, Queen of Acheh, ref1
Ṣāḥib Aṭā, ref1
ṣāḥib Giray
   I and II, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
   Khān of Kazan, ref1
Saʿid
   ‘Abd al-Wādid, ref1
   Abdallāh, Qungrat, ref1
   Abu ’l-Qāsim, Carmathian ruler, ref1
   Āl al-Julandā, ref1
   b. Aḥmad, Āl Bū Saʿid, ref1
   b. Idrīs, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. Mas‘ūd, Ghaznawid Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
b. Sulṭān, Bū Sa‘īd, ref1
b. Taymūr, Bū Sa‘īd, ref1
Bū Sa‘īd, ref1
Hamdānid, ref1
Mahdāli Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Marwānid, ref1
Sa‘īd al-Al‘ywal, Najāḥid, ref1
Saiful Rijal, Sultan of Brunei, ref1
Sākūra (or Sabakura), Keita of Mali, ref1
Salābat Jang, Niẓām of Hyderabad, ref1
Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn
Rasūlid, ref1
Sultan of Aceh, ref1
Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf (Saladin), ref1, ref2, ref3
Ṣalāḥ Re‘ūs Pasha of Algiers, ref1
Salāmat Giray I and II, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
Salghur Shāh, Atabeg of Yazd, ref1
Ṣāliḥ
b. Mirdās, Asad al-Dawla, Amīr of Raḥba, Mirdāsid, ref1
Mazrū‘ī, ref1
Salīm
II and III, Ottomans, ref1
Bū Sa‘īd, ref1
Mazrū‘ī, ref1
(Selīm) I, Yavuz (‘the Grim’), Ottoman, ref1
Selīm Giray I, II and III, Khāns of the Crimea, ref1
Sallār, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Salmān Nari, King of Songhay, ref1
Saltuq I and II, Saltuqids, ref1
Sām
I and II, Ghūrids, ref1
b. Muḥammad Shams al-Dīn, Ghūrid, ref1
Rukan al-Dīn, Atabeg of Yazd, ref1
Samā’ al-Dawla, Būyid in Hamadan and Isfahan, ref1
Samgū, al-Muntaṣir, Midrārid, ref1
Sanda Limanambe Wuduroma, Kanembu Shehu of Bornu, ref1
Sanjar, ruler in Khurasan and supreme sultan of the Seljuqs, ref1
Sanjar Shāh, Mu‘izz al-Dīn, Zangid, ref1
Sarfārāz Khān, ‘Alā’ al-Dawla, Nawwāb of Bengal, ref1
Sarīgh Buqa (or Sāsibuqa), White Horde Khān, ref1
Sartaq, Batu‘id, ref1
Sarukhān Beg, Sarukhān Oghullari, ref1
Sāsibuqa (? Sarîgh Buqa), White Horde Khan, ref1
Satîlgan, Khân of Qâsimov, ref1
Sawchï, Bey of Alanya, ref1
Säwtigin, Seljuq commander, ref1, ref2
Sayf
  I and II, Ya’rubids, ref1
governor of Mombasa, ref1
Sayf al-Dawla,
  Ḥamdânîd, ref1
  Zîrid of Granada, ref1
Sayïn Bulât, Khân of Qâsimov, ref1
Sayyid ‘Abdallâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Aḥmad
  I and II, Golden Horde Khâns, ref1
Sayyid Ahmad al-Sharîf, ref1
Sayyid ‘Alî
  b. Khalaf, Musha’sha’id, ref1
  b. Sajjâd, Musha’sha’id, ref1
  nephew of Faraj Allâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid ‘Ālim Khân, Mangît, ref1
Sayyid Awwiyâr, Khân of Qâsimov, ref1
Sayyid Badrân, Shujâ’ al-Dîn, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Baraka, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Burhân, Khân of Qâsimov, ref1
Sayyid Falâḥ, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Faraj Allâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Ḥaydar (‘Abdallâh), Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Ḥaydar Tora, Mangît, ref1
Sayyid Ḥusayn, Mangît, ref1
Sayyid Ḥusayn Shâh, ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
Sayyid Manṣûr, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mawlâ ‘Abd al-‘Alî, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mawlâ Faraj Allâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mawlâ Ismâ’îl, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mawlâ Jûd Allâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mawlâ Muḥammad
  b. Jûd Allâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
  b. Naṣr Allâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mawlâ Muḥsin, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mawlâ Muṭṭalib
  b. Muḥammad, Musha’sha’id, ref1
  b. Naṣr Allâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mawlâ Naṣr Allâh, Musha’sha’id, ref1
Sayyid Mubārak, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
Sayyid Muḥammad
  b. ‘Abdallāh, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
  b. ‘Ālī, founder of Sanūsiyya dervish order, the ‘Great Sanūsi’, refl
  b. Falāḥ, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
  b. Mubārak, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
Sayyid Muḥammad al-Mahdī, refl
Sayyid Muḥammad Amīn Sa‘ādat Khān Bahādur, Nawwāb of Oudh, refl
Sayyid Muḥammad Bahādur, Qungrat, refl
Sayyid Muḥammad Idrīs, refl
Sayyid Muḥammad Rahīm, Qungrat, refl
Sayyid Muṭṭalib, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
Sayyid Nāṣir, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
Sayyid Rāshid, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
Sayyid Sajjād, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
Sayyid Sultān ‘Alī, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
Sayyid Sultān Muḥsin, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
Sayyid Sultān or Sultān (Mir) Sayyid, Ming, refl
Sayyid Zunbūr ‘Alī, Musha‘sha‘id, refl
al-Sayyida Arwā, Ṣu’layḥid queen, refl
Sebüktigin, governor in Ghazna for the Sāmānids, refl
Selema, Sultan of Kanem, refl
Selfīm
  Ramadān Oghullarī, refl
    (Salīm) I, Yavuz (‘the Grim’), Ottoman, refl
    (Salīm) II and III, Ottomans, refl
Seljuq Shāh, Salghurid, refl
Sha‘bān Sūlī, Dulghadīr Oghullarī, refl
Shabīb, Numayrid, refl
Shaddād, Shaddādid, refl
Shādī Beg
  Arghūn, refl
    Golden Horde Khān, refl
Shāh ‘Ālam I and II, Mughals, refl
Shāh ‘Alī, Khān
