

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Problems of Medieval Armenian and Muslim Historiography: The Mxit'ar of Ani Fragment

Author(s): Dickran K. Kouymjian

Source: *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Oct., 1973), pp. 465-475

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/162315>

Accessed: 22/06/2013 14:57

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
International Journal of Middle East Studies.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Dickran K. Kouymjian

PROBLEMS OF MEDIEVAL ARMENIAN AND MUSLIM HISTORIOGRAPHY: THE MXIT'AR OF ANI FRAGMENT¹

Only the introductory portion of the *History* written by the Armenian Mxit'ar of Ani has come down to us.² However, an extensive passage on the Ghaznavids and Seljuks from the lost part of the work is quoted in the *Universal History* composed c. 1268 by Vardan Vardapet.³ The content and the sources used for the compilation of this much-neglected narrative is the subject of this study.

From biographical data and the final date (1193)⁴ in the surviving introduction,

¹ The article was originally presented in a much abbreviated form as a paper at the 4th Annual Meeting of the Middle East Studies Association, 6 November 1970, in Columbus, Ohio. The author would like to acknowledge, with thanks, the travel grant provided by the Research and Conference Grant Program of the American University in Cairo for this purpose. The Mxit'ar of Ani fragment has already been treated in a related article: D. K. Kouymjian, 'Mxit'ar of Ani on the Rise of the Seljuqs', *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, new series, vol. VI (1969), pp. 331-53, which will henceforth be referred to as *R. E. Arm.* For the Armenian translation with Russian résumé of the original paper, see now the journal of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, Erevan, Armenian S.S.R., *Lraber*, no. 4 (352), (1972), pp. 74-84.

² Published by K. Patkanean and appended to his edition of the *History* attributed to Sebêos (St Petersburg, 1879), but with separate pagination; the text exists in a unique manuscript now no. 2678 of the collection of the Matenadaran (i.e. Manuscript Library) in Erevan, Armenian S.S.R.

³ Ed. and Russian trans. by M. Emin, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1861); by L. Ališan (Venice, 1862). Despite the conclusions of J. Muyldermans to the contrary (*La domination arabe en Arménie* [Louvain/Paris, 1927], pp. 29 and 37; cf. *R. E. Arm.*, p. 333, n. 10), Ališan's edition, at least for the section containing the Mxit'ar fragment, is superior to Emin's, not only because he had access to much older manuscripts, but also because he had a better knowledge of oriental languages. To settle the debate on editions of Vardan one need only consider that when Patkanean appended the excerpt in Vardan at the end of his edition of Mxit'ar (pp. 49-52) he used Ališan's edition and not that of his fellow Russian Armenian, Emin. As for the manuscript tradition of Vardan, the four oldest - Library of the Mechitarist Congregation in Venice, nos. 516 (dated c. 1300) and 1244 (dated 1307), the Matenadaran, Erevan, no. 3074 (also dated 1307), and Museo Borgano, The Vatican, Arm. MS no. 30 (dated 1630, but probably from an original of 1274) - display no major divergencies one from the other or from the printed texts. The writer would like to take this opportunity to thank again the Research and Conference Grant Program of the American University in Cairo for a grant during the summer of 1970 which allowed him to examine these manuscripts (as well as many others) in person.

⁴ Ed. Patkanean, pp. 2, 46-8, also reproduced in G. Zarbhanalean, *The History of Ancient Armenian Literature* [in Arm.], vol. I (Venice, 1897), p. 725. For biographical material on Mxit'ar, in addition to works already cited in *R. E. Arm.*, p. 332, n. 6, one

the history can be safely ascribed to the last years of the twelfth century. Near the beginning of the same extant section Mxit'ar provides a list of sources he used, which for the eleventh and twelfth centuries are exclusively Armenian.¹ Yet we know he was able to utilize Islamic, or at least Persian, sources, for both Vardan and Mxit'ar of Ayrivank' (*Chronological History* to 1289) report that he translated a book on eclipses from the latter language into Armenian.² As will be seen later, Mxit'ar seemingly consulted both Armenian and Muslim works for the section of his history under study.³

An examination of the works of the writers of the period who are named by Mxit'ar – Aristakês (*History* to 1070), Kozeïn (*History of the Bagratids*, written c. 1050), and Samuel of Ani (*Chronology* to 1179) – reveals that the detailed information on the Ghaznavids and Seljuks presented by him did not originate from these works.⁴ There is the further possibility that he used other contemporary Armenian authorities but neglected to cite them; these might include the

may consult P. S. Somal, *Quadre della Storia Letteraria di Armenia* (Venice, 1829), p. 106; Ališan, *Snorhali and His Time* [in Arm.] (Venice, 1873), pp. 126–8; A. Łazikean, *New Armenian Bibliography and Encyclopaedia of Armenian Life* [in Arm.] (Venice, 1909–12), vol. 1, cols. 2013–14; H. Ačařean, *Dictionary of Armenian First Names* [in Arm.], vol. III (Erevan, 1946), pp. 369–70; G. Hovsêp'ean, 'Mxit'ar of Ani, Scribe and Miniaturist' [in Arm.], *Hask Yearbook*, vol. 1 (Antelias, 1948), esp. pp. 192–4, which discusses four different Mxit'ars of Ani living during our period, the one of the title not being the Mxit'ar of this paper.

¹ Ed. Patkanean, p. 15, with details in *R. E. Arm.*, p. 334; the list will be found in the next paragraph of the text below.

