



BRILL

The Titulature of the Early Ghaznavids

Author(s): C. E. Bosworth

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Oriens*, Vol. 15 (Dec. 31, 1962), pp. 210-233

Published by: [BRILL](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1579847>

Accessed: 21/12/2012 04:31

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

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



BRILL is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Oriens*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE TITULATURE OF THE EARLY GHAZNAVIDS

by

C. E. Bosworth

St. Andrews, Scotland

I

During the course of the 4th/10th century, honorific titles became widespread in the Islamic world, not merely for independent rulers, but also for provincial governors and military commanders, and finally, for the civilian officials of the *dīwāns*. Previously, the principal honorifics known in Islam had been those adopted on their accessions by the Abbasid Caliphs, titles which usually expressed either dependence on God or else the desire for divine aid in the businesses of ruling or of war; see the interesting study of A. Abel, *Le Khalife, présence sacrée*, *Studia Islamica*, VII (1957), 29-45, in which he traces the changing pattern of Abbasid titulature as it was faced with the threats of the Ismā'īlis and Fāṭimids. J. H. Kramers made an important study of those titles which were compounded with the element *dīn* "religion". He noted that they were especially popular in eastern Islam; that the word *dīn* is connected with Middle Persian *dēn* and ultimately, with Old Persian *daēnā* "religion"; and that the twin concept of *daula* "secular power" is also linked with the exalted ideas of kingship prevalent in ancient Persia. (Kramers, *Les noms musulmans composés avec dīn* 53-4, 56-61).¹

Kramers' list here of 94 titles, drawn mainly from the period up to the 7th/12th century, has now been added to by A. Dietrich, *Zu den mit ad-dīn zusammengesetzten islamischen Personennamen*, *ZDMG*, CX (1960), 43-54, who brings 92 further titles, mainly from the period after the 7th century. See also the recent general work of Ḥasan al-Bāshā, *al-Alqāb al-islāmiyya fī t-ta'riḫ wa'l-wathā'iq wa'l-āthār*, who gives an historical survey of Islamic titulature (with particular reference to the dynasties which reigned in Egypt) and then (Part II, 118-544) an analytical list of honorific titles and forms of address.

It is therefore tempting to see the frequent adoption in the 10th century of these honorific titles as a recrudescence of older Iranian ceremonial and titulary practices. In these last, a theocratic view of the God-Empe-

¹ Those works most frequently cited are usually referred to by author and/or title alone, or by abbreviations. Full bibliographical details will be found at the end of the article.

ror's power was expressed, and many of the Islamic titles likewise give their holders cosmic rôles in upholding the common fabric of religion and empire. The Sasanids had a wide variety of titles which they bestowed on particular classes of society, e.g. on those of the military commanders and the Zoroastrian priesthood. Christensen quotes Sir Aurel Stein that the title *dār-andarzbād* "counsellor, organiser of the court" designated in the 5th century the Emperor's chief minister, and he points out that this title is analogous to the Islamic ones given to Viziers (*L'Iran sous les Sassanides*² [Copenhagen 1944] 400 ff., 409-11; see also G. Widengren, *The sacral kingship of Iran*, in *La regalità sacra* [Supplement to Numen, Leiden 1959] 249-50). Moreover, it was the Dailamī dynasty of the Buyids who played a prominent part in the process of the adoption of honorific titles, assuming ones which were highly reminiscent of Sasanid usage like *Shāhanshāh* "Emperor of emperors" and *Malik al-mulūk* "King of kings". The former title became so intimately connected with the Buyids that Baihaqī often refers to the dynasty as *Shāhanshāhiyān* (Baih. 41, 400, 438). The Buyid family were in origin military adventurers from the geographically inaccessible and culturally backward Caspian highlands, where Islam had only recently penetrated and where Zoroastrianism and other pre-Islamic beliefs lingered on; and the Buyid period has been seen in the general context of eastern Islamic history as one in which older Iranian ways enjoyed a certain resurgence. In particular, V. Minorsky has stressed the "Dailamī interlude" in Iranian history as a distinct and important entity and as a period meriting sympathetic study.

For eastern Islam, the Abbasid Caliph in Baghdad was the prime fount of honours and titles. These were granted in return for presents of cash and luxury articles, and such payments came in time to be regulated according to a definite tariff. There is a discussion in Baihaqī 293 on what was the customary rate (*rasm*) for the presents to be sent to the new Caliph al-Qā'im on his accession in 422/1031; on this occasion, Mas'ūd of Ghazna expected in return Caliphal confirmation of the lands which he held. During the 10th century, and under the tutelage first of their Turkish slave generals and then of the Buyid Amīrs, the Abbasids were reduced to the position of *fainéants*, deriving what regular income they had in the form of grants from the Amīrs, who were nominally their subjects but in fact their masters. The degradation of the Caliphate is a constant theme of contemporary writers, and Abū Dulaf Mis'ar b. Muhallhil in his famous *qaṣīda as-Sāsāniyya* humorously enumerates the Caliph al-Muṭi' (334-63/946-74) as one of the fellowship of professional beggars (*mukaddūn*):

“Another of our members is the mainstay of religion, al-Muṭī‘, whose fame is well-known;

He begs his bread in periodic instalments from Mu‘izz ad-Daula”

(Tha‘ālibī, *Yatīma*, III, 357, 371; Mez, *Renaissance* 135-6).

Why were these titles so keenly desired? The wish to appear important in the eyes of one’s fellow-men is a universal one, and Qalqashandī traces the use of *laqabs* back to Abraham, the “Friend of God”, and the Patriarchs (*Ṣubḥ*, V, 440); but in the mediaeval Orient, in particular, the standing of a man (unless he were known to be an ascetic or Ṣūfī) was in large part judged by his outward appearance and dress, by the deference which had to be shown in addressing him and by the closeness of his relationship to higher authority. The possession of robes of honour, sonorous titles and other insignia of office or military rank became, to use a contemporary expression, status symbols, outward and visible signs of a man’s value to the state and society. These attitudes have persisted down to our own times. An English traveller in the Nishapur district towards the end of the last century relates an amusing incident in which he was asked by the headman of a village publicly and ostentatiously to present him with a robe of honour; the headman himself supplied the robe, and the whole pantomime was meant to increase his esteem in the eyes of the villagers (C. E. Yate, *Khurasan and Sistan* [Edinburgh 1900] 415). In the mediaeval Islamic east, the emphasis on publicising oneself and one’s rank clearly goes back to the Byzantine and Sasanid empires which had ruled over the region in earlier centuries, and in which ceremonial and the sense of social hierarchy had been strongly developed; and in the Islamic period, the use of *laqabs* was consciously linked with the Persianised east, as the term *al-alqāb al-mashriqiyya*, used in disparaging reference to them by Maghribī writers, shows (Goldziher, ‘*Alī b. Mejmūn al-Mağribī und sein Sittenspiegel des östlichen Islam. Ein Beitrag zur Culturgeschichte*, ZDMG, XXVIII [1874], 306-10). Thus subjects sought after respect and deference by acquiring titles, and rulers sought similarly to boost their reputations and to share indirectly in the religious and moral influence of the Abbasid Caliphs.

For the religious prestige and charismatic power of the Caliphs of Baghdad was still great, despite their reduced material circumstances. The importance of the cachet of orthodox, Sunnī approval even influenced the Buyids in their keenness to acquire their titles from the Caliphs, despite the fact that they themselves were Shī‘īs. Certainly, they were usually careful not to go too far in offending the Abbasids’ sentiments; they were, for instance, careful to place the Caliphs’ names on their coinage, and avoided putting on it the common Shī‘ī formula “‘Alī is

the Friend of God" (*‘Alī Walī Allāh*). Powers newly-established on the fringes of the Islamic world, such as the Turkish Qaraxanids and Seljuqs, were also desirous of opening relations with Baghdad as soon as possible (see below, 222, 227). However, the spiritual claims of the Shī‘ī Fāṭimids, who from the time of the Mahdī ‘Ubaidallāh (d. 322/934) had arrogated to themselves the title of Caliph and whose court in Cairo came to eclipse in splendour that of Baghdad, cast a shadow over the religious authority of the Abbasids. The power of the Fāṭimids challenged that of the Abbasids in the realm of the granting of titles and honours, for the former also granted them to their clients, and it was possible for the Arab rulers of northern Syria, the Caṣīra and the Arabian peninsula, strategically placed as they were between the two spheres of influence, to play off the two sides in their demands for honours and consideration.

All these factors explain the urge for titles visible during the 10th century and after, and show how they inevitably became cheapened. The poet Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-‘Abbās al-Xwārizmī says in a satire:

“What do I care that the Abbasids have thrown open the gates of *kunyas* and *laqabs*?

They have conferred honorifics on a man whom their ancestors would not have made doorkeepers of their privy.

