ART. XXV.—*Three Arabic MSS. on the History of the City of Mayyāfāriqīn.* By H. F. AMEDROZ.

MAYYĀFĀRIQĪN, like many a Moslem city, was not without its historian, but hitherto he has been a name only—Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqi—known to us by the quotations from his history in the biographies of Ibn Khallikān. Now, however, the British Museum has acquired a nearly complete copy of the *Ta'rikh Mayyāfāriqīn*, Or. 5,803. Its date of composition is 572 A.H. The MS. is written in a good hand, and was copied probably at Damascus, and in the seventh century of the Hijra. It contains 200 folios of about twenty-two closely written lines a side: the first eight folios, to 17 A.H., are wanting; a gap, covering the years 567–9, follows folio 194, and the years 571–2 are wanting at the end.

And recently the Museum has acquired a fragment of an earlier version of the same history—Or. 6,310—composed, as appears from a passage on folio 94*b*, in 560 A.H. Its form is more concise, owing to the absence of much of the non-local matter of the later version, and its contents correspond with the latter half of that version, and do not cover the first two and a half centuries of the Hijra. It may be that this period, during which Mayyāfāriqīn had no history of its own apart from that of the Caliphate, was therein dealt with briefly.¹

¹ This MS. is in a more formal hand than Or. 5,803; it contains 138 folios of ten short lines a side; it commences at 255 A.H. (fol. 103*a* of Or. 5,803), proceeds through 130 folios to 543 A.H., when there occurs a gap of a year (fols. 173–4 of Or. 5,803), and then extends to 548 A.H. (fol. 178*a* of Or. 5,803). There is also a gap at fol. 25*b*, line 3, which is covered by the matter on fols. 121–125 of Or. 5,803, being the period between the revolt at Mayyāfāriqīn against the Dailamite garrison of Samsām al-Daula the Buwaihīd and the seizure of Āmid by Ibn Damnah early in the reign of Mumahhid al-Daula the

Some details of Ibn al-Azraq's career may be gathered from his history, but beyond the fact that he was the grandson of 'Ali, his name had to be sought elsewhere¹ Fortunately Professor D. S. Margoliouth drew my attention to a citation from the Bodleian MS., Marsh 333, in the "Life and Letters of Abu'l-'Alā," Oxford, 1900, relating to the bequest of a library to Mayyāfāriqīn. This bequest was mentioned also in Or. 5,803 (fol. 135*a*) and Marsh 333, which is a geographical and historical description of Mesopotamia (Bodl. Cat., i, No. 945), proved to contain copious quotations from Ibn al-Azraq's history, and to give its author's full name as Aḥmad b. Yūsuf b. 'Alī.² 'Alī b. al-Azraq, the grandfather, is mentioned (fol. 149*a*) as holding the office of Nāẓir of Ḥuṣn Kayfā at the taking of Mayyāfāriqīn by Ibn Jahīr in 478 A.H., when he was party to a pious fraud through which the late Marwānid Vizier, Ibn al-Anbārī, was saved from death at the hands

Marwānid. And the contents from fol. 88*b*, line 5, to fol. 90*b*, line 6, are out of place, and should follow on fol. 92*a*, line 9, owing, no doubt, to the copyist's original having been out of order. Being generally unpointed, this MS. forms a useful exercise in reading, with Or. 5,803 as a key.

¹ The name Abu Muḥammad given to Ibn al-Azraq by Wüstenfeld, (Gesch. No. 256) is erroneous. The person referred to is a Zāhid and miracle-worker. (See the passage cited, Abu'l-Fida, iii, 624.)

² The authorship of Marsh 333 is not settled (see Nicoll's note, Bodl. Cat., ii, p. 602), but the manuscript may now, I think, be safely regarded as the second volume of al-A'lāq al-Khatira fi Dhikr Umarā al-Shām wa'l-Jazīra, by the Kātib 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād of Ḥalab (Brockelmann, Gesch., i, p. 482), for on fol. 36*b* of the MS. the author mentions as his work the Sirat al-Sultān al-Malek al-Zāhir, i.e. Baibars, and of this work 'Izz al-Dīn was the author. (See Ḥāji Khalifa, No. 7,330, and also Safadi, List of Authorities to his Wafī bil-Wafayāt, Vienna, No. 1,163, i, 18*b*.) The MS. would, indeed, have been identified as the above work by Nicoll, but for the error of Ḥāji Khalifa (No. 935) in attributing al-A'lāq to Bahā al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, who died in 632 A.H. (Brockelmann, Gesch., i, p. 316), whilst the author of Marsh 333 was writing in 679 A.H. Ḥāji Khalifa does, in fact, attribute al-A'lāq to 'Izz al-Dīn, but under the name of al-Durrat al-Khatira (No. 4,934). Further, the Ḥāfiẓ Zain al-Dīn, who is suggested by Nicoll as a possible author of the MS., is mentioned therein as an actor in the narrative. It is noticeable that Ibn Shaddād's account of Bād the Kurd, the founder of the Marwānid line (fol. 79*b*), is given on the authority of Ibn al-Athīr (ix, 125) on the ground that he is not mentioned by Ibn al-Azraq. This is untrue of Or. 5,803 (see fol. 121*a*), but is true of the other MS. as it stands, owing to the gap in the text at fol. 25*b*, and there are many indications that the version used by Ibn Shaddād must have been more akin to this one than to Or. 5,803. More about the Bodleian MS. follows *infra*. I am indebted to the Librarian of the Bodleian, Mr. E. W. Nicholson, for the advantage of having been able to compare it with the History of Ibn al-Azraq.

of Ibn Jahīr, by whom he was credited with a too accurate knowledge of the amount of Marwānid treasure which had been got in.

‘Ali is again mentioned (fol. 150*a-b*) as one of a deputation of inhabitants sent to the Sultan’s court in 481 to procure the removal of the Governor, Abu ‘Ali al-Balkhī, who had succeeded Ibn Jahīr. In 482, under Ibn Jahīr’s son, ‘Amīd al-Daula, the new Governor, he is mentioned (fol. 151*a*) as Nāẓir and Governor of Arzan, and in the earlier version (fol. 76*b*) he is included among the leading persons of Mayyāfāriqīn who accompanied ‘Amīd al-Daula on his departure to Baghdād late in 484 by way of Iṣpahān, when they were admitted to the Caliph’s palace and treated with much honour.

His grandson, the historian, was born at Mayyāfāriqīn in 510 A.H. (fol. 160*a*). His first public mission was to Māridīn in 529 (fol. 167*b*), and during the next twenty years he repeatedly records his presence in various cities of Mesopotamia and Syria. In 536 he was at Āmid with his father (fol. 170*a*); in 542 at Mu’dan, buying copper for an issue of coinage by the Ortoqid Ḥusām al-Dīn (fol. 172*b*); in 544 at Mosul, selling iron on behalf of this sovereign, when he was present on the Maidān at the meeting between the Atābek Qutb al-Dīn Maudūd and the Qādi Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūri on his release from prison (fol. 174*b*)—see his life in Ibn Khallikān (Sl. Eng., ii, 646), whose account of the meeting seems to be taken from this history—and when he had from Kamāl al-Dīn particulars of the killing of Zangi at the siege of Qal’at Ja’bar in 541, and how its commander’s confident trust in succour from Allah was justified (see Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 81, and his *History of the Atābeks of Mosul*, “*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Orientaux*,” vol. ii, pt. 2, p. 131). He was in the camp of Ḥusām al-Dīn late in the year when he received the surrender of Dārā (fol. 174*b*), his absence from Mayyāfāriqīn being due to his holding the office of Mutawallī Ashrāf al-Waqf, i.e. superintendent of charitable property, outside its territory (fol. 174*a*).

