

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES TO "ARABIC BOOKS AND LIBRARIES  
IN THE UMAIYAD PERIOD"

The following notes are additions to my previous article, "Arabic Books and Libraries in the Umayyad Period" (*AJSL*, July, 1936, pp. 245 ff.; July, 1937, pp. 239 ff.; October, 1937, pp. 41 ff.), which, it is hoped, will be useful to those interested in Umayyad contributions to Islamic civilization. The numbers correspond to those of the footnotes to which they are supplementary.

NOTE 29. R. Strothmann, "Das Problem der literarischen Persönlichkeit Zaid ibn ʿAlī," *Der Islam*, XIII (1923), 1 ff. The text of the legal compendium was published by Griffini, *Corpus iuris di Zaid ibn ʿAlī* (Milan, 1919).

NOTE 73. Al-Masʿūdī (d. A.D. 956) states (*Murūj al-Dhahab*, IV, 89) that the *Book of Kings* by ʿUbad ibn Sharyā circulated widely in his day; it was used by Ḥamdānī (d. A.D. 945) in his *Iktlāl* and later in the historical commentary to *The Himyarite Ode*, probably also written by the author of the ode, Nashwān ibn Saʿīd al-Ḥimyarī (d. A.D. 1177) (see Nicholson, *Literary History of the Arabs*, p. 13). The present form of the *Relation* of ʿUbad, which consists of answers to questions asked by Muʿāwīya, agrees with the statement of the *Fihrist*, p. 89, to the effect that this caliph summoned him to court to ask him for historical information, after which he caused it to be recorded. Taken with the above-mentioned use of this work, there seems to be considerable evidence for its authenticity and the historicity of its author. It is published as a supplement to the *Tʾjān* of Wabḥ ibn Munabbih in the recension of Ibn Hishām (Hyderabad, A.H. 1347) (see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, Suppl. I [1937], pp. 100 f.).

NOTE 107. See also Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, Suppl. I, pp. 76 ff.

NOTE 126. The *Fihrist*, p. 34, also refers to a *Tafsīr* by Al-Ḥasan of Baṣra (d. 110/728-29). His glosses were collected in commentary form by ʿAmr ibn ʿUbad (d. 145/762) (see G. Bergsträsser, "Die Koranlesung des Ḥasan von Baṣra," *Islamica*, II [1926], 11-57). The chief source for Ḥasan's comments is the *Ithāf* of Al-Bannāʾ (d. A.H. 1117), published at Cairo, A.H. 1317 (see also Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, Suppl. I, pp. 102 f.).

NOTE 130. Other tractates by Al-Ḥasan have come to light recently, *Risāla Lālelī*, MS 1703, published in *Le Monde oriental*, VII, 97; for a Turkish translation of it see Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, Suppl. I, p. 103. His work on *Qadar* (Köprülü, MS 1589, and an abridgment Aya Sofya MS 3998) is published and discussed by H. Ritter, "Studien zur Geschichte der islamischen Frömmigkeit I, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī," *Der Islam*, XXI (1933), 1-83. Its significance is dealt with by J. Obermann, "Political Theology in Early Islam," *JAOS*, LV (1935), 138-62. These tractates agree with other indications for the nature of early Arabic prose literature, the writings of ʿUrwa and ʿUbad ibn Sharyā, in being in the form of brief treatises written in response to inquiries,

usually from caliphs. The letter of ʿAbd al-Malik ordering him to vindicate himself from charges made by certain unnamed persons that he was teaching subversive doctrine is prefixed to the *Ḳadar Risāla*. The abridgment, apparently sent to the caliph by Al-Ḥajjāj, governor of Iraq, is accompanied by a note of warm commendation of Al-Ḥasan (see Obermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-43). Like all Al-Ḥasan's writings, it is a devout and emotional homily rather than a systematic presentation of his subject.