This Caliph of ours has few dirhams in his hands, so he lavishes *laqabs* on people”

(Tha‘ālibī, *Yatīma*, IV, 130 = Mez, *Renaissance* 87). At the opening of the 11th century, Birūnī moralisingly observed in his *Āthār al-bāqīya* that when the Abbasids started indiscriminately rewarding courtiers, friends and enemies with vain *daula* titles, extending even to triple ones, their empire perished: “In this way, the matter became utterly opposed to common sense and clumsy to the highest degree, so that he who mentions them gets tired before he has scarcely commenced, he who writes them loses his time and writing, and he who addresses them runs the risk of missing the time for prayer” (*Chronology* 129). Hilāl aṣ-Ṣābi’ has a long passage in his *Kitāb al-Wuzarā’* (Cairo 1958) 166-74, in which he denounces the proliferation of titles and pompous forms of address, chiefly on the ground that they cause a blurring of social distinctions: “Since they became equalled out and levelled down, ranks and degrees have inevitably become debased”. He goes on to say that the Caliph al-Qā‘im complained that there was no rank or designation left which could be given to a deserving person (*lam tabqa rutba li-mustahiqq*) (*ibid.* 169). By the end of the century, the process of debasement was complete, and the resulting worthlessness of titles is described scathingly by Nizām al-Mulk: “Nowadays, the meanest person has ten titles, and

if any one of them is missed out in addressing him, he becomes angry and abusive" (*Siyāsat-nāma* 158).

II

The Samanids of Transoxania and Xurasan, whose practices the Ghaznavids followed in many ways, observed the older custom and were abstemious in the use of titles. Normally, the Amīrs were addressed simply by their *kunyas* during their lifetimes, and after their deaths they were referred to by an epithet like *as-Sa'īd* "the Fortunate one" or *ar-Riḍā* "the Well-pleasing one". However, numismatic evidence suggests that other epithets may have been used by the Amīrs during their own lifetimes, if only perhaps for the *sikka*: on coins of Nūḥ b. Naṣr, after death called *al-Ḥamīd*, appears the legend *al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad*; on those of 'Abd al-Malik b. Nūḥ, after death called *al-Mu'ayyad*, that of *al-Malik al-Muwaffaq*; on those of Maṣṣūr b. Nūḥ, after death called *as-Sadīd*, those of *al-Malik al-Muzaffar* and *al-Malik al-Mu'azzam*; and on those of Nūḥ b. Maṣṣūr, after death called *ar-Riḍā*, that of *al-Malik al-Maṣṣūr* (Lane Poole, *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 100, 105-6, 109-10, 115-16, Nos. 375, 391-2, 403-4, 407-9, 420, 425; Ḥasan al-Bāshā, *al-Alqāb al-islāmiyya* 497, quoting Dorn, *Inventaire des monnaies des Khalīfes orientaux et de plusieurs autres dynasties* [St. Petersburg 1877] 123, 125). But the only fully-authenticated assumption of a *laqab* by one of the Samanids during his own lifetime was in 390/1000 when the last of the dynasty, the fugitive Ismā'īl b. Nūḥ (d. 395/1005) assumed the title *al-Muntaṣir* ('Utbi, I, 320; Curb. 141; IA [Cairo], VII, 204, year 390 = Tornberg, IX, 111). An authority quoted by Spuler says that the Samanids used the title *Shāhanshāh*, but no verifiable reference is given by this authority (*Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit* 359-60); moreover, Niẓām al-Mulk's assertion that Nūḥ b. Maṣṣūr (366-87/967-97) had this title is unconfirmed by any other literary or any numismatic evidence (*Siyāsat-nāma* 158). The Samanids were in effect independent rulers, although their nominal dependence on the Caliphs was shown in the title *Maulā Amīr al-Mu'minīn* which appears on some of their coins (cf. *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 96, 102, 111, Nos. 352, 379, 411; Oliver, *JRASB* [1886], 129).

Nevertheless, they did award *laqabs* to their generals and governors, acting here as independent sovereigns. Hence of their Turkish military commanders in Xurasan in the second half of the 10th century, we find Abū l-'Abbās Tāsh Ḥācīb with the title *Ḥusām ad-Daula* (frequently found on Samanid coins, e.g. *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 113-14, Nos. 416, 419);

Abū l-Ḥasan Fā'iḳ Xāṣṣa with that of 'Amīd ad-Daula; Abū l-Fawāris Begtuzun with that of *Sinān ad-Daula*; Abū l-Ḥasan Sīmcūrī with that of *Nāṣir ad-Daula*; and his son Abū 'Alī Sīmcūrī with that of 'Imād ad-Daula. The Amīr Nūḥ b. Maṣṣūr also gave the title *Nāṣir ad-Daula* to the commander of the ghāzīs of Buxara, Abū 'Abdallāh b. Ḥafṣ (Bīrūnī, *Chronology* 130; 'Utbī, I, 155, 271; Curb. 79, 121; Gard. 48-9, 53; Sam'ānī, *Ansab* f. 323a; IA [Cairo], VII, 108-9, year 371 = Tornberg, IX, 8-9; Cūzcānī tr. 44-5).

Unfortunately for the Samanids, their Turkish slave generals wished to follow the prevailing trend and acquire more grandiose titles. In 381/991 Abū 'Alī Sīmcūrī made himself master of Xurasan, appropriated all the state revenues there and assumed the lofty designation of *Amīr al-Umarā'*, *al-Mu'ayyad min as-Samā'* "the Divinely-aided Supreme Commander" ('Utbī, I, 155; Curb. 80; Gard. 53. Barthold's statement that it was the Samanid Amīr who granted the titles [*Turkestan* 253] should therefore be corrected; 'Utbī and Gardīzī state clearly that it was self-assumed, *talaqqaba bi-, xwīsh-tan-rā... laqab kard*). Furthermore, in return for help against the Qaraxanid invader Bughra Xān Hārūn or Ḥasan, Abū 'Alī in 992 demanded of Nūḥ b. Maṣṣūr that he be addressed as an equal, by *laqab* and *kunya*, and not as a subordinate, and he also claimed the title of *Maulā* or *Walī* of the Commander of the Faithful. The Amīr was obliged to concede this, although as 'Utbī says, "his only relationship of dependence (*walā'*) was to the Samanids" ('Utbī, I, 173-4; Curb. 86). The local rulers in Čaghāniyān of the Āl-i Muḥtāc were vassals of the Samanids, and the last known ruler of this line, Abū l-Muẓaffar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, had in the early years of the 11th century, when the poet Farruxī was at his court, the honorific *Faxr ad-Daula*; it is unknown whether this title was acquired directly from the Caliphs or whether it was bestowed by one of the last Samanids, the nominal suzerains of the Muḥtācids (Farruxī, *Dīwān* 177, 221; cf. Nīzāmī 'Arūḍī, *Čahār maqāla* 58-65, tr. 39-45, 122-3).

III

The founders of the Ghaznavid kingdom, Abū Maṣṣūr Sebūktigin and his son Abū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd, received their first *laqabs* from their Samanid masters. According to Bīrūnī, *Chronology* 130, Sebūktigin had originally the honorific of *Mu'īn ad-Daula*, but it is not known when this was conferred. The description in Baihaqī 99 of the Ghaznavid kingdom as *Mu'īnī* may be an echo of this. It is not recorded that Alptigin, Sebūktigin's old master, had any *laqabs*, and the one coin of his

whose attribution is certain (cf. Thomas, JRAS [1848], 295 ff.) gives no help here. In 384/994 Sebüktigin and Maḥmūd helped Nūḥ b. Maṣṣūr score a mighty victory over the rebellious generals Abū 'Alī and Fā'iq. As a reward, he gave Sebüktigin the title *Nāṣir ad-Daula* and Maḥmūd that of *Saif ad-Daula* (Bīrūnī, *Chronology* 130; 'Utbī, I, 193; Curb. 93; Gard. 56; IA [Cairo], VII, 164, year 384 = Tornberg, IX, 72; Cūzcānī 8, tr. 75. Baih. 200 places the Amīr's award of the title *Saif ad-Daula* before the battle with Abū 'Alī, at the time when Maḥmūd was entrusted with a military command in Xurasan). The sources differ over the exact form of Sebüktigin's title; in Bīrūnī and Gardizī it appears as *Nāṣir ad-Dīn wa'd-Daula* (and in the much later source of Cūzcānī 8, tr. 75 as *Nāṣir Dīn Allāh*).

Uncertainty such as this is, of course, of frequent occurrence from the 11th century onwards. Often the components *dīn* and *daula* seem interchangeable; the two words may be combined in a title to give a verbal effect of parallelism and alliteration, and in inscriptions, the exact form of a title may be altered to fit the space available or for artistic effect. But the *daula* titles are first in chronological appearance; it is only with the Selcuqs that the *dīn* ones become preponderant, although the Ghaznavids continued, on the whole, to favour the older, *daula* ones (cf. Kramers, *Les noms musulmans composés avec dīn* 59 ff.).

A very early appearance of a *daula* title was when the Caliph al-Muktafi honoured his Vizier Abū l-Ḥusain al-Qāsim b. 'Ubaidallāh with the title *Walī ad-Daula*, and this appears on coins from 291/904. A generation later, in 319/931, al-Muqtadir awarded the title *'Amīd ad-Daula* to Abū l-Ḥusain's son, the Vizier al-Ḥusain b. al-Qāsim, and ordered that he should be addressed by his *kunya* (F. Rosenthal, *ET²* Art. "Dawla"; Miskawih in *Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate*, I, 223, tr. IV, 250).

