

ART. XXVII.—*Three Years of Buwaihīd Rule in Baghdad, A.H. 389–393.* Being a fragment of the History of Hilāl-as-Šābī († A.H. 448) from a MS. in the Library of the British Museum (Add. 19,360). By H. F. AMEDROZ.

(Continued from p. 536, July Number, 1901.)

NOTE TO III (p. 523).

A notice of Khalaf b. Aḥmad is contained in Šafadi's *Wāfi bil-Wafayāt* (Paris, 2,064, 22*a*). The pedigree does not differ from that given by Dhahabi, but some further information is given about Khalaf, and on the authority of Yāqūt—presumably, therefore, from his *Mu'jam al-Udabā*. We are told that Khalaf was at one time a rationalist in doctrine, when he became notorious for his persecution of members of the contrary sect. And Yahya b. 'Ammāra, who was in *Sijistān* at the time, had to make his way to *Harāt* in the disguise of a woman.

[Šafadi also gives a notice of Yahya (B.M. Add. 23,359, 342*a*), and there calls him b. 'Ammār ash-Shaybāni an-Nihī. He says he was a strictly orthodox preacher, and a bitter opponent of the *Jahmiyya* sect (as to which see Shahrastāni, ed. Cureton, p. 60, Haarbrücker's translation, p. 89); that he was very popular; gave a course of public lectures on the entire *Qurān*; and that a second course was interrupted at *Sūra* 75 by his death, which occurred in 422 A.H.]

Later Khalaf became a follower of tradition, and then proceeded to persecute his late co-religionists. As an author, in addition to the huge work on the *Qurān*, which is here said to have consisted of one hundred and twenty volumes, he wrote a work on the interpretation of dreams, entitled *Tuḥfat al-Mulūk*. Whilst a prisoner of Maḥmūd of *Ghazna* he swallowed a stupefying draught, by which he deceived his custodians into the belief that he was dead, and he was placed in a coffin and removed by his attendants. Maḥmūd heard of it, and had him re-arrested. He tried the device again, but this time the Sultan had him placed in a closed coffin, and so caused his death.

V.

The campaign of Abu Ja'far al-Ḥajjāj against the Oqailid tribe and 'Alī b. Mazyad (fols. 80–88).

Ibn al-Athīr disposes of these eight folios in some ten lines, saying that al-Ḥajjāj called in the aid of the Khafājah tribesmen, whom he summoned from Syria, and that, after suffering a reverse at Bākarmā, he ended by defeating the enemy at Kūfa and pillaging their camp. The events which led up to this campaign were, briefly, as follows :—

In 381 the troops of Bahā ad-Daula under al-Ḥajjāj had taken Mosul from Abu adh-Dhawwād Muḥammad b. al-Musayyib, the Oqailid chief. He died in 386, whereupon his brothers al-Muqallad and 'Alī both claimed to succeed him, but the latter was preferred as the elder. Al-Muqallad, by gaining over some of the Dailamite troops under al-Ḥajjāj, managed with the help of 'Alī to retake Mosul from al-Ḥajjāj. It was then arranged between the brothers that al-Muqallad should be the ruler there, but that 'Alī should be represented by a deputy, and should share in the revenue. Further dissension followed between them up to 'Alī's death in 390. He was succeeded by a third brother, al-Ḥasan, who became reconciled to al-Muqallad.

On the death of al-Muqallad in 391 his minister, Abu'l-Ḥusain 'Abd Allah b. Ibrāhīm b. Shāhrawaih, formed a plan to divide the deceased's property between his son Qirwāsh and a certain Abu Maṣṣūr Qurād b. al-Ladīd¹ to the exclusion of Qirwāsh's uncle al-Ḥasan. This plan was frustrated, Qurād had to fly, and the uncle and nephew were reconciled (see Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 65, 88, and 116–117), the last episode being also given in this MS., fols. 54–56.

¹ Ibn al-Athīr calls him Abu Maṣṣūr b. Qurād al-Ladīd. In this volume Hilāl mentions him in 390 as quarrelling with a certain Abu Ṭāhir Yaghmā about property at Bādūrayā (fols. 30, 31); and in 391 as kidnapping an official, who was rescued by Qirwāsh (fol. 70a).

In the hostilities now to be related the principal leader of the Oqailids is another uncle of Qirwāsh, named Marḥ b. al-Musayyib, who is not mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr. Ibn Khallikān, in his life of al-Muqallad, calls him Abu'l-Murrah Mus'ab, and says he died in 397 (Sl. Eng., iii, 418), but in the MS. the name is clearly written 'Marḥ'—see fol. 80*b*, and also fol. 105*b*, where he is again mentioned as succeeding on the death of his brother al-Ḥasan in 392 to the headship of the tribe, and also to Ḥasan's moiety of the Mosul revenue. He is there said to have first employed, and afterwards put to death, a certain Abu 'Abd Allah b. al-Ḥiri, secretary to his brother al-Ḥasan, who had treacherously murdered the above-mentioned Ibn Shahrawaih, Qirwāsh's secretary, and also another official concerned in the collection of Qirwāsh's moiety of the revenue.

[This event is also mentioned in the contemporary chronicle of Elias of Naṣībīn (B.M. Add. 7,197), where the Syriac text confirms the spelling of the name 'Marḥ.' The text is translated by Bāthgen, *Abhandl. D.M.G.*, viii, 3.]

Hilāl tells us (fol. 80) that the Oqailids under Du'aij, a follower of Qirwāsh, were compelled to evacuate the town of al-Madā'in. Thereupon, notice is sent to Marḥ, to Qirwāsh, and to Qurād, who were at Mosul, to collect their men. Du'aij with a force returns and besieges al-Madā'in, but is forced to retire before the troops of al-Ḥajjāj. Du'aij then applies for help to 'Ali b. Mazyad,¹ and he, distrusting al-Ḥajjāj, sends him a contingent under his brother Abu al-Ghanā'im, and, later, joins in person. Their united forces inflict a defeat on the Dailamite and Turkish troops despatched against them under the command of al-Ḥajjāj's brother, Abu Ishaq, at a place called Bākarmā.² But al-Ḥajjāj's force was now doubled in number by the rather unlooked for arrival of a contingent of the Khafājah tribe

¹ The founder of the house that reigned at al-Hilla and the ancestor of Ṣadaqah; died in 408. He is mentioned previously by Ibn al-Athīr in 387 as at war with al-Muqallad the Oqailid (vol. ix, pp. 95 and 96).

² باكرمی; later on, fol. 107*b*, باكرما. In Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 121, باكرم. The place does not seem to be mentioned by Arab geographers.

under Abu 'Ali al-Ḥasan b. Thumāl.¹ Al-Ḥajjāj had long been urging him to come, for he omitted no opportunity of stirring up strife against the Oqailids, so inveterate was his resentment against them for their past behaviour to him.

[This alludes no doubt to the seizure of Mosul in 386 A.H.]

But Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl was far off, and his coming was uncertain. Hilāl tells a story (fol. 82a) to the effect that he remembered being with a certain Abu'l-Qāsim b. Kabshah, a man of great vigour and daring, and long in the service of 'Aḍud ad-Daula as emissary and spy, who said to him: "I see you are corresponding with al-Ḥasan b. Thumāl and are inviting him to come to you, whilst he is putting you off with promises. Now, if the General were to send me with a secretary, I would not return without him but would bring him to you." Hilāl told the General of this, who said, "Ibn Kabshah is a great liar and a great talker of stuff; still, you may send him with a letter, and so get us rid of him." Hilāl accordingly prepared a letter, obtained from the superintendent an allowance for the man's journey, and he started. Those about the General tried to make him believe that Ibn Kabshah would shift for himself and not come back, but soon he arrived, saying that Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl was at Ṣarṣar. This pleased al-Ḥajjāj (it followed closely on his brother's affair with Ibn Mazyad and the Oqailids), and he treated al-Ḥasan b. Thumāl and his men with every consideration. Al-Ḥajjāj was now exposed to insults from his troops on the news arriving of his being superseded as governor of 'Irāq by 'Amīd al-Juyūsh, and he retired to the bridge of boats at Nahrawān. Shortly after he again starts out to join Abu Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. 'Annāz,² who had been

¹ I can find only one mention of him in Ibn al-Athīr, under 426 A.H., vol. ix, p. 302, where he is stated to have been murdered by his nephew, who thereupon succeeded him as head of the tribe. The first instance of a member of the family being taken into the Government service was in 374 A.H., when Abu Ṭarīf 'Alyān b. Thumāl was made Governor of Kūfa (ib., p. 28).

² Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 96) mentions him as in possession of Daqūqā, situate between Baghdad and Irbil, saying how it had been seized in 387 A.H. by a certain Jabra'il b. Muḥammad; that later it was held by al-Muqallad the Oqailid, and after him by Muḥammad b. 'Annāz. (Hilāl, fol. 37b, states that in Shawwāl, 390, news reached Baghdad that al-Muqallad had seized Daqūqā and the neighbouring town of Khānijār, and had left there as his deputy Abu

persuaded to come and assist him against 'Ali b. Mazyad. An engagement follows at Barīqayā (?), when the Oqailids are defeated, Du'aij taken prisoner, and 'Ali b. Mazyad forced to fly.