  of Kazan, refl
  of Qāsimov, refl
Shāh Brunei, Sultan of Brunei, refl
Shāh Budaq, Dulghādīr Oghullarī, refl
Shāh Ghāzī, Fakhr al-Dawla, Bādūspānid, refl
Shāh Ghāzī Rustam, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, refl
Shāh Ḥusayn
  Arghūn, refl
Hazāraspid, ref1
Shāh Jahān
I, II and III, Mughals, ref1
Quṭb al-Dīn, Quṭughkhānid, ref1
Shāh Maḥmūd
Quṭb al-Dīn, Muẓaffārid, ref1
Tīmūrid, ref1
Shāh Malik of Jand, Khwārazm Shāh, ref1
Shāh Manṣūr, Muẓaffārid, ref1
Shāh Mīr Swātī, Shams al-Dīn, Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Shāh Murād
Amīr-i Maʿṣūm, Mangīt, ref1
Ming, ref1
Shāh Rukh
Afshārid, ref1, ref2
Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Tīmūrid, ref1, ref2
Shāh Shujāʿ, Sadozay, ref1
Shāh Suwār, Dulghādār Oghullari, ref1
Shāh Temūr, Chaghatayid, ref1
Shāh Walad, Jalāyirid, ref1
Shāh Yahyā, Muẓaffārid, ref1
Shāh-i Shāhān Abu ʿl-Fatḥ, Mihrābānid Malik of Sistan, ref1
Shāh-i Shujāʿ, Muẓaffārid, ref1
Shāanshāh or Shāhānshāh
ʿImād al-Dīn, Zangid, ref1
(Malik Shāh), Seljuq of Rūm, ref1
Mengüjekid, ref1
Shaddādid, ref1
Yazādī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Shāḥbāz Giray, Khān of the Tatārs, ref1
Shāhī Khān (ruling title Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn), called Bud Shāh (Great King), of Kashmīr, ref1
Shāhīn Giray, Khān of the Crimea, ref1
Shahrāgīm, Bādūspānid, ref1
Shahrīwash, Bādūspānid, ref1
Shahriyār
I, II and III, Bāwandid Ispahbadhs, ref1
Nāsir al-Dīn, Bādūspānid, ref1
Yazdagird, Nāsir al-Dawla, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, ref1
Shajāʿat Khān, governor of Mālwa, ref1
Shajar al-Durr, Bahrī Mamlūk, ref1
Shams al-ʿĀlam or Wandi Tēbing, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
Shams al-Dawla, Būyid in Hamadan and Isfāhan, ref1
Shams al-Dīn
  II and III, Karts, refl
Nizārī Ismāʿīlī, refl
Qārāmān Oghullārī, refl
Sultan of Kashmīr, refl
Shams al-Dīn Shāh, Sultan of Acheh, refl
Shāpūr, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, refl
Sharaf al-Mulūk b. Kay Khusraw, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, refl
Sharīf I, Ḥamdānī, refl
Sharīf Aḥsan, Jalāl al-Dīn, governor and later Sultan of Maʿbar, refl
Sharīf Ali, Sultan Berkat, Sultan of Brunei, refl
Sharīf Ḥāshim Jamāl al-Dīn Badr al-ʿĀlam, Sultan of Acheh, refl
Sharīf Sayf al-ʿĀlam, Sultan of Acheh, refl
Sharwān I and II, Bāwandid Ispahbadhs, refl
Shāwur I and II, Shaddādids, refl
Shaybān, Țūlūnīd, refl
Shaykh Aḥmad, Golden Horde Khān, refl
Shaykh Ḥasan-i Buzurg, Tāj al-Dīn, Jalāyirīd, refl
Shaykh Ḥaydar, Khān of Astrakhan, refl
Shaykh Khazʿal of Muhammara, refl
Shaykh Shāh or Ibrāhīm, Sharwān, refl
Shaykh Uways I, Jalāyirīd, refl
Shidebala (or Suddhipala Gege’en or Gegen), Mongol Great Khān, refl
Shīr ‘Alī
  Bārakzay, refl
  Ming, refl
Shīr Khān, governor of Bengal, refl
Shīr Shāh Sūr, Sūrī Delhi Sultan and ruler in Bengal, refl, refl2
Shīrshāmak, Shihāb al-Dīn, Sultan of Kashmīr, refl
Shīrzād, Ghaznavīd, refl
Shīrzīl
  b. Fanā Khusraw ‘Adud al-Dawla, Būyid, refl
  b. Fīrūz Bahā’ al-Dawla, Būyid, refl
Shujāʿ Khān, Shujāʿ al-Dawla, Nawwāb of Bengal, refl
Sikandar
  II Nizām Khān, Lōdī Delhi Sultan, refl
  ‘Ādil Shāhī, refl
  But-shikan, Sultan of Kashmīr, refl
  Sultan of Gujarāt, refl
Sikandar Jāh, Niẓām of Hyderabad, refl
Sikandar Shāh
  I, ‘Alā’l al-Dīn, Tughluqid Delhi Sultan, refl
  I and II, rulers of Bengal, refl
Nabhānī of Pate, refl
Qadïr Tamghach or Tabghach Khān, Qarakhānid, refl
Qānūnī (‘the Lawgiver’ and ‘the Magnificent’), Ottoman, refl
Qaramān Oghullari, refl
Qarasî Oghullari, refl
Shīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa (523/1129), refl
Ṭāhirid in Baghdad and Iraq, refl
Tāj al-Dawla, Hūdid, refl
Umayyad caliph, refl
Sulaymān Dama or Dandi, King of Songhay, refl
Sulaymān Kararānī, ruler of Bengal, refl
Sulaymān Shāh
  Germiyān Oghullari, refl
  (Raja Udahna Lela), Sultan of Acheh, refl
  Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, refl
Sultān
  I and II, Ya’rubids, refl
  ĀlBū Saʿīd, refl
  Āl Rashīd, refl
  rival to Ya’rubid Imāms, refl
  Shaddādid, refl
Sultān Abū Isḥaq, Muẓaffarid, refl
Sultān Aḥmad
  Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Jalāyirid, refl
  ‘Imād al-Dīn, Muẓaffarid, refl
  Tīmūrid, refl
Sultan Aḥmad Shāh, ruler of Malacca, refl
Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, ruler of Malacca, refl
Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ri‘āyat, Manṣūr Shāh, ruler of Malacca, refl
Sultān ‘Azīz b. Kayūmarth, Bāḍūspānid, refl
Sultān Khaḍīl, Aq Qoyunlu, refl
Sultān Maḥmūd, Mihrabānīd Malik of Sistan, refl
Sultan Maḥmūd Shāh, ruler of Malacca, refl
Sultan Muda (‘Alī Ri‘āyat Shāh), Sultan of Acheh, refl
Sultān Muḥammad, Bāḍūspānid, refl
Sultān Murād, Aq Qoyunlu, refl
Sultān Mu‘tasim, Muẓaffarid, refl
Sultan Muẓaffar Shāh, ruler of Malacca, refl
Sultān Qulī Khawāṣṣ Khān Bahārīlu, Quṭb al-Mulk, Quṭb Shāḥī, refl
Sultān Shāh, Seljuq in Aleppo, refl
Sultān Shāh Isḥāq, Seljuq of Kirman, refl
Sultān Shāhzāda Barbak Shāh, ruler of Bengal, refl
Sultan Śri ‘Ālam, Sultan of Acheh, refl
Sunqur, Salghurid, ref1
Sūrī, Sayf al-Dīn, Ghūrid, ref1
Surkhāb
  I and II, Bāwandid Ispahbadhs, ref1
  b. ‘Annāz, ‘Annāzid, ref1
  b. Badr, ‘Annāzid, ref1
  b. Muḥammad, ‘Annāzid, ref1
Susuhunan (Tjakrakusuma Ngabdurrahman, Sultan Agung), ruler of Mataram, ref1
Suʿūd
  I and II, Āl Rashīd, ref1
