

Edis

235446

# ÖTEKİLERİN PEŞİNDE AHMET YAŞAR OCAK'A ARMAĞAN

IN PURSUIT OF THE OTHERS  
Festschrift in Honor of  
Ahmet Yaşar Ocak

A LA POURSUITE DES AUTRES  
Mélanges en l'honneur  
d'Ahmet Yaşar Ocak

HAZIRLAYANLAR

Mehmet Öz

Fatih Yeşil

Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi Kütüphanesi	
Dem. No:	235446
Taa. No:	956 OCA. Ö



ÖTEKİLERİN PEŞİNDE  
AHMET YAŞAR OCAK'A  
ARMAĞAN

TİMAŞ YAYINLARI | 3803  
Tarih İnceleme Araştırma Dizisi | 75

EDİTÖR  
Adem Koçal  
Zeynep Berktaş

KAPAK TASARIM  
Ravza Kızıltuğ

İÇ DÜZEN  
Serhat Küçük

1. BASKI  
Mayıs 2015, İstanbul

ISBN

ISBN: 978-605-08-1952-6



TİMAŞ YAYINLARI  
Cağaloğlu, Alemdar Mahallesi,  
Alayköşkü Caddesi, No: 5, Fatih/İstanbul  
Telefon: (0212) 511 24 24  
P.K. 50 Sirkeci / İstanbul

timas.com.tr  
timas@timas.com.tr  
facebook.com/timasyayingrubu  
twitter.com/timasyayingrubu

Kültür Bakanlığı Yayıncılık  
Sertifika No: 12364

BASKI VE CİLT  
Sistem Matbaacılık  
Yılanlı Ayazma Sok. No: 8  
Davutpaşa-Topkapı/İstanbul  
Telefon: (0212) 482 11 01  
Matbaa Sertifika No: 16086

YAYIN HAKLARI

© Eserin her hakkı anlaşmalı olarak  
Timaş Basım Ticaret ve Sanayi Anonim Şirketi'ne aittir.  
İzinsiz yayınlanamaz. Kaynak gösterilerek alıntı yapılabilir.

## Al-Dhahabī's *Ta'riḫ al-Islām* as a Guide to Arabic Literary Sources for the History of the Seljuks of Anatolia

Gary LEISER\*

Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Uthmān b. Qāymāz b. 'Abd Allāh al-Turkumānī was born in Damascus or Mayyāfāriqīn in 673/1274 and died in Damascus in 748/1348 or 753/1352-53. As the name of his great grandfather Qāymāz and the ascription al-Turkumānī indicate, he was of Turkish descent. In contemporary documents, it was customary to give the name "'Abd Allāh" to the father of someone who had converted. Thus Qāymāz may have been the first of his line to become a Muslim. Al-Dhahabī began to study *ḥadīth* in Damascus around the age of 18 under leading authorities. He went on to pursue the same subject primarily in Ba'labakk, Aleppo, Nablus, Alexandria, Cairo, and Mecca. Eventually he became an instructor in *ḥadīth* in the *madrassa* of Umm al-Ṣāliḥ in Damascus.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Dhahabī knew the leading scholars of his age in Syria and Egypt and had access to a wide range of Arabic literary works. Using the resources at hand, he became a prolific writer, above all of books on *ḥadīth* and history. He is renowned, above all, for his massive *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, which has now been published in 52 volumes.<sup>2</sup> This work is a general history of the Muslim world from the first year of the *hijra* to 700/1300. For the most part, it follows the scheme of the *Kitāb al-Muntazam* of Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200), being a chronology of events, in greater or lesser detail, combined with biographies of noteworthy persons. The biographies are actually more like obituaries. In the chronology, the events are described decade by decade. Each decade is followed by biographies of those who died during that period. The biographical material far outweighs the annalistic, constituting about 85 per cent of the work.

For the period up to 300/912, al-Dhahabī relies overwhelmingly on *Ta'riḫ al-rusul wa 'l-mulūk* by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923). Thus, for these centuries the *Ta'riḫ al-Islām* is not very important. For the subsequent period, however, up to 700/1300, he resorts to many authors whom he usually mentions by name.<sup>3</sup> Because of this and because some of the works of these aut-

---

\* Independent scholar, Sisters, Oregon.

<sup>1</sup> For an overview of his life, see Moh. Ben Cheneb-[J. de Somogyi], "al-Dhahabī," *EP*, vol. 2, 1965, pp. 214-16, which is based chiefly on de Somogyi, "The 'Ta'riḫ al-Islām' of adh-Dhahabī," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, (1932), pp. 815-55, with biographical references on p. 819.

<sup>2</sup> Edited by 'Umar 'Abd al-Salām Tadmūrī, Beirut 1987-2000.

<sup>3</sup> De Somogyi has listed all the events after 301/913 for which al-Dhahabī gives a source, "The 'Ta'riḫ al-Islām' of adh-Dhahabī," pp. 833-43.

hors are lost, this part of the *Ta'rikh al-Islām* is very useful. Indeed, as Joseph de Somogyi pointed out many years ago, al-Dhahabī records many events neglected by Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233), for example, especially concerning the Great Seljuks, Ayyūbids, Mongols, and other matters.<sup>4</sup> Given the encyclopaedic nature of the *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, it seems worthwhile, therefore, to examine it and assess its value as a guide to Arabic literary sources for the history of the Seljuks of Anatolia or Rūm, whose rule conveniently falls between 473-707/1081-1307.<sup>5</sup>

### Chronology

We shall begin with al-Dhahabī's chronology and then turn to his biographies. The first events that he describes related to the Seljuks were Sulaymān b. Qutalmush's recovery of Antioch from the Byzantines in 477/1084, followed by his clash with Sharaf al-Dawla Muslim b. Quraysh the ruler of Mosul in 478/1085, and his siege of Aleppo.<sup>6</sup> Al-Dhahabī does not mention any source for these events, but his information is identical, that is, almost word for word, to that in Ibn al-Athīr's *al-Kāmil*.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, Ibn al-Athīr's account is much fuller. Therefore, al-Dhahabī adds nothing to these events. Next our author describes Sulaymān's death in battle near Aleppo in 479/1086 at the hands of Tutush b. Alp Arslan the ruler of Syria.<sup>8</sup> Again he gives no source; and Ibn al-Athīr's record of this event is again more detailed.<sup>9</sup> To the extent that these two writers report the same information, al-Dhahabī uses almost the same terminology as Ibn al-Athīr. As we shall see frequently below, al-Dhahabī's writing has the hallmarks of a quick "cut and paste" compilation. Some sentences here seem disconnected and there is a lack of context, which tends to make his report somewhat vague and confusing. It cannot be properly understood without reading Ibn al-Athīr. There

<sup>4</sup> Moh. Ben Cheneb-[J. de Somogyi], "al-Dhahabī"; de Somogyi, "The 'Ta'rikh al-Islām' of adh-Dhahabī," pp. 843-44.

<sup>5</sup> In the bibliography to his well-known and ground-breaking, but unannotated, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, New York 1968, Claude Cahen simply mentions the *Ta'rikh al-Islām* as containing extracts from an unknown work by 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī (d. 629/1231-32), p. 437. Later Cahen published these extracts as "'Abdallaṭīf al-Baghdādī, portraitiste et historien de son temps," *Bulletin d'Études Orientales*, 23 (1970), pp. 101-28. Here he refers to 'Abd al-Laṭīf's work as his *Mémoires*. Cahen also mentioned the *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, but without comment, in the bibliography of the revised French version of his aforesaid book, *La Turquie pré-ottomane*, Istanbul 1988, pp. 351-52. In his highly detailed and heavily annotated *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye tarihi*, Istanbul 1984, Osman Turan sometimes cites *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, but he gives no criticism of his sources.

<sup>6</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 32, pp. 21-23.

<sup>7</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. C.J. Tornberg, rpt. 1851-76; Beirut 1965-67, vol. 10, pp. 138-41. D.S. Richards has translated the sections of *al-Kāmil* concerning the Seljuks up to 490/1096-97 as *The Annals of the Saljuq Turks*, London 2002. See pp. 217-20.

<sup>8</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 32, p. 28.

<sup>9</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, pp. 147-48, trans. Richards, pp. 223-24.

are, nevertheless, a few minor differences in the information provided by the two historians. For example, al-Dhahabī says that Sulaymān was killed on the field of battle, but "it was said" (*wa qīla*, a ubiquitous phrase indicating an anonymous source) he committed suicide. Ibn al-Athīr reverses the emphasis, saying he killed himself, but there was a report that he died fighting.

