

The Tajârib al-Umam of Abu 'Ali Miskawaih.

By

H. F. Amedroz.

The recent appearance of Vol. V of the *Tajârib al-Umam* is an opportunity for saying something on that and on Vol. VI, the concluding part of the work, for both deal with a period later than Ṭabari and, ceasing to be a mere echo of that historian, contain original matter ¹⁾ much of which appears in an abridged form in the *Kâmil* of Ibn al-Athîr. The first sixty pages of Vol. V are concerned with the closing years of Mu'taḍid and with the short reign of Muktafi and all, with the exception of the two anecdotes referred to below, is found in Ṭabari, but from the accession of Muḩtadir onwards the narrative becomes independent of Ṭabari, and also in the main independent of 'Arîb, who appears to have drawn his material from Şûli, d. A. H. 335 (Wüst. No. 115) and from Farghâni who, like 'Arîb, continued Ṭabari, d. circ. A. H. 362 (Kindi, introd. p. 51).

Miskawaih's narrative of Muḩtadir's reign down to the death of Ibn al-Furât, A. H. 312, proves to be largely identical with the contents of Hilâl's *Kitâb al-Wuzarâ* ²⁾, and it is probable that the matter concerning the viziers 'Ali b. 'Îsa, Hâmid b. al-'Abbâs, and Ibn Muḩla would likewise be found in the missing portions of Hilâl's work. Both historians relied certainly on the history of Hilâl's uncle,

¹⁾ Dr. SARASIN has compared the portion of the *Tajârib* edited by DE GOEJE in *Fragm. Hist. Arab.* Vol. II (which is covered by the contents of the forthcoming Vol. IV of the Gibb Facsimile) with Ṭabari's history and informs me that, practically, the whole is to be found there. The advantage, therefore, to accrue from the publication of Vol. IV, even were it to prove more legible than the other volumes, is not obvious.

²⁾ They were contemporaries: Hilâl lived A. H. 359—448; Miskawaih's death is dated A. H. 421 (*Irshâd* II. 89. l. 1), but as he describes himself in the *Tajârib* as in attendance on the vizier al-Muhallabi as early as A. H. 341 (Vol. VI. p. 194. l. 5), this date seems too late.

Thâbit b. Sinân, the continuer at Baghdâd of Ṭabari, (Wüstr. No.135), for they quote him by name. In the Preface to Vol. V it is suggested (p. XII) that Miskawaih "had at his elbow some full chronicle of the Caliphate which is unfortunately at present unknown to us". The supposition seems to be uncalled for having regard to Thâbit's history, and had any such chronicle existed it would probably have been disclosed in later histories. One of these, yet another continuation of Ṭabari by Muḥammed b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Hamadhâni, d. A. H. 521 (Wüstr. Nq. 232), is extant for this period in the Ms. Paris, Ar. 1469, and whilst it is apparent that the narrative is largely based on that of Miskawaih although he is never mentioned therein by name, some of the matter is given on the authority of Thâbit.

Another history which covers this period is the *Kitâb al-'Uyûn* (Brock. I. p. 344) viz. the portion of it comprised in the Berlin Ms. which is subsequent in date to that published by DE GOEJE, *Fragm. Hist. Arab.*, Vol. I: it corresponds with the entirety of Vol. V and most of Vol. VI. The contents point rather to a source other than Miskawaih, and in some cases, e. g. for the Caliphs Râḍi and Muttaki, the authority cited is Farghâni. In one case this diversity of source provides us with accounts of the same incident from different points of view. The story of Ibn Thawâba's attempt to extort from Ibn al-Furât, on his first fall from office in A. H. 299, the inordinate sum of thirteen million dinars occurs in Vol. V, pp. 170—172, and in Hilâl's *Wuzarâ*, p. 103, (and also in the Leiden Ms. of *Faraj ba'd Shidda*, although it is wanting in the printed edition), as told by Ibn al-Furât after he had recovered office. In the *Kitâb al-'Uyûn* we are given Ibn Thawâba's version, of which the text is appended for the purpose of comparison ¹). The truth may, I suggest,

قل العباس من محمد (يعنى ابا حيثم ابن ثوابية): فدخلت الى ابن
الفرات فوثب عن مجلسه واقبل يرحف فناظرته على الاموال فالظ فامر
بتقييده فقال: من عجائب ما رأينا ان تُقيدنى. فعرفته ما اعرف من اولية
اخيه وان اخاه لما تزوج ائينا عجب الناس فقال لى: انت تظالمينى بئار ابن
عبدون. فقلت: يا جاهل تريد ان تُعرفهم ان بينى وبين ابن عبدون
قراية؟ ثم امرت بعرك اذنيه بحضرتهم فالتفت الى وقال: اقرؤا على الوزير
السلام وقولوا له « هذه سنة رديئة على الوزراء من قيد حتى أُقيد انا؟
فقلت: صاحبك الذى نوه باسمك واسم اخيك اسمعيل بن بلبل. فامسك
ثم خرجت من عنده (قال) ثم دخلت بعد ذلك فرايت على المصلى آثار

embrace both the versions. The vizier portrays himself as resisting the claim by argument, and as being consoled under the suffering inflicted on him by Ibn Thawāba in the thought that it might be a requital for his hasty, and soon repented, illtreatment of others in the past. Ibn Thawāba depicts the vizier as protesting against a person of his official rank being treated with violence. The opening dialogue

رشاش المداق فقلت: اراك تدخل اليك دواة اذا خرجت من عندك. فقال:
من اين وعلى بضعة عشر رجلاً؟ فامرت باخذ المصلى وللصر والهملة واخليت
للحرة وضيقته عليه فسمعتة يقول « اليوم حُبستُ اللهم اقبضنى اليك. »
فدخلت عليه وقد احدث في مكانه وقد اشرف على امرٍ عظيمٍ من ثقل
للديد فامرت بتحديدته ففك ورايت القدر قد غلب روائحه في البيت
فقلت: ليس هذا يوم مناظرة اروحه اياماً ثم اعود. فخرجت الى رسالة
[بعزم على] العود غداً فعدت من الغد فاخذت خطه بثلاثة الاف انف
دينار. فلما كان بعد ثلاثة ايام دخلت عليه وقد احضرت جبة من
صوف وغلاً برمانة وشيئاً يمنع المغلول ان يرد راسه الى خلف وغلاً بغير
رمانة فامرت من البسه للجبتين واحدة فوق الاخرى وغله فاشفقت من
العغل الذى بالرمانة ان يتلفه فقلت: ان تلف تلف بيت مال الخاصة.
فترعت احدى للجبتين فقال: يا ابا هيثم من البس من الوزراء جبة صوف؟
فقلت: صاحبك اسمعيل بن بلبل. وارتت ان اذكر له دهن الاكارع وكيف
فعل بابى الصقر فقال: لا تذكر شيئاً. وقدم الى السندان وقام نسيم واخذ
يلابسه فقال له: يا نسيم ليس يومى منك بواحد. فقلت لنسيم: وما يومه
منك؟ قال: انا ازلت عزة اخذت السيف والمنطقة من وسطه ونجعت
اقببته في اليوم الذى قبض عليه فيه وانا اجزه الى السندان. فجرة اليها
وهو يصيح: اقتلوني يا ام موسى اقتلوني هذا جزاى منك وحق خدمتى
لكم! فقالت له: يا فاجر قد صحح عندنا انك اردت اخراج هذا الامر من
ولد العباس الى ولد ابى طالب. فوضع راسه على السندان وهو يصيح:
اقتلوني ما رايت مثل هذا قط. وجعل يبكى ويقول: واصببتاه. فقلت:
يا ابا الحسن جزعنا الاماء وافريسات الاسد ما هكذا يجب ان تكون.
وانصرفت.