It is apparent that Al-Ḥasan's teachings on free will were of political significance. Obermann points out that the *terminus ad quem* for the writing of this work is 86/705, the year in which ʿAbd al-Malik died, and the hitherto friendly relations between the governor and Ḥasan were severed (*ibid.*, p. 141). We have other indications that about the turn of the century the *Ḳadar* controversy had become an acute issue with political as well as religious implications. In 699 Maʿbad al-Juhani was martyred because of his teachings on free will, by order of ʿAbd al-Malik or Al-Ḥajjāj. His pupil Ghaylān al-Dimashkī met the same fate in 730 at the hands of Hishām, a son of ʿAbd al-Malik. (For a letter of reproof addressed to ʿUmar II by Al-Dimashkī and his controversy with Hishām see M. Horten, *Die philosophischen Systeme . . . im Islam* [Bonn, 1912], pp. 122 ff.) The late professor A. V. W. Jackson (*Zoroastrian Studies* [New York; 1928], pp. 238-40) drew attention to the report that Maʿbad learned the doctrine of *Ḳadar* from a Persian Abū Yūnas Sn̄sūyh or Sinbūya (Maḳrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ* [Cairo, A.H. 1326], IV, 181, ll. 25-27; Al-Shahrastānī, *Book of the Religious and Philosophical Sects*, Arabic text, ed. Cureton [Leipzig, 1923], I, 17, trans. Th. Haarbrücker [Halle, 1850], I, 25; see also Browne, *Literary History of Persia*, I, 282 f.; A. von Kremer, *Streifzüge*, p. 9, n. 1), and raises the question whether Muslim teachings on free will may not have been influenced by Zoroastrianism, to which the doctrine at some time became essential, as well as by Christian and Neo-Platonic thought.

Ḥasan was of Persian extraction and lived in Baṣra, a city open to Persian influence. It is noteworthy that Iraq and Persia were frequently the scenes of politico-religious disaffections, the dangers of which to Umayyad prestige were fully recognized by the caliphs. During the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik the vigorous and ruthless measures of Al-Ḥajjāj and his lieutenants were needed to eliminate the rival caliph ʿAbd Allah ibn al-Zubair, who exercised considerable influence in Iraq, to suppress the ʿAlid party of Al-Mukhtār ibn Abī ʿUbad at Kufa and the militant Azrakites, whose zeal endangered the peace of the Persian provinces. This last was hardly settled when the governor of Sijistān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, revolted and was subdued only after two years of vigorous campaigning (see *Encyclopedia of Islam*, arts. "ʿAbd al-Malik" and "Al-Ḥadjdjād"; P. K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs* [London, 1937], pp. 206 ff.).

It is not surprising that ʿAbd al-Malik, who was most concerned to bring about the unification of the empire, viewed with apprehension the charges

lodged by some of his supporters that the saintly Ḥasan of Baṣra was guilty of religious views which were inimical to the solidarity of the state. Obermann sees correctly that the doctrine of individual self-responsibility was not merely an academic question but might easily undermine the authority of the state and especially Umayyad domination (*op. cit.*, p. 145). He does not, however, suggest that Ḥasan's views might have been of Persian origin, and therefore congenial to, or possibly the expression of, Persian opposition to Arab arrogance. Rather, Obermann denies that the Ḳadar ideology is of foreign origin and stresses the point that Ḥasan's teachings show no Jewish, Christian, or Greek influence, except in so far as such elements can be detected in the Koran, for Ḥasan bases his arguments on the authority of revealed scripture (*ibid.*, pp. 147 [n. 29] and 157-58 [n. 72]).

It is significant, nevertheless, as Obermann points out, that Ḥasan accuses his opponents of using their doctrine of predeterminism as an excuse for their "sinful appetites and treacherous iniquities," a statement which agrees with other evidence that this was a favorite justification of government officials for corrupt practices (Ibn Ḳutaiba, *Kitāb al-Ma'ārif*, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 225). Furthermore, one of the men who brought these offenses to the attention of Ḥasan was his friend, and possibly pupil, the above-mentioned martyr, Ma'bad al-Juhanī (Obermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 150 and 153; on the relations of the two men see Ibn Ḳutaiba, *op. cit.*).

