

Nizām al-Dīn, who was fourteen at the time of his father's death, studied under Mullās 'Alī Kulī of Dja'is, Amān Allāh of Benares and Nakshband of Lucknow. On finishing his education he established the teaching tradition in Farangī Maḥall, including amongst his many pupils not only members of his own family and the forerunners of the Khayrābād school of *ma'kulāt* studies but also students from Bengal and much of Awadh. At the same time through his powerful relationship with the illiterate Kādīrī mystic, Sayyid 'Abd al-Razzāk of Bānsa (d. 5 Shawwāl 1136/27 June 1724) he established his family's connections with the most dynamic saint of the region, who has been to the present day the prime source of the family's spiritual inspiration. He died on 1 Djumādā 1161/29 April 1748. His son 'Abd al-'Alī Baḥr al-'Ulūm (d. 12 Raddjāb 1225-13 August 1810) [q.v.] ranks with Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz of Dihlī [q.v.] as the leading Indian scholar of his day.

Nizām al-Dīn's greatest achievement was the consolidation of the Dars-i Nizāmiyya. Through this curriculum the tradition of *ma'kulāt* scholarship, which had been boosted by the migration of many Persian scholars to northern India from the time of Faḍl Shīrāzī's arrival at Akbar's court in 1583, and which had been brought to new heights by the scholars of Awadh in the late-17th and early-18th centuries, was spread through much of India. Tradition has it that in developing this curriculum Nizām al-Dīn was merely giving form to the customs of his father. These meant directing the student only to the most difficult and most comprehensive books on each subject so that he was both forced to think and had a chance of finishing his education while still a youth. They also meant in practice a strong bias towards the rational as opposed to the transmitted sciences. Champions of the curriculum assert that this need not necessarily be the case; the *Dars* was not a specific course of books but a special way of teaching.

Nizām al-Dīn's writings reveal him to be at the heart of the development of Persian traditions of *ma'kulāt* scholarship in northern India. Among his more prominent works were: his notes on Mullā Sadra's commentary on al-Aḥbarī's [q.v.] *Hidāyat al-hikma*, his notes on Djalāl al-Dīn Dawānī's [q.v.] commentary on the 'Akā'id of 'Aḍud al-Dīn Iḍjī [q.v.] and his notes on the *Shams al-bāzighāh* of Maḥmūd Djawnpūrī and his commentaries on the *Manār al-anwār* of Hāfiẓ al-Dīn al-Nasafī and on the *Musallam al-thubūt* of Muḥibb Allāh al-Bihārī [q.v.], his father's pupil. His writings also show him to be a supporter of the reformed understanding of Ibn al-'Arabī promulgated by the 17th-century scholar and mystic, Shāh Muḥibb Allāh Ilāhābādī. This understanding is instinct in his record of the sayings and doings of his *pīr*, Sayyid 'Abd al-Razzāk of Bānsa, *Manāḥib al-Razzākīyya*, in which, while supporting Ibn al-'Arabī's concept of the "unity of being" (*waḥdat al-wuḍūd*), he nevertheless insisted on a full observance of the *shari'a*. Nizām al-Dīn's combination of *ma'kulāt* scholarship and moderate *wuḍūdī* Ṣūfism remained the style of the Farangī Maḥall family and their followers through much of India down to the 20th century. Nizām al-Dīn's shrine in Lucknow remains celebrated for the solace it can bring the mentally disturbed and scholars in difficulty.

**Bibliography:** The basic modern source for Nizām al-Dīn is Muḥammad Raḍā Anṣārī, *Bānī-i Dars-i Nizāmi*, Lucknow 1973; among other sources comprising the family tradition are: Nizām al-Dīn Farangī Maḥallī, *Manāḥib al-Razzākīyya*, Lucknow 1313; Walī Allāh Farangī Maḥallī, *al-Aghṣān al-*

*arba'a*, Nadwa ms., Lucknow; Alṭāf al-Raḥmān Kidwā'ī, *Aḥwāl-i 'ulamā'-i Farangī Maḥall*, 1907; 'Abd al-Bārī, *Āthār al-uwal*, n.d., and *Malfūz-i Raz-zākī*, Kanpur 1926; Mawlawī 'Ināyat Allāh, *Tadhkira-yi 'ulamā'-i Farangī Maḥall*, Lucknow 1928; other major sources are: Ḡhulām 'Alī Āzād Bilgrāmī, *Ma'āthir al-kirām*, Haydarābād 1913, and *Subḥat al-marḍjān*, Bombay 1303/1886; Faḳīr Muḥammad Laḥawrī, *Hadā'ik al-hanafiyya*, Lucknow 1324/1906; Nawwāb Siddīk Hasan Khān, *Abḍiyyat al-'ulūm*, Bhopal 1296/1878; Faḍl Imām Khayrābādī, *Tarāḍjim al-fuḍalā'*, Eng. trans. Bazmee Anṣārī, Karachi 1956; for broad context and interpretation see: F. Robinson, *Perso-Islamic culture in India from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century*, in R.L. Canfield, ed., *Turko-Persia in historical perspective*, Cambridge 1991; idem, *Scholarship and Mysticism in early eighteenth-century Awadh*, in A. Dallapiccola and S. Zingel-Ave Lallemand eds., *Islam and the Indian regions 1000-1750 AD*, forthcoming, and idem, *Problems in the history of the Farangī Maḥall family of learned and holy men*, in N.J. Allen et al., eds., *Oxford University Papers on India*, i/2, Delhi 1987. (F. ROBINSON)

