THE IQṬĀ‘ SYSTEM OF IRAQ UNDER THE BUWAYHIDS
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In 334 A.H. (946 A.D.), having established his authority in Baghdad, Mu‘izz al-Dawla granted iqṭā‘s in the Sawād to his commanders, his associates, and his Turks. This is the formation of the so-called “military” iqṭā‘ system in the Islamic history. The appearance of the military iqṭā‘s brought about not only the evolution of the Islamic state, but also the transformation of the Iraqi society during the 10–11th centuries and of the other countries in the following periods. Niẓām al-Mulk understood this as the change from bīstgān (cash pay) to iqṭā‘,(1) while al-Maqrizī described as the change from ‘aṭā‘ to iqṭā‘ in the same meaning.(2)

As for the iqṭā‘ system under the Buwayhids, H. F. Amedroz first translated the Miskawayh’s text into English with annotations,(3) and then C. H. Becker tried to realize the iqṭā‘ system in the history of ‘Lehen’ from the early Islamic period to the Ottoman Turks.(4) A. A. al-Dūrī, who studied the economic history of the Buwayhid Iraq, made clear the character of iqṭā‘ comparing it with milk (private land) and waqf, though the reality of iqṭā‘ holding remained to be investigated in future.(5) On the other hand, Cl. Cahen published the general survey of iqṭā‘ in the history of the Islamic land holding, which gave us useful informations concerning the right and obligation of soldiers, and the fall of peasants by way of himāya (protection) and the loan at high interest.(6) We also find the general description of iqṭā‘ in the study of H. Busse on the Buwayhids in Iraq,(7) but these studies are not necessarily on the strict and comprehensive analysis of the main source, Tajārib al-Umam of Miskawayh.

So in this article, I try to study the enforcement of iqṭā‘ system, the meaning of iqṭā‘ grant, the struggle between muqta‘ and wālī concerning himāya, and the evolution of the Iraqi society(8) on such sources as Tajārib al-Umam, Nishwār al-Muhāḍara of al-Tanūkhī, and al-Ḥafawāt al-Nādira of Ghīr al-Nī‘ma al-Ṣābī.
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I. Establishment of the Iqṭāʾ System

What is the historical moment which led to the enforcement of *iqṭāʾ* system in Iraq in the half of the 10th century? C. H. Becker told that the Turkish salve soldiers, who were organized in stead of the Arabs, became to take the main part of the state income, and as a result of it the *iqṭāʾ* system (Lehenswesen) was introduced. On the other hand, Cl. Cahen explained that the new *iqṭāʾ* developed from *ighār* (land with partial immunity from taxation), the holder of which had become to neglect paying the contract-fee to the government from the 9th century on. But A. K. S. Lambton, who attached importance to the state finance, claimed that *iqṭāʾ* system was enforced as a result of the progressive deterioration in the financial stability of the state. On the contrary, A. A. al-Dūrī considered that to attribute the rise of this new *iqṭāʾ* to the crisis of the treasury is not tenable. He paid attention to the background of the Buwayhids, whose troops with their feudal semi-tribal tradition looked at the land as being theirs by right of conquest.

But, as to the explanation of al-Dūrī, I have some doubt because it was always the Turks, not the Daylams, who ran the riot claiming *iqṭāʾ* in the early Buwayhid period. For the full comprehension of this problem, we should take into consideration the social and economic conditions which led to the failure of the state finance, as well as the development of *ighār* and *iljāʾ* (recourse). And also it was one of the important factors that the owners of the landed property (*sāhib al-dayʿa*) became to have the household members such as *ašḥāb*, *asbāb*, *hasham* and *kātibs* for controlling their properties, who had the responsibility for ‘*imāra* (cultivation of land) and *himāya* (protection of roads and people).

Anyhow, Muʿizz al-Dawla, having taken the title *amīr al-umaraʾ*, began to grant the *iqṭāʾs* to his commanders and soldiers. About this grant Miskawayh describes as follows:

In this year (334 A.H.), the Daylams ran the riot against Muʿizz al-Dawla, and gave open revile to him and violated him with much stupidity. So he guaranteed the payment of their stipends (*amwāl*) in the fixed dates, but thereby was forced to illtreat people by collecting the taxes other than the proper items. Therefore, to his officers (quw-
wād), his associates (khawāṣṣ) and his Atrak he granted the state domain (diyā’ al-sultān) and the land property of the persons who had gone into hiding (diyā’ al-mustatirīn) and of Ibn Shīrzhād, also the dues of state treasury (haqq bayt al-māl) on the private estates of subjects (diyā’ al-raʿīya). As a result of it the greater part of the Sawād came to be closed and passed out of the control of the tax-collectors (ʿummāl).\(^{(15)}\)

As it was after the description of 340 A.H. that Miskawayh wrote down on his own experience or the information ascertained by himself,\(^{(16)}\) he might have written the above mentioned paragraph on some other documents or books. Tough its sources are not clear now, it is no doubt that the description of Tajārib is the most reliable one concerning the enforcement of iqṭā’ system.

