CHAPTER V

THE 'ABBASID PERIOD

After the Umayyads the 'Abbasids established their rule in 132 A.H./749 A.D. Ibn al-Athir continues to describe the historical account as the wheel of the time rolls ahead. A chain of caliphs who came one after another is presented by the author. After Abu al-Abbas Al-Saffah, Mansur became the caliph in 136 A.H./753 A.D. His reign lasted nearly 22 years. Mehdi took the charge of the caliphate in the same year. He continued to rule until 169 A.H./785 A.D. He was succeeded by Hadi, who, having been in power for a year and three months or four, died in 170 A.H./786 A.D. After Hadi, the celebrated caliph - Al-Rashid was proclaimed a caliph in 170 A.H./786 A.D. He remained in the office of the caliphate for 23 years, two months and 18 days. He died in 193 A.H./808 A.D. Amin assumed the power, but a serious conflict between Amin and his brother Mamun had developed which resulted in the killing of Amin in 198 A.H./813 A.D. This Mamun became the unrivalled caliph. His period ranged over a considerable length of time. It ended with the death of Mamun in 218 A.H./833 A.D. Al-Mu'tasim
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succeeded Māmūn in the same year and played his role for eight years and eight months. His death in 227 A. H./841 A.D. brought Wāthiq in power. In the year 232 A. H./846 A.D. After the death of Wāthiq Al-Mutawakkil succeeded him. His reign continued upto 247 A. H./861 A.D. in which he was killed. Muntasir could not live more than six years after the assumption of power (862 A.D.). He was succeeded by Musta'īn, who was later killed in 248 A. H./862 A.D. He ruled for four and a half years, after which he died in 255 A. H./868 A.D. Al-Mutawakkil accepted his turn in the same year. Next year, in 256 A. H./869 A.D. he was deposed and died. Mu'tamid al-ālālah was proclaimed a caliph in the same year. His reign lasted 23 years and six months. He died in 279 A. H./892 A.D. During his last days, he was naturally a puppet in the hand of his brother 'Alī Ahmad Muaffaq. The successor of Mu'tamid became Mutaḍid who ruled for a considerable number of years. With his death in 289 A. H./901 A.D., a new caliph Muktāfi was brought into power. He died in 295 A. H./907 A.D. Muqtadir succeeded him, but withi
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a few months he was deposed. Ibn al-Mu'taz came into power, but his fortune no longer favoured him, and Muqtadir again captured the power. He was again deposed from the caliphate in 317 A.H./929 A.D., but later on he held sway for three more years. Lastly in 320 A.H./932 A.D. he was murdered. Qahir after retaining the caliphate for two years, was forced to yield to another candidate, Ahmad b. Muqtadir in 322 A.H./933 A.D. He was designated as Al-Radi. The most remarkable event during the time of Qahir was the establishment of the Buwayhid rule. Al-Radi died in 329 A.H./940 A.D. He ruled for six years, ten months and ten days. Ibrahim b. Muqtadir assumed in the power the same year. He was called Al-Muttaqi. He was succeeded by his son Al-Ta'ia in the same year. He was deposed in 333 A.H./944 A.D. leaving the place for Al-Mustakfi. The weakness of the Abbasi caliphs reached its culmination when Maz al-Duwalah b. Bawab conquered Baghdad in 334 A.H./945 A.D. and later, the caliphs became puppets in the hands of Buwayhid rulers. Mustakfi was deposed and Muti' was brought into power. He was in the office for 29 years and about five months (974 A.D.). After Tai'a who completed seventeen years eight months and six days, Qadir came into power in 381 A.H./991 A.D. He died in
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The above summary of the caliphs of the 'Abbásid period is presented with a view to give a general idea of the contents of Ibn al-Athir's history. The author, however, goes into the details of the period.
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An analysis of the sources of Ibn al-Athir's historical account pertaining to the Abbasid period shows that the major portion of the historical information, especially upto the year 302 A.H./914 A.D. has largely been taken from the history of Tabari. Tabari's information and the method of presenting the material continues to guide Ibn al-Athir. This view is based on a thorough comparison between the two texts. But we can not deny that at a few places regarding some events, our historian utilized other sources. Such account is related with the Abbasids. For example after narrating an account, he quote Ibn abi Usma's history as an authority. Harith b. Muhammad b. Abû Usâma 282-186 A.H./896-802 A.D. is mentioned as a traditionist and a compiler of Musnad; but his history is not mentioned by the scholars. Since Ibn al-Athir mentions the history of Abû Usama there is every likelihood that he would have utilized the book.

The way in which Ibn al-Athir has utilized the history of Tabari requires some discussion. When we say that Ibn al-Athir has copied major portion of the historical accounts pertaining to the Abbasids, from the beginning upto the year


302 A.H./914 A.D., it generally means that Ibn al-Athir copies the account not always word by word but he pays attention to the contents and copies them. There is hardly an account in the history of Tabari which is left out by Ibn al-Athir. Our historian has completely taken either the content or both the content with the words from it. If an account is very lengthy in the history of Tabari and it is narrated from different sources, then its abstract is taken by the historian. He derives the content and briefly reproduces it in his own words.

Ibn al-Athir reports:

Ibn al-Athir reports which shows how Ibn al-Athir has copied the historical material from the history of Tabari. It also suggests that how for Ibn al-Athir relied on the history of Tabari.

The sources of Tabari's information concerning the Abbâsids are of two kinds, the first one is the recorded material and the second one is oral. Among the written sources the book of Ibn Abi Khaitama is to be mentioned. Abû Bakr Ahmad b. Zuhair al Nasai was known as Abu Khaitama. He wrote a book

named Al-Tarikh al-Kabir, which contained historical material up to his own period. Baghdad was his native city and he died there too. It is to be noted that he was well informed of the events took place during his own time. So the information recorded by him in his book, may be considered trustworthy and reliable. After having gone through the book, Dhahabi expressed high opinion about the book. Moreover it suggests that the book was extant during the time of Ibn al-Athir, but we cannot say whether Ibn al-Athir utilized the book. So the information recorded by him in his book, must be taken trustworthy and unbiased. Tabari possessed the book whose extracts through Tabikh al-Tabari, can be seen in Al-Kamil. Another historian whose work proved of much help in this respect, was Madaini.

Ali b. Muhammad al-Madaini was one of the greatest historians of the third century. He was born in 135 A.H./752 A.D. and died in 225 A.H./839 A.D. The date of Madaini’s death coincides with the birth of Tabari. It means that Tabari did not see Madaini. But it is certain that Tabari utilized the historical works of Madaini through his pupils like Zuhair b. Bakkar 256-142 A.H./869-759 A.D. and Ahmad b. Abu Khaithama. The


former died when Tabari was 30 or 31 years old. Thus Madaini's book *Kitāb Akhbar al-Khulafāʾ al-Kabīr* and *Kitāb Akhbar al-Saffāh* became the source of Tabari. The first book contained the informations from the time of Abu Bakr the first caliph upto the Abbāsīde Caliph al-Mustasim. Another book of Madaini is mentioned as *Kitāb al-Tarikh al-Khulafa* in the *Fihrist* of Ibn Nadīm. But it is difficult to know the content of the book as well as the period it dealt with. Further, a very rich and valuable work is *Kitāb Jawalat al-Abbāsiyā* of which Ibn Nadīm does not give full name. The work consisted of several books some of which were later available to Yaqtū in Sukkaria's manuscripts and it may not be credulous to think that with the whole collections of Yaqtū, these books were also transferred to Ibn al-Athīr after the death of Yaqtū in 626 A. H./1228 A.D.

Madaini moved in a wide circle of the men of distinction, the judges of Baghdad like Yehya b. Uktum, ministers of the government and favourite companions of the caliph al-Māmūn. Ibrāhīm b. Ishaq al-Musali (160-235 A. H./767-849 A.D.) was one of the favourite companions whom Māmūn held in high regard.

Ibrahim frequently visited him and lived during the reign of Al-Rashid, Mamun and Wathiq. Being so esteemed in the court of Mamun, and having a wide circle of friends who held high offices in the government, he was closely in touch with the affairs of the Abbásid empire. He was himself interested in lexicology, music, history and theological subjects. Madaini had a very intimate relation with Ibrahim and possessed remarkable position, which enabled him to acquire first hand knowledge about the Abbásides. He might have benefited not only from official library of Mamun and his predecessors, but the documents, secret papers, and governmental registers were also made accessible to him. Thus the accounts which Madaini wrote in his book *Kitab Al-Dualat al-Abbasiya*, was reliable authentic and rich. Madaini's information which covered wide range came down to Tabari. He fully utilized the historical works and later these information, through Tarikh al-Tabari was recorded by Ibn al-Atir.