Baghdād he visited three times. First, in 534 (fol. 169*a-b*), when he stayed six months, and studied under various teachers, whom he enumerates. He relates how he saw the Caliph Muqtafi receive the homage of the Khwāja ‘Izz al-Mulk¹; and how he was present at the Bāb al-Ḥujra on the arrival of the Sultan Mas‘ūd’s sister,² and also at the marriage of the Sultan with the Caliph’s daughter, when the Vizier Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Tīrād al-Zainabī acted as proxy, as he had acted for the Caliph on his marriage. From one prominent official—Abu ‘Abd Allah Muḥammad b. ‘Abd ‘l-Karīm al-Anbārī, who was nephew to the above-mentioned vizier of that name, and was long in the service of the Caliphs from Mustazhir onwards, in the Dīwān al-Inshā’, refusing the post of vizier (fol. 153*b*), until his death in 558 (fol. 186*a*; Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 196)—he received a full account of the conflict between the Sultan Mas‘ūd and the Caliphs Mustarshid and Rāshid, their deaths, and the accession of the Caliph Muqtafi (fols. 165–6).³

¹ “Abu’l-‘Izz Tāhir b. Muḥammad al Barūjirdī,” forced on Sultan Mas‘ūd as vizier by Qarā Sunqur in 533 in place of Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusain the treasurer (Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 42, *sub* 532, and al-Bundārī’s abridgment of Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Iṣfahānī, “Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seldjoudes,” by Houtsma, vol. ii, at p. 187, where the treasurer is named Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, and he is called, too, al-Manāzī in the Zubdat al-Tawārikh, B.M. Stowe, Or. 7, 62*a*).

² Her father, Sultan Muḥammad, had given her mother to his Mamlūk Qarājā al-Sāqī before 508 A.H., when she entered Mayyāfāriqīn as his wife (fol. 159*b*; as corrected by earlier version, fol. 99*b*). Fāṭima, her daughter, had been espoused to the Caliph three years before (Ibn Khallikān, Sl. Eng., ii, 234). The Halls (Ḥujra) were added to the palace by Mustarshid (Yāqūt, i, 144), and in one of these Fāṭima lived until her death in 542. (See “Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate,” Oxford, 1900, by G. Le Strange, p. 273.)

³ This account accords in substance with that given by Ibn al-Athīr (xi, 14–17, and Atābeke, 87–98), but Ibn al-Azraq’s informant, who was an eye-witness of, and actor in, the proceedings, adds many interesting particulars. He relates how Mustarshid started on the campaign against Mas‘ūd in opposition to the advice both of himself and of the Vizier al-Zainabī, who instanced the fatal move of al-Ḥusain from Mecca to ‘Irāq, to all of which the Caliph’s reply was that, if death was inevitable, a coward’s death was a poor one to choose:

إذا لم يكن من الموت بد فمن الغيب ان تموت جباناً

He said, too, that the Caliph’s assassination whilst a prisoner in Mas‘ūd’s camp was by many attributed to Mas‘ūd, acting perhaps on the advice of his uncle, the Sultan Sinjār: and by some to the instigation of the Mazyadid Dubays b. Ṣadaqa, the Caliph’s bitter enemy. That the people of Baghdad believed both Sultans to be guilty is shown by the recollection of ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Iṣfahānī,

His second visit was in 546 A.H. (fol. 175*a*), when he arrived in Ramadhān, and, whilst there, attended the classes

who was there in 549 A.H. (see al-Bundāri, *op. cit.*, p. 178), and the killing of Dubays by Mas'ūd is regarded by Ibn Khallikān (*Sl. Eng.*, i, 506) as a device for laying the deed to his charge. Neither of these theories has the support of Ibn al-Athīr. On the contrary, he suggests that Dubays' death was due to Mas'ūd having no longer occasion to play him off against the Caliph (vol. xi, p. 19). Al-Anbārī went on to say how he, and the other advisers of the late Caliph, were now summoned by Mas'ūd from the fortress of Sarjahān, where they had been imprisoned since their defeat—a place which the historian mentions he saw when at al-Rayy in 549 A.H.—and were consulted as to what was to be done about the Caliphate. The Sultan held very Erastian views as to the position of the Caliph towards the Saljūq power. When the vizier said that the office had passed to the designated successor, Rāshid, who had received homage on that occasion and again lately, he replied that he would never confirm his appointment. Rāshid, he said, meant to revolt, like his father, Mustarshid, who had attacked his brother Maḥmūd twice and himself once, with the result that, till the end of time, they would have to bear the odium of a Caliph's death, after having restored the dignity to his house—an allusion, no doubt, to the suppression of the revolt of al-Basāsiri and the restoration of the Caliph Qāim by his ancestor, Tughril Beg, in 450 (Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 445). His wish was to have someone appointed who would not interfere in matters outside the faith, and not put himself at the head of a party hostile to him and his dynasty. An Abbasid of some years should be chosen—there were plenty to select from—a man of sense and judgment, who must bind himself to be duly obedient and to keep at home, and he told them not to leave out of sight Hārūn (the words are

لا تعزّجوا عن هرون, see the same form used with الی in the sense of

turning the attention to taking another's territory, Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 520, l. 19), Hārūn being a son of the Caliph Muqtadi, for he was an elderly man and would not be inclined to rebellion; he was, moreover, recommended to him by his uncle Sinjār. The historian then enumerates the descendants of Muqtadi, Mustāzhir, Mustarshid, and of Rāshid, who had over twenty children, the eldest born to him when he was 9 years of age only, and the historian dwells on this instance of precocity and cites other cases (fol. 166*a*). Then, resuming the narrative, he tells us that Mas'ūd, whilst recommending Hārūn, added that, in pursuance of the advice of his uncle Sinjār, a guarantee for the behaviour of the person appointed would be required from the vizier, the treasurer, and Ibn al-Anbārī, whereupon the vizier said that, having regard to this liability, it was for them to select, and that their choice fell on the most fit of them all, namely, Mustāzhir's son, Abu 'Abd Allah, for whose acts they would go surety. (He was, in fact, the vizier's son-in-law, having married his daughter when his father was Caliph and hers Chief Naqīb.) The Sultan assented, and advised secrecy, lest the nominee should be murdered in Baghdād. Later they proceeded there with Mas'ūd. Then follows (fol. 166*b*) an account of the doings of Rāshid, and his offer to Zangī to procure the Sultanate for Alp Arslān, son of Mas'ūd's brother Maḥmūd, and then under Zangī's charge, and that Zangī should be Atābek (guardian) to both Sultan and Caliph. Zangī advanced to Baghdād, but had to retire before Mas'ūd, and Rāshid, seeing that his fall was inevitable, assembled all the members of the house of 'Abbās in an underground chamber, which he ordered should be closed. And the historian was told by a chamberlain that Rāshid had handed him a sword, saying he was to help him in killing them all, and so leave no one eligible for the Caliphate, as the enemy might substitute one of them for himself; and that he then ordered the chamber to be opened. Just then came the news of Zangī's flight to Mosul after pillaging the Ḥarīm of Tāhir, and the Sultan's arrival at Nahravān, whereupon they both threw

of the Preacher Quṭb al-Dīn al-'Abādī;¹ he also saw the Sultan Mas'ūd on his coming to pass the winter there, "and

away their swords, and, seizing some valuables, started off with the Chief Qāḍī al-Zainabī, and the lately appointed vizier Ibn Ṣadaqa, to join Zangī at Mosul.

[Ibn al-Athīr attributes the pillage to the criminal class, and Zangī's withdrawal, not flight, to discord among the allies and to the irresolution (تلوّن) of the Caliph (Atābeks, p. 94). He is always favourable to the Mosul dynasty.]

Al-Anbārī went on to say that on reaching Baghdād in 530 A.H. he and the rest gave the required guarantee, and afterwards waited on Abu 'Abd Allah, when the Vizier stipulated that he should abide by the conditions imposed, and informed him that they had already guaranteed this. (It appears from al-Bundārī, op. cit., p. 235, and from the Zubdat al-Tawārīkh, 71b, that one condition was not to keep any Turkish mamluks, which the Caliph evaded by hiring Armenians and Greeks. Ibn al-Athīr records that a similar condition was submitted to by Rāshid, vol. xi, p. 62.) Abu 'Abd Allah assented, and they informed the Sultan, who fixed the day following for the ceremony of homage. On that day (fol. 167a) they first removed from the palace various instruments of music and other improper objects, and then took the evidence of its inmates that Rāshid was given to fermented beverage, whereupon his deposition was pronounced by Abu Ṭāhir Aḥmad b. al-Karkhī, the Chief Qāḍī of the Shafēite sect (in the absence of al-Zainabī at Mosul, Ibn al-Athīr, xi, p. 27). Next they presented the new Caliph with a list of titles, which included 'Muqtafi,' 'Mustaḍī,' and 'Mustanjid'—in the earlier version (115a) 'Mustajir.' He left the choice to them (Ibn al-Athīr, xi, p. 28, attributes the choice to a dream), and al-Anbārī, being asked for his opinion, chose Muqtafi. The Caliph said, "May it be blessed," whereupon the Vizier and the rest of them kissed the Caliph's hand and did homage in these terms:—

بايعت سيدنا ومولانا المقتفى لامر الله امير المؤمنين على كتاب
الله وسنة رسول الله واجتهاده

whilst al-Anbārī substituted, after the titles, the words—

على ما بايعت عليه اباہ وابن اخيه في ولاية عهده

for he had done homage to Mustazhir as Wakīl al-Dār in 490 and to Mustarshid when in the Diwān al-Inshā' in 507, and also to Rāshid, presumably on his designation as successor. (Earlier in the MS., on fol. 135a, is given the form used on the accession of al-Qāim in 422 A.H. The Ḥajīb asked each person in turn—

تبایع الامام القايم بامر الله على الرضى بالالتزام بطاعته وامامته
to which the person replied "Yes," and kissed the Caliph's hand.)

