CONTENTS

Special Issue
History of Islamic Science:
From the Perspective of the Characteristics of Players in Scientific Activities

Historia Scientiarum is the international journal of the **History of Science Society of Japan.** The Society, founded in April 1941, aims to advance research in all aspects of the history of science and technology from ancient times to the present. It publishes two major journals: *Historia Scientiarum* and a Japanese quarterly journal *Kagakusi Kenkyu*. *Historia Scientiarum* was formerly titled as *Japanese Studies in the History of Science*, established in 1962, and renamed the present title in 1980. It is published three times a year, and contains articles, notes, documents, and reviews, written in English, French, or German.
http://wwwsoc.nii.ac.jp/jshs/historiascientiarum/

Information for Contributors

Manuscripts and Style
Historia Scientiarum invites original contributions on all aspects of the history of science, technology, and medicine.
1. The journal accepts manuscripts for "articles," "notes," "documents," or "reviews."
2. Manuscripts should be written in English, French, or German.
3. The text, including footnotes and references, should not normally exceed 12,000 words.
4. The text should be prepared in an electronic form and formatted as a text file or a Word file. Those who wish to use other formats should consult the Editor.
5. Place an asterisk (*) on the right side of the author's name, and put the author's affiliation after another asterisk at the bottom of the first page.
6. Figures and tables should be prepared separately from the text with their proper locations indicated in red on printouts.
7. The article should contain an abstract of about 200 words as well as five key words.
8. Please mark clearly for the typesetter special fonts, mathematical notations, chemical formulae, and characters that cannot be expressed by author's personal computer.
9. Notes and references should preferably be compiled as footnotes rather than endnotes. Use superscripts for the numbering of notes and references. *Historia Scientiarum* recommends the conventions of the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. The following are examples:
 [1]Lewis Pyenson, "Imperium in Imperio: The Natural History of Natural Knowledge," *Historia Scientiarum*, 10 (2000): 1−15.
 [2]Mary Jo Nye, *Before Big Science: The Pursuit of Modern Chemistry and Physics, 1800−1940* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), pp. 26−27.
 [3]Masao Watanabe, *Nihonjin to Kindai Kagaku: Seiyo eno Taio to Kadai* (Japanese and Modern Science: Reactions to the West and Their Problems) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1976), p. 59.

Submission
1. A digital file as attached to an e-mail should be sent to: kagakushi@bunken.co.jp
2. Please inform the contributor's email address as well as postal address.
3. Members of the History of Science Society of Japan are able to submit manuscripts with no charge. Non-members from outside Japan who wish to submit manuscripts will be charged a publishing fee of 10,000 yen. Invited contributors may submit manuscripts with no charge.
4. The manuscript will be reviewed normally by two referees before the Editorial Committee makes decisions for publication.
5. The copyright of articles, notes, documents, and reviews published in *Historia Scientiarum* belongs to the History of Science Society of Japan. The authors who wish to publish in other journals or books their articles, notes, documents, or reviews that have been published in *Historia Scientiarum* must request permission from the Editor in advance.

Proofs
The first proofs will be sent to the author for typographical or other minor corrections. The authors will have to bear costs that may arise from introducing any additional revisions.

Pdf file
A pdf file of the printed version of the paper will be offered to the author. Offprints will not be provided to the author for free of charge. If the author wishes, offprints will be made and sent to the author at the author's request and cost.

Recruitment of Intellectuals in an Early Islamic Society Mainly in the Buwayhid Period

Retsu HASHIZUME*

Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between intellectuals and the rulers in reference to securing human resources. Intellectuals made use of their specialised disciplines and skills to serve the caliphs and warlords, but they also often served outside their own areas of specialisation. Thus, the act of gathering intellectuals, providing allowances, protecting them and supporting their work meant that the rulers, when they encountered political, diplomatic or administrative needs, were able to use the abilities of specialists both within and outside their fields of specialisation and their personal connections to address the issues they were facing.

And this paper indicates that the *majlis* were used to secure such human resources. It was a place or an opportunity where monarchs, high officials, academics with various specialisations and other influential people gathered, discussed specific topics, indulged in table-talk and exchanged information. In this way, talented people were found and recruited.

The results of this paper were obtained by deciphering historical materials such as chronicles, biographies, and anecdotes. Much of the information on the relationship between intellectuals and rulers preserved in various historical materials may not yet be available. This paper provides a starting point for collecting such information.

Keywords: Buwayhid Dynasty, court, intellectuals, *majlis*, *munāẓara*

---

1.   Introduction

This paper examines the relationship between intellectuals and the ruler or ruling class in reference to securing human resources. In particular, we examine the period of the Buwayhid Dynasty, during which the power of the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate declined and that of the warlords rose throughout the ʿAbbāsid empire. It is not hard to imagine that these rising warlords would try to secure human resources with a talent for military or administrative affairs. In general, however, for the early Islamic period, we do not yet know how caliphs and amīrs secured talented staff, with the exception of military slaves. Here, we focus on the Buwayhid Dynasty, which ruled in the tenth and eleventh centuries,

* Chiba Institute of Science, Faculty of Pharmacy.

that is, during the age of the warlords under the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate, and demonstrate how talented individuals were found during this time, according to sources. Here, we limit the discussion to the intellectuals who had a relationship with the warlords in the process of performing administration or study, as an instance of this particular theme.

2.   Previous Studies

The relationship between intellectuals and rulers in this context is probably best understood as a case of the patron–client relationship. Brentjes indicates in detail how the patronage worked for people engaging in mathematics in Islamicate society and with what outcomes.[1] She focuses on the time period from the eighth to the eighteenth centuries, studying the Buwayhid Dynasty in great detail. Two main considerations led her to focus on that period. The first is the abundance of historical material available for the study of patronage among intellectuals. The second is the existence of two close studies of patronage in the Buwayhid era, namely, Mottahedeh's monograph and Berggren's unpublished study.

