

FROM PERSIAN TO ARABIC

M. SPRENGLING

On the subject of the Arabization of the great Moslem world-empire that arose in the seventh and eighth centuries of the Christian Era, the core of which lies, as the title indicates, in the Persian area, a deterioration of knowledge has taken place in the last thirty years, especially in America, so serious as against the amelioration and extension which is possible that it is necessary to set forth the whole process summarily once more.

The writer's attention was called to this state of affairs by the collectanea "Arabic Books and Libraries in the Umayyad Period," which during the last few years he undertook to publish for one of our students, Mrs. Ruth S. Mackensen, especially her latest "Supplementary Notes" printed elsewhere in this number of *AJSL* (LVI, 2). In these notes Mrs. Mackensen, working largely with secondary material in modern languages, especially English, was misled by one of those odd but catching statements which Herzfeld sometimes makes in passing. From this she took a story of the *confiscation* of a "Baedeker" "from the luggage of the Sassanian princess Behāfrīd," translated for al-Ḥajjāj, the introduction to this translation copied in its entirety by the "very reliable early historian, Hishām ibn al-Kalbī," a statement on whose work is reported by Herzfeld from photographs taken by him of the complete "Book of the Countries" of Ibn al-Faḳīh, discovered by Ahmed Zekī Validī in a manuscript at Meshhed. Attention was called by the editor to the insufficiency of this report. The notes were returned with little change in essentials, with two imperfect quotations from the editor's published statements on the *Kaaba* of Zoroaster inscription added. An added paragraph cites for proof of correctness of the view presented "the social process," a metaphysical concept couched in terms of sociologizing philosophy or philosophizing sociology, which does not produce, indeed often vitiates, reliable history. That the facts in the case may be clear, the "Notes" are printed as they stand, except for necessary minor corrections, in this issue.

Much more serious are the paragraphs in Herzfeld, upon which alone the factual statements in the "Supplementary Notes" are in truth founded. Herzfeld first touched the subject lightly in passing in his Schweich Lectures on the *Archaeological History of Iran* (London, 1935), pages 105 f. With a tacit correction of the name of the princess to Shāhāfrīd, the story, expanded not altogether happily, is again presented in passing in the introduction to the polemical essay "Khusrau Parwīz und der Tāq ī Vastān," *AMI*, IX, No. 2 (June, 1938), 93-97. The book in question remains a princess' Baedeker, now characterized as brought up to date for A.D. 705 (p. 97). The supposed

translator is named (pp. 94 f.) as Zādhānfarrūkh of Kaskar, said to be probably a grandson of Zādhānfarrūkh, commander of Chosroes II's bodyguard. An elaborate attempt is made to establish the exact genealogy of the princess (p. 94). No criticism of all this material will be presented here. Instead the whole story from all the sources available to this writer will be told in full. One point, likely to be forgotten later, must be fully cleared up here. Herzfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 94, n. 2) refers to the *Iranian Bundahishn*, page 216, for a statement about Yazdagerd's son *Pīrōz*. The *Bundahishn*, *Zendākāsh*, after retelling in the lower half of page 215 the Mazdakite troubles under Kavāt and the killing of Mazdak and the re-establishment of order and security in Ērānshahr by Anōshirvān, proceeds in the middle of line 1 on page 216 immediately to the last Yazdagerd, omitting all mention of Hormizd, Khosroes Parvēz, and the others between. In a few sentences Yazdagerd is disposed of. After coming to the throne he ruled for 20 (or must one read 30?) years. Then the Arabs overran Iran with death and destruction. Though not crushed by them in battle, Yazdagerd went to Khurasān-Turkestān. There he asked some men for aid and was killed by them. Then, verbatim, "A (or the) son of Yazdkart went to the Hindus (not necessarily to India!) and brought up an army. Before arriving in Khorasan he was killed, that army was dispersed, Ērānshahr remained to the Arabs." The name Pērōz does not appear. The whole story is late and reflects no intimate knowledge of affairs. Hindus might be men of Kābul (Nöldeke, *Artachštr i Pāpakān*, 58, n. 1), perhaps even Tokharians, Turks, or Tibetans (*Hudūd al-Ālam*, tr. Minorsky, §§ 23 and 24). On the other hand, in those centuries just as now, more than just at present, Hindu influence in trade, religion, language, and script pervaded Russian and Chinese Turkestān (Sinkiang), and something of that sort may be what the author of these lines has in mind. An influential Hindu merchant could at a price easily hire an "army" for a "prince."

In addition to these lapses of recent date, Walther Björkman in his diligent work on Ḳalkaṣhandī, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei im islamischen Ägypten* (Hamburg, 1928), touches cursorily upon the transfer of the chancery (*dīwān*) from Persian to Arabic. Beside Ḳalkaṣhandī and his source, the *ʿIqd*, he uses al-Šūlī, Ibn ʿAbdūs al-Jahshiyārī, and al-Rāghib al-ʿIṣfahānī's, *Muḥāḍarat al-udabāʾ*, the last named, late, of the eleventh or twelfth century, inaccessible to me. He knows two versions, one of which makes Zādhānfarrūkh's successor, the Arab (*sic*!) Abu'l-Walid Šāliḥ b. ʿAbdarrahman, the chief figure in the transfer; the other Ḳahdham, grandfather of Walid ibn Hisham. Björkman seems to consider the two traditions of equal value and arrives at no decision between them.

Hitti's *History of the Arabs* (New York, 1937) has on the whole momentous upheaval, marked and in part made by the great change in language over the entire southern half of the Mediterranean world, the old Roman Empire, and extending thence over Persia into Soghdian and Turkish lands to the north-east and into India's Panjab southeastward, just one paragraph on page 217,

naturally inadequate and barely skimming the surface, erroneous in some of its detail and in the general impression which it tends to produce.

In Hitti there is no mention at all, in the *Encyclopedia of Islam* no special article for men of first-rate importance in this "social process," Zādhānfar-rūkh, Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Sulaimān ibn Saʿd al-Khushanī, Kaḥdham.

All this means a decided deterioration of historical knowledge from the highpoint reached in Wellhausen's fundamental *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, published in 1902. Wellhausen knew and stated all these things infinitely better. Björkman, though he names and uses inadequately two sources not attainable to Wellhausen, would have been much better off if he had simply known thoroughly and used effectively Wellhausen alone.

This being the case, a restatement of this important phase in a momentous sector of human history is clearly called for. In making this from thirty odd Arabic and Persian sources, it is hoped that this presentation may attain something of the clarity and adequacy of Wellhausen's work, as, on the one hand, we put together into one unified picture what in the nature of the case is somewhat dispersed in Wellhausen's book and, on the other, add what Wellhausen did not yet have or omitted in view of the larger scope of his work.

Naturally the Arabs, when they broke over the boundaries of Syria, Persia, and Egypt in the second quarter of the seventh century A.D., presently had to deal with numbers of men and sums of money and other values which went beyond the most sanguine expectations and the wildest dreams that may be ascribed to Mohammed and the early Moslems. Some city Arabs of that time were neither so ignorant nor so illiterate as has sometimes been assumed, and there were among them comparatively rich merchants who knew how to handle trade, merchandising, and financial transactions on a fairly large scale.

Nevertheless, Mohammed, Abū Bekr, and ʿUmar in his first years seem not to have kept any books for what might be considered state income and expense. Since the Moslem world from very lowly and little beginnings was only just emerging into something like state form and the power of these rulers was divinely autocratic and affairs were, after all, in these earliest times primitively patriarchal, this is quite intelligible. No one gave it a thought, and, though some state and church transactions did have a distinctly commercial flavor, other aims and considerations and generally known dominant personalities outweighed all that. When the conquests outside the borders of Arabia began, the mass of the soldiery was beduin, desert nomad, accustomed to a hard, hand-to-mouth existence and not addicted to written reckoning and accounting.

As affairs expanded and became more complicated, as dealings with more largely settled lands and their peoples became more numerous and took on an aspect of greater permanence, shrewd heads among the city Arabs presently saw the lack and the need of these things. The year 20 A.H. = A.D. 640 is plausibly named as the year in which the first change was introduced, (Bilādhurī, *Futūḥ* 450). Characteristic is the story (*ibid.* 453) how Abū Hurairah

came from Baḥrain and announced to ʿUmar, as he met him after the evening prayer, that he had brought with him 500,000 (dirham). ʿUmar said: "Do you know what you are talking about?" He replied: "I have brought 500,000." ʿUmar says: "Just what are you saying?" He says: "100,000, plus 100,000," counting up to five. ʿUmar says: "Look here, you're dopey. Go home and sleep it off and come to me in the morning!" The morning produces no change, no awakening from a dream. So ʿUmar proceeds to dish out the booty, not knowing rightly whether to do it by count or by measure. Someone suggests: These Persians establish a register by which they regulate their gifts. This story is found in a number of other Arabic books interested in the question, e.g., Ibn ʿAbdūs al-Jahshiyārī, *K. al-Wuzarāʾ wa-l-Kuttāb*, ed. Mẓik (Leipzig, 1926), 15 (8a); al-Šūlī, *Adab al-Kuttāb* (Cairo, 1341), 190; Ibn Miskawayh, *History*, ed. Caetani ("Gibb Memorial Series," VII, 1), 454 f.; Māwardī, *Aḥkām al-Sulṭānīyah*, ed. Enger (Bonn, 1853), 344, French by Fagnan (Algiers, 1915), 429 f.

