

A POSSIBLE FĀṬIMID BACKGROUND TO THE BATTLE
OF MANZIKERT

by Abbas HAMDANI

(Milwaukee)

The Battle of Manzikert¹ in 463/1071 is an important land-mark in history in so far as it resulted in two important processes—the gradual settlement of the Turks in Asia Minor (along with the Islamisation of the heart-lands of Byzantium), and the beginning of a Byzantine desire to open its territories to western European powers for the launching of the Crusades. The causes of the battle are equally important. First of all, there was the constant conflict between Byzantium and the central Muslim power, aggravated by the arrival of Turkish tribes and the rise of the Saljūqs in the eleventh century. Second, the Armenian territories played a significant role in providing a setting for this conflict. But one aspect of Manzikert which has never been emphasized, though not altogether neglected, is the active Fāṭimid foreign policy connected with frustrating the rise of the Saljūqs in the East. It is this last aspect which I wish to isolate for discussion in the following pages, not so much to contribute new information as to furnish a re-interpretation indicating possible Fāṭimid machinations behind the Battle of Manzikert.²

Byzantium and the Central Muslim Power.

Much has been written about the relations between Byzantium and the Arabs (beginning shortly before Islam and in Muslim history) down to the

1 The name is spelled Mantzikert or Manzikert in western sources; Manāzgard, Malāzgirt in Muslim sources.

2 A full bibliography at the end of this article is given only to illustrate the many-sided complexity of the subject. However, due to the limited scope of this article it has been used here only in a selective manner.

The references below are abbreviated as given in the bibliographical index.

'Abbāsīd period by scholars such as Brooks,³ Vasiliev,⁴ Wellhausen,⁵ Canard⁶ and Gibb.⁷ Canard⁸ has continued with a discussion of these relations in the Ḥamdānīd period, while Laurent⁹ and Cahen¹⁰ have given us the Turco-Byzantine picture. The Caucasian background has been provided by Toumanoff.¹¹ A vast variety of sources-Islamic, Greek, Armenian and Syrian have been used by these writers. The story that emerges from their labors is too long and not immediately relevant. Yet a summary is given in the notes for convenient reference.¹² There are certain salient features of their presentation, however,

3 Brooks: *Asia Minor; Byz. -Arabs.*

4 Vasiliev: *Byz.-Arabes; Episodes.*

5 Wellhausen: *Kämpfe; Arab Kingdom.*

6 Canard: *Expeditions; 'A-coté'.*

7 Gibb: *Relations.*

8 Canard: *Ḥamdānides; Ḥamdānids-E.I.*

9 Laurent: *Byz. et Turcs.*

10 Cahen: *Mantzikert; Turkey*, among other titles mentioned in the index.

11 Toumanoff: *Background.*

12 The story begins with the M'uta campaign in 8/629 when Prophet Muḥammad for the first time changed his hitherto friendly attitude towards Byzantium by mounting an expedition to meet the invading forces led by Heraclius. This was the prelude to the conquest of Mecca and the debut in Islam of Khālīd b. Walīd's career. Many Byzantine positions in Syria were taken in the last years of the Prophet's life. The wars of conquest in the time of Caliph 'Umar took away two of Byzantium's best provinces-Egypt and Syria. Mu'āwīya, then as governor of Syria took Cyprus in 29/649. 'Abdullah and then 'Amr as governors of Egypt conquered Byzantine territory in North Africa namely the Pentapolis (Barqa) region and reached Carthage (Qayrawān). A Syro-Egyptian fleet engaged a Byzantine fleet of 500 ships under Constans II off the Lycian coast in 35/655. After assuming the title of Caliph, Mu'āwīya sent under his son Yazīd an expedition toward Constantinople in 48-49/668-669. With this the interesting legend of Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī and his combat and burial near the walls of the city are connected. The year 52/672 saw the conquest of Rhodes or Cyzique depending on the interpretation of the name "Arwād". At the end of Mu'āwīya's reign a seven year's campaign (54-60/674-680) is reported which could have been continuous border engagements, till events in Arabia suspended it for the time as soon as the Caliph 'Abdal-Malik raised his head from the involvement against the rebel Ibn Zubayr, he resumed in 73/692 the struggle against Byzantium. Justinian II was defeated at Sebastapolis. Tyana in Cappadocia was taken in 89/707 at the beginning of Walīd I's reign. Again during the period of the great Muslim conquests in the time of Walīd I preparations for a campaign against Constantinople began in 95/713, continued with the capture of Sardis and Pergamon and culminated in the siege of the city in 98/716 in the time of Caliph Sulaymān by his brother, Maslama. Although the internal condition of the Caliphate demanded Muslim withdrawal, many legends are woven round this campaign, namely the supposed entry of Maslama in Constantinople and the building of a mosque there. Hishām's time brewed with revolt and although he had resumed war with the Byzantines, no headway could be made. The Muslim lands were now engulfed in the sweeping 'Abbāsīd revolution and Byzantium got its respite once again.

The situation of Armenia is of special significance (cf. Toumanoff: *Background*, Grousset: *Arménie*; Charanis: *Byz. Eleventh Cent.*). It was the Persian recruiting ground in its wars with Ancient Greece and Byzantine recruiting ground against later day Persia. Despite the Peace of Rhandia in 63 A.D. it remained the bone of contention between Byzantium and the Sāsānid Irān and later between Byzantium and Islam. Mu 'āwīya's General Ḥabīb al-Fihri had occupied it in 24/644-5 but it was lost to the Muslims shortly after the death of the Caliph, when civil war broke out in Arabia. After the second 'Abbāsīd Caliph Maṣū'ir consolidated his position against the rebels in Ḥijāz, 'Iraq and Persia, Armenia again became the battleground between Byzantium and Islam. The ruined border fortresses of Melitene and Massisah were restored and even Baku is reported to have been reached. During the time of his successor Maḥdī, the latter's son Hārūn led an expedition against Constantinople in 166/782 and reaching the Bosphorus, a treaty was concluded by which Queen Irene on behalf of her minor son Constantine VI agreed to pay a large semi-annual tribute. Hārūn received from his father the title of ar-Raṣhīd as a result of his conduct of this campaign. On Nicephorus I's repudiation of the treaty, Hārūn, now as Caliph sent an expedition that resulted in the capture of Tyana and Heraclea, and the re-imposition of the tribute. Hārūn's exchange of friendly embassies with Charlemagne was based on their common hostility to both Umayyad Spain and Byzantium. Hārūn's son Ma'mūn personally commanded a campaign against Theophilus (829-42) but died enroute at Tarsus in 218/833. The next Caliph Mu'taṣim continued the expedition and succeeded in taking Amorium in 225/839. From his time, the Caliphate entered its Sāmarrā phase dominated by the Turkish Amīrs al-Umarā', too much involved in its internal affairs to be able to continue its hostilities against Byzantium.

However, in another area of Byzantine influence - the Mediterranean, the Aghlabid dynasty (184-296/800-909) of North Africa took up on behalf of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate, a struggle that resulted in their occupation of Sicily. The reduction of this important Byzantine island began in 217/827 in the time of the third Aghlabid ruler Ziyādat Allah I and was completed in 287/900 by the capture of Palermo and Reggio in the time of the ninth Aghlabid ruler Ibrāhīm II. In the meantime Malta was acquired in 255/868. (cf. Talbi: *Aghlabides*; Marçais: *Aghlabids-E. I. 2*)

The 'Abbāsīd Caliphate had returned to Baghdād from Sāmarrā in 279/892, but was still in the grip of the Amīrs al-Umara. In the meantime many petty dynasties in the West as well as in the East had become autonomous. What is more, rival Caliphate of the Fāṭimids had been instituted in North Africa in 297/909 with a vigorous mission and an expanding empire. At the centre the Būyids, a Persian dynasty, although of Shi'ite persuasion, had replaced the Turkish Amīrs al-Umara and dominated the affairs of the Caliphs at Baghdad. (Kabir: *Buw. Dyn.*; Cahen: *Buwayhids-E. I. 2*)

This was a period of utter weakness of the Central Caliphate but coincided with a great revival and resurgence of Byzantine authority under its Macedonian Dynasty. The brunt of the Byzantine attack was born by the Ḥamdānīds (293-394/905-1004) of Syria and the Fāṭimīds of North Africa and Egypt. Aleppo in the hands of the Ḥamdānīd ruler Sayfad-Dawla (333-356/945-967) was the base of almost yearly campaign in Asia Minor. However, Nicephorus Phocas, in 350/961 a Byzantine General, succeeded in taking Aleppo and punishing the town with a massacre. He retired within nine days. On his becoming Emperor two years later many territories in Cilicia were recovered and Cyprus reconquered. In 358/969, the last year of his reign, the important religious center of Antioch was taken (about the same time as the Fāṭimīd

that could be noted here. The Muslim war against Byzantium was continuous and was only interrupted in times of civil war, as for example during the wars of Ridda, the war between 'Alī and Mu'āwiya, the war of 'Abd Allah b. Zubayr against Yazīd, Marwān and 'Abd al-Malik, the period of the change-over from the Umayyad to 'Abbāsīd rule and the involvement of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate with provincial and central Amīrs. Second, despite the war, the rulers of Byzantium and Islam had numerous occasions to exchange gifts and courtesies and to promote commercial pursuits.¹³ Third, both the Muslim ḡhāzīs and the Byzantine akrites believed in the necessity of a holy war, a doctrine which was generated by centuries of incessant conflict, making it difficult for any Muslim ruler to declare alliance or friendship with Byzantium. One could manage, however, with a truce. Moreover, there was never a wholesale crusade or *jihād* but fighting for border fortresses and booty. Such a situation was not desperate. It became so only in the eleventh, when the great flood of Turkish tribes began to spill over Asia Minor. A similar movement of the Arab bedouin tribes (the Hilālī migration) was sweeping over North Africa at about the same time, and we shall see the connection between the two presently.

The Turkish tribes and the Rise of the Saljūqs:

Turks had played an important part in Middle Eastern politics before the advent of the Saljūqs¹⁴ and even constituted independant dynasties such as the Ikḡshīdids. The Arab scholar Jāḡiz devoted a *Risāla* to their praise.¹⁵ But with them we are not concerned here. The advent of the Turkish tribes in the eleventh century was epoch-making and the subject is discussed at

occupation of Egypt) and it remained in Byzantine hands until 477/1084. Aleppo under Sa'd ad-Dawla had to sign a humiliating treaty. Emperor John Tzimiscēs (969-76) may have envisaged the conquest of Jerusalem but was deterred by the Fāṭimid entry in Syria and the Ḥamdānid allegiance to them (see Paul walker: The so-called Crusade of John Tzimiscēs, paper given at the 6th Conference on Medieval Studies, Western Michigan University, may, 1971). Basil II (976-1025) campaigned in Syria against the Fāṭimids but had to sign a ten-year truce with them in 388/998 and that ushered in an entirely new relationship of peaceful co-existence between the two empires that endured for more than 70 years (with interruptions and provocations of course!) till the Battle of Manzikert.

13 Gibbs: *Relations*, pp. 55-60.

14 Aydın Sayıt: *Turks in the Middle East before the Saljuqs*, J. A. O. S., 1943.

15 Al-Jāḡiz: *Risāla fī manāqīb at-Turk wa 'āmmat jund al-Kḡhilāfa* in Tria Opuscula, ed. Van Vloten, Leiden, 1903. Cf. Bosworth: *The Ḡhaznawids*, pp. 206, 209, where other writers like Ibn Hawqal and Ibn Ḥassūl are also cited.

length by Cahen in two articles,¹⁶ also previously by Laurent¹⁷ and Mukrimin Halil.¹⁸ The tribes mentioned are: the *Qinīq*, from whom the Saljūqs were derived (on the authority of Maḥmūd Kāshgharī and the *Malik-nāma*); the *Döger* in the Kurdish region, to whom belonged the later day Artūqids (on the authority of Vardan and Jazarī); the *salghūr*, who gave their name to a 12th century dynasty in Fārs, but arrived early alongside with the Saljūqs (on the authority of the 16th century *Shīrāz-nāma*); the *Ivālī* in the Adherbaijan-Armenian region who figure at the end of the 12th century when under the name of *Yārūqī* they were transplanted near Aleppo by the Zangī (on the authority of I. Ath, Rāwandī, Imād ad-Dīn and Nasawī, but Cahen thinks they came early in the eleventh century); the *Avshār*, who were a significant tribe in Khūzistān region in the late 12th century (on the authority of Köprülü's article *Avşar* in the Turkish Encycl. of Islam, but Cahen thinks they arrived earlier).

More relevant to our story are the tribes that entered Anatolia. Yāziji-Oghlū (ed. Houtsma) repeatedly mentions the *Qai*, the *Bāyāt*, the *Bayundūr* and the *Sālūr* (Salghūr) but Cahen eliminates the information on the ground that they figured much later and that Yāziji mentioned them as a matter of style since these peoples were the four pillars of Saljūq power. We are not concerned here with the Aghatsḥeri (mentioned by Bar Habraeus, Ibn Bībī, Ibn Shaddād etc.) which belong to a much later Mongol period.