(Kitāb al-'Uyūn, Berlin Ms. fol. 75^v. sub A. H. 300.)

between them discloses that a marriage between members of their two families had resulted in making Ibn Thâwaba a connection of Ibn 'Abcûn, whose death Ibn al-Furât had caused during his vizierate for conspiring to supplant him (Vol. V p. 71 and *Wuzarâ* p. 26), and he surmises that his death was now going to be avenged on himself, whereas Ibn Thawâba resents the connection being disclosed at all. As a precedent for his ill treatment of Ibn al-Furât he cites the case of Ismâ'il b. Bulbul to whose patronage, he says, the brothers Aḥmad and 'Ali b. al Furât owed their official success¹). They had indeed shared his fall in A. H. 278 (Tab. III. 2123), and were in prison until released by his successor 'Ubaid allah b. Sulaimân when he stood in need of competent officials such as they were, (*Wuzarâ* pp. 8—10); indeed the ability of the elder brother Aḥmad (as to whom see ib. pp. 179—200), nearly made him vizier on 'Ubaid allah's death in 288 — see the story from the *Muntaẓam* given in *Hilâl*, Introd. 31. n 3; also in the *Mir'ât al-Zamân*, Par. Ar. 6133, 111 b. Aḥmad died in 291 (Dhahabi, Leiden 843. 159 a, Rev. Cat. II. p. 21), and his brother 'Ali's continued favour under the viziers Al-Ḳâsim b. 'Ubaid allâh and al-'Abbâs b. al-Ḥasan is shewn by anecdotes in *Wuzarâ*. He may now have regarded Ibn Bulbul's memory with gratitude, for when Ibn Thawâba begins to give particulars of the tortures inflicted on him, which are referred to by Mas'ûdi, *Prairies d'Or* VIII. 109²) and told in repulsive detail in Tanûkhi's *Nishwâr*, Par. Ar. No. 3482³), he begs him to desist. Ibn Thawâba's closing act of illtreatment, the dragging to and placing his head on the *Sandân* (obscure in meaning) terrified the victim whose cries drew taunts from his tormentor. In time came his retribution when he was done the death in prison at Kûfa in A. H. 303 (*Arîb* 59), that is to say before the date of Ibn al-Furât's second term of office. It is to be noticed that 'Umm Mûsa accuses Ibn al-Furât of having entertained a project of supplanting the ruling dynasty by an Alide one, and that such a suspicion had conduced to his fall is shewn by the absurd inference drawn from the sight of an empty litter proceeding towards Kûfa, told *Wuzarâ* p. 265—7, where the absurdity is emphasized by a note on the margin of the Ms. The imminence of the Fatimide conquest of Egypt and Syria must have kept the dynasty ever in fear of an Alide rival, certain of support

¹) Ḥamid b. al-'Abbâs when imprisoned by Ibn Bulbul relied on the intercession of Abu-l-'Abbâs b. al-Furât, — *Faraj ba'd Shidda* I. p. 114. l. 11.

²) The term ماء الأكارع is there rendered by "gélatine"; it is equivalent to بول.

³) The publication of this Ms. by Professor D. S. MARGOLIOUTH may be looked for in a year's time.

from wealthy and high placed members of the family at Baghdad and from the population of the large Karkh quarter. *Hamadhâni*, in the above mentioned continuation of *Ṭabari*, relates how Mu'izz al-Daula had resolved on such a change in the Caliphate, but was dissuaded by his vizier al-Ṣaimari who urged, inter alia, the Abbasid demerits as ground for preferring them to any other line as puppets to the princes of the Buwaihîd dynasty.

Two gaps occur in this facsimile of the *Tajârib al-Umam*. In one of them, (Vol. VI. p. 439), should have been told the failure of 'Aḍud al-Daula in A. H. 364 to suppress the revolt of Ibn Baḳiyya at Wâsiṭ which he had sent him to govern at his own request, and with a view to gaining him over to compliance with his rule (ib. p. 437). The defeat of 'Aḍud al-Daula's force by Ibn Baḳiyya's troops, assisted by a contingent from 'Umrân, the ruler of the Baṭiḥa, is recorded by Ibn al-Athîr VIII. 479, l. 11, in the course of what has every appearance of being an abridgment of Miskawaih's narrative. And inasmuch as the latter was an avowed admirer of 'Aḍud al-Daula, and had small esteem for Ibn Baḳiyya or for his sovereign 'Izz al-Daula, the above omission cannot be attributed to intention; moreover he admitted openly enough the subsequent shipwreck, for a time, of 'Aḍud al-Daula's policy owing to his father Rukn al-Daula's obstinate and unreasoning support of 'Izz al-Daula: the omission must therefore be attributed to lack of information.

The other gap at the close of A. H. 366 (Vol. VI. p. 476) should have included an account of the fall of Abu-l-Faṭḥ Ibn al-'Amîd. This omission is obviously not designed, for the heading of the omitted event is given. And that it would in the natural course have been inserted is clear from this, that the son's unfortunate defects of character had been indicated by Miskawaih, and the prophecy of Abu-l-Faḍl, the father, that they would result in their house's ruin had been recorded (Vol. VI. p. 347. l. 10). The prophecy will be found also in the son's life in *Irshâd al-Arib* Vol. V. p. 371, in the citation there given from Miskawaih's work, and it is to be noticed that the previous accounts of the son's dismissal from office and death — pp. 349 and 358 — are based, not on the authority of Miskawaih, but of Hilâl al-Ṣâbi and of the vizier al-Âbi (d. A. H. 421, Brock. I. 351). The account of his death may therefore have been likewise absent from the copy of the *Tajârib* used by the author of the *Irshâd*. In the Ms. Bodleian Marsh 357, which includes this portion of Vol. VI, the gaps are not present, and the narrative proceeds continuously and without any diversity from the text of Vol. VI.