With regard to Sebüktigin's title, *Nāṣir ad-Daula* is probably the original form, and the *dīn* component may have been added to it in popular usage soon after his death or even during his lifetime. A *marthiya* on Sebüktigin's death by Abū l-Faṭḥ Bustī, quoted by 'Utbī, begins "I said when Nāṣir ad-Dīn wa'd-Daula died, 'May his Lord bestow His favour on him when He raises him to life again!'" ('Utbī, I, 263; Curb. 118; Ibn Xallikān, III, 338). This change in the title, reflecting as it does Sebüktigin's rôle in furthering God's work, may well be an aspect of the cult of him as the *Amīr-i 'Ādil* which sprang up very early (see the anecdotes on his piety and justice in Baih. 202-4, 450-1, and those listed in Niẓāmu'd-Dīn's *Introduction to the Jawāmi'u'l-ḥikāyat* 199). Echoing Sebüktigin's fame as precursor of his son in raiding India, Niẓām al-Mulk gives him the title of *Nāṣir ad-Dīn* and says that it was awarded

to him by the Caliph for his exploits there (*Siyāsat-nāma* 126). Unfortunately, there is no epigraphic evidence on the exact form of the *laqab*. Sebūktigin's tomb at Ghazna has on it a Kufic inscription and its workmanship seems to be contemporary with his death, but only the *kunya* and *ism*, Abū Maṣṣūr Sebūktigin, are given, together with the military title *al-Ḥācīb al-Acall* "Most exalted general", the form of address which he had had as one of the Samanids' commanders (Flury, Syria [1925], 62-5).

We have seen that Maḥmūd himself received the title *Saif ad-Dawla* from Amīr Nūḥ, and this *laqab*, together with his *ism*, the name of the Caliph and that of the Samanid Amīr, appear on the coins minted by him at Nishapur during his governorship of Xurasan. A dirham from Nishapur dated 385/995 attributes to Maḥmūd, if its legend has been read aright, the title *Abū Laca* "Father of refuge", a title otherwise unknown and probably therefore to be considered suspect (Thomas, JRAS [1848], 307, No. 8 = *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 131, No. 458). In 389/999 Maḥmūd turned against the Samanids on the double pretext of avenging the deposed Amīr Abū l-Ḥārith Maṣṣūr b. Nūḥ (387-9/997-9) and of getting the Caliph al-Qādir's name placed in the *xuṭba* in the Samanid territories. The Samanids had refused to recognise the succession in 381/991 of al-Qādir, considering him a mere tool of the Buyids, and had continued to acknowledge his deposed predecessor aṭ-Ṭā'i' (Hilāl aṣ-Ṣābi' in *Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate*, III, 340-5, tr. VI, 365-70). Despite Maḥmūd's arguments in the *fath-nāma* to al-Qādir, he had in fact been quite content to follow the lead of the Samanids in acknowledging aṭ-Ṭā'i' and not al-Qādir; the coins minted by him at Nishapur before 389 all bear at the side of the names of himself and the Samanid Amīr that of aṭ-Ṭā'i' (Thomas, JRAS [1848], 271-2 and 307, No. 8 = *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 131, No. 458; Oliver, JRASB [1886], 134).

But now, in return for his recognition of al-Qādir, Maḥmūd received a charter (*manshūr*) granting him Xurasan, a standard, a splendid robe of honour, and his first titles from Baghdad, those of *Yamīn ad-Dawla* and *Amīn al-Milla*, stressing his rôle as a mainstay of the Caliphate and as a trusty defender of orthodox religion ('Utbī, I, 317; Curb. 138; Gard. 62; Ibn al-Cauzī, VIII, 53, year 421; Ibn Xallikān, III, 337, 339). The title *Yamīn ad-Dawla* became the favoured one for Maḥmūd, very common on his coins and much used by the historians, from 'Utbī onwards, when referring to him. From amongst his *laqabs*, the poets 'Unṣurī and Farruxī use those of *Yamīn ad-Dawla* and *Amīn al-Milla* almost exclusively in their eulogies. Farruxī addresses the Sultan only once by his later title Nizām ad-Dīn (*Dīwān* 33), and may perhaps on

another occasion allude to that of *Kahf ad-Daula wa'l-Islām* (*Dīwān* 172: *Kahf-i Muslimānī*) (see for these later titles, below, 219). *Yamīn ad-Daula* and *Amīn al-Milla* were also used as *laqabs* by at least one later member of the Ghaznavid dynasty, sc. Bahrāmshāh b. Mas'ūd b. Ibrāhīm (512-47/1118-52) (Gulam Mustafa Khan, *A history of Bahram Shah of Ghaznin*, Islamic Culture, XXIII [1949], 79-80).

Gardizī also adds that Maḥmūd obtained the title *Walī Amīr al-Mu'minīn*, and this indeed appears on a coin from Nishapur dated 389 (Aḥmed Tevḥīd, *Mūze-yi Hümāyūn, Meskūkāt-i qadīme-yi islāmiyye-yi qataloghū*, IV [Istanbul 1321/1903-4], 42, No. 70). This formula, with either the element *Walī* or *Maulā*, had already been used by the Samanids and by Maḥmūd's rivals in the dismemberment of the Samanid empire, the Qaraxanids (see above, 214, and below, 222). An anecdote given by 'Aufī purports to tell how Maḥmūd disliked being addressed from Baghdad as *Maulā Amīr al-Mu'minīn* (taking *Maulā* here in its sense of "client, dependent"), and so got the first element changed to *Walī* ("confidant, close friend"). What looks like a variant of the story appears in Daulatshāh, who quotes from the *Tāc al-futūḥ* (of 'Unṣurī? Cf. Nāzim, *Sultān Maḥmūd* 1). In this version, the Caliph offers the title *Walī Amīr al-Mu'minīn*, but Maḥmūd considers this to be ambiguous and wants it changed to *Walī Amīr al-Mu'minīn* "Governor on behalf of the Commander of the Faithful" ('Aufī 269-70 = Nizāmu'd-Dīn, *Introduction* 181; Daulatshāh, *Tadhkirat ash-shu'arā*, ed. M. 'Abbāsī [Tehran 1337/1958], 40). Daulatshāh's story has more circumstantial detail than 'Aufī's, e.g. that Maḥmūd's envoy to Baghdad was the author Abū Maṣṣūr Tha'ālibī, and that the Caliph was reluctant to grant the Sultan any titles because the latter was a mere *banda-zāda*; nevertheless, these stories must be treated as apocryphal, since no definitely contemporary sources mention the incident. Nor can such exact shades of meaning be read into the 11th century usage of these various derivatives of the root *walā*. Certainly, contemporary usage of *Maulā* shows that it frequently implied mastery and grandeur, and it is, for instance, used with this denotation in the titlature of Maḥmūd's coeval, the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Ḥākim (Ḥasan al-Bāshā, *al-Alqāb al-islāmiyya* 208-11, 516-22). However, because of its ambiguity, Qalqashandī recommends that the term *Maulā* is best avoided in correspondence (*Ṣubḥ*, VI, 31-2).

Further titles expressing Maḥmūd's zeal in the cause of orthodox religion, those of *Nizām ad-Dīn* and *Nāṣir al-Ḥaqq*, came to him from Baghdad in 403/1012-13 after the execution at Bust of the unfortunate Fāṭimid *dā'i* Tāhartī (Ibn al-Cauzī, VIII, 53, year 421; IA [Cairo], VII, 271, year 404 = Tornberg, IX, 171; Cūzcānī 8, tr. 75. On the case of

Tāhartī, see Bosworth, *The rise of the Karāmiyyah in Khurasan*, MW, L [1960], 10-11). In 417/1026 Maḥmūd made his famous expedition against the idol-temple of Somnath, and was rewarded by the Caliph with fresh honours. He himself received at Balx the title *Kahf ad-Daula wa'l-Islām* (Baih. 49 gives this as *Kahf al-Islām wa'l-Muslimīn*); his son Mas'ūd, those of *Shihāb ad-Daula* and *Camāl al-Milla*; his other son, Muḥammad, those of *Calāl ad-Daula* and *Camāl al-Milla*; and his brother Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf b. Sebūktigin, those of *'Aḍud ad-Daula* and *Mu'ayyid al-Milla*. In this way each one of them had mentioned in his titles both the dynasty's secular power and also its support to the faith. In addition, the Caliph sent the Sultan a charter confirming his possession of Xurasan, India, Nīmrūz (sc. Sistan) and Xwārizm, and promised to agree to the nomination of whichever heir Maḥmūd should chose (Gard. 87-8).