Mottahedeh examines the various relationships of patronage that were built between individuals and families under the Buwayhids, and how those relationships that were built out of an oath of allegiance (*bayʿa*) were formed from three central elements: benefits, vows and gratitude.[2] However, Mottahedeh does not specifically note whether a similar oath of allegiance was made between rulers and mathematicians because he is focused on examining patronage relationships in the military and state administration.[3]

Berggren examines the Buwayhid patronage of mathematics in several perspectives, describing the complexity of the network formed by monarchs and administrators, on the one hand, and the scholars and instrument makers they patronised, on the other. He also describes how passionately officials at the Buwayhid court supported developments in mathematics.[4]

Another work of Brentjes has recently been published under the title *Teaching and*

---

[1] S. Brentjes, "Patronage of the mathematical sciences in Islamic societies, structure and rhetoric, identities, and outcomes," in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Mathematics*, eds. Eleanor Robson and Jacqueline Stedall (Oxford U.P., 2009), pp. 301–327. As for the definition of the term "Islamicate" used here, refer to Hodgson's book (She does not, however, refer to his book). Hodgson said that 'Islamicate' would refer not directly to the religion, Islam, itself, but to the social and cultural complex historically associated with Islam and the Muslims, both among Muslims themselves and even when found among non-Muslims (Marshall Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, 3 vols. [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974], vol, 1, p. 59). It seems that she uses this term to solve the problem of evaluating the work of scientific research carried out in the Islamic world as "Arabic science" or "Islamic science."

[2] R. Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 50–93.

[3] Brentjes, "Patronage of the mathematical sciences," pp. 305–306.

[4] Brentjes, "Patronage of the mathematical sciences," pp. 321–322. I have not referred to Berggren's work cited by Brentjes. It was not clear from my research whether any of the studies described by her as "Berggren, J. Lennart, 'Patronage' unpublished" are currently available. Therefore, Berggren's views are presented based on Brentjes' summary.

Learning the Sciences in Islamicate Societies (800–1700). While the article mentioned above deals only with mathematics, this book extends the area of study to the sciences. In Chapter 2, how scientific knowledge was exchanged in the patron-client relationship in royal courts or in the private residences of nobles and high officials is described.[5] However, because she focuses on teachers and students, the main agents of the transfer of scientific knowledge, the patron's own intent and purpose for providing an opportunity for education in scientific knowledge are not considered.

When the relationship between a ruler and an intellectual is considered relative to patronage, we must provide an account of what intellectuals were able to do through financial or emotional support and what kind of favourable treatment they could receive on earth. Likewise, we must determine the purpose for which rulers, dignitaries and men of means gave their support to intellectuals. Here, we reconsider studies that examine the intentions of the ruling class in supporting intellectuals and scholars and in encouraging the arts.

Kabir states, 'The patronage extended by many of the Buwayhid Amīrs to men of learning and their generally liberal views, particularly because they were Shīʿites encouraged much notable scientific and literary activity.'[6] Kabir does not consider why the dominant Shīʿite faith of the Buwayhid Dynasty should be linked to the patronage of intellectuals by rulers and the powerful. However, it is certain that the Buwayhid Dynasty brought encouragement and support to academic and cultural activities as the influence of the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate government faded, as it lost its financial base. Kabir cites ʿAḍud al-Dawla's devotion to learning, as it is shown in historical materials,[7] deducing that the academic preferences of the given ruler could be directly linked to support granted to intellectuals. That is, patronage was dispensed for personal reasons.[8]

Hartung deals with rulers' patronage of jurists. He notes, 'Patronage was the common means of binding religious scholars to the ruler,' and argues that the reason that rulers provided patronage to jurists was to seek their protection and support in their pursuit of absolute authority, to resemble a caliph within their domains.[9]

[5] S. Brentjes, *Teaching and Learning the Sciences in Islamicate Society (800–1700)* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2018), pp. 33–66.

[6] M. Kabir, *The Buwayhid Dynasty of Baghdad (334/946–447/1055)* (Calcutta: Iran Society, 1964), p. 168.

[7] For example, *Muntaẓam* of Ibn al-Jawzī related the following:
ʿAḍud al-Dawla always preferred studies and scholars, and he gave allowances to jurists, writers and preachers. For this reason, people wanted to study. He also made it a rule to be involved in learning. His memorandum stated that he would donate 20,000 dirhams as a *ṣadaqa* after all of Euclid's problems were solved and 50,000 dirhams would be donated after reading Abū ʿAlī Naḥwī's book was finished'. (Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-Muntaẓam fī Taʾrīkh al-Mulūk wa al-Umamʾ*, vols. 5–10 (Ḥaydarābād, 1358H), vol. 7, p. 115.)

[8] Kabir, The Buwayhid Dynasty of Baghdad, p. 171.

[9] Jan-Peter Hartung, "Enacting the Rule of Islam: On courtly patronage of religious scholars in pre- and early modern times," in *Court Cultures in the Muslim World: Seventh to nineteenth centuries*, eds. Albrecht Fuess and Jan-Peter Hartung (London: Routledge, 2011), pp. 295–325 (p. 299).

Gutas assessed the intent of the early 'Abbāsid caliphs to support translations and academic study, revealing the basis that such support provided them the means to create ideological claims against their adversaries. For example, al-Manṣūr, the second 'Abbāsid caliph, promoted the translation of Zoroastrian texts and astrology books to create grounds that would justify the rule of the 'Abbāsid Dynasty with the help of Zoroastrian ideology of the Sāsānid Empire.[10]

Thus, it is concluded that the patronage that rulers exercise in favour of intellectuals stems from the rulers' own personal preferences for the sciences, their own self-assessment as enlightened monarchs, and their intent to acquire greater legitimacy or prestige for their rule. Of course, it is clear that patronage is the result of such reasons. However, in attempts to attract intellectuals to their royal palaces and pavilions, to discuss academic, political and other subjects with them, to protect the intellectuals who gathered there and to provide them with allowances, there was the likely intention to seek out capable individuals and assign them various roles. The relationship between rulers and intellectuals is discussed below in relation to securing human resources.