¹ "Al-Muzaffar b. Ardashīr." He had come to Baghdād in 541 on a mission from Sultan Sinjār to the Caliph, when his sermons were largely attended; he died in the year 546 in Khūzistān, whilst on a mission from the Caliph to the Saljūq Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, and was buried in Baghdād (Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 78 and 103).

his elephant, parrot, and monkey"; and he says that the Sultan died in the following year outside Ḥamadhān,¹ the news reaching him at Takrīt on his way homewards.

And he was again in Baghdād in 568 or 569 A.H., for he tells us (fol. 91a) that he then visited the tomb of Abu 'Abd Allah Sufyān b. Sa'īd b. Marzūq b. Mundhir al-Thauri,² and (fol. 92b) that of the Imām Mūsa al-Kāẓim, but the narrative of these years is unfortunately wanting in the MS.

In 548 the historian was for some time at the Court of the king of the Abkhāz, Demetrius, son of David the Restorer. Having recorded the occupation of Tiflīs by David in 515, after his defeat of the Ortoqid Najm al-Dīn Īl Ghāzi and his Moslem allies outside that city, and that many of the prisoners were still in captivity, he says (fol. 161b) that he saw the field of battle when he went to Tiflīs in 548 to the Court of Demetrius; that he accompanied the King in a journey of over seventy days through his kingdom, passing by Ablān and Darband to the province of Abkhāz; that there they came to a fortress in which the King told him was a prisoner of Īl Ghāzi's force, 'a Must'arab,' and that he ought next day to visit him and ask him whence he came; that he was prepared to do this, but at night came tidings of disturbances which compelled their sudden departure, and so prevented his seeing the captive. On fol. 162a he records the regulations respecting the Moslem inhabitants of Tiflīs, which he describes as eminently favourable to them, and that in 548 they were still in force. Further, that he had seen King Demetrius, when on a visit to Tiflīs, attend at the Mosque on a Friday and take his seat on a raised bench (مَنبَر) opposite the Khaṭīb, and listen to his address, and that on leaving he gave 200 dinars for the benefit of the Mosque; and that his conduct towards men of learning and piety was both honourable and liberal; in fact, he had seen Moslems treated by him

¹ This passage is quoted by Ibn Khallikān in his life of Mas'ūd (Sl. Eng., iii, 357).

² Imprisoned by order of the Caliph Maṣṣūr in Mecca in 158 A.H. with members of the Alīde family; died in 161 (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, vi, 23 and 38).

with a respect that they would not have met with even in Baghdād itself.¹ It was on this journey that he heard of the death of ʿĪl Ghāzi, in Dhu'l-Qa'da, 548, for he says (fol. 176*b*) that when near Darband, in Muharram, 549, the King sent for him and told him his master was dead, and that the news had just reached him. On his return by way of Greek territory (fol. 180*a*) Ibn al-Azraq resisted an attempt by Nizām al-Dīn Yāghī Siyān b. Dushmand² to

¹ After the city had been taken by assault and pillaged for three days David promised the inhabitants protection and fair treatment. He remitted various taxes during that year; at the request of the Moslems he provided that no swine should be allowed to be slaughtered in their quarter of the city; he issued coin bearing on one side the names of the Caliph and Sultan, and on the other the names of Allah and of the Prophet, with his own name on the border (and some of these coins are in existence, see "Suites Monétaires de la Georgie," V. Langlois, p. 45; Paris, 1870); he made proclamation that he would refuse to protect anyone injuring a Moslem; that these should have the right of calling to prayer, and of praying and reading openly, and of pronouncing the *Khuṭba* from the pulpit on Friday for the Caliph and the Sultan, but for these only; that no Georgian, Armenian, or Jew should enter the baths of Ismā'il at Tiflis; and he fixed the yearly payment due to himself, *خدمة*, for Georgians at five, for Jews at four, and for Moslems at three dinars (fol. 162*a*). This statement by a Moslem historian is strong evidence of David's toleration. Moslem practice was otherwise. 'Amīd al-Mulk, governor of Mayyāfāriqīn in 580, hearing the call to prayer (ناقوس) sounding from a Nestorian monastery on a hill near, exclaimed, "This is sounded on Moslem hill-tops, whilst we need authorization (اذن نحن) at Constantinople!" and being told the edifice was once a mosque, he had it reconverted (fol. 150*a*, earlier version 74*a*). Both these episodes are told by Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi in the *Mir'āt al-Zamān* (Paris, 1506, 306*a* and 202*b*), and are doubtless taken from this history, and the former is given also by al-'Aini (Broek., ii, 52) in his history; Petersb. As. Mus. Rosen, 177 (see Brosset's *Hist. Géorgie*, vol. i, Add. 240-1). Ibn al-Aṭhīr (x, 399) mentions only the pillage, not the toleration. In his account of the recapture of Tiflis by the Moslems under Jalāl al-Dīn Khwārizm Shāh in 623 (xii, 293-6) he draws attention to the strength of the Georgians in holding the city so long against all Moslem attacks.

² I.e. of the Dānishmand family. See Lane-Poole's "Mohammedan Dynasties," p. 156. Both forms of the name occur in the MS., fols. 186*a*, 197*a*, and 200*a*. In the list of this dynasty given in Jannābi's *History* (Bodl., Pocock 177 and Laud 238) this Yāghī Siyān appears as the third ruler, being son to Muḥammad al-Ghāzi, whom he succeeded in 537. He died in 562. He is mentioned again in the MS. under 570 A.H. (fol. 200*a*) as having been at some date deprived of his territory by the Sultan (of Rūm).

retain him in his service, and went on to Akhlāt, and thence to al-Rayy by way of Arjīsh, Barkari, Nūshahr, Qatwar, Khawayyi, Marand, Tabriz, Zaraknān, and the river. At al-Rayy he visited the tomb of Chosroes, and of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, the pupil of Abu Ḥanīfa,¹ and then retraced his steps to Akhlāt.² In 549 (fol. 181*a*) he was again in Mayyāfāriqīn.

In 558 he was at Akhlāt (fol. 186*a*), when the news arrived of the defeat of the Georgian king by a coalition of Moslem rulers, viz., Shāh Arman, the Saljūq Arslān Shāh of 'Irāq, Shams al-Dīn Īldigiz of Adharbijān, and Fakhr al-Dīn of Arzan. He says that the king fled to some densely wooded ground, three days off, a spot known to him from his visit in 549, and he describes the rejoicings at Akhlāt, when 300 oxen were slaughtered and distributed among the needy.

In 562 (fol. 190*b*) he records his appointment as superintendent of charitable property at Mayyāfāriqīn, and in 563 (fol. 191*b*), having journeyed to Damascus by way of Ruhā, Manbij, Ḥalab, Ḥimş, and Ḥamāh (and the journey lasted from the middle of Sha'abān to the 17th Ramadhān), the Chief Qādi, Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūri, appointed him Nāzir of charitable property there. He was at Damascus at the time of the severe earthquake in 565, which, he says, was fatal to only one person there (fol. 193*a*), and in Rabī' II, 566 (fol. 194*a*), he witnessed the starting of a remarkable caravan for Egypt, in which travelled Saladin's brother, Shams al-Daula (Tūrān Shāh), with his children and nephews and their families and dependants, and which consisted, it was said, of over 70,000 camels, with as many as eight persons on a camel—three women and five small children. It arrived in safety and was met by Saladin.³

On the 13th Jumāda I in the same year (fol. 194*b*) he

¹ His life is given by Ibn Khallikān, *Sl. Eng.*, ii, 590.

² For this route see *Iṣṭakhri*, p. 194.

