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NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION.

The Arabic alphabet is thus represented: َ in the middle of a word by · (as el-Ma'mūn), ب b, ت t, ث th, ـ (English j, but in Lower Egypt pronounced as hard g in “get”), ح h, خ kh, د d, ذ dh (as th in “this”), ر r, ز z, س s, ش sh, ص s, ضḍ ẓ, صṣ ŏ, ت t, ج gh, ف f, ك k, ل l, م m, ن n,ه h, و w, ي y. The Persian گ is represented by g. The vowels and diphthongs are ـ a or e (according to the rules of imāla), ـ u or o, ـ i; ـ ـ ـ, ω ـ ـ ـ i; ـ ـ ـ aw, ـ ـ ـ ey or ay. When a name is repeated the article is often omitted; as El-Ḥākim and Ḥākim. Ibn (son) is abbreviated as b. D stands for dinār, a gold coin worth about half a guinea.
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A HISTORY OF EGYPT
UNDER THE SARACENS

CHAPTER I

THE ARAB CONQUEST

639—641


MOHAMMAD, the prophet of the Arabs, died in 632. In a few years his followers overran Arabia, Syria, and Chaldaea, defeating the forces of the Emperor of Constantinople and the “Chosroes” or Sāsānian king of Persia; and in 639 the Arabs invaded Egypt. The caliph ‘Omar yielded with reluctance to the urgent representations of the general, ‘Amr ibn el-‘Āṣī, and even stipulated that if a letter of recall should reach the army before it entered Egyptian territory, it was to march back to Medina. The letter was sent, but ‘Amr contrived to cross the frontier before opening it, and thus effected his purpose. He had visited Alexandria in his youth, and had never forgotten its wealth. The expedition was arranged whilst the caliph and ‘Amr were together near Damascus on their return from
Jerusalem in the autumn of 639, and 'Amr kept the Feast of Sacrifice (10 Dhū-l-Ḥigga, A.H. 18), 12 Dec., 639, at el-'Arish, the frontier town of Egypt.

The invading army mustered 3,500 or 4,000 men, but was quickly reinforced by a second body of 4,000. They were almost all horsemen, armed with lances and swords and bows. The first opposition the Saracens met was at Pelusium (el-Faramā), where the Roman\(^1\) garrison held out for a month, until the success of the besiegers was attained partly through the aid of the Copt or native Egyptian population, who were eager to welcome any prospect of release from the oppression of the eastern empire. The schism definitely opened at the council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451 had established a sharp hostility between the national monophysite or "Jacobite" church of Egypt and the official "Chalcedonian" or "Melekite" church which the emperors of Constantinople supported in Egypt; and the Melekite persecution of the Jacobites, who formed the great bulk of the Egyptians, had alienated whatever trace of loyalty the people might have retained towards their distant sovereigns, and had prepared the way for foreign intervention. Indeed, the Persians had quite lately (616) conquered the country, and had only been ejected by the Romans a few years (626) before the Arab invasion. The Egyptians had served many foreign masters, and had suffered under all, so that a change of rulers signified little, and any change from Byzantine intolerance would probably, in their eyes, be for the better. This widespread disaffection contributed to the easy triumph of the Arabs. It was first seen in the taking of Pelusium, when the patriarch, called by the Arabs "Abū-Miya-mīn" (possibly meaning the banished Jacobite patriarch Benjamin), advised the Copts to support the invaders.

The Romans made a second stand at Bilbeys, some thirty miles from Miṣr, where another month was spent

\(^1\) The term Roman is used throughout, in preference to Greek, for the east Roman or Byzantine empire. In Arabic the Byzantines are always called *er-Rūm*; in the sing. *Rūm.*
MARCH ON MEMPHIS

in the siege¹; and after the fall of Bilbeys, 'Amr had again to fight the Romans at Umm-Duneyn, a village or suburb which stood near the present 'Ab'din quarter of Cairo. The Saracens were once more successful; but before proceeding further 'Amr appealed to the caliph for more troops, and a second reinforcement was sent, bringing the army up to 12,000 men.² Part of this force was on the west bank of the Nile, advancing upon Asyût and Behnesa, and trying to penetrate into the Fayyum, where they were opposed by Theodosius the dux of the Thebaid, and by the general John of Márös; but the main body was on the east bank, posted in the neighbourhood of the city of Miṣr, or “Babylon of Egypt,” a northern extension of the ancient Memphis.³ The city was defended by a large Roman army, and guarded by a strong fortress, rebuilt by Turbo in 116, the remains of

¹ The romantic legend of the defence of Bilbeys by Armenossa, the daughter of the prefect George el-Muḫawḳis, rests only upon the authority of el-Wâḳīḍi, and cannot be accepted without reserve. It may be read in Mrs. Butcher’s Story of the Church of Egypt, i. 359, 360, or more fully in Quatremère’s Mémoires sur l’Égypte, i. 33; 54.
² According to another tradition, ez-Zubeyr brought 12,000 men to reinforce 'Amr. The figures cannot be relied on, but the total force of the Arabs was evidently small.
³ Memphis itself existed, though in decay, at the time of the Arab conquest, but as it is never mentioned by the chroniclers, its inhabited portion must be intended when they speak of “Miṣr.” There is much obscurity about this city of Miṣr at this period, which is increased by the word Miṣr being used also to signify Egypt. The Arabic writers speak constantly of Babylon (Babilyûn) as though it were a fortress and nothing else, and there is very little evidence for the independent existence of a city of Babylon or Miṣr apart from the fortress. It is only in John of Nikiu’s chronicle that we find a distinction between the taking of Miṣr and the surrender of the fortress. In the sixth century, however, Hierocles and George the Cyprian both mention Memphis, but not Babylon; and there must have been an inhabited city representing the ancient Memphis, and probably forming a more modern and northern extension of it. One would expect to find it on the west bank of the Nile, but all the authorities concur in placing Miṣr on the east bank, in the neighbourhood of the fortress of Babylon. Ṭendûnyâs, on the other hand, seems from John of Nikiu’s account to have been on the west bank. Memphis was an immense city, and may have extended, with its suburbs of Miṣr and Ṭendûnyâs, across the river as far as the fortress of Babylon.
which still stand under the name of Kasr-esh-Shema', "the castle of the candle." 'Amr divided his forces into three corps, one of which he posted to the north of Babylon, the second was stationed at Tendûnyâs (apparently a fortified suburb on the west bank to the south-west of Babylon), and the third withdrew northwards to Heliopolis (On, 'Ayn-Shems), in the hope of tempting the Romans out of their fortifications, upon which the other two corps were to fall on their rear or flank. The manoeuvre succeeded. The Romans marched out of their fortifications, and attacked the Saracens at Heliopolis, but being themselves taken in rear by the other divisions, were routed and driven to the Nile, where they took to their boats and fled down the river. Upon this the Muslims occupied Tendûnyâs, the garrison of which had perished in the battle, except 300 men who shut themselves up in the fort, whence they retired by boat to Nikiu. The taking of Tendûnyâs was evidently followed by, or synonymous with, the taking of the whole city of Misr, except its citadel, which was blockaded; for John of Nikiu, from whose almost contemporary chronicle this account is taken, mentions no subsequent siege or conquest of the city of Misr, but only the later reduction of the fortress. The defeat of the Romans at Heliopolis was so complete that not only Misr, the chief city of that part, fell into the hands of the Saracens, but even in the Fayyum Domentianus, the praeses of Arcadia, secretly escaped from the chief town, deserted the Roman troops scattered about middle Egypt, and hurried down the Nile to Nikiu; whereupon the Arabs took Medinet-el-Fayyum, Asyût, and eventually Behnesa, with great slaughter.\footnote{In the rubric of John of Nikiu's chronicle the conquest of Misr is carefully distinguished from the conquest of the fortress of Babylon. The former is placed in Anno Indictionis XIV., which corresponds to 1 Sept. 640—31 Aug. 641, and the fall of Babylon in XV. The latter date cannot be sustained satisfactorily, but the distinction between the two events, and the emphasis laid on the interval between them, are important. The rubric is the work of the Arabic translator, according to M. Zotenberg, but it may be assumed that he had earlier data to go upon, otherwise he would scarcely have used the Indiction chronology.}
CONQUEST OF MISR

The Arabic accounts of the conquest of Miṣr conflict with each other, and with that given above, in many details, but confirm the main fact of the victory at Heliopolis (which must have taken place before the inundation covered the land, i.e., before September), and record the subsequent occupation of Miṣr during the inundation. They add various stories of negotiations, and even entertainments, between the Egyptians and the Arabs, which ended in a formal treaty. We read of a certain Abū-Maryam, a “catholic” (qathaliṣ) of Miṣr, who joined ʿAmr's army, accompanied by a bishop, and endeavoured to arrange terms. ʿAmr showed them goodwill; enlarged on the friendly disposition of the late prophet Moḥammad towards the Copts,1 in virtue of their traditional kinship through Hagar, the Egyptian mother of Ishmael, the ancestor of the prophet; and offered them the usual choice—to embrace Islām or to pay the special poll-tax levied by the conquerors on all non-Muslims. Abū-Maryam and the bishop were anxious that the latter alternative should be accepted; but the Roman commander “Artabūn”2 would not listen to it. He was killed in attempting to surprise the Saracens by a night attack; the battle of Heliopolis followed; ez-Zubeyr escalated Miṣr and opened a gate; and the Egyptians sued for peace. The treaty ran as follows, according to the Arab tradition recorded by Ṭabari: “In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful, this is the amnesty which ʿAmr ibn el-ʿᾹṣi granted to the people of Miṣr, as to themselves, their religion, their goods, their churches and crosses, their lands and waters: nothing of these shall be meddled with or minished; the Nubians shall not be permitted to dwell among them. And the people of Miṣr, if they enter into this treaty of peace, shall pay the ǧizya (poll-tax), when the inundation of their river

1 For the traditions see Abū-Ṣāliḥ, . 286, and Mr. Everet’s notes and references.

2 Also called by the Arabs el-Mandakūr (or Mandhafūr) ibn Kurkub and in Arabic nicknamed el-Aʿraḡ or el-Uʿeyrig, “the viper.”
has subsided, fifty thousand thousand. And each one of them is responsible for [acts of violence which] robbers among them may commit. And as for those who will not enter into this treaty the sum of the tax shall be diminished [to the rest] in proportion; but we have no responsibility towards such. If the rise of the Nile is less than usual, the tax shall be reduced in proportion to the decrease. Romans and Nubians who enter into their [the people of Misr’s] covenant shall be treated in the like manner. And whoso rejects [the treaty] and chooses to go away, he is protected till he reach a place of safety or leave our kingdom. The collection of the taxes shall be by thirds, one third at each time. For [sureties for] this covenant stand the security and warranty of God, and the warranty of His Prophet, and the warranty of the caliph, the commander of the faithful, and the warranty of the believers . . . . Witnessed by ez-Zubeyr, and his sons ‘Abdallāh and Moḥammad, and written by Wardān.” (Ṭabarī i. 2588.)

The negotiation of this treaty of peace is attributed by most Arabic historians to a certain Gīrgīs (or G’ureygh) or George, son of Menas, el-Muḵawkīs, who has been magnified as the chief ruler of Egypt, and denounced as the supreme traitor to Christianity. At first, indeed, he

1 This is probably a slip for “pay the poll-tax [of two dinārs a head] and fifty million dirhems in land-tax (khariḡ),” for it would be the land-tax, not the poll-tax, that would be modified in proportion to the fertility dependent upon the extent of the inundation. Ibn-Khaldiṅ, quoting registers of the latter half of the 8th c., gives the land-tax of Egypt as nearly forty-four million dirhems. Abū-Ṣāliḥ says (f. 22a) that Aḥr imposed a yearly tax of 262 dirhems (i.e. two dinārs) on all, but two dinārs and three ardebs of wheat on all rich men; in this way the country produced twelve million dinārs, as the population (he assumes), excluding children and aged men, was six millions. The dinār, henceforward generally abbreviated as D., contained rather more gold than our half-sovereign, and may be roughly called a half-guinea.

2 A “Muḵawkīs” had certainly been in communication with the Arabian prophet in 628, and had sent him two slave-girls, a white mule, a pot of Benḥā honey, and other gifts; one of the damsels, Mary the Copt, of the curly hair, became the Apostle’s concubine; but since Muḵawkīs is stated by the Arabic writers to be only the title of the successive Roman governors of Egypt (possibly a corruption of the
opposed the Saracens, but after the fall of Miṣr, during which he and most of the troops are said to have retreated to the opposite island (afterwards called "the Island of the Garden," G'ezirat-er-Rūda), he opened communications with 'Amr, hoping to obtain easier terms if he could manage to conclude a treaty before the inundation subsided, which then hemmed in the Muslims; and peace was made on the basis of a poll-tax of two dinārs (about a guinea) per head, excluding women and children and aged men, together with a moderate land-tax, and the obligation of three days' hospitality to Muslims—apparently a form of contribution to the keep of the Arab army. The Egyptians accepted these terms, and the Romans were given the choice of acceptance or a retreat to Alexandria.\(^1\) When the

Greek μεγαλός, "most glorious," as suggested by Karabaček, Mittheil. aus d. Samml. d. Papyr. Erzherzog Kaimer, i. 1-11), Mōhammād's correspondent may have been a different person from the Muḥākwīs of 640. That 'Amr had relations with a certain "George the prefect" is clear, for John of Nikiu states that, after the conquest of Miṣr and the Fayyūm, 'Amr "sent orders to George the prefect to make a bridge over the canal of Kalyūb," to facilitate further conquests in the delta, and adds that "it was then that they [the Egyptians] began to assist the Muslims." This George, who may have been praeses of Augustamnica (Milne, Egypt under Roman Rule, 225), was probably George, son of Menas, the Muḥākwīs of the Arab traditions (though they make him the governor of all Egypt, ruling from Alexandria), and his assistance after the taking of Miṣr supplies a clue to the elaborate stories related by the Arabic chroniclers. 'Amr's orders to George imply previous relations, and as some one must have conducted the peace negotiations on the Christian side, and as it was more likely to be an Egyptian than a Roman, there is no improbability in the Arab tradition that 'el-Muḥākwīs was the negotiator.

\(^1\) Probably it is this treaty that is referred to by Nicephorus, who says (28, ed. Bonn) that the patriarch Cyrus (perhaps the "bishop" of the Arab traditions) was recalled to Constantinople by the emperor Heraclius, and censured for having agreed to pay tribute to the Muslims. Theophanes (518, ed. Bonn) also mentions a treaty, by which Cyrus agreed to pay 'Amr 120,000 denaria, and did pay this tribute for three years; but he seems to refer to the second treaty on the surrender of Alexandria. In the confused accounts of the Greek writers there is a prevailing idea that the patriarch agreed at an early date to pay tribute to the Arabs. See J. B. Bury, Later Roman Empire, ii. 271.


**CORRIGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>READ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Gauth</td>
<td>Ghawth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Hanḍhala</td>
<td>Hanzala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Ḥārūn</td>
<td>Hārūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Ghatās</td>
<td>Ghiṭās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ḥiḡāz</td>
<td>Ḥiḡāz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Tyy</td>
<td>Tayy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>el-Ŷāzūrī</td>
<td>el-Ŷāzūrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Ommayyad</td>
<td>Omayyad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Dābīk</td>
<td>Debiḳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Amīr</td>
<td>Emīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Aydhāb</td>
<td>'Aydhāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Ḥassān</td>
<td>Ḥassān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Abū-Nejāḥ</td>
<td>Abū-Neğāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>'Abdul-Meqīl</td>
<td>'Abd-al-Meqīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Atfīḥ</td>
<td>Āṭfīḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Akaba</td>
<td>'Akaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>naptha</td>
<td>napthha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Aradus</td>
<td>Antaradus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Sarkhab</td>
<td>Sarkhad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
after chasing them into the fortress, quietly returned to the spot where he had been disturbed, and finished his prayers. Again, when the messengers from the Muḥawṣīs, after being entertained some days in ‘Amr’s camp, returned to their master, he asked them to describe the Arabs. They answered, “We found a people who love death better than life, and set humility above pride, who have no desire or enjoyment in this world, who sit in the dust and eat upon their knees, but frequently and thoroughly wash all their members, and humble themselves in prayer: a people in whom the stronger can scarce be distinguished from the weaker, or the master from the slave.”

When the fortress of Babylon was taken, the Arab general prepared to march north as soon as the Nile had returned to its banks. After the victory at Heliopolis, he had sent several detachments to different parts, to the Ša‘īd (Upper Egypt) and the Fayyūm, as well as north towards Alexandria, Damietta, and Tinnis on the coast. They met with little resistance in most parts, and imposed the usual terms (poll-tax and land-tax) upon the submissive population; the Roman troops were concentrated in a few large cities. ‘Amr himself, after establishing a strong force at Miṣr, and mooring a fleet of boats under the wall of the fortress, at that time washed by the Nile, marched down the east bank to engage Theodorus the augustal prefect. He found however, that the prefect and most of the Roman army had retired to Alexandria, leaving Domitianus at Nikiu, and Dares of Semennūd to guard “the two rivers.” On the approach of the Arabs Domitianus fled from Nikiu and took boat for Alexandria. The Arabs then entered Nikiu unopposed on 13 May, 641 (18 Genbōt, Ind. xv. [łege xiv.] according to John of Nikiu), and are said to have massacred all the inhabitants and perpetrated atrocious cruelty throughout the “island of Nikiu,” enclosed between the arms of the Nile. From Nikiu ‘Amr pressed northwards, taking Athribis and Busiris, Damsis and Sakhā, anxious to subdue the whole of the delta before the inundation should check
operations. He was repulsed, however, at Damietta, and finding himself impeded by the canals and arms of the river, returned to Miṣr, whence he made a fresh start. Choosing this time the west bank, he marched by way of Terenuthis, fought three battles with the Romans, and reached Kiryawn, twenty miles south of Alexandria. The first attack was repulsed, but the capital was then torn by factions, "Blues" and "Greens," Byzantines and Nationals, Greeks and Copts, and was in no condition for resistance; Theodorus, the august prefect, was at Rhodes, and Domentianus was a poor substitute, and was at enmity with his colleague, Menas, the prefect of Lower Egypt. The distracted state of the city and the general panic can alone explain the surrender of a well-fortified stronghold which could be provisioned and reinforced at will by sea.

Accordingly, when the Arabs arrived near Alexandria, they found the enemy eager to treat. The report of a man who served under 'Amr at the taking of Miṣr and Alexandria has been handed down and preserved by Ṭabarī (i. 2ś8ś-3). This man, Ziyād ez-Ẓubeydi, said that after taking Babylon the Muslim army advanced into the Rif (delta) between Miṣr and Alexandria, and arrived at Belhib, where the governor of Alexandria sent to 'Amr, offering to pay the poll-tax on condition that the Roman prisoners should be surrendered. 'Amr replied that he must refer the proposal to the caliph at Medina; he wrote what the governor had said, and the letter was read to the troops. They waited at Belhib, during the armistice, till the caliph 'Omar's answer came. 'Amr read it aloud. It required the Alexandrians to pay the poll-tax; the prisoners were to be given the choice of accepting Islām or remaining true to the religion of their own folk; if they chose Islām, they belonged to the Muslims; if they held to their own creed, they should be sent back to Alexandria; but those prisoners who had already been sent to Arabia could not be returned. So they gave the remaining prisoners their choice, and when some chose Islām, the army shouted "Allāhu Akbar," "God is Most Great,"—
"it was the loudest Te Deum (tekbir)," said Ziyād, "that we had shouted since we conquered the land." The rest returned to Alexandria, and the amount of the poll-tax was fixed. Thus Alexandria capitulated and the Muslims entered in.

John of Nikiu, like Ziyād, mentions no prolonged siege of Alexandria, but says that the patriarch Cyrus, who had returned from Constantinople armed with full powers to treat, went to 'Amr at Babylon 1 to propose terms of peace and offer tribute, and it was settled that the Alexandrians should pay a monthly tribute, and deliver up 150 soldiers and 50 civilians as hostages; that the Muslims should not interfere with the churches and affairs of the Christians; that the Jews (who doubtless helped to furnish the tribute money), should be allowed to remain at Alexandria; and that the Muslims should hold aloof from the city for eleven months, after which the Romans would embark and leave the city, and no other Roman army would be sent to regain it. They embarked on 17 September (642), which, if the term of eleven months was strictly observed, would make the date of the treaty of capitulation October, 641. 2

1 Possibly a transcriber's error for Belhib; the two could be easily confounded in a careless Arabic MS., from which the Ethiopic version of John of Nikiu appears to have been made. But as Cyrus was back in Egypt before Easter, 641, he might have found 'Amr at Babylon, and there begun the negotiations which were continued at Belhib.

2 The received tradition, however, recorded by many of the Arab historians, is that Alexandria endured a siege of fourteen months, during which the Muslims lost more than 20,000 men; and many incidents of this siege have been handed down, some of which may really refer to the later reconquest of the city in 645. They state that at the time of the battle of Heliopolis several detachments were sent to various parts of Egypt, and one went to Alexandria. There may have been a corps of observation near Alexandria for fourteen months, but the story of a siege is contradicted by Ziyād's plain tale, as well as by John of Nikiu. The Arab siege material, moreover, must have been extremely weak. Though they early made use of mangonels and stone-slings, these could hardly have been powerful enough to reduce the forts of Alexandria. The legends of 'Amr being made prisoner, and eluding discovery by the presence of mind of his slave, and of his narrow escape in a bath, are improbable. What the relations were between the Muslims and the Romans during the eleven months of
The Muslim writers describe Alexandria as it was in 642 with their customary exaggeration: it had, they say, 400 theatres, 4000 public baths, &c., and its population numbered 600,000 (without reckoning women and children), of whom 200,000 were Romans, and 70,000 Jews. Of any destruction or spoliation by the Arabs there, is not a word in any of the early authorities, nor, since the city capitulated on terms, was any spoliation permissible. John of Nikiu records that 'Amr levied the taxes agreed upon, but took nothing from the churches, nor wrought any deed of pillage or spoliation, but protected them throughout his government. The story of the destruction of "the Alexandrian library," and the distributing of the books to light the fires in the 4000 public baths, is found in no early record. It is not mentioned by any Greek writer, nor by John of Nikiu, Ibn-'Abd-el-Ḥakam, or Ṭabarî. It first appears in the thirteenth century, six hundred years after the alleged event, in the works of 'Abd-el-Laṣīf and Aḥṭ-tr-Farag. It is absolutely contradictory to John of Nikiu's account of 'Amr's protecting policy. The legend may have had its origin in the destruction of books of the fire-worshippers during the Arab conquest of Persia.

grace we do not know. It is recorded by John of Nikiu that the Muslims came to Alexandria to collect the poll-tax, and that disturbances ensued, which were allayed by Cyrus the patriarch; but whether, after this, the Muslims occupied Alexandria, as the Arabic historians would have us believe, or (as seems more probable) received the tax outside the city, and observed the truce, there is no evidence to show. According to a tradition repeated by several Arabic historians, Alexandria was taken by storm, but almost immediately retaken by the Romans, who were then driven out a second time, and fled by sea and land, but this may refer either to the disturbances caused by the collection of the poll-tax, or to the second conquest of Alexandria from Manuel in 645. The fact, generally admitted, that the Alexandrians were allowed to pay the poll-tax, instead of having all their property confiscated, is presumptive evidence of a capitulation, though some of the chroniclers explain it away as an act of grace. There was an obvious motive on the part of the Arabs to represent that Egypt was conquered vi et armis, because a country so conquered would, according to Mohammadian law, be deprived of all rights, and be exposed to confiscations, which would not be the case if it had capitulated upon terms.
CHRONOLOGY OF THE CONQUEST

One anecdote of the alleged siege of Alexandria may be quoted as illustrating the spirit which inspired the Arab warriors. 'Amr's son 'Abdallāh was severely wounded, and groaning in his pain he let the regret escape that his father would not lead his army back to peace and rest. 'Amr's reply was typical of the race: "Rest," he said, "is in front of you, not behind."  

The chronology of the Arab conquest of Egypt is almost hopelessly bewildering, and the difficulties are too complex to be discussed here. The account given above is based chiefly upon John of Nikiu and Ibn-'Abd-el-Ḥakam, compared with Ṭabarī and later historians. John's chronicle, however, is obviously transposed in some of its chapters, and I have transferred chapters cxvi.-cxviii. to precede cxiv. I am glad to see that Mr. E. W. Brooks, who has carefully examined the subject in the Byzantinische Zeitschrift, iv. 435-444, has arrived independently at the same conclusion with regard to this transposition. It implies the correction of the date XV. Ind. in ch. xv. for the northern march to Damietta, which must have been in the late spring or early summer (before the inundation) of 641 (i.e. XIV. Ind.). In the same way the XV. Ind. given in the rubric for the fall of Babylon fortress must be corrected to XIV. Such slips are not surprising in an Ethiopic version translated from a probable Arabic version of a probable Coptic original. The one valuable date supplied by the Arabic historians is Ibn-'Abd-el-Ḥakam's statement that 'Amr celebrated the Feast of Sacrifice, 10 Dhū-Hijja, A.H. 18, i.e. 12 Dec., 639, at el-'Arish on entering Egypt; the other dates of Arabic writers frequently conflict with each other and cannot be relied upon; but the references to the Nile inundation help to fix the season and order of events. The one date in John of Nikiu on which there seems to be no ground for doubt is that of the death of the patriarch Cyrus on 25 Magabit, the Thursday before Easter, which can only be 21 March, 642. The importance of this date is that it fixes the last celebration of Easter by Cyrus (a ceremony specially described by John) as Easter, 641, and makes his negotiation of the capitulation of Alexandria, for which he had been sent back by the emperor armed with full powers, fall certainly in 641, not 642. Another important indication is furnished by the Arabic historians' statement that Alexandria capitulated nine months after the death of Heraclius. His death took place on Feb. 11, 641, and the ninth month would therefore fall in October to November, which allows the stated term of eleven months before the evacuation on Sept. 17, 642. The traditional Arabic date for the capitulation, 1 Mūharram, 20 A.H. (21 Dec., 640), is incredible as to the month; but the year 20 given by the earliest chroniclers, Ibn-Ishāk and el-Wākidī, as quoted by Ṭabarī (i. 2579 ff.), for the conquests of Babylon and Alexandria, agrees with the data given above, and is confirmed by Ibn-'Aḍ-d-Ḥakam's statement that Alexandria fell in the eighth year.
CHAPTER II

A PROVINCE OF THE CALIPHATE

641—868

Monuments.—Nilometer on island of er-Rōḍa.
Inscriptions.—Gravestones from Fustāṭ and Aswān in Cairo Museum, Miss. archéol. française, Egypt. Inst., and private collections at Cairo, and a few in Europe (Brit. Mus., Louvre, Vatican).
Coins.—A few of the caliphate coins struck at Miṣr (Fustāṭ) bear the names of governors.
Glass weights and stamps.—Many show the names of governors, treasurers, and other officials (see pp. 47—56).

641 The surrender of Alexandria was the last important act in the conquest of Egypt. No serious resistance was encountered elsewhere, and the whole country from Eyla on the Red Sea to Barka on the Mediterranean, and from the first cataract of the Nile to its embouchure, became a province of the Muslim caliphate. The Arabs spread over the country during the winter of 641-2, restoring order and levying taxes, for ‘Amr was not the man to keep them idle: "Go forth," he said, "now that the season is gracious: when the milk curdles, and the

of the reign of ‘Omar, which began in the middle of A.H. 20. The two dates, April and October, 641, for the taking of Babylon and the capitulation of Alexandria respectively, completely bear out the prevalent Arabic tradition that Babylon fell after a seven months’ siege, and Alexandria after fourteen months. The siege of Babylon would thus have begun in Sept., 640, immediately after the fall of Miṣr, during the inundation, and the appearance of the Arabs in the neighbourhood of Alexandria (though not a siege) would be brought to the same month.
leaves wither and the mosquitoes multiply, come back to your tents.” Even Nubia was made tributary by an expedition of 20,000 men, under 'Amr’s lieutenant 'Abd- 
allāh b. Sa‘d. The Copts, who had aided the invaders, welcomed the change of masters, and were rewarded. 'Amr retained Menas the prefect in his government for a time, and appointed Shinūda and Philoxenos governors of the Rif and the Fayyūm: all three were of course friendly with the Muslims, and exerted themselves to levy the taxes. Alexandria, the monthly tribute of which was rated at 22,000 pieces of gold,¹ was squeezed by Menas till it paid over 32,000. Many Egyptians became Moḥam-
madans to escape the poll-tax; others hid themselves because they could not pay. In the country towns and villages, the conquerors mixed with the conquered, and the maidens of Sūlṭeys in the delta became the mothers of famous Muslims by their willing union with Arab warriors.

The capital of Egypt was no longer to be Alexandria. The great commercial emporium was liable to be cut off by the Nile inundation from land communication with Medina, then the seat of the caliphate; and the caliph 'Omar was so far from thinking of permanent colonisation, and so averse from depriving himself of the services of 'Amr's fine army, that he forbade the soldiers to acquire land and take root in Egypt, in order that they might always be ready for a fresh campaign elsewhere. Alex-
andria, moreover, was the symbol of Roman dominion and the tyranny of the orthodox church, and was therefore distasteful to the Copts. 'Amr was ordered by the caliph to select a more central position, and he chose the plain close to the fortress of Babylon, and not far north of the old Egyptian capital Memphis, where his camp had been pitched during the siege of Miṣr. Here he

¹ These must be solidi, represented by the Arabic dinār. Belādhuri mentions (223) that the poll-tax of Alexandria in about 730 was raised from the previous sum of 18,000 to 36,000 D. At the rate of two dinārs a head per annum, this monthly payment implies a taxable male population not exceeding 192,000 in 'Amr’s time, and 216,000 a century later.
MOSQUE OF ‘AMR

Fig. 1.—Mosque of ‘Amr at Fustat.
built his mosque, which still stands, though repeatedly altered or restored; and here he began the foundation of the city which he called el-Fustât, "the tent," on the spot where, according to the story, when he marched north to take Alexandria, his tent had been left standing, because he would not suffer his farrâshes to disturb the doves which were building their nest there. Fustât remained the capital of Egypt for more than three centuries, until el-Ḫâhira (Cairo) was founded close by in 969; and, even after that, it continued to be the commercial, as distinguished from the official, capital, until burned on the invasion of the crusading king Amalric in 1168. "The site of Fustât," says el-Maḵrīzī (Ḳhiṭāṭ, i. 286), the most learned authority on Egyptian topography, "which is now called the city of Miṣr, was waste land and sown fields from the Nile to the eastern mountain called G'ebel-el-Muḳaṭṭam; there were no buildings there except the fortress, now called the Castle of the Candle (Kaṣr-esh-Shema') and el-Mo'allāḳa. There the Roman governor who ruled Egypt for the Caesars used to stay when he came from Alexandria... This fortress overlooked the Nile, and the boats came close up to the western gate... In the neighbourhood of the fortress on the north were trees and vineyards, and this became the site of the Old Mosque [or Mosque of 'Amr]. Between the fortress and the mountain were many churches and convents of the Christians." The new

1 Nothing of the original structure remains. It was "a simple oblong room, 28.9 metres by 17.3; the low roof, no doubt, supported by a few columns, the walls probably of baked, but very possibly only unbaked, bricks, and unplastered; the floor pebble strewn; the light probably supplied, as in the great colonnade at the present day, through square apertures in the roof. It possessed no minarets or other attractive outside feature; no niche nor any other internal decoration" (E. K. Corbet, J.R.A.S., n.s., xxii.). In this humble building the conqueror of Egypt, as the caliph's representative, led the public prayers, and preached the sermon, standing on the floor, for the caliph forbade the elevation of a pulpit. 'Amr's own house was opposite the main entrance of the mosque.

2 Possibly from the candles used in the Coptic churches there. Mr. A. J. Butler suggests (Abū-Ṣāliḥ, f. 21a) that the name may be a corruption of Kaṣr-el-Khemi, the "castle of Egypt."
capital spread rapidly, and soon became one of the chief cities of the Mohammedan empire.

Henceforward, for two centuries and a quarter, Egypt was but one of the provinces of the Muslim caliphate. The Arabs appear to have made no sweeping changes in its administration: they were a conspicuously adaptive folk, and were generally content to accept other people’s ideas. In Egypt they found a system of government ready-made, and they adopted the plan of their Roman predecessors—a plan doubtless moulded on time-honoured precedent—with little modification. The system lasted in all essentials down to the present century, and developed into a completely decentralized series of inferior governments loosely related to the chief government at Fustat. The village sheikhs were subordinate to the district governors, who in turn reported to the governor-in-chief; but the central government interfered little with the district officers, or these with the peasants (fellâhîn), so long as the taxes were paid; and the whole machinery of government was directed to the end of collecting as large a revenue as possible. A special department, however, had charge of the irrigation, and appointed inspectors annually to see to the maintenance of the government dikes and dams; but the local dikes were left to the management of each separate village or town, and paid for out of the local funds. The governor was appointed by the caliph; and the governor usually appointed the three great officers of state, for war, justice, and finance—the marshal, the chief kâdi, and the treasurer. The marshal had command of the guard, controlled the army and police, and maintained order. The kâdi was the chief judge, he was also the controller of the mint (at least down to the 13th century), and represented religion and law; the treasurer looked to the

---

1 Mr. Milne (Egypt under Roman Rule, 216) has shown that the mudirs, or governors of provinces, corresponded to the epistrategoi; the mâmîr, or sub-provincial governor, performed the duties of the toparch, and partly of the strategos; and the land-inspector, khûlî, was the ancient sitologos. The taxation, however, seems to have been much heavier under late Roman rule than under the Arabs.
REVENUE

collection of the taxes, and so important was his office that he was often appointed directly by the caliph, and held a position independent of the governor. It was his duty, after collecting the taxes and paying the expenses of government, to hand over the surplus to the supreme treasury of the caliph. Sometimes he farmed the revenues for a fixed payment to the caliph's treasury, and made what he could out of the taxes. Sometimes the governor combined the office of treasurer with his proper political functions. In any case, no doubt a considerable balance stuck in the pockets of the officials, and did not find its way to the caliph. The frequent changes of governors and the uncertainty of their tenure rendered some such economy almost inevitable, as is still the case in the Ottoman empire.

‘Amr, from his new capital of Fustâṭ, directed the raising of the necessary revenue. He collected one million dinârs from the poll-tax alone in the first year, four million in the second, and eight in the third year (642, 643, and 644), a progression which shows that the country was not immediately brought under financial control. The total revenue he was able to raise amounted to $12,000,000\ D.,$ on a population estimated by Ibn-'Abd-el-Ḥakam at from six to eight millions, excluding women and children. The total was probably made up of about $3,000,000$ land-tax on a million and a half of cultivated acres, $8,000,000$ poll-tax on four million male adults, and $1,000,000$ various duties and contributions.¹

¹ It is impossible to reconcile the various estimates of the Arab historians satisfactorily. ‘Amr is stated to have raised eight million dinârs from the poll-tax, which implies a taxable male population of four (not six or eight) millions. But Ya‘qûbî places the poll-tax of Egypt in about 670 at five million dinârs, implying a population of two-and-a-half million adult males, or else a very large conversion of the Copts to Islâm in order to evade the tax, which according to all authorities was not the case. The land-tax in the latter part of the 8th c. was forty-four million dirhems (or three-and-one-third million dinârs), which tallies well enough with the fifty millions fixed by ‘Amr in the treaty of 640. In the first half of the 9th c. the land-tax had increased to nearly four-and-three-quarter million $D$. El-Bilādhurî says
The policy of the caliph enjoined a generous treatment of the cultivators of the soil, and we hear of harshness only where wealthy Copts endeavoured to conceal their resources and evade the taxes; the consequence was confiscation, sometimes to a fabulous amount. 'Amr developed the productiveness of the land by irrigation, and the immemorial corvée system was enforced: 120,000 labourers were kept at work winter and summer in maintaining and improving the dams and canals. The old canal, traditionally called the Amnis Trajanus, connecting Babylon with the Red Sea, which had long been choked up, was cleared and reopened in less than a year,¹ and corn was sent by ships to Medina, instead of by caravan as in the previous year. In spite of this efficient and prudent administration, the caliph was dissatisfied with the small revenue received from Egypt,² and reduced 'Amr to the inferior office of governor of the delta, whilst the Sa'id, or Upper Egypt, was placed under the authority of 'Abdallâh ibn Sa'id, who was soon afterwards (on the murder of the caliph 'Omar) appointed governor of all Egypt.

Before he left, however, 'Amr achieved another signal success. A Roman fleet of 300 sail, under Manuel, an Armenian, supported by the Roman population in the delta, seized Alexandria in 645, and the Copts, dreading that at the end of the 8th c. the total revenue was fixed at four dinārs a head, but this looks like a mere combination of the two dinār tax per head and the two dinār tax per acre.

¹ In A.H. 23 (beginning in Nov., 643) according to el-Kindi. It ran past Bilbey to the Crocodile Lake and then down to Kulzum, the port at the head of the Red Sea. It remained open for about eighty years, after which it was neglected and again became choked up, until reopened in the caliphate of el-Mahdi, c. 780. The picturesque but malodorous canal (el-Khalīfī) flowed through Cairo for some distance to the N.E. until 1899, when it was filled up for sanitary reasons. Its connection with the Crocodile Lake had long ceased, and its place was taken by the still older Busiris or "Freshwater Canal."

² The authentic correspondence on this subject between the caliph and 'Amr is preserved in Ibn-'Abd-el-Ḥakam, and shows that 'Omar regarded Egypt chiefly in the light of a milk-cow, whose milk was to nourish the faithful at Medina rather than fatten the governor at Fustat.
DEFEAT OF ROMANS

a restoration of the hated Melekite domination, entreated that their old champion might be sent against the enemy. 'Amr hastened with an army by land and water towards Alexandria, and encountered the Romans near Nikiu. The imperial archers covered the landing of the troops from the river, and the Arabs suffered heavy loss. 'Amr’s horse was shot under him, and some noted warriors began to fly. At this moment a Roman captain challenged the Muslims to single combat; a champion rode out from their ranks, and both armies stood under arms while the duel was fought out. After an hour’s sword-play, the Arab killed his opponent with a knife. Encouraged by this, the Muslims attacked the enemy with such fury that they broke and fled to Alexandria with the loss of their general. The spot where the victory was won was commemorated by the building of the ‘Mosque of (Divine) Pity.’ The walls of Alexandria were then destroyed, as 'Amr said, “so that men could go in at every side as to the house of a harlot.” As a reward for this service the successful general was offered the command of the troops of Egypt, but not the governorship: he declined the honour in the pithy phrase, “I might as well hold the cow by the horns whilst another milked her.”

The new governor, ‘Abdallāh b. Sa’d,¹ bestirred himself to emulate the deeds of his predecessor. In 651-2 he invaded Nubia, laid siege to Dongola, battered down the Christian church with his stone slings, and compelled the blacks to sue for peace. The treaty then concluded has been preserved by Ibn-Selim, as quoted by Maqrizi, and is a curious document:—

“In the name of God, &c.—This is a treaty granted by the emir ‘Abdallāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abi-Sarḥ to the chief of the Nubians and to all the people of his dominions, a treaty binding on great and small among them, from the

¹ The abbreviation b. stands for ibn, “son of.” The classical form of this name is ‘Abdu-l-lāhi-bn-Sa’d, but in this history the inflexional terminations are disregarded, as they are in Egyptian colloquial usage.
TREATY WITH NUBIANS

frontier of Aswān to the frontier of ‘Alwa. ‘Abdallāh b. Sa‘d ordains security and peace between them and the Muslims, their neighbours in the Sa‘id [Upper Egypt], as well as all other Muslims and their tributaries. Ye people of Nubia, ye shall dwell in safety under the safeguard of God and his apostle, Moḥammad the prophet, whom God bless and save. We will not attack you, nor wage war on you, nor make incursions against you, so long as ye abide by the terms settled between us and you. When ye enter our country, it shall be but as travellers, not as settlers, and when we enter your country it shall be but as travellers not settlers. Ye shall protect those Muslims or their allies who come into your land and travel there, until they quit it. Ye shall give up the slaves of Muslims who seek refuge among you, and send them back to the country of Islām; and likewise the Muslim fugitive who is at war with the Muslims, him ye shall expel from your country to the realm of Islām; ye shall not espouse his cause nor prevent his capture. Ye shall put no obstacle in the way of a Muslim, but render him aid till he quit your territory. Ye shall take care of the mosque which the Muslims have built in the outskirt of your city, and hinder none from praying there; ye shall clean it, and light it, and honour it. Every year ye shall pay 360 head of slaves to the leader of the Muslims [i.e. the caliph], of the middle class of slaves of your country, without bodily defects, males and females, but no old men nor old women nor young children. Ye shall deliver them to the governor of Aswān. No Muslim shall be bound to repulse an enemy from you or to attack him, or hinder him, from ‘Alwa to Aswān. If ye harbour a Muslim slave, or kill a Muslim or an ally, or attempt to destroy the mosque which the Muslims have built in the outskirt of your city, or withhold any of the 360 head of slaves—then this promised peace and security will be withdrawn from you, and we shall revert to hostility, until God decide between us, and He is the best of umpires. For our performance of these conditions we pledge our word, in the name of God, and our compact and faith, and belief in the name
TRIBUTE OF SLAVES

Of His apostle Mohammad, God bless and save him. And for your performance of the same ye pledge yourselves by all that ye hold most sacred in your religion, by the Messiah and by the apostles and by all whom ye revere in your creed and religion. And God is witness of these things between us and you. Written by 'Amr b. Shuraḥbil in Ramaḍān in the year 31.” (May-June, 652 A.D.)

Before this treaty the bikt, or annual tribute of “360 head of slaves,” had been paid to 'Amr b. el-'Āṣi, together with forty slaves whom he declined to accept as a present, but paid for in corn and provisions. This exchange continued for a long time. The bikt of 360 slaves was regularly paid every year to an Egyptian officer at el-Kaṣr, five miles from Aswān, the frontier town of Egypt, and forty slaves in addition were exchanged for wheat, barley, lentils, cloth, and horses. The treaty and the slave tribute remained in force down to Mamlūk times, more than six centuries later.

Three years after the Nubian campaign, a Roman fleet of 700 to 1000 sail appeared off Alexandria. The Muslims had only 200 ships to oppose the invasion, but after volleys of arrows, and, when these were exhausted, of stones, they came to close quarters and fought sword to sword, till the Romans were put to flight. From the forest of rigging the engagement acquired the name of “the Battle of the Masts.” Henceforth, for centuries, in spite of occasional raids by the emperors' fleets, Egypt was secure from foreign attack. Meanwhile 'Abdallāh pressed the taxes, and succeeded in raising a revenue of 14,000,000 D. The caliph 'Othmān, at Medina, observed to 'Amr that “the camel yields more milk now.” “Yes,” was the reply, “but to the hurt of her young.” The result, indeed, was widespread disaffection. The people rose, drove the vice-governor out of Fustāt, proclaimed the deposition of the caliph, refused to admit 'Abdallāh when he returned from a journey to Palestine, and sent a force of rebels to Medina to demand the appointment of a governor of their own choice. An intercepted letter, which seemed to argue double-dealing on the caliph's
part, embittered the controversy, and the Egyptian Arabs at Medina took a leading share in the events which ended in the murder of 'Othman. The contest over the succession to the caliphate was fought out in Egypt, as elsewhere; 'Ali, the new caliph, was strongly supported, and sent a governor to Fusat, who read his commission aloud in the mosque of 'Amr. He was removed by intrigues, and the next governor was poisoned before he even reached his seat of government. Ten thousand men, pledged to avenge the murder of 'Othman, established themselves at Kharibta, in the Hawf (or eastern part of the delta) and defied authority. With their support, and backed by 5000 Syrian troops, joined by as many Egyptians, 'Amr, the nominee of the rival caliph Moawiya, re-entered Fusat in July, 658, after defeating the governor's army, and put an end to the authority of 'Ali in Egypt. The conqueror's second government lasted over five years, but was marked by few important events beyond a couple of expeditions against the Berbers of Libya. In view of his great services, Moawiya, first of the Omayyad caliphs of Damascus, granted him the entire revenue of Egypt, after payment of the cost of administration; and so large was the surplus that when 'Amr died, in January, 664, at the age of ninety, he left seventy sacks of dinars, each of which weighed ten bushels (two ardebs). At about 160 lbs. to the ardebb, this would amount to the wholly impossible amount of ten tons of gold! It is said (but, in the Arab historians' qualifying phrase, "God knows best") that his sons refused to inherit their ill-gotten treasure.

A record of the several reigns of the ninety-eight governors who ruled Egypt under the successive caliphs of Medina, Damascus and Baghda, up to the time when Ibn-Tulun established a practically independent dynasty in 868, would serve little purpose. The system was the same all through, but mildness and

1 Their jejune annals may be read in F. Wustenfeld's Die Statthalter von Aegypten zur Zeit der Chalifen, published in the Abhandl. der Kon. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Gottingen, Bd. xx., 1875.
severity alternated according to the disposition of the governor, or the character of his treasurer and other officials. Several governors are described as generous and upright, benevolent towards the people, and beloved by them. Such were commonly followed by martinets, who restored the treasury balance by fresh exactions. Honesty was not likely to be the salient virtue among men who were liable to sudden dismissal at the caprice of a caliph; yet it is recorded of Keys b. Sa'd that on his demission he refused to appropriate the house he had built at Fuṣṭāṭ because "it was erected with the money of the Muslims" to be the official residence of future governors. Another exceptional ruler, a "God-fearing man, just and incorruptible," used to say, "When presents come in at the door, honesty flies out of the window." Yet it was under this very man that ʿOsāma b. Zeyd carried on a peculiarly oppressive policy, acting on the caliph's instructions, "Milk till the udder be dry, and let blood to the last drop." The normal taxation was not excessive; non-Muslims paid about a guinea a year in poll-tax, and the same amount per cultivated acre (faddān, rather more than an English acre) in land-tax. The taxes brought in annually from twelve to fourteen million dinārs; and in the first half of the 9th c. the land-tax (of two dinārs per acre) amounted to 4,857,000 D., or about 2,500,000l. But in Egypt the tax-gatherer did not always content himself with the legal taxes; and apart from such extortion, there were various other duties, on trades and markets, etc., increased and varied from time to time, which swelled the revenue. The Muslim subjects moreover had to pay a tithe as poor-tax, and also a property-tax. At the beginning of the 8th c. the district officials reported the extraordinary intelligence that their treasuries were so full that they could hold no more, and the caliph gave orders that the superfluity should be expended on building mosques. Among
others, the Mosque of 'Amr was restored, and it is mentioned that when the workmen turned out of an evening and went home, the governor, Kurra, had wine brought into the sacred building, and tipped all night to the strains of music—another way of disposing of the surplus. Some governors, however, rigorously suppressed all wine-shops and places of public amusement.

The vast majority of the people of Egypt were of course the Christian Copts, and whatever oppression existed was mainly borne by them. There is very little evidence, however, to show that they were grossly ill-treated. 'Amr, the conqueror, received an embassy of monks, who asked for a charter of their liberties and the restoration of their patriarch Benjamin; he granted the charter and invited the exiled patriarch to return. The Muslims naturally favoured their allies of the national or Jacobite church, rather than the orthodox church of Constantinople, which was still represented in Egypt. The governor Maslama allowed the Copts to build a church behind the bridge at Fustát, to the scandal of the faithful; and when 'Abd-el-'Aziz b. Marwán removed for his health to Ḫulwán, near Memphis, he chose the Coptic monastery at Tamweyh on the opposite bank of the Nile as his residence, and paid the monks 20,000 D. for it. This is worth noting, because, according to the Muslim theory, Egypt was a conquered country and its inhabitants had no rights, could not own land, and were

1 Here he is stated to have struck the first purely Arabic coins issued in Egypt in A.H. 76 (695), in accordance with the monetary reform of the caliph 'Abd-el-Melik. Abū-Ṣaliḥ says (f. 52b) that 'Abdel-'Aziz b. Marwán wished to make Ḫulwán the capital, and built several mosques there, a pavilion of glass, a Nilometer, a lake and aqueduct, and planted trees. His physicians sent him there for the alleviation of his lion-sickness (elephantiasis), on account of the sulphur springs. He also built a palace with a gilt dome, "the Golden House," at Fustát. Osāma b. Zeyd built the first Nilometer on the island of Rōḍa, formerly called G'ezirat-es-Ṣina'a, "the island of the artisans" (boat-builders), in 716, which superseded the old Nilometer of Memphis, and was still in use in 944 (Mas'ūdī, ii. 366). Another Nilometer was erected at the upper end of Rōḍa in 861, and improved by Ibn-Tūlun in 873; it registered eighteen cubits' rise, each cubit divided into twenty-four inches (Egyptian).
liable (and too often subjected) to confiscation. On the other hand, his nephew and successor, ‘Abdallāh, bore heavily upon the people, forbade Christians to wear the burnus, and ordered Arabic to be used in all public documents, instead of Coptic as heretofore. Executions, arbitrary fines, torture and vexatious passports are recorded, and a system of badges to be worn by monks, by way of licence, was devised: if a monk were found without the brand, his monastery was liable to be sacked.

A still worse oppressor was the treasurer ‘Obeyd- allāh b. el-Ḥabḥāb, who in 722, by the caliph’s order, carried out a general destruction of the sacred pictures of the Christians. Such persecutions led to a rising of the Copts in the Ḥawf, between Bilbeys and Damietta, which, although suppressed for the time, broke out again and again in later years, and the imprisonment of a Coptic patriarch aroused such indignation among his co-religionists in Nubia that the king (Cyriacus) marched into Egypt at the head of 100,000 Nubians, and was only induced to return to his own country by the request of the patriarch, who was hastily liberated.

The Muslim historian Makrizī does not attempt to minimize these persecutions, and himself repeats a story of the heroism of one of the religious women who were

1 These stamps were impressed on glass bottles by the government as guarantees of standard capacity. The glass weights were used to test the weight of the coins. The inscriptions on both usually include the name of the ruling governor or treasurer, the measure or weight indicated, a word or formula referring to the justness of the weight or measure, and occasionally the date.
dragged out of their convents by the Arab soldiers. Febronia was a virgin of such surpassing beauty that her captors could not decide who was to own her. Whilst they were consulting she offered to reveal to their leader the secret of an unguent with which her ancestors used to anoint themselves, and thereby became invulnerable. The captain of the troop agreed to let her go back to her convent if she let him prove the efficacy of the ointment upon herself. "So he went with her into the convent, and she approached the picture of the Lady, and prayed before it, and begged the Virgin to assist her to obtain deliverance." Then she anointed her neck with the oil, and one of the soldiers drew a sharp sword. "And the maiden bent her knees and displayed her neck; but they did not know that which was in her heart. Then she covered her face and said, 'If there is any strong man among you, let him strike with his sword upon my neck, and you will see the power of God in this great secret.' So the man . . . struck with all his might; and her head immediately fell from her body; for it was her purpose by this means to preserve her maidenhood, that she might appear before Christ a pure virgin, as she had been created, without earthly stain. So when the ignorant Bashmurites saw what had befallen the maiden, they knew at last what had been her intention; and they repented and were exceeding sad, and did no injury henceforth to any of those virgins, but let them go."1

It is remarkable that in spite of such intermittent oppression and their invariable position of inferiority, and also the temptation to escape the poll-tax and all disabilities by the simple process of conversion to Islam, the Copts in general remained steadfast to their faith (they still numbered five millions about 725)2; insomuch that about 732 the treasurer 'Obeydallah, finding that Islam was making no progress among them, imported 5000 Arabs of the tribe of Keys and settled them in the Hawn

---

1 Abu-Salih, f. 84b-86a. The story comes from John the Deacon.
2 El-Kindi in Abu-Salih, f. 266.
to the north-east of Fustat, where they presently formed a hot-bed of revolt. The Arab population, however, apart from this small addition, must have been considerable, though for the first century of Moḥammadan rule they were almost confined to the large cities. Most governors appear to have come to Egypt escorted by an Arab army, estimated at different times at 6,000, or 10,000, or even 20,000 men; and many of these soldiers most probably settled in the towns, and some certainly intermarried with Copt women. These Arabs were no doubt favoured by government at the expense of the Christians; and at one time we read that 25,000 D. were distributed among the Muslims to pay their debts. Arab tribes from time to time migrated bodily into Egypt. Thus the tribe of el-Kenz (a branch of Rabī‘a) settled chiefly in the Sa‘id in the middle of the ninth century, intermarried with the people, and became an important political factor in later insurrections in the time of the Fātimids and of Saladin.

The governors of Egypt under the Omayyad caliphs were all Arabs, and four of them were sons or brothers of the reigning caliphs. Two of the Omayyad caliphs themselves visited Egypt: Marwān I. in 684, to defeat the party supporting the rival caliph ‘Abdallāh b. Zubeir; and Marwān II., who came there in his flight from his victorious

Fig. 4.—Glass weight of el-Ḳāsim b. ‘Obeyd-allāh [730].

Fig. 5.—Glass weight of ‘Abd-el-Melik b. Yezid [750].
supplanteers, the 'Abbāsids, crossed at Gīza to Fustāṭ, and sent troops to hold the Ša'īd and Alexandria; but was pursued to the death by the 'Abbāsid general, Šālih b. 'Ali, who took possession of Fustāṭ for the new dynasty in August, 750. The partisans of the late caliph were driven out of the country, or killed at sight.

The change from the Omayyad to the 'Abbāsid caliphs was thus effected in Egypt with little difficulty: indeed some governors who had served the old line were quite willing to accept office under the new, and other leading men of the old régime were taken to the caliph's court to become acclimatized. Their tenure of power, however, was even more precarious, and an 'Abbāsid governor generally ruled only half the brief time that an Omayyad governor had kept his seat.¹ Under the new dynasty a considerable number of the governors belonged to the 'Abbāsid family, and of the others most were Arabs; but in 856 the caliphs began to send Turks, and since then, with the exception of the Fātimid caliphs, hardly any Arabs have ever ruled in Egypt. From 834 to the independent rule of Ibn-Ṭulūn in 872, the province was given in fief to one or other of the commanders of the caliphs' Turkish bodyguard, or to the caliph's son or brother; these fiefs did not govern in person but appointed a deputy governor to do the work and pay them the surplus revenue.²

The change of dynasty was marked by a change of residence. The Omayyad governors had generally lived at Fustāṭ, though two had temporarily removed the seat of government to Alexandria, leaving a deputy at Fustāṭ. The 'Abbāsid governors built a new official capital (a military suburb rather than a city) at a place called el-Ḥamrā el-Ḳūswā ("the further red way") on the plain to the north-east of Fustāṭ, where the soldiers of some of the

¹ Under the Omayyads there were thirty-one changes of governors in 109 years; under the 'Abbāsids, sixty-seven in 118 years.
² These fiefs were Ashnās, 839—844; Itāsh, 845—849; el-Muntasir 850—856; el-Feth, 856—868; Bāḳbāḳ, 868; Barūg, 869—872; el-Muwaffāq, 872.
Arab tribes had formerly built houses of defence; whence the place was known as el-‘Askar, “the army.” Šāliḥ, the ‘Abbāsid general, camped there in 750; his lieutenant, Abū-‘Awn, built houses there; and el-‘Askar became the official residence of the governor, his guard, and ministers. Suburbs connected it with Fustat, from which the Nile had already (by 725) retreated some little distance westward. Another palace, called the Kubbat-el-Hawā (“Dome of the Air”), was built in 809-810 by the governor Ḥātim on the spur of the Muṣṭaṭṭam hills, where the Citadel of Cairo now stands, and here the governors often resorted for the cool breezes.

The period of the government of Egypt under the ‘Abbāsid caliphs of Baghdad was distracted by frequent insurrections. These were due less to the Copts (who joined in, rather than caused rebellion) than to the Muslims themselves. There were already serious schisms in Islām. Not to speak of the slight differences of the four orthodox schools of theology—of which the Mālikī, or school founded on the teaching of the great divine Malik, was most widely followed in Egypt from the eighth to the tenth century, though after the coming of the Imām ʿAlī b. ʿAlī to Fustat, at the beginning of the ninth century, the ʿAsharī begins gradually to acquire the predominance which they still enjoy in Egypt—the bitter enmity between the Shiʿa and the Sunnis, between the upholders of the divine right of ʿAlī’s family to the caliphate and the defenders of the caliphate actually in power, already divided the Muslims. The supporters of the claim of ʿAlī’s descendants to the caliphate, and the Khārīğis (or “revolted”), a sect of puritans who had a large share in the downfall of ʿAlī himself, were strongly represented in Egypt, and the Arab tribes who had been imported into the Hawf were continually in a state of rebellion. In 754 Abū-‘Awn, Šāliḥ’s general, who had been campaigning against the Berbers in Barka, was

1 Maqr. i. 304. El-‘Askar decayed after Šāliḥ’s departure, but was restored and enlarged by Mūsā b. ʿIsā el-‘Abbāsi forty years later. Cf. Lane, Cairo fifty years ago, 7 ff.
obliged to return to put down a great rising of the Khārījis in Egypt, and the result was the despatch of 3000 rebels' heads to Fustat. In 759 there was another campaign in Barqa, where the Khārījis had made common cause with the Berbers and the supporters of the late Omayyad dynasty, and the Egyptian army was defeated. The next governor, Humeyd, who brought 20,000 men with him, and was shortly further reinforced, carried on the war, and after some reverses succeeded in beating the rebels and killing the Khārīji leader. The 'Alawis or 'Alids, adherents of 'Ali's faction, next came on the scene, and one of the family ('Ali b. Mūhammad b. 'Abdallāh) was near becoming caliph in Egypt, till the 'Abbāsid caliph el-Manṣūr, after catching and killing another rebel of the family at Basra, adopted the deterring expedient of sending the victim's head to be exposed in the mosque at Fustat, which so daunted the 'Alids that the movement collapsed. So serious was the ferment, however, that Yezid b. Ḥātim, the governor, forbade the annual pilgrimage to Mekka in 764. In the following year he had to suppress a Khārīji insurrection in Abyssinia, and as a reward for his services the province of Barqa was in 766 for the first time joined to his government of Egypt.

It was now the turn of the Copts. They had already twice risen at Semennūd in the delta, and in 767 they rebelled at Sakhā, twice defeated the governor's troops, and drove out the tax-gatherers. A considerable district of Lower Egypt was in open insurrection, and was not restored to order until several years later. The result was naturally more stringent suppression and persecution. Tranquillity was restored for a while under the gentle rule of Mūsā b. 'Olayy, who treated the people with
benevolence, and delighted in discoursing in the mosque and reciting the prayers, for he was a noted divine. A violent alternative was supplied in 779 by Abū Ṣāliḥ, known as Ibn-Memdūd, the first governor who came of Turkish race, a most capable and energetic ruler, but stern and severe.

Fig. 7.—Glass weight of Moḥammad b. Saʿīd [769]. He found the roads infested by robbers of the Keys Arabs of the Ḥawf, and immediately put a stop to their exploits by summary executions. It was his theory that under his sway thieving could not exist, and he therefore issued orders that all gates and house-doors, and even taverns, should be left open at night. People used to stretch nets before their open doors to keep the dogs out. He interdicted the employment of watchmen at the public baths, and announced that if anything were stolen he would replace it out of his own pocket. When any one went to the bath, he would lay down his garments in the dressing-room and call out, "O Abū-Ṣāliḥ, take care of my clothes!" and would then go and bathe in perfect confidence that when he came out no one would have dared to touch them. But Ibn-Memdūd's severity caused more fear than it allayed, and his ridiculous sumptuary laws, prescribing special head-dresses for judges and other officials, and his constant interference, so harassed the people that his dismissal was universally applauded.

A grave political rebellion occurred in 782 in the Saʿīd, where Dihya b. Mus'ab, the Omayyad, proclaimed himself caliph. Most of Upper Egypt joined his faction, and the government troops were repulsed. A new governor was sent out, who first mulcted his unsuccessful predecessor in the sum of 350,000 D. for his failure to suppress the revolt, and then adopted the strange method of ingratiating
his rule with the people by doubling the land-tax, and imposing fresh duties on markets and beasts of burthen. Musā thus made himself so generally detested that even his own soldiers deserted. The Arab tribes in the Ḥawf seized the opportunity to take up arms again, and the governor was defeated and killed. His successor was not more fortunate. He failed to reduce the rebels in the Ṣaʿīd, but the campaign was memorable for a curious incident. The governor's brother challenged the rebel general to single combat, each ran the other through, both died, and the two armies fled from each other in panic. It was not till el-Faḍl, the son of Šāliḥ, the ʿAbbāsid conqueror of Egypt, took the matter in hand, that this wide-spread rebellion was put down. El-Faḍl tried no half-measures, but brought a loyal army from Syria, which gained a series of victories in the Ṣaʿīd, and captured the pretender. Dīhya was executed at Fustāṭ, his body crucified, and his head sent to the caliph at Baghdād.

Unfortunately el-Faḍl grew so puffed up by his triumph that he had to be removed, and his nephew, who succeeded, though a just man and benevolent (save towards the Copts, whose churches he demolished), following in his ambitious steps received a similar recall from Hārūn er-Rashid. Both these men were members of the ʿAbbāsid family, and were consequently disposed to cherish dreams of election to the caliphate, which was not so entailed that er-Rashid could afford to despise them. The same ambition was discovered in the next governor, Musā b. ʿĪsā the ʿAbbāsid, a man of great official experience, and well disposed towards the Copts, whom he allowed to rebuild their ruined churches.
REBELLION OF ARABS

When it was reported that he was harbouring designs against the caliph, Hārūn exclaimed, with his usual levity, "By Allāh, I will depose him, and in his place I will set the meanest creature of my court." Just then 'Omar, the secretary of the caliph's mother, came riding on his mule. "Will you be governor of Egypt?" asked G'āfar the Barmecide. "Oh, yes," said 'Omar. No sooner said than done; 'Omar rode his mule to Fustāt, followed by a single slave carrying his baggage. Entering the governor's house, he took his seat in the back row of the assembled court. Mūsā, not knowing him, asked his business, whereat 'Omar presented him with the caliph's despatch. On reading it Mūsā exclaimed, in Korānic phrase, "God curse Pharaoh, who said 'Am I not king of Egypt?'" and forthwith delivered up the government to "the meanest creature." The story is too like one of Hārūn's practical jokes to be quite disbelieved, and it is at least certain that Mūsā retired in 792.

During these changes of government, the Arabs of the Hawf pursued their career of insubordination. In 802 and 806 there was severe fighting; the nomads refused to pay taxes, plundered travellers, lifted cattle, and made raids into Palestine, with the support of the frontier Arabs. A treacherous decoy of some of their chiefs in 807 checked them for the moment, but the contest for the caliphate, which arose on Hārūn's death in 808, between his sons, el-Amin and el-Ma'mūn, divided the allegiance of the Egyptians, and led to fresh outbreaks in the Hawf. The two claimants appointed rival governors, and el-Amin shrewdly nominated the chief of the Keys Arabs to the office, thus securing the support of the party most disaffected to the government. El-Ma'mūn's representative was accordingly defeated and killed.

To this official recognition the Arabs of the Hawf now added a new source of strength by the arrival in Alexandria in 798 of over 15,000 Andalusians, besides women and children. These refugees had been banished from Spain by the Omayyad prince el-Ḥakam, in consequence of a rebellion at Córdova, which had gone near to over-
throwing his monarchy. They were allowed to land, but not to enter Alexandria, and they supported themselves as best they could by sea commerce. They soon became a factor in the political situation, and having leagued themselves with the powerful Arab tribe of Lakhm, seized Alexandria in 815. Here they fought and treated alternately with the government and with malcontents of the Hawf, until at last the task of suppressing the obnoxious colony was placed in the hands of a strong man. The caliph el-Mamün sent ‘Abdallāh the son of Ṭāhir, one of the most famous generals of the age, to Egypt in 826, with an army officered by trusty veterans from Khurāsān. A siege of fourteen days brought Alexandria to terms, in 827, and the Andalusi\ns agreed to embark on their ships, taking every soul belonging to them, free and slave, woman and child, on pain of death. They sailed away to Crete, where they settled and ruled till the eastern emperor recovered the island in 961.

Ibn-Ṭāhir had undertaken a difficult task. Before exiling the Andalusi\ns he had fought the governor, ʿObeydallāh b. es-Sari, who refused to accept his dismissal until Ibn-Ṭāhir had starved him out of Fuṣṭāṭ. As a last hope, he sent his besieger in the dead of night an offering of a thousand slaves and slave-girls, each carrying a thousand dinārs in a silk purse; but Ibn-Ṭāhir sent them back, saying “I would not accept your gifts by day, still less by night.” After the surrender of Fuṣṭāṭ and the expulsion of the Andalusi\ns from Alexandria, the successful general, whom the caliph had prophetically named “Victorious” (el-Mansūr), restored order throughout the country, reorganized the army, and made Egypt loyal once more. In return for his great services, the caliph allowed him to enjoy the full revenue of Egypt, amounting to 3,000,000 D. He is described as a just and

1 Dozy, Hist. des Musulmans d'Espagne, ii. 68-76; Quatremère, Mem. sur l'Égypte, i.
2 3,000,000 D. cannot be the gross revenue, but it might be the amount derived from the land-tax. But as it appears that the land-tax about this time reached the sum of 4,857,000 D., it is more probable
humane governor, a man of learning, and a staunch friend to poets, of whom several were always in his train. His name has been preserved in the ‘Abdallāwi melons of Egypt, a variety which he specially introduced.

The brief rest which the land enjoyed under his strong and judicious rule was broken upon his departure for his own province of Khurāsān, in the north-east of Persia. The Arabs of the Ḥawī speedily renewed their outrages, and advancing close to the capital, at Maṭariya, defeated the new governor, who burned his baggage and took refuge behind the walls of Fustāt. When el-Moṭaṣīm, brother of the caliph, and afterwards caliph himself, came to the rescue with 4000 Turkish troops, he found the city blockaded by the Arabs; and though he dispersed them (829) and killed their chiefs, as soon as he had returned to Baghdād, five months later (driving a crowd of wretched barefoot prisoners before his savage troopers), the insurrection broke out afresh, and spread among the Copts; and at last the caliph resolved to go to Egypt in person.

It was the first time that an ‘Abbāsid caliph had visited the Nile, the praises of which poets had constantly been dinning in his ears; and when el-Ma’mūn surveyed the view from the “Dome of the Air,” he was frankly disappointed. “God curse Pharaoh,” he cried, “for saying, ‘Am I not king of Egypt!’” If only he had seen ‘Irāk and its meadows!” “Say not so,” replied a divine, “for it is also written, ‘We have brought to nought what Pharaoh and his folk reared and built so skilfully’; and what must have been those things which God

that the 3,000,000 D. represents the excess or revenue over the cost of administration—the surplus (after paying the army, officials, etc.) which would in the ordinary course have been sent to the caliph.

1 Korān, xliiv. 50. 2 Ibid, vii. 133.
destroyed, if these are but their remnants!" The caliph then disgraced the ineffective governor, beheaded a leader of the revolt, and sent an army under the Afshin into the Ḥawf, where the rebellious Copts were massacred in cold blood, their villages burnt, and their wives and children sold as slaves. This stern repression broke the spirit of the Copts, and we hear no more of national movements. Many of them apostatized to Islām, and from this date begins the numerical preponderance of the Muslims over the Christians in Egypt, and the settlement of the Arabs in the villages and on the land, instead of as heretofore only in the great cities. Egypt now became, for the first time, an essentially Moḥam-madan country.

Meanwhile, the caliph had visited Alexandria and Sakhā; there is also a legend, resting on no early authority, that he attempted to open the great pyramid of G'iza in search of treasure, but gave it up on finding that his workmen could make no perceptible impression on the vast mass. After over a month's stay, el-Ma'mūn returned to Baghda'd. He left the country in a state of peace, which, save for a brief outbreak among the Lakhmi Arabs of the delta, was not disturbed for many years. Whatever dissensions arose were caused by theological differences among the Muslims themselves. El-Ma'mūn's enforcement of the doctrine of the createdness of the Korān, as a test without which no kādi or judge could be enrolled, produced more heart-burning than the subject seems to merit. A chief kādi, who would not conform to the established doctrine, was shorn of his beard, whipped, and driven through the city on an ass. His

Fig. 10.—Glass weight of Ashnās [834 ff.]

1 Cf. 'Abd-el-Latīf, 176, and de Sacy's note, 219; Wüstenfeld, Statthalter, 43 n.
continued to scourge him at the rate of twenty cuts a day, till he extorted the desired bakshish. Followers of the (orthodox) sects of the Hanafis and Shāfiʿis were driven out of the mosque. A suspicious slip in reading the Korān brought a flogging.

A similar system of petty interference vexed the Copts a little later. A series of new regulations of the caliph el-Mutawakkil was promulgated throughout the provinces of Egypt in 850. The Christians were ordered to wear honey-coloured clothes, with distinguishing patches, use wooden stirrups, and set up wooden images of the devil or an ape or dog over their doors; the girdle, the symbol of femininity, was forbidden to women, and ordered to be worn by men; crosses must not be shown nor processional lights carried in the streets, and their graves must be indistinguishable from the earth around. They were also forbidden to ride horses. Such childish persecution could only be designed to furnish occasion for disobedience, and thus for fines and extortion.

The independent spirit of the ḳādi, who was whipped for non-compliance with superior orders, was typical of his class and office. In a period of grasping governors and extortionate treasurers, when corruption and injustice prevailed throughout the administration, the chief  ḳādi, or lord chancellor and primate of Egypt, could almost always be trusted to maintain the sacred law, despite threats and bribes. The law may have been narrow, and the ḳādi a bigot, but he was at least a man of some education, trained in Moḥammadan jurisprudence, and generally of high character and personal rectitude. So important was his office and so great his influence that when other ministers were changed with the rapid succession of governors, the ḳādi frequently remained in office for a series of administrations, and even when deposed he would often be restored by a later governor or caliph. Sooner than submit to any interference with his legal judgments, he would resign his post, and so beloved were many of the ḳādis that a governor would think twice before he risked the unpopularity which
would follow any meddling with their jurisdiction. Indeed in 'Abbāsid times he had scarcely the power to dismiss them, for from the time of Ibn-Lahi‘a, who was appointed ḵādi by the caliph el-Manṣūr in 771-2, the nomination to the office seems generally to have been made at Baghdaḍ, and the salary fixed, if not paid, by the caliph. The salary of Ibn-Lahi‘a was 30 dinārs a month, but in 827 ḫādi b. el-Munḳadīr received monthly 4000 dirhems (or 300 D.), and a fee of 1000 D. ḵādi Ghaouth (†785) was a model of uprightness, and accessible to any petition; every new moon he attended public sittings with the lawyers. His successor, el-Mufaḍḍal, also bore a very high character, and he was the first to insist on the necessary reform of keeping full records of causes. It was a laborious office, demanding besides juridical sessions the regulation of the religious festivals, keeping the calendar, often preaching in the mosque, and other duties, so that we read of several men refusing a post which taxed their energy and probity so severely. Abu-Khuzyeyma accepted it only after the governor had sent for the executioner’s axe and block. This ḵādi had been a rope-maker, and one day when on the bench he was asked by an old acquaintance for a halter, where-upon the good man fetched one from his house, and then went on with the case before the court. The combination of extreme simplicity and benevolence with a firm and dignified maintenance of the law of Islām procured him vast popularity.

The last Arab governor of Egypt, ‘Anbasa, was the best of them all—a strong, just man who held a tight hand over his officials, and showed his subjects such goodwill as they had not known before. Unostentatious, he always went on foot from the government house at el-‘AsKar to the mosque; strict in his religious duties, he never failed to observe the fast of Ramaḍān in all its rigour. He was not only the last governor of Arab blood; he was also the last to take his place in the mosque as leader of the prayers, which was the duty of governors in the absence of the caliph, the supreme head of religion. ‘Anbasa’s tenure of office was memorable.
for two invasions of Egypt from opposite ends. In May, 853, whilst the governor was celebrating the Feast of Sacrifice (10th Dhū-l-Ḥijja) at Fustat, for the due observance of which he had ordered up most of the troops in garrison from Damietta and Tinnis, and even from Alexandria, to take part in a grand review, the news arrived that the Romans were raiding the coast. They found Damietta deserted, and burned it, making prisoners of 600 women and children. By the time Anbasa reached the city they were off by sea to Tinnis, and when he pursued, they had sailed home. As a precaution against similar surprises a fort was built to guard the approach to Damietta—as the Crusaders long afterwards discovered to their cost—and Tinnis was similarly strengthened.

The other attack came from the Sudan. In 854 the Baqa people of Nubia and the eastern desert repudiated the annual tribute, consisting of four hundred male and female slaves, a number of camels, two elephants, and two giraffes, which they had been compelled to send to Egypt ever since the campaign of 652. They put to the sword the Egyptian officers and miners in the Emerald mountains, and then falling upon the Sa'id, plundered Esna, Edfu and other places and sent the inhabitants flying north in a panic. This was a formidable affair, and Anbasa wrote to the caliph at Baghdad for instructions. In spite of the alarming accounts given him by several travellers as to the wildness of the country and the ferocity of the Bagas, the caliph el-Mutawakkil decided to bring them to order. Great preparations were made in Egypt; quantities of stores, weapons, horses and camels were collected, and troops assembled, at Kuft, Esna, Erment, Aswan, on the Nile, and Kuseyr on the Red Sea. Seven ships laden with stores sailed from Kulzum to Sanga near Aydhab, at that time the chief port on the African coast of the Red Sea. The marshal, Mahammad of Kumm, marched from Kus with 7000 soldiers, crossed the desert to the emerald mines, and even approached Dongola. The news of his advance spread over the Sudan, and Ali Bab, its king, collected
a vast army to resist him. Fortunately for the Muslims these Südānis, instead of wearing mail, were completely naked, and armed only with short spears, whilst their camels were ill-trained and unmanageable, as is the manner of their kind. When they saw the weapons and horses of the Arabs, they understood that they would have no chance against them in a set battle; but by manoeuvring and skirmishing from place to place they hoped to wear out the enemy and exhaust their provisions. In this they had nearly succeeded, when the seven ships from Kulzum appeared off the coast. To cut off the Arabs from their supplies, the Südānis were forced to attack at all costs. The Arab general, however, had hung camel-bells on the necks of his horses, and let the blacks come up till they were almost at spear length; then, with a great shout of "Allāhu Akbar," he ordered a general charge, amid a deafening din of bells and drums, which so terrified the enemy’s camels that they threw their riders and turned tail in a stampede. The plain was strewn with corpses, and 'Ali Bābā, who escaped, was glad to make peace and pay the arrears of tribute. The Muslim leader received him honourably, seated him on his own carpet, made him handsome presents, and induced him not only to pay a visit to Fustāţ, but even to go and see the caliph at Baghdād. To the credit of the Muslims he was allowed to return in safety to his own people.¹

After four years of good government and valiant service, 'Anbasa was recalled, and a series of Turkish governors misruled the country. Disliking the Arabs with the hatred of race, and supported by a decree of the caliph el-Musta'īn, they favoured the Copts, restored many of their confiscated lands and possessions, and permitted the rebuilding of their churches. To the Arabs they were intolerable, and the Muslims were the victims of their eccentricities. One of them, Yeṣīd, entertained a strong aversion to eunuchs, and had them flogged out of the town; he also disliked the weird sound

¹ Ibn-Miskaweyh, ed. de Goeje, 550 ff.
of the women’s wailing at funerals, and objected to horse-
racing. In his government the second Nilometer at
Rōda was founded, and the charge of measuring the rise
of the Nile was taken away from the Copts, who had
always fulfilled it. He possessed an evil genius in his
finance minister, Ibn-Mudebbir, who invented new taxes,
and besides the ḫarāḡ (land-tax) and hilāli (monthly
duties on shops and trades, etc.), established government
monopolies in the natron mines and the fisheries, and
imposed taxes on fodder and on wine-shops. The usual
disturbances followed; first a rising at Alexandria, then
in the Ḥawf, scarcely put down before another occurred
at Gīza, and a fourth in the Fayyûm. The whole
country fell into disorder, much bloodshed ensued,
many were cast into prison, and the people were cruelly
and fantastically oppressed. Women were straitly ordered
to keep to their houses; they could not even visit the
graves or go to the bath. Public performers and the
professional keening women were imprisoned. No one
might even say “In God’s name” aloud in the mosque
—a test point in orthodoxy—or deviate an inch from
the orderly rows of the worshippers: a Turk stood by with
a whip to marshal the congregation and keep the ranks,
like a sergeant. A number of frivolous rules and changes
in rites and customs exasperated the people. At last a
Turk came who knew how to govern. His name was
Ahmad ibn Ṭūlūn, and he and his dynasty demand a
separate chapter.

