'l-djawāb, grammatical analysis with exercises. 1365/1946. 7. al-Mntālo^ca al-Carati 7. al-Muțāla al-carabiyya al-cașriyya, 1366/1947. 8. al-Risāla al-sarfiyya bi 'l-shakl al-tāmm, n.d. 9. Ta rīkh madīnat Kusantīna li 'l-Ḥādidi Ahmad Ibn al-Mubārak, 1952. 10. Arīb b. Sacīd al-Kātib al-Kurtubī, Le livre de la génération du foetus et le traitément des femmes enceintes et des nouveaux-nés, tr. et annoté par H. Jahier et A. Noureddine, 1956. 11. Avicenne, Poème de la Médecine, texte arabe publié, traduit et annoté, accompagné d'une traduction latine du XIIIe siècle, par H.J. et A.N., Paris 1956. 12. Ibn Abī Uşaybi'a, K. 'Uyūn al-anbā' bi-tabakāt alațibba' (chap. XIII: médecins de l'Occident musulman), publié, traduit et annoté par H.J. et A.N., 1377/1958. 13. Ibid., chap. IV, V, et VI: Hippocrate et les hippocratiques, Galien et ses successeurs, les médecins alexandrins, publié, traduit et annoté par H.J. et A.N., 1958. 14. K. I'rāb aldumal, 1377/1958. 15. Ibn 'Abd al-Djabbār al-Fadjīdjī, Rawdat al-sulwān (Le Jardin de Consolation), publié, traduit et annoté par H.J. et A.N., 1378/1959. 16. Anthologie de textes poétiques attribués à Avicenne, publié avec traduction française et notes par H. J. et A.N., 1960. 17. al-Inshā' al-carabī, 1960. 18. Asās al-carabiyya li-taclīm alhurūf al-hidjā iyya, 1960. 19. al-Muntakhab min ash ar al-'Arab, 1961. 20. K. al-Wasīla li-cilm al-carabiyya, n.d. 21. Pages de la médecine arabe, avec préface et commentaire; gérontologie arabe au Moyen Âge, n.d. 22. Şafahāt fī ta rīkh madīnat al-Djazā'ir, Constantine 1385/1965. 23. Mukhtaşar fi 1-cibādāt, trad. française, n.d. 24. Dictionnaire français-arabe de Ben Sedira, revu et augmenté par N.A., n.d.

B. Articles

1. Un épisode de l'histoire de l'ancient Alger, in Mélanges E. F. Gautier, 1937. 2. Un philanthrope maure du XIXe siècle, El Hadj Abderrahmane El-Kinai. Essai d'une biographie critique et commentaire, in Feuillets d'El-Djezair, no. 2 (Algiers, Sept. 1942), 57-63. 3. Rapprochement littéraire, in BEA, no. 21 (Algiers, Jan.-Feb. 1945), 7-8. 4. Ibn. Khallikān, no. 10tice biographique sur Avicenne extraite des Wafayāt al-a'yān, texte arabe présenté et traduit par N.A. et H. Pérès, in ibid., no. 52 (March-April 1951), 36-43. 5. Nubdha min ṣafaḥāt fī ta'rīkh madīnat al-Djazā'ir..., in Madjalla Kulliyyat al-Ādāb, no. 1 (Algiers 1964), 3-32.

Bibliography: H. Pérès, Critique de manuels d'arabe classique. I. Manuel de Noureddine, in BEA, no. 39 (Sept.-Oct. 1948), 171-7; A. Merad, Compterendu de la publication du poème Rawdat al-sulwān, in RAfr., ciii/3-4 (1959), 409-10.

(R. Bencheneb)

NŪR AL-DĪN ARSLĀN SHĀH ABU 'L-ḤĀRITH B. Mas'ūd B. Mawdūd B. Zancī, called al-Malik al-'Ādil, sixth ruler in Mawşil of the Zangid line of Atabegs, reigned 589-607/1193-1211.

On the death of his father 'Izz al-Dīn Mas' $\bar{u}d [q.v.]$, Nūr al-Dīn succeeded him, but for many years was under the tutelage of the commander of the citadel of Mawsil, the eunuch Mudjāhid al-Dīn Kaymaz al-Zaynī, till the latter's death in 595/1198-9. Nūr al-Dīn's early external policy aimed at securing control of Nişibīn [q.v.] from his kinsman, the Zangī lord of Sindjar 'Imad al-Din Zangi and the latter's son Kutb al-Dīn Muḥammad (594/1109), but was frustrated by the intervention in Diyar Bakr, leading to a siege of Mārdīn [q.v.], by the Ayyūbids al-Malik al- c Ādil and al-Malik al-Kāmil [q.vv.]. Nūr al-Dīn was victorious there in 595/1199 and drove al-Malik al-Kāmil back to Damascus, but had himself to return to Mawsil through illness. Kutb al-Din Muhammad retained his formal allegiance to al-Malik al-GAdil (600/1203-4), and Nur al-Din's capture of and attempt to hold Tell Acfar failed in the next year.

The pattern of alliances then changed, with a marriage union between Nūr al-Dīn's daughter and alMalik al-'Ādil's son, when the Zangids of Mawşil and the Ayyūbids for a while united Kuṭb al-Dīn, but this alignment changed with the intervention of the lord of Irbil, Muzaffar al-Dīn Gökbūri, and the formation of an alliance against al-Malik al-'Ādil which now included the Saldjūk sultan of Rūm Kay Khusraw I [q.v.]. Nevertheless, in the end Kuṭb al-Dīn retained possession of Sindjār until 616/1219, but Nūr al-Dīn himself died in Radjab 607/January 1211, to be succeeded in Mawşil by his son 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd al-Malik al-Kāhir.

Nūr al-Dīn left behind a reputation in Mawşil as a benefactor to the town, building inter alia a madrasa there for the $\underline{Sh}\bar{a}fi^c\bar{i}s$ when he himself passed from the Hanafi madhhab to that of the $\underline{Sh}\bar{a}fi^c\bar{i}s$.