These four then proceed to tell what Bilādḥurī in his work hitherto published does not have. They name as the man who saw ʿUmar's need and supplied it not just an unnamed Arab soldier who had seen Persian pension lists but a specific Persian noble of that time, a *dihkān*. Differing slightly among themselves, all four tell in the last analysis the same story. Šūlī makes Fairuzān the very man who suggests pension lists, but then proceeds with the others to tell how Fairuzān, naturally after his conversion, seeing ʿUmar dispatch an expeditionary force, expressed his surprise at seeing no record kept of so important and expensive a transaction and explained to ʿUmar how such a record should be kept, i.e., simply a list of soldiery (and dependents) with the sums allotted to them, a pay roll. That is the original *dīwān*, its institution the great fundamental innovation of ʿUmar. Instead of the less-known Fairuzān, Māwardī substitutes for him the better-known and more vivid figure of *Hurmuzān* the Mihrjānite. Both belong to the great lords of the time of Yazdagerd the last Sassanian king, though the Arabs are inclined to class both along with the minor gentry, the *dihkāns*. Both are said to have broken off relations with Yazdagerd in Marv, as they appear on the same page together for the last time in Ṭabarī (I, 2682). That this Fairuzān ever was in Medinah, where he would have had to be to speak to ʿUmar, or that he ever counseled a Moslem leader in the field or governor, who might then have transmitted the message to ʿUmar, is extremely improbable. According to one account, indeed, he was killed at the Honey Pass, as he was fleeing eastward after the battle of Nihāwand (Ṭab., I, 2626-49).

There is, however, another curious figure who occurs in the early operations of al-Mughīrah ibn Shuḥbah in Ahwāz in the year 15/16 A.H. = A.D. 636 or 637. De Goeje in Bilādḥurī's *Futūḥ* (376) calls him Bi(or Bai)rawāz; Wüstenfeld in Yāḳūt's *Bulḍān* (I, 412), where this very passage of Bilādḥurī is quoted, has Bīruwān; Wellhausen in his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (107) prints Beravān; Murgotten in his translation of the second part of Bilādḥurī

(630) writes Birwāz. Murgotten with De Goeje may be most nearly right. This looks like an older Arabic attempt to write in Arabic an older Persian form of Fairūz-Pērōz, such as is found in the KZ inscription at Naḵsh i Rustam (*AJSL*, LIII, No. 2 [January, 1937], 131-33; *ZDMG*, XCI, 668) and elsewhere (Herzfeld, *Paikuli, Glossary*, Nos. 810 and 811, p. 232; *AMI*, VII, No. 1, 59-61). A Persian name Bērāwān is most uncertain, as Justi's *Namenbuch* shows. If this is our man and his name is archaic or archaizing, perhaps Parthian rather than Persian, it would be only natural that later Arabic writers should tamper with it, as did Yāḳūt, and substitute for it the better-known Pērōzhān-Pērōzān-Fairuzān. Whoever the man may have been and whatever his name, the story bears the stamp of verisimilitude. There were Persian *dihkāns* in Medinah in ʿUmar's time, and some of these were even on the pay roll (Bilādihurī, 457; Murgotten, 251).

There would seem to be little or no evidence that much else was done in this early time to account for income and expenditure, to keep any detailed record of such things. This appears astonishing to us today, but it is neither so desperate nor so unnatural as it appears to us. Their problem was not nearly so serious as is ours. We, at the end of a period of highly developed order and relative decency, are having smart boys manipulating our money until no one knows what it is, and handling fabulous finances until no one knows what the books are saying. For the Arabs in ʿUmar's day everything was beginning. These Arabs had never coined any money of their own, or felt the need of it.¹ They arrived at this point fully only fifty years later. It was no small thing that a man like ʿUmar saw so early the need of a fixed era for the dating of state records and papers. It was the deed of a great man for ʿUmar to learn and accept from much distrusted and despised Persians the creation of a great pension or pay roll, fixed in writing, with as just a rating as possible for each individual. The establishment of at least so much of a "Department of the Exchequer" was, indeed, under the circumstances, as Muir says in his *Annals of the Early Caliphate* (229), a "herculean task." To expect more of a man like ʿUmar, situated as he was, would be unreasonable and unfair.

From penury to more than plenty in a few short years, that was ʿUmar's problem. Out of many lean and hungry years in desert Arabia his Arabs swept in an incredibly short time as conquerors over what seemed to them unlimited fertile territory with rich and populous cities and into the possession of booty such as few conquerors and certainly no Arab had ever seen before. They had no truly applicable rules, laws, or precedents for this unprecedented state of affairs. It was not always easy to distinguish between booty to be divided on the spot among its winners and income to be managed by a new, just organizing state; between Allah, the state on its religious side, and *sultān*, the state's secular authority; between Allah and the Muslims. Allah

¹ The clumsy imitation of Greek coins in South Arabia, evidently under the influence of Greek merchants, cannot be cited against this statement. Neither does coinage made for desert borderlands invalidate it.

had a way of getting into the road of the Muslims, and the Muslims became entangled with Allah in their minds. In these circumstances it was a great step in advance that the central authority of the state took in hand the perception and distribution of at least the steady income from what we would call taxes and established in fixed and controllable written form a pay roll, pay being designated as gifts due, for the Muslim soldiery which was the backbone of this state. And whatever the Arabs may have learned in this as in other matters from Greeks, Aramaeans, or Copts, this was in origin and in large part a Persian contribution to the state and civilization which they were producing. That is clearly recognized, for example, by the great ʿAbdalmalik, who used to say of Rawḥ ibn Zinbāʿ, one of the men closest to his counsels, that he was a Syrian in loyalty, an ʿIrākian in handwriting, a Ḥijāzian in legal lore, and a Persian in bookkeeping (*kitābah*, al-Jahshiyārī, 30 = 15b).

Naturally beyond this and even in the establishment of so much in so early a time as that of ʿUmar much was left to the discretion of the leaders. What was their private property and what was state funds was not yet so clear as it became later. ʿUmar seems, indeed, to have refused to favor too greatly himself and his kin, but they did not remain paupers. ʿUmar seems also to have favored recognition of non-Arabic as well as Arabic Muslims, scarcely, however, in very great numbers. Acting in the open, though his power was jealously watched by many companions, his dominant personality disposed of affairs pretty much as he pleased, with none except accidental written record kept of his decisions. There is no evidence of any formal state archive whatsoever. What he had enacted had presently to be determined by oral testimony more often than by reference to writing. In the state finances expense accounts were not closely watched. The times were far too lusty for such squeamishness. In general, ʿUmar's principle seems to have been not indeed to pile up unpayable debt, as our world is doing, but to spend pretty much all that came in from year to year. Religiously, heaven was more important than the hither world anyway, and he expected this world to come to an end pretty soon in any case. In worldly affairs, though an Arab townsman, he was neither merchant nor banker, but in his hard-bitten improvidence much nearer the beduin nomad than any cityman or farmer outside of Arabia. Characteristic—and timely for America today—is the doubt of the old merchant-prince of Mecca, Abū Sufyān, as to the wisdom of so much public spending; it would lead people to eat off the state pay roll and to neglect business (Bilādhurī, 457; Murgotten, 251). It is only natural that ʿUmar could not see, what the shrewd banker Abū Sufyān sensed, that he was ruining the morale of his people, that he was playing *après nous le déluge*, that he was sowing the seeds of revolution.

ʿUmar's "system" worked fairly well in Medinah, where a constant flow of new riches and his own strong personality held things together, and in Syria, where a very able administrator, Muʿāwiyah, the son of Abū Sufyān, learned early how to manage his men and affairs; not quite so well in Egypt,

whose astute governor, ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, was neither as loyal to the common weal nor as able in administration as Muʿāwiyah; not nearly so well over the wide stretches of the Persian Empire, which was going completely to pieces. It is not altogether an accident that ʿUmar's death by assassination, whatever interpretation be put upon it, is traceable in the last analysis to that region and its loose and unsatisfactory administration.

