

*Field : History*

*Type : Review Article*

*Received: 27.01.2016 - Accepted:03.03.2016*

## **Viziers of the Seljuk Empire during the Reign of Toghrul-Beg ibn Mikail (1040-1063)**

**Özgür TOKAN**

**Email: [ozgurtokan@hotmail.com](mailto:ozgurtokan@hotmail.com)**

### **Abstract**

The office of vizier has been present in the bureaucratic organization of various states since ancient times. Entered into Islamic world during the period of Abbasid Caliphate, the office of vizier kept its presence in the bureaucratic organizations, but with slight differences, also in emirates like Samanid Empire and in Ghaznavids, which was emerged from Samanids. Arriving Khorasan region over Amu Darya in 1035 and establishing an independent empire after successful struggles against Ghaznavids until 1040, Seljuks also inspired by these states, adopted the office of vizier and maintained it in their organizational structure. Hence the reign of Toghrul-Beg ibn Mikail, the Sultan of Seljuk Empire (1040-1063), the office of vizier was present in the state organization, and totally six statesmen were assigned as the head of the office of vizier, with the title of vizier. They were Abu al-Kasm Sâlâr Bujkân, Abu'l-Fath Râzî, Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî, Nizam al-Mulk Abu Ahmed (Muhammad) Dehistanî, Reîsu'r-Ruesâ Abu Abdullah al-Huseyin (Hasan) ibn Ali ibn Mikâil and Amîd al-Mulk Kundurî.

**Keywords:** Vezîr (Vizier), Vezâret (the Office of Vizier), Toghrul-Beg ibn Mikail, Seljuks, Amîd al-Mulk Kundurî.

## Tuğrul Beg b. Mikâil Dönemi (1040-1063) Selçuklu Vezîrleri

**Özgür TOKAN**

**E-posta: [ozgurtokan@hotmail.com](mailto:ozgurtokan@hotmail.com)**

### Öz

Vezâret müessesesi, çok eski zamanlardan itibaren muhtelif devletlerin bürokratik teşkilâtlarında yer almıştır. Abbâsîler döneminde İslâm dünyası içerisine de giren bu müessese, çok ufak farklılıklarla bu devlet içerisindeki bürokratik teşkilâtı devam ettiren Samânîler gibi emirliklerde ve Samânîler içerisinden çıkarak kurulmuş olan Gazneliler Devleti'nde de varlığını devam ettirmiştir. 1035 yılında, toplu halde Ceyhun nehrini aşarak Horasan bölgesine gelen ve 1040 yılına kadar verdikleri mücadelelerle Gazneliler'e karşı başarı sağlayıp bağımsız bir devlet halini alan Selçuklular da, söz konusu müesseseyi ismi geçen siyasî unsurlardan esinlenerek kendi devlet teşkilâtları içerisine sokmuş ve devam ettirmişlerdir. Büyük Selçuklu Devleti'nin ilk sultanı Tuğrul b. Mikâil'in hükümdarlık döneminden (1040-1063) itibaren Selçuklu devlet teşkilâtı içerisinde yer alan söz konusu müessesenin başkanlığına, vezir unvanıyla toplamda altı devlet adamı tayin edilmiştir. Bunlar; Ebu'l-Kasm Sâlâr Buşkân, Ebu'l-Feth Râzî, Ali b. Abdullah Cüveynî, Nizamü'l-Mülk Ebû Ahmed (Muhammed) Dehistanî, Reîsü'r-Rüesâ Ebû Abdullah el-Hüseyin (Hasan) b. Ali b. Mikâil ve Amîdü'l-Mülk Kündürî'dir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Vezîr, Vezâret, Tuğrul b. Mikâil, Selçuklular, Amîdü'l-Mülk Kündürî.

## Introduction

It has been recorded that the term *vizier* is actually Persian word, derived from the Avestan *vicira* meaning "decree, arbitrate" and Pahlavi *vicir* meaning "decree, arbitrament", became Arabic and then passed to Persian again as an Arabic word (T. H., 1986)<sup>1</sup> Actually, some statements by Ibn Khaldun (İbn Haldun) and Christensen support this kind of an approach. For example, according to Ibn Khaldun: "*Prophet Hazrad Muhammad held a consultation with his companions about the important matters, whether private or general, and discussed these matters with them. Besides, He consulted Hazrad Abu Bakr about some other issues. As a matter of fact, Arabs, knowing the states where Khosrau, Kaiser and Negus were the rules and their conditions, entitled Abu Bakr as 'the Vizier of Muhammad'. However, at that time the term vizier was not known among Muslims.*" (2005, I: 484-485). That is, the term vizier, which was not known by Muslims at the beginning, was later adopted either from Persian states under the rule of Khosraus, or from East Roman Empire under the rule of Kaisers or from Neguses. Christensen, discussing the Sasanid state organization in detail, stated that the titles of *vezîrbez*, *vazurg framaahar* were used for viziers during Sasanid period (1387: 160). However, it seems quite difficult to confirm that the term passed to Persian from Arabic or to determine when it passed. On the other hand, it is known for certain that the term *vezîr* (*vizier*) has been used in Arabic since ancient times and it is mentioned in Holy Qur'an (Al-Furqan: 35) meaning "helper".<sup>2</sup>

There are different views on the roots of the terms *vezîr* (*vizier*) and *vezâret* (office of vizier) in Arabic and how they emerged. According to Mâverdî, they emerged based on three different sources. The first one is that they have been derived from the verb stem *vzr* meaning "weight, undertaken". As an evidence, he has pointed to the resemblance of the word's meaning to the fact that vizier undertakes some of the weights, responsibilities of the caliph. The second one is that they have been derived from the word *ezr* meaning "reliance". As evidence to this, he pointed that the caliph resorts to, relies on vizier's opinions, help. The third one is that they have been derived from the word *ezr* meaning "back, back plate". Since back plate holds all the strength in the body, the caliph strengthens with his vizier that is assumed him as his back plane (1976: 29). Ibn Khaldun has also stated that the word *vezâret* means absolute help and it has been derived from the word *mîvazeret*, or the verb stem *vzr* as mentioned in Mâverdî, meaning *muavenet* (assistance) (2005, I: 483-484). In the dictionary, these terms are said to be derived from the verb stem *vzr* meaning "humping something, undertaking", similar to the common ideas in Mâverdî and Ibn Khaldun (*el-Muncid fi'l-Lugative'l-Alâm*, 1973: 898).