³ The departure is mentioned by Ibn al-Aṭhīr (see *Atābeks*, p. 258, and Ibn Khallikān, *Sl. Eng.*, iv, 497).

started homewards, and retracing his steps to Manbij, reached Mayyāfāriqīn, through Harrān, Ra's al-'Ain, and Māridīn, in the middle of Jumāda II. In 570 (fol. 198b) he is journeying by Āmid, to Hamāh, on to Hāni, and thence home by the Monastery of the Cross.

And in 571 (fol. 200a), after another successful campaign against the Georgians, he was at Akhlāt when the remains of a deceased vizier of Shāh Arman arrived there, and witnessed the grief and mourning of the ruler and people. How long he lived after 572 is uncertain, as I have been unable to find any biographical notice of him. From his constant journeys it would appear that, like his grandfather, he was connected with state business—in two instances he says so—and various passages in his history indicate that he was interested in public works; on bridges, for instance, he has much to say, and seems to look at them with a practised eye.¹

Ibn al-Azraq says (fol. 7a) that his history had originated in a perusal of the Kitāb Baghdād, with its description of the building of that city by al-Manṣūr, and of the Kitāb al-Mauṣil, composed by al-Shimshāṭi for the Oqailid Qirwāsh, and extending to about 440 A.H. Of this last work and of

¹ He mentions that a bridge at Aqrāmān, over the Sātidamā river, gave way in 539 (fol. 171a); that an attempt to rebuild it in 541 failed owing to the foundations being undermined by a flood; that the person charged with the work was saddled with the cost; and that his successor did his work excellently, the bridge being completed in 548 (fol. 171b). He states its height as over sixty cubits "bi'l-Najjar" (i.e. one larger by a sixth than the ordinary cubit; see Ibn Hauqal, 112 (c), and Gloss Geogr. sub "Najar"). He says, too, that it was the first bridge to be built in Diyār Bakr; and proceeds to instance other bridges of later date (fol. 179b), one of these being that over the Yāryār river between Fanak and Jazīrat ibn 'Omar, built by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Iṣbahānī, the vizier at Mosul, who contemplated another over the Tigris at Bāfatā below Jazīra, but did not live to complete it (ib. and 185b). On fol. 195b he records, too, that in 570 Banafsaḥ, a slave girl belonging to the Caliph, made a second bridge of boats (Jisr) over the Tigris for which the chain, which cost 1,500 dinars, was procured from Hāni (where there were iron-mines, Yāqūt, ii, 188); that it was moored below the Taj palace, the old bridge being removed to near the entrance of Darb Zakhī near the college of Muwaffaq; and that the new bridge proved of great use. (The building by Banafsaḥ of a bridge near the Shūniziyya quarter, probably the 'Thorn bridge,' is mentioned in "Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate," by G. Le Strange, p. 79, on the authority of the Ta'rikh-i-Guzidah of Ḥamd-Allah. Perhaps the bridge was misdescribed by Ḥamd-Allah.)

its author nothing is known,¹ but the *Kitāb Baghdād* is the well-known work by Ibn abi Tāhir Ṭaifūr, the prototype of all subsequent histories of Baghdād. (See Brockelmann, *Gesch.*, i, p. 138.)² The earlier version of Ibn al-Azraq's history (Or. 6,310) is smaller in compass than Or. 5,803, not so much owing to greater conciseness as to the absence of the matter added to the later version. The scope of the history is rather local than general, and, apart from the proof afforded by the existence of the earlier version, it would have been apparent that much of the non-local matter in Or. 5,803, at least in its latter half, which alone I have fully read, was an addition to an existing work. This foreign matter, down to the fall of the Marwānid dynasty in 478 A.H., consists in the main of scraps of Baghdād history with some notices of the Fatimide rulers, inserted, at times, in the middle of an episode, or out of order of date, or twice over, and under different dates. And many of the dates are at variance with those given in other histories. Later, from the time of Zangi onwards, when the centre of politics had shifted to Mosul and Damascus, when Māridīn and not Mayyāfāriqīn was the residence of the ruling dynasty, and when Ibn al-Azraq was himself a spectator of events, his history broadens somewhat, and is made up of unconnected notices of events occurring in Mesopotamia and elsewhere. To its close the

¹ This author must not be confused with 'Ali b. Muḥammad al-Shimshāṭi, a poet at the Court of Saif al-Daula; see fol. 113*b* of this MS., Yāqūt, iii, 320, and Ibn Khallikān (Sl. Eng., ii, 335). Dhahabi (Or. 48, 2*b*) quotes a History by 'Ali b. Muḥammad al-Shimshāṭi for warfare between Saif al-Daula and the Greeks in 351 A.H.

² I have found but one subsequent reference in the MS. to the *Kitāb Baghdād*—at fol. 95*a*, where it is quoted as fixing the death of the Imām Mālik in 199 A.H. at the age of 85 years. Ibn al-Azraq there says that he had already given the date otherwise and as he then believed it to be, and that he now gave this different date. And he had in fact stated (fol. 92*a-b*) that the Imām died in 179 A.H., aged 84 years, or, according to al-Wāqidi, aged 90 years. Ibn Khallikān's life of the Imām (Sl. Eng., ii, p. 547) contains a similar statement. Ibn al-Azraq was evidently struck by the discrepancy between the two dates. That given by Ibn Ṭaifūr unfortunately does not fall within the period covered by the fragment of his work (B.M. Add. 23,318) relating to the reign of Ma'mūn, which begins at 204 A.H. Ibn al-Azraq relates the foundation of Baghdād at fol. 89, but does not quote the *Kitāb Baghdād*.

work continues to be rather a patchwork than a tissue of history.

In the course of the opening narrative of the Moslem conquest of the country is inserted an account of the founding of Mayyāfāriqīn (fol. 7*b* et seq.), taken from a 'Tash'ītha' in the Melkite Church there, which a Christian translated for the author from the Syriac into Arabic. And Yāqūt, writing just half a century after Ibn al-Azraq, gives the same account in a more concise form in the Mu'jam al-Buldān, ed. Wüst., iv, 703.¹ The narrative proceeds under headings of successive Caliphs until, on fol. 110*a*, comes an account of the rise of the Hamdānids, and in particular of Saif al-Daula, who held Mayyāfāriqīn, with notices of his campaigns, of his Court, of the names of the literary men who frequented it (fol. 113*b*), of his death, and of his

¹ Some of the variants in the two texts are noticeable. The original name of Mayyāfāriqīn—'City of Martyrs'—in Yāqūt, 705, مدورصلا is, on fol. 9*b*, ميفرقت (see Assemani, B.O. i, 174). In the list of the city towers, Yāqūt's برج الزرية وبيعة اليعاقبة is برج الرومية والبيعة بالعقبة and برج الزرية is برج الزاوية. In the list of gates Yāqūt's الخنازير, قلونج, and الهوة are, respectively, الجنايز, قولفج, and الشهوة (though on fol. 140*a* the second of these appears twice as قلوبج). The meadow where the conquerors stuck up their spears (Yāqūt, 707), عين البيضة, is, on fol. 6*a*, عين النصبة. Further, the date of the Seleucid era, corresponding with 300 A.D. (the foundation of the city), given in Yāqūt as 623, is, on fol. 10*b*, erroneously 923, but the words which follow in Yāqūt, 706, l. 21, وقيل اول عمارتها في ايام بطرس الملك في ايام يعقوب النسي are, more probably, وقيل كان ذلك في ولاية انطرس الملك وقيل انطوس وكان ذلك في زمن يعقوب الذي بنى بيعة نصيبين i.e. the Bishop James, d. A.D. 338. (See Assemani, B.O. i, 17.)

elaborate funeral (117*a*).¹ Then follows an account of the conquest of Mayyāfāriqīn and the rest of Diyār Bakr by

¹ Among the expeditions of Saif al-Daula, one against Armenia in 328 A.H. (940 A.D.), mentioned on fol. 111*b*, contains some interesting names. It runs thus:—

وفي سنة ثمان وعشرين وثلثمائة سار سيف الدولة من ميفرقين
الى ارمينية ونزل بطيطوانة على البكيرية واستدعى بابن جاجيق
بن الديرانى واحمد بن عبد الرحمن و ابو المعز صاحب خلاط وذات
الجوز وارجيش وبركرى وعبد الحميد صاحب منازل جرد و سبالورك
والهرک اشوط بن جرجور و بطريق البطارقة بارمنية وحضروا لديه
واخذ من ابن الديرانى حصن شهران والحامد و بلدانها و ماجوارها
(sic) واخذ من احمد بن عبد الرحمن بدليس و ما جاورها (sic)
واخذ من اشوط بلد السنانسة و فاتحه و ملك قلعة قلب و حصن
سليمن و اعمالها و رة ملوک . . . تحت حكمه و فى خدمته و سار
الى بلاد ابن المرزبان و بلد الخالدية فنهب و سبا منه خلقا عظيما
و فتح حصونهم اجمع و ذلك فى مدة خمسين يوما و عاد