It is in telling of the murder of Mardāwij in the year A. H. 323, that Miskawaih's name first occurs, and he states that he derived his story from the deceased statesman Abu-l-Faḍl Ibn al-'Amīd, — Vol. V. 479 — but from A. H. 344 onwards, — Vol. VI. 181 — he declares the narrative to be based on his own knowledge, supplemented by information given him by Ibn al-'Amīd who had narrated to him the encounter between Rukn al-Daula and the Samanid general Ḳarātakīn which he was then telling, and he emphasizes the accuracy and value of the information so acquired. Henceforth too he appears himself as an actor in events. In A. H. 341 he was already one of the vizier Muḥallabī's circle — ib. 194. l. 5. In A. H. 355 he saw at Rayy the reception of the Marzubān by Rukn al-Daula — ib. 280. l. ult., and he was in constant and close attendance on the vizier Ibn al-'Amīd until his death in A. H. 360, as appears from his eulogy of his patron, already published in *Der Islam*, III. 339—346. In A. H. 363 he accompanied the son Abu-l-Faḥḥ b. al-'Amīd from Rayy on his expedition to rescue 'Izz al-Daula from the revolting Turkish troops under Alaftakīn, — ib. 427, l. 1. And in A. H. 368 he was one of those sent by 'Aḍud al-Daula to bring away the prisoners and treasure captured at the surrender of the stronghold of Ardamisht, when he pleaded in vain with the sovereign the cause of its commander, Ṭashtam, who sought to escape being surrendered to his former master the Hamdanid Abu Taghlib, — ib. 496—497.

Miskawaih closes his history abruptly in A. H. 369, (the point is indicated by Ibn al-Athīr, VIII. 521, l. 2), at the moment when 'Aḍud al-Daula's failing health was shewing itself. As he must have survived him by quite half a lifetime it is strange that he did not bring his work down to the monarch's death, but that task was left to be performed by Muḳtadi's vizier Abu Shujā', died A. H. 488 (Wüst. No. 227, where the date of death is erroneous); his *Dhail* to the *Tajārib* extends to A. H. 389, as stated by Ibn al-Athīr IX. 107, l. 5, who made use of it for the *Kāmil*. By the zeal of his Excellency Ahmed-Zéki Pacha this text has recently been recovered in Constantinople, and its publication would form a fitting sequel to that of Vols. V and VI of the *Tajārib*, (Vol. V is already in course of being printed at Cairo), for it so happens that the *Dhail* precisely bridges the interval between the close of the *Tajārib* and the opening of the three years fragment of Hilâl's history which was published in the same volume as his *Wuzarâ*. The fragment would afford a specimen of oriental history in its original form; the *Dhail* would present other portions of that history apparently but slightly

abridged¹⁾; and the more rigorous abridgment would appear in the pages of Ibn al-Athīr.

The summary of the contents of Vol. V appears, from what is said in the preface, to have undergone vicissitudes of which indeed it bears traces. It is described as being more minute than that prefixed to Vol. I, owing to the increased importance of this text, (and indeed Vol. I was merely Ṭabari abridged), but even as it stands, it can scarcely be regarded as adequately representing the narrative, for the illegible condition of the text, which the preface admits and explains, makes a faithful summary especially necessary as a guide to its contents. The sixth and concluding volume, which is to be the next in order of publication, will be found to be even less legible than the fifth; it would be well therefore if its summary were subjected to some special care.

A marked feature of the summary is the preponderance of names over facts, and those names often imperfectly identified. It is the *Nisba* or some patronymic which is valuable as a means of identification: it is the full name minus the *Nisba* which, as a rule, is given: e. g. on p. XV there is nothing to shew that Bakr (who died after joining the Alide in Ṭabaristān) and Ḥārith are brothers, and both of them of the Abu Dulaf family. On the other hand in the opening paragraph on that page the use of "al-Qāḍi" as a *Nisba* is misleading, for Yūsuf was but one of many Qāḍis and his *Nisba* was, in fact, al-Azdi. Again the statement on p. XVI that the Caliph "recognises the independence of Hārūn b. Khumārawaih in Egypt" would have staggered Mu'taḍid whose father, Muwaffaq, had been the persistent adversary of Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn, Khumārawaih's predecessor. What the latter now asked and was granted, was merely a confirmation of the status quo, with a surrender by him to the Caliph of a part of his territory. In five years'

¹⁾ That the author of the *Dhail* based his work on Hilāl's history is certain. After frequent quotations from a *Sāhib al-Ta'rikh*, he gives on that authority an anecdote of 'Aḍud al-Daula's zeal in repressing brawls, and the *Sāhib al-Ta'rikh* recalls an occasion when, "Abu Ishāq my grandfather being in prison", a friend who was in conversation with his father had a difference with a passing fruit vendor as to which a bystander was with difficulty prevented from giving information to the authorities. The grandfather is Abu Ishāq Ibrāhīm, the author of the *Kitāb al-Tāji*, and he was in prison until released after the death of 'Aḍud al-Daula by Ṣamṣām al-Daula (see his life *Irshād al-Arib* I. 325, l. 11 and that of his son, Muḥassin, father to Hilāl, ib. VI. 244). Again, Ibn al-Ḳalānisi's *History of Damascus*, which from A. H. 448 onwards forms a *Dhail* to that of Hilāl, is for its earlier portion largely based on his history, as is shewn by some of its matter being quoted in the same words by Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi direct from Hilāl. In the *Dhail* of Abu Shujā' forty consecutive pages, (one twelfth of the whole), are devoted to Egyptian and Syrian affairs, and most of their contents occurs almost verbatim in Ibn al-Ḳalānisi. The inference is that both of them were quoting Hilāl.

time the whole was recovered for the Caliphate by the *Kâtib* Muḥammed b. Sulaimân. This *Kâtib* is, I think, identical with the official of the same name mentioned on p. 119 of the text, (omitted in the summary), as employed against Ibn Musâfir of Ṭarum (the ancestor of the line of Sallârs so largely mixed up with Rukn al-Daula), for the identity appears reasonably clear from the account of his intervening career given by Maḳrîzî in the *Ṣuḳūḳ* (see note J. R. A. S. 1908, p. 451). On p. XVI, Ismâ'il, the conqueror of 'Amr b. Layth, the Saffarid, is, of course, the Samanid.

The story of the message sent by the Karmathian Abu Sa'id to the Caliph, which is "wanting in Ṭabari," (p. XVII), occurs in *Faraj ba'd Shidda* I. 110: here its purport is somewhat misstated. Abu Sa'id's message was that his power of withdrawal into the desert made him safe against any force sent against him; moreover, that his territory was not worth taking. "Fallere et effugere" is, in a sense, to triumph, but such a triumph should not be described as likely to result in the opposing force being "overpowered". And the second anecdote on the same page, also "wanting in Ṭabari" but present in *Faraj ba'd Shidda* II. 17, is incorrectly reproduced in the summary. What the Imâm saved by his untimely but ingenious call to prayer was, not the woman's life, but her honour, for her failure to get home owing to the violence of the drunken turkish trooper would have made her liable to be divorced.