The following tables give the lists of the caliphs and
governors, together with the heads of the departments of
war (marshal), finance (treasurer), and justice (chief kādi).
The list of ministers is doubtless incomplete; but a good
many of the gaps are explained by the fact that a
governor was often his own finance minister, and some-
times marshal as well. The genealogical complication
of the names is necessary for identification, and the tribal
names (as el-Baḡeli, el-Kelbi, el-Azdi) are interesting as
showing their origin. It will be noticed that there was
evidently a species of official class; for the same names,
or the same families, often recur, and the man who was
GLASS WEIGHTS

marshal might become in turn ڭەدە or governor. Some of the governors' and treasurers' names occur on coins, and on the glass weights and stamps impressed on measures of capacity, which are apparently peculiar to Egypt, and of which many examples have been published from the British Museum, the Khedivial Library, and Dr. Fouquet's fine collection at Cairo.
# GOVERNORS OF EGYPT

## I. UNDER EARLY CALIPHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>VICE-GOVERNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>632 Abû-Bekr</td>
<td>640 'Amr b. el-'Ăṣī</td>
<td>Khâriga b. IJu-</td>
<td>'Othmân b. Қeyes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634 'Omar</td>
<td></td>
<td>dheyfa Es-Sâib b. Hishâm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 'Othmân</td>
<td>644 'Abdallâh b. Sa'd</td>
<td>Suleym b. 'Itr et-Tuğibî</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Oğba b. ʻAmir el-Guhenî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656 'Alî</td>
<td>656 Keys b. Sa'd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>657-8 Mohammad b. Abî-Bekr</td>
<td>[Mâlik b. el-Iflârith el-Ashtar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. UNDER OMAYYAD CALIPHS

| 661 Mo‘awiya | 658 'Amr b. el-'Ăṣī bis | Suleym b. 'Itr Khâriga b. IJu-dheyfa |
|             |                        | 'Abdallâh b. Keys b. 2l Iflârith |

1 Brother of the caliph Mo‘awiya. Tabari makes 'Abdallâh succeed his father 'Amr in 664 and govern Egypt till 667 (A.H. 47), when he was replaced by Mo‘awiya b. IJu-deyğ (47-50), who was followed by Maslama in 670 (50, Tab. ii. 93, 94): thus ignoring 'Otba and 'Oğba; Bilâdhuri and Abû-l-Mahâsin adopt
### II. UNDER OMAYYAD CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>War</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Vice-Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>Yezid</td>
<td>681 'Abdulläh b. Zubayr</td>
<td>682 Sa'id b. Yezid el-Azdi</td>
<td>'Abi</td>
<td>'Abi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683</td>
<td>Marwan</td>
<td>684 'Abd-er-Rahman b. 'Otba b. G'al-dam el-Kurasi</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Abi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>'Abd-el-'Aziz  b. Amr b. Sa'id</td>
<td>686 'Abd-er-Rahman b. Ijugeya el-Khawlani</td>
<td>Bashir b. en-Nadr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>'Abd-el-Melik</td>
<td>686 'Abd-er-Rahman b. Ijugeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>'Abdalläh b. 'Abd-el-Melik 3</td>
<td>706 'Abd-er-Rahman b. Shuraibil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This version. Tabari, however, is singularly defective in his scanty notices of Egyptian governors, and the same remark applies to his follower, Ibn-el-Athir.

1 Brother of the caliph 'Abd-el-Melik.
2 Son of the caliph.
## II. UNDER OMAYYAD CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>VICE-GOVERNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>705 El-Welid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709 'Abd-el- 'Alā b. Khālid</td>
<td>'Abd- el- 'Alā b. el- 'Absī</td>
<td>Khālid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714 'Abd-el-Melik b. Rifi'a el-Fehmi</td>
<td>El-Welid b. Rifi'a</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Osama b. Zeyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715 Suleymān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717 'Omar b. 'Abd-el-'Azīz</td>
<td>Ayyūb b. Shurahbīl el-Asbahi</td>
<td>El-'Ia'ran b. Yezīd</td>
<td>'Iṣyā'īn b. Shu- reyḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720 Yezīd II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721 'Ilanḍhala b. 'Aṣfāwān el-Kelbi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obeydallāh b. Yaḥyā b. Meymūn</td>
<td>'Oṣba b. Mas- lama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724 Hishām</td>
<td>Mohammad b. 'Abd-el-Melik b. Marwān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724 Hishām</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A glass stamp (for a measure of capacity) in the Fouquet Coll., with this governor's name, is published by Casanova in *Mem. de la Miss. archéol. du Caire*, vi. p. 367.

2 Glass weights of 'Osama are in the British Museum (Lane-Poole, *Catalogue of Arabic Glass Weights in the B M.*, No. 2) and Fouquet Coll. 'Osama b. Zaid is mentioned as governing Egypt in A.H. 102 (720-1) by Ibn-el-

3 Glass weights of this treasurer are in *B.M.* and Fouquet.

4 Several glass weights and stamps of this treasurer in *B.M.* and Fouquet; one dated A.H. *II. = 729-30* (*Catal. B.M.*, p. 108).
## II. UNDER OMAYYAD CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>VICE-GOVERNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>724 Hishām</td>
<td>724 El-Ḫurr b. Yūsuf</td>
<td>Ɨfṣ b. el-Welid</td>
<td>‘Obeydallāh b. el-Ɨabālāb</td>
<td>Yaḥyā b. Meymūn</td>
<td>Ɨfṣ b. el-Welid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727 Ɨfṣ b. el-Welid</td>
<td>727 El-Ɨadramī</td>
<td>Ɨfṣ b. el-Welid</td>
<td>‘Abd-er-Raḥmān b. Ḥālid el-Fehmī</td>
<td>Wuḥayb b. el-Yahsubī</td>
<td>Tubā b. Nemir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737 Ḥanḍhala b. Ṣafwan bis</td>
<td>737 ‘Iyād b. Ḥayrama</td>
<td>El-Ḵāsim b. el-Kelbī</td>
<td>‘Obeydallāh b. el-Ɨabālāb</td>
<td>Wuḥayb b. el-Yahsubī</td>
<td>Tubā b. Nemir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

El-Welid II

1 Maḵr. gives his date A.H. 114-116; but glass weights and stamps in the B.M. (no. 4) and Fouquet Coll. bear dates 119 and 122 = 737 and 740.

2 Glass stamps and weights of Ɨfṣ have been published (B.M. *Catalogue*, and Casanova, *Collection Fouquet*).
## II. UNDER OMAYYAD CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>VICE-GOVERNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>744 Yezid III.</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>Marwān II.</td>
<td>745 Ḥassān b. ‘Aṭāhiya et-Tuğbī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>Ḥafṣ b. el-Welid ter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>El-Ḥawthara b. Suheyl el-Bāhili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>El-Mughira b. ‘Abdallāh b. el-Mughira el-Fazārī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>‘Abdallāh b. Abd-er-Rahmān b. Marwān Iludeyq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>‘Abd-el-Melik b. Marwān b. Marwān el-Lakhmi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>‘Ikrima b. Abdallāh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 'Isā b. Abl-'Aṭā Kheyr b. No'eym
2 'Abd-er-Rahmān Ḥassān b. 'Aṭāhiya b. Sālim

---

1 Glass stamps and weights of these officials have been published (B.M. Catalogue, and Casanova, Collection Fouquet).
2 Besides glass weights and stamps of ‘Abd-el-Melik b. Marwān, there are coins bearing his name in the B.M. and at Cairo; some bearing the mint names Miṣr and El-Fustat on opposite sides, and one Miṣr and El-Iskendariya (?) (Alexandria). Lane-Poole, Cat. Ar. Coins in Khediv. Coll. pp. 114, 115.
### III. UNDER 'ABBASID CALIPHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>VICE-GOVERNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>750 Es-Saffah</td>
<td>750 1 Ṣaḥīḥ b. 'Āli el-Abbāṣī</td>
<td>Yezīd b. Ḥānī</td>
<td>'Abd-er-Rahmān b. Sālim</td>
<td>Kheyr b. No'eym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>751 Abū-'Awn 'Abd- el-Melik</td>
<td>ʻIkrima b. 'Abd- allāh</td>
<td>'Āṭā b. Shuraḥ-bīl</td>
<td>Ghawth b. Suleyman ʻIkrima b. 'Abd- allāh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>753 Ṣaḥīḥ b. 'Alī bis</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 El-Fāḍl b. Ṣaḥīḥ b. 'Alī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754 El-Manṣūr</td>
<td>754 Abū-'Awn bis</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Abū-Khuzeyma</td>
<td>Khālid b. Ḥalīb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>758 1 Mūsā b. Ka'b et- Temimī</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 Nawfal b. el-</td>
<td>Kheyr b. No'eym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>759 1 Moḥammad b. el- Ash'ath el Khu- zā'ī</td>
<td>1 El-Muhāġir b. 'Othmān</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 Ḥumeyd b. Ḥaḥ- ṭaba et- Ṭa'ī</td>
<td>Moḥammad b. Moʿāwiya</td>
<td>Moḥammad b. Moʿāwiya</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>762 1 Yezīd b Ḥātim el- Muhallebī</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Glass stamps and weights of these officials have been published (B.M. Catalogue, and Casanova, Collection Fouquet).

2 Yezīd b. Ḥānī was marshal at el-'Askar; ʻIkrima at el-Fustāṭ.
### III. UNDER ‘ABBĀSID CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>War</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Vice-Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>779 Abū-Sāliḥ Yaḥyā (Ibn-Memduḥ)</td>
<td>780 Sālim b. Sawāda et-Temīmī</td>
<td>El-Akhḍar b. Marwān</td>
<td>1 Abū-Katīfa</td>
<td>Ismā‘īl b. Sumeyr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781 2 Ibrāhīm b. Śāhī b. ‘Assāma b. ‘Amr</td>
<td>2 ‘Ali el-‘Abbāsī</td>
<td>1 Ismā‘īl</td>
<td>Ghawth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Glass stamps and weights of these officials have been published (B.M. *Catalogue and Collection Fouquet*).
2 A coin of Ibrāhīm dated Miṣr 167 = 783-4 A.D. is published (*Cat. Cairo*, 863); also a weight and stamp (B.M., Fouquet).
### III. UNDER ‘ABBĀSID CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>War</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Vice-Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>775 El-Mahdi</td>
<td>784 Mūsā b. Mus‘ab</td>
<td>‘Assāma b. ‘Amr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghaith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>785 ‘Asāma b. Amr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El-Mufaḍdal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>785 1El-Faḍl b. Șāliḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuḍāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALi El-‘Abbāsī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abū-Ṭahir el-A‘rāğ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. ALi El-‘Abbāsī</td>
<td>b. Mūsā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>787 Mūsā b. ‘Īsā Al-</td>
<td>El-Hasan b. Yezid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbāṣī</td>
<td>ASMā’il b. ‘Īsā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786 Er-Rashid</td>
<td>789 Mūṣlama b. Vahyā</td>
<td>‘Asāma b. ‘Amr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El-Bagēlî</td>
<td>‘Abd-er-Raḥmān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>789 Mohamed b. Zuheyr El-</td>
<td>Habīb b. Abān</td>
<td>‘Omar b. Ghey-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azdî</td>
<td>Maslama</td>
<td>lān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>790 Dāwūd b. Yezid</td>
<td>‘Ammār b. Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥātim El-Muhalibî</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Șāliḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El-Mufaḍdal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuḍāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791 Mūsā b.  ‘Īsā El-</td>
<td>Naṣr b. Kuthūm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbāṣī bis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792 Ibrāhīm b. Șāliḥ El-</td>
<td>Khālid b. Yezid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Assāma b. ‘Amr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbāṣī bis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Glass stamps and weights of these officials have been published (B.M. Catalogue, and Collection Fouquet).
### III. UNDER ‘ABBÁSID CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>VICE-GOVERNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>786 Er-Rashid</td>
<td>793 ‘Abdallāh b. el-Musayyab</td>
<td>Abūl-Mukīs</td>
<td>El-Mufadḍal b. Fuḍāla Mohammad b. Masrück</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>793 Ḳāḥ b. Suleyman</td>
<td>Muslim b. Bekkār el-‘Oḳeyli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>794 ‘Abd-el-Melik b. Śāliḥ b. ‘Ali el-‘Abbāsi (non-resident)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Abdallāh b. el-Musayyab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>795 ‘Obeddallāh b. el-Mahdi el-‘Abbāsi</td>
<td>Mo‘āwiya b. Şurad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>796 Mūsā b. ‘Isa el-‘Abbāsi</td>
<td>‘Ammār b. Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>796 ‘Obeddallāh b. el-Mahdi bīs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dāwūd b. Ịfu-beyθ</td>
<td>‘Awn b. Wahb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>797 ‘Ismā‘il b. Śaliḥ b. ‘Ali el-‘Abbāsi</td>
<td>Suleymān b. Ịṣimma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 A weight of Ismā‘il is in B.M. (*Cat.* 23), but of the time when he was *mohtesif* of Egypt under the caliph el-Mahdī.
### III. UNDER 'ABBĀSID CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>VICI-GOVERNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>786 Er-Rashid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Abd-er-Rahmān b. 'Abdallah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803 Ahmad b. Ismā'īl b. 'Ali el-'Abbā'ī</td>
<td>Mo'āwiya b. Sūrad</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Abdallāh</td>
<td>Häshim b. 'Abdallah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805 'Obeydallāh (Ibn-Zeyneb) el-'Abbāsī</td>
<td>Ahmad b. Mūsā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806 El-Ḥuseyn b. G'emīl</td>
<td>Mohammad b. 'Assāma</td>
<td>El-Kāmil el-Hunā'ī</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Abd-er-Rahmān b. Mūsā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807 Mālik b. Delhem el-Kelbī</td>
<td>Mohammad b. Tubā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Häshim b. 'Abdallāh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809 El-Ḥasan b. et-Takhtāḥ</td>
<td>Mohammad b. G'eld</td>
<td>Mohammad b. Ziyād</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Gābir b. el-Asḥ'ath et-Ta'i</td>
<td>'Obeydallāh et-Tarsūsī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kasim el-Bekrī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. El-Bekkā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. UNDER ‘ABBĀSID CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>VICE-GOVERNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>809 El-Ārin</td>
<td>812 1°Abbad el-Balkhi</td>
<td>Ḥubayra b. Hāshim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lahi'ā el-Ḥadrām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815 El-Ma'mūn</td>
<td>813 2°El-Muṭṭalib el-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khuzā'ī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814 3°El-'Abbās b. Mūsā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Īsā el-'Abbāsī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815 El-Muṭṭalib bis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816 4°Es-Sarī b. el-</td>
<td>Mohammad b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥakam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816 Suleyman b. Ghālib</td>
<td>Abū-Bekr b. G'u-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>el-Bağel</td>
<td>nāda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Es-Sarī bis</td>
<td>Mohammad b.</td>
<td>El-'Abbās b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osāma</td>
<td>Lahi'ā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meymūn b. es-Sarī</td>
<td>Lahi'ā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ibn-el-Mukhārīk</td>
<td>El-'Abbās</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Lahi'ā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820 5°Mohammad b. es-</td>
<td>Mohammad b.</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarī</td>
<td>Isbāk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kabīs</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. el-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G'arrāh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Gold coins of ‘Abbād dated 196, 197, 198 (812-813) are in the Cairo collection.
2 Gold coins of el-Muṭṭalib dated 198, 199 (813-815), and silver of 199, are in B.M. and Cairo collections.
3 Gold coin of el-'Abbās, dated 198, is in Cairo coll.
4 Gold coins of es-Sarī dated 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, (815-820) are in the B.M., Cairo, or Artīn Pasha's colls.
5 Gold coins of Mohammad b. es-Sarī dated 205, 206 (820-2) are in the B.M., Cairo, and Hermitage colls.
### III. UNDER ‘ABBÁSID CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>War</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Pifféee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>813 El-Ma'mün</td>
<td>'Obaydallāh b. es-Sari</td>
<td>Ibrahim b. el-Garrāḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822 'Obaydallāh b. es-Sari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir</td>
<td>Mu'ādh b. 'Azīz</td>
<td>Isā b. el-Munṣadīr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827 'Īsā b. Yezīd el-Galūdī</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Isā Ṣāliḥ b. Shīrzd</td>
<td>El-Mo'taṣīm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829 'Omeyr b. el-We'īd et-Temīmī</td>
<td>Muhammad b. 'Omeyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829 'Īsā b. Yezīd Ṣūs</td>
<td></td>
<td>[No Ḵādi]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829 El-Mo'taṣīm el-'Abbāsī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 'Abdaweyh b. G'ebela</td>
<td>Ibn-'Abdaweyh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831 'Īsā b. Manṣūr</td>
<td>Yūnus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832 El-Ma'mūn (the caliph)</td>
<td>Ibn-'Is'endiyār</td>
<td>Ḥārūn ez-Zuhṛi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832 Naṣr b. 'Abdallāh (Keydar)</td>
<td>El-Muẓaffar b. Keydar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833 El-Mo'taṣīm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834 El-Muẓaffar b. Keydar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashnās ²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Gold coins of 'Obaydallāh dated 206, 207, 208, 209, 210 (821-826) are in the B.M. and Cairo colls.

² A glass weight of Ashnās, stamped by an under-official in Egypt, dated 223 (838) is in B.M. (Cat. 2[C]).
### III. UNDER ‘ABBÁSID CALIPHS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>FIEFFEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>833 El-Mo’tasim</td>
<td>834 Mūsā el-İñanafi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hārūn ez-Zuhri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>839 Mālik b. Keydar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>841 ‘Ali b. Yahyā el-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armeni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842 El-Wāthik</td>
<td>843 ‘Isā b. Mansūr bīs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abū-Ḵuteyba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847 El-Mutawakkil</td>
<td>847 Harthama b. en-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naḍr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Itāsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>849 Ḥātim b. Harthama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noʿeym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>850 Ishāk b. Yahyā</td>
<td></td>
<td>El-Hagghāgi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Khūt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El-Īlārīth b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>851 ‘Abd-ul-Wāḥid b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammad b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yahyā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulaymān el-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bağelī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>852 ‘Anbasa b. Ishāk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammad el-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kummi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khālid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>856 Yeẓīd b. ‘Abdallāh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmad b. Khā-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>et-Tūrki</td>
<td></td>
<td>lid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>861 El-Muntasir</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmad b. Mu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debbīr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>862 El-Mustaʿīn</td>
<td></td>
<td>El-Fetḥ b. Khā-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. UNDER ‘ABBĀSID CALIPHS *(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIPH</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>WAR</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>JUSTICE</th>
<th>FIEFFEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>868 Ahmad b. Muzāhim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868 Argūz Tarkhān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bākbāk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

ΤÜLÜN AND IKHSHİD

868—969

Monuments.—Mosque of Ibn-Tülûn, aqueduct south of Cairo, new Nilometer at Rûdâ.
Inscriptions.—Mosque, Nilometer (?), gravestones, two shop title-deeds of wood (see van Berchem, Corpus inscr. arab.).
Coins.—Mints: Miṣr (i.e. el-Fuṣṭât), Damascus, Aleppo, Emêsa, Antioch, Ḥarrân, er-Râfiḳa, Palestine (i.e. er-Ramlâ).

Since 856 the governors of Egypt had been Turks, and, twenty years before that, the province had been given in fee to successive Turks at Baghdaď, who appointed lieutenant-governors to administer it for them. This change from Arab to Turkish rule was part of a revolution which was felt in most parts of the caliphate, and led to the extinction of the temporal authority of the “commander of the faithful.” From the time when the Arabs came in contact with the Turks on the Oxus and brought them under their rule, Turkish slaves had been highly prized in Muslim households. Their physical strength and beauty, their courage, and their fidelity had won the trust of the great emirs, and especially of the caliphs, who believed they could rely more safely upon the devotion of these purchased foreigners than upon their own jealous Arabs or the Persians among whom they dwelt and who had hitherto had a large share in the administration of the empire. The young Turkish slave who served his master well usually acquired his freedom and received valuable court appointments. “The caliphs, who were often unable to appease the turbulent spirits of the native
emirs, except by granting them special privileges and territorial rights, were gradually led into the opposite error in alienating the most powerful of their own subjects, and in giving all their confidence to these foreign slaves, who thus acquired the entire control of the interior of the palace. These illiterate and barbarous white slaves (or mamlūks), now incorporated into the society of the educated rulers of a great empire, soon became conversant with the law of the Korān. They adopted the language and religion of their masters. They studied science and politics; and when any of them became capable of undertaking the more difficult tasks or of occupying the more eminent posts in the court, they were emancipated, and appointed to the various government offices according to the talents they displayed. Thus manumitted Turks were appointed not only to the chief offices in the palace, but to the governorships of some of the most important provinces in the empire.¹ Not only so, but they were formed into a special bodyguard by the caliph el-Mo'taşim, son of Hārūn er-Rashid, and from that time forward took the leading part in the setting up and putting down of the caliphs, and maintained a reign of terror in Baghdaḍ.

Ṭūlūn was one of these slaves, a Turk of the Taghāzghān tribe, who was sent to Baghdaḍ with other youths by the governor of Bukhārā as a present to the caliph el-Ma'mūn in 815, and rose to high rank at court. His son (real or adopted) Aḥmad, the future ruler of Egypt, was born in September, 835, and received the usual careful education of the age, studying not merely Arabic and the Korān, but jurisprudence and divinity according to the teaching of the great Muslim schoolman Abū-Ḥanīfa. Not content with the able professors of Baghdaḍ, he visited Tarsūs several times to study under special lecturers, until he became himself an authority on points of criticism and doctrine. Along with this culture, he pursued with great industry and delight the course of

military instruction given to the young Turks at Samarrā, the caliph’s new residence up the Tigris. On one of his journeys from Tarsūs he was able to defeat some Arab marauders and rescue a large treasure which was being brought from Constantinople to the caliph; and later he was chosen to accompany the deposed pontiff el-Musta‘in in his exile at Wāsiṭ. When offered a handsome bribe to put the caliph out of the way, Āḥmad indignantly refused. His loyalty brought him no disfavour among the Turks, however, and when the emir Bākbāk, who had married the widow of Ṭūlūn (†854), was presented to the sief of Egypt, he sent his stepson Āḥmad as his representative.

Abū-l-‘Abbās Āḥmad ibn-Ṭūlūn entered Fustāṭ in September, 868, at the age of thirty-three. A rich friend advanced 10,000 D. to meet his expenses, since the new governor was apparently penniless, and having held no previous appointment was quite unversed in the official methods of squeezing his subjects. He was a man of great ability, however, and a good judge of men, and he soon made his authority felt. Throughout his reign he had an able coadjutor in his secretary, Āḥmad of Wāsiṭ. He had to deal first with the treasurer, Ibn-Mudebbir, a crafty peculator, who had enjoyed a free hand with the revenue for some years, and kept up a state which outshone the governor’s. He was always followed by a mounted escort of a hundred powerful young slaves, beautiful to behold, and dressed with elaborate finery, Persian cloaks, and silver-mounted whips. Judging the new governor by his own standard, the treasurer sent him 10,000 D. as a small douceur, and was surprised to find them returned. Ibn-Ṭūlūn presently informed him that instead of the money he would accept the guard, and the treasurer had to send him his escort of slaves. Finding his authority vanishing with his pomp, he appealed to the caliph to remove the imperturbable governor; but Ibn-Ṭūlūn stayed on. He had other enemies besides those of his ministry. The ‘Alids rose to the west of Alexandria in 869; other ‘Alids carried fire and sword through the district of Esnē in the Sa‘id. Both were put
down, not without hard fighting, and driven to the oases.

Meanwhile the nominal governor of Egypt, Ibn-Ṭūlūn’s stepfather, was beheaded; but the appointment was fortunately given to the emir Bargūq, whose daughter was Ibn-Ṭūlūn’s wife. The new nominee not only gave his son-in-law a free hand in Egypt,—writing simply, “Go

Fig. 11.—Section of Nilometer on island of Rūda, 9th century.

your own way as you like”—but delivered into his charge the city of Alexandria and other places which had not been included in his original patent of command. Ibn-Ṭūlūn took over the government of the great port in 870, but wisely left the former commandant in office. His power was now so firm that when the province once
more changed its nominal head, in 872, he scarcely troubled to obtain the formal ratification of the new chief, el-Muwaffak, the caliph’s brother. He was accordingly summoned to appear before the caliph at his palace of Samarra on the Tigris, to give an account of his stewardship. This too obvious manoeuvre of his enemies was met very simply by sending his secretary with ample bribes and tribute money, and it ended in strengthening his position. His two chief secret opponents in Egypt were got rid of: one was so terrified by his threats that he went home and died; the other, the treasurer, Ibn-Mudebbir, was glad to exchange his post for the exchequer of Syria.

Ibn-Tulun now held kingly state in Egypt. The government house at el-‘Askar, the official suburb of Fustat, was too small to house his numerous retinue and army. He was not content, either, with a mere governor’s palace. In 870 he chose a site on the hill of Yeshkur, between Fustat and the Mukattam hills, levelled the graves of the Christian cemetery there, and founded the royal suburb of el-Katari or “the Wards,” so called because each separate class or nationality (as household servants, Greeks, Soudanis) had a distinct quarter assigned to it. The new town stretched from the present Rumeyle beside the citadel to the shrine of Zeyn-el-‘Abidin, and covered a square mile. The new palace was built below the old “Dome of the Air,” and had a great garden and a spacious enclosed horse-course or meydân adjoining it, with mews and a menagerie; the government house was on the south of the great mosque, which still stands, and there was a private passage which led from the residence to the oratory of the emir. A separate palace held the ḥarim, and there were magnificent baths, markets, and all apparatus of luxury. The great mosque was not begun till 876-7 and took two years in building. It is remarkable for the use (for the first time in mosques) of brick piers, instead of stone columns taken from earlier monuments, and for being the earliest dated example (the pointed arches of the second Nilometer on the island of Roda are possibly a few years earlier) of pointed
Fig. 12.—Mosque of Aḥmad ibn Ṭūlūn at Cairo, 877–79.
arches throughout the building,—earlier by at least two centuries than any in England. Its architect was a Copt, and was granted 100,000 dinārs to build the mosque, and given 10,000 for himself, with a handsome allowance for life.\(^1\) Another great work was the building by the same Coptic architect of an aqueduct to bring water to the palace from a spring in the southern desert.\(^2\) Ibn-Ṭūlūn also dredged and cleared the canal of Alexandria, repaired the Nilometer on the island of Rōḍa and built a fort there.

When it is noted that in 870 the treasurer sent 750,000\(^D\). as tribute to the caliph, and in four years 2,200,000; that some of the new buildings at Kāṭāfī were estimated to have cost nearly half a million, that Ibn-Ṭūlūn gave to the poor at least 1000\(^D\). a month beyond the obligatory alms, kept open house and spent 1000\(^D\). a day

---

\(^1\) The story of the origin of the curious corkscrew tower or minaret, in the winding of a strip of paper round the finger, is well-known. The true original of the tower, however, seems to be the similar corkscrew tower at Samarrā, which Ibn-Ṭūlūn doubtless saw in his youth. Architects, however, throw doubts on the antiquity of Ibn-Ṭūlūn’s minaret.

\(^2\) A story is told that some objection was made to the water conveyed in this aqueduct, and Ibn-Ṭūlūn sent for the learned doctor Mūḥammad ibn-‘Abd-al-Ḥakam. “I was one night in my house,” he related, “when a slave of Ibn-Ṭūlūn’s came and said, ‘The emir wants thee.’ I mounted my horse in a panic of terror, and the slave led me off the high road. ‘Where are you taking me?’ I asked. ‘To the desert,’ was the reply; ‘the emir is there.’ Convinced that my last hour was come, I said, ‘God help me! I am an aged and feeble man: do you know what he wants with me?’ The slave took pity on my fears and said, ‘Beware of speaking disrespectfully of the aqueduct.’ We went on till suddenly I saw torch-bearers in the desert, and Ibn-Ṭūlūn on horseback at the door of the aqueduct, with great wax candles burning before him. I forthwith dismounted and salaamed, but he did not greet me in return. Then I said, ‘O emir, thy messenger hath grievously fatigued me, and I thirst; let me, I beg, take a drink.’ The pages offered me water, but I said, ‘No, I will draw for myself; I drew water while he looked on, and drank till I thought I should have burst. At last I said, ‘O emir, God quench thy thirst at the rivers of Paradise! for I have drunk my fill, and know not which to praise most, the excellence of this cool, sweet, clear water, or the delicious smell of the aqueduct.’ ‘Let him retire,’ said Ibn-Ṭūlūn, and the slave whispered, ‘Thou hast hit the mark’” (Maḫrizi, Ḧiḥṭat).
ANNEXATION OF SYRIA

on his table, was lavish to learned men, had a large army and a numerous household to pay, and costly forts to maintain on the frontier, it is incredible that he could have met all his expenses on the revenue of $4,300,000D. a year; and the legend that he paid for his mosque with treasure which he dug up is natural enough. It is more than probable that he mulcted the Coptic patriarch now and then in heavy fines, as the Christian writers allege, though he did not extort unjust taxes from the Coptic population, who enjoyed a rare immunity from persecution during his reign. The constantly increasing expenditure, however, led to the discontinuance of the annual surplus to the caliph's brother. El-Muwaffak prepared an army to depose the too powerful viceroy, but it came to nought; the army got no further than Rakka, where it stopped for lack of funds. Nor did two rebellions in the Safid and in Barka succeed any better.

Encouraged by this immunity, Ibn-Tulun extended his borders. He had before this been on the point of occupying Syria at the caliph's desire, and though another governor was afterwards appointed, he held that he had a prior claim to the province. On the death of this governor, Magur, who had proved a formidable and jealous obstacle to his advance, Ibn-Tulun set aside the title of the son who had been appointed in Magur's place, and throwing off all semblance of obedience to the caliph, marched in April, 878, to Damascus and received the immediate homage of the officials and inhabitants. Thence he made a progress through Syria, accepting the allegiance of the chief towns, as far as Tarsus, the scene of his early studies. Only Antioch resisted, under Sima the Long, and after a bombardment by mangonels, aided by treason within, was stormed and sacked in September. Masala and Adhana were next occupied, but Tarsus for the moment defied his attack. His dominions now stretched from the Euphrates and the frontier of the

1 G'mal-ed-din, who gives these details, only mentions the kharaj or land-tax, which (he says) rose from $800,000 under Ibn-Mudelbir to $4,300,000 under Ibn-Tulun. To this must apparently be added the poll-tax on non-Muslims, and other duties and contributions.
Byzantine empire to Barša on the Mediterranean, and Aswān at the first cataract of the Nile. Leaving strong detachments at Rakka, Harrān and Damascus, to hold his new possession, and carrying away 600,000 D. which he extorted from his old enemy Ibn-Mudebbir, the treasurer of Syria, he hastened back to Egypt, after just a year's

1 Ibn-Ṭūlūn first began to put his name on his coinage after this campaign. Hitherto the coins struck by him in Egypt bore only the name of the reigning caliph; but in A.H. 266 (879-880) the dinārs of Miṣr present the name of Aḥmad ibn Ṭūlūn as well as the caliph's. He never omitted the caliph's name, but he did not add (as governors of other provinces did) the name of the regent el-Muwaffaq. His coins were issued at Miṣr in A.H. 266, 267, 268, 269, 270 (the year of his death); er-Rāfi'qa, 267, 268, 270; Damascus, 270.
absence, to deal with his eldest son, el-'Abbās, who had taken advantage of his temporary elevation to the office of vice-governor to throw off the paternal authority. On his father’s approach, however, he lost courage, and carrying off all the treasure and war material he could lay hands on, retreated with 800 horse and 10,000 of his father’s famous black infantry to Barka. His father tried persuasion, and sent the qaṣi Bekkār to reason with him, in vain; the fatuous young man refused all offers, and dreamed of a North African kingdom. He even laid siege to Tripolis, and plundered Lebdā, until driven off with heavy loss by the Aghlabid prince of Tūnis. After eluding his pursuers for two years, he was at length defeated and captured by his father’s troops, and brought to Fustāṭ, where he witnessed (some say he was forced to take part in) the torture and execution of his fellow-rebels, received a hundred stripes himself, and spent the rest of his life in captivity.

The breach between Ibn-Tūlūn and his nominal superior el-Muwaffak, the caliph’s brother, was widened when the latter trafficked with the loyalty of Lu’lu’, the commander of the Egyptian detachment on the frontier at Rakka.1 Lu’lu’ went over with all his army to the enemy, and even drove Ibn-Tūlūn’s representative, Ibn-Ṣafwān, out of Karkisiyya, on the Euphrates. El-Muwaffak was far the most powerful prince in Mesopotamia, and he made his power felt so

---

1 A dinār struck at er-Rāsīka (a suburb of er-Rakka) in A.H. 268 (881-2) bears the name of Lu’lu’ beneath that of Ahmad ibn Tūlūn (Lanc-Poole, Cat. Cairo Collection, no. 905). In the following year Lu’lu’ threw over Ibn-Tūlūn and joined el-Muwaffak’s party. In 270 a Rāsīka dinār appeared with Ibn-Tūlūn’s name, but without Lu’lu’s (Lavoix, Cat. Monu. Or., Egypte, no. 3).
disagreeably to his brother, el-Mo'temid, that in 882 the helpless caliph attempted to escape to Ibn-Ṭūlūn, who had offered him protection, partly, no doubt, with a view to saving the annual tribute, and partly to diminish the influence of Muwaffak. The presence of the caliph under his wing at Miṣr would, no doubt, have increased the ambitious governor's prestige, and might have changed to some extent the future both of the caliphate and of Egypt; but the fugitive was unhappily caught on his way, and taken back to Samarrā. An attempt of Ibn-Ṭūlūn's to get possession of the holy city of Mekka, for his greater glory, was also frustrated. His troops were driven out, and he was publicly cursed in the sacred mosque.

These repulses only exasperated the governor of Egypt, and he showed his resentment by cutting the name of the regent Muwaffak out of the Friday bidding-prayer which (with the coinage) in Miṣr and the countries forms the official act of homage to the sovereign powers. He even assembled a meeting of ḥādis and lawyers at Damascus, who proclaimed the deposition of the regent and his exclusion from the succession, on the ground of his ill-treatment of his brother the caliph. Bekkār, who had been ḥādi of Egypt for more than twenty years, and was distinguished for his scrupulous conscientiousness, refused to sign the declaration, of which both the grounds and legality were doubtful; he was accordingly thrown into prison, where he languished till his death, still holding his dignified office, and teaching students from the window of the gaol. The only result of these futile proceedings was that the caliph was forced by his imperious brother to order Ibn-Ṭūlūn to be cursed from the pulpit in every mosque in his dominions. There can be little doubt that if el-Muwaffak had not been taxed to the utmost in dealing with a serious revolt of the Zeŋ or East African slaves who had settled in lower Mesopotamia, Ibn-Ṭūlūn's effrontery would have been more severely punished.

He had better fortune on the north-west border, where his friendly relations with the emperor had been changed
to hostility, and Khalaf, his lieutenant at Ṭarsūs, had (881) led a successful raid and returned with much booty. Again, in 883, the Romans under Kestu Sty.-piotes suffered a disastrous defeat at Chrysobullon \(^1\) near Ṭarsūs at the hands of Ibn-Ṭulūn’s forces, in which at least 60,000 Christians are said to have fallen, and valuable spoils of gold and silver, jewelled crucifixes, sacred vessels, and vestments, besides 15,000 horses, were taken. The eunuch who had commanded the victorious army was so elated that he threw off his master’s yoke, and Ibn-Ṭulūn was obliged to march in person to vindicate his authority. It was a severe winter, and his opponent dammed the river, flooded the country, and nearly drowned the besieging army at Adhana. Ibn-Ṭulūn was forced to retire to Antioch, where a copious indulgence in buffalo milk, following upon the exposure
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**Fig. 15.**—Title-deed (on wood) to a shop, 882.

and privations of the campaign, brought on a dysentery. He was carried in a litter to Fustāt, where he grew worse. In sickness the fierce emir was a terror to his doctors. He refused to follow their orders, flouted their prescribed diet, and when he found himself still sinking, he had their heads chopped off, or flogged them till they died. In vain Muslims, Jews, and Christians offered up public prayers for his recovery. Korān and Tora and Gospel could not save him; and he died in May, 884, before he had reached the age of fifty.

Aḥmad ibn-Ṭulūn is described by Ibn-Khallikān, who

---

used the almost contemporary biography of Ibn-ed-Dāya, as "a generous prince, just, brave, and pious; an able ruler, an unerring judge of character. He directed in person all public affairs, re-peopled the provinces, and inquired diligently into the condition of his subjects. He admired men of learning, and kept every day an open table for his friends and the public. A monthly sum of 1000 D. was expended by him in alms, and when one of his officials consulted him as to giving relief to a woman who wore a good veil and a gold ring, yet asked for charity, he answered, 'Give to every one who holds out the hand to you.' But with all these virtues he was too hasty with the sword, and it is related that 18,000 persons were put to death by him or died in his prisons. He knew the Korān by heart, and had a beautiful voice: none recited it more diligently than he." In spite of the necessity of a large revenue to furnish the means for his grandiose plans and magnificent buildings, and his extravagant court, so far from raising the taxes, he abolished Ibn-Mudebbir's new imposts, and encouraged peasant proprietorship and security of tenure, to use modern terms; so that his revenue was due more to better cultivation than to extortion. He left ten million dinārs in his treasury, from seven to ten thousand mounted mamlūks, twenty-four thousand slaves of the bodyguard, a stud of three hundred horses, thousands of mules, asses, and camels, and a hundred ships of war. He was at least the first Muslim, since the Arab conquest, who revived the power of Egypt and beautified her capital.

Abū-l-G'eysh Khumaraweyh,¹ the second of Ahmad's seventeen sons (he had besides sixteen daughters), succeeded his father. The eldest son was still exiating his rebellion in prison, where his warders now made an

¹ Khumaraweyh's coinage, almost entirely of gold like the rest of the Tūlūnid coinage, was issued at Miṣr, A.H. 271 (884-5 A.D.) consecutively every year to 282 (895-6); er-Rāṣīq, 270, 273, 275, 276, 278, 279; Damascus, 272, 275, 276, 277, 281; Emesa (Hims), 274; Harrān, 276; Antioch, 276, 278, 279; Aleppo, 281; Fīlisṭīn (Palestine, i.e. er-Rāmla), 277, 278
end of him, to save disputes. A youth of only twenty years, with a decided taste for self-indulgence, and no experience of either war or government, Khumāraweyḥ seemed marked out as the prey of craftier heads; and it needed one or two sharp lessons to rouse him to the degree of energy necessary for the preservation of his realm. It says much for his character that he was able to recover from his first humiliations, and not only to maintain but extend his inheritance. Two formidable antagonists, the Turkish governors of Mōsil and Anbār, on the Tigris and Euphrates, combined with the warden of Damascus to overthrow the supremacy of Egypt in Syria, and restore Khumāraweyḥ’s Asiatic possessions to the caliph, or rather to his active brother, Muwaffaḳ. They had a fair pretext, since Khumāraweyḥ had no official title to the government of Egypt, whilst the governor of Mōsil, Ishāḳ ibn Kundaḡık, had received the caliph’s diploma for it. There was no hereditary title at that date. They occupied Syria, supported by Muwaffaḳ’s son, Abū-l-‘Abbās, who entered Damascus in February, 885. Khumāraweyḥ had already sent troops by land and sea to oppose them, and an Egyptian force had been blockaded and defeated at Sheyzar, on the Orontes. He then led a fresh army of 70,000 men into Palestine, which encountered a small force of the enemy under Abū-l-‘Abbās at Ṣawāṭiḥin, “The Mills,” on the Abū-Butrus river, near Ramla. Unhappily, Khumāraweyḥ, who had never before seen a pitched battle, was seized with panic, and fled pell-mell to Egypt, followed by the greater part of his army. Only the reserve stood firm, under Sa’d el A’sar, and whilst their prince and comrades were vying with each other who should first reach safety at Mīṣr, this sturdy remnant fell upon the enemy, who were busily engaged in plundering the Egyptian camp, and utterly routed them. Sa’d searched in vain for his master, whose disgraceful flight was hardly credited, and then marched on Damascus, and from the recovered capital of Syria sent a despatch to his trembling sovereign announcing the unexpected news of a brilliant victory. As Khumāraweyḥ stayed idly in Egypt for a
whole year—a year marked by a violent earthquake, which shook down houses, damaged the mosque of 'Amr, and killed a thousand people in Fustāṭ in a single day—the impression of his cowardliness was confirmed, and Sā'd, at Damascus, declined to serve such a master. On his declaration of independence, Khumāraweyh set out again, gained a decisive victory over his rebellious subject, and entered Damascus in June, 886. Continuing his march, he met the governor of Mūsīl, Ibn-Kundāġik, in pitched battle, and checking a retreat with much personal bravery, drove the enemy in confusion as far as Samarrā on the Tigris. Having vindicated his character as a general, he concluded peace with Muwaffaḳ, and a diploma, signed by the caliph and his brother, and by the heir to the caliphate, was sent assigning him the governments of Egypt, Syria, and the Roman marches, for thirty years.

Inspired by his successes, Khumāraweyh accepted an appeal to interfere in a contest then in progress between Ibn-Abī-Saḡ, the governor of Anbār, and his former ally, Ibn-Kundāġik, and the result of a campaign in Mesopotamia was the capture of Raḳḳa,¹ and the recognition of the prince of Egypt as regent and governor of Mūsīl and Mesopotamia in the public prayers. His new vassal, Ibn-Abī-Saḡ, however, prying fickle, invaded Syria, and Khumāraweyh once more displayed his generalship by defeating him in May, 888, near Damascus, and pursuing him as far as Beled on the Tigris, on the bank of which the conqueror built a lofty throne to sit in triumph. The war of the emirs kept him in Mesopotamia and Syria for more than a year. One result of his enhanced reputation was the adhesion of Yāzmaṇ, or Bazmāz, the eunuch governor of Tarsūs, who had repudiated the authority of the Tūlūnids since 883, but now signified his homage with presents of 30,000 ḏ., 1000 robes, and arms, and followed them up

¹ Coins of er-Rāfika (i.e. Raḳḳa) of a.h. 273 and 275 bear the name of Khumāraweyh, but one of 274 (a.d. 887-8) omits his name. This was doubtless struck during Ibn-Kundāġik’s occupation of Raḳḳa.
with 50,000 £. more. Several raids were made from Tarsus into Roman territory in 891-4.

The death of Muwaffak in 891, followed by that of Ibn-Kundagik, and of the caliph Mo'temid in 892, led to a closer understanding between Egypt and Bagdad. The former diploma was renewed for thirty years, and Khumara'weyhi offered to marry his daughter Katr-en-Nedâ ("Dewdrop") to the caliph's son. El-Mo'tadid, however, preferred to wed her himself. The bride was hardly ten years old, but the wedding was postponed till 895, when she was nearly twelve. An exchange of costly presents preceded the marriage; the caliph's dot included a million dirhems, rare perfumes from China and India, and various precious things; the bride was carried on a litter from Egypt to Mesopotamia, and at every night's halt she found a palace built ready for her with every possible luxury prepared. Her portion included 4000 jewelled waistbands, ten coffers of jewels, and a thousand gold mortars for pounding the perfumes for her elaborate toilette. This aristocratic alliance cost Khumara'weyhi a million dinars; but in return his dominion was once more confirmed from Hit on the Euphrates to Barka on the Mediterranean, and his annual tribute to the caliph was fixed at 300,000 £. The yearly pay of his troops in Egypt amounted to 900,000 £.; and his kitchen alone cost him 23,000 £. a month. The caliph viewed with satisfaction the impoverishment of his formidable vassal, whose extravagance increased with every year. The passion which Ibn-Tulun had shown for splendid building was fully shared by his son, who enlarged the palace in Katâi, and converted the Meydan into a garden stocked with all kinds of sweet-smelling flowers, planted in the form of sentences and other designs, with rare trees, and date palms set with gilded tanks of water. An aviary was filled with beautiful birds. His "golden-house" was adorned with painted images of himself and his wives and singers, despite the Muslim prejudice against portraiture. And to soothe his restless nights an air-bed
was laid upon a lake of quicksilver,\(^1\) nearly a hundred feet square (sic!), and rocked very agreeably, moored by silken cords to silver columns. A tame lion from his menagerie guarded his master whilst he slept.

Neither the lion nor his bodyguard of vigorous young Arabs from the truculent Ḥawf could save the voluptuous prince from the jealousies of his ḥarīm. Early in 896\(^6\) some domestic intrigue ended in his being murdered by his slaves whilst on a visit to Damascus. His murderers were crucified, and, amid loud lamentations, his body was buried beside his father’s, not far from his stately palace, under Mount Muṣṭām. Seven Korān readers were engaged in reciting the sacred book at the tomb of Ibn-Ṭūlūn, and when the bearers brought the body of Khumaraweyh and began to lower it into the grave, they happened to be chanting the verse, “Seize him and hurl him into the fire of hell” (Kor. xliv. 47).

His eldest son, Abū-l-‘Asākir G’eysh,\(^2\) who succeeded him, was a boy of fourteen, utterly incapable of taking a serious view of his position, and wrapped up in the pleasures and follies of his age. Syria and the northern frontier disowned his authority, the army and government were neglected, the treasury empty; and after murdering three of his uncles the young savage was himself assassinated by his troops, after a few months’ abuse of power. His last public act was to throw two of his murdered uncles’ heads to the mutineers, crying, “There are your emirs for you!” His younger brother, Abū-Mūsā Hārūn,\(^3\) was now set on the throne with Ibn-Abālī, the major domo, as regent; but the prince was as careless and incapable as his brother, and the regent was no statesman. The Turkish officers did what they pleased; an uncle led a rebel army to Fustat, but was defeated; and Syria and Tarsūs were under no sort of

---

\(^1\) Traces of the quicksilver were found in later years on excavating the ground after the destruction of the palace.

\(^2\) A coin of Miṣr, a.h. 283 (896) bears the name of G’eysh b. Khumaraweyh.

\(^3\) Hārūn’s coins are struck at Miṣr, a.h. 283—92; Damascus, 284, 288; Aleppo, 285, and Palestine, 285, 290, 291.
control, though the caliph accorded Hārūn the patent as governor of Syria and Egypt, on condition of paying a yearly tribute of 450,000 Dinars, and resigning the northern districts of Syria. The Karmāṭis (Carmathians) overran Syria and laid siege to Damascus, and the Egyptian armies suffered heavy losses. The caliph at last found it necessary to interfere. Strengthened by a decisive victory over the Carmathians, and supported by some leading Egyptian emirs in Syria, he sent a fleet from Ţarsús to Dāmietta and an army overland to ʻAbbāsa, a small town on the Syrian frontier, a day’s march from Bilbeys, developed out of one of the rest-houses erected to smooth the progress of “Dewdrop” to her nuptials at Baghda. Here Hārūn assembled his half-hearted troops, and here, as he lay intoxicated in bed, two of his uncles entered his tent and made away with his useless life. The murderer Sheybān, son of Ibn-Ţulūn, took his nephew’s government, and prudently withdrew the army to Mīṣr, where he laboured, in spite of a depleted treasury, to win popularity by promises and gifts. The caliph’s general, Mūḥammad b. Suleyman, pursued, and after a brief resistance Sheybān surrendered on terms, and left his army to its fate. Mūḥammad entered Kaṭā’ī on Jan. 10, butchered most of the black troops, burnt their quarters, and utterly demolished the beautiful city which Ibn-Ţulūn had built. The mosque was respected, but the houses were sacked and pulled down, the gates were thrown open, the women outraged, and the people used as brutally as if they had been heathen. After an orgy of devastation, plunder,
and extortion, which lasted four months, the caliph's army withdrew, taking Sheybān and all the remaining members of Tūlūn's family as prisoners to Baghdād. The dynasty had lasted thirty-seven years and four months, during which Egypt had regained much of her ancient importance, and her capital had reached a height of wealth and luxury unknown since the Arab conquest.

THE IKHSHĪD.


Inscription.—Of Kāfir on east wall of Ilāham at Jerusalem.

Coins.—Minted at Mīr (Fusṭāt), Filestīn (Ramla), Damascus, Ḥims, Tiberias.

For thirty years after the fall of the house of Tūlūn Egypt remained in an unsettled state. It was once more a dependent province, but the caliphs had become too weak to exert their authority, and the government was in the hands of Turkish soldiers. The armies sent from Baghdād, to hold Egypt against internal revolt and foreign invasion, dictated their own terms to successive governors, and the man who would rule the province must first be acceptable to the troops, whose favour depended upon their pay. Next to the generals, therefore, the most powerful personage was the treasurer, and this office was held during the whole of this disturbed period by one family, called Mādarānī (from their birthplace Mādarāyā, near Baṣra, on the Euphrates), who gradually acquired all but supreme power in Egypt. The other officials were of less importance under this military tyranny than in the earlier period of provincial government, and only one kādi deserves commemoration, the universally revered Ibn-Ḥarbaweyh, the last judge
whom the governors visited in state, and who did not rise to receive them.

The feeble hold which the caliphs' governors retained on the country is shown by the successful usurpation of an obscure but spirited young man named Moḥammad el-Khalangi, who collected in Palestine a handful of Egyptians who sympathized with the fallen house of Tūlūn; seized Ramla, and recited the public prayers in the three names of the caliph, as head of church and state, Ibrāhim (a captive son of Khumāraweyh) as governor, and himself as his deputy. The people listened placidly, and seemed interested in this curious band of adventurers, driven from house and home, and without any visible means of subsistence. The troops led against them by ‘Īsā, who had taken over the government of Egypt from the ‘Abbāsid general, retreated step by step, and in September, 905, Khalangi entered Fuṣṭāt and proclaimed in the prayers the same three names as at Ramla. The people, who had not forgotten the glorious days of Ibn-Tūlūn, rejoiced at the shadowy restoration, and in the height of enthusiasm painted themselves and their horses yellow with saffron. The adventurer appointed the necessary officers of administration, and took up his residence in the governor’s house unopposed. His popularity and following increased with his immunity. It is true he found an empty treasury, for ‘Īsā had carried off the public money together with all the account-books and most of the clerks, so that it was impossible to discover the due assessments of the tax-payers. But Khalangi did not trouble himself much about legality, and bade his collectors draw the revenue as best they could, covering their extortions with an orderly distribution of receipts and promises of reimbursement on the recovery of the tax-books. This wonderful young man next sent troops by sea and land to Alexandria (though the real governor of Egypt was encamped hard by), captured the city, and brought back in triumph not only the governor's treasure, but some of the missing accountants. Meanwhile the caliph, who did not recognize the self-constituted lieutenant-governor, sent an army from Mesopotamia to
bring him to reason, but Khalangī drove it away from el-'Arish with much slaughter. The time of reckoning, however, was at hand. A defeat of part of his army by 'Īsā was followed by the arrival by sea and land of stronger forces from the caliph, which effected a junction with 'Īsā; and after a series of determined engagements, Khalangī was forced back upon Fustāt, where he was betrayed by his friends to the tardily vindicated govern-ment, and sent to the caliph at Baghdaḍ, to be displayed on a camel as a fearful example to the whole city, and then executed (May, 906). That a mere adventurer should have held the capital of Egypt and defied the caliph’s armies for eight months is a striking comment on the insecurity of the government.¹

To add to the confusion came the danger of foreign invasion. The famous dynasty of the Fāṭimid caliphs—the greatest Shi’a power in mediaeval history—was

¹ The following is the list of the governors of Egypt from the downfall of the Tūlūnid dynasty to the accession of the Ikhshid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>El-Muṭṭedir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Tekīn el-Khāṣṣa el-G’ezerī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>Dhuḵā er-Rūmī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>Tekīn restored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>Maḥmūd b. Ḥamāl (for three days).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>Tekīn again (for a few days).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>Hilāl b. Bedr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>Aḥmad b. Keyghalag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>Tekīn (for fourth time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>El-Ḵāhir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>Mohammad b. Tekīn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>Mohammad b. Ṭughṭ the Ikhshīd (absent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>Aḥmad b. Keyghalag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>Usurpation of Mohammad b. Tekīn, June—July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>The Ikhshīd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marshals were frequently changed under these governors; Mohammad b. Tāhir was the most important. The chief ḫāḍī under the first seven governors to 924 was Ibn-Ḫarbaweyh. The treasurers were Abū-Zunbūr el-Māḍarānī and his successor Mohammad el-Māḍarānī.
beginning its conquest of North Africa. In 909 the last of
the once powerful house of the Aghlabids of Tunis came
flying to Egypt, and his pursuers were not far behind.
In 913-4 Khubasa, the Fatimid general, entered Barka,
committing abominable atrocities; and, in July, 914,
joined by el-Ka‘im, the son of the first Fatimid caliph
el-Mahdi, he occupied Alexandria without opposition—
the inhabitants in panic had taken to their ships—and
thence, avoiding Fustat, advanced as far as the Fayyum.
There the invaders were attacked and defeated by the
Egyptian army—strongly reinforced from Baghda—and
driven out of Egypt. Five years later they returned to
the attack; the Alexandrians had again to take to the
water, their city was sacked, the Fayyum devastated, and
fire and sword carried as far as Ushmuneyn. Meanwhile
the Fatimid fleet of eighty-five sail anchored in Alex-
andria harbour. The caliph’s admirals could only collect
twenty ships at Tarsus to send against it, but so well
were they handled that most of the enemy’s vessels were
burned with naphtha, and their crews and soldiery killed
or brought prisoners to Fustat. On land, however, the
outlook was less hopeful. Ducas the Greek (Dhukā er-
Rūmi), who was then governor, had great difficulty in
getting the Egyptian troops to move; they had to be
bribed with gratuities, and even then they timidly en-
trenched their camp at Gīza to prevent surprise. At
this critical moment Ducas died, and his successor, Tekin,
was fortunately a persona grata with the troops, and in-
spired some confidence among the panic-stricken popula-
tion. The invaders in the Fayyum, moreover, were
suffering severely from famine and plague, brought on
by their own excesses. Their attack on the Gīza camp,
now protected by a double ditch, was repulsed at about
the same date as the victory off Alexandria; but they
still held Upper Egypt, and Tekin hardly attempted to
disodge them, even when strongly reinforced by 3000
fresh troops sent from Baghda. He was hampered by
intrigues at home, for both the kādi and Mādarānī the
treasurer, with many other leading persons, were dis-
covered to be in treasonable correspondence with the
Faṭīmid caliph and eager to welcome him at Fustāt. With treachery in the capital, and Alexandria in the enemy’s hands, Tekīn stood on the defensive, until a second contingent from Mesopotamia came to his relief. Then, at last, in the spring of 920 the Egyptian army marched against the invaders, and a series of engagements in the Fayyūm and at Alexandria, ended before the close of the year in the retreat of the Faṭīmids to Barbary.

The condition of the country after their expulsion was chaotic. The eunuch Mūnis who, as commander of the troops from Baghdād, had been dictator of Egypt for some years, and had deposed and set up governors as he pleased, was at last recalled in 921; but the soldiery continued to dominate the government; disbanded troops harried the country and plundered and murdered the folk; and the disorder was so great that even Tekīn, when appointed governor for the fourth time, because no one else could pacify the army, found it necessary for safety to quarter his troops in his own palace. Some degree of order was at length restored, but after his death, in March, 933, his son was hooted out of the country by the army, clamouring for arrears of pay; the treasurer Mādarānī was in hiding; rival governors contended for power, mustered their troops, and skirmished over the distracted country; and a fearful earthquake, which laid many houses and villages low, followed by a portentous shower of meteors, added to the terror of the populace.

In this desperate state of affairs the Ikhsīdī took over the government of Egypt in August, 935. It needed an exceptionally strong man to meet the emergency, and the Ikhsīdī proved himself equal to the position. Moḥammad b. Ṭughī came of a princely family in Ferghānā on the Iaxartes, who bore the title of Ikhsīdī in

1 He was allowed to use the ancestral title by special permission of the caliph four years after his arrival in Egypt. His coinage, like that of the Tulunīds, was almost all of gold, and was issued from the mints of Mīr (i.e. Fustāt) in A.H. 328 (A.D. 939-40) and 333 (944-5); Fileṣṭin (Ramla), 331, 332, 333; Damascus, 333, 334.
the same manner as the sovereigns of Persia and Tabaristan were styled Kisra (Chosroes) and Ispehbedh. His grandfather G’uff was among the Turkish officers imported into Irak by the caliph Mo’tasim, son of Harun er-Rashid; and his father, the emir Tughl, had served with distinction in the armies of Khumaraeyeh, fought against the Romans when commandant of Tarsus, and had been rewarded with the government of Syria. The pride of success brought its punishment, and he ended his life in the prison of Damascus. His son Mo’hammad, the future ruler of Egypt, who shared his captivity, obtained his own release; and, after various vicissitudes of fortune, took service under Tekin, was appointed to the command of the seditious district of the Hawf in Lower Egypt, and after holding various appointments in Syria, where he gained the high approval of the caliph, became governor of Damascus in 920. Three years later he was nominated by el-Kahir to the charge of Egypt, but the state of Syria did not then permit his leaving, and though he was duly recognized as governor in the public prayers at Fustat in 933, and sent a deputy to represent him, another governor temporarily filled his place until he came in person, on a second nomination by the caliph Raddi, in 935. The virtual ruler of Egypt, Madarani the treasurer, instigated the governor to resist the appointment, and to oppose the entrance of the Ikhshid. They were, however, completely routed at Farama, and the fleet from Syria, sailing up the Nile from Tinnis to Gizza, commanded the capital until the Ikhshid brought his army up and took possession.

How largely the previous anarchy was due to the incapacity and jealousy of the governors and their officers is evident from the fact that during the eleven years of the Ikhshid’s firm government we do not read of a single insurrection or disturbance. The army recognized its master, and his Syrian troops overawed whatever disaffection may have subsisted among the Egyptians. He was an energetic yet cautious general, and his immense strength—for no other man could stretch his bow—inspired respect. Yet he is said to
have gone in fear of his life, and to have taken extraordinary precautions against assassination. He preferred peace to war, and would conclude a treaty and submit to loss of territory, and even payment of tribute, sooner than continue a doubtful struggle. His powerful army of 400,000 men, of whom 8000 formed his bodyguard, not only prevented any serious attempt of the Fāṭimids to renew their invasions, after they were driven back from Alexandria in the first year of his reign, but also gave him weight in the scrimmage then surging round the tottering caliphate. The temporal sway of the "commander of the faithful" had by this time disappeared. The governors of the various provinces had acquired sovereign powers. The Buveyhids held Persia, the Sāmānids the lands beyond the Oxus, the Ḥamdānids Mesopotamia, and a number of ambitious Turkish emirs fought for the possession of Baghda and the office of gaoler to the unhappy pontiff of Islām. The Ikhsid's efforts were chiefly directed towards preserving his Syrian province against the aggression of one or other of these turbulent neighbours. He first came in conflict with the emir Ibn-Rāʾik, who without provocation seized Ḥims and occupied Damascus. After an Egyptian defeat, probably at el-'Arish on the frontier, and a sanguinary but indecisive battle at el-Laggūn, twenty miles from Tiberias, peace was made on the terms that Ibn-Rāʾik retained Syria north of Ramla and received a yearly tribute of 140,000 D. from the Ikhsid. This understanding was partly due to the good feeling produced by the chivalry of the emir, who was so distressed to find the corpse of one of the Ikhsid's brothers among the slain at Laggūn that he sent his own son to his adversary as an atone-
ment, to be dealt with as he chose. Not to be outdone in generosity, the Ikhsid clothed the intended sacrifice in robes of honour and sent him back in all courtesy to his father. Of course the youth married the daughter of his chivalrous host, now joined in the friendly ties of treaty and alliance. The episode forms a pleasing con-
trast to the many barbarities of the age.

After Ibn-Rāʾik's death, two years later, the Ikhsid
recovered Syria and re-entered Damascus without striking a blow. To Syria and Egypt the caliph el-Muttaqi now added the governorship of the holy cities of Mekka and Medina, and the hereditary principle was established when the Ikhshid made the captains and soldiers of his army do homage to his elder son as their future prince. Tossed between the powerful dynasty of the ʿHamdānids and the contending emirs Tūzūn and el-Baridi, the wretched caliph, driven out of Baghdād, turned for succour to the Ikhshid, who came north to recover Aleppo from an aggressive ʿHamdānīd, and after settling his own affairs, had an interview with his spiritual suzerain on the Euphrates opposite Raḵka, and pressed him to seek refuge with him in Syria or Egypt. The caliph, however, stood in too great terror of the other emirs to venture upon so critical a step, nor would he even accept an offer of troops, though he took a subsidy of gold, and a vast amount of money passed into the hands of all the court. He let his great vassal depart, after showing him exceptional and touching favour, and confirming the government of Egypt and Syria to him and his heir for a term of thirty years; and trusted himself to the sworn honour of Tūzūn a month later, only to be treacherously blinded and deposed. The shrieks of the victim and his wives were drowned in a tattoo of drums and the acclamation of his successor.

The Ikhshid was still far from secure on his northern frontier. Aleppo was reoccupied by the ʿHamdānīd leader, Seyf-ed-dawla, before the close of the year, and an army despatched from Egypt under the eunuchs Kāfūr and Yānis was met at er-Rastan (Arethusa) on the Orontes, and routed with the loss of 4,000 prisoners, besides killed and drowned. Seyf-ed dawla proceeded to annex
WAR WITH HAMDANIDS

Damascus, and the Ikhshid was forced to march against him in person with a large army. They met near Kinnesrin. The Ikhshid placed his light troops, armed with short lances, in front, and kept a body of 10,000 chosen men, whom he called the “standfats,” in the rear. The light troops were quickly broken by the Hamdānid’s attack, and the enemy, thinking the victory already won, fell to plundering the baggage: whereupon the Ikhshid flung his “standfats” upon them with complete success and scattered them in all directions. The prince of Egypt re-entered Aleppo, and then Damascus, whence he negotiated a strangely unfavourable treaty with his vanquished enemy; he agreed to abandon Aleppo and northern Syria to the Hamdānid, and to pay him an annual tribute in return for the possession of Damascus. The explanation seems to be that the Ikhshid found the guardianship of northern Syria too troublesome a business at his age, for he was now sixty-four. He survived the campaign but a year, and died at Damascus in July, 946, and was buried at Jerusalem, where his successors also lie.

Of his government in Egypt little is recorded, and though like Ibn-Ṭulūn, he was a builder, and set up a beautiful palace in the pleasure called the “Garden of Kāfur,” which lay west of the present Suk-en-Nahhāsin, no trace of his buildings remain. The historian Masʿūdi, who visited Egypt during his reign, is more occupied with the pyramids and other wonders than with contemporary buildings or people. He gives no description of the palace or the court, or of its master, nor does he throw any light upon the condition of the inhabitants. He does, however, give some account of the system of irrigation, and describes the cutting of the canal dams on the 14th of September, and their closure (in the delta) in January. “The Night of the Bath (Leylat el-Ghaṭās),” he writes, “is one of the great ceremonies, and the people all go to it on foot on the 10th of January. I was present in 356 [942] when the Ikhshid Moḥammad Ṣ. Tughī lived in his house called el-Mukhtāra (‘the elect’) in the island that divides the Nile in two. He ordered
the bank of the island and the [opposite] bank of el-Fusṭāṭ to be illuminated each with a thousand torches, besides private illuminations. Muslims and Christians, by hundreds of thousands, crowded the Nile on boats, or in kiosks overlooking the river, or [standing] on the banks, all eager for pleasure, and vying in equipage, dress, gold and silver cups, and jewellery. The sound of music was heard all about, with singing and dancing. It was a splendid night, the best in all Miṣr for beauty and gaiety; the doors of the separate quarters were left open, and most people bathed in the Nile, knowing well that [on that night] it is a sure preservative and cure for all disease.71 He also states that the Ikhshid gave leave to people to dig for treasure, of which they said they had found clues in ancient manuscripts: but they discovered only caves and vaults full of statues, which were made of bones and dust—an early reference to mummies.2 But if we know little of the internal affairs of Egypt under the Ikhshid, it is at least clear that he brought repose to the distracted country, and that he established for the first time an hereditary principality recognised by the caliph, and practically implying independence. The tenure indeed was limited to thirty years, and confirmation by each successive caliph was a necessary and expensive formality, but in capable hands the virtual independence of his dynasty was assured.

Whether the Ikhshid's two sons Abū-l-Ḳāsim Īṅgūr (946-961)3 and Abū-l-Ḥasan 'Ali (961-965), who nominally

---

1 The 'Īd-el-Maghīta or “feast of the tank” was really the Christian Epiphany, in memory of Christ's baptism (Abū-Ṣāliḥ, p. 129, note). Mas'ūdi, Murūj-edh-Dhahab, ii. 364-5.
2 Ibid, ii. 419.
3 Coins bearing Abū-l-Ḳāsim's name were issued at Miṣr in a.H. 335 (946-7), 337, 339, 341, 342; Fileṣṭīn, 335, 336, 337, 339, 341, 345.
THE IKHSHID’S SONS

succeeded, were capable or not, they were allowed no opportunity of proving it. The elder was only fourteen at his father’s death, and though the younger, ‘Ali, had reached the age of twenty-three when his turn came to enjoy the name of governor, he was kept in the same state of pupilage as his brother by the black eunuch Kāfūr, who acted as regent of what may now almost be called the kingdom of Egypt. They were given a comfortable allowance of 400,000 Dinars, and bidden to enjoy themselves and not meddle with affairs of state. They submitted with scarcely a struggle, enjoyed their ḥarīm or ḥorān, according to their tastes, and died in luxurious obscurity, when (965) their black tyrant ascended the throne, with the caliph’s approval, as “master” (ustād) of Egypt and its dependencies. Abū-l-Misk Kāfūr (“Musk Camphor”) was an Abyssinian slave bought from an oilman for a matter of less than ten pounds by the Ikhshid, who discovering his merits made him governor to his two sons. The relation of tutor and ward lasted for their lives. Kāfūr was doubtless an excellent servant, though not always a successful general; but when in power he showed all the unbridled love of luxury and ease that marks the black in office. Few external difficulties troubled him; for after a campaign against the ever-encroaching Ḥamānīd, in which the Ikhshid’s energetic brother Ḥasan, accompanied by Kāfūr, won two signal victories over Seyf-ed-dawla, near Lāqgūn and on the Marg ‘Adhrā by Damascus, and the Egyptian army entered Aleppo, peace was concluded on the same basis as in 945, except that the tribute then imposed was discontinued. The consent of the caliph (or his keeper) to the succession of the two young princes to the govern-

346. 347 (958-9) ; Damascus, 338 (949-50) ; Ḥims, 336 ; Ṭabarīya (Tiberias) 337 (948-9).

1 Coins bearing the name of ‘Ali b. el-Ikhshid were issued at Miṣr in A.H. 350, 351, 352, 353, 354 (961–5) ; Filestin, 350, 351, 352, 353, 355 ; the last must have been struck within eleven days of his death on 11 Moḥarram, 355 (7 Feb. 965).

2 No coins bear Kāfūr’s name: his currency was in the name of the caliph alone.
ment of Egypt, Syria, and the holy cities, was easily obtained, and in the latter part of Kāfür’s administration not only Damascus but the whole of Syria as far as Aleppo and Tarsus was again incorporated under the rule of Egypt. Beyond some temporary disturbances at the Mekka pilgrimages in 953-5, and a raid of the Karmathis upon Syria in 963, and their capture of the great Egyptian pilgrim caravan of 20,000 camels in 966, there was little trouble abroad; and in Egypt, in spite of a series of terrific earthquakes, a great fire which destroyed 1700 houses in Fustat, bad Niles, and much consequent scarcity and distress, the people seem to have remained strangely quiet. Even an irruption of the Nubians, who carried fire and sword, slaughter and famine through the Ša‘id in 963 did not stir up a revolt. The Ikhshid had got the Egyptians into order, and the big black eunuch “Camphor” evidently knew how to maintain it.

Kāfür was at once the Lucullus and the Maecenas of his age. He had contrived to acquire some cultivation, as most clever slaves did, and he loved to surround himself with poets and critics, and listen to their discussions of an evening, or make them read him the history of the caliphs of old. Like all blacks he delighted in music. He had control of vast sums of money, and he scattered it liberally among his literary friends, who repaid him in fulsome verse. The celebrated poet el-Mutanabbi was among his intimates for a couple of years, and from his odes one gains such a picture of the “master” as an avowed panegyrist, who afterwards became a bitter satirist of his patron, may afford. When another poet explained in choice verse that the frequent earthquakes of the time were due to Egypt’s dancing for joy at Kāfür’s virtues, the pleased Ethiopian threw him a thousand dinārs. A sherif of the

Fig. 19.—Dinar of Abū-l-Ḳāsim b. el-Ikhshid, Miṣr, 950.
LUXURY OF COURT

family of the Prophet, who once picked up his riding-whip for him, found himself suddenly the owner of a baggage-train worth 15,000D. On his table, “Camphor” was lavish; he had the black’s jolly sensuality. The daily provision for his kitchen consisted in 100 sheep, 100 lambs, 250 geese, 500 fowls, 1000 pigeons and other birds, and 100 jars of sweets. The daily consumption amounted to 1700 lb. of meat, besides fowls and sweets, and 50 skins of liquor were allowed to the servants alone. A favourite drink was quince-cider, for which the kādi of Asyūt sent 50,000 quince-apples every season.

On Kāfur’s death in April, 968, after nineteen years of virtual and three of titular rule, the chief officers of the court immediately assembled to elect a prince, the minority agreeing to accept the choice of the majority. Such a proceeding was without a precedent in Egypt, and shows how the authority of the caliph—the nominal sovereign—was ignored. The choice fell upon a child of eleven, Abū-l-Fawāris Āḥmad, son of ʿAli b. el-Ikhshid, who was forthwith acknowledged in the public prayers as ruler of Egypt, Syria, and the holy cities, with his second cousin, el-Ḥoseyn b. ʿObeydallāh b. Ṭughḥā, as next heir. Ibn-el-Furāt undertook the finances, and Samuel, the former director of the pigeon-post, ventured upon the war office. The extortions and niggardliness of the one, and the incompetence of the other, led to a military revolt, and Ḥoseyn assumed the regency. It was not for long. The helpless condition of the government did not escape the shrewd observation of el-Moʿizz, the fourth Fāṭimid caliph of Barbary, and the ambition to be master of Egypt, which had only slumbered since the Ikhshid’s accession, revived in fresh vigour. The inroads of the Karmatīs in Syria, and the distracted state of ʿIrāk, precluded the fear of interference from the east, and the opportunity was not to be neglected. A little more than a year after Kāfur’s death, the Fāṭimid army

1 Coins of Āḥmad are dated a.h. 358 (968-9) at Miṣr and Fileṣṭīn.
2 A coin with the name of el-Ḥoseyn b. ʿObeydallāh was issued in 358 at Fileṣṭīn (Ramla), of which he was governor (Lavoix, Cat., Égypte, 64)
entered Fustat. With the fall of the last Ikhshid Egypt ceased for two centuries to be numbered among the provinces of the eastern orthodox caliphate.