The full brunt of the results of ʿUmar's gravest error fell presently upon his successor, the kindly but weak ʿUthmān. Though he is presently accused of innovations and though he himself was of the great merchant and banking family of the Umayyads and employed as his general manager, in all but name his prime minister, the very able Marwān, son of al-Ḥakam, of the same redoubtable clan, his known and recognizable attempts at improvement of ʿUmar's financial management are neither many nor sufficiently thorough to outweigh the weakness of his vacillating personality. His chief innovation seems to be that under him we hear for the first time of a man other than the caliph himself being put in charge of the central state treasury, the *bait al-māl*, at Medinah. It seemed a good thing, and the choice seemed a noble and excellent one, ʿAbdallāh ibn Arḳam, who had, like ʿUthmān himself, been a secretary to the prophet (Jahshiyārī, 12; Ṭab. II, 836) and twice had acted for ʿUmar as night watchman over the state fifth of booty, too large for any house in Medinah to contain, until it could be divided next morning among the Medinensians (Ṭab., I, 2466, 2630). He is listed also as secretary to Abū Bakr and to ʿUmar (Jahsh. 14; Ṭab., II, 836). But when ʿUthmān appointed him to the more responsible position (Jahsh. 19), the appointment turned into a great disappointment for ʿUthmān (Bilādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 58 f., 88). When ʿUthmān for an unnamed purpose withdrew or borrowed a considerable sum from the state treasury, this treasurer drew up against him a title deed or mortgage in favor of the Muslims and had it witnessed by the pillars of Islam. Much to his disappointment ʿUthmān repaid it in due time, as Abū Bakr and ʿUmar had not done in similar cases. Later, when ʿUthmān wished to withdraw a larger sum to equip a body of men for a campaign and wanted to give simple vouchers for the sum withdrawn, this treasurer of the Muslims, not of ʿUthmān, refused to issue the money, unless it be charged against ʿUthmān, as he had done before. ʿUthmān naturally refused, and the noble treasurer demonstratively resigned his post. With the conquest of new rich lands and the consequent flow of booty slowing down, while the emigration of Arabs into the newly won fertile lands and their newly founded, ill-organized cities increased, the methods introduced by ʿUmar led inevitably, as Abū Sufyān had foreseen, to rioting and revolt of the state-paid unemployed (Bilādhurī, *Ansāb*, V, 44), and this revolution, fomented by the pillars of Islam, issued in the foul murder of ʿUthmān.

It is curious that for this troubled time in the one province, where order reigned and no troubles to speak of arose, while the Muslim world round about was seething, in Syria, our major sources—in fact, all the sources known to

this writer—mention neither *diwān* nor secretary of *diwān* or *kharāj*, while such men are named for ʿUmar in Baṣrah and Kūfah, and for ʿUṭhmān both there and in Medinah.² Thus the very probable initiation of a major innovation and improvement in the financial administration of the early Muslim empire very nearly escapes us. True, very much of the credit for this must go to Muʿāwiyah. He could confidently tell ʿUṭhmān to make all the changes and improvements he wanted to elsewhere; he would take proper care of Syria for the caliph. The chief reason for Muʿāwiyah's confidence was the peaceful and prosperous order of Syria's finances, and for that Muʿāwiyah cannot be given the sole, perhaps not the major, credit. Here for the first time Greek-Christian influence comes prominently to the fore. The name of the man is Sarjūn (*Theophanes*, ed. De Boor, p. 365, who knows of him only later, under ʿAbdalmalik, calls him Sergios), son of Maṣṣūr, whom Hishām son of the Kalbite with ʿAwānah designate in Ṭabarī (II, 239) as the freedman (*maulā*) of Muʿāwiyah, and an older no less good authority (*ibid.* 228) even as a freedman of Yazīd. Many sources know that he was at the head of the tax bureau in Syria during the caliphates of Muʿāwiyah I, Yazīd I, Muʿāwiyah II, Marwān I, and well into the times of ʿAbdalmalik. It is nowhere definitely stated that Muʿāwiyah employed him in this capacity, before he arrived at the caliphate. Yet that is in itself so probable as to be practically certain, and Ṭabarī, on excellent authority, expresses himself in such fashion, that we may without violence to the text (II, 205) read: "When Muʿāwiyah was acclaimed, he appointed [so and so to such a position], while his secretary and his associate in the administration (*ṣāhibu amrihi*) was Sarjūn ibn Maṣṣūr, the Rūmī." That he was close to Muʿāwiyah and stood high in his counsels, as well as in those of his son Yazīd, is further attested by both versions of the story found in the pages cited above, whichever may be nearer to actual facts. It is in all probability Muʿāwiyah, therefore, who first appoints to a position in complete charge of tax affairs (and according to Baghdādī, as quoted by Björkman, who does not list him under Muʿāwiyah I, p. 57, also of landed estates) a non-Muslim expert, in Syria naturally a Greek (Rūmī) Christian. How good this improvement of procedure was, and how excellent Muʿāwiyah's choice of the right man, becomes clear when we stop for a moment to make clear the length of his service. Bilādḥurī in his *Futūḥ* (193; Hitti, 301)³ names as the date for the replacement of the man and his method the year 81 = 700, the fifteenth year of ʿAbdalmalik's reign. A conservative guess for the year of his installation by Muʿāwiyah would be the year 30 = 650/51. Few rulers in the world's history made as many good appointments as did Muʿāwiyah; none made a better than this one.

² Björkman (pp. 56 f.) shows his lack of judgment by preferring for some of their names the unreliable *ʿIkā* to Ṭabarī and Jahshiyārī.

³ Here, as everywhere else, Hitti's translation stands in need of correction. "Ere the year came to an end, he had finished his translation and laid it before ʿAbdalmalik. (The latter) then called in his secretary, Sarjūn, and apprised him of the accomplished act." *Waṣīfah* is not "the total tax" but the annual assessment.

‘Alī, during his reign (if so it may be called) of five years, contributed nothing but confusion to the financial affairs of the empire, though attempts are made by ardent partisans (Shiites) to credit him with the origin of all good things, including the foundations of Arabic grammar. He was and needs had to be satisfactory to his Kūfan friends; that is sufficient condemnation of his course. That his lazy and much-wived son Ḥasan, in the few months of his nominal rule, accomplished less than nothing is self-evident.

One of the very few good appointments made by ‘Alī was the placing in charge of the taxes (*kharāj*) and the pay roll (*dīwān*) of Baṣrah young Ziyād, “son of his father” (Jahshiyārī, 20 f.; Björkman does not list this appointment at all). Who his father really was, was not decided until later. Still a boy with curls he had come to young Baṣrah very early, in 635 or 636, with a group of questionable characters from the slums of Ṭāʾif (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams*, p. 106, n. 4). In spite of cleverness and ability far beyond the ordinary, he was for his times and circumstances honest and loyal to a fault. He began early to earn his pennies daily by his ability to write and count. Like other Arabs in early Baṣrah, as witness Bilādhurī (*Ansāb*, IV B, ed. Schloessinger [Jerusalem, 1938], 78) and others cited by Nöldeke (*Iran. Nationalepos* [2d ed.], p. 91, n. 2), indeed, like his elder and patron, Muḡhīrah ibn Shuʿbah (Ṭab., I, 2560), he undoubtedly picked up a smattering of Persian. He came early into favorable notice with ‘Umar in connection with Muḡhīrah ibn Shuʿbah’s unsavory affairs in Baṣrah (*Agh.*, XIV, 145 ff.; Ibn Khallikān, *Būlak* 1275, II, 442 ff.; Wellhausen, *Proleg.*, pp. 106 f., and the sources there cited). According to Jahshiyārī’s story, he seems not to have had a very good conscience and tried to remain in hiding when ‘Alī came to Baṣrah after the Battle of the Camel. It is to ‘Alī’s credit that he overlooked Ziyād’s peculations and other peccadilloes and appointed him to so responsible a post. His confidence in this instance was not misplaced. From Baṣrah, Ziyād went for ‘Alī to Fārs-Persis and Kirmān and, without using force, pacified and brought into line the people of those regions, who had gone out on a tax strike, so well that the people themselves compared the management of this Arab with that of Kisrā Anūshirwān (Ṭab., I, 3448 f.). Thence, after ‘Alī’s death and the abdication of Ḥasan, he made his peace with Muʿāwiyah, who presently made him governor of Baṣrah, and after Muḡhīrah’s death of all of ʿIrāq and its dependencies as far as Khurasān and India. In this position he died before his master Muʿāwiyah. In connection with his personal career, it may here be observed, on the one hand, that his success in Persia goes far to confirm the supposition that he, like Muḡhīrah, knew Persian better than most Arabs. On the other hand, Yazīd’s judgment of this career illustrates an important feature of the mind of the early Arabs, as Jahshiyārī (24 = 12b) reports it: “We raised you from the Thāḡifite slums to Ḳuraish, from sonship to (an unknown) ‘Ubaid to that of Abū Sufyān, from the pen to the speaker’s rostrum,” i.e., to a governor’s chair, which was a princely throne. Scribal cleverness did not rank high in the eyes of the Arabs

when they were a conquering caste. More than one refused a merely administrative post and preferred the life of a warrior.