In the early Islamic era, there was no recruitment system for human resources. The first such system that focused on talented people was the Niẓāmiyya Institute (*madrasa*), founded by Niẓām al-Mulk (1018−1092), the Vizier of two Great Seljūk Sulṭāns, Alp Arslān and Malik Shāh. This institution was established to nurture human resources of a specific legal school (*Shāfiʿī Madhhab*) and to encourage them to participate in government.[11] Following this model, *madrasas* were established in numerous places, developing a deep relationship with local rulers and supplying many trained and capable individuals as resources to the existing governments. However, this system did not exist during the Buwayhid period. Instead, the Buwayhid rulers, like other Islamic rulers before the appearance of the Niẓāmiyya Institute, relied on local elites and their relatives or military slaves (*mamlūk*). The existence of mamlūk has drawn much attention, with studies produced by Crone, Pipes and others, as well as by Sato, Shimizu and others in Japan.[12] However, no research has focused closely on the appointment of civil and

---

[10] D. Gutas, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early 'Abbāsid Society (2nd−4th/8th−10th centuries)* (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 28−60. He also breaks down the patrons who supported the translation movement by social class and lists them, but does not discuss the specific reasons why each group supported the movement; see Gutas, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture*, pp. 121−136.

[11] G. Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges: Institutions of Learning in Islam and the West* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh U. P., 1981), p. 32; C. E. Bosworth, "Niẓām al-Mulk," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam New Edition*, ed. C. E. Bosworth (Leiden: Brill, 1995), vol. 8, pp. 69b−73a (pp. 71b−72a).

[12] P. Crone, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (London: Cambridge U.P., 1980); D. Pipes, *Slave Soldiers and Islam: The Genesis of a Military System* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981); T. Sato, *Mamlūk: The Rulers in the Islamic Society Came from Pagan World* (Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press, 1991) (in Japanese); K. Shimizu, *Slave Soldiers, Bureaucrats and the People: Iraqi Society during the Disintegration of the 'Abbāsid Dynasty* (Tokyo: Yamakawa-Shuppansha Ltd, 2005) (in Japanese).

administrative officials, and only Bowens' monograph,[13] which introduces historical sources, can be cited in this connection.

In the following sections, therefore, we examine how the Buwayhids recruited non-military personnel. Particular attention is given to the recruitment of human resources through patronage relationships.

3.   Opportunities and Methods for the Recruitment of Human Resources

Prior to the appearance of the Niẓāmiyya Madrasa, no institutions existed that were designed to systematically develop men of letters and bureaucrats. How did rulers find and recruit such people? In the Buwayhid Dynasty, in many cases, existing bureaucrats were brought to service adopted as they were, or influential locals and their children were adopted. In addition, to determine a greater diversity of human resources, it is thought that rulers made use of the connections of the intellectuals who were already gathered at their court and in the residences of influential vassals. The following text[14] comes from *Tartīb*, a chronicle of jurists belonging to the Mālikī School of Law:

> ①Abū ʻAbd Allāh al-Azdī and others said that: ʻAḍud al-Dawla Fanākhusraw ibn Yazīd[15] al-Daylamī always preferred the intellectuals. His *majlis* had many scholars (*ʻulamāʼ*)^{α} versed in all disciplines. Most of them were jurists and theologians. In that place meetings were often held to discuss various issues (*li-munāẓarat majālis*).^{β} At the time, Bishr ibn al-Ḥusayn was the chief judge under ʻAḍud al-Dawla. One day ʻAḍud al-Dawla said to Bishr, ʻthere are many *ʻulamāʼ*'s in this *majlis*,^{γ} but there is no person who belongs to the people of corroborating (*ahl al-ithbāt*), namely *ahl al-ḥadīth* (the adherents to the *ḥadīth*), to support that group.ʼ Then his judge Bishr said, ʻRather, they are the people of obedience (*taqlīd*) and traditions (*riwāya*); they are those who believe in one fact and in its opposite. I do not know who supports this group.ʼ He began to criticise those people and praise Muʻtazila. Then ʻAḍud al-Dawla said to him, ʻThere must be a representative of any school (*madhhab*) in the world. Find someone who can argue. I will write a letter in order to invite him to our *majlis*.ʼ^{δ} As he made this decision such, the Judge said, ʻPeople have told me that in the city of Baṣra, there are two intellectuals: an old intellectual, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Bāhilī, who belongs to the tradition of Abū Bakr Ibn Mujāhid, and a young intellectual known as Ibn al-Bāqillānī̄ʼ. Then the king (ʻAḍud al-Dawla) wrote to his subordinate from his place in the town of Shīrāz, and he commanded those

---

[13] H. Bowen, *The Life and Times of ʻAlī ibn ʻĪsā: ʻThe Good Vizierʼ* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1928).

[14] All underlines in the quoted texts were written by the author of this paper.

