Between Sunna and Realpolitik: The Concept of Loyalty in the Letters of Rashīd al-Dīn al-Waṭwāṭ

Hu, Yifan

Between *Sunna* and Realpolitik: The Concept of Loyalty in the Letters of Rashīd al-Dīn al-Waṭwāṭ

Research Master Thesis in Middle Eastern Studies

Name: Yifan Hu

Student Number: S2069474

Supervisor: Dr. Peter A. Webb

Word Count: 33764

Table of Contents

Introduction

This thesis is a study on the letters of Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Jalīl al-ʿUmarī, known as Rashīd al-Dīn al-Waṭwāṭ (508/1112 - 573/1177), a high-ranking clerk and the chief *kātib* (scribe official) in the court of Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh dynasty as well as a brilliant poet and litterateur in the 6th/12th century Khwarazm. With his excellent literary ability, al-Waṭwāṭ successively served two Khwārazmshāhs (the title of the Anūshtakīnid rulers, literarily means "the king of Khwarazm"): ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Atsiz (r. 521or 522/1127 - 551/1156)[1], and his son Tāj al-Dīn Īl Arslān b. Atsiz (r. 551/1156 - 157/1172). His letters are collected in various collections and a considerable proportion of his letters were written in the name of Khwārazmshāh and Anūshtakīnid court. As a dedicated official and devout Sunni Muslim, the loyalty, whether between the populace and ruler, between the officials and ruler, or between rulers themselves, is presented as an honorable qualification of social morality, it is also a recurring theme in his letters.

The rulers who al-Waṭwāṭ served, however, had a controversial reputation, especially on the issue of loyalty. Most Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs are remembered as realpolitik military rulers that did not neglect any opportunity to gain political military interests. Atsiz was the most represented figure among them. In their respective works of Central Asian political history, Wilhelm Barthold and C. E. Bosworth both particularized the talent of Atsiz for gaining political benefits by exploiting the conflicts between great powers: on the one hand, Atsiz kept as a rebellious vassal governor (*shiḥna*) to Saljūq Sultan Sanjar; on the other hand, he also demonstrated subjective attitudes to two main competitors of Sanjar --- he paid tribute to Yelü Dashi, the Gurkhān of QarāKhiṭā, and vowed allegiance to the Abbāsid caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh.[2] Through this reign, Atsiz benefited from such "un-loyalty" relations with other

[1] Paul, "Atsız b. Muḥammad", *Encyclopaedia of Islam, 3rd Edition (EI3).*
[2] Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, translated by C. E. Bosworth, 339; Bosworth, "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (a.d. i 000-1217)", in: *Cambridge History of Iran, vol.5*, 143.

rulers in the east Islamic world, expended territory for his dynasty, and transformed his dynasty from a vassal regime of Saljūqs to an "autonomous" and strong power in Transoxiana (*mā warāʾ al-nahr*).[3]

When we related the emphasis of loyalty in al-Waṭwāṭ's letters and the figures of Khwārazmshāhs in history, the story seems to lack concurrence: on the one hand, Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh dynasty had a fame of unloyalty in written history; on the other hand, as this thesis will present, loyalty as a principle of political and cultural moralism, is one of the most frequent themes in the official letters of Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmian court written by al-Waṭwāṭ. In this case, the question arrises: how can one explain such discordance? This thesis is derived from this question and shall, in answering this question, study the narrative of al-Waṭwāṭ on the concept of loyalty in his letters.

The Loyalty of Khwārazmshāh Atsiz and His Dynasty Represented in Written History

Before we study the theories on the concept of loyalty, it is necessary to review the figure of the al-Waṭwāṭ's lord Khwārazmshāh Atsiz in the written histories compiled by Islamic historians from late 6th/12th to 7th/13th century and focus on the how the figure of Atsiz changed during this century.

Ẓahīr al-Dīn Nīshābūrī (d. 572/1176) was a witness to the rise, decay, and final end of the Great Saljūq dynasty. His book *Saljūq-nāma* was believed to have been written in about 571/1175, the year that the rule of last Great Saljūq Sultan Ṭughrul b. Arslān (Tughrul III) was ended by Khwārazmshah Takish, the grandson of Atsiz.[4] By the limited records of Nīshābūrī in *Saljūq-nāma* , Atsiz is depicted as a disloyal vassal of Saljūq Sultan Aḥmad Sanjar, as well as a bellicose person --- When Sanjar experienced a catastrophic defeat in the war with Gurkhān of Qarākhitās, Atsiz betrayed his vow of loyalty to Sanjar and launched a rebellion against Sultan Sanjar and looted Marw and

[3] Bosworth, "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (a.d. 1000-1217)", 144.
[4] Nīshāpūrī, *The History of the Seljuq Turks, from The Jami' al-Tawarikh: An Ilkhanid Adaptation of the Saljuq-nama*, translated and annotated by Kenneth Allin Luther, 6.

Nīshābūr.[5] As the tutor of Saljūq Sultan Ghirāth al-Dīn Masʿūd (r. 526/1134-547/1152), Nishaburī's stance was on the side of Saljūqs, opposite to Khwārazmshāhs.

The narrative of ʿIzz al-Dīn ibn al-Athīr (555/1160-630-/1234) on Atsiz was even more negative than al-Nīshābūrī. In his book *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, Atsiz is depicted as not only betraying his loyalty as a vassal of Saljūq Sultan Sanjar, but also betraying his obligation of obeying the value of Islam as a ruler. For the former, Ibn al-Athīr recorded that in 533/1138, Atsiz informed Sanjar that he "refused to continue being loyal to Sanjar (*taraka khidma ʿalayhi*) anymore".[6] Then he gathered his army and battled with Sanjar. Ibn al-Athir also implied that Atsiz may have invited infidel (*kuffār*) Qarakhiṭās to invade Transoxiama, which led to Sanjar and his vassals being defeated by Qarakhiṭās in the battle of Qatwān and experience the "biggest failure in the history of the Islamic army".[7] For the latter, Ibn al-Athīr recorded that Atsiz paid tribute to Gurkhān of Qarākhitās, an infidel invader of the Islamic world after the battle of Qatwān.[8] From the perspective of Ibn al-Athīr, what Atsiz did in Khurāsān in 536/1142 was more unforgivable than his submission to Ghurkhān, so he had a section in al-Kāmil recording Atsiz's atrocity in detail. In Ibn al-Athir's version, Atsiz invaded Saljūq-controlled Khurāsān with the support of Gurkhān in 536/1142 and captured Marw and Nīshābūr. In Marw, Atsiz initially respected Islamic scholars (*ʿulamāʾ*), but when he found the scholars had provoked people in Marw to rise against him, he took the *ʿulamāʾ* to Khwārazm and killed them.[9] In Nīshābūr, Atsiz forced local notables and *ʿulamāʾ* to remove the name of Sanjar from local coins and Friday sermons, and vow loyalty to him. When ʿulamāʾ and people of Nīshābūr refused to submit to Atsiz and

[5] Ibid, 86.
[6] Ibn al-Atīr. *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, vol.9, 309. The original text of *al-Kāmil* in this section is that "Atsiz told Sanjar by himself that he refused him and discontinued to serve him (*Atsiz yaḥduthu bi-nafsihi ilayhi bi-al-imtināʿhi wa-taraka al-khidma lahu*)". Khidma, literally means serving, is a form of medieval Islamic loyalty between different rulers, which was detailedly studied by Jürgen Paul. see Paul, "*Khidma* in the Social History of pre-Mongol Iran", 407.
[7] Ibid, vol.9, 319.
[8] Ibid, vol.9, 319. Ibn al-Athir recorded Gūrkhān of Qarākhiṭā (kūkhān in *al-Kāmil*) was a Manichean Chinese (*Al-Kāmil, 321*), however, his record is unlikely to be the fact because Chinese written histories such as *Liaoshi* and *Yuanshi* did not mention anything on Manichean faith of Gurkhān Yelü Dashi. Hence, the so-called "Manichean identity" of Gurkhān may be used by Ibn al-Athir to emphasize the "unbelievers" identity of Gurkhān and his army.
[9] Ibid, vol.9, 323.

riot against him, Atsiz slaughtered ʿulamāʾ and then looted the city for five days.[10]

From the 7th to the 13th century, there were some changes on the figure of Atsiz in written histories. For example, Minhaj al-Dīn Juzjānī (589/1193-664/1266), the historian and scholar that served as another antagonist dynasty of Anūshtakīnid Khwarazm---Ghūrids, described Atsiz as an excellent ruler that made Khwārazm become the dominant power in the region and brought "uprightness, justice, and beneficence to his people"[11] However, Juzjānī also used the following cryptic narrative to imply Atsiz's betray to Sanjar and his submission to Qarākhitās: Atsiz "sometimes moved out of Khwarazm, sometimes out of necessity, and sometimes of his own free will" for invading Jand, Turkistan, and Khurasan;[12] Atsiz "continued in attendance at the Court of that Sanjar until he gained the Sultan's confidence and good-will", but "the sovereignty of Khwarazm, and the whole steppe of Turkistan, and Jand, fell into his hands, and were left in his possession" after Sultan Sanjar was captured by Oghuz (*Ghūzz*) Turks.[13]

Comparing this to the above three historians, ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī (623/1226-683/1283) had praise for Atsiz. The figure of Atsiz in Juwaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngoshāy* is closed to an ideal ruler. Juwayni described that Atsiz was famous for his courage and justice, and he fulfilled every obligation as a vassal of Sultan Sanjar.[14] In Juwayni's narrative, it was Sanjar that envied and distrusted Atsiz, which finally led to the war between two rulers.[15] Juwayni directly quoted al-Waṭwāṭ's poems to demonstrate that Atsiz had the upper hand in the conflicts with Sanjar.[16] Different from Ibn al-Athīr or Juzjānī, Juwaynī did not mention anything about the relation between Atsiz and Qarākhitās in his book.

From the Nishabūrī to Juwaynī, we could find a trend that the figure of Atsiz changed from an immoral overlord, notorious for betrayals to an ideal king that loyal

[10] Ibid, vol.9, 324.
[11] Juzjani, *Tabaḳāt-i –Nasiri*, Translated by Major H. G. Raverty, 236.
[12] Ibid, 237.
[13] Ibid, 237.
[14] Juvayni, *Tarikh-i Jahangushay*, Translated by Boyle, 278-279.
[15] Ibid, 279.
[16] Ibid, 278.

to Allāh and the moral obligation that he was supposed to obey. The changes of the figure of Atsiz form a contrast to the figure of another Khwārazmshāh ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Takish, who battled with Mongols and ended the rule of Anūshtakīnid in Khwārazm: In the record of Ibn al-Athir, Muḥammad was "a brave and wise king"[17] and a "great warrior that defeated Qarākhiṭās"[18], while Juwaynī described Muḥammad as an arrogant, stubborn, and incapable ruler who failed to make any reasonable decision in the whole process of the Mongol invasion.[19] The changing figure of Atsiz and Muḥammad may reflect the change of Islamic historians' mindset during the different stages of Mongol invasion: at the time of Ibn al-Athir, the Mongols invaded Transoxiana but Islamic armies still had hope of defending against invaders, which is why he criticized Atsiz who was "disloyal" to Islamic world and submitted to infidels, but praised Muḥammad who at least resisted infidel invaders. While at the time of Juwaynī, the Mongols had already carried out serious destruction in Transoxiana and Khurāsān, but also established governance in the whole east Islamic world. Besides this, numbers of Islamic intellectuals represented by Juwaynī was working in the court of Mongols. In this case, Juwaynī tended to hate Muḥammad for two reasons: firstly, Muḥammad was the enemy of the new Mongol governers to whom Jwaynī owed his allegiance, and secondly, it was Muḥammad's unreasonably offence to Mongols, in the view of Juwaynī, that made the catastrophe of Mongol invasion a reality in his hometown Khwārazm, and in the Islamic world at large. This disaster might have been avoided if the ruler of Khwārazm had been wiser. In this case, Atsiz, with his flexible diplomatic skills to manoeuvre with Qarākhiṭās, the infidel invaders from the East who predated to the Mongols, and thus became a figure contrasting with Muḥammad in the written history of Juwaynī. However, it should also be noted that even Juzjānī and Juwaynī still used certain specific historical-writing skills to conceal the "in fact immoral deeds" of Atsiz, including using obscure narratives, and deliberately skipping

[17] Ibn al-Atīr. *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, vol.10, 407.
[18] Ibid, vol. 10, 408.
[19] Juvayni, *Tarikh-i Jahangushay*, Translated by Boyle, 383. In Juwaynī's version, Muḥammad's "stupidness" includes his unthinkingly offending Mongol envoys, and his incapability of making any decision after Samarqand was fallen by Mongols which made his followers "much disheartened" (Juvayni, 383).

a certain period or certain events in their texts.

Disputes about the loyalty of Khwārazmshāhs whom al-Waṭwāṭ served, did not only remain in medieval written history. Scholars in the field of Islamic historical studies, including Wilhelm Barthold, Clifford E. Bosworth, Ziya Bunyadov, and Jürgen Paul also had different and even opposing views on this topic. Barthold, Bosworth, and Bunyadov all adopted the accusation of Ibn al-Athīr on the "unloyalty" of Khwārazmshāh Atsiz, but tend to bring in a new perspective of explanation on his "unloyalty" --- they claim that Atsiz's "betrayals" perused to "make Khwārazm under his governance get rid of the rule of Saljūqs".[20] While Paul disagreed on such "story of perusing independence", rather, he suggested that the "unloyalty" and "betrayals" of Atsiz was a narrative gradually constructed by different medieval historians in a long period of time.[21] In this case, the loyalty of Khwārazmshāhs represented by Atsiz and Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh dynasty is a topic that is continually discussed in the modern academic field.

This thesis would also be placed in this debate. However, this thesis does not aim to be a moral critique of the loyalty or be betrayal of Atsiz and Anūshtakīnid dynasty; rather, this thesis aims to contribute to an understanding the concept of loyalty that was prevalent in Khwārazm, and the east Islamic world at large in the 5th/11th Century. Considering that the letters of al-Waṭwāṭ were the important historical sources that were used by the court of Khwārazmshāh for contacting with various recipients with varied social hierarchies and identities, this thesis suggests that a narrative study on his letters would be a key for understanding the concept and relationships of loyalty at the time.

Research Questions, Methodology, and Chapters

As the written history presents, Khwārazmshahs and their courts presented bifacial characters on the issue of loyalty. on the one hand, they actively branded their religious

[20] Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, translated by C. E. Bosworth, 339; Bosworth, "the political and dynastic history of the Iranian world (a.d. i 000-1217)", in: *Cambridge History of Iran, vol.5*, 143; Bunyadov, *A History of the Khorezmian State under the Anushteginids, 1097-1231*, translated by A. Efendiyev, 8.
[21] Paul, "Sanjar and Atsız: Independence, Lordship, and Literature", 89

loyalty to Allāh and *ṣunna*, while on the other hand, they seldom hesitate to break the loyalty for the political-military interest when they need. In this context, al-Waṭwāṭ, as a high-ranking clerk of Khwārazmian court and the author of a large number of diplomatic documents, was obliged to use his narrative skills in his letters to reconcile such contradiction. Hence, the research question of this thesis is as follows:

How did al-Waṭwāṭ reconcile the moralism and real politikal interest inside the relationships of loyalty in his letters?

This will be answered by examining through what narrative al-Waṭwāṭ presented the concept of "loyalty" in the official letters of the Khwārazm court written by him, which not only ensured the Khwārazmshāh and his court gained realpolitikal benefits from various relationships of loyalty, but also allowed that Khwārazmshāh occupied the vantage point of moralism, thereby being able to ensure that the recipients of the letters followed the will of the Khwārazmshāh, or in other words, was loyal to him.

The research question will be placed in the two historical contexts: the mainstream Sunni revival trend in Khwārazm under the governance of Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs, and realpolitikal interactions between them and other rulers of the east Islamic world at that time. By studying this research question, this thesis would try to contribute a narration-based understanding for the concept of loyalty in the east Islamic world at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ.

From the methodological perspective, this thesis is a philological narrative study of al-Waṭwāṭ's texts, focusing on al-Waṭwāṭ's narratives around loyalty. Besides narrative, the empirical history will also be studied, but more with a view to provide background knowledge for understanding of the historical context for the texts than as a main study focus. The reason for such a choice is due to two aspects. From one aspect, the information that al-Waṭwāṭ's letters could provide is not enough for an empirical study: we could know the name and title of the receiver of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters, but we neither precisely know when the letters were written, nor if letters were responded to. Other sources such as recorded history and monographies written by other medieval

Islamic intellectuals may complement some deficient information of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters, however, a "panoramic schema" of historical information --- which is a foundation of a proper empirical history study, is still difficult to achieve. From the other aspect, the importance of narrative in historical studies has been sufficiently proved since the trend of "linguistic turn" in history emerged in the 1970s. Lawrence Stone argued that narratives or story-telling are closer to the essence of traditional historical writing than empirical historical information, thus historians should never neglect narratives in the effort of pursuing a more "scientific" historical study.[22] George G. Iggers indicated the advantages of narrative study, which is that it could better explore the spiritual as well as material aspects of "every day history", compared with classic empirical history studies.[23] Comparing the "historical reality" of loyalty and betrayal of Anūshtakīnid Khwarazm at the time, the narrative of al-Waṭwāṭ could more directly reflect the concept of loyalty at the time.

As a thesis of intellectual history and narratives based on texts, a series of empirical historical information of al-Waṭwāṭ and his letters is still essential for analysing the narratives of the text. For al-Waṭwāṭ himself, his biographical information and his social networks, and for his letters, the philological information on the historical contexts of his letters, including when the letter was written, to whom the letter was sent, what the letter was written about, etc, are all necessary to be studied.[24] As for the narrative of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters, I will focus on the vocabulary and terms that al-Waṭwāṭ used in his texts about the different categories of people and the relationships of loyalty among them. The vocabularies and terms will also help to conceptualize different types of loyalties presented by al-Waṭwāt. Besides vocabulary and terms, the "story-writing" content of al-Waṭwāṭ's texts were also important part of narrative studies. Hayden White, for example, provided a narrativist theoretical framework on history-writing in his famous work *Metahistory*. The "emplotment theory", which constructed a

[22] Stone, "The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History", 22.
[23] Iggers, *Historiography in the twentieth Century*, 99.
[24] Intellectual history works based on texts such as Mitha's *Al-Ghazālī and the Ismailis* and Peter Webb's study on his annotated translation of Al-Maqrīzī's *al-Ḫabar ʿan al-bašar* all had sufficient length for the author's biography. Some other more empirical text studies contained detailed philological speculations on the historical contexts of text, represented by Paul's "Sanjar's Letter to the Notables of Samarqand".

relationship between the mode of historical writing and the mode of tropes,[25] is the core of his framework. As the following chapters will present that many of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters about relationships of loyalty shared a very similar "plot" if we look at al-Waṭwāṭ's narratives from a "story-writing" perspective. These plots and tropes that al-Waṭwāṭ used for persuading the recipients of his letters to meet the demands of Khwārazmshāh and remain in a relationship of loyalty with him would be the focus of this thesis.

The main body of this thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 is the literature review chapter of the thesis. This chapter will divide the various academic works and arguments on loyalty into four categories based on historical periods and disciplines, and focus on the differences and connections between the various theories and discourses on loyalty. Based on such reviews, this chapter will seek to conceptualise the concept of loyalty in the eastern Islamic world at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ.

Chapter 2 will focus on the empirical historical background information of al-Waṭwāṭ and Anūshtakīnid Khwārazm. Such information includes the life of al-Waṭwāṭ, a philological study on the existing versions of his letters, political history of Anūshtakīnid Khwarazm at the time, political-military interactions between Khwārazmshāh and other rulers in Eastern Islamic World such as Saljūq Sultan and Abbāsid caliph, and the role of Orthodox Sunni intellectuals in the court of Khwārazmshāh.

Chapter 3, Chapter 4, and Chapter 5 will respectively study three types of relationships of loyalty, which are respectively the relationships of loyalty between the populace and the rulers who governed them, the relationships of loyalty between the officials and the rulers they served for, and the relationships of loyalty between rulers in the east Islamic world (especially the relationships of loyalty between Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs and other various rulers of east Islamic world at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ). These three chapters will follow the similar structure by conceptualizing loyalty based

[25] White, *Metahistory*, 5, and 34. In the section of "the theory of the historical work", White analysed four modes of employment (romance, tragedy, comedy, satire) that respectively paralleled to four modes of tropes (metaphor, metonymy, synechedoche, and irony).

on the vocabularies at first, then analyse the narratives of certain letters that are related to the three types of loyalty from a "story-writing" perspective. In these three chapters, the thesis will use Roy Mottahedeh's theory of "loyalty of categories"[26] in his work *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society* as a foundation, for classifying people by their different classes, groups, and hierarchies. Some representative categories of the populace, such as *ʿayn* (pl. *aʿyān*) --- the prominent notables in the town, and religious elites represented by *imam* (pl. *aʾimma*) will be studied in the Chapter 3. Similarly, the officials would also be classified by two different categories: the civic officials represented by financial officials (*muḥtasib* or *ʿāmil*), scribes (*kātib,* pl. *kuttāb*), and viziers (*wazīr* pl. *wuzarāʾ*); and religious-judicial officials, represented by judges (*qāḍī,* pl. *quḍāt*), and muftī (pl. muftūn). As for rulers, this thesis would particularly distinguish the Abbāsid Caliph and the Great Saljūq Sulṭān (*al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam al-saljūqī*) from other rulers of East Islamic world, including various *amīr*s, *wālī*s, *shāh*s, and *sulṭān*s --- at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ, Abbāsid Caliph still owned the sole religious-political legitimacy as the nominal highest leader of the whole East Islamic world. All Islamic rulers were supposed to be loyal to him, despite his limited military power; while the Saljūq Sulṭān remained the hegemony, and many provincial Islamic overlords including Khwārazmshāh still claimed their obedience and loyalties to him.

[26] See Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society,* 97. The chapter 1 of this thesis will also further study on Mottahedeh's theory of "loyalty of categories".

Chapter 1.

Conceptualizing Loyalty

As a thesis discussing the concept of loyalty, this concept should be clearly defined. For examining this, this chapter will engage a comparative literature review on four types of academic texts that focus on the concept of loyalty, which are the philosophical and sociological academic works on the concept of loyalty, academic works on international relations and medieval studies about the concept of relationships of loyalty, academic works on the loyalty of the medieval Islamic world since the second half of the 20th century, and the arguments of medieval Sunni Islamic literati in the east Islamic world about loyalty. Based on the various elaborations of loyalty in different texts, this chapter aims to identify the inadequacy of current studies on loyalties in pre-modern Islamic society, and then to determine a plausible conceptualization of "Islamic loyalty" at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ, for use in the remainder of this thesis.

1.1. Studies on Loyalty in the Fields of Philosophy and Sociology

From the early 20th century to today, a number of scholars have studied the concept of loyalty from the perspective of philosophy, sociology, and historical studies.

American philosopher Josiah Royce provided a philosophical framework around loyalty in his famous book *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. As an advocator of Protestant Christian morality who lived in the early 20th century, Royce tried to study loyalty from a philosophical-ethical perspective and branded his theory of loyalty as a retort to the prevalent skepticism on religion at the time. Royce's definition of loyalty was the "fulfilling the whole moral law", which is the most moral principle "at the center of the whole moral world".[27] Differing from the later scholars that will be reviewed in the following text, Royce also gives two complementary definitions of loyalty in different

[27] Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 9.

chapters of his book, that loyalty is the spirit of "fulfilling the whole moral law"[28] and "the will to believe in something eternal".[29]

James Connor provided a theoretical framework of loyalty from the perspective of sociology. In his book, he defined loyalty as a kind of emotion --- "an individual experience as a consequence of interactions within the world." He argued that loyalty is a social relation of "attachment" based on the sense of belonging and identity. If Royce's "loyalty" is a personal pursuit of moral excellence, then Connor's loyalty is a kind of de-moralized social product in the social relationship and interactions between persons or communities. Connor also discussed the mediation between loyalty and disloyalty (or betrayal). Using the example of Australian migrants' dual loyalty to both Australia and their mother nations, Connor refuted the traditional dichotomy of "loyalty" and "betrayal", and argued that loyalty is not a black or white concept.[30]

Nachman Ben-Yehuda studied social behavior of betrayal. In her framework, loyalty is a kind of social relation and a form of trust, while trust is the basis of any kinds of social exchanges,[31] while betrayal is the "violation of trust and loyalty".[32] In this case, Ben-Yehuda emphasized the interactive feature of loyalty on the one hand, implied it as an ethical principle on the other hand. Both Connor and Ben-Yehuda discussed multi-loyalty issue. She indicated that people may have more than one loyalty towards different groups, but for the people, some of the loyalties are more prior than others. Thus, when the groups are in the conflict, people will be loyal to the most prior one and betray others.[33]

From the works of three scholars in the different periods, it could be concluded that loyalty is generally defied as an ethical principle, or a form of interpersonal interactions, or both. As an ethical principle, loyalty is an obligation and a moral requirement for

[28] Ibid, 49. Royce suggested the essence of loyalty is "being loyal to the loyalty" itself, which could reflect the good originality of the loyal people.
[29] Ibid, 166. Here, Royce suggested that to declare something "real" and "eternal" is a superhuman experience. While for human, will of believing something is "real" is enough. This is what he called "the biggest pragmatism" in his book.
[30] Ibid, 89.
[31] Ibid, 11.
[32] Ben-Yehuda, *Betrayals and Treasons*, 5.
[33] Ibid, 16. Ben-Yehuda divided the loyalty to "major" and "minor" loyalties.

people or social groups to follow and practice. As a form of interpersonal relationship, loyalty is based on series of societal elements such as identity and interest, and thus, become more flexible and changeable. If we integral these two characteristics, it is plausible to interpret loyalty as a social relationship for the exchange of interests, which has two basic features: firstly, the loyalty is supposed to be rewarded, or other words, if an individual or a group obey his obligation inside a relationship of loyalty, he should get benefits from that; and secondly, the loyalty is always based on a certain framework of moralism, because the latter provide a legitimacy to such social relationship --- For Royce, loyalty as an ethical quality is founded on the Christian religious moralism; for Ben-Yehuda, loyalty is a basic moral pillar for the society in the context of nation states; and for Connor, even though he places more emphasis on the "amoral" characteristics of the loyalty, he still argued that some types of loyalty relationships are to some extent more innate and "quintessential", such as family values.[34] This thesis would adopt such interpretation on loyalty, with its two basic features mentioned above.

1.2. Studies on Loyalty in the Fields of International Relations and European Medieval Studies

When we come to discuss the relationships of loyalty between political entities or political actors, it would be natural to relate the concept of loyalty to two different spheres: in a modern context, it could be interpreted as a field of international relations, while in a medieval European historical context, it could be analysed as an integral part of feudal relations.

In the sphere of international relations, loyalty between political entities is commonly related to the topic of alliance relations, which are guaranteed at the legal level by alliance treaties between two territorial states.[35] International relations scholars have interpreted the topic of "loyalty among allies" in several different ways. The first interpretation was represented by Jonathan Mercer, who explained the alliance relation

[34] Connor, 74.
[35] Henry, "What Allies want: Reconsidering Loyalty, Reliability, and Alliance Interdependence", 49.

as "the extent to which a state will risk war to keep its promises" for its allies.[36] Iain Henry criticized Mercer's interpretation on the alliance loyalty in his case study on the Taiwan Strait Crisis during 1954 to 1955. In his analysis, different allies of the US in the Pacific West had very different stances on the Taiwan Strait Crisis, which made the US's "extent of risking war" become even harmful for the alliance's relationship between it and its allies.[37] In this case, Henry argued that a country's "alliance reliability" --- which he defined as a state's "ability and willingness to allow Allies to benefit from situations (such as an unwanted wars) in which their interests would be harmed by the alliance" --- is more important than the "willingness of risking war for protecting promise" in an alliance relationships of loyalty.[38] When we compare Mercer's and Henry's interpretations on loyalty, we could find that two scholars both hypothesised that the realpolitikal interests are the core influencing factor on relationships of loyalty between allies, and suggests that alliance loyalty is particularly important in emergency situations such as wars and geopolitical crises.