It took a man like Ziyād to find, to evaluate properly, and to place into a fitting administrative position another non-Arab to rival Mu'āwiyah's Sarjūn. Mu'āwiyah, after his rather peaceful occupation rather than conquest of ʿIrāk following the death of ʿAlī, had his troubles in the management of it, especially in getting from it for his treasury the income which he considered proper. He could not very well spare in difficult Kūfah the crafty old Mughīrah ibn Shuḥbah, and he had to give to the old gentleman, as to ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀs in Egypt, fairly free reign, even though he knew that he was being done in in more ways than one. A fairly credible story, told in slightly different form by Yaʿqūbī (ed. Houtsma, II, 258 f.) and by Jahshiyārī (21 = 11a), has Mu'āwiyah placing in charge of the tax income of Kūfah during Mughīrah's governorship one of a pair of able brothers, sons of Darrāj, freedmen (*mawālī*) of his own. Yaʿqūbī calls him ʿAbdallāh, as does Bilādhurī (*Ansāb*, IV B, 123, l. 18), while Jahshiyārī writes ʿUbaidallah, a very common variant. Ṭabarī (II, 837) knows only the other, probably elder, brother, ʿAbdalrahmān, as secretary, apparently, to the great Sarjūn. The Kūfan brother, with a wisdom derived from Mu'āwiyah's practice in Syria, makes inquiries from the local authorities who had handled such matters in Persian times, the *dihkāns*. Thereby he discovers a number of things which presently make the tax income of Kūfah and Baṣrah and their dependencies both easier to collect and of a size which makes it of considerable use to Mu'āwiyah. The old custom whereby on New Year's and Mihrjān festival days the people bring "presents" to government house is revived; these "presents" are probably the regularly assessed taxes, the dates named are the regular terms at which people were accustomed to pay their taxes in Sassanian times—dates on which the taxpayers were more likely to be in funds and because of holiday mood readier to pay. Jahshiyārī names as income thence derived in Kūfah annually 1,000,000 dirhams. Yaʿqūbī the Shiite goes on in the spirit of accusation to charge Mu'āwiyah's government with bad innovations in the good young Muslim community. The *dihkāns*, evidently intent upon shifting as much of the tax load as possible from their own shoulders, tell Ibn Darrāj of the Sassanian crown lands, from which the Sassanian kings derived their major income, much more than the income from taxes on private property. The *diwān*, i.e., the office with its lists and books, of these crown lands was left at Hulwān, when Yazdagerd fled eastward. These things are found, and presently by these means Mu'āwiyah's income from Kūfah and the fertile land connected with its administration rises to 50,000,000 dirhams annually. Similar procedure in Baṣrah, inaugurated by a brother's son of Ziyād, the docile and pious, but not very clever, Abdalrahmān, son of Abū Bakrah, brings the income from there up to 10,000,000. Having charged all this, in our eyes not so great an offense as in his, up to Mu'āwiyah and his minions before the appointment of Ziyād, Yaʿqūbī has to find new accusations against Ziyād.

Without naming names, Ya'qūbī (279) accuses Ziyād of being the first to organize the *diwāns*, of having copies made, appointing secretaries for the official correspondence from among the Arabs and Mawālī who knew Arabic well, of saying that the secretaries for the tax (bureau) (*kharāj*) must be taken from the leading Persians who knew the affairs of the *kharāj*, and finally of establishing fixed salaries. In general, it is odd how little is reported by our Arabic authorities for the time of Ziyād about the great Persian, whom he discovered and made general manager of his tax office. At this point Jahshiyārī barely makes mention of him (22=11*b*, last line): "Secretary to Ziyād for the taxes was Zādhānfarrūkh." Al-Šūlī in his *Discipline of the Secretaries* (ed. Cairo, 1341=1922/3), 192, lines 9 f., writes, in so far as a poorly edited text permits exact translation: "The first to whom both 'Irāks were turned over together was Ziyād, and he employed as his secretary for them (the tax bureau) Zādhānfarrūkh the One-eyed. He (Zādhānfarrūkh) remained (in this position) to this time (the time of al-Ḥajjāj)." Ahmad ibn Shādhān, in the unique manuscript of his *Book of the Discipline of the Viziers* at Leiden, as quoted by Enger in his *Maverdīi constitutiones politicae* (Bonn, 1853), pages 46 ff., says: "The first to hold the governorship of both 'Irāks together (Baṣrah and Kūfah) was Ziyād, son of Abū Sufyān, . . . and his secretary for *kharāj* was Zādhānfarrūkh the One-eyed, nor did the tax bureau (*diwān*) cease to be in Persian until the time of al-Ḥajjāj, his secretary for it being Zādhānfarrūkh" (De Goeje, quoting the same passage in Bilādhurī, *Futūḥ*, 36, omits a part of this important statement). It seems almost as though Ibn Shādhān did not recognize the identity of Zādhānfarrūkh the One-eyed under Ziyād and the Zādhānfarrūkh of Ḥajjāj. They are, of course, one and the same man, as Šūlī clearly states.

Though our sources treat him in the time of Ziyād as casually as they treat Sarjūn with Mu'āwiyah, they know him and his family pretty well for some generations forward and backward and furnish us with really reliable information quite different from that of the romancing Hishām ibn al-Kalbī, whom Herzfeld trusts so implicitly, and to whose romance Herzfeld adds a further touch, when in *AMI*, IX, 95, note 1, he supposes him to be the grandson of that Zādhānfarrūkh who was commander of the bodyguard of Chosroes II. There were other Zādhānfarrūkhs, and in the well-known names of our great tax-office Zādhānfarrūkh's family there is no evidence whatever that they followed the custom of giving to a grandson the name of his grandfather. Quite the contrary!

The name of Zādhānfarrūkh's father is known to the writer as transmitted in a number of Arabic texts. In order that any competent reader may check any statement here made, the references at my disposal are listed as follows: Bilādhurī, *Futūḥ*, ed. De Goeje, 300, line 11; 393, line 15; *Ansāb*, ed. Ahlwardt, 343 and 352; al-Nadīm's *Fihrist*, 242. The Arabic writing permits of various readings. It is not necessary to list all the very improbable and impossible readings. The Arabic consonants may be read: *Byry-Pyry*, *Tyry*, or

Nyry. Herzfeld (*AMI*, *loc. cit.*) adds, naming no authority, *Myry*, a most improbable original guess. De Goeje reads in one place *Bīrī* (misread by Hitti *Yabrā*, the one wholly impossible reading!) and in the other *Nīrī*. Flügel or Müller in the *Fihrist* read *Pīrī*. Ahlwardt has the impossible *Tīzī*. Murgotten, not quite as bad as Hitti, reads De Goeje's *Nīrī* as *Nīra*. Murgotten with Hitti, probably influenced by the latter, is as wrong as can be in the ending. The ending, at least, is perfectly transparent and has been well known for at least fifty years. In 1888 Nöldeke in his *Persische Studien* (*SBAW*, Wien, Phil.-hist. Class., Vol. CXVI, No. 1), page 393, showed clearly, once and for all, that the ending *-y* on Persian names written in Arabic was a very old, perhaps the oldest, Arabic attempt to express the Persian hypocoristic, pet, or short-name ending *-ōi* or *-ōē*, corresponding, say, to our *-y* in Freddy, Eddy, etc. For the first part of the name we need consider only three real possibilities: *Pyr*, *Tyr*, and *Nyr*. Of these on general grounds the preponderance of probability, as by far the most frequent in occurrence in early Arabic times, leans heavily toward the first, *Pyr*, i.e., *Payr-* (*ay* as in English *ay* or *ayah*). This preponderance is given considerable added weight by the following considerations. *Zādhānfarrūkh* himself, as will presently be developed, is an outstanding figure in the early organization of Arabic tax administration in the eastern half of their empire. For three generations after him we know members of his family who remained in this branch of the government service down into Abbasid times, though no longer in such dominant role as *Zādhānfarrūkh*. It is important to remember, also, that the man who discovered *Zādhānfarrūkh* and first appointed and employed him was the great viceroy Ziyād. Now the only Persian previous to him interested in the financial management of the Arabic empire, as was shown above, was Payruzān or Payrōazh, who on pretty good authority was said to have suggested and helped to organize ʿUmar's pay roll—*diwān*. To accomplish this, Payrōazh (or Payruzān) need not have had personal contact with ʿUmar. He had fought and made his peace in the very early years, as early as the year 14 or 15 A.H. = A.D. 635 or 636, with one of the shrewdest Arabs of his time, Mughīrah, son of Shuʿbah (Bilādhurī, *Futūḥ*, 376, ll. 16–18), patron and friend of Ziyād. Now the biography of Mughīrah in *Aghānī*, in the part published by Wellhausen, *ZDMG*, Volume L (1896), clearly states (p. 149, ll. 16 f.) that "he (Mughīrah) was the first to establish the pay roll—*diwān*—in Baṣrah and to arrange the people in it, and he paid them according to the roll." Therewith we have arrived at the very bottom and primeval origin of ʿUmar's great institution, the *diwān*. It was Mughīrah, probably even then with the help of the spoils-apportioning boy Ziyād, who learned from Payrōazh-Pairuzān the tricks of bookkeeping. He paid the people by the book and so avoided complaints and rows, while he safely and quietly lined his own pockets. Mysterious government bookkeeping was not invented yesterday, though indeed in it, as in so many other things, we have made great progress and reached in our own day the very acme of perfection. All that ʿUmar did was to take it over and, truly

great administrator that he was, put a little more honesty into and behind the system. Now therewith, also, we have arrived at a far more probable guess at the true personality and name of Zādhānfarrūkh's father than is Herzfeld's grandfather Zādhānfarrūkh. Payrōē, Zādhānfarrūkh's father, is a short nickname form of this very Payrōazh or Payruzān. If the name is Payrōazh, we can go no farther. If the name is Payruzān, that may also, according to Justi's *Namenbuch*, be a name in itself, with which we come to a stop. More probably, like *-sen* or *-son* in Scandinavian, *-ski* or *-vich* in Slavic, the ending *-ān* constitutes a sort of impermanent family name or patronymic, as in Pāpakān, Hurmuzān, etc. In that case Payruzān would mean Payruzson; we would not know the proper name of Zādhānfarrūkh's father, only his patronymic, but we would know the name of his grandfather, Payrūz.