Al-Ḥajjāj and his allies then pursue and come up with 'Ali b. Mazyad. The latter had gained over a body of the Shaybān tribe who were under Abu'l-Faṭḥ b. 'Annāz, and had arranged that when the battle was proceeding they should desert al-Ḥajjāj. They do this, and he and Abu'l-Faṭḥ are left with a scanty following, as the Khafājah tribe under Ḥassān, a brother of Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl, had taken the wrong road. Abu'l-Faṭḥ, too, threatened defection, but nevertheless al-Ḥajjāj stood firm, and although 'Ali b. Mazyad had carried his tents, and even given thanks to Allah in one of them for his success, he resisted his attacks and finally charged and routed him, capturing his camp with enormous treasure. (This fact is mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 121). Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl is charged by al-Ḥajjāj to protect the women in the camp against the Dailamite soldiery, and does so, but fails to prevent the Khafājah tribesmen from doing considerable pillage. Al-Ḥajjāj having returned to his camping-place at Nīl, finds that the flight of the Shaybān tribe and their story of his defeat had caused a subordinate officer of his to prepare to retire to the hills, after first putting his prisoner, Du'aij, to death. Al-Ḥajjāj and Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl move on to Kūfa, and prepare for the attack of the Oqailids under Qirwāsh b. al-Muqallad. At this point the Khafājah tribesmen desert in various directions. Pursued by 'Ali b. Thumāl, at the sound of his trumpets they turn back and demand

Muḥammad Jabra'il, called Dabbūs ad-Daula.) Muḥammad b. 'Annāz also figures elsewhere in the manuscript. In 389 he treacherously seized and murdered a certain Zahmān b. Hindī and his three sons (fols. 5, 6); in 391 an adherent of his, named Abu'l-Fawāris Behistūn b. Dazīr (who was head of the police, fol. 53a), was killed by the Bani Sayyār, a branch of the Shaybān tribe, from whom he was recovering stolen cattle (fols. 65, 66); and in 392 he was himself induced to submit to 'Amīd al-Juyūsh, then governor of 'Irāq (fol. 108). He was also concerned in the contest between the latter and Abu Ja'far al-Ḥajjāj at Baghdad in 397 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 136), and in the hostilities between Badr b. Ḥasanwaih and his son Ḥilāl in 400 (ib., 150). He died at Ḥulwān in 401, after twenty years' rule (ib., 158).

a money payment in return for having exposed their lives. Eventually they consent to return on condition of being allowed to pillage the country, and proceed to pillage accordingly with terrible results.

Then comes (fol. 86*b*) the story of the engagement and defeat of the Oqailids, which is as follows (text C):—

The General proceeded to a place called as-Subai', outside Kūfa, wishing to await and encounter the Oqailids at that spot. And Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl said to him: "General, we have ill-treated and oppressed the inhabitants of this district, and they dislike and complain of us. If we have them behind us, in the event of a battle we shall be exposed to a rear attack, to the advantage of our foes. We ought, therefore, to put some distance between us." They accordingly advanced and encamped at a place called as-Ṣābūniyya, two farsakhs distant from Kūfa, Abu 'Ali having about 7,000 horse with him, and the General Abu Ja'far about the same number of Dailamites. In his march to that spot the General had been followed by less than 300 men; the rest held back demanding a money payment, for 'Amīd al-Juyūsh and Abu'l-Qāsim b. Mimmā had been in communication with them, and made them disaffected; but Abu Ja'far sent off Abu'l-Qāsim b. Zahr, who brought in most of the defaulters, for he was a favourite of theirs and they were ashamed to say "No" to him.

The Oqailids arrived 7,000 strong with munitions, catapults, weapons, and quilted doublets,¹ their banners

¹ قزاعند. The word is also written كزاعند. See Dozy, Supp., sub voc.

In Dhahabī's *Tārīkh al-Islām* it occurs in both forms (see B.M. Or. 48, 13*b*, and Or. 49, 25*b*). We read in the latter passage that it was worn in 446 A.H. by the troops of Mu'izz b. Bādīs of Tunis when attacked by the Arabs under Mūnis b. Yahya, who said to him:

فأين نطعن هؤلاء وقد لبسوا الكزاعندات والمغائر قال في عيניהم

فسمى أبا العينين

See the same incident in Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 389, who concludes with

وسمى ذلك اليوم يوم العين. It was worn also by Saladin in 571 A.H.—

Ibn al-'Adīm in the *Zubdat al-Ḥalab*, Paris, 1666, 192*b*.

flying and their trumpets and drums sounding as they advanced, and they were as impatient for the fight as the Sultaniyeh.¹ Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl had paid a visit to the Mashhad at al-Ghariyeh²—peace be upon its inmate!—and had prayed and prostrated himself at the tomb, and besought Allah Most High for aid and victory. And he said to his men, "This will be a place of death and dishonour if you are weak-hearted and slack, but of life and glory if you are firm and victorious." They promised to assist at the risk of their lives in withstanding the enemy.

The General drew up his lines in front of the main group of tents, posted Abu'l-Qāsim az-Zahīr on his right and Khusru Shāh on his left, and stationed himself in the centre. And the women appeared riding in litters on camels, with the infantry in front of them with bucklers made of skins and with swords, and Abu 'Ali at their head with the cavalry, the distance between our force and his being considerable. The onslaught took place, and all was confusion, the captured horses being goaded to madness, whilst the prisoners were led away and the Arabs of the Khafājah tribe brandished their spears.³ A message was sent by Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl to the General telling him the road was blocked and that he must advance towards him. But he replied, "Is this a place for one in my position to advance over, seeing that I must not separate from my forces, nor spread them out before the cavalry in this open ground?" Again and again he pressed him, but this was his answer, until finally Abu 'Ali said, "Send me, then, a body of Persian troops that our people may see them, for their courage will be doubled when they know that you are behind them." So he sent off Abu'l-Qāsim az-Zahīr to him with a body of Dailamite cavalry, and with the Turks stationed at Kūfa, who had marched out with the General. But before they reached the scene of the battle the Oqailids

¹ I cannot understand this term.

² One of two tall buildings near Kūfa, where is the tomb of 'Ali (Yāqūt, iii, 790).

³ This passage is obscure.

had been defeated, about a thousand of them having been taken prisoners who were led off to the tents, after having their clothes, beasts, and weapons taken from them.

Abu 'Ali avoided and prevented slaughter, and only one man, a secretary of Rāfi' b. Muḥammad (the Oqailid) was killed. When the two forces met, the Khafājah women and their male and female slaves were mounted on horses and camels, and they now proceeded to the Oqailid camp, which was situate at some distance from the battlefield, and took and pillaged it. The Oqailids turned and fled, those in front not heeding those behind, and the Khafājah tribe took their treasure, weapons, beasts, and baggage."

We are told in conclusion that Abu 'Ali b. Thumāl himself told Hilāl how he pursued the Oqailids to beyond the Mashhad of al-Ḥāir,¹ and that another informant told him of al-Ḥajjāj's alarm at his absence and his return on the following day, want of men having prevented him from taking any prisoners or booty.

The two commanders then returned to Kūfa.

The absence of al-Ḥajjāj on this campaign led to such an outbreak of anarchy and outrage at Baghdad that 'Amīd al-Juyūsh was sent there to restore order. How he succeeded in the task has been already mentioned. But the resentment of al-Ḥajjāj at being thus superseded twice led to actual hostilities. In the next year, 393 A.H., he advanced from Kūfa with his Dailamite and Turkish soldiery, and his Khafājah allies against the forces of 'Amīd al-Juyūsh, by whom he was defeated at an-Nu'māniyya. Mutual acts of aggression followed, each trying to secure the support of the neighbouring Arab tribes, until 'Amīd al-Juyūsh was summoned away to Khūzistān in order to resist the attack of Abu'l-'Abbās ibn Wāṣil (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 123). Al-Ḥajjāj is next mentioned in 395 A.H. as concerned with Qirwāsh, the Oqailid, in the capture at Kūfa of an Alide, Abu 'Ali 'Omar b. Muḥammad b. 'Omar, from whom Qirwāsh took the sum of 100,000 dinars.

¹ The burial-place of Ḥusain (Yāqūt, ii, 189).

[He is mentioned in the MS., fol. 13, as one of the relatives of the wealthy Abu'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. 'Omar b. Yaḥya, then deceased.]

In 397 A.H. al-Ḥajjāj attacked Baghdad itself. 'Amīd al-Juyūsh had appointed Abu'l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. 'Annāz to succeed a certain Qulḥ¹ as guardian of the Ṭarīq Khurāsān, and had thereby displeased Badr b. Ḥasanwaih. He and other Arab chiefs thereupon joined forces with al-Ḥajjāj, and together they advanced on Baghdad, which was defended by Abu'l-Faṭḥ b. 'Annāz. But on news arriving of the final defeat of Abu'l-'Abbās b. Wāṣil, the Arab contingents melted away and al-Ḥajjāj retired to Ḥulwān. He then succeeded in making terms with Bahā ad-Daula, and was admitted to an interview with him, but secretly for fear of giving offence to 'Amīd al-Juyūsh (ib., p. 136). In 400 A.H. al-Ḥajjāj died at Ahwāz (ib., p. 154).

VI.

The Flight of the Vizier Abu'l-'Abbās ad-Dabbī from ar-Rayy (A.H. 392).

Six folios are given to the story of the flight of the vizier Abu'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm ad-Dabbī from ar-Rayy to the territory of Badr b. Ḥasanwaih. Ibn al-Aṭhīr merely states the fact under the year 393, but in his mention of the death of the vizier in 398 he gives the cause of his flight (vol. ix, 126 and 147). He was appointed vizier to Fakhr ad-Daula in 385, in succession to the Ṣāḥib Ibn 'Abbād (ib., p. 77), and when in 387 Fakhr ad-Daula was succeeded by his son Majd ad-Daula, under the regency of his mother, he continued in office (ib., p. 93).

¹ The MS. mentions a certain Abu'l-Fawāris Qullah, probably the same person, as attacked by 'Ali b. Mazyad in 389 A.H. at Dair al-'Aqūl (fol. 5a), as summoned from Baghdad to assist in expelling the Oqailids under Qurād b. al-Ladīd from Bādūravā in 390 A.H. (fols. 31, 32), and as meeting 'Amīd al-Juyūsh on his way to take up his appointment as Naib of Baghdad in 392 A.H. (fol. 98b).

The vizier was an author. Specimens of his writings are given in the *Yatīmat ad-Dahr*, iii, 118. On p. 119 he is said to have ranked next to the *Ṣāḥib* and to *Ibrāhīm as-Ṣābi*; and we are told that the loss suffered by letters in his death was repaired by the merits of the *Amīr Abu'l-Faḍl 'Ubaid Allah b. Aḥmad al-Mikālī*, of whose works extracts are also given (vol. iv, 247).