In later times, Maḥmūd was referred to as the great Ghāzī or warrior for the faith *par excellence*; but the evidence of contemporary official documents and of numismatics shows that *Ghāzī* was not used as an official title during his own lifetime, even though it is to a moderate extent applied to the Sultan by his panegyrists 'Unṣurī (*Dīwān* 2, 160) and Farruxī (*Dīwān* 30, 46, 149, 207, 394). The old Iranian title *Shāh-anshāh* appears in Maḥmūd's reign, but again, only in eulogistic, poetical usage as a general, regal term. Farruxī applies it not merely to Maḥmūd but also to his brother Yūsuf b. Sebūktigin; when Manūčihri describes Mas'ūd b. Maḥmūd as *Shāhanshāh-i 'Irāq*, he seems to be employing the phrase to combat Buyid pretensions in western Persia ('Unṣurī, *Dīwān* 82, 96; Farruxī, *Dīwān* 2, 13, 93, 209, 258, 307, 419; Manūčihri, *Dīwān* 20, 69, tr. 170, 204). It may be briefly noted that the designation *al-Malik al-Manṣūr* appears on a *fals* of Maḥmūd minted in the region of Ghazna in 405/1014-15; this seems to be an isolated imitation of Samanid practice (see above 6), and the designation was not, so far as is known, used for any other purpose (Thomas, JRAS [1848], 333, No. 54 [incompletely described] = *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 152, No. 515).

It is perhaps appropriate to mention here that the regal inscription on the so-called "Tower of Maḥmūd" near Ghazna may no longer be adduced as evidence for Maḥmūd's titles. This inscription was first examined by the British officer J. A. Rawlinson during the First Afghan War of 1839 and published in JRASB, XII (1843), 77. Succeeding generations of scholars have depended on the transcription given there, together with the corrections of Flury in Syria (1925), 65-8; but recently, Mme. J. Sourdél-Thomine has shown clearly that the tower is to be attributed not to Maḥmūd, but to Yamīn ad-Daula Bahrāmshāh, who ruled a century later (*Deux minarets d'époque seljoukide en Afghanistan*, Syria, XXX [1953], 110-21). Thus the title *Ghāzī al-Maghāzī Amīr al-Mu'minīn*, which appeared on a part of the tower which has since perished, cannot now be attributed to Maḥmūd. As Mme. Sourdél-Thomine points out, *ibid.* 113, n. 3, the formula is incomprehensible and was almost certainly wrongly transcribed.

So far we have touched only on the Islamic titlature of Maḥmūd and his father, for it is upon this that we are best-documented. The Ghaznavids' opulent court life and ceremonial and their encouragement of Islamic learning and literature, shows that they were undoubtedly, in Spuler's phrase, "kulturell iranisiert" (*Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit* III. The culture of the early Ghaznavids is evaluated at length in my doctoral thesis *The transition from Ghaznavid to Seljuq rule in the Islamic East* [Edinburgh 1961, unpublished]). But they were still Turks, and the predominance of Turkish *ghulāms* in the army, especially in the higher ranks, meant that the Sultans still used their ancestral tongue in day-to-day dealings with their Turkish commanders and courtiers. Certainly Mas'ūd, and *a fortiori* his father, always used Turkish when speaking informally to these classes: cf. Baih. 163, 166, where Mas'ūd speaks Turkish to one of his *ghulām* generals in the presence of some Tācīk offenders in order to frighten them, and *ibid.* 450, where Sebūktigin speaks in Turkish when secret communication is required.

Unfortunately, the Islamic sources are rarely explicit about the Turkish side of the Ghaznavid heritage. We know that Maḥmūd was praised by his court poets for his Turkish lineage. Badī' az-Zamān Hamadhānī says:

"The sun of Maḥmūd has overshadowed the stars of Sāmān, And the house of Bahrām has become subject to the son of the Xāqān"

(Tha'ālibī, *Yatīma*, IV, 296, see also Nöldeke, *Über das Kitāb Jamīnī des Abū Naṣr Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Ġabbār al-'Utībī*, SBWAW Phil.-Hist. Cl., XXIII [1857], 83-4). On the other hand, the fictitious genealogy elaborated for the Ghaznavids, probably during the course of the 11th century, links them with the Persian Sasanid past, and not with some ancient, princely family of the Turks, an affiliation which would have been just as easy to make and more plausible (Nazim, *The Pand-Nāmāh of Subuktigin*, JRAS [1933], 609-11, tr. 621-2 = Shabānkāra'ī, *Macma' al-ansāb* ff. 167a-167b; Abū l-Qāsim Muḥammad b. 'Alī 'Imādī, *Ta'rīx-i mucadwal* in Cūzcānī 6, tr. 69-70). That Maḥmūd was addressed as "the Amīr of Xurasan, Maḥmūd Qara Xān" in a letter arriving in 418/1027 from the ruler of Qitā (sc. from the dynasty in China of the West Liao, who appear in Islamic history a century later as the Qara Xiṭāy) is an interesting usage of Turkish *qara* "black" > "powerful" as a designation implying respect and honour, but it cannot, of course, reflect the practice of the Ghaznavids themselves (Gard. 87; Minorsky, *Sharaf al-Zamān Tāhīr Marvazī on China, the Turks and India* [London 1942] 19, 79; cf. O. Pritsak, *Qara, Studie zur türkischen Rechtssymbolik*, in 60. *doğum*

yılı münasebetiyle Zeki Velidi Togan'a armağan [İstanbul 1955] 243). If the early Ghaznavids had been in the habit of using Turkish titles, it seems unlikely that the Islamic sources would be entirely silent. But the establishment of the dynasty within the borders of the Islamic world as a successor-state to the Samanids, placed the Sultans on a different footing from the Qaraxanid rulers, who remained in closer contact with the Central Asian steppes. Thus there was amongst the Ghaznavids no double system of Turkish and Islamic titlature, the system which, as Pritsak's researches have shown, existed among the Qaraxanids.

Considering the extent of Maḥmūd's achievement, the titles of which he disposed at the end of a reign of some thirty years were modest, especially when compared with those of his squabbling and often mutually hostile Buyid rivals, who felt the need to buttress their power with grandiose official titles like *Malik al-Umam* "King of the nations" and *Shāhanshāh*. It seems, indeed, that the desire for these titles and for the prestige which they gave varied inversely with the effective power of the holders.

The title *Shāhanshāh* was applied to 'Aḍud ad-Daula as early as 363/973-4 (Ḥasan al-Bāshā, *al-Alqāb al-Islāmiyya* 353, quoting the RCEA, V, No. 1831), and it is found on the coins of Rukn ad-Daula in 374/984-5 (Zambaur, WNZ [1904], 86-7, Nos. 104-6). Titles of this type were, however, considered by the theologians as objectionable (cf. Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ*, VI, 16-17 with supporting ḥadīths). When in 423/1032 the ruler of Fārs and Xūzistān, Abū Kālicār b. Sulṭān ad-Daula, sought to assume the titles *as-Sulṭān al-Mu'azzam* and *Malik al-Umam*, it was protested that such titles belonged to the Caliph alone, and the second one had to be toned down to *Malik ad-Daula*; five years later, the assumption by the Amīr of Baghdad, Calāl ad-Daula, of the titles *Shāhanshāh al-A'zam* and *Malik al-Mulūk* also met opposition (Ibn al-Cauzī, VIII, 65, 97-8, years 423, 429; IA [Cairo], VIII, 16, year 429, cf. 48, year 440 = Tornberg, IX, 312-13, cf. 374; H. F. Amedroz, *The assumption of the title Shāhanshāh by Buwayhid rulers*, Num. Chron. 4th Series, V [1905], 393-9, using Sibṭ b. al-Cauzī and Dhahabī; Mez, *Renaissance* 135-6).

Because of Maḥmūd's moderation in regard to titles, it is unlikely that the anecdote given by Nizām al-Mulk, repeated in briefer form by 'Aufi, has any historical foundation. In it, Maḥmūd complains to the Caliph that he has only one *laqab*, whilst the Qaghan of the Qaraxanids has been given three; but the Caliph will not give the Sultan anything more than a grudging second title. His defence is that the Qaghan is an ignorant and unlettered Turk, and so needs these factitious adornments (*Siyāsat-nāma* 153-8; 'Aufi 270-1 = Nizāmu'd-Dīn, *Introduction* 181). It seems undoubtedly true that the Caliph was somewhat abstemious in granting Maḥmūd *laqabs*, even if he was not as niggardly as the above tale suggests. Some explanation for this may lie in the facts just indicated, that Maḥmūd's power was too real to require being propped up by a long

string of titles. This is what Farruxī asserts in a *qaṣīda* addressed to Maḥmūd:

“Your name drives out and overshadows the names of all other kings; after this, the *Shāh-nāma* loses its supremacy.

O noble one, Lord, you have no need for any *laqab*; your own name is greater and more exalted than three hundred *laqabs*.

Wherever one speaks the name “Maḥmūd”, people know who is meant, because of the immense scope of your activity and the nobleness of your deeds.

I am convinced that there cannot be any *laqab* better than the name “Maḥmūd”; this saying is self-evident and well-known to every person.

Your name is linked with your own nature and your nature is bound up with your name; bravo for a name and a nature coupled together and pregnant with meaning!

There is no doubt that the glory which every [ordinary] monarch derives from his *laqab* would appear mere dishonour to you”

(*Dīwān* 81-2). Moreover, the Caliphs were under close Buyid surveillance and had to be circumspect in their dealings with the Buyids’ rivals, the Ghaznavids. Yet the basic reason seems to be that the early Ghaznavids were continuing, as in many other things, the tradition of the Samanids, and were content with modest titles.