Another authority whose books Tabari utilized, is Haitham b. Adi (174-207-309 A.H./790-822-921 A.D.). He was a man of letter and genealogy. He had friendship with Hasan b.
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Sahal (236-166 A.H./850-782 A.D.) the grand minister and sometimes the governor of the caliph Al-Mamun. His daughter Dūrān was married to Hamūn. His house was considered a resort for the men of distinction and high repute and Haitham was among one of them. Haitham was provided with all kinds of facilities by him. Besides, he was among the frequent visitors to the court of Mansūr, Mehdi, Hādī and Rashīd. These relations and special circle in which Haitham moved and lived, facilitated him together important and reliable information for his historical works. Of his fifty books recorded by Ibn Nāṣīm in Al-Fihrist at least two Kitāb al-Daulah and Kitāb al-Tārikh perhaps, consisted of the information about the Abbāsides. They were arranged according to the annalistic order. Tabārī has quoted Haitham 31 times, mostly in connection with the Abbāsid History. He received the historical knowledge of Haitham.b. Adi through his books which was later recorded in Al-Kāmil Ibn al-Athīr did not make a slight change in the contents which he copied from the history of Al-Tabari.

Thus the historical knowledge of Tabārī about the Abbāsid up to the first half of the third century, has mainly been drawn


from the above historians whose close association with the Abbāside enabled them to record first-hand information in their books. The authorities upon which Tabari has relied have been discussed here with a view that their historical knowledge and its value has great importance for us, because Ibn al-Athīr has derived the information from the history of Tabari and recorded them in Al-Kāmil. He did so with great honesty.

For the later period upto the year 302 A.H. Tabari's information heavily depends on oral sources. His sentences fairly suggest the authorities who have supplied information to him. He does not often quote the name of the transmitter who conveyed information to him. Why does it happen? One of the answers and the most convincing is that Tabari did not like to mention his authorities due to political reason. Probably,
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he and his transmitter feared punishment. Another reason which is the least important is that Tabari did not remain very particular about mentioning the authorities in concluding portion. But sometimes he records the names of the transmitter. It is because of the fact that the information was in compliance with the political tune of the time. There was no fear of serious consequences.

I have remarked that Tabari himself was afraid of the ruling power because the information which he preserved about his period is not proportionately detailed. He concludes the last volume of his history in 655 pages covering 37 years from 246-302 A.H./869-914 A.D. It is pertinent to note that Tabari concluded the Abbaside portion at the close of the year 294 A.H. 914 A.D. and gave permission for its transmission. But the accounts of later period which begin with al-Muqtadir were not permitted for circulation according to Yaqut. At the same time it is relevant to mention that Tabari does not supply sufficient information after 296 A.H./907 A.D. Probably, the present text of Tabari’s history may not be considered a complete one but the text which was in the hand of Ibn al-Athir might have contained the missing material. But if we think that the additional
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information recorded by Ibn al-Athir after 295 A.H./907 A.D. was not copied from *Tarikh al-Tabari*. Then it means that some other books served as a source to him. To our luck Ibn al-Athir himself solves the problem. He narrates an account in 302 A.H., 914 A.D. on the authority of Ibn Miskawah which testifies, that Ibn al-Athir has started to copy the account from other sources than *Tarikh al-Tabari*. The comparison of the accounts recorded by Ibn Miskawah and Ibn al-Athir supports the view.

**Africa and Andalus:**

The accounts of Africa and Andalus during the period of 'Abbaside is usually missing in *Tabari*. But our author has devoted considerable pages to the description of African and Andalusian history. The following accounts under each year have been narrated in *AL-Kamil*. The entrance of Abd al-Rahman b. Moawiah in Andalus and the establishment of the Umayyad rule there in 139 A.H./756 A.D. is narrated by Ibn al-Athir. *Tabari* avoided the history of the Umayyad in Andalus. He has mentioned it in two lines.

"في هذه السنة صار عبد الرحمن بن هشام بن عبد الملك بن مروان إلى الأندلس فملك بها مروه فولده ولاته إلى اليوم" it means that Ibn al-Athir's accounts pertaining to the histories of Africa and Andalus have been copied from other sources than the history of *Tabari*.
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The sources for African and Andalusian histories discussed above under the Umayyad, most possibly again, served Ibn al-Athir. Most of them might have extended their help to Ibn al-Athir. Only the history of Ibn al-Qutiya terminates at the time of Abd Allah b. Muhammad who died in 299 A.H./911 A.D.

Sicily:

Ibn al-Athir deals with the history of Sicily also from the time of its conquest by the Muslims. His information on the history of the Island is very likely based on recorded material available to him.

Ibn al-Athir does not mention the authorities who helped him in this respect and provided him with information. Moreover we do not possess a single book which is written on the subject during the early of the 'Abbasid's period whose information may
be compared with the accounts preserved in *Al-Kāmil*. But merely on this ground, it cannot be held that historical books pertaining to Sicily were not written during the early of the fourth century A.H.

When we start investigation of such books written on the history of Sicily, we find some books helpful in this respect. They may be supposed as a possible source for Ibn al-Athīr. For example Hāji Khalifa mentions two books, which were written in this connection. One of them entitled *Tārikh Sīliyah* was written by Ibn Qattāa Ālī b. Jafar al-Sīλī and the other book having similar title was written by Abu Zaid al-Ghumari. These two books might have directly or indirectly helped Ibn al-Athīr as a source.

It is to be noted that some regional historical books did contain the account of other areas too. For instance, *Futūh Mīṣr* of Ābd al-Hakam dealt not only with the accounts of the conquest of Mīṣr but also the conquest of Africa and Andalus have been described in it. In this way, the books which were

written mainly on the histories of Africa and Andalus might have preserved the information about Sicily. We have the history of Ibn al-Azari entitled *Al-Bayan al-Mughrib* in two parts: the first one basically deals with the account of Africa which has included the historical accounts of Sicily.

The accounts of Sicily recorded by Ibn al-Athir in *Al-Kamil* and Ibn al-Azari in *Al-Bayan al-Mughrib* present a great identity, but there was a remote chance for Ibn al-Athir to utilize the book of Ibn al-Azari as I have already discussed. So the only way left for us is to suppose that the above mentioned two books and possibly the histories of neighbouring countries such as Africa and Andalus might have supplied historical information to Ibn al-Athir.

**Al-Andalus:**

The importance of Ibn Hayyān regarding the Andalusian history from the second century up to the time of Ibn Hayyān needs a little more consideration. Ibn Hayyān held one of the highest post, equivalent of Wazir or al-Hājib. His grandfather was among one of the top clients of Abd al-Rahman al-Awal - the founder of the Umayyad rule in Andalus. After it, Ibn Hayyān did not hold any post. He devoted a considerable time of his life in historical study. This devotion

and close association with the ruling power, provided him with the best opportunity to accumulate authentic information for his historical books.

The foregone historians about whom a considerable discussion has already been recorded like the descendants of Razi, Mamün b. Hashim al-Sanbasi, Hasan b. Muhammad b. Mufarraj, Ibn al-Qutia preceded Ibn Hayyán. Many learned authorities like Abu Ali Ghasani and Ibn Khalladūn affirm the veracity and truthfulness of Ibn Hayyán. Perhaps his historical works were one of the most consulted and reliable authorities for the

1. The historical works of Ibn Hayyán do not exceed more than two. The first one entitled Kitab al-Muqtabis fi Tarikh Andalus consisted of ten volumes. It begins with the account of Muslim conquest of Andalus till the time of the author. The Manuscript of the book Al-Muqtabis exists in Oxford and Constantinople. Dairat al-Ma'arif Vol. 2/481. Some parts of the book have been edited and published by M. Antune, E. Levi Pro Wencal and García Cames.


2. Muhammad b. Musa came to Andalus as a Merchant in 249 A.H. and was attached to the Amir Muhammad. Later he took interest in history and wrote a book, Kitab al-R'aiheh, His son Ahmad was also scholar of history. The grand child of Muhammad Isa b. Ahmad continued the tradition of his family and wrote two books, Kitab Tarikh Andalus and Kitab Hijab Khulfa' al-Andalus, Ibn al-Qutia, Tarikh Iftitahal Andalus p. 23-24.

later historians. Ibn al-Azârî and many others reverently refer to Ibn Hayyân.

Abdul Wahid al-Marakashi, who lived in the thirteenth century A. D. quotes Abu Marwan Ibn Hayyân. It means that Ibn Hayyân's works were available in the Mashriq. It is also a fact that Marakashi had written and completed his book on 24th of Jamâd al Akhara 621 A. H./1224 A. D. on the request of a certain wazîr of the Abbâside caliph Nasir Le Din allah.

Another historian Abu Abd allâh al-Humaidi who is a contemporary of Ibn Hayyân left many historical works behind him. Al-Humaidî was a widely travelled scholar. He was fortunate enough to have benefitted from all the contemporary scholars who were living all over the Islamic world. He met Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî and Abu Nasr Ali b. Muqla and exchanged knowledge with them. His interest in history in general and Andalus in particular is well known. Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî and Ibn Muqla both held him in high esteem. Ibn al-Athîr was familiar not only with the author but also with his works. He remarks in the obituary section of the year 488 A. H./1096 A. D. that Al-Humaidî al-Andalusi was born before 420 A. H./1029 A. D.