  I, II and III, Suʿūdīs, ref1
Tāhir
  I and II, Ṭāhirid of Khurasan, ref1
  Bahāʿ al-Dawla, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
  Ḥasanūyīd, ref1
  Khalafīd Ṣaffārid regent, ref1
  Laythīd Ṣaffārid, ref1
Ṭahmāsp I and II, Ṣafawids, ref1
al-Ṭāʿi, ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
Tāj al-Dawla, Bāḏūspānid, ref1
Tāj al-Dīn
  I, Mihrabānid Malik of Sistan, ref1
  Oghullārisī, ref1
Tāj al-Dīn Aḥmad, Menteshe Oghullārisī, ref1
Takūdār (or Aḥmad Tegüder), II Khānid, ref1
Ṭalāl
  Šīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
  ŠShīrāzī Sultan of Kilwa, ref1
Tambari, Fulani, ref1
Tamerlane see Tīmūr
Tamīm
  Zīrid of Granada, ref1
  Zīrid of Kairouan, ref1
Tandu Khātūn, ref1
Tarmashirin, ‘Ala’ al-Din, Chaghatayid, ref1
Tashufin
    Almoravid, ref1
    Marinid, ref1
Tatir Khan
    governor of Bengal, ref1
    (Muhammad Shah (I)), Sultan of Gujarat, ref1
Tekele or Degele
    Hazaraspid, ref1
    Salghurid, ref1
Tekish, Anushtiginid Khwarazm Shah, ref1
Temur, Golden Horde Khan, ref1
Temur Malik, White Horde Khan, ref1
Temur Olyeytu, Mongol Great Khan, ref1
Temur Qirani Khan, Qamar al-Din, governor of Bengal, ref1
Temur Qutlug, Golden Horde Khan, ref1
Temur Tash
    Artuqid, ref1
    Il Khaanid governor of Egirdir, ref1
Tharwan, ‘Usayedid, ref1
Thimal, Mirdasid, ref1
Thuwayni, Al Bu Sa’id, ref1
Timur-i Lang (Tamerlane), Kureken, Timurid, ref1
Timur Shish, Sadozay, ref1
Tinhi Beg, Batuid, ref1
Tipu Sultan, ruler in Mysore, ref1
Tjakarakusuma Ngabdurrahman, Sultan Agung
    (ruling title Susuhunan), ruler of Mataram, ref1
Toke Mongke (Mengu), Batuid, ref1
Togha(n) Shah, Atabeg of Yazd, ref1
Toghan Temur, Mongol Great Khan, ref1
Togha(y) Temur, Il Khaanid, ref1
Togrul
    II and III, Seljuq in Persia and Iraq, ref1
    (Mughith al-Din), governor of Bengal, ref1
    (Togrul) I Beg Muhammad, supreme Sultan, Seljuq, ref1
    Togrul Shah, Muhyi ‘l-Dunya wa ‘l-Din, Seljuq of Kirman, ref1
    Togrul Toghan Khan, ‘Izz al-Din, governor of Bengal, ref1
Tole Buqa, Batuid, ref1
Toqa or Buqa Temur, Chaghatayid, ref1
Toqta, Ghiyath al-Din, Batuid, ref1
Toqtamish, Ghiyath al-Din, White Horde and then Golden Horde Khan, ref1
Toqtamish Giray, Khan of the Crimea, ref1
Toqtaqiya, White Horde Khān, ref1
Töregene Khätūn, Mongol regent, ref1
Tuanku Muḥammad or Muḥammad Shāh, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
Tuanku Raja or Ṣaḥmūd Shāh, Sultan of Acheh, ref1
Tufāl Khān Dakhnī, ‘Imād Shāhī regent, ref1
Tughluq Shāh I and II, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Tughluqid Delhi Sultans, ref1
Tughluq Temür, Chaghatayid, ref1
Ţughril (or Ţughrīl) I Beg Muḥammad, ruler in Persia and supreme Sultan, Seljuq, ref1
Ţughtigin
  Börid, ref1
  ruler in Damascus, ref1
Tūrān Shāh I and II, Seljuqs of Kirman, ref1
Turkī
  Āl Bū Saʿīd, ref1
  Āl Suʿūd, ref1
Ţūsr, Saʿd al-Dawla, Bādūspānid, ref1
Tutush I and II, Seljuqs, ref1
‘Ubaydallāh
  (‘Abdallāh) b. Ḥusayn, Fāṭimid, ref1
  Abu ‘l-Ghāzī, Shībānid, ref1
  b. Abi ‘l-Fayḍ, Toqay Temūrid, ref1
  b. Šubḥān Qulī, Toqay Temūrid, ref1
  Ťāhirid in Baghdad and Iraq, ref1
Ulaghchi, Batu’id, ref1
Ulűjīyū (or Muḥammad Khudābanda Öljeytü), Il Khānid, ref1
Ulugh Beg, Tūmūrid, ref1
Ulugh Muḥammad Golden Horde Khān, ref1
  Khān of Kazan, ref1
‘Ulūj ‘Alī, Turkish conqueror of Tunis, ref1
‘Umar
  I and II, Ḥafṣids, ref1
  (II), Umayyad caliph, ref1
  I b. al-Khaṭṭāb, al Fārūq, ‘Rightly-Guided’ Caliph, ref1
  ‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
Aftāsid of Badajoz, ref1
Almohad, ref1
Dulafid, ref1
Fatḥ al-Dīn, Zangid, ref1
Hāshimid of Darband, ref1
Kanembu Shehu of Bornu, ref1
Mangīt, ref1
Nabhānī of Pate, ref1
Ramaḍān Oghullarī, ref1
Sanda Mandarama, Shehu of Dikwa, ref1
Ṭoghriḥ Tigin, Qarakhānid, ref1
(Umaru), Fulani, ref1
‘Umar Abba Yarema, Mai of Dikwa, ref1
‘Umar b. ‘Abdallāh, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
‘Umar b. Idrīs, Sayfī of Bornu, ref1
‘Umar b. Idrīs, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
‘Umar Sanda Kiarimi, Shehu of Dikwa and later Bornu, ref1
‘Umar Sanda Kura, Shehu of Dikwa and Bornu, ref1
‘Umar Shāh, Shihāb al-Dīn, Khaljī Delhi Sultan, ref1
Ume, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Ume Jilmi, first Yazaṇī ruler of Kanem, ref1
Umur I and II, Aydīn Oghullarī, ref1
Ünūjūr, Ikhshīdid, ref1
Uraz Muḥammad, Khān of Qāsimov, ref1
Urus, White Horde Khān, ref1
Usmanu dan Fodio (‘Uthmān), Fulani, ref1
‘Uthmān
I and II, ‘Abd al-Wādids, ref1
I, II and III, Marīnids, ref1
III b. Muṣṭafā II, Ottoman, ref1
(‘Othmān) II and III, Ottomans, ref1
b. ‘Affān, ‘Rightly-Guided’ Caliph, ref1
b. Dāwūd, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
b. Idrīs, Sultan of Kanem (767/1366), ref1
b. Idrīs, Sultan of Kanem (792/1390), ref1
b. Kade, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
Ḥafṣid, ref1
Ḥusaynid Bey, ref1
Kachim Biri, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
(‘Othmān) Chelebi, Tekke Oghullarī, ref1
(‘Othmān) I Ghāzī, Ottoman, ref1
al-Qāḍī, Ḍimīr, ref1
Sultan of Harar, ref1
Ulugh Sultan al-Salāṭīn, Qarakhānid, ref1
(Usumanu dan Fodio), Fulani, ref1
‘Uthmān Biri, ruler of Kanem, ref1
‘Uthmān Gifo, King of Songhay, ref1
‘Uthmān Kalinumuwa, Sultan of Kanem, ref1
‘Uthmān Ma’n, Ma’n Amīr, ref1
‘Uthmān Shāh, Naṣrid Malik of Sistan, ref1
Uways II, Jalāyirid, ref1
Uzun Hasan, Aq Qoyunlu, ref