Three hundred and thirty years had passed since the Saracens first invaded the valley of the Nile. The people, with traditional docility, had liberally adopted the religion of their rulers, and the Muslims now formed the great majority of the population. Arabs and natives had blended into much the same race that we now call Egyptians; but so far the mixture had not produced any conspicuous men. The few commanding figures among the governors, Ibn-Tulun, the Ikhshid, Kafur, were foreigners, and even these were but a step above the stereotyped official. They essayed no great extension of their dominions; they did not try to extinguish their dangerous neighbours the schismatic Fatimids; and though they possessed and used fleets, they ventured upon no excursions against Europe. In material conditions it may be doubted whether the people gained anything by the Arab conquest. No doubt the old system of cultivation and irrigation went on, as it always has done; but it owed little to the enterprise or public spirit of the rulers, who left the irrigation and agriculture to take care of themselves, and were chiefly concerned in drawing the revenue. The decrease in the land-tax recorded by Makrizi faithfully reflects the carelessness of the governors. Their public works were almost wholly confined to the capital, which they enlarged and adorned with palaces and other buildings, gardens, and meydans, for their own pleasure. The luxury of such princes as Khumaraewyeh must have benefitted the townspeople, for a time, at the expense of the country taxpayers. The courts of men like Ibn-Tulun and Kafur attracted men of learning and polite letters from other parts of the caliphate, and Misr was gradually acquiring a reputation as a centre of enlightenment. But so far it was much behind Bagdad, Damascus, and Cordova; the Azhar university was not yet founded, nor had the Muslims of Egypt yet produced a poet, historian, or critic of the first rank in Arabic literature. On the other hand, it must be remem-
bered that historiography and literary criticism were still in a very crude stage of development in all parts of the Mohammedan dominions; the celebrated Tabari, a contemporary of Khumāraweyh, had not risen above the mere collecting of traditions, without attempting to coordinate or criticize them; Mas'ūdi, who saw the Ikhshid, was chiefly a collector of anecdotes and curiosities of history; and the poets or versifiers of the caliphate were essentially an artificial product of the court, whose talents were best remunerated at the richest capital, or wherefo ever fools and their money were most readily parted. The genuine poetry of the desert was no longer a living inspiration, but a classical tradition. The literature of erudition and compilation was only beginning.
CHAPTER IV

THE SHI'A REVOLUTION

969


The great revolution which sixty years before had swept over north Africa, and now spread to Egypt, arose out of the old controversy over the legitimacy of the caliphate. The prophet Mohammad died without definitely naming a successor, and thereby bequeathed an interminable quarrel to his followers. The principle of election, thus introduced, raised the first three caliphs, Abû-Bekr, ‘Omar, ‘Othman, to the cathedra at Medina; but a strong minority held that the “divine right” rested with ‘Ali, the “Lion of God,” first convert to Islam, husband of the prophet’s daughter Fatiha, and father of Mohammad’s only male descendants. When ‘Ali in turn became the fourth caliph, he was the mark for jealousy, intrigue, and at length assassination; his sons, the grandsons of the prophet, were excluded from the succession; his family were cruelly persecuted by their successful rivals, the Omayyad usurpers; and the tragedy of Kerbelâ and the murder of Hoseyn set the seal of martyrdom on the holy family and stirred a passionate enthusiasm which still rouses intense excitement in the annual representations of the Persian Passion Play.

The rent thus opened in Islam was never closed, and to this day the hatred between Sunnis and Shi'a, between the Popular Choice and the Divine Right, is more bitter
than between Protestant and Catholic in the days of persecution. The ostracism of 'Ali "laid the foundation of the grand incurable schism which has divided the Mohammedan church, and equally destroyed the practice of charity among the members of their common creed and endangered the speculative truths of doctrine. Abroad, it necessarily lamed the propagation of the faith by the evidence which it afforded the unbeliever of the diversity of opinion, strife, and reciprocal maledictions of its professor's themselves. At home, it placed the caliphs in so false a position that they presented the extraordinary spectacle of sovereign pontiffs who rendered their unjust claim to the crown still more palpably indefensible by persecuting the descendants of the author of their faith and founder of their throne; and who, to fill up the measure of inconsistency, were obliged publicly to invoke every blessing on that family by whose exclusion alone they enjoyed the privilege of performing the khutba. Thus it alienated the hearts of a large portion of the people from their spiritual and temporal head; sowed the ineradicable seeds of sedition, conspiracy, and rebellion; placed the usurper on a tottering throne from which the rightful claimant might at any time hurl him; and left him to rule a divided people with a broken sceptre."¹

The history of the 'Alid schism, or of Shi'ism, may be read elsewhere;² here we can only take up the links that connect it with the conquest of Egypt by the Fātimids. The descendants of 'Ali, though almost universally devoid of the qualities of great leaders, possessed the persistence and devotion of martyrs, and their sufferings heightened the fanatical enthusiasm of their supporters. All attempts to recover the temporal power having proved vain, the 'Alids fell back upon the spiritual authority of the successive candidates of the holy family, whom they proclaimed to be the Imāms or spiritual leaders of the faithful. This doctrine of the Imāmate gradually acquired

¹ Nicholson, Establ. of Fat. Dyn., 7, 8.
² See, for example, Dozy, Hist. de l'Islamisme, trans. Chauvin, ch. ix.
a more mystical meaning, supported by an allegorical interpretation of the Korân; and a mysterious influence was ascribed to the Imâm, who, though hidden from mortal eye, on account of the persecution of his enemies, would soon come forward publicly in the character of the ever-expected Mahdi, sweep away the corruptions of the heretical caliphate, and revive the majesty of the pure lineage of the prophet. All Mohammadans believe in a coming Mahdi, a Messiah who shall restore right and prepare for the second advent of Mohammad and the tribunal of the last day; but the Shi'a turned the expectation to special account. They taught that the true Imâm, though invisible to mortal sight, is ever living; they predicted the Mahdi's speedy appearance, and kept their adherents on the alert to take up arms in his service. With a view to his coming they organized a pervasive conspiracy, instituted a secret society with carefully graduated stages of initiation, used the doctrines of all religions and sects as weapons in the propaganda, and sent missionaries throughout the provinces of Islam to increase the numbers of the initiates, and pave the way for the great revolution. We see their partial success in the ravages of the Carmathians, who were the true parents of the Fatimids. The leaders and chief missionaries had really nothing in common with Mohammadanism. Among themselves they were frankly atheists. Their objects were political, and they used religion in any form, and adapted it in all modes, to secure proselytes, to whom they imparted only so much of their doctrine as they were able to bear. These men were furnished with "an armoury of proselytism" as perfect, perhaps, as any known to history: they had appeals to enthusiasm, and arguments for the reason, and "fuel for the fiercest passions of the people and times in which they moved." They combined indeed the intellectual dexterity and unscrupulousness ascribed to the Jesuit, with the talent for criminal organization of the Decisi. Their real aim was not religious or constructive, but pure nihilism. They used the claim of the family of 'Ali, not because they believed in any
divine right or any caliphate, but because some flag had to be flourished in order to rouse the people.

One of these missionaries, disguised as a merchant, journeyed back to Barbary in 893, with some Berber pilgrims who had performed the sacred ceremonies at Mekka. He was welcomed by the great tribe of the Kitāma, and rapidly acquired an extraordinary influence over the Berbers—a race prone to superstition, and easily impressed by the mysterious rites of initiation and the emotional doctrines of the propagandist, the wrongs of the prophetic house, and the approaching triumph of the Mahdi. Barbary had never been much attached to the caliphate, and for a century it had been practically independent under the Aghlabid dynasty, the barbarous excesses of whose later sovereigns had alienated their subjects. ‘Alids, moreover, had established themselves, in the dynasty of the Idrisids, in Morocco since the end of the eighth century. The land was in every respect apt for revolution, and the success of Abu-‘Abdalāh esh-Shi‘i, the new missionary, was extraordinarily rapid. In a few years he had a following of 200,000 armed men, and after a series of battles he drove Ziyādat-Allāh, the last Aghlabid prince, out of the country in 908. The missionary then proclaimed the Imām ‘Obeydallāh as the true caliph and spiritual head of Islām. Whether this ‘Obeydallāh was really a descendant of ‘Ali or not,¹ he had been carefully

¹ He was represented as the brother of the twelfth Imām, who mysteriously vanished at Samarrā; or as the son of one of the “hidden” Imāms, who (according to the Ismā‘ilians) succeeded to the direction of the religion after the death of the seventh Imām. But there were at least eight different pedigrees provided for ‘Obeydallāh, and this discrepancy among his own supporters is a strong argument against his pretended descent from ‘Ali and the other Imāms, especially in view of the pride and care with which the Arabs preserved their genealogies. The opponents of the Fātimids (or ‘Obeydids as they prefer to call them), on the other hand, asserted that ‘Obeydallāh’s real name was Sa‘id; some said he was a Jew; and they traced his descent, or that of his adoptive father, to a Persian eye-doctor of dualistic views. Arab historians are sharply divided on this point, but their opinions are partly biased by religious and political influences. El-Maqrīzī and Ibn-Khaldūn are the most noted supporters of the
prepared for the rôle, and reached Barbary in disguise with the greatest mystery and some difficulty, pursued by the suspicions of the Baghdād caliph, who, in great alarm, sent repeated orders for his arrest. Indeed, the victorious missionary had to rescue his spiritual chief from a sordid prison at Siğilmāsa. Then humbly prostrating himself before him, he hailed him as the expected Mahdī, and in January, 910, he was duly prayed for in the mosque of Kayrawān as "the Imām ‘Obeydallāh el-Mahdī, commander of the faithful." The missionary’s Berber proselytes were too numerous to encourage resistance, and the few who indulged the luxury of conscientious scruples were killed or imprisoned. El-Mahdī, indeed, appeared so secure in power that he excited the jealousy of his discoverer. Abū-‘Abdallāh the missionary now found himself nobody, where a month before he had been supreme. The Fāṭimid restoration was to him only a means to an end; he had used ‘Obeydallāh’s title as an engine of revolution, intending to proceed to the furthest lengths of his philosophy, to a complete social and political anarchy, the destruction of Islām, community of lands and women, and all the delight of unshackled licence. Instead of this, his creature had absorbed his power, and all such designs were void. He began to hatch treason and to hint doubts as to the genuineness of the Mahdī, who, as he truly represented, according to prophecy ought to work miracles and show other proofs of his divine mission. People began to ask for a "sign." In reply, the Mahdī had the missionary murdered.

The first Fāṭimid caliph, though without experience, was so vigorous a ruler that he could dispense with the dangerous support of his discoverer. He held the throne for a quarter of a century and established his authority, more or less continuously, over the Arab and Berber tribes and settled cities from the frontier of Egypt to the

province of Fez (Fās) in Morocco, received the allegiance of the Moḥammadan governor of Sicily, and twice despatched expeditions into Egypt, which he would probably have permanently conquered if he had not been hampered by perpetual insurrections in Barbary. Distant governors, and often whole tribes of Berbers, were constantly in revolt, and the disastrous famine of 928-9, coupled with the Asiatic plague which his troops had brought back with them from Egypt, led to general disturbances and insurrections which fully occupied the later years of his reign. The western provinces, from Ṭāhart and Nakur to Fez and beyond, frequently threw off all show of allegiance. His authority was founded more on fear than on religious enthusiasm, though zeal for the ‘Alid cause had its share in his original success. The new “Eastern doctrines,” as they were called, were enforced at the sword’s point, and frightful examples were made of those who ventured to tread in the old paths. Nor were the free-thinkers of the large towns, who shared the missionary’s esoteric principles, encouraged; for outwardly, at least, the Mahdī was strictly a Muslim. When people at Kayrawān began to put in practice the missionary’s advanced theories, to scoff at all the rules of Islām, to indulge in free love, pig’s flesh, and wine, they were sternly brought to order. The mysterious powers expected of a Mahdī were sedulously rumoured among the credulous Berbers, though no miracles were actually exhibited; and the obedience of the conquered provinces was secured by horrible outrages and atrocities, of which the terrified people dared not provoke a repetition at the hands of the Mahdī’s savage generals.

His eldest son Abū-l-Ḵāsim, who had twice led expeditions into Egypt, succeeded to the caliphate with the title of el-Ḵāim (934-946.) He began his reign with warlike vigour. He sent out a fleet in 934 or 935, which harried the southern coast of France, blockaded and took Genoa, and coasted along Calabria, massacring and plundering, burning the shipping, and carrying off slaves wherever it touched. At the same time he despatched a third army against Egypt; but the
firm hand of the Ikhshid now held the government, and his brother 'Obeydallāh, with 15,000 horse, drove the enemy out of Alexandria and gave them a crushing defeat on their way home. But for the greater part of his reign el-Ḳā'im was on the defensive, fighting for existence against the usurpation of one Abū-Ẓezid, who repudiated Shi'ism, cursed the Mahdi and his successor, stirred up most of Morocco and Barbary against el-Ḳā'im, drove him out of his capital, and went near to putting an end to the Fāṭimid caliphate. It was only after seven years of uninterrupted civil war that this formidable insurrection died out, under the firm but politic management of the third caliph, el-Mansūr (946-953), a brave man who knew both when to strike and when to be generous. Abū-Ṭezid was at last run to earth, and his body was skinned and stuffed with straw, and exposed in a cage with a couple of ludicrous apes as a warning to the disaffected.

The Fāṭimid so far wear a brutal and barbarous character. They do not seem to have encouraged literature or learning; but this is partly explained by the fact that culture belonged chiefly to the orthodox caliphate, and its learned men could have no dealings with the heretical pretender. The city of Ḳayrawān, which dates from the Arab conquest in the eighth century, preserves the remains of some noble buildings, but of their other capitals or royal residences, el-Mahdiya (founded 913-918), el-Moḥammadiya (924), and el-Mansūriya (the ancient Ṣabra, restored and renamed in 948)—the last two being merely suburbs of Ḳayrawān—no traces of art or architecture remain to bear witness to the taste of their founders. Each began to decay as soon as its successor was built.

With the fourth caliph, however, el-Moʿizz, the

---

1 His full name and title was the Imām Abū-Tenīm Maʿadd, el-Moʿizz-li-ṭūnī-li-llāh (fortifier of the religion of God). Coins of Moʿizz are fairly numerous, struck at el-Mahdiya and el-Mansūriya, and Sicily; and, after the conquest, at Miṣr (Fustat) from A.H. 358 (969), Fileṣṭīn (Ramla) from 359, Tyre, 361, and Tripolis, 364 (974-5). A unique coin in the Khedivial Library at Cairo bears the usual inscriptions of
The Caliph Mo'izz

Conqueror of Egypt (953-975), the Fatimids entered upon a new phase. He was a man of politic temper, a born statesman, able to grasp the conditions of success, and to take advantage of every point in his favour. He was also highly educated, and not only wrote Arabic poetry and delighted in its literature, but studied Greek, mastered Berber and Sudani dialects, and is even said to have taught himself Slavonic, in order to converse with his slaves from eastern Europe. His eloquence was such as to move his audience to tears. To prudent statesmanship he added a large generosity, and his love of justice was among his noblest qualities. So far as outward acts could show, he was a strict Muslim of the Shi'a sect, and the statement of his adversaries that he was really at heart an atheist seems to rest merely upon the belief that all the Fatimids adopted the esoteric doctrines of the Isma'ilian missionaries.

When he ascended the throne in April, 953, he had already a policy, and he lost no time in carrying it into execution. He first made a progress through his dominions, visiting each town, investigating its needs, and providing for its peace and prosperity. He bearded the rebels in their mountain fastnesses, till they laid down their arms and fell at his feet. He conciliated the chiefs and governors with presents and appointments, and was rewarded by their loyalty. At the head of his ministers he set G'awhar "the Roman," a slave from the eastern empire, who had risen to the post of secretary to the late caliph, and was now by his son promoted to the rank of vezir and commander of the forces. He was sent in 958 to bring the ever-refractory Magrib (Morocco) to allegiance. The expedition was entirely successful, Sigilmasa and Fez were taken, and G'awhar reached the shore of the Atlantic. Jars of live fish and seaweed reached the capital, and proved to the caliph that his empire touched the ocean, the limitless limit of

Mo'izz and the date Miṣr, A.H. 341, the year of his accession. As there was no expedition into Egypt that year, this coin must either record a pretension—anticipating the conquest of Miṣr eighteen years later—or present an engraver's error.
the world. All the African littoral, from the Atlantic to the frontier of Egypt (with the single exception of Spanish Ceuta), now peaceably admitted the sway of the Fāṭimid caliph.

The result was due partly to the exhaustion caused by the long struggle during the preceding reigns, partly to the politic concessions and personal influence of the able young ruler. He was liberal and conciliatory towards distant provinces, but to the Arabs of the capital he was severe. Kayrawān teemed with disaffected folk, sheykhsl and theologians bitterly hostile to the heretical “orientalism” of the Fāṭimids, and always ready to excite a tumult. Moʿizz was resolved to give them no chance, and one of his repressive measures was the curfew. At sunset a trumpet sounded, and anyone found abroad after that was liable to lose not only his way but his head. So long as they were quiet, however, he used the people justly, and sought to impress them in his favour. In a singular interview (recorded by Makrizī) he exhibited himself to a deputation of sheykhsl, dressed in the utmost simplicity, and seated before his writing materials in a plain room, surrounded by books. He wished to disabuse them of the idea that he led in private a life of luxury and self-indulgence: “You see what employs me when I am alone,” he said; I read letters that come to me from the lands of the east and the west, and answer them with my own hand. I deny myself all the pleasures of the world, and I seek only to protect your lives, multiply your children, shame your rivals and daunt your enemies.” Then he gave them much good advice, and especially recommended them to keep to one wife: “One woman is enough for one man. If you straitly observe what I have ordained,” he concluded, “I trust that God will through you procure our conquest of the East in like manner as he has vouchsafed us the West.”

The conquest of Egypt was indeed the aim of his life. To rule over tumultuous Arab and Berber tribes in a poor country formed no fit ambition for a man of his capacity. Egypt, its wealth, its commerce, its great port, and its docile population—these were his dream.
For two years he had been digging wells and building rest-houses on the road to Alexandria. The west was now outwardly quiet, and between Egypt and any hope of succour from the eastern caliphate stood the ravaging armies of the Karmatīs. Egypt itself was in helpless disorder. The great Kāfar was dead, and its nominal ruler was a child. Ibn-Furāt, the vezir, had made himself obnoxious to the people by arrests and extortions. The very soldiery was in revolt, and the Turkish retainers of the court mutinied, plundered the vezir's palace, and even opened negotiations with Mo‘izz. Ḥoseyn, the nephew of the Ikhshīd, attempted to restore public order, but after three months of vacillating and unpopular government he returned to his own province in Palestine to make terms with the Karmatīs. Famine, the result of the exceptionally low Nile of 967, added to the misery of the country; plague, as usual, followed in the steps of famine; over six hundred thousand people died in and around Fustāṭ, and the wretched inhabitants began in despair to migrate to happier lands.

All these matters were fully reported to Mo‘izz by the renegade Jew Ya‘kūb b. Killis, a former favourite of Kāfar, who had been driven from Egypt by the jealous exactions of the vezir Ibn-Furāt, and who was perfectly familiar with the political and financial state of the Nile valley. His representations confirmed the Fātimid caliph's resolve; the Arab tribes were summoned to his standard; an immense treasure was collected—24,000,000 D. in gold according to Ma‘rūzī, all of which was spent in the campaign—gratuities were lavishly distributed to the army; and at the head of over 100,000 men, all well mounted and armed, accompanied by a thousand camels and a mob of horses carrying money,
stores, and ammunition, G'awhar marched from Kâryâ-wân in February, 969. The caliph himself reviewed the troops. The marshal kissed his hand and his horse's shoe. All the princes, emirs, and courtiers passed reverently on foot before the honoured leader of the conquering army, who, as a last proof of favour, received the gift of his master's own robes and charger. The governors of all the towns on the route had orders to come on foot to G'awhar's stirrup, and one of them vainly offered a large bribe to be excused the indignity.

The approach of this overwhelming force filled the Egyptian ministers with consternation, and they thought only of obtaining favourable terms. A deputation of notables, headed by Abû-G'a'far Muslim, a sherif (or descendant of the Prophet's family), waited upon G'awhar near Alexandria, and demanded a capitulation. The general consented without reserve, and in a conciliatory letter granted all they asked. But they had reckoned without their host; the troops at Fustâṭ would not listen to such humiliation, and there was a strong war party among the citizens, to which some of the ministers leaned. The city prepared for resistance, and skirmishes took place with G'awhar's army, which had meanwhile arrived at the opposite town of G'iza in July. Forcing the passage of the river, with the help of some boats supplied by Egyptian soldiers, the invaders fell upon the opposing army drawn up on the other bank, and totally defeated them. The troops deserted Fustâṭ in a panic, and the women of the city, running out of their houses, implored the sherif to intercede with the conqueror. G'awhar, like his master, always disposed to a politic leniency, renewed his former promises, and granted a complete amnesty to all who submitted. The overjoyed populace cut off the heads of some of the refractory leaders in their enthusiasm, and sent them to the camp in pleasing token of allegiance. A herald bearing a white flag rode through the streets of Fustâṭ proclaiming the amnesty and forbidding pillage, and on August 5 the Fâtimid army, with full pomp of drums and banners, entered the capital.
That very night G'awhar laid the foundations of a new city, or rather fortified palace, destined for the reception of his sovereign. He was encamped on the sandy waste which stretched north-east of Fustat on the road to Heliopolis, and there, at a distance of about a mile from the river, he marked out the boundaries of the new capital. There were no buildings, save the old "Convent of the Bones," nor any cultivation except the beautiful park called "Kafur's Garden," to obstruct his plans. A square, somewhat less than a mile each way, was pegged out with poles, and the Maghrabi astrologers, in whom Mo'izz reposed extravagant faith, consulted together to determine the auspicious moment for the opening ceremony. Bells were hung on ropes from pole to pole, and at the signal of the sages their ringing was to announce the precise moment when the labourers were to turn the first sod. The calculations of the astrologers were, however, anticipated by a raven, who perched on one of the ropes and set the bells jingling, upon which every mattock was struck into the earth, and the trenches were opened. It was an unlucky hour: the planet Mars (el-Kahira) was in the ascendant; but it could not be undone, and the place was accordingly named after the hostile planet, el-Kahira, "the martial" or "triumphant," in the hope that the sinister omen might be turned to a triumphant issue.\footnote{Maqr, i. 384, adds that el-Kahira was also named el-Manṣūriya (probably after the city or suburb of Kayrawān built by the Fāṭimid el-Mansūr): see Lane's Cairo, 23-6. The name of el-Kahira appears first on a coin in a.H. 394 (1003-4), with the epithet el-Mahrūza, "the guarded"; but does not recur until more than a century later, a.H. 508-24, when it has the form el-Mu'izziyah el-Kahira, "the triumphant city of Mo'izz." The rare occurrence of the name is explained by the mint of the metropolis being still worked, as before, at Fustat. After the burning of Fustat in 1168 and the accession of Saladin, the coinage regularly bears the name of el-Kahira (Cairo).} Cairo, as Kahira has come to be called, may fairly be said to have outlived all astrological prejudices. The name of the 'Abbāsid caliph was at once expunged from the Friday prayers at the old mosque of 'Amr at Fustat; the black 'Abbāsid robes were proscribed, and the preacher, in pure white, recited the khutba for
the Imām Moʿizz, emīr el-muʾminin, and invoked blessings on his ancestors, ʿAlī and Fāṭima, and all their holy family. The call to prayer from the minarets was adapted to Shiʿa taste. The joyful news was sent to the Fāṭimid caliph on swift dromedaries, together with the heads of the slain. Coins were struck with the special formulas of the Fāṭimid creed—“ʿAlī is the noblest of [God’s] delegates, the wezīr of the best of apostles”; “the Imām Maʿadd calls men to profess the unity of the Eternal”—in addition to the usual dogmas of the Mūḥammadan faith. For two centuries the mosques and the mint proclaimed the shibboleth of the Shiʿa.

G’awhar set himself at once to restore tranquillity and alleviate the sufferings of the famine-stricken people. Moʿizz had providently sent grain-ships to relieve their distress, and as the price of bread nevertheless remained at famine rates, G’awhar publicly flogged the millers, established a central corn-exchange, and compelled everyone to sell his corn there under the eye of a government inspector (moḥtesib). In spite of his efforts, the famine lasted for two years; plague spread alarmingly, insomuch that the corpses could not be buried fast enough, and were thrown into the Nile; and it was not till the winter of 971-2 that plenty returned and the pest disappeared. As usual, the viceroy took a personal part in all public functions. Every Saturday he sat in court, assisted by the wezīr, Ibn-Furāt, the kāḍī, and skilled lawyers, to hear causes and petitions, and to administer justice. To secure impartiality, he appointed to every department of state an Egyptian and a Maghrābi officer. His firm and equitable rule ensured peace and order; and the great palace he was building, and the new mosque, the Azhar, which he founded in 970 and finished in 972, not only added to the beauty of the capital, but gave employment to innumerable craftsmen.

The inhabitants of Egypt accepted the new régime with their habitual phlegm. An Ikhshīdi officer in the Bashmūr district of Lower Egypt did, indeed, incite the people to rebellion, but his fate was not such as to encourage others. He was chased out of Egypt, captured on the
coast of Palestine, and then, it is gravely recorded, he was given sesame oil to drink for a month, till his skin stripped off, whereupon it was stuffed with straw, and hung up on a beam, as a reminder to him who would be admonished. With this brief exception we read of no riots, no sectarian risings, and the general surrender was complete when the remaining partisans of the deposed dynasty, to the number of 5000, laid down their arms. An embassy sent to George, king of Nubia, to invite him to embrace Islām, and to exact the customary tribute, was received with courtesy, and the money, but not the conversion, was arranged. The holy cities of Mekka and Medina in the Hīgāz, where the gold of Mo‘izz had been prudently distributed some years before, responded to his generosity and success by proclaiming his supremacy in the mosques; the Hamdānid prince who held northern Syria paid similar homage to the Fātimid caliph at Aleppo, where the ‘Abbāsids had hitherto been recognized. Southern Syria, however, which had formed part of the Ikhshid’s kingdom, did not submit to the usurpers without a struggle. Hoseyn was still independent at Ramla, and G‘awhar’s lieutenant, G‘a‘far b. Fellāh, was obliged to give him battle. Hoseyn was defeated and exposed bareheaded to the insults of the mob at Fustāt, to be finally sent, with the rest of the family of Ikhshid, to a Barbary gaol. Damascus, the home of orthodoxy, was taken by G‘a‘far, not without a struggle, and the Fātimid doctrine was there published, to the indignation and disgust of the Sunnī population.

A worse plague than the Fātimid conquest soon afflicted Syria. The Karmāṭī leader, Ḥasan b. Aḥmad, surnamed el-A‘sam, finding the blackmail, which he had lately received out of the revenues of Damascus, suddenly stopped, resolved to extort it by force of arms. The Fātimids indeed sprang from the same movement, and their founder professed the same political and irreligious philosophy as Ḥasan himself; but this did not stand in his way, and his knowledge of their origin made him the less disposed to render homage to the sacred pretensions of the new Imāms, whom he contumeliously designated
as the spawn of the quack, charlatans, and enemies of Islam. He tried to enlist the support of the 'Abbāsid caliph, but el-Muṭi' replied that Fātimis and Karmaṭis were all one to him, and he would have nothing to do with either. The Buweyhid prince of 'Irāk, however, supplied Ḥasan with arms and money; Abū-Ṭaghlib, the Ḥamdānīd ruler of Rahba on the Euphrates, contributed men; and, supported by the Arab tribes of 'Ōkeyl, Tyy, and others, Hasan marched upon Damascus, where the Fātimids were routed, and their general, G'a'far, killed. Mo'izz was forthwith publicly cursed from the pulpit in the Syrian capital, to the qualified satisfaction of the inhabitants, who had to pay handsomely for the pleasure.

Ḥasan next marched to Ramla, and thence, leaving the Fātimid army of 11,000 men shut up in Jaffa, invaded Egypt. His troops surprised Kulzum at the head of the Red Sea, and Faramā (Pelusium) near the Mediterranean, at the two ends of the Egyptian frontier; Tinnis declared against the Fātimids, and Ḥasan appeared at Heliopolis ('Ain Shems) in October, 971. G'awhar had already entrenched the new capital with a deep ditch, leaving but one entrance, which he closed with an iron gate. He armed the Egyptians, as well as the African troops, and a spy was set to watch the wezir Ibn-Furāt, lest he should indulge in treachery. The sherifs of the family of 'Alī were summoned to the camp, as hostages for the good behaviour of the inhabitants. Meanwhile, the officers of the enemy were liberally tempted with bribes. Two months they lay before Cairo, and then, after an indecisive engagement, Ḥasan stormed the gate, forced his way across the ditch, and attacked the Egyptians on their own ground. The result was a severe repulse, and Ḥasan retreated under cover of night to Kulzum, leaving his camp and baggage to be plundered by the Fātimids, who were only baulked of a sanguinary pursuit

---

Fig. 21. - 1. Dinār of el-Mo'izz, Palestine, 974.
by the intervention of night. The Egyptian volunteers displayed unexpected valour in the fight, and many of the partisans of the late dynasty, who were with the enemy, were made prisoners. Thus the serious danger, which went near to cutting short the Fāṭimid occupation of Egypt, was not only resolutely met, but even turned into an advantage. There was no more intriguing on behalf of the Ikhsidids, Tinnis was recovered from its temporary defection and occupied by the reinforcements which Mo‘izz had hurriedly despatched under Ibn-‘Ammār to the succour of G‘awhar; and the Karmāṭi fleet, which attempted to recover this fort, was obliged to slip anchor, abandoning seven ships and 500 prisoners. Jaffa, which still held out resolutely against the besieging Arabs, was now relieved by the despatch of African troops from Cairo, who brought back the garrison, but did not dare to hold the post. The enemy fell back upon Damascus, and their leaders fell out among themselves.

The Karmāṭi chief was not crushed, however, by his defeat: in the following year he was collecting ships and Arabs for a fresh invasion. G‘awhar, who had long urged his master to come and protect his conquest, now pointed out the extreme danger of a second attack from an enemy which had already succeeded in boldly forcing his way to the gate of Cairo. Mo‘izz had delayed his journey, because he could not safely trust his western provinces in his absence; but on the receipt of this grave news, he appointed Yūsuf Bulugin b. Zeyrī, of the Berber tribe of Sanhāga, to act as his deputy in Barbary, left Sardāniya—the Fontainbleau of Kayrawān, as Maṣūriya was its Versailles—in November, 972, and making a leisurely progress, by way of Kābīs, Tripolis, Aġdābiya, and Barka, reached Alexandria in the following May. Here the caliph received a deputation, consisting of the kādi of Fustāṭ and other eminent persons, whom he moved to tears by his eloquent and virtuous discourse. A month later he was encamped in the gardens of the monastery near G‘iza, where he was reverently welcomed by his
devoted servant, G'awhar, content to efface himself in his master's shadow.\footnote{G'awhar appears to have taken no conspicuous part in the government or campaigns after the arrival of Mo'izz, and in Oct., 974, he was deprived of all his appointments. No quarrel is recorded, but Mo'izz probably felt that even perfect loyalty may not always counterbalance a dangerous popularity. We hear of the great ḫā'īd (general) again in the next reign.} 

The entry of the new caliph into his new capital was a solemn spectacle. With him were all his sons and brothers and kinsfolk, and before him were borne the coffins of his ancestors. Fustāṭ was illuminated and decked for his reception; but Mo'izz would not enter the old capital of the usurping caliphs. He crossed from Rōda by G'awhar's new bridge, and proceeded direct to the palace-city of Cairo. Here he threw himself on his face and gave thanks to God.

There was yet an ordeal to be gone through before he could regard himself as safe. Egypt was the home of many undoubted sherīfs or descendants of 'Alī, and these, headed by a representative of the distinguished Ṭabāṭabā family, came boldly to examine his credentials. Mo'izz must prove his title to the holy Imāmate inherited from 'Alī, to the satisfaction of these experts in genealogy. According to the story, the caliph called a great assembly of the people, and invited the sherīfs to appear: then half drawing his sword, he said, “Here is my pedigree,” and scattering gold among the spectators, added, “and there is my proof.” It was perhaps the best argument he could produce. The sherīfs could only protest their entire satisfaction at this convincing evidence; and it is at any rate certain that, whatever they thought of the caliph's claim, they did not contest it. The capital was placarded with his name and the praises of 'Alī, and Mo'izz was acclaimed by the people, who flocked to his first public audience. Among the presents offered him, that of G'awhar was especially splendid, and its costliness prepares one for the coming records of the colossal wealth of the Fāṭimidūs. It included 500 horses with saddles and bridles encrusted with gold, amber, and precious stones;
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tents of silk and cloth of gold, borne on Bactrian
camels; dromedaries, mules, and camels of burden;
filigree coffers full of gold and silver vessels; gold-
mounted swords; caskets of chased silver containing
precious stones; a turban set with jewels, and 900
boxes filled with samples of all the goods that Egypt
produced.

On the day of the 'Īd, or festival after the fast (the 973
Turkish Bairam), the caliph himself performed the prayers
at the head of the congregation of the people, and then
delivered the khutba from the pulpit. He valued him-
self on his sacerdotal talents, and his unction on this
occasion touched all hearts. When the ceremony was
over, Mo'izz returned to the palace at the head of his
troops, escorted by his four sons in armour, preceded by
two elephants, and gave a banquet to his guests. This
palace, almost a city, the nucleus of the modern Cairo,
was built, as we have seen, at some little distance from
the old capital Fustat, and, though sometimes called
el-Medina, 'the city,' was really an immense royal castle,
reserved exclusively for the use of the caliph and his
multitudinous harem and household, his guard, his choice
regiments, and his government officers. The broad
enclosure of the castle was forbidden ground to the
public, and even ambassadors from foreign powers—the
eastern emperor had sent envoys to G'awhar and also to
Mo'izz—were required to dismount outside and were led
into the presence between guards in the same manner as
at the Byzantine and Ottoman courts. "The chief
buildings were the Great East Palace (or Palace of
Mo'izz), the caliph's personal residence, where he kept
his women, children, slaves, eunuchs, and servants, esti-
mated at from eighteen to thirty thousand in number;
and the Lesser West Palace, or pleasure-house, which
opened on the spacious garden of Kāfur, where a meydān
or hippodrome provided exercise for the court.
The two were separated by the square called 'Betwixt
the Palaces' (Beyn-el-Kaşreyn), where as many as ten
thousand troops could parade; the name is still preserved
in part of the Sūk-en-Nahhāsin or Coppersmiths' Market.
An underground passage connected the two palaces, by which the caliph could pass without violating that mysterious seclusion which was part of his sacred character. Hard by were the mausoleum where lay the bones of his Fāṭimid ancestors, brought from far Ḍayrawān, and the mosque, ḍel-ʿAzhar, where the caliph was wont to lead the Friday prayers as Prince and Precentor of the Faithful.

"Of the size and splendour of the Great Palace the Arabichistorians speak with bated breath. We read of four thousand chambers;—of the Golden Gate which opened to the Golden Hall, a gorgeous pavilion where the caliph, seated on his golden throne, surrounded by his chamberlains and gentlemen in waiting (generally Greeks or Südānis), surveyed from behind a screen of golden filigree the festivals of Islām;—of the Emerald Hall with its beautiful pillars of marble;—the Great Divan, where he sat on Mondays and Thursdays at a window beneath a cupola;—and the Porch where he listened every evening while the oppressed and
wronged came below and cried the *credo* of the Shi‘a till he heard their griefs and gave redress."

This description applies to the Fāṭimid Palace of later times, but it is true in the main of the Kāhira of Mo‘izz. The buildings had all been planned by himself, to the smallest detail, and G‘awhar had laboured for more than three years to realize his sovereign’s designs. The profusion of wealth and costly magnificence of the court may be gathered from many indications. One of the daughters of Mo‘izz left at her death five sacks of emeralds and a prodigious amount of precious stones of all sorts, 3,000 chased and inlaid silver vessels, 30,000 pieces of Sicilian embroidery, and 90 basins and ewers of pure crystal: forty pounds of wax were used in sealing her rooms and chests. Another daughter died worth 2,700,000 *D.*, and left 12,000 different dresses. His wife built a mosque in the Kerāfa, and lavished large sums on its decoration: a Persian architect designed it, and artists from Baṣra painted the ceilings and walls. Mo‘izz himself commanded a piece of silk to be made at Tustar in Persia, representing in gold and colours a map of the world, which cost him 22,000 *D.* If the Fāṭimid heresy discouraged learning and literature, it stimulated art; and the prejudice against the representation of living things, which cramped orthodox painters, did not influence the work of the schismatics, who readily adopted Persian ideas. The Fāṭimid wezir el-Yāzuri (see p. 142) pitted two painters of ‘Irāk against each other: one, el-Kasir, painted a dancing-girl in white dress, who seemed to retreat within a black arch, and his rival Ibn-‘Azīz made his girl in crimson appear to come out of the yellow arch behind her. Such a design would not have been tolerated by an ‘Abbāsid caliph. There is no doubt that great artistic activity prevailed under the Fāṭimid rule, which was developed in Sicily as well as in Egypt. The famous Bayeux ivory casket, with its chased silver inlay repres-

1 Lane-Poole, *Life of Saladin*, 112-114.
senting parrots and other birds, has a Fātimid inscription, and an ivory box dated 970, in the Victoria and Albert Museum, is probably due to their workmen. A rock crystal vase in the treasury of St. Mark at Venice bears the name of el-ʿAzīz, the son of Moʿizz. Pottery, with metallic lustre, and glass, were worked, and the looms of Egypt were renowned. Alexandria and Cairo manufactured silks so fine that a whole robe could be passed through a finger ring; ʿAsyūt was famous for its woollen turban cloth, Behesa for white woollens, Debik for silks, Damietta, of course, for dimity; and at Tinnis, where the products of the royal factory were wholly reserved for the Fātimid household, they made besides cambric the beautiful iridescent stuff called Būkalamūn, or “chameleon,” used for royal saddle cloths and litters. Besides native manufactures, the artistic work of Persia, Asia Minor, and Sicily was in high demand in Cairo. Moʿizz, however, was no sybarite, and he combined with a love of beautiful things a watchful alertness to the preservation and development of his power. He had inherited a fleet in Sicily, which raided the coast of Spain in 955 and brought away booty and prisoners. The caliph of Cordova, the great Nāṣir, retorted by sending his ships to Tunis, where they had burnt a small port near Bona and ravaged the Barbary coast. The possession of the Egyptian harbours led to larger naval plans. A dock was built at Makhs, the predecessor of Būlāk as port of Cairo, and six hundred ships were built there—the largest fleet Egypt had seen since the Arab conquest. The army was carefully maintained in a high state of efficiency, nor did the caliph neglect any means to win the esteem of his new subjects. His tribunals were renowned for equity, he took a personal interest in all details of administration, proclaimed the height of the inundation as registered in the Nilometers, presided over the cutting of the Cairo kulaīg or canal, and delighted the people by the splendid gold-embroidered silk covering (shemsiya) which he

1 See below, p. 121, note.
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prepared for the Ka'ba at Mekka, and which all the world was admitted to see on the Feast of Sacrifice. It was four times as big as any cover ordered by the 'Abbāsids, or even by Kāfūr. Evidently, the people thought, this caliph was a model of magnificent piety.

Meanwhile the threatened invasion of the Karmāṭīs still lingered. They had made an attempt upon Tinnīs, which failed, but no further movements had taken place. Mo'izz endeavoured to negotiate with their chief, but in reply to a conciliatory epistle Hasan merely wrote:—

"From Hasan b. Aḥmad el-A'sam. I have received thy letter, full of words, but empty of sense. I will bring my answer." He was as good as his word, and in the spring of 974 the Karmāṭīs appeared again at 974 Heliopolis, and then, joined by partisans of the Ikhshīdīds and by rival 'Alīds, spread over all parts of Egypt in a wave of devastation. Mo'izz was prepared for them, but his forces were unequal to the defence. His son 'Abdallāh with 4,000 men had some successful engagements with scattered bodies of the enemy in the delta, but could not prevent the main body closing upon Cairo, where they drove the defenders over the trench into "the city." Pent up within the walls, the caliph's troops were unable to make head against the Arabs, until Mo'izz contrived to bribe the chief of the Benū-Tayy, the strongest ally of the Karmāṭīs, with 100,000 D. manufactured for the purpose of lead, gilt, since there was not enough gold in the treasury. The treacherous Bedawī deserted his leader in the next battle; Hasan was forced to fly, his camp was taken and plundered, and 1500 of his camp followers were massacred. Ten thousand men were soon despatched into Syria, where the Karmāṭīs were fortunately weakened by the jealousies of their two leaders, one of whom delivered the other into the hands of the Fātimid, who put him and his son in wooden cages and sent them to Egypt. The Karmāṭī plague was stayed, but Damascus was a prey to faction and disorder for some years. The eunuch Rayān, who had conquered Tripolis from the Romans for Mo'izz, and 975 was now sent to Damascus, was unable to hold the city
against the Turkish emir Aftegin, who restored the name of the 'Abbāsid caliph, and gave the Syrian capital and the surrounding province some measure of peace and good government. Meanwhile another eunuch had taken Beyrūt with the Fāṭimid troops, and this loss brought Tzimisce to Syria. Aftegin at once paid him homage and made a treaty; but Ṣayān sallied out of Tripolis and administered a crushing defeat, and the Roman retreated.

The news of this victory and the tidings that his name was again recited in the prayers at Mekka and Medina lightened the last days of the caliph Mo‘izz, who died about Christmas, 975, in his forty-sixth year. His two years’ residence at Cairo had been marked by many reforms. He had appointed the Jew Ibn-Killis and ‘Aslug as general land administrators, and abolished at one stroke the petty powers and profits of the collectors and farmers of the taxes. These two officers sat daily in the office of the emirate, adjoining the mosque of Ibn-Ṭūlūn, fixing the tithes and assessments of lands, and superintending the taxes, customs, tithes, poll-tax, waḵfs, and all branches of revenue; calling up arrears, and examining scrupulously all complaints and demands. The result was a large increase in revenue. All taxes had to be paid in the current Fāṭimid coinage, and the Mo‘izzī dinār, reckoned at 15½ dirhems, completely ousted the ‘Abbāsid dinār of the Ikhshidids, to the considerable loss of the inhabitants. The taxes moreover were collected rigorously, for Mo‘izz was eager to recover the immense sum he had spent on the conquest of Egypt, which so far had not answered his expectations of a gold-mine. Nevertheless, in a single day the taxes at Fustāṭ amounted to 50,000 D., and sometimes as much as 120,000 D.; and once Tinnis, Damietta, and Ushmuneyn contributed 200,000 D. in a day.

In his brief management of his mixed subjects in Egypt Mo‘izz displayed judgment and justice. He forbade his

1 His eldest son ‘Abdallah predeceased him by about a year, but three sons, Nizār, Temim, and ‘Okeyl, with seven daughters, survived.
African troops to interfere with the residents in the capital, and settled them at el-Khandak, near Heliopolis, to prevent broils. They could not be kept out of Fustat by day, but every evening a crier went round to warn them to leave the city before dark. To the Copts Mo'izz was not ill-disposed, and one of them was appointed to the head of the customs, first in Egypt and afterwards in Palestine, and was held in high favour by the caliph. Indeed the only sectarian trouble he had was of his own importing. The Shi'a were naturally much set up by the Fatimid successes, and they celebrated the martyrdom of Hoseyn on the 10th of Moharram—a day dreaded by the police even now in Bombay—with unwonted publicity at Cairo in 973, visited the tombs of the lady Nefisa and Kulthum, of the holy family, in vast crowds, and insulted the Sunni shop-people in the exuberance of their zeal. Street fights were prevented by the timely closing of the gates which separated the various quarters. The incident shows that the Shi'a revolution was still resented by a considerable section of the population, and we shall see that even two centuries later the restoration of orthodoxy was effected with surprising unanimity.
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CHAPTER V

THE FĀTIMID CALIPHS


Monuments.—Mosques, el-Azhar (970—2), Ḥākim (990—1003), and G’uyūshī (1085); second wall of Cairo (1087), and three gates of Naṣr, Futūḥ (1087), and Zawila (1091); mosques, el-Āḵmar (1125), el-Fakahānī (1148, but restored), es-Ṣāliḥ ibn Ruzzik (1160).


Coins.—Mints, in Egypt: Miṣr (Fusṭāṭ), el-Kāhira (Cairo, 1003-4, 1114 ff.), Alexandria, Kūs (1123-4); in Africa (Tunisia), el-Manṣūrīya, el-Mahdiya (to 1064); Zawila; Sicily (to 1054); Mekka (976-7), Medina (1061), in Syria, Filestīn (Ramla), Damascus (to 1067), ‘Akka, Ascalon, Tiberias, Tripolis, Tyre, Aleppo (1050—5).

Glass Weights.—These bear the names of all the caliphs, and sometimes dates, and are very numerous (Lane-Poole, Cat. Ar. Wis., Casanova, Coll. Fouquet).

The Fāṭimid rule established in Egypt by Moʿizz subsisted 975 for two centuries by no merits of the rulers nor any devotion of their subjects. Most of the caliphs were absorbed in their own pleasures, and the government devolved on wezirs, who were frequently changed in accordance with their sovereigns’ or the army’s constant demand for more money and the ministers’ success or failure in satisfying it. Most of the wezirs were bent mainly on money-getting. No great ideas, no ambitious schemes found a place in their policy. The empire, which in the days of Moʿizz included the whole of north Africa, Sicily, Syria, and the Ḥiḡāz, soon sank to little
more than Egypt proper. The African provinces, from mere tributary connexion, passed in 1046 to frank independence, and reverted to their old allegiance (however nominal) to the caliphs of Baghdad. Syria was always loosely held, and was the scene of frequent rebellions and civil wars.\(^1\) In Arabia alone the Fāṭimid s acquired an increased influence, not by any effort of their own, but by the Shi'a propaganda which went on independently of their leading. In Egypt itself their power rested upon no equitable basis, nor upon any general adhesion to the Shi'a doctrines or their disputed pedigree, which was repeatedly refuted by Shi'a and Sunni theologians;\(^2\) their throne was founded upon fear, and subsisted by the terror of their foreign legions. The Berber troops, constantly recruited from their birthplace in the west, the Turkish mercenaries, renewed by purchase or volunteering from the east, the bloody and sensual Sudānis from the south, these were the bulwarks of the Egyptian caliphate and the sole cause of its longevity. Yet even in face of such a military tyranny, it may be questioned whether any people but the patient Egyptians would have submitted so long to an intolerable yoke.

The beginning, it is true, of this long oppression gave no promise of its coming burden. El-'Azīz,\(^3\) the son of Moʿizz (975—996), who succeeded his father in Decem-

\(^1\) The vicissitudes of the Fāṭimid rule in Syria are reserved for the next chapter.

\(^2\) There were at least three formal repudiations of their pretended descent from the Prophet, drawn up at Baghdad, signed by celebrated doctors of the law of all schools, and circulated in Syria, and even communicated to the Fāṭimid caliphs themselves.

\(^3\) Full name and title: el-Imām Nizār Abū-Mansūr el-‘Azīz bi-l-lāh ("the mighty through God") emir-el-muʿminin (commander of the faithful). His coins were issued at Misr (Fustāt) A.H. 365 (976)—386 (996); Filestīn (Ramla) 364—383; el-Mahdiyya, 370—384, and el-Mansūriyya, in Africa, 367—386; Sicily, 366—377; Tripoli, in Syria, 374, and Mekka. 366. The Misr coinage is continuous every year, but the coinage at the other mints seems to have been issued at irregular intervals when required. The same remark applies to later Fāṭimid issues. The coinage that has come down to us is almost entirely of gold, but the silver currency, though nearly destroyed, must have been very large.
ber, 975, but was not formally proclaimed till the Feast of Sacrifice in August, 976, was an excellent ruler. Big, brave, and comely in person—though with reddish hair and blue eyes, always feared by Arabs—a bold hunter and a fearless general, he was of a humane and conciliatory disposition, loth to take offence, and averse from bloodshed. The tendency of the Fātimid creed (or policy) was towards toleration or indifference in regard to religion and race; but in the case of ‘Aziz a special influence was exerted by a Christian wife, the mother, strange to say, of the monster Ḥākim. Her two brothers were appointed Melekite patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, by the caliph’s express though irregular command, and the Christians never enjoyed so much toleration as under his rule. The Coptic patriarch Ephraim stood in high favour at his court, and obtained leave to rebuild the ruined church of Abū-s-Šeyfeyn (St. Mercurius) outside Fustat, and the opposition of the Muslims, who had turned it into a sugar warehouse, was summarily suppressed by the caliph.1 With the catholicity or speculative curiosity characteristic of the Fātimids, ‘Aziz encouraged Severus, the bishop of Ushmuineyn, to discuss points of doctrine with the Muslim divines, such as the famous kāli Ibn-en-No‘mān, president of the prayers and director of the mint and of weights and measures for fourteen years; and the caliph even refused to persecute a Muslim who turned Christian, though apostasy was punishable by death. His generosity extended to his enemies; he knew how to respect a brave man, and when the gallant Turkish

---

1 Abū-Ṣāliḥ, ff. 34b—36.
leader Aftegin, who had raised all Syria against him and even out-generalled the veteran G'awhar, was betrayed into his hands, the caliph gave him a high post at court and loaded him with rewards for his valour in the field.

For the first fifteen years of his reign the caliph's chief minister or vezir was the converted Jew, Ibn-Killis, who had served Mu'izz well and became the right hand of his son. It was largely due to this man's prudent statesmanship that Egypt enjoyed a long period of perfect tranquillity, and that the treasury overflowed with wealth. Another high official, who also became vezir for the last two years of the reign, was the Christian Isā b. Nestorius; and a Jew, Manasseh, was at one time chief secretary in Syria. These appointments naturally gave offence to the Muslims, who found themselves in the odd situation of being worse off under a Mohammedan sovereign than were the "infidels." Poets wrote sarcastic verses, and remonstrances were thrust into the caliph's hands as he rode through the streets. He attempted to pacify his too zealous subjects by removing the obnoxious officials from their posts; but in the case of Ibn-Nestorius, at least, harim influence was too strong, and the caliph's beloved and capable daughter, the Princess Royal (Seyyidet-el-mulk), obtained the Christian's restitution. In truth, 'Aziz could not do without the help of these able servants, who were evidently superior to their Muslim colleagues in business capacity. When Ibn-Killis was thrown into prison for poisoning, out of mere jealousy, the Turkish favourite Aftegin, his master missed his counsels so much that in forty days he was restored to office. A similar degradation of the same vezir in the following year (983) was followed by an almost equally speedy restoration. Firm and just administration, backed by a powerful army, no doubt reconciled the Muslim population in some degree to what they regarded as an unnatural preference; but their dissatisfaction was always ready to break into active hostility on provocation. During the war with the emperor Basil in 996, for which 'Aziz had built a fine fleet of 600 sail, eleven of his largest vessels lying in the harbour of Makṣ on the
Nile (then the port of Cairo), were set on fire, and the sailors and mob, ascribing the disaster to the Greek inhabitants of the neighbourhood, massacred many of them, plundered their goods, and played ball with their heads. Order was promptly restored, however, and in three months the energy of Ibn-Nestorius produced six new vessels of the first class.\footnote{Nāšir-i-Khusrau, who in 1046 saw seven of the galleys of Mo'izz drawn up on the bank of the Nile, where they had been beached on the conquest three-quarters of a century before, says that they measured 150 cubits long by 60 in the beam (Safar Nāma, ed. Schefer, 126). This would probably represent about 275 ft. by 110 ft.}

Able as these ministers were, they shared with their master an inordinate love of wealth and luxury. Ibn-Killis, who died in 991, enjoyed a salary of 100,000 D.\footnote{Nāšir-i-Khusrau, who in 1046 saw seven of the galleys of Mo'izz drawn up on the bank of the Nile, where they had been beached on the conquest three-quarters of a century before, says that they measured 150 cubits long by 60 in the beam (Safar Nāma, ed. Schefer, 126). This would probably represent about 275 ft. by 110 ft.} and left a princely fortune in lands, houses, shops, slaves, horses, furniture, robes, and jewels, valued at four million dinārs, besides his daughter's dowry of 200,000 D. He kept 800 ḫarīm women, besides servants, and his bodyguard consisted of 4000 young men, white and black. His house, the "Palace of the Wezīrs" was fortified and isolated like a castle. His choice carrier pigeons outstripped the caliph's own. 'Aziz himself attended his funeral (which was as sumptuous as his daily life), and supplied the embalming materials, camphor and musk, and rosewater, and fifty gorgeous robes for the shrouding of the corpse. Mounted on a mule, and rejecting the usual parasol of state, the caliph rode slowly to the house of his faithful counsellor, and standing before the bier, weeping, said the prayers for the dead, and with his own hand set the stone to the entrance of the tomb. For three days he kept no table and received no guests. Eighteen days the offices of government remained closed, and no business was done. For a month the grave was a place of pilgrimage, where poets recited the virtues of the departed, at the caliph's expense, and a legion of Korān-readers chanted the sacred book day and night. Slave girls stood beside with silver cups and spoons to minister creature comforts of wine and sweetmeats to the crowd of mourning or interested visitors. The
caliph freed all the mamlûks of the deceased wezîr, paid his outstanding debts, and arranged for the salaries and maintenance of his vast household. In contrast to this display, when a year later the great general G’awhar died, in the comparative obscurity of his later years, one reads only of a present of 5,000 D. from the caliph to his family in token of regard.

‘Azîz himself set the example of luxury which makes the records of Fâtimid wealth almost incredible to those who do not realise the oriental passion for gewgaws. The caliph was a connoisseur in precious stones and articles of virtu.¹ A number of fashionable novelties are ascribed by the historian G’emâl-ed-din of Aleppo² to this reign, such as the heavy gold-embroidered many-coloured turbans, sixty yards long, made of the costly fabrics woven at the royal factories of Debik; robes and coverings of the ‘Attâbî (taby) cloth of Baghâdâd, or the coloured stuffs of Ramla and Tiberias, or Cairo saklâtûn; horse housings set with jewels and scented with ambergris, to cover armour inlaid with gold. The luxury of the person was matched by the luxury of the table. Fish were brought fresh from the sea to Cairo, a thing unknown before; truffles were eagerly sought a few miles from Mukaţtam and sold in the markets in such quantities that from choice dainties they became cheap and common. The love of rarities brought strange animals and birds to Cairo; female elephants, which the Nubians had carefully reserved, were at length introduced for breeding, and a stuffed rhinoceros delighted the astonished crowd. These novelties were secured at a cost which made heavy demands on the treasury, and could be met only by rigorous financial control. ‘Aziz kept a tight hand over his exchequer, and strictly forbade all bribes and presents; nothing could be paid without a written order. The money was not all spent upon luxuries, however. His reign saw many archi-

¹ A crystal vase in the treasure of St. Mark at Venice is said to bear the name of el-‘Azîz; cp. the St. Denis vase in the Louvre, and see Lane-Poole, Art of the Saracens, 163, Maḵrîzî, i. 409 ff., etc.
² Extract in Wüstensfeld, 162-4.
tectural and engineering triumphs at Cairo, such as the Golden Palace, the Pearl Pavilion, his mother's mosque in the Kerāfa cemetery, the foundation in 991 of the great mosque known as el-Ḥākim's (then outside the Bāb-en-Naṣr), some important canals, bridges, and naval docks. 'Aziz was a man of orderly mind, and introduced many reforms in ceremonies and management. He was the first to make processions in state every Friday in Ramaḍān, the month of fasting, and to perform the prescribed service in the presence of the people as their high-priest; the first to give fixed salaries to his servants and retainers, and to supervise their liveries; the first of his family to adopt the disastrous policy of importing and favouring Turkish troops. With all his shrewdness and no inconsiderable culture, and a turn for poetry, he fancied himself a soothsayer—indeed, it was part of the Fāṭimid pretension to know the unknown—and exposed himself to some ridicule on this score. He once went out of his way to satirize the Omayyad caliph of Cordova in an insulting letter, but received the crushing retort: "You ridicule us because you have heard of us: if we had ever heard of you, we should reply." Nevertheless 'Aziz was the wisest and most beneficent of all the Fāṭimid caliphs of Egypt. The unbroken rest which the country enjoyed is his best witness; and though Africa was loosening its ties to Egypt, and Syria was only held down by force of arms, the name of 'Aziz was prayed for in the mosques from the Atlantic to the Red Sea, in the Yemen, in the sanctuary of Mekka,¹ and once (992) even in the pulpit of Mōṣīl. A complication of agonizing disorders carried off this great ruler at Bilbeys, October 996, after a touching interview ² with his little son, in happy ignorance, despite his prophetic fancy, of the evil which the boy would work in the kingdom his father had so carefully nursed.

El-Ḥākim,³ (996—1021), the only son of this prudent

1 A coin of a.h. 366 (976-7) struck at Mekka bears the name of 'Aziz (B.M. Cat., iv., p. ix.).
2 See Ibn-Khallikān, iii. 529.
3 El-Maṣūr Abū-'Alī el-Ḥākim bi-amr-il-lāh ("ruling by God's
father and Christian mother, was but eleven years old when 'Aziz fell dead in his bath at Bilbeys. The emir Barghāwān fetched him out of a fig-tree, and hastily setting the jewelled turban on his head, brought him forth to the people, who kissed the ground before their new Imām. Next day, lance in hand, and sword hanging from the shoulder, the little boy followed the camel that bore his father's remains back to Cairo; and the day after he was solemnly enthroned in the great palace in the presence of the whole Court, marshalled in order of rank. For the first few years he was naturally kept in a state of tutelage. His governor (ustād), appointed by 'Aziz, was the Slav eunuch Barghāwān, whose name is still commemorated in one of the streets of Cairo; the Maghrābī (Berber) Ibn-'Ammār was given the command of the troops, with the title of "intermediary" (el-Wāsit) and the surname Amin-ed-dawla ("warden of the realm"); whilst the Christian Ibn-Nestorius continued to control the finances until his summary execution. The Berber general was practically regent, and used his power to promote the interests of his own tribe, the Kitāma, and to subordinate the Turkish party command "). His coins were struck at Miṣr, el-Manṣūriya, el-Mahdiya, Zawila (once), Sicily, Damascus, Fīlṣṭīn (Ramla), Tyre (once), Tripoli (once), and once at Cairo with the epithet "guarded" (el-Ḫāhira el-Maḥrīsa). The glass weights (for testing dinārs and dirhems, and their fractions and multiples) bearing el-Ḫākīm's name, and sometimes a date, are numerous.

1 He was the first Maghrābī to receive an honorific surname in Egypt. The practice of inventing special designations and titles for wezirs, popular with this pompous dynasty, dates from this time. Examples are the title of "Generalissimo" (Kāid el-Ḵuwwād), given to Barghāwān's successor el-Ḥoseyn, the son of G'awhar; Šāliḥ of Rūdhār was styled Thīḥat thīḥāt es-seyf wa-l-kalam, "trusty of the trusty of the pen and the sword"; Ibn-'Aḥdūn, el-Kāfī, "the efficient"; Zura', the son of Ibn-Nestorius, esh-Shāfī, "the salutary"; el-Ḥoseyn b. Tāḥir, Amin el-Umanā, "faithful of the faithful"; 'Alī b. G'aßer el-Fellāhī, Dhūl-Riyāṣateyn, "he of the two departments," etc. From 1137, the wezirs of the Fāṭimidīs took the title of melik, "king."
imported by 'Azīz. The Berbers accordingly waxed insolent, plundered and ill-treated the Egyptians, and fought the Turkish soldiery in the streets. It became a struggle between east and west, and the east won. The Kitāma were beaten and disgraced; Ibn-'Ammār was deprived of his office; the Turks sacked his palace, and when he ventured to come to court, they cut him down and presented his head to the delighted young caliph.

Bargawan, who had hitherto lived quietly in the palace, protecting his ward, now became regent, and intoxicated by sudden power and riches abandoned himself entirely to pleasure. He passed his time agreeably in the society of singers, listening to the music he loved, in the Pearl Palace which 'Azīz had built near the bridge-gate, overlooking the beautiful gardens of Kāfūr on the one hand, and on the other commanding a view over the canal to the Nile and the pyramids. Immersed in pleasure he lost all count of power. Ḥākim, left without control, began to assert himself and despise his governor, who, tutor-like, had called his pupil names. Very soon the boy began his career of bloodshed by having Bargawan assassinated. The people, shocked at the death of the popular chief, crowded threateningly to the palace; but the caliph put them off with lies and appealed to them to support him in his helpless youthfulness. The mob dispersed, and a dangerous crisis was over. It was a lesson in deportment that Ḥākim did not forget.

As the young caliph came more before the public, the eccentricities of his character began to appear. His strange face, with its terrible blue eyes, made people shrink; his big voice made them tremble. His tutor had called him "a lizard," and he had a creepy slippery way of gliding among his subjects that explained the nickname. He had a passion for darkness, would summon his council to meet at night, and would ride about the streets on his grey ass night after night, spying into the ways and opinions of the people under pretence of inspecting the market weights and measures. Night was turned into day by his command. All business and
catering was ordered to take place after sunset. The shops had to be opened and the houses illuminated to serve his whim, and when the poor people overdid the thing and began to frolic in the unwonted hours, repressive orders were issued; women forbidden to leave their homes, and men to sit in the booths. Shoemakers were ordered to make no outdoor boots for women, so that they might not have the wherewithal to stir abroad, and the ladies of Cairo were not only enjoined on no account to allow themselves to be seen at the lattice-windows, but might not even take the air on the flat roofs of their houses. Stringent regulations were issued about food and drink. Ĥākim was a zealous abstainer, as all Muslims are expected to be. Beer was forbidden, wine was confiscated, vines cut down, even dried raisins were contraband; malûkhiya (Jews' mallow) was not to be eaten, and honey was seized and poured into the Nile. Games, such as the Egyptian chess, were prohibited, and the chessboards burnt. Dogs were to be killed wherever found in the streets, but the finest cattle could not be slaughtered save at the Feast of Sacrifice. Those who ventured to disobey these decrees were scourged and beheaded, or put to death by some of the novel forms of torture which the ingenious caliph delighted in inventing. A good many of these novel regulations were no doubt inspired by a genuine reforming spirit, but it was the spirit of a mad reformer. The lively ladies of Cairo have always needed a tight hand over them, but who could expect to restrain a woman by confiscating her boots? The prohibition of intoxicating liquors, gambling, and public amusements, was in keeping with the character of a sour and bitter Puritan, and were doubtless intended as much to improve the morals as to vex the souls of his subjects. But the nightly wanderings, the needless restrictions and harassing regulations concerning immaterial details, were signs of an unbalanced mind. Ĥākim may have meant well according to his lights, but his lights were strangely prismatic.

During the first ten years of the reign the Christians and Jews enjoyed the immunity and even privileges
which they had obtained under the tolerant rule of 'Aziz; but as time went on they came in for their share of irrational persecution. In public they were forced to wear black robes by way of livery; and in the baths, where one man without clothes is very like another, the naked Christians were compelled to distinguish themselves by wearing large and heavy crosses, while the Jews had to wear bells, or in the streets display a wooden image of a calf, in pleasing allusion to a discreditable episode in their early history. Next, a general order was issued for the destruction of all the Christian churches in Egypt, and the confiscation of their lands and property; the work of demolition went on for at least five years (1007—12). The Christians were offered the choice of becoming Muslims, or leaving the country, or else wearing a heavy cross as a badge of their degradation. Many Christians, especially among the peasantry, to escape persecution, accepted the Muslim religion; and the office where the declarations of conversion were received on two days in the week was besieged with applications, insomuch that some of these eager proselytes were trampled to death in the crush. Such as remained true to their faith were subjected to various humiliations, and forbidden to ride horses, to keep Muslim servants, to be rowed by Muslim boatmen, or to purchase slaves.\footnote{The caliph was said to have been excited against the Christians by a monk in revenge for the patriarch's refusal of a bishopric. See Renaudot, Hist. Patr., 388.}

\footnote{Some of these restrictions were scarcely oppressive. The Christians seem to have voluntarily adopted the black dress two centuries before (Abû-Sâlih, 524), and riding horses had become the mark of the soldier. Ḥākim himself rode an ass. The purchase of slaves by Christians can only mean the purchase of Christian slaves.}
The penalties inflicted upon Christians, however, were more a part of a general contempt of mankind than a sign of special dislike to one section. Whilst these very orders were being issued, Christians were still appointed to the highest offices, in virtue, no doubt, of their superior fiscal capacity. Ibn-'Abdūn, the wezir who had to sign the decree for the demolition of the Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem, was a Christian; and his successor was another Christian, "the Trusty" Zur'a, the son of the aged ex-wezir Ibn-Nestorius, who died in 1012. It is true their "path of glory led but to the grave." Ḥākim's wezirs, whether Christian or Muslim, were murdered with scrupulous impartiality. Fahd, a Muslim prime-minister, was made away with in 1003, and his successor was executed a month later; Ibn-'Abdūn was killed in 1010, and in the same year the generalissimo Hoseyn, the son of G'awhar, after being degraded and obliged to fly, then restored to office and apparent favour, was foully murdered in the palace by his treacherous sovereign, after every assurance of protection. Officials were tortured and killed like flies; arms were hacked off, tongues cut out, every kind of barbarity inflicted. A special department of government, the ḏiwān mufrīd, was established for the management of the confiscated property of murdered and disgraced officials.

The deadly freaks of the caliph were most acutely felt at Cairo, but his fantastic orders ran throughout his dominions, and all Egypt suffered. Three years of low Niles increased the distress, and were taken as God's judgment for the wickedness of the times. It was no wonder that an adventurer was able to raise the country and defy the Fāṭimid armies for two years. A member of the royal Omayyad family, flying from Spain, set himself up as caliph, and winning the adhesion of the Benū-ʿKurra Arabs and of the Kitāma Berbers, who had never forgiven their humiliation at the hands of the Turks in Cairo, obtained possession of Barka, defeated the Fāṭimid troops sent against him, and over-
ran Egypt. Abū- Raḵwa,¹ “the father of the leather bottle,” as he was called, from the waterskin he carried after the manner of the dervishes, worsted the caliph’s army again at Gīza, and camping beside the pyramids kept Cairo in a fever of alarm. When at last he was crushed in a bloody battle, and captured in Nubia, his head and 30,000 skulls of his followers were sent in procession through all the towns of Syria on the backs of a hundred camels, and then thrown into the Euphrates. The general Faḍl, who had rid the caliph of this rival, reaped an ill reward for his service. He had the misfortune to enter the royal presence when Ḥākim was busily engaged in cutting up the body of a beautiful little child whom he had just murdered with his own knife. El-Faḍl could not restrain his horror, but he knew the consequences: he went straight home, made his will, and admitted the caliph’s headsmen an hour later. He had seen too much.

With all his frantic savagery, Ḥākim had gleams of intelligence and certainly of piety; and his reign was not altogether wanting in religious and public works. His most famous monument is the mosque that still bears his name, close to the north gate or Bāb-en-Naṣr. Begun by his father in 991, it was completed in 1003, except the heightening of the minaret. He also built the Rāshida mosque, and often prayed there on Fridays; and at Maḵṣ he founded both a mosque for the next world and a belvedere for this, near the river bank.

¹ His adopted titles were eth-Thāʾir bi-amri-llāh and el-Muntaṣir min-aʿdāʾi-llāh, both favourites with Shiʿa pretenders, but strange in an Ommayyad.
His most original foundation, however, was the "Hall of Science" (Dār-el-ʿIlm, or Dār-el-Ḥikma), erected in 991-1003 chiefly for the propagation of Shiʿa theology and every sort of heterodoxy, but also for the promotion of learning in general—astronomy, lexicology, grammar, poetry, criticism, law, and medicine. It was a luxuriously fitted establishment, with a magnificent library, largely supplied from the royal palaces, open to everyone, and supplied...
with all necessaries of study. All the men of learning of Cairo and many visitors from afar used to meet there, and once they were invited in a body to the palace, and to their surprise returned clothed with robes of honour instead of losing their heads.

Even in his buildings, however, there was something fantastic and suspicious. When he set up a great barn on the Muṣṭṭām hills, and filled it with firewood, the people were convinced that he meditated a general holocaust on a gigantic pyre, and an official proclamation barely reassured them. The desert slopes of Muṣṭṭām were his favourite haunt. There he had his observatory (another in the Kerāfā was never finished), where he pursued the astrological calculations which he sternly forbade to his subjects. Hither he would ride on his grey ass before break of day, dressed in the extreme simplicity which he substituted for the pomp and splendour of his ancestors, attired in a plain robe of one colour, without a jewel even in his turban, and attended by a groom or two, or often quite alone. It must be admitted that he had courage. When he had roused hatred on all sides, killed whole families on suspicion, and exasperated every passion of vengeance, he still rode out, scarcely attended, in the deserts or in the crowded streets, by day and by night, indulging in fresh fancies or prying into the ways of his subjects, too often with bloody consequences. Only his deadly ferocity, and a sense of mysterious awe, saved him from the hourly risks of assassination. Not an attempt was made upon him for a quarter of a century. It is true he had an omnipresent secret police, including women spies, who served him well in the ḫarims.

1 The sums allowed for the maintenance of the Hall of Science seem small compared with the luxury of the times. The annual grant for paper for copying MSS. was 90 D.; for ink and pens, etc., 12 D.; for repairing books, 12 D.; for cushions and carpets and winter curtains, 19 D.; for water, 12 D.; for salaries of the librarian and servants, 63 D. The total grant was 275 D. (Maqrizi, Khitaṭ, i. 409.) The Hall of Science was closed in 1119 by the vezir Afdal, in consequence of its use by heretical teachers; but a new Hall of Science was built near the great palace, and opened in 1123 by order of his successor, the vezir Ma’mūn.
Matters grew worse as the caliph grew older. Wanton executions and confiscations became more frequent, and other people’s lands were bestowed at random on common soldiers and sailors, or anybody. The folk began to fly the country. The bazars of Fusṭāṭ were closed. All business was at a standstill. For seven years not a woman was seen in the streets. Revolt was in the air. Alexandria was independent under the Kurra Arabs.

At Cairo a female guy was set up in the street, lampoon in hand. The caliph took it as he rode by, and black with fury seized the supposed woman, who proved to be of paper. Thereupon, in one of his ungovernable passions of rage, Ḥākim sent his black troops to burn Fusṭāṭ. The inhabitants ran to arms; there was three days’ fighting in the streets; the mosque was full of shrieking supplicants; half the city was sacked or burnt, and many of its women enslaved. Still the people endured. Then a new mania seized the bemused caliph. He fancied himself the Incarnation of the Godhead, and compelled all men to worship his name. It was the legitimate outcome of extreme Shi’a mysticism, and it found support. One Ḥasan, known as “Slit-nose” (el-Akhram), came from distant Farghāna and preached the divinity of Ḥākim. A man of the people murdered him and was executed, and the Sunnis honoured the murderer’s grave. Then Ḥamza came from Sūsan, in Persia, to propagate the new doctrine, and won many adherents, who adorned themselves with strange titles. Some of these fanatics rode into the old mosque of ʿAmr at Fusṭāṭ and began to preach, their followers applauding and clapping their hands like thunder. The people flocked in to see the sight, but when one of the preachers addressed the kādi “In the Name of el-Ḥākim the Compassionate, the Merciful,” it was too much: a tumult ensued, the people killed the blasphemers, dragged their bodies through the streets, and burnt them.

Never had Ḥākim been so near a revolution. His palace was besieged by the Turkish troops in search of Darāzi, a leader of the new-fangled sect, who had taken
refuge there: but Ḥākim was true to his insolent courage. He told them from a balcony that the man was not there, and afterwards that he was dead; he lied, but he did not give him up. Darāzī escaped to found the Druze religion in the Lebanon. For a time Ḥākim dissembled his rage, but in the seclusion of his palace he was concocting plans of vengeance. After a month or so of ominous reserve, the negro troops were again sent into Fustāt, where the revolt had begun. They went quietly, in separate bands; but once there, they set about plundering and devastating the city, burst into houses and even baths, hauling out the young girls, and committing every atrocity that black blood suggests. The caliph came riding along on his ass, as usual, and to him the desperate folk crowded with piteous entreaty to be saved from the brutal soldiery. He answered never a word.

One result of his assumption of Godhead was the relaxation of many of the prescribed rules of Islam. In his new capacity Ḥākim rescinded the laws of fasting and pilgrimage, since the ordinances of the Korān were to be interpreted allegorically, and he personally abandoned the now superfluous habits of prayer and fasting. It was probably in the same spirit of religious emancipation, as much as to add to the exasperation of his afflicted Muslim subjects, that he rescinded his penalties against Christians, permitted them to resume their religion, and rebuild their churches. Many nominal Muslims thus reverted openly to their real creed, and the churches were restored to more than their former state. On the other hand the Muslims were treated with increased barbarity; nothing was safe from the black troops, and the people prayed in the mosques and cried aloud in vain, for there was none to help them.

At last a stand was made. The Turkish troops and the Kitāma Berbers, finding themselves neglected, made common cause against the black infantry, and in a series of street battles broke their power and restored some degree of order in the distracted city. Ḥākim for once could make no head against the resistance of the
indignant troops. He had raised up, moreover, a powerful enemy within his own household. His only sister, the Princess Royal, a woman of spotless character and great intelligence, had not escaped the madman's rancour. She rebuked him boldly for the horrors of his reign; he retorted by an outrageous slander against her chastity. To save her father's kingdom for her father's grandchild,1 no less than to preserve her purity from an odious ordeal, she abandoned her wretched brother, and joined the rising conspiracy. She entered into negotiations with the Berber chiefs, and the result was soon seen.

On February 13th, 1021, Hákim took his wounted ride towards the Muqatam hills, and rambled about all night. In the morning he dismissed his two grooms, and went on alone into the desert, as he had often done before. Some days later his ass was found, maimed, on the hills; then his coat of seven colours, with dagger marks; his body was never discovered. After four years a man confessed to the murder, “out of zeal for God and Islām”; but a mystery still hung over the vanishing of the mad caliph. People refused to believe that he was really dead. His return was anxiously awaited. Pretenders arose and claimed to be the lost Hákim; and to this day the Druzes in the Lebanon worship the Divine Reason incarnate in his singularly unworthy person, and believe that one day he will come again in majesty and reveal truth and judgment.

The effects of this terrible quarter of a century could not be speedily undone, nor was Hákim’s only son, a boy of sixteen, who was proclaimed caliph with the name of ʿez-Zāhīr 2 (1021-1036), the man for the crisis. His

1 Hákim in 1013 had set aside his only son, the future Zāhīr, and proclaimed as his successor a certain ʿAbd-er-Raḥmān, a great-grandson of el-Mahdī. This person was duly recognized in ḥuṭba and sīkka, prayer and coins, and coins bearing his name, struck at Miṣr, Damascus, and el-Manṣūriya, are found, from 1012 to 1021, with the title “heir of the covenant of the Muslims.” When Zāhīr succeeded his father, ʿAbd-er-Raḥmān absconded.

2 Abū-ʾl-Ḥasan ʿAlī ʿez-Zāhīr li-ʿizāzi-dini-llāh, “the triumphant in strengthening God’s religion.” His coins were issued from the mints
aunt, the Princess Royal (Seyyidet-el-Mulk), managed the affairs of state for four years, but she had to deal with a military oligarchy, and to meet them with their own unhandsome weapons. The Berber leader of the revolt against Ḥākim was treacherously murdered in the palace by her order, and the execution of two vezirs followed. After her death the government fell into the hands of a court clique, who, to preserve their power, banished wiser counselors from the young caliph’s side, and encouraged him in his natural folly and self-indulgence. Once a day the three sheykh’s who formed this cabal visited the royal youth in due form, but all serious affairs of government were arranged without his concurrence. The condition of the people, relieved by the cancelling of all Ḥākim’s obnoxious restrictions, was nevertheless aggravated by a serious failure of the inundation, which entailed great scarcity and high prices. Oxen rose to 50 D. a head, and their slaughter had to be prohibited, to prevent utter extermination. Camels of burden became scarce, and fowls, the common meat of Egypt, were not to be had. People tried to sell their furniture, and could not find purchasers. They sickened and died for want of food, and the stronger turned brigand and plundered the caravans, even of pilgrims; the roads were infested with robbers, and the Syrian rebels invaded the frontier towns. The people crowded before the palace, crying, “Hunger, hunger! O commander of the faithful, it was not thus under your father and grandfather!” The palace itself was so short of food, that when the banquet for the Feast of Sacrifice was spread, the starving slaves swept the table. The

Fig. 28.—Dinār of ez-Zāhir, Misr, 1030.

of Misr, el-Manṣūriya, el-Mahdiya, Zawila (once), Sicily, Fileştin (Ramla), and Tyre, and Alexandria appears for the first time as a Fatimid mint in A.H. 423 (1032). Numerous glass weights, often dated, exist.
treasury was empty, the taxes in arrears. Slaves broke into revolt, and the citizens formed committees of safety, and were permitted to kill them in self-defence. Barricades were thrown up to keep the rebels out. The wezir, el-G’argarâî, was a prisoner in his own house. The situation was critical; but an ample Nile in 1027 restored plenty, and with the relief from famine the disturbances quieted down.