2. Ibid.
and died in 488 A. H./1095 A.D. He learnt Hadith in Andalus, Egypt, Hejāz and Iraq and he is the author of the book بن الطائفين. He was learned and reliable; his works were donated for public use and so people frequently utilized them. This reference suggests that our author might have utilized the work of Al-Humaidi, which contained the information up to the year 480 A. H. 1087 A.D.

For the material of Andalusian history from 488 A. H./1095 A.D. in which Humaidi died, who had written, besides other books — Bughyat al-Musta'jil fi al-Tarikh, onwards to the time of Ibn al-Athir, the sources turn to be oral. But it does not mean that recorded material were not available to the historian. Though the account pertaining to the "Munawhadun" dynasty of Andalus are based on oral authorities, his sentence "كذا قال بعض مرسل السر" clearly suggests that Ibn al-Athir possessed written records as well. But soon after this remark he rejects the fact and produces his own information on the subject. We find a very clear reference which provides positive evidence about the authorities. He, while stating the length of Musādimah's rule as 70 years and the total number of the
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rulers as four — Yusuf, Ali, Tashfin and Ishaq, add;

١

which suggests that Ibn al-Athir has utilized both the oral and written records.

The above statement of Ibn al-Athir gives us reason to think that he had ascertained the account before putting them into record; and thus his information is very reliable and authentic. Here to mention the name of a scholar who was the Professor of Majd al-Din - the elder brother of Ibn al-Athir — Abu Bakr Yehya b. Sadun al-Maghribi al-Qurtabi, is very relevant. Many other scholars and physicians of Andalus were frequent visitor to the famous house of Ibn al-Athir.

It is a significant point that from 642 A.H. onwards the historical accounts of Andalus and Africa gradually decrease due to the fact that the Oral authorities, being far from their home land, were not able to furnish Ibn al-Athir with fresh and detailed information. It is why that in the last two volumes of Al-Kamil, especially the twelfth one does not contain detailed information and they reduce into a few lines. Another possible reason for the scarcity of the materials is the political upheaval of the time. The crusaders were constantly

attacking on Asia Minor and Egypt. Andalus was under the grip of internal anarchy and external fear. The Mangols, coming out in great swarm from China, had invaded central Asia. Thus the fear of Mangols plunged the whole Muslim world into grief, and despair. This three side danger made the communication among the Muslim states and movement from a country to another most difficult. Internally the warlike condition and the insecurity of the highways on which the merchants, travellers and scholars troded, prevented the Andalusians from setting out on journey.

Alavid Dynasty of Africa:

The material in connection with the Alavid dynasty which was established in Africa in 296 A.H./908 A.D. was derived from many sources, notably from the works of Amir Abd al-Aziz who is referred to by Ibn al-Athir. He says:

ساحب تاريخ أفريقية والغرب

He is also referred to by Ibn Khallikan. Ibn Khallikan mentions the full name of the author عزالدين ابن امير ابن محمد عبد المنيز بن شداد in connection of the account of Ibn Tahir Maz Yehya Ibn Tamim b. Maz b. Balis. He is again quoted by our author, while narrating an event of 607 A.H./1213 A.D. (تاب عمال المنيز). But he gives different title of
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the book (زجمع والبيان في اختار القروان). It is possible that the book might have gotten a title and which was different from the one by which it was popularly known. This happened due to the possible alteration made by calligraphers. Another possibility also exists that the author probably wrote more than one book among which one got the title: "تاريخ إفريقية والغرب"

The question whether the author whom Ibn al-Athir quotes is the same to whom Ibn Khallikan has referred, requires consideration.

The rule of Alavids which was first established in Africa grew stronger with the march of time. At one stage it extended its South-eastern frontier to the Nile and consolidated the whole Egypt under its banner. Their rule lasted up to the year 567 A.H./1171 A.D. when it breathed its last. Since the author belongs to the sixth century A.H. as it can be determined from the references made by Ibn Khallikan, and besides Ibn al-Athir and Ibn Khallikan, both utilized him in connection with the Alavid history, the opinion that the author quoted by the two historians is the same has valid ground. This source probably continued to serve Ibn al-Athir at least up to the year 507 A.H./1113 A.D.

From the year 302 A.H./914 A.D. or 303 A.H./915 A.D. in which Tabari finished his history, our historian naturally depends on a number of sources.

Abbasids:

A comparison of the last two volumes of *Tajārib al-Umam*, with *Al-Kāmil*, shows that there exists a striking similarity between the two texts, and there is great identity between the information presented by the two authors.

Abū Ali Ahmad b. Yaqt b. Miskawah, 421 A.H./1021 A.D. though basically philosopher, chemist, took great interest in history in his later age and he wrote the famous history *Tajārib al-Umam*. This book, especially its last two volumes is very important source for Ibn al-Athir.

The accounts till 340 A.H./951 A.D. in the *Tajārib* are based on written records for which we have evidence in his own words but from 340 A.H./951 A.D. till 369 A.H./979 A.D., most of the information was derived from oral sources. Some of the events recorded by him happened in his presence. So

4. Ibid. Vol. 2/393. He says:

قال الاستاذ أبو علي احمير بن ميسكوه صاحب هذا الكتاب كان مالكيه بعد هذه السنة نهولان مشاهدة و بيان أو خبر حصل بجري عند يهود معاينةه

قال صاحب هذا الكتاب كان عقب الدولة اوزان اخبار من خواصاته الى هذه القلمة.
his part of his history may be considered a very original and authentic.

Among one of the written sources upon which Ibn Miskawah relied was Thabit b. Sanan who is frequently quoted by the historian. Sanan's history is the main source of information to Ibn Miskawah.

Thabit b. Sanan b. Thabit b. Qurra (365 A.H./975 A.D.), who lived during the reign of the Abbaside caliph al-Mutie wrote a


2. Thabit emerged up from a family of a great name in the field of philosophy, mathematic, and medicine. His grand father Thabit b. Qurra was a reputed scholar in these fields. He bequeathed his very rich tradition to the youngest of his family. Thus our Thabit proved a worthy inheritor of his grandfather.

Thabit did not confine himself only to philosophy and medicine but he extended his interest to the field of history. He recorded the contemporary events covering the Abbasides and Buawhids. Thabit, in the beginning relies on his father and teachers. This can be witnessed in the extracts preserved in the Tajarib. Ibn Miskawah records:

"حکی تایید بن سانان کتابه ان ایام سانان بن تایید کان بیه دری ای بی پر قرایه موده"

This statement suggests that Thabit, for previous years, base his information on very important personalities who were not only very close to the affairs but were also involved in them. Thus the information recorded by Thabit bears authenticity. The later portion which belongs to author's period is, probably, based on his own eye observation. The other narrators may not be ruled out. In this way, the materials recorded in the history of Thabit is to be considered very valuable. Ibn Khallikan and Ibn al-Athir both praised its authenticity. Ibn al-Qifti, Tarikh al-Hukama, p. 109-10. Yaqut, Irshad al-Arib, Vol.7/142. Ibn Khallikan, Wafayat, Vol. 1/279. Hadji Khalifa, Kashaf al-Zunun, Vol.1/290. Ency. of Islam, Vol.IV, p.733. Ibn Miskawah, Tajarib al-Umam, Vol. 1/231.
history in continuation of Tabari’s history. His work contains the historical information from 295 A.H./1004 A.D. till the end of 363 A.H./973 A.D., two years before his death. Ibn al-Qifti, Ibn al-Athir, and Yaqut record that the length of the period which covers his history is 68 years. But Haji Khalifah gives different statement. He suggests that the history recorded the events from 190 A.H./805 A.D. It creates great confusion in the mind. The gap is very wide. All the historians state that 295 A.H./907 A.D. is the starting year for the history of Thabit and the Haji gives quite different date.

The question whether Ibn al-Athir utilized Thabit’s history is very important. Our historian does not quote Thabit as an authority, whom he consulted but in the end of 363 A.H./973 A.D., he remarks:

"يَدْنَ بِهِ تَأْيِدًا نَزِيِّحًا إِلَى أُخْرَى هَذِهِ الْسَّنَةِ اِنْتَهَى تَارِيْخُ ثَابِتُ بْنِ سَنَانٍ بِنِّ ثَابِتٍ بْنِ قَرْثَانِ وَأَوْلِيَاءٍ مِنْ خَلَقَةِ الْمُقَدَّضِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِ سَنَةَ خَمَسٍ وَتَسَمِّينَ وَمَا يَثُنِّينَ"

We find him making a similar statement about Tabari at another place. He says:

"يَدْنَ بِهِ تَأْيِدًا نَزِيِّحًا إِلَى أُخْرَى هَذِهِ الْسَّنَةِ اِنْتَهَى تَارِيْخُ ابِي جَفْرُوجُهُ اللَّهِ"

This similarity of the identical statements made by Ibn al-Athir in connection with the two historians suggests that our historian did utilize the history of Thabit. The following discussion substantiate the view.