An amusing touch is lent to the controversy by Ḥasan's charge that his critics are actually ignorant of proper Arabic usage and by his temerity in enlightening them by quotations from poetry and popular expressions (*ibid.*, p. 152). Does not this also give us a glimpse into the deep-set antagonism between the "pure Arabs" and their Persian converts?

Another work on Ḳadar was composed by a contemporary of Al-Ḥasan, also of Persian extraction, Wahb ibn Munabbih (they both died 110/728-29), who, however, is quoted as saying that, after consulting some seventy prophetic writings, he regretted ever having written this book (Yaḳūt, *Irshad*, VII, 232). He is included in the list of Ḳadarites headed by Ma'bad (Ibn Ḳutaiba, *op. cit.*, p. 301). The text of his *Kitāb al-Ḳadar* is lost, unless, as Krenkow suggests, it is incorporated in the early pages of the *Tijān*, where there is considerable discussion of the subject (F. Krenkow, "Two Oldest Books, etc.," *Islamic Culture*, II [1928], 232). One cannot but wonder whether his retraction was not due to political pressure. He was imprisoned during the last years of his life and flogged to death by order of the governor of the Yemen, Yusuf al-Thakafi, who, like his famous son Al-Hajjāj, was a vigorous inquisitor of political and religious malcontents (Horovitz, art. "Wahb ibn-Munabbih," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, and *Islamic Culture*, I [1927], 553 ff.). Wahb's family, though settled in the Yemen since the time of Khusraw Anushirwan, apparently maintained connections with Persia, for he says that he had occasion from time to time to go to Herat to look after family affairs (Krenkow, *op. cit.*). The *Tijān* shows familiarity with Iran and some acquaintance with

the more eastern provinces; in fact, his folklore, which Krenkow notes is scarcely Semitic, may be Central Asian. It should also be noted that Wahb flourished at the time of the Muslim conquests of Transoxania.

Is it not more than likely that Umayyad persecutions of the *Ḳadarite* heresy were due to a recognition of its Persian connections combined with its possible justification of too independent thought and activity? Both were a menace to the state. The *Ḳadarite* movement eventually gave birth to the Muṭʿazilite, so warmly espoused by the Abbasids Al-Ma'mūn and Wāthiq, both of whom had Persian leanings, and Persian Shi'ite doctrine to the present contains many Muṭʿazilite elements. A saying attributed to Mohammed, but which, as Professor Macdonald points out, must be later than the rise of the *Ḳadariya*, says: "The *Ḳadarites* are the Mājūs [Zoroastrians] of the people" (*Encyclopedia of Islam*, art. "Ḳadariya").

Coming from a Persian background, it does not appear improbable that Wahb and Ḥasan had consciously or unconsciously stressed those aspects of Mohammed's teachings which were most congenial to the Zoroastrian thought of their time. Their mystical personal piety doubtless played a part, too, and it is surely not a coincidence that Persia has ever been a congenial home for Šūfi doctrine and practice. At any rate, Ḥasan's tractate and the *Ḳadar* passages in the *Tījān* should be studied from the viewpoint of possible Zoroastrian influence. Certainly, one must take into account *all* the systems of thought which were current in the atmosphere in which Muslim theology developed.

It has usually been assumed that contacts with the teachings of John of Damascus are responsible in large measure for the *Ḳadarite* heresy. This Byzantine theologian, who died sometime before 754, was born at the end of the seventh century, just at the time when Ma'bād suffered martyrdom, Ḥasan was being questioned as to his teachings on *Ḳadar*, and Wahb retracted his writings on the same subject. Hence the movement is earlier than the active years of John. It has been noted that a modern Muslim critic of Wensinck's *Muslim Creed*, which presents the view of the influence of Greek theology on Muslim, suggests rather that John was influenced by Islam (see *AJSL*, LIV [1937], 51, n. 129).