Another view on the loyalties in international relations was provided by Lauge N. Poulsen, who interpreted loyalty among alliances as the "emotional attraction" of one country to another.[39] Different from Mercer and Henry, Poulsen's interpretation does not take realpolitikal interests as overwhelmingly important, rather, Poulsen suggested that the alliance loyalty is influenced by varied factors, including the personal ties between the leaders of states, the national or ideological identity ties between allied states, the moral obligation ordered by the treaty of alliance, the beneficial ties between allies, etc.[40] These influencing factors commonly make the loyalties between states are flowing between the "minimalist level" --- "choosing not to harm the interests of allies", and the "maximalist level" --- "actively promote the interests of allies", depending on

[36] Mercer, *Reputation and International Politics*, 15; also see Henry, "What Allies want", 50.
[37] Henry, "What Allies want", 72-75.
[38] Ibid, 54.
[39] Poulsen, "Loyalty in World Politics", 1166.
[40] Ibid, 1158, 1165-1166. In this article, Poulsen quoted and analysed varied sociologists' theories on loyalty, including James Conner, which shows Poulsen's interpretation on loyalty was influenced by sociological studies on loyal relations out of international relations. It is clear that Poulsen did not see interstate loyalties in the sphere of international relations as fundamentally different from relationship of loyalty in other fields.

the "extent of the affective attraction" between allied states.[41] Poulsen's interpretation could be applied to a broader range of situations in international relations than Mercer's and Henry's. The "affective attraction" always exists between states; hence, alliance loyalty does not exist merely in emergency situations.

In the sphere of medieval studies, the relationships of loyalty between two political entities were closely related to the interpersonal feudalist relationships between respective rulers. In his famous monograph *Feudalism*, Belgian historian François L. Ganshof interpreted the European feudalism as a relationship of loyalty between two free men --- "a free man place himself under the protection and at service another free man, while maintaining his own free statues"[42]. According to Ganshof, vassalage and benefice (fief) were two key elements of feudal system in medieval Europe. The former was an act of "commendation", accompanied by a legal document stating series of obligations for both parties.[43] While the latter refers to the transfer of "property rights" of one party on one piece of his land to another party. Such act was also guaranteed by charters with legal effect.[44] Both vassalage institution and benefice institution generated in the early Merovingian period of the 6th -7th century.[45] In the Carolingian period, two institutes combined to be the feudalism, which was spread from the limited area between Loire and Rhine to the broader territories under the rule of Carolingian rulers in the 8th and 9th century.[46] Until the end of 12th century, feudal relationships of loyalty with vassalage and benefice have been developed to complicated systems with a series of rituals and regulations and became the most prominent social system in medieval Europe.[47]

In her *Fiefs and Vassals*, Susan Reynolds studied European feudalism from a critical historical perspective. She suggested that Ganshof's conceptualizations on vassalage and benefice lack accuracy. According to her, Ganshof's "vassalage"

---

[41] Ibid, 1162-1163.
[42] Ganshof, *Feudalism*, translated by P. Grierson, 4.
[43] Ibid, 7.
[44] Ibid, 9-12.
[45] Ibid, 3.
[46] Ibid, 22.
[47] See Ganshof, *Feudalism*, translated by P. Grierson, Part Three (pp. 59-155).

contained a wide variety of highly differentiated types of social relationships and he did not distinguish them sufficiently. For this reason, Reynolds even suggested to stop using the term of vassalage.[48] For the benefice, Reynolds agreed Ganshof's interpretation as a transfer of the property rights of land, but she also argued that property rights are far from absolute ownership in medieval Europe. On the contrary, such transfer of property rights were commonly accompanied by a series of obligations and limitations.[49] Similar as Ganshof, Reynold also suggested that the interpersonal vassalage relationships (although she opposed to use this term) and the transfer of property right (benefice) were two basic elements of feudalism, however, she argued that both two institutions have such an internal conflict: on the one hand, two institutions emphasized the hierarchy and the obedience of the subordinate party to the superior party, on the other hand, both two institutions requested two parties to follow justice and mutual obligations to each other.[50]

The above analysis reveals a difference between the international relations studies and medieval studies on the issue of loyalty between two political entities --- the former tends to interpret the relationships of loyalty from an interterritorial perspective, while the latter tends to explain it from an interpersonal perspective. Besides, the former assumes political entities have at least nominal equal statues in modern alliance relationships, whereas the latter never denies the hierarchical difference between political entities in feudal relationships. Such differences are related to the assumed essential difference between the "modern nation states" and "pre-modern European feudal states". It is also necessary to notice that both modern alliance loyalty and medieval European feudal loyalty have their respective unique inner logic --- the former based on the idea of the modern territorial states, and the latter derived derived from the transfer of the property rights of land --- which made both notably different from the loyalty relationships of the 6th/12th century medieval Islamic society. Despite such differences, both fields discussed in this section interpreted the loyalty between entities

[48] Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 33.
[49] Ibid, 56.
[50] Ibid, 35, 58.

as a social relationship that involves both an exchange of realpolitikal interests and mutual moral obligations, in consonance with the philosophical and sociological studies on loyalty mentioned in the previous section. Therefore, both could serve as useful references for the research topic of this thesis.

1.3. Studies on Pre-Modern Islamic Loyalty

In the field of Islamic history studies, scholars such as Roy Mottahedeh, Thomas Welsford, Hugh Kennedy, Andrew Marsham, and Jürgen Paul studied loyalties in medieval Islamic society and conceptualized Islamic loyalty in medieval societies from their respective perspectives.

Mottahedeh divided the loyalties in the 3rd/9th century of the East Islamic world into two types — "acquired loyalty" and "loyalty of category". For the "acquired loyalty," Mottahedeh deliberately distinguished "loyalty based on vows or oaths" from "loyalty based on benefits". Because the Quran requires people to keep vows and oaths, the loyalty based on vows and oaths (such as *bayʿa*, the loyalty of Muslims to Caliphs) is an ethical obligation. As for the latter type, two representative kinds of "loyalties based on benefits" are the loyalty of soldiers to rulers and the loyalty of ordinary people to rulers; hence, soldiers received visible salaries from rulers, and the ordinary people received invisible benefits such as protection from rulers. In this case, the loyalty of soldiers and the populace was the gratitude for the ruler's generosity (*shukr al-niʿma*). Regarding the "loyalty of categories", the author suggested that the form of loyalty varied among different groups. Soldiers, *ghulām*, officials, *aʿyān* (notables or eminent people of the community), and *ruʾasāʾ* (leaders of specific groups) have different patterns of loyalty based on their own social hierarchy (*ṣinf*). Mottahedeh also argued that loyalty is a kind of relationship between individuals, which means that it could not be inherited by the next generations in the 3rd/9th century.[51]

[51] Ibid, 61. Mottahedeh indicated that the oath (*yamīn*) between two rulers could not be inherited by their decedents; And ibid, 85. Even though the patronage of lord to *ghulām* is inheritable and transferable according to Islamic law, he loyalty of *ghulām* to their lords cannot passed on after inheritance or transformation because this kind of loyalty is essentially a personal tie between slave and lord.

Compared to Mottahedeh, Welsford used a more "realpolitikal" description to present loyalty in 10th/16th century Islamic society. Although he also defined loyalty as a kind of social relationship and attachment,[52] he argued that it is "unhelpful" to understand loyalty from legitimacy (such as the relation between oath and loyalty in Mottahedeh's framework) or identity[53], because in the 10th/16th century Central Asia, attachment and loyalty were based on either an oath or category are not as firm as the cases studied by Mottahedeh in the 3rd/9th century.[54] Rather, he understood loyalty as the willingness of an individual or a social group to support another one for a varieties of reasons, including interests and affection.[55] Based on different reasons of constituency, he classified loyalty as four types: Charismatic loyalty (loyalty based on the Charisma of the leader), clientelist loyalty (loyalty based on benefits), inertial loyalty (loyalty reserved and inherited from precedents), and communal loyalty (loyalty based on the mutual interest of a group).[56] In all four cases, the superior party needed to bid for the loyalty of his subalterns by offering varied benefits to them and satisfying their demands.[57] Mottahedeh's and Welford's frameworks were based on two the different historical contexts of two different periods, which makes their frameworks different. However, we could find some commonalities between their frameworks on loyalties in pre-modern Islamic societies to the frameworks of Royce and Conner which were based on the context of modern societies: for example, both Mottahedeh and Royce mentioned the importance of vows and the moral obligations derived from vows for the relationships of loyalties, and also, both Welford and Conner emphasised on the important of "realpolitikal interest" or "benefit-exchange" for maintenaning loyalty relationships.

In their representative works, Kennedy and Marsham studied the development of *bayʿa*, a typical type of medieval Islamic loyalty relationship, as well as its different

[52] Welsford, *Four Types of Loyalty in Early Modern Central Asia*, 17.
[53] Ibid, 17.
[54] Ibid, 21. Welsford indicated that the situation that "people widely maintained the attachment they contracted" could not apply to the political history of early Central Asia.
[55] Ibid, 22.
[56] Ibid, 24.
[57] Ibid, 24.

features in different periods of history. *Bayʿa* was originally a public ritual in the pre-Islamic period. This consisted of taking the pledge of allegiance to tribe leaders.[58] In the period of early *Umma*, *bayʿa* is the symbol that the public of Islamic society (*Umma*) admiting the leadership of individuals, including Muḥammad the prophet and *Rashīdūn* Caliphs.[59] In the Umayyad period, *bayʿa* as a ritual became part of the enthronement ceremony of every Caliph, in which both high-ranking officers of caliphal court and all provincial governors (*umarāʾ*) pledged their loyalties to the new Caliph. The loyalty-vowing of all crucial figures in the caliphate sustained the legitimacy of every caliph as legitimate "ruler of pledges (*wālī al-ʿahd*)", as well as his reign (*wilāyat al-ʿahd*).[60] In Umayyad period, ordinaries did not ever participate in *bayʿa* as they did in previous history, which made *bayʿa* become a ritual of political elites.[61] Since middle Abbāsid period, provincial governors did not come to the capital and pledge allegiance to caliph, which made *bayʿa* a ritual only between caliphs and political elites of the capital of caliphate.[62] Such change of the *bayʿa* ritual reflected the decay of Abbāsid Caliphs' political power after the a series of political chaos and civil wars happened in the early 3rd/9th Century. Since the second half of the 3rd/9th century, the mention of Caliphs' *laqab* (regnal title) in the Friday sermons and depiction on provincial coins replaced *bayʿa* and became the main form of provincial demonstration of their nominal allegiance to the Caliphs.[63] In the 4th/10th century, when the Būyids controlled Baghdad and Abbāsid Caliphs became actual political figureheads, the ritual of *bayʿa* became a ritual with three parts: a private oath among a Caliphal family (*bayʿat al-khaṣṣa*), a more public oath in the court of Caliph (*bayʿat al-ʿamma*), and finally Caliph and Buyid Emir swore oaths of loyalty to each other.[64] Kennedy and Marsham demonstrated the "realpolitik" meaning of *bayʿa*: Even though the form of *bayʿa* ritual consistently changed, it has always reflected the competition between different political powers and

[58] Kennedy, *Caliphate*, 35.
[59] Ibid, 35.
[60] Marsham, *Rituals of Islamic Monarchy*, 255.
[61] Kennedy, *Caliphate*, 36.
[62] Marsham, *Rituals of Islamic Monarchy*, 256.
[63] Ibid, 256.
[64] Kennedy, *Caliphate*, 91.

the contesting tensions between central caliphal power and the provincial powers in the mid-Abbāsid Islamic world.

Paul studies the political logic of the "*khidma*" relationship in the 5th/11th and 6th/12th century in the east Islamic world. In his studies, *khidma* --- the loyalty of the suborder *khādim* (Ar. The serving one, could refer to servants, slaves, suborders, and vassals) towards the superior *makhdūm* (Ar. The one being served. e.g. kings, Caliphs, and superior rulers) was a binary contract in which both sides had obligations and rights.[65] *Khādim* is obliged to offer enough benefit to the *makhdūm* to exchange his loyalty and support, and the *khādim* also had the right to punish the *makhdūm* politically or militarily when … *makhdūm* accepted benefits but refused to be loyal.[66] In return, *makhdūm* also had right to withdraw his loyalty or deliver his loyalty to other one else when *khādim* did not keep his word and reneged benefits.[67] Literally *khidma* means a interpersonal relationship between lord and servant, but in practice, it was generally used to describe a loyalty relations between not only rulers but also dynasties, which gave *khidma* some similarities to Ganshof's framework on the European feudal relationships and modern alliance relationships, even though that *khidma* was neither based on the transfer of property right, nor based on the framework of territorial states. As Paul indicated, the *khidma* relations constituted a political system --- a number of *makhdūm*s vassals announced loyalty to one *khādim* suzerain, which is the political-social basis of all hegemonic military-political powers in pre-Mongol Islamic world, including Ghzanawids, Saljūqs, as well as the hegemony of Anūshtakīnid Khwarazmshāhs in the late 6th/12th and early 7th/13th century.

As analysed above, scholars specialized in pre-modern Islamic society tend to conceptualise loyalty as a form of social relationship that based on the exchange of interest and hypothesise that the real politikal interest was the key element influencing the relationships of loyalty in the pre-modern Islamic world. By comparison, although Mottahedeh has related loyalty to the Islamic ethical value of vows and oaths, the

[65] Paul, "*Khidma* in the Social History of pre-Mongol Iran", 407.
[66] Ibid, 412.
[67] Ibid, 398.

moralist characteristic of relationships of loyalty has not been studied so deeply.

1.4. Loyalty and the Sunni Revival Period

In order to further study both the ethical and societal characters of loyalty, it is necessary to see how the concept of loyalty has been elaborated on and presented by the literati from the 5th/11th century to the 7th/13th century east Islamic world.

Scholars such as Bosworth and S. Fredrick Starr all discuss the expansion of orthodox Sunnism in the 6th/12th Century in Khwārazm under the rule of the Anūshtakīnid family.[68] Bosworth suggested that the prevalence of orthodox Sunnism in Khwārazm was related to the dominance of orthodox Sunnism in other regions directly governed or indirectly controlled by Saljūqs, including ʿIrāq, Jibāl (aka. ʿIrāq al-Aʿjamī) and Khurāsān.[69] Considering the numbers of official letters written by al-Wāṭwāṭ that were sent to the court of Abbāsid caliphs and other Sunni rulers, Starr's comment, whether it is totally plausible, reminds us to consider the relation between the concept of loyalty and the prevailing Sunni Orthodox in the period.

It should be first clarified that the term "Orthodox Sunni" is not directly derived from any Arabic historical texts of the time, but only a term always used by modern scholars. Farouk Mitha equaled "Orthodox Sunni" to "*ahl al-sunna wa-al-jamāʿa*" ("people following prophet's edification and the religious consensus"), a phrase used by al-Ghazāli in his work *Kitāb al-Mustaẓhirī*.[70] In this thesis, I will also use "Orthodox Sunnism" for such meaning. As for the rise and prevalence of Sunni orthodoxy from the early 5th/11th century to the Mongol invasion, scholars commonly use the term "Sunni revival" to describe it.[71] This was closely related to the hegemony of the Saljūq Dynasty because Saljūq Sultāns were commonly main sponsors for Orthodox Sunnism

[68] See Bosworth, "Khwārazm", *EI2*, and Starr, Lost Enlightenment, 533. Starr even argued that the rising of Orthodox Sunnism was one of the main reasons that made the fall and the end of the "age of renaissance" in the Eastern Islamic world, however, Starr did not used primary sources to support his argument about Orthodox Sunnism, hence, this thesis will not use Starr's view.
[69] Bosworth, "Khwārazm", *EI2*
[70] Mitha, *Al-Ghazāli and the Ismailis* ,88
[71] such as Yasser Tabbaa (2001), Vanessa van Renterghem (2011), Daphna Ephrat (2011), Massimo Companini (2011), and D.G. Tor (2011). They all used the terms such as "Sunni revival" or "Sunni Revivalism" in their works.

by providing military protection, building religious schools, and providing *waqf*, the institutionalized religious stipend, to the Sunni religious authority.[72] It is necessary to note that the idea of "Sunni Revival" is controversial --- there is evidence to prove that the revival of Orthodoxy Sunni had already begun before Saljūqs became a dominant power,[73] and the Saljūq Sultans were neither such initiative advocators of Sunnism, nor such ascetic defenders of Sunni religious authority as the description of medieval historians.[74] Despite these debates, this idea still reflected the prevalence of Orthodox Sunnism in the east Islamic World, which was promoted by Abbasid Caliphs and Saljūqs for their politico-religious interests. For this reason, this thesis would still use the term of "the period of Sunni Revival" to refer the period that this thesis plans to study.

The Orthodox Sunni literati in the Sunni revival period, represented by Niẓām al-Mulk and al-Ghazālī, elaborated the concept of loyalty in their works. Nizām al-Mulk was the *wazīr* of Saljūq Sultan Malikshāh. During his tenure, he established official orthodox Sunni institutions --- al-madrasa al-Niẓamiyya in several main cities in the east Islamic world such as Baghdād, Nīshābūr, etc. In his famous book *Siyasāt-nāma* (*The Book of Government* as the English translation version), Niẓām al-Mulk shows his two different attitudes to the issue of loyalty. On the one hand, He claimed that the generosity (*niʿma*) is the most important characteristic for a ruler who will govern, thus, suggested that rulers were obliged to provide enough benefits to clerks, soldiers, and peasants for exchanging their loyalties (*bayʿ*) and avoiding their rebellions. For example, the rulers must regularly pay a salary for his troops in order to keep them effective;[75] When people have complaints, rulers should carefully hear the explanations and requests of people, then offer judgement, in order to avoid the situation that crowds of complainants gather at the capital[76]. Furthermore, the monthly salaries of officials should be paid officially, otherwise officials would have opportunities for corruption

[72] Tor, "Sovereignty and Pious", *The Seljuqs*, 41.
[73] Tabbaa, *The Transformation of Islamic Arts during Sunni Revival*, 18.
[74] Tor, "Sovereignty and Pious", *The Seljuqs*, 40.
[75] Niẓām al-Mulk, *The Book of Government*, translated by Hubert Darke, 99.
[76] Ibid, 241.

and bribery.[77] In this case, loyalty is a relationship based on benefits and interests, and the loyalty of subjects to their ruler is a reward for the benefits that rulers had offered. On the other hand, he insisted that rulers should be unconditionally loyal to the *sharīʿa* (law) and *sunna* (orthodoxy) of Sunni Islam. In this case, rulers should appoint orthodox Sunni Muslims as high-positioned officials and subordinate rulers (*shiḥna*),[78] and be hostile to "the enemies of Islam", such as Ismāʿilīs (or *Baṭinīs* in *Siyasāt-nāma*) and Zoroastrians.[79]

Niẓām al-Mulk's contemporary Muḥammad Abu Ḥamīd al-Ghazālī's attitude about loyalty is on the one hand more dogmatic, on the other hand more realpolitik than Niẓām al-Mulk. The more dogmatic element is that he insisted that the *sunna* is the basis of Islamic society. Thus, all Muslims should unconditionally keep loyalty to *sunna* (*yuṭīʿu ilā al-sunna*), and protect it from the attacks of heretics and "unbelievers", especially Ismāʿīlī Shiʿites.[80] The pragmatic element is that all forms of loyalty relations between mundane rulers could be accepted, as long as such forms were useful for defending Orthodox Sunnism.[81] The al-Ghazālī ideal political system, as Carole Hillenbrand described, was "the symbiosis between Caliphate and Sultanate".[82] In this system, al-Ghazālī supposed that the Abbāsid Caliph would keep his nominal position as highest ruler of Islamic world, but cede his theoretically highest political-military power to the most powerful and mighty Islamic overlord at the time --- Saljūq Sultan and legitimize Sultan's hegemony by official rituals. By such arrangement, both caliph's legitimacy as the highest religious authority of Sunni Islam (*najda*) and Sultan's military-political power (*shawka*) would be used for the interest of orthodox Sunnism, and the conflicts between Saljūq Sultan and Abbāsid Caliph for the political power would be reconciled.[83] For the loyalty issue, al-Ghazālī's arrangement reflected

[77] Ibid, 63.
[78] Ibid, 14.
[79] Ibid. In chapter XLIII, Niẓām al-Mulk suggested kings to realize the "fact" that *Bāṭinī*s (*Ismaʿīlī*s) were the enemy of Islam, even they claimed themselves as Muslims; and in Chapter XLIV, he supposed the revolt Zoroastrains such as Noshirvans are also enemy of Islam.
[80] Mitha, *Al-Ghazāli and the Ismailis* ,67. The word "unbeliever" is also quoted from the text of Mitha.
[81] Companini, "In Defense of Sunnism: al-Ghazālī and the Seljuqs", 238.
[82] Hillenbrand, "Islamic Orthodox or Realpolitik", 86.
[83] Ibid, 83.

his different attitudes towards two kinds of loyalties: for the loyalty to *sunna*, it is beyond negotiation and doubt as well as all political arrangements being designed to serve it; regarding the relationship of loyalty between mundane rulers, he placed it in a subordinate position. Different from Niẓam al-Mulk who kept unswerving loyalty to Saljūq Sultan, Malikshāh, al-Ghazālī did not completely deliver his loyalty to any ruler, neither Caliph nor Sultan.[84]

In the 7th/13th century, a famous Islamic scholar of the Ḥanbalī school Ibn Taymiyya's *fatwā*s on the issue of loyalty could be considered as the development of the loyalty thoughts of pre-Mongol Orthodox Sunni intellectuals after the Mongol Invasion. Ibn Taymiyya classified loyalty as two kinds: *ṭāʿa* and *bayʿa*. The former is loyalty to the religious regulation of Islam (*tanẓīm al-islām*), which is an obligation of Muslims to obey. The latter is the loyalty of people to a specific person (who could be an imam, a shaykh, or a sultan), which is a contrast (*ʿaqd*) with credibility.[85] Ibn Taymiyya thought both *ṭāʿa* and *bayʿa* are obligatory for a Muslim to obey --- *ṭāʿa* is naturally axiomatical, while *bayʿa* is not only a contrast between two sides, but also between two sides and Allāh.[86] However, two kinds of loyalty are not equal in stature. *Ṭāʿa* is the prerequisite of all *bayʿa*s, thus is also more prior than the latter. Ibn Taymiyya used the loyalty of early Muslims to the prophet as an example of the suggested the difference between the alliance of infidels and the alliance of Muslims is that the infidels' alliance (*ḥalf al-jāhīliyya*) is only based on benefits, while the Muslims' alliance (*ḥalf al-muslim*) should first be based on the Islamic moralities (*fuḍūl*) and *sharīʿa* law.[87]

From the works of Sunni intellectuals, we could know that there was a tendency in the framework of orthodox Sunnism that classified loyalty as two kinds: the loyalty of

---

[84] Companini, 231. Companini indicated that al-Ghazālī regarded himself more as a servant of Abbasid caliph than Saljūq sultan, but he did not trust any rulers for thinking all mundane rulers were corrupting, even though their existences were necessary for the interest of *sunna*.

[85] Ibn Taymiyya, *Al-Naṣihat al-Dhahabiyya ilā al-Jamāʿāt al-Islāmiyya*, collected and edited by Ḥasan Salmān, 9. Ibn Taymiyya quoted a question of "If a Muslim refuses to be loyal to the sultan who violated *sharīʿa*, is his refuse sinful (*yaʾthumu*)?"; and 11. He mentioned the question of "if a Muslim claims loyal to an imam, then claims loyal to a shaykh, who should he follow?" and tried to solve it in following texts.

[86] Ibid, 15.

[87] Ibid, 16. In this case, the alliance of Muslim was called "*ḥalīf al-fuḍūl* (the alliance of morality)" by ibn Taymiyya in his fatwas

an individual to Allāh and *sunna*, and the loyalty to other individuals. The former is the prerequisite to the latter, while latter is subordinate of the former. From the lexicographic perspective, all three Sunni intellectuals tended to use the word "*ṭāʿa*" to describe the former (the lexical root letters of "*ṭāʿa*" are "*ṭ-w-ʿ*", with the meaning "to obey"), while use the word "*bayʿ*" to describe the latter (the lexical root letters are "*b-y-ʿ*", with the meaning of "to transact"). The difference among the three intellectuals' narratives is that Ibn Taymiyya deliberately distinguished and conceptualized these two kinds of loyalty, while Niẓām al-Mulk and al-Ghazālī did not deliberately distinguish them except for using two words in different contexts. Such a difference may reflect that the dichotomy of two kinds of loyalty have become increasingly systematical from the 6th/12th to 7th/13th century. Such a dichotomy of loyalty could be paralleled to the theories of modern scholars as we have mentioned before: the loyalty to Allāh is a dogmatic moral discipline; while the loyalty to human is a comparatively flexible social relationship and an interpersonal contract, but still protected by the religion.

Conclusive Remarks

From the above analysis, it can be found that there is a gap between the specific studies on pre-modern Islamic loyalties and the studies of relationships of loyalty from other research fields mentioned in this chapter. The former assumes that the exchange of realpolitikal interest was the foundation of Islamic loyalties, the latter, on the contrary, demonstrated that both the exchange of interests and mutual moral obligations are integral to a relationship of loyalty. When we focus on the arguments of Orthodox Sunni literati from the 5th/11th to 7th/13th century, represented by Niẓām al-Mulk, al-Ghazālī, and Ibn al-Taymiyya, it can be seen that they used to elaborate the concept of loyalty from an ethical perspective and constantly related loyalty to the moralism of Orthodox Sunnism. Such arguments make the gap of current academic work on Islamic loyalty even more apparent, and also serves as a reminder that the moralist meaning of pre-modern Islamic loyalty should not be neglected and necessitates further studies, which is the purpose of this thesis.

Chapter 2.

Rashīd al-Dīn al-Waṭwāṭ and Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh Dynasty

This chapter aims to provide the necessary historical background about al-Waṭwāṭ, as an underlay for the further studies in the following chapters. This chapter will be constituted of two parts, and will respectively focus on al-Waṭwāṭ's life, and Khwārazm under the governance of Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh at the time --- the state he served for. For his life, the line of enquiry will analyse the historical sources that recorded him, the existing collections of his letters, and his life experience, and his social relations in Khwārazm. For Anūshtakīnid-governed Khwārazm, the political-social history of Anūshtakīnid Khwārazm at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ will be focused on, especially the interactions between Anūshtakīnid dynasty and other powers in the east Islamic world, and the social influence of Sunni Orthodox in the 6th/12th Khwārazm.

2.1. Philological Study on al-Waṭwāṭ

2.1.1. Sources and Studies on al-Waṭwāṭ's Life

As one of the most prominent literati in his period, a series of medieval Islamic writers have recorded some certain aspects or fragments of al-Waṭwāṭ's life in their respective compilations. However, there is not any extant biographical work (*sīra*) which specifically records his entire life; instead, the biographical information about al-Waṭwāṭ was dispersed in various secondary sources.