The Qaraxanid Qaghan who first moved against the Samanid empire, Bughra Xan Hārūn or Ḥasan (d. 382/992), seems to have assumed his titles of *Shihāb ad-Dawla* and *Zahīr ad-Da‘wa* of his own accord; such is the assumption in Bīrūnī, *Chronology* 131, cf. Pritsak, *Von den Karluh zu den Karachaniden*, ZDMG, CI (1951), 297-8. Soon afterwards, other members of the Qaraxanid dynasty are found with a profusion of *laqabs* which may have derived from the Caliph or may again have been self-assumed. R. Vasmer attempted to sort out the multiplicity of titles found on the coins of the early Qaraxanids in his article *Zur Münzkunde der Qarāḥāniden*, MSOS, XXXIII (1930), Westasiatische Studien 83-104. From as early as 390/1000 the family’s coinage bears the name of the Caliph al-Qādir and the legend *Mawlā Amīr al-Mu‘minīn* (Barthold, *Turkestan* 271-2; Pritsak, *Die Karachaniden*, *Der Islam*, XXXI [1953-4], 27).

Finally, in regard to Maḥmūd’s titles, we may mention the question of the title *Sultān*. Barthold, *Turkestan* 271, and Kramers, *EI*¹ Art. “Sultān”, decisively refuted the assertion of several sources (e.g. IA [Cairo], VII, 184, year 387 = Tornberg, IX, 92, and Cūzcanī 8-9, tr. 75-6, none of these, however, being contemporary) that Maḥmūd was the first ruler in Islam to style himself thus, and showed that *Sultān* was already used in the 10th century for even petty, local rulers. According to Qalqashandī, the first award of the title *Sultān*, which he says is one of the *laqabs* of the military, was to the Vizier Xālid b. Barmak by Hārūn ar-Rashīd (*Ṣubḥ*, V, 447-8). Of the contemporary Ghaznavid sources, ‘Utbi frequently refers to Maḥmūd as “the Sultan”, but this does not imply that this was an official designation; he also uses other

inflated phrases for Maḥmūd, such as *al-Amīr as-Sayyid al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad*, *Malik ash-Sharq bi-Canbaihi* and *Malik ash-Sharq wa-Sayyid al-Gharb wa-Ḥuḥḥat Allāh fī l-Ard*, which were not official titles in the sense that the *laqabs* from the Caliph were ('Utbi, I, 31, II, 355). In parallel with the title *Malik ash-Sharq* it is notable that *Xusrau-yi Mashriq* is a favourite title for Maḥmūd with the poets. In Baihaqī the title *Sultān* is frequently used in referring to the ruler, and extended forms like *Sultān-i A'zam*, *Sultān-i Buzurg* or *as-Sultān al-Mu'azzam* are used, for example, in the headings of official documents and treaties dating from 1029-30 and 1035, which Baihaqī quotes verbatim (2, 127, 138, 470; these phrases are often also linked with the designation *Walī an-Ni'am*). But for ordinary court and familiar usage he normally speaks of "the Amīr". In his section on the Ghaznavids, Gardīzī invariably uses the title *Amīr* when referring to Maḥmūd and other members of the royal family, and this title is generally reserved for them alone; the generals and commanders are simply called *Hācib*, except that Maḥmūd's favourite Ayāz b. Aimaq is once called *Amīr*, perhaps because of his particularly close relationship to the family. The sole time that Gardīzī uses the title *Sultān* is when he refers to the reigning sovereign, under whom he was writing, as *Sultān-i Mu'azzam* 'Abd ar-Rashīd; this is also how Baihaqī refers to the reigning monarchs, Farruxzād and Ibrāhīm b. Mas'ūd (Gard., 61, 93; Baih. 110, 114, 136, 178, 378, 380 and *passim*). The poets use the title *Sultān* incessantly, but in their verses it is merely one amongst other regal titles employed, like *Xudāvand*, *Xusrau* and *Shāhanshāh*.

The official adoption of the title *Sultān* may well have been prompted by the extensive use which the Selcuq Sultans made of it from 1038 onwards (see below 226 f.). The evidence from Ghaznavid coins confirms that the title did not achieve full official status till the middle of the 11th century. Thomas, JRAS (1848), 343 lists a *fals* with the name "Mas'ūd" and the titles *as-Sultān al-Mu'azzam Malik al-'Ālam*, but the coin is worn and dateless and should probably be ascribed to Mas'ūd III b. Ibrāhīm (492-508/1099-1114). According to Zambaur, WNZ (1914), 130-1, No. 454, the word appears on a coin as early as Mas'ūd's reign (421-33/1030-41), but I cannot, as does Zambaur, accept this as evidence for the early appearance of the title. The coin itself has no decipherable date or mint, and on the reverse, Mas'ūd's *kunya* Abū Sa'īd and the single *laqab* *Nāṣir Dīn Allāh* appear, but not his *ism*. The word *sultān* (without the definite article) appears on the obverse above the *tauḥīd*. Surely this should be taken not as a title, but as the original sense of the word, the abstract "power, authority"? In its position on the coin

it forms an exact parallel with the term 'izz "might" on a dirham of Maḥmūd, that of *zafīr* "victory" on a dinar of Mas'ūd, and the very common 'adl "justice" which appears, for instance, on several of Zambaur's dirhams of Maḥmūd and Mas'ūd (*B. M. Catalogue*, II, 156, No. 521; *Khedivial Library Catalogue* 333; Zambaur, WNZ [1914], 128-30, Nos. 440-5, 447, 450, 453). The earliest coin known to bear the legend *as-Sultān al-Mu'azzam* as an official title is one of Farruxzād in the Hermitage Museum at Leningrad; in the early part of the next reign, that of Ibrāhīm b. Mas'ūd, the title becomes standard (Sourdel, *Inventaire* xiii-xiv, citing Markov, *Inventory-catalogue of the Muslim coins in the Imperial Hermitage* [St. Petersburg 1896-8, in Russian] 189, No. 38).

On Maḥmūd's death in Ghazna in 421/1030, the throne passed for a few months to the less experienced and effective of his two sons, Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad. In addition to the two *laqabs* which he had received from the Caliph in 1026 (see above 218), Muḥammad is given by the *Mucmal at-tawārīx*, Mustaufī and Saif ad-Dīn Faḍlī the further one of 'Imād ad-Daula (*Mucmal at-tawārīx* 428; *Guzīda* 402, tr. 80; *Āthār al-wuzarā'* f. 87b). It is uncertain whether this was acquired when Muḥammad first gained the throne or during his second brief Sultanate in 1041 (see below 230), but the latter is perhaps more probable; Farruxī, whose *Dīwān* contains 43 poems dedicated to Muḥammad and who seems himself to have died before Muḥammad's second reign, only applies the *laqabs* of 1026 to Muḥammad. The repetition of the phrase *Qutb-i Ma'ālī* in three of Farruxī's odes to Muḥammad (*Dīwān* 91, 102, 271) may conceivably point to a further *laqab* of his, but no further evidence for this exists. At some equally unknown time, Muḥammad's son Aḥmad received the title *Mu'ayyid ad-Daula* (Cūzcānī 11 n. 2).

In the latter part of 1030, Maḥmūd's other son Abū Sa'īd Mas'ūd came to power. A second *kunya* is attributed to Mas'ūd in a *qaṣīda* of Manū-čihri (*Dīwān* 57, tr. 196), where he describes the Sultan's palace as having "A monarch enthroned in its centre, whose beloved is victory (*zafīr*) and whose *kunya* is Abū l-Muzaffar", but this patronymic is not mentioned elsewhere. Already in 1026 Mas'ūd had received two titles from the Caliph, given by Gardīzī 87 as *Shihāb ad-Daula* and *Camāl al-Milla* (see above 219); in Baihaqī 588 they are given as *Shihāb ad-Daula* and *Qutb al-Milla*. His father's death found Mas'ūd in the far west of the Ghaznavid empire, in the region of western Persia and its cities of Ray, Isfahān and Hamadān, which had just been conquered from the Buyid Macd ad-Daula and the Kākūyid 'Alā' ad-Daula. He hurried eastwards in 1030 and when at Nishapur, received the Caliph's envoy (Gard. 95-6; Baih. 44 ff.). Whilst still at Isfahān, he had written to

Baghdad setting forth his claim to the throne. Now, in return for Mas'ūd's recognition of al-Qādir in the *xuṭba*, the envoy brought rich presents, together with what was to be an important ideological weapon for Mas'ūd's coming struggle with his brother, a resplendent string of fresh *laqabs*. These *nu'ut-i sultāni* are given by Baihaqī as *Nāṣir Dīn Allāh, Ḥāfiẓ 'Ibād* (or *'Ubbād) Allāh, al-Muntaqim min A'dā' Allāh* and *Zahīr xalīfat Allāh Amīr al-Mu'minīn*. Mas'ūd's joy was such that he commanded that these marks of Caliphal favour, which extended to him emphatic recognition as Maḥmūd's true successor, should be extensively publicised in the region of Xurasan and Ṭuxāristān, for he was hoping to win these over to his own allegiance: "The Sultan ordered that despatches should be sent to Herāt, Pūshang, Ṭūs, Saraxs, Nasā, Abīward, Bādghīs and Ganc Rustāq announcing these latest actions on the part of the Caliphate. They put up copies of the patent of investiture and of the Caliph's letter, and set forth the Sultan's *laqabs*, so that the people might address this mighty ruler by them and proclaim them in the *xuṭba*" (Baih. 48-9).