² Vardan, ed. Venice, p. 137, ed. Moscow, p. 180; Mxit'ar of Ayrivank', ed. Emin (Moscow, 1860), p. 64. It is also mentioned by Ařakel of Tabriz, *History* (seventeenth century), ed. (Vařarřapat, 1884), p. 48, and probably copied from the latter in an eighteenth-century chronology which has only recently been published, N. Polarean, 'Chronology' [in Arm.], *Banber Matenadarani*, vol. 9 (1969), p. 259. The name of the author is given as Očîê in older manuscripts and as Očîk'ê in later ones as well as Ařakel and the eighteenth-century chronicle. Ačařean, *loc. cit.*, suggests the possibility that Mxit'ar of Ayrivank' understood it as a date, i.e. ԹՇԻԷ = 1127, and that later it was mistakenly entered in Ařakel under 1187, but this should probably be rejected, for all of the oldest manuscripts of Vardan agree exactly in understanding it as a name; Mxit'ar of Ayrivank' places the event just before 1191 and after 1181, and Ařakel and the eighteenth-century chronicle also clearly regard it as a name. On the other hand, Brosset's more reasonable, yet still problematic, suggestion that it is a poor Armenian rendering for Persian *zîj*, a book of astronomy, deserves further investigation, *Mém. de l'Acad.* vol. IV (1862), no. 9, pp. 5–6; see *R. E. Arm.*, p. 333, n. 10 for full citation. Ališan expresses the same opinion, but without reference to Brosset, *Snorhali*, p. 127.

³ Mxit'ar actually says as a preface to the short history in the Vardan fragment, 'A great deal of effort was exerted in discovering [the history of] the sultans who were Turks, and by the grace of God I found it [to be] as follows'; ed. Venice, p. 94; ed. Moscow, p. 127. The great effort was probably research into non-Armenian as well as Armenian sources; Ališan comments much to the same effect, *ibid.*

⁴ Aristakês of Lastivert, critical ed. (Erevan, 1963) and Russian trans. (Leningrad, 1968), both by K. N. Yuzbařyan; Samuel of Ani, critical ed., A. Têr-Mik'ëlean (Vařarřapat, 1893); for Kozeïn and a discussion about the surviving parts of his lost history see below, pp. 467–8, n. 4. It is most interesting that Ališan felt the lost history of Kozeïn contained an account of the Seljuk invasions, but unfortunately he does not say on what grounds he bases this (*Hayapatum* [in Arm.], vol. 1 (Venice, 1901), p. 90).

History of Hovhannês Sarkawag (d. 1129), the *Chronicle* (952–1136) of Matthew of Edessa, the *Chronicle* to 1162 of Mxit'ar Goš, and that of Vahram (type and date of work uncertain).¹

But once again, none of these have any important material on the Ghaznavids or Seljuks with the possible exception of the history of Sarkawag. However, it has not come down to us. From excerpts of this work quoted by his pupil Samuel of Ani and later by Kirakos of Ganjak (*History* to 1265)² we have some idea of its general content. The first of its two parts dealt with the 'Scythians', i.e. the Turks, more probably the Seljuks, while the second part was specifically about Malikshâh son of Alp Arslan.³ In a previous study (see p. 465, n. 1), by incorrectly associating the name Kozern, in the oblique form 'Kozrann', with Hovhannês Sarkawag, it was conjectured that Mxit'ar of Ani used this important history. Even now that 'Kozrann' is clearly identified as Hovhannês of Tarôn, called 'Kozern',⁴ it is still held by this writer on the basis of contextual

¹ On Hovhannês Sarkawag see below in the text; Matthew of Edessa, ed. (Jerusalem, 1869) and a later edition based on a more complete text (Valaršapat, 1898), Fr. trans., E. Dulaurier (Paris, 1858); Michael the Syrian, ed. (Jerusalem, 1871), Fr. trans., V. Langlois (Venice, 1868), but on the question of the various and divergent Armenian versions see J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1899 [actually pub. 1924]), pp. L–LI; Mxit'ar Goš, *Albanian Chronicle*, trans. and commentary, C. J. F. Dowsett, *BSOAS*, vol. XXI (1958), pp. 472–90; on Vahram see Ališan's comment in Vardan, ed. Venice, p. 94, n. 3, and *Hayapatum*, vol. 1, p. 92, cf. *R. E. Arm.*, p. 333, n. 12. This latter Vahram is probably not to be confused with Vahram of Edessa who wrote a rhymed history of the *Kings of Cilician Armenia* despite comments in some eighteenth-century manuscripts, for which see H. A. Anasyan, *Armenian Bibliology* [in Arm.], vol. 1 (Erevan, 1959), p. LV.

² Samuel, pp. 96–8, quoted in Ališan, *Hayapatum*, vol. II, pp. 336, 358–9, and Zarbhanalean, p. 609. Kirakos of Ganjak, critical ed. K. A. Melik'-Ôhanjanyan (Erevan, 1961), p. 84; Kirakos probably took his excerpts from Samuel rather than from Sarkawag's text directly, for which see H. Oskean, *Literary Researches* [in Arm.] (Vienna, 1926), p. 39.