Is it too daring to suggest that Zoroastrian teachings on free will, directly or more probably indirectly, brought about the *Ḳadarite* heresy, which in turn colored in some degree the thinking of John and was finally mediated to Christian scholasticism through the twelfth-century Latin translation of his *De orthodoxa fide*, which is known to have influenced Peter the Lombard and Thomas Aquinas? The subject merits investigation by someone familiar with Zoroastrian, Muslim, and Christian thought. The problem of the possible influence of Persian teachings on Mohammed is more remote but also pertinent.

NOTE 138. J. Ruska draws attention to the evidence furnished by Al-Rāzī's *Kitāb al-Shawāhid* (not yet published) that *ca.* A.D. 900 the legends of Khālid's

alchemical studies were already established. Ruska is still very emphatic in his opinion that the Khālid tradition is baseless and holds that there can have been no scientific activity before the time of the early Abbasids. Further, he asserts that the translations of medical and astronomical texts must have preceded the alchemical ("Alchemy in Islam," *Islamic Culture*, XI [1937], 32 and 36). It is my belief that we now have evidence of beginnings, during the Umayyad period, in both of these sciences, as well as in alchemy.

Manuscripts are still extant of Avicenna's Persian translation of an ode on the preservation of health by Tayādhūk (d. ca. A.H. 90), court physician to Al-Ḥajjāj. He is also credited with a large work on the preparations of medicines (Ibn abī Uṣaibī'a, I, 121; Ibn al-Ḳiftī, p. 105; *Fihrist*, p. 303; *Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore* [Calcutta, 1910], IV, 165, No. 108, iii).

H. E. Stapelton and M. Meyerhof have recently brought to light information which suggests far greater scientific activity in the Umayyad period than was supposed at the time my former article was written. Stapelton, in a letter to the editor of *Isis*, gives a preliminary report of his investigation of the alchemical manuscripts in the libraries of India. His findings are most significant for the genuineness of the Khālid tradition and the relations of the studies of Jābir and Ja'far al-Šādiḳ to those of the Umayyad prince. Khālid was born A.D. 672, and, from a fifteen-line extract of a poem, apparently addressed by him to his cousin Yazīd II, at or after the time of the latter's accession, it is certain that he survived at least until A.D. 720 and lived in Damascus. In it he claims to have succeeded in the practice of alchemy. A manuscript in the Aṣāfiyah library in Hyderabad makes it clear that he acquired some of his knowledge from the monk Mariyānos, from whom Jābir's learning was derived through two intermediaries. Stapelton is now convinced that the alchemical treatises in the Rampur Library, with which he and Azo dealt years ago, are probably authentic and not forgeries as has long been supposed (see "Further Notes on the Arabic Alchemical Manuscripts in the Libraries of India," *Isis*, XXVI [1936], 127-31, and "Note on the Arabic Manuscripts in the Aṣāfiyah Library, Hyderabad," *Archeion*, XIV, 57-61, where he lists manuscripts of two or three treatises by Khālid). Stapelton suggests that the contents of these Indian manuscripts will clear up details on the transference of alchemical knowledge current in pre-Islamic times in Alexandria and northern Mesopotamia to the Arabs through Khālid and Jābir. The statement (*AJSL*, LIV [1937], 55) on the date of Khālid's death must be corrected in the light of these findings, which also make more probable the tradition of his literary and scientific activities at Damascus under 'Umar II (*ibid.*, quoted from *Encyclopedia of Islam*, art. "Kitāb-khāna," p. 1045). Information on the Arabic source of this Khālid tradition would be appreciated.

Meyerhof offers very suggestive evidence for one path by which the learning of Alexandria, especially on the medical side, reached the Moslem world.