Bibliography: 1. Sources. Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, xii; idem, Atabegs, in RHC, Historiens orientaux, i, 71, 74, 82, 86, ii/2, 5, 346-62; Ibn Khallikān, ed. 'Abbās, i, 193-4, tr. de Slane, i, 174-5. 2. Studies. H.M. Gottschalk, al-Malik al-Kāmil von Ägypten und seine Zeit, Wiesbaden 1958, 41-3; R.S. Humphreys, From Saladin to the Mongols, the Ayyūbids of Damascus 1193-1260, Albany 1977, 91, 114, 120, 128-21. See also Zambauer, Manuel, 226; El' art. s.v. (K.V. Zetterstéen), of which the above article is a résumé. (C.E. Bosworth)

NŪR AL-DĪN MAḤMŪD B. ZANKĪ, Zankid or Zangid sultan and successor to Zankī (d. 565/1174), who was murdered during the siege of Kal^cat Dja^cbar [q.v.] in Rabī^c I 541/September 1146. The succession posed a series of problems since there were four heirs:

Sayf al-Dīn \underline{Gh} āzī, the eldest, represented his father at Mawṣil [q.v.], the second son, Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, had accompanied his father in the majority of his military operations, the third, Nuṣrat al-Dīn Amīr-Amīrān, was to be governor of $\underline{Harrān} [q.v.]$, the fourth son, Kuṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd [q.v.] was to succeed his eldest brother at Mawṣil. There was also a daughter who was to marry the amīr Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Sūrī.

After the death of his father, Nūr al-Dīn made his way to Aleppo [see ḤALAB], following the advice of Shīrkūh, a Kurdish amīr and friend of the former sultan. Sawār, the governor of the town, recognised Zankid sovereignty. Ḥamāt [q.v.], of which the titular amīr was Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Yāghisiyānī, also rallied to his cause. At Mawṣil, the situation was more complicated, but the pro-Zankid amīrs succeeded in bringing Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī from Kurdistān and obtained from the sultan his appointment as ruler of Mawṣil.

Raymond of Poitiers, prince of Antioch, did not hear the news of the assassination of Zankī until seven days after the establishment of Nür al-Dīn at Aleppo. He dispatched two forces, one against Aleppo and the other against Ḥamāt, whereupon the Muslims compelled their opponents to withdraw to Antioch [see AN-TĀKIYA]. Edessa, eastern bastion of Frankish expansion for the previous half-century (1098-1144 [see AL-RUHĀ]), came again under Muslim control, but Armenian elements who constituted the majority of the population there succeeded in neutralising the effectiveness of the local Muslim garrison and called upon the aid of Joscelin, who was the son of an Armenian mother. After six days of forced marches from Aleppo, Nūr al-Dīn was the first to arrive with siege machinery. The vigour of his operations induced the Armenians to evacuate the town. Joscelin found refuge at Sumaysat on the right bank of the Euphrates. Edessa was then incorporated into the domain of Nur al-Din. Relations between the latter and Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī became strained until, on the occasion of his brother's investiture, Nur al-Din addressed

to him, from Aleppo, an official act of homage, recognising the primacy of his elder brother. He obtained guarantees for his eastern frontier where Harrān took the place of Edessa and was charged with the responsibility of conducting the $\underline{d}jih\bar{a}d$ [q.v.] against the enemy from the West.

Reviving the policy of his father, Nūr al-Dīn decided to take possession of Damascus [see dimashk] and to incorporate it into a Syrian federation, for political reasons in view of the presence of the Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem to the south, and for economic reasons since, being deprived of the Djazīra [q.v.], Syria needed the Bikā' and also the Ḥawrān [q.vv.] to gain adequate supplies of cereals. In spring of 541/ May 1147, Nūr al-Dīn and Mu'īn al-Dīn Unur together confronted the Franks in the Ḥawrān, where Altīntāsh, governor of Ṣalkhad and of Boṣrā [q.vv.] was seeking to make himself independent of Damascus with the aid of the Franks of Jerusalem, but the latter were forced to withdraw.

For the Latin states, the objective was to remove Nūr al-Dīn, but the absence of political direction among the Crusaders spared the latter a campaign which could have caused him serious problems. On 24 July 1148, following a series of debates in the Assizes of Jerusalem, the decision was taken to attack Damascus. In July, the Franks mustered at Tiberias and arrived before Damascus on the 24th. Mucīn al-Dīn sent urgent appeals for help to Mawṣil and Aleppo and exploited the Zankid threat to repel the Franks, who raised the siege on 28 July.

The year 1149 was a time of considerable activity. Nūr al-Dīn was determined to counter the attacks of Raymond of Antioch. He decided, after receiving reinforcements from Damascus, to attack the region of Afāmiya [q.v.], then occupied by the Franks. He also laid siege to Inab which commanded the valley of the Ghāb [q.v.]. On 20 Şafar 544/29 June 1149, having defeated the Latins at a place known as 'Ard al-Ḥātim, Nūr al-Dīn occupied the land between the Rudj and the Orontes [see AL-'s̄s̄i]. He took Afāmiya and Kal'at al-Mudīk, and then Ḥārim [q.v.], where he installed a Muslim garrison and then resumed the siege of Antioch, where the antagonists concluded a truce.

On 23 Rabīc II 544/28 August 1149, on the death of Mucin al-Din Unur, there was tension in Damascus, where Mudiīr al-Dīn Aybak took control of the government. Seeking to intervene, Nur al-Din found a pretext in the campaign currently being conducted by the Franks in the Hawran. He appealed for the participation of a Damascene contingent in his support but, on the basis of previous agreements the Damascenes called upon the Franks of Jerusalem for help in resisting Nur al-Din. Advancing with undiminished speed, the latter crossed the Bikac, traversed the Anti-Lebanon and deployed his army some ten km to the south-west of Damascus at a place known as Manāzil al-'Asākir, on 26 Dhu 'l-Ḥididia 544/25 April 1150. From his encampment, Nür al-Din sent a declaration to the Damascenes, informing them that he had come to protect them from their supposed allies, the Franks. Since his supporters were still too few in number to control the city, Nūr al-Dīn decided to return to Aleppo, where his presence was necessary following the capture of Joscelin of Edessa by Turcomans in Dhu 'l-Ḥidjdja 544/April 1150 and his incarceration in the citadel of Aleppo. This event gave rise to various repercussions: in the month of Muharram 545, the Saldjūk ruler of Rūm, Mas^cūd b. Muhammad, set out to blockade Tell Bāshir and invited Nur al-Din to join him. The latter accepted, not wishing to allow his rival to be the sole beneficiary of the situation. While Mas cūd succeeded in taking all the places situated in the valleys to the west of the Euphrates, Nūr al-Dīn attacked the region of upper 'Afrīn [q.v.] in order to take control of the communications routes linking Antioch with the north. In autumn 545/1150 he occupied the region downstream of al-Bīrā [q.v.] on the right bank of the Euphrates. The frontier of the $D\bar{a}r$ al-Islām was thus transferred from the Euphrates to the Orontes.