The statement at the foot of p. XVII that the vizier "intrigues" against Badr, who "falls into the hands of his enemies, and is beheaded", is a very colourless account of an act of treachery which stands out even in oriental annals. The vizier having failed to induce Badr to join him in altering the succession to the Caliphate, was careful to procure the choice of Muḳtafi as Caliph on the ground that he was hostile to Badr. And, apprehensive that once Badr had reached the Court he would disclose the project which he had foiled, the Vizier lured him on by a pretended safe conduct which he found a Ḳâḍî pliant enough to convey without actual instructions from the Caliph, intercepted him on his way, and had him killed; and the Ḳâḍî, incurred popular reproach for his conduct. The small increase in the summary's bulk by such detail as would have given an insight into the standard of conduct and of morals thus depicted would not have been waste: in Ṭabari, the latin argument adequately reproduces the story.

Passing to the accession on Muḳtadir (p. XIX ult.) we are again face to face with "intrigues" on the part of the vizier. In this case these

represent his bona fide doubt as to who should be named Caliph, and the advice he sought and received thereon from Ibn al-Furât, which appears more fully in Hilâl's *Wuzarâ*, 114. And Ibn al-Furât's subsequent "good government" as vizier (p. XX) lay mostly in precept contained in letters of advice sent to provisional governors; his practice, as recorded in the text, was that with a practically free hand owing to the Caliph's frivolity (he was but thirteen years old), he emptied the treasury. The anecdotes of his methods (pp. 73—75) are not noticed in the summary: one is given in *Faraj ba'd Shidda* I. 124. Ibn Thawâba's "enquiry into Ibn-al-Furât's administration", after his loss of office (p. XXI) is a euphemism for the extortion of money from him and from his adherents by torture, and to this end Ibn Thawâba was appointed over the *Diwân al-Muṣâdarîn*. The story how he tried to force him to pay an outrageous sum has been already mentioned. Ibn Thawâba's bad repute is confirmed by Farghâni's statement, (*Irshâd* I. 298), but he was never actually given the opportunity of justifying it by bad government in the capacity of vizier, as stated in the summary. What he did was to take advantage of the vizier's slackness to induce the Caliph, (Umm Mûsa was only their go-between), to let him exercise his powers of extortion against the Mâdarâ'i family; the vizier was instructed accordingly, and Ibn Thawâba did manage to encroach to some extent on his authority, for he had long been a stranger to office, and his incompetency led later to his being replaced by 'Alî b. 'Îsa. The "severity" attributed to the latter (p. XXI) misdescribes the account in the text of his mild treatment of the fallen vizier; of slight retribution inflicted by him on Ibn Thawâba; of his diligent conduct of business; and of his precise instructions to local officials, illustrated (pp. 94—6) by anecdotes on the authority of Thâbit b. Sinân which are given also in *Wuzarâ*; these are not noticed in the summary. On the other hand the statement there that the Caliph was forced to reduce his expenditure has no warrant in the text, although it is doubtless a very correct surmise of what the vizier would have wished to bring about. The precise method by which the treasury was "aforetime robbed" is to be gathered apparently from the anecdote on p. 97, which is to the following effect. The new vizier, being inundated with doubtful orders for money payments under the signature of his predecessor, invited him to distinguish from the mass those that were forged, but he, wishing to gain favour with the public, declared them all genuine. In this object he succeeded, and by a similar sequence of cause and effect the new vizier's economies made him unpopular and led to his fall. The notice of his fall (p. XXII) is made

consequent of "intrigues" of the stewardess Umm Mûsa, but what she, in fact, did was to apply to the vizier for funds for the requirements of a festival and, angry at his delay in assenting, to complain to the Caliph and to his mother, (elsewhere in the summary called "Sayyidah", as though that were her name), and this led to his dismissal and to the return to office of Ibn al-Furât. His "instructions to his subordinates" (p. XXII sub fin.), must represent what, in the text (p. 109), is a circular letter announcing his appointment emanating from the Caliph's secretary, a letter which will be found set out in *Irshâd* VI. 463. On p. XXIII, Ibn al-Furât is, in turn, described as suffering from "intrigues", which, this time represent the discontent of his favoured follower Ibn Muqla at the favour he was shewing to a rival, and this enabled Ibn al-Furât's enemies to invite Ibn Muqla's corroboration of a charge that the vizier had, on his previous fall from office, misstated the amount of his wealth. Ibn al-Furât refused to believe this conduct on the part of Ibn Muqla, and it should be held to the credit perhaps of both of them that, when the time for action arrived, Ibn Muqla refused to face his patron with such a charge (p. 135), an incident rather quaintly described in the summary (p. XXIV) as a refusal by Ibn Muqla to "bring an action against Ibn al-Furât".

The statement made earlier on p. XXIV, of 'Ali b. 'Îsa having «abandoned» his co-vizier Hâmîd, requires some elucidation. Hâmîd had procured the post of vizier simply as a means of forestalling enquiry by Ibn al-Furât into his profits as a revenue farmer (pp. 126—7, of which the summary, p. XXIV gives no hint), and his incapacity was obvious to all (p. 128 l. 6). Ibn al-Ḥawâri, far from "controlling the administration" was rebuked for suggesting Hâmîd's appointment, in answer to which he urged his wealth and grand style of living and advised putting 'Ali b. 'Îsa over all the diwans as his deputy (p. 128), and this he managed to bring about (p. 129). And 'Ali cannot be charged with having abandoned Hâmîd. What happened was that Hâmîd, not finding nominal power to his taste and stung by popular lampoons, sought to resume his career of farmer of revenue. And it was when the terms came to be discussed that 'Ali b. 'Îsa objected to Hâmîd's fiscal methods as amounting to what the French express by the saying: "manger son blé en herbe" (p. 145. l. 3). Hâmîd's methods were denounced by Ibn al-Furât when, after his dismissal, he was under examination by Hâmîd and other officials, and his charge against Hâmîd was a good deal more than the "incompetence" stated in the summary (p. XXIV). He alleged (p. 134. l. 6) that Hâmîd as revenue farmer, owed the State a balance of over a million dinars, and hoped

to evade the obligation of accounting by occupying the post of vizier for which he was quite unsuited. And he contended that, as he was vizier, his acts as revenue farmer ought to be looked into by 'Ali b. 'Îsa whose ability and character were of a very different order, for the combination of the offices of vizier and revenue farmer amounted to dishonesty. In fact, so utterly worsted was Hâmîd in this encounter with Ibn al-Furât, that he told his critics that he had been quite unnerved by their previous warnings to him to be mindful who his adversary was, and to act accordingly. Thus it came about that "the conduct of Hâmîd was much criticized". Indeed his acts, as vizier, had been restricted to getting money out of Ibn al-Furât whom the Caliph had refused to put wholly in Hâmîd's power, but he too was so obviously bent on extracting an adequate sum that Ibn al-Furât, acting on a friend's warning, alleged a pretended appearance of his deceased brother Aḥmad, (the summary, p. XXIV treats the dream as a real one), to tell him that the inheritance he had left was intended for such a necessity as the present; he accordingly surrendered it to the Caliph, to the dismay of the two viziers as to what this act might portend for themselves. How money placed by Ibn al-Furât on deposit with the Kâḍî Abu 'Umar was by him disclosed and surrendered, is stated (p. XXV) but not the sequel, viz. that, when Ibn al-Furât had regained office, the Kâḍî was advised not to try any excuses for his conduct but to replace the money, which he did (p. 142). And the "coming to power" of Ibn al-Hawâri and his son should be mitigated by adding that the latter was then aged ten years, (p. 143 l. 5).