**NIZĀM AL-MULK**, ABŪ 'ALĪ AL-ḤASAN B. 'ALĪ B. ISHĀK AL-TŪSĪ, the celebrated minister of the Saldjūkid sultans Alp Arslān [q.v.] and Malikshāh [q.v.]. According to most authorities, he was born on Friday 21 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 408/10 April 1018, though the 6th/12th century *Ta'rikh-i Bayḥak* of Ibn Funduk al-Bayḥakī [q.v.], which alone supplies us with detailed information about his family, places his birth in 410/1019-20. His birth-place was Rādkān, a village in the neighbourhood of Tūs, of which his father was revenue agent on behalf of the Ḡhaznawīd government. Little is recorded of his early life. The *Wasāyā-yi Khwādja-yi Nizām al-Mulk*, however (for a discussion of the credibility of which see *JRAS* [1931], *The Sar-gudhashī-i Sayyidnā*, etc.), contains several anecdotes of his childhood, and is also responsible for the statement that he became a pupil in Niṣāpūr of a well-known Shāfi'ī doctor Hibat Allāh al-Muwaffak. On the defeat of Mas'ūd of Ḡhazna at Dandānkān [q.v. in Suppl.] in 431/1040, when most of Khurāsān fell into the hands of the Saldjūks, Nizām al-Mulk's father 'Alī fled from Tūs to Khusrāwdjird in his native Bayḥak, and thence made his way to Ḡhazna. Nizām al-Mulk accompanied him, and whilst in Ḡhazna appears to have obtained a post in a government office. Within three or four years, however, he left the Ḡhaznawīd for the Saldjūk service, first attaching himself to Čaghri-Beg's [q.v.] commandant in Balkh (which had fallen to a Saldjūkid force in 432/1040-1), and later, probably about 445/1053-4, moving to Čaghri's own headquarters at Marw. It seems to have been now, or soon after, that he first entered the service of Alp Arslān (then acting as his father's lieutenant in eastern Khurāsān) under his *wazīr*, Abū 'Alī Aḥmad b. Shādhān. And he so far won Alp Arslān's regard as on Ibn Shādhān's death to be appointed *wazīr* in his stead (then, probably, receiving his best-known *lakab*). During the period between the death of Čaghri-Beg in 451/1059 and that of Tuḡhril-Beg in 455/1063, therefore, Nizām al-Mulk had the administration of all Khurāsān in his hands.

The fame which he thereby acquired, and the fact that by now Alp Arslān was firmly attached to him, played a considerable part in prompting Tuḡhril-Beg's *wazīr* al-Kundurī [q.v.], first, before his master's death, to scheme for the throne to pass to Čaghri's youngest son Sulaymān, and then, after it,

to do his utmost to prevent Alp Arslān's accession. For he calculated that Alp Arslān, on becoming sultan, would retain Nizām al-Mulk rather than himself in office. In the event, al-Kundurī, who soon found himself too weak to oppose Alp Arslān, and thereupon sought to retrieve his position by acknowledging his claim, was retained in his post on the new sultan's first entry into Rayy. But a month later Alp Arslān suddenly dismissed him and handed over affairs to Nizām al-Mulk. Al-Kundurī was shortly afterwards banished to Marw al-Rūdh, where ten months later he was beheaded. His execution was undoubtedly due to Nizām al-Mulk, whose fears he had aroused by appealing for help to Alp Arslān's wife.