The one tribe that figured early in Anatolia, that remained in Anatolia (settled later in the northwest region) and that played a part in the events prior to the Battle of Manzikert was called variously the *Nāvūkī*, *Yāvukī*, *Nārūkī* or *Bādukī* (because in the Arabic letter "n" the change of dots would result in "y", or "b"; whereas "r" and "v" could also be confused). Cahen has pointed out, however, that the name could come from the Kḥwarazmian *Nav-qi* (*Tribus*, p. 186). The Saljūqs, it is well known, had settled in Kḥwarazmian territory before their occupation of Kḥrāsān, and that Chaghri and Tughril had married a Kḥwarazmian lady. (Same) Tughril's sister Jawhar Kḥātūn was married to Arisighī¹⁹ (or Erisgen) who was the muqaddam (leader) of the Nāvūkī. Shortly after the Battle of Manzikert, the leader of the Nāvūkī was Atsīz b. Uvaq, again Kḥwarazmian.²⁰

16. Cahen: *Penetration Turque* (1948); and *Tribus* (1950).

17. Laurent: *Byz. et Turcs* (1914).

18. Mukrimin: *Turkiye Tarihi* (1934).

19. He is Chrysosculos in Bryennius *Commentari* 32 and 117.

20. Sibḥ: *Mir'āt* in Amedroz ed. of I. Qal.: *Dhayl* pp. 98-99.

Bayhaqī (d. 470/1077), who was contemporary to the early migration of Turks westwards, in his *Ta'rikh Mas'ūdi*,²¹ has a chapter on K̄hwarazm where he repeatedly talks of two Turkish families or tribes who had come to that area, viz. Saljūqiyān and Yināliyān. It is generally accepted that Ibrāhīm Yināl was a half-brother of Tugh̄ril and therefore the separate identity of the Yinālī is ignored. But it appears that the Yinālī were just as much a separate group as the Nāvukī, connected by marriage with the Saljūqs, and like the latter entered Anatolia and claimed to be the Mawālī Amīr al-Mu'mīnīn (the clients of the Caliph).²² They are also referred to as Yagh̄mūriān, and Qiziliyān²³. Cahen²⁴ states that Ibrāhīm's mother had later married Tugh̄ril's father Mikā'il or that Mikā'il's widow had married Ibrāhīm's father. Thus Tugh̄ril and Ibrāhīm were half-brothers. This is in keeping with most of the sources. However, much confusion has arisen on the name Yūsuf. (i) According to some he is the father of Ibrāhīm.²⁵ (ii) According to others he is the fourth son of Saljūq²⁶ (the other three being Arslan=Isrā'il, Mūsa and Mikā'il) and (iii) still according to others he is Saljūq's grandson Yūsuf b. Mūsa.²⁷ (iv) Yūsuf (or Yūnus) is also the father of Arīsighī mentioned above, according to one version.²⁸ It is quite possible that there were several individuals called Yūsuf, and that this is the cause of confusion among our sources. Synthesising the genealogy,²⁹ Cahen arrives at: Ibrāhīm b. Yūsuf Yināl b. Mūsa b. Seljūq, which would place him a generation below Tugh̄ril and would not in that case make him his half brother. The purpose in going into this discussion here has been to maintain that Yināliya were a separate tribal group.³⁰ Two factors bear this out: Bayhaqī's referring to them as separate from Saljūqs and the word Yināl applied to both Ibrāhīm and his father Yūsuf, as a group or tribal designation. We will notice later Ibrāhīm's initial support to Tugh̄ril and later defiance of him, in collusion with the Fātimids.

21 Ed. by Sa'īd Naffisī, Teheran, 1940-53, Vol. III, pp. 829, 830, 837.

22 *Ibid.*, pp. 582, 863.

23 *Idem.*

24 Cahen: *Malik-Nameh*, p. 58.

25 I. J. *Muntazam*, VIII, 114.

26. *Ta'rikh Āl Saljūq* in Cahen: *Malik-nāmeḥ*, p. 58.

27 By virtue of Cahen's identification of this Yūsuf b. Mūsa (mentioned in Rāwandī) as Yūsuf Yināl.

28 *Zahīr ad-Dīn Nishāpūrī* group of historians, according to Cahen: *Malik-Nāmeḥ*, p. 58.

29 Cahen: *ibid.*

30 Genealogical reconstructions: (See Chart at the end of the notes).

Many of these tribes that flooded Asia Minor from the east belonged to the Oghuz Turkic confederation, who are called by the Arabic sources Ghuzz. However, there were other tribes of the Ghuzz that had descended on Byzantium from the north and on the Balkan frontiers since 1065. These were known to Byzantine historians³¹ as *Uzes*. Charanis³² says, "The Uzes are merely the Oghuz in Byzantine form, but the distinction is useful in separating those who crossed the Russian steppe from those who crossed the Persian plateau." The Ghuzz, however, were not the first Turkish tribes that Byzantium had to cope with. Since the ninth century thousands of Pechenegs (or Patzinaks)³³ and Kumans had crossed the Danube into Byzantine territory and it took much tact and diplomacy by that state to keep them in check.

A distinction has been made by Cahen³⁴ between the autonomous Turkish tribes and those under the control of the Saljūq sultāns - the former were predatory, the latter disciplined regular army; the former had plunder, booty and ransom in mind, the latter pursued political ends. But the distinction is very thin. How can we classify Ibrāhīm Yināl's raids in Armenia of 440/1048 as predatory and Tughril's campaign of 446/1054 as regular?³⁵ Again how can we make a distinction between the activities of Arīsīghī, leader of the Navūkīya and those of Sultān Alp Arslān's protégé Afshīn, both prior to the Battle of Manzikert?³⁶ Booty and ransom-money formed an important item in the Sultān's budget and was used for political purposes. But the more important factor is that of migration. The Middle East was overflowing with newly arrived Turkish tribes, who may have been nomadic to begin with but were definitely in search of a new home and not just grazing grounds for their animals. Their rapaciousness was only a passing phase. The ethnic-religious opposition of both the Fāṭimid and the Byzantine states emanated not from fear of the Turks as such, but from the fear of the settlement of this new element. The eagerness of the 'Abbāsīd invitation to the Saljūqs was not so

31 eg. Cedrenus - Skylitzes, *Hist.* II, 654.

32 Charanis: *Byz-Eleventh Cent.*, p. 185, note 6.

33 See Valilievsky: *Patzinaks* and McCartney: *Pechenegs* pp. 342-355 and Charanis, *op. cit.*

34 Cahen: *Manzikert*, p. 621.

35 I. Ath: *Kāmil*, IX, p. 546; I. J.: *Muntaẓam*, VIII, p. 137, 160.

36 Sibṭ: *Mir'āt*, in Amedroz's edition of I. Qal.: *Dh̄ayl*, pp. 100-101. (about Arīsīghī and Afshīn). See Köymen: *Askeri Teşkilati* for the clear distinction made between the Turkoman forces of the earlier period and the regular army of Ghulāms recruited later when the Saljūq Empire had been established; particularly the invariable employment of the Turkoman irregulars against non-Muslim countries (p. 36).

much a result of the love of orthodoxy as a result of the desperation stemming from their conflict with the Fāṭimids.

ʿAbbāsīd invitation to the Saljūqs.

The early history of the Saljūqs—their tribal origin and settlement in Kḥwārazm, conversion to Islām, Sāmānīd and Qārākhānīd service, hostility to the Ghaznavids leading to the Battle of Dandanaqān with them in 431/1040 has been related by Cahen (in his article *Malik-Nameh* and book *Turkey*) where four different traditions in muslim sources are examined: (i) the early Persian historians of the Ghaznavids, mainly Gardīzī (ca. 441/1050) and Bayhaqī (d. 470/1077); (ii) the Bagḥdādī historians Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200) and Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī (d. 654/1256) (iii) the Persian work *Malik-Nameh* (lost) which was the basis of ʿImād ad-Dīn's (d. 560/1164) account (although not acknowledged) which in turn was the basis of Bundarī's abridgement (with acknowledgment). *Malik-Nameh* was followed in the 7th/13th century work *Zubdat at-Tawārikh* which in turn was followed by Ibn al-Atḥīr (d. 631/1233) without acknowledgment. The *Malik-Nameh* tradition is also embodied in the works of Bar Habraeus (7th/13th cent.) and Mirkḥwand (d. 904/1498) (iv) the *Saljūqnāma* of Ḥāzīr ad-Dīn Nishāpūrī (6th/12th century) which follows a tradition independent of *Malik-nāmeḥ* and is followed by Rāwandī (end of the 6th/12th century). Cahen's summaries have been succinctly stated in English by Kouymjian in his article (1969) on Mixit'ar of Ani. The details of these works will be found in the bibliographical index attached. Restatement of this early Saljūq history is not necessary as it is only remotely relevant here.

We pass on, then, to the ʿAbbāsīd interest in inviting the Saljūqs. Since 336/946 the ʿAbbāsīd Caliphate had come under the tutelage of the Buwayhid Amīrs. The Sunni Caliphate had been incongruously adjusted to a Twelver Shīʿī political authority but together they shared a common rivalry with the new Shīʿī Ismāʿīlī dynasty of North Africa—the Fāṭimids. However, the increasing power of the Fāṭimids (for in the first half of the 5th/11th century they also controlled Egypt, Syria and the countries bordering on the Red Sea, and had their Kḥuṭba read at Mecca and Medina) and the weakening of the Buwayhids by internal dissensions and military revolts, had created for the ʿAbbāsīd Caliphs a danger as well as an opportunity. The opportunity increased with the rise of such stalwarts as Maḥmūd of Ghazna and later Tuḡhril Beg in the East; and the danger decreased because of the chaos in which Egypt had been plunged by an eccentric Caliph al-Ḥākīm (386–411/996–1201).

Two measures that the 'Abbāsīd Caliph al-Qādir (381-422/991-1031) adopted were of far-reaching significance—the issuance of a manifesto against the Fāṭimid origin of the Fāṭimid Caliphs in 402/1011³⁷ which heralded an ever-growing anti-Fāṭimid campaign, and the commissioning of the Qādī Māwardī to write his famous book on Sunnī political theory *al-Aḥkām as-Sulṭāniya*³⁸ which justified the legitimacy of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate by fending off the objections that could be made to the many irregularities in the institution. The same Māwardī (often referred to as Aqḍā'l-Quḍāt) was destined to be the next Caliph's (Qā'im) ambassador to Tuḡhril Beg. It must be remembered that in the history of 'Abbāsīd-Fāṭimid conflict, the Qādīs played as important a role in the service of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate and orthodoxy as the Dā'īs played in the service of the Fāṭimid Caliphate and heresy. Only two other examples in the immediate context need be mentioned here. In the time of the Caliph Qā'im we know of the high position and missions of the Qādī Dāmighānī, and of a rabble-rousing Qādī Ibn Muṣṭarī in the court of the penultimate Būyid Amīr Abū Kālījār at Shīrāz who almost chased away the Fāṭimid dā'ī Mu'ayyad from there.³⁹

The Caliph Qā'im (422-467/1031-1075) was even more energetic than his predecessor. He had a young advisor Ibn al-Muslima⁴⁰ from the very beginning of his career. The contemporary Fāṭimid agent at Shīrāz, Mu'ayyad⁴¹ states that Ibn al-Muslima arrived at Ahwāz en route to Shīrāz, threatening to oust him by force from the Būyid court, but that he left on his own in 429/1038. He also states that Ibn al-Muslima had committed many atrocities against the Shī'ī places of worship. He further informs us that Ibn al-Muslima was instigating the revolt of Mu'izz b. Bādīs, the Zīrid governor of Qayrawān against the Fāṭimids of Cairo. Later in 437/1045, the penultimate Būyid Sulṭān's wazīr Ibn Fasānjas intrigued to get 'Amīd ad-Dawla deposed by the 'Abbāsīd Caliph and Ibn al-Muslima appointed in his place as the Ra'īs ar-Ru'asā.⁴² However, Ibn Fasānjas was executed by Abū Kālījār two years

37 I. Ath., *Kāmil*, IX, 236 and I. J.: *Muntaẓam*, VII, 281-2. The full text of the manifesto as given in Abu'l-Fidā is translated in Manour's *Polemics on the origin of the Fāṭimī Caliphs*, London, 1934, p. 25.

38 See Gibb's article: *Al-Māwardī's Theory of the Caliphate in his Studies on the Civilisation of Islam*, pp. 152-53.

39 Mu'ayyad: *Sīra*, pp. 9-10.

40 I. J.: *Muntaẓam*, pp. 200-1 gives the date of his birth as 397/1006.

41 Mu'ayyad: *Sīra*, pp. 56-57.

42 I. Ath. *Kāmil*, IX, 530.

later.⁴³ Ibn al-Muslima later succeeded in running the Būyid commander Basāsīrī out of Baghdad. He was the chief promoter of ʿAbbāsīd-Saljūq solidarity.

The Saljūqs and the Yināliya left Central Asia in 426/1035 and arrived in Khurāsān claiming to be the clients of the Commander of the Faithful (Mawālī Amīr al-Muʿmin.n).⁴⁴ In 428/1037, Çaghr. took Marw, Ibrāhīm Yināl and Tuğhril occupied Nişāpur in 429/1038. Soon after that an ʿAbbāsīd envoy, the Qādī Saʿīd arrived at Nişāpur ostensibly to protest against the ravages committed by the Turkoman troops⁴⁵ but in fact to begin negotiations for Tuğhril's takeover from the Būyids. Tuğhril assumed the title of as-Sultān al-Muʿazzam in 429/1038⁴⁶ and was prayed for in Bayhaq as a Sultān.⁴⁷ In 431/1040, the Battle of Dandanaqān was fought against the Ghaznawid Masʿūd, who was defeated and had to abandon Khurāsān finally to the Saljūqs.⁴⁸ In 434/1042 Ibrāhīm Yināl entered Rayy followed there by Tuğhril.⁴⁹ Tuğhril received the Caliphal envoy, the famous Qādī Māwardī⁵⁰ in the same year. The professed purpose of the mission was to seek correction of the activities of one ʿAlī b. Muḥammed b. Ḥabīb. Ibn al-Jawzī informs us that the next year the Qādī revisited Tuğhril who went out four parasangs to receive him.⁵¹ The repeated visit of the Qādī and the welcome given him by Tuğhril show that some negotiations were in progress. Probably these resulted in the Caliphal confirmation of Tuğhril as a Sultān, for we are informed by Miles⁵² of a dīnār from Rayy dated 438/1046-7 which bears the name "as-Sultān al-muʿazzam Shāhinsḥāh Tuğhril Beg Abū Ṭālib." Only a year earlier in 437/1045-6 had Tuğhril received from the Caliph permission to strike coins.⁵³

Again the purposes of the mission of Qādī Māwardī can be inferred from the events that soon followed, namely the stepping up of pressure on.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 542.