Besides the Syrian war (see ch. vi.), the most notable event of Zâhir’s fifteen years’ reign was a solitary religious persecution in 1025, when all the divines of the Mâlikî school were banished from Egypt. As a rule there was perfect toleration of the Moâemmadian sects, and the Sunnis were not disturbed in the free exercise of their religious rites. A treaty was also made with the Roman Emperor, Constantine VIII., who allowed Zâhir’s name to be prayed for in the mosques in his dominions, and the mosque at Constantinople to be restored, in return for the caliph’s permission to rebuild the Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem.¹ Zâhir himself was completely engrossed in his pleasures and in the training of his mamlûk guard; but his love of music and dancers was combined with a savage cruelty which proved him his father’s son. He once invited all the young girls of the palace to a merry-making. They came in their holiday best, and were led into the mosque, to await the festivities. The doors were then closed and bricked up, and 2660 girls perished of starvation. The history adds that for six months their bodies lay there unburied, and it is a relief to learn that the wretch who planned this wanton barbarity himself died of the plague in June, 1036.

He was followed by his seven year old son Ma‘add (1036—1094), who, at the age of eight months, had been proclaimed heir, and now assumed the caliphate with the name of el-Mustaﬁr.² His reign of sixty lunar

¹ Mâk. i. 355. This arrangement was renewed in 1037-8, when the emperor Michael IV. released 5000 Muslim prisoners and sent architects to Jerusalem. Abû-î-Fidâ, iii. 96.
² Abû-Temîm Ma‘add el-Mustaﬁr bi-llâh, “The seeker of aid from God.” With the exception of five years (four of which, 1070 ff.,
years and four months is probably the longest recorded of any Moḥammadan ruler. For the third time in the history of the Fāṭimids we find a woman’s influence almost supreme. The Christian wife of ʿAzīz, the political sister of Ḥākim, were followed by the black mother of Maʿadd. She was a Südānī slave, bought of a Jew of Tustar, and she and Abū-Saʿīd, her Hebrew vendor, enjoyed most of the power during the caliph’s childhood. By their exertions the new wezir who succeeded G’argarāi (+1044) was 1044 deposed and executed, and Ṣadaḵa, a renegade Jew, appointed in his place. The renegade, however, finding Abū-Saʿīd’s interference intolerable, turned upon his patron and had him murdered by the Turkish guard. In revenge, the wālīda (dowager, or caliph’s mother) had the wezir assassinated. The next minister sought to balance the overweening power of the Turks by importing negro troops, but he too was deposed, and his successor held office for only three months. Then, in 1050, el-Yāzūrī entered upon a wezirate which lasted eight years.

In territorial extent the dominions of the Fāṭimids were now reduced to little more than Egypt itself. Syria had long resisted their authority (see ch. vi.). North Africa, under four successive rulers of the Sanhāga Berbers, seated at Mahdiya, had acknowledged their suzerainty by citing the caliphs’ names in the prayer and on the coinage, by paying an annual tribute, and by receiving formal investiture on each succession by the caliph’s diploma; but about 1044 Moʿizz, the ruling governor, joined the orthodox Sunni sect, and renouncing

fell during or immediately after the great famine) there is a consecutive series of annual issues of Mustanṣir’s gold coins from the mint of Miṣr from A.H. 427 to 486 (1036-93). His other mints were Alexandria (especially during the last twenty years of the reign, to A.H. 488 = 1095), el-Baṣṭa, el-Manṣūriya (to 1036-7), el-Mahdiya (to 1065), Sicily (to 1054-5), Fileṣṭīn (Ramla), Damascus, Ṭabariya (Tiberias), ʿAkkā, Tyre, Tripolis, Aleppo (1050-5), Medina (1061), and Baghdad (Medīnat-es-Selām, 1058). His glass weights abound.
the Faṭimid caliph in 1046. At this the Shiʿa of the west revolted against Moʿizz, and at the same time on the east the Egyptian government sent the great Arab tribe of Hilāl to bring him back to his allegiance. The Hilāl occupied Barqūk and Tripolis, and settled there; but Moʿizz, though defeated, maintained his independence at Mahdiyya, letting other minor states spring up further west. Sicily, where the Kelbi emirs had recognized the Faṭimid supremacy, fell to the Normans in 1071 ff. Henceforth, beyond an intermittent authority in Barqūk, the rulers of Egypt owned no subjects further west.

In Arabia, on the other hand, they received an unexpected accession of prestige by the voluntary homage of a Shiʿa proselyte, ʿAlī the Ṣūlīḥīd, who subdrew the Yemen and the Ḥijāz from Ḥaḍramawt to Mekka by 1063, and proclaimed the divine right of the Faṭimid caliph in every pulpit. A still more surprising development was seen, when not only in the holy cities which had witnessed the birth of Islām, but even in Baghdād itself, the home of the orthodox caliphate, the name of Mustanṣir was prayed for in the mosques. It was but the temporary success of a Turkish general, el-Bēṣāṣīrī, that procured this unparalleled honour, and when this

1 The latest coin of el-Mansūriyya (KāṬrawān) bearing the Faṭimid caliph’s name, is of A.H. 438 (1046-7). Several coins, however, were struck at el-Mahdiyya from 1062-5, in the name of Mustanṣir, showing a temporary return to allegiance.

2 The Sicilian emirs issued their coinage solely in the names of the Faṭimid caliphs, and the last dated issues are of A.H. 446 and 448 (1054-7).

3 A coin of Baghdād (Medinat-es-Selām) struck in A.H. 450 (1058-9) with the name of Mustanṣir is recorded by Frāhn (Inedita Asiat. Mus., 1847).
adventurer discovered that it was the better policy to submit to the irresistible strength of the rising Seljuk power than to build his hopes on the support which the Fatimid government had lavishly tendered, Baghdad resumed its old allegiance to the 'Abbâsids. The fact, however, that for forty Fridays the mosques of the "City of Peace," resounded with the name and style of the Egyptian caliph, and that the robe and turban and filigree throne of the rival pontiff had actually been carried off and deposited in the palace at Cairo,¹ caused the liveliest enthusiasm; the city was en fête, and Mustansîr spent two million dinârs in furbishing the "little West Palace"—originally built by 'Azîz for the Princess Royal—as a gilded cage for the 'Abbâsîd caliph, whom he confidently expected to hold as his prisoner. Long afterwards the land beside the Nile near the "River" or "Iron" Gate was known as "the demesne of the tamburina" (Arîd-et-Tabâla), after the estate bestowed by Mustansîr upon a singer who improvised some verses on this amazing triumph of the Fatimids and sang them to the accompaniment of her drum.

An interesting description of Cairo and other places in Egypt by the Persian traveller Nasîr-i-Khusraw has fortunately been preserved.¹ The royal city, Cairo itself (then called el-Kâhirâ el-Mo'izzîya), was a very large town when he saw it in 1046—49; the houses, roughly estimated at 20,000, were built chiefly of bricks, so carefully joined that they looked like squared stone, to the height of five or six storeys, and separated from other houses by well-cultivated gardens and orchards, irrigated by wells and water-wheels. The rent of a moderate-sized house of four storeys was 11 D. a month (or about £70 a year), and the landlord of the house in which the traveller lodged refused 5 D. a month for the top storey.

¹ They remained there until the restoration of orthodoxy by Saladin, who sent back the turban and robe to Baghdad. The iron throne or lectern was retained, and eventually placed in the mosque of Beybars II.

All the houses in Cairo belonged to the caliph, and the rents were collected every month. The shops, which were reckoned at 20,000, were also his property, and were let at from 2 D. to 10 D. a month, which, even taking so low an average as 5 D., represents an annual income of about £650,000. The old wall of the city was no longer standing in 1046, and the second wall had not yet been begun; but the Persian traveller was struck by the high blank walls of the houses and still more of the palace, the stones of which were so closely united that they looked like a solid block. His account of the interior is disappointingly brief, but he mentions the celebrated throne-room, with its throne of gold sculptured with hunting scenes, surrounded by a golden lattice screen, and ascended by silver steps. He was told that the palace contained 30,000 people, including 12,000 servants, and that the guard mounted every night consisted of 1000 horse and foot. The city of Miṣr (Fustāt) was separated from Cairo by a space of nearly a mile, covered with gardens, flooded by the Nile in the inundation, so that in summer it looked like a sea. This was the well-known and well-loved "Lake of the Abyssinians," (Birket el-Ḥabash), with its surrounding gardens, a favourite resort of Cairenes, of which Ibn-Sā'id sings: "O lake of the Abyssinians, where my day was one long spell of happy peace; so that Heaven seemed on thy bosom, and all my time a joyous feast. How lovely is the flax when it rises upon thee with its flowers or buds in knots, and its leaves unsheathed from thee like swords." Hard by was the monastery of St. John, with its beautiful gardens, laid out by Ṭemim the son of the caliph Mo'izz, and afterwards a favourite spot of the caliph Ḥāfiz; and the "Well of the Steps" shaded by a giant sycamore. Miṣr was built on an elevation, to escape the water, and to the Persian traveller looked "like a mountain" from a distance, with its houses of seven to fourteen storeys, standing each on a space of 30 cubits square, and capable of holding 350 people. Some of the

Abū-Ṣāliḥ, ff. 76, 406.
CUTTING THE CANAL

streets were covered, and lighted by lamps. There were seven mosques in Miṣr and eight in Cairo; the number of khāns (wekālas) was reckoned at 200. A bridge of 36 boats joined Miṣr to "the Island" (Rōda), but there was no bridge from the island to G'īza, only a ferry.

The traveller was especially struck by the Market of Lamps at Miṣr, where he saw rarities and works of art such as he saw in no other city, and was astonished at the profusion of fruits and vegetables in the bazars. He describes the pottery made at Fustāt as so delicate that you could see your hand through it, and remarks the metallic lustre which is still seen in fragments found in the mounds which occupy the site of the city. He also saw some fine transparent green glass made there. The shopkeepers sold "at a fixed price," and if they cheated they were put on a camel and paraded through the streets, ringing a bell and confessing their fault. All the tradespeople rode donkeys, which were on hire in every street, to the number of 50,000. Only the soldiers rode horses.

Nāṣir-i-Khusrau found Egypt in a state of the utmost tranquillity and prosperity. The shops of the jewellers and money changers, he says, were left unfastened, save by a cord (perhaps a net, as in the present day) stretched in front, and the people had full confidence in the government and in the amiable caliph. He saw Mus-tanṣir riding his mule at the high festival of cutting the canal: a pleasant-looking young man, with shaven face, dressed very simply in a white kaftān and turban, with a parasol enriched with precious stones and pearls carried by a high officer. Three hundred Persians of Deylem followed on foot, armed with halberds and axes. Eunuchs burnt incense of ambergris and aloes on either side, and the people threw themselves on their faces and called down blessings on the caliph. The chief kādi and a crowd of doctors and officials followed, and the escort included 20,000 mounted Kitāma Berbers, 10,000 Bāṭilis, 20,000 blacks, 10,000 "Orientals" (Turks and Persians), 30,000 purchased slaves, 15,000 Bedawis of the Ḥijāz, 30,000 black and white slave attendants and chamber-
lains (ustād), 10,000 palace servants (serāyi), and 30,000 negro swordsmen. Besides these (which constituted the whole army, and probably were only represented by select divisions), the caliph’s suite included various princes visiting the court, from Maghrib, Yemen, Rūm, Slavonia, Georgia, Nubia, Abyssinia, and even Tatars from Turkestan and the sons of the king of Delhi. Poets and men of letters, in the caliph’s pay, attended; and all Cairo and Miṣr, Christians included, turned out to see the cutting of the dam by the caliph, beside the pavilion es-Sukkara, built by his ancestor ‘Azīz near the mouth; and then to go sailing on the Nile. The first boat-load was of deaf and dumb people, whose presence made an auspicious opening of the festivities. Though his descriptions relate chiefly to the capital, the Persian traveller records enough about the country, from Tinnīs to Aswān, to confirm the impression that in agriculture and in general appearance it differed little from the Egypt of to-day.

The administration of el-Yāzūrī (1050—58), a man sprung of a humble sailor’s family at Yāzūr near Jaffa, who rose to be ḫādi of Egypt and then wezir, was characterized by an honest desire to improve the condition of the cultivators and at the same time increase the declining revenue.1 A general return taken in his wezirate set forth the total receipts and expenditure in all the districts of the kingdom, and the revenue from the land-tax appeared to be only one million dinārs for Egypt and the like for Syria (Maḵr. i. 99, 100). Yāzūrī attempted economic reforms, both wise and foolish. His first step was to sell the government corn reserves (worth 100,000 D. annually) at the lowest current price, instead of waiting as before for a dear market. He seems to have deprecated government speculation in the necessaries of life. The result was not only a heavy loss to the treasury, but when a low Nile produced a famine

---

1 Suyūṭī says he was allowed for a month to add his own name to that of the caliph on the coinage, but there is no numismatic confirmation of this.
RELATIONS WITH CONSTANTINOPLE

soon after, there was no reserve of corn to fall back upon. As usual plague followed hard upon famine, and a thousand people are said to have died daily. In this distress the government arranged with the emperor of Constantinople for a supply of 2,000,000 bushels of grain; but the death of Constantine Monomachus in 1055, and the conditions imposed by Theodora, including an offensive and defensive alliance between the two empires, led to the withholding of the needed supply and to hostilities in northern Syria. The Byzantines had discovered, like Besāṣīrī, that the Selğūks were more worth conciliating than the Egyptians, and the name of the Abbāsid caliph, at the request of the Selğūk Sultan Tughrîl Beg, was now prayed for in the mosque at Constantinople. In retaliation Mustanṣîr laid hands upon the treasure accumulated in the newly restored Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem.

Warned by failure, Yāzūrī took the opportunity of a good Nile to introduce a different system in relation to the fellāḥīn. He put a stop to the mischievous practice of allowing merchants and usurers to buy the standing crops at a low price, ruinous to the cultivators, and, like a second Joseph, he laid up immense stores of corn at Fustât as a reserve against famine. He was not himself above the suspicion of illegal aggrandisement, unfortunately, and his extortions from the Copts were especially unjust. He threw the patriarch Christodulus into prison on a false suspicion of having influenced the Christian king of Nubia to withhold the yearly tribute. Many fines were exacted from the Copts on slight pretexts, and

1 Ibni-Mammâfī, who died in 1209, gives the following statistics for the taxation of the different classes of land. Wheat and barley land paid 3 ardebbs (15 bushels) per acre, up to 1172, and afterwards 2½; broad beans, 3 to 4½ arbd. per acre; peas, chickpeas, and lentils, 2½; flax varied, the highest amount was 3 dinars per acre; clover, 1 D.; lupin, 1½ D.; melons and white beans, 3 D.; cotton, 1 D.; sugar cane, of the first growth, 5 D.; later growth, 2½ D.; colocasia, 5 D.; bâdingân (melon-gourd), 3 D.; indigo, 3 D.; vines and fruit trees in the fourth year, 3 D. There is no mention of rice, or maize, or dhura in the list; but it does not profess to be complete. In the present day the value of the winter crops averages £7 an acre.
at Dimrū these extortions were coupled with a general closing of the churches, some of which were destroyed. An inscription in the name of the Trinity over the patriarch's door was erased: "You cannot efface it from my heart," was his retort. Soon after, all the churches of Egypt were ordered to be closed, the patriarch and bishops were imprisoned, and a fine of 70,000 dinārs demanded. Yāzūrī was poisoned in 1058, being suspected of intrigues with Baghdad. His inordinate wealth doubtless led to his downfall. He was a man of fine taste, a great lover of pictures, and a munificent patron of learned men.

After Yāzūrī, vezīrs came and went like ministers of a modern republic. There were forty changes in nine years; but by this time it had been discovered that it was not absolutely necessary to kill a deposed vezīr, and it became usual to confer upon him some lower office, from which he often rose to the top rank again. Some of these vezīrs held office three or four times, and a change of ministry did not necessarily involve a massacre. These frequent changes were due to the incompetence of the caliph and the factious composition of the court and army. Mustanṣir was in the hands of all sorts of nobodies, who gave him conflicting counsels, distracted his experienced officials, and left him more perplexed than ever. Eight hundred letters a day testified to the grievances of his subjects and the weak vacillation of their sovereign, open to every influence and impression, however base and interested. A curious story is related of his irritability. He was one day superintending a murderous bastinading of a vezīr, when the black dowager remonstrated, and told her son that killing a man was not the best way to make him disgorge his wealth, but if he would hand over the vezīr to her, she knew how to squeeze him. The caliph thereupon rose in great wrath, and marched off towards the mosque of 'Amr. His chamberlains pursued, wondering what this new proceeding meant. Mustanṣir told them that as everybody thwarted him and kept him in leading strings he was resolved to throw up the government and retire to the mosque and devote
the rest of his life to religion. The thought, however, of the pillage that would at once destroy his beautiful palace brought him back to reason, and the chamberlains persuaded him to return. His religious yearnings were not deep-seated, if the story be true that in his palaces at Heliopolis he erected a pavilion in imitation of the Ka'ba of Mekka, and laid out a pond full of wine to represent the sacred well of Zemzem, and there sat and drank to the sounds of stringed music and singers, saying, "This is pleasanter than staring at a black stone, listening to the drone of the mu'edhdhin, and drinking bad water!" In such pleasures he consoled himself for the lack of all power and dignity. That he was not wanting in kindly feeling, however, is shown by the following story. Every year the usual pension-list, amounting to between 100,000 $D$ and 200,000 $D$, was laid before him for his revision. On one occasion he did not strike out a single pensioner's name, but with his own hand endorsed the list with this comment: "Poverty is a sore diet, and want bows the neck. Our anxiety for their welfare is shown in a generous distribution of help; let them therefore have their shares liberally. What ye possess will be spent; what is given to God lasts for ever."

Meanwhile the jealousy between the Turkish troops and the Sūdānī battalions, favoured by their countrywoman, the caliph's mother, grew to alarming proportions. A broil led to a general engagement, and the Turks, supported by the Kitāma and other Berbers, drove the blacks, to the number of 50,000, out of Cairo into Upper Egypt, whence for several years they repeatedly advanced by land and water to attack their enemy. The Turks, however, had the upper hand in the capital, in spite of the dowager's intrigues, and they used their power in despoiling the palace and emptying the treasury, terrifying the changing vezirs, and treating the caliph with contempt. Instead of 28,000 $D$, they now drew 400,000 $D$, a month from the treasury in pay and allowances. Their leader, Nāṣir-ed-dawla b. Ḥamān, commander-in-chief of the Fātimid army, carried matters with so high a hand that at last he alienated his own colleagues and officers,
who induced the helpless caliph to dismiss him from his post. The deposed general made them all pay dearly for their revolt. Though obliged to fly from his enemies in Cairo, he had Alexandria in his power, and quickly obtained the support of some Arab tribes and of the Lewāta Berbers. The caliph had shown some spirit during this disturbance, and had even appeared in mail at the head of such troops as remained loyal, by whose aid he had defeated Naṣir-ed-dawla; but his authority was now limited to his capital. The black regiments held all Upper Egypt, and 40,000 horsemen of the Lewāta overran the delta, and abandoned the dikes and canals to destruction, with the open intention of starving the inhabitants. Cairo and Fuštāţ were cut off from supplies, and a terrible famine which had begun with the low Nile of 1065, and lasted unbroken for seven years (1066-72), brought the country to the utmost pitch of misery. The fellāhīn, in terror of the armed bands that infested the land, dared not carry on their work, and the usual effects of a bad Nile were thus prolonged to successive years. In the capital, cut off from all communication with the provinces, the famine was felt in the greatest severity. A cake of bread was sold for 15  Din., though an ardebb (five bushels) of corn could be bought for 100  Din., a house was exchanged for 20 lbs. of flour, an egg went for a dinār. Horses and asses were eaten, a dog fetched 5  Din., a cat 3  Din., till soon there was not an animal to be seen. The caliph’s own stable, which once held 10,000 horses and mules, was reduced to three nags, and when he rode abroad his escort, on foot, fainted with hunger. At last, people began to eat each other. Passengers were caught in the streets by hooks let down from the windows, drawn up, killed, and cooked. Human flesh was sold in public. Horrible tales are recorded of the atrocities of that reign of terror, and though examples were made of some of the criminals, the feeble government could make no head against the maddened populace. Plague came to finish what famine had begun, and whole houses were emptied of every living soul in twenty-four hours.
The rich suffered almost as much as the poor. Gay courtiers sought employment as grooms and sweepers. A man went to a bath, and the manager asked him whether he would prefer to be served by Ḥizz-ed-dawla, or Fakhr-ed-dawla, or Sa'd-ed-dawla—three of the great emirs of the day, who now undertook his shampooing. Ladies of rank tried vainly to sell their jewels for bread, and threw away their useless pearls and emeralds in the street. One lady, who contrived with great difficulty to secure a handful of flour in exchange for a necklace worth 1000 D., made a little cake and brandished it before the crowd, crying, "O people of Cairo, pray for our lord the caliph, whose reign brings us such blessing and prosperity! Thanks to him, this cake cost me 1000 dinârs." Mustanṣir was roused for a moment from the lethargy in which he was sunk, and compelled the merchants, who had "cornered" the wheat stores, to disgorge and sell to the people at a moderate price; but he could do little. His own vast means were exhausted. Of all the caliphs none had approached him in wealth. Two extremely aged princesses, daughters of his ancestor Mo'izz, had died in 1050 (see p. 111), and left him the treasures for which four caliphs had successively sighed. Their wealth amounted to millions. The inventory of Mustanṣir's treasures recorded by Maqrizi reads like a fable in "the Thousand and One Nights;" yet all these exquisite

1 Some of the items are interesting as evidence of the art and luxury of the times. Omitting precious stones (such as a box containing 7 medd, or 10 lb., of emeralds, worth 300,000 D.; 7 weyba, or 250 lb., of fine pearls, ruby rings, etc.), the inventory included thousands of large crystal vases, some engraved with the name of 'Aziz; gold plates inlaid and enamelled in colours, cups of bezoar engraved with the name of Hārūn er-Rashid; inkstands of gold, silver, ebony, ivory, aloes and other woods, carved, inlaid, and jewelled; great porcelain jars full of camphor of Keysûr, cups of amber, phials of musk; large wash-tubs on three legs in form of animals, worth 1000 D. apiece; white China eggs (for warming the hands, perhaps); the gold mattress on which the caliph Ma'mûn had slept on an interesting occasion; enamelled plates presented by the Roman emperor to 'Aziz; steel mirrors; glass and pottery innumerable; parasols with gold and silver sticks; chased and inlaid silver vessels of all shapes; chess and draught boards of silk embroidered
DISPERSION OF TREASURES

and priceless works of art had been dissipated among the barbarous Turks during the tyranny of Nāṣir-ed-dawla. They had forced the caliph to sell everything, and then bought the treasures at an absurd forced price. Jewellery which had cost 600,000 $D$. was sold for 20,000; emeralds valued at 300,000 went to a Turkish general for 500; often there was not even the pretence of a sale, but a scene of open looting. One of the valuers stated that at the lowest reckoning the treasures sold in a single fortnight of December, 1067, were worth 30,000,000 $D$. The costly collections of the "Treasury of the Flags" were destroyed by a torch dropped by a follower of one

in gold, with pawns of gold, silver, ivory, and ebony; 4000 gold vases for narcissus flowers, and 2000 for violets; artificial fruits and other toys made of amber and camphor; a jewelled turban valued at 130,000 $D.$, the stones of which weighed 17 lbs.; perfumes in vast masses; a gold peacock with ruby eyes and enamelled feathers; a gold cock, whose comb and eyes were made of rubies; a gazelle covered with pearls; a table of sardonyx; a gold palm tree with dates of precious stones. The thirty-eight state barges or dahabiyas for Nile processions included one made for the caliph by order of the vezir Gargarâl at a cost of 13,000 $D.$, and the "silver barge" of the black dowager, presented to her by her former owner, Abū-Sa'īd. The silks and embroideries, velvets, and other stuffs, included red damask brocaded with gold in the design of parks where elephants roamed; silks embroidered with the history of the dynasties of the east, and portraits of famous men, with their dates and deeds; the carpet made for Mo'izz at Tustar, depicting a map of the world, its mountains, rivers, cities, where Mekka and Medina were clearly recognized; stuffs of Dâlib, Kalmûn, Behnesa, Damascus, China, innumerable and priceless; immense collections of jewelled daggers, swords, Khâlang javelins, Khaṭṭ lances, and arms of all sorts, including the sword of 'Amr b. Ma'dî Kerib, of Mo'izz, of Kâim, the cuirass of Hoseyn, the shield of Ḥamza, and even the famous "Dhū-l-Fikār," the Excalibur of the Prophet Moḥammad himself. The tents of gold brocade and silk were sometimes worked with pictures of men and animals and birds, and supported by gilt poles; one specially large tent, made for Yāzūrî at a cost of 30,000 $D.$, had a pole 65 cubits high, and a circumference of 500 cubits, and required 100 camels to transport it with its furniture. It was covered with designs, and took 50 artists nine years to make. The caliph Zâhir's tent was of pure gold thread, supported on six silver pillars; another made at Aleppo, and costing 30,000 $D.$, was supported by the tallest mast of a Venetian galley; another was called "the slayer," because it invariably killed one or two men in pitching.——Ma'kīzī.
of the Turkish goths—collections which had been formed at a cost of 70,000 or 80,000 D. a year for a century past.

But the most irreparable loss of that reign of brigandage was the dispersion of the caliphs' library of over 100,000 books on every branch of learning and belles-lettres known to the Arabs. They were stored in locked presses round the room, with labels to indicate the contents of each press. The library staff seems to have consisted of only a librarian, two copyists, and two servants. Among the manuscripts were 2400 illuminated Korâns, books in the handwriting of Ibn-Mu'âkla and other famous calligraphers, thirty copies of the great Arabic dictionary called the 'Ayn, twenty copies of Tabari's history, including the author's autograph copy, a hundred copies of Ibn-Dureyd's Gamhara, and innumerable works of incomparable value. All these were sold or carried off by the Turks on pretext of arrears of pay, save only the private library of the ḥarim. Rare manuscripts, which scholars would give anything to possess now, went to light the fires; their bindings mended the shoes of the Turkish officers' slaves. Many torn volumes were thrown aside and got buried under the sand, and the "hills of the books" were long known near Abyâr. The most fortunate were those that were exported to other countries. It says much for the literary zeal of the Fâtimids that, in spite of this lamentable destruction, they set about collecting books with so much energy that Saladin found at least 120,000 volumes in their library a century later.

These forced sales and robberies of his treasures had reduced the unhappy caliph Mustansîr to the depths of misery. Nâṣir-ed-dawla held the caliph and the remnant of the garrison besieged in Cairo and Fustât, and reduced to such straits by famine and fear that the soldiers were looting the houses, the people flying by night, and the caliph's own household dying or fled. In 1070 his daughters and their mother took refuge, even in Baghda, to escape starvation. There was nothing for it but to make terms with the rebels, but even then the Turks fell out among themselves, and Nâṣir-ed-dawla burnt and sacked part of Fustât, and after defeating Mustansîr's
little army, who made a good fight, entered Cairo. The rebel's messenger found the caliph in his empty palace, seated on a common mat, attended by three slaves. A daughter of the celebrated grammarian Ibn-Bābshād charitably sent him two loaves a day. To such a pass had the famine and the Turkish despoilers reduced the Commander of the Faithful.

At last a state of things which could not be worse began to mend. A plentiful harvest in 1073 put an end to the famine that had wasted Egypt for seven years. In the same year Nāṣir-ed-dawla was assassinated by some jealous rivals, and his body sent in pieces to various cities of the empire. The change of keepers, from one Turk to another, did little to improve the government of the

country, but when the caliph, at his wits' end, sent for the governor of 'Akka (Acre) to take command, a complete change came over the face of affairs. Bedr el-G'emāli, an Armenian slave of the emir G'emāl-ed-din b. 'Ammār, had risen to high office in the Syrian wars, had twice been governor of Damascus, and had successfully fought the Turks till he had become the most powerful general in Syria. He accepted Mustansir's appeal, only on condition that he brought with him his hardy Syrian troops—"the Easterns" as they were called, in distinction from the Turkish, Berber, and Śūdānī regiments of Egypt. Despising the risks of a sea-voyage in winter, when scarcely any one dared to put to sea off that coast, he sailed from
'Akka in December, 1073, reached Tinnīs with a favouring wind in four days, and landed at Damietta. On his approach the caliph summoned up courage to arrest the Turkish commander İldeguz. Bedr then entered Cairo at the beginning of February. The Turks received him with cordiality, not knowing that he had been sent for. Each Turkish general was allotted as a victim to one or other of the Syrian officers, and next morning each of these appeared before Bedr, as was arranged, with a Turk's head in his hands. The detestable despotism was abolished in a night.

The caliph, overjoyed at his release from his oppressors, loaded his deliverer with honours, named him Âmîr el-G'uyûsh or commander-in-chief, and presently added all the civil offices of state. He was, in fact, endowed with the full supreme government, and became the *alter ego* of the caliph. Bedr established himself in the Bargawān street, and set about restoring order, executing all possible rivals, and recovering for his master as much as could be discovered of the palace property. When this was done he began the reduction of the provinces; slaughtered or subdued the Lewāta Berbers in the delta, and took Alexandria by storm; marched into Upper Egypt, where the blacks and the Arab tribes had long done as they pleased, and restored the caliph's authority as far as Aswān. The captives were so numerous that a woman could be bought for a dinār, and a horse for half as much again. After this ruthless and sanguinary beginning, all was quiet. Thefellāhin under his strong, just, and benevolent rule, soon began to enjoy a security and prosperity unknown for many years. In 1090 a return of taxation ordered by Bedr el-G'emâlî showed that the revenue of Egypt and Syria had risen from the usual 2,000,000 or at most 2,800,000, to 3,100,000 *D*.1 Indeed the remaining twenty years of Mustanṣîr's reign saw nothing but peace and plenty in Egypt, though in Syria there was continual war, which threatened at one

1 This, if it refers to the land tax of Egypt alone, is probably the same return as that cited by Abû-Ṣâliḥ (ff. 8a-9a) as having been made
time to break over the frontier. For the first time since
the reign of 'Azīz, Cairo became the home of architects. A
new brick wall was built round the palace-city; the three
great stone gates, the Bāb-en-Naṣr, Bāb-el-Futūh (1087),
and Bāb Zawīla or Zuweyla (1091) were removed and re-
built within the new wall, and assumed the imposing
appearance they wear to this day. The three gates are
stated to have been the work of three brothers, architects,
from Edessa, each of whom built a gate.1 As has been
seen, Yāzūrī and others employed artists from Mesopo-
tamia and 'Irāk, and there is nothing improbable in Bedr
importing architects from Edessa, which was full of his
Armenian fellow-countrymen. According to Abū-Ṣalīḥ,
however, the gates and the new wall were planned by
"John the Monk" (f. 51a): but "planning" or designing
(the Arabic word is explicit) does not include building,

"in the days of the kāḍī el-Ḳaḥḥāl" (i.e. Ibn-el-Ḳaḥḥāl, c. 1090), the
details of which (for 1276 districts and 890 villages) are as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Provinces</th>
<th>Southern Provinces</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dinārs.</td>
<td>Dinārs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esh-Sharkiya</td>
<td>694,121</td>
<td>129,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Murtāhiya</td>
<td>70,358</td>
<td>39,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed-Dakahlīya</td>
<td>53,761</td>
<td>39,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Alwāniya</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>145,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G'ezrāt-Ḳūsaniya</td>
<td>159,664</td>
<td>234,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Gharbiya</td>
<td>439,955</td>
<td>304,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es-Sennūḍiyya</td>
<td>200,657</td>
<td>[304,834?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Menūfiyateyn</td>
<td>140,933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fūwa, etc.</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>1,020,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-Nestarāwiya</td>
<td>14,910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosetta, etc.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G'ezrāt-Beni-Naṣr</td>
<td>62,508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Buḥeyra</td>
<td>139,313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iľawf Ramsis</td>
<td>[59,080?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total. 2,040,040

This estimate admittedly excludes the revenue from Alexandria,
Damietta, and Tinnis on the northern coast, and Kūf and Neḳāda
(i.e. the provinces of Kūṣiyā and Ikhmīmiya) in Upper Egypt, the
revenues of which are estimated at 60,000 D. Abū-Ṣalīḥ adds that in
the reign of el-Āmir a poll-tax of 1 D. was imposed, which was raised
to 2 D. by Ruḍwān, a wazīr of el-İlaḡ, noted for his oppression of
Christians.

1 Maḳr., i. 381.
and it is possible that the monk and the Edessa architects co-operated. The Edessa origin explains, as no Coptic source alone could do, the Byzantine appearance of these massive gateways. Edessa was long an outpost of the Roman empire against the caliphs, and its architects must have been well acquainted with the military architecture of Byzantium. Nor could Bedr el-G'emālī himself, after his long wars in Syria, have been ignorant of the buildings of the mediæval Romans.¹

¹ See M. van Berchem, *Notes d'archéologie arabe*, in *Journ. Asiat.*, 1891.
During these twenty years the great Armenian who had rescued Mustanṣir from the Turks kept his weak and pleasure-loving sovereign completely under his control. When Bedr el-G'emāli died in the spring of 1094 at the age of eighty, his son Abū-l-Ḵāsim Shāhānshāh succeeded to his power with the title of El-Aḍal. The caliph, who had seen such terrible vicissitudes of fortune, and deserved all his troubles, did not long survive his trusty minister. Mustanṣir died at the end 1 of December, in his sixty-eighth year and the sixty-first of his inglorious reign.

Before relating the causes which led to the fall of the Fāṭimid caliphate, some account may be given of the machinery of their administration. Arabic historians are usually wanting in this class of information, which they take for granted as familiar to their readers; and it is difficult to obtain any precise statement about the details of government under the early Arab and Turkish governors. For the Fāṭimid period, however, we possess a systematic outline of the military and administrative system, which, so far as it goes, is useful.2

The army was divided into three principal ranks: 1. Emīrs, who were subdivided into (a) gold-chain emīrs, the highest class; (b) sword-bearers, who escorted the caliph on horseback; (c) ordinary officers. 2. The officers of the guard, consisting of (a) the masters (ustāds) or eunuchs, who were held in high honour and given important posts; (b) the "young guard," a body of about 500 picked youths of family; and (c) the troops of the caliph's barracks, to the number of about 5000. 3. The regiments, each named after some caliph or vezir or

1 18th of Dhūl-il-Ḥijja, A.H. 487, or 29th Dec., 1094. A coin of Alexandria bearing the date 488 must have been issued, probably on the 1st of January, before the news of the caliph's death was known there.

2 El-Kalkashandi, translated by Wüstefeld, Die Geographie und Verwaltung von Aegypten (1879), pp. 171-222. Kalkashandi was a contemporary of Maqrizi, but like the latter he had access to a large number of earlier authorities and documents of the Fāṭimid period. He also gives a long and curious account of the numerous court ceremonies and pageants.
according to its nation, as the Ḥāfīziya, Gʿuyūshiya, Rūmiya (Romans, i.e. Greeks), Șakāliba (Slavs), Südāniya (blacks). The number of regiments was very large, and varied at different times. The pay ranged from 2 $D$ to 20 $D$ a month.

The fleet, which was stationed at Alexandria, Damietta, Ascalon and other Syrian ports, and Aydhib in the Red Sea, numbered over seventy-five galleys, ten transports, and ten galleasses, under a high admiral.

![Gate of Victory (Bāb-en-Naṣr), Cairo, 1087.](image)

The official ministers of the caliphate were divided into two classes, the “Men of the Sword” and the “Men of the Pen.”

The men of the sword superintended the army and war office, and consisted in: 1. The wezīr (unless he were a civil man of the pen). 2. The “lord of the door,” or high chamberlain, who stood next to the wezīr, and was sometimes called the lesser wezīr, and
enjoyed the privilege of presenting ambassadors. 3. The field marshal (isfehsâlâr) or commander-in-chief, who commanded the whole of the forces, and looked to the protection of the palace. 4. The umbrella-bearer, a great emir, who carried the parasol of state over the caliph. 5. The sword-bearer. 6. The lance-bearer. 7. The equerries. 8. The commandant of Cairo. 9. The commandant of Mîsr (Fustât). To the men of the sword belonged also the household attendants, stewards, chamberlains, ink-bearer, and various court functionaries.

The men of the pen included (besides the wezîr, unless he belonged to the military order): 1. The chief kâdi, endowed with very great powers, the head of the law, director of the mint, who held his court in the mosque of ‘Amr on Tuesdays and Saturdays, seated on a raised divan, with his inkstand before him, the witnesses ranged on either hand in the order of their causes, four lawyers seated in front, and five ushers to keep order. 2. The chief preacher, who presided in the hall of science. 3. The inspector of markets (mohtesib), who held unrestricted control over the bazaars and streets, assisted by two deputies for Cairo and Mîsr, supervised weights and measures, prices, and trade generally, and punished cheats and defaulters. 4. The treasurer, who presided over the Beyt-el-Mâl or state treasury, and had besides various duties, such as manumitting and marrying slaves, making contracts for building ships, etc. 5. The deputy chamberlain, who joined the “lord of the door” in introducing an ambassador to the caliph, each holding one of his hands, and never letting him loose. 6. The reader, who recited the Korân to the caliph, in season and out of season.

A lower division of the men of the pen comprised the whole body of civil servants, attached to the following departments: 1. The wezirate (unless the wezîr were a man of the sword). 2. The chancery, subdivided into the secretariat and the two branches of the record office or registry of the caliph’s acts, one to take down and draft his instructions, the other to write them out in
fair copy. 3. The army pay office, which also attended to the proper mounting and furnishing of the troops. 4. The exchequer, subdivided into fourteen departments, dealing with every branch of the finances, accounts, allowances, presents, pensions, tribute, crown inheritance, royal factories, with special bureaux for Upper Egypt, Alexandria, etc. The physicians, of whom the caliph always kept four or five, and the poets, whose name was legion, also formed separate classes of the men of the pen attached to the court.

Outside these court functionaries were the local officials who governed the three divisions of the empire, Egypt, Syria, and the borders of Asia Minor. Egypt was administered by the four governors of Kūş, or Upper Egypt, Shārkiya (Bilbeys, Kalyūb, Ushmūm), Gharbiya (Māhalla, Menūf, and Abyār), and Alexandria (including all Buḥeyra). The governor of Upper Egypt ranked almost next to the vezīr, and had several deputy governors under him in the various provinces. Under these were the district officials and heads of towns and villages. The management of all local affairs was entrusted to the local authorities, including the maintenance by troops and corvée labour of the irrigation canals and dams belonging specifically to the district or village; but the larger dikes, which could not be assigned to one local authority, were managed by inspectors appointed annually from Cairo, with a large staff of skilled assistants. The system reads well on paper, but in practice there was doubtless much corruption and peculation. The general testimony of the Arabic historians, however, points to a mild and even benevolent treatment of the fellāhīn as the prevailing policy of the Fāṭimid government.
CHAPTER VI

THE ATTACK FROM THE EAST

969-1171

 Authorities.—As preceding; also Osāma, Bahā-ed-dīn, William of Tyre.
 Monuments, Inscriptions, Coins, etc.—See preceding chapter.

Syria had been a dependency of Egypt, with brief intermission, since the days of Ibn-Ṭūlūn, but under the Fāṭimid s the connection had been growing more and more strained. The orthodox inhabitants, especially in Damascus, strenuously repudiated the Shi‘a heresy, and could be induced only by force to recognize the caliphs of Egypt. The Fāṭimid conquest by G’afar b. Fellāh in 969 was immediately followed by revolt, and the intervention of the Karmāṭīs practically severed Syria from Egypt for the next eight years. Even after the caliph ʿAziz in person had led a successful campaign in 977, and quashed the insurrection under ʿAbgēṭīn, Damascus was still but nominally under the control of Egypt, and it was not till 988 that the Syrian capital was thoroughly subdued for the time. The northernmost city of the Fāṭimid empire was then Tripolis.¹ Antioch still belonged to the eastern Roman empire; and Aleppo was in the possession of the last descendants of the

¹ The earliest Fāṭimid coinage at Tripolis dates from 974-5; the latest is 1101-2. But the Syrian coinage of the Fāṭimids was too intermittent (or too few examples have come down) for it to be taken as a chronological guide. The most regular mints were Filestīn (i.e. Ramla), Tyre, and Tripolis. Under el-ʿĀmir, when Syria had nearly all fallen to the Crusaders, ʿAṣkālān (Ascalon) became the Syrian mint of the Fāṭimids, 1109—17.
Román Campaños

Hāmdānids, ever sworn foes to Egypt, and protected by the Romans as a necessary buttress to Antioch, which the emperor Nicephorus had recently recovered from the Arabs (969). When Mangūteğin, the Fāṭimid general, besieged Aleppò for thirteen months in 993-4, after defeating an army of 50,000 men despatched to its relief by the Roman governor of Antioch, the emperor Basil II himself, abandoning a campaign against the Bulgarians, came to its support. At his approach the Egyptians retired on Damascus, and the emperor sacked Hīmṣ and Sheyzar and made an unsuccessful attack on Tripolis. A parade of 250 Roman prisoners at Cairo was the only triumph enjoyed on this occasion by the caliph ‘Azīz.

Under Hākim, after two victories over the Romans, by sea off Tyre and by land near Apamea, peace was concluded for ten years with the emperor; but Syria remained in a chronic state of revolt. Tyre had to be reduced, and the G‘arrāḥ family at Ramla set up a rival caliph in the sherrif of Mekka, with the title of er-Rashid; defeated the Fāṭimid army near Dārum; and were with difficulty brought to some degree of submission by judicious bribes and diplomacy. Nominally, the Egyptian caliph acquired some prestige by the acknowledgment of his sovereignty in the mosques of the Euphrates valley, from Mōsil to Kūfā, by the Arab (‘Oṣayyid) ruler Kīrwāsh; but this temporary adhesion was summarily severed by the Buweyhid sultan of ‘Irāk. Nor was the brief accession of Aleppo to the Fāṭimid party in 1011, when the Hāmdānids were expelled by their freedman, Ibn-Lu‘lu‘, of much value. Such homage was in reality in the nature of an appeal for help against some pressing danger.

On the accession of Zāhir, the authority of the Egyptian government was scarcely felt in Syria. The capable commander of their army, Anūṣhtēğin ed-Dizbīrī, the governor of Caesarea, had to face an insurrection under Hassān b. Daghfal in Palestine, another under Sinān around Damascus, and the hostility of Sāliḥ b. Mīrīdās, who took Aleppo in 1025 from the Princess
Royal's Indian slave Firūz, by whom the city had been held for the last three years. Anūshtegin at last defeated and killed Ṣāliḥ at the battle of Uḵwuwāna near Tiberias, drove Ḥassān into exile among the Romans, and restored most of Syria, except the north, to the Egyptian caliph. Another defeat of the Mirdāsid Arabs on the Orontes, near Sheyzar, gave Aleppo and the rest of northern Syria, except the Roman territory, to his master the child caliph Mustanṣīr, and Anūshtegin's firm rule not only preserved peace and order in Damascus, but induced the governor of Ḥarrān, by the Euphrates, to proclaim the caliphate of Egypt in the mosques of Ḥarrān, Sarūḡ, and Rakka. Meanwhile a ten years' peace had been concluded with the emperor Michael IV, who was allowed to complete the restoration of the ruined Church of the Resurrection in 1048.

The government of Anūshtegin marks high-water in the Fāṭimid relations with Syria. From 1043 their power rapidly declined. The new governor, Naṣir-ed-dawla b. Ḥamdān, afterwards notorious in Egypt, found himself powerless at Damascus; Palestine was once more in revolt under Ḥassān; and two attempts to recover Aleppo from the Mirdāsids, in 1048 and 1049, proved fruitless, though 30,000 Egyptian troops were sent in the second year. It is true the Mirdāsid Moʿizz-ed-dawla afterwards submitted, sent the caliph 40,000 D., and presently made his home at Cairo; but his nephew carried on the struggle in 1060, after which Aleppo was never a Fāṭimid city.

A greater power, however, was rapidly advancing from the east, which merged all minor contests in a struggle for bare existence. The Sel̲ğûk Turkmāns had subdued Persia, and in 1055 their leader, Tughril Beg, was recognized at Baghdād in the Friday prayers as the caliph's lieutenant, or in other words master. The Sel̲ğûk were sternly orthodox and zealous for the faith:

1 There is a coin of Aleppo, A.H. 429 (1037-8), with the name of Mustanṣīr, in the Bibliothèque nationale at Paris.
2 Coins of Aleppo from 1050 to 1055 bear the name of the caliph Mustanṣīr.
SELGUK INVASION

... to extirpate the Egyptian heresy was their sacred duty. To reduce Syria, as a first step, was no very difficult task, in its divided and rebellious state. The Seljuk general Atsiz conquered Palestine and entered Jerusalem in 1071, and after laying siege to Damascus annually for five years and destroying the crops around, at last, with the connivance of one of its inveterate factions, acquired the city in 1076. Damascus never again belonged to the Fatimids. The only capable leader in Egypt, Bedr el-G'émâlî, was fully occupied in recovering the Nile valley for his indolent master, and had no force to spare for Syria. He bribed Atsiz to abstain from crossing the frontier—he had advanced as far as Gaza and el-'Arîsh, the border town—and meanwhile prepared ships to convey the Fatimid court to Alexandria if the worst should happen. Had Atsiz been adequately supported from the east, the fears of the great vezir might have been realized, and the Seljûqs might have extinguished the Shi'a dynasty a hundred years before its actual fall. As it was, as soon as Egypt was pacified, the troops were free to be employed in Syria, and Damascus was at once besieged. The Egyptians had to retire on the approach of Tutûsh (the brother of Melik Shâh, the greatest of the Seljûk sultans), who was appointed viceroy in Syria and entered Damascus in 1079. Still undaunted, Bedr himself, despite his seventy years, led a fresh campaign against the invaders in 1085, but his siege of Damascus was equally fruitless. He lived, however, to see some minor successes on the coast, where the Fatimid armies sent by his order took Tyre, which had been many years in revolt, and re-conquered 'Akka and G'ubeyl.

The deaths of Bedr el-G'émâlî and the caliph Mustanṣîr made little difference in the situation. Bedr was succeeded in the vezirate by his son el-Afḍal Shâhânsâh, who hastily set the youngest of the seven sons of the late caliph on the throne with the title of el-Musta'li (1094—1101).

1 The latest Fatimid coin of Damascus bears the date 1066-7.
He thought a youth of eighteen more amenable to management than a mature man. The eldest son Nizār, who was close upon fifty, naturally represented this supersession, and set himself up at Alexandria, with the governor's approval, as the Imām el-Muṣṭafā; and although he was forced to surrender a year later and vanished in his brother's prisons, he was long revered as the true Imām and head of the Shi'a by the Ismā'ilians, especially by the "Assassins" of Persia. On Musta'li's death at the close of 1101 his son el-Āmir (1101-1131), a child of five, was duly enthroned by el-Afdal, who had a little seat made on the pommel of his own saddle and rode through Cairo with the baby caliph seated in front. The wezir's power was now absolute, and for twenty years he governed Egypt as he pleased, as his father had done before him. Indeed from 1074 to 1121 these two great Armenians were, in all but name, kings of Egypt, and to their mild just rule, as much as to their energy and firm control, the country owed half a century of internal quiet and prosperity.

1 El-Imām el-Muṣṭafā-li-dini-llāh. Coins were issued in his name by the Assassins of Alamūt, who pretended to be his descendants; one is in the Hermitage at St. Petersburg, with the mint Kursī zarīn, "the Golden Throne," and date 499/5 A.H. A reputed son of Nizār is said to have struck coins as caliph in the Yemen with the title Imām Mohammad b. Nizār. He was crucified at Cairo with the ex-wezir Ma'mūn and his five brothers in 1128. Another son, el-Īlāsān, raised an army in Maghrib (Barṣa, perhaps), and was defeated and killed by Ḥāfiz's troops.

2 Abū-'Ali el-Manṣūr el-Āmir-bi-āḥkāmi-llāh, "the ruler by the decrees of God." His coins were issued at Miṣr (1101-30), el-Moʿizziyā el-Kāhirah (Cairo, 1114-30), Alexandria (1101-30), Kūs (1123-4), Ascalon (1109-16), and Tyre (1102-23). The epithet el-Moʿizziyā ("of Moʿizz") applied to Cairo is also used by Nāṣir-i-Khusraw in 1046.
THE FIRST CRUSADE

The one engrossing topic of Afdal's rule was the danger from the east. Not from the Seljuks, for on the deaths of Melik Shāh (1092) and Tutūsh (1095) their empire broke into fragments, and the war of succession that paralyzed their influence in Persia was echoed by a lesser rivalry between the sons of Tutūsh, one of whom (Duḳāḳ) held Damascus, whilst the other (Ruḍwān) ruled at Aleppo and even had the Fātimid's name proclaimed in the mosques in the hope of winning Egyptian support against his brother. But though the Seljuḳ power was broken in Syria, the impulse that brought them westward was still strong, and numerous bodies of hardy Turkmāns were gathered round the standards of daring chiefs, trained in the Seljuḳ wars, and ready to embark on fresh conquests whenever a fresh leader should appear who could unite them for a common purpose. Meanwhile, in the lull between the Seljuḳ hurricane and the gathering storm which was to break upon Egypt in the armies of Nūr-ed-din, a new force appeared which at first threatened to carry all before it. The temporary paralysis of the Moḥammadan dynasties in Persia and Syria, and the degenerate luxuriousness of the Fātimids in Egypt, offered an opportunity for invasion. In 1096 "the first Crusade began its eastward march; in 1098 the great cities of Edessa and Antioch and many fortresses were taken; in 1099 the Christians regained possession of Jerusalem itself. In the next few years the greater part of Palestine and the coast of Syria, Tortosa, 'Akka, Tripolis, and Sidon (1110) fell into the hands of the Crusaders, and the conquest of Tyre in 1124 marked the apogee of their power. It was the precise moment when a successful invasion from Europe was possible. A generation earlier, the Seljuḳ power was inexpugnable. A generation later, a Zengi or a Nūr-ed-din, firmly established in the Syrian seats of the Seljuḳs, would probably have driven the invaders into the sea. A lucky star led the preachers of the first Crusade to
seize an opportunity of which they hardly realized the significance. Peter the Hermit and Urban II. chose the auspicious moment with a sagacity as unerring as if they had made a profound study of Asiatic politics. The Crusade penetrated like a wedge between the old wood and the new, and for a while seemed to cleave the trunk of Mohammadan empire into splinters.\footnote{Lane-Poole, \textit{Saladin}, 24, 25.}

When the news of the approaching Crusade reached Egypt, Afdal welcomed it as a source of strength against the Seljuks, and seems to have even anticipated an alliance with the Christians against the common enemy.\footnote{He may even have proposed to become a Christian in order to cement the alliance. \textit{Cp. Hist. Occ. des Croisades}, iv. 48, 78.} Emboldened by the prospect, he marched into Palestine and took Jerusalem after more than a month's siege from its Seljuq commandants, the brothers Sukmân and Il-Ghazi.\footnote{They afterwards founded the Ortukid dynasties at Māridin and Keyfa in Diyâr-Bekr, one of which subsisted to the time of Timūr.} The dismissal of these valiant defenders only paved the way for the Crusaders, and when the Christian conquerors massacred 70,000 defenceless Muslims in the Holy City, Afdal at last understood what he had to expect from his presumed allies. He received a further lesson when the Franks surprised him before Ascalon, and attacking the Egyptians, in spite of a flag of truce, utterly routed them, captured their camp and baggage, and set fire to a wood in which many of the fugitives had sought refuge. Afdal sailed hurriedly for Egypt, and Ascalon bribed the Franks to leave it alone. So long as he lived, however, the Armenian vezir waged war against the invaders. \textit{In 1101} the Crusaders were again victorious near Jaffa, but in 1102 an Egyptian army, composed probably of some of Bedr's Syrian veterans, had their full revenge near Ascalon, defeated Baldwin and 700 knights, and compelled the king of Jerusalem to take refuge in a bed of rushes, whence he was smoked out and hunted as far as Jaffa. Ramla once more became a Saracen city. In the following year, several engagements took place. Afdal sent his son, who beat the
Franks at Yāzūr (when Baldwin hid in a haystack), took Ramla, and sent 300 knights as prisoners to Egypt, after killing the rest. A force of 4000 Egyptian horse was sent to Jaffa the same year, supported by a fleet; but the Crusaders were also reinforced, and no effort of the Egyptians could arrest their progress. By 1104 most of Palestine was in Christian hands, except a few coast fortresses, and of these ‘Akka and G'ubeyd fell in that year. The struggle centred round Ramla for some time, and the Atābeg or Selğūk governor of Damascus, Tughtegin, made common cause with the Fāṭimids in endeavouring to save the remnant of Muslim power in the Holy Land; but after an indecisive battle between Jaffa and Ascalon in September, 1104, both sides retired exhausted. After 1109, when Tripolis at length fell after an heroic siege, 1109 Tyre became the hope of İslām and resisted all attempts of the Crusaders until 1124, when Ascalon remained the northern outpost of Egypt and almost the only relic of her former sway in Syria. In 1117 King Baldwin even invaded Egypt itself, burnt part of Faramā, and reached Tinnis, when his fatal illness compelled him to return. The Egyptians attempted no reprisals, and henceforth, until the end of the Fāṭimid dynasty, defensive diplomacy was the prevailing policy of their wezirs.

The wise rule of Afdal came to an end when his sovereign, growing to manhood, chafed in leading strings, and had the great wezir assassinated in the street at the close of 1121. The caliph visited the dying man and exhibited the deepest sympathy; and, as soon as his eyes were closed, spent forty days in plundering his house of the treasures which he had amassed during his long administration. The historian G'emāl-ed-dīn, who was acquainted with one of Afdal’s officers, declares that the wezir’s wealth comprised 6,000,000 D. in gold, 250 sacks (5 bushels each) of Egyptian silver dirhens, 75,000 atlas (satin) dresses, 30 camel-loads of gold caskets from Irāk, etc., together with an amber frame or lay figure on which to display the state robes. The milking of his vast herds was farmed out during his last year for 30,000 D. Among his institutions was that of a sort of
order of chivalry, called the "squires of the chamber," a body of youths furnished each with a horse and arm, and pledged to execute without faltering any command he gave them. Those who distinguished themselves were promoted to the rank of emir. His successor, Ibn el-Baṭā’ihi, styled el-Ma’mūn, though a capable financier and a tolerant minister, could not keep his place; he was imprisoned in 1125 and afterwards crucified.\(^1\) The caliph now tried the experiment of being his own vezir, aided only by the monk Abū-Nejāḥ b. Kenna, who farmed the taxes of the Christians for 100,000 D. The monk became general collector of revenue, but gave himself such airs that the caliph had him flogged to death with thongs.

El-Āmir's sole rule made him universally detested. Oppression of every kind and wanton executions showed the innate cruelty of his nature, and in November, 1130, as he rode back from the Hawdag—a delightful pleasure-house on the island of Rōda, which he had built for his favourite Bedawi mistress, and which rivalled his charming rosaries at Kalyūb—the caliph was set upon by ten of the Ismā’ilian Assassins, and died of his wounds the same night. Apart from his taste in roses, the most notable fact about his private life is that 5000 sheep, at 3 D. a head, were consumed in his kitchen every month.

El-Āmir left no son, and his cousin el-Ḥāfiz\(^2\) succeeded him (1131-1149), at first as regent, pending the delivery of one of the late caliph’s wives who was with child.

\(^1\) He built the Grey Mosque (G’āmi of el-Akmar) in 1121-2, of which the ruins are still to be seen in the Beyn-el-Kasreyn.

\(^2\) Abū-l-Meymūn ‘Abdu-el-Megīd el-Ḥāfiz-li-dini-llah, “the guardian of the religion of God,” struck coins only at Miṣr (Fustāt) and Alexandria, with dates from 1131 to 1148-9.
Unluckily for her, she bore a daughter, but before the regent became actual caliph a curious interregnum occurred. Afdal's son Abu-'Ali, nicknamed Katifat, who had been made vezir by the overwhelming voice of the army, was a staunch Imamian or Twelve-Imam's-man, a believer in the return of the Mahdi, and a complete sceptic as to the Fatimid claim to the caliphate. He shut up the regent in the palace, and had the prayers recited and the coinage struck in the name of no living ruler but of the predicted Mahdi, or Imam el-Muntazar ("the expected").¹ This farce went on for a year, during which Katifat exercised plenary powers. He was not a bad ruler, nevertheless — the tradition of good government was strong in his family; — he was just and benevolent, tolerant and generous to the Copts, and a great lover of poetry. His autocracy could not last long, however, with the rightful caliph intriguing against him in the palace; and in December, 1131, whilst riding out to play polo, he was assassinated by some of the caliph's personal corps or "young guard."

El-Hafiz now entered upon his real caliphate, at the 1131

¹ Coins bearing the name of "the Imam Mohammad Abu-l-Kasim el-Muntazar-li-amri-ilah, commander of the faithful," were struck at el-Mouzziya el-Kahira ("the victorious city of Mouizz, i.e. Cairo), Misr (i.e. Fustat), and Alexandria, in A.H. 525 (1131 A.D.), and another, struck at Misr in 526 (Nov.-Dec., 1131, for the vezir was assassinated on Dec. 8), bears not only the titles of "the Imam el-Mahdi el-Kahim-bi-amri-ilah Husayn-Allah-ala-l-Alamin," which denote the same predicted personage as el-Muntazar, but also presents the name of "el-Afdal Abu-'Ali Ahmad" as "his lieutenant (nabil) and khalifa," titles which indicate an advance in the vezir's pretensions. See Makrizi, Khitat, i. 406; Lanc-Poole, Cat. of Or. Coins in the British Museum, vol. iv., pp. ix.-xiii., 55-6; Sauvage and Lane-Poole, The Twelfth Imam on the Coinage of Egypt, J.K.A.A., N.S., vii. 140-151.
age of 57, with Yānis, an Armenian slave of Afdal, wezīr. Yānis was a strict disciplinarian, a hard, upright, intelligent, and detested man. In nine months he was found too overbearing, and the caliph had him poisoned by the court doctor. After this, perhaps in order to avoid arousing jealousy among the troops, or to escape the tyranny of a too powerful minister, Ḥāfiz tried for a time to do without any wezīr, and proved himself no mean administrator, till the quarrels of his sons over the appointment to the heirship brought about civil war between the rival battalions of the Reyhāniya and the G'uyūshiya black soldiery, to whom the caliph was forced to sacrifice his elder son. The victorious G'uyūshiya mustered to the number of 10,000 in the Beyn-el-Kasreyyn square, and demanded the head of prince Ḥasan, who had caused the deaths of many emirs. The helpless caliph summoned his two court doctors: Abū-Mansūr the Jew refused to do the job, but his Christian colleague, Ibn-Kirfa, mixed a deadly draught, which Ḥasan was forced to drink. Ibn-Kirfa was a man of considerable attainments in science, apart from his practical acquaintance with toxicology; he held several lucrative court appointments, such as master of the wardrobe, and possessed a charming house on the canal; but the caliph could not endure him after he had poisoned his son, and the too subservient doctor was cast into prison and executed soon after his victim.

The remaining years of Fāṭimid rule in Egypt were marred by the continual contests of rival ministers, supported by factions in the army. The troops set up as wezīr Bahrām, an Armenian Christian, who was nevertheless styled “the Sword of Islām,” but his wholesale appointment of his fellow countrymen to all the offices and departments of state, and the consequent indulgence of Christians, led to his expulsion, together with 2000 of his Armenian protégés,¹ and his eventual

¹ The number may be exaggerated, but it should be noted that Bedr el-G‘emālī brought an Armenian bodyguard with him to Cairo, and that for more than half a century the government had been in Armenian
adoption of the monastic life. His successor, Ruḍwān, was the first to assume the title of king (melik), afterwards used by all Fāṭimid wezīrs: he was styled el-Melik el-Afḍal and Seyyid el-Ağall (“the most excellent king and most illustrious noble”), but his titles did not save him from a fall: he was thrown into prison, and though after ten years he contrived to bore his way through the prison wall with the proverbial iron nail, and assembling many followers established himself in the Grey Mosque (el-Aḫmar) in front of the great palace of the caliph, he was cut down and his head was thrown into his wife’s lap. A horrible story is told that his body was cut into small pieces and devoured by batting warriors, in the belief that they would thus assimilate his pith and courage.

The last year of the old caliph’s reign—if reign it could be called when his authority hardly extended beyond the palace and was only maintained there by his drunken negro guard—was passed in a scene of constant faction and tumult; the streets were unsafe, and the people lived in a perpetual terror. The caliph was now 75 years of age, and suffered grievously from indigestion. His physician invented a drum, cunningly composed of the seven metals, welded at the exact moment when the south- ing of each of the seven planets promised fortunate results; and whenever this magic drum was beaten, the caliph’s flatulence was relieved. This interesting machine was in the palace at the time of Saladin’s conquest, and one of his Kurdish soldiers carelessly thrummed it, in ignorance of its peculiar properties. The effect was so astonishing that the man dropped the drum in confusion, and it was broken.

There is no doubt that under the Fāṭimids, on the whole, the Christians of Egypt were treated with unusual consideration, far more than under succeeding dynasties. Setting aside the persecutions of Ḥākim, which were merely part of a general tyranny, the Copts and hands, no doubt to the great increase and aggrandisement of the Armenian colony.

1 Abū-Ṣāliḥ, f. 84a.
Armenians had never before received so much benevolence from Muslim rulers. Under 'Azīz they were favoured beyond the Moḥammdans and were appointed to the highest offices of state. Under Mustanṣir and his successors, Armenians (whether Christians or not) protected their fellow-countrymen and through them the other Christians during the long period when the vezirate was in their hands. Most of the financial posts of government were then, as always, in the possession of Copts. They were the farmers (ḏāmin) of taxes, and the controllers of accounts; and their ability made them indispensable. Throughout the reigns of the later caliphs we read constantly of the building and restoration of churches, recorded by the Christian Abū-Ṣāliḥ, whose contemporary history accurately reflects the state of Egypt at the close of the Fāṭimid rule. The caliph Ḥāfīz even welcomed the Armenian patriarch at his usual public levees on Mondays and Thursdays every week, to receive his instruction in history, and continued the practice up to his death. Ḥāfīz was fond of visiting monasteries, where a manṣara or belvedere was sometimes erected looking on the secluded gardens and commanding a view of "the blessed Nile," and he and his son Zāfir, and the last caliph 'Aḍid, used for this reason to frequent the monastery of Our Lady at el-ʿAdawiya, eighteen miles south of Cairo, and contributed to its support in return for the monks' hospitality. The caliph Āmir, a great lover of gardens, delighted in the monastery of Nahyā, west of Gīza, where he built a belvedere, and whence he used to go out hunting. Every time he went he gave the monks a thousand dirhems. He amused himself by standing in the priest's place in the church, but he refused to bow in order to enter the low door, and compromised matters by stooping and going in backwards. The revenue of the Egyptian churches, largely derived from Fāṭimid gifts, amounted in 1180 to 2923 D. and 4826 sacks (of 5 bushels) of corn, and they owned 915 acres of land.

1 Abū-Ṣāliḥ, ff. 26, 7a, 46b, 61-2, etc.
On the death of Ḥāfīz in October 1149, his youngest son ez-Zāfir⁴ was set on the throne. He was a gay, handsome, careless youth of 16, who thought more of girls and songs than of arms and politics, and was wholly managed by the shrewd wezir Ibn-es-Sālār, a Kurd and an orthodox Sunni, who was styled el-Melik el-ʿAdil. He had driven out the caliph’s nominee, Ibn-Masāl, and was consequently hated by ez-Zāfir (whose “young guard” he suppressed and well-nigh exterminated in 1150), and as heartily detested by the people, whose lives were never safe from his executioners. His assassination by his wife’s grandson, Naṣr, followed by the murder of the caliph by the same treacherous hands, belongs to one of the darkest chapters of Egyptian history. We have the story from the pen of a contemporary, the Arab chief Osāma, who used to hawk cranes and herons with Ḥāfīz’s court, was the guest of Ibn-es-Sālār, and the intimate, if not instigator, of his murderer.⁵ The wezir’s skull was placed in the Museum of Heads in the finance department by the overjoyed caliph, who gave the handsome young assassin twenty silver plates covered each with 20,000 D., and encouraged him to follow up his first essay in the fine art. The suggestion was that he should make away with his own father and fellow-conspirator ʿAbbās, who had succeeded to the wezirate of his murdered stepfather, Ibn-es-Sālār. Naṣr was not indisposed to the second crime, and ʿAbbās, scenting danger, prepared to poison his son. The strained situation was relieved by the murder of the trusting caliph at a friendly entertainment in the young villain’s own house. The next day Osāma was sitting in the palace porch, when he suddenly heard the clash of

---

2 See H. Derenbourg, Vie d’Ousama, 203-260.
swords: it was his friend 'Abbās with his thousand swordsmen, who had gone to the palace ostensibly to inquire for the vanished caliph, and was now massacring the caliph's brothers, whom he had the assurance to tax with the mysterious crime. The baby heir was displayed to the weeping court mounted on the wezīr's shoulder, and the soldiers shouted their mercenary homage. So ghastly was the scene that one of the old janitors of the palace died of terror behind his door with the key in his hand. Cairo rose in revolt, there was fighting in the streets, and the very women and children of the ḥārīms threw stones from the windows upon the wezīr's retainers, who immediately deserted him. 'Abbās could not withstand the storm of indignation and vengeance, and fled towards Syria.\(^1\) On the way he was surprised and killed by the Franks, probably those of Montréal or of Karak by the Dead Sea, who had been set on his track by one of the murdered caliph's sisters. The source of all this tragedy, the inhuman Naṣr, was sold by the Templars to the avengers for 60,000 D., sent to Cairo in an iron cage, tortured by the women of the court, paraded through the city without nose or ears, crucified alive at the Bāb-Zawīla, and left to hang there for many months.

The poor little child of four years, who entered upon his caliphate amidst all these horrors, and nearly died of fright on the awful day of his accession, was proclaimed with the title of el-Fāiz (1154-1160).\(^2\) During the tumult

---

\(^1\) A graphic account of these events is given by the eye-witness Osāma, possibly the Iago of the tragedy (Derenbourg, Vie, 238-258).

\(^2\) Abū-l-Ḳâsim 'Isā el-Fāiz-bi-naṣrī-llāh, "the overcomer by God's help." His coins were from the mints of Miṣr and Alexandria, 1154-5 to 1160.
that succeeded the murder of his kindred, the women of the palace had cut off their hair in mourning and sent it—the strongest possible sign of entreaty in a Muslima—to the emir Ṭalāʾī ibn-Ruzzik, the governor of Ushmuneyn, imploring him to come to the rescue. It was his advance, supported by the Arab tribes of the desert, and joined by the Südānī troops of the household, many emirs, and the general mob of Cairo, that had compelled the instant flight of ‘Abbās. Waving the women’s tresses upon his lance, Ibn-Ruzzik entered Cairo and took possession of the Dār-el-Maʾmūn, the sumptuous palace of ‘Abbās and before him of Ibn-el-Baṭāḥī." He went to the room of the murderer Naṣr, raised a flagstone pointed out in the pavement, and there found the body of the murdered Zāfrīr, which he interred in the mausoleum of the caliphs amid universal lamentation. Then he set about restoring order, punishing the guilty, executing the truculent generals who had made havoc in Cairo for so many years, and establishing a reign of law.

El-Melik eṣ-Ṣalīḥ, as he was now styled, was a strong man, and Egypt was sorely in need of strong men at that time. Ascalon, her last outpost in Palestine, had fallen away from her during the divisions and confusion that followed upon Ibn-es-Salār's assassination. It had long been a source of great solicitude, frequently attacked by the kings of Jerusalem, and doggedly defended by a large garrison, which was renewed twice a year from Egypt. The hurried return of one of these six-months' commanders, 'Abbās, to enjoy the fruits of his stepfather's assassination, left it comparatively unprotected; the Christians seized the occasion, and with the capture of Ascalon in the summer of 1153 vanished the last hold of the Fāṭimids on Palestine. That the Crusading rule had not been extended over Egypt itself was chiefly due to the growing power of the Turkish states on the east. The king of Jerusalem was too closely occupied, first with the savage onslights of Zengi, the Atābeg of Mūṣil, who

1 It was converted by Saladin in 1177 into the ʿIṣnafī "College of the Swordmakers" (Maqr. ii. 365-6).
had joined Aleppo to his dominions on the Tigris and Euphrates, harried Syria and defeated the Crusaders with great slaughter at Athārīb in 1130, and had finally taken Edessa, "the conquest of conquests," in 1144.1 After the death of Zengi two years later, his son Nūr-ed-dīn succeeded to his post as champion of Islām in Syria, and greatly strengthened his position by the annexation in 1154 of Damascus, which had long been in defensive alliance with the Crusaders. The collapse of the second Crusade under the emperor Conrad and Louis VII had disheartened and discredited the Franks; and the establishment of so strong a power as Nūr-ed-dīn’s kingdom at Aleppo and Damascus in the immediate north and east rendered the position of the Jerusalem kingdom extremely insecure. Had Egypt been strong, had Egypt been of the same orthodox creed, a combination with Damascus would doubtless have driven the Crusaders to the coast—as such a union did a little later. The Egyptian wazirs were fully alive to the value of Nūr-ed-dīn’s support, and Ibn-es-Sālār had opened negotiations with him through the mediation of ʿOsāma, who was well-known at both courts. But the weak point of Nūr-ed-dīn was excessive caution, and his ambition was satisfied with the ample dominions he possessed, without venturing upon wider schemes. Moreover, whilst as a notably devout Muslim he was bound to wage the Holy War against the infidels, his very piety raised scruples against any alliance with the schismatic caliph of Egypt. Thus it fell out that whilst the fear of Nūr-ed-dīn restrained the Franks from invading Egypt,2 the horror of heresy withheld the sultan of Damascus from co-operation with Egypt against the common enemy.

Neither Damascus nor Jerusalem could afford to let Egypt fall into the hands of the other, and thus we find Cairo becoming the centre of diplomatic activity. The

1 See an outline of Zengi’s career in Lane-Poole, *Life of Saladin*, 35–61.
2 The Sicilian fleet made a descent on Tinnīs in 1153, and again in 1155, but after plundering the coast cities it attempted no serious occupation of the country.
wēzīr Ṣāliḥ ibn-Ruzzik was eager for an alliance with Nūr-ed-dīn, and his pourparlers, expressed in elegant Arabic verse addressed to his friend Osāma, who was now again at Damascus, enlarged on a victory won by the Egyptian army under Ḍirghām near Gaza over the Franks in March, 1158, extolled the valour and numbers of the troops and ships of Egypt, and urged Nūr-ed-dīn to bestir himself to similar efforts, sketching a glorious campaign of combined triumphs. He got nothing but evasive replies, couched in vague poetic metaphor, from Osāma; Nūr-ed-dīn evidently distrusted the Egyptian proposals. Ibn-Ruzzik even sent a formal embassy in October to Damascus, with handsome presents and a collection of the wezīr’s war-songs, offering 70,000 D. towards the Holy War, but wholly in vain.

Failing in his policy of combined action against the Crusaders, Ibn-Ruzzik was yet successful in maintaining order in Egypt itself. “He was eminent by his personal merit,” says Ibn-Khallikān, “profuse in largesse, accessible to suitors, a generous patron to men of talent, and a good poet.” His verse was collected in two volumes, and he had a bad habit of reciting it to his friends, not without retaliation. Like other wezīrs, he built a mosque, the ruins of which are still to be seen close to the Bāb-Zawila, though much of the decoration is attributed to a later restoration. He was not above avarice, however, and farmed the taxes to the highest bidders on six months’ tenures to the great injury of the fellāḥīn. He might have long survived their discontent, but he ran a more serious risk in imposing a strict regimen upon the caliph’s household. The little caliph Fāiz had died in July, 1160, at the age of eleven, after six years of virtual captivity and constant epileptic seizures. His successor,

---

1 See the poetical correspondence in the autobiography of Osāma, and Derenbourg Vie d’Ousāma, 285-295.
el-'Āḍid (1160–1171), the last of the Fāṭimid caliphs, was as
only nine, and was chosen from the various possible heirs
simply because his childhood made him easy to manage.
But the weizir had to reckon with the women of the
ḥarīm, who hated his rigorous control; and an aunt of
the caliph succeeded in procuring the great man's assassi-
nation. As Ibn-Ruzzik lay dying, he begged the child
 to send the guilty woman to be punished, and had her
executed before his eyes. His last words were a regret
that he had not conquered Jerusalem and exterminated
the Franks, and a warning to his son to beware of Shā-
war, the Arab governor of Upper Egypt. The regret
and the warning were well founded. Shāwar deposed
and executed the weizir's son, el-'Āḍil Ruzzik, at the
beginning of 1163, and within the year the Christian
king of Jerusalem was in Egypt.