Under the year 491/1097-98, al-Dhahabī briefly mentions the march of the First Crusade across Anatolia. He states that it clashed with Sultan Qılıç Arslan b. Sulaymān and defeated him in 490/1097. Then it passed through the country of Leo the Armenian (Cilicia) and went on to besiege Antioch. Yaghī Siyān, the ruler of Antioch, resolutely defended the city for nine months, but then it fell to treachery and he barely escaped.<sup>10</sup> Once more al-Dhahabī supplies no source, merely saying "it was said." His account is disjointed and comes across as somewhat garbled. It can only be properly understood by reading Ibn al-Athīr's more detailed description of the same events.<sup>11</sup> Much of al-Dhahabī's text is identical to that in Ibn al-Athīr. There are, however, a few differences. Al-Dhahabī says the Crusade passed through the country of Leo the Armenian, but Leo did not rule Cilicia until 1129-38. Ibn al-Athīr does not make this mistake. He rightly says this army traversed the lands of "the son of the Armenian," probably Constantine I (r. 1095-99), the son of the first Armenian ruler of Cilicia. Al-Dhahabī also says that during their siege of Antioch most of the Crusaders were killed or died of plague. Ibn al-Athīr simply says most of them perished.

Under the year 493/1099-1100, al-Dhahabī writes that Gümüshtigin b. Dānishmand, the ruler of Malatya and Sivas met Bohemond the ruler of Antioch [in battle] and took him prisoner. Then our author adds that seven counts (*qawāmiṣ*?) came by sea and they took the fortress of Ankara, slaughtering its people. Afterwards they clashed with Gümüshtigin. At this point al-Dhahabī specifically cites Ibn al-Athīr, stating: "Ibn al-Athīr says, 'Not one of the Franks escaped, they were 300,000, except for 3,000 who fled by night.' This is what he says and he is responsible for it." Then the Franks marched from Antioch and he [Gümüshtigin] met and broke them.<sup>12</sup> Ibn al-Athīr gives a somewhat fuller and clearer account of these events, but he does not mention here that Bohemond was the ruler of Antioch.<sup>13</sup> It is noteworthy, of course, that al-Dhahabī doubts Ibn al-Athīr's figures. For the beginning of his narration of these events, al-Dhahabī may not have relied on Ibn al-Athīr.

<sup>10</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 34, pp. 8-9.

<sup>11</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, pp. 272-75. Richards has again provided a valuable service by translating those sections of *al-Kāmil* related to the Crusades from 491/1097-98 to 628/1230-31, the end of the work, under the title *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for the Crusading Period from al-Kāmil fi'l-Ta'riḫ*, Farnham, Surrey, England 2005-08. This includes everything Ibn al-Athīr has to say about Anatolia. For this passage, see pt. 1, pp. 13-15.

<sup>12</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 34, p. 24. In note 5, the editor says that *qawāmiṣ* was the plural of *qumṣ*, which was a kind of boat, but this would not make sense.

<sup>13</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, p. 300, trans. Richards, pt. 1, p. 32.

In year 494/1100-01, al-Dhahabī briefly reports that a Frankish army of about 50,000 passed through the lands of Qılıç Arslan. The Sūltan mobilized his troops, putting 6,000 horsemen in the field. They hid in ambush, routed the Franks, and seized enormous booty.<sup>14</sup> This was the Crusade of 1101.<sup>15</sup> Ibn al-Athīr also briefly mentions this event, but under the year 495/1101-02 and in a different fashion, saying, for instance, that [Raymond of] St. Gilles led an army of 100,000 men.<sup>16</sup> Under the same year, al-Dhahabī again gives a short notice of this crusade, this time specifically citing, but abbreviating, Ibn al-Athīr.<sup>17</sup> This suggests, of course, that al-Dhahabī was confused about this event.

Immediately following his aforesaid first mention of the Crusade of 1101 and before coming to the year 495, al-Dhahabī expands on this clash of armies by citing "Ibn Munqidh," a source who is apparently unique to *Ta'rikh al-Islām*. He says, "Muḥammad al-Mustawfī, the envoy of Janāḥ al-Dawla<sup>18</sup> to the Byzantine Emperor<sup>19</sup> told me that they had been warned of their number. They were 345,000 people and with them were 50 loads of gold, silver, and brocade; and they were supplemented by those who had been defeated in the previously mentioned battle (the capture of Bohemond earlier in the year?). So, Qılıç Arslan gathered the Turks in his country, and they were more than 50,000. He drained away the water on their route, burned the pastures, and emptied the villages. Consequently, they advanced through a land of no water or pasture."<sup>20</sup>

Ibn Munqidh goes on to say, "The envoy of Riḍwān to the king of the Franks [sic] Ṭatkin<sup>21</sup> told me that he [Ṭatkin] had joined King Tanīn<sup>22</sup> the leader of this host. And he [Ṭatkin] said: 'I set out from my country in [a force of] 400,000 among whom were 1,000 drinking attendants (*sharrābī*), 1,000 cooks, 1,000 servants, 700 mule loads of brocade, other goods (*māl*), and more than 5,000 cavalry. When I departed Constantinople, [I went] for days without comfort. I did not submit to Ṣanjil's<sup>23</sup> command on the route. But I couldn't go back because of the weakness of the people [in the host] and the thirst and hunger. So, in desperation, I took off with three men. We took hounds of the chase with us to make people believe that I had gone hunting. I

<sup>14</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 34, pp. 38-39.

<sup>15</sup> See James Lea Cate, "The Crusade of 1101," *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Kenneth M. Setton, Madison, Wisconsin 1969-89), vol. 1, especially pp. 355, 361.

<sup>16</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, p. 343, trans. Richards, pt. 1, p. 59.

<sup>17</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 34, p. 48.

<sup>18</sup> The atabeg of Riḍwān b. Tutush (d. 507/1113), the Seljuk ruler of Aleppo.

<sup>19</sup> *Malik al-Rūm*. This title was sometimes also given to the Seljuk ruler of Anatolia (Rūm), but he was more frequently called *Ṣāḥib al-Rūm*.

<sup>20</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 34, p. 39.

<sup>21</sup> Taticius/Tsitas, a Byzantine general who accompanied this crusade.

<sup>22</sup> Raymond of Toulouse, who, along with Taticius, served as an advisor on this crusade.

<sup>23</sup> Raymond of St. Gilles.

headed for the sea and boarded a ship, leaving the army.' He informed me [Ibn Munqidh] that the Turks had fallen on it and that no one could save himself. They perished. They either died or were killed. The booty of the Turkmen was beyond description. Tanīn [who had fled] then continued and made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem and he [Ṭatkīn] returned to his country by sea."<sup>24</sup>

Who was Ibn Munqidh? De Somogyi says he was the well-known Usāma Ibn Munqidh.<sup>25</sup> But Usāma was born in 488/1095, and therefore only six years old when this crusade took place. And he does not mention it in his *Kitāb al-Ibar*.<sup>26</sup> More important, Janāh al-Dawla was assassinated in 495/1102.<sup>27</sup> Therefore "Ibn Munqidh" must be another member of the Banū Munqidh. Perhaps he was Usāma's uncle Abū 'l-'Asākir Sulṭān who ruled (492-549/1098-1154) a small principality centered on Shayzar, about 150 km south of Aleppo and 20 km north of Ḥamāh. He surely had a good knowledge of Riḍwān's affairs and probably knew Janāh al-Dawla, who established himself in Ḥimṣ, just south of Ḥamāh, personally. In any case, al-Dhahabī is certainly referring here to a lost source.

Under the year 498/1104-05, al-Dhahabī describes how the Great Seljuk sultan Muḥammad I Tapar (r. 498-511/1105-18) killed the *amīr* Ayāz. This is only of interest to us because in the course of his account, we learn that the Sultan had called a council of his *amīrs* in Baghdad (in 1105) in order to decide how to counter an offensive by Qılıch Arslan against Diyar Bakr and al-Jazīra. At the meeting the Sultan had Ayāz killed.<sup>28</sup> Although he mentions no source, al-Dhahabī's description of this affair is a somewhat condensed and garbled version of Ibn al-Athīr's.<sup>29</sup>

Under the year 500/1106-07 al-Dhahabī mentions in passing the death of Qılıch Arslan, simply saying he fell into the Khābūr River and his swollen body was found a few days later.<sup>30</sup> But under the next year 501/1107-08, he tells how Qılıch Arslan was able to take possession of Mosul in Rajab (i.e., Rajab/March 1107) and then gives a much fuller account of his death. As for Qılıch Arslan's occupation of Mosul, al-Dhahabī recounts how this came about in a very confusing manner.<sup>31</sup> We know from Ibn al-Athīr that after Sultan Muḥammad appointed the *amīr* Jāwulī, who had governed lands

<sup>24</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 34, p. 39. For the last two words I read *fi 'l-baḥr* for *fi 'l-fajr* in the text.

<sup>25</sup> "The 'Ta'rikh al-Islām' of adh-Dhahabī," p. 837.

<sup>26</sup> See the translation by Paul Cobb as *The Book of Contemplation, Islam and the Crusades*, London 2008.

<sup>27</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, p. 345, trans. Richards, pt. 1, p. 61.

<sup>28</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 34, pp. 64-65.