By the way, in what month of 334 A.H. were the first iqṭā’s granted? One clue to this problem is that the land property of Ibn Shirzad was contained in the granted iqṭā’s. According to Miskawayh, Ibn Shīrzhād abandoned the status of Muʿizz al-Dawla’s kātib and took sides with Nāṣir al-Dawla in the beginning of Shaʿbān in this year.\(^{(17)}\) And also al-Hamadānī told in his Takmila iqṭā’s were granted before the floods of Khālis canal and Nahrawān canal in Shaʿbān.\(^{(18)}\) Adding to these, the fact that Muʿizz al-Dawla opened battle with Nāṣir al-Dawla at the end of Shaʿbān led us to the conclusion that the iqṭā’ system was enforced in Shaʿbān of 334 A.H. (March of 946 A.D.).\(^{(19)}\)

The above quotation states that the persons who were granted iqṭā’ were quwwād, khawāṣṣ, and Atrak. Quwwād (pl. of qāʾid) were sometimes called as “the amīrs of Daylam” or “the amīrs of Atrak”,\(^{(20)}\) but it is not clear that they were the same qāʾids as the ones in the early ʿAbbāsid period who commanded 100 soldiers.\(^{(21)}\) The next khawāṣṣ (pl. of khāṣṣa) were composed of Muʿizz al-Dawla’s kin, and maybe also of the high officials of Daylams and Turks. The last Atrak means the Turkish slave soldiers excluding the Turkish qāʾids mentioned above. So the iqṭā’ holders (muqta’s) in the early Buwayhid period, we can suppose, were Daylamite and Turkish officers, and Turkish soldiers, while the Daylamite soldiers were paid the stipend (māl, rīzq) only.

Then, as for the lands granted as iqṭā’, diyā’ al-sultān, which was also called diyā’ al-khalīfā, al-diyā’ al-khāṣṣa, or al-diyā’ al-furāṭīyya, was the large private property of caliph mainly located in the Sawād.\(^{(22)}\) But as this land was sold over for the state treasury from the early 10th century on,\(^{(23)}\) the large part of it was handed over to the officers and merchants by the time when Muʿizz al-
Dawla confiscated the caliphal domain. diyāʿ al-mustatirin was the private property of the person who had hidden himself, and the diyāʿ of Ibn Shīrzād was the same property as this land. The last one, haqq bayt al-māl, which was also called haqq al-sultān, was the due of the state while haqq al-akrawa and haqq al-raqaba were respectively the dues of cultivators (akara) and diyāʿ holders. According to Ḥafawāt, the state’s due on its diyāʿ was 1/3 the same as the due of wakil despatched from the diyāʿ holder as his agent. But, as Būzjānī quotes the examples of the state’s due from 12/60 to 27/60, it could be supposed that the due was different according to the districts and times.

The above mentioned diyāʿ and the due from the diyāʿ were granted as iqṭāʿ, and as the result of it the greater part of the Sawād passed out of the control of the tax-collectors as Miskawayh described. But it is not true that he said “the greater part of the Sawād passed out”, because the districts of Baṣra, Wāṣīṭ and Baṭṭā’īḫ were not granted at that time. As Baṣra and Wāṣīṭ were under the control of al-Barīḍis from the year 325 A. H. (937 A. D.), Muʿizz al-Dawla had to be content with the tax-farming contract of 160 million dirhams with Abū al-Qāsim al-Barīḍī before the grant of iqṭāʿ. As for the Baṭṭā’īḫ, ‘Īmrān b. Shāḥīn, who was called Abū al-‘Urbān (father of the Arabs), enjoyed independent rule there against the Buwayhid state, taking profit by the control on the roads between Baghdād and Baṣra, and on the cultivation of rice (aruzz). It was after the year 349 A. H. (960 A. D.) that Muʿizz al-Dawla oppressed the ‘Īmrān’s power and granted this district as iqṭāʿ.