The interference of Amalric was the result of a fresh
change in the weizirate. Shāwar was driven from Cairo
by the popular favourite, Dirghām, a Lakhmi Arab, who
had successfully commanded the troops against the
Crusaders at Gaza, and held the post of colonel of the
Barqiya battalion and "lord of the door"—an office
second only to that of weizir. Shāwar fled to Nūr-ed-
din and implored his help. He offered not only to pay
the cost of an expedition, but promised a third of the
revenues of Egypt in the form of an annual tribute. The
king of Syria was not indifferent to the importance
of obtaining a hold upon Egypt: he knew that it was the
master-key of the political situation and would form a
prolific source of revenue. Yet he hesitated to accept
Shāwar's overtures. Distrust of the man himself, and
apprehension of the risks to which an expedition would
be exposed when marching through the desert on the
Crusaders' flank, made him pause. Events, however,
moved too fast for his prudence. Dirghām quarrelled

---

1 Abū-Moḥammad ʿAbdallāh el-ʿĀḍid-li-dīn-illāh, "the strenghtener of the religion of God." His few coins were struck at Miṣr (1161 and 1164–5), Cairo (1160, 1167–1171), and Alexandria (1167–71).
2 The following account of the conquest of Egypt by Nūr-ed-din's armies is slightly abridged from Lane-Poole, Life of Saladin, pp. 81–97.
with Amalric over the yearly subsidy (which had apparently been paid of late by the vezirs of Egypt to the Franks to stave off a Christian invasion\(^1\)), and the new king of Jerusalem with prompt decision invaded Egypt. Dirghâm, after a severe defeat near Bilbeys, ingeniously avoided total discomfiture by breaking down the dams and causeways and flooding the country with the imprisoned waters of the Nile, then at its height. Amalric had already retired to Palestine, but half satisfied with some sort of composition, when Dirghâm, hearing of Shâwar’s negotiations at Damascus, perceived his error in not conciliating the Latin king, and hastened to proffer an eternal alliance, to be cemented by increased tribute. This step must have been known to Nûr-ed-dîn; fortified by an auspicious consultation of the Korân, he immediately cast his former scruples to the winds; and before Amalric could intervene, Shâwar was on the march to Egypt, supported by a strong force of Turkmâns from Damascus, led by Shirkûh, with his nephew Saladin on his staff.

The Egyptians were defeated at Bilbeys, but rallied again under the walls of Cairo. For several days indecisive conflicts took place, Shâwar holding Fusût, and the other the castle of Cairo. Then, to raise funds, Dirghâm possessed himself of the waḫf, the “money of the orphans,” and at once the people began to fall away from him. Worse still, he was deserted by the caliph and the army. Driven to bay, for the last time he sounded the assembly. In vain “the drums beat and the trumpets blared, ma-sha-ilah! on the battlements”: no man answered. In vain the desperate emir, surrounded by his bodyguard of 500 horse, all that remained to him of a powerful army, stood suppliant before the caliph’s palace for a whole day, even until the

\(^1\) William of Tyre calls it annuum tributi pensionem (Hist., xix. 5), and others give the amount as 33,000 D. The tribute or blackmail must have been very recently instituted, for Ibn-Ruzzik, who died in 1161, assuredly would have paid no such subsidy to the “infidels.” Probably Shâwar began the payment in 1162, but the fact cannot be proved.
sunset call to prayer, and implored him by the memory of his forefathers to stand forth at the window and bless his cause. No answer came; the guard itself gradually dispersed, till only thirty troopers were left. Suddenly a warning cry reached him: "Look to thyself and save thy life!"—and lo! Shāwar’s trumpets and drums were heard, entering from the Gate of the Bridge. Then at last the deserted leader rode out through the Zawila gate: the fickle folk hacked off his head, and bore it in triumph through the streets; his body they left to be worried by the curs. Such was the tragic end of a brave and gallant gentleman, poet, and paladin. May

Shāwar, restored to power, was eager to see the backs of the allies who had effected his reinstatement. He cautiously excluded Shīrkūh from the fortified city of Cairo and kept him in the suburbs. Then safe, as he thought, within his own strong walls, he defied his ally, broke all his promises, and refused to pay the indemnity. Shīrkūh was not the man to forego his rights or condone broken faith; he sent Saladin to occupy Bilbeys and the eastern province. This hostile movement compelled Shāwar in turn to appeal to Amalric. On the arrival of the Crusaders the Syrian army entrenched itself at Bilbeys, where it resisted all assaults for three months. A fortunate diversion at last came to its relief. Nūr-ed-din was waging a successful campaign in Palestine. After a reverse at the hands of Gilbert de Lacy and Robert Mansel, he had taken Harenc and was laying siege to Cæsarea Philippi; and Amalric was sorely wanted at home to protect his own kingdom, always dangerously exposed upon its eastern marches. Nor was Shīrkūh less anxious to extricate himself from a situation where, attacked all day and every day, penned in behind weak earthworks, and running short of food, his position was neither safe nor agreeable. An armistice was accordingly arranged, and the two parties came to terms. On the 27th of Oct., October, the Syrians marched out of their camp and filed off between the lines of the allied Crusaders and Egyptians, Shīrkūh himself, battle-axe in hand, bringing up the rear.
The expedition to Egypt had ended without glory, but it had accomplished its object; it had spied out the land, and Shirkūḥ was able to report favourably on the possibility and advantages of annexation. Egypt was a country, he said, "without men, and with a precarious and contemptible government." Its wealth and defencelessness invited aggression. The ambitious general was devoured by desire for a viceregal throne at Cairo, and from this time forth he persistently urged Nūr-ed-dīn to authorize the conquest of Egypt. The bolder spirits at court supported his importunity, and the caliph of Baghdaḍ accorded his blessing and encouragement to a project which involved the deposition of his heretical rival. Nūr-ed-dīn, ever cautious, resisted these influences for a while, but at last gave way,—possibly because rumours had reached him of a closer union between Shāwār and the Franks, which soon proved to be well founded.

It was, in fact, a race for the Nile. Shirkūḥ started first, at the beginning of 1167, with 2000 picked horsemen, and, taking the desert route by the Gazelle Valley to avoid a collision with the Franks, but encountering on the way a violent and disastrous sandstorm, reached the Nile at Atfih, some forty miles south of Cairo, where he might cross to the west bank without fear of molestation. He had hardly carried his army over, however, when Amalric appeared on the east side, having hurried from Palestine as soon as he heard of the enemy's movements. The two armies followed the opposite banks down to Cairo, where Amalric pitched his camp close to Fustāṭ, whilst Shirkūḥ took up a position exactly facing him at G'īza. There each waited for the other to begin operations. Meanwhile, Amalric took the opportunity of the wezir's amicable dispositions to place their alliance on a more formal basis. Convinced of the unstable character of the minister, he resolved to have a treaty ratified by the caliph in person. The conditions were that Egypt should pay the king 200,000 gold pieces then and there, and a further like sum at a later date, in return for his aid in expelling the enemy. On this
agreement Amalric gave his hand to the caliph’s representatives, and claimed a like ratification from the caliph himself.

The introduction of Christian ambassadors to the sacred presence, where few even of the most exalted Muslims were admitted, was unprecedented; but Amalric was in a position to dictate his own terms. Permission was granted, and Hugh of Cæsarea with Geoffrey Fulcher the Templar were selected for the unique embassy. The wezîr himself conducted them with every detail of oriental ceremony and display to the Great Palace of the Fâtimids. They were led by mysterious corridors and through guarded doors, where stalwart Südânîs saluted with naked swords. They reached a spacious court, open to the sky, and surrounded by arcades resting on marble pillars; the panelled ceilings were carved and inlaid in gold and colours; the pavement was rich mosaic. The unaccustomed eyes of the rude knights opened wide with wonder at the taste and refinement that met them at every step;—here they saw marble fountains, birds of many notes and wondrous plumage, strangers to the western world; there, in a further hall, more exquisite even than the first, “a variety of animals such as the ingenious hand of the painter might depict, or the license of the poet invent, or the mind of the sleeper conjure up in the visions of the night,—such, indeed, as the regions of the East and the South bring forth, but the West sees never, and scarcely hears of.” A last, after many turns and windings, they reached the throne room, where the multitude of the pages and their sumptuous dress proclaimed the splendour of their lord. Thrice did the wezîr, ungirding his sword, prostrate himself to the ground, as though in humble supplication to his god; then, with a sudden rapid sweep, the heavy curtains broidered with gold and pearls were drawn aside, and on a golden throne, robed in more than regal state, the caliph sat revealed.

The wezîr humbly presented the foreign knights, and set forth in lowly words the urgent danger from without,
and the great friendship of the king of Jerusalem. The caliph, a swarthy youth emerging from boyhood,—
*fuscus, procerus corpore, facie venusta,—*replied with suave dignity. He was willing, he said, to confirm in the
amelest way the engagements made with his beloved ally. But when asked to give his hand in pledge of
faithfulness, he hesitated, and a thrill of indignation at the stranger’s presumption ran through the listening
court. After a pause, however, the caliph offered his hand—gloved as it was—to Sir Hugh. The blunt
knight spoke him straight: “My lord, troth has no covering: in the good faith of princes, all is naked and
open.” Then at last, very unwillingly, as though
derogating from his dignity, the caliph, forcing a smile,
drew off the glove and put his hand in Hugh’s, swearing
word by word to keep the covenant truly and in all
good faith.¹

The treaty thus ratified, Amalric attempted to throw
a bridge of boats across the Nile; but the presence of
the enemy on the other side defeated the plan, and he
resorted to another. Descending to where the river
forked into its two main streams, he conveyed his army
over to the delta by night, and thence to the other side,
in ships. Shirkūh discovered the movement too late to
oppose, and finding the enemy landed he retreated to
Upper Egypt. The king pursuing came up with him at
“the two Gates” (el-Bābān), ten miles south of Minya.
Here was a plain, on the border where the cultivated
land touched the desert, and numerous sandy hills gave
cover to the combatants. Shirkūh’s captains at first
advised him not to risk a battle; but one of them stood
forth and said stoutly, “Those who fear death or slavery
are not fit to serve kings: let them turn ploughmen, or
stay at home with their wives.” Saladin and others
applauded; and Shirkūh, always ready for hard knocks, ¹¹⁶⁷
gladly gave battle (18 April, 1167). He put the

¹ William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*,
lib. xix., cap. 19, 20. The embassy is not recorded by the Arabic
chroniclers.
baggage in the centre, covered by Saladin's troop, which was to bear the first brunt of the attack. Saladin's orders were to fall back when pressed and draw the enemy in pursuit, and then to press them in turn, as the fight might allow. Shirkuh himself took command of the right wing, composed of a body of picked horsemen, which was to cut up the enemy's rear, consisting of the less warlike Egyptians. It fell out as he expected. The Franks were drawn away by Saladin; the Egyptians were cut up and routed; and when the Crusaders, returning from the pursuit, found their allies fled, they also hastily retreated, abandoning their baggage and leaving Hugh of Caesarea among the prisoners. The victors, however, were not strong enough to follow up the success, march on to Cairo, and run Shawar and Amalric to earth. Taking the lesser risk, Shirkuh went north by a desert route and entered Alexandria without opposition. Here he installed Saladin as governor, with one half of his army, while with the other he again turned southwards to levy contributions in Upper Egypt.

The joint forces of the Franks and Egyptians now invested Alexandria, whilst the Christian fleet held the coast. The defence of the city was Saladin's first independent command, and he quitted himself well. He had but a thousand followers of his own, in the midst of a mongrel and partly foreign populace, who, as malcontents, were not sorry to take part against a feeble government or to defend their city against the savage and bloodthirsty Franks; yet, as merchants and tradesmen, could not conceal their terror of the siege-machines and infernal engines which the "infidels" brought against their walls. Provisions, moreover, ran short; and short rations make a humble stomach. At last they

1 Ibn-el-Athir, Kamil, 548; according to his Atabegs it was a month earlier. The numbers engaged are variously estimated. The Arab historians give Shirkuh only 2000 horsemen. William of Tyre (xix. 25), on the other hand, puts the Saracen force at 9000 men mailed (loricis galeisque), 3000 archers, and at least 10,000 Arabs armed with spears. The Latins, he says, had only 374 knights, an uncertain number of light infantry (Turcopoles), and a body of Egyptians who were more a burden than a help.
rose in a tumult and openly talked of surrender. Saladin meanwhile had sent to his uncle for help, and Shirkūh was hurrying down from Kūš laden with treasure. The news put fresh heart into the people, already spurred on by Saladin's spirited exhortations and the promise of reinforcement, or frightened into a desperate courage by his tales of the monstrous barbarities inflicted by the Franks upon the vanquished. They held out for seventy-five days, in spite of hunger and incessant assaults, till it became known that Shirkūh was at the Abyssinians' Lake, laying siege to Cairo. On this, Amalric gave up all thoughts of Alexandria, and a peace was arranged, by which both parties agreed to leave Egypt to the Egyptians. Alexandria was surrendered to Shāwar; prisoners were exchanged; and Shirkūh led the exhausted remnant of his 2000 troopers back to Damascus.

The Christians claimed the campaign as a triumph, and the evacuation of Alexandria as a surrender; but if the Arab chroniclers are right in saying that Amalric paid Shirkūh 50,000 pieces of gold to go away, the advantage would appear to have been on the side of the Muslims. On the other hand, the Franks, in violation (apparently) of their agreement, not only left a Resident at Cairo, but insisted on furnishing the guards of the city gates from their own soldiers; they also increased the annual subsidy to be paid by Shāwar to the king of Jerusalem to 100,000 gold pieces. Not content with this hold, the more impetuous among Amalric's counsellors presently began to urge the complete conquest of Egypt, and their advice was strongly supported by the garrison they had left at Cairo and

Fustāt, who had naturally the best means of discovering the weakness of their defences. The king of Jerusalem
once more marched into Egypt; but now he entered as an enemy where before he had been bidden as an ally. Arrived at Bilbeys on 3 November, 1168, he added to perfidy the crime of wholesale massacre,—he spared neither age nor sex, says the Latin chronicler, in the devoted town.

This barbarous act at once ranged the Egyptians on the side of Nūr-ed-din, and inspired them to heroic exertions. They took advantage of the Christians' foolish loitering to marshal their forces and strengthen their defences. The old city of Fustāṭ, for three hundred years the metropolis of Egypt and still a densely populated suburb of Cairo, was by Shāwar's orders set on fire, that it might not give shelter to the Franks. Twenty thousand naphtha barrels and ten thousand torches were lighted. The fire lasted fifty-four days, and its traces may still be found in the wilderness of sandheaps stretching over miles of buried rubbish on the south side of Cairo.¹ The people fled "as from their very graves," the father abandoned his children, the brother his twin; and all rushed to Cairo for dear life. The hire of a camel for the mile or two of transit cost thirty pieces of gold. The capital itself was in a tumult of preparation for the attack. The assault, however, was postponed by the negotiations which Shāvar adroitly contrived, to buy off his greedy assailants. There was more pretence than honesty in his diplomacy, for he was sending at the same moment couriers to Damascus to implore the aid of Nūr-ed-din. The young caliph of Egypt wrote himself, and even enclosed some of his wives' hair as a supreme act of supplication which no gentleman could resist.

This time the king of Syria did not hesitate; he was nettled at the poor results of the two previous expeditions, and indignant with the Franks for what he held to be a flagrant breach of faith. He might even have gone in person, but that he was preoccupied with the

¹ The population reoccupied the burnt city to some extent for a century, and its final abandonment and demolition dates from the reign of Beybars (Kaškashandī, 58).
unsettled state of Mesopotamia. He lost no time, however, in despatching a force of 2000 picked troopers from his own guard, with 6000 paid Turkmans of approved valour, under the command of Shirkūh, supported by a large staff of emulous emirs. Nūr-ed-dīn himself superintended the marshalling of the army at the Spring Head, a day’s march from Damascus, and gave every man a gratuity of twenty gold pieces, whilst he committed to Shirkūh 200,000 D. for his military chest.

On 17 Dec., 1168, the third expedition began its march to Egypt, once more to rescue Shāwar, in name, but in fact with far larger designs. Amalric, always needy and greedy, was still waiting before Cairo for more of the wezir’s promised gold, when Shirkūh suddenly evaded his junction with the Egyptians (8 Jan., 1169), effecting the Frank army which had gone out to intercept his advance. Deceived by Shāwar and outgeneralled by Shirkūh, the discomfited king retired to Palestine without offering battle, having gained, as the proverb has it, nothing better than the “boots of Honen.” The Syrians entered Cairo in triumph, and were welcomed as deliverers. The grateful caliph gave audience to Shirkūh and invested him with a robe of honour, clothed in which he returned to display himself to the army. Shāwar, inwardly devoured by jealousy and alarm, rode out daily to the Syrian camp, in great state, with all his banners, drums, and trumpets, and overwhelmed the general with protestations of devotion; but meanwhile he took no steps to perform his engagements to Nūr-ed-dīn, but was actually meditating a treacherous arrest of Shirkūh and his officers at a friendly banquet. The Syrian leaders soon determined that he was not to be trusted, and Saladin and G’urdik resolved to get rid of him. As the wezir was riding out to visit the general, who chanced to be paying his respects to the venerated tomb of the Imām ʿesh-Shāfiʿī, Saladin and his men dragged him from his horse and made him prisoner. Whatever doubts Shirkūh may have entertained as to the fate of Shāwar were set at rest by a peremptory order from the caliph himself, who demanded the head
of the wezir. Thus ended the brief and checkered career of a remarkable and politic minister; an Arab chief, moreover, of ancient lineage, with all the Bedawi's daring and the ancestral love of poetry—insomuch that his once filled 'Omâra's mouth with gold in delight at a ran ode—and, it must be added, with the Arab's full share of falsehood and deceit.

The caliph el-'Âdid, who was much impressed by the gallant bearing of his deliverers, immediately appointed Shîrkûh to the vacant office, clad him in the robes of wezir, invested him with plenary powers, and gave him the titles of el-Melik en-Nâṣir, "Victorious King," and Commander-in-chief. The people were as pleased as the pontiff; they had liked the jolly soldier as he rode over the country a year and a half ago, even though he was levying taxes; and the Cairenes appreciated the liberal manner in which he had disbursed from his heavy military chest, and had refreshed them with the looting of Shâwar's palace, where they left not so much as a cushion for his lavish successor to sit on. The poet saw more clearly when he remarked that the claws of "the Lion" ¹ were now fastened on his prey. The "Lion of the Faith," however, lived scarcely more than two months to enjoy his quarry, but died suddenly, 23 March, 1169. He was succeeded by his nephew, the famous Saladin, and two years later the Fâtiûmid Caliphate was abolished.

It is remarkable that, although several of the Fâtiûmid caliphs were men of intellectual culture and highly appreciative of literary talent, the period of their rule was unproductive in writers of exceptional merit. It was not for lack of patronage, for the wezirs of Egypt, as well as some of the caliphs, were often generous in their gifts to scholars, poets, and divines. The wezir Ibn-Killis used to hold meetings every Thursday night, when he would read his compositions to the assembled savans, rhetoricians, grammarians, and divines, and poets

¹ Asad-ed-din, "Lion of the Faith," was the Arabic surname of Shîrkûh, which is itself Persian for "Mountain-Lion."
would recite their verses, usually panegyrics of their host. He employed a regular staff in transcribing manuscripts, and every day a large table was laid for the learned men who joined his household and other guests. The caliph's physician, et-Temimi of Jerusalem, was a man of real science, and his librarian, esh-Shābushtī, wrote a history of the monasteries. Abū-r-Rakāmak of Antioch (†1008-9), whom Tha'labī described as "the pearl of his age, the amalgam of excellences, master of poetry in its light as in its serious moods," was among the panegyrist who attended the levees of Ibn-Killis, and wrote odes in praise of him and of the caliphs Mo'izz, 'Aziz, and Ḥākim. El-Kindī, the historian and topographer of Egypt (†961), lived at Fustat, and his continuator, Ibn-Zūlāk (†977), an Egyptian, also wrote a history of the Kādis. But the most famous men of the early Fātimid time were the Kādi en-No'mān and his sons and grandsons, who held the highest legal and religious offices for forty years, from the conquest of Egypt to the middle of the reign of Ḥākim, who accorded them special privileges. These Kādis, like most of their order, were not merely learned in the law and able judges, but men of the highest education of the age, familiar with all branches of Arabic literature, and themselves historians and poets. Another celebrated civil servant (though he wore a uniform) of the time of Ḥākim was el-Musebbiḥi (†1029), an Egyptian by birth, who wrote the history of his country in 26,000 pages, and other works on religion, poetry, astrology, curiosities of literature and history, and the arts of the table, to the extent of 35,000 pages more. The wealth of the Fātimid court and the encouragement given to the polite sciences drew many foreigners to Cairo. El-Kuḍā'ī, the historian and jurisconsult (†1062), Ibn-Bābshādh, the grammarian (†1077), and Abū-Ya'kūb en-Nagīrāmī (†1126) of Baṣra, a distinguished philologer, were amongst these visitors; and the Arabic manuscripts on philology, poetry, and the "Days" of the Arabs, copied by the last's accurate pen at an extremely moderate price, or delivered orally at his precise dictation, long remained the received texts in
Egypt. The poet Ibn-el-Khallâl (†1171), described by his contemporary, 'Imād-ed-dîn (Saladin’s secretary), as “the pupil of Egypt’s eye, combining all the noble qualities of his country,” at the time of Hâfiz, was president of the correspondence department, where the art of writing despatches in the most elaborate style was studiously cultivated. When a candidate for admission was asked what qualifications he possessed for the art of correspondence, he replied, “None, except that I know the ʻKorân and the Ḥamâsa by heart.” “That will do,” said Ibn-el-Khallâl. It was as though an Englishman should say that he could repeat the whole of the Bible and the “Golden Treasury.” The vezîr Ibn-es-Sâlîr was a devout Shāfî‘ite Muslim as well as a tyrannical governor, and the college he founded at Alexandria to propagate the teaching of the theological school initiated by the Imâm Shâfî‘ had an excellent president in the eminent traditioner and divine es-Sâlîf of Isfâhân (†1180), among whose pupils was Ibn-el-G‘arrân (†1219), the poet, calligrapher, and ornament of the correspondence office. He elaborated a riddle which takes three large quarto pages to unravel. The Kâdi er-Rashîd ibn-ez-Zubeyr (†1166), poet and accomplished man of letters, was another of Ibn-es-Sâlîr’s friends.

That there was not a larger number of distinguished scholars during the two centuries of Fatimid rule in Egypt is partly due to the insecurity of life—the court poet, ‘Abd-el-Ǧhaffâr, for example, was wantonly beheaded by Ḥâkim, as were some of the celebrated Nō‘mân Kâdis—but much more to the heretical character of the dynasty. Orthodox Muslims shunned the court of caliphs whose doctrines and claims they utterly repudiated. A great deal of intellectual activity, however, was shown by the rank and file of students in Cairo during this period, and although the University of the Azhar had not yet attained the celebrity which it acquired under the orthodox rule of the succeeding dynasties, there was already the nucleus of a great theological school. The era of Egyptian colleges begins with the reign of Saladin.

In art, as has been shown, the immense wealth of the
Fatimid Monuments

Fāṭimids tended to encourage the production of costly and beautiful objects of luxury, and the caliphs and their wazīrs were notable builders. The great mosques of el-Azhar (though restored out of all semblance to the original design) and Ḥākim are still standing to testify to their zeal, and the remains of the smaller mosques or chapels of el-Aḵmar and of ēs-Ṣāliḥ ibn-Ruzzik display the bold and effective designs and austere Kūfī inscriptions for which Fāṭimid art is renowned. The three massive gates of Cairo, built by Roman architects and resembling in plan and in details the heavy gates of Byzantine fortresses, are among the most enduring relics of the Shi‘a government in Egypt, and it is worth noticing that the heretical formula of faith inscribed in beautiful Kūfī characters over the Gate of Victory in the reign of Mustaṣir has triumphantly survived eight centuries of dominant orthodoxy.
CHAPTER VII

SALADIN

1169—1193


Monuments.— Citadel of Cairo and third wall of city.

Inscriptions.—Irrigation decree at Damascus, A.H. 574; restoration tablet in great mosque of Damascus, 575 (these two have disappeared, but are recorded by Waddington and van Berchem); citadel of Cairo, 579 (Casanova, Mém. Miss. Arch., vi. 569); mosque of el-Akshá, Jerusalem (de Vogüé, Temple de Jer., 101); Dome of the Rock, Jerusalem, 585 (de Vogüé, 91); Kubbat Yusuf, Jerusalem; Church of St. Anne, Jerusalem, 588 (de Vogüé, Églises de la Terre Sainte, 444, van Berchem, Inscr. Ar. de Syrie, Mém. de l’Inst. Egypt, 1897, Pl. v. fig. 10); tomb of Saladin, Damascus (inscr. disappeared, but recorded by Ibn-Khallikán, iv. 547).

Coins.—Minted at Cairo, Miṣr, Alexandria, Damascus, Iḫmáh, Aleppo.

Glass weights.—Bearing name of ‘Abbásid caliphs el-Mustadī and en-Násir, without Saladin’s name or date (Lane-Poole, Cat. Arab. Glass Weights in B.M., 36-8).

The epoch of Saladin’s rule, though brief, was the most glorious in the history of Muslim domination in Egypt; but it owed its glory to causes outside. Of his reign of twenty-four years, Saladin 1 passed only eight at Cairo; the other sixteen were spent in campaigns in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Palestine. These external wars can only be briefly described here, and the chief place must

1 Saladin is the European softened form of Ṣalāḥ-ed-din, “Honour of the Faith.” His full names and titles were El-Melik en-Nāṣir Abū-l-Muṣaffar Ṣalāḥ-ed-dunya-wa-d-din Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb.
be given to the affairs of Egypt proper.\footnote{1} Saladin was born at Tekrit in 1137-8, the son of Ayyûb, a Kurdish officer in the employment of the Baghdād caliph and afterwards of the Atâbeg Zengi of Mūsîl. His youth was entirely undistinguished; and when his father became governor of Damascus, Saladin lived ten years at the court of Nūr-ed-dīn without making any mark. He took no part, apparently, in the Syrian campaigns of his uncle Shîrkhûh, who was Nūr-ed-dīn’s chief general; he loved retirement, and up to the age of twenty-five remained a completely obscure individual. He did indeed accompany the expeditions to Egypt in 1164 and 1167, and distinguished himself at the battle of Bābān and the defence of Alexandria; but it was with great reluctance that he joined the third expedition in 1168, which proved to be his stepping-stone to empire. His succession to the office of wezir of the Fāṭimid caliph on his uncle’s death in March, 1169, was due, no doubt, partly to his kinship, but chiefly, as it seems, to the belief of the Egyptian court that so young and apparently unambitious a man would be easy to manage. His own comrades resented the appointment, and though the majority were won over by tact and presents, a certain number of jealous veterans retired to Syria.

The young wezir’s position was curiously anomalous. He was at once the prime-minister of an heretical (Shī‘a) caliph and the lieutenant of an orthodox (Sunni) king. With superb inconsistency the two names were included in the same prayer every Friday in the mosque. The Muslim population belonged to both creeds, but it may be assumed that two centuries of Fāṭimid rule had given some predominance to the Shī‘a doctrine. To win the loyalty of the people was Saladin’s first object, in order to strengthen himself against the obvious jealousy of his sovereign, the king of Syria, and pave the way for the abolition of the Shī‘a caliphate and the foundation of an independent monarchy in Egypt.

\footnote{1 This necessary limitation may be compensated by reference to the recently published \textit{Life of Saladin} by the present writer, from which the following pages are partly abridged.}
Saladin's generosity and personal charm soon gained him the confidence of the Egyptians, and the substitution of his own father and brothers,—a conspicuously able and gallant family,—in the place of suspected officers of the court, strengthened his position. A rising of the caliph’s black troops was repressed after some hard fighting in the streets, and the Südânîs were banished to the Sa’îd, where rebellion smouldered for several years. Hardly was the negro revolt checked when Damietta was attacked by the combined fleets of the Eastern emperor and the king of Jerusalem, numbering 220 galleys. Saladin had just time to reinforce the garrison, which proved equal to repulsing even the powerful mangonels and movable siege-towers of the enemy, whilst the army of Cairo harassed them outside. Famine and storm came to the aid of the Muslims, and the half-drowned starving invaders made peace and returned in great dejection to Palestine. This was the turning-point in the Franco-Egyptian struggle. Henceforth, instead of going forth to attack, the kingdom of Jerusalem was forced to stand upon its defence.

Saladin followed up this success by a raid into Palestine, in which he plundered the town of Gaza, and in the same year took Eyla, at the head of the gulf of Akaba, the key of the Red Sea route for pilgrims to Mekka. To carry out this operation he resorted to a device which was repeated by his adversaries afterwards; he built ships in sections at Cairo, and carried the parts overland to the Red Sea, where they were put together. The result of these successes against the “infidels” was such a measure of popularity in Egypt that Saladin felt himself strong enough to take a decisive step. As a strictly orthodox Muslim, he had chafed under his forced recognition of an heretical caliph, and he had only submitted to the situation because he did not feel sure of popular support. To educate public opinion he had founded

Fig. 42.—Glass weight of caliph el-Mustâdî, issued by Saladin, 1171.
three orthodox colleges in 1170; and now, with the added reputation of the “holy war” successfully waged in Palestine, he caused the name of the 'Abbāsid caliph to be proclaimed instead of the Fātimid in the mosques on Friday, 10 Sept., 1171. This ecclesiastical revolution passed off without a murmur. The assembled congregation looked merely surprised. The last of the Fātimids, happily, never learnt the secret of his deposition. He had been a recluse in his palace since the arrival of Saladin, and when his name was suppressed he lay dying. The news was mercifully withheld from him; and the last of the famous dynasty, which had been given such great opportunities and had misused them so contemptibly, died three days later, ignorant of his fall. His family and kindred were maintained in gilded captivity, and his 18,000 slaves and servants distributed. Of all the treasures that he found in the palaces, Saladin kept nothing for himself. He gave some to his followers, some he presented to his sovereign Nur-ed-din; the library of 120,000 manuscripts he gave to his learned chancellor, the Ḳādī el-Fāḍil; the rest was sold for the public purse. Nor did it suit his simple and austere mode of life to take up his residence in the stately halls of the late caliph. He remained in the “House of the Wezîr,” and gave up the palaces to the officers of the army. No longer a royal residence, the beautiful mansions of the Fātimids fell into decay, and not a vestige of them has been preserved. “O censurer of my love for the sons of Fāṭima,” cried 'Omāra the poet,

1 The caliph el-'Āḍid left eleven sons, four sisters, four wives, and other relations to the number of 152, whom the majordomo Karâkûsh shut up in different buildings of the palace, separating the sexes, but indulging them with every luxury except posterity. Nevertheless they contrived to rear grandsons of the caliph, and the family was not extinct in 1260. A curious magic cup from Cairo, dated 571 (1175-6), bears the name of “the Imām el-Mo’tasîm-bi-llâh Abū-l-'Abbâs Zâhir, the moon being in Cancer,” and this may refer to one of the sons of el-‘Āḍid, whose claim was perhaps supported by the pro-Fātimid party, who continued for some years to conspire in the hope of restoring the fallen dynasty or of profiting by its nominal restoration. See Casanova, Les derniers Fâtimides, in Mém. de la Miss. Arch., vi. 415-445.
Saladin's career, from his accession to power, falls into three distinct periods, which may be called the Egyptian, Syrian, and Palestinian in regard to the chief scene of action, or the Defensive, Consolidating, and Aggressive in reference to policy. From the day he became ruler of Egypt he had vowed himself solemnly to the Holy War, the war of extermination against the Franks. Henceforward his whole policy was directed to that one great end. During the first or Egyptian period (1169—1174) he was on the defensive, not only against the Crusaders, but against the friends of the Fatimids, and even against his liege-lord the king of Syria. The policy of this period was to resist internal and foreign attack, avoid a collision with Nur-ed-din, and strengthen himself in Cairo by every possible means, political and military. The second or Syrian period (1174—1186), beginning with the death of Nur-ed-din, saw Saladin, as now the leading Muslim ruler of the near East, extending his sway over Syria and Mesopotamia, and consolidating all the available forces of Islam for the final struggle with the "infidels." The third or Palestinian period (1186—1193) was wholly devoted to the Holy War against the Crusaders, and ended with the peace of Ramla, followed in a few months by the death of the champion of Islam. Through all these periods the one aim was steadily kept in view, and every act of policy, every campaign, was strictly directed to the main object—the creation of a united Saracen empire, strong enough to drive the Franks to the seaboard, if not into the sea. Whatever personal ambition may have mingled unconsciously with it, aggrandizement in Saladin's case meant primarily, if not solely, the triumph of Islam over the "infidels."

The first or Egyptian period had begun well. The Crusaders had not ventured to renew the attack by land, and the invasion by sea had been a fiasco. The mutiny of the black troops of Cairo—the greatest of all internal dangers—had ended in their expulsion to Upper Egypt. The Fatimid caliphate had been abolished
with scarcely a sign of popular disapproval. The next step was to fortify himself alike against internal revolt and external invasion. The Fātimids had contented themselves with a fortified palace on the plain. Saladin, with a soldier’s eye, had perceived the weakness of the position, and had already chosen a better site for his purpose. So far each successive dynasty in Egypt had enlarged the capital by extending it in the form of suburbs or vast palaces towards the north-east. Instead of carrying on this plan, Saladin "sought to unite the sites of all the four capitals, and to build a Citadel—the famous 'Castle of the Mountain'—on the westernmost spur of Mount Muṣṭaṭṭam, to be the centre of government and to form a military stronghold capable of overawing the whole city and resisting assaults from outside. His plan was to connect this fortress by a bastioned wall with the old fortifications of the Fātimid 'city,' and to extend it so as to enclose the site of Fustāṭ and Ḫaṭā‘i, and thus to sweep round to the river; but the plan was not completed, and even the Citadel was not finished till long after his death. Saladin's enlargement of the area of the city was accompanied by the demolition of whole suburbs between the 'old city' and the shrine of Nefīsī. These were replaced by pleasure-gardens, and it is recorded that the tall Zawīla gate could be seen from the door of Ibn-Ṭulūn's mosque. Jehan Thenaud, who accompanied an embassy from Louis XII to Cairo at a later period, found these gardens still a striking feature of the city: 'moult somptueux et grans jardins plains de tous fruictiers: comme cytrons, lymons, citrulles, oranges, aubercots, cassiers et pommes de musrez ou d'Adam pour ce que l'on dict este le fruit duquel Adam oul trepassa le commandement de Dieu. Lesquelz jardins tous les soirs et matins sont arrossed de l'eau du Nil que tirent beufz et chevaux.'

Traces of some of these pleasure-grounds may even now be seen from the battlements of the Citadel.

1 *Le voyage et itinéraire de outre mer fait par Frère Jehan Thenaud*, cited in Schefer's *Nassiri Khosru*, 133.
"It has been supposed that Saladin designed the Citadel of Cairo to protect himself against a possible insurrection of the partisans of the late dynasty. A sufficient explanation, however, is found in his early associations: every Syrian city had its citadel or fortress, and experience had shown many a time that the town might be taken whilst the citadel remained impregnable, a refuge for the people and a means of recuperation. Therefore Cairo must have a citadel too. It might soon be needed as a tower of defence against his liege-lord Nūr-ed-dīn himself. Saladin had propitiated the king of Syria with presents from the treasures of the Fātimid palace; prayers were offered for him as sovereign lord every Friday in the mosques, above all in the great mosque of Ḥākim, which temporarily supplanted the Azhar as the chief mosque of the city; and his name appeared on the coins struck by Saladin at Cairo. But in spite of this nominal subjection and the absence of all symbols of personal sovereignty, Saladin was virtually his own master; and supported as he was by a strong army commanded by his brothers and nephews, he was in fact king of Egypt. Nūr-ed-dīn was well aware of this, but his difficulties with the Franks, with the Selğūk Sultan of Rūm, and with various contentious rulers in Meso-

potamia, left him no leisure to clip the wings of his vassal in Egypt. He could not even count upon his co-operation in the Holy War; for Saladin was convinced that if once his suzerain had the chance of seizing his person, there would be an end of his power; and nothing could induce him to venture within Nūr-ed-dīn's reach. Not only this, but he seems to have carried this dread so far that he preferred to have
the Franks on his borders as an obstacle to Nūr-ed-dīn’s advance.”

This dread in some measure accounts for his desultory and half-hearted attacks upon Montréal and Karak, near the Dead Sea, in 1171 and 1173, and it is conjectured with much probability that his southern campaigns of 1173-4 were undertaken with a view to providing a place of retreat in case Nūr-ed-dīn carried out his threat of invading Egypt. A division of Saladin’s army had already conquered the African littoral from Bārka to Gabes in 1172-3; but this strip of coast offered no strategic position for defence. The expedition to the Sūdān was prompted by the necessity for castigating the retreating but still rebellious blacks, but another probable object was to examine the resources of the country as a possible refuge. Saladin’s elder brother, Tūrānshāh, after pursuing the blacks into Nubia, took the city of Ibrīm (the Roman Primis) near Korosko, pillaged the church of the monophysite Christians, tortured the bishop, and satisfied his Muslim prejudice by slaughtering 700 of the pigs that there abounded. But his report on the climate and products of the Sūdān was discouraging, and Saladin sent him to Arabia to seek a better country. Tūrānshāh reduced the whole of the Yemen (Arabia Felix), with its cities of Ṣan‘ā, ʿAden, Zebīd, and G‘ened, and established his government at Ta‘izz, whence the Yemen was ruled by members of Saladin’s family for fifty-five years.

The absence of a gallant general and a considerable army in the Yemen furnished an opportunity to the partisans of the Fāṭimids who still hoped to eject the young “mamlūk,” as they called Saladin, from his seat, and to re-establish the old order, which promised better profits to the hangers-on of a luxurious court. The plot was generally ascribed to the Arab poet ʿOmārah, but whoever was the original instigator, it found wide support. Egyptian and Sūdānī officers, abetted even by some of Saladin’s jealous Turkmāns, joined in the con-

---

1 Lane-Poole, Saladin, 118-120.  
2 Abū-Ṣāliḥ, f. 96.
spiry ; the kings of Sicily and Jerusalem were induced
to co-operate by promises of gold and territory; the
master of the Assassins was invited to send some of his
secret murderers; and preparations were made for a
combined attack by sea and land, in which Saladin was
to be enmeshed. Fortunately the intended victim got
wind of the secret, seized the leading conspirators,
including the poet-politician, and crucified them all.

Apr. The inferior ranks of the plotters were exiled to Upper
Egypt.

"The sea attack, which was to have supported the
Cairo conspiracy, did not take place till the late summer.
The Franks of Palestine did not move when they heard
that the plot had failed; but the king of Sicily, less
well-informed, despatched a large fleet, estimated at 282
July vessels, which arrived off Alexandria on 28 July. The
scanty garrison were completely taken by surprise, but
they tried to resist the landing, which was nevertheless
effected near the pharos. The catapults and mangonels
which the Normans had brought were soon playing
upon the curtain of the city walls, and the defenders
were obliged to fight desperately all the first day till
night fell, to resist the storming parties. The next day
the Christians advanced their machines close up to the
walls, but reinforcements had joined the garrison from
the neighbouring villages, and again the attack was
beaten off. On the third day, there was a vigorous
sortie: the machines were burnt, the enemy lost severely,
and the garrison returned flushed with triumph. Scarce
ly were they within the gates, when an express arrived
from Saladin, to whom they had sent for support. The
courier had ridden from Cairo that same day with relays
of horses, and, reaching Alexandria between three and
four in the afternoon, loudly proclaimed the approach of
Saladin's army. The tidings put fresh heart into the
defenders, and they rushed out again in the gathering
darkness, fell upon the camp of the Normans, and drove
them, some to the ships, some into the sea. The news
that Saladin was on the march finished the fiasco: the
Normans slipped their moorings and fled, as swiftly and
suddenly as they had come. The three days' wonder vanished on the horizon, and Alexandria breathed again." 1

The conspiracy had been suppressed at Cairo in April; the Norman invasion was repelled in July; in the same month Amalric, the king of Jerusalem, died, and was succeeded by Baldwin, a child and a leper; but meanwhile a still greater obstacle to Saladin's career had been removed in May by the death of Nūr-ed-dīn, the noble sultan of Syria. By this far-reaching event, Saladin became at one bound the leading Muslim sovereign of the near East. His only possible rivals were Nūr-ed-dīn's son, a mere child, in Syria; Nūr-ed-dīn's nephew, Seyf-ed-dīn, the prince of Mōsīl and head of the family of Zengī; and the Seljūk sultan of Rūm or Asia Minor, and none of these was his equal in military power or capacity. To oppose the Crusaders successfully there must be one king and one consolidated Muslim empire, and these several principalities must be brought into line in a general advance. Thus began the second—the Syrian or Consolidating period of his career.

Saladin dealt with them separately. Syria was, of course, his first object. Its child-king was in the hands of a clique, and the scheming emīrs were making terms with the Franks. An appeal from Damascus supplied the necessary justification for the first step. With only 700 picked horsemen, Saladin rode across the desert to the Syrian capital and took possession in the name of the child-king. Passing through Emesa and Ḣamāh, he reached Aleppo, where Nūr-ed-dīn's heir, or rather his wezīr, prudently shut the gate in his face. Saladin's protestations of loyalty to his old master's son were not believed, and an attempt was made to assassinate him by means of the emissaries of the "Old Man of the Mountain," whilst the Franks, under Count Raymond of Tripoli, made a diversion in favour of their Muslim ally. The siege of Aleppo was therefore raised, and Saladin was checked. He had to be content for the

1 Lane-Poole, Saladin, 127-8.
present with the possession of all Syria south of Aleppo. Nor was he allowed to hold this without interference. The Atabeg of Mosul despatched an army from Mesopotamia to combine with his cousin of Aleppo, and the joint forces marched upon Hamah. In face of this formidable attack, Saladin essayed to make terms, but all overtures being rejected he won a brilliant victory at the Horns of Hamah, and pursued the enemy up to the gates of Aleppo.\footnote{1} A second victory in the following year, at the Turkman’s Wells, over Seyf-ed-din himself, ended in the total rout of the Mesopotamians, and a treaty of alliance with the young king of Aleppo, by which Saladin was recognized as sovereign over all the countries he had conquered, from Egypt almost to the Euphrates.

An interval of six years passed (1177-82) before the first step was followed by the annexation of Mesopotamia. Peace reigned between Saladin and the house of Zengi, and there was also a nominal truce with the Crusaders, negotiated by Humphrey of Toron, whose friendship had even gone the length of admitting Saladin to the rank of

\footnote{1} Technically, Saladin’s independent sovereignty dates from this victory, for it was only after this success that he issued coins in his own name. As vezir of Egypt he had successively placed on the coinage the names of the Fatimid caliph el-‘Aqid (A.H. 565, 566, 1169-71 A.D.), and of Nur-ed-din (A.H. 567, 569, 1171-4 A.D.), but never his own name. When he occupied Damascus, he placed the name of Nur-ed-din’s son es-Salih on the copper coins, adding his own as well. In 570 (A.D. 1174-5, but undoubtedly in the latter year) for the first time gold coins of Cairo and Alexandria appeared with the titles of “the king strong to aid, Joseph son of Ayyub,” el-Melik en-Nasir Yusuf ibn Ayyub. The title el-Melik en-Nasir was bestowed upon him by the Fatimid caliph on his appointment as vezir. There is a nearly complete series of Saladin’s Cairo dinars from 570 to 589 (1175-93), and a less continuous series of Alexandria from 570 to 585. His Damascus and Aleppo coinage were in silver and copper, and he also used the mint Hamah.
knighthood. The organisation of his wide dominions, and the fortification of Cairo, occupied much of his time. The new stone walls were laid out, and the building of the Citadel was begun, though it was not finished till the reign of his nephew Kāmil thirty years later. The enceinte may still be recognized through a considerable extent of walls, but the citadel has so often been restored and remodelled by the Mamlūk sultans and by Moḥammad ʿAli Pasha, that it is difficult to identify much of the original work;² the founder's inscription, however, may still be read over the old "Gate of the Steps," a dark portal in the west face of the original enceinte. It records how "the building of this splendid Citadel,—

![Fig. 45.—Citadel of Cairo (drawn in 1798).](image)

hard by Cairo the Guarded, on the terrace which joins use to beauty, and space to strength, for those who seek the shelter of his power,—was ordered by our master the

1 *Itin. Reg. Ric.*, i. 3; cp. v. 11, and William of Tyre, xvii. 17, and l'Ordine de Chevalerie.

2 See, however, the elaborate historical description of M. P. Casanova in *Mém. de la Miss. Arch.*, vi., and M. van Berchem's *Notes d'Archéologie Arabe, Journ. Asiat.* 1891, where it is remarked that Saladin's citadel and enceinte belong to the French type of defences, introduced by the Crusaders, in contradistinction from the earlier Byzantine type employed by Bedr el-G'emāli in the second wall and the three existing gates.
THE CITADEL OF CAIRO

King Strong-to-aid, Honour of the World and the Faith, Conquest-laden, Yusuf, son of Ayub, Restorer of the Empire of the Caliph; with the direction of his brother and heir the Just King (el-'Adil) Seyf-ed-din Abu-Bekr Mohammad, friend of the Commander of the Faithful; and under the management of the Emir of his Kingdom and Support of his Empire Karakush son of 'Abdallah, the slave of el-Melik en-Nasir, in the year 579 (1183-4)."

Fig. 46.—Saladin’s inscription on the Gate of Steps in the Citadel of Cairo, 1183.

The famous "Well of the Winding Stairs," 280 feet deep, was excavated in the solid rock by the eunuch Karakush under Saladin’s orders; but the other buildings (now demolished) associated with his name belonged to later times. The people of Egypt were proud to name public works after their great sultan, and thus his memory is preserved in the Cairo aqueduct (a Mamluk work), and even in the chief canal of Upper Egypt, which is still known as the "River of Joseph," Bahr Yusuf, though it dates from the time of the Pharaohs. Saladin’s chief public work outside Cairo was the great dike of G’iza, built (1183-4) like the Citadel with stones taken from the smaller pyramids, and carried on forty
arches along the border of the desert, as an outwork against a possible invasion from the west.  

But perhaps none of his innovations had more permanent influence than the medresa or collegiate mosque. Hitherto there had been no theological colleges at Cairo. Beyond the ordinary elementary schools, almost the only lectures that could be attended were given in the old mosque of 'Amr. The Fāṭimid "Hall of Science" was an exception, but it was largely devoted to initiation into the several degrees of Shi'a mysticism and the discussion of speculative philosophy. The college—or mosque where regular teaching was given, generally quite gratuitously, to all who came—was an innovation from Persia, introduced into Syria by Nūr-ed-dīn, and imported into Egypt by Saladin, who was eager to impart the Shāfi'ite form of orthodoxy to the misguided Egyptians. He founded colleges for this purpose at Alexandria and Cairo, the earliest being built close to the tomb of the Imām Shāfi'i himself in the southern Kerāfa or cemetery. Others were the Nāṣiriya (or Sherifiya) and Kamīhiya colleges near the mosque of 'Amr at Fustāṭ, and the Medresa of the Swordmakers, installed in the old palace of Māmūn in Cairo itself. None of these has been preserved, but it is only after Saladin's time that we find the familiar cruciform medresa or collegiate mosque with its four deep porticos, where the doctors of the four orthodox sects (Hanafi, Shāfi'i, Mālikī, and Ḥanbali) taught their circles of students.

In the administration of his kingdom Saladin had the valuable assistance of a faithful and learned servant. The Kādi el-Fādíl, an Arab of Ascalon, had been in the secretariate of the Fāṭimid caliph since the time of el-'Ādil the wezīr, and on Saladin's accession to power became his chancellor or wezīr, and exercised great influence in that high office during the whole of the reign of Saladin and his son and grandson, until his own death in Jan., 1200. He was famous for his ornate style and the elegant finish of his despatches. Saladin trusted

1 Maqr., Khīṭat, ii. 204, 151; Ibn-G'ubeyr, 49.
him implicitly. He was as devout and orthodox as his master, and also founded a theological college in Cairo. It was perhaps due to his rigid tenets that the Christians, who had been indulged under the later ignoble Fātimids, were subjected, if not to persecution, certainly to confiscations under the enlightened rule of Saladin.¹

The six years' interval, however, was not wholly spent in works of peace. There were several brushes with the Franks, who had already forgotten their truce, and forayed the country about Damascus. Saladin retorted by invading their peculiar province, the Holy Land. At Tell G'ezzer, near Ramla, he was surprised and utterly routed by king Baldwin backed by 375 knights, and had to ride for his life. It was his first, indeed his only, serious defeat. In three months, however, he was able to take the field again at Ḥimṣ with a fresh army, and in 1179 he won a brilliant victory over the king of Jerusalem at Marq Oyûn (Mergion), and took seventy knights prisoners, including the masters of the Temple and Hospital, Raymond of Tripolis, Balian and Baldwin of Ibelin, and Hugh of Tiberias. The victory was followed by the destruction of the castle at Jacob's Ford which the king had erected as a menace to the Saracens.

¹ Abû-Ṣāliḥ, 25a, 67b, etc.
WAR WITH BALDWIN

Meanwhile the Egyptian fleet of seventy vessels harried the coast of Palestine and brought back a thousand Christian prisoners, who were usefully employed in building the Citadel of Cairo. The winter was spent in equipping a larger navy, and when Saladin opened the campaign in the spring with a combined advance by sea and land, king Baldwin prudently proposed a truce, which was forthwith concluded for two years and confirmed by solemn oaths. Turning north to Cilicia, Saladin entered into negotiations with the Seljuk sultan of Konya, the king of Lesser Armenia, and the princes of Mosul, Gezira, Irbil, Keyfa, and Maridin, who all set their seals to a solemn pact, whereby they bound themselves on oath to keep peace and amity with one another for the space of two years. For this time war was to be unknown within their borders, and a holy truce, a Magna Pax Saracenica, was to reign throughout the Near East.

The great truce showed that Saladin’s influence now overawed all smaller powers from the Black Sea and the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, and the temporary union of all the neighbouring Muslim states was a long step towards that united effort which he intended to make against the crusading powers. It was the beginning of the policy which used the warlike tribesmen of Mesopotamia as recruits for the Holy War. The death of Nur-ed-din’s son, the king of Aleppo, and the perfidious negotiations between the Mesopotamian princes and the Franks, opened the way; and when Saladin left Cairo, as it proved for ever, on 11 May, 1182, it was to carry out his great schemes as the champion of Islam. After some engagements with the Franks, and an unsuccessful siege of Beyrut, he marched into Mesopotamia and subdued the whole country, excepting the city of Mosul. 

Aleppo was purchased by exchange; and, after two unsuccessful but exhausting sieges, Mosul at last consented to become Saladin’s vassal. By this treaty the whole of Northern Mesopotamia and part of Kurdistan were permanently joined to his empire.

The object of his long and arduous campaigns on the
Tigris and Euphrates had been attained. He had now allies instead of enemies on his northern flank. Before this no invasion of the Christian territory could safely be undertaken without posting an army of observation to guard against attack from the north; but now he could advance with confidence. He had also more troops at his back, and could not only command the full strength of his Syrian and Egyptian levies, but also count upon large contingents from the Mesopotamian provinces. In the Holy War, upon which he was now to embark in deadly earnest, all the great barons of those parts came to reinforce the Muslim army, and the princes of Zengi’s line, the lords of Mūsul, Singār, G‘ezīra, Irbil, Harrān, and even the Kurds from beyond the Tigris, swelled the general muster with their vassals and retainers.

Thus prepared and strengthened, Saladin entered upon the third period of his career—the Palestinian or Aggressive. There had been provocations and reprisals for several years. Reginald of Châtillon, lord of Karak, had entered the Red Sea, seized pilgrim ships, and even invaded Arabia with the intention of destroying the tomb of the Prophet at Medina and the Ka‘ba at Mecca. He was pursued by the Egyptian fleet, and his expedition was cut to pieces. In Palestine there had been an indecisive battle near La Fève (el-Fūla), and twice had Saladin laid unsuccessful siege to Reginald’s impregnable fortress of Karak. A treaty of peace for four years was then arranged by Raymond of Tripolis, (the regent of the infant king Baldwin V), who was personally on terms of friendship if not actual alliance with Saladin; but the peace was a hollow form whilst all Europe was beating to arms, and English knights from the Cheviots to the Pyrenees were taking the Cross, and

Fig. 48.—Dirhem (silver coin) of Saladin, Aleppo, 1186.
the two great military orders were burning, as ardently as Saladin himself, to strike a blow for the faith. The smallest spark would kindle the conflagration. The spark came from Reginald of Chatillon, who for the third time, in spite of the treaty, pounced upon a peaceful caravan of merchants who were journeying past his stronghold. It was not only a rich prize, but was rumoured to include one of Saladin's sisters. The provocation was ample; Saladin vowed to kill the truce-breaker with his own hand, and kept his word.

The history of the Holy War of 1187 to 1192 is familiar to students, and forms no part of the history of Egypt. The order of events is all that need be mentioned.

Fig. 49.—Saladin's inscription at church of St. Anne, Jerusalem, 1192.

The crushing defeat of the Crusaders under their new king, Guy of Lusignan, at Hittin, near Tiberias, was followed by the rapid conquest of Palestine. Saladin's army spread over the Holy Land, and the whole kingdom of Jerusalem, with the exception of a few castles and fortified cities, was subdued in a month. Ascalon fell in September, and on 2 October Jerusalem itself capitulated on honourable terms. Tyre alone escaped capture in the first rush of conquest, almost by a miracle; and its second successful resistance (Nov., Dec.) was the turning point in Saladin's victorious career. The county of Tripolis and the principality of Antioch, all the coast cities north of Tyre, were easily occupied in a single brilliant campaign, May—Sept., 1188, and Antioch itself was obliged to agree to a humiliating truce. The great
inland fastnesses of Belvoir, Safed, and Karak, that still held out, were taken in December and January. Nothing remained of all the conquests of the Crusaders but Tyre and Belfort.

Tyre, however, was the rallying point of the Franks. Thither the garrisons let free by Saladin, with more magnanimity than prudence, as each city or fortress capitulated, immediately betook themselves. Thither came king Guy and most of the nobles and knights who had been released on their solemn pledge never again to bear arms against the sultan. From Tyre marched the army which began the memorable siege of ‘Akka,’ and welcomed the powerful reinforcements of the third Crusade. Tyre was the fatal wooden horse of Saladin’s Troy. Had he overcome the impatience or revived the exhaustion of his troops, and sacrificed every other interest to the one object of taking Tyre, there might have been no siege of ‘Akka and no third Crusade. Without that πως οτι even Richard of England would have found it hard to bring his Danish battle-axe to bear upon the Saracens.

The siege of ‘Akka by Guy of Lusignan began on 28 August, 1189; the siege of the besiegers by Saladin began two days later. The first great battle between the Franks and the double enemy—the garrison within and the relieving army encircling the Christians—was fought on 4 October, and ended in the repulse of the Crusaders with heavy loss. Saladin neglected to follow up his victory, and the Franks spent the winter in entrenching and strengthening their position before ‘Akka. In the spring the reports of the approach of the German crusade under Frederick Barbarossa drew off a large part of the Saracen forces. A second great attack on the Muslims on 25 July, however, was severely punished; but the success was not followed up, and the chances of annihilating the besieging army were sensibly diminished by the landing of Henry of Champagne with 10,000 fresh men. The siege and countersiege went on, with constantly lessening hopes for the Saracens. The

1 The Arabic ‘Akka represents the ancient Akko. The modern French spelling, Acre, should be abandoned in English.
Duke of Swabia brought the survivors of the German army into 'Akka in October, and the first English fleet arrived in the same month. Still Saladin more than held his own. An attempt of the Christians to bring in provisions from Haifa was checked by a strenuous engagement at the Spring-Head, and then winter turned the plain into a sea of mud, and both sides waited for the spring, while famine and fever decimated the Christian camp. Meanwhile Saladin had revictualled 'Akka, and relieved the exhausted garrison.

The leaders of the third Crusade at last arrived: Philip of France at Easter, Richard of England on 8 June. With such reinforcements the long siege soon came to an end. On 12 July 'Akka surrendered. Saladin was no party to this act of the exhausted garrison, but he had been unable to relieve it, and was forced to accept the situation. Negotiations for peace had been opened before the capitulation, and were concluded after it; but some delay in carrying out the stipulations with regard to the surrender of Christian prisoners so exasperated Richard that he massacred 2700 Muslim prisoners in cold blood in sight of the two camps. There was no more talk of peace, and the king of England (Philip had already set off on his return to France) marched down the coast with the intention of taking Ascalon and then striking inland for Jerusalem. Saladin hung upon the Crusaders during the whole march, but after a defeat at Arsuf he was obliged to draw off his forces to Ramla, and, on the approach of winter, to Jerusalem. Two attempts to march on the Holy City brought Richard actually in sight of his goal, but dissensions in the mixed council of the Crusaders and the increased strength of the Saracens frustrated the design. Richard retired disappointed to 'Akka, and Saladin seized the opportunity to make a dash upon Jaffa, which was immediately relieved and defended by the king of England and a handful of knights—the most brilliant feat of the whole war, of which both sides were now weary. Ever since the battle of Arsuf negotiations for peace had been carried on in a desultory manner;
THE PEACE OF RAMLA

but now that Richard was ill and the state of England urgently called for his presence, they were pressed to a conclusion, and a treaty was signed for three years, by which the Crusaders retained the coast cities from 'Akka to Jaffa, and pilgrims were permitted to visit the holy places at Jerusalem.

The Holy War had lasted five years. Before the decisive victory at Hitiṭin in July, 1187, not an inch of Palestine west of the Jordan was in Muslim hands. After the peace of Ramla in September, 1192, the whole land was Muslim territory except a narrow strip of coast from Tyre to Jaffa. To recover this strip the whole of Europe had risen in arms, and hundreds of thousands of Crusaders had fallen. The result hardly justified the cost. Saladin, on the other hand, came out of the war with power unshaken. He had been loyally supported by the whole strength of his empire and his vassals, from Egypt to the Tigris: Kurds, Turkmāns, Syrians, Arabs, and Egyptians mingled in his armies, and all were Muslims and his servants when he called upon them for an effort. Not a province had fallen away, only one youthful vassal rebelled for an instant, though the trials and sufferings of the long campaigns had severely taxed the soldiers' endurance and faith in their leader. After the war was over he still reigned unchallenged from the mountains of Kurdistan to the Libyan desert, and far beyond these borders the king of Georgia, the Catholicos of Armenia, the Sultan of Kōniya, even the emperor of Constantinople, were eager for his alliance. He lived to see the triumph of his life's ambition: he had driven the Christians out of the Holy City and restored the unity of Islam. The exhaustion of the long campaigns, however, had enfeebled his never robust health, and a fever carried him off at Damascus, six months after the peace. The popular conception of his character has not erred. Magnanimous, chivalrous, gentle, sympathetic, pure in heart and life, ascetic and laborious, simple in his habits, fervently devout, and only severe in his zeal for the faith, he has been rightly held to be the type and pattern of Saracen chivalry.
CHAPTER VIII

SALADIN'S SUCCESSORS

(THE AYYÜBIDS)

1193—1250


Monuments.—Tomb of Imâm Shâfi'i, 1211; completion of the citadel of Cairo; medresa of el-Kâmil (almost disappeared), 1224; tombs of emir İsmâ'il, 1216, and Sheykh el-Fârisî, 1225; minaret of (old) Hasaneyn, 1235-6; medresa of eș-Şâliḥ Ayyûb, 1243.

Inscriptions.—On monuments enumerated above; ‘Ādîl on fortress at Mt. Tabor, 1211.

Casket of el-‘Ādîl II in V. & A. Mus.; Coins.—See under each reign.

Since 1182, when Saladin left Cairo for the last time, Egypt had played a subsidiary part in the empire of which it was the head. The centre of politics was removed to Syria, and Egypt had to be content to act as a recruiting-ground for the levies which its sultan was constantly demanding for the reinforcement of his exhausted armies. The practice throughout these wars was to fight in the summer; and when the winter rains stopped military movements in Syria and Palestine the various contingents were sent to their homes to recover health and attend to their farms. In Egypt this practice saved much hardship, for the winter was the season for the principal agricultural operations. During the sultan’s absence, his brother el-'Ādîl Seyf-ed-dîn, the “Saphadin” of the Crusaders, administered Egypt with the assistance of the Ḫâdî el-Fâdîl. In 1184, indeed, he was trans-
THE AYYUBID DYNASTIES

The subjoined tables (taken from *The Mohammedan Dynasties*, by the present writer) show the succession of the various members of the Ayyūbid family in the seven chief divisions of the empire. They all descended from five sons of Ayyūb—Saladin, 'Ādil, Shāhānshāh, Tūrānshāh, and Tughtegin,—except the Emesa branch which descended from Shīrkūh, Ayyūb's brother. An upright stroke between successive names indicates sonship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.—EGYPT.</th>
<th>D.—MESOPOTAMIA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En-Nāṣir Šalāḥ-ed-din Yūsuf (<em>Saladin</em>)</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-'Aziz 'Othmān (son)</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Manṣūr Moḥammad</td>
<td>1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-'Ādil Seyf-ed-dīn * (<em>Saphadin</em>)</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Kāmil Moḥammad *</td>
<td>1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-'Ādil II *</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb * (brother)</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Muʿazzam Tūrānshāh *</td>
<td>1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Ashraf Mūsā</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—1252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These Sultāns also ruled at Damascus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.—DAMASCUS.</th>
<th>E.—ḤAMĀH.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El-Muḥaffar I Taḥi-ed-dīn 'Omar (son of Shāhānshāh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El-Mansūr I Moḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En-Nāṣir Kīlīj-Arsālān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El-Muḥaffar II Maḥmūd (brother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El-Mansūr II Moḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El-Muḥaffar III Maḥmūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—1298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Governors under the Mamlūk Sultāns]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El-Afdal 'Ali (son of Saladin)</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-'Adil Seyf-ed-din (see Egypt)</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Mu'azzam 'Isa</td>
<td>1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-Nasir Dawud</td>
<td>1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Ashraf Musa (of Mesopotamia)</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esh-Salihi Isma'il (son of 'Adil)</td>
<td>1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Kamil (of Egypt)</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-'Adil II</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esh-Salihi Isma'il (restored)</td>
<td>1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esh-Salihi (of Egypt)</td>
<td>1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Mu'azzam (of Egypt)</td>
<td>1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-Nasir Yusuf (of Aleppo)</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Mu'ayyad Abü-l-Fidā (the historian, cousin of the last)</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Afdal Mohammad</td>
<td>1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.—EMESA (IIIMŞ).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Kahir Mohammad (son of Shirkūh)</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Mugahid Shirkūh II</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Manṣūr Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Ashraf Musa</td>
<td>1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.—ARABIA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Mu‘azzam Turānshāh (brother of Saladin)</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyf-el-Islām Tughtegin (brother of Saladin)</td>
<td>1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘izz-ed-din Isma‘il (son of Tughtegin)</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-Nasir Ayūb (son of Tughtegin)</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Muṣaffar Suleyman (grandson of 'Omar)</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Mes‘ūd Salāḥ-ed-din-Yūsuf (son of Kāmil)</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.—ALEPPO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esh-Zahir Ghāzī (son of Saladin)</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-'Aziz Mohammad</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-Nasir Yusuf (see Damascus)</td>
<td>1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[To face p. 212.]
El-Afdal 'Ali (son of Saladin)           1186
El-'Adil Seyf-ed-din (see Egypt)         1196
El-Mu'azzam 'Isa                         1218
En-Naṣir Dāwūd                           1227
El-Ashraf Mūsā (of Mesopotamia)          1228
Eṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ismā'īl (son of 'Ādil)          1237
El-Kāmil (of Egypt)                      1238
El-'Adil II                               1238
Eṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ismā'īl (restored)              1239
Eṣ-Ṣāliḥ (of Egypt)                      1245
El-Mu'azzam (of Egypt)                    1249
En-Naṣir Yusuf (of Aleppo)               1250
	-1260

F.—EMESA (ḪIMṢ).
El-Ḳāhir Mūhammad (son of Shirkūh)       1178
El-Muṣahhid Shirkūh II                   1185
El-Manṣūr Ibrāhīm                        1239
El-Ashraf Mūsā                           1245
	-1262

G.—ARABIA.
El-Mu'azzam Tūrānshāh (brother of Saladin) 1173
Seyf-el-Islām Tughtegin (brother of Saladin) 1181
Mu'izz-ed-din Ismā'īl (son of Tughtegin)  1196
En-Naṣir Ayyūb (son of Tughtegin)         1201
El-Muṣaffar Suleyman (grandson of 'Omar)  1214
El-Mes'ūd Ṣalāb-ed-din-Yūsuf (son of Kāmil) 1215
	-1228

C.—ALEPPO.
Eṣ-Ẓāhir Ghāzi (son of Saladin)           1186
El-'Aziz Mūhammad                         1216
En-Naṣir Yusuf (see Damascus)              1236
	-1260

[To face p. 212.]
ferred to Aleppo and his nephew Taḵi-ed-dīn ʿOmar sent to Egypt instead; but ʿOmar proved intractable, and ʿAdil was restored to Cairo in 1186, with Saladin’s second son el-ʿAzīz as nominal chief. ʿĀdil was the ablest of his brother’s kinsmen, a good general and hard fighter, but also and beyond all a skilful diplomatist and shrewd politician. He loyally supported his brother in his campaigns, led the Egyptian contingent to the annual rendezvous in Palestine, distinguished himself especially in several engagements on the plain of ‘Akka, and was indefatigable in beating up recruits, equipping ships, and supplying stores and money for Saladin’s campaigns. He was personally on a friendly footing with Richard of England, and it was he, and not Saladin, who was a guest in the English camp. One of his sons was knighted by Cœur de Lion,1 and “the noble Saphadin” was the intermediary to whom Richard applied when he negotiated the treaty of Ramla. Everything indicated el-ʿĀdil as the successor of his heroic brother.

Saladin, however, had naturally ordered the succession in favour of his own sons, three of whom, for some years before his death, had held the governments of the three chief provinces. The eldest, el-Afsāl, had Damascus and central Syria; el-ʿAzīz, Egypt; and ez-Zāhir, Aleppo. Their cousins ruled at Ḥamāh, Ḥims, and Baʿalbek; and an uncle governed the Yemen. Mesopotamia and Diyār-Bekr became the special appanage of Saladin’s brother el-ʿĀdil. From the beginning of this division, however, Egypt was clearly regarded as the supreme province. Damascus struck a coin, in the very year of Saladin’s death, in the name of ʿAzīz of Egypt, though Afsāl was its own ruler. But whatever homage was paid, there was no unity among the members of the family. ʿAzīz besieged his brother in Damascus within the year, and though peace was patched up by the mediation of ʿĀdil and Zāhir, the quarrel broke out again in the

1 Itin. Reg. Ric., v. 11. A similar honour was accorded by Frederick II to the emīr Fakhr-ed-dīn, the general who afterwards commanded at Manṣūra against Louis IX.
following year, when Afdal pursued his younger brother into Egypt as far as Bilbeys. Again the prudent uncle intervened, aided by the venerable Kādi el-Fādil, who had been Saladin’s chief adviser; and ‘Azīz found himself saddled with ‘Adil as his minister at Cairo, to the detriment of his independent authority. ‘Adil had been a loyal right hand to his brother, but he was not the man to let sentiment stand in the way of his own advance. Saladin’s sons were breaking up the empire, and ‘Adil resolved to reunite it under his own personal command.

The key of the situation he knew to be Egypt. He had carefully argued Afdal out of his design of seizing Cairo, because he wanted it for himself. Afdal, a pleasure-loving, wine-bibbing profligate, would be a danger to Egypt; whereas ‘Azīz had all the virtues and the special merit of being peculiarly biddable. He was “full of generosity,” says one who knew him, “most brave and modest, a youth of high morals and no touch of avarice: he knew not how to say no.” This was the proper instrument for ‘Adil to play on. The two agreed to oust Afdal from Damascus, where his tardy self-reform could not efface the memory of his weaknesses. The city was easily occupied, and delivered over to ‘Adil as viceroy under ‘Azīz. Friendly with Egypt and master of central Syria, ‘Adil now went north to settle his Mesopotamian possessions (1198–9), which after Saladin’s death had been threatened by his old rival, the Atābeg of Mūsīl. He speedily reduced the country to order, and from that time up to the Mongol invasion the Euphrates country remained in the hands of his sons.

‘Adil was recalled from the north by the news of the early death of ‘Azīz,3 from a fever caught whilst hunting in the Fayyūm, and of the immediate arrival of the

1 El-Fādil died in Jan., 1199, and his colleague the secretary ‘Imād-ed-dīn in 1201. See Lane-Poole, Saladin, 187–9.
2 ‘Ahd-el-Latif, ed. Sacy, 469.
3 El-‘Azīz struck coins at Cairo A.H. 589–595 (1193–8 A.D.); at Alexandria, 589–595; Damascus, 589 and 594; and Aleppo, 592 (1196). The last two were issued by ‘Adil and Zahir, without their own names, in token of vassalage.
family scapegrace, Aḍal, at Cairo. Here he posed as guardian to his brother's infant heir, el-Manṣūr, and took the opportunity to lead the Egyptian troops to the conquest of Damascus, aided by Zahir of Aleppo, who shared his brother’s hatred of their uncle. But ʿAdil was at Damascus before them, the besiegers retired, and Aḍal was forced to capitulate and to deliver up Egypt. ʿAdil was now master of the whole of Saladin's empire, with the exception of Arabia and of northern Syria, where the three dynasties of Aleppo, Ḥimṣ, and Ḥamāh, whilst recognizing his supremacy and rendering military service, maintained their own virtual independence. The child Manṣūr was soon deposed, and ʿAdil appointed his own sons as viceroys (nāib) over the various provinces under his control: el-Kāmil represented him in Egypt, el-Muʿazzam at Damascus, el-Awhad, el-Fāiz, el-Ashraf, and el-Ḥāfiz in the several districts of the Tigris and Euphrates country.

Egypt was still the head of the empire, but it was passing through a period of distress. An exceptionally low Nile produced a failure of the crops in 1201, repeated in 1202, and famine and pestilence ensued. The Baghdād physician, ʿAbd-el-Latīf, who lived at Cairo for ten years (1194–1204), attending the professors' lectures at the Azhar mosque, records the terrible experiences of the famine. The distress was so desperate

1 El-Manṣūr’s coinage is dated A.H. 595, 596 (1198–9) at Cairo and Alexandria.
2 El-ʿAdil struck coins at Cairo A.H. 597–615 (1200–1218); Alexandria, 596–614; Damascus, 599–615; Mayyāfaḵin, 591 (1195); Ḥarrān, 591; Edessa, 601, 604 (1204–8). His name was also inscribed as suzerain on the coinage of ʿez-Zahir of Aleppo, 599; el-ʿAziz of Aleppo, 614; and el-Ashraf of Diyar-Bekr, 612.
that the inhabitants emigrated in crowds, whole quarters and villages were deserted, and those who remained abandoned themselves to atrocious practices. People habitually ate human flesh, even parents killed and cooked their own children, and a wife was found eating her dead husband raw. Men waylaid women in the streets to seize their infants, and baby fricassee and haggis of children's heads were ordinary articles of diet. When detected the criminals were burnt alive; but few were caught. The very graves were ransacked for food. This went on from end to end of Egypt. The roads were death-traps, assassination and robbery reigned unchecked, and women were outraged by the multitude of reprobates whom anarchy and despair had set loose. Free girls were sold at five shillings apiece, and many women came and implored to be bought as slaves to escape starvation. An ox sold for 70 D., and corn was over ten shillings the bushel. The corpses lay unburied in the streets and houses, and a virulent pestilence spread over the delta. In the country and on the caravan routes flocks of vultures, hyenas, and jackals mapped the march of death. Men dropped down at the plough, stricken with the plague. In one day at Alexandria an imām said the funeral prayers over 700 persons, and in a single month a property passed to forty heirs in rapid succession. The depreciation of property was disastrous. Owing to the decrease of population, house-rent in Cairo fell to one-seventh of its former price, and the carvings and furniture of palaces were broken up to feed the oven-fires. Violent earthquakes, which were also felt throughout Syria and as far north as Armenia, shook down countless houses, devastated whole cities, and increased the general misery.

Meanwhile ʿAdil was steadily consolidating his empire. His chief fear was that the Franks might take advantage of the internal divisions among Saladin's successors to renew the crusade. So, indeed, they did, but in so desultory and feeble a fashion that their efforts scarcely injured the Muslim power. Henry of Champagne, the titular king of Jerusalem, was too weak to venture on a
forward movement, and was obliged to be content to govern his coast cities and observe the truce which 'Aziz had prudently renewed on his accession. The prince of Antioch and Tripolis was perpetually engaged in keeping his neighbour, the Armenian king of Cilicia, at bay. There was no present danger from the Syrian Franks, and if a new crusade were to be set on foot, it must come from Europe. Again the pope, Celestine III, summoned the Christians to the Holy War. England and France were too busy with their own quarrel to listen to his appeal; but the emperor Henry VI took the cross in 1195, assembled an army of 60,000 men and a fleet of forty-four vessels on the Apulian coast, and despatched them under the command of the bishop of Würzburg to 'Akka, where they arrived in September, 1197. The Germans, however, were no welcome allies to the French followers of Henry of Champagne, and found themselves acting alone. 'Adil took advantage of their hesitation to seize Jaffa, and the death of king Henry almost at the same time produced further confusion. Amalric of Lusignan, king of Cyprus, was chosen to succeed him on the imaginary throne of Jerusalem, and married his widow, Isabella, who had already survived three husbands. Not daring as yet to march on Jerusalem, the Germans, after defeating 'Adil near Sidon, seized Beyrut, which had already been dismantled on their approach, and then in concert with Boemond of Antioch prepared an attack upon the Holy City. At this moment the news came of the sudden death of their emperor; the Germans abandoned the siege of Toron ('Tubnîn) and hurried home, and 'Adil and 'Aziz were content to make peace.

The Latin Crusade, fortunately for the Muslims, stopped at Constantinople, where it established the Latin kingdom, which lasted for nearly half a century and drew off many adventurers from the Christian forces in Syria. Beyond a few skirmishes in the neighbourhood of Crac des Chevaliers and Markab, and a raid upon the coast of Egypt, no hostilities of importance took place, and in 1204 Amalric made a fresh truce with the Egyp-
tian sultan, who was glad to purchase tranquillity by the restoration of Jaffa and Ramla to the Franks. A similar truce was concluded with Tripolis in 1207. The sultan was a born diplomatist, and always preferred a treaty to a battle. He secured powerful support and corresponding immunity by the commercial treaty which he negotiated with Venice in 1208, whereby the Venetians acquired special trading facilities in Alexandria and up the Nile in return for their alleged good offices in restraining the Crusaders from an advance upon Egypt. Meanwhile Amalric had died in 1205, and his stepdaughter Mary (Isabella's child by Conrad of Montferrat) succeeded to the crown of Jerusalem, and was provided with a husband, John of Brienne, who was presently to show himself a vigorous Crusader; but at first his forces were unequal to any attempt upon the Holy City. Pope Innocent III again sounded the war-cry, but the first response, the luckless "Children's Crusade," only filled Egypt with youthful captives, betrayed to the enemy. Ashamed, perhaps, at the heroic example of the "children," Andreas, king of Hungary, supported by the grand-duke Leopold of Austria, Hugh of Cyprus, the king of Armenia, Ranulf of Chester, and many nobles and prelates, landed a considerable force at 'Akka, and Hungarians, South Germans, Frisians, and Rhinelanders, flocked to their standards. They made three useless expeditions, first to Beysán and even beyond the Jordan; then to the fortress which 'Adil had built on Mount Tabor, which they failed to take; and thirdly against Beaufort. The sultan of Egypt watched their movements, but dared not risk an engagement. Finally the king of Hungary went home in deep chagrin, but some of the Germans remained and helped to strengthen the coast fortresses, and especially to build Castle Pilgrim (Mons Peregrinus) near Haifa.

