

## BACKGROUND OF THE HISTORY OF MOSLEM LIBRARIES

BY RUTH STELLHORN MACKENSEN  
Chicago, Illinois

The Moslem era dates from the flight (*Hijra*) of Mohammed and a handful of followers from Mecca to Medīna in 622 A.D., but it was not long before the eccentric of Mecca had become the prophet of Arabia. However, the religion he founded was not destined to remain an insignificant sect or cult, peculiar to that isolated peninsula, for within a few years it had spread to lands the names of which were probably unknown to Mohammed. Nor was Islām to remain simply a religion; submission to Allāh became the heart of a great civilization which united lands as widely separated as Spain and India, and peoples hitherto divided by race, language, culture, and religion. Mohammed, the Koran, and the Arabic language soon became their common bond, and the grounds for a loyalty more vital than the differences which separated them. This is not to say that Islām swept away all the old distinctions of nationality, language, and custom, but it did supply the elements necessary for the development of a great empire and civilization.

As the Arab armies poured over the East they obliterated much which hindered their progress; they destroyed many of the material and cultural as well as religious products of older civilizations which they either did not respect or considered positively obnoxious. They conquered, they killed, they looted, they burned, but they left untouched far more than they destroyed. The amazing thing is not that these virile but unlettered sons of the desert merely respected the cultures of their new subjects, but that they quickly took possession of much which was utterly alien to their former life. It was not enough for these simple nomads to exchange their black tents for palaces and city houses, to enjoy the conveniences and luxuries of a settled life. Before long, eager minds among them recognized that those whom they had conquered had much to teach, and they showed themselves apt pupils. "Unbelievers" as well as non-Arab converts to Islām became their

teachers, and they learned the strange lessons so rapidly and so well that within a few generations their new capital, Bagdad, was a center of learning and the arts. Islām was transformed from the simple faith in Allāh and his prophet into a great culture in which the heritage of the desert was united with that of Greece, Christendom, Persia, and India. As has happened so often, the conquerors were the conquered.

The Golden Age of the Abbasid caliphs of Bagdad is characterized by a love of literature, music and the other arts, philosophy and science, as well as by religious, political, and material developments. The followers of Mohammed no longer felt that his book alone sufficed. The time had passed when the library of a Moslem contained but one book, the Koran. Mohammed was deeply impressed with the writings, especially the Scriptures, of the Jews and Christians about him; he believed that every people had its sacred book, and he became convinced that his people too must have one of their own, if they were to have a religion with authority and prestige. And so he gave them one. The written word fascinated him, and through the ages it has continued to fascinate his spiritual posterity. The Arabs brought a book with them from the desert, and wherever they went they found more books. Many felt that these foreign books were of no value as compared to their one, but others, though continuing to hold the Koran unique, hastened to read whatever they found. And so, with the eagerness of a child in a toy shop, they collected books and translated them into the language of the prophet. They saw and heard of libraries and felt they too must have libraries.

One cannot but admire the willingness and ability of the Arabs to learn from their neighbors and to adapt this new knowledge to their own needs. They originated little but they copied and assimilated much. Just as they took the great Byzantine churches as architectural models for their mosques, so also they built their learning on the models of those who were adepts. In the course of this article it will become apparent that the idea of libraries, not merely as storehouses for books but as centers of culture and study, was taken over along with foreign literature and developed into something quite characteristic and individual. It is more than likely that the processes of book manufacture and library technique were also borrowed. They saw the collections of books in Christian monasteries and churches, in the homes

of scholars and the palaces of enlightened rulers of Byzantium and Persia, and they heard or read of great Greek libraries and academies, especially in Alexandria. But they developed the library as an institution to unprecedented lengths. Not until quite recent times have libraries been so numerous, well stocked, and widely patronized as they were in Moslem lands.