<sup>29</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, pp. 387-89, trans. Richards, pt. 1, pp. 88-89.

<sup>30</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 34, p. 80. The river is apparently the Greater Khābūr, which rises near Ra's al-'Ayn southwest of Mardin and flows into the Euphrates rather than the Lesser Khābūr which flows into the Tigris about 150 km north of Mosul.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 35, p. 11.

between Khūzistan and Fars, to replace Chökermish as governor of Mosul in 500/1106, Jāwulī defeated Chökermish in battle and captured him. Afterwards he died while Jāwulī was using him to try to convince the garrison in Mosul to surrender. The garrison then sent word to Qilich Arslan and two *amīrs* offering to surrender the city to whomever reached it first. After various maneuverings among the parties, Qilich Arslan reached Mosul with an army and Jāwulī fled. Qilich Arslan then entered Mosul and he dropped Muḥammad's name from the *khutba* and added his own.<sup>32</sup> Al-Dhahabī does not mention his source, but his terminology seems to be taken from Ibn al-Athīr whom he likely summarized. Nevertheless, al-Dhahabī's report of these events is so condensed and disjointed that it is almost incomprehensible.

Our writer immediately follows this, again under the year 501, with a more detailed report on the death of Qilich Arslan.<sup>33</sup> We learn that Qilich Arslan left Mosul to fight Jāwulī. In the heat of battle, Qilich Arslan managed to strike him, but he was saved by his armor. Then Jāwulī's men charged and put Qilich Arslan's troops to flight. In an attempt to save himself, Qilich Arslan leapt into the Khābūr on his horse. The water was deep, however, and he drowned. A few days later his body appeared and he was buried in a village along the river. Once more, al-Dhahabī cites no source, but this entry is a shortened version of what Ibn al-Athīr has to say and, to that extent, repeats it almost word for word.<sup>34</sup> Clearly, al-Dhahabī has gotten mixed up concerning the death of Qilich Arslan and the events leading up to it.

Between 501/1107-08 and 537/1142-43, al-Dhahabī says nothing about the Seljuks of Anatolia. During this period he only chronicles certain events concerning the Armenians of Cilicia or the Byzantines. He says that in 506/1112-13 the Armenian Basil the ruler of Cilicia died and that Tankrī [Tancred] the ruler of Antioch had set out to take possession of his lands but became ill en route. He was then forced to return to Antioch where he died.<sup>35</sup> Al-Dhahabī closely follows Ibn al-Athīr here, but the latter says nothing about the death of Basil.<sup>36</sup>

In 531/1136-37, al-Dhahabī describes in very truncated and unclear fashion how Zangī's siege and capture of the fortress of Ba'rīn, which was near Ḥamāh, provoked a counter-offensive by the Byzantine Emperor who went to Antalya by ship, then invaded Armenian territory, and then laid siege to

<sup>32</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, pp. 422-27, trans. Richards, pt. 1, pp. 111-15.

<sup>33</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 35, p. 11.

<sup>34</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, pp. 430, trans. Richards, pt. 1, pp. 116.

<sup>35</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 35, p. 26.

<sup>36</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 10, pp. 493, trans. Richards, pt. 1, pp. 160-61. Kogh Basil ruled a small principality in the Eastern Taurus (1082-1112). His death is mentioned by Ibn al-Qalānisi (d. 555/1160) who might be al-Dhahabī's source. See his *Dhayl Ta'rikh Dimashq*, trans. H.A.R. Gibb as *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, London 1932, pp. 131-32.

the Crusaders in Antioch at the end of 531/1137. The Emperor reached an agreement with the Armenians and then descended upon Aleppo.<sup>37</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, who is probably al-Dhahabī's source here, gives a long account of these events. Without him, al-Dhahabī is almost unintelligible.<sup>38</sup> Under the year 532/1137-38, al-Dhahabī has two entries for the Byzantine capture of Buzā'a, a town near Aleppo. The second is more extensive.<sup>39</sup> Again, no source is mentioned, but it is no doubt Ibn al-Athīr, who gives a detailed report of this event.<sup>40</sup>

Al-Dhahabī returns to the Seljuks in 537/1142-43. He states in two sentences that in this year Muḥammad b. Dānīshmand the ruler of Malatya died and that al-Malik (the "king") Mas'ūd b. Qılıch Arslan Sulaymān b. Qutalmush the ruler (*ṣāhib*) of Konya seized his lands.<sup>41</sup> Our author follows Ibn al-Athīr almost exactly here.<sup>42</sup> Then al-Dhahabī says, in the same year, rather cryptically that the "tyrant" of the Byzantines once more invaded Syria and the ruler of Antioch "met him."<sup>43</sup> Ibn al-Athīr describes this a bit differently and, as always, in more detail.<sup>44</sup>

Afterwards, al-Dhahabī is silent on our subject for three more decades. Then in 568/1172-73, he mentions how Mleh, the son of Leo the Armenian and the ruler (1170-75) of Cilicia, who was in the service of Nūr al-Dīn, defeated a Byzantine army.<sup>45</sup> Here he greatly abridges Ibn al-Athīr, who is not cited.<sup>46</sup> Immediately after this, al-Dhahabī tells us, again in the same year, that Nūr al-Dīn departed Mosul, crossed the Euphrates and invaded Anatolia, capturing Bahasnā and Mar'ash. Nūr al-Dīn did this because Qılıch Arslan [II] had seized the lands of Dhū 'l-Nūn Ibn al-Dānīshmand who took refuge with him. Nūr al-Dīn promised to restore his lands and therefore attacked Qılıch Arslan. The Seljuk sultan then offered to return the strongholds he had taken from Ibn al-Dānīshmand, but Nūr al-Dīn imposed three stipulations before accepting his offer. First, Qılıch Arslan had to renew his faith in Islam because he had been accused of unbelief (*al-zandaqa*). Second, he should send troops to Nūr al-Dīn when required. And third, his daughter

<sup>37</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 36, p. 204.

<sup>38</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, pp. 51-53, trans. Richards, pt. 1, pp. 336-37. Curiously, al-Dhahabī, Ibn al-Athīr, and Ibn al-Qalānsī, *The Damascus Chronicle*, p. 240, mistakenly say that the emperor initially landed at Antioch rather than Antalya.

<sup>39</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 36, pp. 205, 206-07.

<sup>40</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, p. 56, trans. Richards, pt. 1, pp. 339-40. Cf. Ibn al-Qalānsī, *The Damascus Chronicle*, pp. 249-51, who gives information not found in Ibn al-Athīr.

<sup>41</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 36, p. 222.

<sup>42</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, p. 92, trans. Richards, pt. 1, p. 367.

<sup>43</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 36, p. 223.

<sup>44</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, p. 92, trans. Richards, pt. 1, p. 367.

<sup>45</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 39, pp. 45-46.

<sup>46</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, pp. 387-88, trans. Richards, pt. 2, pp. 210-11. Cf. Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubdat al-ḥalab min ta'riḫ Ḥalab*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār, Damascus 1997, vol. 2, p. 507, which is less extensive than *al-Kāmil*.

should marry the son of his brother Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, the ruler of Mosul. Qılıç Arslan agreed to all of these requirements; and Nūr al-Dīn sent troops to Malatya and Sivṣa to assist Ibn al-Dānishmand. When Nūr al-Dīn died, Ibn al-Dānishmand's lands reverted to Qılıç Arslan.<sup>47</sup> Al-Dhahabī does not mention a source for these events, but again it must be Ibn al-Athīr. Indeed, his account appears to be a somewhat disjointed condensation and amalgamation of two of Ibn al-Athīr's works, *al-Kāmil* and *Ta'riḫ al-Bāhir fī 'l-dawla al-atābakiyya*, his history of the Atābaks of Mosul. The former has only the first stipulation while the latter has all three.<sup>48</sup>

A few years later, in 575/1179-80, al-Dhahabī gives an entry on the defeat of Qılıç Arslan [II] at the hands of Taqī 'l-Dīn 'Umar b. Shāhinshāh, the Ayyūbid ruler of Ḥamāh. The Seljuk Sultan had demanded the return of the fortress of Ra'bān, which was between Aleppo and Samsat, from the Ayyūbids, claiming Nūr al-Dīn had taken it and bestowed it on his son al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā'il. Saladin refused to hand it over, so Qılıç Arslan besieged it with a large army. Saladin sent Taqī 'l-Dīn against him. He was accompanied by the *amīr* Sayf al-Dīn 'Alī 'l-Mashṭūb. They had only a thousand cavalry. But Taqī 'l-Dīn attacked by surprise and when the Seljuk troops (*al-Rūm*) heard the noise they thought they were being attacked by a huge army and fled, abandoning great booty.<sup>49</sup> As usual al-Dhahabī, does not tell us his source. Ibn al-Athīr's account is more detailed, but somewhat different, saying nothing about the surprise attack.<sup>50</sup> We cannot be sure if al-Dhahabī used him. He may have relied on more than one source.