Before this the Crusaders had begun to realize that the best way of overcoming an enemy is to strike at his vital part. Egypt was the vital part of the Muslim empire, and until Egypt were subdued, petty raids in Palestine were merely a waste of strength. Reinforced
by a fleet of Frisians and men of the Rhine, John of Brienne at last plucked up courage to make a descent upon Damietta. The king of Jerusalem was accompanied by the archduke of Austria, Count William of Holland, the Count of Wied, and the masters of the Temple, Hospital, and Teutonic order, and a large army was soon encamped on the shore of the delta. Damietta was strongly fortified by a triple bastioned wall, by a great tower planted on an island in the Nile, by chains stretched across the river, and by the natural advantages of its position on a peninsula partly defended by water.

The Crusaders were on the west bank, and their efforts were directed to capturing the great tower in mid-stream. They set up siege-towers on their ships, with scaling ladders, but the fire and shot of the garrison, strongly supported by Kamil's army on the east bank, withstood their first assault. They then lashed vessels together and built a yet more powerful castle, with a drawbridge, and moored it alongside the river tower; and on St. Bartholomew's Day, after a fierce struggle, the defenders were forced to capitulate.

The loss of this bulwark of Egypt killed the sultan.
‘Adil died on 31 August, 1218, at the age of seventy-three or seventy-five. He had enjoyed a long and brilliant career from the day, fifty years before, when he had entered Egypt with Shîrkūh. He had served his famous brother loyally and with exceptional ability for nearly a quarter of a century, and after his death he had spent another twenty-five years in laboriously restoring the powerful empire which Saladin’s jealous sons had broken up. He had succeeded in all his plans. Every part of Saladin’s empire, except northern Syria, was under his control and governed by one or other of his many sons. Cairo, Damascus, Edessa, Ḥarrān, G’a’bar, Mayyâfâriḵin, even the Yemen, had each a son of the great sultan for its governor, and his frequent journeys from end to end of his empire kept each and all in a high state of efficiency and preparedness:

A Monarch, whose majestic air
Fills all the range of sight, whose care
Fills all the regions everywhere;
Who such a watch doth keep
That, save where he doth set his lance
In rest to check the foe’s advance,
His eye with bright and piercing glance
Knows neither rest nor sleep.¹

The Franks had been powerless against him; their little raids had scarcely injured him; and the few sacrifices of territory he had made—Beyrūt, Jaffa, Nazareth—were well repaid by long intervals of tranquillity, during which he was continually increasing his strength. His personal character must have been attractive, for he won the admiration and friendship of King Richard and many other Crusaders. His oriental biographer ² describes him as a man of extraordinary prudence and foresight, armed with information and fortified by experience, and therefore fortunate in all his undertakings. He was endowed

¹ Bahā-ud-din Zuheyr, ii. 258, paraphrased by Palmer to preserve the play upon the Arabic word for slumber or rest. Bahā-ud-din was a contemporary poet, who afterwards became the confidant and court poet of ʾes-Ṣâliḥ Ayūb, ‘Adil’s grandson.

² Ibn-Khallikān, iii. 235 ff.
SIEGE OF DAMIETTA

with remarkable physical powers, sound health, and high spirits; a great eater, who could finish off a roast lamb at a meal; passionately fond of women: he indulged in pleasure with his whole soul, and, like other strong men, made the most of his enjoyments as he did of his work.

He left to his eldest son the difficult task of driving out the Franks. El-Kāmil\(^1\) inherited many of his father's qualities: he was a good soldier and a skilful diplomatist —too wily, indeed, for the taste of his contemporaries. He set to work at Damietta with great energy, threw a bridge or pontoon over the Nile to obstruct the Frankish vessels, and led repeated but fruitless assaults upon the enemy's position. When the bridge was cut by the Crusaders, he sank ships to block the passage. Camp fever and the Nile inundation did the Christians more damage than his onslaughts, but the very unhealthiness of their camp compelled them to advance. They determined to cross at all hazards, and with this object they deepened a large canal and thus brought their fleet up to a spot thirteen miles south of Damietta. Though at the first attempt they were frustrated by the solid array of Kāmil's troops on the opposite bank, a conspiracy among the leading Muslim generals, which threatened the sultan's throne, if not his life, and forced him to fly by night up country, produced such confusion that the Crusaders crossed almost unopposed, captured the Saracen camp, and closed round Damietta. But their difficulties were not yet over. Kāmil, aided by his brother Mu'azzam of Damascus, raised a new army, harassed the besiegers night and day, burnt their bridges, and destroyed their siege-works and entrenchments. In spite of all his efforts, however, the blockade was maintained, and starvation began to do its part. The weary Crusaders were constantly relieved and reinforced from Europe; French and English knights and men-at-arms

---

1 El-Kāmil's coinage is dated Cairo, 616—35 (1219–38); Alexandria, 617—34; Miṣr, 624; Damascus, 615—19, 627; Harrān, 623, 635. He also is named as suzerain on coins of el-ʿAziz of Aleppo, 619; el-Aṣraf of Diyār-Bekr, 615, and el-Muṣaffār of Diyār-Bekr, 618, 635.
under the counts of Nevers and Marche and the earls of Winchester, Arundel, and Chester, came to their support; whilst the still more exhausted garrison steadily dwindled, till of about 50,000 men only 4000 remained able to stand to arms. The contest was too unequal to last much longer.

Seeing this the sultan asked for terms. He offered to surrender the whole of the kingdom of Jerusalem as it was before Saladin's conquest of 1187, if Damietta were spared. Incredible as it appears, this amazingly profitable exchange was refused as inadequate: further concessions were demanded. The Crusaders were in no humour for terms of any kind. The papal legate, cardinal Pelagius, who had been elected commander-in-chief, filled with the exaltation of a pilgrim of the cross, would have no traffic with the "infidels"; others held that Damietta was too valuable a commercial centre to be abandoned. The king of Jerusalem and the northern knights in vain urged the advantages of the exchange. The cardinal carried the day, and it was resolved to press the war to the uttermost. The greatest opportunity that the Crusaders had ever been offered was irremediably lost. When Philip Augustus, who had known how the Saracens could fight before 'Akka, heard that the Crusaders had refused to take a kingdom in exchange for a city, he exclaimed, "They are fools and simpletons!" It is true

Nov. 5 Damietta fell by assault; the remnant of the exhausted garrison was ruthlessly massacred, and the alarm of the Muslims was such that they hastily demolished the walls of Jerusalem and other cities in Palestine, lest they might become strongholds of the enemy. But the taking of Damietta did not imply the conquest of Egypt. With their usual incapacity the Franks delayed action, and spent a year and a half at Damietta quarrelling amongst themselves. It was not till July, 1221, that, again strongly reinforced from Germany, they took the field against the sultan. Moreover, they had chosen the wrong route for the conquest of Egypt. Damietta was a valuable port, but it was not the base from which to advance upon Cairo, the essential objective of attack.
ADVANCE OF CRUSADERS

Any army marching on the capital of Egypt would naturally choose the old road from Pelusium to Bilibey. It had been used again and again by invaders, from the days of Cambyses and Alexander to the conquest of 'Amr and the expeditions of Amalric I. Beyond the hardships of a desert march, it presented no obstacles to the advance upon Cairo. But between Damietta and the capital lay a network of canals and arms of the Nile, offering a dozen obvious positions of defence, and constituting a series of traps to an invading army which was totally ignorant of the geography of the country.¹

By this time Kāmil had built strong fortifications on the Nile, a little south of Damietta, at a village which he afterwards enlarged into the city of el-Manṣūra, "the Victorious." He had also summoned his kinsmen, and one and all, laying aside their rivalries in face of the common danger, rallied to his support. Mu‘azzam of Damascus had joined him from the first, and now the princes of Aleppo, Ḥamāh, Ḥims, Ḥarrān, and every part of the empire, led their contingents to the rescue of their chief. Never since Saladin lay before 'Akka had the dynasty shown a more united front than when they lined the bank of the Nile to dispute the passage of the Crusaders.

The Franks had advanced southwards, but were July speedily brought to a stand by the obstacle of Manṣūra and its resolute garrison of hardy Syrians and highlanders from the north, entrenched behind the "canal of Ushmūm," the old Tanitic arm of the Nile. The season was ill-chosen, for the river was rising; a number of canals intersected the flat low-lying lands of the delta, impeded strategic movements, and enabled the Muslims to bring up a fleet to their support. As soon as the inundation had risen high enough, bodies of Muslim troops spread over the plains behind and around the enemy, and cut the dams which restrained the Nile waters; the country became a lake, and the Crusaders found themselves on a peninsula, surrounded by water and by watchful foes,

¹ See Oman, *Art of War in the Middle Ages*, 264-5.
and practically cut off alike from advance or retreat.

**Aug.** On the night of 26 August they made their desperate attempt to escape to Damietta by the narrow causeway that still remained passable. Hardly were they in motion when the enemy was upon them from every quarter. The road to the north was already occupied in force by the Saracens. Struggling through the inundated fields, enmeshed among the deeper canals, the knights fought their way with magnificent valour. For two nights and days the hopeless contest was maintained, and then the Crusaders cried for quarter. The more hot-headed Muslims were for exterminating the "infidels" at one blow; but Kâmil, true to the statesmanlike policy of his father, overruled them. He perceived that generous terms would end the war of the creeds, at least for a time, whilst a butchery would infallibly lead to a crusade of revenge and probably nerve the garrison of Damietta to resistance. He allowed the Crusaders to depart; they must evacuate Egypt, surrender Damietta, and keep the peace for eight years. The proviso was added, however, that any crowned European king should have the right to break the truce. A fresh reinforcement from Germany about this time landed near Damietta, and took the news of the treaty in very ill part; but repudiation was out of the question, whilst the main army and valuable hostages were still in the power of the Saracens. In a week the whole of the crusading host, which had begun the campaign forty months before with high hopes and signal success, left the shores of Egypt in shame.

All this time there had been no attempt to recover Jerusalem. The neglect was not due merely to strategical reasons. The spirit of the Crusaders had changed; zeal for the faith had mellowed into worldly wisdom. The men on the spot, the Franks settled in Syria, preferred their wealthy coast cities, full of Italian traders and bordered by rich cultivated lands, to the desolate interior of Palestine, laid waste by the struggle with Saladin and the systematic neglect of his successors, who had no wish to tempt the Christians to an occupation. The mer-
chants, and especially the Venetians, seeing no commercial advantages in arid plains, deserted villages, and waterless routes, had fixed their eyes on Damietta and Alexandria, which to them were worth fifty Jerusalems. The old craving for the city of Christ's passion had been quenched in the appetite for wealth. Yet the spirit was not dead; it still animated the indomitable bishops of Rome, and, despite his philosophical attitude towards religion, the call of Christendom compelled the young emperor Frederick II to undertake a new crusade. The peace of 1221 had reserved to a "European crowned head" the right of rupture, and Frederick was clearly indicated in the proviso. He had taken the cross as early as 1215; he had sent troops to reinforce the luckless army in Egypt at the very time of its surrender; in 1225 he married the "heiress of Jerusalem," the daughter of King John of Brienne, and, though Yolande died three years later, he claimed and assumed her crown to the exclusion of her father. His crusade was delayed year after year on one pretext or another, and he brought upon himself the ban of the impatient pope; but at last, despite the papal prohibition, he sailed for Syria, with only 600 knights, more "like a pirate and follower of Mohammad," said Gregory IX, than as a king and a soldier of Christ.

Frederick's Crusade was unique in all its circumstances. He won Jerusalem against the will of the church and without a single battle. His forces, in truth, were too weak to risk an engagement with the powerful armies of the Saracens. His contemptuous treatment of John of Brienne had alienated the sympathies of many of the settled Christians; his contest with Rome lost him the support of zealous churchmen. The religious orders of the Temple and Hospital sullenly refused to follow a leader who was under the curse of the Holy See. No one in Syria seemed to care very much about the recovery of Jerusalem. But Frederick had an argument on his side that outweighed all these negations. Kâmil had encountered a rival in his brother Mu'azzam, the lord of Damascus, who was suspected of taking advantage
of the exhaustion after the siege of Damietta, and of presuming upon his own services in the war, to shake off the sovereign powers that Egypt claimed over the empire of Saladin. Alarmed at this disaffection, Kāmil had sent an embassy to Frederick, as sovereign of the Saracens of Sicily, offering him the kingdom of Jerusalem in exchange for his support. In return bishop Bernard of Palermo had come on a mission to Cairo, and costly presents had been exchanged. Frederick was on exceptionally good terms with the Muslims, and his toleration gave rise to suspicions of his orthodoxy. The pope, as we have seen, called him "a follower of Mohammad," and the correspondence which has been published between the emperor and the Arab philosopher Ibn-Sabin, together with the metaphysical discussions into which Frederick loved to draw Kāmil’s envoys after his arrival in Syria, point at least to what we should now call emancipated views, which in those days were apt, in the case of less distinguished advocates, to lead to the stake. An Arab historian confesses that "the emperor was the most excellent among the kings of the Franks, devoted to science, philosophy and medicine, and well-disposed towards Muslims," and twenty years later Joinville found that his kinship to Frederick was the best passport with the mamluks. This toleration, probably shared by Kāmil, who had associated with European nobles, doubtless led to a mutual appreciation. There is no evidence that any treaty was signed, but some understanding was arrived at. Meantime the situation was changed. Mu'izzam died in the winter of 1227; the danger of Syrian rivalry was hardly critical enough to press Kāmil to any great renunciation, and it says much for the emperor’s diplomacy that he was able to bring his Egyptian correspondent to the point of the treaty, signed on 11 February, 1228, and ratified on oath a week

1 This is denied by Abū-‘Abdālā, who says that Mu'izzam was, invariably deterrent to Kāmil, and always caused his name to be removed as sovereign in the public prayers.

2 Published by Prof. Mehreru.
later by the two sovereigns. Kâmil was no doubt in some measure committed by his previous proposals, but his main motive is to be found in the valuable counter-guarantees of the emperor.

The treaty of 1229 was the most remarkable that was ever signed between a Christian and a Mohammadan power, before the days of European engagements with the Turkish empire. On his part the sultan of Egypt surrendered Jerusalem (which was not to be fortified, however), together with Bethlehem, Nazareth, and the pilgrim road to Jaffa and thence to ‘Akka, into the absolute possession of the emperor, reserving only the haram of Jerusalem, enclosing the mosque of ‘Omar, for the exclusive use and possession of unarmed Muslims. He also released all Christian prisoners, including many of the unhappy victims of the “Children’s Crusade.” The emperor in return engaged to defend the sultan against all enemies, even Christians, and guaranteed that the northern Syrian princes of Antioch, Tripolis, and various other places, should receive no assistance from any external power. These engagements were to hold good for ten years and a half.

There is no doubt that, if the treaty were honestly observed, Kâmil gained much more than he lost by it. The territory sacrificed was of little value, and the only part of Jerusalem specially sacred to the Muslims was reserved; whilst the advantages of the emperor’s defensive alliance were overwhelming. However satisfactory the result may have appeared to the two high contracting parties, the treaty roused a storm of indignation among the zealots of both sides. The Holy City was indeed once more Christian—save one part—but at what a cost of honour! Frederick, said the papal party, had bargained with the “infidels” instead of slaying them. Most of the old Latin kingdom was still in the hands of the Saracens. And the prince of Antioch, and the military orders who held many castles in the north of Syria, deeply resented the clause that cut them off from all succour from Europe; it looked, indeed, very much like a spiteful revenge for their disaffection. The
Muslims, for their part, regarded the whole transaction as a shameful betrayal of Islam to the "infidel."

Frederick entered Jerusalem within a month of the treaty, and, enthroning himself in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, set the crown upon his own head. The next day the archbishop of Caesarea placed the Holy City under an interdict, to the amazement and indignation of the crowds of pilgrims: "the place where Jesus Christ suffered and was buried," they cried, "is banned by a pope!" Scared by the calamity, they hurriedly followed the emperor to 'Akka, whence, after appointing honest men to govern his new acquisitions, and strengthening by all possible means the Teutonic order, he sailed for Italy. The Crusade was over, and though it had procured the recovery of Jerusalem, the city was in the midst of a hostile country and could not be held against any attack in force. Kamil religiously observed the treaty he had sworn (as did the Christians by the pope's reconsidered order), but he could not always prevent bands of fanatical Muslims from ill-using the pilgrims and disturbing the peace of the Holy City. The emperor's haughty treatment of many of the Syrian and Cypriote nobles left unhealed wounds and led to a series of quarrels. The gain to Christendom from the Crusade was insignificant, but the fault lay more with the
pope and his supporters than with the indiscrėt emperor.

The nine remaining years of Kāmil’s life were free from crusading molestation, and also from serious rivalry among his own kindred. His title to be the head of the various provinces ruled by the Ayyūbids was generally recognized. He appointed his brother Ashraf as viceroy at Damascus, and the two brothers made an expedition into the Euphrates country, and took Amid from the Ortukid prince whose ancestors had reigned there for 130 years. Kāmil endeavoured to cement the family union by marrying his daughters to the princes of Aleppo and Ḥamāh, and though unsuccessful in a campaign against Kay-Kubād, to the Selğuk sultan of Asia Minor, he recovered Edessa from him, and maintained his authority over the whole of the empire inherited from his father. It was not maintained without friction, for the minor princes of his family regarded him with jealous suspicion and distrusted his crafty diplomacy. There was a rupture with Ashraf in 1236, and on his death in 1237 Kāmil marched upon Damascus to assert his rights as supreme king. The city was defended by his brother eṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ismā’īl, supported by the lords of Aleppo and Ḥims, who were not descended from ʿĀdil and had always held as aloof as they dared from him and Kāmil. After a vigorous siege, an accommodation was arranged; the Egyptian sultan was given Damascus, Ṣāliḥ received Baʿalbekk and other Jan. cities; and Ḥims was punished for meddling. But the exposure and hardships of a winter campaign proved too much for Kāmil’s strength; fever ensued, and at Damascus Mar. he died. For forty years he had governed Egypt, twenty 8 before and twenty after ʿĀdil’s death. As a statesman he was his father’s equal, prudent and firm in counsel,
an energetic and capable administrator, who managed his kingdom alone. After the death of his father’s wezir, Șafi-ed-din, he employed no prime minister, but performed all the business of the state himself. Egypt prospered exceedingly under his reign. He laboured to improve the irrigation system, personally inspected the work of the engineers, extended and improved the canals, dikes, and dams, ensured the safety of travellers, completed the fortification of the Citadel of Cairo; and being a devout Muslim he founded many institutions, such as the Där-el-Ḥadith or Kamiliya college in the Beyn-el-Ḳasr eyn. Like most of his family he loved learning and the society of scholars, and was able to hold his own in the literary debates which took place at his Thursday evening receptions.

He was succeeded by his son el-Ådil II, a profligate who was deposed by a conspiracy among his officers in a couple of years, when his brother es-Șāliḥ Ayyūb assumed the throne. The chief events of Șāliḥ’s reign took place in Syria, where he had a determined enemy in his uncle, es-Șāliḥ Ismā’īl, who had seized Damascus in 1239 and now sought to strengthen himself by the support of the Franks, to whom he surrendered the castles of Shekif, Șafad, Tiberias, and Ascalon. The Christians, however, were in no very efficient condition. The disastrous crusade of the king of Navarre, the duke of

---

1 The younger ʿÅdil’s coins are dated Cairo, 635—37 (1238—40); Damascus, 635. He died in prison in the citadel of Cairo in Feb., 1243. There is a casket of inlaid silver and brass bearing his titles in the Victoria and Albert Museum at South Kensington.

2 Es-Șāliḥ Ayyūb struck coins at Cairo, 637—46 (1240—48); Damascus, 644, 645; and he is named as suzerain on a coin of en-Nāṣir of Damascus, 647 (1249).
Burgundy, and the count of Montfort, defeated at Gaza, and barely rescued from destruction by the prudence of Richard of Cornwall and Simon of Montfort, paralyzed the energy of the Franks. The savage Khwārizmian tribes, driven westward by the invasion of Chingiz Khān, and called in by Šāliḥ Ayyūb to aid in the extirpation of the Christians, took Jerusalem, massacred 7000 of the helpless inhabitants, and restored the Holy City once more and finally to Islam. The combined forces of the Franks and the Syrian Muslims were disastrously routed Oct. by the Egyptians and Khwārizmians near Gaza; Ayyūb recovered Damascus (1245), and Ascalon (1247); and restored his kingdom to the same height of power that it had reached under his father and grandfather. His victori-

**Fig. 55.—Inscription on tomb of eṣ-Šāliḥ Ayyūb, at Cairo, 1252.**

ous campaigns were only checked by a severe illness, during which he received the despatch announcing Louis IX's invasion of Egypt. He immediately had himself transported in a litter to the threatened scene of war.

The Crusade of Louis of France was perhaps the only expedition since the days of Godfrey of Bouillon that deserved the name of a Holy War. It was led by a saintly hero, a veritable Sir Galahad, whose "whole life was a prayer, his whole aim to do God's will"; a king
whose high and noble character inspired universal trust and reverence; a leader whose courage and endurance rested on the sanctions of faith as well as on the obligations of knightly honour. The very loftiness and purity of his nature, however, were impediments in controlling an unruly and licentious army, but the main cause of his lamentable failure is to be sought partly in his ignorance of the topography of the field of action, partly in the inadequacy of his force. His was no crusade of all Europe, such as St. Bernard had excited; Germany and Italy were absorbed in the quarrel between pope and emperor, and the king of France had to depend mainly on his own subjects. He collected some 2800 French knights, with their numerous squires and men-at-arms, and 5000 archers, and these were joined by small contingents from England, Cyprus, and the Syrian Franks. The French sailed in 1720 ships, but the larger half was dispersed by storms between Cyprus and Egypt and driven into the Syrian ports, and only 700 vessels reached Damietta at the beginning of June. The city was garrisoned by Arabs of the Kīnāna tribe, famous for their bravery, supported by an Egyptian army under Fakhr-ed-din; but no sooner had the French appeared than the garrison fled, followed by all the inhabitants, and the Egyptians fell back on Maṣūra.

Louis occupied Damietta almost without striking a blow. Like John of Brienne he had landed on the wrong side of the Nile, but as the enemy in their haste had neglected to destroy the pontoons, he crossed without difficulty. Again, like his predecessor of thirty years before, he committed the fatal mistake of delaying his advance. His one chance was to push on to Cairo before the Nile rose and whilst the Saracens, panic-stricken at the loss of Damietta, were paralyzed by the illness of their dying sultan, whose stern execution of the

1 The Arab historians estimate the total force in round figures at 50,000.
2 According to Joinville, 27 May; but most authorities place the occupation of Damietta, which took place immediately after the arrival of the fleet, on June 5 or 6.
fugitive Kīnāna scarcely reassured his followers. Instead of this, the French waited at Damietta nearly six months, expecting the arrival of the rest of the troops who had been driven to Syria. These reached the seat of war in October, and a debate was then held whether to go to Oct. Alexandria or to march direct upon Cairo. It was decided to “strike at the head of the snake,” and the march towards Cairo began. Once more the vicious precedent of 1219 was followed. Forgetful or ignorant of the disastrous lessons then learnt, the Crusaders again risked the endless obstacles of an advance through a country intersected by deep canals and arms of the Nile, instead of choosing a fresh departure and an easy march through open country from Pelusium. They took a month to work their way less than fifty miles up the river, and all this time, during nearly seven months of unexpected grace, the Saracen army had been constantly reinforced, and had so completely recovered from its panic that the Christians were frequently surprised in their tents by adventurous Muslims, eager to win the reward offered for every “infidel” head.

The French were brought to a stop at exactly the same spot as their unfortunate precursors of 1219. They reached Sharmesa at the corner where the old Tanitic branch of the Nile—then known as the canal of Ushmūm, and now as the Little River (Bahr-eš-Šugheyyyir)—divides eastwards from the great Damietta arm. On their right was the main course of the eastern Nile, in front the Little River, on the opposite side of which could be seen the camp of the Egyptian army resting on the town of Mānsūra, some four miles south of the point where the rivers divided, and supported by ships on the

1 The Rev. E. J. Davis, of Alexandria, in his Invasion of Egypt by Louis IX, 32–34, gives some interesting topographical details derived from local observation and researches. He states that in 1249 the Little River branched off from the Damietta arm some four or five miles north of Mānsūra, instead of (as now) close to the town. Joinville’s name for the Little River, “canal de Réxi,” he derives from the village of Dërekṣa, still existing, and not from “Rosetta,” thus vindicating Joinville from an absurd mistake. He also records the discovery of a large number of skulls, pronounced to be European,
main stream. To advance, one or other of the two rivers must be crossed, and Louis chose the smaller. He immediately began throwing a dam or causeway across the Little River, and before Christmas he had erected two "cats" or pent-houses to protect the working parties, and a couple of belfries or armed towers to guard the cats. The Saracens on the other side undermined the bank, which was speedily washed away by the stream, so as to maintain the breadth of the channel, and they directed a heavy discharge of missiles from their sixteen stone-slings (perrières, petrariae) upon the French defences. The latter replied from eighteen machines, and an artillery duel was kept up across the river for some time. The causeway was the centre of the attack. The Muslims harassed the working parties by a sustained fire of bolts, arrows, and stones, by land and water, and twice they destroyed the cats and other wooden works by a copious discharge of Greek fire. To add to the dangers of this position, they crossed the Little River at a lower part, and attacked the king's army from the rear. They were beaten off, but Louis had now to entrench his camp on the north-east, and guard it on all sides.

The causeway was still unfinished, the river as impassable as ever, when a traitor—some "infidel of Salmūn," it was said—betrayed a secret ford, higher up the Little River, for 500 gold pieces; and on Shrove Tuesday, the king of France took the flower of his knights, his mounted men, and horse-archers to the place. The cavalry crossed in three divisions or "battles;" first, the Templars, then the second division and horse-archers, under the king's brother, Robert count of Artois, and in the rear, the king's battle and his personal following. The passage was unopposed, though not unobserved, but no sooner had the count of Artois reached the other side than, in direct disobedience of the king's orders, he insisted on an immediate ad-

scattered over a considerable area, "like a vast cemetery," north-east of Maṣṣūra, which he believes to be the remains of the Crusaders who fell in the battle of Shrove Tuesday.
The master of the Temple and William Longsword, titular earl of Salisbury, vainly prayed him to wait till the king's division had crossed. He replied with taunts, which left them no option but to join him in his foolhardy gallop. They all charged furiously through the Saracens' camp right into Mansūra and out at the other side. They slew the Muslim commander-in-chief, Fakhr-ed-din, who was in the bath and had barely time to get his weapons. He had been knighted by Frederick II, but his knighthood did not save him. The Crusaders broke up into scattered bands, and enjoyed their fill of personal encounters, regardless of any formation or precaution against attack. They were even venturing upon the conquest of the sultan's palace on the river bank behind the city, when their well-deserved fate overtook them.

The ordinary Egyptian and Arab levies had broken in disorder, but the trusty squadrons of perhaps 10,000 mamlíks, whom Şāliḥ had carefully trained as a corps d'élite, were not so easily scared. They rallied near the palace, and their furious charge under Beybars the Arbaileester turned the fortune of the day. The Crusaders were driven into the narrow streets of Mansūra, which were already barricaded and the windows and roofs manned by archers; and here or in the entanglements of the tents the chivalry of France was cut to pieces. The count of Artois and 300 of his knights were killed; of the Templars scarcely five escaped; Longsword and nearly all the English stood their ground to the death; the horse-archers were exterminated, and the Muslims reckoned 1500 knights and nobles among the dead. The remnant were driven towards the Little River, where Louis, after repeated charges, had succeeded in gaining a position opposite the unfinished causeway. In repelling the assaults of the mamlíks, the king exposed himself to great danger, and many of his best knights were captured and

---

1 This is not clear in Joinville, but appears evident from the letter of Jean Pierre Sarrasin to Nicholas Arrode, printed at the end of Michel's edition of Joinville.
rescued. It was impossible with swordsmen alone to drive off the mounted bowmen of the enemy, who held the advantage of a long range; but the army on both sides of the river had been desperately hard at work building a make-shift bridge over the space still open between the causeway and the south bank. The captured perrières and other engines of the enemy, fascines, and timber of all sorts, furnished the material; and by sunset the duke of Burgundy, who commanded the camp, was able to send across a body of infantry cross-bowmen, under the constable of France, who effectually covered the exhausted remnant of the cavalry, and compelled the mamlûks to draw off. Before this, however, many of the French, in panic, had plunged their horses into the river in the hope of reaching the camp, and the stream was dark with the floating bodies of drowned men and horses.

The battle of Maṣṣūra was but a Pyrrhic victory. Louis indeed held possession of the south shore of the Little River, and had captured the enemy's camp and destroyed their war-engines. But he had lost perhaps half his cavalry and all his horse-archers, and had so little discomfited the Saracens that in three days they were vigorously attacking the bridge-head which he had constructed to guard the causeway, whilst he was only able to maintain the defensive. The battle is a signal illustration of the essential interdependence of cavalry and infantry. Without his foot archers, Louis would have been driven into the river. It was probably inevitable that his advance across the ford should be made by mounted men alone; but once across, their first object should have been to get into touch with the infantry left behind on the north side, and to complete the bridge. This was clearly the king's plan, and its ruin was solely due to the impetuosity of the count of Artois.¹

The chief credit of the day belongs to the steady

¹ Mr. Oman has ably criticized the battle of Maṣṣūra in his History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages, 338–50.
QUEEN SHEGER-ED-DURR

fighting of the mamluks, who bore the brunt of the battle and inflicted the chief punishment upon their rash opponents. Their steadiness was the more remarkable because they were without a king to lead them. Šāliḥ Ayyūb had died on Nov. 21, when the French were just setting forth from Damietta on their fatal march. He is described as a prince of strong character, ascetic, taciturn, severe, and intensely proud and autocratic. He was ambitious, and undoubtedly maintained and even enhanced all the power he had inherited from el-Kāmil. ¹ His death at the critical moment was a serious disaster. His eldest son Tūrānshāh was far away at Keyfa in Diyār-Bekr. The natural result of an interregnum at such a time would be a struggle between rival emirs for the regency or even the throne, and the collapse of any organization against the enemy. Fortunately, Šāliḥ left in his ḥarīm a singularly capable woman—a Turkish, or, as some say, Armenian slave, named Sheğer-ed-durr ("Pearl-spray"). She at once took charge of the situation. Calling together two or three trusty emirs, she formed her plans in consultation. The sultan's death was concealed; he was given out to be seriously ill, but his meals were regularly sent in to where he was supposed to lie, and the necessary orders of state duly appeared, authenticated by his autograph forged by Şāheyl the eunuch. Whatever suspicions may have been aroused, no overt disturbances occurred, and Sheğer-ed-durr and her officers managed the government and defence of the country with unqualified success. She was still the mainspring of the state, holding the court, receiving the ministers and generals on behalf of her "sick" master, and watching over the discipline of the army, when the battle of Maṣūra was fought. Through all the anxious time between November and February, when the heir, who had been urgently summoned, at last arrived, Sheğer-ed-durr held the Muslim kingdom together.

¹ He built the castle of Rūda, and that of Kebsh, between Cairo and Fustāt, besides the town of Šāliḫiyā. His tomb-mosque still stands in the Beyn-el-Kašreyn at Cairo.
When Tūrānshāh came, she immediately resigned her temporary authority. The young man, who enjoyed no very popular reputation, at least conducted the campaign with energy and skill. His first move was to take a number of ships to pieces and transport them on camels back to a point on the Damietta arm of the Nile at some distance below the French fleet; there they were put together, and the result of the stratagem was the capture of thirty-two French ships and the stopping of all supplies for the crusading army. Louis was now in a hopeless position. He was not strong enough to break through the enemy and force his way to Cairo; his supplies were cut off, and the troops began to feel the effects of low rations, added to the deadly influence of camp fever. Still he waited, too proud to turn his back upon the enemy, though he retired to the north side of the Little River, still holding the bridge-head on the south. At last he opened negotiations, in the vain hope that the Saracens would renew the terms offered by Kāmil in 1219—an exchange of Damietta for the kingdom of Jerusalem—but this time it was the Muslims who declined the bargain. Finally, when the army was all but starving, and fever, want, and wounds had exhausted its strength, the king burned his war-engines, abandoned his camp and baggage, and set out by night on the desperate retreat towards Damietta, himself taking the post of danger in the rearguard. In the confusion, the bridge and causeway over the river were left standing. The Saracens streamed over in pursuit, massacred the abandoned sick, kept up a running fight as far as Fāreskūr, two-thirds of the way to Damietta, and there made an end of the Christian army. Tūrānshāh himself wrote that 30,000 Crusaders were slain; it is at least certain that almost the whole French host was either

1 They were probably transported "from the Nile at Semennūd over-land to the great canal which issues from the canal of Mahalla a little to the south of the town of that name. In 1249 this canal communicated with the Nile a long distance down by means of a side canal" (Davis, 46).
killed or taken prisoners, and of the prisoners all except those of gentle birth were massacred.

King Louis was laid low with fever when he was taken, and the Sieur de Joinville, who wrote the moving chronicle of the crusade and himself played a brave man's part in the battle of Manṣūra, was also among the captives. They were eventually held to ransom for 100,000 livres (10,000,000 francs) for the lives of the army, and the surrender of Damietta in exchange for the king. It is related that Louis exhibited such regal indifference when the amount of the ransom was stated to him, that Tūrānishāh, not to be outdone, reduced the sum by a quarter. The prisoners went in great peril when the sultan, who had contrived to make himself generally hated in his two months' reign, had offended his stepmother and slighted the Bahri generals, was murdered by the mamluks.¹ Happily, the woman who had already saved Egypt again assumed the throne, and the terms of ransom were honourably confirmed, in spite of the opposition of the more fanatical Muslims. The French went to Damietta, where Louis's queen had scraped together the stipulated half of the ransom. Thence he sailed in May for 'Akka, with the remnant of his gallant and unfortunate army. Damietta, which had tempted so many Christian invasions, was soon afterwards razed to the ground and rebuilt on a safer site further inland, whilst a boom was stretched across the mouth of the river.

With the murder of Tūrānishāh, the Ayyūbid dynasty came to an end in Egypt. The mamluks were now the masters, and their history belongs to the next chapter. Beyond 'Abd-el-Laṭīf's description of the famine years, we have few detailed notices of the internal condition of Egypt under the sultans of the line of Saladin. The general but vague testimony of the historians goes to show that the country was prosperous as a rule, and that the three kings, whose reigns cover nearly the

¹ Joinville was an eye-witness of the murder, which was accomplished in the river where the sultan was swimming to escape with a sword stuck in his ribs.
whole interval from 1196 to 1250, were intelligent and capable governors, fully alive to the agricultural interests of the land, and to the importance of order and justice. We hear of no revolts or conspiracies, except against two notoriously unworthy sultans. Of the high character and cultivated tastes of the three chief rulers, ʿĀdil, Kāmil, and Şāliḥ, we have contemporary evidence from Ibn-Khalīkān, Ibn-el-Athir, and Bahā-ed-dīn Zuheyr; and it is clear that the society which these learned men, and ʿAbd-el-Latīf, met in Cairo was intellectually distinguished and found appreciation at the court. Bahā-ed-dīn was the secretary and intimate of Şāliḥ, and his poetry reflects the court life of Egypt before the middle of the thirteenth century. It is not what is generally expected in oriental poetry, but in its playfulness, bonhomie, humour, and light treatment of serious things, it more resembles European vers de société, whilst in some of its panegyrics it succeeds in being stately without affectation, and admiring without servility. The Ayyūbid kings showed a business-like readiness to open the country to European trade. In 1208 ʿĀdil granted special facilities to the Venetians throughout Egypt, and allowed them to build a fundak or mart, called the Sūk- ed-dīk, at Alexandria. Similar privileges were granted about the same time to the Pisans, who sent a consul to Alexandria, and these concessions were renewed in 1215-6. The Christian invasion of 1219 naturally interfered with commercial relations, and no further record of trading privileges occurs till 1238, when ʿĀdil II confirmed their former rights to the Venetians. The duties paid by non-Muslim traders on all goods imported into Egypt was a tenth of their value.1

1 In an interesting description of Fustāt, Ibn-Saʿīd, the Spanish Moor, states that "ships and vessels of all sorts arrive from all the lands of the earth at the quays on the Nile... As for the merchandise from the Mediterranean and the Red Sea which comes to Fustāt, it is beyond description, for it is here collected, not at Cairo, and from here it is forwarded to all parts of the country." The passage has been translated by Mr. Corbet (see Mrs. Butcher's Church of Egypt, ii. 148—51).
KAMIL AND THE CHRISTIANS

The relations of the Ayyūbids with their Christian subjects grew more friendly as time went on. Saladin and his brother 'Ādil had been severe and exacting, but Kāmil was recognized by the church of Egypt as the most generous and beneficent sovereign they ever had. As prince regent he often interceded with his father in favour of the Christians, and when he succeeded him he continued the same policy, and resolutely refused to meddle in the petty squabbles of the "national church." His correspondence with the emperor Frederick showed a toleration which was rare among Muslims, and apparently led the Christians to believe that the sultan might be converted. St. Francis of Assisi himself visited the court in 1219, and preached before Kāmil, and was at least received with respect; and in 1245 we find Śāliḥ writing to pope Innocent IV regretting that he was unable to argue with the Preaching Friars by reason of the impediment of an unknown language. The crusade of St. Louis, however, exasperated the Saracens, and it is said that 115 churches were destroyed in consequence of the conquest of Damietta.

As a whole the period of Ayyūbid rule in Egypt, in point of imperial power, internal prosperity, and resolute defence against invasion, stands pre-eminent in the history of the country.
CHAPTER IX

THE FIRST MAMLÜKS

1250—1277


Monuments at Cairo.—Tomb-mosque of es-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, 1250; tomb of Sheger-ed-durr; medresa (1262), and mosque of es-Zahir Beybars, 1267-9; Dār-el-‘Adl, below ramparts of citadel.

Inscriptions.—On monuments above: emir Bilbek in chapel of Fāṭima, 1254; tomb of ‘Abd-er-Raḥmān el-Ḵurashi, 1259; Beybars in Azhar, 1256; on citadel of Damascus, 1261; at tomb of Khālid at Ḫims, 1266, 1267; on white mosque at Ramla, 1267; at Karak, 1271; at Sāfed, Crac des Chevaliers, Bāniyas, Yubna, Lydda, and el-Kahf (M. van Berchem, Corpus and Inscr. Ar. de Syrie, and MSS. notes).

Coins.—See under each reign.

The word mamlūk means "owned," "belonging to," and was specially applied to white male slaves captured in war or purchased in the market. The habit of employing a large body-guard of foreign and especially Turkish slaves dates from the time of the Ābāsid caliphs of Baghdād (see above, pp. 59ff.), who imported the handsome vigorous youth of central Asia to protect them against the Arab tribes and the rising power of the provincial governors, and found that their Turkish guard became their gaolers. In the same fashion the most able and ambitious of the slave generals of the Selţūk sultans became the founders of the numerous independent dynasties that gradually shared what was left of the Selţūk empire. The practice of employing slave officers and troopers naturally prevailed among the dynasties that had risen from the same condition. Nūr-ed-din and Saladin were surrounded by choice companies of mamlūks, brought up with peculiar care,
exercised in all manly exploits, splendidly equipped and trained in the art of war. The system of a halka or bodyguard of white slaves or freed-men was continued under Saladin’s successors, and was brought to the highest pitch of efficiency by his grandnephew es-Sâlih Ayyûb. This sultan had early experience of the jealousies of his kinsmen and the hostility of the Franks; he put little trust in the ordinary Egyptian and Arab levies, and created a small but perfectly trained army of purchased slaves, his personal property, who owed everything to his favour. He imported these mamlûks from various markets, but wherever they were bought, the great majority were Turks. The corps d’élite of picked horsemen were stationed at the castle which he had built on the island of Rûqa, opposite Fustâṭ, on the Nile, and from their river barrack they acquired the name of the fluvial or “Baḥrî Mamlûks,” “the white slaves of the river.” They were not the only mamlûks in his service, by any means, but they were the most favoured and powerful regiment. The circumstance of slavery was so far from a stigma that a little later we find a celebrated emir (Kawsûn) looked askance upon because he had not been a slave, and the relationship of slave to master in the east has always approached kinship more nearly than servitude. The Baḥris were proud of their origin, and it formed no bar to their advancement. Their colonels, or “emirs of a thousand,” exercised great influence, and one of them, Fâris-ed-din Aḫtâī, succeeded Fakhr-ed-din as commander-in-chief after the battle of Maṇṣûrâ. These officers had already risen, before Sâlih’s death, from the ranks of the common slaves to posts of honour at their master’s court; they had become cup-bearers, or tasters, or masters of the horse, and had won their enfranchisement; and these freed mamlûks became in turn the masters and owners of other mamlûks. Thus at the very beginning of their history we find a number of powerful emirs who had acquired a large body of retainers whom they led to battle and who were ready to support them to the death. After the murder of Tûrânsâh, which was the work of the Baḥris, it was but a short step to
the throne, and for the next 130 years the colonels of this celebrated regiment, and their descendants, rapidly succeeded each other as sultans of Egypt. The only title to kingship among these nobles was personal prowess and the command of the largest number of adherents. In the absence of other influences the hereditary principle was no doubt adopted, and we find one family, that of Kalâ‘ûn, maintaining its succession to the throne for several generations; but as a rule the successor to the kingly power was the most powerful lord of the day, and his hold on the throne depended chiefly on the strength of his following and his conciliation of the other nobles. The annals of mamlûk dominion are full of instances of a great lord reducing the authority of the reigning sultan to a shadow, and then stepping over his murdered body to the throne. Most of these sultans died violent deaths at the hands of rival emirs, and the safety of the ruler of the time depended mainly upon the numbers and courage of his guard. This bodyguard enjoyed remarkable privileges and was the object of continual solicitude on the part of the sultan. As his own safety and power depended upon the guards’ fidelity, he was accustomed to bestow upon them grants of lands, rich dresses of honour, and unstinted largesse. The greater part of the land of Egypt came to be held by the emirs and soldiers of the guard in fiefs granted by the crown. These soldiers of the guard numbered several thousand, and must have passed from sultan to sultan at every change of ruler; their colonels became important factors in the choice of rulers, and often deposed or set up a king as seemed good to them. The sultan, or chief mamlûk, was in fact more or less, according to his character, at the mercy of the officers of his guard; and the principal check he possessed upon their ambition or discontent was found in their own mutual jealousies, which might be played upon so as to neutralize their opposition.

1 Some of the following pages are reprinted, with emendations, from my Art of the Saracens in Egypt, ch. iii.
MAMLUK NOBLES

Each of the great lords, were he an officer of the guard, or a court official, or merely a private nobleman, was a mamlûk sultan in miniature. He, too, had his guard of mamlûk slaves, who waited at his door to escort him in his rides abroad, were ready at his behest to attack the public baths and carry off the women, defended him when a rival lord besieged his palace, and followed him valiantly as he led the charge of his division on the field of battle. These great lords, with their retainers, were a constant menace to the reigning sultan. A coalition would be formed among a certain number of disaffected nobles, with the support of some of the officers of the household or of the guard, and their retainers would mass in the approaches to the royal presence, while a trusted cup-bearer or other officer, whose duties permitted him access to the king's person, would strike the fatal blow; and the conspirators would forthwith elect one of their number to succeed to the vacant throne. This was not effected without a struggle; the royal guard was not always to be bribed or overcome, and there were generally other nobles whose interests attached them to the reigning sovereign rather than to any possible successor, except themselves, and who would be sure to oppose the plot. Then there would be a street fight; the terrified people would close their shops, run to their houses, and shut the great gates which isolated the various quarters and markets of the city; and the rival factions of mamlûks would ride through the streets that remained open, pillaging the houses of their adversaries, carrying off women and children, holding pitched battles in the road, or discharging arrows and spears from the windows upon the enemy in the street below. These things were of constant occurrence, and the life of the merchant classes of Cairo must have been exciting. We read how the great bazar, called the Khân-el-Khalîlî, was sometimes shut up for a week while these contests were going on in the streets without, and the rich merchants of Cairo huddled trembling behind the stout gates.

The uncertainty of the tenure of power, and the
general brevity of their reigns (they average about five years), make it the more astonishing that the mamlük sultans found leisure to promote the many noble works of architecture and engineering which distinguish their rule above any other period of Egyptian history since the Christian era. The actual office of sultan was no sinecure, apart from the constant vigilance needed to manage the refractory mamlûks. The sultan was supreme judge, and had to sit regularly, not only to hear causes, but to receive complaints and petitions from any subject who chose to present them. He had to control a large correspondence, and most sultans took a personal share in drafting the dispatches to all parts of the empire and to foreign powers. The most famous and energetic of all the Bahri sultans, Beybars, established a well-organized system of posts, connecting every part of his wide dominions with the capital. Relays of horses were in readiness at each posting-house, and twice a week the sultan received and answered reports from all parts of the realm. Besides the ordinary mail, there was also a pigeon post, which was no less carefully managed. The pigeons were kept in cots in the Citadel and at the various stages, which were further apart than those of the horses; the bird was trained to stop at the first postcot, where its letter would be attached to the wing of another pigeon for the next stage. The royal pigeons had a distinguishing mark, and when one of these arrived at the Citadel with a dispatch, none was permitted to detach the parchment save the sultan himself; and so stringent were the rules, that were he dining or sleeping or in the bath, he would nevertheless at once be informed of the arrival, and would immediately proceed to disencumber the bird of its message. The correspondence conducted by these posts was often very considerable, as may be seen by an example of the business hours of Beybars. He arrived before Tyre one night; a tent was immediately pitched by torchlight, the secretaries, seven in number, were summoned, with the commander-in-chief; and the adjutant-general (Emir 'alam) with the military secretaries were instructed to
OFFICERS OF THE COURT

draw up orders. For hours they ceased not to write letters and diplomas, to which the sultan affixed his seal; this very night they indited in his presence fifty-six diplomas for high nobles, each with its proper introduction of praise to God.

In addition to necessary business, state ceremonies occupied no inconsiderable part of the sultan's time. The mamlûk court was a minutely organized system, and the choice of officers to fill the numerous posts of the household, and the tact demanded in satisfying their jealousies and disagreements, to say nothing of the constant presentation of ceremonial dresses of honour, the writing of diplomas, and granting of titles and appanages, must have been a tax upon their master. The posts about the royal person were valuable and highly prized, and it needed some diplomacy to arrange the cabinet and household appointments to the satisfaction of everybody. Besides the great officers of state, such as the Viceroy (Nâib-es-Saltana) or Wezîr, Commander-in-Chief (Atâbeg-el-'Asâkir or Emîr-el-Kebîr), the Master of the Household (Üstâddâr), Captain of the Guard (Râs-Nawba), Armour-bearer (Sâhâdâr), Master of the Horse (Emîr-Akhûr), Cup-bearer (Sâhî), Taster (Gâshnektîr), Chamberlain, Equerry, Secretaries, Grooms-in-Waiting, etc., there were many smaller posts, which often commanded great power and influence. The Emîr-Meqîlis, "Lord of the Seat," so called because he enjoyed the privilege of sitting in the sultan's presence, was the superintendent of the court physicians and surgeons; the Gâmdâr, or Master of the Wardrobe, was a high official; the Emîr-Shikîr, or Grand Huntsman, assisted the king in the chase; the Emîr-Tabar, or Master of the Halberds, held almost the rank of the Captain of the Guard, and commanded the Tabardârs, or Halberdiers, the Gentlemen-at-Arms of the sultan, ten in number; the Bashmâkâr bore the sovereign's slippers; the Gûkândâr bore the sultan's polo-stick, a staff of painted wood about four cubits long, with a curved head; the Zimâmdârs were eunuch guards. The various household departments had also their officers, who were often great
nobles and men of influence in the realm. The Us-täddär-es-Suhba presided over the cookery; the Tabl-khānāh, or Drummery, was the department where the royal band was kept, and it was presided over by an officer called the Emir-ʿAlam, or adjutant-general. The sultan's band is stated at one time to have comprised four drums, forty kettle-drums, four hautbois, and twenty trumpets. The permission to have a band was among the most coveted distinctions of mamlūk times, and those lords who were allowed to have a band playing before their gates were styled Emir-Ṭabī-khānāh, or Lord of the Drums; they were about thirty in number, and each had command of a body of forty horsemen, with a band of ten drums, two hautbois, and four trumpets, and an appanage of about the value of 30,000 dinārs. The practice of employing these ceremonial bands went out with the Ottoman conquest.

Then there was the Tisht-khānāh, or Vestiary, where the royal robes, jewels, seals, swords, etc., were kept, and where the clothes were washed; the Sharāb-khānāh, or Buttery, where were stored the liquors, sweetmeats, fruits, cordials, perfumes, and water for the sovereign; and the Ḥawāīq-khānāh, or Larder, where the food and vegetables required for the day were prepared. At the time of Ketbughā the daily amount of food prepared here was 20,000 lbs., and under en-Nāṣir the daily cost of the larder was from 21,000 to 30,000 dirhems.

It will be seen that court life was complicated even in the fourteenth century, and the state ceremonies of a mamlūk sultan must have involved as much etiquette as any modern levée, and presented a much more splendid spectacle. When the sultan rode abroad in state, to hold a review or to make a progress through his dominions, the composition of his escort was elaborately ordered. Beybars, for example, rode in the centre, dressed in a black silk gubba, or vest with large sleeves, but without embroidery or gold; on his head was a turban of fine silk, with a pendant hanging between the shoulders; a Bedawi sword swung by his side, and a Dawūdī cuirass was concealed beneath his vest. In front a great lord
carried the *ghâshiya*, or royal saddle-cloth, emblem of sovereignty, covered with gold and precious stones; and over the sultan's head a prince of the blood or the commander-in-chief bore the state parasol of yellow silk, embroidered with gold and crowned with a golden bird perched upon a golden cupola. The housing of his horse's neck was yellow silk embroidered with gold, and a *sunnâri* or cloth of red atlas satin covered the crupper. The royal standard of silk and gold thread was borne aloft, and the troops had their regimental colours of yellow Cairene silk, embroidered with the escutcheons of their leaders. Just before the sultan rode two pages on white horses with rich trappings; their robes were of yellow silk with borders of gold brocade, and a *kâffiya* of the same: it was their duty to see that the road was sound. A flute-player went before, and a singer followed after, chanting the heroic deeds of former kings, to the accompaniment of a hand-drum; poets sang verses antiphonally, accompanying themselves with the kemenga and mûsil. Tabardârs carried halberds before and behind the sultan, and the state poniards were supported by the polo-master (*Gûkândär*) in a scabbard on the left, while another dagger with a buckler was carried on the monarch's right. Close behind him rode the *Gâmakdâr*, or mace-bearer, a tall, handsome man, who carried the gold-headed mace aloft, and never withdrew his eyes from the countenance of his master. The great officers of the court followed, with little less pomp. When a halt was called for the night, on long journeys, torches were borne before the sultan, and as he approached the tent, which had gone on in front and been pitched before his arrival, his servants came to meet him with wax candles in stands inlaid with gold; pages and halberdiers surrounded him, the soldiers sang a chorus, and all dismounted except the sultan, who rode into the vestibule of the tent, where he left his horse, and then entered the great round pavilion behind it. Out of this opened a little wooden bedroom, warmer than the tent, and a bath with heating materials was at hand. The whole was surrounded by a stockade, and the mamlûks mounted guard
in regular watches, inspected periodically by visiting rounds, with grand rounds twice in the night. The *Emir-Bābdār*, or Grand Doorkeeper, commanded the grand rounds. Servants and eunuchs slept at the door. Joinville describes the sultan’s camp at Damietta. It was entered through a tower of fir-poles covered round with coloured stuff, and inside was the tent where the officers left their weapons when they sought audience of the sultan. “Behind this tent was a doorway similar to the first, by which you enter a large tent, which was the sultan’s hall. Behind the hall there was a tower like the one in front, through which you entered the sultan’s chamber. Behind the sultan’s chamber there was an enclosed space, and in the centre of this enclosure a tower, loftier than all the others, from which the sultan looked out over the whole camp and country. From the enclosure a pathway went down to the river, to the spot where the sultan had spread a tent over the water for the purpose of bathing. The whole of this encampment was enclosed within a trellis of wood work, and on the outer side the trellises were spread with blue calico, and the four towers were also covered with calico.”

The historian Makrizi is fond of telling how the sultan made his progresses, held reviews of his troops, led a charge in battle, or joined in the games at home. The mamluks were ardent votaries of sport and athletic exercises. Nāṣir was devoted to the chase, and imported numbers of sunkurs, sakrs, falcons and hawks, and presented valuable fiefs to his falconers, who rode beside him, hawk on wrist. Beybars was a keen archer, and a skilful hand at making arrows. He erected an archery ground outside the Gate of Victory at Cairo, and here he would stay from noon till sunset, encouraging the emirs in their practice. The pursuit of archery became the chief occupation of the lords of his court. But Beybars, like most of the mamluks, was catholic in his tastes; he was fond of horse-racing; spent two days in the week at polo; was famous for his management of the lance in the tournaments which formed part of the amusements of the day; and was so good a swimmer that he once swam
across the Nile in his cuirass, dragging after him several
great nobles seated on inflated carpets.

Such outward details of the life of the mamlûks may
be gathered in Maqrizi: but if we seek to know some-
thing of the domestic life of the period, we must go else-
where. We find indeed occasionally in the historian an
account of the revels of the court on great festivals, and
how there were concerts in the citadel, where a torch
was gently waved to and fro to keep the time. But to
understand the home-life of the mamlûks, we must turn
to the Thousand and One Nights, where, whatever the
origin and scene of the stories, the manners and customs
are drawn from the society which the narrators saw
about them in Cairo in the days of the mamlûks; and
the various articles of luxury that have come down to us,
the goblets, incense-burners, bowls, and dishes of fine
inlaid silver and gold, confirm the fidelity of the picture.
With all their prayers and fasts and tedious ritual, the
Muslims of the Middle Ages contrived to amuse them-
selves. Even in their religion they found opportunities
for enjoyment. They made the most of the festivals of
the faith, and put on their best clothes; they made up
parties—to visit the tombs, indeed—but to visit them
right merrily on the backs of their asses; and they let
their servants go out and amuse themselves too in the
gaily illuminated streets, hung with silk and satin, and
thronged with dancers, jugglers, and revellers, fantastic
figures, Kârâkûsh (the oriental Punch), and the Chinese
Shadows.

The poet Bahâ-ed-din Zuheyr, the secretary of Šâlih,
who survived his master and died in 1258, gives a vivid
picture in his verses of the joyous society of early mam-
lûk times, from which it is evident that there was no
very strict observance of the Muslim rule of temperance
among the gay courtiers. The wine-cup is as prominent
in Zuheyr's poems as in 'Omar Khayyâm's. Many of
the mamlûk sultans are described as being addicted to
wine, and the great lord Beysari was at one time stated
to be incapable of taking part in affairs, because he was
entirely given over to drink and hazard. Yet there are
redeeming points in this sottishness. The Muslims of
the days of good Hārūn, and not less of the other
"golden prime" of Beybars and Barḳūk, did not take
their wine moodily or in solitude. They loved to have
a jovial company round them, and plenty of flowers and
sweet scents on the board; they perfumed their beards
with civet, and sprinkled their beautiful robes with rose-
water, while ambergris and frankincense, burned in the
censers we still possess, diffused a delicious fragrance
through the room. Nor was the feast complete without
music and the voices of singing women, and the scene
of their revels was often a palace such as Kubla
Khan might have pictured in his dreams. We can
scarcely realize now the stately pleasure domes which
the mamluks once decreed; how they hung them with
rich stuffs, and strewed them with costly carpets; what
wealth of carving and ivory-work embellished their doors
and ceilings; how delicately inlaid were their drinking
and washing vessels; how softly rich the colouring of
their stained windows. In this flowering time of
Saracenic art, a real interest belongs to the life and
social condition of the people who made and encouraged
the finest productions of the oriental artist. History can
show few more startling contrasts than that offered by
the spectacle of a band of disorderly soldiers—a stand-
ing army of foreigners, rarely intermarrying with the
natives, a class absolutely apart—to all appearance
barbarians, prone to shed blood, merciless to their
enemies, tyrannous to their subjects, yet delighting in
the delicate refinements which art could afford them in
their home life, lavish in the endowment of pious
foundations, magnificent in their mosques and palaces,
and fastidious in the smallest details of dress and
furniture. Allowing all that must be allowed for the
passion of the barbarian for display, we are still far from
an explanation how the Turks chanced to be the noblest
promoters of art, of literature, and of public works, that
Egypt had known since the days of the Ptolemies.
During this brilliant period the population of Egypt
was sharply divided into two classes, who had little in
common with each other. One was that of the mamlüks, or military oligarchy, the other the mass of the Egyptians. The latter were useful for cultivating the land, paying the taxes which supported the mamlüks, and manufacturing their robes; but beyond these functions, and that of supplying the judicial and religious posts of the empire, they had small part in the business of the state and appear to have been very seldom incorporated into the ranks of their foreign masters. The names of the mamlüks that have descended to us in the accurate and detailed pages of Maqrizi are generally Turkish, and even when they are ordinary Arabic names, they were borne by Turks who had put on an Arabic name along with the speech, dress, and country of their adoption. In the glories, military and ceremonial, of the mamlüks the people had no part. They were indeed thankful when a mild sovereign, like Lāğin, ascended the throne, and when taxes were reduced and bakhshish distributed; and they would join, like all mobs, in the decoration of the streets and public rejoicings, when the sultan came back

---

1 It will be useful here to explain the system of mamlük names and titles. Every mamlük had (1) a proper name, such as Ketbughā, Lāğin, Beybars, Kalā'un, generally of Turkish derivation; (2) a surname or honourable epithet, as Ḥūsām-ed-dīn, "Sword-blade of the Faith," Nūr-ed-dīn, "Light of the Faith," Nāṣir-ed-dīn, "Succourer of the Faith"; (3) generally a pseudo-patronymic, as Abū-l-Fetḥ, "Father of Victory," Abu-n-Naṣr, "Father of Succeed"; (4) if a sultan, an epithet affixed to the title of sultan or king, as el-Melik es-Sa'īd, "The Fortunate King," el-Melik en-Nāṣir, "The Succouring King," el-Melik el-Manṣūr, "The Victorious King"; (5) a title of possession, implying by its relative termination ֶthat the subject has been owned as a slave (or has been employed as an officer or retainer) by some sultan or lord, as el-Ashrafī, "The slave or mamlük of the sultan el-Ashraf," el-Manṣūrī, "The mamlük of the sultan el-Manṣūr." The order of these titles was as follows: first, the royal title, then the honourable surname, third, the patronymic, fourth, the proper name, and last the possessive: as es-Sultān el-Melik el-Manṣūr Ḥūsām-ed-dīn Abū-l-Fetḥ Lāğin el-Manṣūrī, "The Sultan, Victorious King. Sword-blade of the Faith, Father of Victory, Lāğin, mamlük of the Sultan El-Manṣūr." It is usual, in abbreviating these numerous names, to style a sultan by his title, el-Manṣūr, etc., or by his proper name, Lāğin, etc., omitting the rest, while a noble (emīr) is conveniently denoted by his proper name alone.
from a career of conquest, or recovered from an illness; but they had no voice in the government of the country, and must make the best they might of the uncertain characters of their ever-changing rulers.

The following list shows the names and order of succession of the twenty-five sultans of the Bahri dynasty, few of whom call for detailed biography:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queen Shefger-ed-durr</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Mu'tizz 'Izz-ed-din Aybek</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Manṣūr Nur-ed-din 'Ali b. Aybek</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Muṣaffar Seyf-ed-din Kütuḫ</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ez-Zahir Rukn-ed-din Beybars</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es-Sa'id Nāṣir-ed-din Baraka Khān b. Beybars</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-'Ādil Bedr-ed-din Selāmish b. Beybars</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Manṣūr Seyf-ed-din Ḥalā'ūn</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Ashraf Ṣalāh-ed-din Khalīl b. Ḥalā'ūn</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ed-din Mohammad b. Ḥalā'ūn</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-'Ādil Zeyn-ed-din Ketbūghā</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Manṣūr Ḥusām-ed-din Lāḡīn</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-Nāṣir, second reign</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Muṣaffar Rukn-ed-din Beybars II</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-Nāṣir, third reign</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Manṣūr Seyf-ed-din Abū-Bekr b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Ashraf 'Ala-ed-din Kūḡuk b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-Nāṣir Shihāb-ed-din Anāmād b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es-Sāliḥ 'Imād-ed-din Ismā'īl b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Kāmil Seyf-ed-din Shābān b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Muṣaffar Seyf-ed-din Ḥājjī b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ed-din Ḥasan b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es-Sāliḥ Shālāh-ed-din Sāliḥ b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-Nāṣir Ḥasan, second reign</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Manṣūr Shālāh-ed-din Mohammad b. Ḥājjī</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Ashraf Nāṣir-ed-din Shābān b. Ḥoseyn b. Nāṣir</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Manṣūr 'Āli b. 'Abbās b. Shūbān</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es-Sāliḥ Shalāḥ-ed-din Ḥājjī b. Shūbān</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Barquq, Burji mamliks]</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥājjī, second reign, with title el-Manṣūr</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1290 After the murder of Turānshāh it was inevitable that the mamluks should seize the throne of Egypt, yet

1 Original Bahri mamluks of Sāliḥ Ayyūb.
2 Mamluks of Ḥalāʿūn. It will be observed that from 1290 all the sultans were descendants of Ḥalāʿūn, except those who were his mamluks.
they showed their respect for the late dynasty as well as gratitude for her former statesmanship by electing Şâliḥ’s widow, Sheğer-ed-durr, as their queen—almost the only queen who has ruled a Mohamadan country before the present Empress of India.

Sheğer-ed-durr combined the qualification of a mamlûka and comrade of the Bahris with that of marriage with the Ayyûbid sultan, to whom she had born a son. The son, Khalil, died in infancy, but how insistently she based her right to sovereignty upon her motherhood of a prince of the royal line is proved by her official signature on all state documents: she styled herself merely Umm-Khalil (or Wâlidat-Khalil), “the mother of Khalil.” The prayers were recited in her name, and coins were struck with the feminine titles “el-Mustaʿṣimīya, es-Şâliḥiya, Melikat-el-Muslimin, Wâlidat el-Melîk el-Manṣûr Khalil-Amir-el-Muʿminin,” which signify “the [former] slave of [the caliph] Mustaʿṣim [and afterwards] of Şâliḥ; queen of the Muslims, mother of el-Melîk el-Manṣûr Khalil [friend] of the Commander of the Faithful.”¹ The first act of the new sultan was to

¹ The only coin known of Sheğer-ed-durr is in the British Museum (Lane-Poole, Catalogue, iv. p. 136), and bears these titles, together with those of the contemporary Abbâsid caliph Mustaʿṣim, and the date, Cairo, A.H. 648 (which began 5 April, 1250). The titles are the same as those given in Maqrizi. The coin is the sole numismatic record of her reign, which lasted less than three months, and is the only known coin of a Muslim queen, except Riṣiya of Dehli, Abish of Fârs, and Nûr-Jâhan on the Mogul emperor Jahângir’s coinage. The queen’s surname or takab was ‘Asmat-ed-din, “Defender of the Faith,” and her royal style was sultân: there is no such feminine form as “sultana” in Arabic. The generic name Sheger-ed-durr, so written by Abû-l-Fidâ and other historians, is often altered to the noun of unity Shegeret-ed-durr by Maqrizi and later writers.
THE QUEEN AND AYBEK

confirm the previous treaty with king Louis, and despatch him and his army safely out of the country. It is at least highly probable that partly to her the Crusaders owed their lives; since in the excitement after the murder of Tūrānshāh, and again when they were drunk with the re-occupation of Damietta, the mamluks were in two minds whether to massacre the Christians or not. The ransom probably turned the scale. Louis’s queen, who had been at Damietta, paid the first half of the 800,000 besants, and the king lost no time in leaving the coast.

The anomaly of a Muslima queen was too repugnant to Mohammadan ideas to last. The blessed Prophet had said, “the people that make a woman their ruler are past saving,” and the caliph of Baghdad, far from being conciliated by the apparent fact that the new sultan of Egypt had once been in his ḥarim, wrote to the Egyptian leaders that “if they had no man among them, he would send them one.” The hint was taken, and Izz-ed-din Aybek, one of the leading Bahris and then atābeg-el-‘asākir, or commander-in-chief, was chosen by the emirs to be the husband of Sheger-ed-durr and July sultan of Egypt, with the title of el-Melik el-Mo‘izz.1

A further precaution was observed in view of the hostility of the Ayyūbids in Syria. The descendants of Saladin were not disposed to let Egypt pass from their possession without an effort to preserve it to the family, and en-Nāṣir of Aleppo, Saladin’s great-grandson, had already seized Damascus (which then belonged to Egypt) as a step towards a march

---

1 Aybek’s rare coins are from old dies of es-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, with the addition of the name Aybek (no title), and with the dates Cairo, 651 and 652 (1253, 1254). No coins bear the joint names of Aybek and el-Ashraf Mūsā.
upon the Nile. In order to deprive him of a pretext, the mamluks set up a joint-king, to reign with Aybek, in the person of el-Ashraf Mūsā, a child of six, great-grandson of el-Kāmil. But the real power still rested in the queen’s hands; she controlled the finances, refused to inform Aybek where the treasure of the late sultan Ṣāliḥ was deposited, and kept her husband in strict subordination. His real function was to fight the queen’s enemies; whilst she managed the internal affairs of state, always, however, in the names of the joint kings, and with the assistance of a military oligarchy composed of the leading mamluks, of whom Āktāi, Beybars, and Balban were the most prominent and held the chief official posts.

Aybek had two dangers to guard against; one was invasion by the legitimist Ayyūbids of Syria, the other, conspiracy among his brother mamluks and Arab subjects—the risk of trouble from the native Egyptians might be neglected. The most pressing peril was from the legitimists. Already a portion of the mamluk army at Ṣālihiya near the Syrían frontier had proclaimed a rival king in el-Mughith ‘Omar, a son of ‘Adil II and grandson of Kāmil, a candidate with a good title to the throne,—so good, indeed, that his uncle Ṣāliḥ had kept him a close prisoner at Shawbek (Montreal). Thence he had only just been released by his opportunist gaoler, and had immediately occupied the strong fortress of Karak. Aybek’s reply to this competition was to throw Egypt under the protection of the caliph of Baghdaḍ, by proclaiming it a province of the ‘Abbāsid caliphate and himself as the caliph’s viceroy. Having thus set up another legitimist title, far older than that of the Ayyūbids, Aybek turned to measures of war. He first sent Āktāi, the commander of the Bahri mamluks, to relieve Gaza, which the Syrians were besieging, and meanwhile he exerted himself to convince the people of Egypt of his respect for the late dynasty. The body of

1 Mūsā was the son of en-Nāṣir Yūsuf, the son of el-Mes‘ūd Yūsuf (Kāmil’s son) who ruled the Yemen from 1215 to 1228.
Şâliḥ Ayyûb was removed from the castle of Rûḍa, where it had been hurriedly concealed by She❣er-ed-durr, and was accorded a magnificent funeral in the tomb-mosque (still existing) which she had built for it in the Beyn-el-Kaṣreyn: Aybek and Ashraf, the joint-kings, and the officers of state attended in great pomp; all the mamlûks were dressed as mourners in white and cut off their hair; the tomb was reverently covered with banners, and the bow and quiver of the late sultan were laid upon it. The people were also encouraged to believe that the Ayyûbid opposition was divided, that Mughîth of Karak had become the ally of Aybek, and all sorts of false rumours were put about.

Nevertheless everybody predicted the triumph of the old dynasty, and when Nâṣir of Damascus arrived on the frontier, the people of Cairo were confident in his success and prepared a welcome. Aybek and Âktâi, with a large army of mamlûks and Arabs of Upper Egypt, met the legitimist claimant near ʿAbbâsa, and an obstinate battle ensued. The Egyptian Arabs, routed at the first onslaught, fled to their homes, announcing on their way the defeat of Aybek. Cairo at once ranged itself on the side of the supposed victor; Nâṣir’s name was honoured next day in the Friday prayers, and preparations were made for his entertainment. The battle, however, was not over when the Arabs fled; the Egyptian right drove in the Syrian left; the centres were evenly balanced, and the issue wavered. At last, the desertion of Nâṣir’s mamlûks to their comrades of the other side turned the scales, and the remnant of the Syrian army fled to Damascus, abandoning camp and baggage, and losing many killed and prisoners. Among the latter, who graced Aybek’s triumphant entry into Cairo, was eş-Şâliḥ Ismā‘îl, the former lord of Damascus (see p. 229), and several other princes of Saladin’s blood. Ismā‘îl was paraded before the tomb of his old rival, Şâliḥ Ayyûb, and strangled in the Citadel as an inveterate enemy of Egypt.

Encouraged by this victory, Aybek sent Âktâi to recover Gaza and Palestine, and took the opportunity of
increased prestige to depose his nominal partner, the child Ashraf, and send him away to Constantinople (1254). Meanwhile the caliph intervened to promote a peaceful understanding between his contending subjects of Syria and Egypt. His motive was evident: the Mongol invasion was already touching his frontiers, the barbarians were in Diyār-Bekr, and it was imperative to sink all minor differences and present a united front to the enemies of Islām. Peace was arranged by ambassadors from Baghdād on the basis that Egypt should hold Palestine west of the Jordan, including Jerusalem and the Muslim part of the coast. The treaty was renewed in 1256, when Nāṣir abandoned his protection of Egyptian malcontents, and Aybek had no further trouble from the legitimists.¹

The danger from the intrigues of his own household was more difficult to guard against than the open attacks of the enemy. Ṭāḥi, who was the most distinguished of the mamłūk generals and had not only completed the discomfiture of Louis IX but repeatedly beaten the Syrians, was a serious rival to Aybek. The Bahrī mamłūks would obey no other leader, and with Ṭāḥi's connivance this truculent soldiery became a terror to the inhabitants; they indulged their licence in atrocious acts of violence, pillaged innocent houses, and raided the public baths for women. The very Franks, says Maqrīzī, could not have done worse. To add to the general anarchy, the Arabs of the Sa'īd broke into revolt with the cry of "Egypt for the Arabs," not the Turks, and this race movement became so popular that the Arabs were able to muster some 12,000 horse and a multitude of foot soldiers. They were met near the apex of the delta by Ṭāḥi with only 5000 of his trusty mamłūks, but his usual skill and their courage once more brought victory. A campaign in the north quickly reduced the Arabs of the delta who had caught the spirit of revolt, and Aybek treacherously entrapped their leader

¹ The Egyptian frontier, according to Abū-l-Fidā, was then fixed near el-'Arish, as it is to-day.
and many of his followers, and punished the tribes by increased taxation. The result was their ruin. The Arabs of Egypt had been rich and owned many horses and large herds: henceforward, says the historian in the fifteenth century, they were reduced to the state in which they now decline.

This latest triumph made Āktāi more insupportable than ever; and Aybek resolved to get rid of him. The general was trapped in the citadel of Cairo, and his head was thrown to his escort standing below the walls. Many Bahri mamluks, appalled at this sudden blow, fled the country, and some who stayed behind were arrested. For the moment Aybek had saved his throne. The exiled mamluks, however, remained a perpetual menace: they raided Palestine, sought to stir up Naṣir at Damascus, and when he was induced by the caliph to dismiss them, they joined Mughith at Karak and hovered on the borders of Egypt. Aybek spent the best part of three years in camp on the frontier, guarding against their attack. He was now bent on legitimizing his title, and sent an embassy to the caliph at Baghdād to request the robes of honour and usual insignia of investiture. At the same time he proposed to marry a daughter of Lu‘lu, the prince of Mūṣil. This produced a final rupture with his wife, Sheger-ed-durr, who, although she lived on the worst terms with her husband, was intensely jealous of sharing him with other women. She had already made him divorce a former wife, and she would not tolerate a fresh marriage, especially to a princess of rank. Aybek had been told by the court astrologer that he would die of a woman’s plot, and he was privately warned that the queen was meditating his removal. He seems to have entertained corresponding designs on his own part, but she anticipated them. Inviting him to the Citadel with every assurance of sincerity, she had him murdered in his bath. When it was done, she tried to pass it off as a natural death, but the mamluks soon extracted the truth from tortured slaves. In vain the queen offered the throne to several nobles; none dare to accept so perilous a gift. The mamluks would have killed her in their
fury, but the old ties of comradeship secured her the protection of the Baḥris, who had moreover no cause to love Aybek. She was shut up in the Red Tower, and foreseeing her doom the heroic lady devoted her last hours to pounding her jewels in a mortar, that no other woman should wear them. Three days later she was dragged before the wife whom she had compelled Aybek to divorce, and in her rival’s presence queen Sheğer-ed-durr was battered to death by the wooden clogs of the women slaves. They threw her half-naked body into the citadel ditch, where it lay several days to be devoured by dogs, until at last some one buried it. Her tomb still stands near the chapel of Sitta Nefisa, and some pious modern hand has covered it with a cloth embroidered with her name. Her end was like Jezebel’s: yet she had saved Egypt.