44 Bayhaqī, *Taʿriḫ*, 582, 863, Juzjani, *Tabaqāt*, p. 120.

45 Bayhaqī, *Taʿriḫ*, p. 692. Cf. Cahen: *Malik-Nāmeḥ*, p. 62.

46 Cahen: *Malik-Nameh*, p. 62; Bosworth: *Ghaznavids*, p. 267; *Akḥbār*, trans. 6-7.

47 I. Funduq: *Bayhaq*, 274; Cahen: *idem*.

48 Attested by all the chronicles; see the *Malik-nameh* version in I. Ath: *Kāmil*, IX, 483; Mirkḥwand: *Rawḍa*, 18-35.

49 I. J. *Muntaẓam* VIII, p. 113.

50 *Idem*.

51 *Ibid.*, 116; I. Ath., *Kāmil*, IX; Bundarī, *Zubda*, p. 27; Bar Habraeus, *Chronography*, p. 201. Cf. Makdisi, *Ibn ʿAqīl*, p. 81.

52 Miles, G. C.: *The Numismatic History of Rayy*, New York, 1938.

53 Rāwandī (following the Nişāpurī School), *Rāḥa*, p. 105 (trans. p. 104). This is considered by Iqbal, the editor and translator of the *Rāḥa*, as too early a date. He suggests 447/1055.

Byzantium and the encirclement of the Fāṭimids. The king of Vaspurkan had ceded his territory to the Byzantine Emperor in 412/1021. Between 431/1039 to 435/1043 Byzantium had annexed the Armenian kingdom of Ani. But the very devastating raid of Ibrāhīm Yīnal on Armenia in 440/1048⁵⁴ had led the Emperor Constantine Monomachos to join his forces with those of the Iberian prince Liparites and the Byzantine governors of Vaspurkan and Mesopotamia who now massed a large army to meet the new Turkoman danger.⁵⁵ However, this army was defeated and Liparites taken prisoner. The Emperor was obliged to send a mission to Tuḡhril (led by the former's secretary, Giorgios Drosos, in 442/1050) which demanded and got the release of Liparites, and which promised to have the Kḥutba read in the mosque of Constantinople in the name of the Sulṭān.⁵⁶ Laurent doubts that it was ever done.⁵⁷ The Marwānid prince of Diyār-Bekir, Naṣr ad-Dawla, who was in the Byzantine sphere of influence did read the Kḥutba for Tuḡhril;⁵⁸ and so did the Rawwādid prince Wahsūdān at Tabrīz and the Shāddādid prince Abu'l-Aswār at Ganja.⁵⁹

Let us turn to North Africa and Egypt. The Zīrī Amīr of Ifrīqiya, Mu'izz b. Bādīs (r. 496–453/1015–1061) who was officially under Fāṭimid protection, began to show signs of independence, with some encouragement from Bagḥdad. We have precious information on this from Maqrīzī who is the most useful historian for the Fāṭimid period. Although he wrote in the fifteenth century, he utilised contemporary Fāṭimid sources such as the historians Musabbiḥī (d. 420/1029) and Qudā'ī (d. after 461/1069) whose works have survived only in small sections, and Ibn aṣ-Ṣayrafi (d. 542/1147) whose works are separately available to us. Jamāl ad-Dīn Shayyāl very recently (1967) published Maqrīzī's *Itti'āz* from a complete manuscript of it (the only one known) preserved in the Ahmad III Library at the Topkapu Serai in Istanbul (no. 3031), but before the second part of it could be published he died. The information relevant for us would have been in this part. However, fortunately, H. R. Idris extracted from this part all the passages concerning the Fāṭimid-Zīrid

54 I. J. *Muntaẓam*, p. 137, I. Ath: *Kāmil IX*, p. 546.

55 Cahen: *Penetration Turque*, p. 15 on the authority of Arisdaguès; *Histoire*, pp. 74–85, Attaligtes: *Historia*, pp. 44–45; Cedrenus-Skylitres: *Hist.*, pp. 575–580; Mathew: *Chronique*, pp. 83–88 and Brosset *Georgie*, I, 323.

56 See Dölger: *Regesten*, II, p. 9 (no. 898) and the documentation in it.

57 *Byzantion* II, 109.

58 I. Ath: *Kāmil IX*, p. 599.

59 *Ibid.*, p. 598.

relationship and published them in *Arabica*, vol. XI (1964). It is on this and with corroboration from Ibn 'Idhārī, that the following information is based.

Returning to the Zīrī Amīr of Ifrīqīya, Mu'izz b. Bādīs, we know that he received an ambassador from the 'Abbāsīd Caliph Qā'im in 433/1041.⁶⁰ Having received the robes of honor from Baghdād via Constantinople he had the Kḥuṭba for the 'Abbāsīd Caliph read throughout his realm and had the Kḥuṭba of the Fāṭimids discontinued.⁶¹ Mu'izz introduced a new currency in the Maghrib in 441/1049 and insisted upon black as a color of ceremonial dress (which was the color of the 'Abbāsīd court) in 443/1051. The Amīr of Barqa (Cyrenaica) Jabara b. Mukhtār al-'Arabī declared for Mu'izz and read the 'Abbāsīd Kḥuṭba also in 443/1051.⁶² Mu'izz became curt in his correspondence with the Fāṭimid Wazīr Yāzūrī and disrespectful in addressing the Fāṭimid Caliph Mustansir - this being an important factor in the final rupture of Zīrīd-Fāṭimid relations, according to our historians.⁶³

In the same year Mu'izz asked Baghdād for official investiture. Caliph Qā'im's envoy Abū Ghālib aṣḥ-Shīrāzī was sent with an 'Abbāsīd robe of honor, a black standard and gifts. The envoy arrived at Constantinople seeking permission to pass through to Qayrawān. But the Emperor Constantine was treaty-bound with the Fāṭimids, and on request from Cairo, he re-routed the Baghdād embassy via Cairo. In Cairo, the envoy was humiliated and paraded on a camel; the papers of investiture, presents and the black standard were burned in the Bayn al-Qasrayn. Tuḡhril Beg in the meantime had personally appeared at Constantinople asking permission to march across the Byzantine territory to Egypt, but was not allowed to do so. The 'Abbāsīd envoy was returned to Constantinople.⁶⁴

We have brought the narrative down to the year 443/1051. To Maqrīzī we owe the unique information about Tuḡhril's presence near Constantinople in this year, probably taking advantage of the treaty made with the Emperor in the previous year (when Liparites was released). An interesting fact that emerges is the tactics of creating dissension between the Fāṭimids and Byzantium in order to spoil a good relationship that had existed throughout the early part of the eleventh century. With the relationship contaminated, it

60 I. 'Idhārī: *Bayān*, p. 275.

61 Maqrīzī: *Iti'āz*, Idris: *Glances*, p. 302.

62 I. 'Idhārī: *Bayān*, pp. 277-78, 288.

63 I. Ṣayrafī: *Iṣhāra*, pp. 40-45 and Maqrīzī: *Iti'āz* (in Idris: *Glances*), 303.

64 Maqrīzī: *Iti'āz* (in Idris: *Glances* 303; I. Muiy, *Akḥbār*, p. 5.

was easier to proceed against both. We will notice similar tactics later in Sultān Alp Arslān's occupation of Aleppo, before Manzikert.

The Fāṭimid reaction was twofold: (i) to punish North Africa and the Zirids with the Hilālian invasion, whose main wave came in 443/1051 and (ii) to mount a campaign against Tuḡhril Beg and Baḡhdād that resulted in Ib-rāhim Yināl's defiance of Tuḡhril in 448/1057 and the occupation of Baḡhdād by Basāsīrī in 450/1058. But more about this later, which may explain a similar Fāṭimid reaction to Sultān Alp Arslān's proposed march on Egypt, before the Battle of Manzikert.

We know that Tuḡhril was awarded the title of "Rukn ad-Dīn" by the 'Abbāsīd Caliph in 443/1051, after he received the treasures unearthed by Tuḡhril at Iṣfahān on its conquest.⁶⁵ The coins of Nishāpūr of this year bear this title.⁶⁶ He also received later, on his entry into Baḡhdād, the title "King of the East and the West",⁶⁷ but the import of this title had already been in evidence much before. He was already the King of the East, and was encouraged by the 'Abbāsīd Caliph to become also the King of the West (by occupying the territories of the Byzantine and the Fāṭimid States). Probably this was the understanding arrived at in Qāḏī Māwardī's embassies to Tuḡhril as early as 434/1042 and 435/1063.

We must interrupt the narrative here, to examine the situation in the west.

Fāṭimid-Byzantine relations.

Qāḏī'n-Nu'mān (d. 363/974)⁶⁸ served the first four Fāṭimid Caliphs, in North Africa and Egypt and rose to be the Chief Qāḏī as well as a leader in the Ismā'īli religious organization, the Da'wa. He is the author of the chief Fāṭimid law-book *Da'ā'im al-Islam*. He also wrote the history of the establishment of the Fāṭimid Caliphate called *Kitāb Ifṭitāḥad-Da'wa* (c. in 346/957)⁶⁹ which contains some information on Fāṭimid-Byzantine contacts. This source has been extensively utilised in Talbi's *L'Emirat Aghlabide*. Nu'mān's other

65 I. Ath: *Kāmil*, IX, 397-8 and Bar Habraeus: *Chronography*, p. 206.

66 Miles, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

67 I. J. *Muntazam*, VIII, 233, I. Ath: *Kāmil*, p. 634 (under year 446 H.). Cf. Cahen: *Turkey*, p. 24.

68 See the bibliography of Isma'īli works by Ivanow entitled *Ismā'īli Literature*, Teheran, 1963, pp. 32-33.

69 It has recently been published at Beirut, but I have not seen it. However, I have the MS of the Hamdani collection.

work *Al-Majālis wa'l-Musāyarāt* (Séances)⁷⁰ also contain an account of a Byzantine embassy at the Fāṭimid Court, which has been utilized by Stern (See index). A contemporary of Qāḍī'n-Nu'mān, the poet Ibn Hānī (d. 362/973) sang the praises of the Fāṭimid Caliph Mu'izz, particularly his exploits against Rūm. Some of the poems from his *Dīwān* have been used by Canard: *L'Imperialisme* and translated by Dewhurst (see index). And their contemporary Ustādh Jawdhār, secretary-treasurer of the Fāṭimid Caliphs in his *Sīra* gives some information relevant to our subject (See index). Besides these Ismā'īlī sources, the works of two Sunnī Qāḍīs of Fāṭimid Egypt, of the 5th/11th century, are of great relevance. One is al-Qāḍī ar-Rashīd Ibn Zubayr whose *Dhakhḥā'ir* (see index) contains information on embassies exchanged between the Fāṭimids and Byzantium, and the other is the Qāḍī al-Quḍā'ī, a historian and a sort of Kātib sirr (confidential secretary) of the Fāṭimid Caliph Mustansir. His work *Uyūn al-Ma'ārif* (see index) has not been directly consulted, as its ms. in Cairo was not available to me. although Quḍā'ī is a key figure in this study.

For confirmation of information on Fāṭimid history of North Africa we have the geographer al-Bakrī (d. 487/1094), and the historians Ibn 'Idhārī and Ibn Kḥaldūn (d. 809/1406). On the Fāṭimid history of Egypt we have Ibn aṣ-Ṣayrafī (d. 521/1127), Ibn Zāfir (d. 613/1216), Ibn Muyassar (d. 677/1278) and Bar Habreaus (events to 685/1286) (see index for their works).

There are also two historians of later times, Maqrīzī (d. 845/1441) and the Da'ī Idrīs 'Imād ad-Dīn (d. 872/1467), the former Sunnī and the latter Ismā'īlī. Both are of immense importance, for they draw on detailed information given by earlier writers contemporary to the events, some of whose works have not survived.

There is a long list of the historians of Egypt, prominent among them being Ibn Taghribirdī, Dawādārī, Ibn Qalqashandī and Dhahabī, who usually are useful for corroborating the evidence of earlier writers.

On Byzantine embassies, a basic reference-work is Dölger's *Regesten* (see index), full of information on treaties, truces, envoys, exchanges of gifts, ransoms, tributes etc. with documentation from original sources, Muslim and Byzantine, and from basic modern studies.

We have four general histories of the Fāṭimid period, by Wustefeld, Lane-Poole, O'Leary and Zahid Ali. Of these only the last one has used Fāṭimid-Ismā'īlī sources, but as his work is in Urdu it is little used. (See index for the titles).

Byzantium had every reason to look upon the establishment of the Fāṭimid Caliphate in North Africa in 297/909 with favor, for it opposed the ʿAbbāsīd Caliphate and had just defeated the Aghlabids of Qayrawān who had caused the Byzantine State much grief by their occupation of Sicily and other Mediterranean islands. Byzantine hopes were frustrated, however, because the Fāṭimids insisted on retaining their Mediterranean heritage from the Aghlabids. But in so far as they could divert the attack of the eastern Caliphate, their friendship was to be hoped for and to this end Byzantine policy was directed. Not always did the Fāṭimids oblige, for they were keen on presenting an image of Islamic leadership untarnished by a friendship with this non-muslim power.