At the end of 545/spring 1151 the problem arose of the renewal of the treaty concluded between Damascus and Jerusalem. It was then that Nūr al-Dīn established his base to the south of Damascus and issued an appeal to the population but, failing to prevent contacts between the Damascenes and the troops of Baldwin III, he withdrew to the valley of the Baradā [q.v.]. The Franks entered the city and, before returning to Jerusalem, claimed a portion of the indemnity promised in July 1151. After their departure, Nūr al-Dīn renewed the siege of Damascus and engaged in negotiations: Damascus agreed to recognise his sovereignty, to mention him in the khutba [q.v.] and to strike coinage in his name, but in fact the city retained its independence.

In April-May 1152 the Zankid prince sent troops to the coast, taking Tartūs, a port situated between al-Lādhikiyya [q.v.] and Tarābulus al-Shām, thus severing communications between the County of Tripoli and the principality of Antioch.

Mudjīr al-Dīn preferred the Frankish protectorate to the Zankid ascendancy. To win over the population of Damascus to the cause of Nur al-Din, his agents engaged in subtle propaganda, while he himself resorted to more persuasive tactics: he intercepted the food supplies arriving from the south. Prices rose and famine threatened. While the city starved, Nur al-Din had dealings with the heads of the ahdāth [q.v.] and with the zuccar who were recruited among the porters and lower echelons of the souks. Mudjīr al-Dîn appealed to the Franks, but before they had time to intervene, Nür al-Dīn launched his operation. When his troops entered the town, the middle classes barricaded their homes against them and the mob went on the rampage, but within a few hours Nur al-Din restored order, distributed provisions and undertook to respect private property. The population was reassured. Mudjīr al-Dīn, isolated in the citadel, accepted Hims [q, v] in return for his capitulation. On the day of his departure, Nur al-Din called a meeting, the participants including the ra'is Radī al-Dīn al-Tamīmī and Nadim al-Dîn Ayyūb, the kādīs and the fukahā, as well as leading citizens and merchants. He repeated his conciliatory assurances and announced the abolition of taxes levied on the markets. The arrival of Nūr al-Dīn in Damascus marked the beginning of a new era for all the victims of previous régimes; thus the amīr Usāma b. Munkidh, who had left the city ten years earlier, returned at the start of Rabīc II 549/June 1154.

In eight years, Nūr al-Dīn was to achieve, by gradual stages, his objective of a united Syria. He began by consolidating his position at Aleppo; as a means of suppressing the Shī'īs, he revived with increased vigour the measures which Zankī had inaugurated: the imposition of Sunnī Islam was to be one of the major objectives of his policy. Having relocated his eastern frontier on the Balīkh, he was assured of the neutrality of his elder brother. He also participated in the dismemberment of the County of Edessa, as a result of which he had, in the north, a common frontier with his father-in-law Mas'ūd,

Saldjūk sultan of Rūm. Whereas the power of Zankī had extended, from east to west, from Mawşil to Aleppo, that of Nūr al-Dīn extended, in 549/1154, on a north-south axis from 'Azāz [q.v.] and al-Ruhā to Boṣrā and Salkhad, guaranteeing the food-supplies of the Muslim towns.

The following year, Nūr al-Dīn demanded the submission of the amīr Daḥhāk al-Bikā'ī, since the region of Ba'labakk [q.v.] was dependent on the province of Damascus. When his demand was refused, he did not hesitate to send a detachment to rid himself of the rebel, who capitulated on 7 Rabī' II/9 June 1155. This problem being settled, the treaty with Jerusalem renewed and another concluded with Antioch, Nūr al-Dīn was free to intervene in the struggle which had broken out between Saldjūks and Dānishmendids [q.v.] regarding the inheritance of his father-in-law who had recently died. He responded to the appeal of his brother-in-law Yaghī-basan, amīr of Sīwās, and took possession of the Saldjūk localities on the right bank of the Euphrates, including al-Bīra.

In the spring of 551/1156, weary of the skirmishes provoked by Renaud de Châtillon, the amīr Madjd al-Dīn, representative of Nūr al-Dīn in northern Syria, launched an attack in the direction of Harim. Informed of the depredations committed by the Franks, Nür al-Dīn left Damascus with a strong contingent to support the army of the north. Learning of his arrival, Renaud de Châtillon offered peace negotiations. An agreement was reached by which the treaty with Antioch was restored: Harim remained in the hands of the Franks but produce and revenues were shared between the two states. Nur al-Din returned to Damascus in Ramadan 551/November 1156 and renewed the treaty with Jerusalem, but at the end of Dhu 'l-Hididia 551/early February 1157 the Franks violated it. Baldwin III, pre-occupied by heavy debts and anticipating easy booty, launched an attack against the fertile region of the \underline{D} jawlān [q.v.] where, under the terms of the treaty, Turcomans pastured a considerable number of horses and cattle; the Frankish cavalry seized these herds and took the herdsmen prisoner. This raid gave Nūr al-Dīn, who was eager to take possession of Baniyas [q.v.], an excellent pretext for intervention. In Safar 552/early April 1157 he succeeded in persuading the Damascenes and the peasants of the \underline{Gh} ūţa [q, v] to contribute towards the cost of equipping his army with siege engines. Having reinforced the garrison of Ba^clabakk to guard against possible intervention from the north, Nūr al-Dīn sent an army commanded by his brother Nusrat al-Din in the direction of Baniyas, where Frankish reinforcements were reported to have arrived. On 13 Rabic I/26 April 1157 the troops of Damascus inflicted a heavy defeat on the Franks and, although he succeeded in breaching the walls of Baniyas, Nur al-Din learned of the advance of Baldwin, marching to the rescue of the besieged town, and taken by surprise, he gave the order to withdraw. Baldwin, believing that the troops of Damascus would not return, entrusted the task of restoring the town's defences to his infantry, and set out with his cavalry towards Galilee. Nür al-Dīn set up an ambush near Djisr Banāt Ya^cķūb [q.v.] on the Jordan, and when the Franks halted on the shore of Lake Tiberias he surrounded them and took them prisoner. This success had the effect of uniting all the Frankish factions against him.