Not only did cultured or scholarly individuals assemble private collections, but special libraries were founded for the cultivation of various departments of literature and the sciences. Hence we find collections of medical books in hospitals; works on mathematics, astronomy, and astrology in observatories; religious and legal writings in mosques and colleges; and rich and more diversified collections in several great academies. Moslems early discovered the possibilities of libraries as institutions of propaganda, and not a few were founded for the express purpose of disseminating the peculiar doctrines of special sects. Public libraries were truly public and ministered to the interests of a great variety of readers. They offered unusual facilities for study to serious scholars, and they provided entertainment and a means of education through reading, lectures, and discussions to the general public. The city library at Baṣra, in the fifth century after Mohammed, which al-Ḥarīrī characterized as "the counsel-hall of the cultured, the meeting place of townsfolk and strangers," was by no means unique.<sup>1</sup>

It is both unnecessary and impossible to describe here the libraries of the world into which Islām spread, but it will not be amiss to remind ourselves of some of the great repositories of learning which the Arabs found, and which served them as the patterns on which they modeled their own "houses of books."

Ever since 1663, when Pococke published the Arabic text of the *Dynasties* by Abū'l Faraj (Barhebraeus) with a Latin translation, there has been a perennial interest in the account there given of the destruction of the Alexandrian library by the Arabs when they conquered that city in 642 A.D. Renaudot<sup>2</sup> and Gibbon viewed the story with skepticism, and numerous recent scholars, after examining all the

<sup>1</sup> *The Assemblies of al-Ḥarīrī*, trans. T. Chenery and F. Steingass (London, 1867, 1898), I, 114; De Sacy's Arabic text (2d ed.; Paris: Reinaud & Derenbourg, 1847), I, 26 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. Alex. Patriarch.*, p. 170.

available sources in detail, believe it entirely unfounded. But many more have been willing to accept it as true, partly, perhaps, because it is a well-told and on the surface fairly convincing tale, and partly due to prejudice against Mohammedanism. Those who accept it for the latter reason overlook similar charges which Moslems, supported by far more dependable evidence, make against Christians. They point to the destruction of a princely library in Syrian Tripolis at the hands of the Crusaders, and to the burning of the royal library at Granada by Cardinal Ximenez in 1492. In the minds of many non-Arabists the annihilation of the Alexandrian library is the only connection of Arabs with libraries, and hence if for no other reason the affair merits discussion here.

Briefly, the story is that the Arab general ʿAmr became friendly with a famous Christian scholar, John Philoponus, who observed to him that among the treasures of Alexandria the conqueror had left untouched the great library, and since the Arabs were not interested in its contents he asked for the books as a gift. ʿAmr, personally inclined to accede to the request, considered it his duty to refer the matter to his caliph. ʿUmar sent back the brief order, "Touching the books you mention, if what is written in them agrees with the Book of God, they are not required: if it disagrees, they are not desired. Therefore destroy them." Whereupon ʿAmr ordered the books distributed to the four thousand baths of the city, which required six months to consume the precious fuel.<sup>3</sup>

As A. J. Butler points out,<sup>4</sup> the chief argument for the authenticity of the story is its picturesqueness and the true oriental flavor of ʿUmar's reply. The latter somewhat loses its force when one is reminded that Ibn Khaldūn places the same words in the mouth of this caliph in response to the inquiry of another general as to the proper disposal of books found in the course of his Persian conquests.<sup>5</sup>

Probably some Western readers have been inclined to believe the report just because it is found in Arabic sources. However, the total lack of contemporary references to the supposed event, especially in

<sup>3</sup> Abū'l-Faraj (Barhebraeus), *Historia compendiosa dynastiarum historiam complectens universalem, etc.*, ed. E. Pococke (Oxford, 1663), trans., p. 114; Arabic text, pp. 180 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Arab Conquest of Egypt* (Oxford, 1902), p. 403.

<sup>5</sup> Ibn Khaldūn, *Prolegomena*. Quatremère's text in *Notices et extraits*, XVIII, 89 f.; De Slane (trans.), XXI, 124 f.; ed. Bulaq (1274/1857), p. 234, ll. 3 f.