II. The Meaning of Iqṭāʿ Grant

The army of the Buwayhid dynasty was composed of the Turkish cavalry-men and of the Daylamite foot-soldiers. According to al-Kāmil, the commanders (qāʿīds) of the Turks and the Daylams were granted the prosperous villages (al-qurā al-ʿāmira) which made gradually a rise of their iqṭāʿ revenue. But unfortunately, it is not clear which size and value of iqṭāʿ these qāʿīds had in Iraq. Giving an example in Iran, the Daylamite qāʿīds had the iqṭāʿs in Khūzistān, the yearly revenue of which varied from 200,000 to 300,000 dirhams, while in Rayy and Jībāl the Daylamite influentials (wujūh al-Daylam) had the iqṭāʿs whose revenue was 1/10 of it in Khūzistān. Cl. Cahen estimated the value in Rayy and Jībāl as the average revenue of amir’s iqṭāʿ in the Buwayhid period, but it seems to me that it is difficult for us to decide which
value was the average one according to this source only.\(^{33}\)

Then, as for the soldiers under the qa'ids the Turks were granted both iqṭa' and stipend from the early Buwayhids, while the Daylams were paid the stipends only. This is evident from the fact that the Turks and the Daylamite commanders made trouble claiming the iqṭa' and stipend, but on the other hand the Daylams always claimed their stipends only.\(^{34}\) It is after the year 376 A. H. (986 A. D.) that we can confirm the iqṭa' holding of the Daylamite soldiers on the historical sources.\(^{35}\) However, these soldiers had held the iqṭa's previous to this year, because Sābūr b. Ardashīr, wazīr of Bahā’ al-Dawla, controlled by himself the iqṭa's of the Daylams he confiscated then. In 376 A. H. (997 A. D.), 500 of the minor Daylams and 300 of the Kurds had the iqṭa's, the total revenue of which was under 100,000 dinārs.\(^{36}\) This indicates the revenue of one soldier was under 125 dinārs whose amount was, if the stipend was not paid, rather low compared with the Dūrī's estimation that the standard of living of the middle class was about 360 dinārs per year in the 10th century.\(^{37}\)

By the way, as C. E. Bosworth and M. Kabir already made clear, the great amir (amīr al-ūmarā') transformed the basis of his political power from the Daylams to the Turks in the early Buwayhids.\(^{38}\) We can trace the same process on the iqṭa' holding in this period as follows. In 345 A. H. (956 A. D.), Mu'izz al-Dawla arrested the Daylams taking chance of Rūzbahan's revolt in Ahwāz, and granted the large iqṭa's to the Turks in Wāsīt and Başra.\(^{39}\) Miskawayh also informs that the status of the Daylams went down gradually because of his granting many iqṭa's to the Turkish slave soldiers.\(^{40}\) The next Bakhtiyār confiscated the iqṭa's of the Daylamite high officers in 356 A. H. (967 A. D.), and gave iqṭa's to the high officers of his attendants, especially the large one to Sabkutikīn, the Turkish officer.\(^{41}\) Then in 388 A. H. (998 A. D.), Şamsām al-Dawla confiscated iqṭa's from the Daylams whose origin was obscure and also from the Daylams who lacked loyalty, and granted them to the Turks.\(^{42}\) This policy, of course, called forth the violent reaction of the Daylams. It is said that in 362 A. H. (972-3 A. D.) the battle between the Turks and the Daylams already began and then spread to all over Iraq.\(^{43}\) But, as is clear from Mu'izz al-Dawla's last will to his son Bakhtiyār; "Even if the Daylams rose in revolt against you, you could suppress them with the Turks because they were the core (jamra) of the army,"\(^{44}\) the status of the Turks in whom the great amir put such a firm confidence did not change even after
that. Thus the power of the Turks became to be so great that the kingdom (mamlaka) was under their rule by the early 11th century.\(^{(45)}\)

It is generally said that the Buwayhid iqṭāʾ was the right of collecting the tax from peasants in stead of receiving stipend, which corresponds with iqṭāʾ al-istighlāl in the works of jurists.\(^{(46)}\) But the only financial study of iqṭāʾ system is somewhat insufficient for our full understanding of it. Because we can find the following examples concerning the iqṭāʾ grant in the contemporary sources.

(1) In 335 A. H. (946–7 A. D.), Muʿizz al-Dawla gave iqṭāʾ, whose revenue was 40,000 dirhams, to Takin al-Shīrzādī who was sent from Naṣīr al-Dawla as a peace envoy.\(^{(47)}\)

(2) When Abū al-Qāsim al-Baridī wanted safety (amān) from Muʿizz al-Dawla in 337 A. H. (948–9 A. D.), he consented this and granted iqṭāʾ in Nahr al-Malik whose revenue was 120,000 dirhams.\(^{(48)}\)

(3) In 349 A. H. (960 A. D.), after the suppression of the revolt in Baṭāʾiḥ Muʿizz al-Dawla gave Aḥmad b. Shāhīn the iqṭāʾ of which revenue was 300,000 dinārs, and also gave iqṭāʾ to his brother ʿImrān b. Shāhīn of which revenue was 200,000 dirhams.\(^{(49)}\)