2. Ibid., Vol. 8/29.
Unfortunately, the history of Thabit is not extant otherwise the comparison might have helped us in arriving at a definite opinion. But the extracts of the book preserved in the Tajarib of Ibn Miskawah and its remarkable identity with the accounts recorded in Al-Kāmil, reasonably suggests that Ibn al-Athir directly utilized the history of Thabit.

Moreover, the above reference to Thabit b. Sanān made by Ibn al-Athir tells us that the historian knew the history of Thabit. Since Thabit was senior to Ibn Miskawah and he was the most trusted authority of Ibn Miskawah. It is very likely that Ibn al-Athir might have paid greater attention to the history of Thabit rather than Ibn Miskawah; because the original one requires priority from historical point of view. The mode of the sentence also suggests that the book was accessible to Ibn al-Athir.

The identity which exists in the materials recorded by Ibn al-Athir and Ibn Miskawaih strongly proves that Thabit's history was the common source for both the historians. Among the identical accounts recorded by both the historians, one ought to be quoted here. Ibn Miskawaih narrates a detailed account on the authority of Thabit, about the Abbāside caliph-Muttaqī and his tragic end, his arrest and the process of making him blind. Thabit reports the account from Abu al-Abbās Tamīmī-al-Razi that the latter was the cause for all the destruction brought upon the caliph.
Thus the historical accounts go ahead with complete identity. But it is very important to keep in mind that in relation with many happenings, this identity exists not only in the contents but even in the words. It means that the Tajārib might have served as a source to Ibn al-Athīr. During the year 344 A.H./955 A.D. the account recorded by Ibn Miskawaih, on the authority of his great patron - Ibn al-Amīd — the vizir, is the same authority upon which our historian has relied. This is an evidence to hold that Ibn al-Athīr probably copied from the history of Ibn Miskawaih.

Though the similarity exists in the accounts of the Tajārib and Al-Kāmil, the way which both the historians adopt in recording the information varies due to the difference in the nature of the two books. The Tajārib includes the happenings of a limited area - especially pertaining to the kingdom of Buwahids. So his narratives are in details. On the other hand,

Al-Kāmil is comprehensive in its nature, it includes Buawhid, Abbasids, Fātimid, Alavid of Africa and the accounts of Andalus and Sicily in its compass; therefore, the accounts are briefly narrated and balanced. Moreover, Ibn al-Athīr write a comprehensive world history. He did not leave or overlook any region, while Ibn Miskwaih had excluded from his history. For instance Ibn Miskwaïh does not pay much attention to the Samānīd very few narratives about them are given any place in the Tajārib. In this connection he remarks:

It shows that Ibn al-Athīr tried hard to make his book very balanced and comprehensive. It also suggests that there were many books on regional and dynastic histories which were utilized by Ibn al-Athīr. But, unfortunately, he does not mention the works upon which he relied. We find a number of books pertaining to the history of Khurāsān which were referred to by Hāji Khalīfah in his Kashaf al-Zunūn. These books might have been the source of Ibn al-Athīr.

It is also to be noted that Ibn al-Athir has utilized a good number of historical works even in dealing with the Buwahids; because, sometime we find certain information which have not been recorded by Ibn Miskawaih but our historian has furnished them. Anyhow, the Tajarib of Ibn Miskawaih supplied very rich information concerning the Buwahids from 303 A.H./915 A.D. upto 369 A.H./940 A.D. to Ibn al-Athir.

The account of Ahmad b. Sahl which is missing in the Tajarib has been dealt with detail in Al-Kamil. It indicates that Ibn al-Athir has utilized not only the Tajarib but other historical books which dealt with the Buwahids.

The obituary note on Muhammad Jarir al-Tabari also shows two authorities which have been quoted by Ibn al-Athir - Ibn Miskawaih and Abū Bakr al-Khatib al-Baghdadi. What has been written by Ibn Miskawaih about Tabari is copied by Ibn al-Athir. Baghdadi's information pertaining to Tabari is also quoted by Ibn al-Athir. It shows that Ibn al-Athir has received information from the history of Khatib al-Baghdadi. Two more authori

4. Ibid., Vol. 8/43-44.
ties - Abu Ahmad Husain b. Ali b. Muhammad al-Râzi and Abu Muhammad Abdallah b. Ahmad al-Ferghâni are also quoted in this respect.

Our historian has utilized not only historical works but also literary books. He quotes Muhammad b. Hâni - the poet of Andalus in connection with the Fatimid prince-Mad of Egypt.

Ibn al-Athîr informs us about the establishment of the empire of Ghazâna in 366 A.H./976 A.D. But this portion has not its parallel in the Tajârib. He has utilized other historical works.

Another historical work which may be considered as a vital source for the years to come from 369 A.H./979 A.D. upto 389 A.H./1008 A.D. is the supplement of the Tajârib prepared by the great Wâzîr Abu Shujaa Muhammad b. Hisain, known as Zahir al-Dîn of Rozarâvâry (488 A.H./1096 A.D.). His piety and justice has been praised by many historians. But it is significant that the supplement deals with the time far from his period — nearly a century back. It covers only 21 years. Our historian knew the supplement and has mentioned it among the works of Abu Shujaa.

2. Ibid., Vol. 8/227.
3. Ibid., Vol. 10/87.
The Wazir, naturally, deals with the Buwahids in details while other dynasties have not been mentioned by Abū Shuja. Even the early activities of Mahmūd of Ghazāna, and the ruling family of the Samanids have been neglected by the Wazir. His supplement in fact covers very short period of time. Any how it may be held as one of the sources which was utilized, for the period under discussion, by Ibn al-Athīr.

When we compare the accounts from 369 A. H./979 A. D. to 389 A. H./1008 A. D., recorded in the Tukmilah of Abu Shuja with the accounts of the same period preserved in Al-Kāmil, a great identity is evident. The accounts from 369 A. H./979 A. D. to 389 A. H./1008 A. D. testify the opinion that Ibn al-Athīr has drawn the information of the period under discussion especially of the Buwahids from the Tukmilah of Abu Shuja. Not only the identity exists in the materials but fortunately, a reference is also preserved in Al-Kāmil which confirms the view. Ibn al-Athīr remarks: "وَفِيِهَا أَخْرِجَ مِنْهَا نَزلُ الزِّيْرَابِيِّ شَجَال" which strongly supports that Ibn al-Athīr has copied the accounts from the Tukmilah.

In this connection a notable historical work of Abu the Ishaq as-Sabi (313-384 A. H./926-994 A. D.) concerning Buwahid

---
dynasty, deserves to be mentioned. The author was compelled
to write the history of the house; and its process of comple-
tion was supervised by the prince Aṣṣ al-Dowlah himself. The
book is mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr. But it is doubtful whether
Ibn al-Athīr thought it reliable for the use, because it was
written by the order of the Prince and thus was not very
unbiased.

The history of Thabit b. Sanan was supplement and it
was again supplemented by his nephew Hīlāl b. Muḥsin al-Sabī
(359-448 A. H./969-1056 A. D.). He has written many books among
which two mainly concern history. His work Tuhfah al-Umara,
was very voluminous of which a part is edited by A. F. Amedruz.
Perhaps this book might have been accessible to the historian.
But his second work on history containing the informations
from 360 A. H./970 A. D. to 447 A. H./1055 A. D. is very important
from our point of view, because the work, though its loss is
most deplorable, may be considered as the main source on the
history of Abbasides for Ibn al-Athīr.

But it is very significant that the man of such high
calibre and reputation was not mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr in the
obituary notes. Is it acceptable to assume that our historians

1. Abu Shujaa, Tukmila, p. 23.
   Haji Khalīfa, Kashf al-Zunun, Vol. 1/290. Ency. of Islam,
did not know the author and his work? It is very difficult
to accept this opinion, because those historical works which
were definitely known to our historian preserve a lengthy
account about Hilal b. Muhsin. This point fairly suggests that
the historian and his works were known to our author. But the
question whether he utilized the works of Hilal is merely a
matter of conjecture, because he does not mention it.

It is a general attitude of Ibn al-Athir that he does
not mention the authorities but some had fortunately slipped
from his pen and got mentioned in his history; but a large
number of books have not been mentioned. Instead of mentioning
Hilal, our author mentions the date of the death of his cele­
brated Son Ghars al-Ni''amah Abu al-Hasan Muhammad b. Sabi
Sahib al-Tarikh. His history is in continuation of his father's
work. This indicates that Ibn al-Athir was aware of the work
and most probably he had utilized it.

Muhammad Ibn Sabi 416-480 A.H./1025-1087 A. D. continued
to record the events upto a considerable period. The book
entitled Jum: al-Tawarikh was very important and reliable.