[15] It seems to be mis-transcribing what should be read as "Buwayh".

intellectuals to be brought to him, and that they be given the proper amount allowance. When the king's letter reached them, Bāhilī and some of his disciples said, 'They are sinful heretics because of the Daylams among the al-Rāfiḍites (repudiators). Therefore, we cannot walk on their carpet. This (favourable treatment or the payment of allowances) is not the purpose of a king. Rather, it is said that the *majlis* of king is occupied by the holders of the ink jars (*aṣḥāb al-maḥābir*). If the *majlis* belongs to Allāh, I shall depart for it'. The Judge (Ibn al-Bāqillānī) said, 'I said to them that Ibn Kilāb and al-Muḥāsibī and their contemporaries said that "Ma'mūn is a sinner, and no one wishes to attend his *majlis*".ᵉ As a result, Ma'mūn exiled Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal to Ṭarsūs, and then, something you all know happened. However, if they (the intellectuals) had argued with Ma'mūn, they would have prevented him from acting in this way (falling into heresy), and Ma'mūn would have found the grounds on which such intellectuals relied. My master! You are going to follow the same path as them. The same thing that happened to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal will happen to the jurists, and people will preach the theory that the Qur'ān was created, denying that they see God. Even if you don't go to the king, I will go. Bāhilī said, 'Allāh revealed this in your mind. Go!' So, I went to Shīrāz with the king's messenger. After arriving at Shīrāz, I asked how to visit the king's court, I was given the following response: On Fridays, a person wearing a *Ṭaylasān* garment can visit the king's court, for there will be a forum of discussion (*majlis munāẓara*) in the presence of the king.'ᶻ ⋯ Ibn al-Bāqillānī had been with king ('Aḍud al-Dawla) until he entered Baghdād. The king sent his son to Ibn al-Bāqillānī and commanded him to teach his son the way of the people of the sunna (*ahl al-sunna*).�η Ibn al-Bāqillānī wrote a book called *al-Tamhīd* for the prince, and Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī and the people of Sunna in Shīrāz read it.[16]

This passage describes the process by which Ibn al-Bāqillānī came to serve 'Aḍud al-Dawla. The word *majlis*[17] appears in the underlined parts denoted by α, β, γ, δ, ε and ζ. The other four underlined parts simply denote a gathering of people,[18] but it should be

---

[16] Al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, *Tartīb al-Madārik wa Tarqīb al-Masālik li-Ma'rifat A'lām Madhhab Mālik*, 8 vols. (Tūnis: Maṭba'a Faḍāla, 1981–83), vol. 7, pp. 51–53, 57.

[17] Cf. ED. "MADJLIS," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam New Edition*, ed. C. E. Bosworth (Leiden: Brill, 1995), vol. 5, pp. 1031a-1033a. The word *majlis* has the basic meaning of "a place to sit" and is derived from this to mean "to sit" or "to hold a session." This common noun *majlis* appears in all historical materials, and has been used to refer to various situation where the people are gathering, such as royal court, a gathering of scholars, or a large number of people holding a meeting or banquet. This paper focuses on the use of *majlis*, which has a variety of meanings, especially in the context of academic, religious and political discussions.

[18] Joel L. Kraemer, *Humanism in the Renaissance of Islam: The Cultural Revival during the Buyid Age* (Leiden: Brill, 1986, rep. 1992), pp. 55–56.

noted that β and ζ indicate forums to discuss specific subjects. This is because the word *munāẓara*[19] is used in conjunction with the word *majlis*. In particular, the underlined part of ζ indicates that in the meeting being discussed, only those specifically designated by an article of clothing, the *Ṭaylasān*, which was worn by the outstanding *'ulamā'* or *ashyākh*,[20] could participate; this forum occurred in the presence of 'Aḍud al-Dawla every Friday. The phrases *majlis al-munāẓara* and *majlis al-naẓar* meant, according to Makdisi, 'the meeting place for disputation' or 'regular sessions of disputation.'[21] In addition to the places described in the *Tartīb*, the term *munāẓara* appears to refer to disputations and discussions between different sects and religions.[22] Thus, this invitation constituted a request to meet to dispute religious issues.[23]

Likewise, this passage shows the event that led to the invitation of Ibn al-Bāqillānī by the kings' *majlis*. When 'Aḍud al-Dawla points out that no one could represent the ideas of the traditionalists in his *majlis*, the judge Bishr informs him of the existence of such a representative (namely, Ibn al-Bāqillānī) as hearsay; then, 'Aḍud al-Dawla orders his servants to bring Ibn al-Bāqillānī to his *majlis*. Although it does not appear to have been common to record in such detail the process by which someone entered the service, from this case, we can conclude that information that is circulating on talented people was provided to the ruler through the rumours heard by and personal connections of *majlis* participants, and those heard of are invited to the *majlis*.

Many intellectuals gathered at 'Aḍud al-Dawla's court, and he patronised them. The following passage offers another glimpse of the interior of his court:

---

[19] The word *munāẓara* takes the form III of gerund of the Arabic verb *naẓara* (to look at, to consider), which means "consideration" and "investigation". According to Lane's Dictionary, this word is synonymous with *mujādala*, which means "the disputing respecting a question of science for the purpose of convincing the opponent, whether what he says be wrong in itself or not" (E. W. Lane, *Arabic–English Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1984), vol. 2, p. 2811). However, as shown in this paper, the term is not limited to "discussions in the scientific field" in a narrow sense, but can be considered to refer to a broad academic or political discussion. It is safe to assume that the word *naẓar* is used in the same sense as *munāẓara*. Cf. note 21 of this paper.

[20] Hilāl al-Ṣābi', *Rusūm dār al-Khilāfa*, ed. Mīkhā'īl 'Awwād (Bayrūt: Dār al-Rā'id al-'Arabī, 1986 [2nd ed.]), p. 91 n. 2.

[21] Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges*, p. 11, 13, 110. It is clear from the following quotation that *majlis al-naẓar* is such a forum for discussion.

On every Friday night, Amīr 'Alā' al-Dawla set up a forum for discussion (*majlis al-naẓar*), which was attended by intellectuals of different classes. Our master Abū 'Alī (Ibn Sīnā) was one of the participants. (Al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rīkh al-Ḥukamā'*, ed. Julius Lippert [Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903], p. 421)

The last king that Ibn Sīnā served, 'Alā' al-Dawla of the Kākwayhid Dynasty, also seemed to have held a forum for various intellectuals on Friday.