Learning that the Crusaders had established their head-quarters in the Bukay^ca [q.v.], not far from Hiṣn al-Akrād [q.v.], with the intention of attacking in the direction of the Middle Orontes, Nūr al-Dīn left

Damascus in Radjab 552/August 1157 in order to repair the defences of fortresses damaged by the earthquakes of the previous month. Arriving at Sarmīn, he spent some time there. Shortly after the beginning of Ramadan 552/October 1157, he fell ill there and summoned Nuşrat al-Dīn, Shīrkūh and his senior officers. Aware of the gravity of his condition, he gave instructions to be followed in the event of his death: he nominated Nusrat al-Dīn as his successor, to be resident at Aleppo; Nadjm al-Dīn Ayyūb was to remain military governor of Damascus and Shīrkūh was to be his representative there. In spite of intensive treatment, his condition worsened. The prince was transferred to Aleppo where he was lodged in the citadel. His health improving, he resumed the control of affairs and sent troops to occupy Shayzar. Henceforward the entire course of the Orontes was under the control of the Zankid power. Finally restored to health, Nur al-Din returned to Damascus on 6 Rabīc I 533/7 April 1158 and immediately set about mustering an army with the object of taking revenge for recent French raids against the Hawran and Dārayyā in the Ghūṭa. The army left Damascus on 9 Rabi^{*} II 533/11 May 1158 with heavy equipment for laying siege to Ḥabīs Djaldaķ, a cave fortified by the Crusaders which controlled Djawlan to the east and Lake Tiberias to the north-east. Learning that reinforcements were advancing, Nür al-Din raised the siege and the two armies met near the Jordan on 14 Djumādā II/13 July. When some of the Muslim contingents were forced to give ground, Nur al-Din ordered a strategic withdrawal; the Franks, fearing a trick on the part of the Damascenes, declined to pursue them.

In Dhu 'l-Ḥidjdja 553/December 1158-January 1159, Nūr al-Dīn once again fell ill in Damascus. Learning that Manuel was approaching from Cilicia, he urged the governors of the Syrian border regions to be vigilant. As his condition deteriorated, the prince summoned his senior amīrs to Damascus and warned his entourage against any sinister intentions towards him on the part of his brother Nuṣrat al-Dīn. To avoid any misunderstanding, he appointed as his successor his brother Kuṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd, ruler of Mawṣil.

At the beginning of 554/1159 Nūr al-Dīn was threatened by a proposed Franco-Byzantine coalition. He issued to his amīrs a summons to the Holy War, had an advanced bastion constructed at Aleppo and ordered the abandonment of certain sites which would be difficult to defend such as Kūrus. Learning that the Franks and the Basileus were intending to march against Aleppo, the prince set out to meet them. The latter had reached the ford of Balaneus on the 'Afrīn, whilst other elements were advancing from Imm to the west of Aleppo. There then began a long series of negotiations which concluded, in Şafar 554/end of May 1159, with an agreement between Manuel and Nūr al-Dīn. An important element of this agreement was the latter's promise of support against Kilidj Arslan II, the enemy of Byzantium. Manuel sought to conduct in northern Syria a policy of checks and balances, and it was fear of a Byzantine intervention which for many years prevented Nūr al-Dīn exploiting to the full his successes against the Franks. He entrusted Harran [q.v.] to the isfahsalar amīr Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī Küčük, ruler of Irbil [q.v.]. From Ḥarrān he descended towards the Euphrates and set about wresting control of al-Rakka from the sons of the amīr djāndār, who had recently died. Worried by the ambitions of Kilidj Arslan II, Nür al-Dīn launched a campaign to coincide with a Byzantine expedition conducted against Eskishehir [q.v.]. Taking advantage of the troubles of Kilidj Arslān II, he occupied the former dependencies of the County of Edessa of which the Saldjūks had taken possession, and set out from Aleppo towards the north by way of Tell Bāshir [q, v.]. He reached 'Ayntāb [q, v.] then took successively Ra'bān and Kaysūn, occupied Bahasnā then Mar'ash [q, v.].

In 1160, Kîlîdj Arslân II succeeded in obtaining from his brother-in-law Nûr al-Dîn a cessation of hostilities since, as the Byzantine menace grew more serious, he needed all his troops. Ultimately, the Saldjûk sultan signed a peace agreement with Manuel.

After two years of respite, Baldwin III, knowing Nur al-Din to be occupied in campaigning in the north, attacked territory dependent on Damascus, sending his troops towards the Hawran. Nadjm al-Dīn Ayyūb negotiated the withdrawal of the Franks and obtained a truce of three months. As Nur al-Din had not returned by the expiry of this respite, the Franks once again invaded the province of Damascus. Nur al-Din returned to Damascus and, in the autumn of 555/1161, opened negotiations which concluded with a two-year treaty with Jerusalem. He was able to return to Aleppo, and from there he followed the course of events unfolding around the succession to the Saldjūķ sultan in Hamadhān [q, v], a crisis which was keeping the troops of Kuth al-Din Mawdud far from Syria.

The situation of Antioch having been settled in the interests of Manuel, the treaty with Baldwin being still valid and the army of Mawsil at his disposal, Nur al-Dīn had no fear of imminent interference with his domains, and he seized the opportunity to perform the hadidi [q.v.] in 556/1161. He set out from Aleppo with Shīrkūh, passed through Damascus and took the darb al-hadidi in order to reach the Holy Cities of the Hidiaz where he showed considerable generosity to the local inhabitants, particularly in the improvement of wells. At Medina he restored the defences of the town and arranged for the construction of a second perimeter wall complete with towers, to guarantee the protection of the population against raids by Bedouin marauders. On his return from the Pilgrimage in Şafar 557/February 1162, informed of Frankish plans to intervene in Egypt, Nur al-Din decided to engage in diversionary operations in the north in the hope of restraining the campaign of the king of Jerusalem against Fāţimid Egypt. At the end of 557/1162, Baldwin III fell seriously ill in Tripoli, and Nūr al-Dīn took advantage of the situation to muster an army at Aleppo and once again lay siege to Harim. When the Franks arrived to within a short distance of this site, Nür al-Dīn challenged them to a pitched battle, but the heavy rains of November cut the engagement short. Nur al-Din decided to raise the siege, and Harim remained in the hands of the Crusaders.