The next year, 576/1180-81, al-Dhahabī records that Saladin set out for the lands of the Armenians and the land of Rūm in order to fight Qılıç Arslan. The reason for this was that Muḥammad b. Qara Arslan, the ruler of

<sup>47</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 39, pp. 46-47.

<sup>48</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, pp. 391-92, trans. Richards, pt. 2, p. 213. For *al-Bāhir*, see the ed. by 'Abd al-Qādir Aḥmad Ṭulaymāt, Cairo 1963, pp. 160-61. There is a virtually unknown English translation of an extract of *al-Bāhir* covering these events. It was made from a French translation by J. de Guignes as "Histoire des princes Atabeks en Syrie, par Azz-eddin Ebn al-Athīr," *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, vol. 1 (1787), pp. 542-78. The English translation, without attribution, appeared in the translation of the aforesaid *Notices et Extraits* entitled *Accounts and Extracts of the Manuscripts in the Library of the King of France*, vol. 2 [sic], London 1789. It was published as "The History of the Atabek Princes in Syria." See pp. 460-61.

<sup>49</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 40, pp. 32-33.

<sup>50</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, p. 458, trans. Richards, pt. 2, pp. 266-67. Ibn al-Athīr relies here on *al-Barq al-Shāmī* by 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Iṣfahānī (d. 597/1201). See H.A.R. Gibb, "The Arabic Sources for the Life of Saladin," *Speculum*, 25 (1920), reprinted in *Saladin: Studies in Islamic History*, ed. Yusuf Ibish, Beirut 1974, see pp. 59-60. 'Imād al-Dīn, and especially the extensive account of Ibn Abī Ṭayyī' (d. ca. 625-30/1228-33), which is lost in the original, are cited in *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn* by Abū Shāma (d. 665/1268), Beirut n.d., pt. 2, pp. 9-10; but see Ramazan Şeşen, "'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Iṣfahānī'nin eserlerindeki Anadolu tarihiyle ilgili bahisler," *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3 (1971), pp. 266-67. Cf. Ibn Waṣīl (d. 697/1298), *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl et al., Cairo 1957-77, vol. 2, p. 79.

Ḥiṣn Kayfā on the upper Tigris, had married the daughter of Qılıç Arslan but then ignored her for a singing girl. He married the girl and she began to dominate the affairs of his lands. When the Seljuk sultan learned of this, he became angry and set out to retrieve his daughter. Fearing him, Muḥammad asked Saladin for help. Envoys were exchanged and after a year the singing girl was sent away.<sup>51</sup> Our author gives no source. Ibn al-Athīr gives a much richer and clearer account of this affair, and it differs from that of al-Dhahabī in a few details.<sup>52</sup> Ibn al-Athīr says, for example, that Saladin went to Armenia after going to Ḥiṣn Kayfā while al-Dhahabī says it was the other way around. In haste al-Dhahabī may have jumbled his information. It is likely that he took it from Ibn al-Athīr.<sup>53</sup>

Under the year 578/1182-83, al-Dhahabī mentions in passing that the "king" of Rūm, Qılıç Arslan, conquered a vast land (*baladan kabīran*) belonging to the Christians. Then he sent the good tidings, probably in the form of a *fetiḥnāme*, to "al-dīwān," which must mean to the Caliph in Baghdad.<sup>54</sup> No source for this is given. It must be lost, for it is not mentioned in any other Arabic source. Two Christian sources, Nicetas Choniates and Michael the Syrian, state that in 1182 the Seljuks captured Ulu-borlu, Kütahya, Eskişehir, and surrounding areas and extended their border to Denizli.<sup>55</sup>

For 585/1189-90, al-Dhahabī gives, for him, a very long description of Frederick I Barbarossa's march across Anatolia and attack on Konya as part of the Third Crusade.<sup>56</sup> The first part of this narrative appears to be a summary of Ibn al-Athīr, although he is not mentioned.<sup>57</sup> They differ in only a few minor details. Then our author specifically cites Ibn Wāṣil's (d. 697/1298) version of these events, again in summary fashion.<sup>58</sup> He includes the letter found in Ibn Wāṣil that the Armenian Catholicos at Qal'at al-Rūm on the upper Euphrates sent to Saladin describing Frederick's march.<sup>59</sup> Ibn Wāṣil no doubt took this letter from *al-Nawādir al-sultāniyya* by Bahā' al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād (d. 632/1235), where it is found in full.<sup>60</sup> Indeed after giving the

<sup>51</sup> *Ta'riḫi al-Islām*, vol. 40, pp. 39-40.

<sup>52</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, pp. 464-65, trans. Richards, pt. 2, pp. 271-72.

<sup>53</sup> Abū Shāma, citing 'Imād al-Dīn, is very brief, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn*, pt. 2, p. 16, but does not contradict Ibn al-Athīr. See Şeşen for full account, "'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-İsfahānī'nin eserlerindeki Anadolu tarihiyle ilgili bahisler," p. 271. Ibn Wāṣil closely follows Ibn al-Athīr, *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, vol. 2, pp. 96-98.

<sup>54</sup> *Ta'riḫi al-Islām*, vol. 40, p. 46.

<sup>55</sup> Turan, *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye tarihi*, p. 214.

<sup>56</sup> *Ta'riḫi al-Islām*, vol. 41, pp. 48-54.

<sup>57</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 12, pp. 48-50, trans. Richards, pt. 2, pp. 374-76.

<sup>58</sup> *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, vol. 2, pp. 317-20.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 50-52.

<sup>60</sup> Ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl, Cairo 1964, pp. 124-26; translated by D.S. Richards as *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, Aldershot, Hampshire, England 2002, pp. 114-16. The letter from the Catholicos is also found in 'Imād al-Dīn's *al-Faḥ al-quḍsi*, which may be Ibn Shaddād's

text of the document, Ibn Wāṣil specifically cites a passage from Ibn Shaddād, which al-Dhahabī repeats. Ibn Shaddād, by the way, gives a much different account of Frederick's march than Ibn al-Athīr. Given his long account of Frederick's march, al-Dhahabī was clearly very interested in it, and gives several speculative reasons for his death en route, using the ubiquitous phrase *wa qīla*.

For 588/1192-93, al-Dhahabī mentions in passing the killing of Qılıç Arslan.<sup>61</sup> As we shall see below, he later expands upon his life in a biography. The next entry relative to our subject does not occur until 605/1208-09. Here our author merely states that in this year Kay Khusraw [I] the Ruler of Rūm went on campaign and headed for the land of Sis, that is, Cilician Armenia. A fortress surrendered to him with safe conduct. He was assisted by troops from Aleppo. He went on to plunder and take prisoners.<sup>62</sup> Ibn al-Athīr says nothing about this. Al-Dhahabī seems to have taken his information from Ibn Wāṣil in slightly condensed form.<sup>63</sup> For 615/1218-19, al-Dhahabī mentions in passing the death of Kay Khusraw and says that he was an oppressor, tyrant, and murderer, and was dissolute (*fāsiq*).<sup>64</sup> As we shall see, he provides additional details on his life later in an obituary.

In 621/1224, al-Dhahabī tells the "disgusting" story (*al-wāqī'a al-qabīḥa*) of the son of the Seljuk prince of Erzurum who converted to Christianity to marry the queen of Georgia. Our author relates how one day her husband caught her in flagrante delicto with a *mamlūk*, but she told him to accept it and mind his own business. Indeed, she went on to seek other marriages to slake her desire.<sup>65</sup> Al-Dhahabī surely delighted in telling this story in some detail. He took it entirely from Ibn al-Athīr, whom he cites.<sup>66</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, however, reports it under the year 620/1223-24.

Under the year 625/1127-28, al-Dhahabī reports at length, rather surprisingly, on how the Seljuk sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Kay Qubādh I took direct possession of Erzincan and the nearby fortress of Kamākh and then threatened to take control of Erzurum as well. Under Ayyūbid pressure, however, he reconsidered and later went on to take Samsun on the Black Sea from the

---

source. See Şeşen, "İmād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-İsfahānī'nin eserlerindeki Anadolu tarihiyle ilgili bahisler," pp. 352-53.

<sup>61</sup> *Ta'riḫi al-Islām*, vol. 41, p. 88.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 43, p. 22.

<sup>63</sup> *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, vol. 3, p. 187. Cf. the more detailed account of Kay Khusraw's campaign in Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubdat al-ḥalab*, which is from the perspective of the ruler of Aleppo, vol. 2, pp. 629-30.

<sup>64</sup> *Ta'riḫi al-Islām*, vol. 44, p. 21.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 45, p. 7.

<sup>66</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 12, pp. 416-17, trans. Richards, pt. 3, pp. 244-45. The prince was the son of Muḡhīth al-Dīn Ṭuḡhrīl Shāh the son of Qılıç Arslan II. The Georgian queen was Rusudan the daughter of the renowned T'amar.