Hilāl begins (fol. 109) by referring to certain troubles between the vizier and the army, and to his arrest and subsequent return to office, as having been previously narrated. He then says that for the space of a year the conduct of affairs proved satisfactory, but that the vizier was severe and grasping. Then occurred the death of a nephew of the regent, called *al-Iṣḥabdh*,¹ and the vizier was suspected of having brought this about by poison. The regent applied for 200 dinars for his obsequies; the vizier thought the money would be better employed in satisfying the demands of the soldiery; and the regent, in her resentment, exclaimed, "How should the murderer perform the mourning for his victim?" Hearing of this, the vizier made arrangements for taking refuge with *Badr b. Ḥasanwaih*, who distrusted the wisdom of the step but offered him an asylum. A year is spent by the vizier in settling his affairs. He then consults a friend, *Abu 'Alī al-Ḥusain b. al-Qāsim*, surnamed *al-Khaṭīr*, who treacherously advises him to fly. His secretary tries to open his eyes, but he persists in trusting *al-Khaṭīr*, and suddenly quits *ar-Rayy*. Much commotion follows. *Al-Khaṭīr* assures the troops that the treasury has been emptied, and offers them the terms they had when in the service of *Fakhr ad-Daula*. They accept; *al-Khaṭīr* becomes vizier, and publicly reprobates the name of his predecessor.

Arriving at *Barūjird*, *Abu'l-'Abbās ad-Ḍabbi* is not met by *Badr b. Ḥasanwaih*, either in person or by a representative, but his needs are provided for. He contents himself with

¹ She is called his sister by *'Utbi* (op. cit., 371). Her death occurred in 419 A.H. (*Ibn al-Athīr*, ix, 260).

very little, and eventually excuses himself from receiving any money allowance. He now begins to regret his course of action. A friend, consulted by Abu'l-'Abbās' secretary, says that his master's right course is to conciliate Majd ad-Daula's mother and the principal persons at Court. The secretary protests that to do this would require 200,000 dinars, and that they had lost everything for the sake of saving 200. (It may be that this is the foundation for Ibn al-Athīr's statement, vol. ix, p. 147, that the vizier actually spent this sum in trying to regain office.) Within a year and a half his successor, al-Khaṭīr, is arrested. Thereupon, Abu Sa'd Muḥammad b. Ismā'il b. al-Faḍl hastens from Hamadhān, confident that his wealth and position, and his connection with the regent, will procure him office. Badr, disliking him, is averse to this, and sends a force of 3,000 men to reinstate Abu'l-'Abbās as vizier. On approaching ar-Rayy, Abu'l-'Abbās is invited by the regent and the leading inhabitants to enter the city, but he is warned by friends that treachery is intended, so he turns back.

Abu Sa'd accordingly becomes vizier, and by spending his own revenue he gains over the ruling personages. But he was severe in his treatment of the troops, and they made an attack on him, whereupon he also took refuge with Badr at Barūjird, and al-Khaṭīr resumed office. Badr refuses to address al-Khaṭīr by the title of vizier, and he in turn refuses Badr the title of Sayyid. This leads to their being on very bad terms, and prompts al-Khaṭīr to sow dissension between Badr and the local chiefs, and also between him and his son Hilāl, which was the main cause of his subsequent revolt against his father.¹ The origin of Badr's dislike towards Abu Sa'd is next explained. When the latter filled the office of Nāẓir at Hamadhān and elsewhere under

¹ They came to open warfare in 400 A.H., and Badr, being worsted, called in the aid of Bahā ad-Daula, who sent a force under his vizier, Abu Ghālib Faḥr al-Mulk. He defeated and captured Hilāl, and forced him to surrender a fortress where he seized vast treasure (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 149-152). The fortress was probably Dazbaz, the citadel of the town of Sābūr Khuwāst, the capital of Badr's dominion (Yāqūt, ii, 572).

Majd ad-Daula, his brother Shams ad-Daula sharing in the revenue, Badr sought to establish a special Khān at Hamadhān for the sale of goods coming from his territories. It brought him in a sum of 1,200,000 dirhams, and he appointed an agent to manage it and farm it out to someone willing to take it. This was not to the liking of Abu Sa'd, who anticipated it would result in a diminution of the revenue of the country. He accordingly sent hired Dailamites to make an attack on the house of the agent, who fled back to Barūjird and, on the plea that he had been heavily robbed, obtained leave to indemnify himself against certain estates belonging to Abu Sa'd. And he recovered thereout 50,000 dinars. Thereupon Abu Sa'd made an insulting remark about open robbery which reached the ears of Badr and irritated him. Consequently, when on the arrest of al-Khaṭīr Abu Sa'd sought to become vizier, Badr sent troops as above stated to try and reinstate Abu'l-'Abbās ad-Dabbi. Abu Sa'd remained in office for two years; then the troops revolted and he fled—it is said he was lowered in a basket from the house roof—and arrived suddenly at Karaj,¹ whence he came on to Sābūr Khuwāst. Here he was well received and given liberal allowance for his needs, including some white wine, which had not been provided in the case of Abu'l-'Abbās ad-Dabbi, for Abu Sa'd was known to be an easy-going and tolerant man. After a few days he went on to Barūjird.

He was not met on his arrival there by Abu'l-'Abbās ad-Dabbi, who excused himself on the ground of an attack of gout, but sent his son to meet Abu Sa'd, and the two exchanged courtesies and entered the city together. Later in the day Abu'l-'Abbās came in a litter to visit Abu Sa'd and embraced him from the litter, addressing him by the

¹ Karkh in the MS. (fol. 114b), but Karaj near Barūjird must be intended, known as Karaj Abi Dulaf; see Iṣṭakhri, 196 and 199, and Tabari sub 253 A.H., ser. III, p. 1687. Karaj was the cradle of the Buwaihids' power. The head of their house, 'Alī b. Buwaih, afterwards 'Imād ad-Daula, on joining Mardāwīj, the Ziyarid, was appointed by him Governor of Kaṭaj. How Mardāwīj attempted to recall the appointment and was frustrated by 'Alī, is related by Ibn al-Athīr (viii, 200).

title of vizier. This he made a point of doing, for Abu Sa'd had addressed him from ar-Rayy after his fall from office by the title of Ustādh ar-Ra'is, and he now wished to give him to understand that misfortunes do not deprive a vizier of his title. They met but this once.

A life of the vizier Abu'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm ad-Dabbi is given by Yāqūt in the volume of the *Mu'jam al-Udabā* above referred to (Bodl. Or. 753, fol. 17a). After quoting from the *Yatimat ad-Dahr* the estimate of his literary eminence, and his connection with the *Ṣāhib Ibn 'Abbād*, he mentions his flight from ar-Rayy, and his fruitless expenditure with a view to regaining office; his death, followed closely by that of his son Abu'l-Qāsim, his wish to be buried in the *Mashhad* of al-Ḥusain, and his son's offer of 500 dinars to the *Sharīf* Abu Aḥmad¹ for a tomb there, which was refused, but a free site granted, the *Sharīf* himself attending the interment; all of which is stated by Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 147).

The remainder of Yāqūt's narrative is given on the authority of one 'Hidāk,' which is doubtless a copyist's error for 'Hilāl,' for the person mentioned by this authority as his informant is the Qāḍī Abu'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Bārūdi, the identical person from whom Hilāl derived the information concerning the vizier's flight from ar-Rayy and his subsequent doings at Barūjird contained in the foregoing narrative. What follows is clearly, therefore, taken from an earlier portion of Hilāl's History. First, the death in 385 A.H. of the *Ṣāhib Ibn 'Abbād* is related, and his last advice to his sovereign, Fakhr al-Mulk, and how on his death the latter at once proceeded to lay hands on the dead man's property (see Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 77, who

¹ Abu Aḥmad al-Ḥusain b. Mūsa, surnamed at-Ṭāhir, or the 'pure,' father to ar-Raḍī and al-Murtadā, was fifth in descent from the Imām Mūsa al-Kāzim, through his son Ibrāhīm al-Jazzār, and was the Naqīb or head of the descendants of 'Alī, having been dismissed four times from this office and reappointed. In 394 A.H. he was named Chief Qāḍī of Baghdad by Bahā ad-Daula, but the Caliph, al-Qādir billah, refused to confirm his appointment. He was also judge for criminal matters—al-Muzālim, and leader of the pilgrimage. He died in 399 A.H. (Dhahabī, B.M. Or. 48, 262a).

mentions an instance of similar conduct on the part of the Fatimide al-‘Azīz towards his vizier — Yāqūt b. Killis). Then follows an account of the Ṣāhib’s funeral and the story of the graceless doubt on the part of the Ṣāhib’s dependent, the Qāḍi ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad, as to whether he had been deserving of Allah’s mercy, which was followed by the Qāḍi’s arrest and fine, as stated by Ṣafadi (see *infra*, p. 771, n. 1). The Ṣāhib’s successor in office was Abu’l-‘Abbās ad-Dabbī, but a principal Kātib of the deceased one Abu ‘Ali al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. Ḥamūla, who had great influence with the troops, and who was then engaged in opposing the efforts of Qābūs b. Washmaghīr to recover Jurjān after his eighteen years’ banishment, made Fakhr ad-Daula an offer of eight million dirhams for the post of vizier, and announced his coming in person. Fakhr ad-Daula decided to meet him, and insisted on Abu’l-‘Abbās doing likewise. He in turn offered six million dirhams if he might continue sole vizier, and be dispensed from meeting his rival. In the result they were named joint viziers, Abu ‘Ali being pacified by a rebate of two million dirhams, and the two jointly made liable for a sum of ten millions, so the terms were not unfavourable to the monarch. Each received similar honours, the duties of the office being performed by them in turn, and letters being couched in their joint names. Both concurred in the business of seizing the Ṣāhib’s property, and in laying fines on his partisans, and the Qāḍi al-Bārūdi has some edifying stories to tell of their doings. At Iṣpāhān they extorted large sums. The town of Istirābādh and its district was given over to the care of one Abu Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Rāfi‘. He invited the leading inhabitants to his house, delayed admitting them till the heat of the day was come, and then gave them highly salted food with nothing to drink. Later water was brought in, and with it writing materials, and under compulsion of thirst a sum of ten million dirhams was extorted from the guests. The reputation of the inhabitants of Qazwīn for violence made the officials slow to commence