Wahsūdān
Justānid, ref
Musāfīrid, ref
Rawwādīd, ref
Wājid ‘Alī, Nawwāb of Oudh, ref
Wālij Allāh, Bahmanīd, ref
Wālij Muḥammād, Toqay Temūrid, ref
al-Walīd, I and II Umayyad caliphs, ref
Wandi Tēbing or Shams al-‘Ālam, Sultan of Acheh, ref
Wardānrūz, Muḥyī ’l-Dīn, Atabeg of Yazd, ref
Wāsūl al-Fatḥ, Midrārid, ref
al-Wāthiq
I and II, ‘Abbāsid caliphs in Cairo, ref
‘Abbāsid calif in Baghdad, ref
Waththāb, Numayrid, ref
Wazīr ‘Alī, Nawwāb of Oudh, ref
Wushmgīr, Zīyārīd, ref

Yādgār Muḥammād, Tīmūrid, ref
Yādigār Muḥammād, Khān of Kazan, ref
Yaghmurāsan, ‘Abd al-Wādid, ref
Yaghmurchi, Khān of Astrakhan, ref
Yahyā
I and II, Dhu ’l-Nūnids of Toledo, ref
I, II and III, Ḥafṣīds, ref
I and II, Ḥammūdīds, ref
I, II, III and IV, Idrīsīds, ref
I and II, Waṭṭāsīds, ref
Afṭāsid of Badajoz, ref
Almohad, ref
b. Aḥmad, Zaydī Imām, ref
b. Ibrāhīm al-Gudālī or al-Jaddālī, Almoravid, ref
b. Muḥammād, Abū Ṭālib, Zaydī Imām, ref
b. ‘Umar al-Lamtūnī, Almoravid, ref
Ḥammādid, ref
Ibn Ghāniya, ruler in Cordova, ref
‘Izz al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref
al-Mu’talī, Spanish Umayyad, ref
Najm al-Dīn al-Hādī ilā ’l-Haqq, Zaydī Imām, ref
Niẓām al-Dīn, Mihrabānid Malik of Sistan, ref
TUJĪBĪD, ref
Zīrid of Kairouan, ref1
Yaḥyā al-Hādī ilā 'l-Ḥaqq, Zaydī Imām, ref1
Yaḥyā al-Mutawakkil, Zaydī Imām, ref1
Yaḥyā Karāwī, Sarbadārid, ref1
Ya‘ish, Dhu ’l-Nūnid of Toledo, ref1
Yakhsī, Qaramān Oghulları, ref1
Yakhshī Khān, Shujā‘ al-Dīn, Qarasī Oghulları, ref1
Yaman, Shams al-Dīn, Jāndār Oghulları, ref1
Ya‘qūb
  I and II, Germiyān Oghulları, ref1
  Abū Yūsuf, Laythid Ṣaffārid, ref1
(Aḥmad), Sökmenid, ref1
  Almohad, ref1
  Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
  b. al-Mutawakkil I and II, ‘Abbāsid caliphs in Cairo, ref1
  Marīnid, ref1
  Qarakhānid, ref1
  Rustamid, ref1
Ya‘qūb Shāh, Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Yaḡtūṭī, Artuqids, ref1
Yaqẓān, Rustamid, ref1
Yār Quṭ Shāhī, ref1
Ya‘rub, Ya‘rubid, ref1
Yazdagird b. Shahriyār, Tāj al-Dawla, Bāwandid Ispahbadh, ref1
Yazīd
  I, II and III, Umayyad caliphs, ref1
  ‘Alawid Sharīf, ref1
  b. Aḥmad, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1, ref2
  b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī, governor of Armenia, precursor of the Sharwān Shafs, ref1
  b. Muḥammad, Yazīdī Sharwān Shāh, ref1
Yeremferden (? Jabbār Berdi), line of Orda, ref1
Yesū Mōngke, Chaghatayid, ref1
Yesūn Temūr
  Chaghatayid, ref1
  Mongol Great Khān, ref1
Yıldız Mu‘izzī, Tāj al-Dīn, governor for the Ghūrids, ref1
Yu‘fir, Yu‘firid, ref1
Yülük Arslan
  Ḥusām al-Dīn, Artuqid, ref1
  Mużaффār al-Dīn, Chobān Oghulları, ref1
Yūnus, Tekke Oghulları, ref1
Yūnus Ma‘n, Ma‘n Amīr, ref1
Yūsuf
I and II, ‘Abd al-Wādids, ref1
I and II, Almohads, ref1
I-V, Naṣrids, ref1
‘Abbāsid caliph
  in Baghdad, ref1
  in Cairo, ref1
Abū Ya‘qūb, Carmathian ruler, ref1
‘Alawid Sharīf, ref1
Almoravid, ref1
b. Muḥammad, Qarakhānid, ref1
Begtiginid, ref1
Bey of Alanya, ref1
Kalbid, ref1
Marīnid, ref1
al-Mu‘tamin, Hūdid, ref1
Qādir Khān, Nāṣir al-Dawla Malik al-Mashriq wa ‘l-Ṣīn, Qarakhānid, ref1
Qaramānlī, ref1
Rustamid, ref1
Sājid, ref1
Shihāb Amir, ref1
Sultan of Harar, ref1
Zaydī Imam, ref1
Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān, governor of Dawlatābād, ref1
Yūsuf Buluggīn I, Zīrid governor of the Maghrib, ref1
Yūsuf Shāh
  I and II, Rukn al-Dīn, Hazāraspids, ref1
  Atabeg of Yazd, ref1
  Shams al-Dīn, ruler of Bengal, ref1
  Sultan of Kashmīr, ref1
Yuzbak (ruling title Abu ‘l-Muẓaffar Ghiyāth al-Dīn), governor of Bengal, ref1
Za Bisi Baro or Ber, King of Songhay, ref1
Zafar Khān
  (Abu ‘l-Muẓaffar Hasan Gangu ‘Alā’ al-Dīn), Bahmanid, ref1
governor of Gujarāt with the title of Muẓaffar Khān, ref1
al-Zāfir, Fāṭimid, ref1
al-Zāhir
  ‘Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad, ref1
  Fāṭimid, ref1
Zāhir, Hasanūyid, ref1
Zakariyyā’
  I and II, Ḥafṣids, ref1
  ‘Abbāsid caliph in Cairo, ref1
Zakiyyat al-Dīn Shāh, ‘Ināyat, Queen of Acheh, refl
Zamān Shāh, Sadōzay, refl
Zangi
   I, II and III, Zangids, refl
   Salghurid, refl
Zaraku b. Abī Bakr ‘Atīq, called Mai Cimola, Fulani, refl
Zarrīn Kamar, Bādūspānid, refl
Zāwī, Zīrid of Granada, refl
Zaydān, Sa‘did Sharīf, refl
Zayn al-‘Ābidīn
   ‘Alī, Mujāhid al-Dīn, Muẕaffarid, refl
   Aq Qoyunlu, refl
   (Shāhi Khān or Bud Shāh), ruler of Kashmīr, refl
   Sultan of Acheh, refl
Zīnat al-Dīn Kamālat Shāh, Queen of Acheh, refl
Zīrī, Zīrid governor of the Maghrib, refl
Ziyād
   b. Ibrāhīm, Ziyādid, refl
   b. Ishāq, Ziyādid, refl
Ziyādat Allāh I, II and III, Aghlabids, refl
Ziyār, Tāj al-Dawla, Bādūspānid, refl
Zuhayr al-Ṣaqlabī, of Almería, refl, ref2
Zuray`, Zuray‘id, refl