In the time of the Fāṭimid Maḥdī, the Sicilian Muslim governor Ibn Quḥrab tried to separate Sicily from North African rule by reading the Kḥutba for the ʿAbbāsīd Caliph. However his rebellion was crushed and Sicily was re-secured in 304/916. At this time the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII agreed to pay an annual tribute of 22,000 gold pieces to the new Fāṭimid governor of Sicily,⁷¹ probably to purchase peace for the Italian coast harassed by the new Fāṭimid navy with Sicily as its base. At the same time in 305/917 Byzantium sent an embassy to the ʿAbbāsīd Caliph Muqtadir with gifts.⁷²

The King of Bulgars sent emissaries to Maḥdī for an alliance against Byzantium. Maḥdī sent his envoys in return but while crossing the Mediterranean, they were captured by Byzantine ships. However, the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus released them and the Fāṭimid Caliph in a return gesture reduced by half the annual tribute paid to Sicily.⁷³

The next Caliph Qā'im instructed his General Ya'qūb b. Ishāq at-Tamīmī to raid the southern coast of France and the Italian coast of Genoa and Calabria.⁷⁴ The city of Genoa was occupied.⁷⁵ Crete, Corsica, Malta and Cyprus followed suit, although only for a short while. In fact according to Ibn Kḥal-

70 Ms. Hamdani Coll. See Ivanow: *Isma'ili Literature*, pp. 32-33.

71 Canard: *Fāṭimids* - E. I. 2.

72 I. Zub: *Dḥakḥa'ir*, pp. 131-132 and many other sources in Dölger, *Regesten*, I, 69 (no. 578).

73 Canard: *Fāṭimids* - E. I. 2.

74 Amari, *Sicilia*, Vol. II, pp. 211-212, mainly on the authority of Dḥahabī: *Ta'rikḥ al-Islām* and Ibn Kḥal. : *Ibar*.

75 Amari, op. cit. (Arabic text) vol. I, p. 459, extract from Dḥahabī's *Ta'rikḥ*. Also Maqrīzī: *Kḥiṭat*, II, 163.

dūn,⁷⁶ the Fāṭimids became the masters of the entire Mediterranean and their fleets operated freely throughout its length and breadth. The Byzantine emperor, on the other hand, supported the revolt of the Girgenti.⁷⁷ and turned his attention to exchanging embassies with the ʿAbbāsid Caliph Raḍī in 326/937 and 327/938.⁷⁸

In 335/946 when the dangerous revolt of Abū Yazīd, the Kḫarijite leader was brewing, a Byzantine embassy arrived, probably to apprise itself of the situation, and was welcomed by al-Manṣūr⁷⁹ who had just succeeded to the Caliphate. Recovering from the rebellion, Manṣūr sent the celebrated Amīr Ḥasan b. ʿAlī ṭo Sicily as governor. His Kalbite dynasty ruled the island for the Fāṭimids⁸⁰ for more than a century till it was taken by the Normans.

Byzantium now wanted a long term truce with the Fāṭimids. The opportunity to dictate it came when the Umayyad Caliph of Spain asked the Emperor in 344/955-6 for help against the Fāṭimids. The Emperor Constantine VII proposed this truce to Muʿizz (the fourth Fāṭimid Caliph) or else his troops would help the Umayyads. In retaliation Muʿizz had the Kalbite ʿAmmār land troops in Italy in the next year.⁸¹ Soon after, a Byzantine ambassador arrived in 346/957 with tribute and obtained a truce for five years. Caliph Muʿizz in a reply to the ambassador did not accede to the latter's request to send an embassy to the Emperor, on the ground that he had no need "unless the Emperor accedes to our request."⁸² Stern thinks this "request" involved the acceptance of Islam; more probably, it concerned Byzantium's help in the big undertaking of Muʿizz's career, namely the conquest of Egypt.

Some Muslim emigrants from Umayyad Spain who had established a colony in Crete raided in the Aegean Sea as far as Thessalonica.⁸³ When thre-

76 ʿIbar, extract in Amari, *op. cit.* (Arabic text), I, 461-62. Original text, Sec. I Book I on the Leadership of Fleets.

77 Art. *Djirdjent* in E. I. 2; Amari, *op. cit.* II, 218 seq., Vasiliev, *Byz. et Arabes* II, 261.

78 I. Zub. *Dhakḫarʿir*, pp. 60-64 (nos. 73, 74). Cf. Dölger: *Regesten*, I, p. 78 (nos. 632, 633).

79 Canard: *Fāṭimids* - E. I. 2.

80 I. Ath: *Kāmil*, VIII, 354; I. Kḫal: ʿIbar (Cairo ed.) IV, 43.

81 an-Nuʿmān: *Majālis*, Vol. I, reproduced in Daʿī Idrīs ʿUyun, Vol. VI, quoted in Hasan and Sharaf: *al-Muʿizz*, p. 39 seq. Cf. Stern: *Embassy*, 211.

82 The anonymous history *Kitabal-ʿUyūn* (in yr. 346) cf. Dölger: *Regesten*, I, p. 83 (no. 668). Details given in Nuʿmān's *Majālis* (the relevant passage translated in Stern, *Embassy*, 244-249, being Caliph Muʿizz's reply to the Byzantine ambassador).

83 Vasiliev: *Byz. Empire*, I, 372-374. His description is based on the eyewitness account of the priest John Cameniates. Also see K. M. Setton: *On the Raids of the Moslems in the Aegean*

atened by the Byzantines, they sought the help of Caliph Mu'izz. The Fāṭimid navy defeated the three fleets of Byzantium, Umayyad Spain and Ikhshīdīd Egypt, thus bringing Crete under its protection.⁸⁴ This was in violation of the truce that had been previously arranged. However, in 351/962 Crete was surrendered to the Byzantines, probably as a deal by which Fāṭimid authority was recognised in Sicily and in an attempt to neutralise it while the Egyptian campaign was being planned.

At Constantinople, the new Emperor in 352/963 was the forceful Nicephoros Phocas. His mission to Caliph Muṭīf at Baghdad in the next year was sheer insolence. His victories were listed and his intention of conquering the East was stated.⁸⁵ Against the Fāṭimids, he resumed hostilities in Sicily and discontinued tribute. The Fāṭimid army and fleet inflicted two defeats on Byzantium at the Battle of Rametta and the Battle of the Straits in 354/965. The poet Ibn Hānī sang the praises of this victory.⁸⁶ This resulted in the signing of a peace treaty in 356/967 between the two powers.⁸⁷ The very next year Nicephoros sent another mission demanding the release of the Patriarch Niketas taken prisoner in Sicily. This resulted in an anti-Baghdād Pact.⁸⁸

With its conquest of Egypt in 358/969, the Fāṭimid State developed a new frontier with Byzantium, in Syria, and gradually reverted to peaceful commercial relationships in the Mediterranean, with Amalfi, near Naples as its window to the West.⁸⁹ Syrian politics brought many complications. Besides Byzantium and the 'Abbāsids on its frontiers, there was the eternal problem of the Arab bedouin tribes (the Hilālīans) influenced by the dissident Qarmatian creed and allied to Turkish soldiers of fortune under Alptegin (Aftakin, Alaftakin, Haftakīn). Byzantium under John Tzimisce supported Alptegin and feared the Fāṭimid advance in Syria.⁹⁰

Basil II had acceded to the Byzantine throne in 976 and was to rule until 1025, a period that saw a revival of Byzantine power and prestige abroad.

in the Ninth Centuries and their alleged occupation of Athens, American Journal of Archeology, 58 (1954) 311-319. Also A. M. Fahmy: *Muslim Sea Power in the Eastern Mediterranean*, Cairo, 1966, pp. 100-113; 128-138.

84 Nu'mān: *Majālis* (MS.) II, 412. Cf. Hasan Ibrahim Hasan: *al-Mu'izz*, p. 46 seq.

85 Dölger, *Regesten*, I, p. 90 (no. 701) on the authority of Ibn Kathīr.

86 Quoted in Canard: *Impérialisme*, p. 187.

87 Dölger: *Regesten* p. 91 (no. 708) on the author of Ibn Dīnār.

88 *Ibid.*, p. 92 (715).

89 Citarella: *Amalfi*, pp. 299-312.

90 I. Qal. *Dḥayl*, pp. 11-18.

In three missions in quick succession he settled his southern front. The first was a letter to Baghdād in 371/979 protesting against ʿAdud ad-Dawla's support and refuge to a rebel;⁹¹ the second was to Saʿd ad-Dawla the Ḥamdānid ruler of Aleppo in 376/988 obligating him to a tribute to be paid according to a treaty that was signed;⁹² the third was to the new Fāṭimid Caliph al-ʿAzīz in 377/987 with lavish gifts. It was agreed that ʿAzīz would be prayed for in the mosque at Constantinople as the rightful Caliph of Islam and that he would undertake the restoration of the Church of Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem.⁹³ These missions put the Byzantine foreign policy, as had existed for a long time, in clear perspective—they needed to cultivate Fāṭimid friendship and use it against their common foe, Baghdād. They also needed peace with the Ḥamdānids of Aleppo for the security of their frontier.

ʿAzīz solved the southern Syrian problem by defeating the Qarmāṭians and the Turks of Alptegin. The Qarmāṭians retired permanently with a promise of tribute; the Hilālīan tribes transplanted from Syria and settled in southern Egypt; Alptegin was brought to Cairo as prisoner but was taken into Fāṭimid service and put in charge of a newly formed Turkish guard. The veteran wazīr Yaʿqūb b. Killīs was opposed to this, had Alptegin killed, and was himself removed from office, but was later reinstated. In Palestine, a Jarrāhid governor Mufarrij b. Daḡfal remained a real trouble-maker.⁹⁴

When Caliph ʿAzīz visited the dying wazīr Ibn Killīs, the latter gave him this advice: "O, Commander of the Faithful, keep peace with Byzantium, when they keep peace with you; keep the Ḥamdānids satisfied by constant contact (daʿwa and sikka, thus recognising their autonomy) but do not let al-Mufarrij b. Daḡfal b. al-Jarrāh remain, whenever there is an opportunity to do so."⁹⁵

After Ibn Killīs's death in 380/990 the advice was not heeded; fresh hostilities opened with Byzantium and continued till after the accession of Ḥākim. The main reason for this was the Emperor Basil's pressure on Aleppo. From now on, Aleppo was destined to remain the focal point of a triangular

91 Dölger: *Regesten*, I, 98 (no. 763) on the authority of Ibn al-Aṭhīr and Bar Habraeus.

92 *Ibid.*, (no. 769) on the authority of Aleppan historian Kamāl: *Ḥalab*.

93 *Ibid.*, (no. 770) on the authority of I. Aṭḡ. and others.

94 I. Qal. *Dḡayl*, pp. 19-32, I Khal, *Ibar* (in De Slane), I, 29; Maqrīzī, *Itiʿāz*, pp. 249-270 (yrs. 369-380 H.).

95 I. Qal. *Dḡayl*, pp. 32. I. J.: *Muntaẓam VIII* (yr. 380 H.), I. Kh. *Wafāya*, II, 442; trans. IV, 365.

conflict between the three powers - Fāṭimid, ʿAbbāsīd and Byzantine, till the Battle of Manzikert which itself developed from politics involving Aleppo.

The Fāṭimid governor of Damascus, Manjutakin, laid siege to Aleppo in 382/992. Basil hastened to its relief and from there proceeded to Apamea, Antioch and Tripoli, but returned from there to Tarsus and Constantinople. In the meantime Byzantine vessels were cruising near Alexandria. But the return of the Emperor shows that he was not seriously intending to march on Egypt.⁹⁶ In 387/997, the year after ʿAzīz's death there was an uprising of sailors at Tyre, fomented by Byzantium; however, the Fāṭimid commander Jaysh was able to put it down after defeating a Byzantine force at Apamea.⁹⁷

With the accession of Caliph Ḥākim, a new era of long truces with Byzantium begins. Ḥākim's administrator Barjwān approached Basil for a truce and the emperor welcomed the idea. A ten years, truce was agreed upon in 388/998.⁹⁸ A similar truce was also made by Basil with Ibn Marwān, the Amīr of Diyār Bekīr.⁹⁹ Exactly during the years of this truce Ḥākim enacted many discriminatory ordinances against Christians and Jews in his realm. In 399/1009 the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem was ordered to be demolished.¹⁰⁰ This is considered as one of the provocations for the Crusades. However it was not viewed by Byzantium so seriously. At the most, commercial relations with Egypt were broken off by Basil in 406/1015 only temporarily. In 412/1021 shortly before Ḥākim's death attempts at reconciliation were made.¹⁰¹ Byzantine diplomacy was shrewd enough to understand that Ḥākim's many acts of discrimination were not a result of hostility but of mental aberration; that they were directed not only toward Christians but also toward Muslims, and that they were never consistent, since periods of great favour to the religious minorities alternated with periods of discrimination. It must be remembered that in 402/1011, the ʿAbbāsīd Manifesto launched a major anti-Fāṭimid propaganda campaign at the initiative of the ʿAbbāsīd Caliph Qādir. This was no time for hostility between the Fāṭimids and Byzantium.