3. He was literateure, Secretary and a historian. He was
highly regarded and respected by the Caliphs and Princes,
and he established a library in Baghdad to which he donated
four thousand books. Al-Sabi, Tuhfatul Umara, Preface. Raji
Khalifa, Kashf al-Zunun, Vol.1/290, Ibn Khallikar, Wafayat,
Vol. 5/162-166.
He has recorded the accounts which were authentic and reliable. The date, in which he terminated his history is suggested by Brocklemann 479 A.H./1086 A.D. It is extremely possible that Ibn al-Athir might have utilized the book for the period.

From 480 A.H./1087 A.D., another historian Muhammad b. Abd al-Malik b. Ibrāhīm al-Hamadhānī continued to record the historical accounts till 515 A.H./1121 A.D. Thus Ibn al-Hamadhānī preserved the information of 32 years. Now the important question is whether Ibn al-Athir utilized the works of Ibn al-Hamadhānī. There is every likelihood of Ibn al-Athir's access to the works of the historian. We have a definite evidence which decides the issue. Ibn al-Athir has not only recorded the date of his death but he remarks:

"ذکر ابن الحمدان وغيره من المرافقين ان الله نفيس دمشق كان" which confirms that Ibn al-Athir has utilized the work of Ibn al-Hamadhānī. This reference again suggests that a number of other books supplied the information to Ibn al-Athir. Ibn al-Hamadhānī lived at the time when the Saljuq's decline was set in. He touched not only the happenings occurred in Baghdad but, also extended his interests in the history of the Saljuq who

2. Ibn al-Hamadhānī belonged to an educated family of Hamadhānī (name of a village) where he was born. It seems that he settled in Baghdad in his early of childhood. He was Shafā'ī and one of the greatest traditionist historians. Subkey quotes the opinion of Ibn Najjar as he remarks; "The art of historiography ended with him" while Ibn al-Tusi thought him among the descendants of traditionists and scholars. Subkey, Tabaqāt al-Shafayāh, Vol. 4/81. Ibn al-Jowzī, Al-Muntazim, Vol. 10/8.
built their own glory on the ruins of Bujahids. Ibn al-Hamadhânî is quoted by Ibn Khallikân in connection with the history of the Saljuqs. It means that Hamadhâni books contained the informations of the Seljuqs which were copied by the later historians.

Ibn al-Athir relied on the history of Ibn al-Hamadhâni but it is difficult to say how for Ibn al-Athir has utilized the books of Hamadhâni, because we do not possess the history of the author. However it is possible that Ibn al-Athir might have copiously copied the accounts from the history of Hamadhâni and most of the informations for the period under discussion were taken from it. We cannot say that Hamadharxi's book was the only source on this period, many other histories were at the disposal of Ibn al-Athir which might have been utilized by Ibn al-Athir.

After 616 A.H./1121 A.D., where Hamadhâni terminated his history, the most possible source for Ibn al-Athir is the history of Ibn al-Zâghuni. He has started to record the accounts from 616 A.H./1121 A.D. down to the year 627 A.H./1132 A.D. in which

---


2. He has written a number of historical works like Umr al-Siq Tabagat al-Fugha, Akhâbîr al-Wazara — a supplement of Tohfat al-Umara, A supplement to the history of Tabari and a third supplement to the Tukmila of Abu Shujaa. These books suggests the nature of the content which might have been rich source for the later historians.
1. Ali b. Abd allah known as Ibn al-Zaghuni was born \( \frac{466}{1063} \) at Baghdad and was a scholar of wide interest. History, Jurisprudence and Hadith were the main subjects in which he acquired a great name. Beside several works on many subjects, a book of history is mentioned. Haji Khalifa think it a supplement to the history of Ibn al-Hamadhani, but others hold it as an independent book. Ibn al-Zaghuni died at Baghdad leaving many theological books behind him. Ibn al-Jowzi lived with him a number of years and received much benefits from him. Ibn al-Jowzi, Al-Muntazim, Vol.10/32. Ibn Kathir, Al-Bidayah, Vol.12/205.

complete book of Ibn al-Zaghuni or some parts of it. Ibn al-Athir generally does not copy the whole contents of a particular book but he seeks assistance from various books on a definite period when he deals with it. For instance, when he takes up the period of Ibn al-Hamadhani and records the accounts of it several authorities are quoted:

"قد ذكر الحمداني وغيره من المراقيين"

This suggests that Ibn al-Zaghuni in any way might not have been the only source for Ibn al-Athir, but many other historical works supplied information to him. The wheel of historiography which was set on by Ibn al-Hamadhani and given impetus by Ibn al-Zaghuni was forced to roll ahead by Sadaqah Ibn al-Haddad.

Sadaqah b. al-Husain al-Haddad (573-477 A.H./1177-1084 A.D.) was a historian, theologian, jurist, literateure, poet and writer of Baghdad. He has prepared a supplement to the history of Ibn al-Zaghuni which terminates at 527 A.H./1132 A.D. and extended it to the year 570 A.H./1174 A.D. Thus he recorded the accounts of forty seven years. He lived in Baghdad throughout his life and witnessed all the happenings occurring in Baghdad.

2. Ibn al-Kathir preserves a number of opinions expressed by scholars about the Sadaqah. Ibn al-Sai' pays a great reverence to his professor Sadaqa. But despite his great scholarship and wisdom, fortune never flashed upon him. He led throughout a very miserable life. Sadaqa adopted the profession of calligraphy as a means of livelihood, but always remained poverty-striken. From his verses Ibn al-Jowzi has drawn a conclusion that he was heretic. Ibn Hajar quotes the couplet

لا نوطينها نفيست بمقام * واجتنبها فهي دار الإعتقام
اتراها صنعة من صنع * وتراها رمية غير رام

or heard them by reliable source. So his history is to be considered very important and reliable.

We have no evidence that Ibn al-Athir utilized the book of Šadaqa but he mentions the date of his death in which he remarks, The sentence, at least suggests that he knew the work of Šadaqa which probably was available to Ibn al-Athir. But this historian was not the only source upon whom Ibn al-Athir relied, but many others like Harun b. Abbas al-Abbasi al-Mamuni may be considered as a source for Ibn al-Athir. He was a contemporary of Šadaqa and died in the same year. He wrote a contemporary history which was latter utilized by Ibn Khallikan.

Among the most distinguished historians of this period is Ali b. Hasan-known as Ibn Asakir (571-499 A.H./1123-1106 A.D.). He was one of the brightest stars who formed the constellation in the field of scholarship and knowledge during the sixth century A.H. He wrote a large number of books among which the most celebrated is the history of Damascus, prepared on the line of the history of Baghdad in eighty volumes. This excellent work of a great mind still exists and has been

published. Our historian has utilized the history of Ibn Asākir. He quotes him when he deals with the accounts of the Saljūq in the context of Syria’s history. He remarks:

which confirms that Ibn al-Athīr has utilized the history of Ibn al-Asākir. Ibn al-Asākir collected information with great labour and patience. He travelled far and wide and accumulated vast information for his history. Besides, he established wide contact with the scholars of other countries of which an example is to be noted. Abu al-Kāsim — the son of Ibn al-Asākir, reports that one day a certain friend of my father Abu al-Hasan al-Murādi of Andalus came to my home with four bundles of books. These books had already been learnt by oral transmitters by my father. Seeing the books my father burst with joy and expressed gratitudes for God for having provided them without wear and tear. He further adds, taking one of them, it appeared as if he possessed the whole world. It shows that Ibn al-Asākir was extremely fond of knowledge and paid keen attention to acquire information for his history.

Ibn al-Athīr utilized the history of Ibn al-Asākir and, he has drawn some informations from it. But he has not frequently copied from the book. Because, in the period under discussion he seems to have recorded most of the account relying on oral

authorities. A contemporary and friend of Ibn al-Asakir is Abd al-Karim b. Muhammad al-Samaani (562-506 A.H./1206-1112 A.D.). He was interested in Hadith, Fiqh, history and genealogy. His two historical books — the Dhail of the history of Baghdad of al-Khatib and the second one the history of Mevy invite our

1. The father and the grandfather of Al-Samaani were considered to be the greatest traditionists and jurists of their time. His father was Shafai and the grandfather belonged to Hanafi school.

Ibn al-Athir, in his compendium, Kitab al-Lubab, of Kitab al-Ansab remarks thus:

Samaani visited Jerusalem while it was under the Christians. Bokhara and Samarkand were also visited by the author.

Ibn Najjar mentions that the number of his teachers reaches seven thousand. Among his transmitters Ibn Asakir, Qasim b. Asakir, deserves mention. He spent his last days at his native city Merve.

attention. The former book was in fifteen volumes and the latter one consisted/more than twenty volumes. It means that their content was of a wide range and very rich. Ibn al-Athir was familiar with the historical works of Al-Samaani. It is possible that Ibn al-Athir might have utilized them while dealing with the contemporary history of Iraq.