The names Gagic, Déranic, Ashot, and Grigor seem to be those of princes of the house of Ardzrouni (see their history in "Collection d'historiens Arméniens," by M. Brosset, vol. i, 248 and 263; St. Petersburg, 1874). The title 'Marzpan' (Marzubān) of Armenia occurs, *ib.* 210. The Baṭriq al-Baṭāriqa is probably the 'Ishkhān' or central king. The Sunāsuna, who are mentioned elsewhere in the MS. as hostile neighbours, were an Armenian tribe (Ibn al-Aṭhīr, ix, 306). For 'al-Taṭawāna,' see Yāqūt, iii, 570, and for 'Barkari,' *Iṣṭakhri*, 194. The latter is marked as 'Pergri' on Kiepert's map of Turkey in Asia, and as situate on the stream at the north-east corner of Lake Van, with Arjish, Dhāt al-Jauz, and Akhlāt lying along the north shore in succession westwards, Dhāt al-Jauz being "Ardzgē or 'Ādeljīwāz," and on fol. 160*a* it occurs again as عاد الجوز. I am informed by Mr. A. G. Ellis that the word should more properly be 'Artskē,' the Armenian having probably been transliterated according to Constantinople pronunciation; further, that

‘Aḍud al-Daula, with a notice of his literary Court, which included al-‘Utbi, the author of the Kitāb Yamīni (fol. 120*a*). And then an account of how in 372, on the death of ‘Aḍud al-Daula, Bād the Kurd succeeded in establishing himself in Diyār Bakr as an independent ruler, where he was followed in succession by his three nephews, the children of his brother-in-law Marwān, with Mayyāfāriqīn as their capital. Their dynasty—the Marwānid—with that of their successors, the Ortoqids of Māridīn, under whom Ibn al-Azraq lived, occupy the remainder of the MS. Of these I hope to give some account on a future occasion.

Ibn al-Azraq’s quotations from other histories by name are few, and from the time of the Marwānid rulers onwards no historian is cited. In the earlier half of the MS., so far as I have perused it, I have found quotations from the following authors:—

Al-Wāqidī, Brockelmann, *Gesch.*, i, p. 135, on fol. 92*b*; Ibn Qutaiba, Kitāb al-Ma‘ārif, *ib.*, p. 120, on fols. 88*b*, 90*a*, and 94*b*; al-Bilādḥuri, Kitāb al-Buldān, *ib.*, p. 141, on fol. 2*a*; Ibn Ṭaifūr, Kitāb Bagḥdād, *ib.*, p. 138, on fol. 95*a*; Al-Dīnawari, al-Akhbar al-Ṭiwāl, *ib.*, p. 123, on fol. 12*b*; Al-Ṣūlī, Kitāb al-Aurāq, *ib.*, p. 143, on fol. 100*a*; and Hilāl al-Ṣābi, Ta’rīkh, *ib.*, p. 323, on fol. 123*a*. And on fol. 108*a* an unknown historian, Ibn Shajara, is quoted for a strange gift to the Caliph Muqtadir, in 306 A.H., of the upper half of a huge fish’s head, which was said to have remained in the palace until it was pillaged by al-Basāsiri (in 450 A.H.; Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 442). The text is as follows:—

وقيل ما رواه ابن شجرة في تاريخه انه اهدى الى المقتدر في سنة
ست وثلثمائة نصف راس سمكة الاعلى الذي فيه العينان سمكة

Lucas Injijian, in his *Universal Geography*, Venice, 1806, vol. i (Armenia) of the first part of the work (Asia), at p. 165 gives the modern name of the place as ‘Aljavaz’ or ‘Atiljewaz.’ ‘Sibalwark’ is the modern Turkish ‘Séverek.’ ‘Qalb’ is included in the list of the towns and fortresses of Diyārbakr, given by Ibn Shaddād (Bodl., Marsh 333, 65*a*), which, he says, passed from one ruler to another as if they were pledges or chessmen.

اكثر من قامة وزن بالرطل العراقى فكان وزنه سبعة الف وثلثمائة
رطل وكان قد جف وكان يقال انه بقى فى دار الخلافة الى زمن
البساسيرى واخرج لما نهب دار الخلافة

I have found Ibn al-Azraq's history quoted or copied by Ibn Khallikān in the following passages of De Slane's English translation :—Vol. i, p. 127 (Or. 5,803, fols. 134*b*–135*a*), for the bequest by al-Manāzi of his library to two mosques; p. 158 (fols. 140*b*–141*b*), p. 506 (fol. 165*b*), and p. 602 (fol. 183*a*); vol. ii, p. 111 (fol. 121*a*), p. 581 (fol. 103*b*), p. 629 (fol. 182*a*), and p. 646, without mention of the history, being the above-mentioned passage relating to Kamāl al-Dīn al-Shahrazūri (fol. 174*b*); vol. iii, p. 338 (fol. 163*b*), p. 356 (fol. 175*a*), and p. 601, where our author's name is printed by error Ibn Zūlāk (fol. 189*a*).

Sibt Ibn al-Jauzi, in the *Mir'āt al-Zamān*, quotes a History of Mayyāfāriqīn—meaning no doubt that by Ibn al-Azraq—B.M. Or. 4,619, fol. 216*b*, under 418 A.H., for the placing of a purse of money in the coffin of the Vizier al-Maghribi as a means of identification (see Or. 5,803, fol. 135*b*), and also (*ibid.*, fol. 217*a*) for a statement, on the authority of a certain Abu Hawāri al-Wāsiṭi, that the vizier wished to be buried beneath the feet of al-Husain, a statement which appears neither in Or. 5,803 nor in the earlier version.

And again, in the same work (Paris, 1506, fol. 69*a*), under 453 A.H., he quotes this history for many facts relating to the life of the Marwānid Naṣr al-Daula; again, on fol. 252*b*, in connection with the summoning of Qiliġ Arslān b. Sulaimān in 498 from Malaṭiyyah to rule at Mayyāfāriqīn, for the fact that his father, Sulaimān b. Qutalmish, had been sent by Malek Shāh to conquer the former place; on fol. 258*a*, for the defeat of Qiliġ Arslān in 499 by Jāwali Saqāwah, a mamlūk of Sultan Muḥammad, and his death by drowning (see Or. 5,803, 158*a*); and on fols. 258*a* and *b*, in the notice of Qiliġ Arslān, under 500 A.H., for the statement that Muḥammad also despatched Jāwali to fight the Franks, and

ordered the local rulers to obey him; that Jakarmish of Mosul refused to do so, was defeated by Jāwali, and died of his wounds; that Qilij Arslān then occupied Mosul, but was also attacked by Jāwali and drowned; and that his infant son was sent to the Sultan Mas'ūd, and became the ancestor of the Saljūq line of Rūm. (This passage is not to be found in Or. 5,803; the events are told by Ibn al-Athīr, x, 291 et seq.) Again, on fol. 306*b*, the passage relating to the earthquake at Janzah in 510 A.H. is taken verbatim from Or. 5,803, 162*a-b*, viz., that the town was attacked and pillaged by David (the Restorer), the captives being so numerous that they were conveyed to Tiflīs in waggons. Moslems were brought in there in flocks, and most of them were bought and released by the inhabitants—presumably the Moslem section—many of whom told the author (i.e. Ibn al-Azraq, on his visit in 548) that they became impoverished in that year.

Lastly, the author of the MS. Bodl. Marsh 333 drew from the history of Ibn al-Azraq about one-fourth of its contents. Of that MS. the probable author, as above stated, was 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād.