such writings as that of a Coptic bishop, John of Nikiou, who, writing before the end of the seventh century, gives minute details of the capture of the city, is significant. Further, the first Arabic reference to the incident, so far as we can judge from extant literature, comes from the twelfth century, approximately six hundred years after the event. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf (d. 1231 A.D.), who went to Egypt in 1193, wrote a description of that country some time after 1202, in which he makes passing allusion to "the library which ʿAmr burned with ʿUmar's permission."<sup>6</sup> The first detailed account is given by the Egyptian historian Ibn al-Ḳifṭī (d. 1248 A.D.), the existing summary of whose work, generally called *Tarīkh al-Ḥukamāʾ*, was made by al-Zauzanī the year after the author's death.<sup>7</sup> Shortly before his death in 1286 Abu'l-Faraj, the great Syrian Christian scholar, prepared an Arabic abridgment of the first half of his great Syriac Chronicle, to which he added a summary of biblical history and an account of Arabic scientific literature. For the latter he drew greatly on Ibn al-Ḳifṭī, from whom he copied word for word the much-quoted fate of the Alexandrian library.<sup>8</sup> Thereafter Arabic and Coptic writers refer to the matter frequently. Picturesque as the story is, it will not bear close scrutiny.

It is most unlikely that if ʿAmr had been ordered to destroy the books he would have troubled to dole them out to the baths of the city—an arrangement entailing considerable work and a delay which would have given ardent bibliophiles every opportunity to make away with many of the most valuable manuscripts. The picture of four thousand baths ablaze with books for six months is the very stuff of fairy tales, and is characteristic of the fabulous numbers so dear to the heart of oriental story-tellers. An even more serious discrepancy is the part supposedly played by John Philoponus, for it is known that he was writing as early as 540, and possibly before the accession of Justinian in 527, over a century before Alexandria fell into the hands of the Arabs in 642. And, finally, scholars have shown that it is highly improbable that the library survived until this date.

The history of the Museum and its successor the Serapium is fraught with many problems which need not be discussed here. Nor

<sup>6</sup> *Relation de L'Egypte par ʿAbd Allatif*, ed. De Sacy (Paris, 1810), p. 183. See editor's long note, pp. 240–44, n. 55.

<sup>7</sup> Ed. Lippert (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 354–56.

<sup>8</sup> See Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science* (Baltimore, 1931), II, 976.

shall we detain ourselves with an examination of the sources. For complete details the reader may refer to some of the complete studies of the subject.<sup>9</sup> However, certain conclusions which are pertinent to our problem are fairly clearly established. The Museum, of which the great library was a part, seems to have been planned and possibly begun by Ptolemy Soter, whose successor, Philadelphus, completed its equipment and organization about the middle of the third century B.C. It is generally supposed that the library suffered and perhaps was destroyed in the conflagration which spread in the Bruchion quarter as a result of the burning of the harbor by Julius Caesar in 48 B.C. Scholars, however, continued to frequent the Museum, at least until 216 A.D., when Caracalla suppressed the common hall. The institution came to an end in 273, when Aurelian destroyed all the buildings. Sometime early in the Christian Era a new library grew up in connection with the great temple of Serapis. Some suppose that the royal library of Pergamus which Mark Antony carried off to present to Cleopatra, a few years after the fire in 48 B.C., furnished the nucleus for this new collection. Others, among them Butler, hold that Cleopatra placed her books in the Caesarion, begun during her reign and finished by Augustus, for the libraries of that temple are referred to occasionally. The Caesarion was plundered in 366 A.D. It is worthy of note that Ammianus Marcellinus speaks of numerous libraries in Alexandria.

At any rate, it is quite clear that by the fourth century the older Museum had disappeared and in its place was the daughter-institution, the Serapium, which continued its traditions as a scientific and literary academy. In 391 the latter was plundered and demolished by the Christians, to whom the great image of Serapis and its cult had long been hateful. There is no positive evidence that the library perished at this time. Rufinus, an eyewitness who gives considerable detail on the destruction of the temple, makes no mention of the fate of the library. His silence has led some scholars to suppose that the books were kept in other buildings on the Acropolis and thereby survived the catastrophe. But from the remarks of Aphthonius, who visited the

<sup>9</sup> Butler, *op. cit.*, Appen. and Bibliog.; also P. Casanova, "L'incendie de la bibliothèque d'Alexandrie," *Comp. rend. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, 1923, pp. 163-71; G. Parthey, *Das Alexandrinische Museum* (Berlin, 1838).