The historical informations about the Ghazanavids from 366^665 A.H./976-1160 A.D. which are preserved in Al-Kamîl, have their sources in a number of books. But only one source is referred by Ibn al-Athir/Muhammad b. Abd al-Jabbar al-Utbi which (427 A.H./1035 A.D.) is twice quoted by Ibn al-Athir. Tarikh Utbi possesses not only the historical value but also its literary importance is known. It's verse-laden and allegorical language generates administration in the mind of a reader.

The present text of the book includes the accounts from the beginning of the dynasty to the year 409 A.H./1018 A.D.

1. Muhammad b. Abd al-Jabbar al-Utbi, originally from Al-Ray, was brought up in Khurasan and Iraq. He served as a Secretary to Amir Abu Ali, Abu Mansur Subuktakin and, later he assisted Shams al-Ma'ali. He settled permanently in Nashapur. He was interested in poetry, literature and history and wrote two books which belong to literature and history respectively. Lataif al-Khutab was a literary book and Tarikh Utbi was on history. Brocklemann records the date of his death 413 A.H. but the author of Hadiat al-Arifin thinks that Utbi died in 431 A.H. Al-Thalabi, Yetimat al-Dahr, Vol. 4/281-85. Haji Khalifa, Kashf al-Zunun Vol. 1/124. Ismail Pasha, Hadiat al-Arifin, Vol. 2/68. Brockelmann, G. 1/547-8.
Utbi's information is authentic and reliable, because most of the events were witnessed by the author himself and rest of the accounts are recorded relying on trusted authorities who were the eye-witness of them.

Thus the information pertaining to the Ghazanawids from the beginning of the dynasty to 409 A.H./1018 A.D. recorded in Al-Kamil, have been drawn, to great extent, from the Tarikh Utbi. Ibn al-Athir has taken the account from the book and reproduced them in his own excellent style. This fact is established after a thorough comparison between the two texts. Ibn al-Athir has occasionally quoted Al-Utbi in his history. But, along with the accounts of Utbi, he records the opinion of others. For example, under the title of 'Tahir b. Khalluf', narrating a long account, he remarks:

"إنا الذين ذكرت فيهم غير هذه وسواي ذكر الله"

which obviously suggests that the account which is furnished by Ibn al-Athir is not taken from the history of Utbi but some other source is utilized for this piece of information.

After 409 A.H./1018 A.D., the accounts pertaining to the dynasty evidently/been narrated on the authority of other sources. But Ibn al-Athir does not mention the source. Moreover, we do not find any other book except Tarikh al-Utbi, in

3. Ibid., Vol. 9/59.
Arabic which may be taken as a possible source for the Ghazanavids.

But a very remarkable work exists in Persian which exclusively deals with the history of Ghazanavids, is Tacikh Behaqi. The book is highly valuable, because its author recorded whatever he saw with his own eyes. There may be some hypocritical elements in the book but as a whole the book is trustworthy and valuable. The author of the book Muhammad al-Husain al-Behaqi was Secretary to the rulers of the dynasty. He served Muhammad and his successors until the last ruler — who Farrukhizad was dethroned. After it, Behaqi confined himself to his house and passed away in 470 A.H./1077 A.D. He wrote the history of the dynasty. He named it Tacikh-Nasiri after Nasir al-Din Mahmud. Behaqi was well-versed in Arabic and composed poems which suggests his strong knowledge of the language. The book was written in Persian, was it possible for Ibn al-Athir to utilize the book without the acquaintance of the language?

2. Its very valuable edition is prepared by the famous Iranian scholar Sa'id Nafisi and it has been published from Tehran. Its Arabic version has also been published from Cairo recently.
3. جرس قد اري على القدر * فليس ليس شئ من الصبر
فانثر من خاطري كله * لنفق الأيام في الفكر
قال هواحبوس * كلما مر من سويرك يوم
مر في الحبس من بلاي يوم * لم يدم في اللئفص والبسقوم
ما بشق ولا لنعم دوم * لم يبقي في النجوم والبوس قوم
But it is difficult to determine whether Ibn al-Athir knew Persian though some points favour it. In those days educated men of such a high calibre generally knew Persian for academic and administrative reasons. Moreover, Ibn al-Athir, at certain places translates a Persian word "نماد" into Arabic "لَاء إدري". This Persian word is also recorded by Al-Tabari, Hilal al-Sabi and many others, but its Arabic translation is not recorded by any one. It suggests that Ibn al-Athir had knowledge of this language. At another place, our historian records the death of Qadi Abu Bakr al-Mahmudi and maintains that the Qadi was the author of many famous books among which one was written in Persian in the style of Muqamat al-Hariri. This reference also provides support to the above opinion. Any how if it is accepted that Ibn al-Athir knew Persian then it can be established that Tarikh Behagi was also read by Ibn al-Athir. Mahmud generally kept the Abbaside caliphs informed of the conquest which he made in India and of which a reference is preserved in Wafayat. So it is also possible that Ibn al-Athir might have gathered the information from such letters and documents which were available in Baghdād during those days.

2. Ibid., Vol. 11/118.
For the accounts of Şam (Syria) ranging over more than one century, from 441 A.H. to 555 A.H./1160 A.D., the history of Ibn al-Qalānasi, was one of the sources for Ibn al-Athīr.

The author Hamāza b. Asad b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad Tamīmī, Abu Yala (464-555 A.H.) was a reliable historian and a distinguished jurist. He was entrusted with the post of secretary twice in Baghdād. His supplement records the events from 441 A.H. as it is reported by Yaqut and Ibn Asākir, down to the year 555 A.H.

The account concerning the crusade in the history holds special importance because the author has closely been attached to the affairs. So the account recorded in the history of Ibn al-Qalānasi, is based on eye-witness.

Our historian Ibn al-Athīr has frequently utilized the history of Ibn al-Qalānasi though he mentions him only once.

1. Like most upperclass citizens, he was well-educated in literature, theology and law, and went into public service as a Secretary in the Correspondance Bureau or Chancery of which, apparently, he rose to be head. In addition, he twice held the highest civil office in the city, that of raʿīs al-Mayor, though the exact function attached to this office are not quite clear to us. He died on Friday 7th. first Rabi 555 A.H./1160 A.D., over ninety years of age. He was therefore, already of mature age when the first crusad bust upon Syria and though he does not appear to have taken any part in the actual fighting, His chronicle is of exceptional interest as presenting a contemporary account of the fortunes of the crusaders, in so far as they were known at Damascus from the beginning of the crusad down to the year of his death. H.R. Gibb, The Damascus Chronicle of the crusade, p. 8-9. Yaqut, Muʿājam al-ʿUdāba, Vol.10/278-80. Ibn Asākir, Tarikh Damascus, Vol.4/129. Yafai, Mīrat al-Jenān, Vol.3/30. Mīrat al-Maʿarif, Vol.3/467. Brocklemann, S.1/566.

Another historian Ibn al-Azraqi al-Fariqi 590 A.H./1193 A.D. is a possible source for the information of the Seljuqs in relation with the account of Mayya Fariqin. When Ibn Khallil narrates the biographical event of Mahmud b. Muhammad Malikshah b. Alp Arsalan, he quotes him.

Fatimids:

For the history of Fatimids in Egypt (297-567 A.H./909-1171 A.D.) our historian does not mention any source. But the only help which comes to our assistance is guess and imagination. We can think on reasonable grounds the possible sources which Ibn al-`Athir might have utilized. Among the noted historians who wrote on the Fatimids of Egypt is Al-Safadi. Ibn Yūnus `Abd al-Rahman b. Ahmad al-Safadi (348 A.H./959 A.D.) wrote two books on the history of Egypt. A supplement to them is prepared by Yehya b. Ali Khazari known as Ibn Tabkal (416 A.H./1025 A.D.). Another supplement was prepared by Husain b. Ibrāhim b. Zulaq (387 A.H./997 A.D.). Besides these historical books, many other books may be considered to have been the possible source for Ibn al-`Athir.

For the account of Seljuq in later centuries and of the Atabeks, Ibn al-Athir has acquired information from an important source. The historical works of Amad al-Din Al-Asfahani, have supplied valuable information to Ibn al-Athir, but it must be noted that Ibn al-Athir has not copied much from the works of Asfahani. He mentions Al-Berg Al-Shami in the context of biographical sketch of Salah al-Din and of the conflict flared up between Salah al-Din and the Atabek of Musal.