(B) DYNASTIES, PEOPLES, TRIBES ETC.

‘Abbādids, refl
‘Abbāsid caliph, in Aleppo, refl
‘Abbāsid caliphs, in Baghdad, refl
‘Abbāsid caliphs, in Cairo, refl
‘Abd al-Wādids, refl
Abdālīs or Durrānīs, refl
Abū Dāwūdids, refl
Abū ‘l-Khayrids, refl
Abū Sa‘id al-Jannābī, line of, or Carmathians, refl
Acheh, Sultans of, refl
‘Ādīl Shāhīs, refl
Afrīghids, line of Khwārazm Shāhs, refl
Afšārids, refl
Afṭasids, refl
Aghlabids, refl
Aḥmad Grāñ, line of, in Harar and Ausa, refl
Aḥmar, Banū, ‘I-, refl
Aḥmadīlīs, ref1
Āl al-Julandā, ref1
Āl Bū Saʿīd, ref1, ref2
Āl Rashūd, ref1
Āl Suʿūd (Saʿūd), ref1
ʿAlawīd Sharīfs, ref1
ʿAlī b. Dāwūd, line of, in Harar, ref1
Almohads (al-Muwaḥḥidūn), ref1
Almoravids (al-Murābiṭūn), ref1
ʿĀmirīds, ref1
Ānī, line of Shaddādīs in, ref1
ʿĀnūzīds, ref1
Anūshṭigin Shīḥna, line of Khwārazm Shāhs, ref1
Aq Qoyunlu, ref1
Arghūns, ref1
Artuqīds, ref1
Ashraf Oghullarī, ref1
Ashtarkhānīs, ref1
Ashtarkhānīs, ref1
Askīyās, Kings of Songhay, ref1
Assassins of Persia, or Ismāʿīlīs, ref1
Assassins of Syria, or Ismāʿīlīs, ref1
Atabegs of Yazd, ref1
ʿAwn family, ref1
Ayyūbīds, ref1
Ayyūbīids, ref1
Bāduspānīs, ref1
Bahmanīs, ref1
Baḥrīs Mamlūks, ref1
Balban, line of rulers in Bengal, ref1
Bānījūrids, ref1
Bārakzays (Muḥammadzays), ref1
Bārīd Shāhīs, ref1
Batuʿīds (Blue Horde), ref1
Bāwandid Ispahbadhs, ref1
Begtiginīs, ref1
Bīrūzāl, Banū, ref1
ʿBlack’ sultans of Kanem, ref1
Būrūds (Burūds), ref1
Būrūd Mamlūks, ref1
Būyīds (Buwayhīds), ref1
Carmathians or Qaraḍāḡīs of Abū Saʿīd al-Jannābī’s line, ref1
Chaghatayids, ref1
Chingizids, ref1
Chobān Oghullarï, ref1