(4) In 368 A. H. (978–9 A. D.), ʿAḍud al-Dawla proposed to grant iqṭāʾ to the Hamdanid prince Abū Taghlib on condition that he surrendered, but he rejected this.\(^{(50)}\)

(5) In 375 A. H. (985–6 A. D.), ʿAḍud al-Dawla gave Wāsīṭ and Shaqī al-Furāt as iqṭāʾ to the two Qarmatians, Ishāq and Jaʿfar, who captured Kūfā.\(^{(51)}\)

(6) In 380 A. H. (990 A. D.), Bahāʾ al-Dawla made peace (ṣulḥ) with Šaṃṣām al-Dawla, who was to hold iqṭāʾ in Iraq. Then Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn was sent to Baghdād as Šaṃṣām al-Dawla’s agent and managed iqṭāʾ there.\(^{(52)}\)

(7) In 395 A. H. (1004–5 A. D.), Bahāʾ al-Dawla, who made peace with Abū al-ʿAbbās b. Wāṣil, the ruler of Baṭāʾiḥ, increased his iqṭāʾ.\(^{(53)}\)

(8) In 411 A. H. (1020–1 A. D.), after the suppression of Ibn Sahlān’s revolt in Wāsīṭ, Musharrīf al-Dawla made a covenant (hilf) with his Daylams, and granted them iqṭāʾs.\(^{(54)}\)

Among these examples, (1) and (6) are the grants of iqṭāʾ to the rulers outside Iraq, and (2), (4), (5), (7) are the iqṭāʾ grants to the influential of the districts such as Baṭāʾiḥ and Baṣra. The examples of (3) and (8) also indicate
that the leaders of revolts and their followers were granted *iqṭāʾs* on condition that they surrendered to the great amir. That is, on these *iqṭāʾ* grants, the receivers needed to make peace (*ṣulḥ*) or covenant (*ḥilf*), to claim protection (*ʿaman*), or to surrender. This means that these persons were integrated into the Buwayhid regime by the *iqṭāʾ* grants as Ṣāḥīb Ibn ʿAbbad, wazīr of Muʿayyad al-Dawla, said, “If you respond to the call for integration and walk on the right way, you are guaranteed your status before the majesty and granted *iqṭāʾ*”.(55) After the breakdown of the ‘Abbāsid caliphate, the *iqṭāʾ* grant of the great amir, thus indeed, played an important role in his forming the state order.

### III. Management and Rule of *Iqṭāʾ*

Miskawayh criticizes the *iqṭāʾ* grant of Muʿizz al-Dawla and its result in his *Tajarib al-Umam* as follows:

Among this (evil result), there was the practice of granting many lands in the Sawād when they were in a desolate state with small productivity and before they were restored to cultivation. And also the wazīrs gave the *muqṭaʾs* easy terms, in some cases in return for bribes, doing them a favourite or giving them recommendation, so that the *iqṭāʾ* were granted on inconsistent annual estimate (*ʿibra*). So, in some *iqṭāʾ* the revenue rose with increased production as a result of the advance of cultivation, but in others the revenue decreased with the fall of prices.(56)

As I mentioned above, Muʿizz al-Dawla granted *iqṭāʾ* three months after his entrance into Baghdad, when his political power was uncertain facing the battle with Nasir al-Dawla. This situation made him unable not only to carry out the tax investigation or the cadastral survey beforehand, but also to restore the ruined villages which had already appeared from the early 10th century. That is to say, *iqṭāʾ* were granted under the condition that the estimated annual revenue (*ʿibra*) did not coincide with the actual revenue (*irtifāʾ*). The phrase quoted above “on inconsistent annual estimate” (*bi-ʿibar mutafāwīta*) should be understood in such meaning. According to Ibn al-Athīr, those who were granted *iqṭāʾ* such as the revenue increased with prosperity of the villages in several years, were the officer (*qaʿīd*) class,(57) but as I mentioned above, it is...
not clear which size and value of iqṭāʾ these qaʾids had in Iraq. Anyhow, these profiteers (rabīḥān) grew their powers by means of such as the forced protection which I take up afterwards.

On the other hand, the soldiers of lower class, who were granted iqṭāʾs with bad condition, exchanged their iqṭāʾs frequently as Miskawayh says as follows:

The losers (khāsirūn) returned their iqṭāʾs in exchange for another iqṭāʾ, but the result was the decrease of the revenue and the wide spread of the ruined field. So it became the regular practice for the soldiers to let their iqṭāʾs go to ruin, and then to return them on receiving other iqṭāʾs as they chose for taking the profit. As the returned iqṭāʾs (al-iqṭāʾāt al-murtajaʿa) were granted anew to persons whose object was to get what they could by raising the calculation, any attempt at cultivation (ʿimāra) was given up entirely.(58)