No matter what its roots are, the term vizier has been used as the title for the statesmen who are the top authority after the ruler/emperor in any state/empire. This term, stated to be used in bureaucracy in Sasanid period for the first time,<sup>3</sup> is accepted by many scholars that it has been used during Abbasid period in the Islamic world for the first time. According to these scholars, Abbasid adopted the term *vezîr* and the institution *vezâret* from Sassanids (Zeydan, 2009, I: 162-163, 201; Köprülü, 2004: 56; Uzunçarşılı, 1988: 6; Üçok, 1983: 134). However, there is no consensus about the person who used the title vizier for the first time in Islamic

<sup>1</sup>In Muin's work it was stated to be Persian, and the words *vicir*, *vazir*, *vajir* were used (Muin, 1353, IV: 5020).

<sup>2</sup>The aforementioned verse is as follows: "And We had certainly given Moses the Scripture and appointed with him his brother Aaron as an assistant."

<sup>3</sup>Christensen stated that the office of vizier had been in place since Arsacid Empire; however, he also stated that there was not any word in Persian meaning the class of viziers, and such word was present in Sassanids as *vezîrbez*. (1387: 137-138, 160).

world. While some scholars advocate that this title has for the first time been given to Abu Seleme Hafis ibn Suleiman al-Hallal from Hamadan by the Abbasid Caliph Abu'l-Abbas Abdullah as-Saffah (750-754) (Zeydan, 2009, I: 201; Uzunçarşılı, 1988: 8; Hasan, 1985, II/3: 71; Kazıcı, 2003: 141), others report that this title has been used by the Shiite leader al-Muhtar before Abu Seleme (Goitein, 2010: 162). As a result, we can say that, as was in Abbasid Caliphate, this term was used in various Muslim states (such as Samanids, Ghaznavids and Ottoman Empire), and thus also in Seljuk Empire and other branches of Seljuks. Statesmen using this title were appointed with several duties and stand as the head of Dîvân-Âlâ, meaning the *Ministerial Cabinet* today, where council chairmen meet to discuss state matters (about this matter see more in Tokan, 2015).

Sultan Toghrul-Beg ibn Mikâil was the first sultan of Seljuk Empire (about Toghrul-Beg ibn Mikâil, see more in Köymen, 1976). Seljuks was excellently organised including the institutions that actually belonged to previous Sasanid state organization, transformed in Islamic traditions and formed the basis of state organisation of many Islamic states (such as Abbasid Caliphate, Samanid Emirate and Ghaznavids). Thus, the office of vizier was adopted in the aforementioned state organisation for the first time by Seljuks in the same period, which can also be clearly understood from the presence of many viziers worked in that period.

From the time of Battle of Dandanaqan (1040) when the Seljuks were established as an independent empire (about this battle see more in Köymen, 2011) until the death of Sultan Toghrul Beg, several people worked as vizier for him. According to some scholars, before the last one of these viziers, Amîd al-Mulk Kunderî holding the title until 1054-1055, four people were assigned as the vizier of the sultan (İkbal, 1338: 37; Köymen, 1976: 93). However, the dates when these viziers were appointed to this position or dismissed cannot be accurately specified. Therefore, in the following section, all viziers, shown to be present during the reign of Sultan Toghrul Beg, will be discussed in the light of various sources.

### **Abu al-Kasım Sâlâr Bûjkân (Bujgânî: Bûzcanî)**

Salar Bûjkân was recorded as the first vizier of the reign of Sultan Toghrul Beg in many sources. According to Ravendî, after the Battle of Dandanaqan (1040), emirs of Seljuk summoned a *kurultay* (general assembly) and with a decision taken in this kurultay, they wrote a letter to Abbasid Caliph Al-Qa'im bi-Amr Allah. When the letter was sent to caliph via Abu Ishak al-Fukkaî, the competent and the head commander was Abu al-Kasım Bujkân (Ravendî, 1999, I: 102). This information is also confirmed in other sources. For instance, this vizier, mentioned as Abu al-Kasım Sâlâr Buzcanî or Sâlâr Bujkânî in *Selçuknâme-i Nişâburî* (Zahîreddîn Nişâburî, 1390: 18) and *Tarih-i Güzîde* (Hamdullah Müstevfî, 1387: 428), was recorded as the vizier of Toghrul Beg at the time they invaded Khorasan, just after the Battle of Dandanaqan of Seljuks. In fact, according to the information in *Tarih-i Güzîde*, the letter sent to the aforementioned caliph was written on the recommendation of this vizier.<sup>4</sup> In his work, Rashîd al-Dîn Fadhl-allâh (Reşîdeddîn Fazlullah), utilizing the work of Ravendî, mentioned that Sâlâr Bûjkân was the vizier at that time -probably directly based on the information in Ravendî (Reşîdeddîn Fazlullah, 2010: 94).<sup>5</sup> Akîlî recorded that this person, acted as the tax collector in Khorasan during the reign of Mahmud of Ghazni, took the service

<sup>4</sup>In this work, in which Göksu translated the information about the period of Seljuks into Turkish and evaluated, he also recorded that aforesaid person was a vizier (Göksu, 2011: 296).