[22] Al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, *Tartīb*, vol. 7, pp. 50, 57–67.

[23] Al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, *Tartīb*, vol. 7, p. 58. Although not actually done, there are reports that Ibn al-Bāqillānī and the astronomer 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ṣūfī are about to start a debate (*munāẓara*) over the pros and cons of astrology.

②Allowances were given to ascetics, jurists, exegetes, theologians, traditionalists, genealogists, poets, grammarians, metricians, physicians, astrologers, arithmeticians and engineers. And for the best of the philosophers and sages, <u>a place in the palace of ʿAḍud al-Dawla near his seat the *majlis* was</u> prepared. It was a room specially allocated for chamberlains. They (the above-mentioned allowance recipients) often gathered in the room, where they argued in safety from the obstacles of the unenlightened and vulgar. They were assigned allowances and honoraria. In this way, various subjects that had been on the wane came alive, and scholars who had been scattered in all directions returned. The young wished to receive education and the old wished to instruct, and the gifted were inspired to study. As a result, the market for the talented was buoyant, where there had previously been none. An enormous sum of money from the treasury was spent on those who needed it as a charity (*ṣadaqa*), whether it benefitted Muslims or non-Muslims.[24]

This quotation shows that a special place was prepared for intellectuals in the palace (See the underlined part). It also clearly shows that financial support for them was given by ʿAḍud al-Dawla. Following this, both ʿAḍud al-Dawla and Buwayhid rulers and high officials of the periods before and after him provided opportunities for intellectuals to gather and discuss.[25] By creating these opportunities, providing financial support and encouraging the residence of intellectuals, the rulers created a situation in which people with information, communication and talent could always be present. It is believed that those who played a necessary role in the management of the government were found among this group that rulers gathered around them.

Thus, the *majlis* offered by rulers and high officials functioned as a means of recruiting human resources.

Two other examples of ways to secure human resources can also easily be found. One is the recruitment of foreign envoys. In the year 342/953–4, peace was established between the Sāmānid general Ibn Muḥtāj and the Buwayhid monarch Rukn al-Dawla. At the time of the peace agreement, the mathematician Abū Jaʿfar al-Khāzin was an envoy

[24] Miskawayh, *Tajārib al-Umam fī Taʿāqib al-Himam*, in *The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate*, vols. 1–2, ed. Amedroz (Oxford: Brackwell, 1921), vol. 2, p. 408. Some technical terms are based on Amedroz's translation. cf. H. F. Amedroz, *The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate*, 6 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1921), vol. 5, p. 447.

[25] Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, *Kitāb al-Imtāʿ wa al-Muʾānasa*, 3 vols., ed A. Amīn, A. Al-Zayn (al-Qāhira: al-Hayʿa al-ʿĀmma li-Quṣūr al-Thaqāfa, 2002), vol. 1, p. 19 (in case of Ibn Saʿdān vizier of Ṣamṣām al-Dawla), vol. 3, pp. 212–213 (in case of al-Muhallabī vizier of Muʿizz al-Dawla); Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ al-Maʿrūf bi-Irshād al-Arīb ilā Maʿrifat al-Adīb*, 7 vols., ed. Margoliouth (London: Luzac, 1923–1931), vol. 6, pp. 258–260 (in case of ʿAḍud al-Dawla), Al-Tanūkhī, *Nishwār al-Muḥāḍara wa Akhbār al-Mudhākara*, ed. ʿAbbūd al-Shālijī, 8 vols. (Bayrūt: Dār Ṣādir, 1971), vol. 1, p. 69 (in case of al-Muhallabī).

from the Sāmānid Dynasty.[26] It is notable that a mathematician was chosen to act as a diplomatic envoy. No detailed biographical information exists on al-Khāzin or his skill as an envoy, simply the two facts that he was from Khurāsān and was an adherent of al-Ṣābiʾan belief. According to one source, after the peace negotiations, he lectured on mathematics and astronomy with his counterpart, Rukn al-Dawla, and his vizier Abū al-Faḍl Ibn al-ʿAmīd.[27] According to al-Tawḥīdī, al-Khāzin was recruited because Rukn al-Dawla valued his abilities and hoped to have his vassals learn part of his scholarship.[28] However, he had been on the enemy's side until just before the conclusion of the peace negotiations. His recruitment would increase the risk of espionage. However, Rukn al-Dawla may have given priority to his connections and abilities, even in the face of such risk. In addition to this, al-Tawḥīdī relates that people paid attention to what al-Khāzin brought. It is not known what this was, but because it is discussed separately from reports of his learning, it may be right to think that it regards information or personal connections that were useful to Rukn al-Dawla.[29]

Another example follows below. Abū al-Ḥusayn Ibn Dankhā may have been the private physician of Bahāʾ al-Dawla ibn ʿAḍud al-Dawla. One day, Bahāʾ al-Dawla appointed Ibn Dankhā as the administrator of Baṣra. Qifṭī stated the following:

> ③He is the physician and Kātib, one of the most distinguished physicians of high-ranking individuals during the Buwayhid period. He often accompanied the king on expeditions and administered Baṣra as a clerk. He became well known as an administrator.[30]

This quotation indicates how a physician was selected to act as an administrative officer. It is probable that the Bahāʾ al-Dawla entrusted Ibn Dankhā, who had served as a physician, with the administration of Baṣra due to his administrative prowess.

These two examples indicate that intellectuals can play a role outside their own fields of specialisation. For al-Khāzin, we have no information on the position he held

[26] Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, vol. 2, p. 154.

[27] E. Calvo, "Khāzin: Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Khāzin al-Khurāsānī," in *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Astronomers*, eds. Thomas Hockey et al. (New York: Springer, 2007), pp. 628−629; Aydın Sayılı, *The Observatory in Islam and its Place in the General History of the Observatory* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988 [second ed.]), pp. 103−104.