Here the unlawfulness of iqṭāʾ holding was described such as that the soldiers got the exceed neglecting ʿimāra, and claimed new iqṭāʾ when the villages became to be ruined. The ʿimāra, before the establishment of iqṭāʾ system, was under the responsibility of tax-collector (ʿāmil) or tax-contractor (dāmin).(59) But, after the villages were granted as iqṭāʾs, the collection of the revenue and attempt at cultivation were to be carried out by the iqṭāʾ holder (muqṭāʾ). This led to the decrease of ʿāmil’s right as Miskawayh described that ʿummāl al-maṣālikh (āmils charged with the furtherance of cultivation) were released from the management of the districts, and their obligation was restricted to calculating what was needed and distributing the burden (taqsīt) among the muqṭāʾs.(60)

The taqsīt just mentioned above was the temporary burden for taking out the financial source of stipend. For example, in 334 A. H. (945 A. D.) Ibn Shirzād, who was assigned post of the great amir after Tūzūn, levied (qassata) the tax on the tax-collector, the scribe and the merchant for breaking the financial difficulties.(61) And also, in 417 A. H. (1026 A. D.) it is said that the Turks, who increased their power in Baghdād, put 100,000 dinārs as taqsīt on the merchants of Karkh.(62) So we may suppose it was temporal to the last end that the government distributed the taqsīt among the muqṭāʾs in this time. But anyhow, the right of ʿāmil as a tax-collector, being pushed by the
power of the soldiers, decreased gradually. Against this tendency, the ‘āmils resisted by means of breaking off the tax resisters (uṣūl al-‘uqud), on the occasion that the Turkish soldiers usurped the due of the state treasury (ḥaqq bayt al-māl) by the rule of Wāṣīṭ, Baṣra and Ahwāz, but in vain. As Cahen says, under the new regime these agents of the state treasury should permit that they could not enter into the soldier’s land and also could no more estimate the correct revenue.

Then, we mention the persons who managed the soldier’s iqṭā’ in the Buwayhid Iraq. There is a description about them in Tajārib al-Umam:

The result was that ‘imāra was given up, the diwāns were closed, and the tradition of clerkship (kitāba) and administration (‘amāla) were cancelled. Those skilled therein died off and others arose who were unskilled, and anyone who was in charge of one thing thereof behaved as a rude intruder. The muqta’s managed their iqṭā’s by their own ghilmān and wukalā’ (agents), who did not account what was under their hands, and did nothing to further productiveness and cultivation.

According to this description, the unskilled ghilmān or wakils of muqta’s came to manage the iqṭā’s in place of the above mentioned ‘āmils. In this period, the Turkish slaves (ghilmān Atrak) were called generally ghilmān, who were also expressed as mamalik in some sources. These ghilmān, before the time of the Buwayhids, managed the land property (day’a) of the high officials or the influential officers, as well as they served as the private soldiers to these influentials. The sources call these persons variously ašḥāb, ašbāb, hasham and hāshīya. And also, after the establishment of iqṭā’ system, the muqta’s had their ghilmān who were the core of their military force and the managers of their iqṭā’s. For example, when Subktikīn was confiscated his iqṭā’ in 363 A.H. (974 A.D.), his ašḥāb in Baṣra were arrested with his agent (wakil). And Naṣir-i Khusrū, who visited Baṣra in 443 A.H. (1051 A.D.), reports that the ruler, Abū al-Fath ‘Alī had his kins and followers (hāshīya).

On the other hand, the wakils were already used as the agents of the holders of land property from the ‘Abbāsid period. Though the above mentioned ghilmān were also used as the agents, there contained other persons in the wakils different from the ghilmān who were the military forces in their true nature. These were the private scribes (kātibs) of the muqta’.
examples about them.

(1) Abu al-Hasan ‘Ali al-Qummi was kātib of Rûzbahân b. Randâ Khûrshidh, grandfather of amîr al-Daylam. He was the manager of Rûzbahân’s iqṭâ’ in the Sawâd as well as his agent at Mu’izz al-Dawla. (72)

(2) Abu al-Hasan al-Qummi was also the kātib of Abû Manşûr Râdharwayh, mamlûk of Mu’izz al-Dawla. But when Râdharwayh claimed of him the excess of the iqṭâ’ revenue (fâdıl iqṭâ’), he complained of him to Wazîr Abû al-Fâdîl al-Shîrâzî. (74)

(3) Abu al-‘Araqîl al-Ṭâhri was the kātib of Banjâsib, the Daylamite officer. Once before, Abû ‘Ubayd Allâh (chief of diwân al-Ahwâz) called him out and said, “Your master should pay the excess of the iqṭâ’ revenue (fâdıl al-iqṭâ’).” (75)

