



نهاية الأرب

في

فتوى الأرب

107

Mahmud b. Muhammed Tapa

تأليف (78-20, 26-28)

شهاب الدين أحمد بن عبد الوهاب النويري

٦٧٧ - ٧٢٣ هـ

İslamiye Diyanet Vakfı
İslami Araştırma Merkezi

6999-27

الجزء السابع والعشرون

تحقيق

دكتور سعيد عاشور

مراجعة

دكتور فؤاد عبد المعطي الصياد

دكتور محمد مصطفى زيادة

Dr. İbrahim Faruk

M. G.



المسئولية محفوظة للمكتبة
١٤٠٥ هـ - ١٩٨٥ م

وخطبوا الملك مسعود بالسلطنة ، وضربوا له التوب الخمس (١) ، وكان ذلك على تفرق عساكر السلطان محمود ، فقوى طمعهم وأسرعوا إليه ليلته وهو في قلة من العسكر ، واجتمع إليه نحو خمسة عشر ألف فارس .

فسمار السلطان إليهم فالتقوا عند عقبة استراباد (٢) نصف شهر ربيع الأول ، واقتتلوا نهرا كاملا والبرسقي في مقدمة عسكر السلطان محمود وأبلى يومئذ بلاء حسنا . فانهزم عسكر الملك مسعود في آخر النهار ، وأسر جماعة كبيرة من أعيان أصحابه . وأسر الوزير ، فأمر السلطان بقتله وقال : « ثبت عندى فساد نيته » وكان حسن الكتابة والشعر ، وله تصانيف في صنعة الكيمياء ضيعت للناس من الأموال ما لا يحصى كثرة .

قال : ولما انهزم أصحاب الملك مسعود وتفرقوا ، قصد جبلا بينه وبين المصاف اثني عشر فرسخا ، واختفى فيه بألفي فارس ، وأرسل إلى أخيه يطلب منه الأمان ، فرق له وأجابه إلى ما طلب ، وأمر اقسنقر البخاري بالمسير إليه وإعلامه بعفو السلطان وبسطه .

ولما كتب إلى أخيه في طلب الأمان وصل إليه بعد ذلك بعض

(١) النوبة : فرق الجند التي تتناوب الوقوف لحراسة شخص السلطان ، وهي خمس يكون تغييرها في الظهر والعصر والمساء ونصف الليل وعند الصباح .

(٢) كذا في ك ، وفي ابن الأثير استراباد وفي ع البخاري . وقد ذكر ياقوت في معجم البلدان أن استراباد بفتح الألف وسكون السين وفتح التاء بلدة كبيرة من أعمال طبرستان .

ذكر عصيان الملك مسعود على أخيه السلطان محمود والحرب بينهما والصلح

وفي سنة أربعة عشرة وخمسمائة في شهر ربيع الأول كان المصاف بين السلطان محمود وأخيه مسعود . وكان لمسعود الموصل وأذربيجان . وكان سبب هذه الحرب أن دبب بن صدقة كان يكتاب جيوش بك أتاك الملك مسعود ، ويحثه على طلب السلطنة . وكان مقصده أن يقع الاختلاف بينهما ، فينال من الجاه وعلو المنزلة ما ناله أبوه بانتلاف السلطان محمد وبركياروق . وكان اقسنقر البرسقي مع الملك مسعود منذ فارق شحنة كية بغداد ، وأقطع الملك مسعود مراغة مضافة إلى الرجة . وكان بينه وبين دبب عداوة مستحكمة ، فكانت دبب جيوش بك يشير عليه بالقبض على البرسقي ، فعلم البرسقي بذلك ، ففارقهم إلى السلطان محمود ، فأكرمه وأعلى محله وزاده .

واتصل الأستاذ أبو اسد اعيل الحسين بن علي الأصميهان الطبراني بالملك مسعود . فاستوزره مسعود بعد (أن) عزل (أبا علي) (١) بن عمار ، فحسن له أيضا مخالفة السلطان ، والخروج عن طاعته . فبلغ السلطان محمود الخبر فكتب إليهم يحذرهم من مخالفتهم ، ويعددهم الإحسان إن أقاموا على الطاعة ، فلم يصغوا إلى قوله وأظهروا ما كانوا أضمره ،

(١) أضيف ما بين الحاصرتين من الكمال في التاريخ لابن الأثير حوادث سنة أربع عشرة وخمسمائة .

JOURNAL

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

OF

GREAT BRITAIN & IRELAND.



January,

1902.

A.D. MDCCCXXXIII. IH. S.I.

JANUARY 15th.

SCHMIDT PERIODICALS GMBH
D-8201 Bad Feilnbach 2
W. Germany

1. Selcuklular
2. Tugrul Bey
3. Alp Arslan
4. Melikshah
5. Bekyaruk
6. Muhammed Tugrul
7. Sencer
8. Mahmud b. Muhammed
9. Tugrul b. -
10. Masud b. -
11. Melikshah b. Mahmud

566 COMPARATIVE VOCABULARY OF MALAYAN DIALECTS.

Whether the *مكواه* and *توليهو* vocabularies (which are, no doubt, equally full of mistakes) would be of any value to philologists I cannot say, for I do not know what other records (if any) of these two dialects may exist. For the study of Madurese there is, I believe, ample material elsewhere.