[28] Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, *Mathālib al-Wazīrayn: Akhlāq al-Ṣāḥib Ibn ʿAbbād wa Ibn al-ʿAmīd*, ed. Ibrāhīm al-Kīlānī (Dimashq: Dār al-Fikr, 1961), p. 228.

[29] Al-Tawḥīdī said that people paid attention to the "thing" he brought. It is not known what this "thing" is, but given that it has been taken up separately from the tales of his learning, it is not so wrong to think that it has given rise to information or personal connections useful to Rukn al-Dawla. (Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, *Mathālib*, p. 228.)

[30] Al-Qifṭī, *Ḥukamāʾ*, p. 402. However, there is a record that a person with the same name was killed in the year 352/962, but the relationship between them is not clear. cf. Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, vol. 2, p. 199.

and the treatment he received under the Sāmānid Dynasty. However, judging from his diplomatic role as a diplomat, it can be concluded that he was trusted in the Sāmānid court or that his talent and personal connections were relied upon.

In this section, we consider the opportunities and the means through which rulers recruited intellectuals. They invited competent intellectuals and gave them various roles by means of opportunities described as *majlis*, where rulers and intellectuals gathered, discussed pressing issues, conversed and dined with each other, and obtained information through the personal connections of others who also participated at those functions. In addition, when intellectuals were granted an audience with a ruler as a diplomatic envoy or when they joined expeditions, they could be promoted by the impression their abilities made on the rulers. Before the institution of the *madrasa* system (that is, the creation and spread of publicly run schools for training intellectuals), the recruitment of human resources was greatly influenced by the direct and indirect transmission of information to rulers on talented people. Therefore, the rulers may have sought to secure capable personnel by creating or participating actively in intellectual opportunities, such as the *majlis*, where such information could be easily gathered.

4.   Activities of Intellectuals Outside Their Field of Specialisation

At the end of the previous section, examples were given of a mathematician who was selected to be a diplomat and of a doctor who was appointed to be an administrative official. Both cases describe the selection of persons who were expected to play an active role in areas outside their areas of specialisation. Although there have been few such examples, they do appear in historical material. In this section, we consider three cases in which intellectuals played a role outside their field of expertise. In this way, we show that rulers interact with intellectuals and support their activities not only because of their personal academic preferences and to support their own legitimacy but also for a pragmatic purpose, that is, to secure talented people who can be used to play various roles in the government.

Let us take the case of Ibn al-Bāqillānī first, who figures in the first extract given.[31] As this text shows, Ibn al-Bāqillānī was a Mālikī jurist and Ashʿarī theologian who came to ʿAḍud al-Dawla's court for sectarian disputes (*munāẓara*). However, ʿAḍud al-Dawla expected him to do more than disputation. The underlined line *η* suggests that he was in charge of the education of ʿAḍud al-Dawla's son. It appears that one important role that an intellectual could play was to educate rulers and their children. In the case of Abū Jaʿfar al-Khāzin, as shown above, it was said that he taught mathematics to princes under Rukn al-Dawla's vizier Abū al-Faḍl Ibn al-ʿAmīd.[32] Ibn al-Bāqillānī was a Sunnī jurist and

---

[31] See Citation ① above.
[32] Calvo, "Khāzin", pp. 628–629; Sayılı, *The Observatory in Islam*, pp. 103–104.

theologian, so it would have been within his field of expertise to impart Sunnī law and theology to the children of the ruler. Later, he was sent to the Byzantine Empire as an envoy. This was an important role that was beyond the usual domain of the jurist, but he probably gained the trust of ʿAḍud al-Dawla enough to bear the heavy responsibility.

Tartīb narrates that Ibn al-Bāqillānī was dispatched to take up a theological dispute with the Byzantine Emperor. When the emperor asked the opinion of Muslims about ʿĪsā b. Maryam (Jesus), Ibn al-Bāqillānī answered, 'He is the spirit of God, His word, His servant, His prophet and His apostle. Like Adam, who God created from dust and when He said, "be" then he was certain.'[33] On the other hand, it should be noted that his role was to solve the problem of how to treat asylum seekers from Byzantium to the Buwayhid court. This role is not described in the narration of his life in the *Tartīb*, but it can be indirectly deduced from information contained in *Dhayl Tajārib al-Umam* of al-Rūdhrāwarī. In *Dhayl*, Ibn Shahrām, who was also dispatched to the Byzantine Empire, described the contents of the negotiation. His remarks refer frequently to the activities of Ibn al-Bāqillānī and confirm the terms of the agreement on asylum. It is unknown whether the embassy was entirely entrusted to Ibn al-Bāqillānī, but it does appear that he was responsible for negotiating the conditions.[34] The reason why Ibn al-Bāqillānī was chosen to be a diplomat is not specified, but it is probably because he participated in the discussions. Both the conduct of a theological dispute with Christians and that of negotiations regarding the treatment of asylum seekers require the participants to justify their positions and convince others. In that sense, Ibn al-Bāqillānī was the right person for the role.

Next is the case of al-Tanūkhī, the judge. Let us examine what kind of person he was and what he said:

> ④The narrative passed from al-Muḥassin (al-Tanūkhī) via ʿAlī ibn al-Muḥassin via al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī to al-Qazzāz.
> I was born in Baṣra on the night of Sunday, Rabīʿ I 26, 327 Hijrī (939). In 333 Hijrī (944–5) I first heard of the Ḥadīth. And my first assignment as a judge was in Qaṣr (ibn Ḥubayra) and Sūrā. I went there in succession to Abū al-Sāʾib ʿUtba ibn ʿUbayd Allāh in 349 Hijrī (940–1). Then, I was appointed by Caliph al-Muṭīʿ li-llāh the judge of ʿAskar Mukram, Īzaj and Rāmhurmuz, and then, I served as a judge in many places.[35]

Al-Tanūkhī served as a judge in various places. However, he is not primarily known

---

[33] Al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, *Tartīb*, vo. 7, p. 65.