It becomes increasingly clear that the Umayyad rulers played a considerable role in the beginnings of Arabic scientific interests and the translation of Greek words. Al-Masʿūdī (d. A.D. 956, *Tanbih*, p. 122) states that the ancient center of philosophical teaching was transferred, in the days of ʿUmar II, from Alexandria to Antioch and from there to Harrān in the time of Mutawakkil. A quotation from the autobiography of Al-Fārābī (d. A.D. 950) preserved by Ibn abī Uṣaibʿa (II, 135) agrees with this. According to both statements, the school at Antioch finally dwindled down to one teacher and two pupils before it was moved to Harrān. Ibn abī Uṣaibʿa (I, 116 f.) also gives a brief sketch of a Christian physician, Ibn Abjar, who as the confidant of ʿUmar II accepted Islam at the caliph's hand. He was the head of the Alexandrian school which ʿUmar moved to Antioch and which later went to Harrān. Finally, Meyerhof found confirmation for these statements in the unique Cairo manuscript of the *Useful Book in Medicine*, by ʿAlī ibn Riḍwān (d. after A.D. 1067), who repeatedly insists that the last Byzantine emperors persecuted the philosophers of Egypt and neglected the sciences, whereas several of the caliphs, particularly ʿUmar II, Hārūn al-Rashīd, and Al-Maʾmūn, were great patrons of every kind of scientific activity. Ignoring the anti-Christian touch, it is noteworthy that Ibn Riḍwān brackets the name of the Umayyad caliph with those of the two foremost patrons of Greek science among the Abbasids.

None of these Arabic sources explains why the school was removed from its ancient center to Syria, but Meyerhof suggests that it is "possible that the rapid decay of Alexandria cut off from Mediterranean commerce after the Arab occupation prevented the purchase of indispensable Greek manuscripts while Antioch had during the intervals between the long Byzantine-Arabic wars, intercourse and commerce with the Byzantine Empire" ("Transmission of Science to the Arabs," *Islamic Culture*, January, 1937, pp. 19-21). He does not believe that such a school was of an official character, for both orthodox Christians and Moslems distrusted Hellenic science. It would be interesting to know something of the activity of the scholars at Antioch during Umayyad times, but, to judge from the later interests of both pagan and Nestorian Christian scholars at Harrān, it seems likely that the study of Greek texts continued. Whether there was also a beginning of translations into Syriac and Arabic is not stated.

Al-Fārābī's report carries the scientific tradition from Harrān on to Baghdad. This scientist, who Al-Masʿūdī says was the heir of the scientific learning of this school, makes a point of the continuity of the scholarly tradition at Alexandria from Greek through Roman and Christian times to the days of Islam and states that the basis of instruction consisted of copies of Aristotle's works made from still earlier manuscripts dating from the very days of the philosopher himself. Hence, when he speaks of the last three members of the school leaving Antioch taking *the books* with them, it appears that he wishes to stress the reliability of the texts transmitted by the school as well as the continuity of learning. Therefore, although Al-Fārābī does not say so ex-

plicitly, the inference seems to be that a quantity of books was carried to Antioch from Alexandria at the time the school was moved by ʿUmar II.

Are we not justified in seeing the schools at Antioch and Harrān as the connecting links between the Museon of Alexandria and the House of Wisdom (*Bait al-Ḥikma* or *Dār al-ʿIlm*) of Baghdad? (See my previous article in *AJSL*, Vol. LII [October, 1935, and January, 1936], where the relations between the Moslem scientific academies and the school of Alexandria are discussed.)

None of these four reports collected by Meyerhof appears to use the term "House of Wisdom," but we have one hint that it was known in Umayyad times. Wahb ibn Munabbih, who, as we have seen, wrote under Umayyad patronage, in the *Tījān* says that, when King Solomon was on his way to visit Bilkīs the first time, her governor at Najrān—one of the wisest men of the day—assembled the people in the *Dār al-ʿIlm* to try the reputed wisdom of the Hebrew king. Where did Wahb get the idea of an "Abode of Learning" as a place of assembly for the discussions of wise men? (Ibn Hishām, *Kitāb al-Tījān* [Hyderabad, 1347/1928], p. 154; *Islamic Culture*, April, 1928, p. 83.)