Lower on p. XXV, the "revolt" which Mûnis was sent to Egypt to quell and the "flight of al-Maghribî", represent the invasion of Egypt by the son of the Fatimide Mahdi (al-Kâ'im) and his repulse, (see 'Arîb 80, Kindi 275—277). Some fragmentary information follows on al-Ḥallâj and his execution, (pp. XXV—XXVI), but the entirety of the text of Vol. V, pp. 153—161, is given in a note to 'Arîb, pp. 86—96 from the Paris Ms. of the *Tajârib*¹⁾. The statement (p. XXVI) that "the Qâḍî Abu 'Âmir ('Umar) decrees that al-Ḥallâj may be put to death and states his reasons in writing", gives a very misleading impression of what the text relates. Al-Ḥallâj supported a dictum as to what was an adequate substitute for the pilgrimage by the authority of a work by al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrî; this work the Kâḍî had read at

¹⁾ The unabridged text of Ibn Zanji's narrative, on which the *Tajârib* text is based, has now been published by M. LOUIS MASSIGNON from the notice of Ḥallâj in the *Ta'rikh Baghdâd* of Khaṭîb Baghdâdî; *Quatre textes inédits relatifs à la biographie d'al-Ḥallâj*, Paris, 1914. This narrative forms Texte 1.

Mecca, and in anger at this fiction he addressed al-Ḥallāj by the Moslem equivalent of "you felon", i. e. guilty of a capital offence. Ḥāmid seized on his words and, in spite of his attempted evasion, forced him to commit them to writing, and the others present followed his example.

Ḥāmid, conceiving alarm at the growing unpopularity of 'Alī b. 'Īsā (who, though guiltless of the charge laid against him in the summary (p. XXVI) of "ceasing to pay any of the officials" had incurred their enmity by a diminution of their salaries), proposed to the Caliph to "guarantee" 'Alī (i. e. to get money out of him) and to himself conduct the government (p. 165. l. 6—7). The Caliph made him put his offer into writing, and give a list of his proposed heads of diwans (p. 166. l. 2), and then submitted the whole for the consideration of Ibn al-Furāt, then a prisoner in his palace. He told him that no set of officials, however ideal, with Ḥāmid at their head could work well, and he proceeded to outbid Ḥāmid's offer (ib. l. 7; the summary's version is misleading). His proposal to the Caliph was backed by the offer of a positive sum of money from his son Muḥassin, who was not in prison, on condition that he was given a free hand over a number of prominent persons whom he specified (p. 168. l. 6). Thus Ibn al-Furāt became for the third time vizier, with his son to help him, a help that proved his ruin owing to Muḥassin's vindictive violence. Ḥāmid was still a real danger to them (pp. 178—9) but when they had him securely in their power, Muḥassin's treatment of him caused even his own father to expostulate (p. 185. l. 4). Ḥāmid had been induced to disclose his hidden wealth by a promise that he should not be given over to Muḥassin (ib. l. ult.), a promise violated, in spite of Ibn al-Furāt's protest, by the Caliph (p. 187. l. 9). When reproached by his former victims, Ḥāmid told them to take him rather as a warning than an example (p. 182, ult.): this the summary, p. XXVIII, converts into a protestation of innocence. And the Mūnis there described as "forced to give the Caliph a large sum, he being in want of money", is not the general, but Ḥāmid's clerk who bore that name (p. 183. l. 11), and from whom some money of Ḥāmid's was recovered.

Ḥāmid reaches Wāsiṭ in a dying condition and is then, according to the summary, p. XXVIII, "brought before other judges". A Ḳādi with Shāhids were summoned by Ḥāmid's custodian to disprove any suspicion of foul play on his part (p. 188. l. 10). It may well be that in temper and attitude they were more akin to a judicial body than those before whom Ḥāmid had lately appeared, but this is the sole justification for the summary's statement.

To turn for a moment from affairs of state to domestic life. The notice of Ibn al-Furāt in Ṣafadi's *Wāfi bil Wafayāt* — B. M. or. 6587, 191^a, has an anecdote from the *Dhail* to the *Ta'rikh Baghdad* by Ibn al-Najjār (d. A. H. 643, Brock. I. 360), of which the text is appended ¹),

¹) This anecdote is not to be found in the vizier's life as given in the Ms. Paris Ar. 2131, identified by M. AMAR in J. A. 1908 t. XI, 237, as a part of the *Dhail* of Ibn al-Najjār. It runs as follows in Ṣafadi:

روى ابن النجار في ذيله يسنده الى ابي النصر المفضل بن علي الازدي كاتب المقدر ومؤديه انه حضر مجلس ابي الحسن ابن الفرات وعن يمينه ابو الحسن علي بن عيسى بن داود بن الجراح وعن يساره القاضي ابو عمر محمد بن يوسف وقد تأخر حامد بن العباس عن الحضور فقال الوزير: اتعلمون السبب في تأخر حامد؟ فقالوا: لا. قال: ولكنى اعرف سبب ذلك انصرف البارحة مساءً وداره بعيدة فابطأ على جاريتها فلما وصل استقبلته وقبلت جبينه وقالت: يا مولاي اقلقتنى بتأخرك فما الذى بطأ بك. فقال: موافقة الوزير اعز الله على الحساب. فقالت: يا مولاي حساب في الدنيا وحساب في الآخرة حمل الله عنك. ثم نعتت خفيه وقدمت نعليه وافرغت عليه دست ثياب قد بخرتها واخذت ثيابه عنه وقدمت اليه الطهور فلما صلى المغرب وعشاء الآخرة ندمت اليه طبقاً تولت لغيبته ألوانه وقد وقفت مع الطبّاخة تحرياً لنظافتها واخذت تلقمه وتأكل منه ثم تولت غسل يديه وقدمت اليه الشراب واصلحت عودها فشرب ثلاثة ابطال وشربت مثلها واغتبقا فلما اصبح دخل الحمام وخرج فسقنته من الجلاب بالثلج ما قطع خماره وقدمت اليه طبقاً من الخبضات ألواناً طيبة وهو الآن يأكل. ثم قال: غسل يده ولبس ثيابه. ثم قال: ركب وتوجه الينا. ثم لم يزل ينزله الطريق الى ان قال: هو في الدهليز. ثم قال: يدخل حامد. فرفع الستر ودخل حامد فلما رايناه ما تمالكنا ان ضحكنا فلما سلم واخذ موضع جلوسه قال: ما الذى أضحككم عند مشاهدتى. قلنا: صحّة حدس سيدنا الوزير فان شئت اقتصصناه. فقال: تفضلوا. فاقتصصنا ما جرى باسره فتخير ثم قام على قدميه وحلف بالله جلت اسماءه لولا انه يعلم ان الوزير أعف خلق الله لقدرت انها هي حدثت ما جرى فما اخل بشيء منه. فضحك الجماعة.