<sup>5</sup>Again in this source, in another page, Abu al-Kasım was openly stated as the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul beg (page:109).

with the Seljuks after they arrived at Khorasan and became their guide (1337: 203-204). Records by Beyhakî, giving the earliest information on aforementioned vizier, also supports the sources provided above. According to Beyhakî, this vizier took the service with the Seljuks after the Battle of Sarakhs (1038) of Toghrul Beg, before the Battle of Dandanaqan, and he was given a province (vilayet) and *hil'at* (Khelaut - robe of honour) by Toghrul Beg (1389: 507). This record shows that aforesaid vizier was took part on the side of Seljuks who were in a battle with Ghaznavids at that time. Hence, Köymen and Zahoder confirm this information. As can be understood from the information provided by these scholars, Sâlâr Buzgân provided an advantage with his 3-4 thousand armed man for Seljuks against Ghaznavids (Köymen, 2011: 263-264, 272-274<sup>6</sup>; Zahoder, 1955: 526). It is quite reasonable that such a man was appointed as vizier. Besides, many scholars except for İkbâl (1338: 36-37, 40) showed this man as the vizier of Seljuks (Bowen, 2010: 142-143; Agacanov, 2006: 157; Taneri, 1967: 83; Zahoder, 1955: 526; Köymen, 2011: 3655). One of the earliest authors providing substantial information about the period of Seljuks, Bahârzî also mentioned about Abu al-Kasım Buzcânî as vizier; however, he did not clearly state the date when became a vizier (1993: 680). As a result, considering these information, it is a considerably strong argument that Abu al-Kasım was the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg.

#### **Abu'l-Fath Râzî (Kiya Abu'l-Fath)**

This person previously served under Feramerz ibn Kakuye,<sup>7</sup> the judge of Isfahan. However, Toghrul Beg appreciated Abu'l-Fath Râzî's skills when he was sent to him as an envoy by Feramerz, retained him and appointed as vizier (in H. 434=1042-1043) (İkbâl, 1338: 37). In some sources, he was recorded as the second vizier (Taneri, 1967: 83; Sevim-Merçil, 2014: 35) and in others as the first vizier (İkbâl, 1338: 37-38). However it is hard to say that he was the first vizier of Seljuks. Yet, considering the information about Sâlâr Bujkân discussed as the first vizier, it is obvious that Abu'l-Fath Râzî became a vizier after him. In addition, it is understood that even this person became a vizier; it was for a short time. Likewise, Ibn Athir (İbnü'l-Esîr) recorded that another man named Abu al-Kasım Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî, who Toghrul Beg showed as his vizier, was became the vizier of the Seljuks in H. 436 (1044-1045) (2008, VIII: 115). Moreover, İkbâl, giving detailed information about Abu'l-Fath Râzî, also recorded that this person resigned after a while by the courtesy of Toghrul Beg (1338: 38).

#### **Abu al-Kasım Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî (Kûbânî=Kûmânî)**

According to Ibn Athir, Ali ibn Abdullah was the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul-Beg ibn Mikail and was appointed to this position in H. 436 (1044-1045) (2008, VIII, 115). However, as can be understood from the above information, it is very difficult to accept this person as the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg. According to İkbâl, this vizier was the same person as Sâlâr Bujkân Abu al-Kasım Kevbânî (Kûbânî) in Ravendî and he was not the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg (1338: 40). However, it is not possible to comply agree with this idea. This person was probably the third vizier of the Seljuks after Sâlâr Bujkân and Abu'l-Fath

<sup>6</sup>Based on the information by Köymen in the mentioned source, before the Battle of Dandanaqan, not only aforesaid vizier and his men, but also many Ghaznavid statesmen turned to Seljuks' side because of the cruelty of Surî, the Amid of Khorasan.

<sup>7</sup>This person is mentioned as Feramerz ibn Alau'd-Devle and was the judge of Isfahan. It is also understood that they were under the rule of Buveyd Dynasty and at war with them around that time (İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 111).

Râzî, and a different person from Sâlâr Bujkân. It is quite obvious that Ikbâl reached this decision because of the fact that in the records of Ravendî, a necessary comma was missing between Sâlâr Bujkân and the other vizier Abu al-Kasîm al-Kevbânî (Kubânî), and this can be quickly understood after a slight evaluation. Now, we will show how we reached this decision by organizing the information in articles about the people reported as the viziers of Sultan Toghrul Beg such as Sâlâr Bujkân, Abu'l-Fath Râzî and Ali ibn Abdullah.