Serapium not long before the events of 391, it is evident that the library was associated with the temple building and was still frequented by men of learning. Hence it is most likely that it was destroyed along with the temple proper. There is also little reason for accepting the suggestion that the books were removed and shipped to Constantinople, for the frenzied mob, whose sole desire was to wipe out idolatry and all its accompaniments, can scarcely be supposed to have given thought to the value of pagan literature. The much-discussed lament of Orosius on the empty bookshelves is evidence that in 416 there were no longer any large and ancient libraries in Alexandria.<sup>10</sup>

The total lack of any references to such libraries in all subsequent writings, both previous to and in the centuries following the Arab conquest, can only be interpreted as mute testimony to their disappearance. Above all, we should expect John Moschus and his friend Sophronius, who evince a passionate interest in all matters relating to books and who do describe lesser libraries they saw, to have mentioned the Serapium library if it was still in existence. They visited Egypt a few years before the coming of the Arabs in 642.

Some writers have attempted to clear Abū'l-Faraj of responsibility for the famous report of the destruction of the Alexandrian library. They point out that it does not appear in the Syriac original of his history and hence hold it to be a late interpolation in the Arabic.<sup>11</sup> However, we have seen that Abū'l-Faraj is responsible for the Arabic epitome of his work and the additions to it. Its absence in the Beirut edition<sup>12</sup> is due to the red pencil of the Turkish censor rather than to a difference in manuscripts. This passage as well as several others lacking in this edition are on the proof sheets which were sent me by the director of the Catholic Press of Beirut in response to my inquiry. The manuscript used by Pococke is fairly late,<sup>13</sup> but was collated by the more recent editor with other manuscripts, all of which include the incident in question.

<sup>10</sup> See a discussion of this by Butler, *op. cit.*, pp. 420 f.

<sup>11</sup> See R. Vasudeva Rau, "Did Omar Destroy the Alexandrian Library?" *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1894, pp. 560 f. This author supposed the story to be of Christian origin. He is apparently unaware of its mention by Ibn al-Kifī.

<sup>12</sup> Ed. Šālḥānī (1890).

<sup>13</sup> Written 861/1457. See *Bodleian Catalogue*, No. 96: *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum orientalium bibliothecae Bodleianae* (Oxford: Nicoll, Pusey, 1835), Part II.

At any rate, the problem of its existence in Abū'l-Faraj's history is of secondary importance, for it is evident from the statements of two Moslems, Ibn al-Ḳifṭī and ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, that the tradition was current in Arabic literature. Neither will Bury's argument<sup>14</sup> that Abū'l-Faraj did not use the word "library" but *libri philosophici qui in gazophilaciis regiis reperiuntur* get us out of the difficulty. The Arabic which Pococke so translated is *khazā'in al-mulūkī'a*.<sup>15</sup> This phrase means literally "royal treasuries or collections"; *khazā'in* and its singular, *khizāna*, can mean simply "treasuries," "stores," "collections." A library is specifically *khizānat al-kutub* ("collection of books"), but Arabic writers quite frequently omit the word "books" when the context makes it clear, as it does here, that "collections of books" are meant. So the *Fihrist*<sup>16</sup> quotes a man as saying, "In my *Khizāna* at Baṣra among his books are . . . ." Of course one can legitimately argue that the royal library or collections does not necessarily refer to the great library of the Museum or Serapium, but we have just seen that there is no evidence that any great libraries survived the depredations of the Christians.

It therefore seems quite clear that there arose—why we do not know, but apparently in Egypt not later than the first half of the thirteenth century—this story that ʿAmr, on the order of the second caliph, destroyed a great library of royal foundation in Alexandria, and that although it was believed and recounted both by Christian and by Moslem historians, it is utterly groundless. The fact that Arabic writers should have perpetuated such a reflection on their forefathers speaks for their candor if not for their critical judgment.

Possibly the story arose among a group of scholarly but heretical Moslems who greatly admired the remnants of Greek learning but regretted that so few survived and at the same time had little use for the early caliphs. One can quite well imagine such among the ranks of Ismāʿīlī *savants* who frequented the court of the Fāṭimids, whose heretical caliphate in Egypt was brought to an end by Saladin in 567/1171. As partisans of the house of ʿAlī, whom they believed foully prevented from succeeding Mohammed as the true head of the Mos-

<sup>14</sup> P. 454, n. 141, to his edition of Gibbon.

<sup>15</sup> Pococke trans., p. 114; Arabic text, p. 181.