It remains to give some account of this author and of his works. Dhahabi, in the *Ta'rikh al-Islām*, B.M. Or. 1,540, *sub* 684 A.H., has a notice of his death, as follows:—"The Kātib 'Izz al-Dīn Abu 'Abd Allah Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. 'Alī b. Shaddād al-Anṣārī of Ḥalab, born there in 613 A.H., was a man of great culture and intelligence. He was the author of a History of Ḥalab, and of a life of the Sultan al-Malik al-Zāhir al-Ṣāliḥī (i.e. Baibars). He had been in close attendance on the Sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yūsuf (i.e. the Ayyubid ruler at Ḥalab, 634-658 A.H.), and had gone on missions from him to Hūlāgū and others. Later, after the fall of Ḥalab, he settled in Egypt, and acquired position and respect at the Court of al-Malik al-Zāhir and al-Malik al-Manṣūr (i.e. Qalāun, 678-689, whose reign followed on those of the two sons of Baibars). He possessed

a courtier's ingratiating qualities, and was alert in rendering service to people. To some extent he imparted traditions, and some persons in Egypt derived them from him. He died in Ṣafar, and was buried at the foot of Muqaṭṭam (*sic* منظم). He was offered the post of vizier under al-Malik al-Sadīd (probably al-Sa'īd Baraka Khān, Baibars' son and successor, ruled 676–8 A.H.), but he declined it. His monthly stipend was a thousand dirhams. He led an honoured and easy life."

This account accords very closely, as will be seen, with what the author of Marsh 333 says therein of himself.

The "History of Ḥalab" is doubtless the first volume of al-A'lāq al-Khaṭīra, composed not earlier than 678, which comprises Ḥalab and the adjacent district. Of this the British Museum possesses an incomplete copy of the seventeenth century, Cat. No. 1,323, and a fragment of the same, *ib.*, No. 282 (2). There is, too, a copy at St. Petersburg—Asiatic Museum, 162. The British Museum possesses also a fine MS. of the third volume of the work—Cat. No. 1,324—comprising Damascus and Eastern Syria, which dates from the time of composition,¹ but which is imperfect, and so greatly damaged by water as to be largely illegible.

The MS. Bodl. Marsh 333 is a fine fourteenth-century copy. It was composed in 679 A.H., and copied in 789 A.H. by Sulaimān b. Ghāzi b. Muḥammad al-Īwānī; and it is both perfect and legible. It comprises the districts of Diyār Moḍar, Diyār Rabī'a, and Diyār Bakr. And there must have been yet another portion of the work, on Mosul, for the author says in his preface that he means to treat of it, for although not strictly part of Mesopotamia, yet it was adjacent, and under the Caliphate was included with it under one governor; and later, on fol. 46a, in his account

¹ The date of the composition of both volumes is given in the B.M. Catalogue, No. 1,324, as 674 A.H. But it appears from the former (Add. 23,334, 92a) that it was composed after the accession of Qalāun, in 678; and as regards the latter volume (Add. 23,335, on fol. 76a) the date 675 appears. As to this volume see concluding Note *infra*.

of the town of Sinjār, he says with reference to the Oqailid Muslim that his story was given in the history of Mosul.

The other work mentioned by Dhahabi—the Life of Baibars—is referred to in Marsh 333 on fol. 36*b*, when the author, speaking of Bīra as having been since 560 under governors appointed by Baibars, adds that the place underwent three sieges by the Tatars, “as shall be related in our history, under successive years, of the life of the Sultan al-Malik al-Zāhir, may Allah perpetuate his rule.”

Further, the author mentions two other historical works as his. On fol. 40*a*, in relating how the Ayyubids had called in Khwārizm Shāh to expel the Atābek Lu’lu’ from Naṣībīn, he adds that this shall be set out fully “in our continuation (ذيل) to the history of Ibn al-Aṭhīr.” And, on fol. 107*b*, when relating the defeat and death of Jalāl al-Dīn Mankburni¹ in 628, he says that he will give some account of his doings “notwithstanding we have gone into this in detail in our work entitled *جنا الحشيين في اخبار الدولتين*,” the two powers being presumably the Khwārizm Shāh and the Ayyubid of Ḥalab, al-Nāṣir Yūsuf.

As regards the employment of Ibn Shaddād by al-Nāṣir Yūsuf, the author of Marsh 333, in his account of Ḥarrān, tells us (fol. 20*b*) that in 640 A.H., after the town had passed to that sovereign, he was sent to inspect it; that he found its revenue at that date to amount to one million dirhams, whilst in the time of al-Ashraf (i.e. fifteen years earlier) the amount had been thrice as much; and that it still further declined later under Tatar rule.

Again, in his account of Jazīrat ibn ‘Omar, which, on the death of its Atābek Maḥmūd in 648, passed to his son Mas‘ūd, he says (fol. 62*a*) that in 649, after the return of al-Nāṣir from defeating the Egyptians, there arrived Tatar envoys, and with them merchants, who were the bearers of

¹ The name is written ‘Mankoberti’ by Houdas in his translation of the life of Jalāl al-Dīn by al-Nasawi, Paris, 1895; see preface and note on p. 3. But it is written ‘Mankburni’ in the thirteenth-century MS. of the same work (B.M. Or. 5,662) and elsewhere. Ṣafadi, in his notice of Jalāl al-Dīn in the *Wāfi bil-Wafayāt* (B.M. Add. 23,359, 23*a*), spells the name ‘Mankūburni.’

orders on various sovereigns for the payment of sums of money,¹ viz., 200,000 dinars on al-Nāṣir, and smaller sums on the rulers of Rūm, Mosul, Māridīn, Mayyāfāriqīn, Jazīra, and Ḥuṣn Kayfā respectively. These all shifted their liability on to al-Nāṣir, on the plea that he was their suzerain, and that they could not satisfy the orders unless he did the same. The claim was accordingly presented to al-Nāṣir, and he was advised by Sulaimān al-Ḥāfiẓi² to satisfy it. But the author protested against this course on the ground that when Tāj al-Mulūk visited Kūyuk Khān in 643, similar documents (يغالغ) were made out to him, to the effect that they on their side should be under no liability to satisfy such orders, nor to provide any assistance in men. And the documents were fetched and bore this out. Thereupon al-Nāṣir sent the author with the envoys and merchants to the other rulers with instructions to traverse the claim (لاحاقتهم). In the meantime a message arrived from Masūd

¹ The words are يغالغ تضمن حوالات عليه, meaning, apparently, orders for payment to the merchants of money due from the various rulers to the Tatars.

The Turkish word يارليغ means a royal order; see Zenker, Dict. Turk., ii, 949.

² This is the person suggested by Nicoll (Bodl. Cat., ii, 603) as the possible author of the MS. He is mentioned on fol. 56b, under the name of Zain al-Dīn, as having given advice owing to which succour sent from Damascus to support al-Lu'lu's son, al-Muẓaffar, in Sinjār against the Tatars was by them intercepted and the place taken. A notice of this Zain al-Dīn Sulaimān al-Ḥāfiẓi is given by Ibn Abi Ṭṣaibi'a (Broek., i, 325) in his "Uyūn al-Anbā," Cairo, 1299, ii, 189, from which it appears that he was first in the service of al-Ḥāfiẓ Arslān Shāh, the son of al-'Adil, ruler of Qal'at Ja'bar, and contributed to bring about its transfer to al-Nāṣir of Ḥalab (in 638, see fol. 35b of the MS.). He then went to Ḥalab, where he gained influence and wealth, and on al-Nāṣir acquiring Damascus (in 648) he accompanied him there. When the Tatars began pressing their demands on al-Nāṣir, he was sent as envoy to Hūlāgū, when he was completely gained over to the cause of the Tatars, and used his position to push their pretensions and to inspire al-Nāṣir, who was averse to warfare, with apprehension by exaggerating their resources as compared with his own. When Damascus submitted to the Tatars, Zain al-Dīn obtained a great position there under the Na'ib, but when the Tatars were defeated by the Mamlūk Sultan Quṭuz, and Syria was restored to the Moslems, the Na'ib fled, and with him Zain al-Dīn, afraid of the treatment he would receive at Moslem hands. His fears were misplaced. Ṣafadi, in the Wāfi bil-Wafayāt, Bodl., i, No. 668 (Seld. Arch. A. 23), records him under the name of Sulaimān b. 'Alī Zain al-Dīn Abu al-Muayyad Khaṭīb 'Uqbarā al-Ḥāfiẓi, and, after quoting the above statements of Ibn Abi Ṭṣaibi'a, says that he was accused by Hūlāgū of corresponding with the ruler of Egypt, and was put to death with his children and relatives, to the number of fifty persons. Ṣafadi adds that the ruler in question was al-Zāhir, i.e. Baibars, and the date 662 A.H.

complaining of the hostility shown to him since his father's death by Lu'lu' of Mosul, and offering to cede Jazīra to al-Nāṣir for a compensation. This offer al-Nāṣir did not immediately entertain, being fully occupied with Egyptian matters, but he directed the author to intercede with Lu'lu' on Mas'ūd's behalf, and to try and arrange matters. The author accordingly followed the envoys to Mosul, where he found he had been preceded by 'Abd al-Raḥīm Majd al-Dīn, son of the Ṣāhib Kamāl al-Dīn 'Omar, known as Ibn al-'Adīm (the historian of Ḥalab), to condole on the death of Lu'lu''s son. Lu'lu' alleged various grievances against Mas'ūd, one being, apparently, that he had taught his daughter bad language, and he offered his guest an opportunity of overhearing a specimen, but received the reply that his statement was sufficient proof. He further said that Mas'ūd was wholly incompetent to guard his territory; that it ought to belong to someone who could do the Moslem cause some benefit; and he offered al-Nāṣir 50,000 dinars in gold if it were made over to him. The author did not encourage this plan, nevertheless Lu'lu' managed, through Majd al-Dīn, to come to a secret arrangement with al-Nāṣir to the effect that when the latter was rid of the Egyptian business he was to be at liberty to seize Jazīra. The author next proceeded to Jazīra, and Mas'ūd offered to leave the place in his charge whilst he went and saw al-Nāṣir, but the author declined this and went on to Māridīn.