The propaganda value of these titles and the moral advantages of possessing Caliphal favour at critical times such as in this succession dispute, are well demonstrated here, and in this instance Mas'ūd was obviously aware of the advantage which he had gained. Ibn Xallikān, III, 343 also stresses how the Caliph's favour caused people to rally to Mas'ūd's side at the expense of his brother. The news of the Caliph's awards must have travelled eastwards very rapidly, for Farruxī alludes to the *laqabs* and to the Caliph's support for Mas'ūd in an ode which he wrote whilst still at Muḥammad's court in Ghazna, inciting Mas'ūd to return and claim his father's power. He addresses Mas'ūd (who must at the time have been somewhere between Nishapur and Balx) thus (*Dīwān* 302):

Nāṣir-i dīn-i Xudāy u ḥāfiẓ-i xalq-i Xudāy, nā'ib-i paighambar u pusht-i Amīr al-Mu'minīn

"Supporter of God's religion and protector of God's creation, vicegerent of the Prophet and mainstay of the Commander of the Faithful"

All these *laqabs* appear frequently on Mas'ūd's coins: cf. Thomas, JRAS (1848), 335-7, 340-2, Nos. 58-60, 67-73, JRAS (1860), 167-8; B. M. Catalogue, II, 155-7, Nos. 520, 521, 523; *Additions to the Oriental Collection*, I, 219, No. 521^v; Sourdrel, *Inventaire* 52-63. Variants of the title *Nāṣir Dīn Allāh* are given in *Guzīda* 401, tr. 80 (*Nāṣir ad-Daula*) and *Āthār al-wuzarā'* f. 87b (*Nasr ad-Daula*).

A further proof of the importance of these honours in the sphere of diplomacy occurred a year or so later, when the Caliph al-Qādir died and his son al-Qā'im bi-amri'llāh succeeded, and Mas'ūd's allegiance had to be renewed. One of the Sultan's stipulations for this renewal

was that the Caliph should not communicate directly with the Qaraxanids in Transoxania and Eastern Turkestan, and in particular, that new *laqabs* and robes of honour should not be forwarded to them except by the intermediacy of the Ghaznavids (Baih. 291; for a consideration in greater detail of this episode, and on the general topic of the Sultan's relations with the Caliphate, see the author's study, *The Imperial policy of the early Ghaznavids*, in *Islamic Studies*, the Journal of the Central Institute of Islamic Research [Karachi], I/3). At this time, the northern fringes of the Ghaznavid empire along the upper and middle Oxus and in Xwārizm were being strongly coveted by the Qaraxanids. It was therefore the Sultans' policy to keep the two most powerful members of the dynasty, Yūsuf Qadīr Xān of Xotan and Kāshghar (d. 1032) and 'Alī b. Ḥasan Bughra Xān, known as 'Alitigin, of Buxara and Samargand, divided and mutually hostile, and to cut them off from direct contact with and support from the Caliphate (on the relations of the early Ghaznavids and the Qaraxanids, see Barthold, *Turkestan* 263-304 and Nāzim, *Sultān Maḥmūd* 47-56).

After receiving the *laqabs* at Nishapur, Mas'ūd received no further ones from Baghdad; nor does it seem that he ever sought for more, although the accession of al-Qā'im would have been an appropriate time for this. Zambaur, WNZ (1914), 133, No. 458, considered that a dirham dated 423/1032 and minted at Hamadān revealed a new title for Mas'ūd, but his tentative interpretation of a somewhat unclear legend as *al-Ḥāfiẓ Iṭhār Allāh* "le gardien des libéralités de Dieu" is unconvincing; it is safer to treat it as being the well-known *Ḥāfiẓ 'Ibād Allāh*.

In the second half of his reign, Mas'ūd's control over the outlying parts of the empire grew weaker under the attacks of the Qaraxanid Böritigin (the later Tamghač Xān Ibrāhīm, d. 1068), of rebellious vassals in Xwārizm, and above all, of the Oghuz in Xurasan. The power of the Ghaznavids in the west was decisively broken in 1040 by the victory of the Selcuqs at Dandānqān, and there were few successes in Mas'ūd's last years to make him rejoice or seek fresh *laqabs*. The power of the Selcuq family and their nomadic followers was in the ascendant, and the invaders themselves quickly saw the value of Caliphal support. As early as 426/1035, when large Turkmen groups crossed the Oxus into Xurasan, the Selcuq leaders Toghrīl, Čaghri and Mūsā Yabghu styled themselves *Mawālī Amīr al-Mu'minīn*, perhaps not fully aware of the implications involved and yet realising that this claim brought them in some way closer into the world of Sunnī Islam which they were just entering. Furthermore, when Toghrīl first occupied Nishapur in

1038, he assumed the title *as-Sultān al-Mu‘azzam* (which does not, however, appear on his coins till after 438/1046-7, cf. Sourdel, *Inventaire xvi-xvii*), received with respect an envoy from the Caliph and sent back an envoy of his own to Baghdad (Baih. 470; Bundārī, *Zubdat an-nuṣra*, ed. Houtsma in *Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seldjoukides*, II [Leiden 1889], 7-8; IA [Cairo], VIII, 25, year 432 = Tornberg, IX, 328; cf. Cl. Cahen, *Le Malik-Nāmeḥ et l’histoire des origines seljukides*, Oriens, II [1949], 57-9, 62-3). Thus began the rôle of the Selcuqs in Islamic history as liberators of the Caliphs from the Shi‘i Buyids and as the secular arm of the orthodox Sunni revival.

IV

Amongst the Buyids, it was the practice for Viziers and senior officials to have honorifics and titles hardly less exalted than those of the Amirs themselves. Birūnī stigmatises the Buyids’ excesses here as worse than those of the Caliphs whom they imitated, and calls the titles given to Viziers like *Kāfī al-Kufāt*, *al-Kāfī al-Auḥad* and *Auḥad al-Kufāt* as “nothing but one great lie” (*Chronology* 131. Cf. Mez, *Renaissance* 86-8, 96). Especially favoured were bombastic dual titles like *Dhū r-Riyāsatain* and *Dhū l-Kifāyatain*, which imputed to their holders equal prowess in the spheres of Sword and Pen, and those like *Shaix ad-Daulatain* and *Nizām al-Ḥadratain*, applied to officials equally in the confidence of the Buyid Amirs and Abbasid Caliphs.

See on these dual titles, Goldziher, *Ueber Dualtitel*, WZKM, XIII (1899), 321-9 esp. 326-9, French résumé by G.-H. Bousquet, *Études islamologiques d’Ignaz Goldziher. Traduction analytique (III)*, Arabica, VII (1960), 254-5. Titles in *Ḥadratain* became especially common later amongst the Selcuqs, e.g. *Thiqat al-Ḥadratain* for a person in the confidence of both Sultan and Caliph.

The early Ghaznavids scorned such rank verbiage for their servants. Their Viziers were usually referred to simply as *Xwāca* or *Xwāca-yi Buzurg*, and in the time of Maḥmūd and Mas‘ūd, *Xwāca* was regarded as an exalted title; cf. Baihaqī 357, who complains that at the time he was writing (sc. 1059), the title had become disused. The famous Vizier Abū l-Qāsim Aḥmad b. Ḥasan Maimandī (d. 423/1032) was later frequently called *Shams al-Kufāt* because of his administrative and secretarial excellence, just as the equally celebrated Vizier of Faxr ad-Daula, the Ṣāhib Ismā‘īl b. ‘Abbād (d. 385/995) was called *Kāfī al-Kufāt*. The title *Shams al-Kufāt* was certainly coined during Maimandī’s own lifetime, but was used as a purely informal expression of praise and not as an official designation. ‘Utbi, Gardīzī and Baihaqī never attribute it to him,

but usually refer to him simply as *ash-Shaikh al-Calil* or *Xwāca-yi Buzurg*. The honorific *Shams al-Kufāt* is found, as one might expect, in the panegyrics addressed to him by Farruxī (*Dīwān* 24, 155 and *passim*), but not, curiously enough, in those dedicated to him by ‘Unṣurī and Manūčihri. In the eulogies of the latter two poets, no titles more complicated than those of *Xwāca*, *Wazir* and ‘*Amīd* are given to Maimandī and to the successor as Vizier after his death, Aḥmad b. ‘Abd aṣ-Ṣamad. Farruxī also gives the title *Sayyid al-Kufāt* to another of Maḥmūd’s Viziers, Ḥasanak (*Dīwān* 194-5).