In Rabī I 558/February 1163, a new phase in the reign of Nūr al-Dīn began with the accession of Amaury. Henceforward, the Franks turned their attention towards Egypt, and Nūr al-Dīn could not afford to be absent from this new theatre of operations, as each of the local powers sought to establish sovereignty in Cairo. Aware of the progressive disintegration of Fāṭimid authority, the king of Jerusalem began to take an interest in Egypt, where the amīrs were in revolt against Ṭalā'f, a vizier of Armenian origin, converted to Twelver Shī'ī Islam. He had tried, on numerous occasions, to establish relations with Nūr al-Dīn, but he was the victim of two assassination attempts in 556/1161, the second, 18 Ramaḍān/10 September, proving successful.

Egypt then collapsed into chaos, at a time when the Latin states of the Orient seemed to have regained their equilibrium in opposition to Nūr al-Dīn.

In the spring of 558/1163, intending to attack the County of Tripoli, Nur al-Din set out with his army and encamped on the plain of al-Bukay'a at the foot of Hisn al-Akrad. Failing to take account of the fact that the Franks had recently gained reinforcements by sea, he was taken by surprise one day in May during the time of siesta. The Muslims were routed by the Frankish cavalry and Nür al-Dīn, obliged to take flight for the sake of his own safety, did not halt until he reached the Lake of Qadesh (Buhayrat Kadish). A Romanesque fresco, dating from 1170, commemorates this battle in the Templars' chapel at Cressac in Charente. This defeat had a profound effect on the personality and the policies of Nūr al-Dīn since, after two successive defeats, he needed to restore confidence to the army and to the population. Henceforward, he was to embrace a life-style imbued with piety and religious observance, a development which earned him the respect of the religious classes and of the public but which was accepted only with some reservations by the amīrs. It was then that he decided to allocate ikiācs to the orphans of combatants. Members of the religious classes, 'ulamā', Şūfīs and Kur an readers received subsidies levied on the public treasury (bayt al-māl [q.v.]) but not on the spoils of war (fay' [q.v.]). Numerous inscriptions subsequent to 560/1165 feature two new composite titles in their protocol: Nāṣir al-ḥakk bi 'l-barāhīn, "Defender of the Truth by means of proofs" and Munsif al-mazlūmīn min al-zālimīn, "the Protector of the Oppressed against the Oppressors'', titles expressing a part of the political programme of Nūr al-Dīn, that by which he sought to rally public support, presenting himself as the champion of the disadvantaged.

The course of events in Egypt was to pose an awkward problem for Nür al-Dīn. In Rabīc I 559/January-February 1164, the vizier Shawar, driven from Cairo by the revolt unleashed by the amir Dirghām [q.v.] in Ramadān 558/August 1163, arrived at his court, imploring his aid. He reminded him that the deployment of Syrian units in Egypt would allow the creation of two fronts and the encirclement of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. Shāwar offered Nur al-Din a third of the revenues of Egypt in exchange for his aid and the financing of the costs of the expedition. Furthermore, he promised to cede him part of the north-eastern province of the Delta and undertook to recognise his sovereignty. In Djumādā I 559/April 1164, impelled by public opinion, Nur al-Dīn dispatched an army commanded by Shīrkūh with the objective of restoring Shawar to power in Cairo. To protect the advance of this army, he conducted a diversionary manoeuvre in the direction of Baniyas, which enabled the troops accompanying Shawar to reach the Delta of the Nile. Dirghām then issued a very urgent appeal to the Franks, offering Amaury a treaty of allegiance which, in the event of success on the part of the Franks, would have made Egypt a vassal of the Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem rather than a Syrian colony. Amaury accepted the offer but, harassed by the attacks of Nur al-Din and not having sufficient troops to fight on two fronts, he was unable to send an army to Egypt in time to prevent Shīrkūh's arrival in the Delta. Having regained his authority in Cairo, Shāwar reneged on the promises made in Damascus, ultimately agreeing to accept the costs of the campaign but refusing to pay the promised

Nūr al-Dīn set out to invest Ḥārim, and the Franks

based in the northern Latin states reacted. The confrontation took place in the first ten days of Ramaḍān 559/end of July 1154. Nur al-Din had deployed a significant quantity of heavy equipment but as the Franks advanced accompanied by Byzantine reinforcements, he raised the siege and, to avoid being encircled, he withdrew towards Artāh, not far from the ford of Balaneus to the east-south-east of the Lake of Antioch. Exploiting the tactic of withdrawal and counter-attack, al-karr wa 'l-farr, on 20 Ramadān 559/11 August 1164 he lured the Franks into a ferocious battle, in the course of which he inflicted heavy losses on them, a success which he immediately exploited, returning to Harim, which capitulated the following day. This problem being settled, Nur al-Din turned against the kingdom of Jerusalem, a large proportion of whose troops were then deployed in Egypt. He invaded Galilee and set about besieging Baniyas, which capitulated in Dhu 'l-Ḥidjdja 559/October 1164. Nūr al-Dīn installed a garrison there, agreed to a treaty with the Franks and insisted on sharing the revenues of the district of Tiberias. His policy had secured its objective, sc. to prevent the defeat of Shīrkūh.

In the spring of 561/1165, fearing an intervention by Manuel and not wanting to see Amaury prolong his stay in Antioch, Nūr al-Dīn agreed to free Bohemond III for a ransom of 100,000 gold pieces. In order to maintain the balance of forces in northern Syria to the advantage of Islam, he sought to avoid any action liable to provoke the anger of the Basileus. The same year, taking advantage of the capture of Raymond III of Tripoli, he crossed the Bikāc and regained from the Franks the fortress of Munaytira.

While the second Egyptian campaign unfolded, Nūr al-Dīn, who had received reinforcements from Mawsil, occupied the fortress of Ḥūnīn, not far from

Bāniyās, in the Djabal 'Āmila.

Although disappointed by his campaign in Egypt, Shīrkūh brought back a considerable sum of money from Cairo when he returned to Damascus on 18 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 562/5 September 1167. To alleviate his disappointment, Nur al-Din awarded him the fiefdom of Hims, the wall and defences of which he had recently restored, then set out towards the coastal plain, where he laid siege to 'Arka. Having taken possession of Ḥalbā, the army of Nūr al-Dīn took the fortress of al-CUrayma, thus securing the lines of communication between Tarțūs and Sāfīthā, but being unable to defend it he demolished it and returned to Hims for the month of Ramadan 562/June-July 1167. After this success he fixed on the objective of Bayrūt [q.v.], in order to have a "window" on the Mediterranean and avoid the necessity of paying export dues to the Franks, but dissensions within the army prevented the realisation of this project.