operations there, and rightly so, for the official who, on the strength of his familiarity with the inhabitants and their wealth, undertook the task, was attacked in his house and murdered. The funds so acquired for Fakhr ad-Daula were squandered within a short period of his death, which occurred in 387 A.H. Under his successor, Majd ad-Daula, power was vested in the Queen mother, as mentioned in the above narrative. Jurjān was at this point conquered by Qābūs, and the state of the army opposed to him demanded the presence of one of the viziers. The choice, which was determined by lot, fell on Abu 'Ali b. Ḥamūla, who after some engagements with Qābūs, found himself in need of supplies from ar-Rayy. These his co-vizier neglected to send, and he had to return discomfited. Dissension followed between the viziers, and the opinion began to prevail that their joint and inharmonious tenure of office was producing mischief, and that one of them ought to be dismissed. Abu 'Ali, confident of being the favourite with the army, was so negligent that Abu'l-'Abbās got an order from the regent for his arrest and conveyance to a fortress, where he had him murdered. He then continued sole vizier until 392 A.H., when we are told, briefly, that the death of the regent's brother and what followed thereon led to his flight to Barūjird and his death there in 398. The speedy death of his son Abu'l-Qāsim was said to have been caused by poison administered at the instigation of Abu Bakr b. Rāfi', whom we may believe to have been, at least, capable of the deed, and who thereupon proceeded from Hamadhān to Barūjird to collect the deceased's estate, of which he was reported to have retained for himself a sum of over 600,000 dinars. This proceeding on his part had a precedent—if, indeed, a precedent was needed—in one of the acts of the vizier Fakhr al-Mulk, whose story is next to be related.

VII.

Fall of the Vizier Abu Ghālib b. Khalaf (A.H. 393).

Under this date is recorded the fall of the vizier Abu Ghālib Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Khalaf, who later bore the title of Fakhr al-Mulk, and the appointment of Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim b. Sūdmandh as his successor.

The life of Fakhr al-Mulk is given by Ibn Khallikān (Sl. Eng., iii, 278), and a notice of him is contained in Dhahabī's Tārīkh al-Islām (B.M. Or. 49, 60b), and also in the Mirāt az-Zamān (B.M. Or. 4,619, 203a). All the accounts agree in extolling his virtues and abilities, Dhahabī saying that even as a boy he was nicknamed by his relatives 'the little vizier,' and that in respect of business aptitude and financial success not even the great viziers of the age, such as al-Muhallabī, Ibn al-'Amīd, or the Ṣāhib Ibn 'Abbād, came up to his level.

Born in 354 A.H., his official career began, Dhahabī tells us, in the finance department at Wāsiṭ. In this narrative he is first mentioned as left in charge of public affairs at Shīrāz by al-Muwaffaq during his campaign against Ibn Bakhtiyār (fol. 14b). He was evidently one of the vizier's adherents,¹ for he was in his company when he was arrested, and was himself for a time imprisoned, until Abu al-Khaṭṭāb was persuaded, against his own inclination, to release him and to appoint him deputy to 'Amīd al-Juyūsh (fol. 36a). He shared the hostility of al-Muwaffaq to 'Amīd al-Juyūsh and to his father, Abu Ja'far Ustādh Hurmuz, and after the retreat of Ṭāhir b. Khalaf from Kirmān he complained that Abu Ja'far had seized vacant fiefs for himself and for his relatives, and caused Ibn Sūdmandh, then an 'Ārid, to be sent to look into the matter. At this date Abu Ghālib was

¹ How on al-Muwaffaq's return to Shīrāz, after his flight to ad-Dīwānī, he got to distrust him (fol. 94), has been already mentioned.

already vizier (fols. 47, 48). He is also concerned in two other incidents, neither of which seems to bear out the character for justice (*ʿadl*), in which respect Dhahabī places him even above the other viziers of the period. The first (fol. 75–78) was his journey to Nāiband¹ and Sirāf early in 392, by express command of Bahā ad-Daula, to enquire into and superintend the getting in of the enormous estate left by a certain Abu at-Ṭayyib al-Farrukhān b. Shīrāz. He it was who had mainly provided for the financial necessities of Šamsām ad-Daula in Fars, and on the death of his vizier, Abu'l-Qāsim al-'Alā b. al-Ḥasan (in 387, Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 94), he was considered the fittest person to succeed him, and was appointed to reside in Ahwāz, with deputies in Shīrāz and Fasā. But his administration was not successful, and he was replaced by Abu 'Alī b. Ustādh Hurmuz ('Amīd al-Juyūsh). On the accession of Bahā ad-Daula he was at first arrested and fined, but later was sent on an expedition against the Zuṭṭ, when he died. His great wealth being much talked about, Abu Ghālib was specially sent to enquire into it. A confidential servant of the deceased gave information to the vizier which enabled him to get in property of enormous value, but he nevertheless caused him to be tortured with such severity that he committed suicide. The vizier's enemies at court suggested that he had caused the man's death in order to conceal the amount of property he had kept for himself, and we are told that this made an impression on Bahā ad-Daula and contributed to the subsequent arrest and fall of the vizier (fol. 78a).

The second incident (fols. 116–118) is the murder of a Kātib Abu'l-Ḥasan b. Ishaq. In the year 392 Ibn Ishaq had been sent by the vizier Abu Naṣr Sābūr² to

¹ This place, which is variously pointed in the MS., is described as distant 15 farsakhs from Sirāf, and is marked on the coastline to the south of that place on St. John's Map of Persia. I am indebted for its identification to Mr. G. le Strange.

² The life of the vizier Sābūr b. Ardashīr is given by Ibn Khallikān (Sl. Eng., i, 554). He succeeded Abu Maṣṣūr b. Šālīhān as vizier to Bahā ad-Daula in 380, and had had intervals of office up to this date. He died in 416, as did also his predecessor. In 383 he founded the Dār al-'Ilm or Academy of Sābūr, mentioned in the Risalat al-Ḡhufrān (J.R.A.S., 1900, p. 648, n. 3; see Ibn

Baghdad together with Abu'l-Qāsim b. Mimmā, with instructions to arrest there a certain member of the Alide party concurrently with the arrest, by Sābūr himself, of another at Wāsiṭ. But Ibn Mimmā gave notice to the Alide, who escaped, and the other being warned, escaped also, and only returned on receiving the promise on oath of indemnity. This failure contributed to the dismissal of Sābūr and his flight to al-Baṭīḥa to avoid arrest. We are told that his successors in the Nāzirship of Baghdad, though they assumed the title of viziers, were laughed at for so doing, as the duties no longer justified the assumption. And the subsequent desolation of the place is vividly described (fols. 71-75). We are now told (fol. 116) that Ibn Ishāq had proved very oppressive and arbitrary in his conduct at Baghdad, exacting fines from the merchants, and imprisoning and ill-treating the Katholikos.¹ On the fall of Sābūr he fled to Awānā, and thence to al-Baṭīḥa. He afterwards managed to regain the favour of Bahā ad-Daula, who sent him to the neighbourhood of ar-Rūdhān (in Fars, near the border of Kirmān, Iṣṭakhri, 125, 126) to take charge of a part of the crown lands there, which he administered with financial success to the satisfaction of Bahā ad-Daula. This was not to the taste of the vizier Abu Ghālib. Accordingly, when Bahā ad-Daula was engaged in fighting Abu'l-'Abbās b. Wāṣil,² the vizier

al-Athīr, ix, 246-7, and Dhahabī, Or. 48, 19b). We learn from the *Mirāt az-Zamān* of Sibṭ Ibn al-Jāuzi (Paris, 1506, 69a) that this Academy stood in the *Karkh* suburb between the two walls; that on the entry of Tughril Beg it was burnt and the contents pillaged and scattered, many of the volumes being removed to *Khurāsān*; and that this led to the foundation, in 452 A.H., of another library in the street of Ibn Abi 'Aun in West Baghdad, which was endowed with a thousand volumes. It is possible that this refers to the short-lived library of Hilāl's son, Ghars an-Ni'ma, mentioned ante, p. 509.

¹ His name was Yuwānīs, and his appointment late in the year 391 is recorded at fol. 71a. His predecessor, Mar Mārī b. Tūbi, died in the previous year (fol. 53a). For the Nestorian Church and Katholikos, see al-Bīrūnī, pp. 282-284.

² His revolt against his master, Muḥadhdhib ad-Daula, whom he expelled from al-Baṭīḥa, as he did Lashkar Sitān from al-Baṣra; his defeat of 'Amīd al-Juyūsh; the flight of Bahā ad-Daula before him from Ahwāz, which he occupied and pillaged; and his eventual defeat by the vizier Abu Ghālib, and death, are related by Ibn al-Athīr under the years 394-397, vol. ix, 127-130 and 137. In this narrative he is mentioned on fol. 76a as in possession of 'Abbādān, at a date when al-Baṣra still belonged to Lashkar Sitān, and in the autograph of

had him imprisoned and rigorously treated. Then, hearing Bahā ad-Daula had been enquiring about Ibn Ishaq, and fearing he might be required to send him to the Court, he cunningly offered him a mission to Kirmān to enquire into and redress the fiscal administration of Abu Ghālib al-Ḥasan b. Maṣṣūr,¹ telling him to proceed to Fasā, where he was to receive money for the journey. The vizier then instructed a body of Zuttas to assassinate him. They accordingly stopped the caravan with which he was travelling, seized him on the pretext of holding him as a hostage for one of their body whom the vizier had imprisoned, and, after removing him to a distance, murdered him. But a chamberlain who was travelling with him found out the truth of the matter, and talked about it. This alarmed the vizier, and he bought the man's silence. But it was reported as evidence of Bahā ad-Daula's regard and concern for Ibn Ishaq that, on a subsequent occasion, he warned a personal attendant of his to be on his guard against falling a victim to the machinations of the vizier.