<sup>16</sup> Ed. Flügel (Leipzig, 1871), p. 139, l. 3.



lem state, they would have felt no scruples against representing ʿUmar and his envoy as ignorant vandals. We know that the academy and library founded and supported by the Fāṭimid caliphs at Cairo was definitely modeled on the Museum or Serapium and that there sciences, of Greek origin, and literature were cultivated along with strictly religious studies. This institution was closed by Saladin and the books from its library were scattered all over Egypt and Syria. Or is it too far-fetched to imagine that the story may be no older than this event and took form as a protest or a bit of literary revenge on the part of some deposed scholar of the Fāṭimid House of Science? Saladin's victory spelled the triumph of orthodoxy in Egypt, and in place of the essentially liberal and diversified studies of the academy there arose numerous *madrasas*, or theological schools, devoted almost exclusively to problems of Koranic exegesis, theology, and canon law. One can quite easily picture some disgruntled Fellow of the old academy viewing the limited interests of these new schools with dismay, saying, "So it has always been with the orthodox; they have no appreciation of true learning. Today their general Saladin closes our school and scatters our books and so the general of ʿUmar, may Allāh curse him, destroyed the academy and the books of the ancients."

The story, then, may be supposed to have circulated—perhaps underground—in Egypt, where it was picked up by ʿAbd al-Laṭīf with his fondness for antiquities, and by Ibn al-Kifṭī with his interest in philosophy and philosophers and translations from the Greek, and accepted as a plausible explanation for the loss of books known only by name. There is good evidence that serious Arabic scholars were aware that they did not possess the full body of Greek literature.

This hypothesis is frankly an imaginative construction for which there is no direct evidence, but it is offered as a possible explanation of the origin of a curious story which has aroused endless discussion.

In reviewing the history of the Alexandrian Museum and library the present writer was struck with the great similarity of its purpose and activities to that of some of the great academies and libraries of Moslem foundation. Most of the higher education of Mohammedans has always been carried on in mosques and *madrasas*. In the earliest days of Islām this was done quite informally; the mosque was the natural meeting-place of the faithful, a civic as well as religious center. The

prophet was hardly dead before eager listeners began to gather about his former companions after prayers to hear them recite his words or recount his deeds. In time these companions became the first teachers of Islām and the mosques were their classrooms. The practice of teachers lecturing and answering questions in mosques has continued to the present. Chairs in different departments of Moslem learning were endowed, and in many places the mosque school took on the semblance of a university. Books were presented and many a scholar bequeathed his library to the mosque of his city, both to insure its preservation and to render the books accessible to the learned who frequented it. And so grew up the great universities of Cordova and Toledo to which flocked Christians as well as Moslems from all over the world, and the famous al-Azhar in Cairo, which after almost a thousand years is still the most famous educational center of the Mohammedan world. *Madrasas* or theological colleges arose later, one of the earliest and probably the most influential was the Nizāmiya in Bagdad, established by the *wazīr* Nizām al-Mulk in 457/1065. These institutions were founded and endowed for strictly educational purposes. On the whole their curriculums were limited to religious subjects, to which were added such philological and historical studies as were needed for Koranic exegesis and the exposition of canon law. Medicine seems to have been the only secular study included. These colleges also had their libraries, containing such works as were needed by their students and their professors.

But there were also other institutions of a more secular sort. The first was the House of Wisdom (*bait al-ḥikma*) founded by the Abbasid caliph, al-Maʾmūn, in Bagdad early in the ninth century A.D. Al-Maʾmūn was an ardent exponent of Muʿtazilite theology, a highly rationalistic system of thought, which left a lasting impression on Moslem dogmatic theology long after it had spent itself and disappeared, only to be remembered as one of the great heresies. With the great emphasis which Muʿtazilites placed on the importance of human reason as a means of ascertaining the truth, it is only natural that they should have been attracted by the products of rational thought among peoples of the past. Hence they were eager students of Greek philosophy and science and probably the first readers of the great works translated under the patronage of al-Maʾmūn and his son al-Wāthiq.