In Radjab 563/April-May 1168 Bedouins of the tribe of the Banū Kalb [q.v.] captured Shihāb al-Dīn Mālik b. 'Ali b. Mālik, ruler of Ķal'at Dja'bar, while he was hunting to the north of the Euphrates. They took their prisoner to Nur al-Din, who purchased him and held him in Aleppo. In exchange for Kal at Djacbar, he offered him money and a fief, but the offer was refused. Finally, it was Madjd al-Dīn Abū Bakr Ibn al-Dāya who succeeded, on 20 Muharram 564/26 October 1168, in persuading Shihāb al-Dīn to exchange the place for the important commercial centre of Sarūdi to the south-west of Edessa as well as the salt-flats of al- \underline{D} jabbûl and Buzā^cā [q.vv.] in the district of Aleppo. Henceforward, he controlled this section of the Euphrates and was assured of freedom of communication with Mawsil.

In the middle of the month of Muharram 564/20 October 1168, the Franks launched an attack in the direction of Cairo. While the population resolved to resist, Shawar warned the caliph al- (Adid [q.v.] that the only chance of salvation was to appeal to Nur al-Dīn, since the presence of Sunnīs was preferable to a Christian protectorate. The Fatimid caliph and Shawar promised him a third of the revenues of Egypt as well as fiefs for the maintenance of the troops. Nur al-Din decided to send a third expedition against the Delta, ordered Shīrkūh to Cairo and entrusted him with full powers. When the latter died on 22 Djumādā II/23 March 1169, his nephew, Şalāḥ al-Dīn, was appointed vizier by al-'Adid and commander of the Syrian forces in Egypt by Nūr al-Dīn. Amaury, concerned at the latter's seizure of Egypt, issued appeals for help to the whole of Christendom. The Franks responded and decided on Damietta (Dimyāt [q.v.]) as an objective, but the lack of co-ordination between Byzantines and Franks led to the abandonment of the siege of this locality. After this retreat, al-Adid wrote to Nūr al-Dīn inviting him to recall to Syria the units sent as reinforcements to Egypt, keeping in Egypt only the original force commanded by Şalāḥ al-Dīn. The Syrian prince seems to have been worried by the attitude and the ambitions of the latter. He instructed Nadjm al-Dîn Ayyûb to remind his son that the struggle against the infidels was the first duty of the believers and that the 'Abbasid khutba must be adopted in Cairo. Nadjm al-Dīn left Damascus on 27 Radjab 565/16 April 1170. To create a diversion, Nur al-Dīn laid siege to al-Karak.

Following the great earthquake of 565/1170, Nūr al-Dīn left his headquarters at Tell (Ashtārā to attend to the repairs needed for the defences of Hims,

Hamāt, Bārīn and Aleppo.

On 1 Muharram 566/14 September 1170, the head of the Zankid family crossed the Euphrates opposite Kal^cat Dja^cbar and took possession of al-Rakka [q, v], its governor ceding the place to him in exchange for substantial compensation. Having taken control of the region of the \underline{Kh} ābūr [q.v.], hitherto a dependency of Mawsil, Nür al-Dīn laid siege to Sindjār. At the approach of the Syrian troops, Fakhr al-Din placed himself under the protection of Shams al-Din Ildeñiz [q, v]. The latter sent a deputation to Nür al-Dīn forbidding to take any action against Mawsil, but the Zankid, confident of the support of the caliph of Baghdad and that of the people of Mawsil, made his entrance into the town on 13 Djumādā I 566/22 January 1171 and took up residence in the citadel. He suppressed all the mukūs and other abuses, and applied to the Djazīra the régime in force in Syria and in Egypt. He confirmed the authority of his nephew Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī over Mawşil and gave him the district of Djazīrat Ibn 'Umar [q.v.], while his nephew 'Imād al-Dīn, son of Mawdūd, received Sindiār. Before leaving Mawsil to return to Aleppo, he laid the foundations of the Great Mosque. Then, after returning to Damascus to observe the fast of Ramadan (May-June 1171), Nür al-Dīn regained possession of Tell al-'Ashtārā, from which point he was able to observe the movements of the Franks of Jerusalem and eventually to support the operations of Şalāḥ al-Dīn.

Until the year 567/September 1171-August 1172, the relations between Nūr al-Dīn and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn remained those between a chief and his subordinate. Thereafter, they soon found themselves in conflict over the manner in which the war against the Franks was to be waged; this was a conflict between two generations and two temperaments, one Turkish, the other Kurdish. Nūr al-Dīn, as Sir Hamilton Gibb (in

Setton and Baldwin, A History of the Crusades, i, 565) has underlined, operated within a political framework defined by the system of his times. For him, Syria was the principal field of battle against the Crusaders and Egypt represented nothing more than a source of additional revenue to cover the costs of the dihād. In that year, before attacking the County of Tripoli, he had ordered Salāh al-Dīn to gather all available forces in Egypt and lead them towards Frankish Palestine, thus trapping the Franks in a pincer-movement. The first objective was the castle of al-Karak; after ten days of siege the garrison offered to surrender to Salāh al-Din. For him, the elimination of all obstacles between Egypt and Syria was not desirable, since henceforward he would be at the mercy of Nūr al-Dīn. He decided to return to Cairo and sent a letter to his sovereign, claiming the pretext of unrest in Cairo fomented by the Shīs. Nūr al-Dīn did not accept this excuse, and announced his intention of going to Egypt in person in order to depose Şalāḥ al-Dīn. The latter, on the advice of his father, re-affirmed his loyalty to Nūr al-Dīn, who relented, and tension abated.

In Rabī' I 568/October-November 1172, when Nūr al-Dīn had been resident in Damascus for more than three months, the Franks launched an attack against the Ḥawrān and advanced as far as Shaykh Miskīn. The prince of Damascus set out with his troops and encamped at Kiswa in the Mardi al-Suffar [q.v.]; the Franks withdrew towards Shallāla, where the Damascene army confronted them. Nūr al-Dīn established his camp at Tell al-'Ashtārā and dispatched cavalry units to raid the district of Tiberias.