During Alp Arslān's reign, Nizām al-Mulk accompanied him on all his campaigns and journeys, which were almost uninterrupted. He was not present, however, at the famous battle of Malāzگرد [q.v.], having been sent ahead with the heavy baggage to Persia. On the other hand, he sometimes undertook military operations on his own, as in the case of the reduction of Iṣṭakhr citadel in 459/1067. Whose, his or Alp Arslān's, was the directing mind in matters of policy, it is hard to determine. Its main points, however, appear to have been the following: first, the employment of the large numbers of Türkmens that had immigrated into Persia as a result of the Saldjūk successes, in raids outside the *Dār al-Islām* and into Fātimid territory: hence the apparently strange circumstance that Alp Arslān's first enterprise after his accession, despite the precarious condition of the empire he had inherited, was a campaign in Georgia and Armenia [see AL-KURDĪ]; secondly, a demonstration that the sultan's force was both irresistible and mobile, coupled with clemency and generally with reinstatement for all rebels who submitted; thirdly, the maintenance of local rulers, *Shīʿī* as well as *Sunni*, in their positions as vassals of the sultan, together with the employment of members of the Saldjūk family as provincial governors; fourthly, the obviation of a dispute over the succession by the appointment and public acknowledgement of Malikshāh [q.v.], though he was not the sultan's eldest son, as his heir; and lastly the establishment of good relations with the ʿAbbāsid caliph al-Kāʿim [q.v.], as the sultan's nominal overlord.

Nizām al-Mulk did not really come into his own until after the assassination of Alp Arslān in 465/1072. But thenceforward, for the next twenty years, he was the real ruler of the Saldjūk empire. He succeeded from the outset in completely dominating the then eighteen-year-old Malikshāh, being assisted in this purpose by the defeat of Kāwurd's [q.v.] attempt to secure the throne for himself (for which service Nizām al-Mulk received the title *atābeg* [q.v.], thus bestowed for the first time). Indeed, in one aspect the history of the reign resolves itself into repeated attempts by the young sultan to assert himself, always in vain.

Malikshāh undertook fewer campaigns and tours than his father, the prestige of the Saldjūk arms now being such that few would risk rebellion, and warlike operations being left largely to the sultan's lieutenants, as they had not been under Alp Arslān. Nevertheless, from Iṣfahān, which had by now become the sultan's normal place of residence, Malikshāh visited the greater part of his empire accompanied by Nizām al-Mulk.

Policy continued on the same lines under Malikshāh as under his father. Nizām al-Mulk, however, was notably less tender than Alp Arslān had been to insubordinate members of the Saldjūk family,

insisting at the outset on the execution of Kāwurd, and, later, on the blinding and imprisonment of Malikshāh's brother Tekesh.

He also reversed during the earlier part of Malikshāh's reign the conciliatory policy originally pursued under Alp Arslān towards the caliph. He had been rewarded for the friendly attitude he first evinced—which formed a welcome contrast to that of al-Kundurī—by the receipt from al-Kāʿim of two new *laḳabs*, viz. *Kiwām al-Dīn* and *Raḍī Amīr al-Muʾminīn* (the latter believed to be the earliest of this type in the case of a *wazīr*); and up to 460/1068, his relations with the caliph's *wazīr* Fakhr al-Dawla Ibn Djahīr [see DJAHĪR, BANŪ] became more and more cordial; so much so, indeed, that al-Kāʿim in that year dismissed Ibn Djahīr, chiefly on account of his too-subservient attitude to the Saldjūk court. To secure this attitude in the caliph's *wazīr* was, however, the very aim of Nizām al-Mulk; and on Fakhr al-Dawla's dismissal he sought to impose a nominee of his own in a certain al-Rūdhrawārī, and subsequently in the latter's son Abū Shudjāʿ. Al-Kāʿim, to avoid this, reappointed Fakhr al-Dawla, though on condition that his relations with the Saldjūks should in future be more correct. In fact, they soon grew strained, till Nizām al-Mulk came to attribute any unwelcome event in Baghdād to Fakhr al-Dawla's influence. For many years, matters were prevented from coming to a head by the tact of Fakhr al-Dawla's son, ʿAmīd al-Dawla [see DJAHĪR, BANŪ], who won Nizām al-Mulk's favour so far as to marry in turn two of his daughters, Nafsā and Zubayda; but in 471/1078 Nizām al-Mulk demanded Fakhr al-Dawla's dismissal, which the caliph al-Muktadī [q.v.] (who had succeeded in 467/1075), was obliged to grant. Nizām al-Mulk now hoped to obtain the office for his own son Muʾayyid al-Mulk; but to this al-Muktadī would not agree. Henceforward, accordingly, his dislike was deflected to al-Muktadī himself, and to Abū Shudjāʿ, his former protégé, whom the caliph now created deputy *wazīr* in an effort to conciliate him, leaving the vizierate itself unoccupied till the next year, when he appointed ʿAmīd al-Dawla. But in 474/1082 Nizām al-Mulk in turn demanded the dismissal and banishment of Abū Shudjāʿ, and at the same time composed his quarrel with Fakhr al-Dawla, when the latter was sent on a mission to Iṣfahān, concerting with him a plan by which Fakhr al-Dawla should watch his interests at Baghdād. As a result, al-Muktadī, who gave in with a bad grace, lost all confidence in the Banū Djahīr, and two years later replaced ʿAmīd al-Dawla with the offensive Abū Shudjāʿ; whereupon Fakhr al-Dawla and ʿAmīd al-Dawla fled to the Saldjūk head-quarters. Nizām al-Mulk, on this, vowed vengeance on al-Muktadī, and at first seems even to have contemplated the abolition of the caliphate (see Sibṭ Ibn al-Djauzī, *Mirʾāt al-zamān*), as a prelude to which he commissioned Fakhr al-Dawla to conquer Diyār Bakr from the Marwānids [q.v.], the sole remaining *Sunni* tributaries of any consequence. The Marwānids were duly ousted by 478/1085, whilst al-Muktadī, on his side, showed himself consistently hostile to Nizām al-Mulk. But the latter's feelings towards the caliph were in the following year completely transformed as a consequence of his first visit to Baghdād (for the wedding of al-Muktadī to Malikshāh's daughter). The caliph received him very graciously; and thenceforward he became a champion of the caliphate in face of the enmity which developed between al-Muktadī and Malikshāh as a result of the marriage.