We shall see later how al-Ma'mūn, like his father Hārūn al-Rashīd, spared no pains or expense collecting and translating works on science and philosophy of Greek, Persian, and Indian origin. They were also interested in other phases of literature; poetry, stories, and that class of writings known as *adab* (*belles-lettres*) which has been so exceedingly popular in Arabic-speaking countries, all found their places in the libraries of these enlightened caliphs. It is to their lasting credit that they were not satisfied to restrict their marvelous collections to their own use, but made them the center of the academy, or House of Wisdom, founded by al-Ma'mūn. There were gathered translators and scholars of every sort, who not only used the books for their private studies but met for discussions and experimental research. A very important feature of the House of Wisdom was its astronomical observatory, in which were compiled the celebrated "Verified Tables." None of the then known sciences was neglected.

Another academy which also bore the name of the House of Wisdom, or Abode of Science, was that founded by the *wazīr* Sābūr Ibn Ardashīr in 381 or 383/993-94. Its activities seem to have been literary and philosophical rather than scientific. Most of the great poets and men of letters of the day sought at one time or another to enjoy its hospitality and stimulating discussions. The famous skeptic and poet Abū'l-<sup>c</sup>Alā al-Ma<sup>c</sup>arrī journeyed from his home in Syria to become a member of this academy for a time. Long afterward he spoke in letters and verse of his longing to take part in those brilliant assemblies once more. In one of his poems occurs the line, "And in the house of Sābūr a sprightly songstress enlivened our evenings with a voice as melodious as a dove's."<sup>17</sup> An unusually fine library was a part of the original foundation and contained rare and beautiful books which later were plundered. Yāqūt refers to it as the "Ancient Library."<sup>18</sup> There is some evidence that the Shi'ite poet, the *Sharīf* al-Raḍī, founded a similar academy also in Bagdad in imitation of Sābūr's. The *Sharīf* (b. 359/970; d. 407/1016) was a contemporary and encomiast of Sābūr ibn Ardashīr.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> *Sakt al-Zand*, II, 51, l. 12. Quoted by Ibn Khallikān, *Biographical Dictionary*, trans. De Slane (Paris, 1843), I, 555.

<sup>18</sup> *Biographical Dictionary* ("Gibb Series," Vol. VI), p. 358; Yāqūt, *Geographical Dictionary*, ed. Wüstenfeld, I, 799.

<sup>19</sup> See *Letters of Abū'l-<sup>c</sup>Alā*, ed. Margoliouth (Oxford, 1898); prefaced Biog., pp. xxiii f., which refers to the Introduction to the *Diwān* of al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (Beirut, 1307 A.H.).

Bagdad, however, was not the only city in which were to be found such academies. We read of a learned jurist and poet of Mosul, Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad ibn Hamdan al Mawṣilī (man of Mawṣil = Mosul; d. 323), who owned a *dar al-ʿilm* ("abode of science") in which was a library containing works of a great variety. There he provided facilities for those who would study, including free paper for the poor. He lectured on law, literary history, and poetry to all who would listen. Hence it would appear that his academy, like Sābūr's, was devoted to literary matters.<sup>20</sup>

Two other men of culture and learning, probably in imitation of the caliphs Hārūn al-Rashīd and al-Maʾmūn, called their libraries their "treasuries of wisdom" (*khizānat al-ḥikma*). One was ʿAlī ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Munajjim, whose father was an astronomer in the employ of al-Maʾmūn, who converted him to Islām, hence of course to that of the Muʿtazilite persuasion. The son, a singer of merit and a translator and patron of translators, had at his country seat an unusual library to the use of which he admitted other scholars. One of them, Abū Maʿshar, a much-quoted astronomer of Khurāsān, on his way to the pilgrimage at Mecca stopped to use the library of Ibn al-Munajjim and became so engrossed in the treasures there that he cared not whether he ever completed the pilgrimage. His heretical tendencies are traced to this event.<sup>21</sup>

Ibn al-Munajjim's own library, as well as his taste in literature and his ability to collect outstanding works, was so famous that the book-loving courtier Faṭḥ ibn Khāḳān engaged him to assemble a library which is also referred to as a "treasury of wisdom."<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Yāqūt, *Biog. Dict.*, II, 420.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 467; see also *Fihrist*, p. 143, and Ibn abī Uṣaibīʿa, *ʿUyūn al-anbaʿ*, ed. Müller (1884), I, 205.

<sup>22</sup> Yāqūt, *op. cit.*; *Fihrist*, p. 143; Ibn Khallikān, *op. cit.*, II, 312.

[To be continued]