(B. M. or. 6587, fol. 191 a.)

and as the anecdote forms a considerable fraction of the entire notice, Şafadi must have deemed it important. Nevertheless that a *Jāriya* should meet her mate on his return from work, gently chide his delay, attend to his bodily and spiritual cravings, and speed him back to work on the morrow, is a picture probable enough in most climes; whether it be interesting, or worthy of eulogy for the insight into fact which it displays, is another matter; and it may be that the vizier's circle was easily amused, or was readily appreciative. The story suggests rather love in a cottage than the style of living attributed to Hāmid (see HILAL, Introd. p. 18. n. 1; according to Ibn al-Jauzi in the *Shudhūr al-'Uḡūd*—Brock. I. 502, No. 4 Hāmid kept seventeen hundred chamberlains), but his own corroboration of the story must be held conclusive.

On p. XXIX we read: "Document signed by 'Ali b. 'Is declares the value of certain lands owned by him. Anecdote". This statement is inadequately helpful towards appreciating the contents. 'Ali, after repelling Ibn al-Furāt's charges against his administration, especially that of having favoured the Karmathian heretics (p. 196) the absurdity of which is emphasized in 'Arīb 59.1.5, was persuaded to submit to pay a given sum. Ibn al-Furāt procured the Caliph's sanction to the offer, and proceeded to make it publicly known as a proof of what 'Ali's official conduct had been, an act which gives but a low idea of his own standard of conduct. Then we are told (p. 197. l. 3) on the authority of Ibn al-Muṭawwaḡ who wrote a work on viziers, (*Fihrist* 129 and *Faraj ba'd Shidda* I. 132) that 'Ali asked the vizier to allow the current year's revenue of his estates to be taken in part payment of the sum he had submitted to pay, and, in reply to the vizier's suggestion that this revenue would amount to 50 000 dinars, said he was content to have it taken at 20 000 for it was probably less. But in fact the higher figure was reached. Then comes the anecdote. Years later when 'Ali, as vizier, was reproaching an accounting official with having underestimated his revenue by two-thirds, he was met by the retort that he had but followed the example set by 'Ali on this occasion, and that 'Ali was thus completely answered.

This is difficult to follow. 'Ali's standard of conduct here depicted far from being a low one, is rather unduly lofty. He was asking to have an expected asset coming in to him applied towards a liability which he owed: it was, therefore, his interest to swell the asset's amount: instead, he cut it down without compulsion and, as it turned out later, without justification in fact. By what process of reasoning can such

an act have been held an adequate retort to a charge of misrepresentation?

But the story is, I suggest, open to doubt. A very full account of 'Ali's examination appears in Hilāl's *Wuzarā*, and 'Ali's claim to be allowed a set off against the sum he had agreed to pay is told (p. 295) on the authority of one of Ibn al-Furāt's secretaries who was present. It is to this effect. The question arose as to the amount payable in respect of treasury dues (*Ḥaqq bait al-Māl*) on 'Ali's estates; he alleged he had been overcharged; the vizier replied that he could not yield on any point which affected his duty as a servant of the state, and continued: "You must be aware that, had the officials declared you liable on the claim for dues to the whole extent of the sum you have agreed to pay, I should have enforced the claim against your property irrespective of the amount for which you have admitted liability as a fine on your conduct as vizier; you have had ample experience of administration. Still, retain if you will the amount of the overcharge out of your own vizier's percentage" (*Istithnā*), as to which see *Irshād al-Arīb* III. 184, l. 15 and J. R. A. S. 1913, p. 828). 'Ali estimated the sum to be 20 000 dinars, whereupon the vizier ordered that, "What should be found to be equitably owing in respect of these dues on 'Ali's estates, including those he had settled (*wuḳūf*), during the period he had held them — (and if this implies the estates to have been the *Ḍiyā*' *Abbāsiyya* which were granted to a vizier on his appointment. — *Wuzarā* 261. l. ult. and 282. l. 9, it is strange that any part of them should have been made the subject of *wakf*) — should be taken as part payment of the fine (*muṣādara*) to the amount of 20 000 dinars, but any excess was to remain owing from him personally".

This arrangement was perfectly honest on 'Ali's part, but it differs from that told by Miskawaih in this, that the set off was in respect, not of a certain sum coming in to 'Ali, but of an unascertained sum overcharged against him. Still the similarity of the assessed amount in both the stories makes it probable that they represent one and the same transaction, and that the story told by Hilāl is, having regard to his authority and the detail of his narrative, the more likely to be the correct one. Nor is it followed by any such anecdote as that told by Miskawaih. It seems to follow, therefore, that the high character given to 'Ali by Ṣūlī in his life (*Irshād* V, at p. 278), should remain unaffected by this doubtful anecdote.

Ibn al-Furāt's acts during his third vizierate were directed mainly against his political enemies. Having disposed of his predecessors, of Ḥāmid by death and of 'Ali b. 'Īsa by exile, he dealt mildly with Ibn Muḳla (whose

petition for mercy had verse superadded, which the historian does not deem worthy of record, p. 202. l. 4), whilst Ibn al-Ḥawāri he caused to be killed, — and the Caliph declared later, (p. 232. l. 8), that this was the only death that he had sanctioned. He then dealt with claims against the Mādarā'i — a family on which we may anticipate much information from the concluding portion of Professor BECKER's *Beiträge*. The head of the family, Abu Zunbūr is described in the summary (p. XXIX) as giving "a secret promise to pay" a specified sum. The sum is misstated, and the secrecy is an addition to the text, but, apart from this, it would have been well to have made some reference to the colloquy between him and Ibn al-Furāt (p. 203). The vizier, after treating him with great consideration, invited him to charge 'Ali b. 'Isa with having accepted bribes from him whilst he was his subordinate, and on his declining to do so asked him why, after bringing this charge against himself at the instance of 'Ali (on p. 133. l. 3) he now refused to do the same at his instance. Abu Zunbūr replied that even in his case, with all the illtreatment he had suffered at his hands, the act had not been a laudable one: after 'Ali's long course of favour to him it would be outrageous, and to this the vizier assented. The story is proof of 'Ali's rectitude, and proof too that Ibn al-Furāt admitted it. Forced to concede in 'Ali one superiority over himself, he ever did his utmost, as we have seen above, to prevent others knowing it. He next turned to Mūnis, the victorious general, and easily persuaded the Caliph that he was dangerous, and on the way to becoming, *Amir al-Umarā*, but the summary's statement of his having to be "exiled from Baghdad" (p. XXIX) does scant justice to the persuasive charm of the Caliph when explaining to Mūnis that his presence was essential elsewhere among the unpaid soldiery (p. 205—6). That he was in fact being got away by Ibn al-Furāt Mūnis was well aware; he told him so to his face (p. 220) when he returned on the happening of the disaster to the pilgrims which the popular voice laid to the vizier's charge, and which brought about his final fall. His calmness deceived those with him, but a verse he was heard to quote on the uncertainty of what the day might bring forth shewed his concern, (the summary p. XXX says that "one of his servants reciting a verse gives him the alarm"). After his arrest he shewed no little resource in defending himself. He enabled the Caliph to secure a fund of money behind the back of his new vizier, and then criticized that vizier and his subordinates (pp. 222—4), — Shafi' did not "extort" money from him as stated on p. XXXI; he was a mere intermediary between him and the Caliph in securing this fund (p. 222. l. ult.). And the part played by Ibn Ba'dsharr, the new vizier's