Dābūyid Ispahbadhs, ref1
Dānishmendids, ref1
Delhi Sultans, ref1
Dhu ‘l-Nūn Beg, line of Arghūns, ref1
Dhu ‘l-Nūnids, ref1
Dulafids, ref1
Dulghadïr Oghullarï (Dhu ‘l-Qadrids), ref1
Durrānīs or Abdālīs, ref1

Eldigüzids, ref1
Eretna Oghullarï, ref1
Eshref Oghullarï, ref1

Fārūqīs, ref1
Fāṭimidṣ, ref1
Filālī Sharīfs, ref1
Fulanis, ref1

Ganja and Dvīn, line of Shaddādids in, ref1
Germiyān Oghullarï, ref1
Ghāniya, Banū, ref1
Ghāzī Shāh Chak, line of Kashmir Sultans, ref1
Ghaznawids, ref1, ref2
Ghūrids, ref1
Ghūrī, line of Mālwa Sultans, ref1
Giray Khāns, ref1
Golden Horde, the, Khāns of, ref1

Ḥabashīs, rulers in Bengal, ref1
Ḥafṣids, ref1
Ḥamdānīds, in Jazīra and Syria, ref1
Ḥamdānīds, in Yemen, ref1
Ḥamid Oghullarï, ref1
Ḥammādids, ref1
Ḥammūdids, ref1
Harar, sultans of, ref1
Ḥasanūyids (Ḥasanawayhids), ref1
Hāshimids of Darband, ref1
Hāshimite Sharīfs, ref1
Ḫātim, Banū, ref1
Hazāraspids, ref1
Hūdids, ref1
Ḫusaynid Beys, ref1
Idrīsids, ref1
Ikhshīdids, ref1
Il Khanids, ref1
İdegizids, ref1
Ilyās Shāh, line of Bengal Sultans, ref1
Ilyāsids, ref1
‘Imād Shāhīs, ref1
Inanj Oghullarï, ref1
Inaqids (Qungrats), ref1
Inju’ıds, ref1
İsfandiyār (İsfendiyār) Oghullarï or Jāndār Oghularï, ref1

Jahwarids, ref1
Jalāyirids, ref1
Jāndār Oghullarï or İsfaniyār Oghullarï, ref1
Jānids, ref1
Jogjakarta, sultans of, ref1
Justānids, ref1

Kākūyids (Kākawayhids), ref1
Kalbids, ref1
Kanembu line of Shaykhs or Shehus of Bornu and Dikwa, ref1, ref2
Karam, Banū, ’l-, ref1
Kararānîs, ref1
Karasī Oghullarï, ref1
Karts (Kurts), ref1
Keita kings, of Mali, ref1
Khalafids, line of Șaffāvids, ref1
Khaljīs, line of Delhi Sultans, ref1
Khaljīs, line of Mālwa Sultans, ref1
Khazrūn, Banū, ref1
Khwārazm Shāhs, ref1
Kilwa, Sultans of, ref1