With the accession of the next Caliph Zāhir in 421/1021, the new Byzantine Emperor Constantine VIII signed a treaty with Egypt in 418/1027 by

96 I. Qal. *Dhayl*, pp. 40-48, Maqrizī, *Iti'āz*, pp. 275-276, 285-286.

97 I. Qal., *Dhayl*, pp. 49-52.

98 I. Qal. *Dhayl*, pp. 54-55 C. V, Dölger, *Regesten*, I, p. 102 (no. 788).

99 Dölger, *Op. cit.*, p. 102 (no. 790).

100 I. Qal. *Dhayl*, pp. 67-8.

101. Canard: *Fāṭimids* - E. I. 2, p. 855.

which the Emperor agreed to return all prisoners, to have Zāhir's name prayed for at the Mosque of Constantinople, to have the mosque itself repaired and have a muezzin appointed. In return the Caliph agreed to restore the Church of Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, to let the Emperor appoint the Patriarch of Jerusalem and to facilitate the return to Christianity of Christians converted by force to Islam.¹⁰²

In Syria and Palestine, Byzantium no longer challenged Fāṭimid suzerainty over Ascalon, Tripoli, Acre, Tyre, Ramla, Jerusalem and Damascus, while the Fāṭimids recognised Byzantine control over Antioch. Aleppo had a nominal Fāṭimid sovereignty, but was actually independent under the Mir-dāsids, and was truce-bound with Byzantium.

In 427/1034 Zāhir was succeeded by his 8-year old son Mustanşir as Caliph. But the power rested with the latter's Sūdāni mother Sitt al-Mulk. By 429/1036 it was time for the third ten year truce. On June 13 a pact was made by Emperor Micheal V with Sitt al-Mulk. 5,000 Muslim prisoners were released, and Egypt agreed to undertake new construction at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.¹⁰³ Again after ten years and with perfect regularity the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Monomachos's mission arrived in 439/1047 with gifts for the renewal of the previous treaty.¹⁰⁴

We have noted in the previous section that by now the Saljūq power was well established in Kḥurāsān and Persia, and that the Turkomans were already raiding deep into the Byzantine mainland. The Emperor had sent a mission to Tuğhril Beg in 447/1050 for the release of Liparites taken prisoner in the earlier encounter with Ibrāhim Yināl in 440/1048. We have also noted Tuğhril's appearance at Constantinople in 443/1057 demanding passage through Byzantine territory for an invasion of Egypt and the Byzantine intervention in getting the 'Abbāsīd envoy to the North African Amīr Mu'izz released from Egyptian imprisonment. We have further noted the Fāṭimid reaction to Saljūq - Zīrī entente which resulted in the unleashing of the Bedouin Hilālīan Arab tribes over North Africa. In 446/1052, the 'Abbāsīd Caliph had re-issued the Manifesto about the origin of the Fāṭimids, and Maqrīzī says this was in connection with the 'Abbāsīd North African policy.¹⁰⁵ Further

102 Maqrīzī, *Kḥiṭaṭ*, II, 169. Cf. Dölger: *Regesten*, II, p. (no. 824).

103 Bar Habraeus, *Chronography*, p. 196. Cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, II, p. 3 (no. 843).

104 I. Ath: *Kāmīl*, (yr. 439); Cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, II, p. 7 (no. 881),

105 Maqrīzī, *Iṭī'āz* (in Idris, *Glances*), p. 304.

understanding of Byzantine-Fāṭimid relations can only be obtained by recognizing their confrontation with the Saljūq-ʿAbbāsīd state.

Fāṭimid-Saljūq Confrontation:

To the list of sources discussed in the previous section, one extremely important Fāṭimid source will now have to be added. It is the autobiography¹⁰⁶ of a Fāṭimid dāʿī Muʿayyad fiʿd-Dīn aṣḥ-Shīrāzī (387-470/997-1077). Muʿayyad was a Daylami Persian, brought up in the Persian Ismaʿīlī tradition. He was posted at the court of the Būyid king Abū Kālījār at Shīrāz, was on good terms with his wazīr Bahrām b. Māfanna and hostile to the local Qādī who took orders from Ibn al-Muslima, the Raʿīs ar-Ruʿasa at Bagḥdād. Muʿayyad had watched the advent of the Saljūqs in Persia at close quarters and had opposed it. In 429/1037 he was forced out of Shīrāz by pressure from Bagḥdād. For nearly ten years he wandered among the city-states of Syria, and we find him in Egypt by 439/1047. In whatever capacity he served the Fāṭimid State, he remained their specialist on Syrian and eastern affairs. In 448/1056 he was sent back to Syria as a roving ambassador to the various Syrian Amīrs, trying to unite them in a common effort to stop Tuḡḡril Beg taking over the ʿAbbāsīd State and administration. He forged links with Basāsīrī who was responsible for the Fāṭimid Kḥuṭba at Baghdad in 450-51/1058, and also with Ibrāhīm Yīnāl who was responsible for a dangerous revolt against Tuḡḡril. He has related all these experiences in his *Sīra* which is rare also because it is one of the very few autobiographies in Medieval Islam. Muʿayyad's *Dīwān* contains some verses relevant to our discussion, particularly to the attempt to form a Fāṭimid-Būyid entente to prevent the coming of the Saljūqs. For the later Būyid court we have Ibn al-Balkḥī's *Fārsnāma* (composed between 500/1106 to 510/1116).

In 435/1043, the Būyid Amīr Abū Tāhir Jalāl ad-Dawla died and the Kḥuṭba was read for the next Būyid Amīr Abū Kālījār at Bagḥdād. The situation was precarious. The Caliph seemed to manage two Kḥuṭbas at Bagḥdād, a

¹⁰⁶ Muʿayyad: *Sīra*, ed. Kamil Husan, Cairo, 1949. Its first detailed study was made in my Ph. D. thesis at the London University, 1950; but this remains unpublished. Cahen had seen a Ms. of the Hamdani collection with the late Paul Kraus at the time of writing his art. on *Manzikert* (1934) where he makes a brief and very general reference to the contents of it. Makdisi has used the Kamil Husayn edition in his book on *Ibn Aqīl* (1963) and also in his article on the *Mazyadīds* of Ḥilla. However, the focus of their attention is on Turco-Byzantine relations, and the Fāṭimid dimension of the problem has been left vague.

Būyid one, officially and unwillingly; and a Saljūq one, unofficially and willingly. It was a matter of time before Tuḡhril would arrive in Baḡhdād and oust the Būyids. Men like Ibn al-Muslima and the Qāḏī Māwardi were keeping the Saljūq interests in Baḡhdād intact. At this time, the Ḡuzz were active in Anatolia, Qarmisīn and Mosul. Tuḡhril himself embarked on an extensive raid in Byzantium that took him as far as Erzerūm. This was in 446/1054.¹⁰⁷

Before this time the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Monomachos had the Patriarch write to the Pope Leo IX in 1053, appealing for peace between the Churches.¹⁰⁸ Such approaches were to continue later till the coming of the Crusades. At the moment, it was in the immediate context of the fear of Turkoman raids.

Tuḡhril's arrival at Erzerūm coincided with a Fāṭimid embassy at Constantinople. The Emperor had agreed to release 400,000 ardabs of grain to famine-stricken Egypt, but before the grain could be shipped the Emperor died. Empress Theodora, who succeeded, was so alarmed over the Turkish invasion, that she refused to ship the grain to Egypt unless Egypt agreed to a complete defensive and offensive alliance. Egypt not agreeing to this, the previous agreement was annulled. The Fāṭimids reacted by an attack on Byzantine Antioch but its commander Makīn ad-Dawla Ibn Mulhim was taken prisoner along with a large part of his troops. However, the Fāṭimid Caliph sent the Qāḏī Abū 'Abd Allah al-Quḏā'ī to Constantinople with a mission of peace in 447/1055. But Tuḡhril continued his pressure. He requested by letter the reading of the ḡAbbāsīd Caliph's Kḡuṭba at the Mosque of Constantinople, which was done. The Fāṭimid envoy al-Quḏā'ī was humiliated. When he reported this to Cairo, the Church of Holy Sepulchre was sacked in retaliation.¹⁰⁹

These events show a persistent Saljūq effort to proceed against Egypt by first spoiling its relations with Byzantium and to make their long-standing alliances ineffective. Soon after Tuḡhril declared, (in the same year) that he intended to proceed to Mecca for pilgrimage and then to the conquest of Fāṭimid Syria and Egypt.¹¹⁰

At Baḡhdād things were brought to a head. It started with Ibn al-Muslima accusing publicly Basāsīrī, the Commander of the Turkish troops of the

107 I. J. *Muntazam*, VIII, pp. 117-160. for the yrs. 435-446 H. Cf. for the same years identical information in I. Ath: *Kāmil*.

108 Dölger: *Regesten*, II, 10 (no. 911).

109 Maqrīzī: *Khiṭaṭ*, I, 266. Cf. Quatremère: *Mémoire*, II, pp. 318-19; Dölger: *Regesten*, II pp. 10, 12 (nos. 912, 929).

110 Ibn Muyassar, *Akḡbār*, p. 7, Mu'ayyad: *Sira*, p. 95.

Būyid Amīr al-Malik ar-Raḥīm of corresponding with Egypt. Basāsīrī was ousted from Bagḥdād at about the same time that Tuḡḥril entered it. At Raḥba, Basāsīrī was contacted by the Fāṭimid Dā'ī Mu'ayyad. Mu'ayyad had come to Syria and was in touch with the Kilābī Ṭḥimāl b. Mirdās b. Sāliḥ, the Mirdāsīd Chief of Aleppo; the Numayrī Ibn Wathḥāb at Harrān, Ibn Marwān at Diyār Bekir, the 'Uqaylī Quraysh b. Badrān at Mosul, and the Asadī Dubays b. Mazīd of Ḥilla.

Tuḡḥril had entered Bagḥdād in 447/1055, arrested the Būyid al-Malik ar-Raḥīm, was officially acknowledged now at Bagḥdād by the Caliph and had brought the rulers of Tabriz, Ganja and Mosul under his suzerainty. In the meantime the Basāsīrī-Mu'ayyad combination made allies among the petty chiefs of Syria and while Tuḡḥril's troops were on leave for Navrūz, Bagḥdād was taken by storm and Fāṭimid Kḥuṭba read there in 449/1058. Ibn al-Muslima was killed; the Caliph was kept a prisoner.

Tuḡḥril was prevented from returning to Bagḥdād by the revolt of his half-brother Ibrāhīm Yīnal who had received monies and provisions from the Fāṭimids, through Mu'ayyad; at the same time Mu'ayyad had corresponded with Tuḡḥril's wazīr al-Kundarī in an attempt to win him over.

After dealing with Ibrāhīm at Hamadan who was taken and killed, Tuḡḥril retraced his steps towards Bagḥdād and occupied it. In 451/1059 Basāsīrī died fighting. The Caliph was released and met Tuḡḥril for the first time. The rest of the story is well known. (For details, see *Sīra* of Mu'ayyad).

From the details of the Basāsīrī incident emerge two important considerations—the Fāṭimid desire to surround and crush the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate by creating a large entente between the Arab bedouin rulers of Syria (although their attitude constantly fluctuated), and their complicity with Ibrāhīm Yīnal.¹¹¹

At Cairo Yāzūrī, the Fāṭimid wazīr was arrested in 449/1057 on charges of correspondence with Bagḥdād, and later executed. Mu'ayyad had returned to Egypt and would now hold the post of the Chief Dā'ī till the end of his life (in 470/1077). (Details in *Sīra* of Mu'ayyad).

Between the death of Yāzūrī and the coming of Badr al-Jamālī, that is between 449/1057 and 467/1074, Egypt was engulfed in great administrative

¹¹¹ The later Ismā'īlī historian, Idrīs 'Imādad-Dīn, in his *'Uyūn*, VII (MS. Hamdani coll.) p. 58 states that the ultimate discomfiture of Ibrāhīm Yīnal was due to the differences of opinion among the ministers at the Fāṭimid court which prevented Cairo from rescuing him in time.

crises. During this period 40 wazīrs and 42 qāḏīs were changed, and famine and plague stalked the country. During these difficult days the only person in the confidence of the Caliph Mustanṣir was his chief of Da'wa Mu'ayyad who relinquished his duties only two months before his death in 470/1077. In all the diplomatic exchanges of the Fāṭimids with Byzantium, where Sal-jūqs were involved, Mu'ayyad's role must be inferred.

In 448/1056, the Caliph Qā'im had married Kḥadija, Arslan Khātūn, daughter of Çhağḥrī Beg and niece of Tuğḥril and the ceremony was performed by Ibn al-Muslima and attended by the Qādī Dāmighānī and the Aqḏa'l-Quḏāt Māwardī.¹¹² In 452/1060 we find Arslān Khātūn at Tuğḥril's court in Rayy, not allowed to return to her husband, as the Caliph was hedging Tuğḥril's request for the hand of his daughter in marriage to the Sulṭān. Makdisi states that Tuğḥril intended to transfer the 'Abbāsīd caliphate to his own line through the offspring of this marriage. During the last years of Tuğḥril's life his relations with the Caliph soured. Although the marriage was at last performed in 455/1063 the Sulṭān died childless within six months.¹¹³

The aftermath of the Fāṭimid attack on Bağḥdād was disastrous for them. We know that the mainstay of the early Fāṭimid state was the Berber army and particularly the leaders of the Kutāma tribe. 'Azīz had introduced Turkish troops commanded by Alptegīn. The wazīr Ya'qūb b. Killis opposed their introduction. During Ḥākim's time much of the malaise was due to the Berber-Turkish conflict. In the time of Caliph Mustanṣir, his Sūdānī mother had introduced the Sūdānī guards. Now the conflict became triangular among these three elements. For some time Egypt had experienced difficulties due to persistent low levels of the Nile river, and the treasury was depleted from military adventures at Bağḥdād and constant war in Syria. A descendant of the Ḥamdānids of Mosul, Nāṣir ad-Dawla had risen to be the governor of Damascus. He kept on pressuring Aleppo, till he was taken prisoner in 451/1062 and sent to Cairo by the Mirdāsīds. He was put in charge of the Turkish and Berber troops there by Mustanṣir in order to suppress the uprisings of the Sūdānīs. He succeeded in doing so in 459/1067 but in turn became dictatorial. His rapacious conduct added to the great famine of 454-459/1062-1067 (called *aṣḥ-ṣḥiddat al-'uzma*) and made things so intolerable that the Caliph himself commanding a force of local Turks defeated Nāṣir ad-Dawla in 461/1068-9, who then operated from the Delta. It is then that Nāṣir ad-Dawla appealed

¹¹² I. J. *Muntaẓam*, VIII, pp. 169-70.