secretary, is quite misstated. All he did was to demand money from Ibn al-Furât and, failing to get it, to try stronger means, but he was promptly told that only by gentleness was anything likely to be realized. And Ibn al-Furât was actually engaged in making his terms with his custodian, Hârûn b. Gharîb the Caliph's kinsman, when the capture of his son Muḥassin supervened. He neither expected, nor received, any mercy; torture failed to make him give up any of his wealth, and his father was equally obdurate. The summary's statement that the new vizier made "an unfavourable report in the matter of Ibn al-Furât's administration" (p. XXXI) is not warranted by the text. What happened was that, on his examination before him and other officials, he proved more than a match his successor "and nearly eat him up" (p. 230. l. 7). An exaggerated estimate of his revenue he disposed of by pointing out the far lower sum realized in the days of his predecessors — and asked whether he was to be charged with miraculous power. (It seems to follow that the estates in question must have been what are termed in *Wuzarâ*, as above stated, the "Abbasid estates", which were habitually assigned to the vizier on his taking office.) To a suggestion that he had annexed thereto estates of the Caliph (*Ḍiyâ' al-Sultân*, and as to this process of annexion cf. *Wuzarâ* pp. 133—134), he replied that the diwan's accounts were accessible, and would disclose whether those had been more or less productive in his time as compared with that of his predecessors, — one of whom, he remarked, was father to the present vizier, and had left the management of those estates to his son. The charge of having murdered people he met (p. 231. l. 2) by disclaiming responsibility for his son's acts, whose appointment was made by the Caliph not by him, and was made, indeed, whilst he was still a prisoner in the palace. When reproached by Mûnis for having procured his removal from Baghdad he pleaded the Caliph's dissatisfaction with Mûnis as expressed in letters to himself which he had retained. They were produced and bore out his statement (p. 233. l. 8), and the Caliph when shewn them by Mûnis could retort only by raging against their disclosure.

Muḥtadir's conduct throughout is indeed deplorable, still the statement (p. XXXII) that at this stage, he "seeks to extort more money from them, but further tortures are of no avail to this end" does him some injustice. Nâzûk, their custodian (he remained so to the last and they were not "transferred to the custody of Mûnis"), tortured them to the utmost, but could get no money out of them. The Caliph, on reproaching his vizier with not procuring from them the sum he had promised, was told that now they found themselves

in the hands, not of questioning civilians, but of the military, they despaired of saving their lives by disclosing their wealth, and on Názúk saying that he had exhausted violent means, in that case, said Muḫtadir, "the only course is to have them conveyed to my palace" (p. 234. ult.). Mûnis and his brother officers saw that this might well result, (as it had indeed before resulted), in Ibn al-Furât gaining the Caliph's ear, and also a free hand over themselves, and they agreed that, if the proposed course were adopted, they would revolt (p. 235). On the question of what should be the prisoners' fate, Mûnis advised their being handed over to himself; that the son should die, and the father be spared; but he was told by the Caliph's kinsman that they would then be nevermore able to trust the father. It was accordingly agreed that both must die, and the Caliph was warned by the kinsman that the danger to himself of refusal lay in a change of sovereign (p. 236. l. 4). The vizier indeed did hold back, and would not go the length of advising their deaths on the ground that it would be a bad precedent for the Sovereign (ib. l. 8), but he must have been but superficially acquainted with the dynasty's annals if he supposed that a vizier's death by violence would stand out therein with any special vividness, and his passive resistance did not avail. Hilâl relates (*Wuzarâ* p. 62), that a secretary of Ibn al-Furât had a dream in which Mûnis declared himself to have assented with reluctance to Ibn al-Furât's violent end; that all of them, the Caliph included, would meet a like fate; and that his own remaining span of life was under ten years.

This examination of less than one half of the summary may suffice to shew that it cannot be deemed an adequate guide to the contents of a volume which has its full share of interest and of importance. It may also serve to palliate, in some degree, the conduct of the withholder of the card-slips which is the subject of a note at the foot of the preface. That outrage was, at least, not inconsiderately aimed, for the index, although not faultless, is assuredly the least vulnerable adjunct to the volume, and as it may be used by readers it is worth while suggesting emendations. — At the outset it may be observed that the lists of identical *Kunyas* with different names appended to them are of little use in the absence of references to the passages where they respectively occur. Where the context identifies a *Kunya* its separate entry is superfluous: where it does not do this, a reference is needed as a guide to its selection from the mass; and were the names of, at any rate, viziers and other prominent persons recorded in the index, as they are in the memory, primarily under their *Nisba* or *Laḡab*, many of these additional entries could be dispensed with. The habit of

designating persons by *Kunya* and *Nisba*, with the name omitted, is constant in oriental texts, and the practice of putting all the page references against the name, with only a cross reference thereto from the *Nisba*, results in a duplication of labour to the student.

Emendations of Index.

القناتى read اسحاق بن على القناتى

يختيشوع بن جبريل the name on p. 328 refers to جبريل بن يحنانيان temp. Mutawakkil, — Tabari III. 1437.

ابن بسطام, both Muḥammad and 'Ali are sons of Abu-l-'Abbâs (Aḥmad b. Muḥammad) of whom there is an anecdote in Kindi, ed. A. R. GUEST, p. 524—5, id. *Faraj ba'd Sh.* I. 132.

الجزرية read الثغور الجزرية

الحسين بن احمد المادرائى Abu Bakr known as Abu Zunbûr should be distinguished from Abu Muḥammad, known as ابن كردى ('Arîb 145) to whom the references pp. 257, 267, and 390 refer.

الحسين بن حمدان should be distinguished from his nephew, Nâsir al-Daula Abu Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. 'Abd Allâh b. Ḥamdân to whom the passages from p. 373 onwards refer.