³ On the author and the work see, Ališan, *Souvenirs of the Armenian Fatherland*, vol. II (Venice, 1921²), pp. 248–73; *idem*, *Hayapatum*, *loc. cit.*; Ačařean, *op. cit.* vol. III, pp. 571–2; Łazikean, *op. cit.* vol. II, cols. 107–8; A. Abrahamian, *Eight Lectures* [in Arm.] (Antelias, 1955), pp. 79–96; Zarbhanalean, pp. 609–10; Samuel, pp. 96–8; Oskean, *op. cit.* pp. 1–64, esp. 37–41.

⁴ An additional note attached to offprint copies *only* of the writer's article in *R. E. Arm.*, vol. VI, correctly identified Kozern/Kozrann with Hovhannês of Tarôn, an eleventh-century author of several works including a *History* of the Bagratids, believed to be lost. He is mentioned by a large number of contemporary and later authors. For fuller details see Ačařean, vol. III, pp. 566–7; Zarbhanalean, pp. 570–1, 788, is not aware that Hovhannês of Tarôn and Kozern are one and the same person, probably repeating the mistake of Mxit'ar of Ayrivank', ed. Emin, p. 23, and an eighteenth-century manuscript (Anasyan, *op. cit.* p. LIV) where the two names are listed separately. MS. no. 1775 of the Matenadaran in Erevan contains the first pages of the beginning of Kozern's history (folios 8^v–16^r), which according to the heading in the manuscript was a history of the house of the Bagratids (f. 8^v). G. Abgaryan quotes verbatim the opening paragraphs of this history, *Banber Matenadaran*, vol. 6 (1962), pp. 50–1, and again in his '*The History of Sebêos' and the Enigma of the Anonymous* (Erevan, 1965), pp. 128–30, and maintains that the first chapter of the pseudo-Sebêos (the so-called *Primary History of Armenia*) belongs to the lost part of the *History* of Kozern. An examination of the surviving pages of this

similarities that Mxit'ar *probably* utilized Sarkawag's *History* and that conclusions based on this premise are valid. The work seems to have existed in Mxit'ar's time, for his contemporary Samuel of Ani used it, and later writers – Kirakos, Vardan, Mxit'ar of Ayrvank' – mention it. More factually, sections of Sarkawag's work quoted by Samuel and Kirakos contain the unusual spelling 'Sarč'uk' for Seljuk, a form also used by Mxit'ar.¹ (On the other hand, the Mxit'ar passage uses *hijrî* dates, while normal Armenian era dating is used in the fragment of Sarkawag's work preserved by Samuel.) Unfortunately, a definitive statement on the relationship between the lost *History* of Hovhannês Sarkawag and the passage in Vardan from the lost *History* of Mxit'ar cannot be made.

Yet it is clear that either Mxit'ar or possibly an Armenian predecessor (i.e. Sarkawag) relied on Islamic works, not only because *hijrî* dates are used exclusively in the fragment (while in other extant parts of Mxit'ar's work they are not²), but also because of (1) the relative accuracy in the rendering of Muslim names and titles, (2) the use of many Arabic and Persian words, and (3) the detailed account of certain incidents totally unrelated to Armenian history.³

What then were Mxit'ar's Muslim sources? Since the fragment, which, being written before the close of the 6th/12th century, is comparatively early, deals with details of Bûyid, Ghaznavid and Seljuk history, the answer to this question is of special interest to the historiography of these dynasties as well as that of Armenia. Before entering into a discussion of this matter, a paraphrased summary of the Mxit'ar fragment on the history of the sultans of the Turks preserved in Vardan is herein presented.⁴

Maḥmûd son of Sebuktegin (*Sbk't'anay*), like Ardashir the Sâsânian, became great in the city of Balkh (*Bahl*) in the land of the Kushans. Word of his strength reached the Caliph (*Xalîfay*) who, becoming frightened, sent him presents, an insignia of office (*alam*, Arabic '*alam*'), the *laqab* (*lalap*) Amîn al-'âdil (*Amin-adl*, read Yamîn al-Dawla), and called him Sulṭân. With these honors Maḥmûd's reputation grew even greater. He

history does not reveal much of interest; beginning with Adam and Eve in Paradise and continuing about the Hebrew prophets and kings, it goes up to the birth of Christ (f. 16r). The history was to be in two parts: (1) from the beginning of the world to 887 when the first Bagratid King Ašot was crowned, (2) from the reign of Ašot to the author's own days (c. 1050). It is possible, indeed very likely, that the second part discussed the Seljuk invasions, which occurred during the author's floruit, as Ališan had himself surmised (see p. 466, n. 4 above). The author would like to thank L. Xaç'ikyan, Director of the Matenadaran, and B. Č'ugaszyan, Assistant Director, for kindly making available photographs of the manuscript text of the Kozein fragment.

¹ Samuel, p. 98; Kirakos, p. 84, in the variants at the foot of the page; for Mxit'ar, ed. Venice, p. 96, ed. Moscow, p. 129, the passage to be translated shortly in the text. The final section of the extant introduction of Mxit'ar's work also uses the form *azgn Turk'ac'*, *Sarč'ukik'n*, 'the nation of the Turks, the Seljuks', ed. Patkanean, p. 48. Ališan felt very strongly that Sarkawag's history began with the origin and development of the Seljuks *Hayapatum*, vol. 1, p. 95, col. 1. ² Ed. Patkanean, *passim*; Zarbhanalean, pp. 725–6.

³ See the passage given in the text, below, and the discussion in *R. E. Arm.*, p. 351.