The question of the money claims had been discussed between the envoys and the author, in Lu'lu''s presence, and had led to much recrimination. The envoys were insolent to Lu'lu'; he reproached the author with having come to his detriment; the author retorted that Lu'lu' was the cause of the envoys' outburst, and the latter were rebuked by the Tatar Nā'ib at Mosul. But to him and them alike the author was inflexible, and refused all payment, whether on the part of al-Nāṣir or his feudatories. Whilst the envoys were on their way to Irbil, Lu'lu' caused them to be attacked and killed to a man, and in answer to the Nā'ib's protests alleged that it had happened outside his territory,

but that he would make an enquiry. He then collected out of his fortresses all such as deserved to die, had them executed, and handed over their possessions to the Nā'ib, saying that they were the culprits. This quite satisfied the Nā'ib, and Lu'lu' told the author in confidence that his suzerain al-Nāṣir might with advantage act by his example. As regards Jazīra, the author says that Lu'lu', on hearing of al-Nāṣir's assent, hastened in 649 to seize the town unconditionally. Mas'ūd was shipped off to Mosul by river, but he never arrived, being drowned on the way. He was the last ruler of the line of Zangī.

The author also gives in the MS. an account of his embassy to Hūlāgū, or, more accurately, to his son Yashmūt, who was in command of the Tatar force besieging Mayyāfāriqīn in 656 A.H. It came about thus. The last Ayyubīd ruler of Mayyāfāriqīn, al-Kāmil Muḥammad, who, in 645, succeeded his father, al-Muzaffar Ghāzi b. al-'Ādil, had induced the Mongol Bātū to recall the Tatar troops who were besieging Mayyāfāriqīn in 650, on condition of his attending in person at the Court of Mangū (fol. 111a-b). Late in the year he did this, bearing rich gifts. His arrival coincided with that of al-Muzaffar Qarā Arslān, the son of al-Sa'id Najm al-Dīn Ghāzi, the Ortoqid ruler of Māridīn, and a contest for precedence arose between them which was decided by Mangū in favour of al-Kāmil, on the ground that his dominions were the more extensive. Both did homage to Mangū, who dismissed them with a letter of recommendation to his brother Hūlāgū, telling them they were not to attend on him again unless by order of Hūlāgū, for they were now under his supervision (امرکم عاید الی هولاکو) (fol. 112b).

Al-Kāmil, on his return to Mayyāfāriqīn, threw off his allegiance to Mangū and imprisoned his representatives. Mangū showed no resentment, only ordering al-Kāmil to proceed with his troops to Baghdād.¹ He did not do this,

¹ In order to assist the Tatar besiegers. Al-Kāmil's disobedience to the order was one of the four acts alleged against him by Hūlāgū when he put him to death on the taking of Mayyāfāriqīn in 658 (fol. 120a).

and when Hūlāgū laid siege to Baghdād he removed to Harrān, and from there wrote to the author, then at Ḥalab and on the point of starting on a mission, telling him to stop and await his arrival. He wrote also to al-Nāṣir announcing his coming, and on his encamping outside Damascus, al-Nāṣir came out to meet him in accordance with the opinion of all his advisers, except al-Ḥāfiẓi. Al-Kāmil urged on him that the Tatars meant conquest, and that it was useless to give way to them. Since 642, he said, his suzerain al-Nāṣir had been making payments to them, and to what purpose? For his part, seeing he must perish, he would prefer to die a martyr in Allah's cause. Why should not the Sultan and his army, including himself, go to the assistance of the Moslems of Baghdād? If they succeeded they would stand well with¹ the Caliph; if they failed they could avenge him. Many of al-Nāṣir's advisers supported this view. He, however, suggested sending an envoy to accompany al-Kāmil to Hūlāgū to negotiate. Al-Kāmil answered, "I base my appeal on religion: you take a worldly view."² If I chose to go to Hūlāgū, I could do so to greater advantage than you could, having already seen him twice." Eventually nothing was done and Baghdād fell. Then the two sovereigns agreed to aid each other when attacked. Al-Kāmil, on his return, met the author at Ḥalab, and was advised by him when he got home to remove his Ḥarīm, appoint a deputy in his place, and come and renew his attempts to instil resolution into al-Nāṣir (fols. 113b-114b).

In 656 Mayyāfāriqīn was attacked by the Tatars under Yashmūt, son of Hūlāgū, reinforced by troops from the rulers of Mosul and Māridīn. The knowledge that al-Kāmil was in the place caused the siege to be pushed hotly. Al-Nāṣir carried out his idea of despatching an envoy, for in 657 the author says (fol. 115b) that he left, accompanied

¹ The phrase is البِدُ الْبَيْضَا. It is used again on fol. 135a.

² امر ديني and امر دنوي.

by a grandson of Saladin and by the three sons of al-Nāṣir, together with his Ḥarīm, who were to be left in Ḥalab, and taking with him 1,500 dinars and a jewelled belt and sword as gifts for Yashmūt. After being attacked at Ḥamah by Tatars, who were bought off with 2,000 dirhams, the party travelled by Harrān to Māridīn, where the author was refused an audience by the Ortoqid Saʿīd because of the Tatars. At al-Ṣūr another Tatar attack was bought off. They then crossed the Euphrates, meeting with further rough treatment from the Tatars, their baggage being searched and some of it taken from them. Next day they were received in audience by the ʿĪl Khān, and delivered their complimentary message, complaining at the same time of Tatar attacks and outrages on the inhabitants. The reply was that these were the aggressors, and that the only object on their side was to punish the Turkomans and Arabs. The envoy then demanded compensation, failing which they would throw off their allegiance; this was answered by threats.

The Tatars now tried to use the envoy as a means of drawing al-Kāmil out from the besieged city. They told him al-Kāmil wished to see him. He replied this was needless. Asked if he would go to him at their bidding, he pleaded the absence of instructions from his sovereign. As they insisted, he asked what he was to say to him; they replied, "Say you are come from al-Nāṣir to plead for permission for him to come out and submit to the ʿĪl-Khān." This message he refused to take, whereupon he was taken past a heap of slain, and told that in an hour he would be as they were. He replied that destiny was inevitable. Pressed as to why he refused to go, he said that they meant through him to lure al-Kāmil out to destruction and to slaughter the inhabitants, all of which would have happened through his means. A chief urged him not to talk thus or he would be killed. Finally, he consented to go, on condition that al-Kāmil was not to come forth, and that when terms were agreed to the Tatars should depart. He was then conducted by a Tatar officer to the city gate, when they were met by

the Governor. Three days' negotiation followed, during which the besieged provided them with ample and varied food, to show their ability to endure the straits they were in. Eventually terms were agreed on, viz., a payment in money and in kind, including camels, mules, and horses, part forthwith, and the rest when the Tatars were gone. And the Tatars were actually moving eastwards on their way to depart, when a message came from Lu'lu' of Mosul announcing that certain coast inhabitants and Kurds were on their way to attack al-Nāṣir, who had resolved on flight. Letters came, too, addressed to the envoy, urging him to make peace, and get the Tatars away. On this the Tatars dissembled. The envoy was interrogated, and in spite of his explanation the operations against Mayyāfāriqīn were renewed, and he was ordered to depart. He withdrew accordingly to Māridīn. This time he saw its ruler, al-Sa'īd, who congratulated him on his efforts in the Moslem cause, and said that if he were granted a subsidy in men and money by al-Nāṣir he would make the Tatars raise the siege, and they could then unite in wresting Mosul from that hypocrite (مناقب), i.e. Lu'lu'. And to this he bound himself by oath. The author then continued his journey to Ḥarrān, when he heard that the Tatars had regretted his departure, and had decided to reopen negotiations through him. At Ḥalab he heard that Yashmūt had raised the siege, but had left a force under a deputy to prevent al-Kāmil's escape, the cause of this being cold, want of supplies, and mortality among the horses. And during the whole of the year 657, messages reached Damascus from Mayyāfāriqīn imploring aid.