ART. XXI.—*Account of a rare, if not unique, manuscript History of the Seljuqs contained in the Schefer Collection lately acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and now described by EDWARD G. BROWNE, M.A., M.R.A.S.*

In the pages of this Journal I have repeatedly had occasion to insist, especially in my notice of M. Blochet's most useful Catalogue (*J.R.A.S.* for 1901, pp. 331-3), on the unique value of the magnificent collection of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish MSS. formed by the late M. Charles Schefer, and now belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale. During a fortnight spent in Paris in the Easter vacation of 1901, I was able to examine more closely some of the most interesting MSS. comprised in this collection, and in particular the MS. which forms the subject of this notice, which is remarkable alike for its age (it is dated the beginning of Ramadán, A.H. 635 = April, A.D. 1238); its fine, clear, careful script; the interest and authority of its contents; and the fact that it is, so far as I have been able to ascertain, unique.

The importance of a careful study of the original materials for the history of the Seljúq period, so far as these are still extant and accessible, has been so admirably expressed by Houtsma in the preface (pp. vi-viii) to the first of the three texts (the *History of the Seljuqs of Kirmán*, by Muhammad Ibráhím) which he published in his *Recueil de Textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjucides*, that I need say nothing more on this head, save that in citing the Arabic text of the *Histoire des Seldjucides de l'Iraq par al-Bondart d'après Imdd ad-din al-Katib al-Isfahani* (Leyden, 1889), which forms the second volume of this *Recueil*, and to which I shall have frequent occasion to refer in the course of the following pages, I shall, for brevity's sake, speak of it simply as "*Bundart*."

Makale "SELÇUKLULAR" posetixtedir.

Khān, as *wazir* and Mīr Djumla as finance minister. Kāsim Barīd, a Turk who had watched the massacre of the people of his own race with indifference, was appointed *kōtwāl* [q.v.].

In 891/1486, four years after his accession, Maḥmūd, anxious to assert his power, conspired with Kāsim Barīd and Dastūr Dīnār, the leader of the Abyssinians (Habashīs), to get rid of both Niẓām al-Mulk and ʿImād al-Mulk. But the plot leaked out and the Sultān apologised to them. However, ʿImād al-Mulk, realising his life to be in danger, left for his own province of Berār, never to return again. Niẓām al-Mulk, who took no precaution, was strangled to death by his friend, Dilpasand Khān, at the instigation of Maḥmūd.

Niẓām al-Mulk's removal from the scene led to the victory of the Āfākīs. But the Dakhanīs, alarmed and angry by the murder of their leader, plotted to assassinate the king with the support of the Habashīs; and on 21 Dhu 'l-Ḳa'da 892/8 November 1487, they entered the palace, locking the gate behind them so that no one else could enter. They killed the Turkish guards, but Kāsim Barīd, with a detachment of 12,000 men, scaled the walls of the palace and rescued the king. The next morning, Maḥmūd ordered the massacre of the Dakhanīs, and for three days this continued until it was stopped by the intercession of Shāh Muhibb Allāh, son of the saint Khālīl Allāh.

Taking advantage of these events, Kāsim Barīd raised the banner of revolt, and compelled Maḥmūd to make him *wakīl* or prime minister (897/1492). Meanwhile, Malik Aḥmad, Niẓām al-Mulk's son, who was at his *djāgīr* [q.v.] of Djunayr, on hearing of his father's death, adopted the title of Niẓām al-Mulk and without seeking the permission of the king, conquered all the forts in Mahārāshtra, including the whole of Konkon and the territory up to the river Godāvārī. He then came to Bīdar, where he was received by Maḥmūd and confirmed in his new possessions; but at the same time Maḥmūd sent troops against Malik Aḥmad and also ordered Yūsuf ʿĀdil to march against him. The royal troops were defeated, while Yūsuf ʿĀdil, in defiance of the king's order, congratulated Malik Aḥmad on his success. It was in 895/1490 that Malik Aḥmad, on achieving his victory over the king's army, had founded the town of Aḥmadnagar [q.v.], which became the capital of the Niẓām Shāhī dynasty [q.v.].

Encouraged by the incompetence of the ruler, the governors in the provinces began to assert their independence. Bahādur Khān Gīlānī, *kōtwāl* of Goa, took possession of the whole west coast from Goa up to Dābul as well as the greater portion of southern Mahārāshtra. But on 5 Šafar 900/5 November 1494, he was defeated and killed by Sultān Ḳulī Ḳuṭb al-Mulk, *ṭarafdār* of Telingāna. Dastūr Dīnār, the Habashī, who held the *djāgīrs* of Culbarga, Aland and Gangāwatī, also declared his independence in 901/1496. But although he was defeated by Yūsuf ʿĀdil, he was forgiven by Maḥmūd and his *djāgīrs* restored to him.