¹¹³ See Makdisi: *Marriage*, pp. 259-275.

to the Saljūq sultān Alp Arslān to invade Egypt. In Egypt now there was a dual authority—that of the Caliph at Cairo and of Nāṣir ad-Dawla in the Delta.¹¹⁴

The situation had to be corrected. There were candidates willing to come to Egypt and restore order for the Caliph. One such was the Dā'i-Sultān of Yaman 'Alī b. Muḥammad aṣ-sulayḥī who had by now built a strong state in southern Arabia. However, when he was on his way to Egypt, at the pilgrimage time at Mecca in 459/1067, he was assassinated. Much later the same role was fulfilled by the Armenian governor of 'Akka, Badr al-Jamālī.

The situation in Syria was extremely nebulous. In 455/1063 Badr al-Jamālī became the Fāṭimid governor at Damascus, while 'Atiyya, the Mirdāsid ruled Aleppo on behalf of the Fāṭimids, but both were soon ousted. 'Atiyya was under attack from Maḥmūd and Badr had to retire to Ascalon. Damascus passed through various hands. Badr had sent an 'Alid Ibn Ṣhūya to Damascus but was defied by its residents. The fityān of the town set up two leaders: Mismār b. Sinān of the Kalb tribe and Ḥāzīm b. Nabḥān b. al-Qurmatī. Then the city was ruled by a brother of Ḥaydara b. Manzu a previous governor. Tyre was autonomous under Ibn Abī 'Aqīl; Tripoli under its qādī Ibn 'Ammār Abū Ṭālib; Ramla and the coast was controlled by Ibn Ḥamdān. Nothing remained in the hands of the Fāṭimid governor Badr except Acre and Tyre. This was the situation in 462/1070, just before the Battle of Manzikert.¹¹⁵

Before we pass on to the next section, a brief reference should be made to an interesting letter from the Byzantine Emperor Constantine X Dukas to Pope Honorius II in early 455/1063. The Emperor was asking the Pope to arrange an alliance between him and the Western Roman Emperor Henry IV. He wanted the unity of the Roman world under the leadership of the Pope. He was willing to offer his son as a hostage and the imperial treasury as a security. His desire was to liberate the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.¹¹⁶ This

114 These events are described in most of our sources. Maqrīzī's *Iti'āz* (Istanbul MS) for the year 454–462 H. is full of the account of famine and ravages of Nāṣir ad-Dawla; also his book *Ighāthatal-Umma fi Kashf al-Gḥumma* devoted to the famines of Egypt has some references. (translated by Wiet under the title: *Le Traité des Famines de Maqrīzī*, J. E. S. H. O., Vol. V (1962), pp 1-90) Cf. Quatremère: *Mémoire* (mainly based on Ibn al-Jawzī and Maqrīzī), and Gibb and Kraus: *Al-Mustanṣir-E.I.I.*

115 Sibṭ. *Mir'āt* in Amedroz ed. of Ibn. Qal.: *Dḥayl*, note on p. 97.

116 Dölger, *Regesten*, II, p. 15 (No. 952) on the authority of Benzo, the Bishop of Alba. Dölger thinks it is genuine on the grounds of the corroborating accounts mentioned.

is another evidence of the Byzantine desire for a crusade which had hardened by the Turkoman pressure, and would become an *idée fixe* after Manzikert. The reference to Jerusalem does not in anyway indicate an anti-Fāṭimid design because in any case the Fāṭimid control of Jerusalem at the moment was dubious due to the depredations of Nāṣir ad-Dawla, whose influence at Ramla near Jerusalem was strong.

Manbij, Aleppo, Manzikert.

For the events surrounding the battle of Manzikert, the sources have been analysed in detail by Cahen in his article on Manzikert (1934). He has analysed the same sources in his *Syrie du Nord* (1940) and in his article on the *Historiography of the Saljūqs* (1962). For all these titles and those that follow see the bibliographical index. Let me make some brief observations about the relative value of only the basic sources: Ibn al-Qnlānīsī (d. 555/1160) uses for this period an older source, the lost history of Gḥars an-Ni'ma (d. 481/1088). But the information is sparse and as his concentration is on Damascus, these events are remote from him. On the other hand Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī (d. 654/1256) has the most detailed information, although at times the long dialogues that he reports seem to be his own reconstructions, and in these parts should not be given much reliance. His source of information is also Gḥars an-Ni'ma and Hamadānī (d. 521/1127). Two other authors are close to the site of the events, namely Ibn al-Azraq al-Fārīqī (d. 572/1176) and Kamāl ad-Dīn b. al-'Adīm (d. 661/1263). Fārīqī wrote a history of Mayyāfāriqīn and Amid, a territory near Manzikert, but unfortunately he gives only a brief account, found elsewhere also. Kamāl ad-Dīn wrote a history of Aleppo, *Zubda*, and a biographical dictionary, *Bughya*. He uses earlier historians of northern Syria, whose works are lost, 'Azīmī (48/1090 - d. after 557/1161). For our purpose his work is the most important, because Aleppo was the storm centre of the politics that shaped the events leading to Manzikert, because he gives certain pertinent information like a Fāṭimid embassy at Manbij in 461/1069 which is not found elsewhere, and lastly because of his accuracy in mentioning details of names, places and dates conforming to a proper sequence of events. For Byzantine sources, the works of Laurent and Charanis (see index) could be consulted.

Tuḡhril had died childless. He had adopted his brother Chaghḥrī's adopted son, Sulaymān, and favoured him for succession. His wazīr Kundarī was committed to this. Qavurd, another son of Chaghḥrī was in control of southern

and eastern Persia and wanted to keep it. The younger Alp Arslān (born in 421/1030) had succeeded his father Chaghri on the latter's death at Marw in 452/1060. Previously he had led his father's campaigns against the Ghaznawids, and recently he had supported his uncle Tughril against Ibrāhim Yināl in 450/1058. On Tughril's death he succeeded to his domain also and was recognised by the Caliph as Sultān in 455/1063. Unlike his uncle he never set foot in Baghdād and ruled from Rayy with the help of his wazir Nizām al-Mulk, keeping a correct distance from the Caliphal court. Having suppressed the various contenders for Sultānate-his two brothers Sulayman and Qavurd, his grand uncle Mūsa Yabghū and his distant cousin Qutlumush, he embarked on Tughril's unfinished work-of conquering the lands of the western Caliphate across the territories of Byzantium. Wherever he went, he was preceded by Turkoman bands who opened the way for him. In 456/1064 he captured Ani and Kars. By 460/1068 he had received the submission of Georgia, and used the Shaddādids of Arrān and the 'Uqaylids of Mosul as buffer states, acknowledging his suzerainty. He captured Arjish and Manzikert from Byzantium in early 463/1071 and attacked the Byzantine fortresses of Sevastopol and Edessa. Soon after he descended on Aleppo and received the submission of the Mirdāsīd Maḥmūd.¹¹⁷

At Constantinople, the death of Constantine X Ducas in May 1067 had created a crisis of succession. The power rested with the widow Eudocia as regent for her young son Michael, supported by Psellus and Caesar John, a brother of the late Emperor. However a military faction saw the need of a strong ruler to cope with the incursions of the Turks. First the Patriarch then the Queen were convinced. The Queen married the General Romanus Diogenes and accepted him as the Emperor in January 1068. Romanus had previously distinguished himself against the Pechenegs and now took up the struggle against the Saljūqs. He had several successes against the Turkoman bands that preceded the advent of Alp Arslān; but his major victories were the taking of Artāh near Antioch and Manbij near Aleppo, thus assuring communications between Edessa and Antioch. From Manbij the Emperor returned to Constantinople in 1071 to muster a motley force of mercenaries comprising of Greeks, Slavs, Armenians, Georgians, Pechenegs, Uzes, Alans, Varangians and Normans, while his young General Manuel Comnenus guarded the eastern frontiers.¹¹⁸

117 See Cahen's: *Manzikert* and art. *Alp Arslan-E.I.2* No further documentation seems necessary on an already worked subject.

118 See Ostrogorsky: *Byz. Hist.* pp. 303-4, and Charanis: *Byz-Eleventh Century* pp. 191-93.

In Egypt, during the years 461-462/1068-69, as we have already noted, a sort of dual authority existed, that of the Caliph Mustanşir at Cairo, and of Nāşir ad-Dawla b. Ḥamdān, a rebel, in the Delta; and the country had for a decade suffered from famine, plague and the ravages of the troops. Egyptian authority in Syria had collapsed. An invitation had been sent by Nāşir ad-Dawla to Alp Arslān to invade Egypt. Nāşir ad-Dawla's mission to Alp Arslan was led by Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Bukḥārī known as Qādī Ḥalab and the 'Abbāsīd Kḥuṭba was read in Alexandria, Dimyāṭ and the Delta region already in 462/1069.¹¹⁹ In the next year, Nāşir ad-Dawla sent a mission to Constantinople led by his envoy Tāj ar-Riyāsa Abū Manşūr 'Abd Allah b. Naşr ar-Raḥabī, known as Ibn al-Kḥallāl with a gift of 40,000 dīnārs and other precious things to the Emperor Romanus Diogenes. The Emperor, in return, also sent gifts to Nāşir ad-Dawla. Ibn Kḥallāl himself reported this to a contemporary writer Ibn az-Zubayr.¹²⁰ The mission, was obviously an attempt by Nāşir ad-Dawla to neutralise the Emperor, in the former's struggle against the Fāṭimid Caliph.

Aleppo,¹²¹ since the time of the Ḥamdānid ruler, Sayf ad-Dawla had been an important base of military expeditions into Byzantium. It was coveted by the Fāṭimids and later by the Saljūqs as a frontier base of the greatest importance. The Arab bedouin tribe of Kilāb had come to settle there and their chief Şāliḥ b. Mirdās became its ruler in 414/1023, thus instituting a Mirdāsīd dynasty. Politics of the big powers - Fāṭimid, 'Abbāsīd and Byzantine was reflected in the constant changes of rulers from the same Mirdāsīd family and their internal struggle. In 443/1051, Aleppo's ruler Ṭḥimāl b. Sāliḥ b. Mirdās agreed to pay an annual tribute to Constantinople and was recognised as Petrarch of the place by Byzantium. He received much money from the Fāṭimids in 448/1056 for helping Basāsīrī to occupy Bagḥdād, but on his shying away from this obligation, he was removed. From 448-454/1056-1062 Aleppo remained solidly under Fāṭimid sovereignty, the main contenders for its control being 'Atiyya b. Sāliḥ b. Mirdās and his nephew Maḥmūd b. Naşr. On the whole 'Atiyya remained loyal to Egypt and ruled between 454-457/1062-1065. He was followed by Maḥmūd, who during his long

119 Ibn Muyassar: *Akḥbār*, pp. 19-20 and Maqrīzī: *Itti'āz* (Istanbul MS) ff. 105-106. both under the year 462 H. Also Kamāl: *Zubda*, II, p. 19 (462 H. is stated to be the date of the mission).

120 I. Zub: *Dḥakḥa'ir*, pp. 85-86 (no. 105).

121 The following details are taken from Kamāl: *Zubda*, I pp. 263-286, and Vol. II, pp. 11-19. Cf. Sauvaget: *Ḥalab-G. I. 2.*

rule (457–467/1065–1074) had been careful not to be too committed to Cairo lest he invite the wrath of the Saljūqs. However, he had resisted the ʿAbbāsīd Kḥṭba, in deference to the Shiʿite beliefs of his people in Aleppo. He had agreed to pay an annual tribute of 14,000 dīnārs to Constantinople in 461/1068, but on wavering, the Byzantium had sent a Turkish General Sunduq against him. On this occasion Artīq, Jazr (near Aleppo), Maʿarrat an-Nuʿmān, Kafr Ṭāb, Ḥama, Ḥims and Rafniye (near Ḥims) were raided. The Aleppans resisted, but ultimately Maḥmūd made peace and sent gifts to Constantinople.

Maḥmūd now wrote to Alp Arslān for help and read the ʿAbbāsīd Kḥṭba in Aleppo in 462/1069. Baḡḥdād sent a mission to him under the Naqīb Abuʿl-Fawāris az-Zaynabī, gave him a robe of honor and the title al-Amīr al-Ajall Ḥusām ad-Dawla. However at the approach of Alp Arslān, Maḥmūd balked, but finally submitted. From now on Aleppo permanently passed into the ʿAbbāsīd sphere of influence.

About the Byzantine conquest of Manbij in 1068, Kamāl ad-Dīn reports:¹²² “in 461 H. the King of Rūm marched towards Syria. He took much from the people of Manbij. Its fortress was abandoned by its people, and he took it and re-inforced it with men, provisions and arms. Then he went to ʿAzāz,¹²³ stayed there for a while and returned. God inflicted on him and his people draught, famine and plague. The king of Rūm said to the Qāḍī al-Qudāʿī, the Egyptian envoy that he has suffered in one day the loss of 3,000 horses besides his troops. It is said that Manbij remained in Byzantine hands for seven years. And the king referred to is Diogenes.”

We know that Qudāʿī¹²⁴ had been sent to Constantinople as an envoy previously in 447/1055 by the Fātimīd Caliph Mustanṣir in an attempt to patch up the breach of truce that had occurred, because of Byzantine refusal to deliver grain to Egypt as agreed. It was a sensitive mission. His choice now is indicative of a similar sensitive situation, when Alp Arslān was at

¹²² Kamāl: *Zubda*, II, pp. 13–14.