#### Data:

1. Sâlâr Bujkân was appointed as a vizier after the Battle of Dandanaqan in 1040 between Ghaznavids and Seljuks, and he was the first vizier (Zahîreddîn Nişâbûrî, 1390: 18; Ravendî, 1999, I: 102; Hamdullah Müstevfî, 1387: 428; Reşîdeddîn Fazlullah, 2010: 94; Bowen, 2010: 142-143; Agacanova, 2006: 152).
2. Ravendî recorded the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg, Sâlâr Bujkân, as Sâlâr Bujkân'ı Abu al-Kasîm al-Kevbânî. Then reported Abu Ahmed Dehistanî as the second vizier and Amîd al-Mulk Kundurî as the third one (1999, I: 96).
3. Rashîd al-Dîn Fadhl-allâh, utilizing the work of Ravendî, recorded Sâlâr Abu al-Kasîm Büzcânî as the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg and Abu al-Kasîm Kûmânî as the second vizier. Then, recorded Ahmed Dehistanî and Amîd al-Mulk Kundurî as viziers in return (2010: 109).
4. Some sources providing information about Vizier Sâlâr Bujkân, reported this vizier as the same person with Abu al-Kasîm Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî, shown as the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg in the work of Ibn Ahir (Enverî, 1355: 151; Clausner, 1343: 125; Taneri, 1967: 83).
5. Ikbâl recorded that Sâlâr Bujkân Abu al-Kasîm al-Kevbânî in Ravendî was the same person with Abu al-Kasîm Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî in Ibn Ahir (1338: 40).
6. Abu'l-Fath Râzî served as the vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg around 1042-1043 and resigned after a while.<sup>8</sup>
7. The vizier named Ali ibn Abdullah was mentioned as Abu al-Kasîm Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî in Ibn Ahir's work and stated that he was appointed between 1044-1045 as the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg (2008, VIII: 115-116).

#### Result:

- a. Sâlâr Bujkân was the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg (article: 1). Considering the vizier's name mentioned in Ravendî (Sâlâr Bujkân-ı Abu al-Kasîm al-Kevbânî: article: 2), the evaluations of Ikbâl about vizier (article: 5) and other information on vizier in different sources (article: 4), we can conclude that Sâlâr Bujkân is the same person who Ibn Athir pointed to as Abu al-Kasîm Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî (article: 7). However, as a result of this evaluation, we have to admit that the years of Ali ibn Abdullah as vizier in Ibn Ahir (1044-1045, article: 7) are the years when Sâlâr Bujkân was appointed as vizier, which will lead us to the misunderstanding that several authors such as Zahîreddîn Nişâbûrî, Ravendî, Rashîd al-Dîn Fadhl-allâh, Hamdullah Müstevfî, Bowen and Köymen (see article: 1 and its footnote).

---

<sup>8</sup>See the information under the title of Abu'l-Fath Râzî.

- b. If we stick to our view, Sâlâr Bujkân and Abu al-Kasım al-Kevbanî are different people, and Ravendî did not use the necessary comma between these names. Even, noticing this mistake and recording the same viziers as Ravendî, Rashîd al-Dîn Fadhl-allâh differentiated between Abual-Kasım Kûmanî (Kevbânî= Kûbânî in Ravendî), who he copied from Ravendî with a slight mistake, and Sâlâr Bujkân, and by reporting them as different people, he corrected Ravendî's mistake (compare articles 2 and 3).
- c. Kevbânî, who should have recorded as the second vizier in Ravendî, is the same person with the second vizier Kûmanî in Rashîd al-Dîn Fadhl-allâh's work and Cuveynî in Ibn Ahir, and served as vizier during the same years (1044-1045) that Ibn Ahir pointed to. In these sources, they only made relative mistakes (see articles 2. and 7.). If we accept this point of view, we can say that Ibn Ahir, who gave the exact date of the Battle of Dandanaqan as 1040 (2008, VIII: 84) did not make any mistake in this date; however, Ikbâl, who stated that Abu al-Kasım Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî (as recorded in Ibn Ahir) and Sâlâr Bujkân were the same person and hence Sâlâr Bujkân served as vizier between 1044-1045, made an incorrect evaluation. Yet, according to the above mentioned sources, even in Ravendî, who lived before Ibn Ahir and served under Seljuks, Sâlâr Bujkân was the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg during 1040s (article: 1).
- d. As can be understood, both the sources reporting Sâlâr Bujgân as the vizier during 1040s and Ibn Ahir were right about the serving years of the person recorded as Cuveynî (Kevbânî/ Kûmanî in Ravendî and Rashîd al-Dîn). On the other hand, Ikbâl gave the right decision by stating that Kûbânî (Kevbânî) in Ravendî and Cuveynî in Ibn Ahir were the same person, but he made a mistake by stating that Sâlâr Bujkân was also the same person with them. Therefore, other sources, following the same order with Ikbâl, even copying many parts directly from Ikbâl (article: 4) made mistakes by reporting Sâlâr Bujkân as the same person with Cuveynî.
- e. As a result, it is very reasonable to accept that, as a different person from Cuveynî= Kevbânî (Kûbânî), Sâlâr Bujkân was the first vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg (during 1040s article: 1), Abu'l-Fath Râzî was the second vizier (1042-1043, article: 6) and Kevbânî, the same person with Cuveynî, served as vizier after Sâlâr Bujkân and Abu'l-Fath (1044-1045, article: 7).

### **Hâce Mansur Zûzenî**

According to Akîlî, when Toghrul Beg became Sultan, someone named Hâce Mansur Zûzenî served as vizier for Seljuks. This statesman was very wise, beware of Allah, performing prayer every morning and was going to before Sultan Toghrul Beg after the morning prayers. However, information in this source show that Zûzenî was a vizier just at the times when Abu al-Kasım Bujgânî, who was mentioned above as the first vizier of Toghrul Beg, was also a vizier (Akîlî, 1337: 204). In other sources, although it was clearly stated that Bujgânî was the vizier at that time, Zûzenî was not reported as a vizier. Then, this person was not a vizier, but he might be thought to serve in some of the sub-councils of Dîvân-ı Âlâ (such as Dîvân-ı İstîfâ (responsible for finance), Dîvân-ı İnşâ (responsible for correspondence) etc.). Yet, if Akîlî's work is analysed carefully, it can be understood that people who did not actually served as vizier, but were present in the councils as the head were also referred to as vizier, meaning minister. Even such a coincidence is also present in Ikbâl's work (1338).