Having repelled the Franks, Nur al-Din turned his attention to northern Syria, where he was able to assist the Armenian Mleh to expel the garrisons of Mașsīșa, Adana and Țarsūs [q.vv.]. He would have been glad to obtain the support of the Saldjuk prince of Konya for operations against Antioch but, following a stern warning from Manuel, Kilidi Arslan II rejected the overtures of Nur al-Din and turned against his neighbour, the Dānishmendid Dhu 'l-Nūn. The latter sought refuge with Nur al-Din, who was also joined by the ruler of Malatya [q.v.] and the amīr of al-Madidal. Nur al-Din promised him his support and insisted that Kilidi Arslan restore the property taken from the amīr of al-Madidal. When this ultimatum was refused, he felt justified in declaring war with a Muslim state; it was necessary for the interests of Islam since this prince was serving the cause of the infidels. While Mleh attacked Cilicia [q.v.] Nūr al-Dīn took Racban, Marzuban, Kaysun and Bahasna, places held by the Saldjūks on the right bank of the Euphrates. On 20 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 568/3 July 1173 he occupied Marcash. Shortly after this, Kilidj Arslan II appealed to him for a truce. Nur al-Din required him to free the prisoners taken in the region of Malatya and to participate in the Holy War, either sending a contingent to join the struggle with the Franks, or operating independently against Byzantium.

To mark his independence vis-à-vis the major atabegs, Nūr al-Dīn sent as an envoy to Baghdād his trusted adviser Kamāl al-Dīn Abu 'l-Fadl Muḥammad al-Shahrazūrī to ask the caliph for a document conferring upon him all the territories and towns in which his authority was recognised. In granting this solemn deed of investiture to Nūr al-Dīn, the caliph deprived the successors of the Great Saldjūks of any authority over the lands situated to the west of the Tigris.

Taking advantage of the absence of Amaury, who had returned to Antioch, Nūr al-Dīn put into operation a plan of attack against the land of Trans-

Jordania. His objective remained the same: to take possession of al-Karak and Shawbak, where the Frankish garrisons cut the route between Egypt and Syria, interrupting caravan traffic and hindering the Pilgrimage. He also needed to gain the support of the nomads, many of whom did not hesitate to serve the Franks as auxiliaries or guides. Once again putting the good will of Salah al-Din to the test, he instructed him to attack al-Karak. The latter obeyed in mid-Shawwal 568/May 1173. The siege had been in effect for some time when Nur al-Din crossed the southern border of Syria in Dhu 'l-Hididja 568/end of July 1173. When Şalāḥ al-Dīn learned that the Zankid army had reached al-Raķīm, two days' march from al-Karak, he ordered his troops to return to Egypt, claiming, in a message to Nūr al-Dīn, that his father, Nadjm al-Dīn Ayyūb, was gravely ill in Cairo and that he feared lest, in the event of his father's death during his own absence, Egypt would slip away from the authority of Nūr al-Dīn and would be removed from the authority of the Sunna. Nūr al-Dīn, not deceived, pretended to understand the reasons for the departure of the Ayyūbid prince. Through this gesture on the part of Şalāḥ al-Dīn, the kingdom of Jerusalem gained a reprieve of forty years and Nur al-Dîn was not to see in the al-Akṣā Mosque [q.v.] the wooden minbar [q.v.] which he had had made in advance in Aleppo as an ex-voto offering for the return of al-Kuds [q.v.] to Islam.

Returning from Aleppo in Muharram 569/ September 1173 Nür al-Dīn heard at Salāmiyya, to the south-east of Hamat, the news of a Frankish attack against the Hawran; while preparing to counter this, he was informed of the adversary's withdrawal. Returning to Damascus, he engaged in preparations for an expedition towards Egypt, the aim of which was to induce Şalāḥ al-Dīn to intervene against the Franks. According to his plan, he left in Syria, confronting the Franks, troops from Mawsil, under the command of Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, and he himself was to set out for Egypt with his squadrons after Ramadan 569/early May 1174. A few days after the 'Id al-Fitr [q.v.], Nür al-Dīn fell ill with an inflammation of the throat. Confined to his bed in the palace which he had had constructed in the citadel of Damascus, he summoned, according to Ibn al-Athīr (Kāmil, ix, 124), two doctors including Djamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf b. Ḥaydar al-Raḥbī al-Dimashķī, his personal physician. Despite their efforts, al-Malik al-'Adil Nür al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Zankī died on Wednesday 11 Shawwāl 569/15 May 1174. At first interred in the citadel, his remains were transferred, when it was ready, to the funeral madrasa which he was having constructed to the south-west of the Great Mosque of the Umayyads. At the present time, his tomb is still the object of popular veneration.

Bibliography: For pre-1965 bibliography, see the very detailed one given by N. Elisséeff in Nūr al-Dīn, un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des Croisades 511-569 H./1118-1174, 3 vols., Damascus 1967, i, Bibliography, pp. XXI-LXXVII, and also Survey of sources, 1-85. The remainder of this bibliography deals with works published subsequently.

A. Árabic sources. 'Alī b. Tāhir al-Sulamī, K. al-Djihād, text and tr. E. Sivan, La Genèse de la Contre Croisade: un traité damasquin du début du XIIe S., in JA, ccliv (1966), 197-224; Ibn 'Asākir, T. Dimashk, facs. text 'Ammān 1988, complete ed. in course of publication at Damascus; Ibn al-'Adīm, Bughyat al-talab, facs. ed. Frankfurt 1986-8, ed. Suhayl Zak-kār, Damascus 1408-9/1988-9; Usāma b. Munkidh, K. al-I'tibār, tr. A. Miquel, Les enseignements de

la vie. Souvenirs d'un gentilhomme syrien du temps des Croisades, Paris 1983.

B. Studies. (a) Political history. K.M. Setton and M.W. Baldwin, A history of the Crusades, I2, Philadephia 1969; J. Prawer, Histoire du Royaume Latin de Jérusalem, CNRS, Paris 1969, i, ch. III, 395-425, ch. IV, 427-59; H. Salame-Sarkis, Contribution à l'histoire de Tripoli et de sa région à l'époque des Croisades, Paris 1980; P.M. Holt, The age of the Crusades, London 1986, 466-52; Carol Hillenbrand, A Muslim principality in Crusader times. The early Artugid state, Istanbul 1990. (b) Dihād and law. H. Laoust, Les schismes dans l'Islam, Paris 1965, 189-22; Sivan, Le caractère sacré de Jérusalem dans l'Islam aux XIIe et XIIIe S., in SI, xxvii (1967), 149-82; idem, L'Islam et la Croisade. Idéologie et propagande dans les réactions musulmanes aux Croisades, Paris 1968, 3, 59-91; F.H. Russell, The Just War in the Middle Ages, studies in medieval life and thought, Cambridge 1975, 195-212; R. Peters (tr. and annotator), Jihad in mediaeval and modern Islam. The chapter on jihad from Averroes' legal handbook Bidayat al-mujtahid and the treatise Koran and fighting by the late Shaykh al-Azhar, Mahmūd Shaltūt, Leiden 1977; P. Rousset, Histoire d'une idéologie: la Croisade, Lausanne 1983. (c) Economy and society. H. Mason, Two statesmen of mediaeval islam, Vizir Ibn Hubayra ... and Caliph an-Nâşir li Dîn Allâh, The Hague-Paris 1972; N.A. Faris, ch. Arab culture in the twelfth century, in N.P. Zacour, H.W. Hazard and K.M. Setton, A history of the Crusades. v. The impact of the Crusades on the Near East, Madison-Milwaukee 1985, 3-32.