⁴ Italicized words in parentheses indicate the Armenian spelling found in the text; when not so indicated the Armenian either has already been given or is identical or very close to the accepted form.

marched to India to the famous idol of Somnâth (*Mat'an*),¹ which he destroyed, and after taking much booty returned home, leaving his son Muḥammad there. Then he took Gurgân and from its ruler 400,000 gold pieces (*tahekank'*) and a treasure in the year 420/[1029] of their (i.e. the Muslim) era. He then passed to Rayy (*Rê*); the ruler of the city, Majd al-Dawla Rustam (*Maĵa-dawla Rstôm*), who had gathered Daylamite (*Dlmikk'*) troops three days before, advanced to meet him. Maḥmûd arrived at Sarâv (*Sraw*) with a formidable force and 250 elephants, and seeing Majd al-Dawla, he said, 'Have you read the *Shâhmâma* (*Šah namaz*)?' And the other answered, 'Yes.' Now Maḥmûd asked, 'Have you ever played chess?' The answer was again, 'Yes.' 'Then does a king enter another king's square (*tun*, lit. 'house')?' And the ruler of Rayy remained silent. Maḥmûd seized him and sent him captive to *Khurâsân* (*Xorasan*) and took all his possessions in Rayy. Then Maḥmûd went to Tabaristân (*Taparastan*) and Tařabi (?)² and Sarî; he gave his son Mas'ûd (*Masxut*) Rayy, Qazwîn (*Āzûin*), and the whole of Kûhistân (*K'ohastan*).³ Leaving Mas'ûd in Rayy he went to Sarâv and took 100,000 *dînârs* (*denari*) and passed to Nîshâpûr (*Našawur*) in 421/[1030] of their era. Mas'ûd then took Hamadân (*Hamian*) and Işfahân (*Aspahan*) and returned to Rayy, where he heard that his *shahna* (*šahnays*) had been killed in Işfahân. He went there again, killed 4,000 men and returned to Rayy. Just at that time they brought him the sad news of his father's (i.e. Maḥmûd's) death and that his brother Muḥammad was made Sultan. Rising in revolt, Mas'ûd marched [toward *Ghazna*], seized his brother, blinded him, and took his sovereignty and throne.

Sometime before, Mas'ûd's father, while on his way to help Qadir-*Khân* Boghra-*Khân* (*Xtrlan-Pôtrlan*) [the Qarakhânid], met an army of Turks; later, he returned on the same road and with a great victory,⁴ he seized their *amîr* Yabghu (*Ap'alu*) and sent him captive to *Khurâsân*. The *amîr*'s people begged Maḥmûd, and later Mas'ûd, to release him, but neither would. Thus angered, the Turks passed across the Oxus (*Ĵahan*) with all their troops and fighting with all their might seized Nîshâpûr. Afterwards they destroyed the armies of Sultan Mas'ûd at Dandânqân (*Dadānlan*) near Marv (*Mrmn*). The sultan fled to *Ghazna* (*i Āzîm*) and then India, but on the way he was killed and his blind brother Muḥammad was enthroned in *Ghazna* (*i Āzûin [sic]*) where until today his sons rule.

As for the leader of the Turks, whose name was Mûsâ Yabghu (*Muséap'alu*) son of Seljuk (Sarč'uk'), he had five [*sic*, read two] nephews whose names were Abû Salim (*Abusalim*, read Abû Sulaymân) Dâ'ûd (*Dawut'*) *Chaghri* Beg (*Ā'alrbek*), [and] Abû Tâlib (*Abutalip*) Tughri Beg (*Tôlri-Bék*). It was Tughri who received the authority

¹ Tentatively it would seem that Armenian *Mat'an* is a badly transcribed form for Arabic *manât*, 'idol', in its generic sense, but originally Manât, one of the pagan idols of the Ka'bah, which was closely, though incorrectly, associated by Muslim writers with Somnâth, especially with regard to Maḥmûd's campaign there in 416/1025-6.

² Other localities mentioned in the text are easily identifiable; Tařabi, however, presents some problems. It would seem too far removed to be either Târâb near Bukhârâ (V. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 2nd ed. [London, 1968], p. 115 n.) or Dârâb-jird in Fars (G. Le Strange, *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* [Cambridge, 1905], pp. 248, 288-9), though Alişan identifies with the latter (Vardan, ed. Venice, p. 95, n. 4).

³ Kûhistân in Syria, i.e. al-Jibâl, V. Minorsky, *Hudûd al-'Âlam* (London, 1937), p. 150. The author would like to thank Professors William Gohlman of Baldwin-Wallace College and William Hanaway of the University of Pennsylvania for independently suggesting the more correct reading in place of the author's *Khûzistân*.

⁴ The words 'with a great victory' were inadvertently omitted from the more exact translation (of the Seljuk portion only) given in *R. E. Arm.*, p. 339, but were properly included on page 342. In general, for specific questions on the Seljuks suggested by the Mxit'ar fragment one should consult the translation and commentary in *R. E. Arm.*

of the sultanate and dividing the lands of Khurāsān, he extended his realm for fifteen years. Later Tughril came to Rayy and discovered two treasures filled with gold, seized them, and sent to the Caliph asking for his blessing. The latter honored him with ambassadors, an insignia of office (*alam*), presents, he read his name from the *minbar* (*mambar*), and gave him the title Rukn al-Dawla (*Ruk'nadōvla*). And from that day he was proclaimed conqueror.¹

The passage, even in its abridged form, contains a wealth of diverse information which naturally lends itself to a detailed commentary. As mentioned above (p. 465, n. 1), the Seljuk portion has already been treated in a monograph, and the section on the Ghaznavids will be studied thoroughly in a forthcoming article. For the present discussion, only two episodes will be singled out to help determine the sources used by Mxit'ar. They are (1) from Ghaznavid history, the interrogation of Majd al-Dawla by Maḥmūd of Ghazna, and (2) from Seljuk history, the occurrence and use of the Turkic title *yabghu*.