NOTE 145. Ruska (*Islamic Culture*, January, 1937, pp. 35 f.), notes that the Rāzī manuscript is evidence that Stephanos appears as Khālid's instructor in the older version of the legend, but that both the Stephanos and the Marianos forms were known in the tenth century.

NOTE 157. Meyerhof says Māsirjīs was a Persian Jew, probably a pupil of the great school at Jundishāpūr. If correct, this raises the question of the possible influence and activities of this center of Sassanian-Hellenistic learning during the Umayyad period. A unique manuscript (Aya Sofya 4838) of the abridgment of his *Fī Abdāl al-Adwiya* ("On Substitutes for Remedies") is still extant (Meyerhof, *op. cit.*, p. 22).

NOTE 162. Professor H. G. Farmer writes me that the Ambrosian manuscript (C. 86. 1) of the *ʿArḍ Miṭṭāḥ* of Hermes states that it was translated into Arabic *Dhwl-Kaʿda*, A.H. 125/September 743.

NOTE 165. A unique manuscript of a work by the geographer Ibn al-Fakīh, photographed by E. E. Herzfeld in the library of the Meshhed shrine (fol. 94b) quotes a very reliable early historian, Hishām ibn al-Kalbī (819 A.D.), as saying that he copied the entire introduction of a book which had been confiscated from the luggage of the Sassanian princess Behāfrīd and translated for the governor Al-Ḥajjāj. The introduction also states that the work was composed for Kavāt (about A.D. 500), and, judging from the citations in the Meshhed manuscript, it contained a collection of all sorts of strange information on the various districts of Iran, including a characterization of the climate and inhabitants of each. Professor Herzfeld draws attention to a Pahlavi pamphlet dealing with the towns of Iran entitled *Shahrīhā ē Ērān*, and the fact that the source for the chapter "On the Nature of the Mountains" in the *Bundahishn* is given as the *Ayātkārihā ē Shahrīhā*. Various historical remarks suggest that it was written during the reign of Kavāt. Herzfeld is convinced

that the corresponding chapters on rivers, lakes, and seas must have been derived from the same source, however much they may have been altered. He concludes that both the pamphlet on the towns and the quotations in the *Bundahishn* are fragments of the original "Baedeker" which the princess carried on her travels. It is to be hoped that the Ibn al-Faḳīh manuscript will soon be published (E. E. Herzfeld, *Archeological History of Iran* [London, 1935], pp. 105 f.; the text of the Pahlavi work has been published with an English translation by J. Markwart, *A Catalogue of the Provincial Capitals of Eranshahr*, ed. G. Messina [Rome, 1931]).

In "A New Pahlavi Inscription," *AJSL*, LIII (January, 1937), 126-44, Professor M. Sprengling presented a preliminary publication of a Pahlavi inscription found by the Oriental Institute Expedition on the Kaaba of Zoroaster in 1936. This portion of a *notitia dignitatum* of the Sassanid empire he dated to the early years of Narseh, but now, according to a private conversation, he is convinced it is from the reign of Shahpuhr I and is an earlier example of the same type of literature as the *Shahrihā ē Ērān*. The usefulness of such a catalogue to Al-Ḥajjāj as governor of the Eastern Provinces is obvious.

Princess Behāfrīd's book adds another bit of evidence for the preservation of books taken as loot in the early days of Muslim conquest and belies the implication, in the famous words imputed to Umar I, that the Arabs destroyed all books that fell into their hands.