Consequently, we do not come across any of the early Ghaznavids’ officials with formal *laqabs* such as their Buyid counterparts possessed. It is not until Maudūd b. Mas‘ūd’s reign that we have what is apparently the first example of an official receiving a *laqab* from the Caliph in Baghdad. One Bū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Ghaffār, a friend and contemporary of the historian Abū l-Faḍl Baihaqī, was much employed on diplomatic missions, and after one of these embassies to the Caliph he was rewarded with the title *Ḥamīd Amīr al-Mu‘minīn* (Baih. 110). In the reign of Ibrāhīm b. Mas‘ūd we hear of a court official, a nephew of Baihaqī’s old master in the *Dīwān-i Rasā’il*, Abū Naṣr-i Mishkān, who was called Thiḡat al-Mulk Ṭāhir b. ‘Alī b. Mishkān; the adoption of such titles in the latter half of the 11th century must be attributed to the influence of Selcuq practice (*Čahār maqāla* 72, tr. 51).

What the early Ghaznavids did do was to single out their great commanders and governors by a form of address (*muxāṭaba*) which conveyed the idea of intimacy with the Sultan or the enjoyment of his trust. This was formally granted to the holder and used in official and personal communication with him. The Xwārizmshāh Altuntash, an old and trusted *ghulām* commander whose service to the Ghaznavids went back to Sebūktigin’s time, was addressed by Mas‘ūd as *Ḥācīb-i Fāḍil*, ‘*Amm* “Excellent Commander, Uncle”. In 1032 Altuntash was killed fighting the Qaraxanid ‘Alitigin, and Mas‘ūd’s young and favourite son Sa‘īd was appointed Xwārizmshāh with Altuntash’s son Hārūn as his deputy (*xalīfat ad-dār*). In the patent of investiture, Sa‘īd was given a *laqab*, but Hārūn got the *muxāṭaba* of *Walad, Mu‘tamad* “Son, Trusted Servant” (Baih. 83, 328, 355).

Viziers and civil officials also got *muxāṭabas* indicating various degrees of honour. For his part in the battle at Dabūsiyya in 1032 against ‘Alitigin, Aḥmad b. ‘Abd aṣ-Ṣamad was granted the *muxāṭaba* of *Shaikh, Mu‘tamad*, and then when he was chosen to succeed Maimandī as Vizier, that of ‘*Amīd* “Mainstay, support” (Baih. 354). This title of ‘*Amīd* was the highest one to which a civil official in the Ghaznavid administration

could attain, being reserved for such personages as the Vizier, the 'Ariḍ, the civil governor of Xurasan and a few others in the top rank of the bureaucracy. It seems originally to derive from Abbasid practice, and often appears as an element in the nomenclature of Buyid officials. From Baghdad it passed into Samanid usage, and Narshaxī mentions the *Diwān* of the 'Amīd al-Mulk as one of the government departments at Buxara in the time of Naṣr b. Aḥmad (301-31/913-43); it seems here to have been the Department of the Chief Secretary, corresponding to the Ghaznavid *Dīwān-i Rasā'il* (Barthold, *Turkestan* 229-30. Schefer's text of Narshaxī is corrupt here; cf. R. N. Frye, *The history of Bukhara* [Cambridge, Mass. 1954] 123-4. On the 'Amīd, see Cahen's article in *EI*²). The term 'Amīd al-Mulk is not attested in the contemporary historical sources on the early Ghaznavids, but Farruxī does use the title for two high officials to whom he addresses *qaṣīdas*, the 'Ariḍs Abū Bakr Qūhis-tānī and Abū Sahl Zauzanī (*Dīwān* 197, 320). The governor of Xurasan, Abū l-Faḍl Sūrī b. Mu'izz, is usually given in Baihaqī the title 'Amīd, and Abū 'Abdallāh Ḥusain Mikālī, who came from the prominent Nishapur Mikālī family of administrators and scholars and who at one time held the *riyāsa* of his home city, is given the title *Xwāca* 'Amīd. When in 1033 Abū Sahl Ḥamdawī (or Ḥamdūnī) was appointed civil governor of Ray and Cibāl, he was given the *muxāṭaba* of *ash-Shaix al-'Amīd*. The Vizier Aḥmad b. 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad was annoyed that this high title should be given to him, but the Sultan explicitly instructed that "the form of address 'Amīd must be employed, because our power is greater than that of the Buyids, and our servant is greater than the Ṣāḥib Ibn 'Abbād" (Baih. 287, 390). It was obviously felt that an official sent to the far west of the Ghaznavid empire should have a designation which would put him at least on the same level as the officials of the neighbouring Buyids.

From citations such as these, we can see the basic simplicity of the practice of the early Ghaznavids in regard to the titles of their officials and governors, as in regard to their own titlature; and this simplicity forms a contrast to the usages of their Buyid contemporaries and Selcuq successors.

The superscription of the letter which the Selcuq leaders wrote in 1035 when they were seeking Mas'ūd's Vizier's intercession, *Ḥaḍrat ash-Shaix ar-Ra'īs al-Calīl as-Sayyid Maulānā* is perhaps a foretaste of the luxuriance of later Selcuq titlature (Baih. 470: note the appearance of the characteristic Selcuq title *Ḥaḍra* "Presence").

V

In amplification of the information on the Ghaznavid dynasty given by Zambaur in his *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire*

de l'Islam (Hanover 1927) 282-3, and by Halil Edhem in his *Düvel-i islâmiye* (İstanbul 1345/1927) 448-54, some further details are given here on the chronology, names and titles of the Sultans up to the reign of Ibrâhîm b. Mas'ûd. Other genealogical tables can be found in Lane Poole, *The Mohammadan dynasties* (London 1893) 285-90; in Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg 1895) 444; and in *Cambridge History of India, III: Turks and Afghans* (Cambridge 1928) 688.

Abū l-Fatḥ Maudūd b. Mas'ûd (432-41/1041-50) succeeded his murdered father and revenged his death by killing his uncle Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, who had been placed on the throne for a brief second reign by Mas'ûd's rebellious generals (Cūzcānī 15, tr. 95 attributes to Maudūd the *kunya* Abū Sa'd [? Sa'îd]; it is possible that he had two *kunyas*, as not infrequently happened). According to Gardizî 110 (cf. *Āthār al-wuzarā'* f. 87b), Maudūd had the *laqabs* *Shihāb ad-Dīn wa'd-Daula* and *Quṭb al-Milla*, and some of Maudūd's coins bring the further titles *Camāl ad-Daula* and *Faxr al-Umma*, with the variant *Quṭb ad-Dīn* for the one given by Gardizî (Thomas, JRAS [1848], 348, No. 87; *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 163-4, Nos. 536-7, 541-2; Sourdél, *Inventaire* 63-5).

Maudūd's son Mas'ûd II, a small child, reigned only for a few days in 441/1050, and then one of Mas'ûd I's sons, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī, ruled for another short period in the same year with the *laqab Bahā' ad-Daula*.

Cūzcānī 16, tr. 99-100 gives a very brief and confused account of the reign of Mas'ûd II and that of his uncle Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī. Their exact lengths and chronology are still uncertain, and no coins from them seem to be extant, at least in the British collections. In the *Mucmal at-tawārīx*'s tables of the Ghaznavid Sultans, 405, 428-9, Mas'ûd II is not mentioned. Ibn Bābā mentions the five-year-old Mas'ûd b. Maudūd as being left in Ghazna as his father's regent whilst Maudūd was away campaigning, and being set aside by Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī. Maudūd's brother 'Abd ar-Rashīd was also involved in these intrigues and was jailed when Maudūd returned and resumed power. But Ibn Bābā goes on to say that Maudūd died, at the age of 29, on Wednesday, 21st Racab 441, and that 'Abd ar-Rashīd ascended the throne on 27th Sha'bān 441 (*K. Ra's mā' an-nadīm* ff. 208a-b). On this reckoning, the ephemeral reigns of Mas'ûd II and Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī must be placed within the five weeks' interval between the two dates (Cūzcānī *loc. cit.* makes the total for the two reigns two months).

The next Sultan, Abū Maṣṣūr 'Abd ar-Rashīd b. Maḥmūd (441-4/1050-3) is given by Gardizî the titles of *Sultān-i Mu'azzam 'Izz ad-Daula wa-Zain al-Milla Saif Allah Mu'izz Dīn Allāh*. Ibn al-Athīr adds those of *Shams Dīn Allāh* and *Saif ad-Daula*, with a reported variant of the latter as *Camāl ad-Daula*; and the *Mucmal at-tawārīx*, Mustaufī and Saif ad-Dīn Faḍlī add that of *Macd ad-Daula* (Gard. 63, who is the authority for the *kunya*; IA [Cairo], VIII, 53, year 441 = Tornberg, IX, 382; Cūzcānī 16, tr. 98; *Mucmal at-tawārīx* 429; *Guzīda* 403; tr. 81;

Āthār al-wuzarā' f. 87b). 'Abd ar-Rashīd's reign was violently terminated in 1053 by the usurpation of a former *ghulām* of Sultan Maḥmūd called Toghrīl, usually given in the sources the epithets *Mal'ūn* "Accursed" or *Kāfir-i ni'mat* "Ungrateful". He massacred the Sultan and several other members of the royal family and ruled in Ghazna for forty days before the legitimate line was restored, the people having refused, it is said, to tolerate the rule of a non-Ghaznavid (*K. Ra's māl an-nadīm* ff. 208b-209a; IA [Cairo], VIII, 61-2, year 444 = Tornberg, IX, 398-401; Cūzcānī 17-18, tr. 99-100). A dirham coined by Toghrīl is extant, the only coin of his which seems to be known; it has no date or mint, but bears the legend "Qiwām ad-Daula Abū Sa'īd Ṭughrīl", showing that the usurper had thought it necessary to assume a *laqab* as one of the appurtenances of kingship (Sourdel, *Inventaire* 67).