(4) One Daylamite officer said as follows; “My kātib has the talent exceeding other kātibs for managing the cattle and the land property, or for purchasing what is needed. That is, he has no defect, but unfortunately he can not write and read.” (76)

Abû al-Hasan al-Qummi mentioned in the examples (1) and (2) was a type of the scribes who changed his master one after another using his talent of writing and calculation. And their right, against our supposition, was strong enough to repulse the claim of the excess of iqṭâ’ revenue, as expressed in the examples (2) and (3). The example (4), which was probably one of the laughable stories inherited among people, teaches us how kātib should be in this period. Taking these examples into consideration, we can understand that those who came to manage the iqṭâ’s were not only the unskilled ghîlman and wakîls as Miskawayh described in his Tajârib. The skilled kātibs, who had once served to the ‘âmîls or managed the land property, have joined in the management of iqṭâ’s under the new regime.

IV. Spread of Private Ḥîmâya

Then, how did the Iraqi society change by the establishment of iqṭâ’ system as I mentioned above? Miskawayh states as follows after the description of frequent exchange of iqṭâ’s:

And in several years the institution of the diwâns (al-ışâl) melted away, the old estimate of revenue disappeared, the irrigation (mashârib) was cor-
rupted, and an attempt at cultivation was given up. These brought tunnā' (pl. of ṭānī) into misfortune and poverty, and as a result they had to either leave the village, or endure injustice without getting redress, or take a means of surrendering (taslim) their land property (day'a) to the muqta‘ for escaping his illtreatment and coming to terms with him.\(^{(77)}\)

The ṭānī in the sentence quoted above, in the ‘Abbasid period, appeared as the owner of the small private estate (day’a) in the village, different from the land property of the high officials and soldiers. For example, one ṭānī in the Nahrawān complained to wazīr about the result of the land survey (22 jarībs), and after the re-survey it was recognized that his cultivated land was 21 jarībs and 1 qafīz.\(^{(78)}\) And in the early 10th century, tunnā’ and tenants (muzārī’ān) in Diyar Rabī’a accused the ‘āmil to the caliph of that he collected the due of 1/4 (ḥaqq al-tarbi‘), more than the ordinary due of 1/10 (ḥaqq al-a’shar), from their private estates.\(^{(79)}\) That is, the ṭānī had day’a as his private land (milk) paying to the government ḥaqq al-a’shar or ḥaqq bāyt al-māl.\(^{(80)}\) And also, Abū al-Fadl ‘Awn, Ma’mūn’s scribe, having marriage relation to the ṭānī in Baradān near Baghdād, came to be one of the notables (wujūḥ).\(^{(81)}\) According to this, the ṭānī was also the farmer of the upper class in the village society as well as he was the land-owner.\(^{(82)}\)

In the above quotation from Miskawayh, it was described that there were the ṭānīs who took a means of surrendering (taslim) their estates to the muqta‘, as well as the ṭānīs leaving their villages or enduring injustice. As for this taslim, the same Miskawayh mentions as the event of 348 A. H. (956 A. D.) that the Atrak destroyed the private land (amlāk) and protected people by means of recourse (talji‘a), and thus withheld the due of the state treasury.\(^{(83)}\) This makes clear that the taslim meant talji‘a, and the muqta‘s protected (hamū) the ṭānīs in return for taking recourse from them. That is to say, the muqta‘s took the protection (himāya) on the ṭānīs having forced them the recourse of their private land, about which Abū Shujā‘ states the following story:

One ṭānī said, “In the time of ‘Adud al-Dawla, my day’a was integrated into the iqṭā‘ of Asfār b. Kurdawayh. Though Asfār’s injustice was well known, ‘Adud al-Dawla permitted Asfār and Shahrākawayh al-‘Adawi everything that they wished, which brought me into devastation and made me unable to get what was enough to pay kharāj. On the
contrary, Asfar gathered more than 3,600 dirhams which I was forced to pay, and moreover he arrested me and spread out his hand over my agent. So, I had to remain in his prison for seven months. (84)

In this story, the muqta’s rule of peasant by force is described vividly. And also, in Muntazam of Ibn al-Jawzi, there is the account that people wanted protection (yalta'una) of Muhadhdhab al-Dawla, sahib al-Ba'tah. (85) And it is said that as a result of the abandonment of government control, the administration of the districts was entrusted to Daylamite officers (wjūh min khawass al-Daylam), who made of them their residence and private land (tu‘ma). (86) This also indicates the soldiers ruled villages privately on the basis of iqta' holding. In the latter half of the 10th century, chiefs (ra‘is) appeared in the villages and struggled each other. (87) I suppose this relates that the village society was being reformed after the fall of tannis as mentioned above and of dihqans who had already lost their privilege as the Arabs expanded their large landownership. (88)