However that may be, with Payrōē's son Zādhānfarrūkh the One-eyed we are in the thick of the tax history of the early Arab Empire in 'Irāk, and we have before us a personality and circumstances which in no way harmonize and in every possible way disagree with Herzfeld's and Hishām ibn al-Kalbī's translator for al-Ḥajjāj of a Persian princess' Baedeker for the year 705, after the poor thing was taken prisoner and her luggage rifled by Kūtaibah ibn Muslim on his mythical conquest of Kāshghar.

In July or August of the year 45 = 665 Ziyād, now some forty years old and officially declared the son of Abū Sufyān, came back after a few years' absence to his home town of Baṣrah as its governor-general, including in his rule all its farflung eastern dependencies. In that same town was the home of Zādhānfarrūkh and his family, though Herzfeld (*AMI*, *loc. cit.*) says—on what authority we know not—that he was from Kaskar, as we might say that Ziyād was from Ṭā' if. How old Zādhānfarrūkh was at that time history sayeth not; he will hardly have been more than ten years younger than Ziyād, say, in his thirties. The connection between the family of Ziyād and this Persian family was close and enduring and may date back to the early days of Baṣrah. When Ziyād took Zādhānfarrūkh into his official family we do not know, but it is not easy to believe that it can have been long after his arrival. Of his story in Ziyād's time very little is said, but that means, as in the case of Mu'āwiyah and Sarjūn, that everything was harmonious and worked smoothly. One episode, which earned Zādhānfarrūkh the deep and lasting gratitude of the entire Ziyād family, can perhaps be placed before Ziyād's death. As told in *Jahshiyārī* (104 = 52b, ll. 4–9) the story makes Zādhānfarrūkh the secretary of 'Abd (to be read 'Ubaid) Allāh, son of Ziyād. Zādhānfarrūkh is then described as a man of prodigious memory, and his influence over 'Ubaidallāh is explained by the fact that the family of Ziyād remembered how a fire occurred in the tax office of Baṣrah, burning it completely to the ground, while there were in Baṣrah at that time eighty thousand able-bodied men with their families. Zādhānfarrūkh wrote them all down by rote without error, except that one lone woman was forgotten.

If this event may at least have occurred during the lifetime of Ziyād, who

died in 673, seven years before Mu'āwiyah, another creditable action that is told of him did not. Reference to it occurs in various places in the course of a conversation between 'Ubadallāh and a companion, when the former after the death of Mu'āwiyah's son Yazīd in mid-November, 683, fled from rebellious Baṣrah to Syria, probably early in 684. The event described, however, took place before Mu'āwiyah's death in 680, in all probability soon after Ziyād's death, shortly after Mu'āwiyah had appointed 'Ubadallāh to succeed his father in the governorship of Baṣrah. The story is found in Bilādihūrī's *Ansāb*, IV B, 109; Ṭabarī, II, 458; Ibn el-Aṭhīr, ed. Tornberg, IV, 116 (Tornberg's text is defective but easy to correct). 'Ubadallāh, riding along on a donkey, is silent for so long that his companion thinks him asleep. On inquiry he finds him merely thoughtful and then offers to guess his thoughts. The guess produces the usual Shiite allegations of misdemeanors in office, which 'Ubadallāh is now supposed to regret. But 'Ubadallāh is no grieving penitent. Instead of regretting that he had employed *dihkāns*, he explains that Zādhānfarrūkh and his honest but somewhat stupid cousin 'Abd al-Rahmān, son of Abū Bakrah, had suggested to Mu'āwiyah that he was not receiving from Baṣrah all the revenue he had a right to expect. Mu'āwiyah then evidently made searching inquiry, and they, which must here mean Zādhānfarrūkh, gave him a full account of all the possible revenue down to the last rice husk and named as the sum 100,000,000 dirham. Mu'āwiyah placed before 'Ubadallāh the choice between deposition and a guaranty of the full amount. He chose the latter course and had to employ the *dihkāns*, both because they understood this business better than the Arabs and because in case of default he could punish them, whereas, if he punished an Arab, he incurred the enmity of his whole tribe.

With this delectable tale the connection of Zādhānfarrūkh with the family of Ziyād, so far as we can trace it, comes to an end, and his star in the tax bureau of the 'Irāk is temporarily eclipsed. During his governorship in the 'Irāk, for five-odd years with a brief interruption, Mu'ab, son of Zubair, to his brother's annoyance much more generous with state moneys than Umayyad governors had been, employs, according to Jahshiyārī (40 = 20b), a Persian of his own, Sārzād, Lord of Bādhīn (perhaps Bādhābīn [Yākūt, *Buldān*, I, 461]), probably a man more to his lordly taste, nor does Zādhānfarrūkh appear again in dated record until al-Ḥajjāj comes to the 'Irāk in 694. Perhaps it was in these ten years of leisure from official duties that he had the canal named after him dug on Muhallabid property in Baṣrah, of which we are told in Bilādihūrī's *Futūḥ* (367).

With the coming of the Marwānids to Syria and the 'Irāk, in the latter case more particularly with the coming to 'Irāk of al-Ḥajjāj, far greater changes in administrative attitude and methods set in than have yet been noticed even by the keen eyes of Wellhausen. Some of these must be reserved for development later. Here the story of Zādhānfarrūkh and his family must be completed. Very soon after his arrival al-Ḥajjāj must have called Zādhānfarrūkh

from his retirement. For a few years, at least, he must have held in his old age, say at seventy more or less, under al-Ḥajjāj a position in which he enjoyed nearly as much favor and wielded influence at least as great as in his younger years under Ziyād from 665 to 673 and with Ziyād's son ʿUбайдallah from 673 to 683/84. The conversation between him and al-Ḥajjāj, as reported in the Introduction to Yāqūt's *Buldān* (I, 52 f.), is a type story and in part mythical. The not unfamiliar, though respectful, footing upon which Zādhān-farrūkh meets al-Ḥajjāj is borne out by other tales. That al-Ḥajjāj should have sought information on the people he was sent to govern from this canny and experienced old master of his treasury is perfectly natural. Such information constituted an important part of the education, training, and qualifications of secretaries and other officials in the tax bureaus. When the hot-tempered viceroy feels offended in person and flares up at an uncompromising characterization of the people of Ḥijāz, the old gentleman cools off his wrath with the calm response: "God bless you! You are not of them, a Ḥijāzian; you are a man of the people of Syria." This is a judgment of considerable importance. There are indications that this conversation is thought of as having taken place in Kūfah. That Zādhān-farrūkh knew Kūfah as well as Baṣrah is further proven by the fact that he is quoted in Yāqūt's *Buldān* (IV, 325) as one of two major authorities on the area covered by the cathedral mosque of Kūfah. In 78 = 697, toward the end of his tenure of the treasurer-generalship of the ʿIrāk, and of the period of his greatest influence, we learn from Ṭabarī (II, 1034) that al-Muhallab, appointed by al-Ḥajjāj as his governor over Sajistān, wishes to be transferred to Khurasān. Muhallab gets Ḥajjāj's chief of police to talk to his master, and to prevail on Zādhān-farrūkh likewise, to induce Ḥajjāj to switch the appointments to these two provinces. This is done, Zādhān-farrūkh seconding the chief of police and showing the hesitant Ḥajjāj how easy it was to change the diplomas of investiture, which had already been made out in the opposite sense. It is well to note that such acts of investiture and the writing of such diplomas belonged, according to Māwardī (ed. Enger, 349 and 360-66; Fagnan's translation, 438 and 450-58), to the department of the general treasury and that Zādhān-farrūkh, though a Persian and proud of it, was perfectly capable of writing such a diploma in Arabic and of supervising its correction.

Shortly after this episode there is good reason to believe that Zādhān-farrūkh was demoted from his high estate, though neither he nor his family nor Persians in general were wholly removed from the tax bureaus. The story of this must be told later with the rise of his great successor. Here we must finish his own tale and that of his family after him. We find him next in Baṣrah, probably in charge of the tax office there, and very near his end. The last bit of advice he gave to Ḥajjāj and his death, though reported separately, are in fact closely related to each other, and both are closely connected with the dangerous revolt of Ḥajjāj's governor of Sajistān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, son of Muḥammad ibn al-Ashʿath, and his "peacock army." When in 81 = 700/701

Ibn al-Ash^cath and his army of Kūfan and Basrensian fighting men decided to submit no longer to the imperious orders of Ḥajjāj, they set out to march home to depose him and presently also his overlord, ʿAbdalmalik, with him. On this occasion Ṭabarī (II, 1059) has Muhallab from far-off Khurasān send to Ḥajjāj the wise counsel (against fellow-Arabs, proud tribesmen and tribal chiefs like himself!) to let them get unopposed to their homes, their wives, and children, where they would disperse and their ardor would cool. Whether or not this corresponds to facts, far more likely is the story of Bilādhurī (*Ansāb*, ed. Ahlwardt, 343), that, as the rebels were approaching Baṣrah after defeating for the first time the army led against them by Ḥajjāj, the canny old “Zādhānfarrūkh, the Magian” (i.e., the Zoroastrian), gave this advice. Though not probable, it is possible that both stories contain an element of truth. However that may be, somewhere during the time that Ibn al-Ash^cath’s men made the streets of Baṣrah unsafe for opponents, between the latter part of January and the latter part of September, A.D. 701, Zādhānfarrūkh was killed. The evidence is unequivocal and convincing. Bilādhurī mentions it in passing in his *Futūḥ* (300, with a slight fault in a chronological statement) and more explicitly and correctly in the *Ansāb* (ed. Ahlwardt, 352). On the approach of Ibn al-Ash^cath he had hidden in Baṣrah and then ventured forth to slip from one house to another. One of Ibn al-Ash^cath’s men espied him and killed him on the spot. Then and thus died Zādhānfarrūkh, whom the well-informed Jāḥiẓ rated as the *non plus ultra* of tax administrators (*Bayān* [ed. Cairo, 1332], I, 182). He may have been ugly and one-eyed, a proud Persian and a stout Zoroastrian throughout his long life, but he was conscientious enough to favor neither loose-fingered young governors like ʿUbaidallāh, son of Ziyād, nor his own countrymen and fellow-nobles, the *dihkāns*, as the amusing tale told by both Jāḥiẓ (*Bayān*, III, 17) and Jahshiyārī (34/35 = 17b-18a) shows.