[34] Al-Rūdhrāwarī, *Dhayl Tajārib al-Umam*, in *The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate*, vol. 3, ed. Amedroz (Oxford: Brackwell, 1921), pp. 28–33. It also suggests that the negotiations were for a territorial issue.

[35] Al-Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, vol. 5, pp. 19–20.

as a judge, but as the author of two great works, *Nishwār al-Muḥāḍara* and *Faraj baʿd al-Shidda*. These two contain various anecdotes that he had collected in various places; in particular, many of the anecdotes come from his participation in *majlis* and record those who were there with him. Thus, these two works are valuable because they describe *majlis* in detail. In fact, al-Tanūkhī writes that among the *majlis* that he participated in were those of al-Muhallabī, the vizier of the Buwayhid-ʿIrāqi regime.[36] He seems also to have served at the *majlis* of ʿAḍud al-Dawla.[37]

After he frequented the *majlis* of ʿAḍud al-Dawla, he was assigned a role outside his ordinary duties as a judge, namely, to read aloud the *khuṭba* at the wedding between the daughter of ʿAḍud al-Dawla and the Caliph al-Ṭāʾiʿ li-llāh. This role is considered to correspond to that of the go-between and witness to the marriage.[38] al-Tanūkhī, thus, seems to have been in charge of monitoring the relationship between the married pair after the wedding ceremony. The following sources clearly illustrate this role:

⑤We arrived in Baghdad. Then, ʿAḍud al-Dawla told me, Caliph al- Ṭāʾiʿ had alienated his daughter, who was married to him, and he did not approach her at all, which troubled ʿAḍud al-Dawla. He said to me (al-Tanūkhī), 'Go to the caliph, and since it is the wish of the daughter's mother, please tell him that we want him to keep our daughter close by. And beg him to consummate the marriage. Then things will return to the right way, and our concerns will be dispelled'. I replied, 'At your pleasure'. And I went back to my house to change into clothes for a visit to the caliph's court.[39]

ʿAḍud al-Dawla was concerned about his daughter's failure to win the caliph's favour. His proximity to the caliph had great political implications. He had married his daughter to Caliph al-Ṭāʾiʿ in the hope that she would bear his successor. If his daughter were to give birth to al-Ṭāʾiʿ's successor, ʿAḍud al-Dawla would have great power as a maternal relative. Therefore, the role that was assigned to al-Tanūkhī was very important. The fact that he was given this role would have much to do with his frequent attendance at ʿAḍud al-Dawla's *majlis*.

Last, we examine Ibn Sīnā, whose biography is known in great detail from his own writings and a biography written by his disciple al-Jūzjānī.[40] These texts indicate that in

---

[36] Al-Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, vol. 1, pp. 38–40, 54–56, 303; Yāqūt, *Irshād*, vol. 6, pp. 253–254.
[37] Al-Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, vol. 5, pp. 36, 85–88, 246, 267, 269; Yāqūt, *Irshād*, vol. 6, pp. 254.
[38] Hilāl al-Ṣābiʾ, *Rusūm*, pp. 138–139.
[39] Al-Tanūkhī, *Nishwār*, vol. 4, p. 100.
[40] Al-Qifṭī, *Ḥukamāʾ*, pp. 413–426; Ibn Sīnā, *al-Shifāʾ: al-Manṭiq 1 al-Madkhal*, ed. Qanawātī (al-Qāhira: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Amīriyya, 1952), pp. 1–4. Cf. W. E. Gohlman, *The Life of Ibn Sina: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1974), pp. 1–89.

his youth, Ibn Sīnā had excelled in various sciences, especially medicine and philosophy. He first served the Sāmānid king. The reason why Ibn Sīnā came to serve the royal palace was that the king's doctors conveyed Ibn Sīnā's reputation to him. Details of this follow:

> ⑥At that time, the ruler of Bukhārā was Nūḥ b. Manṣūr. He fell ill, and the doctors were struggling to cure him. The doctors had known me as someone who was devoted to studying, and they told Nūḥ of my reputation, asking me to come to the palace. So I went to Nūḥ and worked with the doctors to treat him.[41]

At that time, Ibn Sīnā was a young man, not yet 18 years old,[42] but his medical talents appear to have already been well known to many. In the text above, the word *majlis* does not appear, but nevertheless Ibn Sīnā was known: his reputation was transmitted by the doctors who had gathered around Nūḥ, which triggered his attendance, so it appears that his contacts among the doctors and other connections helped bring about his attendance at the court. Following this, Ibn Sīnā moved from one monarch to another, but it is not known what kind of roles he took on at their courts.[43]

Then, we learn that he served the Buwayhid–Jibāli regime in al-Rayy as a doctor. He came to be appointed vizier and took charge of the administration. The following is an excerpt from a long narration of this process, told by al-Jūzjānī:

> ⑦Then, our master (Abū ʿAlī Ibn Sīnā) went to al-Rayy and served Majd al-Dawla, the monarch of the Buwayhid–Jibāli regime, and his Empress Dowager, al-Sayyida. They read the writings brought by our master,[A] and they learned from these the extent of his abilities. At that time, Majd al-Dawla was suffering from an increase in black bile, and our master was engaged in his treatment.[B] He wrote *The Book of the Hereafter* (*Kitāb al-maʿād*) at al-Rayy. He stayed in al-Rayy until he left for Shams al-Dawla, after the killing of Hilāl b. Badr b. Ḥasanawayh and the withdrawal of Baghdād's troops. After that, resulting from various needs, our master went to Qazwīn, then to Hamadhān, and served Kadhbānawayh, and arranged his affairs.[C] Later, Shams al-Dawla had news of our master and brought him to his *majlis*.[D] The reason for this was that he had been suffering from the colic. Our master cured him,[E] and God allowed Shams al-Dawla to recover. Our master was given many robes of honour from his *majlis*,[F] and he stayed in the palace of Shams al-Dawla for 40 days and nights;