The existing earliest source that contained biographical information of al-Waṭwāṭ is Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī al-Rūmī's (d. 626/1229) *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, a dictionary of Islamic litterateurs from the early Islamic period to the early 7th/13th century. al-Ḥamawī recorded al-Waṭwāṭ's talent for composing prose and poems in both Arabic

and Persian, and contained several letters and poems written by al-Waṭwāṭ in Arabic.[88] Zakariyyāʾ al-Qazwīnī recorded two tales of al-Waṭwāṭ in the entry of "Balkh" of his geographical dictionary *Athār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād*.[89] ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī recorded several poems of al-Waṭwāṭ in his *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushāy,* as well as the interactions between al-Waṭwāṭ and two Khwārazmshāhs --- Atsiz and Takish.[90] In *Kharīdat al-Qaṣr wa-Jarīdat al-ʿAṣr*, ʿImād al-Dīn al-Iṣbahānī also recorded the literary talent and social relationship of al-Waṭwāṭ, and collected various letters and poems written by him.[91] The later Islamic scholars such as Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī and Dawlatshāh Samarqandī also provided some biographic information of al-Waṭwāṭ in their respective works.[92]

In 1890, Iranian scholar ʿAbbās Eqbāl's composed a philological thesis on al-Waṭwāṭ, which was the earliest modern academic work that provided extensive biographical data on al-Waṭwāṭ. In his treatise, Eqbāl summarized the dispersed information about al-Waṭwāṭ from various sources, and studied al-Waṭwāṭ's life in Balkh and Khwārazm, his social networks with intellectuals of Khurasan and Transoxiana. Eqbāl's treatise was translated by Ibrahim Amin al-Shawāribī and used as the preface of his Arabic translation of *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fī Daqāʾiq al-Shʿr,* one of al-Waṭwāṭ's monography on grammar and rhetoric of Arabic poems.

2.1.2. Al-Waṭwāṭ's Life

The full name of al-Waṭwāṭ is Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Jalāl al-ʿUmarī. Rashīd al-Dīn was his *laqab* (honorary title). He was believed to be a decedent of the second Caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. His *nisba* al-ʿUmarī may came from his lineage.[93] His famous agnomen al-Waṭwāṭ (the bat) was believed to came from his

[88] Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, Vol.4, 2631-2636.
[89] Al-Qazwīnī, *Athār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād*, 334-335.
[90] Juvayni, *Tarikh-i Jahangushay*, Translated by Boyle, 278.
[91] Al-Iṣbahānī, *Kharīdat al-Qaṣr Wa-Jarīdat al-ʿAṣr*, vol.8, 175-186.
[92] For the record of Dawlatshāh and al-Suyuṭī on al-Waṭwāṭ, see Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shʿr*, translated by Ibrāhīm Amīn al-Shawāribī from Perisian to Arabic, 4.
[93] Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr*, Part 1 (*al-qism al-awwal*), 3.

appearance of "short stature and bald head (*qasīr al-qāma aṣlaʿ al-raʾs*)".[94] There are disputes about his birthplace: al-Ḥamawī, al-Qazwīnī, and al-Aṣbahanī recorded that he was born in Balkh,[95] while F. de Blois also mentioned that there are other sources that recorded that al-Waṭwāṭ's birthplace was Bukhara.[96] For the year of his death, al-Ḥamawī recorded as 573/1177[97], while Dawlatshāh recorded that al-Waṭwāṭ died in 578/1182 at the age of 94.[98]

The sources that mentioned above provide little information on al-Waṭwāṭ's early life, but it is confirmable that he got educated in the *al-Madrasa al-Niẓāmiyya* of Balkh,[99] which was one of Orthodox Sunni academies named by Niẓām al-Mulk, the famous vizier of Saljūq Sultans Alp Arslān and Malikshāh. In al-Niẓāmiyya, al-Waṭwāṭ was trained as a *kātib* and mastered rhetorical skills in both the Persian and Arabic languages. Al-Waṭwāṭ lived in Baghdad for some time, during that period, he contacted the shaykhs and some powerful people (*aqrān*) in the city.[100] Al-Waṭwāṭ went to Khwārazm after he finished his study in Balkh and lived there until his death, where he was appointed by Khwarazmshāh Atsiz as the chief *kātib* (*raʿīs al-kuttāb*) of Khwārazmian court, responsible for compiling files and writing official correspondence (*ṣāḥib dīwān al-inshāʾ*).[101] He was living in al-Jurjāniyya (or *Gorgānj* in Persian), the capital of the Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh dynasty and served the court of the Khwārazmshāhs for the whole of his life. As the chief kātib, al-Waṭwāṭ successively served for two Khwārazmshāhs --- Atsiz and his son Īl Arslān, and even kept his influence in Khwārazm after the death of Īl Arslān. Juwaynī recorded that during the period of two of Īl Arslān's sons, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Takish and Sulṭānshāh contending for the throne of Khwārazmshāh, al-Waṭwāṭ represented Khwārazmian litterateurs to openly

---

[94] This explanation of his agnomen was suggested by Muḥammad Bahja al-Athrī, the editor of al-Iṣbahānī's *Kharīdat al-Qaṣr Wa-Jarīdat al-ʿAṣr.* See al-Iṣbahānī, *Kharīdat al-Qaṣr Wa-Jarīdat al-ʿAṣr,* Vol.8, 175, Footnote 1

[95] See ibid, 175; and al-Qazwīnī, *Athār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād*, 334.

[96] de Blois, "Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Djalīl Al-ʿUmarī, known as Waṭwāṭ", *Encyclopedia of Islam, Second Edition (EI2).*

[97] al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, Vol.4, 2632.

[98] Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr,* Part 1 (*al-qism al-awwal*), 3.

[99] Ibid, 4.

[100] See al-Iṣbahānī, *Kharīdat al-Qaṣr Wa-Jarīdat al-ʿAṣr,* Vol.8, 175, Footnote 1.

[101] de Blois, "Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Djalīl Al-ʿUmarī, known as Waṭwāṭ", *EI2.*

support Takish. Together with other poets and orators in al-Jurjāniyya, al-Waṭwāṭ composed congratulatory poems to Takish.[102]

Al-Waṭwāṭ was recognized as one of the most brilliant scholars living in Khwārazm at his time. He compiled a series of monographs in the field of linguistics, philology, and literature, including *Hada'iq al-Sihr fī Daqa'q al-Shi'r* --- a monograph on grammar and rhetorical devices of classical Arabic poems, *Laṭā'if al-amthāl wa ṭarā'if al-aḳwāl* --- a compilation of Arabic proverbs, and four philological monographs that respectively recorded the biographies of four Rashidūn caliphs; each work collected one hundred sayings from each of them.[103] He had a high reputation for his literature talent. Al-Iṣbahānī described al- Waṭwāṭ as a person for whom "there is no Khwarazmian person who can reach his knowledge (*lā khawā khwārazma mīn ʿilmihi*)". Al-Iṣbahānī believed that al-Waṭwāṭ's talent had surpassed Abū ʿAbd-Allāh al-Muʿizzī, Abū al-Majd al-Sanā'ī, and Abū al-Qāsim al-Firdawsī, and his poems and prose made him to be the "most shining star that eclipses other stars (*lā hadā najm bihā najm nathrihi wa naẓmihi*)".[104] Al-Ḥamawī described al-Waṭwāṭ as "the most brilliant one of his time in compiling prose and poems, and the most knowledgeable on the details of Arabic vocabulary and the secrets of grammar and rhetoric".[105]

Al-Waṭwāṭ was also famous for his sarcasm and bad temper. Al-Qazwīnī collected one of his letters written to a *kātib* of Khwārazmian court. In this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ not only satirized the kātib for his repeated mistakes, but also threated him with leaving office at the end of the letter.[106] He also had some private letters, mocking the ignorance of some of his fellows, and ironizing the jealousy of surrounding people to his talent.[107]

---

[102] Juwaynī, *Tarikh-i Jahangushay*, Translated by Boyle, 290. Also see Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadā'iq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqā'iq al-Shaʿr,* 4.
[103] Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabā'*, Vol.4, 2632; Also see de Blois, "Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Djalīl Al-ʿUmarī, known as Waṭwāṭ", *EI2.*
[104] Al-Iṣbahānī, *Kharīdat al-Qaṣr wa-Jarīdat al-ʿAṣr*, Vol.8, 176.
[105] Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabā'*, Vol.4, 2632.
[106] Al-Qazwīnī, *Athār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād*, 335.
[107] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasā'il Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ, edited by M. A. Fahmī*, Vol.2, 3.

2.1.3. Al-Waṭwāṭ's Letters

Al-Waṭwāṭ wrote considerable numbers of correspondence letters in his life in both Arabic and Persian. According to al-Ḥamawī's record, al-Waṭwāṭ compiled more than one compilation (*diwān*) of his epistles and poems. Among his compilations, *Abkār al-afkār fī al-rasāʾil wa-al-ashʿār* was the largest in volume, which composed of four volumes, and respectively collected al-Waṭwāṭ's Arabic poems, Arabic letters, Persian poems, and Persian letters.[108] However, it is unfortunate that none of his compilations remain today.[109] The remaining letters of al-Waṭwāṭ were re-collected by modern scholars since the late 19th century. The collection of al-Waṭwāṭ's Persian letters was published in 1959 under the title of *Nāmahā-ye Rashīd-al-dīn Vaṭvāṭ,* compiled by the Iranian scholar Qāsem Tūyserkānī. Most of his Persian letters were addressed to Sanjar and the members in Saljūq court.[110] Al-Waṭwāṭ's Arabic letters was collected by the Egyptian scholar Muḥammad Afāndī Fahmī and published under the title of *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn al-Waṭwāṭ* in 1895. Fahmī's compilation was composed of two volumes, totalling 176 letters. Volume I contained letters addressing the various rulers (including the Abbāsid Caliph, sultans, *malik*s, *amīr*s, and *wālī*s) in the different regions of the Islamic world, expanding from Syria to Transoxiana, and many high-ranking officials such as viziers (*wuzarāʾ*), judges (*quḍā*) muftīs (*muftūn*), as well as knowledgeable scholars (*ulamāʾ*), leaders of the populace (*aʿyān*), leaders with social stature (*akābir*), and people with high reputation (*fuḍalāʾ*), while volume II contained al-Waṭwāt's private letters addressing to the various types of social elites with whom he was familiar.[111]

It should be noted that this thesis will focus on the Arabic letters of al-Waṭwāṭ, while Persian letters will not be studied because of practical issues translating the Persian language, as well as the lack of translations for al-Waṭwāṭ's Persian letters.

---

[108] Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr,* Part 1 (*al-qism al-awwal*), 64.
[109] Ibid, 2633. Al-Waṭwāṭ's compilations did not remained, see Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr,* 64.
[110] de Blois, "Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Djalīl Al-ʿUmarī, known as Waṭwāṭ", *EI2.*; and Madelung, "Āl-e Bāvand", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, available at < https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/al-e-bavand >
[111] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ, edited by M. A. Fahmī*, Vol. 1, 3.

Compared to his Persian letters, al-Waṭwāṭ's Arabic letters are greater in number, and the recipients of Arabic letters were also more varied in both identity and position. Thus, even though the neglect of the Persian letters will unavoidably narrow the scope of study and lead to an increase in bias, his Arabic letters are still helpful for abstracting the concept of loyalty at the time.

Al-Waṭwāṭ's Arabic letters could be classified as two kinds -- official letters and private letters, and, the former was based on al-Waṭwāṭ's identity as the chief scribe (*kātib*) of Khwārazmian court, written on behalf of the Khwārazmshāhs and their courts, while the latter was written on the behalf of al-Waṭwāṭ himself, writing to his own friends and for his own purpose. According to this classification, most of his official letters were collected in the first volume of Fahmī's compilation. These official letters directly reflected the ideological and ethical narratives of Anūshtākīnid dynasty in the field of official correspondence, hence will be particularly focused in this thesis comparing to his other letters.

2.1.4. Al-Waṭwāṭ's Social Network

The sources and letters of al-Waṭwāṭ reflect that al-Waṭwāṭ kept close relations with a number of social and cultural elites[112] living inside and outside Khwārazm. According to Eqbāl, in al-Waṭwāṭ's various private correspondences, he clearly wrote the names of 13 recipients in his texts. Among these recipients, five people were religious clerics (*imām*), and the rest of them were various types of litterateurs, including one scholar (*ʿalāma*), one judge (*qāḍī*), three poets (*shāʿir*), one philosopher (*faylasūf*), and one intellectual (*adīb*).[113] From a geographical perspective, eight of these 13 recipients were living in Khwārazm (or at least resided in Khwārazm for a period), and five persons lived in Saljuq-governed Khurāsān and ʿIrāq.[114] Based on the such close relations, it is plausible to conject that al-Waṭwāṭ had an extensive social

[112] See Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr*, 25. Eqbāl used the word "*fuḍalā*", literally means the excellent people or prominent people.
[113] Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr*, Part 1 (*al-qism al-awwal*), 26.
[114] Ibid, 26.

network in Khwārazm and surrounding area.

Scholar Jār Allāh al-Zamakhsharī (467/1074 - 538/1143) was the most influential person in al-Waṭwāṭ's social networks. Al-Zamakhsharī was a polymath, famous for his talent in poetry, linguistics, philosophy, and theology. As an openly Muʿtazilite litterateur, he was not hired by any ruler in his whole life. However, as the most brilliant Khwārazmian scholar at his time, al-Zamakhsharī had a visible social influence in his state. A considerable number of scholars living in Khwārazm (especially in al-Jurjāniyya, the capital of Anūshtākīnid Khwārazm) were his teachers or students.[115] Based on such teacher-student relations, al-Zamakhsharī became one of the core members in the intellectual milieu of Khwārazm. Iranian scholar Mortaza Shīrāzī supposed that al-Waṭwāṭ was one of al-Zamakhsharī's students (*tilmīdh*),[116] however, there was no other evidence to confirm whether these two literati had a "teacher-student" relationship. Among al-Waṭwāṭ's remaining letters, two were addressed to al-Zamakhsharī. One of these two letters was collected by al-Ḥamawī, in which al-Waṭwāṭ requested to participate in al-Zamakhsharī's lecture (*majlis*).[117] In this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ kept a humble attitude for requesting and showed his deep admiration to al-Zamakhsharī. It is difficult to know whether al-Zamakhsharī responded to al-Waṭwāṭ because there is no source which collected any of al-Zamakhsharī's letters that he wrote to al-Waṭwāṭ.[118] Another letter was written to Khwārazmian imam Sadīd al-Dīn al-Ḥātimī, which was collected by Muḥammad Kurd ʿAlī in his *Rasāʾil al-Bulaghāʾ*. In this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ recorded about twenty times, discussions between him and al-Zamakhsharī and Yaʿqūb al-Jandī; the latter was a judge (*qāḍī*) living in al-Jurjāniyya and one of al-Zamakhsharī's students.[119] This letter was presumably written later than

---

[115] Lane, *Al-Zamakhsharī (D.538/1144) and His Qurʾan Commentary al-Kashshāf*, 67. In the section of "teachers and students", the author conceptualized the "teacher-student relations", and summarized a series of intellectuals who had teacher-student relations with al-Zamakhsharī.

[116] See Ibid, 106.

[117] Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, Vol.4, 2632. This letter was also collected in the letters collection of Al-Waṭwāṭ edited by Muḥammad Fahmī, see Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ, edited by M. A. Fahmī*, Vol. 2, 28.

[118] Lane, *Al-Zamakhsharī (D.538/1144) and His Qurʾan Commentary al-Kashshāf*, 106.

[119] Ali, *Rasa'il al-Bulagha'*, 297. Al-Waṭwāṭ also mentioned that Yaʿqūb al-Jandī, a judge (*qāḍī*) living in al-Jurjāniyya and one of al-Zamakhsharī's students participated in his discussions with al-Zamakhsharī as well.

About al-Jandī, Eqbāl recorded that he was al-Zamakhsharī's student. See Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi*

the first one because al-Waṭwāṭ already had a qualification to participate in al-Zamakhsharī's lectures and dialogue with him. In this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ was proud of his capacity for discovering more than 10 grammatical (*iʿrāb*) and rhetorical (*balāgha*) mistakes that al-Zamakhsharī made in some of his poems and his explanatory comment of the Quran --- *al-Kashshāfʿan haqāʾiq al-tanzīl waʿuyūn al-aqāwil fī wujūh al-taʾwīl* (abbreviated as *al-Kashshāf* in this paper). According to the text of this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ was always correct when he demonstrated al-Zamakhsharī's mistakes, and al-Zamakhsharī delivered his appreciation and compliments to al-Waṭwāṭ.[120] al-Waṭwāṭ did not claim that he himself was a student (*tilmīdh*) of al-Zamakhsharī in either of two letters, which possibly suggests that he did not have a formal teacher-student relation with al-Zamakhsharī. However, his letters have confirmed that there were frequent interactions between these two litterateurs.

Besides al-Zamakhsharī, other recipients of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters were also people with considerable social influence in the east part of the Islamic world. Among these recipients, there were *36uftis* having high social statures in Saljūq-controlled Khurāsan, such as ʿAzīz al-Dīn al-Balkhī and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Kūfī;[121] and most famous poets at the time as well, such as Afḍal al-Dīn al-Khaqānī who served for the ruler of Shirwān (*Shirwānshāh*), and Sabīr al-Tirīdhī who served the Saljūq Sultan Sanjar. The correspondences between al-Waṭwāṭ and al-Khaqānī reflected two litterateurs delivered appreciations to each other for a period, but their friendship ended at a certain point in time and after that, they began to disparage the poems and compilations of each other.[122] The interactions between al-Waṭwāṭ and al-Tirmīdhī were kept antagonistic. Both sides had written a series of poems for attacking each other. Considering both al-Waṭwāṭ and al-Tirmīdhī respectively served Atsiz and Sanjar, the antagonism between them was

---

Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr, 35. For the name of al-Jandī, Lane trasliterated his *nisba* as "al-Janadī" (see Lane, *Al-Zamakhsharī (D.538/1144) and His Qurʾan Commentary al-Kashshāf*, 108, footnote 258), while Eqbāl supposed that his *nisba* was derived from Transiaxa city Jand, which was his hometown, thus it should be al-Jandī (See Al-ʿUmarī, 34). This thesis adopts the pointview of Eqbāl.

[120] Ali, *Rasa'il al-Bulagha'*, 298.

[121] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ,* edited by *M. A. Fahmī*, Vol. 1, 41, 42. al-Balkhī was the muftī of Sulṭaniyya Madsara in Khurasān, the Sunni School established by Sanjar; al-Kūfī was the muftī of Nīshābūr. In the letters that addressed to them, Al-Waṭwāṭ delivered his admiration to two muftīs, and disparaged the governance of Saljūqs in Khurasān.

[122] Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr*, Part 1 (*al-qism al-awwal*), 33.

derived from the rivalry between two rulers at the time.[123]

It is certain that al-Waṭwāṭ kept a close relationship with Khwārazmshāh Atsiz. Al-Qazwīnī recorded that Atsiz built a mansion for al-Waṭwāṭ besides his own palace. The balconies of the two buildings adjoined each other so that Atsiz could maintain dialogue with al-Waṭwāṭ at any time.[124] As the chief *kātib* of Atsiz, al-Waṭwāṭ was responsible for writing letters and poems on the behalf of Atsiz himself and his court. It is believed that al-Waṭwāṭ perfectly performed his work. ʿAṭā Malik Juwaynī recorded that al-Waṭwāṭ wrote a series of *qaṣīda* poems after Sanjar was defeated by Qarākhiṭās in the battle of Qatwān. In these poems, Atsiz used his rhetorical talent to propagate that the Saljūqs were already on the way to decay and Khwarazmshāh would become the new hegemonic power of Islamic world.[125] His poems incurred Sanjar's enmity. Diyaʾ al-Dīn al-Juwayni, the *kātib* of Sanjar, recorded that Sanjar once vowed to kill Rashid al-Din and cut him into thirty pieces.[126]

2.2. Khwārazm at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ

From the life of al-Waṭwāṭ, we know that there are two official identities he held – he was a *kātib* of Khwārazmian court, and an orthodox Sunni intellectual. As a *kātib* in charge of file compiling, he participated in the "diplomatic affairs"[127] of Khwārazmian court with other dynasties and political figures in the east Islamic world, and represented the Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs in communicating with their subjects, officials, and vassals. As an Orthodox Sunni intellectual with a high political-cultural position, al-Waṭwāṭ was considered a symbol of dominant influence of Orthodox

[123] About al-Tirmīdhī, see ibid, 45.
[124] al-Qazwīnī, *Athār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād*, 334.
[125] Juvayni, *Tarikh-i Jahangushay*, Translated by Boyle, 278-279.
[126] de Blois, "Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Djalīl Al-ʿUmarī, known as Waṭwāṭ", *EI2*.
[127] Al-ʿUmarī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shaʿr*, preface (*al-taqdīm*), 3. The author of the book's preface Aḥmad al-Khawlī equated the post of Al-Waṭwāṭ --- "*ṣāḥib dīwān al-inshā*'" with "foreign minister (*wazīr al-khārijiyya*)" in modern state. This comment is not completely right because Al-Waṭwāṭ not only compile official "diplomatic letters", but also compiled many official letters addressing to Khwārazmian "domestic" political figures, but at least, it is obvious that Al-Waṭwāṭ to some extent played the role of a "diplomatic bureaucrat".

Sunnism in Anūshtakīnid Khwārazm.[128] Based on these two identities of al-Waṭwāṭ, this section will present the interactions between Khwārazmshāhs with other rulers and dynasties from the beginning of the Anūshtakīnid dynasty to the death of al-Waṭwāṭ, and then the influence of Orthodox Sunnism on Anūshtakīnid Khwārazm.

2.2.1. The Political History of the Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh Dynasty during the reign of Atsiz and Īl Arslān

It is necessary to present the geographical information of Khwārazm before we come to the Anūshtakīnid dynasty. Khwārazm is an arable oasis located on at the lower Amu Darya basin, surrounded by the Aral Sea and Eurasian steppe to the north, the Qyzyl Qum Desert to the east, and the Khurāsān and Qara Qum desert to the south. According to the 4th/10th century Islamic geographer Shams al-Dīn al-Maqīdsī's geographical division in his compilation *Aḥsān al-Taqāsīm*, Khwārazm is the most north-western part of Transoxiana (*ma waraʾ al-nahr*), located on the border between Khurāsān and Transoxiana, the two main geographical zones of "the oriental region" (*mashriq*) of the Islamic world.[129] For the great powers in both Khurāsan and the center of Transoxiana, Khwārazm was a relatively remote agricultural area, so they commonly preferred to appoint one of his trusted followers as a semi-independent governor to rule this region.[130] Khwārazm was also located on the border between the nomadic area of Inner Asia and the settled area of the Islamic world, which made Khwārazm not only an important trading point for livestock and grains on traditional trade routes, but also an area of frequent interaction with Turkic nomads.[131] As a region that had both

[128] See Starr, Lost Enlightenment, 438. Starr's comment on Al-Waṭwāṭ could be considered as a represent of such view.
[129] See Wheatley, *The Places Where Men Pray Together*, 182. For al-Maqdīsī's geographical division and his definition on *mashriq*, see ibid, 178. In al-Maqdīsī's division, the *mashriq* denote the broad territory between al-Jibāl (or ʿIrāq al-aʿjam) and al-Fārs on the West, Sindh (*al-Sind*) on the South, and homeland of Turks (*Dar al-atrāk*), Tibet (*al-tibat*), China (*al-Ṣīn*) on the east.
[130] See Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, 275-279. And Bosworth, "Khwarazm-shahs", *EI2*. Ghaznawid sultan Maḥmūd b. sebuktakīn assigned his Turkic slave commander Altūntash as the semi-independent governor of Khwārazm when he conquered Khwārazm. When Saljūqs expelled Ghaznawids from Khwarāzm, Saljūq sultan Malikshāh also assigned his Turkic slave commander Anūshtakīn Gharjaʾī as the governor of Khwārazm.
[131] Paul, "The Role of Hwārazm in Seljuq Central Asian Politics, Victories and Defeats: Two Case Studies", 15

considerable agricultural resources and nomads as military manpower, the rulers of Khwārazm were potential competitors against the hegemony in the eastern part of the Islamic world.[132]

The rule of the Anūshtakīnid dynasty over Khwārazm began at 470/1077, when Saljūq Sultan Malik Shāh appointed Anūshtakīn Gharjaʾī as his *shiḥna* (delegated governor) of Khwārazm after he defeated Ghaznawids and expelled them from Khurāsan and Khwarazm.[133] In 488/1097, one year after Anūshtakīn's death, his son Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad was nominated by the son of Malikshāh, Saljūq Sultan Barkyaruq as the *shiḥna* of Khwarazm with the title of Khwārazmshāh --- the traditional title of the ruler of Khwārazm that could be traced to the pre-Islamic period, and continued to be successively used by Āfrīghīd, Maʾmūnīd, Altūntashid dynasts of Khwārazm as their official title.[134] Thorughout the reign of Quṭb al-Dīn Muhammad, the court of Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh kept its loyalty to the Saljūq Sultans as a semi-independent vassal dynasty.[135]

ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Atsiz was delegated by Saljuq Sultan Aḥmad Sanjar as the *shihna* of Khwarazm in 521 or 522/ 1127-28[136] after the death of Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad, he also inherited the title "Khwārazmshāh" from his father. In the first decade of his reign, Atsiz was kept as an ideal vassal of Sanjar. He joined in the army of Sanjar whenever Sanjar requested, and participated in many campaigns led by Sanjar, including the battle against Qarakhānid ruler of Samarqand in 524/1130, and the battle of Dāy Marj against his nephew Saljūq Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Masʿūd b. Muḥammad.[137] In the same period, Atsiz occupied Jand, one of the biggest towns in the lower Syr Darya, hence extended the influence of Khwārazmian court to the Central Asian steppe.[138] This expansion

---

[132] Ibid, 1.
[133] Bosworth, "Khwarazmshahs, Decendents of the Line of Anuštigin", *Encyclopaedia Iranica,* available at < https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/khwarazmshahs-i >
[134] See Bosworth, "Khwārazm-shāhs", *EI2*
[135] Paul, "The Role of Hwārazm", 10.; also see Nīshāpūrī, *The History of the Seljuq Turks, from The Jami' al-Tawarikh: An Ilkhanid Adaptation of the Saljuq-nama,* translated and annotated by Kenneth Allin Luther, 101.
[136] Paul "Atsız b. Muḥammad", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *3rd edition* (*EI3*).
[137] Paul, "The Role of Hwārazm", 10.
[138] Bosworth, "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (a.d. 1000-1217)", in: *Cambridge History of Iran, vol.5*, 144; also see Paul, "Sanjar and Atsız: Independence, Lordship, and Literature", 85.

possibly led to the military coalition between Khwārazmshāh and nomadic Turks.[139]

529/1135 or 1136 marked a watershed in the relations between Atsiz and Sanjar because the tension between two rulers became more and more visible after that year.[140] Barthold and Bosworth attribute the "rebellion" of Atsiz to his desire to make his dynasty "as autonomous as possible",[141] while Jürgen Paul suggested that the military supports from nomadic Turks gave Atsiz ambition for not only "achieving independence" but also replacing Sanjar to be the new hegemony in Islamic world.[142] In 533/1138 and 534/1139, Atsiz had two campaigns with Sanjar in Khwārazm and Khurasān. Sanjar's army triumphed in both campaigns, and one son of Atsiz died on the battlefield.[143] In 536/1141, when Sanjar declared war to the Qarākhiṭās, Atsiz delivered the oath of loyalty and promised to support him, however, Khwarazmian army did not appear in the battle of Qatwān.[144] The battle of Qatwān ended Sanjar's hegemony in Transoxiana and shook his control in Khurasan. Meanwhile, Atsiz began to negotiate with Qarākhiṭās. Mongolian-Chinese historian Togtoˀa recorded in his historical compilation *Liao Shi* that "Ninety days after the Khitai army was quartered at Samarqand, the Muslim king came to surrender and delivered tribute"[145]. Here, Chinese scholar Wei Liangtao suggested that the Muslim king denoted to Atsiz.[146] Muslim historians such as Juwaynī also recorded that Atsiz paid an annual tribute of 3000 dinars to the Gūrkhān of Qarākhiṭās.[147]

Atsiz regarded the defeat of Sanjar at Qatwan as an opportunity to replace the Saljūqs and become the new hegemon. Thus, he openly "revolted" against Sanjar. He removed the name of Sanjar from the coins and the Friday prayers of Khwārazm.[148] In 536/1142, Atsiz restarted the war against Sanjar, meanwhile, he ordered al-Waṭwāṭ to