Now, when in 345 A. H. (956 A. D.) Mu'izz al-Dawla decided to exile the Daylams, he sent one group of them, who were his followers (ashab), to Ahwaz, where his wazir al-Muhallabi appointed them to the districts. (89) Then Mu'izz al-Dawla did the same to the Atrak who had no iqta'. That is, he ordered tasbib of what they thought to be their right, in Waṣīt, Başra and Ahwaz. (90)

In the 'Abbāsid period, the tasbib was already used as the means of paying the stipends for ghilman, wakil and hāshiya (bodyguard), or the means of paying back the loans from merchants. (91) Khwarizmi explains the term tasbib is to apply one person's stipend to difficult tax, and its receiver (musabbab) should help the 'amil for collecting it. (92) In case of the above mentioned Atrak, the tasbib was also used as the meaning of that the Atrak, who were sent to Waṣīt, Başra and Ahwaz, took in cash or kind what was equivalent to their stipends. The shares they took everyday, according to Miskawayh, were 10 dirhams for ghulām, and 20 dirhams for naqib (officer). (93)

This tasbib, which was used also in the later period for tiding over the financial difficulty, was not different from iqta' grant actually. And the policy for the present made still stronger the soldier's rule over the districts as Miskawayh describes about the result of tasbib in 347 A. H. (958 A. D.):

Mu'izz al-Dawla had to increase the burden concerning the basic share
(uṣūl) of the Atrak. That is, they wanted the money of tasbīb to be paid lately for making a long stay there, and rendered the uṣūl to the merchandise which passed through there. And even if the money of tasbīb was made ready, they regarded it had no relation to the uṣūl, because if they did so, there remained indeed one dirham for them even after that preparation. The ‘āmils abandoned their right one by one for decreasing oppression, while the soldiers remained there for two or three years. As a result of it, the trade (tijāra) was brought into their bosom, and on what was carried to them neither tax nor burden was levied on the way. And more over, they exceeded the bound to talji‘a, ruled over the districts, overcame the ‘āmils, and protected the merchants.\(^{(94)}\)

According to this description, the Turkish soldiers tried to make a long stay in the district of tasbīb for increasing their profit, and for that purpose they extended their hands to the merchandise and protected also the merchants there. Though E. Ashtor and H. Busse, quoting the same source, conclude that the soldiers in the Buwayhid period came to take part in the trade by themselves,\(^{(95)}\) we should rather put stress on that the soldiers protected merchants in the districts. Because it means that the soldiers became to have the private protection (himāya) on the merchants as well as on the tānis by means of the forced talji‘a.

V. Struggle between Wāli and Muqta‘

When Mu’izz al-Dawla granted iqṭā’s in the Sawād, small land exempted from iqṭā’ was farmed out as the tax-contract (damān).\(^{(96)}\) The contractors (dāmins) were the influencials of officer and soldier, and the high officials (ašhāb al-darā‘i’) and the local officeholders (mutaṣārrifūn).\(^{(97)}\) For getting the self-interest, the formers opposed against the government by force, and the latter behaved more skillfully. We quote some examples about this.

In 336 A. H. (947–8 A. D.), having swept off the Baridis from Baṣra, Mu’izz al-Dawla farmed out this district to Sa’d b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān in common with Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Afwāzī.\(^{(98)}\) Then in the time of Bakhtiyār, ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn, who was mutawalli of al-Baṣra, was also the dāmin there.\(^{(99)}\) According to the contemporary sources, this is the last account of damān in Baṣra. On the
other hand, Ibn Baqiya, who was born at Awānā north of Baghdad, became to be the ḍāmin of Takrīt, and then in 361 A. H. (972 A. D.) was appointed to the wazīr of Bakhtiyār. And as for the district of Wāsīt, it is supposed that ḍāmins were appointed there intermittently from the time of Abū al-Qāsim al-Barīdī. In 359 A. H. (970 A. D.), Abū Qurra, who was born at Dayr Qunnā south of Baghdad and got influence in Wāsīt, became the ḍāmin of this district and gained the great wealth. But he neglected paying the contracted due to the government, which made increase the difficulty of the state treasury. And also the districts of Baṣra and Ahwāz were under the rule of Turkish soldiers as a result of the above mentioned tasbih. In response to such a reality, after the seventies of the 10th century, the tax-contract of ḍāmin became rare, and on contrary the tax-farming of wālī increased in number gradually. This led us to the supposition that the government changed its policy in this period, i. e. appointing walis anew on behalf of ḍāmins, but on which there remains no positive material to us.