---

[41] Al-Qifṭī, *Ḥukamāʾ*, p. 416.
[42] Al-Qifṭī, *Ḥukamāʾ*, p. 416; Gohlman, *The Life of Ibn Sina*, pp. 34–39.
[43] Al-Qifṭī, *Ḥukamāʾ*, p. 417; Gohlman, *The Life of Ibn Sina*, pp. 40–43.

after becoming a boon companion (*nudamā'*), he returned to his residence. Later, the amīr (Shams al-Dawla) left for Qarmīsīn to fight against 'Anāz, and our master accompanied him. After that, they retreated towards Hamadhān. Then, <u>people asked our master to assume the position of vizier,</u>[G] and he accepted it. Later, <u>the army raised an uproar against our master and expressed concern about our master's attitude towards them. And they attacked the residence of our master and confined him and looted his servants and deprived him of his property. And they demanded the Amīr Shams al-Dawla kill our master.</u>[H] Although he refused to do this, he decided to expel our master from his domain to satisfy their demands. So, our master hid for 40 days in the mansion of Shaykh Abū Sa'd b. Dikhdūk. Following this, <u>Shams al-Dawla had a recurrence of colic, and he called in our master. Our master went to his majlis,</u>[I] the seat of Shams al-Dawla. The amīr asked for forgiveness with every word he could say. <u>Our master was engaged in his treatment,</u>[J] and during this time, he was treated with respect and reverence. Then, <u>the position of vizier was returned to him</u>[K].[44]

The above quotation indicates that Ibn Sīnā was called to the court as a doctor (A, I). However, although it has been thought that the reason his relationship with the monarchs drew closer was due to his medical treatment (B, E, J), he was often entrusted with government affairs as well (C, G, K). It should also be noted that, in relation to Shams al-Dawla, the *majlis* is the main body that determined that Ibn Sīnā be called, not Shams al-Dawla himself (D, F, G). It can be concluded, therefore, that Shams al-Dawla and his entourage decided to appoint Ibn Sīnā because the subject of the grant of the robe of honour (*khil'a*) is the *majlis* and, although the word *majlis* is not mentioned, Ibn Sīnā was asked to become the vizier by some means. Those who can decide to whom to entrust the role of a vizier of a state to another must be among those who are close to the monarch, such as close aides and powerful vassals.

No clear reason is given in historical material why the office of the vizier was entrusted to Ibn Sīnā. This is only conjecture, but one possible reason is that in his most important book, *al-Shifā'* (*The Book of Healing*), there is a chapter on political theory,[45] where he presents his political theory to Shams al-Dawla and his trusted vassals. In other words, a decision was made by Shams al-Dawla's administration to grant his political theories a chance and to entrust him to govern. He was well versed in a variety of subjects and may have been considered a suitable candidate to conduct government affairs. It should also be noted that his experience of having worked in several

[44] Al-Qiftī, *Ḥukamā'*, p. 419; Ibn Sīnā, *Manṭiq-Madkhal*, pp. 1–4; Gohlman, *The Life of Ibn Sina*, pp. 48–53.
[45] Ibn Sīnā, *al-Shifā': al-Ilāhiyyāt*, ed. Qanawātī ([al-Qāhira?,] n.d.), pp. 451–455.

governments may have been valued. In particular, this must have led to a familiarity with the circumstances of the various governments of the warlords, as a result of which his potential personal connections would have been valued.

The vizier's most important job may be to control the army and pay them their salaries, but Ibn Sīnā, who came from elsewhere and had no roots, was not up to this task, which caused the army displeasure, as a result of which they tried to kill him (H). He may have failed as a vizier not because of his lack of administrative abilities but because of his lack of an economic foundation.

As is clear from the case of Ibn Sīnā, intellectuals first entered the court based on their professional or academic abilities, but some then moved on to participate in government affairs due to their other abilities and the wishes of the monarchs and their aides. As shown for al-Khāzin, the fact that Ibn Sīnā had worked in several warlords' courts, was familiar with them and had possible personal connections with them may have been a factor in the imposition of this political role. It should also be noted that such persons were largely appointed by *majlis*, where monarchs, their close aides and various intellectuals were assembled.

5. Conclusion

This paper examines the relationship between scholars and intellectuals on the one hand and people in the ruling class, such as monarchs, on the other, from the viewpoint of securing human resources, through specific cases. Intellectuals made use of their specialised disciplines and skills to serve the caliphs and warlords, but they also often served outside their own areas of specialisation. Thus, the act of gathering intellectuals, providing allowances, protecting them and supporting their work meant that the monarchs, when they encountered political, diplomatic or administrative needs, were able to use the abilities of specialists both within and outside their fields of specialisation and their personal connections to address the issues they were facing. In other words, such appointments were intended not only to satisfy the ruler's individual need for knowledge or to enhance their prestige by protecting intellectuals but also to secure the use of potentially necessary human resources.

This paper also indicates that the *majlis* were used to secure such human resources. It was a place or an opportunity where monarchs, high officials, academics with various specialisations and other influential people gathered, discussed specific topics, indulged in table-talk and exchanged information. In this way, talented people were found and recruited.

During the period of the Buwayhid Dynasty, the backdrop for this paper, the particular religious sect to which the intellectuals belonged and their specialised fields were not considered when they were called and made use of in the political or

administrative fields. If an intellectual was competent, whether Sunnī or Shīʿī, that individual was entrusted with power. This trend may be a hallmark of the Buwayhid period. However, it is necessary to examine the pros and cons of this orientation by collecting the other cases of the period of the Buwayhid Dynasty as well as cases from other dynasties before and after this period, clarifying the relationships between intellectuals and monarchs in more detail.