The dialogue between Maḥmūd of Ghazna and Majd al-Dawla Rustamb. Fakhr al-Dawla of Rayy is best known in the version preserved in Ibn al-Athīr's al-Kāmil fī al-ta'rīkh (finished c. 619/1222). After the death of his capable mother Sayyida (the *de facto* ruler of Rayy) in 419/1028, Majd al-Dawla assumed the full responsibility of governing the city. We are told that being unable to control his Daylamite troops, he called on Maḥmūd for help. The latter was waiting for such an opportunity and in 420/1029 he took Rayy. Under that year Ibn al-Athīr records the following conversation. Having had Majd brought before him Maḥmūd asks, 'Have you read the *Shāhnāma*, the history of the Persians,² and the *Ta'rīkh* of al-Ṭabarī, the history of the Muslims?' Majd answered, 'Yes.' 'But your conduct was not like one who had read them,' said Maḥmūd. He continued, 'But do you not play chess?' 'Yes,' replied the other. 'And did you ever see one king approach another?' questioned Maḥmūd. 'No,' said the ruler of Rayy. 'Why then,' admonished Maḥmūd, 'did you call to your kingdom one who is stronger than yourself?' And saying that, Maḥmūd sent him captive to Khurāsān.³

¹ The passage has been published in Armenian as follows: ed. Venice, pp. 93–7; ed. Moscow, pp. 127–31; the Venice version again by Patkanean (*op. cit.* n. 2), pp. 49–52; by Ališan again, *Souvenirs*, vol. II, pp. 353–4; and partially (the initial section on Maḥmūd of Ghazna) by A. Alboyadjian, *History of the Armenian Emigrations* [in Arm.], vol. II (Cairo, 1955), p. 24, n. 1. It has been translated into French, M. F. Brosset, *Additions et éclaircissements à l'histoire de la Géorgie* (St Petersburg, 1851), pp. 220–2; Russian, M. Emin (Moscow, 1861), pp. 118–21; Turkish, H. D. Adreasyan, 'Müverrih Vardan Türk Fütuhâtı Tarihi (889–1269)', *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Semineri Dergisi*, vol. 1/2 (1937), pp. 169–72; English (partial), *R. E. Arm.*, vol. VI, pp. 339–41.

² There is an added poignancy and irony to the story. Firdausî completed the *Shāhnāma* at the commission of Maḥmūd (c. 400/1009–10), but disappointed by the terms of the payment, he fled from the Ghaznavid court and took refuge with the Büyids, specifically, according to some authorities (e.g. Ethé), at the court of Majd al-Dawla in Rayy; see E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia* (Cambridge, 1906), vol. II, pp. 141, 131 n.

³ Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg (Leyden, 1851–76), vol. IX, pp. 261–3 (reprint, Beirut, vol. IX, pp. 371–2); the dialogue has been translated at least twice – Browne, vol. II, p.

Though Mxit'ar's account neglects to mention that fact which makes sense out of the chess episode, namely Majd al-Dawla's invitation to Maḥmūd, his version and Ibn al-Athīr's are nearly the same. Though the famous Arab historian wrote some thirty years after Mxit'ar of Ani, there is absolutely no conceivable reason to assume he could have used the Armenian as an authority. Where then did Ibn al-Athīr get his story? Of the existing Ghaznavid sources written before his time – 'Utbī, Bayhaqī, Gardīzī, and the anonymous *Mujmal al-tawârīkh wa'l-qiṣaṣ* – none mention the incident.¹ Perhaps it may have been included in the lost parts of Bayhaqī's *Mujalladât* which dealt with Maḥmūd, for the surviving section, the *Ta'rīkh-i Mas'ûdî*, only begins in 421/1030, just after the events related above, but there are no references to such a story in the works of later writers who had access to these lost parts.² Yet should we some day find the missing parts of Bayhaqī, or even a new Persian source, we might conjecture its use by Mxit'ar, who knew Persian, but there would still be a problem since we are not sure whether or not Ibn al-Athīr could use that language.³

Two further possibilities may help solve this historiographical question. The story may have been transmitted by the Persian 'Alī b. Zayd Bayhaqī, known as Ibn Funduq, in his *Mashârib al-tajârib*, which was written not in Persian but in Arabic, during the second half of the 6th/12th century. Though the work has not come down to us, there is reason to suppose that Ibn al-Athīr may have used it.⁴ But once again the problem of Ibn Funduq's source would arise as well as that

160, and M. Nâzim, *The Life and Times of Sultân Maḥmūd of Ghazna* (Cambridge, 1931), pp. 82–3. For further details on Majd al-Dawla, see K. V. Zetterstéen, 'Madjīd al-Dawla', *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1st ed.), or *Islam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. VII, pp. 431–2, and G. C. Miles, *The Numismatic History of Rayy* (New York, 1938), pp. 171–97 *passim*.