Laythids, line of Șaffārids, ref1
Lōdīs, line of Delhi Sultans, ref1
Lu’lu’ıds, ref1
Mahdali Sayyids, Sultans of Kilwa, [ref]
Mahdids, [ref]
Mais of Bornu and Dikwa, [ref, ref2]
Malacca, rulers of, [ref]
Maliks of Nīmrūz, [ref]
Mālwa Sultans, [ref]
Mamlūks, [ref]
Maʿmūnis, line of Khwārazm Shāhs, [ref]
Maʿn amīrs, [ref]
Mangīts, [ref]
Marānīds, [ref]
Marwānīds, in Diyār Bakr, [ref]
Marwānīds, line of Umayyad califs, [ref]
Mataram, rulers of, [ref]
Mazruis (Mazrūʿīs), [ref]
Mazyadids, [ref]
Mengūjekids, [ref]
Menteshe Oghullari, [ref]
Midrārids, [ref]
Mihrābānīds, line of Maliks of Nīmrūz, [ref]
Mings, [ref]
Mirdāsids, [ref]
Mongols, [ref]
Mughal Emperors, [ref]
Muḥammad ʿAlī, House of, [ref]
Muḥammad Īsā Tarkhān, line of Arghūns, [ref]
Muḥammadzays (Barakzays), [ref]
Muḥtājids, [ref]
Muʿizzī or Shamsī Slave Kings of Delhi, [ref]
Mujahid, Banū, [ref]
Mukramids, [ref]
Mulūk al-Tawā’if (Reyes da Taifas), in Spain, [ref]
Muṣʿabids, line of Ṭāhirids in Baghdad and Iraq, [ref]
Musāfirids (Sallārids), [ref]
Mushaʿshaʿids, [ref]
Muẓaffārids, [ref]
Nabhānīs, rulers of Pate, [ref]
Najaḥids, [ref]
Naṣīrids line of Maliks of Nīmrūz, [ref]
Naṣīrids of Granada, [ref]
Nawwāb-Viziers and Kings of Oudh, [ref]
Nawwāb-Viziers and Nawwāb-Nāżīms of Bengal, [ref]
Niẓām Shāhīs, refl
Niẓāms of Hyderabad, refl
Nizārī Isma‘īlīs, refl, refl2
Numayrids, refl

Orda, line of (White Horde and then Golden Horde), refl
‘Orthodox’ or Rightly-Guided caliphs, refl
Ottomans (Osmanlis), refl

Pahlawīs, refl
Parwānā Oghullarī, refl
‘Patriarchal’ or Rightly-Guided or ‘Orthodox’ Caliphs, refl
Popalzays (Sadōzays), refl

Qādī Burhān al-Dīn Oghullarī, refl
Qājārs, refl
Qara Qoyunlu, refl
Qarakhānids (Ilig Khāns), refl
Qaramān Oghullarī (Qaramānids), refl
Qaramānlūs, refl
Qaraṣī Oghullarī, refl
Qarmaṭīs (Carmathians), refl
Qāsimids, line of Zaydī Imāms in Yemen, refl
Qubayb, Banū, 'l-, refl
Quŋrats (Inaqids), refl
Quṭb Shāhīs, refl
Qutlughkhānīs, refl

Rājā Gaḥeša, line of Bengal sultans, refl
Ramaḍān Oghullarī, refl
Rassids, line of Zaydī Imāms, in Yemen, refl
Rasūlīds, refl
Rawwādīds, refl
Reyes de Taifas (Mulūk al-Ṭawā’if), refl
Rightly-Guided or ‘Patriarchal’ or ‘Orthodox’ Caliphs, refl
Rustamids, refl

Sa’did Sharīfs, refl
Sadōzays (Popalzays), refl
Ṣafawīds, refl
Ṣaffārīds, refl
Ṣaḥīb Atā Oghullarī, refl
Sājīds, refl
Salghurids,
Sallārids (Musāfīrids),
Saltuqids,
Sāmānids,
Sanūsīs,
Sarbadārids,
Ṣarukhān Oghullarī,
Sayfī (Sefuwa) rulers of Kanem and Bornu,
Sayyid Ḫusayn Shāh, line of, in Bengal,
Sayyids, rulers in Delhi,
Seljuqs,
Shaddādids,
Shāh Mir Swātī, line of Kashmir Sultans,
Shāh-i Armanids,
Shamsī or Muʿizzi Slave Kings of Delhi,
Sharqī Sultans,
Sharwān Shāhs,
Shībānīs (Shaybānīs),
Shihāb Amīrs,
Shīrāzī sultans of Kilwa,
Sīmjūrids,
Sis (Sonnīs), Kings of Songhay,
Sökmenids,
Spanish Umayyads,
Sufyānids, line of Umayyad caliphs,
Ṣulayḥīds,
Ṣumāḥīṭh, Banū,
Sūrīs, line of Delhi Sultans,
Sūrīs, rulers in Bengal,
Susuhunans of Surakarta,

Ṭāhirids, of Khurasan and in Baghdad and Iraq,
Ṭāhirids, of Spain,
Ṭāhirids, of Yemen,
Tāj al-Din Oghullarī,
Tekke Oghullarī,
Ṭūmūrids,
Toqay Temürids,
Tughluqids, line of Delhi Sultans,
Tuṣṭībids,
Ṭūlūnids,

Ulugh Muḥammad, line of,
Umayyad caliphs, ref1
‘Uqaylids, ref1

Waṭṭāsids, ref1
White Horde (line of Orda), ref1

Ya‘rubids, ref1
Yazanīs, rulers of Kanem, ref1
Yüan dynasty, the Mongol Great Khans in China, ref1
Yu‘firids (or Ya‘furids), ref1

Zands, ref1
Zangids, ref1
Zas (Zuwas), Kings of Songhay, ref1
Zaydī Imāms in Yemen, ref1
Zayyānids (Ziyānids), ref1
Zīrids, ref1, ref2
Ziyādīs, ref1
Ziyānids (Zayyanids), ref1
Ziyārids, ref1
Zuray‘īds, ref1