¹²³ North of Aleppo as noted by Sami Dahan, editor of *Zubda*, II, 13.

¹²⁴ Muḥammad b. Salāma b. Jaʿfar al-Qudāʿī was a Shāfiʿī Qāḍī in Egypt. He was attached to the secretariat of the Wazīr Jarjarāʿī; sent to Constantinople on a mission in 447/1055; and on his return was employed in the secretariat of the Wazīr Yāzūrī. His works are listed by Maqrīzī, who thinks he is one of the earliest writers on the topography of Cairo. Qudāʿī's history has been an important source for later historians of Egypt, particularly Maqrīzī. His date of death is generally given as 457/1064, but as we have noted in Kamāl ad-dīn's account he certainly was living in 461/1068. See more details on him in Becker: *Beiträge* and Kāmil Ḥusayn: *Adab Misr*, pp. 40–41.

Aleppo; the Emperor had returned to Constantinople and was in the process of equipping a large force prior to Manzikert. Our historian's mention of him in connection with the conquest of Manbij further indicates a proximity of this mission to the developments that resulted in the Battle of Manzikert. The purpose of the mission is not stated. If it was in the realm of conspiracy and secret diplomacy could it ever have been known to anyone except the parties concerned? The secrecy was necessary for two reasons; first, if its purpose had leaked to Nāṣir ad-Davla, it would immediately have been transmitted to Alp Arslān at Aleppo; second, Romanus had certainly intended to take the Sulṭān by surprise, when he proceeded to Manzikert. Although we could not be certain about it, could we not suspect, or even expect a Fāṭimid-Byzantine collusion in respect of the Byzantine attack on Manzikert? However, even if it was so, the Emperor was not doing it in the interest of the Fāṭimids alone. He had been elected to his office precisely for the purpose of fighting the Turkish invasion effectively. But had this invasion resulted in the occupation of Syria and Egypt, how much graver would have been the plight of Byzantium?

Again, the Fāṭimid Caliph at that time was in no position to render material help to Romanus. His envoy therefore would have chiefly been interested in the strategy - the choice of Armenia as the battleground, and the city of Rayy as Romanus's announced destination rather than a frontal confrontation at Aleppo. Fāṭimid diplomacy was interested in diverting the enemy which it could not fight. Common interests of Byzantium and the Fāṭimids had evolved over a century, as we have noticed in this paper. At this particular juncture the realisation of a common danger was acute. The motivation was so strong that our inference would not be unjustified.

Fāṭimid diplomacy was effective in one important respect. It was the professed ambition of the Saljūqs to occupy Egypt. Both Tuḡhril and Alp Arslān were diverted from it. After the Battle of Manzikert this ambition remained forever frustrated. But had the Fāṭimids failed, the Crusades would either have been launched two decades earlier, or would not have been launched at all.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INDEX

1. Azîmî: *al-Muwaşşal*. al-ʿAzîmî, Muḥammad b. ʿAlî at-Tanûkhî al-Ḥalabî (d. 556/1161): *Kitâb al-Muwaşşal ʿala aṣl al-Mawṣil*, (abridged) ed. Cl. Cahen in *Journ. Asiat.*, 1938. (under the title: *La chronique abrégée d'al-Azîmî*).
2. Bayhaqî: *Taʾrikh*. Bayhaqî (d. 470/1077): *Taʾrikh Masʿûdî*, 3 vols. ed. Saʿîd Naffisî, Teheran, 1940–53.
3. Bundari, *Zubda*. Bundari's abridgment of ʿImad ad-Din's (d. 560/1164): *Nuṣrat al-Fatra*. Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljukides, (4 vols. in 2), ed. Houtsma, Leiden, 1889.
4. Dḥahabî: *Taʾrikh*. Dḥahabî (d. 748/1348): *Tarikh al-Islam*, Ms. Br. Mus. Add. 25,700.
5. Fâriq.: *Mayyâfâriqîn* Ibn. al-Azraq al-Fâriqî (d. 572/1176): *Taʾrikh Mayyâfâriqîn wa ʿĀmid*. British Mus. Ms. 5803; also quotations in Amedroz ed. of I. Qal. *Dḥayl*, pp. 99–100.
6. *Hudūd al-ʿĀlam* (ed. Minorsky) Unknown author: *Hudūd al-ʿĀlam*, ed. V. Minorsky, London, 1937.
7. Ḥusaynî: *Zubda*. al-Ḥusaynî, sadr ad-Din Abu'l-Ḥasan ʿAl. b. Abî'l-Fawâris Nāṣir (attributed to): *Zubdat at-Tawârikh, Akḥbâr Dawlat as Saljûqiya*, ed. Muḥ. Iqbal, Lahore, 1933.
8. I. Ath.: *Kâmil*. Ibn al-Athîr (d. 631/1233): *al-Kâmil fî t-Taʾrikh*, Beirut ed., Vol. IX and X (1966).
9. I. Bal.: *Fârsnâma*. Ibn al-Balkḥî (6th 12th cent.): *Fârsnâma* (ca. 500–510 H.), London, 1921.
10. I. Funduq: *Bayhaq* Ibn Funduq (1100–1169) *Taʾrikh Bayhaq*, Chapkhana Kanun, Teheran, 1938.
11. I. Ḥam.: *Tadhkira*. Ibn Ḥamdûn (d. 562/1166): *Tadhkira* (until 553/1158) Cairo (Kḥanji) ed.
12. I. J. *Muntaẓam*. Ibn al-Jawzî (d. 597/1200): *al-Muntaẓam fî Taʾrikh al-mulûk wa'l-Umam*, Hyderabad, 1938–41 (relevant vol. 8).
13. I. Kḥ.: *Wafâyât*. Ibn Kḥallikân (d. 681/1282): *Wafâyât al-A'yân*, Cairo; trans. De Slane, 4 vols, Paris, 1842–71.
14. I. Qal.: *Dḥayl* Ibn al-Qalânîsî (d. 555/1160): *Dḥayl Taʾrikh Dimishq*, ed. Amedroz, Leiden Beirut, 1908.

15. Juzjānī: *Tabaqāt*. al-Jūzjānī, Minhāj ad-Dīn (d. 650/1252): *Tabaqāt-i-Nāşiri*.
16. Kamāl: *Bughya*. Kamāl ad-Dīn Ibn al-‘Adīm (d. 661/1263): *Bughyat at-ṭalab fī Ta’rikk Halab*. Istanbul Ms. Saray Aḥmad III no. 2925.
17. Kamāl: *Zubda*. Kamāl ad-Dīn Ibn al-‘Adīm (d. 661/1263): *Zubdat al-Halab min ta’rikk Ḥalab*, ed. Sāmī Dahan, Damascus, Vol. I (1951) Vol. II (1954).
18. Kāshgharī: *Lugha*. Maḥmūd Kāshgharī: *Diwān Lughat at-turc*, ed. Kilisi Rifat Bey, Istanbūl, 1917.
19. Mirkhwand: *Rawḍa*. Mirkhwand (d. 904/1498): *Rawdat aṣ-Ṣafa*, 5 vols., trans. by Rehatsek, ed. Arbuthnot, E. A. S., London, 1891-94.
20. Rāwandī: *Rāḥa*. Rāwandī: *Rāhat aṣ-Sudūr wa Āyat as-Surūr* (com. end of 6th/12th cent.), ed. Muḥ. Iqbal, Leiden, 1921.
21. Sibṭ: *Mir’āt*. Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī (Yūsuf b. Quizughlī) (d. 654/1256): *Mir’āt az-Zamān fī ta’rikk al-A’yān*. Fonds Arabe, Paris Ms. 1506; also quotations in Amedroz ed. of I. Qal.: *Dhayl*, pp. 100-105.
22. Zahir: *Saljuqnāma*. Zahir ad - Dīn Nişāpūrī (bth/12th cent.): *Saljuqnāma*, ed. G. Kḥāwar, Teheran, 1953.
23. Al-Bakrī: *Al-Mughrib*. Al-Bakrī, Abū ‘Ubayd ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (d. 487/1094): *Al-Mughrib fī Dhikr Bilād Ifriqiya wa’l-Maghrib*, ed. De Slane, Algiers 1857. (Baghdād reprint).
24. I. Idhārī: *Bayān*. Ibn Idhārī: *al-Bayan al-Mughrib*, 2 vols., Leiden, 1948.
25. I. Kḥal.: *Ibar*. (De Slane) Ibn Kḥaldūn (d. 809/1406): *Kitābal-‘Ibar* De Slane’s trans. as *Histoire des Berbers*, 4 vols.
26. I. M. Akhbār. Ibn Muyassar (d. 677/1278): *Akḥbār Misr*, ed. Massé, Cairo, 1919.
27. I. S. *al-Ishāra*. Ibn aṣ-Sayrafī (d. 521/1127): *al-Ishāra ilā nāla’l-Wazāra*, ed. Mukhlis, Cairo, 1924.
28. I. T. *Nujūm*, Ibn Taghri-bardī (d. 874/1169): *an-Nujūmaz-Zāhira*, Cairo. (relevant vol. no. 5).
29. I. Zāfir: *Duwal* Ibn Zāfir Jamāl ad-Dīn al-Azdī (d. 613/1216): *Ta’rikk ad-Duwal. al-Munqati’a*, Ms. British Mus. Or. 3685.
30. I. Zub.: *Dḥakḥā’ir*. Ibn az-Zubayr, al-Qādī ar-Raṣhīd (5th/11th cent.): *Kitāb adh-Dḥakḥā’ir wa’t-Tuḥaf*, ed. M. Ḥamiduddin, Kuwait, 1959.

31. Idris (Dā'ī): *Uyūn. Dā'ī Idrīs 'Imād ad-Dīn* (d. 872/1467): *Uyūn al-Akḥbār*, Vol. VII, Ms. Hamdani Coll.
- 31a. Jawḥar: *Sīra. Abū 'Al. Maṣṣūr al-'Aziz. al-Jawḥar.*, Secretary of Ustādḥ Jawḥar (d. 362/973), Copied from the latter's diary: *Sīra*, ed. K. Husayn and Shaira, Cairo, 1954.
32. Maqrizī: *Itti'āz. al-Maqrizī* (d. 845/1441): *Itti'āz al-Hunafa bi Akḥbār A'immati'l-Fātimīyyīn al-Khulafa*, ed. Jamāl ad-Dīn aṣḥ-Shayyāl, Cairo (1967 ed. based on the complete Istanbul Ms. No. 3031, Library of Ahmad III, Topkapu Saray).
33. Maqrizī, *Kḥiṭaṭ al-Maqrizī* (d. 845/1441): *Kḥiṭaṭ*, 2 vols., Cairo ed.
34. Mu'ayyad: *Sīra. al-Mu'ayyad fi'd-Dīn aṣḥ-Shīrāzī* (d. 470/1077): *as-Sīra*, ed. M. Kāmil Ḥūsayn, Cairo, 1949.
35. Mu'ayyad: *Dīwān. al-Mu'ayyad fi'd-Dīn aṣḥ-Shīrāz.* (d. 470/1077): *Dīwān*, ed. M. Kāmil Kusayn, Cairo, 1949.
36. Nu'mān: *Ifitāḥ. Qādī Abū Hanifa an-Nu'mān* (d. 363/974): *Ifitāḥ ad-Da'wa*, (Ms. Hamdani Coll.); als ed. Wudad al-Qaḍī, Beirut, 1970.
37. Nu'mān: *Majālis. Qādī-Abū Kanfa an-Nu'mān* (d. 363/974): *al-Majālis wa'l-Musāyarat* (Ms. Hamdani Coll).
38. Quḍā'ī: *Uyūn. al-Quḍā'ī* (d. after 461/1069): *Uyūn al-Ma'ārif wa funūn Akḥbār al-kḥalā'if*, Ms. no. 1779 at Dāral-kutub, Cairo.
39. Arisdaguès: *Histoire. Arisdaguès de Lasdiverd: Histoire d'Armenie*, trans. M. S. Prud'homme, Paris, 1864.
40. Attaliates: *Historia. Attaliates, Michael: Historia*, Bonn, 1853.
41. Bar Hebraeus: *Chronography. Bar Hebraeus, Gregory, Chronography* (events to 685/1286), s. vols. trans. E. A. W. Budge, London, 193°.
42. Bryennius: *Commentarii. Bryennius, Nicephorus: Commentarii* Bonn, 1836.
43. Cedrenus-Skylitzes: *Hist. Cedrenus-Skylitzes: Historicum Compendium*, Vol. II, Bonn, 1839.
44. Mathew: *Chronique. in Dularier E.: Chronique de Mathiey d'Edesse*, Bibliotheque historique armenienne, Paris, 1858.
45. Michael Syr: *Chronique. Micheal, the Syrian: Chronique*, ed. and trans. J. B. Chabot, 4 vols., Paris, 1899-1910.
46. Psellus: *Chronographia. Psellus, Michael: The Chronographid of Michael Psellus* (Eng. trans. E. R. A. Sewter), London, 1953.