¹ 'Utbī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-Yamīnī*, written in Arabic prior to 431/1039–40, the year of the author's death, ed. (Cairo, 1869), with a Persian version by Jurbâdhqânî (c. 602/1206), ed. A. Qawīm (Teheran, 1955). The *Ta'rīkh-i Mas'ûdî* of Abû'l-Fadl Bayhaqī (385/995 to 470/1077) comprises only some five of the supposed thirty-volume history, the *Mujalladât*; the section preserved covers the years 421/1030 to 433/1041. The *Zayn al-akhbâr* of Gardīzī was written before 444/1053 and contains events to 432/1041. The anonymous *Mujmal* was written in 520/1126 according to the unique manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. The author would like to thank Prof. C. E. Bosworth of the University of Manchester for sending photocopies of the sections from Gardīzī, ed. Nâzim (Berlin, 1928), pp. 90–1, and the *Mujmal*, ed. Bahâr (Tehran, 1939), pp. 403–4, used to check this statement.

² An examination of the second and revised edition of the Russian translation of Bayhaqī, A. K. Arends (Moscow, 1969), which contains in the appendix 19 excerpts from the lost parts of the *Mujalladât* quoted by later authors, shows no mention of the episode; of course this does not absolutely exclude the possibility of its being preserved in the still-missing parts of the work.

³ 'For, much as we may admire on the one hand the breadth of his documentary researches, nothing, on the other hand, indicates that he knew Persian' (Cl. Cahen, 'The Historiography of the Seljuqid Period', *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis and P. Holt [London, 1962], pp. 65–6). Contrariwise, his brother Diya al-Dīn ibn al-Athīr seemingly knew Persian (see G. Von Grunebaum, *Islam, Essays in the Nature and Growth of a Cultural Tradition* [London, 1961], pp. 109, n. 9 and 178), and therefore one might conjecture that Ibn al-Athīr himself could in fact use Persian sources. The reference to Diya al-Dīn was supplied by Prof. Gohlman.

⁴ Cahen, *ibid.* p. 66.

of Mxit'ar's access to it.¹ A second alternative might be that some caliphal or Baghdādī chronicle, in this case probably written in Arabic, may have included the tale. A likely candidate is the *History* (a narrative to 447/1055) of Hilāl al-Şābī, of which only the years 388/998 to 393/1003 have been preserved, but which was used and partially transmitted in Ibn al-Jawzī's *al-Muntaẓam* (6th/12th century), Şibt Ibn al-Jawzī's *Mir'ât al-zamân* (7th/13th century), and an anonymous chronicle in the Munich State Library dated 644/1246–7, all three of which expressly used Hilāl's work.² In the *Muntaẓam* we do in fact have preserved the *Fathnâma* actually issued by Maḥmūd of Ghazna and sent to the Caliph after his conquest of Rayy; but again, though Ibn al-Jawzī's work is quite detailed, it has no mention of the confrontation with Majd al-Dawla.³ Furthermore, it would seem that the absence of our story from the rather full account of Ibn al-Jawzī, who relies on al-Şābī, would also exclude its existence in Şibt Ibn al-Jawzī or the Munich anonymous, though a check through the manuscripts of both authors must be made before a definitive negative statement is possible.

A final supposition that the story may have been totally fabricated around the turn of the 6th/12th to 7th/13th century seems improbable in view of its existence in two completely unrelated works. Therefore, we are back where we started without a very encouraging probability as to its origin. At the end of this study

¹ Of course the lost part of the *Mujalladât* comes to mind: however, another possibility is the work of the Bûyid vizier Abû Sa'd Maṣṣûr b. al-Husayn al-Âbî, which is named by the anonymous *Mujmal* as one of its sources. On Abû Sa'd see C. E. Bosworth, 'On the Chronology of the Ziyârids in Gurgân and Ṭabaristân', *Der Islam*, vol. 40/1 (1964), p. 30, n. 10; the author again expresses his thanks to Prof. Bosworth for this suggestion and a copy of the article. As for the question of Mxit'ar's use of Ibn Funduq or other Arabic sources, we have no definite evidence that he did not know and use Arabic, only positive proof that he was able to use Persian (p. 466, n. 2 above). Alişan's statement that the translation of the astronomical work already cited (p. 466, n. 2 above) was made from an Arabic book, *yArab dprut'enê (Şirak* [in Arm.] [Venice, 1881], p. 95, col. 2), must be considered an unintentional slip, for in the same work (p. 100, col. 2) he quotes the source of our information directly from his edition of Vardan (p. 137), '*i parsik lezuê*', 'from the Persian language'. Nevertheless, Arabic as well as Persian, Georgian and other languages, Eastern and Western, were common in the city of Ani at that time (Alişan, *ibid.* p. 96). A detailed linguistic analysis of the non-Armenian vocabulary in both the surviving introduction and the Vardan fragment needs to be made to determine if such words were borrowed from Arabic rather than Persian texts.

² *al-Muntaẓam*, partially published (including the years under discussion), vol. v-x (Hyderabad, 1938–1941, with a recent reprint); *Mir'ât al-zamân*, still unpublished for the years under consideration, but a later section on the Great Seljuks has recently been published, A. Sevim, *Mi'râtü 'z-Zeman fi Tarih ü'l-Ayan 447/1056–479/1086* (Ankara, 1968), on which see Cl. Cahen, 'A propos d'une édition...', *Arabica*, vol. xvii/1 (1970), pp. 82–91; the Munich anonymous has not been published, but reference to the manuscript and its contents will be found in M. Kabir, *The Buwayhid Dynasty of Baghdad 334/946–447/1055* (Calcutta, 1964), p. 216 and *passim*. A discussion of Hilāl al-Şābī's history will be found in Cahen, 'Historiography', pp. 60–4.