(c) PLACES

Acheh (Atjèh, Aceh), ref1
Aden, ref1
Afghanistan, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5, ref6
Africa, Horn of, ref1
Aḥmadnagar, ref1
Aḥsanābād-Gulbargā, ref1
Akhlāt, ref1
al-Ḥadīthā, ref1
al-Miqrāna, ref1
al-Rustāq, ref1
Alamūt, ref1
Albarracin, ref1
Aleppo, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4
Algeciras, ref1
Algeria, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5
Almería, ref1, ref2
Alpuente, ref1
Āmid, ref1
Āmul, ref1
Āna, ref1
Anatolia, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5, ref6, ref7, ref8, ref9, ref10
Ānī, ref1
Antalya, ref1
‘Arabistān, ref1
Arcos, ref1, ref2
Armenia, ref1
Arrān, ref1, ref2, ref3
Astrakhan, ref1
Ausa, ref1
Azerbaijan (Ādharbāyjān), ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5, ref6
Badajoz, ref1, ref2
Badakhshān, ref1
Balad, ref1
Balāsāghūn, ref1
Ba‘lībakk, ref1
Balearic Islands, ref1, ref2
Balkans, ref1
Balkh, ref1
Baluchistan, ref1
Bāmiyān, ref1
Bāniyās, ref1
Baza, ref1
Bengal, ref1, ref2
Berār, ref1
Bīdar, ref1
Bihār, ref1
Bijapur, ref1
Black Sea coastland, ref1, ref2
Borneo, ref1
Bornu (Borno), ref1
Brunei, ref1
Bukhara, ref1, ref2
Buṣrā, ref1
Calatayud, ref1, ref2
Calatrava, ref1
Canik (Jānīk), ref1
Carmona, ref1, ref2
Caucasus, the, ref1
Ceuta, ref1, ref2
Chaghāniyān, ref1
China, ref1
Cilicia, ref1, ref2, ref3
Cordova, ref1, ref2
Crimea, the, ref1

Damascus, ref1, ref2
Darband, ref1
Daylam, ref1, ref2
Deccan, ref1, ref2, ref3
Denia, ref1, ref2, ref3
Deñizli, ref1
Dhū Jibia, ref1
Dikwa, ref1
Divriği, ref1
Diyār Bakr, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5
Dvīn, ref1

Eğridir, ref1
Egypt, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5
Elbistan, ref1
Eritrea, ref1
Eritzen, ref1
Erzincan, ref1
Erzurum, ref1
Ethiopia, ref1

Faraghāna, ref1
Fars (Fārs), ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4
Firrīm, ref1

Gambia, ref1
Ganja, ref1
Gao, ref1
Ghazna, ref1
Ghūr, ref1
Gīlān, ref1, ref2
Golconda-Muhammadnagar, ref1
Granada, ref1, ref2, ref3
Guinea, ref1
Gujarāt, ref1
Gurgān, ref1
Gurgānj, ref1

Ḥamāt, ref1
Harar, ref1
Harrān, ref1, ref2, ref3
Hausaland, ref1
Ḥijāz, ref1
Ḥilla, ref1
Ḥims, ref1
Ḥiṣn al-Ashrāf, ref1
Ḥiṣn Kayfā, ref1
Hīt, ref1
Huelva, ref1
Huesca, ref1, ref2
Hyderabad (Haydarābād), ref1
Ifrīqiya, ref1
Īlāq, ref1
India, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5, ref6, ref7, ref8, ref9
Indonesia, ref1
Iraq, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5, ref6, ref7, ref8, ref9, ref10, ref11, ref12, ref13, ref14
Irbil, ref1
Jaén, ref1
Janad, ref1
Java, ref1, ref2
Jawnpur, ref1
Jazīra, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5
Jibāl, ref1, ref2, ref3
Jogjakarta, ref1
Jordan, ref1
Juban, ref1
Kairouan, ref1
Kanem, ref1
Karaj, ref1
Karak, ref1
Kāshghar, ref1
Kashmīr, ref1
Kastamonu (Qaṣṭamūnī), ref1
Kāth, ref1
Kazan, ref1
Kemakh, ref1
Kenya, ref1
Khāndesh, ref1
Khartpert, ref1
Khiva (Khīwa), ref1
Khokand (Khoqand), ref1
Khotan, ref1
Khurasan (Khurāsān), ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5, ref6, ref7, ref8, ref9
Khūzistān, ref1
Khwārazm, ref1, ref2
Kilwa, ref1
Kirman (Kirmān), ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5
Konya, ref1
Kujūr, ref1
Kurdistan, ref1, ref2, ref3
La Sahla, ref1
Lebanon, ref1
Lérida, ref1, ref2
Libya, ref1
Little Armenia, ref1
Luristān, ref1, ref2
Ma'bar (Madura), ref1
Majorca, ref1, ref2
Malacca (Melaka), ref1
Málaga, ref1, ref2
Malatya, ref1
Malay peninsula, ref1
Mali, ref1
Mālwa, ref1
Marāgha, ref1
Mārdīn, ref1
Mataram, ref1
Mayyāfāriqīn, ref1
Mecca, ref1
Medinaceli, ref1
Mértola, ref1
Mombasa, ref1
Mongolia, ref1
Morocco, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5
Morón, ref1
Moscow, ref1, ref2
Mosul, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4
Muḥammadābād-Bīdar, ref1
Multan, ref1
Murcia, ref1, ref2
Murviedro, ref1
Muscat, ref1
Mysore (Mahisur, Maysūr), ref1

Najd, ref1, ref2
Niebla, ref1
Nigeria, ref1
Niṣībīn, ref1
Nūr, ref1

Oman (‘Umān), ref1, ref2
Oudh (Awadh), ref1

Pate, ref1
Pemba, ref1
Persia, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5, ref6, ref7, ref8, ref9, ref10, ref11, ref12, ref13, ref14, ref15, ref16, ref17

Qalʿat Banī Ḥammad, ref1
Qalʿat Jaʿbar, ref1, ref2
Qāsimov (Goradets Meshehevskiy), ref1
Qipchaq steppe, ref1
Quhistān, ref1
Raqqa, ref1
Rayy, ref1
Ronda, ref1
Rūdbār-Shāh Rūd valleys, ref1
Rūʿln Dīz, ref1
Rustamdār, ref1
Rūyān, ref1, ref2
Ryazan, ref1

Ṣaʿda (Ṣanʿāʾ), ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4
Samarkand, ref1, ref2
Samīrān, ref1
Santa Maria de Algarve, ref1
Saragossa, ref1, ref2
Sārī, ref1, ref2
Sarūj, ref1
Segura, ref1
Semireche, ref1
Senegal, ref1
Seville, ref1, ref2
Valencia, ref1, ref2
Vilches, ref1
Volga region, ref1

Yazd, ref1
Yazīdiyya, ref1
Yemen, ref1, ref2, ref3, ref4, ref5, ref6, ref7

Zabīd, ref1, ref2, ref3
Zanzibar, ref1, ref2