The celebrity of Nizām al-Mulk is really due to the fact that he was in all but name a monarch, and ruled

his empire with striking success. It was not his aim to innovate. On the contrary, it was to model the new state as closely as possible on that of the Ghaznawids, in which he had been born and brought up. His position was similar to that of his forerunners, the Barmakids [see BARĀMIKA], and the notable Būyid *wazīr*, the Šāhib Ismā'īl b. 'Abbād [q.v.]. All three may be said to have represented the old Persian civilisation (progressively Islamicised, of course) in the face of a rise to empire of barbarian conquerors, Arab, Daylamī and now Türkmen. The monarchs were in each case equalled, if not surpassed, by their *wazīrs*, and most of all in the case of Nizām al-Mulk. For with him the invaders aspired to an emperor's position whilst still quite unacclimatised to their new habitat, so that his superiority in culture was the more marked (cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 308). But in revenge, the Saldjūks' lack of acclimatisation stood in the way of a complete realisation by Nizām al-Mulk of the now traditional Perso-Muslim state. Hence the lamentations that recur in the *Siyāsat-nāma*.

The *Siyāsat-nāma* or *Siyar al-mulūk*, written by Nizām al-Mulk in 484/1091 with the addition of eleven chapters in the following year, is in a sense a survey of what he had failed to accomplish. It scarcely touches upon the organisation of the *diwān*, for instance, partly, it is true, because the book was intended as a monarch's primer, but also because Nizām al-Mulk, having absolute control of the *diwān*, as opposed to the *dargāh* (cf. again Barthold, 227), had succeeded with the assistance of his two principal coadjutors, the *mustawfi* Sharaf al-Mulk and the *munshi* Kamāl al-Dawla, in exactly modelling this, his special department, on traditional lines. Of the *dargāh*, on the other hand, Nizām al-Mulk complains that the sultans failed to maintain a sufficient majesty. They were neither magnificent (though he approves their daily free provision of food), formal, nor awe-inspiring enough. At their court, accordingly, the formerly important offices of *hājib*, *wakil* and *amīr-i ḥaras* had declined in prestige. Nor, as had his model potentates, would they maintain a sound intelligence or *barid* [q.v.] service, whereby corruption might be revealed and rebellion forestalled. The *Siyāsat-nāma* consists in all of fifty chapters of advice illustrated by historical anecdotes. The last eleven chapters, added shortly before the *wazīr*'s assassination, deal with dangers that threatened the empire at the time of writing, in particular from the Ismā'īlīs (on the work, see *Bibl.*, 3).

Nizām al-Mulk's situation resembled that of the Būyid administrators in another respect. He was faced, as they had been, with the problem of supporting a largely tribal army, and solved it likewise by a partial abandonment of the traditional tax-farming system of revenue collection for that of the *iktā'* or fief [q.v.], whereby military commanders supported themselves and their troops on the yield of lands allotted to them. Since in the decay of the 'Abbāsīd power provincial *amīrs* had tended to assume the originally distinct and profitable office of *'āmil*, the way for this development had been paved. The Būyids had later attempted to restore the older system; but the establishment of numerous local minor dynasties had favoured the new. Nizām al-Mulk now systematised it in the larger field open to him. In the *Siyāsat-nāma* he insists, however, on the necessity of limiting the rights of fief-holders to the collection of fixed dues, and of setting a short time-limit to their tenures (see on this subject, Becker, *Steuerpacht und Lehnswesen*, in *Isl.*, v [1914], 81-92, and 117<sup>2</sup>).