³ This *Fathnâma (al-Muntaẓam*, vol. VIII, pp. 38–40) has been translated in extenso by Bosworth, 'The Imperial Policy of the Early Ghaznavids', *Islamic Studies*, vol. 1/3 (1962), pp. 70–2.

something will be said about one final possibility, the work of a contemporary to the fall of Rayy, one Ibn Ḥassûl.

Our second example, taken from Mxit'ar's *History*, concerns the identity of the Seljuk Yabghu. The title goes back at least as early as the eighth-century Kök Turkic Confederation, being used in the Orkhon inscriptions to designate the office next after the Qaghan, the King. After the breakup of the Kök Empire, the Oghuz Turks, who were an integral part of it, kept the title *yabghu* and used it to designate their leader. By the end of the 4th/10th century, when the Seljuk Turks broke away from the Oghuz Yabghu, whose capital was at Yengi-Kent on the lower Syr Darya, or shortly after this, Arslan-Isrâ'il b. Seljuk took the title *yabghu* as an act of defiance as well as a sign of his family's increasing power. The title was normally held by the eldest male member of the family and Arslan-Isrâ'il was at the time senior to Mûsâ, Seljuk's only other surviving son.¹

Whether or not 'Yabghu, leader of the Oghuz', mentioned by Gardîzî as aiding a Sâmânid ruler in 393/1003 against the Qarakhânids, was Arslan or the Oghuz Yabghu himself is still not clear,² but certainly by 416-17/1025-6, when Arslan was captured and imprisoned by Maḥmûd of Ghazna, he definitely held the title *yabghu*, for not only does the *Akḥbâr al-dawlat al-Saljûqiyya* (early 7th/13th century) refer to him as 'Arslan Yabghu called Isrâ'il',³ but Mxit'ar of Ani confirms this by calling the captured leader (*amîr*) of the Turks only by his title: Yabghu (*Ap'atu*). Since Mxit'ar wrote at least a quarter of a century before the *Akḥbâr* was composed, his source is independent of it and provides a link with an earlier and now lost source, perhaps in this case the *Maliknâma*.⁴

Further along in the Armenian text, around the events associated with the battle of Dandânqân (431/1040), we find that now it is Mûsâ b. Seljuk who has the title *yabghu* and even more that he is clearly identified as the leader of the Turks.⁵ Of the early sources which have anything to say about Mûsâ, only Mxit'ar and Zahir al-Dîn Nîshâpûrî in his *Saljûqnâma* (second half of the 6th/12th century) correctly identify him as both the Seljuk Yabghu and the uncle of Tughril and Chaghri Begs.⁶ Thus, though Mxit'ar's subsequent testimony makes

¹ A further discussion with full references to the literature will be found in *R. E. Arm*, pp. 337-8.

² Gardîzî, ed. M. Nâzim, p. 64; in addition to the citations in *R. E. Arm*, pp. 338-9, nn. 42-5, see also Cahen, 'Arslân b. Saldjûk', *ET*².

³ Turkish trans., N. Lugal (Ankara, 1943), pp. 2-3 and *R. E. Arm*, p. 342, n. 75.

⁴ On which see the indispensable study by Cl. Cahen, 'Le Malik-nâmeh et l'histoire des origines seljukides', *Oriens*, vol. II (1949), pp. 31-65; cf. *R. E. Arm*, p. 332 and *passim*.

⁵ Further confirmation of this point is found in Mxit'ar of Ayrivank' (p. 2, n. 2 above; this point not presented in *R. E. Arm*), who, probably using Mxit'ar of Ani, places Mûsâ Yabghu (*Musep'aytoy*) at the head of his dynastic list of Seljuks, ed. Emin, p. 22. He again mentions Mûsâ in the chronological part of his work after the year A.D. 901 [*sic!*], '... the Turkman (*T'urk'man*) Seljuk (Salçuk') and Mûsâ Yabghu (Musê P'aloŷ) and Tughril Beg (Dôḥlabêk)... etc.', p. 55.

⁶ There is an almost literal version of the *Saljûqnâma* preserved in the *Râhat al-šudûr* (end of 6th/12th century) by al-Râwandî, quoted here in the ed. by M. Iqbal (London, 1902), pp. 102, 104; cf. *R. E. Arm*, pp. 336, n. 34, p. 346, n. 91.

it evident that Tughrīl was the most powerful member of the Seljuk family in the post-Dandânqân period – although he never took the then seemingly honorary title *yabghu* – it is also evident that we must not regard his uncle Mûsâ as simply ‘far from dynamic’.¹

It is obvious that in our second episode neither the *yabghu* question nor the many other details about the Seljuks contained in the fragment allow us to be as precise in discussing Mxit’ar’s authorities for this section as we were in considering those for the Ghaznavid one. We have nothing as pronounced as the events centered around the capture of Rayy to pin-point the Islamic sources on the Seljuks which Mxit’ar may have used. Nevertheless, generalizations about early Armenian historical works made with regard to Ghaznavid history are equally valid for Seljuk history (see above, pp. 465–8). All we can say is that the pattern which develops out of the Armenian account seems more related to the Zahir al-Din group of Persian sources (which are independent of the reconstructed *Maliknâma*) than to the *Maliknâma* itself, this despite certain similarities between the latter work and Mxit’ar’s.² The problem still remains very unsatisfactorily resolved.