Greeks. Then he went to Antalya for the winter.<sup>67</sup> Here al-Dhahabī summarizes to some extent Ibn al-Athīr's account of these events without mentioning him.<sup>68</sup> Ibn al-Athīr gives Sinope, however, instead of Samsun. He also mistakenly gives Antioch for Antalya, which al-Dhahabī repeats. For our present subject, this was al-Dhahabī's last use of Ibn al-Athīr, who died in 630/1233.

In the year 630/1232-33, al-Dhahabī describes the conquest of Āmid (Diyar Bakr) on the upper Tigris in al-Jazīra by the Ayyūbid sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil. Shortly thereafter in his chronology, he states very briefly that war broke out between Artuq Arslan, who was the Artuqid ruler of Mardin, and 'Alā' al-Dīn Kay Qubādh, who were on one side, and al-Malik al-Ashraf Mūsā, the Ayyūbid ruler of Damascus, who was on the other. Artuq Arslan and 'Alā' al-Dīn besieged Ḥarrān, Edessa, and Raqqa and invaded al-Jazīra. "The Rūm did there what the Mongols [later] did."<sup>69</sup> Al-Dhahabī gives no source. Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 654/1256) mentions this equally briefly but somewhat differently. He says nothing about al-Malik al-Ashraf for instance.<sup>70</sup>

Under the year 634/1236-37, al-Dhahabī states in one sentence that al-Malik al-Kāmil and 'Alā' al-Dīn made peace through the mediation of the Caliph.<sup>71</sup> This agreement followed al-Kāmil's failed invasion of Anatolia, which al-Dhahabī does not mention.<sup>72</sup> Al-Dhahabī then reports a flood in Damascus. Afterwards he says in passing that the ruler of Rūm 'Alā' al-Dīn died in this year. He describes his reign later in an obituary. He also states

<sup>67</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 45, p. 29.

<sup>68</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 12, pp. 478-79, trans. Richards, pt. 3, pp. 290-91.

<sup>69</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 45, pp. 51-52.

<sup>70</sup> *Mir'āt al-zamān*, Hyderabad, Deccan 1951-52, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 677. See Gerhard Vāth, *Die Geschichte der artuqidischen Fürstentümer in Syrien und der Gāzira l-Furātiya (496-812/1002-1409)*, Berlin 1987, p. 141. With regard to these events, the editor of *Ta'rikh al-Islām* gives a cross reference to *al-Mukhtār min Ta'rikh Ibn al-Jazarī*, Beirut 1988, vol. 45, p. 49 n. 1. I have not been able to see this work. De Somogyi, "The 'Ta'rikh al-Islām' of adh-Dhahabī," p. 852, lists "Shams al-Dīn al-Jazarī (died in 710/1311)" as one of al-Dhahabī's sources for years 652 and 659, concerning the Mongols. Our editor apparently considers this to be Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Jazarī (d. 739/1338), cf. A.S. Bazmee Ansari, "al-Jazarī," *EP*, vol. 2, 1965, pp. 522-23.

<sup>71</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 46, p. 18.

<sup>72</sup> On this invasion and the historical sources describing it, see Leiser, "The History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church as a Source for the History of the Seljuks of Anatolia," *Living Islamic History: Studies in Honour of Professor Carole Hillenbrand*, ed. Yasir Suleiman, Edinburgh 2010, pp. 116-21. The renowned biographer Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282) says he was in Damascus when al-Kāmil "returned from the East after having delivered the cities of that country from the hands of 'Alā' al-Dīn Kay Qubādh." Then he adds, "the history of this important event would lead us, however, too far." Ibn Khallikān is being disingenuous here since al-Kāmil's campaign was actually a failure which he did not wish to relate, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, ed. Iḥsān 'Abbās, Beirut [1968]-72, vol. 5, p. 83. We should mention that Ibn Khallikān does not include any Seljuk sultan of Anatolia in his biographical dictionary. He only mentions one or two of these rulers in the context of the biographies of Saladin, vol. 7, pp. 168-69; 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd, the ruler of Mosul, vol. 5, p. 205; and Muẓaffar al-Dīn al-Malik al-Ashraf Mūsā, the Ayyūbid ruler of Diyar Bakr and Damascus, vol. 5, pp. 331-32.

fleetingly, with no explanation, that in 637/1239-40 the ruler of Damascus al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ (II) ordered the *khutba* to be recited in the name of "the ruler of Rūm."<sup>73</sup> Sibṭ sāys almost the same thing and that it occurred right after the burial of al-Kāmil, that is, when members of the Ayyūbid dynasty began to jockey for position.<sup>74</sup>

Under the year 641/1243-44, al-Dhahabī chronicles the event that shook the Seljuk dynasty to its foundation, the Mongol invasion. As he records, in disjointed fashion, "the Tatars [Mongols] invaded the land of Rūm and made peace with its ruler Ghiyāth al-Dīn [Kay Khusraw II] on condition that he deliver to them every day [sic], 1,000 dinars, horses, *mamlūks*, slave girls, and hunting dogs. This was after the battle between the Tatars and Muslims in which the latter were defeated in al-Muḥarram (July, 1243). Many men from Aleppo were killed. They were in the vanguard and few escaped. Then the Tatars besieged Kayseri, plundered Sivas, and then conquered Kayseri and plundered it. The ruler of Rūm was a youth. He was devoted to amusements, was oppressive, and not very intelligent. He played with dogs and lions. A lion bit him and he died."<sup>75</sup> Our author gives no word of his source or sources. He parallels Sibṭ for a few words.<sup>76</sup> Ibn al-'Adīm (d. 660/1262) is much different, emphasizing the performance of the men from Aleppo in the battle.<sup>77</sup> Ibn al-'Amīd (d. 672/1273) exhibits some similarities, but is nevertheless distinct.<sup>78</sup> Ibn Wāṣil also differs from al-Dhahabī and takes the perspective of the ruler of Aleppo.<sup>79</sup> In any case, al-Dhahabī adds no information that cannot be found in these other sources.<sup>80</sup>

In his next entry, for the same year, our author simply says that the Tatars established sway (*shihna*) over Rūm. And then, for the following year, he describes at some length the marauding of the Tatars in al-Jazīra. Here he cites al-Jazarī or Ibn al-Jazarī (d. 739/1338). Only the last volume of his history has survived. Ibn al-Jazarī, in turn, cites "the history of Sa'd al-Dīn." If this is the famous Sufi Sa'd al-Dīn al-Ḥammū'ī (d. ca. 649/1252), his history is apparently lost.<sup>81</sup> De Somogyi says this was Sa'd al-Dīn Ibn Mas'ūd b. al-

<sup>73</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 46, p. 37.

<sup>74</sup> *Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 730. Al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-ma'rifaṭ duwal al-mulūk*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Ziyāda and Sa'id 'Abd al-Fattāḥ 'Āshūr, Cairo 1956-73, mentions this event twice: once under the year 637 and again under 638. See respectively, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 299, 308.

<sup>75</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 47, p. 7.

<sup>76</sup> *Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 742.

<sup>77</sup> *Zubdat al-ḥalab*, vol. 2, p. 709.

<sup>78</sup> Claude Cahen, "La 'Chronique des Ayyoubides' d'al-Makīn b. al-'Amīd," *Bulletin d'Études Orientales*, 15 (1955-57), p. 154.

<sup>79</sup> *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, vol. 5, pp. 326-27.

<sup>80</sup> The aforesaid battle has been thoroughly discussed by Nejat Kaymaz, "Anadolu selçuklu sultanlarından II. Gıyāsü'd-dīn Keyhusrev ve devri," (unpublished PhD Diss., Ankara University, 1958, pp. 104-13.

<sup>81</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 47, pp. 7, 12.

Ḥammū'ī al-Juwaynī al-Kāzarūnī (d. 758/1357), but this might be anachronistic.<sup>82</sup> In any case, the Seljuks are not mentioned.