1. Muhammad b. Muhammad Imad al-Din was born at Asfahan in 519 A.H./1125 A.D. He came to Baghdad in the early of his childhood. He was educated in the famous Nizamiah College of Baghdad where he became master in Shafai' jurisprudence. He developed an excellent taste of literature and poetry. After completing formal education, he met the Wazir — Ain ed-Din Yehya b. Rubaira who was very much impressed by the ability and appointed him as a administrator of Basra and Wasit respectively. After the death of Wazir he lived in Baghdad tasting all kinds of sufferings and trials. Later he decided to leave the city and he reached Damascus in 562 A.H. It was due to his reputation that great justice Qadi Kamal al-Din welcomed him and he stayed in the Nuriah College which late became Amadia College. When he arrived Damascus it was made known to Najam al-Din Ayyubi. He came to him and paid his respect. Najam al-Din always held him in high regard and entrusted him the most important affairs of the government. The sultan sent him as an Ambassador to the Caliphe Al-Mustanjid, when he returned to Damascus the Professorshi of Amadia was offered to him which he accepted. After serving the post he had to leave the city due to the death of the Sultan. He reached Musal and fell seriously ill. After getting recovered he came to know the news of Salah al-Din's intention to capture Damascus, then he came back to the city and met the Sultan in Hamas. Since then he became one of the most reliable courtiers of the Sultan. He served the post of Deputy Wazir. When Sultan died his fortune also fluctuated once again. He confined himself to his house and died in 597 A.H. Ibn Khallikah, Wafayat, Vol.4/233-38. Safadi, Al-Wafi, Vol.1/132-40. Tash Kubra Zad: Miftah as-Saadah, Vol.1/214-15. Abu Shama, Kitab al-Rozatain, Vol.1/144. Yaqut, Mawljam al-Udaba, Vol.19/11-28. Brockalmann, S.1/548.
Ibn al-Athir wrote several historical books which are very important and one of them has been utilized by Ibn al-Athir. Our historian quotes Al-Berq al-Shami as a source for the contemporary account. But it is difficult to hold that Ibn al-Athir has copiously copied the information from the book because, after narrating the account of a war took place between Saif al-Din and Salah al-Din, Ibn al-Athir quotes the statement of Amad al-Din and criticises it. It evidently suggests that Ibn al-Athir did not copy much from Al-Berq al-Shami, but the major source for the contemporary accounts is oral. Ibn al-Athir rarely quotes contemporary histories; because he seems to be inclined towards oral authorities.

For the account of the princes of Arabela and Sinjar from 639-626 A.H./1144-1228 A.D., our historian has relied on a number of sources to which he refers thus:

1. Ibn al-Athir, Al-Kamil, Vol. 11/162.
2. Ali b. Zaid Muhammad b. Husain al-Behaqqi was born at a town near Behaq, Sabwar, founded by the famous Sasanid king Sasan b. Sasan in 409 A.H./1106 A.D. He moved to another village where his father had a very large farm in the very early of his childhood. After the death of his father he came to Merve in 518 A.H./1124 A.D. When he was merely 27 years old, the post of Qazi of Behaq was offered to him. But he declined it. He wandering from city to city throughout Persia. Finally settled in Nesapur. His mother and the son Ahmad died in 549 A.H. He himself died in 565 A.H. Ibn al-Athir, Al-Kamil, Vol. 11/162. Yaqut, Mua'jam al-Udaba, Vol 13/219-40.
books among which *Mashā'ib al-Tajarib* - *Gharāib al-Gharīb*, *Tarikh Hukmai Islām*, and *Tarikh Behaq* were historical works.

The account recorded in the *Mashā'ib* had especial relevance with the princes of Arabel and Singar and with the region in which the historian lived. The account evidently seems to be authentic. It can be inferred from the mode of his life which the historian spent. He was purely academician and devoted to learning. It is due to this fact that he resisted all kinds of temptations. Therefore, treating the account, he might have been objective.

The idea that Behaqqi might have included fragmentary information about Mahmud's expedition in India in his books deserves attention. For Behaq holds especial importance in connection with the Ghaznavids. The people of the city had close relation with the dynasty. Muhammad b. Husain Behaqqi the famous historian of the house deserves to be mentioned. His services to the house and his famous historical work might have facilitated for the access of historical information to the people of Behaq, and thus *Zahir al-Dīn* might have recorded relevant information in his book which later reached to Ibn al-Athir.

For the contemporary accounts of Iraq another source is to be mentioned which supplied through very little, information to Ibn al-Athir. Our historian has utilized the history of

Ibn al-Jowzi has written a history which terminates in 574 A.H./1178 A.D. Al-Muntazam is quoted only once in connection with snowfall in Baghdad in 567 A.H./1171 A.D.;

1. Abu al-Ferj b. al-Jowzi was born at Baghdad. His father died when he was three years old. His aunt carefully brought him up and took him to Hafiz Ibn Nasir who taught him Qur'an, Hadith and other subjects. Afterwards, he joined the famous Nizamiyah College and showed remarkable ability in achieving success and perfection.

He was an excellent orator of his time. Fiqh, Hadith and history were the favourite subjects of Ibn al-Jowzi. It is said that the speeches of Ibn al-Jowzi were so powerful, enchanting and full of information that they attracted lakhs of people at a time. His audience included different types of people like Caliph, Wazir, Commanders, Scholars, Students and the common men.

It is said that he has written more than two hundred and fifty books among which Al-Muntazim - a historical work is to be noted. It is published in ten volumes from Hyderabad and is thought to be a part of in continuation of Tabari's history. Thus it may be considered as a supplement to the history of 'Abd al-Malik al-Hamazani. He died in 597 A.H./1200 A.D. Ibn Kathir, Al-Biday Vol. 13/28-30. Ency. of Islam, Vol. 2/3.


but there is every likelihood that the book would not have frequently been utilized by our historian; because we find a criticism put forth by Ibn al-Athir against the impartiality of Ibn al-Jowzi. He comments that the people, especially scholars, holding contrary opinion to him or being inconformity with him, were criticised by Ibn al-Jowzi. How far this judgment of Ibn al-Athir impairs the veracity of Ibn al-Jowzi, at least in relation with his history is very difficult to determine. Because the partial approach of Ibn al-Jowzi to any individual does not mean that he treated the historical account with the coloured eyes. It is quite possible as it is thought, that he might have been objective while recording the accounts.

The accounts of Ghayath al-Din and Shihab al-Din, in the beginning, have been copied from the written records and later they were added to the oral information. From the remark made to this effect, it is inferred that a number of books were current during those days whose access to the historian is confirmed by Ibn al-Athir himself. He says:

"كلًا سمعنا ورأيناه في صفحاتهم فلهذ ذكرنا الأمين"

The expeditions led by Shihab al-Din Ghuri in India during the following years 547 A.H./1152 A.D., 583 A.H./1187 A.D., 588 A.H./1188 A.D., 590 A.H./1193 A.D., 592 A.H./1195 A.D., 597 A.H./1200 A.D., are recorded by Ibn al-Athir. He narrates them relyi:

1. Ibn al-Athir, Al-Kamil, Vol. 12/64.
2. Ibid., Vol. 11/62.
on oral authorities. The accounts from 683 A.H./1187 A.D. onwards have been gathered from the people of high status. For example, he narrates the event of 583 A.H. on the authority of a merchant friend. He remarks:

"قد حدثت قصة تجارة بعثت بهما هاتين الواقتين المذكورتين بشرب بعض الخلاف وقد ذكرناهما في سنة ٥٨٣.

The invasion of Banaras by Shihab al-Din has got very interesting description in Al-Kamil. Ibn al-Athir has recorded the event on the authority of a person who witnessed the event. He says:

"فلم احتفظ عبد الرحمن به ثبات الدين بلاد بنارس وحمل من خزائنها على الف واربعتها حمل وعاد إلى غزنة ووجه القبلة التي نحن فيها من جملتها في البشرين من رأس قال لما اخذت الفيلة وقدمت إلى شباب الدين وامرت بالخدمة فخدمت جميعها إلا البشرين فإنه لم يخدم.

He further informs us that there were a number of Muslim officers in the Hindu army who settled there since the time of Mahmud.

He again quotes a merchant friend who informed him about the clash that took place between the combined forces of Ghayath al-Din and Shihab al-Din on one side, and the army of Khurasan on the other. He remarks:

"لقد حدثت هذه الأحداثا من التجار وكان بنيسابور في هذه الحادثة.

2. Ibid., Vol. 12/41.
3. Ibid., Vol. 12/65.
This again suggests that the oral authorities helped our historian very much. He relied especially on those who had seen the event with their own eyes. At another place when he depicts the biographical sketch of Shihāb al-Ūn, oral authorities are repeatedly quoted.¹

The information of the Atabek dynasty which covers a great portion of Al-Kāmil, has largely been acquired from oral source. It is relevant to emphasise that the family of our historian was a noble one. It has achieved a social, political, economic and educational immensity due to the great favour accorded to it by the Atabeks. The father of Ibn al-Athīr was a governor of Jazirah Ibn Umar on behalf of Qutb al-Ūn of Musal who died in 565 A.H. His elder brother Majd al-Ūn occupied several high offices in the court of the Atabeks. His younger brother — Ziya al-Ūn b. al-Athīr enjoyed office of the Wizarat in various courts. These and several other opportunities facilitated him in acquiring huge, first hand, and even confidential information not merely about the Atabeks also but/about all the then contemporary Muslim kingdoms.