---

[139] Paul, "Sanjar and Atsız", 82.
[140] Ibid, 89.
[141] Bosworth, "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World", 143.
[142] Paul, "Sanjar and Atsız", 101.
[143] Ibn al-Athir, *al-Kāmil fī-al-Tārīkh*, vol.9, 311.
[144] Paul, "Sanjar and Atsız", 97.
[145] Togto'a/Tuoketuo 托克托, "Benji Sanshi, Tian-Zuo Huangdi Si 本纪三十，天祚皇帝四", *Liao Shi, vol. 30 辽史，卷三十*. "駐軍尋思干凡九十日，回回國王來降，貢方物."
[146] Wei, *Xiliao Shi Yanjiu 西辽史研究*, 94.
[147] Bosworth, "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World", 144; Juvayni, *Tarikh-i Jahangushay*, translated by Boyle, 356.
[148] Paul, "Atsız b. Muḥammad", *EI2*.

compile at least one "diplomatic letter" addressing the Abbāsid Caliph al-Muqtafī, petitioning the Caliph for supporting Khwārazmshāh.[149] At the early period of the war, Atsiz's army temporarily occupied the Saljūq-controlled Marw and Nīshābūr[150] and laid siege to Jurjān under the governance of the Bāwandid dynasty - a vassal of Sanjar.[151] Sanjar was impressed by the considerable number of nomad soldiers in Atsiz's army.[152] However, Sanjar finally retook Khurāsān and expelled the Khwārazmian army.[153] The defeat of Atsiz in the war seemed to end his ambition of replacing Sanjar. From 538/1143, Atsiz did not ever militarily or politically challenge Sanjar. He once again minted Khwārazmian coins with the name of Sanjar on 545/1149.[154] When Sanjar was captured by Ghuzz Turks in 549/1153, he wrote a letter to the leader of Ghuzz Tuti Beg, asking for him to release Sanjar.[155] He also appointed al-Waṭwāṭ to write a congratulatory letter to Sanjar after he was released and returned to Khurāsān,[156]

Īl Arslān was throned in 551/1156 as Khwārazmshāh. Sanjar had died one year later, which symbolized the collapse of the Great Saljuq Empire, and created a power vacuum in Khurasan and Transoxiana. Anūshtakīnid Khwārazm became one of candidates of new hegemony. Īl Arslān attempted to expanded the influence of the Khwārazmian court by more frequent diplomatic interactons, which were reflected by a series of "official diplomatic letters" written by al-Waṭwāṭ representing the Khwārazmian court. During this period, the Khwārazmshāh sought to deepen relations with Abbāsid Caliph,[157] support Abū al-Shajāʿ Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad (Muḥammad II) to be throned as the great Saljūq Sultan,[158] and repair the relationship

[149] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn al-Waṭwāṭ,* Vol.1, 6-7.
[150] Ibn al-Athir, *al-Kāmil fī-al-Tārīkh*, vol.9, 323.
[151] See Bosworth, "80. The Bawandid Ispahbadhs", in *The New Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Manual*. Also see Madelung, "Āl-e Bāvand," *Encyclopædia Iranica*, available at < https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/al-e-bavand >
[152] Paul, "The Role of Hwārazm", 16.
[153] Ibn al-Athir, *al-Kāmil fī-al-Tārīkh*, vol.9, 328.
[154] Paul, "Sanjar and Atsız", 105.
[155] Ibid, 107.
[156] Ibid, 108.
[157] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn al-Waṭwāṭ,* Vol.1, 31.
[158] Ibid, 21.

with the Bāwandid rulers of Mazāndarān.[159] To the east, Īl Arslān kept paying the annual tribute to Qarākhiṭās and admitted the suzerain of Gūrkhān in Transoxiana. Such Suzerain-vassal relations were attacked by antagonistic powers such as the Ghūrīds, and the Abbāsids after the death of Īl Arslān.[160] Because Qarākhiṭās rarely interfered in the internal affairs of Islamic regimes, Īl Arslān succeeded in expanding his influence in the both agricultural and nomadic areas.[161] He deepened his military coalitions with nomadic Turks, especially Kanglīs and Qarlūqs.[162] The alliance between the Khwarazmshāh and nomadic Turks, on the one hand, strengthened the force of the Khwarazmian army, on the other hand, ensured the Khwārazmshāh was able to interfere in Islamic regimes in Transoxiana in the name of mediating the conflicts between nomads and settled Muslims.[163] For example, when the conflicts between the Qarlūqs and the Qarākhānid ruler of Samarqand began in 553/1158, Īl Arslān invaded the realm of Qarākhānids in the name of alleviating disputes.[164] When Īl Arslān died in 157/1172, Anūshtakīnid Khwārazm had become one of the most powerful dynasties in the east Islamic world.

2.2.2. Orthodox Sunnism in Anūshtakīnid Khwārazm

As the above analysis shows, Khwārazm was located at the crossroad of traffic routes between Khurāsān, Transoxiana, and the nomadic area of the Inner Asian steppe. Such a geographical location not only led to the commercial prosperity of Khwārazm, but also made Khwārazm into an intersection of different political, cultural, and religious sects. The flourishing economy was a relatively tolerant political atmosphere with Khwārazm on the one hand attracting external intellectuals of various dissident religious or cultural sects coming to Khwārazm in order to seek development or avoid political persecution, and on the other, raising a number of excellent local

[159] Ibid, 46.
[160] Jackson, *The Mongols and the Islamic World*, 56.
[161] Biran, *The Empire of the Qara Khitai in Eurasian History: Between China and the Islamic World*, 187.
[162] Paul, "Who Makes Use of Whom? Some Remarks on the Nomad Policy of the Khwarazmshahs, 1150-1200", 140.
[163] Ibid, 143-144.
[164] Biran, *The Empire of the Qara Khitai in Eurasian History*, 53.

intellectuals.[165] In the early 5th/11th century, the Khwārazmshāh of Iranian Maʾmūnid Khwārazmshāh dynasty Abū al-ʿAbbās Maʾmūn b. Maʾmūn (Maʾmūn II) (r. ?399/?1009 - 407/1017) accepted the suggestion of his vizier Aḥmad al-Suhaylī on expanding the library of al-Jurjāniyya and established an academy in the city.[166] Throughout his reign, a number of most brilliant scientists, philosophers (*faylasūf*), and scholars at the time, including Ibn Sinā, Abū al-Sahl al-Masīḥī, and Abū al-Mansūr al-Thaʿālibī came to Khwārazm and served in the court of Khwārazmshāh. Together with local scholars represented by al-Bīrūnī, those scholars made al-Jurjāniyya the most prominent academic and cultural center in the east Islamic world.[167] Many of intellectuals living in the early 5th/11th century al-Jurjāniyya were Muʿtazilites, the sect that had already faded and been unwelcomed in other parts of Islamic world.[168] Besides philosophers and Muʿtazilites, it was believed that Sufism (*taṣawwuf*), represented by aḥmad Yasawī and his order, also had a considerable social influence in Khwārazm, especially in the parts of Khwārazm in where nomadic Turks lived at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ.[169]

However, under the governance of Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs, orthodox Sunnism became the dominant sect in Khwārazm. even though Anūshtakīnid Khwārzmshāhs to some extent continued the religious-political tolerance to dissident sects, as the previous Khwārazmian governors did, it was believed that they openly supported the prevalence of orthodox Sunnism in their realm and regarded it as the main pillar of the religious-political legitimacy of their governance.[170] The appointment of bureaucrats and judges directly reflected the attitude of Anūshtakīnid Khwārzmshāhs to orthodox Sunnism and other sects: Throughout the reign of Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad and Atsiz, bureaucrats working in the Khwārazmian administration represented by al-Waṭwāṭ, and judges (*qāḍī*) represented by Yaʿqūb al-Jandī were all orthodox Sunni Muslims, while intellectuals from dissident sects, including Muʿtazilites, philosophers,

[165] Bosworth, "Khwārazm", *EI2.*
[166] Starr, *Lost Enlightenment*, 281.
[167] Bosworth, "Khwārazmshāh", *EI2.*
[168] See Bosworth, "Khwārazm", *EI2;* and Starr, 282.
[169] İz, "Aḥmad Yasawī", *EI2.*
[170] Bosworth, "Khwārazmshāh", *EI2*. Also see Starr, *Lost Enlightenment*, 533.

and could hardly be accepted by the administrative system and got a position. Depending on the supports of Khwārazmshāh, orthodox Sunnism monopolized the justice and bureaucratic system of Khwārazm, while dissident sects were generally marginalized. Maḥmūd al-ʿĀriḍī al-Khwārazmī, a Khwārazmian scholar with considerable attainment in philosophy, was forced to leave Khwārazm and finally committed suicide in Khurāsān.[171] Jār Allāh al-Zamakhsharī, the most famous openly Muʿtazilī Khwārazmian scholar in the first half of the 6th/12th Century, also left Khwārazm for many years because of his Muʿtazilī sectarian identity. Throughout his life, al-Zamakhsharī tried to concur his Muʿtazilite thoughts with orthodox Sunnism after he returned to Khwārazm[172]. *Al-Kashshāf* --- his most represented work of his late period, reflected his intentions of integration of his Muʿtazilite thoughts into orthodox Sunnism.[173] Despite his efforts, he was not able to get a position in bureaucratic system of the court of Khwārazmshāh, even though he held a high esteem by literati represented by al-Waṭwāṭ and to some extent became the core figure of Khwārazmian literati circle. The situation of al-Zamakhsharī seems to be have repeated by Burhān al-Dīn al-Muṭarrizī, another prominent Muʿtazilī scholar who was called "the successor of al-Zamakhsharī (*khalīfat al-zamakhsharī*)": On the one hand, he got high esteem by the Khwārazmian literati circle because of his philological and poetic achievements, on the other hand, however, he did not hold an official position.[174]

Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs' support for orthodox Sunnism could be explained from varying perspectives. From the perspective of ideological legitimacy, orthodox Sunnism was closely related to the legitimacy of the Anūshtakīnid dynasty. Thorughout the reign of Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad and the early reign of Atsiz, Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs were nominal regional governors assigned by Saljūq Sultans. As the vassal of Saljūqs and the symbol of Saljūqs' suzerainty in Khwārazm, the maintaining

[171] Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, Vol.4, 2687. See the entry of "Maḥmūd b. ʿAzīz al-ʿĀriḍ al-Khwārazmī"
[172] Ibid, vol.4, 2587. See the entry of "Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar al-Zamakhsharī".
[173] Lane, "You Can't Tell a Book by Its Author: A Study of Muʿtazilite Theology in al-Zamakhsharī's (d. 538/1144) al-Kashshāf", 83. In this article, the author suggested that even though *al-Kashshāf* was influenced by certain aspects of al-Zamakhsharī's Muʿtazilite thoughts, the whole monograph was still in the framework of orthodox Sunnism, hence, *al-Kashshāf* could not even be defined as a Muʿtazilite work.
[174] See Sellheim, "al-Muṭarrizī", *EI2*; and Keegan, "al-Muṭarrizī", *EI3*.

support of Saljūq Sultans was the pillar of the governance of Anūshtakīnid family in this region, thus, following the saljūqs' religious-political policy of supporting orthodox Sunnism was the most reasonable choice for Khwārazmshāhs. After Atsiz strengthened his army and began to have conflict with the Saljūqs, the coalition between the Khwārazmshāh and nomads became a target of ideological attack. Sanjar blasted Atsiz for being "more like a nomad captain than a Muslim provincial governor" because "there were thousands of Turks in his army, some of them unbelievers".[175] In this case, Atsiz had to continue the openly support his court of orthodox Sunnism when responding to such attacks.

From an administrative perspective, orthodox Sunnism could contribute to the maintenance of central power of Khwārazmshāh in his realm. Marshall Hodgson conceptualized the social structure of medieval Sunni-dominated Khurasān and Transoxiana as the "*amīr-aʿyān*" pattern. In this pattern, the ruler of the central court appointed his military governors (*amīr*, plural. *umarāʾ*) to govern towns, while rural areas in surrounding towns were under the autonomous governance of local notables (*ʿayn*, plural. *aʿyān*). Under the "*amīr-aʿyān*" pattern, the Khwārazmshāh and his amīrs had the power to nominate judges and fiscal bureaucrats of towns from the local notables, hence, the powers of the central court and local notables reached a balance.[176] As the following letters illustrate, in the Sunni-dominated "*amīr-aʿyān*" society of Anūshtakīnid Khwārazm, orthodox Sunni judges and bureaucrats not only guaranteed the effective running of the society, but also were the extension of the will of Khwārazmshāh to every town and village in his realm.

[175] Paul, "Sanjar and Atsız", 92. Also see Paul, "The Role of Hwārazm", 16.
[176] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 115.

Chapter 3.

The Relationships of loyalty between the Populace and the Ruler

From this chapter, the thesis will deeply study the narrative of al-Waṭwāṭ in terms of the concept of loyalty in his letters. As the previous chapters have illustrated, loyalty can be conceptualized as a social interaction based on the exchanges of interests, an ethical principle obeyed by society, or the combination of both. However, the meaning of loyalty is varied in different contexts. As for the "Islamic loyalty" at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ, it could either refer to the relationship and interactions between the ruler (or the governor) and the populace under his reign in a "domestic" context, or refer to the interactions between different rulers and their respective dynasties, as a relationship between "political entities".

"Domestic loyalty" still varies for different groups of people. Gorups of people, or, the various "categories" of people (the term used by Mottahedeh) could be roughly classified into two types: the loyalty of the populace to the rulers who govern them, and the loyalty of the bureaucrats or officials to the lords they served. This chapter will examine the former, and study how are the "realpolitik" and the "ethical" aspect of "domestic loyalty" were reconciled in the text of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters. The populace, including all groups of people under the governance of the rulers and without a position in the court of the rulers, will be the main research object for this chapter. This chapter is constituted of two sections: the first section will start with the vocabularies in al-Waṭwāṭ's letters that relate to the populace, and relate these words to certain theories on the governed populace in the East Islamic world at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ, aiming to conceptualize the loyalty of the populace; and the second section will examine the text of some of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters, studying his narrative on the loyalties of different categories of the populace. Through the analysis of these two sections, there shall be

given a conclusive remark at the end of this chapter.

3.1. The Populace and Their Relationship with the Ruler

In his letters, al-Waṭwāṭ used various vocabularies to refer to the "populace" under the governance of the rulers, including *insān* (pl. *nās*), *sākin* (pl. *sākinūn*), *marʿiyya*, *raʿiyya* (pl. *raʿāyā*), *ḥurr* (pl. *aḥrār*), etc. From a linguistic perspective, the meaning of these words is not exactly the same --- these words refer to different scopes of the populace and were used in different contexts. Such vocabularies provide a clue for conceptualizing "the populace" and the relationship between them and the rulers who govern them at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ.

In one of his letters written in the name of Khwārazmshāh regarding the appointment of a *qāḍī* (judge), al-Waṭwāṭ used the word "*nās*" (literally "humans") to refer to "the people under the just governance of the *qāḍī* (*an yaḥkuma bayna al-nās bi-al-ʿadl*)".[177] In the same letter, al-Waṭwāṭ also used the word "*raʿāyā* (literally meaning subjects, always referring to the populace from lower classes)" to refer to the people who "Allāh [may] make capable of being governed by this *qāḍī* and respect him" (*bi-tilka al-khuṭṭa ḥāṭahum allāhu an yatawaffaru ʿala tamkīmi fulānin wa ihtiramihi*).[178] Here, al-Waṭwāṭ clearly presented that the categories of the populace that could be referred by *raʿāyā*, which are "*aʿyan*, local 'bigwigs' (*kubarāʾ*), famous people (*mashhūrīn wa maʿrūfīn*), local leaders (*ruʾasāʾ*), financial officers with authorities (*al-ʿummāl al-mutaṣarrifīn*), and the rest of people (*sāʾir al-raʿāyā*)".[179] "*Nās*" and "*raʿāyā*" share similar meaning but the scope of the populace that "*raʿāyā*" refers to is more precise than "*nās*". Another word which means the populace under the governance is "*marʿiyya*" (literally means "people under the governance") which shares the same lexical root "r-ʿ-y" with "*raʿāyā*". In one of his letters addressed to an *amīr* of Khwārazm, al-Waṭwāṭ said that *amīr* should protect the "*huqūq al-marʿiyya* (the rights of populace)" of the people he rules. From the context of the letter, it could be known

[177] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ,* edited by M. A. Fahmī, Vol. 1, 79.
[178] Ibid, 80.
[179] Ibid, 80.

that *huqūq al-marʿiyya* emphasizes on the right of the merchants, peasants, and other people from the working class in the field of trading, and tax-paying.[180] *Sākinūn* (literally means the residents) is presented in the letter that al-Waṭwāṭ wrote to an *ʿayn* of Balkh, where he said that "I witnessed the coldness/ apathy of the people of Balkh (*ʿāyantu min jafawāt sākinīha*)".[181] From the context of the letter, one could deduce that the word "*sākinūn*" emphasises more the place where the populace live in than the categories or identities of the people. For example, *sākinū balkh* could refer to "all residents of Balkh", which includes not only the common people under the governance, but also the people with authority and power. If the scope of the *sākinūn* is the widest, then the scope of *aḥrār* (literally means free people) is the narrowest: In his letters, al-Waṭwāṭ used "*aḥrār*" to refer to a considerably limited scope of noble people who have high social status. Different from the ordinary people, *aḥrār* are born into noble families with glorious family history, and are supposed to be pious, ethical, educated, and own a series of good qualities.[182] On the one hand, the meaning and the context of these vocabularies reflected a basic feature of the populace, which is that populace were ruled by the ruler. The feature of being ruled could be shown from the lexical root of *raʿāyā* and *marʿiyya* ---"*r-ʿ-y*" and means "shepherding the livestock". On the other hand, the different semantic scopes of these vocabularies show that the boundary of "the populace" is obscure: *marʿiyya* refers to the working class, *raʿāyā* and *nās* refers to not only working class, but also the notables, and even some officials (*ʿummāl*).

Regardless of which vocabulary is used as the boundary of the "populace", it is obvious that there was a dichotomy between ruler and the populace at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ. The ruler governed, and the populace was being governed. However, the dichotomy of ruler and the populace does not mean that the rulers have absolute political power to control everything in the society. As Mottahedeh and Hodgson presented in their representative works, in general, the ruler did not directly govern all his subjects. On the contrary, they have to confront prominent figures of the populace

[180] Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, Vol.4, 2633.
[181]Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ,* edited by M. A. Fahmī,Vol. 2, 7.
[182] See Ibid, Vol. 1, 77, 79.

and their autonomous authorities in many cases, and hence, share political power with them. Mottahedeh divided the societal hierarchies in the 4th/10th century Islamic society under the governance of Būyid amīrs as *khaṣṣ* (pl. *khwwaṣ*) and *ʿāmma* (pl. *ʿawwāmm*), the former was "men of the regime", including the rulers, and his dependents, such as his officials, clerks, and soldiers; while the latter was similar to *raʿāyā* in al-Waṭwāṭ's letters, referred to the "populace being governed".[183] Mottahedeh also divided *ʿawwāmm* into *ʿayn* (pl. *aʿyān*) --- the notables with authority, and the rest of *ʿawwamm*. *Aʿyān* could be wealthy merchants (*tujjār*), imāms, religious scholars (*ulamāʾ*), and leaders of local groups (*ruʾasāʾ al-nās*), they played a role as the representative of the people, and the mediator between *khwāṣṣ* and the rest of *ʿawwāmm* below them.[184]

Mottahedeh's "*khaṣṣ-ʿāmma*" pattern shares some similar features with Hodgson's "*amīr-aʿyān*" pattern (as we have mentioned in the end of last chapter), which mainly focuses on the 5th/11th to 6th/12th century. Both of two patterns emphasize the fact that on the one hand, rulers possessed dominant power over the populace under his rule, on the other hand, they were not capable of governing the whole populace, and hence, they needed to tolerate local *aʿyān* continually keeping some kind of autonomous authority. In both patterns, rulers could depend on his political-military power to get more advantages in the trial of strength with *aʿyān*, but in the "*khaṣṣ-ʿāmma*" pattern, such advantages were more obvious: as Mottahedeh presented, in the 4th/10th century, Būyid amīrs could send an army to kill *aʿyān* and deprive their power whenever he thought the autonomous power of *aʿyān* ever threatened him.[185] While in the period of the Saljūq Sultans and Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs, (which is the period Hodgson's "*amīr-aʿyān*" pattern discusses), *aʿyān* and the rest of the populace have been capable of forming a recognizable force to go against the rulers and their garrison courts; hence, rulers had to be more cautious to use their military advantages to deal with *aʿyān* and the rest of the populace.[186]

An obvious difference between Motahedeh's and Hodgson's different patterns

[183] Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society,* 121.
[184] Ibid, 123.
[185] Ibid, 124.
[186] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 109.

about ruler-populace relations in a different period of history is that the social positions of religious class among the populace considerably changed. In the period of Mottahedeh's "*khaṣṣ-ʿāmma*" pattern, *ulamāʾ* was just an informal title for the people who had religious knowledge, rather than a social class with privilege and authority. Even though *ulamāʾ* regarded themselves as "the collective sound of the society", and even though an *ʿālim* could be influential if he is simultaneously an official or an *ʿayn*, the identity of *ulamāʾ* had weak leadership.[187] But in the period of Hodgson's "*amīr-aʿyān*" pattern, *ulamāʾ* became a specific privileged social stratum. They were educated in religious schools (*madrasa*), owning intellectual supremacy. [188] They also monopolized the legal and moral legitimations of the society, and were the only class that had qualification to hold the post of judges (*quḍāt*).[189] An extreme case to show the authority of religious class is that Burhān al-Dīn (or Burhānid) Family, the most influential and powerful *ʿulamāʾ* family in Bukhara, replaced the Qarakhānid rulers to temporarily become the de facto governor of the city in the late 6th/12th century. Burhānid *ʿulamāʾ*-governor of Bukhara even used the resplendent title of *Saḍr-i Jahān* --- traditionally, such kind of titles was only used by the military rulers who had an army and a piece of land (*iqtāʿ*).[190] The rise of Burhānids not only demonstrated the potential political power of religious class in the local populace, but only suggested that the boundaries between the populace, the officials, and the rulers are sometimes ambiguous, which we will make further analysis in following chapters. Hodgson attributed such change to the prevalence of orthodox Sunnism[191], however, as we have analysed in previous chapters, it is difficult to say whether the rise of the religious class led to the Sunni revival, or vice versa. The more plausible statement is that these two issues were closely related to each other, and bidirectionally influenced each other.

[187] Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society,* 136, 138.
[188] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 153.
[189] Ibid, 109,120.
[190] See Barthold, *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, 353; Ahmad, "Mapping the World of a Scholar in Sixth/twelfth Century Bukhāra: Regional Tradition in Medieval Islamic Scholarship as Reflected in a Bibliography", 28.
[191] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 154.

3.2. Loyalties of the Populace in al-Waṭwāṭ's Letters

As the above analysis illustrates, the essential feature of the populace is being ruled, hence, the loyalty of the populace manifests as the populace were supposed to be willing to be ruled by the rulers. From the vocabularies al-Waṭwāṭ used in his letters, we could know that al-Waṭwāṭ regarded the loyalty of the populace as simultaneously both an ethical discipline and an exchange of interests: the rulers, on the one hand, owned right to directly or indirectly (i.e. by appointing and authorizing *muḥtasib* (pl. *muḥtasibūn*) or *qāḍī*) to rule his subjects and made them comply to him; on the other hand, they were supposed to protect the *huqūq al-marʿiyya* of the populace under his rule. In one of his letters collected by al-Ḥamawī in *Muʿjam al-Udabaʾ*, al-Waṭwāṭ enlisted a series of elements which are crucial for an *amīr* to maintain his rule, including "controlling the rein of governing to keep his court running well" (*tuṣrifu uʿniyyat al-ʿnāyat ilā tartīb niẓāmihi*), "focusing on perfecting his ruling system" *(tuqṣaru al-himam ʿalā muhimmat ittimāmihi*), "appreciating the firmness of the religion" (*yataʿalliqu bi-thibāt al-dīn*), and "concerning the right of Muslims" (*yatawaqqifu salāḥ al-muslimīn*).[192] In another of his letters collected by Faḥmī, al-Waṭwāṭ praised the amīr for his "honorable morality and pure originality" (*ghazārat al-faḍl wa-ṭahārat al-aṣl*), hence "he (the *amīr*) give the light to the eyes (of people) through his fingers" (*fa-ahdā bi-āthār anāmilihi… bi-anwāʿ al-ayādī ilā al-ʿayn nawran*).[193] These texts seem to suggest a kind of "enlightened politics" scenario --- the ruler ruled the populace by his morality (*faḍl*), justice (*ʿadāla*), protected the rights of the populace and brought benefits to them: therefore, he could gain the loyalty of his subjects. However, could this scenario of "enlightened politics exchanging loyalty" be enough to explain the pattern of loyalties of all stratum of the populace to their ruler?

This section would conceptualize the loyalty of the populace to their rulers. Considering that al-Waṭwāṭ's letters are not cover for every specific category and group of the populace (as Mottahedeh did in his work), I would focus on two representative

[192] Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, Vol.4, 2633.
[193] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ,* edited by M. A. Fahmī, Vol. 1, 86.

and influential categories --- the local notables (*aʿyān*), and the religious elites such as imāms and *ʿulamāʾ*. There are two perspectives in analyzing the text of the letters — the content of the letter, and the etiquette wording. By analysing the different texts in al-Waṭwāṭ's letters from these two perspectives, and comparing the patterns of loyalties of two influential categories of the populace, one can expect to abstract and conceptualize the loyalty of populace to their rulers.

3.2.1. Loyalty of *Aʿyān*

Among the different letters of al-Waṭwāṭ written to the local *aʿyān* in various places, two were particularly representative, which were, the letter to an *ʿayn* of Balkh, and the letter to "one of the pillars of the country and the notables of the town (*wāḥid min arkān al-dawla wa-aʿyān al-ḥaḍra*)". Both two letters were collected in Fahmī's compilation.

The first letter was about al-Waṭwāṭ expressing to an *ʿayn* of Balkh about his grievance to a young person living in the town, and asking the *ʿayn* to deal with the youth. The letter did not provide information about when al-Waṭwāṭ wrote this letter, but the text revealed that this letter was written after al-Waṭwāṭ left Balkh and settled down in Khwārazm --- "they (the Balkh people) were in Balkh and I am in Khwārazm (*hum bi-balkh wa-anā bi-khwārazm*)".[194] In this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ used the opportunity for verbal attack: he first said that the immorality of the Balkh people and their provocation made his love for this city disappear --- "Balkh was used to be more dear to me more than Mecca for pilgrims, but now this city was more disgusting than the city of Tabāla (*kānat balkh…aʿazzu ʿalayya min makka ʿala al-ḥajjāj, fa-ṣārat ahwanu min tabāla*)", and how he hated the Balkh people --- "I always feel pain when talking or corresponding with them…between myself and them are high mountains, deep oceans, and the dark deadly desert (*ʿānaytu min sayʾāt qāṭnaihā fuṭūran bi-al-mushāfiha wa-al-mukhaṭba…baynanā jibāl sāmiyya wa-baḥḥar ṭāmiyya wa-mahāmih faqar fasīḥ*)". After such rhetoric, he explained what made him so angry --- a young man from his home village scolded and cursed him every day, so he requested the *ʿayn*

[194] Ibid, Vol.2, 7.

to stop such that young man in time --- "sooner than the arrow flying (*bi-wajh yakūnu aqrabu min ḥuṣūl al-marām*)". It is difficult to know whether the *ʿayn* helped al-Waṭwāṭ, but the text of the letter showed the authority of *aʿyān* in a town --- they had the power to influence the local populace, and even dispose of them. The etiquette wording of al-Waṭwāṭ also showed his respect to the authority of the *ʿayn*, even though in the situation, he wrote this letter with resentment: the letter began with "may Allāh put the best shields of protection to our master (the *ʿayn*) (*kasā allāhu sayyidanā min durūʿ al-ʿṣma aḍfāhā*)", and end with "may the supreme Allāh wish the noble view of our master on this affair was correct (*wa-raʾyu sayyidinā al-sharīf fī dhalika muwaffiq in shāʾ allāhu taʿālā*)".[195]

The second letter also reflected the authority of *aʿyān* for disposing of local people. This letter is about requesting the recipient --- an *ʿayn* to provide his aid to a poor young man who came to his town. The text of a letter neither reveals who the recipient was nor where he lived, nor did it provide any information about why and how this young man fell into poverty. However, the description of the letter implied that the young man may have had an uncommon background: al-Waṭwāṭ wrote that the youth "were raised in an environment with dignity, and were educated by respected people" (*nashaʾa fī aknāf al-ʿizza wa-tarabbā ʿalā aktāf al-aʿazza*), he used to "dress in a soft wool coat and finely worked straight-fabric cloths (*labasa al-burūd al-munaʿima wa-al-thiyāb al-muqawwima*)", "rode steeds and drove in a high carriage (*rakaba al-jiyād al-muṭhhima wa-al-ʿrāb al-musawwima*)".[196] However, "the time passed by him and took away what was in his hand (*al-zamān jār ʿalayhi wa-intazaʿa mā fī yadayhi*)", so that "the pillar of his life was crushed and the ties of his income were broken (*tahaddamat arkān aḥwālahu wa-tabaddadat ʿuqūd amwālihi*)". Such a description implies that the young man was from a *khaṣṣ* family, but for some reasons his family perished and he was one of only a few survivors.