The concluding folios of the MS. (118-119) are occupied with the story of the vizier's arrest in the beginning of

Elias of Nāṣibīn (B.M. Add. 7,197), his attack on Muhadhhib ad-Daula is given under 393 A.H. (In the Syriac text of the passage he is called a Cushite or Ethiopian, for which the Arabic equivalent of az-Zanjī is given by Bāthgen in his translation, loc. cit.) Dhahabī, in the *Tārīkh al-Islām* (B.M. Or. 48, 249b, under 397 A.H.), notices his death, calling him Abu'l-Ghanāim, and says that people used to tell him he would be a king, and laughingly ask him for future employment and favours; that he did eventually rule at Sirāf and al-Baṣra; that he attacked Ahwāz and drove away Bahā ad-Daula (the event referred to in the text); then conquered al-Baṭīha, when Muhadhhib ad-Daula went off to Baghdad, and lost his baggage on the road, so that he was forced to ride on a cow; that later, unable to withstand the vizier Abu Ghālib, he sought help from Ḥassan al-Khafāji; then fled to Badr b. Ḥasanwaih, and was finally put to death at Wāṣit, after being captured, according to Ibn al-Athīr, by Muḥammad b. 'Annāz.

¹ 'As-Sirāfi Dhu al-Sa'ādātāin' (Dhahabī, B.M. Or. 49, 77b). In 402 he was operating with the Khafaja tribe against the Oqalids, and his allies laid a plot against him, which he discovered and punished by slaughtering many of them (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 165, 166). In 409 he succeeded Ibn Fasanjis as vizier of Sulṭān ad-Daula (ib., 219, 220), and in 412 he was murdered by the Dailamite troops at Ahwāz, when serving as vizier to Muḥarrif ad-Daula, who in 411 had taken 'Irāq from his brother Sulṭān ad-Daula. The latter had, in violation of his promise, employed Ibn Sahlān as his vizier, and no doubt Abu Ghālib had taken the side of Muḥarrif ad-Daula (ib., 224 and 228). This is the Abu Ghālib whom de Slane distinguishes from the vizier Fakhr al-Mulk in his English version of Ibn Khallikān (i, 455, n. 7).

the year 393, and how he was succeeded by Abu'l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim b. Sūdmandh. The latter had come to 'Irāq, in the capacity of secretary, with the vizier Abu Maṣṣūr b. Ṣāliḥān¹ during the reign of Sharaf ad-Daula. He was next appointed Nāzir of certain districts of Ahwāz, and eventually was named 'Ārid of the Dailamites. It is under this title that he is mentioned as employed by al-Muwaffaq in the murder of the Dailamites of Ibn Bakhtiyār's faction at Jirāft (fol. 17); as one of the persons sent to rebuke Bulfaḍl b. Buwaih (fol. 27); as present at the Government office on the last appearance there of al-Muwaffaq (fol. 34b); as sent by the vizier Abu Ghālīb to enquire into the dealings of Ustādh Hurmuz with the fiefs in Kirmān after the retreat of Ṭāhir b. Khalaf (fol. 48); and as in command of the troops sent by Bahā ad-Daula against ad-Diwāni (fol. 92a). We are now told (fol. 119) that he was promoted under al-Muwaffaq, and that "after his death he proceeded to Kirmān, as already stated." (This is presumably the mission referred to above, fol. 48, death being written in error for the fall of al-Muwaffaq, as his death occurred only in the following year, 394.) The success of Ibn Sūdmandh on this mission made a favourable impression on Bahā ad-Daula. This roused the resentment of the vizier Abu Ghālīb, who had him arrested and disgraced. But he managed to communicate through an intermediary with Bahā ad-Daula, and he, recollecting the vizier's dealings with the estate of al-Farrukhān, gave Ibn Sūdmandh permission to arrest him and to take his place as Nāzir of Baghdād. Ibn Sūdmandh accordingly went to the vizier's residence on the day fixed for his arrest, and after attending his presence left and waited outside, where he had men posted in readiness to effect the arrest. And the vizier and all his adherents and suite were arrested. Fines proportioned to their means were laid on each one of them, the vizier being required to pay within a fixed period 100,000 dinars of

¹ He was appointed vizier by Sharaf ad-Daula in 374, confirmed in office by Bahā ad-Daula in 379, dismissed in 380, restored in 382, and he resigned finally in 383 (Ibn al-Aṭhir, ix, 28, 71); died in 416 (ib., 246).

Qāsān, which amounted, we are informed, to four million dirhams of the then currency. Moreover, he was subjected to some violence and pressure, besides [At this point the MS. abruptly breaks off.]

Of Ibn Sūdmandh's subsequent career I can find no information, and how long Abu Ghālib remained in disgrace is uncertain. But at some date prior to 397 he was reappointed vizier and given the title of Fakhr al-Mulk, for in that year he defeated Ibn Wāṣil, who had seized al-Baṭīḥa (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 138); in 400 he defeated Hilāl, the revolted son of Badr b. Ḥasanwaih, and made him surrender the fortress of Dazbaz and its treasures, as already stated (and we are told in the *Mirāt az-Zamān*, loc. cit., that on this occasion he retained for himself a sum of above three million dinars, which on his death the vizier ar-Rukhkhajī succeeded in recovering from the persons with whom it had been deposited); later, he was engaged in warfare with the Khafāja tribe, in consequence of their attacks on pilgrims; and in 405 he was forced to recognize the growing power of 'Ali b. Mazyad by granting him the territories of the Bani Dubays, whom 'Ali had defeated, and whom the vizier had encouraged in their resistance to him (ib., pp. 165-175). The last five years of his life he passed as Governor of 'Irāq in succession to 'Amīd al-Juyūsh, who had died in 401 A.H.

Fakhr al-Mulk was put to death by Sulṭān ad-Daula, the son and successor of Bahā ad-Daula, in 407 A.H. The story told by Ibn Khallikān, of his attributing his fall to a woman having imprecated the vengeance of Allah on him for his refusal to redress an outrage committed by one of his favourites, occurs also in Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 182), where the name of the favourite is stated to be 'Alamkār. It is noticeable that the name of the man mentioned in this narrative (fol. 94a) as employed by the vizier to test the real sentiments of al-Muwaffaq towards him is Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alamkār, who is called the chief Ustādh.

Dhahabi is loud in praise of the vizier's good qualities, and says he was put to death unjustly. The rule of his

predecessor in 'Irāq, 'Amīd al-Juyūsh, was praised by all, and, amongst others, by 'Utbi (p. 303), and he goes on to say that his successor, "the vizier of viziers," surpassed him in general well-doing. This narrative brings into relief other and different characteristics. He is depicted as jealous, grasping, and cruel. But it may be that our historian is also the warrant for his virtues. Dhahabi says that Hilāl's Kitāb al-Wuzarā contained an exhaustive and prolix account of the vizier, and Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzi (op. cit., fol. 203*b*), after describing his generosity to his followers and his public improvements, including a hospital, quotes Ibn as-Ṣābi for the statement that a bequest of his was found giving one-third of his property in alms among the descendants of Abu Ṭālib and of al-'Abbās, with the poor in general, and specifying their names and families, and the place where the property, which was of great value, was to be found. Indeed, Hilāl was himself a recipient of his bounty. Ṣafadi, in his notice of him (B.M. Add. 23,359, 225*b*), says that Hilāl's conversion to Islām led to the vizier depositing with him a sum of 30,000 dinars, and that he succeeded in retaining this sum. For, having frankly disclosed the truth to the vizier ar-Rukhkhaji his official superior, he was told to keep the money for his support.

[Mu'ayyad al-Mulk Abu 'Alī al-Ḥusain b. al-Ḥasan ar-Rukhkhaji was Wakīl to the vizier at the time of his death, and it was by him that his property, which amounted to 1,200,000 dinars, and also the sums deposited with various persons, were traced and got in. Ibn al-Aṭhīr mentions him first in 409, i.e. two years after the vizier's death, as in the service of Sulṭān ad-Daula (ix, 216, 217); and again in 413, as vizier of Musharrif ad-Daula, and as helping to effect a compromise of the two brothers' claims. He adds that on the fall of Fakhr al-Mulk he had been induced by Musharrif ad-Daula (not Sulṭān ad-Daula as one would have expected) to accept the post of vizier (ib., 230, 231). In 414 he was dismissed, and was succeeded by al-Maghribi, as to whom see Ibn Khallikān (Sl. Eng., i, 450). Later, ar-Rukhkhaji was in the service of Jalāl ad-Daula (ib., 235

and 286), and in 431 he died, having exercised great influence during the period of his retirement (ib., 317.)]

VIII.

The remainder of the MS. consists of shorter episodes, some of which are of interest.

On fols. 7-11 is set out a letter from Maḥmūd of Ghaznah to the Caliph al-Qādir billah in 389, telling how he had defeated the Samanid sovereign and conquered Khurāsān, and had caused the Caliph's name to be inserted in the public prayer, that of his predecessor, al-Ṭai', not having yet been discontinued. The style of the letter is very similar to that of the Kitāb Yamīnī; perhaps it also was composed by 'Utbi.

Each of the three following years is prefaced with a notice of the day on which it began, according to both the Alexandrian Era and that of Yezdegird, i.e. the Persian Era. Many of the current events are dated according to the Persian reckoning, for which see al-Bīrūnī, Sachau's translation, p. 218.

The chronicle of isolated events includes deaths, some of persons who can be identified, murders, and accidents, the coming and going of prominent persons,¹ natural phenomena such as comets, excessive cold, and an inundation, and appointments to office, in many instances to that of 'Adl,' which is expressed by saying that the Qāḍī accepts the appointee's 'Shahādah.'² Ibn al-Aṭhīr (ix, 115) tells a story

¹ Amongst others that of the Chief Qāḍī Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad and Abu'l-Ḥusain 'Alī b. Mikāl, who passed through Baghdad in 389 A.H. on their way to perform the pilgrimage, who were received with much state by the principal officials (fol. 4b). The former was a native of Hamadhān and Chief Qāḍī of ar-Rayy. He owed his advancement to the Sāhib Ibn 'Abbād, and, like his patron, held Mu'tazilah doctrines. Nevertheless, on the Sāhib's death, he doubted whether he had found mercy, as he had given no sign of repentance. This was held to be odious conduct, having regard to his obligations to the deceased, and it led to his being arrested and dismissed by Fakhr ad-Da'ula, and fined three million dirhams. He died in 414 or 415 (Ṣafadī, B.M. Add. 23,358, 178b). The latter is possibly the same person as the Khwāja Ḥusain 'Alī Mikāl, who is mentioned in the Chahār Maqāla as the bearer of a letter from Maḥmūd of Ghaznah to Ma'mūn Khwarizmshāh (see E. G. Browne's translation, London, 1900, p. 119).