Ibn al-Athīr refers to various kinds of people among whom his father is quoted not less than five times. He is lastly referred to in 565 A.H./1169 A.D.²

---

² Ibid., Vol. 11/17, 42, 116, 133.
³ Ibid., Vol. 11/133.
When our historian says:

"حكي بعض العلماء من الأكراد ممن له معرفة باحوالهم ان ابنهم " بلغني ان السلطان مسعود ارسل إلى الخليفة العباسي للملك " سمعتهم يذكرون انهم لهم بها نحو ثمانية ولهم مقدمة حسن". فحدثني من رأي اسد الدين حين خرج من بلبيس " 7 " بلغني عنه انه قال له تدماه " 5 " حكي لي عنه بعض اصدقاء من كان تربيا اليه " 1 " حكي لي طبيب كان يخدم نورالدين هو من حذاق الاطباء قال استدعانى الوزير " 4 " حدثني بعض من اثق اليه من اهل العلم بما يحكى وكان قد وصل لكني البلاد " 8 " ومن اعجب ما سمعنا " 3 " وحكي لي انسان " 11 " لقد حدثني صديق لنا انه رأى " 12 " حكي لي بعض من كان يلبذيه " 14

it certainly means that the people were not ordinary one but they belonged to a very important class and many of them might have been involved in the events. His illustrious brother, Majd al-Din has been quoted. 13

The history of the house of Salah al-Din has been described with great honesty. Ibn al-Athir does not appear to be very prejudiced to Salah al-Din who may be alleged to

2. Ibid., Vol.11/17.
3. Ibid., Vol. 11/41.
4. Ibid., Vol.11/102.
5. Ibid., Vol. 11/113.
6. Ibid., Vol.11/128.
7. Ibid., Vol. 11/151.
8. Ibid., Vol.12/35.
9. Ibid., Vol. 12/75.
10. Ibid., Vol.12/76.
12. Ibid., Vol.12/128.
have shown disloyalty to the house of his own benefactor as well as of the historian.

The source from which Ibn al-Athir has drawn the information is generally oral. The only written record which he has utilized and mentioned is Al-Berg al-Shami of al-Amad. But it is not very reasonable to limit it to only this book; many official and secret documents might have been on the disposal of Ibn al-Athir which provided useful information. The opinion requires to be authenticated with a solid evidence Ibn al-Athir, while narrating the defeat of Salah al-Din in Ramla, mentions:

which not only proves the opinion but it also defines the extent to which our historian was able to have access. Further, he narrates most of the besieges, attacks and conquests, relying on himself. He had participated, most possibly as a historian, in the expeditions of Salah al-Din, Amad al-Din of who Sanjer/besieged the forts of Jabla, Lazeqia, Sahun, Bakas,

1. Ibn al-Athir, Al-Kamil, Vol. 11/162.
2. Ibid., Vol. 11/167.
Shaghar, Sermenia, Berzia, Darb Sak, Baghras, Kerk, Saghd, Kukab, and conquered one by one, he was with the Muslim army. At one place he says that:

"رأيت أن من رأس جبل عل يشرف القلمة لكنه لا يصل منه شئ إلى".

Further he refers to the same event in the following words:

"كنت حين ذهبت إلى الشام في عسكر صلاح الدين بيد الغزاة".

His following words:

"لقد حدثت بعض المسلمين القبيبة بعض الأكراد "3 "حدثت بعض الأشاري".

أحد من الذين قال رأيت صلاح الدين "5 "حتى لي بعض أصحابنا".

suggest that the people from whom he has taken the information were reliable and eye witnesses. When the son of Salah al-Din Malik al-Aziz Uthman attacks Damascus, our historian was present there. This account is recorded on the authority of his own observation. He says:

"كنت حين ذهبت بدمشق منزل بنواحي ميدان الحما".

Another authority on the history of Salah al-Din's family is Shihab al-Din. Shihab al-Din was one of the most trusted nobles of Malik al-Zahir Ghazi b. Salah al-Din upon whom he greatly relied. When the Ghazi died in 613 A.H./1216 A.D., he left a child as an heir of the government. But, since the boy was too young to rule, Shihab al-Din being a very

2. Ibid., Vol. 12/10.
6. Ibid., Vol. 12/32.
7. Ibid., Vol. 12/43.
sincere loyal, and selfless noble took the charge of the government and well administered it on behalf of the boy. Ibn al-Athir had very friendly relation with Shihāb al-Dīn. He records good opinion about him. This relation put the historian into such a position which have greatly facilitated him to acquiring with the state of affairs prevailing there. Anyhow the major part of Ayyūbid history has been recorded by Ibn al-Athir relying on oral authorities.

Now the Tatars invade central Asia. Our historian expresses great anxiety and sorrow. He holds his pen to record the happenings with broken-heart and lamentation. This can only be felt by reading those pages devoted to the material. Under the heading "ذكر خروج النتران بلاد السلام" he has expressed his grief and sorrow. The source of his informations is completely oral. He has gathered them from various kind of people. When he writes about Khuwarzam Shah towards whom Tatars marched he quotes:

"هكذ ذكرنا لبعض الفقهاء من كان بيخارا واسروهم همهم الى سيرته ونهاهم ووصل الين بالبه" 2

2. Ibid., Vol. 12/142.
When he records obituary note on the death of Khuwarzam Shah, an oral authority is quoted by Ibn al-Athir. More authorities are quoted thus:

These references suggest that Ibn al-Athir tried to make wide acquaintance with the people of various kinds for accumulating the historical information. He quotes Christian scholars and travellers with whom he had made contact for the acquisition of knowledge. When he records the clash that took place between the ruler of Intakia and the Armans, a Christian authority quoted thus:

He reports the account of a battle which took place between Tatars and the people of Russia on the authority of a Russian merchant, with whom he happened to have met.

2. Ibid., Vol. 12/146.
3. Ibid., Vol. 12/146.
4. Ibid., Vol. 12/146.
5. Ibid., Vol. 12/148.
8. Ibid., Vol. 12/195.
10. Ibid., Vol. 12/150.
The Source of Tarikh al-Dowlat al-Atabukevia - Muluk al-Musal:

Tarikh al-Dowlat al-Atabukevia is one of the most valuable works written by Ibn al-Athir. He has written a history of a long period in which the heroic role of Atabek family has been discussed in detail. The book is not merely a register of the military and the war account, but also a substantial material of social and economic importance. It supplies valuable information for understanding the period and its social, economic and educational conditions.

The book begins with the history of Qasim al-Dowalah Aqsanqar (472 A.H.) the first governor in the family who was forefather of the family and ends with the death of Nur al-Din Arsalan Shah in 607 A.H. Thus the book covers the period of one hundred and thirty years, which was one of the most remarkable periods of Islamic history. The author has written the book with the sense of gratitude and devotion which he had for the house of the Atabek.

The major part of the accounts have been recorded relying on oral authorities. Among the authorities, the father of Ibn al-Athir is the most important one and supplies the largest portion of the accounts. He has been quoted not less than twenty five times. 1 His father was since long attached to the

1. Ibn al-Athir, Tarikh al-Atabeka, p. 58,71,81,82,85,97,110, 113,131,133,136,140,143,147,149,167,201,212,231,265,268,341.
Atabeks. He was administrator of the Jazira Ibn Umar for many years. He was highly respected by the people who almost loved him. The post of Treasurer was offered to him in 566 A.H. by Qutab al-Din Mudud. He discharged the responsibility of the office with great honesty and skill. Being so much close to the Atabeks, and holding various high posts in the government he was able to observes the events very closely. In this way his informations gain importance and authenticity which subsequently were preserved by his able son.

Ibn al-Athir has recorded the accounts on the authority of his father after his death. He recalled the accounts from his memory. He further remarks that most of the informations which ought to have been composed, have slipped from the mind, but nevertheless a lot of them are still preserved. He has deliberately omitted much of the accounts in order to write a short book.

Next to the father of Ibn al-Athir is Majd-al-Din the elder brother of the historian. He was offered the post of Wizârat by Nur al-Din Arsalan Shah but he declined it on health grounds. Ibn al-Athir received informations from his brother and recorded them in the book.

Usâmah b. Murshid, Kamal al-Din Ibn al-Adim — the author of Zubdat al-Halab fi Tarikh Halab, and Muhammad b. Hamid,

2. Ibid., p. 189.
3. Ibid., p. 225.
al-Imad al-Katib are quoted once each respectively. Ibn Asair is also quoted twice. The other authorities, though they are oral, are not mentioned. He simply write such words:

"حكى لي جعاهته من اعرف صلاحهم" "حدثنا بعض اخواننا" "حكى لي البضا بعض العلماء بالأخبار والانساب" "حكى لي ابضا غير واحد من أثنا الأثنا" which, in fact, indicate the authorities who were closely associated with the historian. Sometimes he names them as Al-Biqah Qatlagh al-Kamali and Baha al-Din ali b. Shukry.

1. Ibn al-Athir, Tarikh al-Atabeka, p. 162.
2. Ibid., p. 126.
3. Ibid., p. 124.
4. Ibid., p. 124.
5. Ibid., p. 125.
6. Ibid., p. 294, 300.