In the absence of the intelligence service he desired,

Nizām al-Mulk contrived to intimidate potential rebels and suppress local tyranny by a judicious display of the might and mobility of the Saldjūkid arms. He also insisted on the periodical appearance at court of local dynasts such as the Mazyadids [q.v.] and 'Ukaylids [q.v.], and proclaimed the sultan's accessibility to appeals for the redress of wrongs by means of notices circulated throughout the empire and exposed in public places (see al-Māfarrikkī, *Maḥāsini-i Isfahān*). He also gained the powerful support of the 'ulamā', especially those of the Šāfi'i school, of which he was an ardent champion, by the institution of innumerable pious foundations, in particular of *madrasas*, the most celebrated being the Nizāmiyya of Baghdad (opened 459/1067), the earliest west of Khurāsān (see below), by the general abolition of *mukūs* (taxes unsanctioned by the *sharī'a*) in 479/1086-7; and by undertaking extensive public works, particularly in connection with the *hādidi*. After the Hijāz had returned from Fātimid to 'Abbāsīd allegiance in 468/1076, he exerted himself to make the 'Irāk road safe from brigandage for pilgrims, as well as to diminish their expenses; and from the next year until that of his death, the journey was accomplished without mishap. It was not until the second half of Malikshāh's reign that the full effects of Nizām al-Mulk's achievement made themselves felt. By 476/1083-4, however, such were the unwonted security of the roads and the low cost of living that reference is made to them in the annals.

Nizām al-Mulk was naturally much sought after as a patron. The poet Mu'izzī [q.v.] accuses him of having "no great opinion of poetry because he had no skill in it", and of paying "no attention to anyone but religious leaders and mystics" (see Nizāmī 'Arūḍī Samarkandī, *Čahār makāla*, tr. Browne, 46). But though his charity, which was profuse (see for example, al-Subkī, *Tabakāt al-Šāfi'iyya*, iii, 41), went in large measure to men of religion—among them the most notable objects of his patronage being Abū Ishāk al-Shīrāzī [q.v.] and Abū Hāmid al-Ghazālī [q.v.]—, he was clearly a lavish patron also of poets, as is attested by the *Dumyat al-kaṣr* of al-Bakharzī [q.v.], the greater part of which is devoted to his panegyrists. In another sphere, the inauguration of the Djalālī calendar [q.v.] in 466/1074 was probably due to his encouragement, since at this time his ascendancy over Malikshāh was at its most complete.

Nizām al-Mulk's name is especially associated with the founding of a series of colleges whose ethos and teachings were closely connected with the Ash'arī *kalām* and the Šāfi'i legal school, of which the vizier himself was an adherent. His reasons for the setting-up of a chain of *madrasas* in the main cities of 'Irāk, al-Djazīra and Persia (and especially in his home province of Khurāsān) [see MADRASA. I. 4] are not entirely clear. But in the context of the age, with its reaction against Mu'tazilism in philosophy and dialectics and against political Shī'ism as manifested in the preceding Būyid and north Syrian amirates and the still-powerful Fātimid caliphate in Egypt and southern Syria, it seems possible that he aimed at training a body of reliable, Sunnī-oriented secretaries and officials who would run the Great Saldjūk empire when Nizām al-Mulk had moulded it along the right lines and thus further the progress of the Sunnī political and intellectual revival. In his patronage of such institutions as these colleges, he was by no means an innovator, for the Sunnī *madrasa*-building movement had been under way since the later part of the 4th/10th century, and other leading figures in the Saldjūk state were equally active in founding and

endowing *madrasas* and associated institutions like hostels for students, such as the Ḥanafī official of Alp Arslān's, the *mustawfī* Abū Sa'd, who built a *madrasa* attached to the shrine of Abū Ḥanīfa in Baghdād, and Nizām al-Mulk's enemy at the court of Malikshāh, the *mustawfī* Tādj al-Mulk Abū 'l-Ḡhanā'im (d. 485/1093), founder of the Tādjīyya college there (see G. Makdisi, *Muslim institutions of learning in eleventh-century Baghdad*, in *BSOAS*, xxiv [1961], 1-56; C.E. Bosworth, in *Camb. hist. of Iran*, v, 70-4). Nizām al-Mulk may have intended to give an impetus to the spread of his own Ash'arī and Shāfi'ī views (although, in fact, the Baghdād Nizāmīyya, where the great Abū Ḥamid al-Ḡhazālī had taught, declined in the 6th/12th century, when the Ḥanbalī institutions of learning there showed greater vitality), but it seems reasonable to impute to him a wider vision of a Sunnī political, cultural and intellectual revival in the central and eastern lands of Islam, in which his own colleges would play a contributory role.