Yūsuf ʿĀdil's position became strong due to the betrothal of his daughter to the crown prince, Aḥmad, early in 903/1497, which enabled him to secure the *djāgīrs* of Culbarga, Aland and Gangāwatī which had been assigned to Dastūr Dīnār. Previously to this, Kāsim Barīd, being jealous of Yūsuf ʿĀdil, had contrived his overthrow. He had suggested to Narasa Nāyak, the prime minister of Viḍjayānagar, to occupy Rayčūr and Mudgal which were in Yūsuf ʿĀdil's possession, and had also tried to win over Malik Aḥmad against Yūsuf by offering him Panhāla,

Konkon and Goa, which were at the time in Bahādur Gīlānī's possession. But Yūsuf ʿĀdil had succeeded in foiling Malik Aḥmad's plans. He had first marched towards Bīdar and defeated Kāsim Barīd, who was accompanied by Maḥmūd, near the capital. He had then directed his attention towards the Viḍjayānagar army, which he had defeated on 1 Raḍjab 899/18 April 1493 and had reoccupied Rayčūr and Mudgal, thus upsetting Kāsim Barīd's plans.

Disenchanted with Kāsim Barīd, Maḥmūd now invited Yūsuf ʿĀdil and Ḳuṭb al-Mulk to his rescue at the end of Dhu 'l-Hiḍjja 903/August 1497. They came and besieged Kāsim in his *djāgīr* of Ausa, but gained no success, for the minister was soon reconciled to the king. However, in 909/1503-4, Kāsim Barīd was replaced by Khān-i Djahān, also a Turk, until Kāsim Barīd contrived his death. Thereupon, Yūsuf ʿĀdil, Ḳuṭb al-Mulk and Dastūr Dīnār marched on Bīdar to wrest power from Kāsim. The latter was defeated and fled, but this did not improve things, because he once again won over Maḥmūd. Frustrated in their attempts to rescue the king, the *ṭarafdārs* in disgust returned to their respective *djāgīrs*, leaving Kāsim Barīd as powerful as before. When he died in 910/1504-5 he was succeeded by his son Amīr ʿAlī Barīd, whose domination was even more effective than that of his father.

Taking advantage of these internecine conflicts, Krishnādevarāya compelled Yūsuf ʿĀdil to evacuate the Dō'āb. The Gandjpatīs of Orissa, on the other hand, occupied the whole east coast which had belonged to the Bahmanids. In 923/1517, Maḥmūd tried to recover the Dō'āb from the Rāḍja of Viḍjayānagar, but he was defeated and wounded and compelled to retreat.

Maḥmūd's last days were unhappy. In addition to these territorial losses, there were risings of his *ṭarafdārs*, who were engaged in carving out independent kingdoms for themselves, which he was helpless to prevent; soon his writ did not run beyond the walls of Bīdar, and even there he was subject to the will of Amīr ʿAlī Barīd.

Maḥmūd died on 4 Dhu 'l-Hiḍjja 924/7 December 1518. He was succeeded by four kings, one after another, set up or set aside according to ʿAlī Barīd's pleasure. Kalīm Allāh, Maḥmūd's son, was the last king. He wrote to Bābur for help against ʿAlī Barīd, but as the latter found this out, Kalīm Allāh fled to Bīdjāpūr and thence to Aḥmadnagar, where he is supposed to have died in 945/1538.

Bibliography: Sayyid ʿAlī Ṭabāṭabā, *Ta'rikh-i Burhān-i ma'āthir*, ed. Sayyid Hāshim, Dihlī 1355/1936; Muḥammad Kāsim Hindū-Shāh, *Ta'rikh-i Firishā*, i, Lucknow 1281/1864; Niẓām al-Dīn, *Tabakāt-i Akbarī*, iii, ed. B. De and Hidāyat Ḥusayn, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1935, Eng. tr. B. De and Bani Prashad, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1938; H. K. Sherwānī, *The Bahmanis of the Deccan*, Hyderabad 1953; H. K. Sherwānī and P. M. Djoshi, eds., *History of medieval Deccan (1295-1724)*, 2 vols., Hyderabad 1973-4; M. Ḥabīb and K. A. Niẓāmī, eds., *A comprehensive history of India (1206-1526)*, v, Dihlī 1970; G. Yazdānī, *Bīdar and its history and its monuments*, Oxford 1947. (MOHIBBUL HASAN)

MAHMŪD B. ISMĀʿĪL. [See LU³LU², BADR AL-DĪN].

MAHMŪD B. MUḤAMMAD B. MALIK-ŠĀH, MUGHITH AL-DUNYĀ WA 'L-DĪN ABU 'L-KĀSIM, Great Salḍjūḳ sultan in western Persia and ʿIrāk 511-25/1118-31.

The weakening of the Great Salḍjūḳ central power in the west, begun after Malik-Šāh's death in the