The text of this letter also implies that the young man's family was not welcome in the recipient's town: in the letter, al-Waṭwāṭ boasted of the recipient's virtue of

[195] Ibid, Vol.2, 8.
[196] Ibid, Vol.1, 38.

hospitality, generosity, and forgiveness --- when people in a bad situation come to the recipient, "they would get rid of the fangs of a bad situation and receive aid (*khalaṣa min anyāb al-nawāʾib wa-najā*)", and "he (the recipient) gave hope and expectation to various people who requested (*wa-fāza min anwāʿ al-muṭālib bi-mā amal wa-rijā*)". Even to the people he did not like, gracious *aʿyān* such as the recipient would also be willing to help --- They would "offer camel for breakfast, offer lamb for snacks, offer flaming fires, deliver their helping hands to the people who request (*lahum raghiyya ṣabāḥ wa-thaghiyya rawāḥ wa-nayrān mashbūba wa-ayād ʿalā al-ṭālibīn maṣbūba*)", "they tolerate who they don't want to see, and never showed off their forgiveness (*yaghmiḍūna ʿan al-jāfīnīn wa-lā yaʿriḍūna ʿan al-ʿāfīn*)" .[197] After these compliments, al-Waṭwāṭ made a request --- "now he (the youth) come to the town of our lord (the recipient)…if our lord give him dignity, give him clothes, and give him what is generous in life (money), and what heals his pain, then he would gain the thankfulness, and also the continuous prays (from us). (*wa-al-ān qaṣada ḥaḍrat sayyidinā…fa-in asbala ʿalayhi sayyidunā sjāl karmihi wa-albasahu madāriʿ naʿmihi wa-amara lahu ʿalā wajh al-adrār bi-mā yashuffī ghillatahu, ḥaza shukrān mukhaḍḍir al-ʿawd wa-thināʾ muntaẓim al-ʿuqūd*)".[198]Although we don't know when al-Waṭwāṭ wrote this letter, he as a *kātib* did not had power to deal with an affair about a downtrodden *khaṣṣ* by himself.[199] Thus, one can speculate that this letter was one al-Waṭwāṭ wrote on the behalf of the Khwārazmshāh, the lord he served.[200]

This letter reflected that *aʿyān* not only had authority in disposing *ʿāmma*, but was also able to deal with *khawāṣṣ* in some cases. Such considerable authority and power qualified *aʿyān* as the coordinator or negotiator for the rulers, hence, there was an enough space for interest exchanging between rulers and *aʿyān*. As for what the letter shows, even the most sublime ruler such as Khwārazmshāh, would be willing to make

[197] Ibid, Vol.1, 38.
[198] Ibid, Vol.1, 38.
[199] For the power and authority of *kātib*, see Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 155. Hodgson suggested that an ideal *kātib* was obliged to satisfy any demand of his lord, however, *kātib* himself was lack of power.
[200] Because the text of this letter did not provide any information about when it was written, hence, it is difficult to analyse that Al-Waṭwāṭ wrote on behalf of which Khwārazmshāh --- he could be Atsiz, or Īl Arslān.

a deal with *aʿyān*: he asked the *ʿayn* to dispose the youth (in the text, aiding the youth), in return, the *ʿayn* would gain "the thankfulness and prayers" from the ruler as a reward. It is not sure whether the *ʿayn* had the capability to reject this interest-exchanging, but at least, the etiquette wording shows that he had sufficient dignity in front of ruler in this interest-exchange --- the same as the former letter, in which al-Waṭwāṭ also used the expression "the view of our lord on this affair is correct (*wa-raʾyu sayyidinā fī dhalika muwaffiq*)" in the end of this letter, but the salute in the beginning was "may Allāh preserve his highness (*adāma allāhu ʿuluwwahu wa ḥarasa sumuwwahu*)". Besides these, the etiquette of this letter also includes that "he (the recipient) is the garden for visitors, the law for askers, and the Kaʿba and the *qibla* for all gracious people (*nijʿat al-rawād wa-shirʿat al-warād wa-kaʿba ... wa-qibla yatawajjaha ilayhā akaabir al-anām*)"[201]; such etiquette was obviously more flattering compared to the former letter.

3.2.2. Loyalty of Religious Elites

The letter to the *ʿayn* of Balkh that we mentioned in the last section did not tell the reader whether the *ʿayn* responded to al-Waṭwāṭ's request, however, the letter implied the difference between the authorities of local *aʿyān* and religious figures such as al-Waṭwāṭ: on the one hand, al-Waṭwāṭ was weaker in visible power comparing to the *ʿayn*, considering that al-Waṭwāṭ was not able to stop the attack of Balkh people upon him and had to ask the *ʿayn* for help. But on the other hand, he appeared to be more authentic in the field of social morality than the *ʿayn* --- al-Waṭwāṭ emphasized himself was the "well-doer (*ḥāmil al-khidma*)", for he used to be an educator for the Balkh people before he left the town[202]. Considering his contribution to Balkh, al-Waṭwāṭ "reminded" the *ʿayn* to immediately stop the young man's behavior, claiming that it is not only about "being nice and friendly (*al-rafq wa-al-layn*)", but also about "the way of humanity and religion (*ṭarīq al-muruwwa wa-al-dīn*)".

---

[201] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 37.
[202] Ibid, Vol.2, 8. Here Al-Waṭwāṭ described himself as the person who "put the truth of knowledge into the mind of him (the young man who scolded and cursed him) hence the lock in his brain unlocked (*uthbitu fī dhimmatihi min ḥaqq al-ʿilm ... wa-fa-taḥata lahu aqfāluhu*)".

Different from *aʿyān* who had a strong power among the local populace and kept a close relation to the local people, religious persons and intellectuals who may travel and live in different place in a different period. As Hodgson indicates, the behavioral pattern of religious classes is more diverse than *aʿyān*: religious persons or intellectuals represented the local interests of the populace to confront the rulers in some cases, but also, they were eager to get financial and political support from the rulers in other cases.[203] For the rulers, they were willing to provide benefits to religious class and exchange their loyalty, considering the influence and authority of the religious class were useful for rulers to govern. Among al-Waṭwāṭ's letters written on the behalf of Khwārazmshāh, there are various letters addressed to different religious figures among the populace, including imams (*aʾimma*), and *ʿulamāʾ*. These letters reflected how willing the Khwārazmshāh was to offer substantial benefits to them for bidding their loyalty and support. Among these religious figures, the "respectable person (*nasīb*)" of Khwārazm the "chief imam" (*Ṣadr al-aʾimma*) of Khwārazm and was the most representative, who would be studied in this part.

The letter addressing to the *nasīb* of Khwārazm is about Khwārazmshāh awarding some luxurious gifts to the *nasīb* of Khwārazm. What we could know about the *nasīb* is that he had an honorary title (*laqab*) --- Burhān al-Dīn, this agnomen is easy to make readers to relate the *nasīb* to the notable Burhān al-Dīn family of Bukhara, however, there is no other information in the letter to prove that the *nasīb* had any relationship with the Bukhara and Burhānid authority there. Even so, the *nasīb* was undoubtedly from a reputable family of religious class, according to the titles used by al-Waṭwāṭ in the greeting of the letter – "I am writing to Mawla who is also the son of Mawla (*unhī ilā masāmiʿ mawlāya wa-ibn mawlāya*) …the supporter of Islam (*muʾayyid al-islam*) …".[204] Al-Waṭwāṭ represented the Khwārazmshāh to give the *nasīb* a luxurious robe (*al-khalʿ al-fākhir*) and some other "honoring stuff (*al-tashrīfāt al-zāhira*)". For the reason of awarding, al-Waṭwāṭ said that "as I know, every fancy cloth, however how

[203] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 110.
[204] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 85. "the mawla and the son of the mawla" implied that not only he himself was a reputable person from religious class, but also his father, and even predecessors were also reputable religious figures.

fancy it is, cannot reach his level of nobleness (*murātib*) and virtue (*munāqib*)", hence, it is not the luxurious gift honored on the nasīb, but the gifts honored by the nasīb, just like the Kaʿba makes the cloths (or *kiswa*) over it honorable (*al-kaʿba tushrifu biha malābisahā wa-tabjalu*).[205] The text of letter reflected what narrative a ruler would use for offering benefits to the religious figures from notable families --- the rulers offered benefit to the religious figures because the former admired the noble virtue and reputable family background of the latter, instead of asking for return. Such a narrative covered the benefit-offering behavior with a coat of appreciation and admiration. Hence, the rulers could expect that the benefit they gave out would not be considered as a bribing behavior or a kind of bargaining.

The letter to the *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* reflected that besides material rewards, privileges and promised support were also forms of offering benefits. The laqab of *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* is *Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn*. Al-Waṭwāṭ wrote at least five letters to this *Ṣadr al-aʾimma*, besides, al-Waṭwāṭ mentioned him in several letters written to other powerful figures.[206] All these letters provide a clue about *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* --- he lived in Khwārazm and got support from the Khwārazmshāh, then, he successively travelled to Iṣfahān, Baghdād, and finally Mecca for pilgrimage. When he returned to Khwārazm from Mecca, he became an influential religious figure in al-Jurjāniyya.[207] The letter studied in this part could be speculated as the earliest one among those letters, because the text shows that *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* at the time when letter was written has not been supported by the Khwārazmshāh. The letter started with compliments to his erudition, and his virtue of asceticism --- "even silent people spoke about his (*Ṣadr al-aʾimma*) good deeds and doings, just like a garden with fruits and flowers (*wa-al-jabla al-sākina tanṭiqu ʿanhā afʿālahā wa-tadullu ʿalayhā aʿmālahā, kā-al-dawḥa al-ʿāriya ʿan al-thamar al-khāliyya ʿan al-zuhr*)". But besides compliment, al-Waṭwāṭ implied the poor situation of *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* many times in the text, and what reasons made him lack wealth and

[205] Ibid, 85.
[206] In Fahmī's compilation, there were five letters of Al-Waṭwāṭ addressing to *ṣadr al-aʾimma*, besides, he was mentioned by Al-Waṭwāṭ in his letter addressing to the *wālī iṣfahān* and another letter to the *qāḍī al-quḍāt* of Abbasid court in Baghdad.
[207] See ibid, vol.1, 35, 38, 69; vol.2, 33-45.

authority: first, *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* geographically maintained distance from the Khwārazmshāh --- "the person left his neighbors… come to a distant town…if his noble virtues were not found by people, it could be known that he is a star that had lost its shine because of the undesirable location he found himself in (*man taraka jīratahu… wa-ḥalla bi-bulda qāṣiyya… wa-in wujidat mardūda mardhūla, ʿulima annahu najm kasara fiqʿahu*)"[208]; second, he also kept distance from the court of Khwārazmshāh at the societal level --- "he never provoked a quarrel, never served as a *qāḍī* nor served for the court of governor, never tried to get close to any king or sultan… even when he needed the privileges (*lam yaḥumm ḥawm khuṣuma, wa-lam yashhudu majmaʿ quḍḍaʾin aw majlis ḥukūma, wa-lam biẓalm bi-istẓhār qurbat al-mulūk wa-al-salāṭīn aḥadan…fimā yarjaʿ ilā ḥājātihi al-māsa wa-muhhimātihi al-khaṣṣa*)."[209] After the praise, al-Waṭwāṭ represented the Khwārazmshāh to show benefits and asked for an interest-exchange --- the Khwārazmshāh wanted *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* to judge a troublesome legal case of "immoral" homosexuality between a high-ranking *qāḍī* and a servant of the *qāḍī*, and promised to change the poor situation of *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* if he could deal with it through proper means.[210] One could not know whether or how *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* replied to al-Waṭwāṭ, but from other al-Waṭwāṭ letters that mentioned about him, it could be speculated that he accepted this offer, in return, he got a consistent support from the court of the Khwārazmshāh. As Hodgson indicated, many of the intellectuals and scholars were travelling for years, searching for the support of a ruler.[211] For such reason, offering official positions or promising support was a useful way for rulers to attract *ʿulamāʾ* and get their loyalty.

Conclusive Remarks

This chapter has discussed loyalty of the populace, especially the two most representable and influential categories among the populace --- the *aʿyān* and the religious elites. The loyalty of *aʿyān* could be described as a kind of collaboration with

[208] Ibid, 70.
[209] Ibid, 70.
[210] Ibid, 71.
[211] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 155.

the rulers: they used their authority in local society to guarantee that local society was subject to the rulers. In return, rulers would provide respect and benefits to the *aʿyān*. Comparing to the *aʿyān*, the loyalty of religious elites was featured with their closer connections with the rulers. Even though the loyalty of *aʿyān* and religious elites had certain differences, one can conclude that there are similarities between the two categories and then abstract some features of loyalty of the populace: from an ethical aspect, the loyalty of the populace was on the one hand a form of moral discipline for the populace because of their identity of "those being governed". At the same time on the other hand, the populace-ruler relationship of loyalty also requests the rulers to provide enough respect to the populace loyal to them. From a realpolitikal perspective, the loyalty of the populace was a result of interest exchange between ruler and subjects. Such interest-exchanging or "thanking for generosity" (*shukr al-niʿma*") was not only the indirect form of "loyalty exchange for protection" as Mottahedeh suggested,[212] instead, it could also be concrete and visible benefits, as the cases of the Khwārazmian *ʿayn* and the *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* reflected.

From a narrative perspective, most of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters to the populace analysed in this chapter followed a similar pattern: the letters commonly opened with greetings and compliments to the addressees. Such compliments were generally related to the identities of addresses and the moral qualities based on their respective identities --- for the *aʿyān*, the Khwārazmshāh praised their virtue of generosity and forgiveness, and for the religious elites, the Khwārazmshāh expressed his admiration to their erudition and asceticism. The part after greetings was commonly reserved for requests of Khwārazmshāh to the addressees, in which Khwārazmshāhs wish addressees to follow his will --- in other words, pledge loyalty to him. Through the excellent "story-writing" skills of al-Waṭwāṭ, the requests of Khwārazmshāh would become a natural extension of the addressees' identities and moral qualities, which provided the moralist foundation for the "realpolitikal interest-exchanging acts" between rulers and populace. For example, the *ʿayn* owned virtue of generosity, so that he was supposed to adopt the

[212] Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society,* 42.

young man as Khwārazmshāh requested; similarly, the *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* had incomparable erudition and was just, hence he was supposed to follow Khwārazmshāh's will to judge that law case. Moreover, al-Waṭwāṭ and Khwārazmshāh had never forgotten the exchange of realpolitikal interests; on the contrary, they always clearly implied in the letters that they would offer generous benefits to the addressees: for example, the *ʿayn* was promised "thanks and prayers" from the court of Khwārazmshāh, and the *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* would never be "the star which had lost its shine", if they followed the Khwārazmshāh's order and were loyal to him. Through this narrative, al-Waṭwāṭ ensured that in his letters the moralism and realpolitikal interest were reconciled inside the relationships of loyalty between the rulers and the populace.

Chapter 4.

The Relationships of loyalty between Officials and the Ruler

This chapter shall focus on the loyalty of officials to the lords to whom they served. Similar to the previous chapter, this chapter is also constituted by two sections: the first section will start from with vocabularies in al-Waṭwāṭ's letters that related to the officials. Then, it shall study the theories of Hodgson and Mottahedeh on the loyalties of clerks and ruler-official relationships, and also the sections of *Siyasātnāma* on the model ruler-officials relationship supposed by Niẓām al-Mulk, aiming to and conceptualize the loyalty of the officials and bureaucrats. The second section will focus the al-Waṭwāṭ's letters that are about officials, studying the texts and the contexts of the letters, aiming to abstract the features of the loyalty of different types of officials.

4.1. Ruler-Officials' Relationship with Loyalty during the Sunni Revival Period

Different from the cases of the populace governed by the rulers, it is difficult to find a term or any specific expression in al-Waṭwāṭ's letters that refer to the entire group of officials; instead, al-Waṭwāṭ tended to refer to various types of officials and clerks directly by their posts, including *wazīr* (pl. *wuzarāʾ*, vizier), *kātib* (pl. *kuttāb*, scribe), *muftī* (pl. *muftūn*), *qāḍī* (pl. *quḍḍāṭ*, judge), *ʿāmil* (pl. *ʿummāl*, finance officials)[213], *amīr* (pl. *umarāʾ*, military commanders), etc. Besides the categorization by positions, al-Waṭwāṭ also categorized officials using their intellectual and family background (*nasab wa-ḥasab*) --- in the letter to a *qāḍī* of Khwarazm which is mentioned in the last chapter,

[213] In his letters, Al-Waṭwāṭ used the various word including *ʿāmil*, *muḥtasib*, and *taqallud al-ḥisba* to refer to the financial officials that took charge of taxing, marketing, and even public order. See Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 80, 83.

al-Waṭwāṭ categorized the financial officials (*ʿummāl*) directly appointed by local governors as *raʿāyā*,[214] while in the same letter, he classified the qāḍī as a *ḥurr*.[215] In al-Waṭwāṭ's letters, *ḥurr* (pl. *aḥrār*) is an honorable category for people who not only owned authorities and power, but also owned honorable family background, good morality, and considerable knowledge. For example, al-Waṭwāṭ also used the word "*aḥrār*" to refer the Khwārazmian military officer *Ṣāḥib al-Dawla*,[216] the chief judge (*qāḍī al-quḍāt*) of Baghdad, and other high-ranking clerks of the court of the Abbāsid caliphate[217] in his other letters. According to this catagorisation, even though *ʿāmil* might have a closer personal relationship with the rulers and to a certain extent be more powerful than some of the "*ḥurr*" officials, they were still more inferior than the latter.

The "*raʿiyya-ḥurr*" dichotomy of officials used by al-Waṭwāṭ was partially intertextual with the theories of Hodgson and Mottahedeh on the power structure and social position of officials in medieval Islamic society. Mottahedeh supposed two elements that jointly form the loyalty of officials' loyalty. The first element is still "*shukr al-niʿma*" --- "the grateful for the ruler's generosity", which formed an interpersonal "interest-exchanging" relationship between officials and rulers.[218] The second element is the mutual interest shared by the all officials,[219] and because of such mutual interest, officials would tend to protect their fellows from being harmed by the orders of the rulers, or at least moderate the violence. However, Mottahedeh did not discuss on which element is more prior in the loyalty of officials than the other.

Hodgson indicated that *Sharīʿa* law and the military power of the rulers were two different sources of power in the 5th/11th to 6th/12th century east Islamic world. According to his studies, the rulers tend to appoint religious elites accepted by the local populace to be *quḍāt* for showing their respects to religious law and local religious class

[214] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 80.
[215] Ibid, Vol.1, 79.
[216] Ibid, Vol.1, 77. Al-Waṭwāṭ did not clearly show the position of Ṣāḥib al-Dawla, but from the context of the letter, and his title "al-Dawla", we could speculate that he was a powerful Khwārazmian military officer or an amīr who was loyal to Khwārazmshāh.
[217] Ibid, Vol.1, 35.
[218] Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society,* 73.
[219] Ibid, 110. Mottahedeh suggested that the officials/clerks had formed a *ṣinf* (class or social hierarchy) that shared mutual interest in Abbasid and Buyid period.

on the one hand, and place their trusted cronies in charge of various important civil administrative affairs, such as tax collection and intelligence, on the other.[220] Hence, a religious-judicial court dominated by religious officials and a garrison court directly handed by the ruler and his dependents would simultaneously exist. These two court systems have largely overlapped functions and conflicting interests.[221]

Hodgson's theory may explain why al-Waṭwāṭ used the narrative of "*raʿiyya-ḥurr*" dichotomy to disparage *ʿummāl* and praise *quḍāt*. However, he did not discuss other categories of officials that were neither the local elites nor the cronies of the rulers, such as *wazīr* and *kātib*, hence, his theory was not sufficient in explaining the general loyalty of officials at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ. Besides this, Hodgson's theory implied that the rulers would naturally trust their cronies and dependents more than religious figures and intellectuals, which should be examined in this chapter as well.

Even so, Hodgson's theory reminds one to consider how the background of Sunni revival and "*amīr-aʿyān*" society shaped the loyalty of officials at the time. The former meant the rise of religious class' authority, and the latter provides a necessity for the rulers to arrange more his trusted dependents to help him to control the society. Under such background, Niẓām al-Mulk's *Siyāsatnāma* represented an ideal model of how a ruler could achieve a better rule with the assistance of various types of officials. In *Siyāsatnāma*, Niẓām al-Mulk suggested that a ruler had to do at least three things to ensure the loyalty of his officials to him. First, the ruler should "monthly pay the salary and allowance" to officials. Furthermorehe is supposed to pay an extra payment to the officials who did their job extremely well.[222] As the direct reflection of the *niʿma* of the rulers, salary and payment were the basis of an official's loyalty. Second, the ruler should fully respect the social statures of officials, treat them with decency, and ensure that they could have a range of privileges. For example, rulers should offer the officials with specific honorary titles (*laqab*, pl. *alqāb*) appreciation for their different positions;[223] rulers should post the name and *laqab* of his main courtiers along the

[220] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 133.
[221] Ibid, 131-133.
[222] Niẓām al-Mulk, *The Book of Government*, translated by Hubert Darke, 87.
[223] Ibid, 148.

highways;[224] and if any official makes mistakes, the ruler should not contain his anger and publicly rebuke him, rather, the ruler should "overlook his mistake at time, and later call him in privately and express his respect and pardon to him".[225] Third, the ruler could arrange his trusted sergeants to supervise whether officials fulfilled their duties, but such realpolitik measure should not violate to first and second points.[226]

Besides the above advice to rulers for maintaining officials' loyalty, Niẓām al-Mulk also provided two exhortations for appointing officials. First, Niẓām al-Mulk suggested that rulers could appoint persons with different qualifications on different positions: a ruler should nominate a figure "of good character and sound judgement" to be *wazīr*. He should nominate persons with responsibility and honesty as *ʿummāl*, for ensuring they would collect the fair share of taxes from the people, no more and no less.[227] For the religious-judicial officials such as *quḍāt* and censors, they should be persons that are famous for their knowledge of the Arabic language and Sharīʿa law. The rulers should also avoid appointing dishonest or capricious ones to be judges.[228] And for the Military officials, they should be reliable and loyal.[229] Second, Niẓām al-Mulk still proposed a "red-line" requirement for the appointment of officials: all officials should be orthodox Sunni Muslims, and any person of "perverse sects and evil doctrines" should not be employed by the rulers.[230] These two exhortations reflect how Niẓām al-Mulk proposed to make a balance between religious disciplines of Orthodox Sunnism and the flexibility of employing officials.

4.2. Loyalties of Officials in al-Waṭwāṭ's letters

In *Siyāsatnāma*, Niẓām al-Mulk suggested the rulers to apply various honorary titles (*laqab*) properly to different types of clerks and officials. In his opinion, the title

[224] Ibid, 87. Niẓām al-Mulk enlisted three kinds of *alqāb* which are "*al-Dawla*", "*al-Mulk*", and "*al-Dīn*". "*Al-Dawla*" are for military lords, "*al-Mulk*" are for the high-ranking civil officials, and "*al-Dīn*" are for religious-judicial figures with high reputation.
[225] Ibid, 122.
[226] Ibid, 87.
[227] Ibid, 23.
[228] Ibid, 42, 44.
[229] Ibid, 63.
[230] Ibid, 158.

of "al-Mulk" (such as *Niẓām al-Mulk*, "the order of the reign") should be owned by Iranian (*tāzīk*) civil officials ; the title of "*al-Dawla*" (such as *Sayf al-Dawla*, "the sword of the country") should be owned by the Turkic military officers, for showing their martial valour; and, the title of "*al-Dīn*" (such as *Muʿin al-Dīn*, "the supporter of the faith") should be owned by respectable religious figures.[231] Such a trichotomy could be traced to three basic different types of officials since the 4th/10th century --- *ʿāmil* was responsible for the administration of financial and civil affairs, *amīr* (pl. *umarāʾ*) for the command of the army, [232] and *qāḍī* for religious justice.[233] While at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ, *umarāʾ* had generally owned a piece of land (*iqtāʿ*) under his control , power of tax collection, and semi-independent garrison court, which made them obviously differentiate from civil and religious officials who generally depended on the payment of the ruler. For this reason, this section will only focus on the civil officials and religious-judicial officials, analysing their loyalties by the text of al-Waṭwāṭ's relevant letters. While the loyalty of *amīr*s would be discussed in the next chapter.

4.2.1. Loyalty of Civil Officials

There were various types of civil officials who were the recipients of al-Waṭwāṭ, or were indirectly mentioned by al-Waṭwāṭ in his letters --- *ʿāmil*, *kātib*, and *wazīr*. These three types of officials were also highly representative types among the whole group of civil officials: they directly served the rulers, and were directly employed by the ruler, hence had a close personal relationship with ruler. From the text of letters, we could know that three types of officers were on different rankings of authority in the bureaucratic system, and possessed different levels of political energy. This part would study the loyalties of these three kinds of officials, and discuss on how their position in

[231] Ibid, 148. Here, Niẓām al-Mulk criticized the phenomenon at his time that dignitaries commonly used the *laqab* that was not fit for their respective identities and positions. For example, Turkish military lords may use "al-Dīn" *laqab* even though they have very limited knowledge on the religion.
[232] See Duri, "Amīr", *EI2*; Duri, "ʿĀmil", *EI2*. Duri indicated that in the early Abbasid period, both "*ʿāmil*" and "*amīr*" referred to the provincial governors. The difference between two terms is that "*ʿāmil*" emphasises on the independent taxation power of the provincial governors, while "*amīr*" emphasises on their political-military power. After the 4th/10th century, "*amīr*" still referred to the provincial governors, while "*ʿāmil*" referred to the financial officials that was appointed by the "*amīr*".
[233] Tyan, "Ḳāḍī", *EI2*.

the bureaucratic system and their relationship with the rulers influenced their loyalty pattern.

ʿĀmil was also known as *muḥtasib* or *taqallud al-ḥisba* in the text of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters, ranking in the bureaucratic system was lower than *kātib* and *wazīr*. In spite of that, *ʿummāl* still held considerable power. In his article, Christian Lange suggested that *ʿummāl* were not only the financial officials, but also in charge of police affairs and surveillance,[234] which made *ʿummāl* to some extent resonant to Nizām al-Mulk's advices to rulers for using spies for monitoring his subjects.[235] The power of *ʿummāl* was directly authorized by the rulers, hence the relation between *ʿummāl* and their lords was always close.