For the first seven years of Malikshāh's reign, Nizām al-Mulk's authority went altogether unchallenged. In 472/1079-80, however, two Turkish officers of the court instigated Malikshāh into killing a protégé of the *wazīr*; and in 473/1080-1, again, the sultan insisted on disbanding a contingent of Armenian mercenaries against Nizām al-Mulk's advice. Malikshāh now began to hope, indeed, for the overthrow of his mentor, showing extraordinary favour to officials such as Ibn Bahmanyār and, later, Sayyid al-Ru'asā' Ibn Kamāl al-Mulk, who were bold enough to criticise him. Ibn Bahmanyār went so far as to attempt the *wazīr*'s assassination (also in 473), whereas Sayyid al-Ru'asā' contented himself with words. But in each case, Nizām al-Mulk was warned; and the culprits were blinded. In the case of Ibn Bahmanyār, in whose guilt a court jester named *Dja'farak* was also implicated, Malikshāh retaliated by contriving the murder of Nizām al-Mulk's eldest son *Djamāl* al-Mulk, who had taken *Dja'farak*'s execution into his own hands (475/1082). After the fall of Sayyid al-Ru'asā' in 476/1083-4, however, the sultan left plotting till, some years later, a new favourite, Tādj al-Mulk, caught his fancy.

All went well with Nizām al-Mulk till 483/1090-1. In that year, however, occurred the first serious challenge to the Saldjūkid power, when Bašra was sacked by a force of Karmāṭians [see *KARMAṬĪ*]; and almost simultaneously their co-sectary the Assassin leader al-Ḥasan b. al-Ṣabbāh [q.v.] obtained possession of the fortress of Alamūt [q.v.], from which repeated attacks failed to dislodge him. Meanwhile, moreover, an awkward problem had arisen over the succession to the sultanate, on account of the death in turn of Malikshāh's two eldest sons, Dāwūd (474/1082) and Aḥmad (481/1088). These sons had both been children of the Karākhānid princess Terken Khātūn (see Rashīd al-Dīn, *Djāmī' al-tawārīkh*), who had borne the sultan a third son, Maḥmūd, in 480/1087. She was eager for Maḥmūd to be formally declared heir. Nizām al-Mulk, however, was in favour of Barkiyārūk [q.v.], Malikshāh's eldest surviving son by a Saldjūk princess. Hence Terken Khātūn became his bitter enemy, and joined with Tādj al-Mulk, who was in her service, in instigating Malikshāh against the *wazīr*.

Tādj al-Mulk accused Nizām al-Mulk to the sultan, who by this time was in any case incensed with the *wazīr*'s championship of al-Muqtadi, of extravagant expenditure on the army and of nepotism; and Malikshāh's wrath was finally inflamed beyond bearing by an unguarded reply made by Nizām al-Mulk

to a formal accusation of these practices. But even so, he did not dare to dismiss him. (The earliest historian to assert that he was dismissed is Rashīd al-Dīn Faḡl Allāh, who appears to have misunderstood the purport of some verses by al-Nahhās quoted in the *Rāḥat al-sūdūr* of Rāwandī, and really composed after the *wazīr*'s death.)

Nizām al-Mulk was assassinated on 10 Ramaḍān 485/14 October 1092 near Sīhna, between Kanguwar and Bisutūn, as the court was on its way from Isfahān to Baghdād. His murderer, who was disguised as a Ṣūfī, was immediately killed, but is generally thought to have been an emissary of al-Ḥasan b. al-Ṣabbāh. Contemporaries, however, seem to have put the murder down to Malikshāh, who died suddenly less than a month later, and to Tādj al-Mulk, whom Nizām al-Mulk's retainers duly tracked down and killed within a year. Rashīd al-Dīn combines the two theories, stating that the *wazīr*'s enemies at court concerted it with the Assassins. The truth is therefore uncertain; but as Rashīd al-Dīn is one of the earliest historians to whom the Assassin records were available, his account would seem to deserve attention.

The extraordinary influence of Nizām al-Mulk is attested by the part played in affairs after his death by his relatives, despite the fact that only two appeared to have displayed much ability. For the next sixty years, except for a gap between 517/1123 and 528/1134, members of his family held office under princes of the Saldjūkid house.

Of Nizām al-Mulk's family, *Ḍiyā'* al-Mulk is remarkable as being his son by a Georgian princess, either the daughter or the niece of Bagrat I, formerly married, or at least betrothed, to Alp Arslān, after the campaign of 456/1064.

See further, on the sons and descendants of Nizām al-Mulk in the 6th/12th century, NIZĀMIYYA.

*Bibliography:* 1. For the Arabic and Persian primary sources, see the *Bibl.* of the *EP* article of H. Bowen.