### **Nizam al-Mulk Abu Ahmed (Muhammad) Dehistanî**

He was recorded as vizier during Sultan Toghrul Beg by many scholars such as Ravendî (1999, I: 96), Rashîd al-Dîn (2010: 109) and Ibn Ahir (2008, VIII: 116<sup>9</sup>). However, he was referred to as Muhammad by Ibn Ahir and as Muhammed by Ravendî and Rashîd al-Dîn. It is obvious that they were the same person. However, we do not know for sure what his right name was Ahmed or Muhammad. In addition, according to Bowen (2010: 147) and İkbâl (1338: 41), in fact he was Muhammad and his full name was Abu Muhammad Hasan ibn Muhammad Dehistanî, as given in Ibn Ahir. There is no accurate record as for the dates of appointment and resignation of this person as vizier.

### **Reîsu'r-Ruesâ Abu Abdullah al-Huseyin (Hasan) ibn Ali ibn Mikâil**

According to Ibn Ahir, this person became a vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg after Abu al-Kasım Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî (2008, VIII: 116). Although he was also reported as a vizier of Seljuks in *Dumyatü'l-Kasr* (Bahârî, 1993: 54) and other works (Clausner, 1343: 125; Bowen, 2010: 145; İkbâl, 1338: 39-40; Taneri, 1967: 83), there is no such evidence in the works of Ravendî (1999, I: 96) and Rashîd al-Dîn (2010: 109). However, in line with the information by Bahârî, who served in the council at the time of this vizier, it is reasonable to accept him as vizier, in our opinion. According to Bowen, this statesman served as a vizier during 1052-1053, just before Amid al-Mulk became a vizier in 1054-1055 (2010: 145). If we consider this information, we can conclude that this person served in the office of vizier just before the last vizier Amid al-Mulk. However, if we consider the information by Ibn Ahir, it is quite obvious that we cannot make such a conclusion. Yet, according to him, this person became a vizier just after Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî serving as vizier during 1044-1045. In this case, we can either assume that this vizier served for a long time and resigned in 1052-1053, then Dehistanî was appointed right after him and dismissed after a while, or, contrary to the information by Ibn Ahir, that after Cuveynî, Dehistanî served as the vizier and then Reîsu'r-Ruesâ Abu Abdullah al-Huseyin (Hasan) ibn Ali ibn Mikâil became the vizier and served until 1054-1055, when Amid al-Mulk became the vizier. However, we have to state that these are only assumptions and a more reliable conclusion is that Dehistanî and Mikâil served as vizier in return before Amid al-Mulk, but it is not known which one preceded.

Apparently, both this statesman and his father served as an officer in the Ghaznavid palace. Even al-Huseyin rose to a position that he could attend the council meetings in the reign of Sultan Mesud ibn Mahmud of Ghazni. During the Battle of Nesa, he was a manciple responsible for logistics in Ghaznavid army, was captured by the Seljuks and was appointed as vizier to Sultan Toghrul Beg. During his time as the vizier, Bahârî, the author of *Dumyat'ül-Kasr*, also served as an officer in Seljuk Dîvân-ı Resâil (193: 574, also see in Bowen, 2010: 145). He was later dismissed from the office of vizier and served as the head of Dîvân-ı İnşâ and Resâil of Sultan Toghrul Beg, when Amid al-Mulk was the vizier (İkbâl, 1338: 40).

### **Amîd al-Mulk Kundurî (Amîd al-Mulk Abu Nasr Mansur ibn Muhammad al- Kundurî)**

Kundurî was recorded as the vizier of Sultan Toghrul Beg in many sources (Hüseynî, 1999: 16; Bundarî, 1999: 7; İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 115-116; Mîrhând, 1339, IV: 263; Hândmîr, 1317: 148-149; Ahmed b. Lütfullah, 2000, I: 32 etc.). However, there are different information as to when he was appointed as the vizier and how many years he served. In the

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibn Ahir also stated in the same page that this person was the first vizier to use title Nizam al-Mulk.



works of Bundarî (1999: 7) and Ahmed bin Lutfallah (Chief Astrologer) (2000, I: 32), Amîd al-Mulk was recorded as the first vizier of Toghrul Beg, and he was referred to as the fourth and last vizier of the Sultan by Ibn Ahir (2008, VIII: 116), Ravendî (1999, I: 96) (if we consider Kevbânî and Sâlâr Bujkân as the same person) and Rashîd al-Dîn (2010: 109). However, as can be understood from the below stated sources, he is definitely the last vizier of Toghrul Beg.

It is understood that Amîd al-Mulk Kunderî, who was appointed as vizier during 1054-1055 (Bowen, 2010: 148; İkbâl, 1338: 37; Köymen, 1976: 93) entered under Toghrul Beg's service after the Battle of Dandanaqan (1040). According to records, Sultan Toghrul Beg came to Nishapur after this battle and needed someone good at Arabic, thus appointed Amîd al-Mulk as his clerk on the recommendation of Imam al-Muvaffak al-Bastâmî (Bundarî, 1999: 29-30; İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 230; Özgüdenli, 2013: 88). Apparently, he was fluent in Persian, Arabic, Turkic and Indian languages (Azzavi, 1940: 262;<sup>10</sup> Özgüdenli, 2013: 88).