(N. Elisséeff)

NŪR AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD, the fifth ruler of the Turkmen Artukid dynasty [q.v.] in Ḥiṣn Kayfā and most of Diyār Bakr, d. in Rabī^c I 581/June 1185.

He succeeded on his father Kara Arslan's death, in 562/1166-7 according to the chronicles (although numismatic evidence suggests that the latter may have lived till 570/1174-5), having promised his father to continue support for the Zangid ruler Nur al-Din Maḥmūd's [q.v.] djihād against the Franks, a commitment which he in fact honoured by bringing troops to Nisibīn in 566/1170-1. But after the Zangid's death in 569/1174, Nür al-Din Muhammad transferred his allegiance to Şalāḥ al-Dīn [q.v.], and henceforth, he achieves prominence in the sources almost exclusively in the context of the Ayyūbid's career. Şalāḥ al-Dīn valued an alliance with the Artukids in Diyar Bakr as a check on the Saldjūķ sultan of Rūm, Ķilidj Arslan II [q.v.]. Hence Muhammad frequently sent troops to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn on the latter's request. He was awarded possession of Amid, long coveted by the Artukids of Hişn Kayfa, in 579/1183, as a reward for aid at the siege of Mawsil in the previous year; henceforth, Amid became the seat of power for Nür al-Dīn Muhammad's descendants. The Ayyubid sultan bound his ally even more closely by an oath requiring the despatch of troops against the Franks whenever needed, and the Artukid was accordingly present at the siege of Karak in Djumādā I 580/August-September 1184. However, when Şalāḥ al-Dīn called for troops for his second attempt against Mawşil, Nür al-Dīn Muḥammad was too ill to go personally but sent a force to Dunaysir under his brother 'Imad al-Dīn. Muḥammad died within days, and his young son Kutb al-Dīn Sukmān II immediately established himself in Ḥiṣn Kayfā as his father's successor, with continued allegiance to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, whilst 'Imād al-Dīn had to be content with taking Khartpert, where he established a minor Artuķid line.

Little is known of internal affairs in Hisn Kayfa and Āmid under Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad, but it may be assumed that he continued the courtly traditions of his father which had been sophisticated enough to attract Usāma b. Munķidh [see Munķīdh, BANŪ] to spend some of his declining years at Hisn Kayfa. The extant copper coins minted there in Muhammad's name follow the numismatic traditions of the Turkmen dynasties of Mesopotamia for this century. As well as conventional Arabic inscriptions on one side, they bear figures copied from classical models; one coin depicts Nur al-Din Muhammad in the guise of Seleucus II (Lane Poole, The coins of the Urtukí Turkumáns, 125-7). The Aleppo Gate at Amid has a celebratory inscription dated 579 AH announcing Muhammad's occupation of the city. Van Berchem suggested that he may have taken the title of sultan, used by his successors, after his acquisition of Amid; and he also quotes at length an anonymous, contemporary account describing in fulsome terms Muhammad's just administration of the city (Amida, 71-2, 75-81).

Bibliography: 1. Sources. Abū Shāma, Rawdatayn; Bar Hebraeus, Chronography; Ibn al-Athīr, xixii; Ibn Azrak al-Fārikī, T. Mayyāfārikīn wa-Amid, B.L. ms. or. 5803, fols. 198b, 200b; Ibn al-Furāt, Ta rīkh; Ibn Shaddād, Nawādir; Ibn Wāṣil, Mufarridi, ii; Michael the Syrian, Chronicle, tr. Chabot, iii; Sibṭ Ibn al-Djawzī, Mir'āt, viii/2; Usāma b. Munķidh, Memoirs.

2. Studies. S. Lane Poole, The coins of the Urtuki Turkumáns, in The International Numismata Orientalia, Pt. 2, London 1875, 16; idem, The coins of the Turkumán houses of Seljook, Urtuk, Zengee, etc., in the British Museum, London 1877, 125-7; M. van Berchem and J. Strzygowski, Amida, Heidelberg 1910, 71-81, 96; H.A.R. Gibb, Al-Barq al-Shāmī..., in WZKM, lii (1953), 93-115; Helen Mitchell Brown, Some reflections on the figured coinage of the Artugids and Zangids, in D. Kouymjian (ed.), Near Eastern Numismatics, iconography, epigraphy and history. Studies in honor of George C. Miles, Beirut 1974, 353-8.

NŪR AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD II, Nizārī Ismā'īlī Imām and the fifth lord of Alamūt (561-607/1166-1210). Born in Shawwāl 542/March 1148, he succeeded to the leadership of the Nizārī community and state on the death of his father, Ḥasan II, on 6 Rabī' I 561/9 January 1166. He devoted his long and peaceful reign of some forty-four years to managing the affairs of the Nizārī da'wa and community, especially in Persia, from the central headquarters of the sect at Alamūt. A thinker and a prolific writer, he

also contributed actively to the Nizārī teachings of his

time.

(CAROLE HILLENBRAND)

Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad II affirmed the Nizārid Fāṭimid genealogy of his father and, therefore, of himself; and, henceforth, the lords of Alamūt were acknowledged as imāms, descendants of Nizār b. al-Mustanşir, by the Nizārī Ismā'īlī community. In the doctrinal field, he systematically expounded and elaborated the important doctrine of the kiyāma, announced by his father in 559/1164, and placed the current Nizārī imām and his autonomous teaching authority at the very centre of that doctrine (see Haft bāb-i Bābā Sayyidnā, ed. W. Ivanow, in Two early Ismaili

Aside from petty warfare, the history of the Nizārī state in Persia was politically uneventful under Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad. However, the Syrian Nizārīs were more involved at this time in their own local alliances and conflicts. There are also indications that a widening rift had developed between this Nizārī

treatises, Bombay 1933, 4-42).