47. Vardan, *Univ. Hist.* Vardan (d. 1271): *Universal History*, ed. Ali-an, Venice, 186° (see Brosset, *Georgie*).
48. Amari: *Sicilia*. Amari, Michele: *Storia dei Musalmani di Sicilia* (revised by Nallino) Vol II (1935).
49. Barthold: *Turkestan*. Barthold: *Turkestan, down to the Mongol invasion*, 3rd edition, London, 1968.
50. Becker: *Beitrage*. Becker, C. H.: *Beitrxge zur Geschichte Aegyptens*, Strassbourg, 1903.
51. Bosworth: *Ghaznawids*. Bosworth, C. E.: *The Ghaznawids*, Edinburgh, 1963.
52. Brooks: *Asia Minor*. Brooks, E. W.: *The Arabs in Asia Minor*, 641-à50, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 18 (1898).
53. Brooks: *Byz. and Arabs* Brooks, E. W.: *Byzantines and Arabs in the time of the early sAbbāsids*, *English Historical Review*, Pt. I (Oct. 1900), Pt. II (Jan. 1901).
54. Brosset: *Georgie*. Brosset, M. F.: *Historie de la Georgie*, St. Petersburg, 1851.
55. Bury: *Emperors*. Bury, J. B.: *The Roman Emperors from Basil II to Isaac Komnenos*, EHR, IV (1889), reprinted in *Essays*, ed. H. Temperley, Cambridge, 1930.
56. Cahen: *Mantzikert*. Cahen, Cl.: *La Campagne de Mantzikert d'après les sources musulmanes* Byzantion, 9 (1934) pp. 613-642.
57. Cahen: *Syrie*. Cahen, Cl.: *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades et la principaute Franques d'Antioche*, Paris, 1940.
58. Cahen: *Penetration Turque*. Cahen, Cl.: *La première pénétration turque en Asie-Mineure (seconde moitié du XIes.)*, Byzantion, XVIII (1948), pp. 5-67.
59. Cahen: *Malik-Nameh*. Cahen, Cl.: *Le Malik-Nameh et l'histoire des Origines Seljukides*, Oriens, II (1949), pp. 31-65.
60. Cahen: *Tribus*. Cahen, Cl.: *Les tribus turques d'Asie Occidentale pendant la periode seljukide*, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die kunde les Morgenlandes* (W. Z. K. M.), Wien, 1950, Vol. 51, 51, pp. 178-187.
61. Cahen: *Historiography-Seljuqids*. Cahen, Cl.: *The Historiography of the Seljuqid Period in Historians of the Middle East*, ed. by Lewis and Holt, pp. 59-78.

62. Cahen: *Alp Arslan - E. I. 2* Cahen, Cl.: *Alp Arslan*, article in the Encyclopaedia of Islam (new).
- 62a Cahen: *Çağrı Beg-E. I. 2* Cahen, Cl.: *Çağrı Beg*, art. in Encyclopaedia of Islām (new).
63. Cahen: *Buwayhids - E. I. 2* Cahen, Cl.: *Buwayhids* - article in Encyclopaedia of Islam (new).
64. Cahen: *Tur. Invasion*. Cahen, Cl.: *The Turkish Invasion: The Selchūkids* in Setton and Baldwin's edition of *A History of the Crusades*, Vol. I, pp. 135-176.
65. Cahen: *Turkey*. Cahen, Cl.: *Pre-Ottoman Turkey* (English trans. by Jones-Williams). London 1968.
66. Canard: *Expéditions*. Canard, M.: *Les expéditions des Arabes contre Constantinople dans l'histoire et dans la légende*, Journal Asiatique, 208 (1926), pp. 61-121.
67. Canard: *Impérialisme*. Canard, M.: *L'Impérialisme des Faṭimides et leur propagande*, Annales de l'Institut d'études orientales (A. I. E. O.), Faculté des Lettres d'Université d'Alger, 6 (1942-1947), pp. 156-193.
68. Canard: *Hamdanides*. Canard, M.: *Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdanides de Jazira et de Syrie*, Vol. I, Paris, 1953.
69. Canard: *Hamdanids - E. I. 2* Canard, M.: *Hamdanids* - Article in the Encyclopaedia of Islam (new).
70. Canard: *Hākim - E. I. 2* Canard, M.: *al-Hākim bi amr Allah* - article in the Encyclopedia of Islam (new).
71. Canard: 'à coté'. Canard, M.: *Quelques 'à-coté' de l'histoire des relations entre Byzance et les Arabes*, in *Studi Orientalistici in onore di G. Levi-della Vida. I* (Rome, 1956), pp. 98-119.
72. Canard: *Faṭimids - E. I. 2* Canard, M.: *Faṭimids* - article in Encyclopaedia of Islam (new).
73. Charanis: *Origin-Crusade*. Charanis, P.: *Byzantium, the West, and the Origin of the First Crusade*, Byzantium, XIX (1949), pp. 24-36.
74. Charanis: *Byz.-Eleventh Cent.* Charanis, P.: *The Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century*, in *A History of the Crusades* (ed. by Setton and Baldwin), Vol. I, pp. 177-219.
75. Citarella: *Amalfi*. Citarella, A. O.: *The Relations of Amalfi with the Arab World before the Crusades* in *Speculum*, Vol. 42 (1967), pp. 299-312.

76. Dahan: *Histories of Syria*. Dahan, S.: *The Origin and development of the local histories fo Syria in Historians of the Middle East*, ed. by Lewis and Holt pp. 108-117.
77. Defrémery: *Seldjoukides-Ismaéliens* Defrémery: *Histoire des Seldjoukides et des Ismaéliens* etc. *Journal Asiatique* (J. A.), 1848.
78. Dewhurst: *JRAS*. (1926) Dewhurst, R. P.: *Abū Tammām and Ibn Hānī*, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1926.
79. Dölger: *Regesten*. Dölger, F.: *Regesten der kaiserunkunden des oströmischen Reichen*, Parts I and II, Munich, 1924-25.
80. Erdmann: *Entstehung*. Erdmann, C.: *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugs gedankens*, Stuttgart, 1935.
81. Gibb: *Relations*. Gibb, H. A. R.: *Arab-Byzantine Relations under the Umayyad Caliphate*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, no. 12 (Cambridge, Mass. 1958), pp. 219-233; reproduced in his *Studies on the Civilisation of Islma*, pp. 47-61.
82. Gibb and Kraus: *Mustanşir - E. I.1* Gibb, H. A. R. and Kraus, P.: *al-Mustanşir bi' llah*, article in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (old).
83. Grousset: *Arménie*. Grousset, R.: *Historie de l'Arménie des origines à 1071*, Paris, 1947.
84. Hamdani, A.: *Sīra of al-Mu'ayyad*. Hamdani, A.: *The Sīra of al-Mu'ayyad fi'd-Dīn ash -Shīrāzī*, unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Univ. of London, 1950.
85. Hamdani, A.: *Fātimids-Medit. Power*. Hamdani, A.: *Some Considerations on the Fātimid Caliphate as a Mediterranean Power*, *Proceedings of the III Arabic and Islamic Studies Conference, Ravello, 1966*, pub. Naples, 1967.
86. Hamdani, A.: *Libya-Faṭimid Period*. Hamdani, A.: *Some Aspects of the History of Libya during the Fāṭimid Period in Libya in History*, Beirut, 1970, pp. 321-348.
87. Hamdani, V. A.: *Sources*. Hamdani, V. A.: *A Critical Study of the Sources for the History of the Seljuqs of Persia and Syria* (unpublished thesis, Oxford Univ., 1939).
88. Hasan: *al-Mu'izz*. Hasan Ibrahim Hasan and Taha Sharaf: *al-Mu'izz li dīn Allah*, Cairo, 1947.
89. Houtsma: *Tughril - E. I.1*. Houtsma, M. Th.: *Tughril Beg* - article in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (old).

90. Idris: *Glances Idris*. H. R.: *Glances sur les Zirides d'Ifrīqiya dans le Manuscrit d'Istanbul de l'Itti'āz al-Hunafā*, Arabica, XI (1964), pp. 286-305.
91. Ivanow: *Ismā'īlī Literature*. Ivanow, W.: *Ismā'īlī Literature: A Bibliographical Survey*, Teheran, 1963 (revised ed. of his *Guide to Ismā'īlī Literature*, London, 1933).
92. Kabir: *Relations*. Kabir, M.: *The Relations of the Buwayhids with the Fāṭimids*, Indo-Iranica, VIII (Dec. 1955), pp. 28-33.
93. Kabir: *Buw. Dyn.* Kabir, M.: *The Buwayhid Dynasty of Baghdād*, Indo-Iranica, Vols. XI, II and XIII (1958-60).
94. Kāmil Ḥusayn: *Adab Miṣr*. Kamil Ḥusayn M.: *Fi Adab Miṣr al-Fāṭimiyya*, Cairo, 1963.
95. Kouymjian: *Mxita'r*. Kouymjian, D. K.: *Mxita'r of Ānī on the Rise of the Seljūqs*, Revue, des études Arméniennes, Nouvelle Serie, VI (1969), pp. 331-353.
96. Köymen: *Askeri Teşkilati*. Köymen, M. A.: *Alp Arslan Zamani Selçuklu Askeri Teşkilati*, Ankara Univ. Basımevi, 1970.
97. Krueger: *Ital. Cities*. Krueger, H. C.: *The Italian Cities and the Arabs before 1095*, in Setton and Baldwin edition of *A History of the Crusades*, Vol. I, pp. 40-53.
98. Laurent: *Byz. et Turcs*. Laurent, J.: *Byzance et les Turcs Seldjucides dans l'Asie occidentale jusqu'en 1081*, Nancy 1913.
99. Lane-Poole: *Egypt*. Lane-Poole, S.: *History of Egypt in the Middle Ages*, London, 1901.
100. Le Strange: *Palestine*. Le Strange, H.: *Palestine under the Muslims*, London, 1890.
101. - Loewe: *Seljuqs*. Loewe, H. M.: *Seljuqs*, Cambridge Medieval History, IV, pp. 299-317.
102. McCartney: *Pechenegs*. McCartney, C. A.: *The Pechenegs in the Slavonic Review*, VIII (1929-30), pp. 342-355.
103. Makdisi: *Ibn Aqīl*. Makdisi, G.: *Ibn Aqīl et la resurgance de l'Islam traditionnaliste au XI, sigcle*, Damascus, 1963.
104. Makdisi: *Marriage*. Makdisi, G.: *The Marriage of Tughril Beg* International Journal of Middle East Studies (I. J. M. E. S.) I (1970), pp. 259-275.

105. Marçais: *Aghlabids - E. I.2.* Marçais: *Aghlabids* - article in the Encyclopaedia of Islam (new).
106. Mukrimin: *Türkiye Tarihi*. Mukrimin Halil: *Türkiye Tarihi, Selçuklu Devri, Anadolu'nun Fethi*, Istanbul, 1934.
107. O'Leary: *Fatimid Caliphate*. O'Leary, D.: *A Short History of the Fātimid Caliphate*, London, 1923.
108. Ostrogorsky: *Byz. Hist.* Ostrogorsky, G.: *History of the Byzantine State*, New Jersey, 1957.
109. Pritsak: *Yabğu*. Pritsak, O.: *Der Untergang des Reiches des oguzischen Yabğu*, Fuad Köprülü Armagani.
110. Quatremere: *Mémoires-Egypte* Quatremère, E.: *Mémoires sur l'Égypte*, 2 vols.
111. Quatremère: *Mémoires-Fatimides*. Quatremère, E.: *Mémoires Historiques sur la dynastie des Khalifes Fātimides* in *Journal Asiatique* (J. A.), 1836 and 1837.
112. Sauvaget: *Halab - E. I. 2.* Sauvaget, J.: *Halab* - article in the Encyclopaedia of Islam (new).
113. Schlum: *Epopée*. Schlumberger, G.: *L'épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle*, Pt. III, Paris, 1895.
114. Stern: *Embassy*. Stern, S. M.: *An Embassy of the Byzantine Emperor to the Fātimid Caliph al-Mu'izz Byzantion*, Vol. 20 (1950), pp. 239-258.
115. Sümer: *Turks*. Sümer, F.: *The Turks in Eastern Asia Minor in the Eleventh Century*. Proceedings of the XIII International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, Sept. 1966, pub. London 1967, pp. 439-441.
116. Talbi: *Aghlabides*. Talbi, M.: *L'Emirat Aghlabide*, Paris, 1966.
117. Toumanoff: *Background*. Tuomanoff, C.: *The Background to Mantzikert*, Main paper XIII, Proceedings of the XIII International Congress of Byzantine Studies, (Oxford, Sept. 1966), London, 1967.
118. Vasiliev: *Byz-Arabes*. Vasiliev, A. A.: *Byzance et les Arabes*, 2 vols. (French trans. from the Russian original of 1900-02).
119. Vasiliev: *Byz. Empire*. Vasiliev, A. A.: *History of the Vyzantine Empire*, 2 vols. 1928 (reprint Madison, 1964).
120. Vasiliev: *Episodes*. Vasiliev, A. A.: *Notes on some episodes concerning the relations between the Arabs and the Byzantine Empire from the fourth*

to the sixth century, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 9-10 (Cambridge, Mass. 1955-1956), pp. 306-316.

121. Vasilievsky: *Patzinaks*. Vasilievsky, V. G.: *Byzantium and the Patzinaks*, *Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction*, CLXIV, 1872.
 122. Wellhausen: *Kämpfe*. Wellhausen, J.: *Die Kämpfe der Araber mit den Römern in der Zeit der Umajyiden*, *Nachr. der Kgl. Gesell. der Wiss., Göttingen, Phil. his. kl.*, 1901, p. 414 seq.
 123. Wellhausen: *Arab Kingdom*. Wellhausen, J.: *The Arab Kingdom and its Fall* (English trans. by M. Weir), Khayyat reprint. Beirut, 1963.
 124. Wittek: *Rise*. Wittek, P.: *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, London, 1938.
 125. Wustefeld: *Geschichte*. Wustefeld, F.: *Geschichte der Fatimiden-Caliphen*, Göttingen, 1881.
 126. Zahid Ali: *Fātimiyyīn Miṣr*. Zahid Ali: *Ta'rikh Fātimiyyīn Miṣr*, (in Urdu), Hyderabad, 1948.
-