Kunderî, as a son of Kunder *dihkans* (major landlords) (Hüseynî, 1999: 16), was reflected as a wise, speaking fluently, serious and virtuous man (Bundarî, 1999: 7; İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 230-231). However, according to the records, this vizier of high standing before the Sultan was either castrated by the Sultan Alp Arslan or castrated himself.<sup>11</sup>

Amîd al-Mulk, recorded to serve for 8 years as vizier (Bundarî, 1999: 29) in some sources, while for 10 years (Akîlî, 1337: 206) in other sources, delivered khutbah in the name of Suleiman ibn Chaghri (Dawud) Beg, the heir to the crown, and became the vizier of this new Sultan. However, realising that Melik Alp Arslan ibn Chaghri, who was very strong at that time, would take over the throne, the vizier delivered the khutbah in the capital city Rey in the name of Sultan Alp Arslan and when he became the sultan, he started to serve as the vizier of this new sultan (Sibt İbnü'l-Cevzî, 2011: 125-128; Bundarî, 1999: 24-27; İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 228).<sup>12</sup>

As was in the short reign of Suleiman ibn Chaghri (September 1063-October 1063), it is understood that Amîd al-Mulk did not serve for long in the reign of Sultan Alp Arslan /October 1063-November 1072).<sup>13</sup> Thus, as a result of the influence of Nizam al-Mulk, who

<sup>10</sup>According to Ibn Hassul, then vizier Amîd al-Mulk translated and explained the epistle he wrote for Sultan Toghrul and Amîd al-Mulk.

<sup>11</sup>According to a record in Ahbâr, Alp Arslan sent Amîd al-Mulk as an envoy to ask for Khwarazm Shah's girl in marriage with the Sultan. However, as to a rumour in the public and as the Sultan heard, Amîd al-Mulk asked for the girl in marriage with himself and he got married. Upon this, Sultan Alp Arslan order Him to be castrated and thus this order for the vizier was followed (Hüseynî, 1999: 16). According to another story, Sultan Toghrul Beg sent him as an envoy to ask for a girl in marriage with the Sultan. However, Amîd al-Mulk married her and rose against the Sultan. Upon this, the Sultan castrated him, but did not dismiss him from his position. Another story tells that this was a rumour spread by the enemies of the vizier during Sultan Toghrul Beg. Vizier thought that the sultan would kill him and castrated himself. (İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 231). However, it is more reasonable to admit that this vizier was castrated during the reign of Sultan Toghrul Beg, not Sultan Alp Arslan. Likewise, in Zubdetü'n-Nusra, providing substantial information about Seljuks, the aforementioned vizier was recorded as castrated during the reign of Sultan Toghrul Beg (Bundarî, 1999: 29).

<sup>12</sup> According to the records in Zubdetü'n-Nusra and Mir'atü'z-Zamân, during the short reign of Suleiman ibn Chaghri, the riot of one of the other Seljuk heir to throne, Qutalmish, played a role in the delivering of the khutbah in the name of Alp Arslan. Accordingly, knowing that he would not be able to quell the riot of Qutalmish, delivered the khutbah in the name of Alp Arslan and recognized him as the Sultan in order to quell the riot of Qutalmish with his help and continue serving as the vizier under his serve.

<sup>13</sup>Suleiman ibn Chaghri remained on the throne for a month as the khutbah was delivered in his name. This heir to throne, in whose name the khutbah was delivered in September 1063 after Sultan Toghrul's death, had to leave the throne to his brother Alp Arslan in October 1063 (Sevim-Merçil, 2014: 60-61, 94, 97). Other sources

was with the Sultan Alp Arslan since his melikdom,<sup>14</sup> the Sultan arrested Amîd al-Mulk in H. 456 (1063-1064) (Bundarî, 1999: 28). The vizier, known to be in jail for some time, was killed in the same year in Dhu al-Hijjah (in Hijri Calendar -corresponds to November-December in the Gregorian Calendar of that time) when he was over 40 years old (Ravendî, 1999, I: 115-116; İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 230-231).<sup>15</sup>

It is understood that the next vizier Nizam al-Mulk played a great role in his death. Some sources clearly state this situation (Hândmîr, 1317: 149). We can see this in the words of Amîd al-Mulk, which he told his executioner to convey his message to Nizam al-Mulk and Sultan Alp Arslan. According to the records, his words are as follows:

*"Tell the Sultan that: This is what a blessed and pleasant service that you are doing to me! You uncle (Sultan Toghrul Beg) gave this world to me in order to rule; now you have given me the hereafter and made me a martyr. Tell the vizier (Nizam al-Mulk) that: You have brought a bad bid'ah (innovation) and shameful rule to this world. I hope that you shall experience this practice by yourself and by your children."*<sup>16</sup>

As a result, Amîd al-Mulk served for nearly 20 years under Sultan Toghrul Beg (Hândmîr, 1317: 149) and brought perfection to the Seljuk Empire, but he was beheaded by a sword and murdered. His head (skull) was removed from his body and sent to Nizam al-Mulk in a pack. The remaining from his head (other than the skull) was buried in Nishapur, and the rest of his body (except for his testicles) was buried in Kondor. His testicles were buried in Khwarezm when he was cascaded (İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 230-231).

## Conclusion

The office of vizier was established in Seljuk Empire, in the reign of first Sultan Toghrul-Beg ibn Mikâil. In this period, totally six people were assigned as vizier and served for the Seljuk Empire. The first three of them were Abu al-Kasm Sâlâr Bujkân, Abu'l-Fath Râzî and Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî, in return. After Ali ibn Abdullah Cuveynî, Nizam al-Mulk Abû Ahmed (Muhammad) Dehistanî and Reîsu'r-Ruesâ Abû Abdullah al-Huseyin (Hasan) ibn Ali ibn Mikâil were assigned to the office of vizier, however their exact order is unknown. The last vizier of the period was Amîd al-Mulk Kundurî. The first vizier served approximately from 1040 to 1042-1043, the second from 1042-1043 to 1044-1045. It is not known how long the third vizier, appointed around 1044-1045, served in that position. The fourth and fifth viziers were appointed before 1054-1055; however their exact dates of duties are unknown. Sixth and the last vizier Amîd al-Mulk was appointed as vizier around 1054-1055 and dismissed and killed around 1063-1064.