2. Studies: E.G. Browne, *LHP*, ii, 167, 174-91, 212-17; M.T. Houtsma, *The death of Nizam al-Mulk and its consequences*, in *Jnal. of Indian History*, iii (1924), 147-60; Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, London 1928, 25-6, 306-10; H. Bowen, *The sar-gudhasht-i sayyidnā, the "Tale of the Three Schoolfellows" and the wasaya of the Nizam al-Mulk*, in *JRAS* (1931), 771-82; Asad Talas, *La Madrasa Nizamiyya et son histoire*, Paris 1939; K.E. Schabinger-Schowinen, *Zur Geschichte des Saldschugen-Reichskanzlers Nisamu 'l-mulk*, in *Historische Jahrbücher*, lxii-lxix (1942-9), 250-83; idem, *Nisamulmulk und das Abbasidische Chalifat*, in *ibid.*, lxxi (1952), 91-136; K. Rippe, *Über den Sturz Nizam-ul-Mulks*, in *Fuad Köprülü armağanı*, Istanbul 1953, 423-35; İ. Kafesoglu, *Sultan Melikşah devrinde Büyük Selçuklu imparatorluğu*, Istanbul 1953; 'Abbās Ikbāl, *Wizārat dar 'ahd-i salāṭīn-i buzurg-i Saldjūki*, Tehran 1338/1959, 46-63; C.E. Bosworth, in *Camb. hist. of Iran*, v, Cambridge 1968, 66 ff., 99-102; A.K.S. Lambton, in *ibid.*, 211-17; Carla L. Klausner, *The Seljuk vizirate, a study of civil administration 1055-1194*, Cambridge, Mass. 1973, index; G. Makdisi, *Les rapports entre Calife et Sultan à l'époque Saljūqide*, in *IJMES*, vi (1975), 228-36; idem, *The rise of colleges. Institutions of learning in Islam and the West*, Edinburgh 1981, 23-4, 41, 54, 301-4, 306-7, 311; S.A.A. Rizvi, *Nizam al-Mulk Tusi, his contribution to statecraft, political theory and the art of government*, Lahore 1978; Lambton, *The dilemma of government in Islamic Persia: the Siyāsāt-nāma of Nizām al-Mulk*, in

*Iran, JBIPS*, xxii (1984), 55-66; eadem, *Concepts of authority in Persia: eleventh to nineteenth centuries A.D.*, in *ibid.*, xxvi (1988), 98; eadem, *Continuity and change in medieval Persia*, London 1988, 40-4 and index; Kafesoğlu, *ĪA*, art. *Nizām-ül-Mulk*.

3. On the *Siyāsat-nāma*: see the studies given in 2. above, especially the works of Lambton. Numerous translations exist: (French) C. Schefer, Paris 1893, accompanying critical edition of text, Paris 1891; (Russian) B.N. Zakhoder, Moscow-Leningrad 1949; (Turkish) M. Şerif Çavdaroğlu, İstanbul 1954 (see on this, Kafesoğlu, *Büyük Selçuklu veziri Nizāmü 'l-Mulk'un eseri Siyasetname ve türkçe tercümesi*, in *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, xii, 231-56); (German) Schabinger-Schowingen, Freiburg-Munich 1960; (English) H. Darke, London 1960, second, revised version London 1978, accompanying critical edition of text, Tehran 1340/1962.

(H. BOWEN-[C.E. BOSWORTH])

**NIZĀM AL-MULK** ÇİN KILIÇ KHĀN, KĀMAR AL-DĪN, founder of the Indian Muslim state of Haydarābād in the early 12th/18th century and a dominant figure in the military affairs of the decaying Mughal empire from his appointment as governor of the Deccan by the Emperor Farrukh-siyar [q.v.] till his death in 1161/1748. In the early years of his governorship he was the deadly foe of his rivals for influence in the empire, the Bārha Sayyids [q.v. in Suppl.], and after his victory over them at Shākarkheldā in 1137/1724, virtually independent ruler in Haydarābād with the additional title of Āṣaf Dīh. For further details, see HAYDARĀBĀD, b. HAYDARĀBĀD STATE, and MUHAMMAD SHĀH B. DĪKHĀN SHĀH.

*Bibliography*: T.W. Haig (ed.), *The Cambridge hist. of India*, iv, *The Mughul period*, 331, 336, 341-3, 346-50, 377 ff., and see the bibls. to the articles mentioned above. (Eo.)

**NIZĀM-SHĀHĪ** (i.e. *Ilā'i-yi Nizām-shāhi* "ambassador of the Nizām-Shāh" of the Dakhan), a Persian historian whose real name was Kh'ūrshāh b. Kubād al-Husaynī. Born in Persian 'Irāk, he entered the service of Sultan Burhān [see NIZĀM-SHĀHĪS]. The latter being converted to the Shī'ī, sent Kh'ūrshāh as ambassador to Tahmāsp Shāh Safawī. Reaching Rayy in Raddjāb 952/September 1545, he accompanied the Shāh to Georgia and Shīrwān during the campaign of 953/1546 against Alkāš Mīrzā. He stayed in Persia till 971/1563, perhaps with occasional breaks. He died at Golkonda on 25 Dhu 'l-Kā'da 972/24 June 1565.