From Ḥalab the author was summoned to Damascus, and went to meet al-Nāṣir on his way back from Jerusalem. He told him of what had been suggested. To the proposal of the ruler of Māridīn no reply was sent.

These are the only fragments of the author's personal history to be found in the MS., but it is probable that more might be gathered from the volumes on Ḥalab and on Damascus.

The MS. contains references to the following writers on geography :—

Ya'qūbi (Brockelmann, *Gesch. Arab. Lit.*, i, 226), on fol. 3*a* for Diyār Rabī'a; 26*a* for al-Ruhā; and 27*a* for Jazīrat ibn 'Omar.

Ibn Khurdādhbih (ib., 225), on fol. 3*a* for Diyār Rabī'a.

Ibn Hauqal (ib., 229), on fol. 21*a* for Raqqa; 41*a* for Dārā; and 44*b* for Sinjār.

Idrīsī (ib., 477), *Nuzhat al-Mushtāq fi ikhtirāq al-Āfāq*, on fol. 21*a* for Raqqa; and 26*a* on al-Ruhā.

Writers on philology and tradition :—

al-Sharqi b. Katāmi (Wüst. *Gesch.*, 23), on fols. 65*b* and 66*b* for the origin of the names of Āmid and Mayyā-fāriqīn.

Hishām al-Kalbi (Brockelmann, i, 139), on fols. 21*a* and 44*b* for the names of Raqqa and of Sinjār.

Jawālīqī (ib., 280), "al-Mu'arrab," on fol. 14*a* on the change of 'Arran' into 'Harrān.'

And the following historians :—

Wāqidi (ib., 135), on fol. 26*a* for the conquest of al-Ruhā.

Bilādhuri (ib., 141), on fol. 37*a* for that of Naṣībīn.

Tabari (ib., 142), on fol. 14*a* for the founding of Harrān, and 21*a* for the visit of Maṣṣūr to Raqqa (154 A.H.).

"*Ta'rikh Muza'ffari*" (Wüst. *Gesch.*, 205), on fol. 131*b* for Māridīn, under Muqtadir, 317 A.H.

Hamadhāni (ib., 232), 'Uyun al-Siyar (written 'Unwān), on fol. 11*a* for the Saffārids; on fol. 130*b* for Māridīn in the time of Mu'taḍid; and his "Tadhyl," on fol. 132*a* for the fact that Mumahhid al-Daula reigned only a single year over Diyār Bakr, which, he says, is contradicted by the history of

Ibn al-Azraq al-Fāriqi (ib., 256), which is quoted largely, as above mentioned.

The *Kāmil* of *Ibn al-Athīr* is frequently quoted; once, on fol. 46*a*, for matter *sub* 502 A.H. relating to Sinjār, which does not appear in Tornberg's edition.

Ibn al-ʿAdīm's history of Ḥalab is quoted, on fol. 73*b*, for the revolt of ʿĪsa b. al-Shaikh in Diyār Bakr in 255 A.H.

Lastly, on fol. 26*a* the author quotes Maḥbūb b. Qusṭanṭīn al-Manbijī for the Tower of Babel, and for Nimrod, the founder of al-Ruhā. This Maḥbūb is likewise quoted by Ibn Shaddād in the first volume of the *Aʿlāq*, relating to Ḥalab and its district,—B.M. Add. 23,334, *sub* "Antioch," on fol. 86*a*, for the rise of the Maccabee, John Hyrcanus; and again, *sub* "Manbij," on fol. 96*b*, as saying in his annals of the *Mulūk al-Rūm* that the life of Isaac, the son of Abraham, extended thirty-one years after the birth of Levi, the son of Jacob; and that during that period Queen Semiramis (سمرین) built a temple in a town on the Euphrates to an idol, with a staff of seventy priests, the town being called Hieropolis (?). This passage occurs somewhat differently in a work largely based on that of Ibn Shaddād, the *Durr al-Muntakhab* of Ibn Shihna (Brockelmann, *Gesch.*, ii, 42); see B.M. Add. 22,673, 112*b*, and 23,337, 77*a*, where the quotation from Maḥbūb is made to appear part of a quotation from Yaʿqūbī which precedes it in Ibn Shaddād's work. Masʿūdi also, in his *Kitāb al-Tanbīh wa'l Ishrāf* (*Bibl. Geogr. Ar.*, pt. viii, p. 154), when treating of the Christian Emperors before Islām, mentions Maḥbūb b. Qusṭanṭīn and Eutychius (Brock., i, 148) as the two best Melchite historians he was acquainted with. There is at Florence a MS. which is described by Assemani (*Bibl. Med. Laur. et Pal. Cat. or. Florentiæ*, 1742, No. 133) as a universal history by Maḥbūb b. Constantin, Jacobite Archbishop of Mabbūg (Manbij), extending from the creation to the author's own time, viz. 712 A.H. (1312 A.D.). But inasmuch as Masʿūdi died in 345 A.H., the attribution of this MS. to Maḥbūb is inaccurate, or else it must include a continuation by another hand. And I am told by Mr. E. W. Brooks that the name of Maḥbūb

is not to be found in the list of Jacobite bishops given in the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian (B.M. Or. 4,402, 405*b*), which includes those ordained between 793 and 1166 A.D. Maḥbūb appears also to be quoted in the chronological work of Abu Shākir (Butrus b. Muḥadhḥib), who wrote circ. 662 A.H.; see Dillmann, B.M. Cat. Ethiop., No. 36, under ch. 48.

Note.—A quotation from Ibn Shaddād's description of Damascus contained in the Bibl. Geog. Ar., pt. vi, preface, p. xii, has led to my being favoured with the following information by Professor de Goeje. He writes that the MS. from which the quotation was taken (Leyden, 1466) is entitled "Baraq al-Shām fi Maḥāsin Iqlīm al-Shām," and that a comparison of its contents with the description of vol. iii of "al-A'lāq al-Khaṭira," given in the B.M. Cat., No. 1,324, shows the MS. in question to be the first and second parts of that volume, under a new title. And he adds the following extract from the description of the MS. to appear in the forthcoming revised edition of the Leyden Catalogue :—

"Quum hæc Capita in Exemplaribus operis الاعلاق desiderentur, codex noster pretiosus est; utilissimum nempe est opus ad res Syriæ Meridionalis et Palestinæ præsertim sæculis sexto et septimo cognoscendas. Ex Antiquioribus sæpe laudantur al-Balādzori, Geographia al-Jaḡūbī, interdum Abu-Ḥanīfa ad-Dinawarī et Ibn Hauqal. Codex Anno 870 bene exaratus, continet 289 pag."

The concluding parts, therefore, both of vol. i and of vol. iii, relating to the dynasties which ruled at Ḥalab and at Damascus, as well as the part of the work relating to Mosul, are still to be sought for.

Since this article was in print Professor Sachau, now on a visit here from Berlin, has enabled me to identify, as I believe, yet another MS. as a part of al-A'lāq al-Khaṭira of 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, viz. No. 9,800 in Ahlwardt's Catalogue.

The Professor has been good enough to ascertain that the

account therein of the conquest of Mayyāfāriqīn and Āmid (fol. 47^a) is given on the authority of “Aḥmad b. Yūsuf b. ‘Ali Ibn al-Azraq Ṣāhib Tā’rīkh Mayyāfāriqīn wa Āmid.” From the entry in the Catalogue it appears that the author of the Berlin MS. mentions his embassy to the Tatars in 657 A.H.; that he had written a continuation to the history of Ibn al-Athīr; and that he was writing this work in 679 A.H.;—which accords with the statements in the Bodleian MS. Marsh 333. Its contents seem to be covered by the Berlin MS., but the opening statement in the latter MS., that it was to include an account of Mosul, does not seem borne out by the Catalogue’s analysis of its contents.