---

also confirm that Suleiman ibn Chaghri was the sultan for a short time (Köymen, 1993: 65, 100; Sümer, 2009: 371).

<sup>14</sup>This person was the famous Seljuk vizier Nizam al-Mulk Abu Ali ibn Hasan ibn Ishak.

<sup>15</sup>The year when vizier Amîd al-Mulk was killed was given as H. 456, but the month was not stated. The month Dhu al-Hijjah is mentioned in the same place where we referred to Ibn Ahir. Contrary to these sources, in Ahbâr, the year of death of the vizier was recorded as H. 459 (Hüseynî, 1999: 18). In the records in al-Muntazam, it was stated that he died in H. 457=1065) ("İbnü'l-Cevzî'nin el-Muntazam Adlı Eserindeki Selçuklularla İlgili Bilgiler (H. 430-485=1038-1092)": 42).

<sup>16</sup> With slight difference, these words are mentioned nearly in all sources (Hüseynî, 1999: 18; Ravendî, 1999, I: 116; İbnü'l-Esîr, 2008, VIII: 231; Akilî, 1337: 206-207).

## Conflict of Interest

The author has not declared any conflicts of interest.

## Author's Address

Özgür TOKAN:

Bahçeli Evler mah. Bahar cad. Yalçın Duran Ap. No: 2 Daire: 6

Merkez/ Çorum -Türkiye

Tel: 0553 223 80 88

Email: [ozgurtokan@hotmail.com](mailto:ozgurtokan@hotmail.com)

## REFERENCES

Agacanov SG (2006). *Selçuklular*. E. N. Necef- A. R. Annaberdiyev (Çev.), İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

Ahmed b. Lütfullah (2000). *Câmiu'd-Düvel –Selçuklular Tarihi: I (Horasan, Irak, Kirman ve Suriye Selçukluları)*. Ali Öngül (Çev.), İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi.

Akîlî, Seyfeddîn Hacî b. Nizâm Akîlî (1337 Hş.). *Âsaru'l-Vüzerâ*. Mîr Celaleddîn Hüseyinî Urmevî (Nşr.), Tahran: Çaphâne-i Dânişgâh.

Azzavî A. (1940). “İbni Hassul’ün Türkler Hakkında Bir Eseri. Şerefeddin Yaltkaya”. (Çev.), *Belleten*, (IV/14-15, 235-266). Ankara: TTK.

Bâharzî, Ebu'l-Kasım Ali b. el-Hasan b. Ali b. ebi't-Tayyib. (1993). *Dumyatü'l-Kasr ve 'Usret-u Ehli'l 'Asr*. Muhammed et- Tüncî (Nşr.), Beyrut: Dâru'l-Cilt.

Beyhakî, Ebu'l-Fazl Muhammed b. El-Hasan (1389 Hş.). *Tarih-i Beyhakî*. Azîzullah Alizâde (Nşr.), (3.Baskı), Tahran: İntişarat-ı Firdevsî.

Bowen H (2010). “Bazı Erken Dönem Selçuklu Vezirleri Hakkında Notlar”. Mustafa Alican (Çev.), *TOD (Tarih Okulu Dergisi)*, (VIII, 141-149). İzmir.

Bundarî (1999), *Zubdetun-Nusra ve Nuhbatül-Usra (Irak ve Horasan Selçukluları Tarihi)*, Kıvameddin Burslan (Çev.), (2. Baskı), Ankara: TTK.

Christensen AE (1387 Hş.). *L'Iran sous les sassanides (İrân der Zemân-i Sâsânîyân)*. Reşîd Yasemî (Çev.). Tahran: İntişârât-ı Zerîn.

Clausner CL (1343 Hş.). *Dîvânsalarî der 'Ahd-i Selcûkî (Vezâret der 'Ahd-i Selcûkî)*. Yakub Ajend (Çev.), Tahran: İntişârât-ı Emîr Kebîr.

*el-Muncid fi'l-Lugative'l-Alâm*. (1973). (26. Baskı), Beyrut: Daru'l-Meşrik.

Enverî H (1355 Hş.). *Istılahat-ı Dîvânî Dovre-i Gaznevî ve Selcûkî*. Tahran: Kitaphâne-i Tahûrî.

Goitein SD (2010). “Vezir Teriminin Kökeni Üzerine, Kazım Uzun (Çev.)”. *TOD (Tarih Okulu Dergisi)*, (VII, 161-163). İzmir.

Göksu E (2011). “Târîh-i Güzîde'ye Göre Selçuklu Devletinin Kuruluşu ve Tuğrul Bey Dönemi”. *HS (History School)*, III/1, 289-300.