In his place for the lesser position which Zādhānfarrūkh had held to the time of his death, as head of the taxoffice in Baṣrah, Ḥajjāj appointed his son Mardānshāh, as the priceless Bilādhurī clearly states in the *Ansāb* (ed. Ahlwardt, 352). Of this son more will have to be said in the story of Zādhānfarrūkh’s greatest successor. Here it must suffice to point out that, apart from other things, his name as well as that of his son and grandson, conspicuously pure Persian, not Arabicized or Islamicized, indicate persistent adhesion to Zoroastrian religion and patriotically Persian, anti-Arabic feeling and attitude, an early example and form of *Shuʿūbiyah* outside the fold of Islam. In spite of this pronounced and conspicuous attitude, these men all remained in the Moslem Arabic tax service. Of the son we know, indeed, only the name—Bahrām. But where Jahshiyārī records this important series of names (104 = 52b), he tells us that the son of Bahrām, Māghushnasp, was secretary for the taxes (*kharāj*) to Sulaimān, son of Ḥabīb, in the days of Marwān II (A.D. 744-50). This is not the Sulaimān ibn Ḥabīb who was chief *kāḍī* of Damascus from the time of Walid I (A.D. 713/14, Ṭab. II, 1266) to the time of Hishām, when, according to a note in the Index of Yāqūt’s *Buldān* (458; cf. Ṭab., II,

1871; Abū al-Maḥāṣin ibn Taghribardī, ed. Juynboll and Matthes, I, 332), he died in 126 A.H. = A.D. 743/44. It is his namesake Sulaimān ibn Ḥabīb *ibn al-Muḥallab*. This descendant of a grand old ruling family we find in Jahshiyārī (103) and in Ṭabarī (II, 1946-78) as governor of the districts of Ahwāz for Marwān II. In this capacity he arrested the Abbasid Abū Jaʿfar, who later became the caliph al-Manṣūr, and tried to take from him a large sum of money with which he was making off, luckily for Abū Jaʿfar, in the form of a check. Despite this *faux pas* we learn from Aghānī (VII, 7, ll. 13-23) that by the intercession of the great poet al-Sayyid al-Himyārī he was not only pardoned by Abū Jaʿfar's elder brother al-Saffāḥ but in addition thereto installed once more in the governorship of Ahwāz.

It is altogether probable that he carried with him into this new tenure of office his tax secretary Māhgushnasp, son of Bahrām, son of Mardānshāh, son of Zādhānfarrūkh the One-eyed, secretary of ʿUbadallah, son of Ziyād. This is, so far as yet known, the last occurrence of this great dynasty of tax officials in the early centuries of the Moslem empire.

Herzfeld (*AMI*, IX, No. 2, 94 f.) says: "Zādhānfarrūkh of Kaskar translated it (the princess's Baedeker) for him (Ḥajjāj), known as a financial official, who in 697 translated into Arabic for ʿAbdalmalik the Sassanian tax lists and was still in office under Walid and Sulaiman."

It is, therefore, necessary to proceed now to the story of the great general transfer of the official tax books from Persian, Greek, Coptic, and perhaps Soghdian into Arabic. We meet there with a great, lone figure, whom Herzfeld apparently does not know at all, whom Björkman knows only superficially and erroneously, to whom Hitti devotes not a single word and *EI* no special article. His full name is Abū al-Walid Ṣāliḥ, son of ʿAbdalraḥmān, a typical name for a *mawla* (freed captive) converted to Islam and arrived at high or at least honorable station. This man's history is an open book and is known in considerable detail from beginning to end.

The story begins in Sajistān, the region in which modern Iran, Afghanistan, and Baluchistan meet; hence our man is designated by Bilādhurī (*Futūḥ*, 348) as a Sajistanite. Chiefly from the excellent Madāʾinī, Bilādhurī in the *Futūḥ* (392 ff.) relates how in the year 30 A.H. = A.D. 650/51 ʿAbdallah ibn ʿĀmir, ʿUthmān's able, though much-maligned, governor of Baṣrah, detached from the main army, with which he was marching against Khurasān, a considerable force under the able captain Rabiʿ, son of Ziyād the Ḥārithite, who had served under Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī and later again did excellent service in Khurasān for Ziyād ibn Abīhi until the day when he died there in 53 A.H. = A.D. 673 (Ṭab., I, 2709-13; II, 81 and 155-61). During raids upon smaller towns in the immediate vicinity of the capital city, Zaranj, "he took captive in the town of Nāshrūdī ʿAbdalraḥmān, the father of Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbdalraḥmān (who became the secretary of al-Ḥajjāj in place of Zādhānfarrūkh, son of Pairōē, and administered the taxes of ʿIrāq for Sulaimān, son of ʿAbdalmalik), and his mother. He was bought (naturally in Baṣrah upon delivery of the

captives there) by a woman of the Banī Tamīm—more particularly of the Banī Murrah ibn ʿUbaid ibn Muḳāʿis ibn ʿAmr ibn Kaʿb ibn Saʿd ibn Zaid Manāt ibn Tamīm—whose name was ʿAblah.” Thence Rabīʿ proceeded to the town of Sharwādh and there took captive the grandfather of Ibrahīm ibn Bassām, who became the property of ʿAbdallah, son of ʿUmar the Laithite. This excellent report is given in detail because it corrects more or less serious errors appearing in later authors more remote from the scene. The rather shiftless Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi in the *ʿIkḍ*, written some fifty years later in Spain, in his second and in general more correct account of the conversion of the tax records into Arabic (ed. Būlāḳ, 1293 = 1876, II, 317, completely overlooked by Ḳalkaṣhandī and Björkman) names the lady who bought, and then upon their conversion to Islam freed, the parents of Ṣāliḥ, ʿUtbah; this is pretty certainly a copyist’s, perhaps even a printer’s error, though it is by no means impossible that the generally inexact Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi, whose errors have misled Björkman a number of times, was himself the erring copyist. More surprising and misleading is a glaring error by the usually careful and judicious Yāḳūt. He tells what is evidently the same tale as that found in Bilādhuri twice over in abbreviated form with slight variation between the two. The text seems to be assured, Wüstenfeld reporting no variants for the important words in either case. Under Sharwādh (*Buldān*, III, 282) Yāḳūt says that among the captives taken there was “the father of Ṣāliḥ, ʿAbdalaḥmān, the grandfather of Bassām.” In the article on Nāshrūdh (IV, 728) he includes once more Sharwādh and names “the father of Ṣāliḥ, ʿAbdalaḥmān, and the grandfather of Bassām,” which might be correctly interpreted were it not followed by “and he sent him to Ibn ʿĀmir.” This statement is important because it shows that the captives were transported to Baṣrah and sold there. But it shows, also, that here, too, Yāḳūt considers the father of Ṣāliḥ and grandfather of Bassām to be the same person.

It is of considerable importance that this error be corrected from Bilādhuri. The two have nothing to do with each other, except that the two families came originally from neighboring towns in Sajistān. The Bassām family produced a number of notable secretaries in early Abbasid times. In the case of Ṣāliḥ the one chance in a thousand happened, and an oriental curse came true. According to Jahshiyārī (62 = 31b, ll. 10 f.), he had a son, favored by him though apparently worthless; that son seems to have perished with or before him, and in the sources at hand no other descendants of his are found.

Throughout his life he was a lonely and in many cases a pitiable figure. The date, even approximately the year, of his birth is not known. Of his parentage and upbringing it is surprising that we know so much. His father’s name, Abdalaḥman, is, of course, that which he adopted or which was given him when he accepted Islam and became a freedman. The original name of so obscure a captive slave in Baṣrah is, naturally, not preserved. His son’s fame is all that rescues him from oblivion. Of the mother we know no name or family connection, only that she, too, was of the captives of Nāshrūdh. That

is very much and speaks volumes for the respect in which Ṣāliḥ was held by his contemporaries and for some centuries, especially in secretarial circles, thereafter.