There is no extant official letter of al-Waṭwāṭ directly addressed to an *ʿāmil*, instead, al-Waṭwāṭ tends to write letters to the local rulers, represented by *umarāʾ*, whom the *ʿummāl* were directly loyal to. In one of his letters written to an *amīr* of Khwārazm on the behalf of Khwārazmshāh's court (*diwān khwārazm*), he conveyed the Khwārazmshāh's comments on an Khwārazmian *amīr*'s appointment of a *taqallud al-ḥisba*.[236] Al-Waṭwāṭ described that the taxation (*iḥtisāb*) was the most important affair (*ʿūlā al-umūr*) for a ruler to care because it was related to the "stability of faith (*thibāt al-dīn*)" and the "interest of Muslims (*ṣalāḥ al-muslimīn*)".[237] Hence, the rulers were minded to appoint a pious, abstinent, and knowledgeable Sunni Muslim on this position --- "we first command him (the *taqallud al-ḥisba*) to make piety as his slogan, asceticism as his blanket, knowledge as his guide, and religion as his lighthouse (*wa-amarnāhu awwalān an yajʿala al-taqwā shiʿārahu, wa-al-zuhud dathārahu, wa-al-ʿilm muʿallimahu wa-al-dīn manārahu*)"[238]. Rulers should never "authorize the wicked to take positions got the privileges belong to the faithful Muslims, (otherwise) the villains would take the possessions and stretch their hands to wives and children of faithful

[234] Lange, "Changes in the Office of Ḥisba under the Seljuqs", in: *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*, edited by Christian Lange and Songül Mecit, 157.
[235] Niẓām al-Mulk, *The Book of Government*, translated by Hubert Darke, 75.
[236] This letter was collected by both al-Ḥamawī and Fahmī in their respective compilations. See Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, Vol.4, 2633, and Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 83.
[237] Al-Rūmī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, Vol.4, 2633.
[238] Ibid, 2633.

Muslims (*wa-yusalliṭu al-awbāsh ʿalā duwar al-muslimīn wa-haram al-muʾminīn, fa-yughayyirū ʿalā amwālihim, wa-yamuddū al-aydī ilā nisāʾihim wa-aṭfālihim*)"[239]. Lange suggested that *ʿummāl* generally had a bad reputation at the time for corruption and abuse of power,[240] and this letter was possibly written in this situation. The narrative of letter also implied that even Khwārazmshāh would like to intervene the appointment of *ʿummāl*, it was the local rulers who had power to decide this matter. Therefore, the power of *ʿummāl* could be seen as an extension of the power of local rulers, hence, the loyalty of *ʿummāl,* to a considerable extent belonged to the local rulers who appointed them on the position and authorised them.

For the *kātib*, if we suppose al-Waṭwāṭ himself as the representative of a successful *kātib* at his time, his experience would reflect some typical features of *kuttāb*: First, a *kātib* should have an educational background in the *madrasa*, such as *madrasat al-Niẓāmiyya*, and gained relevant professional skills. *Kuttāb* in the east Islamic world were always multilingual, and mastery of Arabic language was the necessary skill for them. Second, they were identified as *udabāʾ*, and qualified to be part of the circle of literati.[241] Third, *kuttāb* was obliged to draft various formal correspondence on behalf of the ruler, hence they could participate in the political or administrative affairs of the ruler's court, and had the opportunity to establish a close relationship with the ruler. In return, the ruler would offer salary, high social stature, and possibly a *laqab* to the *kātib* for rewarding his hard work.

One of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters collected in al-Qazwīnī's compilation also annotated the relationship between the Khwārazmshāh and his *kuttāb*. Al-Waṭwāṭ wrote this reproaching letter on behalf of Khwārazmshāh to a *kātib* of the Khwārazmian court who repeatedly borrowed riding animals (*dawwāb*) from the court but never returned them.[242] The most noteworthy feature of this letter's text is that al-Waṭwāṭ did not directly accuse the *kātib*'s fault, instead opting for a relatively euphemistic approach --

[239] Ibid, 2633.
[240] Lange, "Changes in the Office of *Ḥisba* under the Seljuqs", 159.
[241] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 155.
[242] al-Qazwīnī, *Athār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād*, 335. Al-Qazwīnī said that this letter "was said (*ḥukiya*)" to be written by Al-Waṭwāṭ, however, al-Qazwīnī did not collect any other Al-Waṭwāṭ's letters in his compilation. The thesis here assumes that this letter was actually written by Al-Waṭwāṭ.

- through a story about a livestock hirer and an unscrupulous merchant in Baghdad. In this story, the merchant snatched the hirer's donkey once and once again, and finally the hirer cannot bear anymore and angrily said to the merchant, "Oh you villain! If you cannot give up your ugly behaviour, then buy yourself a donkey to ride every day. You have worn my donkey out and made me not know what to do with you! (*Yā khabīth! In lam tatruk ṣanʿataka al-shanīʿa…fa-ishtar ḥimārān yarkabūnaka ʿalayhi kull yawm. Fa-qad ahlakta ḥimārī wa-azalta qarārī.*)". After telling this story, al-Waṭwāṭ continued to write on behalf of Khwārazmshāh, "Here I say to you what the Baghdadi hirer said to the merchant. If you want to stay at the lord's court as a *kātib*, then do your work well, otherwise, stay at home and go and live your own life. (*wa-hā anā aqulu mā qāla al-makārī li-al-tājir, in aradta an takūna kātibān li-al-amīr, fa-hayyaʾ al-nafs wa-al-ṭirs, wa-illa fa-ilzam al-bayt wa-al-ʿirs.*)"[243] Although the story itself is satirical, the Khwārazmshāh and al-Waṭwāṭ avoided direct attacks on *kātib*, which reflects the respect and tolerance *kātib* received, despite the fact that his actions were to some extent disloyal to the court. This tolerance notably echoes Niẓām al-Mulk's advice to the ruler in *Siyāsātnāma* about maintaining the loyalties of his officials that this thesis has analysed in last section.

Wazīr was the highest position among the civil officials at the period of Sunni Revival. In their works, Herbert Mason and Omid Safi representatively presented the huge political power of ʿAwn al-Dīn ibn Hubayra (on the position of Abbāsid wazīr during 543/1149-560/1165) --- the *wazīr* of Abbāsid Caliphs al-Muqtafī (r.530/1136-555/1160) and al-Mustanjid (r. 555/1160-566/1170),[244] and Saljūq *wazīr* Niẓām al-Mulk, as well as their close relationship with the rulers they were loyal to.[245] Both two great *wazīr*s had a monopoly on all types of administrative affairs of the dynasties they served for while they were in the positions, which made their wazīrates largely synonymous with the Abbāsid caliphate and Saljūq Sultanate at their times. Nevertheless, the experience of Ibn Hubayra and Niẓām al-Mulk may reflect that the

[243] Ibid, 335.
[244] See Mason, *Two Statesmen of Mediaeval Islam*, 41.
[245] Safi, *Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 44.

power of *wazīr* still derived from the trust and authorisation placed in him by his ruler, much like that of the *ʿummāl* and *kuttāb*. When the ruler lost trust in his *wazīr*, then he would regard the huge power and influence of the *wazīr* as a threat. Abbāsid Caliph al-Mustanjid eliminated the influence of Ibn Hubayra and his family by poisoning him and imprisoning his son and heir, ʿIzz al-Dīn, after his death.[246] While Safi suggested that Saljuq Sultan Malikshāh b. Alp Arslān (Malikshāh I r. 465/1072-485/1092), plotted the assassination of Niẓām al-Mulk in fear of the power of his wazīrate, but attributed his death to Ismāʿīlīs.[247]

Al-Waṭwāṭ had written a series of letters to various *wuzarāʾ* in the east Islamic world at this time, including to the *wazīr* of Caliph al-Muqtafī, the *wazīr* of Caliph al-Mustanjid, and *wazīr* of Shirwānshāh Manūchihr b. Afrīdūn (r. 514/1120-555/1160).[248] All these letters written by al-Waṭwāṭ were in the name of Khwārazmshāh. The text of these letters reflected that the purpose of the letters is to enable communication between Khwārazmshāh and the other dynasties through the *wuzarāʾ* as an intermediary. For this purpose, al-Waṭwāṭ emphasized and complimented the loyalty of the *wuzarāʾ* and their close relationship with the monarchs. He praised the *wazīr* of al-Muqtafī as "the one who seized the rope of his loyalty (to the Caliph) and the owner of the excellent edification (*mutamassik bi-habl walāʾihi wa-mutanassik bi-dhikr naʿmāʾihi*)"[249]. To the *wazīr* of al-Mustanjid, al-Waṭwāṭ boasted of the *wazīr*'s political power --- "convanant of caliphate embodied in the auspiciousness of his mind, and the affairs of the imamate was in accord with his effort (*tantaẓimu bi-yaman raʾyihi ʿuqūd al-khilāfa wa-taltaʾ bi-ḥasn saʿīhi umūr al-imāma*)", and then complimented his loyalty to the Caliph --- "the

[246] Mason, *Two Statesmen of Mediaeval Islam*, 16, 71.
[247] Safi, *Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 79.
[248] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 28, 30, 31, 34. The letter addressing to the wazīr of Shirwānshāh (pp. 34) did not present the name of Shirwānshāh in the text, but it is reasonable to suppose that the Shirwānshāh here is Manūchihr b. Afrīdūn, based on the period of his reign. More information on Manūchihr b. Afrīdūn see Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Manual*, Chapter 9-67.
[249] Ibid, 28. As we have mentioned in the previous chapters, the letters to Caliph al-Muqtafī and his *wuzarāʾ* were written after the battle of Qatwan. The *wazīr* that this letter addressed to could be Niẓām al-Dīn al-Muẓaffar b. Muḥammad b. Jahīr (on the position of *wazīr* from 535/1140-541/1147) or ʿAwn al-Dīn ibn Hubayra. More information on Niẓām al-Dīn al-Muẓaffar b. Muḥammad b. Jahīr see Eric Hanne, "The Banū Jahīr and Their Role in the ʿAbbāsid and Saljūq Administration", 31; and Cl. Cohen, "Djahīr", *EI2*

one (*wazīr*) who took the oath of loyalty to our lord and chief the Imam al-Mustanjid bi-allāh, the Commander of the Faithfuls, and the Caliph of Allāh (*man akhadhī al-bayʿa li-mawlānā wa-sayyidinā al-imām al-mustanjid bi-allāh amīr al-muʾminīn wa-khalīfat rabb al-ʿālamayn*)"[250]. To the wazīr of shirwānshāh, al-Waṭwāṭ called him "the side wing of our lord (shirwanshāh) *(janāb mawlānā*)"[251].

In some other cases, the Anūshtakīnid Khwarazmshāh possibly has regarded the powerful *wazīr* as the de facto centre of power for Abbāsid dynasty, rather than the Caliph, as evidenced by the only letter written by al-Waṭwāṭ to the Caliph al-Mustanjid on behalf of Khwārazmshāh, which was only a highly ceremonial letter of condolence to the newly reigning al-Mustanjid, expressing the mourning for his father the Caliph al-Muqtafī's death.[252] In contrast, there are at least three letters addressed to al-Mustanjid's *wazīr*, and all of those letters dealt with specific affairs relating to the relationship between two dynasties.[253]

Based on the texts of letters written by al-Waṭwāṭ to Abbāsid *wuzarāʾ* that have been mentioned above, it is reasonable to speculate that Khwārazmshāhs clearly understood the advantages of wazīrate institution for the reign of rulers and the potential threat of the wazīrate to the rulers' power. Hence, Khwārazmshāhs assigned *wuzarāʾ* in Khwārazm on the one hand, while limited the power of *wuzarāʾ* on the other hand. It was confirmed that Khwārazmshāh Atsiz first established wazīrate in his dynasty.[254] Khwārazmian *wuzarāʾ* were commonly selected from Sunni literati who were fluent in Arab and Persian languages and had sufficient administrative capacity and ethical qualities. They were authoritised to supervise the bureaucratic system, and had highest position in the group of officials. However, Khwārazmshāhs attempted to make *wuzarāʾ* as private consultants for them, for limiting the power of wazīrate only in bureaucratic

[250] Ibid, 32. The *wazīr* that this letter addressed to could be ʿAwn al-Dīn ibn Hubayra or Sharaf al-Dīn ibn al-Baladī (on the position of wazīr from 563/1167-8 to 566/1170. The latter was executed after al-Mustanjid was murdered in 566/1170). Both two *wazīr*s of al-Mustanjid owned considerable polhanne itical power. More information on Ibn al-Baladī see K.V. Zetterstéen, "Ibn al-Baladī", *EI2*; and Mason, *Two Statesmen of Mediaeval Islam*, 16, 76.
[251] Ibid, 34.
[252] Ibid, 23.
[253] Ibid, 28, 31, 81.
[254] Bunyadov, *A History of the Khorezmian State under the Anushteginids, 1097-1231*, translated by A. Efendiyev, 75.

institutions. [255]

One of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters addressing a Khwārazmian *wazīr* reflected the relationships of loyalty between the Khwārazmshāh and his *wazīr*. In this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ presented the Khwārazmshāh's request to the *wazīr* for solving the livelihood problems of a village.[256] The letter began with a compliment to the moral quality and prominent stature of the wazīr by relating him to the holy cities of Islam --- "the kindness of our respectable, wise, righteous, helpful, victorious, blessed and triumphant master (the *wazīr*) is always… the most splendid decree of pilgrimage sites and the most sublime *mīqāt* (ar. the boundary for the state of *Iḥrām*) of virtue (*lā zālat andīyat mawlānā al-ṣāḥib al-ajl al-ʿālim al-ʿādil al-muʾayyid al-muẓẓafar al-maymūn al-manṣūr…ashraf marāsim al-aqbāl wa-afḍal mawāqīt al-afḍāl*)", and also compared the kindness of the wazīr to the Kaʿba, the symbol of orthodoxy Sunnism --- "Allāh never empty the courtyard of it (*wazīr*'s kindness)… where the noble people practicing *ṭawāf* (ar. Pilgrims going around the Kaʿba) with the truth of prophet Muhammad and his whole prosperous venerable clan (*wa-lā akhlā allāh ʿarṣātahā… taḥsubu fīhā al-dhuyūl wa-al-ṭāfī al-karāmāt…bi-ḥaqq muḥammad wa-ālihi ajmaʿīna al-zahr al-mabjalīna*)".[257] The following text introduced the basic information of the village: it used to be famous for its fertility (*al-qurya al-maʿrūfa bi-kanīra*), but in recent years, it was first struck by drought (*qad ḥabasa ʿanhā al-māʾ*), then the misgovernment by the local governor ʿAbd al-Jalīl caused serious damage to the farmland (*al-ānna hadhā ʿabd al-jalīl… kharaba masannātihā kull al-kharāb*), and a flood had ruined grain (*wa-arsala fīhā maʾ al-ʿadhāb…ḥatā gharaqat al-ghalāt*). As a result, the farmers fled the village (*harabat ʿanhā al-akriyāʾ wa-al-ḥarrāth*). [258] In this case, the Khwārazmshāh asked the *wazīr* to deal with the problem of this village, but in the letter, al-Waṭwāṭ described it not as a request of Khwārazmshāh but a petition of the local populace ---

[255] Ibid, 75.
[256] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 45. Also see Bunyadov, *A History of the Khorezmian State under the Anushteginids, 1097-1231*, translated by A. Efendiyev, 76. This letter did not mention the name of the wazīr, but considering the period when Al-Waṭwāṭ on the position of the chief kātib, it could be confirmed that this wazīr was one of wuzarāʾ appointed by Atsiz or Īl Arslān.
[257] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 45.
[258] Ibid, 46.

"the populace petition to his (the *wazīr*'s) aids thorough all people and the whole village. If he (the *wazīr*) reached a last gasp before death for the people of this village, this gasp would control the death, and if he showed a smile of his generosity, this smile would promise the people for survival (*wa-al-maṭlūb ilā ʿawāṭifihi lā zālat fāʾiḍa ʿalā al-ʿibād mabsūṭ bi-al-bilād. in yudrik ḥashāsha min ahl tilk al-qurya, ashrafat ʿalā al-fanāʾ, wa-yaẓhar la-hum bashāsha min karmihi, tabshuruhum bi-al-baqāʾ*)".[259]

4.2.2. Loyalty of Religious-Judicial Officials

Before we study the loyalty of religious judicial officials, it is necessary to distinguish them from two other kinds of "religious figures", which respectively are the religious elites among the populace that we have discussed in last chapter, and the officials who had a religious background but were not responsible for religious-judicial affairs. For the former, represented by the *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* of Khwārazm and Jār al-Dīn al-Zamakhsharī, even though they might also be loyal to the rulers and cooperated with them, they neither directly served for the court of ruler, nor had an official position. For the latter, represented by Khwārazmian *wuzarāʾ* and al-Waṭwāṭ, even though they themselves might be famous for their religious knowledge, they were appointed by the rulers on the positions of civil officials, instead of religious-judicial officials. There were two typical kinds of religious-judicial officials mentioned in al-Waṭwāṭ's letter, which are the *qaḍī* and *muftī*. The loyalty of these two kinds of officials shall be discussed in this part.

From the studies of Émile Tyan, we could know that *quḍāt* were appointed by the high-ranking overlords such as the Saljūq Sultans and Khwārazmshāhs during the period of Sunni Revival, rather than by low-ranking rulers, such as local *umarāʾ*.[260] And from the studies of Hodgson, one can know that *quḍāt* were normally appointed among the local religious elites of the town, rather than among his dependents.[261] These two features allow *quḍāt* and their religious-judicial courts on the one hand to represent

[259] Ibid, 46.
[260] Tyan, "Ḳāḍī", *EI2*.
[261] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 110.

the will of the local populace counterbalancing the local *umarāʾ*; on the other hand to be supported by the overlords who were willing to use *quḍāt* to counterbalance the power of the *umarāʾ*.

From his letter about the appointment of a *qāḍī* that we have mentioned in the last chapter, al-Watwāṭ conveyed to the newly incumbent *qāḍī* the support of Khwārazmshāh for him. In this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ in the name of Khwārazmshāh, began by praising the integrity and erudition of the *qāḍī* and declaring him fully qualified to be in this post – "we have confirmed that he handles salutary knowledge and was qualified for this sublime job, he distances himself from the houses of sins, and stays away from the obstacles that hindered his progress (*taḥaqqaqnā min ishtighālihi bi-al-ʿilm al-nāfiʿ, wa-iqbālihi ʿalā al-ʿamal al-rāfiʿ, wa-tajannabahu marābiḍ al-āthām, wa-tawqīhi madāḥiḍ al-aqdām*)."[262] After that, al-Waṭwāṭ stated the authority and obligations of the *qāḍī*. The *qāḍī* was authorized by Khwārazmshāh to administer the justice of the town and the area surrounding it (*badla kadhā wa-mā yalīhā min aṭrāfihā wa-nawāḥīhā*)[263]. On the post, the *qāḍī* was obliged to be a paragon of morality: "we command him to make the guidance of Allāh as his slogan, the devotion as his blanket, the fear of Allāh as his foot, and morally chaste as his attire (*amarnāhu an yajʿala al-hudā shʿārahu, wa-al-tuqiyya dathārahu, wa-al-warʿ zādahu, wa-al-ʿuffa ʿatādahu*)"[264]. The *qāḍī* should also distance himself from corruption – "to govern people with justice, to keep away from fluttery and corrupt ways, and to protect himself from the greed of the secular world…do not be enchanted by the secular world and its luxurious decorations (*wa-an yaḥkuma bayna al-nās bi-al-ʿadl, wa-yataḥarraza min al-mudāhana wa-al-mayl, wa-yuṣawwiha nafsahu min al-maṭāmiʿ al-dunniyya… wa-lā yaghtarr bi-al-dunya wa-zakhārifihā*)"[265], and protect people from the wicked – "to protect the money of orphans (meaning the weak populace unable to defend themselves) from the hands of violence and the palms of plunder, the almighty Allāh has said… that those who swallow the money of orphans are wicked, what they swallow in their bellies

[262] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 79.
[263] Ibid, 79.
[264] Ibid, 79.
[265] Ibid, 79.

is fire and where they will go is hell (*wa-an yaḥfuẓa amwāl al-yatāmā min al-ayday al-ghāṣiba wa-al-akuff al-nāhiba, fa-inna allāh taʿālā qāla…anna al-ladhīna yaʾkulūna amwāl al-yatāmā ẓulmān innamā yaʾkulūna fī buṭūnihim nārān wa-sa-yaṣullūna saʿīrān*)"[266]. If one compares this letter with the letter about the appointment of *taqallud al-ḥisba* that has been discussed in last section, one can easily find that the moral requirements of Khwārazmshāh for a qualified *qāḍī* and a qualified *ʿāmil* are almost identical. But we could also find that the description of the villains who plunder people's property in this letter is also extremely similar to the description of the corrupt *ʿāmil* in the *taqallud al-ḥisba* letter. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the villains in the text of this letter refer to those corrupt *ʿummāl* who had become exactors to the people.

In the final part of the letter, the Khwārazmshāh emphasized that the *qāḍī* was authorized to supervise not only the populace, but also the *ʿummāl*.[267] He also remarked that he himself was where the authority of the *qāḍī* derived from – "They (those who are under the administration of the *qāḍī*) will know that his (the *qāḍī*'s) satisfaction is coupled with our satisfaction, and his discontent attached to our discontent. Those who follow the rules will win the most complete fortune and the biggest part of our sympathy, while to those who change their allegiance (faith) and reduce people's dependence, our anger will come to them and our discontent will be directed at them (*wa-an yaʿlimū anna riḍāhu maqrūn bi-riḍāʾinā wa-sakhṭahu mawṣūl bi-sakhṭinā, fa-man imtathala al-mithāl fa-qad fāza bi-al-ḥuẓẓ al-akmal wa-al-naṣīb al-ajzal min ʿāṭifatinā, wa-man ʿaddala ʿan al-ṭāʿa wa-shaqqa ʿaṣā al-jamāʿa fa-bawāʾiq ghaḍabinā musawwiqa ilayhi wa-ṣawāʿiq sakhṭinā muṣawwiba ʿalayhi*)"[268].

For *muftī*, David Powers presented that the important role that *muftī* have been playing in the judicial affairs of medieval Islamic society: the rights of a *muftī* included participating in judicial judgements as consultants, and issuing *fatwā*s on specific issues and policies at the request of the rulers with their knowledge.[269] Similar with *qāḍī*, *muftī*

[266] Ibid, 79.
[267] Ibid, 80.
[268] Ibid, 80.
[269] Powers, "Fatwā", *EI2*.

were also members of judicial-religious administration, but they were not full-time officials, which was a distinct difference between them and *qāḍī*. Al-Waṭwāṭ's relevant letters suggest that *muftī* also commonly worked in the *madrasa* as a scholar (*ʿālim*) and were funded by the endowment of the ruler.[270] In his letter addressing to the ʿAzīz al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Balkhī, the *muftī* of *al-Madrasa al-Sulṭāniyya* (Madrasa of the Sultan) of Khurāsān, al-Waṭwāṭ was trying to convince the *muftī* to end his work in the madrasa of Khurāsān, as well as his loyalty to the local ruler.[271] Similar with many other letters we have studied, this letter was also started by the extolment of the virtues of the *muftī*, especially his academic reputation --- "may Allāh endure his (the *muftī's*) charm because…his virtues were prominent among his intimates and peers, and his excellence far surpassed his rivals and competitors (*adāma allāhu jamālahu ʿalā annahu… baraza fī al-faḍāʾil ʿalā ikhwānihi wa-atrābihi, wa-aḥraza qaṣab al-sabq ʿan aqrānihi wa-aḍrābihi*)", hence "the Madrasa of the Sultan authorized him (the *muftī*), to put the reins of teaching into his hand, let him become the sign of scholars, and empower him to judge the disputes between scholars (*la-qad… al-madrasa al-sulṭaniyya… fawwaḍat ilayhi, wa-ṣārat azzimat tadrīsihā fī yadayhi, wa-iḥtaffat bihi ramz al-fuqahāʾ, wa-ikhtalafat ilayhi ʿaṣab al-ulamāʾ*)"[272]. However, the Madrasa of the Sultan "was not able to deserve the erudition of him (the *muftī*) (*mustaṣghir bi-al-nisba ilā istiḥqāq ʿilmihi*)". More importantly, Khurāsān was far from prosperous under the rule of the local ruler --- "I hope that Allāh will help this country (Khurāsān) more or less, or partly or wholly. If it slopped one more step downwards, this country would be so poor that

[270] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 41, 42. Fahmī collected two of Al-Waṭwāṭ's letters towards *muftī*s, who were respectively ʿAzīz al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Balkhī, who worked in the Madrasa of Sultan *(al-madrasa al-sulṭāniyya)* in Khurāsān, and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Kūfī, who worked in the madrasa of Nīshābūr, one of the main cities of Khurāsān.

[271] Ibid, 41. Based on the letter's description of the dilapidated state of Khorasan, it could be speculated that this letter was written sometime after the death of Saljūq Sultān Sanjar in 552/1157. At that moment, Khurāsān was in the situation of political vacuum and chaotic situation because of the death of Saljūq Sultan. Most main towns of Khurāsān were under the unstable rule of Sanjar's ghulāms or Turkic Ghuzz Amīrs. The letter did not provide any information on the location of the Madrasa of the Sultan, but it was possibly located in Marw where Sanjar located his court. In the "post-Sanjar" period, Marw was occupied by Ghuzz. More information about the political history of Khurāsān after the death of Sanjar see Bosworth, "the political and dynastic history of the Iranian world (a.d. i 000-1217)", in: *Cambridge History of Iran, vol.5*, 185-195; and Bunyadov, *A History of the Khorezmian State under the Anushteginids, 1097-1231*, translated by A. Efendiyev, 25-27.

[272] Ibid, 41.

people could not find a single pearl by day, and milk by night inside the country (*wa-aʿūdhu bi-allāh min dawla tanaṣṣub bi-kuthrihā wa-qillihā wa-juzʾihā wa-kullihā, inṣibāba wāḥida ḥatā lā yabqā fī aṣdāf al-ayyām minhā durr wa-lā fī akhlāf al-layyālī minhā darra*)"[273]. Hence, the letter described Khurāsān as "no more than a country where the people leave quickly like fading shadows (*fa-innahā wa-ḥāshāhu daula qarībat al-irtiḥāl sarīʿat al-intiqāl ka-ẓill zāʾil*)"[274]. For this reason, the Khwārazmshāh implied to the muftī to leave Khurāsān and find a better post in a more prosperous Khwārazm. The letter and the logic behind it once again reflected how al-Waṭwāṭ and the Khwārazmshāh emphasized the interest-exchanging implication of the relationship of loyalty--- if the ruler and his country cannot offer sufficient benefits to match the *muftī*'s virtue, then the *muftī* is justified in ceasing his loyalty to the ruler and leaving that country.

Conclusive Remarks

This chapter discussed the loyalty of two categories of officials --- civil officials and religious-judicial officials. Both of the two groups of officials were appointed by the rulers on their post, and their relationships of loyalty with the rulers were more stable than that of the populace. In return, they gained considerable political weight and benefits from this relationship of loyalty. For civil officials, represented by *ʿāmil*, *kātib*, and *wazīr*, their influence was derived from the trust and authorization of the ruler, from this point, the thought that regarding them as the dependents of the ruler, as Hodgson argued in his work[275], is generally plausible. However, it does not mean that civil officials would always be "obedient servants" of the rulers without any condition. Instead, al-Waṭwāṭ's letters show that their loyalty was based not only on receiving benefits from the ruler, but also on obtaining respect from him. And in the cases of *wuzarāʾ*, they could become political rivals to the ruler when they were sufficiently influential. For religious-judicial officials, including *qāḍī* and *muftī*, their influence was

[273] Ibid, 42.
[274] Ibid, 42.
[275] Hodgson, *The venture of Islam, Vol.2*, 131-133.

not only based on the authorization from the ruler, but also based on the fact that they themselves were the religious elites that were admitted by the local populace and knowledgeable community. For this reason, they had more autonomy in the relationship of loyalty with the ruler than did the civil officials.