We are left to speculate that there was yet another early Seljuk source, perhaps now lost, which was used either by Mxit’ar or his predecessor Hovhannês Sarkawag as well as later Muslim authors. As has been suggested elsewhere (*R. E. Arm.*, vol. vi, pp. 348, 352–3, and above, p. 473), a distant possibility is a supposed late 5th/11th century *Chronicle* about the early Seljuks by Abû’l-‘Alâ’ Muḥammad b. Ḥassûl (d. 450/1058), a vizier of Majd al-Dawla, who subsequently worked in Rayy as a bureaucrat for the Ghaznavids and later for the Seljuk conqueror of the city, Tughrīl Beg.³ Beside the fact that Ibn Ḥassûl was employed by all the major figures in both the episodes cited above, what makes him particularly interesting from the point of view of the Armenian sources is that in another existing work of his, a *Risâla* which was to have been a preface to the same *Chronicle*, he shows, like Mxit’ar but unlike the pro-Chaghri *Maliknâma*, a strong bias towards Tughrīl,⁴ and, more importantly, again like Mxit’ar and Sarkawag, he uses the rare form (at least for Muslim sources) of Sarjuk (*s.r.j.k*) for Seljuk (normally spelt *s.ljûq*).⁵

To add further support to this supposition, a *Ta’rîkh* by one Abû’l-‘Alâ-i-

¹ C. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey* (London, 1968), p. 20; see the more detailed discussion in *R. E. Arm.*, pp. 346–7.

² For details, *R. E. Arm.*, pp. 352–3.

³ C. E. Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids* (Edinburgh, 1963), p. 59; Cahen, ‘Le Malik-nâme’, pp. 36–7.

⁴ *Risâla*, ed. ‘A. ‘Azzâwî with Turkish trans. by Ş. Yaltkaya, *Belleten*, vol. iv (1940), pp. 250–66 and 51 pages of Arabic text; a thorough discussion of the work and its author is given by Cahen, ‘Le Malik-nâme’, pp. 37–8.

⁵ *Risâla*, text p. 49, trans. p. 265. This section of the *Risâla* has been translated into English by D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars* (Princeton, 1954), p. 259; cf. Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 220, and *R. E. Arm.*, p. 348, n. 103. For the Armenian usage see above, p. 468, n. 1, and the text, and *R. E. Arm.*, p. 347, nn. 98–9.

Aḥwal is in fact cited by the early 8th/14th century Persian historian Hamdullāh Mustawfī Qazwīnī in the introduction to the section on the Seljuks in his *Ta'riḫ-i guzīda*.¹ Claude Cahen believes that by a simple orthographic correction this personage is almost certainly to be identified with Abū'l-'Alā Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Ḥassūl and one and the same as the author of the *Risāla*.² Furthermore, if we can believe a note in H. Raverty's translation of Jūzjānī's *Ṭabaqat-i Naṣīrī*, this *Ta'riḫ* of Abū'l-'Alā-i-Aḥwal (now to be read Abū'l-'Alā ibn Ḥassūl) states that Seljuk had four sons named 'Isrā'īl, Mīkā'īl, Mūsā-i-Beghū (*sic*, to be read Mūsā-Yabghu) . . . and Yūnus'.³ Since Raverty claims to have actually used this *Ta'riḫ*,⁴ a manuscript of Ibn Ḥassūl's work may in fact still exist. Of course, like the vizier's other work, the *Risāla*, it would probably have been written in Arabic and would raise again the question of Mxit'ar's use of it. Yet if we can take Raverty's statement referring to such a manuscript at face value, there would seem to be good reason for less caution about the existence of such a history, which, since Ibn Ḥassūl worked for the Ghaznavids in Rayy, might have contained information on the capture of the city by Maḥmūd and, not unlikely, even the story about the author's former employer, the Būyid Majd al-Dawla. If this proves to be true, then Ibn Ḥassūl's *Ta'riḫ* could have served very well as the foundation for the details on both the Ghaznavids and Seljuks found in Mxit'ar's report as well as the original source for the Muslim accounts.⁵

No matter how one may react to the myriad speculations presented above, it is clear that Mxit'ar of Ani's short history of the sultans of the Turks as preserved in Vardan is a well-informed and detailed account which, when more thoroughly examined, may help us to understand better some of the important aspects of Muslim and Armenian historiography of the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th century.

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT
BEIRUT, LEBANON

¹ Ed. (facsimile) and abridged trans., E. G. Browne, 2 vols., *GMS* (London, 1910–13), facsimile p. 434.

² 'Le Malik-nāmeḥ', pp. 37–8, for a complete discussion.

³ H. G. Raverty, *The Ṭabaqāt-i Naṣīrī* (London, 1881–99), pp. 116–18, n. 3.

⁴ Raverty, p. 117, n. 3.

⁵ Bosworth likewise comments (letter of 10 October 1970): 'This leaves rather a mystery, and I can't, offhand, suggest any obvious solution, unless al-Ābī [p. 472, n. 1 above] or Ibn Ḥassūl are possible relaters of the anecdote.'