His appearance in history's spotlight is a story of sufficient importance to be retold, with slight retouching, a remarkable number of times. In the sources at hand it appears first in Bilādhurī's *Futūḥ*, 300 f. The volume of the *Ansāb* in which it must occur has not yet appeared. Then we find it in Jahshiyārī, 33-35=17a-18a. The latter part of the tale as there told is found also in Jāḥiẓ, *Bayān* (ed. Cairo), III, 17; it is probable that the first part is likewise told somewhere by Jāḥiẓ, which would make him the earliest source, though our eyes have not fallen upon it. Ṭabarī, if he knew it, seems to have chosen not to tell it in his history. Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi knew something of it but garbled what he knew of this, as he did much else. Ṣūli has it in full (192 f.), though the edition leaves much to be desired. Nadīm in the *Fihrist* (242) repeats Bilādhurī with trimmings, perhaps his own, perhaps from the *Ansāb*. Māwardī has it (ed. Enger, 350, cf. 349; tr. Fagnan, 436-38). The version of Aḥmad ibn Jaʿfar ibn Shādhān is printed most fully, though faultily, in Enger's *Mawardi, Adnotationes*, 46-48; a smaller portion, omitting essentials, in De Goeje's Bilādhurī, *Glossarium*, 36 f. Nuwairī presents it in his voluminous *Nihāyat al-Arab* (ed. Cairo), VIII (1347 A.H. = A.D. 1929), 198-200. Ibn Khaldūn in his *Muḥaddamah* (ed. Beirut, 1900, 244) is the last of the Arabic writers at hand to quote the tale and the first to falsify it consciously to suit his meta-physical theory of the "social process." He misleads Björkman by making Ṣāliḥ an Arab and probably helped to mislead Herzfeld by assuming that the more "civilized" Zādhānfarrūkh must have suggested the translation into Arabic (the exact reverse being the case), though Herzfeld's worst error is probably due to a hasty misreading of Bilādhurī's *Futūḥ*, 393. There may be other versions, but these suffice, if we correct Hitti's most glaring errors in his translation of Bilādhurī's *Futūḥ* and his prejudiced attitude in his *History of the Arabs*, to give us a thoroughly acceptable and reliable story of the transfer of the tax and financial administration in the Arabic Moslem Empire from foreign tongues into Arabic.

We now find ourselves in the time of the great Marwānids, ʿAbdalmalik and Walid I, A.D. 685-715, and of the viceroyalty of al-Ḥajjāj in ʿIrāk and the East, A.D. 694-714. One very vital difference between these men and their predecessors, the Sufyānids, has never yet been duly noted, and the general marked difference between them pointed out by Wellhausen has since been very largely neglected. The Sufyānids and their great officials—Muʿāwiyah, ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, Muḥirah, Ziyād—came to these non-Arabic lands when they were relatively or really young in years. Contact so familiarly close as they now had with wholly or very largely non-Arabic peoples was of recent date and had still about it something of naïve freshness. In numbers those who did not speak Arabic at all far outweighed the Arabs. The need for knowledge and abilities which the settled peoples had was great and immediate. Muʿāwiyah

was in Syria in a subordinate position for twenty-five years before he became caliph for twenty more. His children and grandchildren were born there and in their youth played with desert beduin in springtime, but with Greeks and Syrians at court the rest of the year. Small wonder that a grandson of his was interested in Greek science; he probably knew Greek to speak and perhaps to read. Mughīrah clearly knew some Persian, though it may have been neither much nor classical and literary. Ziyād practically grew up in Persian-speaking streets and quarters, and his children, born there, certainly knew enough Persian to get along easily with the *dihkāns*. The first note of biting change in this intercourse is introduced into the ʿIrāq by the stupid and inexperienced Ḥamzah, son of ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Zubair, who cuts down his dilatory *dihkān* Mardānshā (Bilādihurī, *Ansāb*, V, 256f.; Tab., II, 751; Aghānī, III, 123). Now ʿAbdalmalik and al-Ḥajjāj were neither as inexperienced nor as stupidly hasty as this Ḥamzah. But, like him, they were born and reared and had spent by far the greater part of their lives in the Ḥijāz, where Arabs spoke Arabic only and foreigners were few and held at a discount, and where a legalistically critical, theological tone was prevalent. These men spoke Arabic and understood little, if anything, of any other tongue. If al-Ḥajjāj besides his Ḥijāzian rearing had some Syrian training, as Zādhānfarrūkh suggested, that was with Rauḥ ibn Zinbāʿ and the Kalbites, not with the Greek and Syrian officials of the court at Damascus or in provincial tax offices. They all came to their new charges and dignities as mature men approaching old age. As wise and able administrators they naturally took over the important officials of their predecessors, of proven worth and ability, even though some of them were well along in years. Just as naturally their relation to these aged officials was different. The position assigned by Theophanes (De Boor, I, 365; II, 232) to Sergius, son of Maṣṣūr, in ʿAbdalmalik's inner circle, *valde familiaris*, suits better the time of Muʿāwiyah and his son Yazīd. Theophanes for just this time makes other, similar mistakes, as when (I, 363; II, 230) he has ʿAbdalmalik sending "Ziyād the brother of Muʿāwiyah" against Mukhtār, instead of ʿUbaidallāh, the son of Ziyād. Not that these great administrators withheld from their great old servants the honor due them, but they were, after all, far less well acquainted with these men than had been the previous caliphs and viceroys. Being great administrators, they wanted full insight into affairs; knowing nought but Arabic, there was much more explaining in Arabic to do; all their lives in Medinah, Mecca, and Tāʾif they had met, in high places certainly, none but Arab Moslems, even though ʿAbdalmalik's grandfather may never have been converted to Islam. This is the background of the stage, in whose limelight Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbdalrahmān now appears.

He came to the government bureaus of al-Ḥajjāj with Zādhānfarrūkh when that worthy was called from his retirement by the great viceroy. That means that he had received his training as an apprentice and passed his master's examination in Zādhānfarrūkh's school for secretaries, the tax offices at Baṣrah. Hence Ṣūlī calls Ṣāliḥ a Baṣrenian. It is Ṣūlī, also, who tells us the

source of this trustworthy tale, namely, al-Qaḥdhamī or Qūḥdhumī, i.e., Abu ʿAbdalraḥmān al-Walid ibn Hishām (*Samʿānī*, "Gibb Series," Vol. XX, s.v.), who naturally had this from his grandfather Qaḥdham or Qūḥdhum, after whom he is named. This must be remembered when we come to Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi's incredible inaccuracy in giving to Qūḥdhum the credit for Ṣāliḥ's accomplishment. This Qūḥdhum is, as we shall see, an excellent authority, in a position to know just these things, quite different from romancers like al-Haitham ibn ʿAdī and *Hishām* ibn Muḥammad *ibn* al-Sāʿib Abū al-Mundhir al-Kalbī (*Jāhiz*, *Bayān*, I, 182, ll. 2-7). It is he, one of the apprentices and students from Ṣāliḥ's own school for secretaries (*Jahshiyārī*, 34 = 17b), who is now telling us that Zādhānfarrūkh made Ṣāliḥ his private secretary and so brought him into frequent and close contact with al-Ḥajjāj. The young man knew both Persian and Arabic well, the latter undoubtedly better than Zādhānfarrūkh himself and his son Mardānshāh. In Zādhānfarrūkh's house Persian was spoken and Zoroastrian habits and rites were cultivated, which outside of business hours placed a social barrier between him and Moslem Arabs. This was not the case with the fully converted Ṣāliḥ, born and reared in Islam. This fact and Ṣāliḥ's conscientious diligence and frugal habits made of Ṣāliḥ a man after al-Ḥajjāj's own heart. He presently found himself in great favor with al-Ḥajjāj, and, a typical trait, that began to worry his loyal heart. He spoke about it to Zādhānfarrūkh, expressing his fear that al-Ḥajjāj might advance him over Zādhānfarrūkh's head, in fact, put him in the place of his superior, who was bringing him into contact with the viceroy. Zādhānfarrūkh, resting on his laurels, felt very secure and said: "Don't worry! He needs me more than I do him. He will find no one else to keep his accounts satisfactorily." On this, Ṣāliḥ's professional pride rose in him, and he said: "If I wanted to, I could even turn the whole thing into Arabic." A test was made before the master's eyes, and it turned out so satisfactorily that now Zādhānfarrūkh feared for his own job and that of his purely Persian accountants. He asked Ṣāliḥ to feign illness, and to that Ṣāliḥ loyally consented. But the great governor missed him and characteristically sent his personal physician, in the *Fihrist* named Theodorus,^{3a} to examine him. Nothing at all is found to ail him, and he is ordered forthwith to appear.

Very shortly thereafter came the order, which master and disciple were now fearing together. Ḥajjāj determined to put the books into Arabic and charged Ṣāliḥ with the task. The date credibly given by *Jahshiyārī* (33 = 17a) is 78 A.H. = A.D. 697. Bilādḥurī omits the date and inclines to place the event after Zādhānfarrūkh's death in 81/82 A.H. = A.D. 701. This is a mistake due to the fact that Zādhānfarrūkh remains connected with the tax offices of Baṣrah to the day of his death and his son, Mardānshāh, succeeds him there. That is perfectly possible and intelligible. What Ṣāliḥ translated and then began to

^{3a} Elsewhere he is called Tayādhūk (*Fihrist*, 303; Ibn Abī Uṣalbiʿah I, 121 ff., 161, 163; Ibn al-Kiftī, 105, 255, 317). Barhebraeus, ed. Ṣāḥnānī, p. 194, has two physicians of al-Ḥajjāj—Tayādhūk and Thawādūn.

keep in Arabic was the official set of books, the budget and balance sheets, which were placed before al-Ḥajjāj. The provincial and local accounts kept on as before for some time to come. It took time for Ṣāliḥ to train enough willing and able men to take care of these. In the meantime the old trained officials and clerks kept on as before, and Ṣāliḥ and his assistants digested their records in the central bureau.