² As to the nature of this office and its duties, see Ibn Khaldun, Proleg. lxxiv, and Dozy, Supp., sub voc. 'adl. See also "The Letters of Abu'l-'Alā," by D. S. Margoliouth, Oxford, 1898, p. 100.

showing how 'Adud ad-Daula protected the independence of the Qādis in making the appointments. Dhahabi (Or. 48, 19a) relates how in 382 A.H. al-Mu'allim, the favourite of Bahā ad-Daula, took steps to reduce the number of 'Udūl, which had risen to 303, by dismissing all those whose appointments were subsequent to the death, in 381, of the Qādi 'Ubaid Allah b. Ma'rūf, who had been in office since 368. And it is shown by the "Qānūn A'māl ash-Shuhūd" (Tunis, 1292 A.H.) that in Tunis at that date the number of these officials was subject to limitation, and, moreover, that the offices of Shāhid and 'Adl were not identical, the latter being apparently of the mercantile class, as they are spoken of as generally having a shop—دكان.

Acts of violence are frequent. Several have been incidentally mentioned. One, with which the narrative opens, was the arbitrary arrest and dismissal of a Naqīb Abu al-Qāsim al-Ḥusain b. Mimmā by Abu Shujā' Bakrān b. Bulfawāris, the Nāzir of Baghdad and a relative of Bahā ad-Daula.¹ It led to Bakrān being replaced by his brother Abu Harb Shīrzil (fols. 1, 2). Another is the burning of a Christian church by the populace in 392 (fol. 78b), mentioned also by Dhahabi (Or. 48, 21b).

In the year 389 the inhabitants of the quarters of the 'Atṭābiyyīn and of the Syrian Gate, enraged at an attempt to impose a tax on silk and cotton goods, attacked and burnt the Dār al-Ḥumūli, where the accounts of the various Dīwāns, or government offices, were kept. The matter was compromised by the tax being levied on silk only (fol. 3).

[For an account of the 'Atṭābi silks and the derivation therefrom of the word 'tabby,' see "Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate," by G. le Strange (J.R.A.S., 1899, p. 876).² A previous attempt, in 375, to impose a similar tax at Baghdad had provoked resistance, and had been

¹ His maternal uncle according to Dhahabī (Or. 48, 19a), uncle to his son Jalāl ad-Daula according to Ibn al-Āthīr (ix, 119). His death in 391 is recorded at fol. 60b.

² The welcome appearance of the author's completed work, Oxford, 1900, enables me to add the reference thereto, p. 138.

abandoned (see Dhahabi, Or. 48, 15*b*, and Sibt Ibn al-Jauzi, op. cit., 182*b*).]

Under the head of disorder may fairly be included the celebration of the Shi'a festival of al-Ghadir. Hilāl says that it was celebrated by that sect in the quarters of al-Karkh and Bāb at-Tāq by street decoration and illuminations and by the sacrifice of a camel; that the Sunnites, wishing to have a counter celebration in their part of the town, pretended that the eighth day after was the anniversary of the day when the Prophet and Abu Bakr entered the cave, and proceeded to celebrate this event in a similar fashion; and that they likewise fixed the eighth day after the festival of 'Āshūrā as the anniversary of the murder of Mus'ab b. az-Zubair, visiting his tomb at Maskin¹ just as the other sect visited the tomb of al-Husain at al-Hāir (fol. 6).² The festival of al-Ghadir originated in a tradition that at a spot called the Ghadir, or Pond, of Khum, on the way between Mecca and Medina, the Prophet had declared 'Ali to be his successor (see al-Birūnī, p. 333; de Sacy, *Chrest. Ar.*, 2nd ed., 193; and Ibn Khallikān, Sl. Eng., iii, 383). Its celebration at Baghdad was introduced compulsorily by Mu'izz ad-Daula in 352, the shops being closed and the streets perambulated by women with their hair unloosed, faces blackened, and other signs of lamentation for the fate of Husain (see Dhahabi, Or. 48, 3*a*, on the authority of Thabit b. Sinān, and see also Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 407).

The Sunnite festival is described by Dhahabi (Or. 49, 15*a*) as mere nonsense, and Sibt Ibn al-Jauzi (op. cit., 191*b*) adds that the incident of the Cave occurred, as was well known, in Ṣafar,³ and not in Dhu-l-Ḥijjah, but that the whole thing was a mere excuse for disorder and plunder. Both these historians emphasize this aspect of the festival, and the rival celebrations were frequently prohibited, e.g., by the above-

¹ On the Dujail river near Awānā. Mus'ab was killed there in 72 A.H., in a battle against 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (Yāqūt, iv, 529).

² See Yāqūt, ii, 188-9, and al-Birūnī, p. 326.

³ See al-Birūnī, p. 329.

mentioned Mu'allim, the favourite of Bahā ad-Daula, in 382 (*Dhahabī*, Or. 48, 19*a*), and by 'Amīd al-Juyūsh in 393 (fol. 118 of the MS.). On rare occasions it passed off peaceably, as in 402 (*Dhahabī*, Or. 49, 2*b*), and in 442, when the two factions joined their forces to oppose an active head of the police (*Sibt Ibn al-Jauzi*, op. cit., 235*b*), but the next anniversary was again disorderly (ib., 236*b*).

The institution of the festival of al-Ghadr was an indication of the Shi'a tenets of the Buwaihid princes, of which a strong instance is given by *Ibn al-Athīr* (viii, 403).¹ The Dailamites, in general, adhered to that sect, whereas the Turks were then, as always, strong Sunnites. It is noticeable that on the celebration of the festival in 402 A.H. (*Dhahabī*, loc. cit.) it was they who provided this sect with ornaments for their decorations.

Hilāl's account of the festival is copied almost verbatim by *Dhahabī* (Or. 48, 21*a*), and is also told in different language by *Ibn al-Athīr* (ix, 110).

The soldiers, too, are frequently mutinous. In 390 they refused to march to Fars until they received their arrears of pay and allowances. The vizier Sābūr compromised the matter by agreeing to pay up the arrears to those who set out, and to consider the claims of those who remained (fol. 38*b*). But the matter was not settled. Sābūr's proposal was to pay one-third of the amount at starting, one-third at Ahwāz, and the remainder on arriving at Shīrāz, and that payment to the others should be deferred. Thereupon the Turkish soldiers attacked his house, and he fled. Collision followed with the populace. The Alide party repulsed the Turks, pelting them with bricks from the roofs. Next day the Turks, who were joined by the Sunnite party, attacked the Alide quarters of Baghdad, and a body of Dailamites were sent to hold the bridge. Some leading Alides then opened negotiations, and, disclaiming all responsibility for the vizier's action, induced

¹ Mu'izz ad-Daula, on occupying Baghdad in 334, even thought of deposing the Abbasids altogether, as usurpers of the Caliphate, and of substituting the Fatimide Caliph or some other descendant of 'Alī, but was dissuaded by one of his advisers (*Ibn al-Athīr*, viii, 339).

the troops to refrain from outrages. The Turks, however, insisted on the money in hand being paid over, and the Dailamites required a share also. In the end no troops started at all (fol. 52). Again, an energetic head of the police having been appointed, and proving successful in checking disorder, the Turks forced him to resign (fol. 53).

On one occasion, too, the Dailamite troops mobbed the house of the vizier Sābūr, from discontent at the debased state of the currency, "for transactions at the time took place in silver" (fol. 37*b*). This must have resulted from the appreciation of gold,¹ and, if I rightly understand another passage in the MS. (at fol. 31*a*), the appreciation was enormous. The passage in question relates to the oppressive and vexatious acts of an agent of the Oqailid chief Qurād b. al-Ladīd at Bādūrayā, which, we are told, bore hardly on the owners of estates and on the cultivators of the soil, and one of such acts was that "payments in respect of safe conduct and protection (i.e. from Arab attacks), which used to be made in silver—the value of which as compared with the gold dinar was as 150 to 1—he reckoned (for the purpose of payment) in gold, at the current rate of exchange, namely, 20 dirhams to the dinar of the old issue, the result being to augment the tax and make it more burdensome." The text is as follows:—

ورد ما كان يؤخذ من مال الخفارة والحماية ورقاً قيمة الدينار به
 مائة وخمسون درهماً إلى العین مصارفة عشرين درهماً بدينار عتيق
 فتضاعف التقرير وزاد التثقیل

The only other indication of the relative value of the precious metals is at the close of the MS., fol. 119*b*, where 100,000 Qāsāniyyah dinars exacted from the vizier Abu Ghālib are said to be equivalent to 4,000,000 dirhams,

¹ The fluctuations in the relative values of the dirham and the dinar are mentioned by v. Kremer (op. cit., pp. 7, 8), and he concludes that the tendency during this century was towards stability.

i.e. at the rate of 40 to 1—a less astounding figure than the foregoing, although greatly in excess of what we are told, on fol. 103*a*, was the rate fixed by ‘Amīd al-Juyūsh in the previous year, 392, for the coinage he then struck, viz. 25 dirhams to the ‘Ṣāji’ dinar.

In 389, dirhams were struck which are called ‘Fathīyyah’ (fol. 5*a*), and in 392 the Kārah of coarse grain is said to cost three ‘Muṭī’iyah’ dinars, rising later to five dinars (fol. 79*a*). These three terms do not appear in Sauvaire’s list of Arabic numismatic terms (see *Journ. Asiat.*, ser. vii, vols. xv, xviii, and xix). The term ‘Qāsāniyyah’ is mentioned (No. 106, vol. xviii, p. 509) as occurring in Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 246 and 308).