Kh'ūrshāh's chief work is the *Ta'rikh-i Ilā'i-yi Nizām-shāh*, a general history from the time of Adam based on such sources as al-Tabarī, al-Baydāwī, *Ta'rikh-i guzīda*, *Zafar-nāma*, *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, the "Memoirs of Shāh-Tahmāsp", etc. The book is divided into a preface and seven *maqāla*, each of which is again divided into several *guftār*. The most important part of this work is that which refers to the reign of Tahmāsp Shāh (in the Brit. Mus. ms. Or. 153, written in 972/1565, the events come down to 969/1561-2) and to the local dynasties of the Caspian provinces: Māzandarān, Gilān, Shīrwān. The two manuscripts in the British Museum show differences in their contents: Add. 23,513 (written in 1095/1684) has passages added by some continuator and taken from the *Djīhān-ārā* of Aḥmad b. Muhammad Ghaf-fārī. The later additions of Or. 153 come down as late as 1200/1786.

According to Firīšta, "Shāh Kh'ūrshāh", during the reign of Ibrāhīm Kutb-Shāh of the Deccan (957-988/1550-80) also wrote a history of the Kutb-Shāhīs [q.v.]. It is difficult to reconcile this with a continuous stay in Persia from 952 to 971.

*Bibliography*: Rieu, *Catalogue*, 107-11; Schefer, in his *Chrestomathie persane*, Paris 1885, ii, 56-103 (notes 65-133), printed the sections relating to the Caspian provinces. See also Storey, i, 113-14, 1239; Storey-Bregel, i, 406-8. (V. MINORSKY)

**NIZĀM SHĀHĪS**, one of five Deccani dynasties, with its capital at Aḥmadnagar [q.v.] which emerged in South India as the Bahmanī [q.v.] kingdom disintegrated. The chroniclers of the Nizām Shāhīs emphasise territorial and power disputes and religious (and possibly racial) tensions. The history of the dynasty splits into four periods. Under the first four rulers, 895-994/1490-1586, there was the vigorous establishment of the kingdom. Under the five rulers from 994-1008/1586-1600, there was intensive internal dissension. The period from 1008-35/1600-26, although with Nizām Shāhī rulers on the throne, was dominated by a Ḥabashī (of black African origins) prime minister who restored much of the kingdom's economic and political viability. By 1041/1632 the state was destroyed, with formal dispersal of the territories of the Aḥmadnagar kingdom occurring in 1046/1636.

The founder of the dynasty, later known as Aḥmad Nizām Shāh Bahārī, was the son of a high official in the Bahmanī court. He held various posts under the Bahmanīs and in 895/1490 he declared independence from them and consolidated the areas in northern and western Mahārāshtra under his rule as Aḥmad Nizām Shāh. Under the first four rulers (Aḥmad, 895-915/1490-1510; Burhān I, 915-60/1510-53; Husayn I, 961-72/1554-65; and Murtaḍā I, 972-97/1565-88) the kingdom prospered despite military skirmishing with neighbouring Islamic successor states, with the Hindu state of Viḍḡayanagar, and with the first Mughal incursions in the 990s/1580s. Burhān I converted to Shī'ism, the choice reflecting to some extent the underlying tension between those considered natives (*deshīs*) and those considered outsiders (*pardeshīs*). Potentially, there were racial implications as well. Many of the foreigners were generally fairer than the Deccanis, but there were many Ḥabashī officers in the court and the exact causes for the continuous realignment of loyalties are rarely clear.

Militarily, the high point of this period came in Djumādā II 972/January 1565. The six major Deccani states aligned and realigned themselves attempting to extend their boundaries. In the early 1560s, the armies of Viḍḡayanagar became particularly rapacious and the Islamic kingdoms reached an accommodation. The major armies gathered in Talikota to organise an assault on the Viḍḡayanagar forces and also, apparently, for a certain amount of pre-battle carousing. In Djumādā II 972/January 1565 the forces marched out of Talikota and moved against the enemy, decisively defeating them and putting an end to that kingdom.

The rapid turnover in Nizām Shāhī rulers from 996/1588 to 1008/1600 reflects the dissension and turmoil in the higher ranks of the Aḥmadnagar court. Husayn II, a parricide, ruled during 997-8/1588-9. He was succeeded by a paternal cousin, Ismā'īl, who ruled in 998-9/1589-91. Ismā'īl was succeeded by his own father, Burhān II, 999-1003/1591-5, who had been a member of the Mughal court for some years but, having manoeuvred his way on to the Nizām Shāhī throne, had to deal with serious Mughal forays into the Deccan. Burhān II was succeeded by his son and Ismā'īl's brother, Ibrāhīm, for four months in 1003/1595. Rival leaders put forth different candidates for the throne, and Bahādur, son of Ibrāhīm and strongly backed by Čand Bibī, was finally declared ruler only to be captured and imprisoned by