خرطامش read خرطاش

النوزان read دوران

روزه read رونة

الزعفرانية read الزفرانية

بن شيرزاد read زكرياء بن غريب

سينيز read سيديز

شابشتى read شابستى الحاجب

شفيح read شفيح

الحرمى read صافى الحرمى

اللبلى read طاهر اللبلى

طريف read طريق السبكرى

الماء read طريق النضاء

العباس بن ثوابة the reference p. 392 is, not to Abu-l-Haytham, but to Abu 'Abd Allâh (Aḥmad b. Muḥammad) b. Thawâba, whose life will be found in *Irshâd* II. 80.

عبد الله بن ابراهيم المسمعى the references pp. 240, 254 refer to the son Ibrâhîm b. 'Abd Allâh. The father died A. H. 305, ('Arîb 65).

الشيرازى read عبد الله بن جعفر الشيرازى

الجرجراى read عبد الله بن على الجرجرانى

النقرى read عبد الله بن على النقرى

العراقى (Shalmaghâni) read ابن أبى العراقى

النوختى read على بن احمد بن على التوجى

is Saif al-Daula, 'Ali b. 'Abd Allâh b. Ḥamdân

— all the references subsequent to p. 174 refer to

على بن خلف من طناب, who seems to be a different person.

بن روح read على بن محمد روح

النهرين read فوهة النهرين

القاسم ابو الكرخى delete.

الكرج read الكرخ

اللغثيط read اللغثيط

المتهمش read لؤلؤ غلام المتهمش

صاحب الجيش read محمد بن سليمان الحاجب
him to be identical with the «Kâtib» next in order mentioned.

احمد بن محمد بن قرابة read قرابة محمد بن قرابة

Qy. read على البريهارى

cf. Sam'âni, *Ansâb*, 197^a. l. 7.

هارون read مروان بن المقندر

some of the references against this name refer to the next
mentioned مفلح ابو صالح الخادم الاسود

النازوكية and نازوك read نازوك ابو منصور

انظر الحسن بن عبد الله بن حمدان read ناصر الدولة انظر الحسين بن حمدان

Parallel Tables of Passages
Covering the reign of al-Muqtadir
A. H. 295—320.

Misk. Vol. V.	'Arib, Ṭab. cont.	Hilâl (Wuzarâ)
A. H. 295 p. 57 ⁶ —60 ¹⁰	21 ⁶ —13 and 22 ¹ —7	114—116
A. H. 296 60 ult.—65 ²	25—29 ¹³	
664—70 ⁶		25—6
707—72 ⁶		26—7 . 137 ¹¹ —1397

Misk. Vol. V.	'Arib, Tab. cont.	Hilâl (Wuzarâ)
73 ⁶⁻⁶		119—20
73 ⁹⁻⁷⁵⁵		27—8 . 102
75 ⁶⁻¹⁰	30 ¹⁴⁻¹⁹	
76 ²⁻³	31 ¹⁻⁴	
A. H. 297		
765—81 ⁶	32 . 34—5	
A. H. 299		
83 ^{1-84¹}	40 ⁴⁻¹³	268—273
84 ²⁻⁸⁵⁵		103—5
85 ^{6-87¹}		263—278
87 ^{11-88¹}	38—39	
88 ⁸⁻¹⁰		269 ^{4af.}
A. H. 300		
89 ¹⁻⁹⁰³	41	263—4
A. H. 301		
90 ¹⁰⁻⁹¹⁵		2823—8
93 ⁴⁻⁵		342—4
94 ⁴⁻⁹⁶⁴		325—7
96 ^{4-97b}		346
97 ^{3-98¹}		278—80
98 ⁹⁻¹¹	44—5	
99 ^{5-100¹²}	39 ⁹⁻¹⁷	
A. H. 302		
101 ^{11-102¹}	47 ^{18-48¹²}	223 ⁶
102 ²⁻³	47 ⁸	
A. H. 303		
1025—105 ⁹	56 ^{9-58¹²}	
A. H. 304		
107 ^{3-ult.}		283
108 ¹⁻¹⁰		285—6
110 ²⁻³		31 ult.
114 ⁸⁻¹¹⁵⁷	67 ¹²⁻²⁰	
117 ¹⁻¹¹⁸⁹	70 ^{20-715 . 77}	
A. H. 306		
1263—128 ⁴		32—33
1323—133 ¹		100—1
133 ^{1-135²}		92—95
135 ²⁻⁶		96—7
135 ^{12-136¹¹}		96
138 ¹⁻¹¹	75 ¹⁰⁻¹²	
139 ¹⁻⁹		243
140 ¹⁻⁶	74 ¹³⁻²⁰	
141 ¹⁰⁻¹²	76 ⁶	99 ¹⁴
A. H. 307		
150—152	84	
A. H. 308		
152 ¹⁰	807	

Misk. Vol. V.	'Arīb, Tab. cont.	Hilāl (Wuzarā)
A. H. 309		
153—162 ¹	86—96	
A. H. 310		
162 ¹⁰	109 ¹⁵ —116 ⁶	
163 ⁶	1085	
A. H. 311		
1685		2443
1689—1699		84—85
170 ¹ —1724		103—105
172 ¹⁰ —175 ¹		38—40
1754—6	114 ^{6—9}	40—41
176—182	112	34—38
186		174—175
190—202		289—308
2029—2044		44—45
204 ⁶ —2067		45—46
2069—208 ¹		47
A. H. 312		
208 ² —209 ¹¹		48—49
2109—2113		63 . 195
2114—238 ¹⁰		49—62
239 ¹¹ —241 ²		272—273
241 ^{2—10}	124 ^{6—9}	309
241 ¹² —2444	124—126	
A. H. 314		
251—252	1285—13	
253	129 ^{1—1}	
A. H. 315		
255 ⁶ —2585	129 ¹⁸ —1315	310—314
268 ¹¹ —269	133 ¹⁵ —18	
288—297	1323—133 ¹⁵	
A. H. 316		
302—303	1345—11	
303 ¹¹ —3044	1367—11	
304—307		314—316
308 ¹⁰ —3097		316—317
A. H. 317		
312—319	139—142 ¹⁵	
320 ¹⁰ —327	142—144	
3293— ¹⁰	136—137	
329 ¹¹	145 ¹	
A. H. 318		
3307	147 ²⁰	
330 ⁸ —331 ¹⁰	148—150	
332—333	150	
A. H. 319		
339—341	159—160	

Misk. Vol. V.	'Arib, Tab. cont.	Hilal (Wuzara)
342-343	161	
343 ¹⁰	161	
345 ⁴ -347 ³	161 ⁵ -162 ⁹	
352-354	164	
356 ⁹ -359 ¹¹	165-166	
367	173-174	
A. H. 320		
373 ¹⁰ -375 ³	169-172	
375-380	176-180	