Two instances occur in the narrative of great individual wealth. One of these, the estate of al-Farrukhān, which the vizier Abu Ghālīb went to Sīrāf to collect (fols. 75–78), has been already mentioned. The other is the estate of an Alide, Abu-l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. ‘Omar b. Yaḥya, who died in 390 (fols. 12, 13). Ṣafadi, who notices his death (Or. 5,320 2*b*), makes him seventh in descent from Zayd the son of ‘Ali Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, and says that he was the head of the descendants of ‘Ali, and that he was fined a million dinars in gold by ‘Aḍud ad-Daula,¹ and imprisoned, until released by Sharaf ad-Daula. This fine is also mentioned by Dhahabī (Or. 48, 219*a*), and by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jauzi (op. cit., 184*b*)—for he is doubtless the person there referred to under the name of Muḥammad b. Maṣṣūr b. Yaḥya—who says that he was also fined a similar sum by Bahā ad-Daula. He puts his yearly revenue from land at

¹ These fines — ‘Muṣādarah’ — were frequent throughout the century. Instances are given by v. Kremer, op. cit., p. 9. On p. 11 he discusses their origin and motive, and whilst admitting the practice to be, on principle, indefensible and dangerous, considers that it did no injury to the community as a whole, and that in the absence of any system of State credit, it was the readiest way of meeting a deficit. He observes that they are mentioned by the historians without a word of disapproval. But it is to be observed that in this very narrative (fol. 98) Hilāl mentions among the causes which led the inhabitants of Baghdad to rejoice at the appointment of ‘Amīd al-Juyūsh as their governor, a letter he had written to the principal inhabitants in which he promised to have done with such fines. And I have met with passages in other historians where to have refrained from exacting these fines is recorded of a sovereign or governor whose rule is eulogized as beneficent.

one and a half million dirhams, which increased largely under Sharaf ad-Daula, who, again, as he says, exacted from him a sum of a million dinars. This, however, does not accord with Ṣafadi's notice.

He relates that an official, Abu al-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Ṭāhir, reported to Sharaf ad-Daula that the Alide possessed in the year 398—probably an error for 388—as much as 800,000 jaribs of cultivated land (some 265,000 acres), and that his estates brought him a revenue of a million dinars. The Alide heard of this, and thereupon went to Sharaf ad-Daula, and after protesting his gratitude for his release from prison, and for the restoration of his property, said that his wish was to make over a moiety of it to Sharaf ad-Daula's son. But the monarch told him that were his wealth twice what had been reported it was the gift of Allah, and that he should keep it all; his son did not need it. Ṣafadi adds that Ibn Ṭāhir fled to Egypt, and did not return till the Alide was dead. And this explains the statement about him in the MS. (fol. 61b), where he is said to have returned to Baghdad in 391 after his flight to Egypt by reason of Muḥammad b. 'Omar. On his return he was suspected of having come for some mischievous purpose on the part of the Fatimide Caliph against the Abbasside dynasty, and shortly after was set on in his house and murdered.

Hilāl gives details of the proceedings for ascertaining the Alide's estate, and how the amount due therefrom to the public treasury was fixed at 50,000 dinars; that this arrangement affected only the property in Fars, but that as regards the landed estates, it was settled that one-half should go to the royal domain and one-half to the heirs; and that in the result the share of the sovereign, by being made to include the best of the land, amounted, in fact, to two-thirds of the whole.

Lastly, a curious story is told by Hilāl, on the authority of a leading merchant of Bukhārā, about the conquest of the place by the Il-Khanian Turks and the expulsion of the Samanid ruler, news of which had reached Baghdād in

the year 390. His story was that, when the Il-Khanian troops arrived, the Samanid Khatibs ascended the pulpits of the mosques, and after reminding the people of the benevolent rule of the Samanids, exhorted them to fight on their behalf and to entreat Allah to aid their efforts. The population of Bukhārā and Transoxiana were, as he says, mostly fighting men. On hearing this appeal the people applied to their Faqīhs for a Fetwa as to whether they ought to fight. The answer was that they ought not to do so. Had the contest been a religious one, to fight would have been their duty, but in a merely temporal dispute it was not lawful for a Moslem to risk his life. And inasmuch as the Il-Khanian customs and religious tenets were unimpeachable, they had better abstain from strife. This contributed greatly to the Il-Khanians' success and to the fall of the Samanid dynasty. The former entered Bukhārā and ruled mildly and well.

[This passage has been published by Baron v. Rosen under the title of "Die Erzählung des Hilāl as-Sābī von der Einnahme Bukhara's durch Bughrā Khān" in the *Zapiski*, Imp. Russ. Archeolog. Soc., vol. ii, 3 and 4, pp. 272-275 (B.M. Ac. 5,584). He observes that the merchant's memory was at fault in making Bukhārā fall, not before Ilak Khān, but before Bughrā Khān, who according to the other authorities, had been dead some years. He adds that a complete copy of Hilāl's history is greatly to be desired.]

Such is Hilāl's narrative of these years of Bahā ad-Daula's rule. It is a narrative only, for the historian as a rule refrains from personal appreciation of his characters, and from drawing any general conclusions from the events he narrates. The story is that of a decaying power. The Buwaihid dynasty had run the brief course, so frequent in the East, from the hardy and successful adventurer to his degenerate descendants. Of the three founders of the family, two at least, Imād ad-Daula and Rukn ad-Daula, were strong rulers. There is something of dignity in the story that the younger brother, Mu'izz ad-Daula, when already an independent ruler, remained standing in

the presence of his elder, 'Imād ad-Daula, even when told to be seated (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 353); and, what is rarer in Oriental history, something of pathos in the lament of Rukn ad-Daula towards the close of his career, after the attempt of his son 'Aḍud ad-Daula to dispossess his cousin, the son of Mu'izz ad-Daula, of his dominions, that he saw Mu'izz ad-Daula nightly in his dreams reproaching him for failing to protect his orphan son; for, adds the historian, Rukn ad-Daula had been deeply attached to Mu'izz ad-Daula and had stood to him in place of a father (ib., 481). In character Mu'izz ad-Daula was far inferior to his brothers. In his youth he gave proof of personal valour (ib., 205), but he was capable, too, of acts of gross treachery and ingratitude (ib., 242-3). His son and successor at Baghdad, 'Izz ad-Daula Bakhtiyār, was a wholly incompetent ruler, and when death had deprived him of the protection of his uncle Rukn ad-Daula he succumbed at once to the renewed attack of 'Aḍud ad-Daula. With him the power of the Buwaihid dynasty reached its zenith.¹ At his death dissensions broke out between his sons, of whom Bahā ad-Daula was the survivor, and the few personal acts recorded of him in this narrative evince no qualities calculated to arrest the decay of the dynasty.² His death, again, was followed by internecine warfare between his sons, and in 447 the dynasty fell before Ṭuḡhril Beg the Saljūq.

[In Note 1 on page 518 'Ramm' should be read 'Zumm,' being the Kurdish word زوم; see de Goeje, *Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*, pt. vi, p. 33, n. 1, correcting the text of Iṣṭakh̲rī and of Muqaddisi, and the *Gloss. Geogr.*, sub 'Ramm.'—And in Note 1 on page 526, خروم should in both places be read جروم.]

¹ The Court of 'Aḍud ad-Daula was the resort of the leading men of letters of the age. For an account of his buildings and improvements at Baghdad, see "Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate," pp. 234 et seq. and 319.

² Bahā ad-Daula, like other members of the Buwaihid dynasty, bore a Dailamite name—Khāshād. It does not appear in this MS., but is disclosed by a MS. of the history of Mayyāfāriqīn by Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqi, to which I have had access. This historian, who was writing in 572 A.H., should be added to the list of those who have quoted Hilāl's history. He does so with reference to the accession of the Caliph al-Qādir billah in 381 A.H.

A.

[90*b*] قال ابو نصر وكتفنى من هذا العود و الرسالة ما حملنى فيه على الغرر و المخاطرة ثم لم اجد بدا من القبول و الطاعة و رجعت الى شيراز و قصدت دار ابى الخطاب ليلا فقال لى ما الخبر فان القيامة قد قامت على الملك بهرب الموفق و تصوّر انه سيتم عليه به فساد عظيم فاعلمته ما جيت فيه فقال ليس يجوز أن اتولى ايصال الكتاب و ايراد ما محملتة في معناه على الملك و هو يعلم ما بينى و بينكم و لكن أُمِضْ الى المظفر ابى العلا عبيد الله بن الفضل و اسأله ان يكتم خبرك في ورودك و ان توصل الكتاب كانه وصل مع بعض الركابيّة و يستر الامر [91*a*] و يعرف ما عند الملك فيه فصرت اليه و واقفته على ما واقفنى عليه ابو الخطاب فلشدة حرص المظفر على اعلام بها الدولة الخبر و ازالة قلقه به ما باكر الدار و عرض الكتاب و لم يكتم و روى بل ذكره فسكنت نفس الملك الى هذه الجملة فقال فما الذى يُريدُ قال التوثقة على يدى الشريف الطاهر ابى احمد المؤسّس فاجاب اليها و وعد بها و راسلنى ابو الخطاب بان اقتصر فيها و لا استوفىها و وعدت بذاك ثم لم افعله و عملت لليمين نسخة استقصيت القول فيها و حضرت الدار بها و حضر الشريف الطاهر ابو احمد و المظفر ابو العلا فخرج الى الامين ابو عبد الله و قال لى الملك يقول ما الذى تقترحه من التوثقة

فاخرجتُ النسخة من كُمي وسلمتها اليه وقلتُ هذه نسخة اصحبنيها الموقت و رسم لي الرغمة الى الكرم الفايز [91*b*] في ان يُتحرّر بخطّ مولانا الامين و أن يُشرف بتلقظ الحضرة العالية بها محضر من الشريف الطاهر فقال أقوم واعرضها ودخل وعرضها فلما رأى الملك طولها وتأكد الاسنيفاً فيها قال لابي الخطاب اليس رسمنا لك مراسلة ابي نصر بالاقتصار والتخفيف قال قد فعلتُ و وعد ثم لم يفعل فتقدم الى الامين بتحريرها فحررها حرفاً وحرفاً واحضرتُ المجلس وحضر الشريف الطاهر ابو احمد والمظفر ابو العلا و ابو الخطاب و الاثير ابو المسك عنبر و الامين ابو عبد الله وبدا الملك بقراتها فلما مضى شطرها قطعها بان قال قولاً اسنفهم به سيّامنها ثم عاد لاستتمامها فقبلتُ الارض ورفع راسه و قال ما لك قلتُ الخادم الغايب يشل الانعام بأن يكون قراءة هذا التشريف بغير عارضٍ يقطعه فاغتاز غيظاً بان في وجهه ثم [92*a*] اعاد قرأتها من اولها الى اخرها فلما فرغ منها قبلتُ الارض فقال اى شيء تُريد ايضاً قلتُ التشريف بالتوقيع العالى فيها فاستدعى دواة و كتب تلقظتُ بهذه اليمين و التزمتُ الوفاً بها على ما اقترحه من ذلك و اخذتها و خرج الشريف الطاهر ابو احمد و المظفر ابو العلا و خرجتُ الى الموقتى ليرد معنا

B.