They do not appear in al-Dhahabī's chronology again until 651/1253-54. He says that in this year or in the following year the daughter of the Seljuk sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn (Kay Qubādh II, who ruled jointly with his brothers) married the Ayyūbid sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣir (who ruled Damascus and Aleppo). Our author gives many details about her dowry and the festivities. In fact he spreads this description over two entries, one in 651 and the other in 652/1254-55. In the latter, he calls 'Alā' al-Dīn *malik* (king) instead of sultan. He emphasizes that the bride's mother was the daughter of the Ayyūbid sultan al-'Ādil.<sup>83</sup> Al-Dhahabī seems to use two sources, unmentioned, because he says there was disagreement over the date of this wedding, so he entered it twice in his chronology. Neither Sibṭ nor Ibn al-'Amīd were his sources for they are far too brief. Sibṭ gives 652 while Ibn al-'Amīd gives 651 for the date of the wedding.<sup>84</sup>

In 656/1258 al-Dhahabī gives a long account of the Mongol conquest of Baghdad and in the course of it states in passing that Hülegü had taken Rūm but had left Rukn al-Dīn [Qılıch Arslan IV] b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay Khusraw [II] in charge, but he ruled only in name.<sup>85</sup> For 658 and 659/1260-61 he lists Rukn al-Dīn and [his brother] 'Izz al-Dīn Kay Kā'ūs as joint rulers under the control of the Mongols.<sup>86</sup>

For 660/1261-62, al-Dhahabī reports that Rukn al-Dīn "the ruler of Rūm" defeated his brother 'Izz al-Dīn near Konya. Rukn al-Dīn was victorious because he had the help of the Mongols. Many of the troops of 'Izz al-Dīn were killed, captured, or hanged. Then Rukn al-Dīn took up residence in Antioch [sic, Antalya].<sup>87</sup> Once more al-Dhahabī provides no source. These events are covered in greater detail and in somewhat different fashion by al-Yunīnī (d. 726/1326).<sup>88</sup>

Then later in the same year our author states that the authority of 'Izz al-Dīn, the son of the ruler of Rūm (said ruler being Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay Khusraw II), had declined and the Mongols oppressed him. So, he set out for [the Byzantine Emperor] al-Ashkarī<sup>89</sup> [in Constantinople] and asked him for assistance. Al-Ashkarī offered to help if he would convert to Christianity. 'Izz

<sup>82</sup> "The 'Ta'rikh al-Islām' of adh-Dhahabī," p. 852.

<sup>83</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 48, pp. 6-7, 10.

<sup>84</sup> See respectively *Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 791, and Cahen, "La 'Chronique des Ayyoubides' d'al-Makin b. al-'Amīd," pp. 164-65.

<sup>85</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 48, p. 34.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 48, 69.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>88</sup> *Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān*, Hyderabad, Deccan 1954-55, vol. 2, pp. 113-14.

<sup>89</sup> The Byzantine Emperor John IV Lascaris (r. 1258-61), but in fact the emperor was then Michael VIII Palaeologus (r. 1261-82).

al-Dīn's followers rebuked him for even considering such a step. Al-Ashkarī, therefore, imprisoned him in a fortress. Meanwhile the Mongol troops of Baraka raided the Emperor's lands and besieged the fortress in which 'Izz al-Dīn was imprisoned. An agreement was reached whereby 'Izz al-Dīn was released to the Mongols and they departed.<sup>90</sup> Al-Dhahabī gives no source. It may be a summary and muddled version of al-Yunīnī's account of these events which is critical to their understanding.<sup>91</sup> Indeed, al-Dhahabī was confused about these matters, for he gives a second and much different description of them under the year 662/1263-64; and again it differs from al-Yunīnī's account. Here he says that 'Izz al-Dīn and his *amīrs* were determined to kill al-Ashkarī. Then he states, rather incomprehensibly, "They (who?) besieged Constantinople with them (who?). He blinded them and imprisoned 'Izz al-Dīn. Then Baraka demanded him and he went to him."<sup>92</sup> As we shall see, al-Dhahabī repeats much of this in his biography of 'Izz al-Dīn.

Al-Dhahabī records that two years later, in 664/1265-66, Rukn al-Dīn, the ruler of Rūm, and his chief minister or personal assistant the Pervane Mu'in al-Dīn Sulaymān set out with gifts to visit the Mongol ruler Abaqa, who was then in Tabriz. When Rukn al-Dīn returned, Mu'in al-Dīn remained behind and told Abaqa that the Seljuk rulers could not be trusted and that Rukn al-Dīn might be conspiring with the ruler of Egypt. Consequently Abaqa appointed Mu'in al-Dīn his representative in Rūm with the power to kill anyone who opposed his authority. Then Mu'in al-Dīn conquered a fortress for Abaqa.<sup>93</sup> Al-Dhahabī may have obtained his information from al-Yunīnī, but, if so, he drastically abridged it.<sup>94</sup>

Under the year 675/1276-77, al-Dhahabī recounts at some length the campaign of the Mamlūk sultan al-Zāhir Baybars into Central Anatolia, which was meant in part to spark a revolt among the Seljuk *amīrs* against the Mongol occupation of that region. He mentions in disjointed fashion Baybars' defeat of the Mongols at Elbistan (1277), his entrance and brief residence in Kayseri, the machinations of the Pervane, the flight of the Seljuk ruler to Tokat, the capture of Konya by Baybars' ally the Turkmen Shams al-Dīn Ibn Qaramān, Baybars' withdrawal from Anatolia, and the subsequent retribution of the Mongol ruler Abaqa against the people of Kayseri.<sup>95</sup> In all of this our author mentions only one source, the history of "Quṭb al-Dīn," that

<sup>90</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 48, p. 84.

<sup>91</sup> *Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 2, pp. 160-61.

<sup>92</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 49, pp. 13-14.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>94</sup> *Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 2, pp. 404-05. Cf. Turan, *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye tarihi*, p. 530.

<sup>95</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 50, pp. 25-28.

is, al-Yunīnī.<sup>96</sup> Altogether, the description of Baybars' campaign is clearly a composite of several sources. A list of leading figures captured at the battle of Elbistan, for example, is inserted *after* Baybars set up court in Kayseri. Nevertheless, modern scholarly studies of Baybars have pointed out that al-Dhahabī's *Ta'rikh al-Islām* is, in fact, an important source for his life. In this respect, they note that al-Dhahabī used 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād (d. 684/1285), Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir (d. 692/1292), and al-Yunīnī, all of whom cover the aforesaid events.<sup>97</sup>

The last events that al-Dhahabī chronicles related to the Seljuks concern Qal'at al-Rūm, which was in the hands of the Armenians. Our author says that in 691/1291 the Mamlūk sultan al-Ashraf Khalīl besieged and captured it. He stationed a garrison there and then withdrew to Syria.<sup>98</sup> Al-Ashraf apparently carried out this operation in cooperation with a son of 'Izz al-Dīn Kay Kā'ūs [II], the *amīrs* of Qaramān, and certain Turkmen tribes who were opposed to the rule of the Mongols and their shadow Seljuk sultans.<sup>99</sup> Al-Dhahabī gives no source, but it was probably al-Yunīnī.<sup>100</sup>

#### Biographies

Al-Dhahabī gives the biographies, or obituaries, of ten rulers of the Seljuk sultanate of Anatolia and of one ruler of the Dānishmendid principality in Anatolia. He also gives a few notices of theologians from that region, but we shall not consider them here.<sup>101</sup> As for our rulers, some of their notices are quite cursory while others are extensive. These notices are usually limited to a few political events, not necessarily the most important, of their reigns, and remarks on how they died. The first is for Sulaymān b. Qutalmūsh. Here our author simply says that he was killed in Šafar 479/June 1086 in battle in the land of Aleppo. He was the *amīr* of Konya [sic, not yet firmly established as the capital] and the forefather of the Seljuks of Rūm and was succeeded by his son Qılıch Arslan.<sup>102</sup> Al-Dhahabī gives no source. The next notice, for Mas'ūd b. Qılıch Arslan, who died in 551/1156, is even shorter. Al-Dhahabī

<sup>96</sup> The editor of *Ta'rikh al-Islām* gives a cross-reference to these events in *Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 3, pp. 170, 177, 181-83, 185-86, which I have not seen.

<sup>97</sup> See, for instance, Syedah Fatima Sadeque, *Baybars I of Egypt*, Dacca, Pakistan 1956, p. 7, and Abdul-Aziz Khowaiter, *Baibars the First*, London 1978, pp. 182-83.

<sup>98</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 52, pp. 12-13, 25.

<sup>99</sup> Turan, *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye tarihi*, p. 606.

<sup>100</sup> The editor of *Ta'rikh al-Islām* gives a cross-reference to these events in the unpublished manuscript of the fourth volume of *Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 52, p. 12 n. 2, p. 13 n. 2.

<sup>101</sup> They include Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 638/1240), *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 46, pp. 374-81, and Šadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī (d. 673/1274), *ibid.*, vol. 50, pp. 92-93. Curiously, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmī (d. 672/1273) is missing. Al-Dhahabī includes as well a few Artuqid rulers from southeastern Anatolia, such as Artuq Arslan (d. 637/1239) the ruler of Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn, *ibid.*, vol. 46, pp. 281-82, 320. The Artuqids are beyond the scope of this study.