Far more significant, the translation of it for Al-Ḥajjāj suggests that Arabic geographical literature grew out of the administrative needs of the Umayyad government. It has been seen above, note 130, that even the *Qadar* controversy was not merely the academic discussion of theologians, detached from practical affairs, but had far-reaching political implications and cannot be properly understood unless it is related to the social process. See my article (*AJSL*, LIV [October, 1937], 58) for a brief discussion of the practical considerations which first stimulated an interest in various intellectual pursuits which in turn resulted in the development of several departments of Arabic prose literature.

According to T. W. Arnold (*Painting in Islam* [Oxford, 1928], p. 63), the geographer Abū Ishāq al-Iṣṭakhrī (middle of the tenth century) describes a manuscript on the history of the Persian kings which he saw in a castle in northern Persia, containing pictures of the Sassanian kings, which seems to have resembled the manuscript seen by Al-Masʿūdī about the same time at Iṣṭakhr and which he said was taken as loot in A.H. 113 and translated into Arabic for Hishām ibn ʿAbd al-Malik. Al-Masʿūdī describes the miniatures in some detail (*Tanbīh*, pp. 106 ff.; see *AJSL*, LIII [July, 1937], 250). One wonders whether the pictures were of more than passing interest to the Umayyad caliphs and whether Persian painting exercised any influence in the Moslem world before the time of the Abbasids. The murals at Ḳuṣair ʿAmra and the mosaics in the mosque at Damascus indicate that the Umayyad



princes were not a little charmed by representational art (Alois Musil, *Ḳuṣajr ʿAmra* [Wien, 1907], Band II, plates; Eustache de Lorey et M. van Berchem, *Les Mosaïques de la mosquée des Omayyades à Damas* [Paris, 1930]).

NOTE 170. It becomes increasingly apparent that a re-estimate of the Umayyad period is imperative for a proper understanding of the cultural history of Islam. Such a study must utilize the rapidly accumulating archeological evidence for the architecture of the period, any scraps of information dealing with the intellectual and social life of the time, and, above all, necessitates a critical re-examination of the historical records. The publication undertaken by the School of Oriental Studies of the Hebrew University of Balādhurī's *Ansāb al-ashrāf wa akhbārahum*, hitherto inaccessible to most scholars, will furnish new material and a valuable check on the more biased accounts (Vol. V, ed. S. D. F. Goitein [Jerusalem, 1936]; see the review by G. Sarton, *Isis*, XXVI [1936-37], 457 f.). The work of Balādhurī (d. A.D. 892), although produced under Abbasid patronage, exhibits a surprising degree of objectivity in the treatment of the deposed dynasty. This is probably due in part to the debt of Balādhurī, for his history of the caliphs, to Al-Madā'inī (d. A.D. 840), much of whose information according to Yaḳūt (VI, 94, l. 8) was drawn from ʿAwāna (d. A.D. 764-65), who wrote in the interests of the Umayyads (Goitein, *op. cit.*, Preface, pp. 15 f.).

These notes and the article to which they are supplementary are intended to draw attention to rather than to solve some of the problems of the intellectual history of the Umayyad period which need thorough investigation. It is probable that we shall soon be in a position to realize that the dark age between the downfall of the Sassanids and the establishment of the Persianized Abbasids at Baghdad had been exaggerated. In the first place, the Arab conquest should not be viewed as the eruption of hordes of uncultivated savages, for the Arabs of the "Days of Ignorance" were possessed of a culture of their own, however much its values differed from those of the settled man, and Arabia was in far closer touch with the movements of civilization than has often been supposed. Second, the more truly Arab Umayyads played a considerable role in the making of Islamic civilization—that strange distillation of ancient Greek and oriental cultures to which the Arabs contributed much more than simply a book and a language. A knowledge of the nature of that civilization is an essential part in the task of understanding our own complex heritage, for the debt of the Western world to the medieval Near East is only recently coming to be appreciated. (For a general survey of Umayyad history see P. K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs* [London, 1937], chaps. xvii-xxii; on the intellectual and artistic interests see chap. xxi and Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, Suppl. I, pp. 76-106.)

RUTH S. MACKENSEN

CHICAGO