فحدّثني القاضي ابو القسم على بن المحسن التنوخيّ قال كان هذا الرجل وهو عبد الله بن عثمان من ولد الواثق بالله يشهد بنصيبين عند الحكّام فيها وعند صدقة بن عليّ بن المؤمّل خليفة القاضي ابي عليّ التنوخيّ والدي على القضاء [58a] بها واليه مع الشهادة الخطابة في المسجد الجامع وكان يفسد على صدقة ويحاول ان يقوم مقامه في خلافة والدي واجتمع صدقة واهل نصيبين على ان كتبوا محضراً بتفسيره وشهدوا بذلك عند صدقة شهادة سمعها وقبلها وانفذ الحكم بها وكتب السى والدى بالصورة وأنقذ اليه المحضرو السجّل عليه فقبل ذلك والدى وأمضى الحكم به وانفذه واشخص الواثقى الى بغداد فلما ورد خاطبه خطاباً قبيحاً ووقع به مكروهاً واعتقله في حبس الشرطة حتّى خاطبه في امره ابو الفرج عبد الواحد بن محمد الببغا الشاعر للبلديّة السّنى كانت بينه وبين الواثقى فاطلقه ونزل غرفة في القرصة بازّآ دار المملكة وذلك في ايام عضد الدولة قال القاضي ابو القسم وكان يواصله ابو العباس احمد بن عيسى المالكيّ [58b] لصداقة بينهما وبلديّة فحدّث ابو العباس قال حضرتُ عنده ليلة في غرفته وقلتُ له الصواب ان تستعطف القاضي ابا عليّ التنوخيّ وتوسّط بينك وبينه ابا فرج الببغا وتصلح امرك معه قال وانا أحاطبه واكرّر هذا الرّأى عليه وهو مُعرضُ عنى فقلتُ له اسمعتَ ما اشرتُ عليك به فقال لى يا ابا العباس انت

جاهل انا مُفكر كيف اطفى شمع هذا الملك الذى يحن بارزاً داره
واخذ ملكه وانت تقول لى استصلح السنوحتى قال ابو العباس فلما
سمعت قوله قلت سلاماً و قمت من فوري منصرفاً عنه وخائفاً من
اذيئة تتطرق على به وقطعته قال القاضي ابو القسم فلما ظهر من
حديثه فيما ورآ النهر بخراسان ما ظهر وقدد الخليفة اطل الله بقاءه
ابا الفضل ولده ولاية عهده وطعن على الواثقى فانكر امره بلعه
[59a] حال المحضر الذى كان أنفذ الى والدى من نصيين بتفسيقه
من جهة بعض من اخبر به بحديثه فاستدعيت الى الدار العزيزة
استدعاً حثيثاً لم تجر عادة به فمضيت ودخلت على ابى الحسن
بن حاجب الثعلب فقال لى ما الذى جرى منك فأنا الطلب
لك ما ينقطع قلت ما اعلم انه حدث ما يقتضى ذلك وكتب
بخبرى فخرج الجواب بانه بلغنا حال محضر أنفذ الى والده من
نصيين بتفسيق الواثقى وانه اسجل به فتطالبه بأحضاره واحضار
الاسجل عليه فاقرأنى ذلك وقلت السمع والطاعة وانصرفت وانا
خائف من ان يكون هذا المطلوب قد ضاع فيما ضاع لنا وتشاغلنا
بالتفتيش عنه فوجدته وحملته من غدي وسلمته فلما حمل الى
حضرة الخليفة اطل الله بقاءه رده وقال [59b] للرئيس سله هل
حفظ على والده اقراره على ما اسجل به فسألنى عن ذلك فقلت
نعم قد كان اقر عندى به ورسم احضار القضاء والشهود والفقهاء ففعل
ذاك وحضر القوم ومنهم القاضي ابو محمد بن الاكفانى والقاضى
ابو الحسن الخرزى وابو حامد الأسفراينى والشهود بأسرهم وعمل

كتاب على سِجِّلٍ والذى بانفاذى ما سمعته من حكمه به واشهدت الجماعة المذكورة على نفسى فيه وكان ذلك فى جملة مما أنفذ السى خراسان و مخرج الوثائق به وحكى القاضى ابو القسم ان هذا الوثائقى دخل بغداد بعد ما جرى له بخراسان ونزل داراً ورآ داره بباب البصرة ثم انتقل عنها لما عُرف خبره وشاع امره وأنه راه فى بعض الايام بالكسرخ وهو لا يعرفه قال فرأيتُ رجلاً عليه قبا [60a] واذارى وعمامة شاهجانية وهو يمشى مُخَنَّبًا ويداه معقودتان من ورأيه كفعل الخراسانية وكان معى ابو العباس المالکى فلما راد سلم عليه وقبل كتفه فنهزه وزبره بلفظ الفارسية الخراسانية فقال له المالکى انما سلمتُ عليك وعندى انك صديقنا الذى يعرفنا ونعرفه فاذا انكرت ذلك فالله معك والتفت السى وقال تعرف هذا الرجل فلت لا قال هذا الوثائقى الذى ادعى ولاية العهد بخراسان

C.

[86b] وبرز صاحب الجيش الى الموضع المعروف بالسبيح من ظاهر الكوفة وأراد ان يجعل انتظاره لبنى عقيل ولقاء لهم فيه فقال له ابو على بن ثمال يا صاحب الجيش قد اشنانا معاملة أهل البلد وثقلنا الوطأة عليهم وهم كارهون لنا وشاكون منا ومتى كانوا فى ظهورنا عند وقوع الحرب لم نأمن ثورتهم من ورأينا ومعاونتهم لاعدائنا علينا والصواب ان يجعل بيننا وبينهم بُعداً فساروا ونزلوا

في القرية المعروفة بالصابونية على فرسخين من الكوفة ومع ابي
على بن ثمال محوسب مائة فارس ومع صاحب الجيش ابي
جعفر نحو العدة من الديلم ولما خرج صاحب الجيش الى هذا
الموضع لم يتبعه من الديلم الا دون ثلثمايه رجلٍ وتأخر الباقون
عنه وطالبوه بالمال واطلاقه لهم وقد كان عميد الجيوش و ابو القسم
بن ممتا راسلاهم و افسداهم [87a] فرّ ابو جعفر الظهير ابا القسم
اليهم حتّى اخرج اكثر المتأخرين لانهم استحبّوا منه و تدمّموا من
الامتناع عليه و ورد بنو عقيل في سبعة الف رجلٍ بالعدد
و المناجنيقات و الاسلحة و القزاعندات و طلعت رأيتهم و ضربت
بوقاتهم و دبادب مواكبهم و رجفوا كما ترجف السلطانية و قد كان
ابو على بن ثمال قصد المشهد بالعريّ على ساكنه السلم و زار و صلّى
و تترغ على القبر و ثال الله تعالى العون و النصر و قال لاصحابه
هذا مقام الموت و الذلّ بالفشل و الجور و مقام الحياة و العزّ بالثبات
و الظفر فوعده المساعدة و بذل نفوسهم في المدافعة و رتب
صاحب الجيش مصافه بين يدي بيوت الحلة و جعل الظهير ابا
القسم في ميمنته و خسرو شاه في ميسرته و وقف هو في القلب و برز
النسوان في الهودج على الجمال و بين ايديهنّ الرجالة بالدرق
و السيوف [87b] و تقدّم ابو على في الفرسان و صار بيننا و بينه مدى
بعيداً و وقع التطاؤد فلم يكن الا و لا حتى و اقتنا الخيل المغنومة
مجنونة و الرجال المأسورون يقادّون و العرب من بنى خفاجة و في
ايديهم الرماح المتدفقة و ارسل ابو على بسن ثمال الى صاحب

الجيش بان سدد و تقدّم اليّنا فقال له ما هذا مقام التقدّم لمثلى
ولا يجوز ان أفارق مصافى واصحر للخيل في هذا البرّ فراجع دفعات
وهو يجيبه بهذا الجواب حتّى قال له ابو على في آخر قوله فأنفذ
الى جماعة من العجم ليشاهدوهم القوم فتضعف نفوسهم ويعلموا
انك وانا فانفذ اليه الظهير ابا القسم في عدّة من فرسان الديلم
واتراك كانوا بالكوفة و خرجوا مع صاحب الجيش فما وصلوا الى
موضع المعركة حتّى انهزم بنو عقيل وأسر منهم نحو الف رجل
وحملوا الى البيوت بعد ان أخذت ثيابهم ودوابهم [88a]
واسلحتهم وكفّ ابو على عن القتل ومنع منه فلم يقتل الا ابو على
بن القلعي كاتب رافع ابن محمد وقد كان نساء بنى خفاجة
وعبيدهم و امّا وهم عند تلاقى الجمع بن ركبو الخيل والجمال
وصاروا الى معسكر بنى عقيل وبينه وبين موضع الحرب بُعد
وكبسوة ونهبوة وولّى بنو عقيل لا يلوى اول منهم على آخر وغنم
بنو خفاجة اموالهم وسلاحهم وكراعهم وسوادهم