<sup>102</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 32, p. 265.

says he was the ruler (*ṣāhib*) of Rūm and died in Konya and his son Qılıç Arslan came to power after him.<sup>103</sup> Once more al-Dhahabī cites no source.<sup>104</sup>

Al-Dhahabī's only biography for a non-Seljuk ruler in Anatolia is for Yāghī [i.e., Yāghī Basan] Arslan [b. Amīr Ghāzī Gümüshtigin] b. Dānishmand, who, he says, died in 560/1164-65. Here our author mainly tells the tale of the clash between Qılıç Arslan b. Mas'ūd and Yāghī Arslan. Al-Malik "Qutluq"<sup>105</sup> had sent his daughter to marry Qılıç Arslan, but Yāghī Arslan seized her and her dowry en route. He wanted to marry her off to his nephew Dhū 'l-Nūn, so she was forced to renounce Islam temporarily in order to annul her marriage to Qılıç Arslan. Once she returned to Islam, she was married to Dhū 'l-Nūn. Qılıç Arslan was outraged and marched against Yāghī Arslan, but he was defeated. Shortly afterwards Yāghī Arslan died and was succeeded by his nephew Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad who was followed by Dhū 'l-Nūn; and they came to an understanding with Qılıç Arslan.<sup>106</sup> Al-Dhahabī gives no source, but probably took his information, in abbreviated fashion, from Ibn al-Athīr.<sup>107</sup>

In 588/1192, al-Dhahabī gives the biography of Qılıç Arslan b. Mas'ūd. He begins with his genealogy and remarks on a difference of opinion over the descent of Sulaymān b. Qutalmish. Then he says that Qılıç Arslan, who was the *malik* of Rūm, was just, followed good policies, and was level headed. His daughter al-Jiha married the 'Abbāsīd caliph al-Nāṣir. He was succeeded by his son Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay Khusraw. Then our author says, "it was said" he was murdered. The Sultan had difficulty with his sons to the extent that he ruled only in name because of his old age and died in Konya.<sup>108</sup> Then al-Dhahabī cites a short passage from Ibn al-Athīr's more extensive account of Qılıç Arslan.<sup>109</sup>

It is worth noting here that al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363), in his massive biographical dictionary *al-Wāfi bi-'l-Wafayāt*, follows al-Dhahabī, his older friend, word for word in his biography of Qılıç Arslan b. Mas'ūd until the end of the passage from Ibn al-Athīr.<sup>110</sup> Then he inserts the incident between Qılıç

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 38, p. 67.

<sup>104</sup> There is an equally brief notice in Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 12, p. 210, trans. Richards, pt. 2, p. 80.

<sup>105</sup> That is, Şaltuq b. 'Alī b. Abī 'l-Qāsim, the ruler of Erzurum.

<sup>106</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 38, pp. 327-28.

<sup>107</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 11, p. 210, trans. Richards, pt. 2, p. 157.

<sup>108</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 41, p. 306.

<sup>109</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 12, p. 87, trans. Richards, pt. 2, p. 403. With respect to Qılıç Arslan's division of his realm among his sons and the consequences thereof, Ibn al-Athīr gives one version and then says, "A reliable source, who knew what he was talking about and had visited those regions, told me a different version, which we shall give now." This is one of the few sources of any kind that Ibn al-Athīr gives for his information on the Seljuks of Anatolia. Cf. Şeşen, "'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Isfahānī'nin eserlerindeki Anadolu tarihiyle ilgili bahisler," pp. 360-61.

<sup>110</sup> Ed. Hellmut Ritter et al., Wiesbaden 1962-2013, vol. 24, pp. 271-72.

Arslan and Nūr al-Dīn that al-Dhahabī described above under the year 568 with a few minor differences. Qılıch Arslan b. Mas'ūd is the first Seljuk sultan that al-Şafadī includes in his book. As we shall see, he relies on al-Dhahabī for all of his subsequent entries on Seljuk sultans.

Next, under the year 600/1203-04, al-Dhahabī gives the biography of Rukn al-Dīn Sulaymān b. Qılıch Arslan. He first cites al-Mundhirī (d. 656/1258) as the source for his date of death.<sup>111</sup> Then he, al-Dhahabī, says "I said his father was mentioned in the year 588. His brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn was devoted to his father. He [Ghiyāth al-Dīn] took possession of Konya after his father. He gained ascendancy over his brother al-Malik Quṭb al-Dīn Malikshāh. Then he gained ascendancy over others as well. Then this sultan Rukn al-Dīn overcame Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay Khusraw. He took Konya from him and Kay Khusraw fled to Syria and asked the ruler of Aleppo al-Malik al-Zāhir Ghāzī for help. When Rukn al-Dīn died in this year he was succeeded by his son Qılıch Arslan [III]. Ghiyāth al-Dīn returned and he took possession of Konya and all of the country, and the kings [i.e., his brothers] were in fear of him. When he died he was succeeded by his son Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kay Kā'ūs b. Kay Khusraw and he ruled until his death. His brother 'Izz al-Dīn Kay Qubādh became sultan after him."<sup>112</sup> Right after this, al-Dhahabī cites Ibn Wāşil on how he captured Ankara [from his brother Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Mas'ūd] and a few days later died of colic.<sup>113</sup>

In the year 615/1218-19, al-Dhahabī gives the obituary of 'Izz al-Dīn Kay Kā'ūs b. Kay Khusraw, whom he calls "al-Sultān al-Malik al-Ghālib (the Conqueror)" and the ruler of Rūm, namely, Konya, Malatya, and Aqsaray. Then he immediately cites Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī. He paraphrases Sibṭ somewhat and in a confusing manner. He records Sibṭ as saying that Kā'ūs was an oppressor, tyrant, and shedder of blood. When he returned to his country after defeat at the hands of al-Ashraf [the Ayyūbid ruler of Diyar Bakr and Damascus] at Aleppo, at the time that he [Kay Kā'ūs] had come to take Aleppo after the death of its sultan al-Malik al-Zāhir, he accused many of his *amīrs* of not having fought hard enough. So he scalded some of them in kettles and put the others in a house and burned them. He died suddenly while

<sup>111</sup> *Al-Takmila li-Wafayāt al-naqala*, ed. Bashshār 'Awwād Ma'rūf, first four vols., al-Najaf, Iraq 1968-71, vol. 3, p. 76. This work is primarily a biographical dictionary of scholars and students of *ḥadīth*. Why Sulaymān is included, with no information except his death date, is curious. Is this meant to suggest that he had studied *ḥadīth*? If he did, one wonders with whom. *Al-Takmila* appears to include no scholars of *ḥadīth* from Anatolia. No other Seljuk ruler is found in this work. It does, however, contain many Ayyūbid rulers and describes their studies in greater or lesser detail.

<sup>112</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 42, pp. 434-35. Ibn al-Athīr's account of these events is much different, *al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 12, pp. 195-96, trans. Richards, pt. 3, p. 80.

<sup>113</sup> *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, vol. 3, pp. 160-62. Al-Dhahabī does not give Ibn Wāşil's full text. Al-Şafadī gives an extremely brief obituary of our sultan using the same wording as al-Dhahabī, *al-Wāfi*, vol. 15, p. 421.

drunk. Sibṭ also reports "it was said" he suffered physically and had pain in the belly (colic?). At that time his brother Kay Qubādh was in prison and he had intended to kill him, but he was then released and became sultan. Kay Kā'ūs died in Shawwāl/December 1218 or January 1219.<sup>114</sup>

Then al-Dhahabī changes sources and inserts the phrase "it was said he encouraged the Franks in Damietta" [against the Ayyūbid sultan of Egypt al-'Ādil]. Then he changes sources once more, this time citing Ibn Wāṣil in abbreviated form. Here he goes back to the previous subject, the clash between Kay Kā'ūs and al-Ashraf. Ibn Wāṣil's detailed account of it makes that of Sibṭ understandable.<sup>115</sup> Ibn Wāṣil follows Ibn al-Athīr's report of these events fairly closely.<sup>116</sup> Finally al-Dhahabī says the Sultan died of diphtheria or quinsy shortly after his defeat. Altogether, this obituary is repetitious and very disjointed.<sup>117</sup>

Al-Dhahabī's obituary for the greatest of the Seljuk sultans of Anatolia, 'Alā' al-Dīn Kay Qubādh, is surprisingly short. He gives his death date as 7 Shawwāl, 634/7 June, 1237 and says that he was the Sultan of Rūm and gives him the title of *malik*. He goes on to say that the Sultan was extremely impressive (awesome), courageous, of superior intellect, and of good fortune. Al-Dhahabī notes that he defeated the armies of the Khwārazm-Shāh and of al-Kāmil and captured and annexed a number of cities. He mentions the marriage of his daughter to al-'Ādil and states that his brother Kay Kā'ūs had taken possession of Rūm before him and had imprisoned him. Then, just before Kay Kā'ūs died he released him, made him his successor, and entrusted him with his children. Al-Dhahabī goes on to say, "according to what we learned," which was perhaps an oral source, that Kay Qubādh returned Anatolia to justice. He ends by giving his genealogy and successor.<sup>118</sup> Sibṭ summarizes much of this information in only a few lines.<sup>119</sup> Al-Dhahabī's main source may have been Ibn Wāṣil who spreads this information, piece by piece, over various pages.<sup>120</sup>

Al-Dhahabī's next obituary is for Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay Khusraw the son and successor of Kay Qubādh. This notice, in 643/1245-46, is very brief. The author informs us that the Sultan was a youth devoted to amusements. When a detachment of Mongols besieged and plundered Erzurum and at-

<sup>114</sup> *Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 598. Al-Ṣafadī follows al-Dhahabī to this point, in slightly abbreviated fashion, without mentioning Sibṭ, *al-Wāfi*, vol. 24, p. 384.