Chapter 5.

Relationships of loyalty between Rulers

In last two chapters, this thesis has successively studied the relationships of loyalty between rulers and populace, and it between rulers and officials. Based on the text of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters, the thesis also analysed the narrative skills that this prominent *kātib* used to connect the realpolitik interest of the Khwārazmshāh for maintaining the loyalty of his subjects and officials, to the moral qualities that the recipients "were supposed to have", based on their varied category identities and moralism of Sunnism. The loyalties between rulers, by contrast, is more complex because it is not only interpersonal but also relationships between political entities. Such difference brings a question on to what extent does the inter-rulers' loyalty framed by realpolitik interest of various rulers and the moralism of Sunni Revival period? and whether al-Waṭwāṭ could also use the moralist discourse prevalent in his period to acquire more realpolitik interest for the Khwārazmshāh, similar as the cases of "ruler-populace loyalty" and "ruler-official loyalty" that we have analysed in previous chapters?

Based on such questions, this chapter would constitute two sections. The first section aims to conceptualise the term of "rulers" and "loyalties between rulers" in the east part of Islamic world in Sunni Revival Period, aiming to study how the loyalty between rulers provide a necessary legitimacy for the rulers at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ. and the second section would be a case study --- based on the letters of al-Waṭwāṭ addressing to the Abbasid Caliph, this section would focus on the relationships of loyalty between Khwārazmshāh, Saljūq Sultan, and the Abbasid Caliph.

5.1. "Islamic Rulers" and Loyalty between them during the Sunni Revival Period

There are a varies of ruler titles appeared in the letters of al-Waṭwāṭ, including *amīr*

(pl.*umarāʾ*), *wālī*, *raʾīs*, *shāh*, as well as Sultan (*sulṭān*) and Caliph (*khalīfa*). From a semantic perspective, these titles would help to understand some essential features of "Islamic rulers" generally shared at Sunni Revival period. In the text of al-Waṭwāṭ, "*amīr*" as a term has two different meanings in different contexts: first, it could be the official title of low-ranking military governors. As the previous chapters have mentioned, these *umarāʾ* owned not only military power, but also tax-collecting power and considerable political power, even though their power was restricted by both superior rulers such as Khwārazmshāh and local *aʿyān*. Second, *amīr* could be an unofficial title generally referred to all rulers in the east Islamic world at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ. For example, in his letter collected in al-Qazwīnī's compilation towards the Khwārazmian *kātib*, al-Waṭwāṭ called the Khwārazmshāh as *amīr*.[276] Similarly, in his different official letters respectively written to the *Wālī* of Iṣfahān[277], the *Raʾīs* of Māzandarān[278], and the chieftain of al-Buḥturī dynasty in Southern Lebanon[279], al-Waṭwāṭ also used the word "*amīr*" to referred to those governors who had varying level of powers in their hands.

Different from "*amīr*", other titles in al-Waṭwāṭ' letters were referred to a certain type of ruler. The governor of Iṣfahān was titled as "*Wālī*", to whom al-Waṭwāṭ had written three letters, and all of them were related to the *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* of Khwārazm, who passed through Iṣfahān for pilgriming (*ḥajj*) to Mecca. In these letters, al-Waṭwāṭ expressed his gratitude to the *Wālī* and town of Iṣfahān for supporting the Saḍr al-aʾimma, as well as his wise for more collaboration between the *Wālī* and Khwārazmshāh. [280] These letters reflected the administrative power and political influence of *Wālī* over the town under his governance.[281]

---

[276] al-Qazwīnī, *Athār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād*, 335.
[277] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 38, 86.
[278] Ibid, 46. In this letter, Al-Waṭwāṭ mentioned the *laqab* of the *Raʾīs*, which was Ṣadr al-Dīn b. Niẓām al-Dīn.
[279] Ibid, 75. Al-Waṭwāṭ mentioned the laqab of the chieftain of al-Buḥturī dynasty, which was Diyāʾ al-Dīn.
[280] See Ibid, 38, 40, 86. The *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* was not mentioned by Al-Waṭwāṭ about his *laqab*, however, ond of another official letters of him addressing to the sublime judge (*qāḍī al-quddāt*) of Baghdad also mentioned this *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* and his pilgrimage, moreover, that letter also mentioned the laqab of *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* was Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn. In this case, it is plausible to speculate that this *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* of Khwārazm was the same one that we had mentioned in Chapter 3.
[281] Durand-Guédy, "Isfahan in Turko-Mongol Period", 259, 283. In his article, Durand-Guédy analysed

For *Raʾīs* of Māzandarān, al-Waṭwāṭ praised him as "the noble son of the noble man, the great son of the great man (*al-karīm ibn al-karīm wa-al-ʿaẓīm ibn al-ʿaẓīm*)" in his letter, such description reflected the prominent reputation of the clan of the *Raʾīs*.[282] The letter also mentioned that the town of Jurjān was under the control of *Raʾīs*. The above information suggests that the *Raʾīs* was very possibly the monarch of Bāwandid dynasty, who held the Persian title *Ispahbad* (or *Iṣbahbadh*, literally means "army chief").[283] It is therefore reasonable to assume that the title "*raʾīs*" here was equal to "*Ispahbad*", with an emphasis on the military power of commanding an army.

As for *shāh*, al-Waṭwāṭ mentioned three "*Shāh*s" in his letters, who were Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāh, Kasrānid Shirwānshāh, and "*Dawlat-shāh*" of al-Buḥturī Dynasty. Both the titles of Khwārazmshāh and Shirwānshāh could be traced to pre-Islamic period, reflecting the dominating power of two *shāh*s on the regions of Khwārazm and Shirwān.[284] The "*Dawlat-shāh* (literally means "shāh of the state")" title of Buḥturīd chieftains, however, had no relation to pre-Islamic Iranian monarchies as the former two rulers. Based on the political history of the Buḥturīd dynasty, it could be speculated that the title of "*Dawlat-shāh*" was possibly derived from the title of "*Amīr al-gharb*".[285] It would be too arbitrary to assert that the title "*Dawlat-shāh*" was created by al-Waṭwāṭ and only used in the letter towards the Buḥturid chieftain,

---

the dynamic balance between the local power of Iṣhafān and the "Imperial power" of Turko-Mongol dynasties controlling Iṣfahān, including Saljūqs, Mongols, and Timūrids. The author suggested that Saljūq military governor of Iṣfahān was powerful enough to force the local elites to collaborate with them. In this case, the pattern of politics of Iṣfahān during Saljūq period conforms to Hodgson's "*amīr-aʿyān*" framework.

[282] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 47.

[283] More information about the *Ispahbad* of Bāwandid dynasty, see Bosworth, "80. The Bawandid Ispahbadhs", in *The New Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Manual*; and Madelung, "Āl-e Bāvand," *Encyclopædia Iranica*, available at < https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/al-e-bavand >. Madelung also mentioned that Al-Waṭwāṭ had written two letters in Persian addressing to the Ispahbad Shāh Ghāzī Rustam, on behalf of Khwārazmshāh Atsiz. These two letters were collected in Tūyserkānī's compilation of Al-Waṭwāṭ's Persian letters that was published in 1960 in Tehran. 22

[284] More information about the title of Sirwānshāh, see Bosworth, "67. Sharwān Shāhs", in *The New Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Manual*; also see Bosworth, "Šervānšahs", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, available at < https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/servansahs >.

[285] See Sabili, "The Buḥturids of the Garb. Mediaeval Lords of Beirut and of Southern Lebanon", 80, 82, 83. Buḥturids established power in the Gharb hills at the southeast of Beirut in the first half of the 6th/12th period by fighting with Frankish crusaders. Later, Buḥturids were successively recognized by Būrid atabeg Mujīr al-Dīn in 542/1147, Zanjid atabeg Nūr al-Dīn in 1154, and Salāḥ al-Dīn of Ayyūbid dynasty in 1187 as "*Amīr al-gharb* (the amīr of Gharb)", as a reward for the loyalty vow of Buḥturid chieftain towards them.

however, we could at least assume that al-Waṭwāṭ used it to express high esteem for the addressee and his young dynasty. The above text of al-Waṭwāṭ's letters reflected that *shāh* as a title was always connected to the name of a certain country (*dawla*), which may be interpreted to mean that a *shāh* was supposed to have dominant governmental power in his country.

Based on the above analysis on titles of rulers, we could summarise the power of "Islamic rulers" at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ includes the military power of commanding an army, and administrative power of governing a piece of land. The control of army and land, in turn, became the basic qualification of a ruler and a boundary between him and subjects under the governance of rulers. This boundary could also explain why Burhānid *Ṣadr-i Jahān* and Buḥturid chieftains could be regarded as rulers --- the former had monopolised the administrative power and financial power of Bukhara, and gained considerable political-military power through marriage and alliance with other rulers in the region;[286] and the latter controlled Gharb and kept strong military power. Their military-political power made them essentially different from other religious elites and *aʿyān*.

Army and land made a ruler sufficiently powerful to be a ruler, but not enough to provide legitimacy for a "legitimate" Islamic ruler at the time because a legitimate ruler also meant that his rule should be commonly admitted by other rulers in Islamic world, especially those with higher hierarchy and authority. Thus, establishment of relationship of loyalty with other rulers is crucial to legitimising the power of Islamic rulers at the time. [287]

Chapter 1 of this thesis has referred to the studies of various scholars two major types of relationships of loyalty between rulers that existed during the Sunni Revival period, which are *bayʿa* and *khidma*. As we have mentioned that *bayʿa* was established between the Caliph and his subjects. Even though Abbāsid Caliphs of the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries was much less powerful than their predecessors in early Abbāsid

[286] Ahmad, "Mapping the World of a Scholar in Sixth/twelfth Century Bukhārā", 28, 29.
[287] See Paul, "An Oath for Fealty for Tekesh b. Il Arslan Khwārazmshāh", 277.; and Paul, "ʿAbbāsid Administrative Legacy in the Seljuq World", 7.

period, they maintained as the nominally highest authority in the Islamic world, and their religious authority as the legitimate covenant of Allāh on earth was even cemented during the Sunni Revival period. Theoretically, Abbāsid Caliph was the suzerain of all Islamic rulers, however, as Marsham indicated that military rulers of different provinces no longer came to Baghdad and delivered their vow of allegiance (*bayʿa*) to every new-succeeded Abbāsid Caliph since the 9th/3rd century, due to the decline of the central political power of Abbāsid Caliphate.[288] Instead, Saljūq Sultan as the hegemony of Islamic world was the rare military ruler that attended the accession ceremony of Abbāsid Caliph. In the ceremony, Saljūq Sultan would pledge *bayʿa* to the Caliph, and as a return, the Caliph would dress the Sultan in a tailored robe symbolizing the legitimate authority of Sultanate[289] and grant him a special "contract (*ʿahd*)" in which the Caliph not only legitimised the hegemony of Saljūq Sultan by nominally delegate him as the guardian of Caliphate, but also promised not to organise Caliphate army.[290] This loyalty-legitimisation connection between Caliph and Sultan was also reflected by the coins minted by Saljūqs (Figure 1 and 2).

Figure 1[291]. Saljūq Dīnār Gold Coin Minded during the Reign of Sultan Ṭughrul Bayk
Obverse (Left): لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له القائم بأمر الله
Reverse (Right): محمد رسول الله السلطان المعظم شاهاشاه طغرل بيك […]

[288] Marsham, *Rituals of Islamic Monarchy*, 315.
[289] Bunyadov, *A History of the Khorezmian State under the Anushteginids, 1097-1231*, translated by A. Efendiyev, 43.
[290] Van Renterghem, "Controlling and Developping Baghdad: Caliphs, Sultans and the Balance of Power in the Abbāsid Capital (Mid-5th/11th to Late 6th/12th Centuries)", in: *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*, edited by Christian Lange and Songül Mecit, 118.
[291] "TughrilCoin.jpg", Wikipedia, uploaded June 7, 2014, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tughril#/media/File:TughrilCoin.jpg

Figure 2[292]. Saljūq Dīnār Gold Coin Minded during the Reign of Sultan Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad (Maḥmūd II)

Obverse (Left): لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له المستظهر بالله

Reverse (Right): محمد رسول الله السلطان المعظم أبو القاسم محمود بن محمد

Khidma, as Paul suggested, was established between "secular" rulers, especially between Saljūq Sultan and other military rulers in the East Islamic world. Similar as the loyalty between Caliph and Saljūq sultan, the loyalties between military rulers also contained a meaning of the exchange between allegiance and legalization --- the subordinate side pledge to "serve (*khadama*)" the superior side and in return, the superior side acknowledged and legitimised the power of the subordinate by the name of delegation (*shiḥna*). The relationships of loyalty of *khidma* were also reflected by coins minted by various military rulers, similar as Caliph-Sultan loyalty. The Khwārazmian copper coin minted thorughout the reign of Atsiz (Figure 3) and the gold coin minted in the name of Īnānj Yabghū Zankī, a military governor subordinate to the Saljūq Sultan Muḥmūd b. Muḥammad (Muḥmūd II, r. 511/1118-525/1131) (Figure 4) were examples to show such relationships of loyalty. The different positions of various rulers' names or titles on the coins also reflected a Multi-hierarchical structure of power in the relationships of loyalty between military rulers: the title of the Caliph and name

[292] "Mahmud II Seljuk Gold Dinar.jpg". Wikipedia, uploaded January 14, 2020, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seljuk_Empire#/media/File:Mahmud_II_Seljuk_Gold_Dinar.jpg.
The obverse of these coins commonly bore the first half of Islamic *Shahāda* --- "there is no deity but Allāh (*lā ilāh illa allāh*)", and the *laqab* of Abbāsid Caliph, while the reverse bore second half of *Shahāda* --- "Muhammad is the messeger of Allāh (*muḥammad rasūl allāh*)", the title of "the Great Sultan (*al-sulṭān al-muʿazzam*)", the name of the Saljūq Sultan, and occasionally his *kunya* or *laqab*.

of superior military rulers represented by Saljūq Sultan were displayed on the obverse, or in relatively prominent positions on the reverse, while the name of inferior rulers were routinely placed in more marginal positions. Such multi-hierarchical structure literally clarified the positions of every military ruler on the one hand, and created a complicated power network on the other, which was also the foundation of the imperial hegemony of Saljūq Sultan in Sunni Revival period.[293]

Figure 3[294]. Khwārazmian Copper Coin Minted during the Reign of Khwārazmshāh Atsiz
Obverse (Right): لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله المسترشد بالله
Reverse (Left): معز الدنيا والدين سنجر[....]

[293] Paul, "*Khidma* in the Social History of pre-Mongol Iran", 417.
[294] "Copper alloy fals of Atsiz/Sanjar, x, xxx H. 1978.43.14". American Numismatic Society, accessed May 21, 2023,
http://numismatics.org/collection/1978.43.14
The obverse of the "copper coin of Atsiz" bore Islamic *Shahāda* and the *laqab* of Abbāsid Caliph al-Mustarshid on the obverse, and the *laqab* of Saljūq Sultan Sanjar --- "Muʿizz al-Dīn" with his name were impressed on the reverse. This coin also has one uncommon feature, which is that the obverse bore the name of Saljūq Sultan Sanjar rather than the *laqab* of Caliph. Sultan Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad was the Sultan who possessed the *ʿahd* of the Caliphate, however, he also vowed loyalty to and established a *khidma* relationship to his uncle Sultan Sanjar who had no *ʿahd* from the Caliph. For showing the hierarchical difference in the relationship of loyalty between Sanjar and Maḥmūd, the coin bore the title of Maḥmūd as "the Great Sultan (*al-sulṭān al-muʿaẓẓam*)" --- the most commonly used title of the Saljūq Sultan shown on the coin, while the title of Sanjar as "the Greatest Sultan (*al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam*)".

Figure 4[295]. Gold Coin minted during the Reign of Sultan Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad (Maḥmūd II), citing governor Īnānj Yabghū Zankī

Obverse (Left): (فتح) لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له السلطان الأعظم سنجر

Reverse (Right): (اينانج يبغو زنكي الحاجب) محمد رسول الله المسترشد بالله السلطان المعظم محمود بن محمد

The above analysis demonstrated that the political system of the Sunni Revival Period was founded on a multitude of interpersonal relationships of loyalty between different Islamic rulers. The relationships of loyalty between Caliph and Saljūq Sultan as the first hierarchy in this system, and beneath that were multilevel relationships of loyalty between Saljūq Sultan, provincial overlords, and various military rulers. All these relationships of loyalty contained two basic elements: the interior side pledged allegiance or vowed to serve the superior side, and the superior side legitimised the power of the interior side by contract or delegation, thus making the relationships of loyalty a moral imperative for each side. From this perspective, the relationships of loyalty between Islamic rulers in Sunni Revival Period was similar to the feudal relationships in Medieval Europe that emphasized obedience and hierarchy on the one hand, while mutuality of obligations on the other, as Reynolds indicated in her study.[296]

It is also necessary to note that such political system was far from steady at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ, even though it had been sacralised by Sunni literati represented by al-

[295] "Coin struck under Mughith al-Din Mahmud II, citing governor Inanch Yabghu.jpg". Wikipedia, uploaded January 14, 2020, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahmud_II_(Seljuk_sultan)#/media/File:Coin_struck_under_Mughith_al-Din_Mahmud_II,_citing_governor_Inanch_Yabghu.jpg
The obverse of this coin bore the first half of *Shahāda*, and the name of Sanjar with the title of "the Greatest Sultan (*al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam*)", while the reverse bore the second half of *Shahāda*, and *laqab* of Caliph al-Mustarshid, the name of Muḥmūd b. Muḥammad, with the name of Īnānj Yabghū Zankī on the margin.

[296] Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 34, 35.

Ghazālī as the integration of the religious authority (*najda*) of Abbāsid Caliph and the hegemonical military political power (*shawka*) of Saljūq Sultan. After the end of reign of Sultan Malikshāh b. Alp Arslān, there were frequent clashes between different Saljūq ruler, which undermined the hegemonic power of the Great Saljūq Sultan. Meanwhile, Abbāsid Caliphs were continually seeking to regain their military political power and to disengage themselves from the control of Saljūq rulers.[297] Such situation not only led to a series of open conflicts between Caliphs and Saljūqs,[298] but also made Caliphs tended to avoid to grant *ʿahd* to Saljūq rulers who would have threatened them.[299] The disorder of the Caliph-Sultan relationship of loyalty weakened the legitimacy of Saljūq Sultan as the hegemony, hence, also disordered the loyalty system between military rulers. For instance, Sanjar was frequently experienced the revolts of his vassals, and highly depend on military power and ironfisted repression to maintain the *khidma* of his vassals.[300]

5.2. Relationships of Loylaty between Khwārazmshāh, Saljūq Sultan, and Abbāsid Caliph thorughout the Reign of Atsiz

In last section, we have analysised two typical kinds of loyalties between rulers --- the loyalty between the Caliph and Saljūq Sultan, and the loyalty between military rulers. Based on this framework, it can be observed that Khwārazmshāh Atsiz had been in a precarious "triangle loyalty relationship" with both Saljūq Sultan Aḥmad Sanjar

[297] Hanne, *Putting the Caliph in his Palace: Power, Authority, and the Late Abbasid Caliphate*, 28.

[298] Nīshāpūrī, *The History of the Seljuq Turks, from The Jamiʿ al-Tawarikh: An Ilkhanid Adaptation of the Saljuq-nama,* translated and annotated by Kenneth Allin Luther, 106, 107, 130. Caliphs al-Mustarshid, al-Rāshid, and al-Muqtafī all violated the *ʿahd* with the Saljūq Sultan to organise Caliphate army, and successively battled with Saljūq Sultans Masʿūd b. Muḥammad (r. 526/1134-547/1152) and Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd (r. 548/1154-554/1159) in 529/1135, 530/1136, and 552/1157.

[299] Ibid, 101. For instances, Aḥmad Sanjar was never be granted *ʿahd* by the Caliph although he was admitted by most of Islamic rulers in the East Islamic world as the hegemony, including Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad who possessed the *ʿahd* of Caliph. In 529/1135, Caliph al-Mustarshid, in an attempt to restrain the threat of Masʿūd b. Muḥammad who was granted *ʿahd* in 527/1133, removed his name of in the Friday Sermon of Baghdad and replaced him with Sanjar, which led to the war between the Caliph and Masʿūd.[299] The institution of *ʿahd* eventually came to an end with the death of Masʿūd, and since then no Saljūq ruler possessed *ʿahd* from Abbāsid Caliphate.

[300] See Paul, "Sanjar's Letter to the Notables of Samarqand, 524/1129-1130", 17-18. The translation of Sanjar's letter demonstrated how Sanjar depended on his iron-fisted attitude and military power to deal with the disobedience of the Qarākhānid rulers of Samarqand.

and the Abbāsid Caliph. On the one hand, Atsiz vacillated several times between allegiance and riot to the Saljūqs, as we have mentioned in the former parts of the thesis, on the other, Atsiz tried to established a direct relationship of loyaltywith the Caliph. This situation continued until the death of Atsiz in 551/1156.

Among the Khwārazmian coins minted thorughout the reign of Atsiz reflected, there were two that could reflect the change of Atsiz in the relationships of loyalty between him with both Sanjar and the Abbāsid Caliph, after the relationship between Atsiz and Sanjar turned into open hostility. The first one was the copper coin that we have analysed in last section, which demonstrated his allegiance to both Sanjar and the Caliph al-Mustarshid. Based on such information, this coin could be assumed to had been minted before the conflicts between Atsiz and Sanjar. Another gold coin of Atsiz (Figure 5) was minted between 529/1135 or 1136 when the relationship between Atsiz and Sanjar has become openly rivalry, and 545/1149 when the relationship between two rulers return to peaceful and the name of Sanjar once was again minted on Khwārazmian coins. The obverse of this coin bore Islamic *shahāda* and the *laqab* of Caliph al-Muqtafī, similar as the copper coin, however, the reverse bore the *laqab* and *kunya* of Sultan Masʿūd who was the main rival of Sanjar within Saljūq family. The name of Atsiz the title "*al-malik al-muẓaffar*"[301] was also impressed on the reverse, after Masʿūd. The change from Sanjar to Masʿūd on the coins demonstrated that Atsiz was continually admitted his *khidma* relationships towards Saljūqs, even after he denied his loyalty to Sanjar.

[301] The title of "*al-malik al-muẓaffar*" literally means "the victorious king". this title was not found in the letters of Al-Waṭwāṭ. It is possible that "al-*malik*" was the equation of the title "*shāh*", and "*al-muẓaffar*" was derived from "*Abū al-Muẓaffar*", the *kunya* of Atsiz.

Figure 5[302]. Khwārazmian Gold Coin Minted during the Reign of Atsiz
Obverse: لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله المقتفي لأمر الله
Reverse: لله السلطان المعظم غياث الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح مسعود الملك المظفر أتسز

Fahmī's compilation has collected five al-Waṭwāṭ's letters addressing to the Caliph al-Muqtafī, on behalf of the Khwārazmshāh, which reveal more complicated details on the relationships of loyalty between Atsiz with Saljūqs and the Caliph. The first one of these letters could be ensured that was written after the battle of Hazārāsp between Atsiz and Sanjar in the month of *Rabīʿ al-Ākhir* in 537/1142[303], one year after Sanjar's defeat by the Gurkhān of Qarākhiṭā at the battle of Qatwān.[304] In this letter, al-Waṭwāṭ attempted to use the Caliph's discontent with Saljūqs to persuaded him stood on the side of Khwārazmshāh against Sanjar. The letter began with a long part of salutation to the Caliph, in which al-Waṭwāṭ used ornate rhetoric to eulogise Allāh, then the Prophet Muḥammad, and finally the caliph. Such salutation formed a chain of legitimacy of Abbāsid Caliphate as the highest authority in Islamic world, or as the term used by al-Ghazālī, the "*najda*" of the Caliphate[305]. In al-Waṭwāṭ's typical Orthodox Sunni

[302] "Atsiz's Gold Dinar of Khwarezm Mint". Mintage World: Online Museum & Collectorspedia, March 28, 2019,
https://www.mintageworld.com/media/detail/9065-atsizs-gold-dinar-of-khwarezm-mint/
[303] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 8.
[304] Various sources recorded different dates on the battle of Hazārāsp (or Hazārāsf): Ibn al-Athīr recorded in his strictly chronological written history *al-Kāmil fīʾl-Tārīkh*, that the war between Atsiz and Sanjar began in 536 and was temporarily truce in 537, which corresponds the date of Hazārāsp battle recorded in the Al-Waṭwāṭ's letter. Juvaini also, however, recorded that the battle happened in 543. For these different date records, it could be speculated that there may have been more than one battle at Hazārāsp between Atsiz and Sanjar, or that one of these recorded dates was incorrect. This thesis here assumes that the date recorded in Al-Waṭwāṭ's letter about the battle of Hazārāsp is correct. See Ibn al-Atīr. *Al-Kāmil fīʾl-Tārīkh*, vol.9, 323.; and Juvayni, *Tarikh-i Jahangushay*, Translated by Boyle, 282.
[305] Hillenbrand, "Islamic Orthodox or Realpolitik", 83.

narrative, Allāh assigned Muḥammad as his messenger (*rasūl*) and authorized him with the mission (*al-risāla*). By the effort of the prophet Muḥammad, "the world of idolatry collapsed and the faith of Islam expanded" (*wa-inhadda bi-ẓuhūrihi ruwāq Dawlat al-iṣnām wa-ittasaʿa bi-mawjūdihi millat al-islām*)".[306] Therefor as the successor of the Prophet, the Caliph al-Muqtafī inherited his authority as "the commander of the faithful, the imām of Muslims, and the deputy (*Khalīfa*--Caliph) of Allāh the lord of two worlds (*amīr al-muʿminīn wa-imām al-muslimīn wa-khalīfat rabb al-ʿālamayn al-muqtafī l-amr allāh*)", and was authorized by Allāh to "uphold the milestones of Islam and eternally maintain the ceremony of the Islamic law and Islamic governance (*aḥyā maʿālim al-islām wa-abdā marāsim al-shawāriʿ wa-al-aḥkām*)".[307]

After the salutation, al-Waṭwāṭ came to the relation between Saljūqs and the Caliphate. Even though Saljūqs were now "the serious disaster that cause serious pain (*awlād saljūq muhimm hadith wa-aʿraḍa mulimm kārith*)", but they used to be humble servants (*khadam*) of the Caliphate and to "fear the Caliph as kids fear their parents (*fazaʿū ilayhi fazaʿa al-ṭifl ilā awlādihi*)".[308] Depending on their "relationships of loyalty towards the Caliphate with the prophetic glory (*intimāʾ ilā ṭāʿa al-mawāqif al-ʿizza al-nabawiyya*)", they have gotten the everlasting glory and permanent nobleness (*lā zāla mahfūẓa bi-al-ʿizza al-abadiyya maknūfa bi-al-karāma al-sarmadiyya*)[309] and expanded their influence thoughout a broad domain from ʿIrāq to Samarqand and Jand. Al-Waṭwāṭ then accused Saljūqs and claimed that the Ismāʿīlī assassins who had murdered Caliph al-Mustarshid and Caliph al-Rāshid were instigated by Saljūqs (*taslīṭ al-ismāʿīliyya ʿalayhi…kamā faʿala bi-al-imāmayn…min kibār al-khulafāʾ al-ṭāhirayn al-mustarshid wa-al-rāshid*)[310]. In al-Waṭwāṭ's discourse, such severe crimes had already weakened Saljūqs' legitimacy as the hegemony of Islamic world. Moreover, their rout in the battle with infidel made them even more scandalous (*aqbaḥa firārhu yawm iltaqat al-fiʾtān… min qitāl al-kuffar al-malāʿīn*)[311]. All those disasters were

[306] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 4.
[307] Ibid, 4.
[308] Ibid, 6.
[309] Ibid, 6.
[310] Ibid, 7.
[311] Ibid, 7. It is reasonable to assume that the rout of Saljūqs that Al-Waṭwāṭ mentioned here referred to

enough to "make their (saljūqs) throne subdued, their army weakened, and their flames extinguished (*fulla ʿirshuhu wa-qalla jayshahu wa-irtafaʿat narahu*)."[312]

Therefore, al-Waṭwāṭ on behalf of Atsiz, suggested the Khwārazmshāh was the better alternative to the Saljūqs as the hegemony of Islamic world, after he completely denied the legitimacy of Saljūq. Al-Waṭwāṭ tried to prove that from two perspectives. From an administrative perspective, al-Waṭwāṭ claimed that Khwārazmshāhs was more humane governors according to the moral principles of Orthodox Sunnism. They were not only "willing to serve the noble prophetic court of Caliph (*mataʿa allāh khadam al-mawāqif al-muqaddasa al-nabawiyya*)", but also had successfully maintained the security and Islamic Sunni rule of Khwārazm and Khurāsān for decades, guaranteeing the people of two regions avoided from the invasion of infidels and the infiltration of heretic sects --- "the people of Khurāsān and Khwārazm could sleep in restful sleeps…the evilness and harm of infidels did not touch them, nor did the corruption and crime of the heretics aggress them (*nāma ahl khurāsān wa-khwārazm…fī maḍājiʿihim āminīn…lā yamussuhum sharr al-khufur wa-maḍarratuhu wa-lā yaṣdimuhum fasād al-shirk wa-maʿarratuhu*)"[313].Then from the military perspective, al-Waṭwāṭ suggested that Khwārazmshāh had more capacity of combat, therefore more qualified to be the defender of Islamic world. The evidence is that Khwārazmian army successfully defended the invasion of Sanjar at Hazārāsp. Al-Waṭwāṭ vividly described "the triumph of Khwārazmshāh's army" --- Sanjar invaded Khwārazm in 537/1142, but confronted tough resistance of Khwārazmian army. Even though Sanjar besieged Hazārāsp for more than a month, he could not take over it. Finally, Sanjar had to withdraw from Hazārāsp and gave up his invasion. [314] In this case, al-Waṭwāṭ represented Atsiz to ask for a contract (*ʿahd*) from the Caliph with his "most noble and sublime signature (*bi-*

---

referred to the defeat of Sanjar with Qarākhiṭā army in the battle of Qatwān, based on the possible date of when this letter was written.