Concerning the wālī and its office (wilāya), Hilāl al-Ṣabī states the following story dated 390 A. H. (1000 A. D.):

Abū Ṭāhir Yaghmā, who had the large iqṭā' in Badūrayā, was appointed to the wālī of this district, which brought him into the struggle with Qarrād b. al-Ladīd. At that time, the person who controlled things and managed problems as his steward (mudabbir) was his kātib, Abū al-Ḥasan Rishā al-Khālīdī. He controlled with Abū Ṭāhir and managed with Abū Naṣr Sābūr b. Ardashīr the problems which rose there. But, as the order was lost and increased the burden on muqta's and peasants (akara), Abū Ṭāhir decided to return the protection-fee (khafāra, himāya) he had already collected.

According to this, Abū Ṭāhir became wālī of Badūrayā on the basis of iqṭā' holding, and collected the protection-fee from the muqta's and peasants. As for Banū Thīmāl in Kūfā, it is said that 'Alyān b. Thīmāl established his rule over there for the first time when he was given himāya al-Kūfā. And also, 'Imrān b. Shāhīn, who was entrusted himāya of Baṭā'īh from 338 A. H. (949–60 A. D.) to 373 A. H. (983–4 A. D.), had the power as “a holder of the order” (ṣāhib al-nizām) as well as he held iqṭā' there. Generally speaking, the holder of himāya should defend the thughūr (frontiers) with his military force,
take care of collecting the materials, and protect the travellers and caravans.\(^{(108)}\) Accordingly, we can say the above quoted examples state exactly the character of \textit{wâli} as the holder of public \textit{himâya}.

But the appointment of such \textit{wâli} as this called out the reaction of the \textit{muqta}'s who had exercised the right of private \textit{himâya} over the peasants and merchants. Then, we quote some examples concerning the opposition or the struggle between \textit{wâli} and \textit{muqta}'s.

(1) In 372 A. H. (982–3 A. D.), Abû ‘Alî al-Hasan al-Râ’î was killed at Naşîbîn in Jazîra. He was \textit{wâli} of this district as well as \textit{‘amil} there.\(^{(109)}\)

(2) Al-Muqallad b. al-Musayyab al-‘Uqayli, who was entrusted the \textit{himâya} of Gharbî al-Furât, was granted Mawṣîl, Kûsa, Qaṣr Ibn Hubayra, and Jâmi‘ân (Hilla) as \textit{iqṭâ’} in 386 A.H. (996 A.D.). But, as the complaint of \textit{muqta}'s increased in Qaṣr Ibn Hubayra and its environs, he abandoned his \textit{iqṭâ’} and was content with taking protection-fee (\textit{rusûm al-himâya}).\(^{(110)}\)

(3) When Fâkhr al-Dawla conquered Dayl ‘Äqûl in 402 A. H. (1011–2 A.D.), three children of Thîmâl al-Khâfâjî came to him and farmed the \textit{himâya} of Saqî al-Furât. As a result of it, Banû ‘Uqayl was banished from this district.\(^{(111)}\)

(4) In 441 A. H. (1049–50 A.D.), al-Malîk al-Râhîm entrusted Dubays b. Mazyad the \textit{himâya} of Nahr al-Šîlâ and Nahr al-Fâqîl. But, as these districts were the \textit{iqṭâ’s} of Atrak stationed at Wâsiţ, the battle took place between Dubays and Atrak, and Dubays overcame them and confiscated their property.\(^{(112)}\)

In the example (1), though the reason of Abû ‘Alî’s killing is not stated, we can suppose with probability the existence of opposition against the \textit{wâli}. Banû ‘Uqayl in the example (3) was the Arabs who kept the nomadic life mainly in the north Iraq, and al-Muqallad in the example (2) was also from this Banû ‘Uqayl. It is not clear whether Banû ‘Uqayl in Saqî al-Furât was granted \textit{iqṭâ’} or not. But in Mawṣîl, they were granted \textit{iqṭâ’} in 377 A.H. (987–8 A.D.),\(^{(113)}\) and amîr Muḥammad b. al-Musayyab of this tribe was also granted Jazîra Ibn ‘Umar, Naşîbîn and other districts as \textit{iqṭâ’} in 380 A.H. (920–1 A.D.).\(^{(114)}\)

Anyhow, from these examples we can conclude that the \textit{muqta’s} regarded the appointment of \textit{wâlîs} as invasion to their right of private \textit{himâya} which was the basis of their profit. As for the five examples including the one of Abû Ṭâhîr Yaghmâh mentioned above, they all attribute to the age of the later
Buwayhids. But to the great amirs after 'Aḍud al-Dawla, there remained no political power for putting down these struggles between wālī and muqta'ī. The Saljuqids, the next ruler of Iraq, succeeded the Buwayhid iqṭāʾ as it was,\(^{(111)}\) the historical relation of which to the latter should be re-examined carefully taking into consideration the problem of this himāya.
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