<sup>115</sup> *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, vol. 3, pp. 263-64, 266-68.

<sup>116</sup> *Al-Kāmil*, ed. Tornberg, vol. 12, pp. 347-50, 354, trans. Richards, pt. 3, pp. 194-96, 199. He says the Sultan died in 616/1219-20 from consumption. He says nothing about his character.

<sup>117</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 44, pp. 256-58.

<sup>118</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 46, pp. 210-11. With the exception of a few words, and the deletion of the phrase "according to what we learned," al-Ṣafadī repeats al-Dhahabī's text, *al-Wāfi*, vol. 24, p. 383.

<sup>119</sup> *Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 703.

<sup>120</sup> *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, vol. 5, see index on p. 398.

tacked other cities, the Sultan mobilized his forces and marched against them, but he was defeated and his mother was taken captive. After his defeat, one of his sons, who was only seven years old, succeeded him. Al-Dhahabī says the Sultan died in this year according to the account of Ibn al-Sā'ī.<sup>121</sup> This Iraqi historian (d. 674/1276) spent his life in Baghdad. Only the years 595-606/1198-1210 of his annalistic history *al-Jāmi' al-mukhtaṣar* have survived, which is why, of course, we do not think of it as a source for the Seljuks of Anatolia. It is possible that al-Dhahabī relied on him elsewhere for our subject without mentioning him. Otherwise Sibṭ marks his death date in passing after earlier giving an account of his clash with the Mongols, which we have mentioned above in the chronology.<sup>122</sup> Ibn Wāṣil recounts the same clash, again as mentioned above, and provides some other details of his life but does not give a separate obituary.<sup>123</sup> Al-Dhahabī may have consolidated and summarized his information.

Under the year 657/1258, al-Dhahabī gives a death notice for 'Alā' al-Dīn Kay Qubādh b. Kay Kusraw, the ruler of Rūm. This was presumably Kay Qubādh II b. Kay Kusraw II, with whom our author surely would not have confused Kay Qubādh I. He simply says "al-Ḍahīr al-Kāzarūnī said he died in his year, that is, year [65]7."<sup>124</sup> This source is perhaps the poet al-Ḍahīr al-Kāzarūnī (d. 697/1298). Al-Dhahabī may have known him. If the source is indeed this poet, one wonders how he obtained his information?

Next al-Dhahabī gives a fairly long obituary of Rukn al-Dīn "Kay Qubādh" b. Kay Khusraw II under the year 666/1267-68. This, however, is an error for Rukn al-Dīn Qılıç Arslan IV b. Kay Khusraw II. He repeats this error throughout the notice. Our author traces his genealogy to Duqāq, the forefather of the Great Seljuks. Al-Dhahabī describes him as high minded, generous, and courageous but subject to the authority of the Mongols. They killed him this year by strangling him with a bow string. This came about because of the machinations of the Pervane who accused him of corresponding with the ruler of Egypt. The Sultan preoccupied himself with amusements while the Pervane controlled his affairs. After he was executed, he was put in a litter and taken to Konya. It was declared that he had fallen from a horse and died. He was 28. Then his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay Khusraw [III] was placed on the throne. He was 8. Afterwards, the Pervane went to meet Abaqa and took with him the Sultan's horse and sword. After con-

<sup>121</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 47, pp. 200-01. Apart from stating the tax that the Sultan had to pay the Mongols, al-Ṣafadī copies al-Dhahabī word for word, *al-Wāfi*, vol. 24, p. 379.

<sup>122</sup> *Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 759.

<sup>123</sup> *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, vol. 5, see index on p. 398.

<sup>124</sup> *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, vol. 48, p. 321. Al-Ṣafadī repeats this but without mentioning al-Kāzarūnī, *al-Wāfi*, vol. 24, p. 383.

sultations, the Pervane returned with Abaqa's brother Ajay.<sup>125</sup> Al-Dhahabī gives no source. He may have summarized, to some extent, al-Yunīnī's description of the scheming of the Pervane, but he rightly calls the Sultan "Qılıch Arslan."<sup>126</sup>

Al-Dhahabī's last obituary of a Seljuk sultan of Anatolia is for 'Izz al-Dīn Kay Kā'ūs [II] b. Kay Khusraw [II] under the year 672/1273-74. He was the brother of Rukn al-Dīn [Qılıch Arslan IV]. Al-Dhahabī tells us that he died in the lands of the Turks in Sūdāq (Sughdāq in the Crimea) at the age of 26 [sic]. He and his brother had divided the realm of Rūm after their father died. Then Rukn al-Dīn seized control of the entire realm and 'Izz al-Dīn fled with his family and retinue to the "king" of Constantinople. The latter did not support him, however, and imprisoned him. Then the king of the Mongols, Baraka, plundered the districts of Constantinople. This forced the king of Constantinople to reach an agreement. This was in the year 660/1261-62. He turned 'Izz al-Dīn over to Baraka who honored him and made him a great *amīr*. Later 'Izz al-Dīn was in the service of Mengü Timur (the ruler of the Golden Horde). He was succeeded by his son al-Malik al-Mas'ūd, who was also in the service of Mengü Timur.<sup>127</sup> This obituary is clearly disjointed. Again al-Dhahabī gives no source. He may have relied on al-Yunīnī.<sup>128</sup>

### Conclusions

1) There are huge gaps in al-Dhahabī's chronology. In fact, most of the major events of the 6<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> century are missing. Many of those that are included are garbled, disjointed, truncated, and lack context. Some events are confused and repeated under different years. Given the nature of *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, as an enormous encyclopaedic work, that is, a work of synthesis, we should expect this, although writing in haste may have contributed to these problems. Perhaps al-Dhahabī was assisted by students or colleagues. In any case, we must frequently consult other works in order to clarify his text.

2) Al-Dhahabī's biographies include most of the major and a few of the minor Seljuk sultans, but their coverage is very uneven. He says almost nothing about the shadow sultans of the last third of the 7<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup> century. His biographical coverage has the same problems of composition as his chronology. Furthermore, he often repeats in the biographies the events found in the chronology, but not always in the same way.

<sup>125</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 49, pp. 230-31. Al-Ṣafadī gives a slightly abbreviated version of al-Dhahabī and also calls the Sultan "Kay Qubādḥ," *al-Wāfi*, vol. 24, pp. 383-84.

<sup>126</sup> *Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 2, pp. 403-06.

<sup>127</sup> *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, vol. 50, p. 105. Al-Ṣafadī gives a shorter version of this account, *al-Wāfi*, vol. 24, p. 384. He also says that the two brothers divided the realm "after their mother" (?).

<sup>128</sup> The editor of *Ta'riḫ al-Islām* gives a cross-reference to these events in *Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 3, 66-67, which I have not seen.

3) Except for mentioning the conquests of Qılıç Arslan II and a few other, mostly minor, facts, *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, provides no information that cannot be found in earlier extant Arabic works.

4) Al-Dhahabī frequently mentions his sources, or we can determine them by textual comparison. These sources were above all Ibn al-Athīr, Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Ibn Wāṣil, and al-Yunīnī. He also cites "Ibn Munqidh," Ibn al-Jazarī, "Sa'd al-Dīn," Ibn al-Sā'ī, and al-Ẓahīr al-Kāzarūnī. The works of these writers are wholly or partially lost. Consequently, we cannot tell how often he consulted them. He also gives anonymous sources, using the phrase *wa qīla*. To the extent that al-Dhahabī mentions his sources, or they can be determined by analysis, in *Ta'riḫ al-Islām*, it does indeed serve as a guide to the Arabic literary sources for the history of the Seljuks of Anatolia that were available to a 7<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup> century Syrian scholar.

Because al-Dhahabī was a near contemporary of the later Seljuks of Anatolia and because there were close political and commercial relations between Anatolia and Syria, where he spent much of his life, it is surprising perhaps that he was not better informed about events in Anatolia, especially if he spoke Turkish. Is this evidence that scholars like al-Dhahabī had little interest in the affairs of Anatolia, and that it was considered a backwater, or is this simply a reflection of the fact that no Arabic literary works, on which al-Dhahabī could rely, were written under the Seljuks of Anatolia? More than fifty years ago, Claude Cahen stated that the Seljuk Sultanate of Anatolia developed "as a stranger to the traditional Moslem World, which has consequently left us almost no reliable information about it."<sup>129</sup> Al-Dhahabī's *Ta'riḫ al-Islām* would tend to confirm this.

---

<sup>129</sup> "The Turks in Iran and Anatolia before the Mongol Invasions", *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Kenneth M. Setton, Madison, Wisconsin 1969-89), vol. 1, p. 675. Vols. 1-2 were originally published in 1962.