[312] Ibid, 8.

[313] Ibid, 5.

[314] See Ibid, 8-12. Here Al-Waṭwāṭ described the whole process of the Battle of Hazārāsp by his version. However, when we compared the story told by Al-Waṭwāṭ about the triumph of Khwārazmian army with other sources such as Ibn al-Athīr's *al-Kāmil fī-al-Tārīkh*, it is easy to find that Al-Waṭwāṭ did not mentioned the invasion of Atsiz to Khurāsān and Sanjar expelled Khwārazmian army. All these was happened just before the battle of Hazārāsp. See Ibn al-Athir, *al-Kāmil fī-al-Tārīkh*, vol.9, 328.

al-tawqīʿ al-ashraf al-aʿlā)" for granting prominent authority to Khwārazmshāh and his country. With this *ʿahd*, the Khwārazmshāh, who claimed himself as the "slave (*al-ʿabd*) of Caliphate" would "crash the greed of his enemy for his court and land (*wa-tanqaṭiʿu bi-yaman dhalik al-ʿahd iṭmāʿ al-ʿaduww min diyār al-ʿabd wa-bilādihi*)".

It is difficult to ensure whether Caliph al-Muqtafī replied to this letter, but on the basis of the information reflected in the Khwārazmian gold coin minted after the war between Sanjar and Atsiz, it could be assumed that the Caliph did not actively respond to Atsiz's reaquest for *ʿahd*, nor did openly support him. Such situation might have influenced the narrative of Khwārazmshāh on the relationships of loyalty with Saljūqs and the Caliphate. In the following letters of al-Waṭwāṭ towards al-Muqtafī, the *kātib* still represented the Khwārazmshāh to deliver his loyalty to the Caliph, however, he did not ask for the *ʿahd*, nor did completely deny the legitimacy of Saljūqs.[315] Al-Waṭwāṭ's last letter towards al-Muqtafī clearly reflected such turning of Khwārazmshāh. This letter can be dated inferentially to sometime after 548/1153, the year when two significant events happened: first was that Sanjar was captured by Ghūzz Turks, which led to serious pollical chaos. Second was that Muḥammad b. Muḥmūd claimed himself as Saljūq Sultan without an *ʿahd* from Caliph al-Muqtafī and defeated the Caliphate army in ʿIrāq.[316] In the letter, al-Waṭwāṭ mentioned the chaotic situation in Khurāsān and Transoxiana (*mā warāʾ al-nahr*) and admitted Muḥmmad as "the Greatest Sultan (*al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam*)", which referred to both two events.[317] It was also known that this letter was a reply letter to the letter from al-Muqtafī in which the Caliph accused the "disastrous incident (*al-ḥādith al-kārith*)" Muḥammad did to him and possibly requested Khwārazmshāh to stand with him.[318] In the letter, al-Waṭwāṭ did not respond to the request of the Caliph at first, instead, he shown the high sense of morality and responsibility of Khwārazmshāh as an excellent Sunni Islamic provincial ruler. By his

[315] See Ibid, 14-19. Also see Bunyadov, *A History of the Khorezmian State under the Anushteginids, 1097-1231,* translated by A. Efendiyev, 24. Here Bunyadov had a concise introduction to all five letters of Al-Waṭwāṭ towards Caliph al-Muqtafī.
[316] Bosworth, "the political and dynastic history of the Iranian world (a.d. i 000-1217)", 175.
[317] Al-Waṭwāṭ, *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn al-Waṭwāṭ*, Vol.1, 21, 22.
[318] Ibid, 22. Based on what happened in 543/1153, it could be assumed that this "disastrous incident" may refers to that the army of Muḥammad defeated the Caliphate army, which might be regarded as an openly humiliation from the perspective of al-Muqtafī.

narrative, Khwārazmshāh was busy for protecting Khwārazm, "the most famous mountain pass of Islamic world, and the most splendid palace to defend the law and the governess of Islam (*hiya thighr mashhūr min thughūr al-islam lā bal qaṣr maʿmūr min quṣūr al-sharāʾiʿ wa- al-aḥkām*)", and "fought every year against the enemies of faith and companions of evil in the heart of idolatry and the nest of infidel Turks (*wa-tawajahhahu kull sana…ilā mujāhadat aʿdāʾ al-dīn wa-munāhadat aḥzāb al-shayāṭīn wa-tawaghghalahu fī ṣamīm bilād al-shirk wa-bi-jubūḥt diyār al-turk*)" [319]. Al-Waṭwāṭ attributed all these efforts of Khwārazmshāh to his "stand of loyalty to the divine noble court of Caliph" (*li-ṭāra ilā tilk al-mawāqif al-muqaddasa al-mukarrama…bi-ajniḥat al-ṭāʿa*)[320]. The Khwārazmshāh was so focusing on his obligation that he "did not even know the reason that caused 'the Greatest sultan' made this 'disastrous incident' to the Caliph (*al-ʿabd laysa yaʿrif sabab dhalik fa-anna kāna manshiʾ hadhini al-ḥāditha al-kāritha min jihhat al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam*)" when he received the letter of al-Muqtafī[321]. On behalf of Atsiz, al-Waṭwāṭ attributed the incident to two reasons: first is that the Sultan did not fulfill the virtue that he should have (*lā tatasahhilu lahu hadhihi al-muniyya*), and second, the Sultan "was not surrounded by the blessing and care of the Caliph (*lam taktanif aḥwālahu barakāt ʿināyat sayyidinā…al-Muqtafī*)", which is possibly referred to the situation that al-Muqtafī refused to granted the *ʿahd* to Muḥammad. Hence, the Khwārazmshāh send this letter of reply, wishing to mediate the conflicts between Caliph and Sultan --- "to turn the sorrow of separation to the happiness of solidarity, and to turn the scorns of severance to the gardens of allegiance (*wa-istizālihi min ḥuzūn al-inqiṭāʿ ilā suhūl al-ijtimʿ wa-min shawāhiq al-imtināʿ ilā ḥadāʾiq al-ittibāʿ*)"[322], especially in that rough time when both Khurāsān and Transoxiana were suffered from the chaotic situation --- "there the prayers and worshippers were being tortured. religious schools and mosques were being damaged, and the blood of respectables was shed (*ʿudhiba fihā al-rākiʿ wa-al-sājid wa-khuriba al-madāris wa-al-masājid wa-*

[319] Ibid, 20.
[320] Ibid, 20.
[321] Ibid, 22-23.
[322] Ibid, 23.

safakat al-dimāʾ al-muḥarrama)"[323]. This was what Khwārazmshāh was obliged to do at the time that "Muslims were all waiting for the resurgence of the Greatest Sultan (*al-waqt alladhi yantaẓiru al-muslimūn min naḥdat al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam*)" for helping the Sultan "to reject everything things that was not good for the glorification of his leniency and to persist in doing the right thing (*tanaffara mithl dhalika… laysa bi-amr yujammil an yatasāhil fīhi aw yataqāʿid ʿan tadārukihi*)"[324]. From the narrative of al-Waṭwāṭ in this letter, it could be found that Khwārazmshāh was ostensibly on the stand of the Caliph; however, he in fact supported Muḥammad, and implied that the Caliph should make peace with Muḥammad, grant the *ʿahd* to him, and acknowledge his authority.

Conclusive Remarks

This chapter has studied two letters of al-Waṭwāṭ towards al-Muqtafī, which had opposing realpolitikal goals to each other. The first letter was aimed to persuade the Caliph to repeal the legitimacy of Saljūqs as the hegemon, while the aim of the second letter was to persuade the Caliph to recognise the hegemonic stature of Saljūq Sultan. However, both letters were based on a same basic viewpoint, which is that the existence of a hegemonic military ruler is necessary, and the multilevel loyal structure of "Caliph-hegemony-other military rulers" should be maintained. For the hegemonic ruler, he was supposed to have a series of qualified characteristics, including sufficient loyalty to the Caliphate and the moralism of Orthodox Sunnism, sufficient moral conscience to be the example of all military rulers, and sufficient military capacity to be the protector of Islamic world and Sunna, etc. For the Caliph, he was supposed to acknowledge the authority of the hegemonic ruler, and if that ruler met the requirements of hegemon, the Caliph should not refuse to legitimise him by granting him the *ʿahd*. In this case, when Khwārazmshāh believed himself had sufficient power to become that hegemon, he would ask the Caliph directly for the *ʿahd*, as the first letter shows. If he realised that he and his dynasty were still inadequate to become the new hegemon, he would ask the

[323] Ibid, 21.
[324] Ibid, 23.

Caliph to maintain the statute of Saljūqs.

Conclusion

In the previous chapters, this thesis studied a multitude of relationships of loyalty, which included various social hierarchies, various categories of people, including the populace represented by *aʿyān* and religious elites, officials represented by civil officials and religious-judicial officials, as well as various rulers represented by Abbasid Caliph, Saljūq Sultans, and Anūshtakīnid Khwārazmshāhs. By studying these relationships of loyalty one by one, one can see that these relationships of loyalty function like many scaffolds, framing the entire social structure of the medieval east Islamic world at the time of al-Waṭwāṭ.

When all analysis of the thesis is gathered together, a picture of the hierarchical social framework of the Sunni Revival period is presented: at the top of this framework was Abbasid Caliph, the nominal highest authority in the East Islamic world, and a hegemonic military ruler, represented by Saljūq Sultan. In theory, the Caliph and Sultan should sit between a relationship of loyalty in the form of "*ʿahd*" and "*bayʿ*". Beneath the Caliph and the hegemony were numbers of rulers with varying levels of political-military power, they were all nominally subordinates of the Caliph, but in fact, they formed a multilevel power structure through interpersonal "*khidma*" relationships of loyalty between each other, as we have seen in the relationships between Saljūq Sultan, Khwārazmshāh, and the *umarāʾ* of Khwārazm. The rulers, in order to guarantee his power covering the whole territory under his rule, would nominate his dependents as civil officials and authorise them with varying degrees of administrative power. These officials constituted the military court of the rulers. In the case of Khwārazm, Khwārazmshāh would also delegate members of local Sunni religious elites as religious-judicial officials. By doing this, Khwārazmshāh on the one hand illuminated his respect to Orthodox Sunnism and the local religious circle, on the other hand used them to counterbalance the power of the *umarāʾ* of Khwārazm vassalised to him. The bottom of this social framework was the populace, who were supposed to be subjective to rulers and in return, rulers were obliged to protect their rights. And as Chapter 3 has analysed, under the "*amīr-aʿyān*" pattern, the local notables and religious elites would

have represented the populace in sharing power with the rulers. Such a social framework was to some extent similar to the description Reynolds provides on medieval European feudal society, which on the one hand emphasizes obedience and hierarchy and on the other hand, stipulates the mutual obligation and moral principle to each part of a relationship of loyalty.

We could also vertically dichotomise this social framework into two groups; the boundary between them is relatively indistinct but can be identified as the religious circle and "secular" circle. The former included religious elites of the populace, the religious-judicial officials, and the Caliph with the unique religious legitimacy of *najda*, who commonly enjoyed higher social prestige in al-Waṭwāṭ's narratives than the "seculars" in their respective social hierarchies. The latter included *aʿyān*, civil officials, and military rulers, who had more power from a realpolitikal perspective than the former.

With this being said, this thesis will now return to the research questions of this thesis: How did al-Waṭwāṭ reconcile the moralism and real political interest inside the relationships of loyalty in his letters? Based on the official letters of al-Waṭwāṭ that the thesis has studied, at least three narratives could be found that were always presented together in his texts, through which al-Waṭwāṭ not only requested the recipients to be loyal to the will of Khwārazmshāh and serve for his realpolitikal interest, but also ensured his requests were highly accorded to the moralism of Orthodox Sunnism.

The first narrative is a compliment on the moral qualities of recipients, which was always closely associated with the categories of the recipients. For example, al-Waṭwāṭ had praised the generosity and forgiveness of the Khwārazmian *aʿyān*, the "noble virtue" of Khwārazmian *nasīb*, the lofty moral sense and ascetism of the *Saḍr al-aʾimma*, the loyalty and Excellent erudition of the Abbasid *wazīr* to the Caliph, the "righteousness and kindness" of Khwārazmian *wazīr*, the justice of the Khwārazmian *qāḍī*, the excellent erudition of the *muftī* of Khurāsān, as well as the *najda* of the Abbasid Caliph, and the loyalty and fighting spirit that the Saljūqs "once processed". These qualities were more and less related to the moral discipline of Orthodox Sunnism and implied to a logic that might be widely accepted by the east Islamic world in the Sunni Revival

period, which was that the one's category means a set of moral principles which, in return, one must observe in order to conform himself to his category. And the higher one's category in the social hierarchy, the higher the moral demands placed on him.

The second narrative is that al-Waṭwāṭ tried to link the will of Khwārazmshāh and his realpolitikal interest closely to the moral qualities of the recipients based on their respective categories. In this way, the recipients would have no choice but to be loyal to Khwārazmshāh's will and serve his interest. For example, because of his generosity and forgiveness, The Khwārazmian *aʿyān* should not refuse the request of Khwārazmshāh to adopt that youth, because of his lofty moral sense. Similarly, the *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* should not refuse the request of Khwārazmshāh to judge that legal case; because of his righteousness, the Khwārazmian *wazīr* should obey the order of Khwārazmshāh to govern a poor village of Khwārazm; and because al-Caliph was the highest authority of the Islamic world, he was obliged to choose a qualified military ruler as hegemon, hence he should deny the legitimacy of Saljūqs and grant *ʿahd* to Khwārazmshāh, as al-Waṭwāṭ requested in the letter. This narrative prominently reflected the excellent professionalism of al-Waṭwāṭ as the chief *kātib*.

And the third narrative is that al-Waṭwāṭ indicated to his recipients that if he was loyal to the will of Khwārazmshāh and served his realpolitikal interest, he would benefit well from the latter's court. This narrative is in concurrence with the theory on loyalty that Chapter 1 of this thesis had mentioned; that loyalty is a kind of social relationship about the exchange of interests. However, al-Waṭwāṭ tended to use subtle and indirect way to express this meaning, rather than clearly showing the benefit to the recipient. For example, al-Waṭwāṭ promised to the Khwārazmian *aʿyān* that if he adopted the youth, he would get "thankfulness and prayers" from the court of Khwārazmshāh; and if the *Ṣadr al-aʾimma* agreed to judge the law case, he would be free from his current dilemma of being "like a star that has lost its shine"; and similarly, if the Caliph agrees to "make his blessing surround" the Saljūq Sultan Maḥmūd as Khwārazmshāh hoped, then Khwārazmshāh would provide more support to him.

Bibliography

Primary Source Materials:

ʿAli, Muḥammad Kurd. *Rasāʾil al-Bulaghāʾ*. Damascus: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya al-Kubrā, 1913.

Al-Iṣbahānī, ʿImād al-Dīn. *Kharīdat al-Qaṣr wa-Jarīdat al-ʿAṣr*. Baghdad: Al-Mujammiʿ al-ʿIrāqiyy, 2000.

Al-Rūmī, Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī. *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ: Irshād al-Arīb ilā Maʿrifat al-Adīb*. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmiyy, 1993.

Al-ʿUmarī, Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Ḥadāʾiq al-Ṣiḥr fi Daqāʾiq al-Shʿr*, translated by Ibrāhīm Amīn al-Shawāribī. Cairo: Markaz al-Qawmiyy li-al-Tarjama, 2009.

Al-Waṭwāṭ, Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Majmūʿ Rasāʾil Rashīd al-Dīn Al-Waṭwāṭ*. Edited by M. A. Fahmī. Cairo: Maṭbaʿ al-Maʿārif, 1890

American Numismatic Society. "Copper alloy fals of Atsiz/Sanjar, x, xxx H. 1978.43.14". Accessed May 21, 2023. http://numismatics.org/collection/1978.43.14

Ibn al-Athīr, ʿIzz al-Dīn ʿAli. *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*. Edited by Abū al-Faḍāʾ ʿAbd Allāh al-Qāḍī. Bairut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1987

Ibn Taymiyya. *Al-Naṣihat al-Dhahabiyya ilā al-Jamāʿāt al-Islāmiyya*. Collected and edited by Ḥasan Salmān. Riyad: Dār al-Rāya, 1990.

Juvayni, ʿAla-ad-Din ʿAta-Malik. *Genghis Khan: The History of the World Conqueror*. Translated by J. A. Boyle. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997

Nishapuri, Zahir al-Din. *The History of the Seljuq Turks, from The Jami' al-Tawarikh: An Ilkhanid Adaptation of the Saljuq-nama*, translated and annotated by Kenneth Allin Luther. Richmond: Curzon Press, 2001

Niẓam Al-Mulk. *The Book of Government or Rules for Kings. The Siyar al-Muluk or Siyasat-nama*. Translated by Hubert Darke. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Togto'a/Tuoketuo 托克托, "Benji Sanshi, Tian-Zuo Huangdi Si 本纪三十，天祚皇帝

四”, *Liao Shi, vol. 30 辽史，卷三十*. Availiable at: < https://zh.m.wikisource.org/wiki/%E9%81%BC%E5%8F%B2/%E5%8D%B730 >

Wikipedia. “Coin struck under Mughith al-Din Mahmud II, citing governor Inanch Yabghu.jpg”. Uploaded January 14, 2020. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahmud_II_(Seljuk_sultan)#/media/File:Coin_struck_under_Mughith_al-Din_Mahmud_II,_citing_governor_Inanch_Yabghu.jpg

----. “Mahmud II Seljuk Gold Dinar.jpg”. Uploaded January 14, 2020. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seljuk_Empire#/media/File:Mahmud_II_Seljuk_Gold_Dinar.jpg

----. “TughrilCoin.jpg”, Uploaded June 7, 2014. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tughril#/media/File:TughrilCoin.jpg

Zakariyyāʾ al-Qazwīnī. *Athār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 2007.

Secondary Source Materials:

Ahmed, Shahab. “Mapping the World of a Scholar in Sixth/twelfth Century Bukhāra: Regional Tradition in Medieval Islamic Scholarship as Reflected in a Bibliography”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 120, No. 1 (2000): 24-43

Barthold, W. *Turkistan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, 3rd Edition. Translated by C.E. Bosworth. London: Messrs. Luzac And Company Ltd., 1968

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman. *Betrayal and Treason: Violations of Trust and Loyalty*. Boulder: Westview Press, 2001.

Biran, Michal. *The Empire of the Qara Khitai in Eurasian History: Between China and the Islamic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge Press, 2005.

Blois, F.C. de, “Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Djalīl al-ʿUmarī, known as Waṭwāṭ”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_6238

Bosworth, C.E., “Khwārazm”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by:

P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_4205

Bosworth, C.E., "Khwārazm-Shāhs", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_4206

----. "Khwarazmshahs, Decendents of the Line of Anuštigin", *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Available at < https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/khwarazmshahs-i >

----, "Šervānšahs", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, available at < https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/servansahs >

----. *The New Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Manual*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

----, "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (A.D. 1000–1217)". In J. Boyle (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, pp. 1-202. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Bunyadov, Z. M. *A History of the Khorezmian State under the Anushteginids, 1097-1231*. Translated by Ali Efendiyev. Samarkand: IICAS, 2015.

Cahen, Cl., "Djahīr", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_1934

Campanini, Massimo, "In Defence of Sunnism: Al- Ghazālī and the Seljuqs", in: *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011): 228-239.

Connor, James. *The Sociology of Loyalty*. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.

Durand-Guédy, David, "Isfahan during the Turko-Mongol Period (11th-15th Centuries)", *Eurasian Studies* 16 (2018): 253-312.

Duri, A.A.,"ʿĀmil", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs.Consulted online on 25 June 2022 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_0593

----, "Amīr", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_0602

Ephrat, Daphna, "The Seljuqs and the Public Sphere in the Period of Sunni Revivalism: The View from Baghdad", in: *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011): 139-156.

Farouk, Mitha. *Al-Ghazālī and the Ismailis*. New York: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd, 2001.

Ganshof, F. L.. *Feudalism*. Translated by Philip Grierson. London: Longmans, Green and CO. 1952.

Hanne, Eric J.. *Putting the Caliph in His Place: Power, Authority, and the Late Abbasid Caliphate*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007.

----, "The Banū Jahīr and Their Role in the ʿAbbāsid and Saljūq Administration", *Al-Masaq*, 20:1 (2008): 29-45.

Hillenbrand, Carole, "Islamic Orthodoxy or Realpolitik? Al-Ghazālī's Views on Government", *Iran*, Vol. 26 (1988): 81-94.

Henry, Iain D., "What Allies Want: Reconsidering Loyalty, Reliability, and Alliance Interdependence", *International Security*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Spring 2020): 45-83.

Hodgson, Marshall G. S.. *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization. Vol. 2. Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Iggers, Georg. *Historiography in the Twenties Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge, with a new epilogue*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2005.

İz, Fahīr, "Aḥmad Yasawī", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-

3912_islam_SIM_0427

Jackson, Peter. *The Mongols And The Islamic World: From Conquest To Conversion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

Keegan, Matthew L., "al-Muṭarrizī", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, Edited by: Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Devin J. Stewart. Consultedonline on 13 July 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_40653

Kennedy, Hugh. *Caliphate: The History of an Idea*. New York: Basic Books, 2016.

Lane, Andrew J., "Al-Zamakhshari (D.538/1144) and His Quran Commentary Al-Kashshaf A Late Mutazilite Scholar at Work". PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2003.

----, "You can't tell a book by its author: A study of Muʿtazilite theology in al-Zamakhsharī's (d. 538/1144) Kashshāf", *Bulletin of SOAS*, 75, 1 (2012), 47–86.

Lange, Christian, "Changes in the Office of *Ḥisba* under the Seljuqs", in: *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011): 157-181.

Madelung,W., "Āl-e Bāvand", *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/al-e-bavand>

Maqrīzī, Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī. *Al-Maqrīzī's al-Ḫabar ʿan al-bašar. Volume V, Sections 1–2, The Arab thieves.* Critical Edition, Annotated Translation and Study by Peter Webb. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Marsham, Andrew. *Rituals of Islamic Monarchy: Accession and Succession in the first Muslim Empire*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd., 2009.

Mason, Herbert. *Two Statesmen of Mediaeval Islam: Vizir Ibn Hubayra (499-560AH/1105-1165AD) and Caliph an-Nâsir li Din Allâh (553-622 AH / 1158-1225 AD)*. The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1972.

Mercer, Jonathan. *Reputation And International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Mintage World: Online Museum & Collectorspedia."Atsiz's Gold Dinar of Khwarezm Mint". March 28, 2019. https://www.mintageworld.com/media/detail/9065-atsizs-gold-dinar-of-khwarezm-mint/

Mottahedeh, Roy P.. *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society*. Princeton:

Princeton University Press, 1980.

Paul, Jürgen, "Atsız b. Muḥammad", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, Edited by: Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Devin J. Stewart. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_24490

----, "*Khidma* in the Social History of pre-Mongol Iran", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 57 (2014): 392-422.

----, "Sanjar and Atsız : Independence, Lordship, and Literature", in *Nomad Aristocrats in a World of Empires* (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2013): 81-130.

----, "Sanjar's Letter to the Notables of Samarqand, 524/1129–1130", *Iran*, 56:1 (2018), 13-20.

----, "The Role of Hwārazm in Seljuq Central Asian Politics, Victories and Defeats:Two Case Studies". *Eurasian Studies*, VII (2008): 1–17.

Poulsen, Lauge N Skovgaard, "Loyalty in World", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 26(4) (2020): 1156–1177.

Reynolds, Susan. *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Royce, Josiah. *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1995.

Salibi, Kamal S., "The Buḥturids of the Garb: Mediaeval Lords of Beirut and of Southern Lebanon", *Arabica*, T. 8, Fasc. 1 (Jan., 1961): 74-97.

Safi, Omid. *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam: Negotiating Ideology and Religious Inquiry*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Sellheim, R., "al-Muṭarrizī", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 13 July 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_5653

Starr, S. Frederick. *Lost Enlightenment: Central Asia's Golden Age from the Arab Conquest to Tamerlane*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Stone, Lawrence, “The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History", P*ast & Present*, Nov., 1979, No. 85 (Nov., 1979): 3-24.

Tabbaa, Yasser. *The Transformation of Islamic Art during the Sunni Revival*. *Seattle*: University of Washington Press, 2001.

Tor, D. G., “‘Sovereign and Pious’: The Religious Life of the Great Seljuq Sultans”, in: *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011): 39-62.

Tyan, E. and Káldy-Nagy, Gy., “Ḳāḍī”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0410

Tyan, E. and Walsh, J.R., “Fatwā”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0219

Van Renterghem, Vanessa, “Controlling and Developing Baghdad: Caliphs, Sultans and the Balance of Power in the Abbasid Capital (Mid-5th/11th to Late 6th/12th Centuries)”, in: *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011): 117-138.

Wei, Liangtao. *Xi Liao Shi Yanjiu 西辽史研究*. Yinchuan: Ningxia Renmin Chubanshe, 1987

Welsford, Thomas. *Four Types of Loyalty in Early Modern Central Asia: The Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Takeover of Greater Mā Warā al-Nahr, 1598–1605*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Wheatley, Paul. *The Places Where Men Pray Together: Cities in Islamic Lands Seventh Through the Tenth Centuries*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltirnore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Yuksel, Azmi, “Al-Zamakhsharī's Life and a Critical Edition of His Dīwān”. PhD diss.,

Durham University, 1979.

Zetterstéen, K.V., “Ibn al-Baladī”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 02 June 2023 http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_3101