- Hamdullah Müstevfî, Hamdullah b. Ebî Bekr b. Ahmed b. Nasr Müstevfî-yi Kazvinî (1387 Hş.). *Târîh-i Güzîde*. Abdülhüseyin Nevayî (Nşr.), Tahran: İntişârat-ı Emîr Kebîr.
- Hândmîr, Gıyaseddîn Hândmîr Muhammed b. Hamîdeddîn Mirhând (1317 Hş.). *Düstûru'l-Vüzerâ*, Sa'îd Nefisî (Nşr.), Tahran: Eqbâl.
- Hasan İH (1985). *Siyasî-Dinî-Kültürel ve Sosyal İslâm Tarihi I-VI*, İ. Yiğit, Sadreddin Gümüş ve diğeri (Çev.), İstanbul: Kayihan.
- Hüeynî, Sadreddîn Ebu'l-Hasan Ali b. Nâsır b. Ali (1999). *Ahbârü'd-Devleti's-Selçukiyye*, Necati Lügal (Çev.), (2. Baskı), Ankara: TTK.
- İbn Haldun, Ebu Zeyd Abdurrahman b. Haldun (2005), *Mukaddime I-II*, Süleyman Uludağ (Çev.), (4. Basım), İstanbul: Dergah.
- “İbnü'l-Cevzî'nin el-Muntazam Adlı Eserindeki Selçuklularla İlgili Bilgiler (H. 430-485=1038-1092)”, (2005). Ali Sevim (Çev.), *Belgeler*, (XXVI/30, 1-84. Ankara: TTK.
- İbnü'l-Esîr, İzzeddîn Ebû'l-Hasan Ali b. Muhammed el-Cezerî (2008). *el-Kâmil fi't-Târîh (el-Kâmil Fî't-Târîh Tercümesi) I-X*, Ahmet Ağırakça, Beşir Eryarsoy ve diğeri (Çev.), İstanbul: Hikmet Neşriyat.
- İkbal A (1338 Hş.). *Vezâret der 'Ahd-i Selâtîn-i Bozorg-u Selcûkî*, Muhammed Takî Danişpejuh-Yahya Zoka (Nşr.). Tahran: İntişârât-ı Danişgâh-ı Tahran.
- Kazıcı Z (2003). *İslâm Medeniyeti ve Müesseseleri Tarihi*, (5. Baskı), İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi).
- Köprülü MF (2004). *Bizans Müesseselerinin Osmanlı Müesseselerine Tesiri*, Orhan Köprülü (Yayına Hazırlayan), (2. Baskı), Ankara: Akçağ.
- Köymen MA (1976). *Tuğrul Bey ve Zamanı*. İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı.
- (1993). *Selçuklu Devri Türk Tarihi*, (2. Baskı), Ankara: TTK.
- (2011). *Büyük Selçuklu İmparatorluğu Tarihi I –Kuruluş Devri-*, (4. Baskı), Ankara: TTK.
- Mâverdî, Ali b. Muhammed b. Habîb Ebi'l-Hasanî'l-Mâverdî. (1976). *el-Ahkâmü's-Sultaniyye*, Ali Şafak (Çev.), İstanbul: Bedir.
- Mîrhând, Mîr Muhammed b. Seyyîd Burhâneddîn Havendşâh (1339 Hş.). *Târîh-i Ravzatü's-Safâ I-XI*, Tahran: Çap-ı Pîrûz.
- Muin M (1353 Hş: Hicri Şemsi). *Ferheng-i Farsî I-V*. Tahran: İntişârât-ı Emîr. Kebir.
- Özgüdenli OG (2013). *Selçuklular I –Büyük Selçuklular Devleti Tarihi- (1040-1157)*, İstanbul: İSAM.
- Ravendî (1999), *Rahat-üs-Sudûr ve Âyet-üs-Sürûr I-II*, Ahmed Ateş (Çev.), (2. Baskı), Ankara: TTK.
- Reşideddîn Fazlullah, İbn-i İmâdüddeve Ebû'l-Fazl b. Ebû'l-Hayr Hemedânî (2010). *Camiü't-Tevarih, (Selçuklu Devleti)*, Erkan Göksu-H. Hüseyin Güneş (Çev.), İstanbul: Selenge.
- Sevim A, Merçil E (2014). *Selçuklu Devletleri Tarihi (Siyaset, Teşkilât ve Kültür)*. (2. baskı), Ankara: TTK.

- Sıbt İbnü'l-Cevzî, Ebû'l-Muzaffer Yusûf b. Kızıoğlu (2011). *Mir'atü'z- Zamân fî Târîhi'l-Âyân -Mir'atü'z-Zamân fî Târîhi'l-Âyân'da Selçuklular-*, Ali Sevim (Çev.), Ankara: TTK.
- Sümer F (2009). “Selçuklular (Kuruluş ve Büyük Selçuklular)”. *DİA*, (XXXVI, 365-371). İstanbul.
- Tahsin H (1986). “Vezîr”. *İA (İslâm Ansiklopedisi)*, (XIII, 309-314). İstanbul: MEB (Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı).
- Taneri A (1967). “Büyük Selçuklu İmparatorluğu'nda Vezirlik”. *TAD (Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi)*, (V/8-9, 75-187). Ankara.
- Tokan Ö (2015). *Büyük Selçuklular ve Irak Selçukluları'nda Dîvân-ı Âlâ*. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Uzunçarşılı İH (1988). *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtına Medhal*. (4. Baskı), Ankara: TTK (Türk Tarih Kurumu).
- Üçok B (1983). *İslâm Tarihi –Emeviler, Abbasiler*. (2. Baskı), Ankara: MEB.
- Zahîreddîn Nişâbûrî (1390 Hş.). *Selçûknâme*, Mirzâ İsmail 'Afşâr-Muhammed Ramazânî (Nşr.), Tahran: İntişârat-ı Esâtîr.
- Zahoder B (1955). “Selçuklu Devletinin Kuruluşu Sırasında Horasan”. İsmail Kaynak (Çev.), *Bellekten*, (XIX/76, 491-527). Ankara: TTK
- Zeydân C (2009=I, 2012=II). *İslâm Uygarlıkları Tarihi I-II*. Nejdet Gök (Çev.), İstanbul: İletişim.