Another son of Mas'ūd I now succeeded, Abū Shucā' Farruxzād, who reigned 444-51/1053-9 with the *laqabs* *Camāl ad-Daula* and *Kamāl al-Milla* (*Mucmal at-tawārīx* 429; *Guzīda* 404, tr. 81; *Āthār al-wuzarā'* f. 87b; Thomas, JRAS [1848], 353-7, Nos. 97-107; *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 166-7, Nos. 546-8; Sourdel, *Inventaire* 68). According to the *K. Ra's māl an-nadīm* f. 209b, Farruxzād died on 27th Šafar 451. On his death began the forty years' rule of Abū l-Muzaffar Ibrāhīm b. Mas'ūd I (451-92/1053-99), during which a *modus vivendi* was reached in the west with the Selcuqs and a period of prosperity and peace began for the Ghaznavid empire, now reduced to eastern Afghanistan and northern India. Numismatic and literary sources give his titles as *as-Sultān al-A'zam* (or *al-Mu'aẓẓam*), *Ẓahīr ad-Daula*, *Ẓahīr al-Milla*, *Nāšīr* (or *Našīr*) *ad-Daula*, *Nāšīr* (or *Našīr*) *al-Milla*, *Niẓām ad-Daula*, *Radī ad-Dīn*, *Sayyid as-Salāṭīn*, *Malik al-Islām* and *Qāhīr al-Mulūk*, to which epigraphic evidence from the region of Ghazna adds those of *Mu'ayyid ad-Dīn*, *Mu'īn al-Muslimīn* and *Malik Riqāb al-Umam* (*Mucmal at-tawārīx* 429; *Cūzcānī* 19, tr. 102-3; *Guzīda* 404, tr. 81; *Āthār al-wuzarā'* f. 88a; Thomas, JRAS [1848], 358-66, Nos. 108-32; *B. M. Catalogue*, II, 168-72, Nos. 550-9; *Additions to the Oriental Collection*, I, 239-40, Nos. 558^d, e, f, 560^k; Zambaur, WNZ [1904], 84, No. 93; Flury, Syria [1925], 70-5; Sourdel, *Inventaire* 70-80). The *K. Ra's māl an-nadīm* f. 210a puts Ibrāhīm's death in Dhū l-Qa'da 492. It thus appears that the territorial shrinkage of the Ghaznavid empire was not accompanied by any diminution in the Sultans' claims and titlature; indeed, with the successors of Mas'ūd I, these titles grow richer and more prolific.

A divergent chronology for these later rulers is found in the *Axbār ad-daula as-Salcūqīyya* of Šadr ad-Dīn Ḥusainī, ed. M. Iqbāl (Lahore 1933), 14-15. Maudūd's death is placed in Rabī' II 440/Sept. 1049; no mention is made of Mas'ūd II and

Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī; Toghrīl's usurpation is placed in 442/1050-1, and his assassination and the accession of Farruxzād in Dhū l-Qa'da 443/March 1052; and Farruxzād's death is placed on 16th Safar 451.

Bibliography of works frequently cited in the text

- Anon., *Muḥmal at-tawārīx wa'l-qīṣaṣ*, ed. M. S. Bahār (Tehran 1318/1939)
- Muḥammad 'Aufī, *Cawāmi' al-ḥikāyāt*, partial facs. edn. by M. Ramaḍānī (Tehran 1335/1956)
- Abū l-Faḍl Baihaqī, *Ta'rix-i Mas'ūdi*, ed. Ghanī and Fayyāḍ (Tehran 1324/1945)
- W. Barthold, *Turkistan down to the Mongol invasion*², GMS (London 1928)
- Bīrūnī, *The chronology of ancient nations*, tr. E. Sachau (London 1879)
- Curbādhqānī, *Tarḥma-yi ta'rix-i Yamīnī*, ed. 'Alī Qawīm (Tehran 1334/1956)
- Cūzcānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, ed. W. Nassau Lees (Calcutta 1863), tr. H. G. Raverty (London 1881-99)
- Farruxī, *Dīwān*, ed. 'Alī 'Abd ar-Rasūlī (Tehran 1311/1932)
- S. Flury, *Le décor épigraphique des monuments de Ghazna*, Syria, VI (1925), 61-90
- Gardīzī, *Zain al-axbār*, ed. M. Nazim (Berlin 1928)
- Ḥasan al-Bāshā, *al-Alqāb al-islāmīyya fī t-ta'rix wa'l-wathā'iq wa'l-āthār* (Cairo 1957)
- Hilāl aṣ-Ṣābi', fragment of *History* in *The eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate*, ed. and tr. H. F. Amedroz and D. S. Margoliouth (Oxford 1921-2), Vols. III, VI
- Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī t-tawārīx* (Cairo 1348-53/1929-34), ed. Tornberg (Leiden 1851-76) [cited in text as IA]
- Ibn Bābā al-Qāshānī, *K. Ra's māl an-nadīm*, Istanbul Arabic Ms. Turhan Valide 234; written in the reign of the Caliph al-Muqtafi (530-55/1136-60)
- Ibn al-Cauzi, *al-Muntaẓam fī ta'rix al-mulūk wa'l-umam* (Hyderabad 1357-9/1938-41)
- Ibn Xallikān, *Biographical dictionary*, tr. de Slane (Paris 1842-71)
- J. H. Kramers, *Les noms musulmans composés avec dīn*, AO, V (1927), 53-67
- S. Lane Poole, *Catalogue of oriental coins in the British Museum* (London 1875-83)
- idem, *Additions to the oriental collection*, 1876-88 (London 1889-90)
- idem, *Catalogue of the collection of Arabic coins preserved in the Khedivial library at Cairo* (London 1897)
- Manūčihri, *Dīwān*, ed. and tr. A. de Biberstein Kazimirsky as *Menoutchehri, poète persan du 11^{ème} siècle* (Paris 1886)
- A. Mez, *The renaissance of Islam*, Eng. tr. (Patna 1937)
- Miskawaih, *Tacārib al-umam*, in *The eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate*, Vols. I-II, IV-V
- Mustaufī, *Ta'rix-i guzīda*, GMS facs. (London 1910), abridged tr. E. G. Browne, GMS (London 1913)
- M. Nāẓim, *The life and times of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna* (Cambridge 1931)
- Nīẓām al-Mulḳ, *Siyāsat-nāma*, ed. Qazwīnī and Chahārdihī (Tehran 1334/1956)
- Nīẓāmī 'Arūḍī Samarqandī, *Čahār maqāla*, ed. Qazwīnī and Mu'īn (Tehran 1333/1954), revised tr. Browne, GMS (London 1921)
- M. Nīẓāmu'd-Dīn, *Introduction to the Jawāmi'u'l-Ḥikāyāt of Muḥammad 'Aufī*, GMS (London 1929)
- E. E. Oliver, *The decline of the Sāmānīs and the rise of the Ghaznavīs in Māwarā'un-Nahr and part of Khurāsān (With some unpublished coins)*, JRASB, LV of 1886 (1887), 89-135
- Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-a'shā* (Cairo 1331-40/1913-22)
- Saif ad-Dīn Faḍlī, *Āthār al-wuzarā'*, India Office Persian Ms. 1569; written 883/1478-9
- Sam'ānī, *K. al-Ansāb*, GMS facs. (London 1912)

- Muḥammad b. ‘Alī Shabānkāra’ī, *Maṣma‘ al-ansāb fī t-tawārīx*, Istanbul Persian Ms. Yeni Cami 909; written 743/1342-3
- D. Sourdel, *Inventaire des monnaies musulmanes anciennes du Musée de Caboul* (Damascus 1953)
- B. Spuler, *Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1953)
- Tha‘ālibī, *Yatīmat ad-dahr* (Cairo 1375-7/1956-8)
- E. Thomas, *On the coins of the Kings of Ghazni*, JRAS, IX (1848), 267-386
- idem, *Supplementary contributions to the series of the coins of the Kings of Ghazni*, JRAS, XVII (1860), 138-208
- ‘Unṣurī, *Dīwān*, ed. Yaḥyā Qarīb (Tehran 1323/1944)
- ‘Utbi, *at-Ta’rīx al-Yamīnī*, with Manīnī’s commentary (Cairo 1286/1869)
- E. von Zambaur, *Contributions à la numismatique orientale*, WNZ, XXXVI (1904), 43-122, XXXVII (1905), 113-98
- idem, *Nouvelles contributions à la numismatique orientale*, WNZ, XLVII (1914), 115-90