Aybek’s son (by the divorced wife) was set upon the vacant throne by the choice of the mamluks, but the lad of fifteen, who spent his time in the frivolous amusements of cock-fighting and donkey-rides, was only a make-shift to avoid a struggle between the jealous emirs. El-Melik el-Manṣūr ‘Ali,1 as he was styled, was no sovereign for the crisis at hand, and in Nov., 1259, he was deposed by the regent, Kentuz (formerly Aybek’s deputy or næb-es-saltana) who ascended the throne with the title of el-Melik el-Muẓaffar.2 As he observed to his followers, this was no time for boy puppets, “we want a fighting king.” The danger now was not from the legitimists, for Kentuz had completely routed the Ayyūbīd el-Mughith of Karak when he attempted with the support of the exiled Bahris to conquer Egypt. A far greater peril threatened the whole Mohammadan east in the advance of the Mongols under Hūlagū, who took Baghdād and murdered the caliph in Feb., 1258, conquered all Syria in 1260, and pushed on to Gaza,

1 A gold coin of el-Manṣūr Nūr-ed-din ‘Ali bears the date Cairo, 656 (1258).
2 A gold coin of el-Muẓaffar Seyf-ed-din Kentuz has the date 658 (1259-60), but the mint is effaced, and a silver coin has the mint Damascus, but the year effaced.
DEFEAT OF THE MONGOLS

harrying and destroying everything in their way. Hülāgū sent an embassy to the sultan of Egypt, bearing a letter full of menace and requiring his abject submission. Kuṭūz replied by executing the ambassadors and hanging up their heads at the gate Zawila. He would have no parleying with the enemy, lest some of the fainter-hearted emirs should be won over. As it was, he had to administer a stern reproof to them before he could lead a united and determined army to the frontier. Murmurs were stifled, and courage raised, when Beybars with the vanguard drove the Mongol garrison out of Gaza; and the whole army of Egypt marched north along the coast, secured the neutrality of the Franks of Ḥakka, and then went to encounter the barbarians. They found them near Beysân at Goliath’s Spring (‘Ayn Gālūd—a famous site in Crusading warfare), and the tremendous shock of the Mongol charge shattered the Egyptian militia. But the headlong flight led to victory; for the Mongols, dispersed in pursuit, lost formation, and were easily cut off by the steady attack of the unshaken mamlūk. The Mongol general, Ḫetbūghā, fell, and his army was soon in full retreat, joined by the garrison of Damascus, where the Muslims immediately rose and slew its Christian population, who had triumphed prematurely over the downfall of Islām. Kuṭūz restored order throughout the devastated cities, replaced the Ayyūbid princes as tributaries in their old seats at Ḥimṣ and Ḥamāh, and the public prayers were recited in his name as far as Aleppo and the Euphrates. As he was returning in triumph from the brilliant campaign which had rescued Egypt and recovered Syria, he fell a victim to the jealousies which are the inevitable bane of a military dictatorship. Beybars, the ablest of his generals, baulked of his desire for the government of Aleppo, conspired with other nobles, and Kuṭūz was assassinated whilst returning from the chase within the Egyptian frontier. The chief regicide was elected sultan on the spot.

Beybars—or es-Sultān el-Melik ez-Ẓahir ¹ Rukn-ed-

¹ “The Ascendant King, prop of church and state, Beybars [mamlūk] of the Arbalesteer [and] of es-Ṣāliḥ.” He first chose the title el-
Beybars
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dunyä-wa-din Beybars el-Bundukdärî ez-Šâliḥî—was the real founder of the mamlûk empire. His predecessors had barely and briefly held their power against rivals, revolts, and foreign foes: Beybars made himself supreme over all. He was a native of Kipchak, between the Caspian and the Ural Mountains,—a tall ruddy fellow, with blue eyes, one or which was disfigured by a cataract: hence he only fetched about £20 in the slave market. He had belonged to the emir Aydekin el-Bundukdär, “the arbalester,” whence his epithet el-Bundukdärî, which Marco Polo wrote “Bendoquedar.” Afterwards he passed into the service of Šâliḥ Ayyûb, and became one of the most conspicuous of the Šâliḥî or Baḥrî mamlûks, especially distinguishing himself at the battle of Manṣūra. He was the first great mamlûk sultan, and the right man to lay the foundations of the empire. “Bondogar,” says William of Tripolis, “as a soldier was not inferior to Julius Caesar, nor in malignity to Nero”; but he allows that the sultan was “sober, chaste, just to his own people, and even kind to his Christian subjects.” So well did he organize his wide-stretching provinces that no incapacity or disunion among his successors could pull down the fabric he had

Kaḥir, but this was found to possess unlucky precedents, and was changed for ez-Zâhir, “the Ascendant.” After re-establishing the ‘Abbâsid caliphate at Cairo he added the title Kašîm-Amîr-el-mu’minîn, “partner of the Commander of the Faithful.” His coinage (like most of the mamlûk currency) is frequently so rubbed as to be illegible, but there are dated coins of Cairo, 664, 665, 666, and 667 (1265-9); Alexandria, 659, 661, 664, 667 (1260-9); and Damascus and Ḥamâh, with uncertain dates. His coins bear his badge, a lion passant—a notable innovation in the Egyptian type of currency. The name is usually written Beybars, but on the coins the y is not inserted, and the name would appear to be Bibars, as Quatremère spells it.
raised, until the wave of Ottoman conquest swept at last upon Egypt and Syria. To him is due the organization of the mamlik army, the rebuilding of a navy, the allotment of fiefs to the lords and soldiers, the building of causeways and bridges, and digging of canals in various parts of Egypt. He strengthened the fortresses of Syria and garrisoned them with mamlik; he connected Damascus and Cairo by a postal service of four days, and used to play polo in both cities within the same week. His mosque still stands without the north gates, and his college once stood—only an angle remains—in the Beyne-Kasreyn. He founded an endowment for the burial of poor Muslims. In many respects he was a great ruler, and his qualities must have been remarkable to have raised him from the level of a one-eyed slave to be the consolidator of an empire that lasted for 250 years.

Beybars was determined to be a second Saladin, to revive the power and prestige of the Egyptian empire, and to wage war against the “infidels” who still lingered on the Mediterranean coast. Syria had indeed been recovered by his predecessor—and Beybars was careful to confirm his local appointments and conciliate the governors—but it was held on a precarious tenure. A rival proclaimed himself king at Damascus, and though suppressed (Jan. 1261) his ambition was significant. The first object of the new sultan was to keep the Mongols—who now formed an established dynasty known as the Ilkhan of Persia or Hulaguids—on the further side of the Euphrates; the second object was to punish the Crusader states which had made common cause with the barbarians against the remnant of the once extensive caliphate. In order to emphasize his position as the pre-eminent sultan of Islam, he not only spent largely upon mosques and pious endowments, but invited an exiled representative of the extinguished Abbasid caliphate to come to Cairo, where he enthroned
REVIVAL OF THE CALIPHATE

him with splendid pomp as the rightful pontiff of Islām, with the title el-Mustanṣir, and received from him the gold-embroidered black turban, the purple robe, and the gold chain and anklets, which denoted the duly appointed and spiritually recognized sovereign of the caliph’s realm.¹

Having thus acquired the title to act as the head of the Muslims, Beybars set about consolidating his power by alliances with foreign princes. By a fortunate coincidence Baraka, the khān of the Golden Horde, or Mongols of Kipchak, who pastured in the valley of the Volga, had embraced Islām, and was in deadly rivalry with his kinsmen the Īlkāns of Persia. Embassies were exchanged (1261-3) between Baraka and Beybars, accompanied by valuable presents, and the two became allies against Persia.² Baraka’s name was even prayed for

¹ At first Beybars seems to have contemplated the restoration of the caliphate at Baghdād, and furnished the caliph with an army and a splendid retinue for the purpose; but when the actual advance upon Mesopotamia began, his fears were excited lest a restored caliphate might prove hostile to himself, and he left the unlucky Mustanṣir almost unsupported to make the attempt, in which he apparently lost his life. Another ‘Abbāsid caliph was then set up at Cairo (1262) with the title of el-Ḥākim; but there was no more talk of reconquering Baghdād, and thenceforward the second or Egyptian dynasty of ‘Abbāsid caliphs were restricted to such spiritual functions as the ritual of the mosque afforded. They formed, however, the technical centre of Islām, and served to connect the old caliphate of Baghdād with the modern sultans of Turkey, to whom they bequeathed such rights as they were able to bestow. The succession of the ‘Abbāsid caliphs of Egypt may here be noted:—el-Mustanṣir 1261, el-Ḥākim I 1262, el-Mustekfī I 1302, el-Wāthīk I 1339, el-Ḥākim II 1340, el-Mu’āṭidī I 1352, el-Mutawekkil I 1362, el-Mu’tasim I 1377, el-Mutawekkil restored 1377, el-Wāthīk II 1383, el-Mu’tasim restored 1386, el-Mutawekkil, third time, 1389, el-Musta’in 1405 (sultan 1412), el-Mu’āṭidī II 1413, el-Mustekfī II 1440, el-Ḳāim 1451, el-Mustenṣīb 1455, el-Mutawekkil II 1479, el-Mustemsik 1497, el-Mutawekkil III 1498, el-Mustemsik restored 1516, el-Mutawekkil III restored 1521, to assumption of caliphate by ‘Othmānli sultan, 1538.

² Detailed accounts of the Egyptian embassy in 1263 to the khān of the Golden Horde are given by Ibn-el-Furūt and en-Nuweyri, translated in Quatremerè’s Makrīzī, i. 213, note. The envoys went to Constantinople, crossed to the Crimea, and thence to the Itil (Volga) where they found the camp of Baraka. Ambassadors from Baraka reached Cairo in 1263.
next to the sultan’s on Fridays in the mosques of Cairo, Jerusalem, Mekka and Medina, and his daughter became the wife of Beybars. The sultan’s envoys went to the khan by way of Constantinople, where a friendly understanding had already been established with the emperor Michael Palaeologus, who was naturally disposed to side with anybody who was the sworn foe of Latin Christianity, as represented by the Crusaders, from whose violence and misrule the East Roman empire had suffered for half a century. Beybars, at the emperor’s request, had supplied a Melekite patriarch for Constantinople, now at last reclaimed to the orthodox church; and in return Michael had authorized the restoration of the old mosque which had existed in his capital for centuries until destroyed by the Latins. Another embassy from Cairo waited upon Manfred, king of Sicily and Tuscany, who, as the son of Frederick II and the enemy of the papacy, welcomed the envoys, though he had no assistance to give. Commercial treaties, moreover, were signed between the sultan of Egypt and James of Aragon, and afterwards (1271-2) with Alfonso of Seville. Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX, sent a mission to Cairo in 1264. An ally was also found in Kay-Khusru, one of the struggling Seljuk princes of Asia Minor, then falling under Mongol sway. All these engagements display Beybars in the character of a prudent and far-sighted statesman; but it was the alliance with the powerful khan of the Golden Horde that preserved the Muslim empire from serious invasion by the Mongols of Persia. They did indeed repeatedly attack Bira, at the passage of the Euphrates, and pushed a raid into Syria as far as Apamea; but Beybars wisely laid the northern districts waste, that the invaders should find no food or fodder, and thenceforward, though a perpetual menace, the Mongol armies effected no important successes during his reign.

There were, however, sympathizers with the Mongols along the Syrian coast who had to be dealt with. The Franks, especially Boemond VI, prince of Antioch and Tripolis, finding them disposed to favour Christianity at
the expense of Islâm, were supporters of the Ilkhâns. Consequently they were special objects of Beybars's attack. For ten years—1261 to 1271—he waged almost annual campaigns against the Crusader states. At first these were merely raids into the territory of Antioch, Cilicia, and the district of 'Akka, accompanied by much cruelty and devastation, or enlivened by great battues of game. Amongst others, the church of Nazareth was destroyed. In 1265, however, he began a series of conquests. In that year Caesarea and Arsûf were taken and razed to the ground, lest they should again become strongholds of the "infidels." By a refinement of insult the Christian defenders of the conquered fortresses were compelled to help in their dismantling, and then led with broken crosses round their necks, and banners reversed, to grace the victor's triumphal entry into Cairo. Dervishes and fakirs, seconded by religious women, had encouraged and inflamed the zeal of the Muslim troops and worked at the trenches; and Beybars himself toiled like a navvy at the demolition of the fortifications. In 1266 the troops were again called out from their homes; and after piously visiting Jerusalem and Hebron and distributing alms, the Sultan seized 'Arka, raided the Christian lands about 'Akka, Tyre, and Sidon, and won Safed, after three attempts to storm it, from the Templars, who were nearly all slain. Unlike the coast towns, Safed was now garrisoned and its fortifications strengthened. In all this Beybars took a personal share, encouraging the men by taking the post of danger, helping in the labour of bringing up the siege train, and displaying unwonted solicitude for the sick and wounded, providing hospital tents, physicians and surgeons. At the same time he severely repressed disorder and pillage in Muslim territory, forbade wine to be used in camp, and slit the noses of officers who indulged in private looting or damage to the crops. In the autumn he again overran the dominions of the king of Little Armenia (Cilicia) as far as Tarsus, and Haithon purchased peace by the surrender of Derbesâk and the country east of the G'eyhün river. Jaffâ was captured in 1268, and Mar.
razed to the foundations: its fine marbles were used to decorate the mosques of Cairo. Sheikf Arnūn (Belfort) surrendered in April, and the crowning triumph of the campaign was the storming of Antioch, the head-quarters of Christianity in northern Syria. The noble city was burnt to the ground.

Beybars took the occasion of the conquest of Antioch to write to its prince, Boemond VI, one of those boastful and sarcastic letters for which he was famous. Addressing him as "count," since he had now lost his principedom, he reminds him that he has been "looking on like a man in a mortal swoon" whilst piece after piece of his dominions has been taken from him. Then the conqueror describes the campaign which ended in the storming of Boemond's capital, sparing him no details: "Hadst thou but seen," he wrote, "thy knights trodden under the hoofs of the horses! thy palaces invaded by plunderers and ransacked for booty! thy treasures weighed out by the hundredweight! thy ladies bought and sold with thine own gear, at four for a dinār! hadst thou but seen thy churches demolished, thy crosses sawn in sunder, thy garbled gospels hawked about before the sun; the tombs of thy nobles cast to the ground; the monk, the priest, the deacon slaughtered on the altar; the rich abased to misery, princes of royal blood reduced to slavery! could'st thou but have seen the flames devouring thy halls; thy dead cast into the fires temporal, with the fires eternal hard at hand; the churches of Paul and of Cosmas rocking and going down!—then would'st thou have said, 'Would God that I were dust!' . . . This letter holds happy tidings for thee: it tells thee that God watches over thee to prolong thy days, inasmuch as in these latter days thou wert not in Antioch! Hadst thou been there, now wouldst thou be slain or a prisoner, wounded or disabled. A live man rejoiceth in his safety when he looketh on a field of

1 There had been a treaty between John of Ibelin, count of Jaffa, and the Ayyūbid sultan, en-Nāṣir, of Damascus, which Beybars confirmed in a personal interview with John in 1261. The death of John of Ibelin, however, terminated the agreement.
slain . . . As not a man hath escaped to tell thee the tale, we tell it thee; as no soul could apprise thee that thou art safe, while all the rest have perished, we apprise thee."

This loss so dispirited the Franks that they asked for peace, and Beybars himself accompanied his own ambassadors into Tripolis, disguised as a groom, in order to spy out the place with a view to a future siege. The Franks of 'Akka also opened peace negotiations, which fell through. A raid upon the country near Tyre and 'Akka in 1269 was followed by a more vigorous campaign in 1271, when the great castle of Crac des Chevaliers (Hisn-el-Akrād) was surrendered by the Hospitallers. \textsuperscript{1271} Tortosa and Markab won a truce by a sacrifice of territory; Akkār capitulated, and the Teutonic knights were unable to defend the fortress of Montfort (el-\textsuperscript{17} Kureyyn). "Our yellow flag hath overcome thy red," wrote Beybars again to Boemond, "and thy bells are silenced by Allāhu Akbar," the call to prayer. After further hostilities Tyre made terms by dividing its territory with Egypt; and Hugh III of Cyprus, styling himself king of Jerusalem, succeeded in obtaining a treaty of peace for 'Akka and Cyprus for ten years, \textsuperscript{1272} ten months, and ten days. This arrangement was partly due to the arrival of reinforcements from England, under prince Edward Plantagenet, in May 1271, who inspired the 'Akkans to renewed courage and even secured a couple of small successes; and partly to the threatening movements of the Mongols, who made incursions into northern Syria in 1271 and 1272. The Egyptian fleet, moreover, had been disastrously wrecked at Limasol in an attempt to conquer Cyprus—the main support of Boemond—and Beybars was busy repairing the injury by the rapid construction of fresh vessels. On the death of Boemond in 1275, peace was renewed with his successor, who agreed to pay an annual tribute of 20,000 D.

The Franks were now harmless, and before this another

\textsuperscript{1} The letter is printed in Arabic (from Nuweyri) and French in Quatremerè, \textit{Mamelouks}, I., ii. 190-4; in German in Weil, iv. 63-7, and the spirited English version is by Sir II. Yule, \textit{Marco Polo}, i. 25.
danger had been removed by the submission or the "Assassins." These fanatics of the Ismā‘īlian sect, secure in their nine rocky fortresses among the Anṣāriya mountains between Markab and Ḥamāh, had been the terror of Syria since the beginning of the twelfth century, and their fidāwis or emissaries had carried out the lethal orders of their sheykh in many a secret murder. Saladin had vainly attempted to suppress them, and since his failure they had been courted by many Christian powers, and were under the special protection of the Knights Hospitallers. In 1267, however, by a treaty with the knights, Beybars took over the tribute of the Assassins, and having acquired an influence over them he set about disarming their power. Between 1270 and 1273 he took their fortresses one by one, by force or by capitulation, and induced the most dreaded of all secret societies to take up its abode in Egypt, where it gradually lost its fanatical character and became merged in the peaceful population.

Meanwhile, relieved from hostilities on the Syrian coast, Beybars turned his arms northwards; once more he overran Cilicia, surprised and burnt el-Maṣṣīṣa and Sis, and raided up to Tarsus, where the prayers of Islām were recited in triumph. He had defeated the Mongols near Bira early in 1273, after swimming the Euphrates at the head of his troops; and in 1277 he waged his last campaign against the most powerful of his foes. They now ruled Asia Minor and the young Selğūk princes by means of a governor, or Perwāna, Mu‘īn-ed-din, and against him Beybars led the yellow standards of his ever-victorious army. Near Abulusteyn he fell upon the enemy, with his 11,000 mamlūks, and inflicted so terrible a defeat that the Mongols left nearly 7000 dead upon the field. Their camp was taken and the prisoners put to death. The sultan seated himself upon the throne at Kaysariya (Caesarea) where the Selğūk sultans of Rūm had reigned for two centuries, and here he received the

1 Beybars was reported to have urged the Assassins to the murderous assault upon Edward Plantagenet, but he strenuously denied the charge.
homage of the people, was prayed for in the mosque, belauded by the poets, hymned by the royal Selğük band; and here he caused coins to be struck in his name, and divided the Perwāna's treasure among the troops. Here too he received the allegiance of the Turkmān ruler of Ḍarāmān, whose tribesmen proved a useful buffer on the northern frontier. It was but a temporary occupation, for the Persian Ilkhān was already mustering a vast army to recover his losses, and Beybars prudently returned to Syria, leaving Caesarea to the pitiless butchery of the enraged Mongols: but the glory of having sat on the Selğük throne was not the least among his triumphs.

Nor was this northern expansion the only side on which the empire of Egypt was enlarged. Slightly more permanent was the annexation of the Südān. Dāwūd, the Christian king of Nubia, who should by ancient custom have paid an annual tribute or baikt of slaves to the sultan (see above, p. 23), had sent various expeditions into the Egyptian territory, and taken Muslims captive at Aswān on the Nile and at Aydhab on the Red Sea coast. In return the Egyptian governor of Kūf had raided Nubia as far as Dongola in 1272-3; and in 1275 Beybars seized the opportunity of the arrival of Dāwūd's nephew Shekenda in Egypt to espouse his cause and set him up in opposition to his uncle. A fresh army was sent into the Südān, the forts of Daw, Sūs and Dongola were taken, Dāwūd defeated, and Shekenda set upon the throne, after taking the most solemn and tremendous oath by all he held sacred to be a true and loyal vassal to the sultan of Egypt, to render the customary baikt of slaves, and to pay half the revenue of the kingdom, together with various elephants, giraffes, panthers, dromedaries, and oxen, as tribute, as well as a gold dinār for each adult male of the population, who were also compelled to take an oath of allegiance. The conquest of the Südān had been attempted before in 652, and again by Saladin's brother in 1173, but its dependence had been merely nominal, and such it soon became again.

Beybars had now reached the goal of his aspirations.
The slave had risen (by a twofold murder of his leaders, it is true) to become the greatest sultan of his century. His orders were obeyed from the fourth cataract of the Nile to the river Pyramus, and on the east from Bira along the Euphrates to Karkisiyya on the Khabur. The Bedawis of the deserts were his auxiliaries, the sherifs of the holy cities of Arabia were under his control; all Syria was subject to him, save the few cities on the coast which the Christians still held, and the principality of Hamah. The king of the Yemen courted his friendship, and sent him costly gifts; the ruler of Abyssinia sought a patriarch at his hands. Sawakin on the Red Sea was his, and the chiefs of north Africa from Barka westwards paid him tribute. At the height of his renown he died, probably from a poisoned cup which he had prepared for another.

The greater part of his reign was spent in campaigns outside Egypt, but he generally passed the winter months at Cairo, whilst his troops rested and rains or snow hindered marching, and he devoted these intervals to improving the country and the capital. It was not only in founding and restoring mosques and colleges, or rebuilding the Hall of Justice at the foot of the citadel, that he showed his public interest. He enlarged the irrigation canals and dug new ones, made roads and bridges, fortified Alexandria and repaired the pharos,

---

1 Weil, iv. 96-97. Karkisiyya was taken from the Mongols in 1265; a year later the sherif of Medina received his appointment from Beybars, who also nominated the sherif of Mecca. Hamah was the last vestige of the Ayyubid power, and its princes retained their title of king, though really subordinate to the mamluk sultans, until their extinction in 1341; the last king but one, Abū-l-Fidā, more famous as an historian and geographer, was born in 1273 at Damascus, whither his parents had fled in dread of a Mongol invasion. Himṣ (Emesa), the penultimate possession of the Ayyūbids, fell into Beybars's hands on the death of its last king in 1263. The rest of their dominions was taken by the Mongols about 1260, and the Syrian part was recovered by Kutuz. In 1263, Beybars had treacherously entrapped Mughith, the Ayyūbid prince of Karak, and probable claimant for the throne of his father ʿAdil II of Egypt, and shut him up in the citadel of Cairo. Karak then became a fortress of Egypt, as Shawbek had been since 1261. Sawakin was taken in 1266.
and protected the mouths of the Nile from the risk of foreign invasion. He revived the Egyptian fleet, built forty war galleys, and maintained 12,000 regular troops—not reckoning, one must assume, the Arab and Egyptian militia or occasional levies. His heavy war expenses entailed heavy taxation; and though with a view to popularity he began his reign by remitting the oppressive taxes imposed by Kutuz to the amount of 600,000 D. a year, he found himself compelled to increase the fiscal burdens as his campaigns developed. Yet we read more often of old taxes repealed than of fresh duties imposed, and his treasury was filled less by the impost of Egypt than by the contributions from the conquered cities and districts of Syria, the tribute of vassal states and tribes, and the valuable custom-dues of the ports. Some idea of his wealth may be gained from the list of the presents he sent to his ally, the khan of the Golden Horde. There was a throne inlaid with carved ebony and ivory, a silver chest, choice prayer-carpets, curtains, cushions innumerable, fine sword-blades with silver hilts, saddles from Khwarizm, bows from Damascus, Arabian javelins, silver and enameled lamps and chandeliers, a priceless Koran in a gold-embroidered case, black eunuchs, cooks, Arab horses, dromedaries, mules, wild asses, giraffes, apes, parrots, etc.

His government was enlightened, just, and strict. He met the severe famine of 1264 by measures at once wise and generous, by regulating the sale of corn, and by undertaking, and compelling his officers and emirs to undertake, the support of the destitute for three months. He allowed no wine (though the tax on it used to produce 6000 D. a year), beer, or hashish in his dominions; he attempted to eradicate contagious diseases by scientific isolation; he was strict with the morals of his subjects, shut up taverns and brothels, and banished the European women of the town; though, personally, he was addicted to the Tatar kumiz, and was suspected of oriental depravity. He was no sybarite, whatever his vices; no man was more full of energy and power of work. If his days were often given to hunting or polo, lance-play or
marksmanship, his nights were devoted to business. A courier who arrived at daybreak received the answering despatches by the third hour, with invariable punctuality. We have seen (p. 247) how once fifty-six documents were drawn up, signed, and sealed in one night.

With the people he was popular: the Muslims always admired a fighting sultan, especially if he had an open hand, and Beybars was lavish in largesse, as well as in alms. He was also approved by the religious, not only on account of his pious endowments, but because he showed no favour to any one party in Islam. For the first time he appointed four kādis, one for each of the four orthodox schools, and, by playing off one against another, contrived to get his own way in everything affecting law and religion. The nobles and officers of the state and army stood in dread of his wrath. He suspected every one, and constantly shifted his governors from post to post to prevent their acquiring local influence. If an emir showed a trace of treason there was no mercy for him; on the other hand, a loyal servant was sure of good pay, rapid promotion, and a share of the conquered lands. The sultan's worst quality was his perfidy; his word and his oath were worthless, and he prided himself upon tricking an enemy to his death. The insidious device by which he got rid of an Armenian ecclesiastic, by sending him a compromising letter and causing it to be waylaid by an Egyptian agent and shown to the Mongol governor, is but one of many instances. But it is fair to remember that he only met like with like, and that the court in which he was trained, supplemented by the experience of his own career, was not such as to encourage boundless confidence in his comrades or servants. By such steps as he had climbed, others might climb too, and it is not surprising that suspicion kept his dungeons in the Citadel constantly full. His mistrust of his agents led to various devices in order to watch them unseen; he was supposed to be confined to his tent by illness in Palestine when he had really ridden incognito all the way to Cairo, where he stayed several days concealed in the
A HERO OF ROMANCE

Citadel, studying the behaviour of his unsuspecting representatives. On another occasion he is said to have ventured in disguise into Asia Minor to spy out the land, and having left a ring in pledge at a cook-shop, he had the effrontery to write to the Mongol Ilkhān Aḥāğā to request that it might be returned. His courage and daring, whether in battle or in dangerous exploration, were extraordinary. The heroic qualities of sultan Beybars have outlived his faults and pettinesses, and to the present century the audiences in the coffee-shops of Cairo have delighted in the story-tellers' recital of the daring exploits and princely generosity of the king who has impressed the imagination of the Egyptians more than any other, scarcely excepting Alexander and Saladin.

1 See the account of the romance of Əḫ-Ẓāhir (Eǧh-Ḥāhir) in Lane, Modern Egyptians, ch. xxi.
CHAPTER X

THE HOUSE OF ҚALĀ‘ŪN

1279—1382


Principal Monuments in Egypt.—Mosque, māristān, and kubbā (medrēn) Қalā‘ūn, 1284—1303; mosque emir Beybars; tomb Khalil, in south Karafa, 1288; Lāgin’s restoration M. of Ibn-Tūlūn, 1296; T. Zeyn-ed-dīn Yusuf, 1298; Medr. en-Nāsir, 1299; restorations M. of el-Ḥākim, Azhar, Ibn-Kuzīk, etc., 1302—4; Khānaqāh Beybars II, 1310; Medr. Ṭaybars (in Azhar), 1309; aqueduct and buildings in Citadel, 1313, and M. en-Nāsir, 1318; M. emir Ḥoseyn, 1319; M. Al-melik, 1319; Medr. Senqar el-Gāwali and Salār, 1323; T. princess Orduteqpin, 1324; M. Abmad el-Mihmendār, 1325; part of M. Ḳawṣūn, 1329; M. Almās, 1330; Medr. ʿAkbūhā, 1334; T. of Tāṣhtimur, 1334; palace Beshtāk, c. 1335; T. and M. Aṭṭūnbūhā el-Māridānī, 1335—9; M. Sīta Miskā, 1339; M. Ašlām, 1346; M. Kuğuk, 1346; M. Aksunkur, 1347; M. Aghān el-Iṣmāʿīlī, 1348; M. Kuṭlūbūghā, 1348; M. Manqāk, 1350; M., khānaqāh, and sebil Sheykhī, 1350—5; cistern of Lāgin, 1351; M. ʿArghytmish, 1357; M. and T. sultan Hasan, 1356—62; restorations M. el-Ḥākim, 1359; and Azhar, 1360; Medr. princess Tatar el-Hiğazīya, 1360; T. princess Ṭulbiyā, 1364; T. Tinkīz, 1363; Medr. el-Gā‘i el-Ŷūṣufī, 1373; M. el-ʿAshraf Shaʿbān, 1368.

Principal Inscriptions in Egypt.—On the mosques and tombs enumerated above, often with dates of commencement as well as of completion; Baraka Khān in mosque (disappeared), 1278; Bekṭimür in M. of Ṭalā‘ī, 1300; Beybars II in M. Ḥākim, 1303; Nāsir on Citadel, 1313, and in M. Қalā‘ūn, 1303.

Principal Inscriptions in Syria.—Baraka (associated as prince with his father Beybars) on citadel of Damascus, and castle of Karak; Қalā‘ūn on mausoleum built by him for Beybars and Baraka at Damascus, tablet commemorating conquest of Markab 1285, inscr. at
THE SONS OF BEYBARS

Balāṭunus, Baʿalbekk, Karak, Jerusalem, Hebron, Nābulus, and Sheyzar; Khalīl at Yubna, on mosque at Tripolis, citadel of Aleppo; Ketbūghā on great mosque (church) of Ramla, and Ḥamāh; Lāḡīn on great mosque (church) of Gaza, at Shawlak, and Munākhir; Naṣir Muhammad in ġaram of Jerusalem, M. el-ʾĀḵsā, k. es-Ṣakhir, etc., in mosques of Gaza, Gʿebela, Tripolis, Ramla, on tower of Ramla, wall and gate of Damascus, and Gʿsr Tora near by, on castle of Karak, at Latakia and on Mt. Hor; Kāmil Shaʿbān in M. el-ʾĀḵsā at Jerusalem, on castles of Karak and Tripolis; Ḥasan in M. el-ʾĀḵsā and in great mosque of Baʿalbekk; es-Ṣālıḥ in M. el-ʾĀḵsā and mosque at Muʿta near Karak; Naṣir Shaʿbān on citadel of Aleppo (MSS. notes of M. van Berchem).

Coins (see under each reign), armorial badges, numerous bowls and other vessels, enamelled glass lamps, etc. In British, Victoria and Albert, Cairo, Paris, and other museums, and in private collections.

Of the three sons of Beybars, the eldest, by a daughter of Baraka Khān of the Golden Horde, was raised to the throne with the titles el-Melik es-Saʿid Naṣir-ed-dīn Baraka Khān. Beybars had proclaimed him his heir as early as 1264, and three years later had caused him to be saluted as “sultan,” so anxious was he to secure the dynastic succession to his line. Unhappily he had not transmitted his great qualities to his sons. Es-Saʿid was a weak pleasure-loving youth of nineteen, the tool of his Mongolian mother and of the gay young courtiers of his choice, upon whom he lavished the best appointments of the empire. The old emirs of his father’s wars were neglected; some were imprisoned, or even poisoned by the queen-mother; their discontent grew into open rebellion, and Saʿid, besieged in the citadel of Cairo, was forced to abdicate, and to retire to the fortress of Karak.1 The mam{lūks begged Ḥalāʿūn, one of the most capable of the elder generals, to accept the throne; but the prudent emir foresaw opposition, and preferred to set up the youngest son of his master, Bedr-ed-dīn Selāmish with the title of el-ʾĀdil. For a hundred days Ḥalāʿūn acted as atābeg or regent for the child of seven years, meanwhile placing his own supporters in all the

1 He died in March, 1280, and was buried beside Beybars at Damascus. His brother, el-Mesʿūd Khīṭr, succeeded him as prince of Karak.
offices of state, and thus preparing the way for the next step. Selâmîsh was then quietly deposed, and Kalâ‘ûn became sultan of Egypt.

El-Melik el-Manşûr Seyf-ed-dîn Kalâ‘ûn el-Elî es-Sâlihi, a Turk of the Burğ Oghlu tribe of Kipchak, more fortunate in his progeny than Beybars, founded a princely house which lasted a hundred years, maintained and even increased the prestige and territorial extent of the Egyptian empire, and filled the capital with noble monuments. He had, however, a stern fight to go through before he was settled on his throne. The mamlûk system had this special weakness, that on the death of the sultan, whom they had elected from their number, the leading emîrs were all possible candidates for the vacant place. There was as yet no hereditary order of succession, though the tendency had been to prefer—pending party combinations—the temporary recognition of a late sultan’s son. There were several of Beybars’s generals who felt that they had as good a claim to the throne as Kalâ‘ûn, and one of them, Sûnkûr, proclaimed himself king of Syria with the style of el-Melik el-Kâmîl. He had the support of several of the leading Zâhirîs or mamlûks of Beybars, together with that of the Bedawis of the desert, and the Ayyûbid prince of Hamâh. Their united forces were defeated by Kalâ‘ûn only after a combat of many hours, aided by desertions, in a great battle at el-G’esûra, near Damascus; and partly by discriminating severity, partly by wise conciliation, the disaffection was brought to an end. Soon after, he renewed the truce which Beybars had made with the Hospitallers of Markab (in spite of their infractions), and

1 “The victorious king, sword of the faith, Kalâ‘ûn the milliary, [mamlûk] of es-Sâlih.” Kalâ‘ûn, so pronounced in Egypt, but written Khilawîn in Turkish, means “duck”; and the representation of a wild duck is very common upon bowls and other works in inlaid silver and brass bearing his name or his son’s. See my Art of the Saracens, pp. 164, 190, 194. The “milliary” refers to his having been purchased for a thousand dinârs. He was a thorough Turk, and spoke very little Arabic. Very few of Kalâ‘ûn’s coins have been preserved; one has a date, Damascus, 682 (1283-4).
concluded treaties with the prince of Tripolis (16 July, 1281), the Templars of Tortosa (15 April, 1282) and the lord of 'Akka (3 June, 1283). These treaties were nominally for ten years, and the most notable provisions they contained were freedom of access for Egyptian vessels to the Christian ports, and ominous restrictions upon further fortifications. That the Christian states agreed to abandon measures of self-defence is evidence that they must have felt their helplessness against the armies of Egypt. Their end was not far off.

These various treaties with the Crusader cities were concluded under the stress of a Mongol invasion. Kalâ‘ûn wanted his hands free to engage his only formidable enemy, who, taking advantage of the confusion of the Syrian revolt, had crossed the Euphrates, and sacked Aleppo. The sultan raised every man he could, mamlûks and Turkmâns, troops from Ḥamâh and Karak, Bedawis of the deserts, and Arabs from the Ḥīḡâz and from the Euphrates.¹ His total muster was about 50,000. The Mongols under Mangûtimûr, a brother of the Ilkhân Abâghâ, numbered according to different estimates from 50,000 to 80,000, of whom about a third were composed of contingents from Georgia, Armenia, and the East Roman borders. The two armies met near Ḥims, and the decisive battle was fought on Thursday, 30 Oct., 1281. The bewildering tactics of the Mongol horsemen, who doubtless employed their famous tulûghma or turning movement, completely broke the Muslim left, which fled helter-skelter to the gates of Ḥims, hotly pursued by the swift archers of the steppes. Some of the Egyptians were there slaughtered; some continued their flight towards Egypt, bearing lamentable tidings of the sultan’s defeat; whilst the victorious pursuers bivouacked outside Ḥims, and feasted upon their spoils. It occurred to neither party that what had happened to the Egyptian left might not

¹ Makrizî describes the contingent of 4000 Arabs of the tribe of Mura as all well mounted, armed with helmet and cuirass covered with silk, carrying sword and lance, and accompanied by a damsel who sang a war-song.
have happened to the right and centre. The steady old troops of the Ayyūbid prince of Ḥamāh were stationed here, with the active and elusive Bedawis, and these had not only stood the brunt of the Mongols’ attack, and put their left to flight, but had wounded their general, and taking them in the moment of leaderless hesitation, had charged home and driven the enemy to utter rout. Just as the Mongol right had chased the Egyptian left, so did the Egyptian right pursue the Mongol left, and the extraordinary spectacle of the two halves of two large armies vehemently hunting each other in opposite directions was exhibited to the amazed sultan of Egypt, as, with a guard of only a thousand mamlūks, he stood deserted upon a hill! The feasting Mongols, however, soon learned the disaster to their left, and hastened to join their retreating comrades. They were in such a hurry that they did not even turn aside to cut up the sultan’s small brigade, though they passed so close to him that he anxiously concealed his banners and silenced his drums. As soon as he saw their backs, however, he fell upon them, harassed their retreat, and sent orders by pigeon to his governors at the Euphrates to bar the fords. It was the worst disaster the Mongols had met with in their attempts upon Syria: Kuṭuz, Beybars, and now Ḷaḷaʿūn had defeated them, and the greatest defeat was the last.

The result was an armed truce for seventeen years.

Both Mangūtimūr and Abāghā died in the following spring, and the next Ḫūkān of Persia, Aḥmad, was a Mongol converted to Islām. He did not on that account renounce the policy of his predecessors, and the correspondence with Ḷaḷaʿūn exchanged through his ambassador hinted not obscurely at war; but a rival in his own country mended his manners, and a second embassy brought handsome presents and friendly assurances. The ambassadors were received at Damascus by Ḷaḷaʿūn, who was surrounded by a guard of 1500 mamlūks, dressed in red atlas satin, with golden girdles, and turbans of cloth of gold, each holding a wax candle. But at this moment Aḥmad was dead, and the sultan of
FOREIGN RELATIONS

Egypt had no further trouble with the Mongols for the rest of his reign. With the rival Mongol of the Golden Horde he preserved the amicable relations established by Beybars, and also with the emperor of Constantinople, the kings of France, and Castile, and Sicily, the republic of Genoa, and the emperor Rudolf of Habsburg. With Genoa he concluded a commercial treaty, whilst Alfonso of Castile and James of Sicily actually made a defensive alliance with the Muslim sultan against all comers (1289). The king of the Yemen sent him costly presents, and even the ruler of Ceylon despatched an embassy with a letter which no one at Cairo could read, and with a more intelligible oral communication inviting trade with his rich country and offering the aid of twenty ships. Kalâ‘ūn, like Beybars, was a far-sighted statesman, and did his utmost to attract merchants to Egypt. His passports, ensuring protection throughout his dominions to foreign traders, were current as far as India and China.

When the fear of the Mongols had abated, the sultan lost no time in reducing the Crusader cities. His treaties were valid only so long as he found them convenient, and his oath was no more sacred than that of Beybars. In spite of his ten years' engagement with the Hospitallers, he suddenly fell upon their great fortress of Markab, which was totally unprepared for a siege, and surrendered. The count of Tripolis was then forced to yield him Marakiya on the coast, though its position defied a siege by land. Margaret of Tyre purchased peace for ten years (on paper) by surrendering half her revenues and engaging never to renew her fortifications. The kingdom of Little Armenia was raided and compelled to buy a ten years' truce by a tribute of 1,000,000 dirhems yearly, to release all Muslim prisoners, and also to desist from all measures of defence. In defiance of the treaty with Tripolis, Latakia was seized; and after the death of Boemond VII—the death of a signatory was then held to void a treaty—

1 Some of these documents are printed in Arabic, with French translation, in the appendix to Quatremère's Ma‘ṣrī, II., i. 166 ff.
Tripolis itself was besieged, sapped, and stormed, the men put to the sword, the women and children enslaved, and the city burnt. Finally, the people of 'Akka having broken the truce, and any pretext being welcome, a Holy War was proclaimed, and the sultan had just set forth to its conquest, when he suddenly died in his tent at the age of seventy.

Kalâ’un followed closely in the steps of Beybars. Their circumstances were identical, and he had confronted the same difficulties with the same policy, fortifying himself by foreign and commercial alliances, temporizing with minor enemies near at hand, in order to meet the one real danger, the Mongol invasion, with his full strength. He had fully maintained the prestige and extent of the empire, and though two expeditions into Nubia (1287, 1289) had not succeeded in suppressing a contumelious king, Shemamûn had at least been so far impressed by the repeated and temporarily successful invasions of the Egyptians, that he renewed the annual bâht or tribute which he had rashly renounced. The army was kept in a high state of efficiency, and never before had the 12,000 mamlíks been so strictly disciplined and restrained from their natural excesses. About a third of these were quartered in the citadel of Cairo, and this brigade was known as “the Burgis” (men of the Burg or tower). Many of them were Circassians, or Mongols from the Golden Horde. Kalâ’un is extolled by his eastern contemporaries as a king at once brave and prescient, just and mild, who abhorred bloodshed; yet he could be stern and severe to disloyal emirs, many of whom were executed, imprisoned, or despoiled, whilst his punishments were sometimes barbarous. A Christian who had married a Muslim, contrary to the law, was burnt, and his wife was disfigured. Against Christians, whether on the Syrian coast or in the Egyptian chanceries, he was prejudiced, and by the end of his reign they were

1 For the various Egyptian campaigns in Nubia and the Sûdân, which cannot be fully narrated here, see Quatremère’s Mémoires géographiques et historiques sur l’Égypte, etc., ii. 39-126.
excluded from all government offices. Towards his Muslim subjects he was benevolent, and his chief pious foundation was devoted as much to the physical as to the spiritual well-being of the people. When Kalāʿūn was lying seriously ill in Nūr-ed-dīn's hospital at Damascus he made a vow that if he recovered he would build a hospital at Cairo. The result was the well-known Māristān, completed in 1284. The buildings are really three: a mosque, a hospital, and the founder's tomb-chapel (medfēn). The tomb-chapel is decorated with wonderful arabesque tracery and reliefs in plaster, and with fine marble mosaic; and the red granite pillars, and the robes of the sultan and his son here preserved, have been touched by sick people, barren wives, and dumb
children for centuries in a belief in their curative virtues. The mosque is less striking, but the hospital is one of the most remarkable buildings in Cairo. It contains three courts, two of which are surrounded by small cells, whilst from a larger court with a colonnade on each side open a number of rooms. There were originally wards for every known disease, and a regular medical staff, lecture room, laboratories, dispensary, baths, kitchens, and every appliance then understood. Musicians soothed the wakeful hours of the sufferers, whilst in the adjoining mosque fifty salaried readers of the Korân taught the consolations of religion, and a librarian with five assistants presided over a fine collection of medical, theological, and legal books. Sixty orphans were maintained and educated in the neighbouring school. The hospital was the first ever built in Cairo, and its value was immediately appreciated. Rich and poor were alike treated gratuitously, and this great work has made the name of Kalâ'un blessed among sultans in Egypt, for with Muslims charity covers a multitude of sins.¹

Of the four sons of Kalâ'un, 'Alâ-ed-din had been declared his successor in 1280, but when he died mysteriously in 1288, the next son Khalîl was appointed heir, though his father, whether from dislike of his violent and godless character, or because he suspected him of poisoning his brother, could never be induced to sign the formal deed of appointment. "I will not give the Muslims," he said, "a king like Khalîl." He was waiting probably for the younger son Mo'hammad to grow up. But meanwhile Kalâ'un's death and the public recognition did what the unsigned diploma intended. Without opposition el-Melik el-Ashraf Salâh-ed-din Khalîl² sat on his father's throne. From the first he set himself to humble

¹ For the condition and use of the Mâristân early in the present century, see Lane, Cairo Fifty Years Ago, 92 ff., and for the architecture and ornament consult my Art of the Saracens, 73—5, 91, 101, 123 ff.

² Coins of Khalîl are known with the dates, Cairo, 691 (A.D. 1292); Alexandria, 692.
or get rid of the trusted henchmen of his father’s court and army. His brief reign of three years is full of execution, imprisonment, and spoliation of the great emirs. The highest ministers of state were the first to suffer: Turuntāi, the chief wezir, was cut down before the sultan’s eyes, and Ḭāgin only escaped death before the throne because the bowstring snapped at his windpipe, and the emirs begged him off. The confiscation of Turuntāi’s goods brought the sultan 600,000 D. in gold, 17,000 lb. of silver coins, and countless slaves, horses, and jewels; whilst the blind son of the murdered man was reduced to beg his bread.

Khalil, at the age of twenty-seven, combined in a superlative degree the worst vices of a cruel and capricious tyrant. His one virtue was courage, and his one exploit the conquest of Ḭakka. Although the campaign was the legacy of his hated father, he was eager to carry out the policy of extirpating the “infidels”; and little as he cared for religion, he had enough superstition to preface every campaign by a solemn service of prayer and Korān-reading under the beautiful dome of his father’s tomb. The Syrian officials were ordered to send their troops to the plain of Ḭakka, together with such quantities of siege material and machines that they filled a hundred ox-carts. Khalil with the army of Egypt joined the camp on April 5, and in a week, ninety-two siege engines were playing upon the walls and outworks. Ḭakka had the reputation, dating from Saladin’s time, of the most formidable fortified place in Syria, and Khalil had brought together an unusually heavy siege train. The defence, however, was not what it had been in former and better days. The fall of so many Christian cities in the campaigns of Beybars and Kalāūn had filled Ḭakka with a dangerously mixed and
CONQUEST OF AKKA

demoralized population, the offscourings of the refuse of Europe.

"Within its walls were gathered representatives from every nation in Christendom. For every one there was a separate commune, and the various lords of the land, the masters of the great orders, the representatives of the kings of France, England, and Jerusalem, each exercised separate authority, so that there were in one city seventeen independent powers, 'whence there sprang much confusion.' It is not strange that in such circumstances the city became, as it were, the sink into which all the vileness of Christendom found its way. Over its mixed population many ruled but none had authority; within its walls the precepts of religion, law, and morality were alike void, so that in its last days 'Akka became a byword in all Christian lands for the luxury, turbulence, and vice of its inhabitants. . . . There were not wanting enough soldiers to have successfully defended the city; but even in this the last hour of their extremity, its inhabitants were more intent upon feasting than upon fighting. Cowardice and discord also played their part in ruining the hopes of a successful defence. Many at the first threat of danger made haste to flee over-sea; whilst others who stayed for a time departed when the prospects of success grew desperate. . . . Not even when the whole purpose of their existence was in peril could the Templars and Hospitallers lay aside their mutual jealousy; and so the defence, if conducted with valour in parts, lacked that general unity of purpose which could alone have made it successful. At length on Friday, May 18, Khalil's engines had wrought such a breach in the walls that, the moat being filled with stones and bodies of the dead, his army forced its way into the city. The people fled before him to the towers, the palaces of the nobles, or the great house of the Templars. Others, making their way to the harbour, crowded on board the ships in such numbers that some vessels were swamped as they lay at anchor. Henry II of Cyprus, who had played a not unworthy part in the early days of the siege, had already escaped to his island
THE LAST OF THE CRUSADERS

kingdom, whither the grand master of the Hospital and a number of other fugitives now followed him. But there yet remained 60,000 Christians whose fate was slavery, or the sword, or worse. The Templars and those who had taken refuge with them met the noblest end; for, resisting to the last, they succumbed only when their fortress was undermined, and together with numbers of their assailants perished in its ruins."

So the last stronghold of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was stormed, sacked, and given to the flames; its renowned towers and bastions were thrown down, its fortifications razed to the earth; and, though a new town rose in its place, the 'Akka of the Middle Ages, the city of a valiant century of fighting, vanished for ever. With its fall the last remnant of the crusading dominions disappeared: for when 'Akka was lost, Tyre, Sidon, Beyrūt, and the few remaining cities of the Franks could only succumb to fate. Some were taken, some surrendered, but all, save Beyrūt, were demolished, their inhabitants massacred or enslaved, and the name of Crusader wiped clean out of the land. The "debate of the world" was closed.

Khalil entered Damascus with a multitude of captives, and a brave display of Christian skulls upon his spearheads. His success heightened his resolve. He extracted the old caliph Ḥākim from his quiet retreat in the Citadel of Cairo, and made him thrice preach a Holy War in the mosque. He had another solemn service at the tomb of his father. He marched to the Euphrates, besieged and took the "fortress of the Greeks," June 29. 1292 1293

Kaʾlat-er-Rūm, and renamed it Kaʾlat-el-Muslimin. He announced that he was about to conquer the whole of Asia and the land of the Romans, till his rule should be supreme from the dawn to the sunset; and then he went home to Cairo. He proclaimed a conquest of the Yemen, and then a campaign in Armenia, but it ended at Damascus, where the prudent Cilician surrendered Maʿash and Behesna in order to keep the peace. The

---

Ilkhān of Persia sent an envoy to say that he wished to live at Aleppo, which had once been taken by his father, and to request its surrender; Khalil replied that he had similar views about Baghdad, which had belonged to his caliphs, and they would see which would get to his goal first. This idle boasting came to an abrupt end when Khalil was lured into a shooting party and murdered by some of his disgusted emirs. When the chief regicide was caught—no less a personage than Beydara, the prime minister of Egypt—before his execution he addressed the assembled emirs in justification of his act. “A man,” he said, “like Khalil, who drinks wine in the month of fasting, who is given over to unnatural vice, who turns his slaves into nobles, and slights the old emirs of his father, throws some into chains, and puts others to the sword, is not fit to rule over Muslims.”

The next half century of mamlūk history is occupied by the three interrupted reigns of Kalāūn’s surviving son (by the Mongol princess Aslān Khātūn) el-Melik en-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ed-din Moḥammad, who was set up by the leading emirs, at the age of nine, after his brother’s death; was deposed in a year; brought back five years later (1208); retired again after ten years; and when a year more had passed came back for the third time in 1309, and retained the throne for thirty years till his death (1340). His repeated restoration was due less to any principle of hereditary right—though respect for the memory of his father inclined people to his descendants—than to the jealousies of the leading emirs, which rendered any choice of a sultan from among them little better than an incentive to civil war and murder. En-Nāṣir’s first reign was of course purely nominal. The real power lay in the hands of the great nobles who divided the high offices of state among themselves. Ketbughā was viceroy (nāib-es-saltana), Sengār esh-Shuḡāʾī was vezir, Beybars the Taster (ḡāshnegīr) was master of the household. The new government at first displayed virtuous energy in capturing the regicides, and avenged Khalil’s murder upon such as they caught by
horrible forms of death. A favourite torment was to
nail the criminal to boards and parade him through the
streets on a camel till he died of thirst and agony. Like
all such military cliques, the party soon split up into
jealous factions, one supporting Ketbughā, the other
Shuḡā’ī. Street fights ensued, and at last Shuḡā’ī was
closely besieged in the citadel by an angry mob
demanding his head. He was at length betrayed by
en-Nāṣir’s Mongolian mother, who sympathized with her
fellow countryman Ketbughā outside the walls. The
head of Shuḡā’ī was paraded on a pike, and the populace
protested their undying loyalty to the royal house.

Ketbughā was now virtually sultan, and his name was
prayed for on Fridays next to en-Nāṣir’s. To strengthen
his position he obtained pardon for the two leading
regicides—Lāgin and Kārāsunkur, who enjoyed large
popularity and had a strong following—with whom he
began to scheme for the possession of the throne. His
favour to these emirs roused the indignation of the
Ashrafis, or mamlūks of the murdered Ashraf Khalīl,
300 in number, who rose in revolt, seized the royal
stables and the armourers’ market, and after plundering
and destroying whatever lay to their hands, encamped
at the Citadel gate and laid siege to the fortress.
Ketbughā’s troops mounted and rode down to disperse
them, and after their defeat the rebels were given over
to sundry forms of torture, blinded, maimed, drowned,
beheaded, and hanged, or nailed to the city gate Zawila;
and only a few were so far spared that they were
allotted as slaves to their conquerers. Thus the
rebellion was put down; but the next day, the viceroy,
calling a council of the great nobles of the court, pro-
tested that such exhibitions were dishonourable to the
kingly state, and that the dignity of sultan would be
irreparably compromised if a child like en-Nāṣir were
any longer suffered to occupy the throne. The child
was therefore sent away to grow up, and Ketbughā, as a
matter of course, succeeded. He was unlucky in being
associated in the people’s mind with a great famine and
a terrible plague, when 700 corpses were borne out of
a single gate of Cairo in one day, and 17,500 deaths were recorded in a month. These calamities, added to the discontent excited by the new sultan’s favouritism towards the Mongol officers, led to a conspiracy. At the end of 1296, on his return from a journey to Syria, his tent was attacked; his guards and mamluks, by a devoted resistance, succeeded in enabling their master to fly; and the leader of the rebellion, the new viceroy Lägin, was forthwith chosen sultan in his stead.

Husam-ed-din Lägin el-Manşūri,1 who now ascended the throne under the title of el-Manşūr, had originally been a slave of el-Manşūr ‘Ali,2 son of Aybek, and had then been bought for about £30 by Kalāūn, under whom he rose from the grade of page to that of silāḥdār, or armour-bearer; and Kalāūn, coming to the throne, gave him the rank of emir, and made him viceroy of Syria. Khalil sent Lägin into prison, and in return Lägin assisted in his murder. During the brief reign of Ketbughā, he held the highest office as viceroy, and now he had turned against his latest lord, and had seized the crown for himself. He had at least some claim of connexion with the royal family (if any hereditary principle was then acknowledged), for he had married a daughter of Kalāūn. The terms of his election throw an interesting light upon the precarious authority of the mamlūk sultans. His fellow-conspirators marched at his stirrup, hailed him sultan, and paid him homage; but they exacted as a

---

1 The few coins preserved of Ketbughā and Lägin generally have their dates effaced by wear, but one of Ketbughā has the date [694] (1294-5).

2 The European idea that Lägin was a German is not confirmed by any Arabic authority, and is probably baseless.
condition of their fealty that the new monarch should continue as one of themselves, do nothing without their advice, and never show undue favour towards his own mamlūks. This he swore; but so suspicious were they of his good faith, that they made him swear it again, openly hinting that when he was once instated he would break his vow and favour his own followers to the injury of the nobles who had raised him to the throne.

When this had been satisfactorily arranged, Lāgin rode on to Cairo, attended by the insignia of sovereignty, with the royal parasol borne over his head by the great lord Beysari; the prayers were said in his name in the mosques, drums were beaten in the towns he passed through; the nobles of Cairo came out to do him fealty; and, escorted by a crowd of lords and officers, he rode to the Citadel, displayed himself as sultan to the people in the meydān, and made his royal progress through the streets from the Citadel to the gate of Victory. The ‘Abbāsid caliph, a feeble relic of the ancient house of Baghdaḍ, rode at his side; and before them was carried the caliph’s diploma of investiture, without which no sultan would have considered his coronation complete. The streets were decorated with precious silks and arms, and great was the popular rejoicing; for the benevolence and generosity of Lāgin made him a favourite with the people, and he had already promised to remit the balance of the year’s taxes, and had even vowed that if he lived there should not be a single tax left. The price of food, which had risen to famine height during the late disturbances, now fell sixty per cent.; bread was cheap, and the sultan was naturally adored.

In spite of his share in a royal murder and a treacherous usurpation, he seems to have earned the affection of his subjects. Not only did he relieve the people from much of the pressure of unjust and arbitrary taxation under which they had groaned, but he abstained, at least until he fell under the influence of another mind, from the tyrannical imprisonments and tortures by which the rule of the mamlūks was too commonly secured. His conduct to his rivals was clement to a degree hardly
paralleled among the princes of his time. He did not attempt to destroy the ex-sultan Ketboughā, but gave him the government of Sarkhad by way of compensation. The child Nāṣir had nothing to fear from Lāgin, who told him that, as his father’s mamlūk, he only regarded himself as his representative, holding the throne until Nāṣir should be old enough to reign himself. Lāgin was zealous in good works, gave alms largely in secret, and founded many charitable endowments. His restoration of the mosque of Ibn-Ṭūlūn, at a cost of £10,000, was impelled by the circumstance that he had found refuge in the then deserted cloisters during the pursuit which followed the murder of Khalil. Hidden in the neglected chambers and arcades of the old mosque, whither so few worshippers repaired that but a single lamp was lighted before the niche at night, and the muṣāhidhīn deigned to come no further than the threshold to chant the call to prayer, Lāgin vowed that he would repay his preservation by repairing the mosque that had sheltered him. Such good deeds, and the magnanimous release of many prisoners, could not fail to endear him to the populace; and after he was confined to the Citadel for two months with injuries resulting from a fall at polo, the rejoicings on his return to public life were genuine and universal. All the streets were decorated with silks and satins, the shops and windows were hired by sightseers eager to catch a glimpse of the sultan, and drums were beaten during his state progress through the capital. He celebrated the occasion by giving a number of robes of honour to the chief lords, freeing captives, and distributing alms to the poor. His private life commended him to the good Muslims of Cairo; for although in his youth he had been a wine-bibber, gambler, and too much absorbed in sport, when he ascended the throne he became austere in his practice, fasted two months in the year besides Ramadān, affected the society of good pious kātibs and divines, was plain in his dress, as the Prophet

1 Ketboughā lived to serve his old master’s son, en-Nāṣir, loyally in his wars, revisited Cairo, and died in 1303, much respected for his high character and piety.
ordains that a Muslim should be, and strict in enforcing simplicity among his followers. His ruddy complexion and blue eyes, together with a tall and imposing figure, indeed marked the foreigner, but his habits were orthodoxy itself; he bastinadoed drunkards, even if they were nobles; and his immoderate eating was not necessarily wicked.

But Lāgin, in spite of his promise, began to make favourites. He had at first appointed his fellow-conspirators to the great offices of state; but gradually he began to replace the old emīrs by new men, and a certain Mangūṭimūr acquired a supreme and unhappy influence over his amiable sovereign. Tried and honoured nobles were tested on the proposal that the new viceroy should be Lāgin's successor, and on their indignant negation of the possibility of such a step, they were cast into prison, where they died with suspicious regularity. At last even the great lord Beysari, the richest and most popular emīr in Egypt, was thus arrested, though the marshal led him to prison with tears in his eyes. Murmurs became louder, and to silence them Lāgin sent the army to ravage Little Armenia, and took the opportunity to disperse the Syrian nobles whom he distrusted. Some fled to the Mongols of Persia, and Syria was given over to anarchy. Egypt was scarcely less disturbed: Mangūṭimūr's oppressions and reprisals were not tamely endured by the emīrs; but it was
NASIR RESTORED

no light thing to risk the horrors of incarceration in the Citadel dungeon, a noisome pit, where foul and deadly exhalations, unclean vermin, and bats, rendered the darkness more horrible. At length a plot was formed by two determined men; Lāgin was murdered as he was in the act of rising to say the evening prayers, and immediately afterwards Mangūtūmūr was entrapped. He was for the moment consigned to the pit under the Citadel; but the emir who had dealt the fatal stroke to Lāgin arrived on the scene, and crying with a strident voice, "What had the sultan done that I should kill him? By God, I never had aught but benefits from him; he brought me up, and gave me my steps of promotion. Had I known that when the sultan was dead this Mangūtūmūr would be living, I would never have done this murder, for it was this man's acts that led me to the deed." So saying, he plunged into the dungeon, slew the hated favourite with his own hands, and delivered his house over to the soldiers to pillage.

The murderers, one of whom assumed the throne for a few days, were duly executed with that sense of justice which the mamlūks always displayed towards other people's crimes. But after this experience of the rule of an emir, the only course was to revert to the established line; and en-Nāšir was brought back to Cairo and welcomed with a burst of enthusiasm. Two days later he was again enthroned with a new diploma of investiture from the nominal caliph. Robes of honour were distributed, cities decorated, drums beaten throughout the empire. He was still only fourteen, and no match for the stern emirs who really governed. The new governors who now departed to their provincial posts, after kissing the threshold of the Citadel according to custom, were all creatures of the emirs Salār and Beybars "the Taster" (gāshnegīr), the one a Uīrat Tatar, the

1 Coins of Nāšir's second reign (1299—1310) bear the dates Cairo, 69x (which must be 698 or 699 = 1299-1300), and Cairo, 707 (1307-8). Many more coins bearing the name of Nāšir, and the mints Cairo, Aleppo, Ḥamāh, Tripolis, Damascus, may belong either to this or to the first or third reign.
other a Circassian, who managed the affairs of state much
to their own advantage. The caliph held councils on
Saturdays, but all he had to do was to register the de-
cisions of his emirs: Salār suggested a certain measure,
and Nāṣir announced its sanction. Whilst the great
nobles were amassing vast fortunes from their landed
fiefs and various perquisites—Salār's daughter was given
a dowry of 160,000 د.——the sultan was kept almost in
penury, and deprived of the delicacies and luxuries to
which he was accustomed. The only question seemed
to be which of the two leaders, Salār or Beybars, would
overthrow the other and seize the throne. So far they
were acting together, inseparable in public acts and
ceremonies, but the duel must come before long.

Meanwhile every other consideration was merged in
the renewed struggle with the Mongols. The Baḥri
mamlūks, who had fled to Ghāzān, one of the greatest
and best of the Ilkhāns of Persia, had fully revealed to
him the distracted condition of Syria at the close of
Lāğin's reign, and with their counsel the Mongols again
crossed the Euphrates in great strength to recover what
they had lost in 1282. The young sultan, though no
warrior, rode at the head of the army of Egypt to meet
the invader, leaving the real command to the emīrs, to
whom war was as the breath of life. Bad fortune attended
the march from the outset. The emirs were jealous and
quarrelsome; a conspiracy of Urat refugees of Syria
against the Egyptian leaders, though savagely suppressed,
bred wider suspicions; much of the camp baggage was
lost in the flooded torrents; a dense flight of swallows,
an evil omen, darkened the sky—the army was dis-
mayed. Then as they neared Damascus crowds of Nov.
fugitives from Aleppo and the north testified to the
terror of the invasion. Still advancing, but with sink-
ing hearts, the Egyptians came in sight of the Mongols
at Ḥimṣ. "Throw away your lances," was the order,
"and trust to sword and mace." The only chance lay in
close fighting, eye to eye, when the Mongol bowmen
could not use their arrows. In the "Ghyll of the
Treasurer" (Wādy-el-Khāzīndār) 20,000 or so of mamlūk
horsemen met a Mongol army estimated at four or five
times their number. But all the great emirs were there,
mighty men of war, and the troopers were heavily armed
and bound by clannish ties to their leaders. The usual
formation in three divisions, centre and right and left
wing, was observed, and a body of 500 grenadiers armed
with naptha tubes was placed in front of the line. Holy
divines went up and down the ranks, exhorting the men
not to waver, till the soldiers wept in self-compassion!
Ghâzân kept his Mongols dismounted, behind their
horses, and threw the first move upon the Egyptians.
The naptha was discharged, without effect, and then the
Mongols abandoned their reserve, and after pouring a
deadly volley of arrows into the advancing Egyptians,
mounted and charged with their usual dash. As at the
earlier battle of Hims, each side scored a success on
opposite wings, and for a moment the issue wavered.
Then Ghâzân, stemming his fears, rallied his men to a
second charge, which broke the centre, and the splendid
cavalry of Egypt turned and fled. The great emirs,
Salâr, Bektimûr, Burlughî, all were riding for their lives,
with the arrows of their pursuers hissing past their ears.
The weeping sultan was left with eighteen mamlûks for
his guard. He was saved by the Egyptian left, who had
been successful at the outset of the battle, and coming
back from the pursuit of their opponents were amazed to
find the day lost and the king abandoned. Their arrival,
coupled with the heavy loss of the Mongols, checked the
rout, and the remnant of the army retreated in fair order
to Damascus, and thence with the utmost speed to Egypt.

The Mongols immediately occupied Damascus without
resistance, and to his credit, Ghâzân, who was a Muslim,
and also a wise and generous king, showed the utmost
clemency to the inhabitants, not only of his own religion,
but Jews and Christians as well. No pillage or annoyance
was to be permitted.1 The community of religion

1 The decree of capitulation (from Nuweyri) is printed in Quatre-
mère’s Makrizî, II., ii. 151, note, and the subsequent firmân constituting
the new government of Syria, ibid, 156, note; see also Howorth, Hist.
of the Mongols, iii. 441 ff.
MONGOLS AT DAMASCUS

naturally distinguished this conquest from the earlier invasions when the Mongols were still heathen; but there was a good deal of the old leaven among them, they were hard to hold, and outside Damascus they committed much havoc. Even inside a vast amount of injury was done, nearly 10,000 inhabitants were killed or sold, and many precious monuments of the age of Nūr-ed-din burnt and destroyed; but this breach of faith must be ascribed less to Mongol perfidy than to the impossibility of restraining a barbarous army, and to the inevitable destruction caused by the valorous defence of the citadel, which Argawash, the Egyptian commandant, resolutely refused to surrender, and whence he waged a vigorous contest with the city. Meanwhile Egypt was strenuously working for revenge. Immense preparations in arms and money were made. The demand for mounts was so great that the price of a horse rose from £12 to £40; and gold was so plentiful that the dinár fell to the exchange value of seventeen instead of twenty-five dirhems. In view of these preparations, and of danger on the eastern frontier, and finding the citadel inexpugnable, the Mongols evacuated Damascus, after an orgy of drink and debauchery such as had never before been known in that home of orthodoxy.

The Bahri mamluks who had accompanied Ghāzān were left in command, and reverted to their Egyptian allegiance. Argawash came down from the citadel he had so valiantly defended, restored order, repressed rioting, poured out the Mongols' wine and broke their bottles. The Egyptians reoccupied Damascus and Aleppo and the whole of Syria; and the Druzes of the Lebanon, whose 12,000 bowmen had harassed the mamluks in their retreat four months before, were brought to a heavy reckoning.

Negotiations followed: after a disastrous expedition into north Syria, where rains and snow decimated his army, Ghāzān sent two embassies to Cairo to treat for peace, but without result.1 Once more the issue of war

1 The correspondence is given in Quatremère, I.c., Appendix, II., ii. 289 ff., where (309 ff.) will be found an elaborate account of oriental diplomatic and the technical formalities of despatches.
must be tried, and 100,000 Mongols under Kutlughshâh marched into Syria. Damascus was in panic; men deserted their families and fled for protection, people were trampled to death in the crowds that thronged out of the gates, extravagant prices were paid for horses and asses to carry out the terror-stricken population. No such fears disturbed Beybars and the great mamlûks who entered the frightened city in April. They rode out to meet the Mongols, whom they found, 50,000 strong, at Shakhab on the plain of Marê-es-Suffâr, where the Saracens had defeated the army of Heraclius nearly seven centuries before. Naṣîr with the caliph and the main body of the Egyptian army came up from Cairo on the same day. The spectacle was repeated of the defeat of the Egyptian right, with severe loss, by the Mongols, whilst the left and centre remained steady and resisted every assault. At the end of the day the Egyptians were in possession of the field, and the Mongols had retired to a neighbouring hill. "The sultan and his people passed the night on horseback, while the drums were beaten and the cymbals sounded to direct the fugitives to the rallying place, and the mountain on which the Mongols had taken refuge was speedily blockaded. Salâr, Kipchak, and the other emîrs spent the night in going round the ranks encouraging the men. At sunrise the Egyptian army was seen ranged in order... an imposing spectacle. Presently the Mongols descended to meet them, and a vigorous struggle recommenced, several of the sultan’s mamlûks having their horses shot under them. The combat lasted till noon, when Kutlughshâh withdrew again to the mountain." Again the Mongols, urged by thirst, came down to force their way through the surrounding enemy, and this time the Egyptians craftily let them through, only to fall upon their retreating squadrons. The exhausted enemy were cut to pieces, or lost in the desert, and it was a miserable remnant that followed Kutlughshâh over

1 The historians Abû-l-Fidâ and en-Nuweyrî both personally took part in the battle.
2 Howorth, Mongols, iii. 470.
the Euphrates. 10,000 prisoners and 20,000 head of
cattle fell to the conquerors. The catastrophe almost
broke Ghāzān's heart: he died soon after, and his
successor, Ulğaitū, was careful never to risk an encounter
with the mamlūks, who had now for the fourth time
beaten back the most dangerous enemy that Egypt had
encountered since the Muslim conquest.
Nāṣir returned to Cairo in a wave of glory. Messengers
had announced the news, and the emīrs vied with one
another in setting up costly pavilions, or grand stands,
richly decorated and furnished, along the route of his
procession. Workmen were forbidden to do anything
but set up these triumphal erections. Rooms along the
route were let at from £2 to £4 for the day. Silken
carpets were laid in the street; and the proud sultan
rode between the brilliant façades and admired the nobles'
pavilions, while troops of Mongol prisoners in chains,
each with a fellow Mongol's head hanging from his neck,
completed the triumph. So noisy were the rejoicings
and so deafening the tumult of drums and music
throughout Egypt that nothing short of an earthquake
sobered the people.¹

The Mongol war was the great event of Nāṣir's second
reign. Beside it the frequent campaigns waged in
Cilicia to compel the king of Little Armenia to pay his
tribute, or to divert the attention of the mamlūk soldiery
from ambitions at home, and a fruitless invasion of
Nubia (1304-6), are unimportant. An expedition was
equipped in transports built on the Nile to expel the
Templars from the island of Aradus (Anṭartūs) on the
Syrian coast, the last foothold of the Crusaders, and
accomplished its object with the usual slaughter. The
relations of the Egyptian sultan with foreign powers
continued friendly. The old alliance with the khāns of
the Golden Horde was maintained, though the mamlūks
had no longer any necessity for making common cause
against the Persian Mongols. Nubia sent tributary
presents (1305), ambassadors came from Morocco,

¹ See below, p. 301.
REVOLT OF THE BEDAWIS

France, and the emperor of Constantinople (1306), who obtained permission to reopen the church of the Muṣal-liya at Jerusalem.

Abroad all was favourable, but the internal condition of Egypt left much to be desired. The taxation for the war-chest had caused much poverty and discontent. The Bedawī tribes in Upper Egypt had thrown off the sultan’s authority after the disaster at Ḥimṣ in 1299, and had mockingly nicknamed their own chiefs “Salār” and “Beybars” after the two dominant emirs at Cairo. They levied blackmail on the villages, and called it taxes. The mamluks made short work of this revolt; the real Salār and Beybars led their troops respectively on the east and west of the Nile, Bektāsh went towards the Fayyūm, other emirs to Suez, whilst the governor of Kūf, with friendly Arabs, cut the desert routes. The various movements were executed with secrecy and rapidity, and the unhappy Bedawī were taken completely by surprise. From Gīza and Aṭfih upwards the inhabitants were put to the sword, to the number of about 16,000 men, whose wives and children and property were seized. If a man claimed to be no Bedawī but a townsman, they bade him pronounce the word dakīk (which no Egyptian can say), and as soon as they heard the true Arab guttural, they cut off his head. The shibboleth disposed of a multitude of evaders. The country-side became the scene of horrible massacres, and the corpses poisoned the air. The Bedawī fled to caves in the hills, but their enemies smoked them to death. Among the spoil were the goods of 1600 landowners, 8000 oxen, 6000 sheep and goats, 4000 horses, and 32,000 camels. The supply was so abundant that a fat tup sold for a couple of shillings, a goat for ninepence, a pound of butter for twopence. After looting the country the punitive expedition returned to Cairo, leaving behind them an empty land where no man was to be seen.

The Christian and Jewish population also suffered by irrational persecution. Recently they had enjoyed remarkable immunity, and had amassed great wealth.
They rode richly caparisoned horses or mules, wore sumptuous apparel, and held a number of valuable government offices. They waxed, indeed, so independent and (in Muslim eyes) so insolent, that an envoy from Morocco—where such tolerance was incredible—took upon himself to remonstrate with the emirs; the kadis were summoned in council, and the result was a revival of the old sumptuary laws. The Christians throughout the empire were to adopt blue turbans, and the Jews yellow, and neither were permitted to ride horse or mule; they must ride asses and yield the middle of the road to the Muslims; must ring no bells, nor raise the voice, with sundry other humiliating restrictions. Many Christians who valued their appearance became Muslims. Some churches were demolished by the gratified mob at Alexandria and elsewhere, and all the churches in Egypt remained closed for the year. It was only at the request of the emperor of Constantinople that a few churches, such as the Mo'allaka in the Kafr-esh-Shema', St. Michael's and St. Nicholas's, were reopened. The "feast of the martyr," or annual Nile festival, a general carnival held on the river near Shubra, was abolished by Beybars, on account of the drinking and disorders that it entailed. The manners of the people had indeed reached an unusual degree of licence. The rejoicings after the triumphant return of the sultan from Syria were prolonged into a drunken and licentious revel. Unveiled women were seen in the company of men drinking wine unabashed on barges in the Hakimi canal, insomuch that pleasure boats were afterwards forbidden on its waters. The tremendous shock of an earthquake that followed gave them something else to think about. The oscillation, the cracking of walls, the fall of houses and mosques, caused a frantic panic. Women rushed into the streets unveiled, and gave birth to premature infants. Men saw their houses crumbling to the ground, and everything they possessed lost; or, flying in amazement, left their homes to be rifled by thieves. The Nile threw its boats a bow-shot on the land. The population encamped outside the city,
trembling for the fall of the heavens and the end of the world. The earthquake was felt all through Egypt, and injured Alexandria as well as Kūš; Damascus and ‘Akka experienced the shock. At Cairo the mosques of Ḥākim, el-Azhar, Ṣāliḥ b. Ruzzik, and Kalā'ūn, and at Fustat the old mosque of ‘Amr, suffered much damage, and for a year and more the chief emirs, notably Salār and Beybars, expended large sums on their restoration. Cairo, after the earthquake, looked like a city that had been wrecked by a conquering army.

The wealth of the governing class was fortunately equal to the expense of mosque restoration. The nobles displayed a remarkable public or religious spirit in devoting large sums to this purpose, and besides restoring the ravages of the earthquake, the government completed (1304) and richly endowed the new college of the Nāširiya or collegiate mosque of en-Nāṣir (still standing in the Sūk-en-Nāḥḥāsin), the Gothic gateway of which had been brought from the cathedral of ‘Akka during the demolition of the city by Khalil’s orders. There was no lack of money in Egypt. When Bektimür, the polo-master of the court, made the pilgrimage to Mekka in 1301, he spent 85,000 D. on the journey, largely in charitable gifts. The emir Beysari, the most honoured and popular of all the mamlūks, who had declined the throne after the death of Khalil, set no bounds to his extravagance, never drank twice out of the same cup—and his cups were doubtless of chased and inlaid silver, like his perfume-burner in the British Museum—lived in the most splendid palace that money could build, and prided himself on being perpetually £15,000 in debt. The rich fiefs of the mamlūk nobles, increased by sundry
emoluments and perquisites, enabled them to maintain a princely state, in spite of frequent dismissal, imprisonment, and confiscation. The luxury and artistic profusion of the times, the remarkable developments of literary and historical studies, and the honourable position of men of learning, form a strange contrast to the constant deeds of violence, the tumults, street fights, murders and atrocious tortures. Egypt was undoubtedly prosperous under this strangely compounded class of rulers. The taxes were heavy, but the Niles had been good, and the trade with Europe was immense; a single ship entering Alexandria harbour is stated to have paid 40,000 D. in customs, and the trade with India must have been equally important. Whatever passed through Egypt was dutiable, and a duty of ten per cent. on trade will account for a vast revenue.¹

¹ According to el-Ḳalkashandi, who died in 1418, but availed himself of the statistics of earlier writers, the principal source of revenue in Egypt, the land-tax, was paid either in kind (as usually in Upper Egypt) to the amount of from one to three ardebs (of 5 bushels each) per acre, or in money (as in the delta). In 1370 this tax amounted to 40 dirhems (= 2 D., or about a guinea) on the best land (ḥāf), and 30 on land (ḥarāib) exhausted by wheat crops, etc.; but it was raised in later times. If the crops failed or were poor the tax was
The sultan himself received nothing of all this. He was kept in straitened circumstances by his overbearing ministers, and when Salār and Beybars fell out and quarrelled over the prey, he found his position yet more intolerable. Once he tried to have them murdered, but the plot was divulged, and matters became worse. The people indeed were on his side, and the rumour of a design against his life roused them to a dangerous pitch of excitement; the feeling of loyalty to the house of Ḫalāʿūn had become part of their character. But the conduct of the emirs made Nashir's rule impossible, and reduced in proportion. The towns of Egypt (meaning apparently the districts) were assigned either to the government or to the emirs and army, except a very small proportion assigned to mosques, schools, etc. (a) The government received (1) for the wezir's exchequer, the taxes from the land of Gīza and Manialūt, in money and kind, together with the clover for the royal and military stables; (2) for the sultan's privy purse (diwān-el-khāṣṣ), one-fifth of the revenue from Alexandria and its district. (b) The emirs, mamluks, and army were assigned (1) the land-tax of the remaining towns and districts, varying according to the inundations and prices, and distributed among the recipients according to their rank; (2) the receipts from (a) the emerald mines, which were, however, abandoned as unprofitable in the last year of Nashir's reign; (b) the alum quarries of Upper Egypt and the Oases, whence the alum was brought to Kūf or Asyūt, and shipped down the Nile to Alexandria, and sold, to Greeks chiefly, at 5 to 5½ D. the quintal (kintār, 100 lb.), of which the government (i.e. the emirs and army) used to take a third, but the system was changed c. 1400; (c) the natron mines of Ta'ābīya (near Behnesa), worked since Ibn-Tulun's days, 100 acres which yielded 100,000 D. a year, and in the Fakūs district; the alum, being a monopoly, rose to 300 dirhems the kintār, and the sultan took one-third, chiefly for the soldiers' pay; (3) the legal alms, which (though usually distributed by the almsgiver himself) were levied by government on the net profits of merchants importing at Alexandria, and from cattle-dealers from Barka; (4) the tribute from protected subjects (i.e. Jews and Christians), amounting to 10 to 25 dirhems per head on their population, according to classes—this tax was used for judicial and religious salaries; (5) import duties on goods brought by foreigners to Alexandria or Damietta, who paid one-tenth; if resold in Egypt, one-fifth more was exacted, so that goods sometimes paid as much as thirty-five per cent. on their value; (6) inheritance of persons without heirs; (7) profit of coinage, then very debased. Besides these there were the customs at the ports of 'Aydhāb, Ḳoseyr, Ṭūr, and Suez, on the Red Sea, amounting to one-tenth of the value; and also on the Syrian caravans. Cp. Wüstenfeld, Die Geographie und Verwaltung von Ägypten, 155 ff.
BEYBARS II

one day he rode away to Karak, on the pretext or a
pilgrimage, and once within the strong castle he
announced his abdication. Remonstrances, sincere or
not, were vain; he was resolved upon a quiet life, and the
emirs had to choose a successor.

Beybars the G'âshnegir, as Master of the Household (Ustâddâr), had gradually acquired the chief influence.
Salâr was indeed viceroy, but Beybars was supported by
the whole body of the Burghis or citadel mamlûks, and
their power was not to be resisted. They had long been
planning to raise him to the throne, and the resignation
of Nâşir fitted their intentions. El-Melik el-Muzaffar
Rukn-ed-din Beybars (II.) el-Mansûri accordingly be-
came sultan. His brief reign was an unmitigated failure.
He never had the support of the people, and a succession
of low Niles and the resulting scarcity were ignorantly
connected in some manner with his mismanagement.
A large number of the mamlûk emirs belonged to the
party of Salâr, who, although he accepted the office of
viceroys, secretly worked against his former colleague.
The ex-sultan at Karak was not idle in the meantime.
He had retired for repose, he said, but his proceedings
showed that he had merely withdrawn from the control
of his Egyptian emirs in order to organize a loyal party
in Syria. In face of these preparations and signals of
revolution all that Beybars did was to make Suleymân el-
Mustekfî proclaim his accession anew. But no one
respected “Commander of the Faithful”; the emir Burlughî, a supporter of Beybars, laughed,
“Suleymân was the Commander of the Wind”; the
people, when they heard the name of Nâşir in the
proclamation, shouted “God save him,” and when the
name of Beybars was read they called out, “We do not
want him.” The news came that Nâşir had entered
Damascus, and had received the homage of the emîrs of
Syria, of Alep, Hamâh, Hîms, Tripolis, Safed, Jerusalem;
that his advanced guard had reached Gaza, and
driven back the Egyptian outposts. Beybars had no

1 A few small copper coins of Beybars II bear the dates 708, 709,
parts of which years correspond to 1309.
counter plan, and could command no efficient support. He took the only prudent course, and sent his abdication and submission to the advancing sultan. Nāṣir accepted, pardoned, and offered him the government of Ṣāḥyūn. But meanwhile his fears had so worked upon Beybars that he had fled from Cairo with his mamlūk guard (who soon deserted him), vacillated between several plans of escape, and was finally made a prisoner at Gaza.

Nāṣir began his third reign,\(^1\) entering Cairo on 5 March, 1310, after eleven months' retirement. Whatever kindly virtues he may have possessed in his youth had been soured and embittered by his unhappy experience. Though only in his twenty-fifth year, he was already a cynic, a double-dealer, and thirsty to revenge the miseries of his boyhood and youth, and to free himself finally from the interference of the powerful emirs. He managed it by trickery and deceit. Beybars, though apparently received into favour, and appointed to a government, was invited to Cairo, and there bow-strung. Nāṣir could not forgive him, among other painful recollections, for having refused him roast goose when he asked for it in his years of humiliation. Salār soon followed his rival: he had aided Nāṣir's restoration and welcomed him handsomely with costly gifts, and in reward was given the small command of Shawbek. Recalled to the capital, he was cast into prison and starved to death. After eight days of hunger, three covered dishes were sent to him by the sultan. The covers were raised, and they proved to be, the first a dish of gold money, the second of silver, and the third of precious stones and pearls. "Praise to God," he said, "who deals me out my chastisement in this life." On the twelfth day he was found dead, with a gnawed-off finger in his mouth. His vast wealth was confiscated to the state, and the income of his estates and properties were reckoned at 1000 D. a day. A contemporary historian, who saw the inventory of his effects, stated that the examination of his goods occupied

---

\(^1\) Coins of Nāṣir's third reign bear the dates, Cairo, 710, 716, 733, 741 (1310-40); Aleppo, 710, 733; Damascus, 733, 735; Tripolis, 717.
four days, and that they found over half a million of dinārs or their value in dirhems, besides chests of precious stones and pearls, silver vessels, dresses, horses, dromedaries, herds of cattle and sheep, and multitudes of slaves. One by one the older emirs who had fought the wars of his father, and had dominated the son in his earlier reigns, were inveigled, betrayed, imprisoned, and executed. Nāṣir had learnt his lesson: he resolved to rule alone, and he had no scruples in "cutting off the tall poppies."

His foreign policy followed the precedents of his father Қalāʿūn and Beybars I, except that altered conditions made him eager to draw closer to the Mongols of Persia.

Fig. 66.—Inscription in medresa of pr’incess Tatar el-Ḥiǧāziya at Cairo, 1360.

He had frequent relations with the Ỉlkhan Abū-Saʿīd, with whom he concluded a friendly treaty in 1333, and on the break-up of the Ỉlkhanate on Abū-Saʿīd’s death, he carried on various negotiations with the candidates for power, and his support was so desired that Sheykh Ḥasan Buzurg, one of the most powerful of the contending leaders, went so far as to acknowledge Nāṣir’s suzerainty in prayers and coinage at Baghdaḏ (1341) in return for the promise of armed assistance, which never
came. Nevertheless, the old friendship with the rival Mongol state, the Golden Horde of Sarâi on the Volga, was maintained and renewed, though the dealings with Persia caused some uneasiness to Uzbeg Khân, and Nâşir's proposal to marry the khân's daughter fell through by reason of the extravagance of the dowry demanded from Egypt. A cheaper bride, however, was found in a kinswoman of the khân, the lady Ğulbiya, whose mausoleum in the eastern Karâfa still bears witness to the alliance, and who is, perhaps, the only princess of the Saracens who has been celebrated by a western poet:—

   Mira al Cayro que incluye tres ciudades
   E el palacio real de Dulfiba,
   Las torres, los jardines e heredades
   Que su espacioso circolo rodea.¹

There were, as heretofore, many little wars with the Cilician kingdom. At Mekka the ruling sherifs were appointed by Egypt, and supported by troops, not without conflicts, and in 1317 Nâşir's authority was also recognized at Medina. The sultan himself thrice made the pilgrimage to Mekka with the usual extravagant display of charity. Yemen, independent under the Rasûlid kings, had from time to time sent presents to Cairo, which the sultans were anxious to recognize as tribute, but although an expedition of 5000 Egyptian troops was sent in 1325 at the request of a Rasûlid, whose succession was disputed, it ended in disaster, and southern Arabia was in no sense under the authority of Nâşir. Nubia, under the usurper Kenz-ed-dawla, was equally independent at that time.² On the other hand, to the west, the khûţba was said in the sultan's name at Tripolis and Tunis (1311-17) by the Ḥâfiḍ king Abû-Zekeryâ Yaŷyâ, whom Nâşir had helped to the throne.

¹ Araucana, canto 28.
² The tribe of Kenz had been a thorn in the side of Egypt from the time of Saladin, and there were frequent conflicts with them in the 14th century; they attacked Aswân in 1366, 1385, about 1390, 1396; and after 1403 the district of Aswân ceased for a time to be 'under Egyptian authority.
Most of these cases of apparent vassalage were due to Egyptian succour during a period of civil war and a disputed succession, and they testify rather to the military efficiency of the mamlūk army than to any permanent extension of the sultan's authority. Egypt had become a factor to be reckoned with whenever complications arose among her neighbours, but she did not expand beyond her normal frontiers, which had long been laid at the Syrian desert, the Euphrates and the Pyramus in the east and north, Sawākin and Aswān in the south, and Tripolis in the west. Nāṣir himself was ambitious of empire, but he was no general, and feared to arm a possible rival with the command of a large army. He was forced indeed to suppress a revolt of the Druzes and Nuṣeyris by force, and to wage war with Little Armenia; but he trusted rather to diplomacy to
extend his influence. His negotiations in the north procured him the adhesion of Artina of Asia Minor and the chief of Dhū-l-Kaḍr. "He continually exchanged embassies with the Mongols of Kipchak, as well as those of Persia, with the kings of the Yemen and Abyssinia and West Africa, with the emperors of Constantinople and the kings of Bulgaria. Even the sultan of India, the king of Aragon, the pope, and the king of France sent envoys to his court. The missions of the Byzantine emperors, often repeated [e.g. 1317, 1326] were apparently designed to negotiate an alliance with Nāṣir against the Turkmāns, who were growing constantly stronger about this time in Asia Minor, and already threatened the East Roman empire. The sultan of Hindustan, who sent an embassy to Nāṣir in 1331-2 by way of Baghādād, was Moḥammad ibn Tughlāk, who was meditating the conquest of eastern Persia, and probably wished to engage Nāṣir in a simultaneous attack on the Mongol kingdom in western Persia. In 1327 an envoy from the pope arrived to urge him to treat his Christian subjects humanely, promising in return to protect, as far as possible, Moḥammadan subjects living in Christendom from annoyance. Philip VI of France sent an embassy in 1330... demanding that Nāṣir should deliver up Jerusalem and part of the coast of Palestine to the Christians; it was naturally dismissed with scorn." ¹

The Christians were better used under Nāṣir's third reign than before, and the sultan endeavoured to relax the humiliating decree of 1301, as far as he could, not without exciting the wrath of the theologians and fanatical faṭḥis. He protected the churches from destruction, and refused to believe that every fire or other calamity must be due to Christian conspiracy, as the bigoted Muslims said. But fanaticism was too strong for him; 20,000 men assembled on the meydān and clamoured: "The only true religion is IslĀm; God shield the faith of Moḥammad! O sultan of IslĀm, protect us, not the misbelieving Christians!" Nāṣir

¹ Weil, iv. 352-4.
surrendered to public opinion, and the former decree was enforced again on pain of death. The Christians closed their churches, and dared not show themselves, unless in disguise. They had undoubtedly burnt many mosques and houses, and in revenge the Muslims demolished scores of their churches and monasteries. Still the sultan used his influence in their favour, whenever there was an opportunity, and his vizirs, several of whom were Christians who had become nominally Muslims, exerted themselves for their old associates, whilst they bled the Moḥammadan subjects as far as taxation could go. Naṣir employed Christians, i.e. Copts, as all Egyptian governments have employed them, because they were better men of business.

1 The best account of the state of the Christians under the mamliḵ sultans—merely incidental to the present work—is in Quatremère's Mémoires sur l'Égypte, ii. 220-66. The émeute of 1321 alone occupies twenty-four pages, and it is impossible to give the details in a brief space.
than the Muslims, and also because they were not
dangerous to his throne, as were the great Muslim
officers, against whom he was perpetually on his guard,
and whom he used with cruel severity.

On the other hand, his humbler servants and officers,
and the bulk of the people of Egypt were well off under
his rule. Many oppressive taxes—on salt, for example, on
chickens, on sugar-cane, on boats and their passengers,
on slaves, horses, etc.—were repealed, and the loss was
made up by mulcting the great nobles. He ordered a
new survey of the land and its revenues, and out of the
twenty-four divisions of the country, he assigned ten to
the state and the other fourteen to the emirs and army,
according to rank. He combatted the extravagant
prices which prevailed in times of scarcity, and had
millers and bakers flogged who charged too highly; im-
ported corn from Syria and fixed its market price, and
compelled the emirs to open their granaries to public
sale, instead of selling their corn privily at exorbitant
rates. His muhtesib or inspector of markets, Dİyâ-ed-
din Yûsuf, an upright and fearless man, reported any
evasions to the sultan, who publicly rated the great emir
Kaşûn, his own son-in-law, struck him over the head
with the flat of his sword, and had the emir's factor
flogged in his presence. These vigorous measures had
their effect, and a moderate price for corn prevailed.
Nâşir was strict in suppressing wine-drinking and every
sort of immorality, and his punishments were as
barbarous and primitive as his methods of confiscation
were sweeping and illegal. Sometimes, indeed, the
judges found it necessary to remonstrate with his high-
headed proceedings, and they were sure of a hearing.
Learned men found an appreciative patron in the cool
calculating sultan, whose intellect was of no mean order.
The learned historian Abû-l-Fidâ, a prince descended
from Saladin's brother, was his intimate friend. Nâşir
restored him (1310) to his ancestors' principedom of
Hâmûh, revived the ancient titles and privileges of his
family, took him with him on pilgrimage to Mecca,
made the Syrian governors treat him as a sultan,
himself addressed him as "brother," and continued to love and honour him till his death (1331). The age was rich in learned men, and they enjoyed every mark of respect and not inconsiderable emoluments under Nāṣir's rule.

It was an age of extraordinary brilliance in almost every aspect. In spite of the occasional records of scarcity and high prices, the wealth of the country, whether from its fertile soil, or from the ever-increasing trade with Europe and the east, was immense, if the fortunes of individuals are any test. The accounts of the almost fabulous prodigality of the emirs of the time in
the Arabic chronicles show their vast resources, and the thirty or more magnificent mosques built by Nāṣir's emirs—such as Sengār el-Gāwali, Kāwṣūn, el-Māridānī, Aḵsunḵur, Sheykhū, to name but a few whose monuments are still standing, are proof that they sometimes spent their wealth to good purpose. The architecture of this period is perhaps the finest in the history of Saracenic art in Egypt. The minor arts were never cultivated in greater perfection. Beautiful bowls, perfume-bearers, caskets, Korān-cases, and kursīs or small tables, were made of bronze or brass, often cut out à jour, and inlaid with admirably chased designs in silver. Enamelled glass lamps, illuminated Korāns, carved wooden panels, painted ceilings, and every kind of decoration, were worked at this period in greater perfection than ever before or since. When a beautiful example of the finest Saracenic art is preserved in our museums, we are almost sure to find in its inscription the words el-Melek en-Nāṣirī, "the (mamlūk) of el Melik en-Nāṣir."

The sultan himself led the way in these civilized tastes. Some of his own furniture—or that of his mosques—has been preserved, and his two chief buildings, the Nāṣiriya college in the Sūk-en-Nāhāšin (corresponding to part of the old Beyn-el-Ḵaṣreyn), built in 1299-1304, and his mosque (1318) in the Citadel of Cairo, are among the most notable of Saracenic

---

1 Ibn-Baṭūṭa, who visited Cairo in 1326, writes of the emulation of the emirs in building mosques, chapels, and especially mentions their monasteries (khānaḵāh—such as that of Beybars II, still standing), where faḵirs, chiefly Persian šūfis, lived in retreat under strict rules. Separate monasteries, he says, were allowed to married devotees. He describes Nāṣir as "of noble character and great virtues," refers to his benevo-
monuments. His exquisite palace in the Citadel, the Kasr el-Ablak, or Striped Palace, so called from its tiers of black and white stone, which cost 500,000,000 dirhems (founded 1313) has unhappily disappeared; the “Hall of Columns” was standing early in this century. The Citadel, indeed, was largely reconstructed in 1312 and following years, and a number of new buildings

Fig. 71.—Hall of Columns built by en-Nāṣir in Citadel of Cairo, 1313.

added.¹ He was reckoned to spend at one time 8000 dirhems (about £300) a day on building. Among the

ience to pilgrims, and his sitting twice a week to hear personally all complaints and petitions; and gives a short list of the chief emirs and men of learning. His account is lamentably meagre, and instead of valuable statistic:s he informs us that there were said to be 12,000 water-carriers on camels, 30,000 bait-masters, and 36,000 boats on the Nile. (Ed. Def. Émery et Sanguinetti, i. 67 ff.)

¹ See Casanova in Mém. de la miss. archéol. française, vi. 619-665.
public works of his reign was the Alexandrian canal, which connected the port with the Nile at Fūwa, and contributed greatly to the commerce and fertility of the country, and to the revival of the neglected Greek capital. The great causeway he constructed beside the Nile served at once as a road and a dam during the inundation. The aqueduct from the Nile to the Citadel of Cairo was the work of this sultan (1311), though popularly ascribed to Saladin. To carry out his schemes, and indulge his tastes, he needed immense revenues, and the money was not lacking. He married eleven of his daughters to leading emirs, and each wedding cost him 800,000 D.: the music alone came to 10,000 D. for each fête. He was a judge of horses, and would give as much as a million dirhems (£4000) for a fine animal. He kept of course a proper stud book, and knew the name, age, price, and pedigree of every horse. Three thousand fillies annually foaled in his stables were broken in by Bedawis, to be given to the emirs or entered for races, for which he was an ardent trainer. Nasir was a farmer, too, and would import sheep of good breeds for his flock of 30,000 kept in the Citadel. He was a sportsman, devoted to falconry, and his huntsmen, falconers, and gamekeepers held no unimportant rank in his court, and received handsome vales. He was also a collector of precious stones, but this was the ordinary mode of amassing portable and easily negotiable capital. Whilst encouraging luxury and profusion in his court, he wore no jewels himself and dressed in the simplest and least expensive way. This self-possessed, iron-willed
man,—absolutely despotic, ruling alone—physically insignificant, small of stature, lame of a foot, and with a cataract in the eye,—with his plain dress and strict morals, his keen intellect and unwearied energy, his enlightened tastes and interests, his shrewd diplomacy degenerating into fruitless deceit, his unsleeping suspicion and cruel vengefulness, his superb court, his magnificent buildings,—is one of the most remarkable characters of the Middle Ages. His reign was certainly the climax of Egyptian culture and civilization.\(^1\)

Unhappily when he died, confessing his sins, in 1341, June 6, at the age of nearly fifty-eight, he left no successor capable of carrying on his work. The confidence of the people in his firm government, and their apprehensions of what would follow, was shown in the panic with which, at the bare rumour of his decease, they closed their shops and laid in provisions for the time of need. His emirs gathered round his bed, and declared solemnly that “they were the mamluks of his house, and so long as even a blind daughter of it remained they would support it to the death.” For forty-one years, indeed, twelve descendants\(^2\) of Nāṣir rapidly succeeded to the throne, but

---

\(^1\) The best European account of Nāṣir’s reign is in the careful *Geschichte der Chalifen*, by Weil, founded upon Maqrizi, Abū-l-Maḥāsin, and most of the available Arabic sources. It has been epitomized, unfortunately with many errors, by Sir W. Muir, *The Mameluke or Slave Dynasty of Egypt.*

\(^2\) Of these successors, the coins are as follows:—es-Sāliḥ Ismā‘īl, Cairo, 744; Damascus, 743, 744. Ḥamāh, 746. Aleppo, no date; el-Kāmil Sha‘bān, Cairo, 747, Damascus, 746; el-Mu‘azzafar Ḥājjī, Cairo, 747, Damascus, 747 (Dhū-1-Hijja); en-Nāṣir Ḥasan (first reign), Cairo, 748, 749, 750, 752, Damascus, 749, 750; es-Sāliḥ Sāliḥ, Cairo, 752, 753, 754, Damascus, 756; Ḥasan (second reign),
they cannot be said to have ruled. Eight sons, two
grandsons, and two great-grandsons followed one another.
Some were mere children, some held the title of sultan
for a few months, one son, Hasan, was kept on the
throne for four years, and was restored for six years
more; one grandson, Sha'bān, even retained the title of
sultan for fourteen years. But when they were not
helpless children they were commonly helpless de-
bauchees, and the real power was in the hands of the
great emirs, of whom Kūsūn (or Kawshūn, a Mongol
follower of Nāṣir’s Kipchak bride), Tāshtemir, Aḵsun-
kur, Sheykhū, Yelburghā and Šarghitmish, were the
most prominent.
The court re-
mained as luxu-
rious and extrava-
gant as ever, the
emirs continued
to amass wealth
and to build ex-
quise mosques
and palaces, and
the prestige of Egypt still held the respect of foreign
powers. But the contests of the emirs and the anarchy
that ensued brought the empire to financial straits, and
the pilgrimage to Mekka was more than once abandoned
for lack of state funds; though money seems never to have
been lacking for the singers and slave girls of the palace.
Sheykhū endeavoured spasmodically to stem the tide of
dissolution, reduced expenses, allowed the sultan Hasan
only £4 a day, repressed the Bedawi brigands who in-
fested the Nile valley; but the visitation of the plague in

Cairo, 754, 756, 757, [75]8, 759, 760, 761, 762; el-Manṣūr Moḥammad, Cairo, 761,
762, 763, 764, Damascus, 763; el-Ashraf Sha'bān, Cairo, 764, 765,
766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 773, 774, 776, Alexandria, 766, 777,
Damascus, 766, 771, 773, 774, 777, Aleppo, Ḥamāh, Tripoli,
without legible dates; el-Manṣūr ‘Ali, Cairo, 779, 781, Damascus,
778, 780, 781, 782, Aleppo, 778; endumūl Ḥaggī, Damascus, Aleppo,
without dates; Damascus, 792, with title el-Manṣūr.
Fig. 75.—Palace of emir Yeshbek at Cairo, 1476, adjoinig mosque of sultan Ḥusayn
1348-9—the same “Black Death” that spread over Europe at this time—reduced the country to a desperate state; 10,000 to 20,000 people died in Cairo in a single day; cattle murrain and fruit disease accompanied the plague, the fish of the river were poisoned, cities were emptied and the land laid waste.

Of external affairs there is little to record in the brief reigns of Nāṣir’s descendants. A little victory at Mekka over the king of the Yemen, another at Singār in Mesopotamia over a Kurdish band of brigands, a temporary adhesion of a rebel governor at Baghdad, who struck coins as a vassal of Egypt (1365), a punitive expedition against the marauding Bedawis in Upper Egypt, and another (supplied by boats which were carried over the first cataract) into Nubia with a similar object (1365), the customary attacks upon Little Armenia (where Adhana, Tarsus, and el-Maṣṣaṣa were taken, and the first two garrisoned), were of small importance. The descent of a hostile European fleet upon Alexandria was a new experience after more than a century of rest from Crusading zeal. Peter of Lusignan, king of Cyprus, supported by the knights of Rhodes and the Genoese and Venetians, suddenly landed 12,000 men, seized Alexandria, plundered it, and sailed away with 5000 prisoners. The Christians of Egypt were made to pay their ransoms and subscribe for the building of a fleet at Cairo and Tripolis. Again in 1369 the Cyprian fleet attacked Tripolis and appeared off Alexandria, but to little
purpose, and after some negotiation peace was made with 1370 Cyprus and the republics. More significant were the hostilities with the Turkmān chiefs of Dhū-l-Ḵadr, on 1378 the northern frontier of Syria, whereby some useful auxiliaries, who had guarded the marches, were con-

![Image: Mosque of sultan Ḥasan, 1362, from the Citadel.](image)

Fig. 77.—Mosque of sultan Ḥasan, 1362, from the Citadel.

verted into enemies—the forerunners of the Turks who conquered Egypt a hundred and forty years later.

There could be but one end to the series of puppets who had figured as nominal sultans since Nāṣir's death. Some emir, more powerful and fortunate than the rest, would
seize the throne, as Beybars and Kalāʿūn had seized it a century ago. The man appeared in Barḵūk, who after disposing of one after the other of his competitors, de-throned the last of Kalāʿūn's house in 1382, and founded the dynasty of the Burği or Circassian sultans. The only wonder was that so feeble a line as Nāṣir's descendants should have survived so long in so stormy a world.
CHAPTER XI
THE CIRCASSIAN MAMLÜKS

1382—1517


Inscriptions in Egypt.—On monuments enumerated above; solar quadrant in M. Ǧawsūn, 1383; decree of Kāntimir in T. Ǧala‘un, 1389; inscr. Barkūk in Citadel, 1389; ‘Abd-el-‘Aziz in T. of Faraq, 1405, 1406; wa‘āf act in Medr. Bars-Bey, 1424, and Khānakāh, 1431; tablet of Sebil of Bars-Bey in Schefer collection, 1433; Gāṃkār in Fayyūm, 1441, in Citadel, 1448, and in Medr. Barkūk; sultan Ḥasan in M. Mu‘ayyad; solar quadrant in Medr. Ināl, 1466; epitaph of princess Shafqā, daughter of Faraq, in his tomb, 1482; inscr. of Kālt-Bey in
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same, 1483, and in Azhar, 1469, 1495; Tûmân-Bey in Citadel, 1501; el-Ghûrî on castle of Kât-Bey at Alexandria, 1501, in Azhar. (M. van Berchem, Corp. Inscr. Arab., iii., proof sheets).

Inscriptions in Syria.—Barbûk in Kubbât-es-Šakhra and on a khân at Jerusalem, on great mosques of Gaza and Ba'âlbeck, acropolis of Ba'âlbeck, citadel of Aleppo; Mu'âyyad, in mosque at Gaza, on wall and hospital of Aleppo, portico of gr. M. at Damascus and his own M.; Aḥmad, decree in ḥaram, Jerusalem; Bars-Bey, decrees in Kubbât-es-Šakhra, Jerusalem, in gr. M. of Damascus and Tripolis, and on castle of Sheyzar, and inscr. on bridge at Sheyzar; Gâkmâk, inscr. in his medr. at Damascus, decrees on Armenian convent, Jerusalem, in the ḥaram, and in gr. M. of Damascus; İnâl, decrees in the gr. M. of Damascus, Tripolis, and Ba'âlbeck; Khûshkadam, on citadel of Damascus; Kât-Bey, numerous inscr. and decrees at Jerusalem and in gr. M. of Damascus, Tripolis, Ba'âlbeck, Ḥamâh, and several inscr. on citadel of Aleppo; Moḥammad b. Kât-Bey, inscr. on citadel of Damascus and in gr. M. of Gaza; el-ʿAdil Tûmân-Bey, several decrees at Damascus (MSS. notes of M. van Berchem).

Coins (see under reigns), armorial bearings, enamelled glass lamps, bowls and other vessels, etc.

BURGİ MAMLÜKS.

Ez-Ẓâhir Seyf-ed-din Barqûk                                    Nov., 1382
[Interrupted by el-Manṣûr Ḥâgî June 1389—Feb. 1390]         
En-Nâşir Nâşir-ed-din Farâq b. Barqûk                      June, 1399
El-Manṣûr ʿIzz-ed-din ʿAbd-el-ʿAzîz b. Barqûk                  Sept., 1405
En-Nâşir Farâq (again)                                        Dec., 1405
El-ʿAdîl el-Mustâʿîn (ʿAbbâsid caliph)                      May, 1412
El-Muʿâyyad Sheykh                                           Nov., 1412
El-Muqaffâr Aḥmad b. Sheykh                                  Jan., 1421
Ez-Ẓâhir Seyf-ed-din Taṭar                                   Aug., 1421
En-Ṣâliḥ Nâşir-ed-din Moḥammad b. Taṭar                     Nov., 1421
El-Asраф Seyf-ed-din Bars-Bey                                April, 1422
El-ʿAzîz Gūmâl-ed-din Yûsuf b. Bars-Bey                    June, 1438
Ez-Ẓâhir Seyf-ed-din Gâkmâk                                 Sept., 1438
El-Manṣûr Fakhâr-ed-din Othmân b. Gâkmâk                Feb., 1453
El-Asраф Seyf-ed-din İnâl                                  Mar., 1453
El-Muʿâyyad Shihâb-ed-din Ahmad b. İnâl                     Feb., 1461
Ez-Ẓâhir Seyf-ed-din Khûshkadam                             June, 1461
Ez-Ẓâhir Seyf-ed-din Yel-Bey                                Oct., 1467
Ez-Ẓâhir Timûrbughâ                                         Dec., 1467
El-Asраф Seyf-ed-din Kât-Bey                                Jan., 1468
En-Nâşir Moḥammad b. Kât-Bey                                Aug., 1496
Ez-Ẓâhir Kânsûn                                             Oct., 1498
El-Asраф Gânbalât                                           June, 1500
El-ʿAdîl Tûmân-Bey                                          Jan., 1501
El-Asраф Kânsûn-El-Ghûrî                                     April, 1501
El-Asراف Tûmân-Bey                                         Oct., 1516
                        —Jan., 1517
THE CIRCASSIAN SULTANS

The second dynasty of mamlûk sultans differed from the first chiefly in race and in the absence of any hereditary succession such as was gradually established in the earlier dynasty, in the family of Kalâ-ūn. The Burğî sultans were all Circassians by race, save two (Khûsh-kadam and Timûrbughâ) who were of Greek origin; and none of them was able to establish the hereditary principle in his family. They were in fact rather head-mamlûks or chief emirs than kings in the absolute sense understood in the east. The Circassian sultan was but primus inter pares, elected by his fellow mamlûks, and depending for the tenure of his power upon his skill in managing the military oligarchy which was the real authority of the kingdom. His success or failure was in proportion to his tact or diplomacy, and still more to his liberality, and to the divisions among the several factions of the mamlûks. Each sultan's followers, after his death, formed a distinct party, known by his regnal title (as Ashrafis, Nasîris, Mu'ayyadis, Zâhiris), and animated by a strong esprit de corps and a determination to win and keep as much power and wealth as possible. By manoeuvring with these parties, forming coalitions or fostering jealousies, by intrigues and bribes, an emir would contrive to be elected sultan; but when on the throne, he found himself little better than a delegate of his insubordinate electors, over whom he seldom maintained much discipline. If he held the throne till his death, his son usually succeeded him for a few months, less in deference to any hereditary tradition referring to earlier times, than for the purpose of acting as a buffer between the ambitions of rival emirs. The son kept the throne warm, whilst the leading nobles fought for the succession; and when the best man won, the "warming-pan" was put away. As a rule he was either placed in honourable confinement, or even allowed to live freely and openly in some Egyptian city, and was seldom put to death in the old fashion. Of the twenty-three sultans of this dynasty, the reigns of six cover 103 out of the total 134 years, and the reigns of nine—Barkûk, Faraq, Sheykh, Bars-Bey, Gâkmâk, Inâl, Khûsh-kadam, Kâit-
Bey, and Ḳânsûh el-Ghûrî, amount to 125 years, leaving but nine years for the other fourteen sultans.

It is with these nine sultans that history has chiefly to do: the rest were ciphers, but the nine were all remarkable men, as indeed their success in winning and keeping their power for eight, sixteen, or even twenty-six years implies. It needed no ordinary abilities to hold even a partial authority over rival emirs and seditious mamlûks for any length of time. Their abilities, however, were seldom those of the warrior-king. They often fought their way to the throne over the corpses of rivals, but once there they seldom led their armies in the field, and Faraq was perhaps the only Circassian sultan who was conspicuously a general. Several of them—as Barkûk, Sheykh, Gâkmaq, Kaït-Bey, besides the short-reigned Ṭâṭar and Timûrbughâ—were much attached to literature and the society of the learned; they were strict, sometimes even austere, Muslims, and many of their pious foundations, mosques, colleges, hospitals, and schools, still bear eloquent witness to their aesthetic refinement. Perhaps the costly elaboration of such exquisite architectural gems as the mosques of Barkûk and Kaït-Bey were intended to atone for the many acts of barbarity and oppression of which the Circassian sultans were commonly guilty. Barkûk caused his rival, Mintâsh, to be “put to the question” in order to make him reveal his hidden treasure: the wretched emir’s limbs were broken one after the other, he was tried by fire, tortured with infernal ingenuity, but all in vain; at last he was put out of his agony, and his head was displayed on a lance through the towns of Syria and exposed at the gate of Zawila at Cairo. Other conspirators were nailed to camel saddles and paraded through the streets till they died. For such deeds Barkûk’s lovely medresa and noble mausoleum were all too small an atonement. His savage cruelty was emulated by his successors.

Egypt indeed suffered grievously under their sway. The perpetual conflicts of the divided factions of mamlûks, the street fights, the unbridled license of the
dominant soldiery, produced a reign of terror. The
mamlûks had, of course, no bowels for the afflicted
populace. They were all foreigners, though not nece-
sarily Circassians, for Barkûk, after a conspiracy among
his Circassian followers, recruited his mamlûks from
Greek, Turkish, and Mongolian slaves. The multitude
of these mercenary pests may be judged from the fact
that Barkûk himself purchased 5000; and when a revolt
of Bedawis and peasants in Upper and Lower Egypt was
repressed by 7000 mamlûks riding over the country, the
horrors of the process may be left to the imagination.
So debauched were the soldiery that even under Bars-
Bey, the strongest of the Circassian sultans, it was
impossible to allow women to appear in the streets,
wedding processions were prohibited, and women who
tried to go forth to attend funerals or visit the tombs of
their dead were driven back by force. The peasants
often dared not bring their country produce and cattle to
the Cairo markets, lest it should be seized by the mamlûks,
or taken by the government at a compulsory rate to supply
the palace, which in Bars-Bey's time required 1200 lb. of
meat a day. The government was corrupt and in-
effectual, justice was awarded to the highest bidder.
In the reign of el-Mu'ayyad, the very Sheykh-el-Islâm,
the head of the law, stole trust-money: he was a Persian
from Herât, and could not speak Arabic; his ignorance
was exposed in a public disputation in Mu'ayyad's
mosque, and he was dismissed. In Alexandria about the
same time the fisher-folk took the law into their own
hands against their oppressors; they shaved one side of
the deputy governor's face, like the men of Jericho,
paraded him through the streets on a camel, escorted by
singers and musicians, and then killed him. They made
the governor himself stand naked before a judge, and
beat him to death. But such successful execution of
lynch-law was rare, and as a rule the people were forced
to suffer without redress or vengeance. The country was
frequently in revolt, especially where the Bedawi tribes
were settled, and when the oppressive taxation and
conscription for the wars, and the general anarchy and
insecurity of life and property, often aggravated by plague and famine, drove the people to desperation; but the rebellions only led to worse suffering, cruel reprisals, and a bloody stamping out of sedition by the implacable mamluks. In the time of Farag the population was said to be reduced to one-third of its normal number.

The sultans were really powerless to restrain their own guards. Some of the worst excesses referred to occurred under Mu'ayyad Sheykh, who was personally a devout man and a learned, a good musician, poet, and orator, scrupulous in the observance of the rules of his religion, very simple and unpretentious in his dress and mode of life, bearing himself in all religious functions as a plain Muslim among fellow worshippers, and robing himself in common white wool in mourning for the pestilence that ravaged the land. He spent little on himself, but 400,000 D. on the mosque which he built on the site of a gaol where he had suffered captivity; a hospital and other institutions showed his charitable soul. But, for all this, he had no hold over the ministers or the people, and though he flogged the oppressors he could not protect the oppressed. His piety was forgotten in his indecision, and his unsuccessful currency experiments outweighed his virtues; and when he died at the age of fifty-two, though there were over a million dinars in his treasury, he was buried without followers, without a shroud, without even a towel for the laving of the corpse. Anxiety for the succession drowned all solicitude for the dead.

A later sultan, Khushkadam, belonging to the degenerate race of the mediaeval Greeks, frankly recognized the impossibility of restraining his own servants, and turned their corruption and violence to his personal advantage. He played off one faction against another, Zahiris against Asrafis, or Nasiris against Mu'ayyadis, as it might happen, and thus nullifying their power, left the field free for the riotous debauchery of his own mamluks, who murdered and ravished and plundered almost as they pleased. This crafty Greek
knew how to make the most out of the mammon of unrighteousness. Official posts were openly sold; the governor of Tripolis paid 45,000 D. to be promoted to Damascus, and his vacant post was purchased by another emir for 10,000 D., whilst Safed went cheap at 4000 D. Worse still, Khūshkadam took bribes from mamluks for the privilege of torturing and killing their personal rivals. An unpopular wezir was scourged, tortured, and at last executed without trial, after his enemies had greased the sultan's palm with 75,000 D. Unquestionably he made them pay for their pleasures. When he was short of money, he would make a call in state upon some wealthy noble, and before the visit was ceremoniously completed the unlucky entertainer was handsomely fleeced.

In spite of sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion, in spite of frequent civil wars, constant factions, and invincible corruption, the Circassian sultans and their mamluks evidently possessed the faculty of collective self-preservation, and knew how to keep their quarrels to themselves without letting in the foreigner. Infamous as was their government, and apparently suicidal their mutual jealousies, they were a splendid soldiery, and thus continued not only to hold Egypt, and generally Syria, for a century and a third, but to beat off one seemingly overwhelming invasion and several minor assaults. When all western Asia was trembling under the shock of Timur's portentous conquests, the mamluks of Egypt braved and defeated
him. Yet the political situation at the time of his approach was singularly unfavourable for solid resistance. Barūk, the first of the Circassian sultans, had indeed deposed the last of the Bahri dynasty, the child Haggī, without difficulty, and had been accepted as sultan throughout Egypt and Syria. But a year later a conspiracy to set up the caliph Muta-
wekkil in his place shook his authority, and though the plot was suppressed with extreme severity, the disaffection, which had spread to north Syria, grew apace. Headed by Mintāsh and Yelbughā, the governors of Malatya and Aleppo, and supported by the Mongols and Turkmāns on the northern frontier, the rebels routed the Egyptian army near Damascus, entered the Syrian capital, and marched upon Cairo, where Barūk, who had lost all presence of mind, after repealing all taxes, arming the raw population, barricading the streets, and entrenching the Citadel, burst into tears and took refuge in a tailor's shop.

The rebels plundered Cairo, and re-established the boy Haggī on the nominal throne; after which they fell out among themselves, and Mintāsh and Yelbughā, from the roof of the mosque of sultan Hasan and the opposite battlements of the Citadel, pounded each other, and paved the way for the counter-revolution which Barūk was preparing in Syria. Escaping from the fortress of Karak he raised an army, discomfited the rebels near Sarkhab, took Haggī and the caliph prisoners, and entered Cairo in triumph; the garrison and people came out to welcome him, the Jews bearing their Tora and the Christians their Gospels; tapers were lighted and carpets spread in his honour. The young sultan Haggī was again deposed, but permitted to live in comfort in the Citadel till his
death in 1412, in spite of the trouble he caused by his extreme brutality to his female slaves, whose shrieks he endeavoured to drown in the uproar of songs and merriment. The next two years were occupied in

Fig. 80.—Pulpit (minbar) in tomb-mosque of Barkūk outside Cairo, 1401-11.

reducing the rebels under Mintāsh in Syria, and hardly was this accomplished when Timūr’s invasion threatened the horizon. The conqueror took Baghādād in August, 1393, overran Mesopotamia in 1394, annexing territory
(such as Māridin) which owned Barkūk's suzerainty, and thus came into direct conflict with Egypt.

Barkūk was no valiant swashbuckler, and lived in fear of assassination, but he showed a firm front to the invader. He joined the northern princes—Burhān-ed-din of Siwās, Karā-Yūsuf, the head of the Turkmāns of the Black Pelt, Tōktāmish, the khān of the Golden Horde, and Bāyezid, the ‘Othmānli sultan—in a general league of resistance. When Timūr sent an embassy to Cairo, ostensibly to open peaceful negotiations, Barkūk, suspecting his motives, executed the envoy. Further, to show his sympathy with the victims of Timūr's aggression, he invited the expelled sultan of Baghdād, Ahmad the G'elāir, to Cairo, and received him with peculiar honour. In reply to a threatening despatch from Timūr, Barkūk used equally haughty language, and contemptuously compared the flowery style of the conqueror's secretary to the scraping of a bad fiddle. The army of Egypt mustered in great strength and marched through Damascus to Aleppo and to Bira on the Euphrates, but Timūr was then fully engaged in the contest with Tōktāmish in Georgia, and the crisis was postponed. The invasion of Syria was averted for the time, and Barkūk, who was well satisfied to see his allies attacked, and stood in far greater dread of the rising power of the ‘Othmānlis than of Timūr, died without crossing swords with the enemy. He was over sixty years of age, and had virtually ruled Egypt since 1378, on the whole with sagacity and mildness, despite some barbarous executions. He remitted some of the most onerous taxes, was a lover of learning, and a great builder. His tomb-mosque, with the two domes, in the eastern cemetery outside Cairo, was erected by his son Farağ (who was also buried there), but the beautiful medresa in the Beyn-el-Kaşrēyn, lately restored by M. Herz Bey, belongs to the early years of his reign, and testifies to his taste in art and his zeal for pious instruction.

Of Barkūk's three sons, the eldest, en-Nāsir Farağ, succeeded. His mother was a Greek, and his original name was Bulghak, "calamity," because he was born .
during the rebellion of Mintāsh, but it was changed to Farāq, "deliverance," after Barkūk's victory over the rebels. Farāq was only thirteen years old, but he did not long run in leading reins. At the close of 1400 he was in Syria at the head of a great Egyptian army, endeavouring to check the fresh advance of Timūr, who 1400 had sacked Aleppo and was threatening Damascus. At first the Egyptians seemed to be driving the invaders back, but the retreat was probably strategic; for when the
Egyptians attacked they were heavily repulsed, and Farağ, finding that the defeat had bred sedition among his emirs, who naturally desired a more experienced leader at such a crisis, withdrew in haste to Cairo, leaving his army to its fate. Damascus surrendered on terms, but was nevertheless sacked, ruined, and burnt by the ruthless Tatars, and all northern Syria was cruelly devastated. After Timûr’s victorious campaign in Asia Minor, and the total defeat of the ‘Othmânî army at the battle of Angora, Farağ consented to the terms demanded by Timûr’s envoys, surrendered his prisoners, and even agreed to strike coins in the conqueror’s name. No such coins, however, have been discovered, and Timûr never entered or controlled Egypt. He died in February, 1405, whilst Farağ was again raising a new army to resist any further demands.

The sultan, however, had lost his credit by these proceedings, and a struggle for power among the leading mamlûks, during which he was treated with contumely, and even defeated in battle, ended in his sudden disappearance. For about two months his brother el-

\[\text{Fig. 82.—Dinár of Farağ, Cairo, } 1407.\]

\[\text{Sepi. } 20\text{.}\]

\[\text{Nov. } 20\text{.}\]

The rest of his reign was largely spent in the endeavour to restore order in Syria, which had become the cockpit of rival emirs—one of whom, G’ekem, even went so far as to style himself el-Melik el-‘Adil—but in spite of seven more or less victorious campaigns, Syria remained in a state of anarchy, and the growing power of the emirs Sheykhl el-Maḥmûdî and Nawrûz at Damascus more and more threatened the sultan’s throne. The seventh campaign ended in his deposition by the caliph. Farağ surrendered to Sheykhl at Damascus on a promise of his life, but the caliph
and 'ulema decreed his death, on the ground of his notoriously debauched habits. Farag fought his executors in vain; his body was cast upon a dung heap. He had been a hard drinker, and had slaughtered his mamluks, and even slain his divorced wife with his own hands. Egypt had groaned under his taxes and his war levies; European pirates had raided Alexandria (1403), Tripolis in Syria (1404), Beyrut and Sidon; and the 'Othmānlis were encroaching on the northern frontier.

The next five reigns made little change in the situation. The caliph Musta'in was set up as a mere stop-gap, whilst Sheykh and Nawrūz settled which was the stronger man; and he retired willingly and with relief in less than six months, when Sheykh accepted the throne, with the title of el-Mu'ayyad. The principal events of the new reign were two campaigns on the northern frontier, with a view to reducing the Turkmān border states of Kāramān, Dhū-l-Kadr, and Ramadān, to their former condition of vassalage. In 1418 Mu'ayyad marched upon Abulusteyn and Tarsus, and received the submission of the princes—Kāramān even issuing coins in the name of the Egyptian sultan—but on his departure the Turkmāns reoccupied the territory he had taken as guarantee; and accordingly in 1419 his son Ibrāhīm marched north, took Kayṣariya (Caesarea), Kōniya (Iconium), and Nigda, striking coins in el-Mu'ayyad's name, and appointing governors from among the cadets of the Turkmān families; Erekle and Larenda (now the town
of Karaman), Adhana and Tarsus, were annexed, and Ibrāhim was welcomed with enthusiasm at Cairo, only to die next year, poisoned (as was rumoured) by his jealous father. Egypt, however gained little by these successes; Mu'ayyad was unable to control the mamluks, and the people suffered grievously. The brief reign of his son Aḥmad, under the regency of Taṭar, and the still briefer reign of Taṭar himself, followed by his son Moḥammad for a few months, under the regency of Bars-Bey, ended as usual in the accession of the regent himself.

1422 El-Ashraf Bars-Bey ruled for over sixteen years, and although his government was exceptionally oppressive, and Egypt groaned under his trade monopolies, the excesses of his mamluks and the scarcity and high prices which naturally accompanied a general state of pillage and insecurity, he was not only strong enough to prevent encroachments upon or revolts within his dominions but even achieved an extension of his power by the conquest of Cyprus. The pirates who infested the shores of Egypt and Syria, though not necessarily Cypriotes, used the harbours of Cyprus as their base, and so long as they were sheltered there it was impossible to capture them. In the summer of 1424 a few ships from Būlāk, Damietta, and Tripolis, manned by volunteers, sailed to Cyprus, sacked Limasol (Lemsūn), and returned laden with prisoners and booty. Encouraged by this success, a fleet of forty sail was despatched from Egypt in the following year, Famagusta (Magūsa) was surrendered by its Genoese garrison, Larnaka was taken, as well as Limasol, after a brief resistance, and the Egyptian admiral G'erbāsh brought over a thousand captives and much spoil in
CONQUEST OF CYPRUS

triumph to Cairo.\(^1\) Bars-Bey, however, had intended no such hasty return but a permanent conquest; and in the next year, rejecting the mediation of the emperor of Constantinople, he sent a larger fleet to Cyprus, manned partly by mamlûks, but chiefly by voluntary adventurers and Bedawis. The new armament landed at Limasol, which fell in a few days despite its restored fortifications, and the troops marched upon Larnaka, the fleet escorting it along the coast. King James of Lusignan killed the herald sent to summon him to surrender, and advanced by sea and land against the invaders. In an engagement at Cheirocitium, the Cypriotes threw away their first advantage, and the mamlûks, renewing the battle, took the king and many of his knights prisoners, before the Christian fleet came up. Nikosia fell next, and the island was subdued. Cairo was en fête on the return of the conquerors after this brief but decisive campaign. The crown of Cyprus and the royal banners were carried in triumph through the streets, followed by a couple of thousand prisoners. King James himself entered the Citadel and was brought into the presence of the sultan, who was surrounded by a brilliant court and by the ambassadors of the ʿOthmânli Porte, the Turkmân emirs of Asia Minor, and the representatives of the Arab tribes, the sherif of Mekka, and the king of Tunis. Bare-headed, and in irons, he kissed the ground before Bars-Bey, and then fainted. Pressed for a ransom, James replied, "I have nothing but my life, which the sultan may deal with as he sees fit." Threatened with death, he showed no fear. The consul of Venice and the European merchants, however, interceded, and guaranteed a ransom of 100,000 \(D\) down, and a similar sum after return to Cyprus; and the king was set at liberty, and allowed a house and suitable provision. He rode through the capital on a splendidly caparisoned

\(^1\) To the credit of the sultan it must be recorded that, when the prisoners were publicly sold, he refused to allow parents and children and other near relatives to be separated. The proceeds of the sale went to the state treasury, after each adventurer had been paid 3½ or 7 \(D\). The double sum perhaps represents the pay of a horse-soldier.
horse, visited the bazars and churches, and finally left Egypt with the Rhodian ambassadors who had come to make a treaty with the formidable sultan who had dared to lay hands on Cyprus. An annual tribute, the amount of which is doubtful, but which probably did not exceed 5000 to 8000 ducats, was to be paid by the king as vassal of Egypt.

Cyprus continued to be tributary to Egypt to the end of the mamlûk dynasty. When John II succeeded James in 1432 he renewed his predecessor's pledges, and a letter from the sultan İnâl to John\(^1\) thanks him for the rejoicings held in Cyprus on the accession of the new ruler of Egypt, and excuses arrears of tribute. On the death of the king in 1458, İnâl supported John's natural son Jacob against his legitimate daughter Charlotte, the wife of Louis of Savoy, and sent an expedition of forty-eight ships to Cyprus to enforce his claim. The expedition was not very successful, the troops suffered from fever, and Jacob was left with a small Egyptian contingent in possession of most of the island, whilst Charlotte held out at Cerines supported by the Genoese and by the knights of Rhodes. For some time Gâni-bek el-Ablâk and the Egyptian contingent domineered over the new king, but Jacob finally got rid of them, without, however, repudiating his tribute and subjection toKhûshkahadâm, the new sultan of Egypt.

In this connexion it may be added that Gâkmaḳ, emulous of his predecessor Bars-Bey's triumph in Cyprus, made an attempt in Aug., 1440, to capture Rhodes. Fifteen galleys sailed from Bûlûk, manned chiefly by volunteers, and after revictualling at Cyprus proceeded to the Asiatic port of el-‘Alâyâ, and thence to Châteauroux, an island of the knights of St. John, which fell at once. Rhodes, however, warned by spies in Egypt, was prepared for the attack, and the knights' fleet drove away the

---

\(^1\) Mas Latrie, *Chypre*, iii. 73. İnâl adds that he has written to the ‘Othmânli sultan Mohammad requesting him to order the Turkish corsairs to respect Cyprus. A present of 400 pieces of stuff for the Egyptian treasury, and twenty fine pieces for İnâl—perhaps in lieu of tribute—is also mentioned.
Egyptians with severe loss. The attempt was renewed more than once, and in June, 1444, a considerable armament sailed from Bûlûk, carrying 1000 of the sultan's mamlûks, besides 18,000 volunteers and recruits from Tripolis, and succeeded in effecting a landing in Rhodes; but the city itself resisted all efforts to take it, and after forty days' siege the expedition returned to Cairo in October, and peace was signed.\(^1\)

The conquest of Cyprus was the sole addition made to the empire of Egypt during the rule of the Circassian mamlûks. It was not the only act that distinguished Bars-Bey's reign from the rest of the dynasty. He devoted special attention to the Indian trade, and contrived to extract more profits from it than any of his predecessors. In 1422 a new departure in the trade took place when a sea-captain from Calicut sailed past 'Aden—where the exactions of the Rasûlîd kings of the Yemen had made profitable trading impossible—to G'idda, the port of Mekka. Here he found himself as badly cheated as at 'Aden, and accordingly in the following year he sailed past both 'Aden and G'idda, and sold his cargo at Dehlek and Sawâkin. Still dissatisfied with his markets, in the third year he proposed to land at Yenbu', the port of Medina, which was under an Egyptian governor. This official advised the captain to try G'idda once more, and promised to protect him from extortion, and so satisfied was he with this treatment that in 1425 he convoyed fourteen vessels with rich cargoes to G'idda, and in 1426 there came to this port over forty ships from India and Persia, paying duties to the value of 70,000 D., most of which no doubt found its way to the Egyptian treasury. Not content with this, the Egyptians sought to increase their profits by sundry duties in addition to the usual tenth, and the trade began to return to 'Aden. Bars-Bey then reverted to the single tax of one-tenth on all importations landed at G'idda, but doubled the duty on all goods brought from 'Aden, with a view to recovering the trade. Goods from

\(^1\) Vertot, *Hist. des chev. de Malte*, ii. 208 ff.; Mas Latrie, iii. 56, etc.
the Rasūlid territory were even confiscated, and pilgrims had to pay customs duty on what they brought home from Mekka.

There are unfortunately no trustworthy statistics to show the results of this policy. Duties were by no means restricted to the ports of importation. There were a number of government monopolies, and all sugar, pepper, wood, metal-work, etc., had to be brought to the government warehouses, and sold at such prices as the government fixed, subject to the duty. A cargo of pepper that cost 50 D. in Cairo was sold at Alexandria to Europeans for 130 D. The Venetians remonstrated through their consul, and getting no redress, broke off relations, and ordered a fleet to Alexandria to bring off all their merchants. This brought Bars-Bey to reason, and he accorded better terms to Venice, retaining only the pepper monopoly. The kings of Castile and Aragon also remonstrated, and sent cruisers to capture Egyptian shipping on the Syrian coast. Besides interfering with trade, Bars-Bey meddled with the currency, altering the relations of gold and silver (the latter coining was exceptionally debased under the mamlūk sultans), putting foreign money out of currency, and then re-admitting it, to the extreme annoyance and loss of the merchants. Under G’ākmak we find royal monopolies and heavy duties still in force, but the Indian import duty at Gīdāda was still one-tenth. İnāl attempted to reform the debased silver coinage, but his changes were not popular. The currency went from bad to worse, and as the mamlūk empire declined, and had to fight for its bare existence, the taxation became more and more onerous.

Bars Bey died unregretted. He had been a stern and oppressive ruler, and the outward tranquillity of the realm was no proof of corresponding prosperity. His
conquest of Cyprus had pleased his mamlûks, and his monopolies had enriched them; but the people suffered. Egypt and Syria, says Maqrizi, became deserts in his reign. One of his last acts was to order the execution of two doctors, because they could not cure him; and this in face of the urgent remonstrances of the emîrs, who revered the good men. Yet he bore the character of a devout Muslim, fasted twice a week, besides five special days in the month, and delighted to hear the historian el-ʻAynî reading to him in Turkish of an evening. His son el-ʻAzîz ʻüsuîf, aged fourteen, soon gave place to his regent (Nizâm-el-mulk) Gâkmak—once a slave of Bar-kûk, a lieutenant under Mu‘ayyad, a colonel under Taţar, and a high minister under Bars-Bey—whose government was mild compared with his predecessor’s, and whose personal character was exemplary. He observed the laws of the Korân scrupulously, touched no forbidden food, prohibited wine, and suppressed profane music. His orthodoxy induced him to persecute Jews and Christians, and to enforce the old sumptuary distinctions. Unlike Bars-Bey, he was as familiar with Arabic as with Turkish, studied Arabic theology, and was fond of the society of learned men. He died at the age of about eighty, and despite his simple life he left but a trifling fortune for his own son, the child of a Greek mother.

This son, el-Manşûr ʻOthmân, who was proclaimed sultan during his father’s last illness, was deposed in a month and a half, by el-Ashraf İnâl, an easy-going, pliable old man, who could hardly write his own name, and whose reign was embittered by the ceaseless rivalries and disorders of the mamlûks. His son el-Mu‘ayyad Aḥmad was totally unequal to his difficult position, and soon abdicated in favour of his governor, the Greek ez-Zâhir Khûshkadam, whose rule was conspicuous for successful corruption, and whose son ez-Zâhir Yel-Bey, known as el-meğnûn or “the lunatic,” was as usual dethroned in a couple of months by a faction of mamlûks to make room for their candidate, another elderly Greek, ez-Zâhir Timurbûghâ. The new sultan was a highly cultivated man, versed in philology, history,
theology, and he accepted the throne with much diffi-
dence. His first steps were to set free the imprisoned
emir's of various factions, as well as the ex-sultans Aḥmad
and 'Othmān, and to endeavour to conciliate all parties.
The result of his good intentions was that he found
himself with no friends, and no money to buy them.
The mamlūks, losing all patience with so incompre-
hensible a chief, burst into the citadel, locked up the
learned sultan, and set up Kheyr Bek with the title of
el-‘Ādil. Kheyr Bek, however, had only time to plunder
his predecessor's hārīm, when a still more powerful emir,
Kāīt-Bey, assembled his mamlūks, ousted the usurper,
and usurped the throne himself. Timurbūgha, twice
deposed on the same day, was treated with the utmost
consideration, and permitted to live in freedom and ease
at Damietta.

El-Ashraf Kāīt-Bey enjoyed the longest reign of any
of the mamlūk sultans since
en-Nāṣir b. ʿKalāʿūn. He
reigned for nearly twenty-
ine years, and was the most
successful and warlike of all
the Circassian line. He had
worked his way up after the
manner of the mamlūks.
BARS-Bey had bought him for
twenty-five guineas (50 D.);
he had been resold to
G'aḵmāk, made a lieutenant by İnāl, a captain, and
eventually a colonel, by Khūshkadam, until he became

1 These terms are here used loosely to represent the mamlūk ranks
"emīr of 10," "emīr of 40," and "emīr of 1000" horse. The ranks
were not merely military, but carried with them the distinction of
official nobility, like the Russian tchin. In Kāīt-Bey's time there
were but fourteen emirs of 1000; in the reign of en-Nāṣir b. ʿKalāʿūn
there had been twenty-four. The pay of the army, on the other hand,
had been constantly increasing, from 11,000 D. a month under
Muʿayyad, and 18,000 D. under Bars-Bey, to 28,000 D. under G'aḵmāk,
and 46,000 D. in the earlier part of Kāīt-Bey's reign. This sum,
amounting to nearly 300,000 a year, was presently reduced by
striking a great many inefficient or mere pensioners off the rolls.
The soldiers' rations were, of course, in addition to their pay.
Fig. 87.—Tomb-mosque of Kaït-Bey, 1474.
commander-in-chief under Timurbughā. He was an expert swordsman, and an adept at the javelin play. His career had given him experience and knowledge of the world; he possessed courage, judgment, insight, energy, and decision. His strong character dominated his mamlûks, who were devoted to him, and overawed competitors. His physical energy was sometimes displayed in flogging the president of the council of state or other high officials with his own arm, with the object of extorting money for the treasury. Such contributions and extraordinary taxation were absolutely necessary for the wars in which he was obliged to engage. Not only was the land taxed to one fifth of the produce, but an additional tenth (half-a-dirhem per ardebb of corn) was demanded. Rich Jews and Christians were remorselessly squeezed. There was much barbarous inhumanity, innocent people were scourged, even to the death, and the chemist ʿAli b. el-Marshûshî was blinded and deprived of his tongue, because he could not turn dross into gold.

The sultan had the reputation of miserliness, yet the list of his public works, not only in Egypt, but in Syria and Arabia, shows that he spent the revenue on admirable objects. His two mosques at Cairo, and his wekālas or caravanserais are among the most exquisite examples of elaborate arabesque ornament applied to the purest Saracenic architecture. He diligently restored and repaired the crumbling monuments of his predecessors, as numerous inscriptions in the mosques, the schools, the Citadel, and other buildings of Cairo abundantly testify. He was a frequent traveller, and journeyed in Syria, to the Euphrates, in Upper and Lower Egypt, besides performing the pilgrimages to Mekka and Jerusalem; and wherever he went he left traces of his progress in good roads, bridges, mosques, schools, fortifications, or other pious or necessary works. No reign, save that of en-Nāṣir b. ẃalāʿūn, in the long list of mamlûk sultans, was more prolific in architectural construction or in the minor industries of art. The people suffered for the cost of his many buildings, but a later age has recognized their matchless beauty.
Kāit-Bey, however had more serious matters to deal with than architectural achievements. The northern frontier of Syria had long been a thorn in the side of the mamlūk sultans, not only on account of the chronic insubordination or revolutions among their Turkmān vassals, but because these disturbances constantly furnished a pretext for intervention on the part of their most dangerous neighbour, the 'Othmānli sultan, whose power was soon to be crowned by the conquest of
Constantinople. Mu'ayyad and his son had more than once reduced the troublesome border states to temporary submission. Bars-Bey had waged war with the Turkmâns of the White Pelt (1433), and even laid siege to their city of Amid in Diyâr-Bekr, without success. G'âkma'â had cultivated the friendship of the border chieftains, married their daughters, and received their homage, at least in form; and his conciliatory policy towards the border Turkmâns as well as towards the 'Othmânlis had been continued by Înâl, who decorated

Fig. 89.—Wekâla or caravanserai of Kâît-Bey, 1477, near Azhar.

Cairo for several days in 1453, when an embassy from Muhammad II brought the news of the conquest of Constantinople, and who maintained a friendly, if nominal, overlordship over the chief of the White Pelt and the Dhû-l-Kadr prince of Abulusteyn, though he had to send an army (1456-7) to recover Tarsus and Adhana from Ibrâhîm, the ambitious prince of Karamân. The vassalage of the chiefs of the White Pelt, however, became merely ludicrous when Uzûn Hâsan adopted the
device of capturing Egyptian cities and fortresses (such as Karkar and Khartbirt), and pretending that he made it all correct by sending the keys to Cairo.

There were signs, moreover, that the ‘Othmānlis were not anxious for the friendship of Egypt. An embassy from Moḥammad II in 1464 pointedly disregarded some of the customary etiquette. In a dispute over the succession to the principality of Ḫaramān, the Porte and Egypt took opposite sides and nearly came to blows, and in another dispute between two brothers for the state of Dhū-l-Ḵadr—which was technically tributary to Egypt—the Porte secretly supported Shāh Siwār, the candidate whom Egypt opposed, and the mamlûks were defeated with heavy loss at ‘Ayn-Tāb, and later on near the river G‘eyhūn. Eventually, deprived of Turkish support, the rebel was forced to surrender, brought to Cairo, and hanged; but the course of the war had shown the danger of ‘Othmānli intervention. Ḫūzūn Ḥasan continued his policy of pretended vassalage to Kait-Bey, sending him presents of camels and coats of mail and Circassian slaves; but so long as he persisted in keeping the fortresses and giving his suzerain only the keys, his career of aggrandisement gave Kait-Bey no little anxiety, and the defeat of his “vassal” by Moḥammad II of Turkey was looked upon with some satisfaction.

All these minor contests proved the growing power and interference of the Ottoman Porte, and, if occasion were needed for a rupture, it was certain that it would easily be found in some border dispute. Kait-Bey went out of his way to invite a quarrel, however, when he welcomed the exiled prince G‘em (Djem), brother and rival of the new sultan of Turkey, Bāyezid II, and not only treated him
with royal honours at Cairo, but supplied him with means for a fruitless rising in Asia Minor. When the unlucky exile was made the cat’s-paw of the European powers, Kāīt-Bey played his part in the ignoble tragedy, and negotiated with the pope for the surrender of so valuable a possession as the heir to the ‘Othmānlī throne, until finding it hopeless to extricate such a prize from Christian toils, he set about conciliating the offended brother at Constantinople. Bāyezid at first rejected all overtures, and invaded Cilicia, taking Tarsus and Adhana; but, when in several engagements, the mamlūks, under the emīr Ṣebek, had the better fortune, whilst Matthias Corvinus was threatening in Hungary, and G’em, the source of all these contests, was still alive at Rome, the Porte thought better of the overtures of peace which Kāīt-Bey, weary of these expensive campaigns, renewed. The first envoy, Mamāy, was imprisoned; but the second, the emīr G’ān-balāt b.’ Yeshbek, managed to reach Bāyezid’s ear, and peace was concluded on the Turks restoring the keys of the fortresses they had seized.

The last years of Kāīt-Bey’s reign were clouded, not only by the heavy taxation and consequent discontent due to the war, but also by an exceptionally virulent plague, which carried off 12,000 persons in a single day in Cairo, killed a third of the mamlūks, and bereaved the sultan himself of his only wife and a daughter on the same day. The plague was followed by scarcity and

---

cattle disease; and to add to the general misery, a fierce contest broke out between two great divisions of the mamlüks. The aged sultan displayed his standard at the Citadel gate, beat to quarters, and quelled the riot for the moment, but the intrigues and jealousies continued, and at length Kāīt-Bey, overcome by years (he was over eighty), and illness and worry, abdicated in favour of his son, and died the day after.

After the brief reigns of Kāīt-Bey’s cruel and incapable son, en-Nāṣir Moḥammad (7 Aug., 1496—31 Oct., 1498); of ez-Zahir Kānsūh (2 Nov., 1498—28 June, 1500); el-Ashraf Gān-balāt (30 June, 1500—25 Jan., 1501); and el-Ādil Tūmān-Bey (Jan.—20 April, 1501), who were all at the mercy of the turbulent mamlüks, el-Ashraf Kānsūh el-Ghūrī, a vigorous old man of sixty, once a slave of Kāīt-Bey’s, was elected to the throne, and quickly proved that age had not abated his natural strength of character. He restored order in the distracted metropolis at once, placed men whom he could trust in office, and set to work to replenish the empty treasury. Never had such drastic measures been known. He levied ten months’ taxes at a stroke, laying not only the lands and shops and the other usual sources under contribution, but also the mills, water-wheels, boats, beasts of burden, Jews, Christians, palace servants, and even the wakf or pious endowments. He imposed heavy customs duties, and mulcted the next of kin of the greater part of their inheritance. He still further debased the coinage for the benefit of the treasury and to the injury of the merchant. The result was a handsome revenue at the cost of the impoverishment and discontent of the people. El-Ghūrī spent his money on his mamlüks, whose number he increased by purchase; on building
his mosque and college in the street of Cairo named after him the Ghūriya; on improving the pilgrims’ road to Mekka, erecting rest-houses and digging wells; on making canals, aqueducts, fortifications at Alexandria and Rosetta, restoring the Citadel of Cairo, and generally improving the public works of the country. He also kept great state at court; his horses, jewels, table equipage, and kitchen were sumptuous and splendid; and though he was niggard and heartless enough to cut off the pensions of orphans, he could be princely in his presents to poets and musicians.

Beyond a few military émeutes and Bedawi risings,

Fig. 93.—Inscription of Tūmān-Bey I in Citadel of Cairo, 1500.

there were few events to disturb the earlier years of his reign. The chief expeditions were to the Red Sea, where a new and formidable rival had appeared, who threatened to destroy the Indian transit trade which brought so much wealth to Egypt. Vasco da Gama had rounded the Cape of Good Hope in 1497, and the Portuguese had established themselves at Calicut in 1500. The trade which went to Egypt by way of ‘Aden and G’idda and Sawākin was being diverted to the Cape route to Europe, and Egyptian ships, or ships trading to the Red Sea, were being seized by the Portuguese.
Fig. 94.—Sixteenth century house at Rosetta.
Ghûrî was entreated by the king of Guğârât and the other Mohammadan rulers of India and southern Arabia to come to the rescue; and the importance of the menaced trade was an argument quite strong enough to move him. He first tried a diplomatic appeal to the pope to check the outrages of the Spaniards and Portuguese upon the Muslims both west and east, and threatened to destroy the holy places of Palestine if these persecutions and depredations continued. The European powers rightly judged that this was but an idle threat, and took no notice of it. Ghûrî then built a new fleet in the Red Sea, and his admiral Ḥoseyn encountered the Portuguese off Chaul, and defeated it, with the loss of the flagship and its admiral.

Lorenço, son of Almeida. The Portuguese, however, had their revenge at Diu in the following year; Albuquerque attacked 'Aden in 1513; the Egyptian carrying trade with India was doomed, but the mamlûk dynasty was doomed too.

So long as Bâyezîd II was sultan of Turkey it was possible to temporize; but when his warlike and ambitious son Selîm I succeeded, in 1512, the long-impending catastrophe could no longer be averted. After the defeat of Ismâ'îl, the first shâh of the new Şafavîd dynasty of Persia, at the battle of Chaldiran in 1514, Selîm turned southwards towards Syria and Egypt.

He seized the border state of Dhûl-Ḳadr, then tributary to Egypt, and sent its ruler's head to Cairo, although Egypt and Turkey were still at peace with one another. The annexation of Diyâr-Bekr brought the 'Othmânîls into close contact with the Egyptian frontiers in Syria and on the Euphrates, and Selîm continued to mass troops on the border. His grievances against Ghûrî were trifling: the sultan of Egypt had allowed the enemies of Turkey and even fugitive princes of the 'Othmânî house to pass through or take
refuge in his territories; he was believed to be in secret communication with shāh Ismā'īl of Persia; he had not commanded his vassal of Dhū-l-Ḳadr to support the Turks in their campaign against the Persians. But Selim was not the man to wait for a fair casus belli: he had resolved to conquer Egypt, and no question of right would stand in his way.

Kānsūh el-Ghūrī had missed his opportunity: he should have joined forces with shāh Ismā'īl in 1514, when the battle of Khaldirān might have had a different issue. He was over seventy years old, however, and his energies were failing. In May, 1516, too late, he left Cairo at the head of his army. Of the twenty-six colonels (or emirs of 1000) of the Egyptian establishment, fifteen accompanied him to Syria, and the number of his personal following of mamlūks is variously estimated at 5000 to 14,000 horsemen. What was the total force under his command is not recorded, but it included the levies of Egypt and Syria and the Bedawī tribes. In June he made a triumphal entry into Damascus, and thence marched north to Aleppo. He received two embassies from Selim, assuring him of his goodwill and repeating that the Turks were mustering against Persia, not against Egypt; but Ghūrī was not convinced, and when an embassy he sent to Selim in reply was grossly and contemptuously outraged by the Turkish sultan, there was no longer any room for doubt as to his intentions. The two armies met on the plain called Marg Dābīk, a little north of Aleppo, on Sunday, the 24th of August, 1516, and despite the bravery of the mamlūks, the Egyptian army suffered a total defeat: the superior numbers and the artillery of the Turks, aided by the jealousy of some of the troops, and the treachery of
Kheyr Beg, who had been won over by Selim and now deserted with the left wing of the army, after spreading a rumour that Ghûrî was killed, completely routed the Egyptians, and they fled from the field. Their sultan was indeed dead, and they had no leader.

In Cairo, Tûmân-Bey, the viceroy, a slave of Ghûrî's was elected sultan as soon as the news was known of his master's death. He accepted the office with reluctance, and only after the sheykh Abû-Su'ûd had pledged the emirs to absolute loyalty. A letter from Selim arrived, proposing to recognize him as viceroy of Egypt, if he would acknowledge the sultan of Turkey on the coinage and in the prayers. Tûmân-Bey was not indisposed to accept these terms, but the mamlûk emîrs compelled him to refuse, and the Turkish envoys were killed. There is no doubt that the mass of the Egyptians regarded the Ottoman conquest as a certainty not to be resisted. The Turks were soon upon them. On 22 Jan. they defeated the Egyptian army outside Cairo, and on the next day Selim was prayed for in all the mosques of Cairo. On the 26th, Selim himself entered Cairo in

Fig. 97.—Bâhi-el-Azab, Gate of the Citadel of Cairo, 18th century.
state, accompanied by the captive caliph. The brief resistance of the mamlûks was overcome; and Tûman-Bey was betrayed, and hanged at the Zawila gate (14 April). The caliph Mutawakkil, last of the 'Abbâsid caliphs of Egypt, was carried off to Constantinople and imprisoned; but after the death of Selim (Sept., 1520), Suleymân the Great set the caliph free and allowed him to return to Cairo soon afterwards, where he died in 1538, after bequeathing his title and rights to the sultan of Turkey. The legality of the inheritance is repudiated, not only by the Shi'a, but by the majority of learned Sunnis, who are aware that a caliph must belong to the Prophet's tribe of Kureysh; but whatever they may be de jure, the sultans of Turkey have been de facto caliphs of the greater part of orthodox Islam ever since the death of Mutawakkil.

After the 'Othmânî conquest, Egypt sank into the position of a mere province of the Turkish empire, and was separated from the neighbouring provinces of Syria and Arabia. The traitor Kheyr Bek was the first governor under the new régime. But the power of the mamlûks was not extinguished, and as time went on the authority of the Turkish pasha, supported by his janizaries, shrunk before the reviving strength of the mamlûks, headed by their chief emir, who was known as the sheykh-el-beled, or mayor. One of the sheyks, 'Ali Bey, in the eighteenth century, supported by a large force of valiant mamlûks, and by the sympathy of the population, expelled the Turkish pasha, proclaimed the independence of Egypt (1768), subdued part of Arabia, and attempted to annex Syria. He was, however, betrayed, defeated,
and killed by his favoured general Moḥammad Abū-Dhahab (1772). The leading mamlūks fought over the government of Egypt, subject, more or less, to the Porte, until Napoleon's invasion and victory at the battle of Embāba or "the Pyramids" (July 21, 1798)

Fig. 99.—Vigirmlik of ʿAlī Bey, Miṣr, 1769.

converted Egypt for three years into a province of France. The British naval victory of the Nile, fought in the bay of Abū-kīr (Aug. 1, 1798) and the battle of

Fig. 100.—The Citadel of Cairo in 1859.
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Alexandria (March 21, 1801), forced the French to evacuate the country (Sept.), and the authority of the Porte was restored. The perpetual jealousies of the mamlûks and their contests with the Turkish pasha were brought to an end when Muhammad 'Ali expelled the pasha (1805), massacred the leading mamlûks (1805 and 1811), and established the dynasty of viceroys or khedives which is still upon the throne of Egypt.