But the great step was taken, though it was anything but easy in itself and opposed to the last ditch by the patriotic Persians. That also is an interesting and important bit of real history. When fears were verified and the order came definitely from al-Ḥajjāj to Ṣāliḥ, his *dihkān* fellow-officials led by Mardānshāh, not by Zādhānfarrūkh, made two determined efforts to deter him. This section, particularly as told by Bilādhurī, has been so seriously mistranslated by Hitti and misunderstood even by men like De Goeje and Wellhausen that it must be righted. In the first attempt Mardānshāh tries to convince Ṣāliḥ that rendition in Arabic of Persian technical terms is impossible. He says: "What will you do about tenths and twentieths?" (These terms have been consistently misread since De Goeje and before. Brünnow's penciled note, only slightly in error, on the margin of his copy of the *Futūḥ*, which I own, leads to the solution. Instead of "twentieths" everyone hitherto has read "sixths." Follow Nöldeke's advice, take the wrong dots off the word and substitute the right ones, and you have *bistawaih*, i.e., *bistūyah*, *bistōē*. This also solves the form of the word for tenth, *dahōē*, or *dihōē*. These are diminutives of common, numeral nouns, of exactly the same form as those referred to previously for the pet or hypocoristic proper noun *Payrōē* from *Payrōāzh*. Thus read, they immediately make the required sense. Arabic had forms usable for fractions down to tenths, but none below.) Ṣāliḥ is not for a moment at a loss. "I will write tenths and half-tenths." Then another puzzler: "And what will you do about *wīd* (a little more, and odd)?" (Hitti's translation of what follows must be seen to be believed.) The answer is prompt, direct, and as simple and clear as the one before: "I will write that also; 'and odd' is *al-nayyif*, i.e., 'something over.'" The despair of the Persian is expressed in a curse: "May God wipe out your lineage from the world, as you have wiped out the lineage of the Persian (language)!" And now follows the second attempt. Intimidation had not succeeded, so bribery is attempted. Ṣāliḥ is offered 100,000 dirhams to feign inability and impossibility. He refuses and goes ahead with the work. A fine trait of his character! He remained, in the face of threats and temptations, loyal to his work and to the trust placed in him by his employer, *but he did not betray his fellow-employees*, or they would never have remained in their jobs for so much as another moment. He had had to tell al-Ḥajjāj about his conversation with Zādhānfarrūkh to explain his feigned illness, and that had probably led the viceroy to give and speed up the order for translation. But though the temptation was great and though he incurred by the course he chose considerable danger to his own person, he chose at the crucial moment not to betray his anything but innocent fellow-workers, which would have led for them

not only to dismissal but to practically instantaneous death. Small wonder that out of this man's school and training come all the great secretaries of the following generation in the East (enumerated by *Jahshiyārī*, 34=17*b*; less well by *Ṭabarī* and others)! Small wonder that his disciples and successors held him in the highest esteem, expressed by Marwān II's probably Christian secretary ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Yaḥyā, when he says (*Bilādhurī*, *Futūḥ*, 301): "What a man Ṣāliḥ was! How great his superiority among the secretaries!" or, with Hitti: "How great his favor to the scribes."

He had arrived, but his life was not thenceforth a bed of roses. The exact nature of his position under al-Ḥajjāj is not clear. He was certainly no longer private secretary or assistant to *Zādhānfarrūkh*. But neither does he seem to have occupied immediately quite the same position, which had been *Zādhānfarrūkh*'s, whatever exactly that may have been. Under al-Ḥajjāj he never held, as he did later, a diploma of appointment as master of the tax bureau from the caliph himself. There was no such second in rank beside al-Ḥajjāj. Ḥajjāj was certainly placed in authority over cult (for the most part faultily rendered "prayer"), war, and finances together, i.e., under the caliph all governmental authority and power in his domain were summed up in his person. When he died, he left in his place in charge of the cult (which usually but not always included the war department) his own son ʿAbdallāh (*Ṭab.*, II, 1268, ll. 9 f.), and in charge of the finances and war (*Jahshiyārī*, 44=22*v*, ll. 12-14), not Ṣāliḥ but his own eccentric, but able and influential, *mawlā* and milk-brother, Yazīd ibn Abī Muslim (*Jahshiyārī*, 38=19*b*, ll. 10 f.), who later, in 102 A.H.=A.D. 720/21, was placed for one cruel moment in charge of Berber Africa by Yazīd II, son of ʿAbdalmalik (*Bilādhurī*, *Futūḥ*, 231, ll. 11 f.). These appointments of al-Ḥajjāj were all confirmed unhesitatingly by al-Walid, but lasted, as *Jahshiyārī* expresses it, only nine months, i.e., until after al-Walid's death his brother Sulaimān took over the reins (*Ṭab.*, II, 1282, l. 16). The position and rank of a man like Ṣāliḥ under al-Ḥajjāj were not very well defined and not without purpose left uncertain. He was simply attached directly to the person of the viceroy and did the work assigned to him, wielding such authority over his assistants and clerks as his nearness to the prince plus his personality in their view gave to him.

Such a man, if like Ṣāliḥ he was endowed with keen eyes, a bright mind, and an active conscience, saw much, frequently more than was good for himself and his master. That was clearly the case with Ṣāliḥ. Before the building of Wāsiṭ in 83 A.H.=A.D. 702, while one of the major residencies was still in Baṣrah and *Zādhānfarrūkh* barely dead, Ṣāliḥ witnessed there on the part of al-Ḥajjāj a fit of sexual jealousy and a rash act, which was neither pleasant nor particularly honorable. The proper form of the story is found in *Aghānī* (XVIII, 130, ll. 27-131, l. 1) taken from *Madāʾinī*, who tells it on the authority of al-Walid ibn Hishām the *Ḳaḥdhamite*. The famous beauty and Amazon Hind, daughter of Asmāʾ ibn *Khārijah* the *Fazārite*, had been the wife of ʿUbaidallāh ibn Ziyād, whom she loved dearly and never forgot. She had then

become and remained the loyal wife of Bishr ibn Marwān, until that worthy died in his cups. Finally the redoubtable Ḥajjāj had wooed and won her. Wishing to please her, when he took her to reside with him in Baṣrah, he had built for her a new palace of unbaked bricks, not far from the aging palace built of red clay by ʿUbadallāh ibn Ziyād, the renovated successor of which was later improperly called the palace of Ziyād. When al-Ḥajjāj proudly showed her his creation and asked whether she had ever seen anything more beautiful, she exclaimed: "Why, this is the Red Palace!" meaning the old residency of ʿUbadallāh, her first husband. Al-Ḥajjāj flew into a jealous rage, divorced her, and tore down the palace. The Jewish Persian Shuʿūbite Abū ʿUbadah, whom the Arabs call a dungheap upon which an occasional pearl may be found, as quoted by Bilādhurī (*Futūḥ* 349; cf. Yāḳūt, *Buldān*, I, 643 f.), gives the tale a nastily puny turn, quite incompatible with the character of al-Ḥajjāj, making the entire event hinge upon the great viceroy's envy of the general fame of Ziyād and his son and missing, besides, the distinction between the two palaces altogether. Ṣāliḥ knew all the details, and we shall presently find him again later on in this locality, to which al-Ḥajjāj manifestly never returned leaving Baṣrah without any proper residency for a matter of ten years or more.

After the rebellion of Ibn al-Ashʿath, to avoid quartering his Syrian troops in the touchy towns of Kūfah and Baṣrah and to keep his Syrians from being tainted by their corruption, al-Ḥajjāj built Wāsiṭ. Ḥajjāj was in a hurry and spared neither labor nor money in building for himself a sumptuous capital city with all appurtenances within the space of a year. When it was finished, the cost having amounted to 43,000,000 dirhams, we are told by Yāḳūt (*Buldān*, IV, 884 f.) that his secretary Ṣāliḥ approached him and gently suggested that these expenses were pretty heavy, and, if the caliph looked into them, it would be painful to him. Ḥajjāj wondered what to do about it, and Ṣāliḥ found a remedy which measures up to the tallest American financing of today. He said: "The wars look better for this," and put down in his accounts for war 34,000,000, and for construction 9,000,000.

No wonder al-Ḥajjāj at times felt uncomfortable in the presence of this faithful servant and was inclined occasionally to test the blindness of his loyalty and to let him feel the absoluteness of his own power over him. Characteristic for the man who suggested it to al-Ḥajjāj and for the man who records it, al Mubarrad (*Kāmil*, ed. Wright, 346 f.) is the horrible test. Ṣāliḥ was suspected of harboring Shuʿūbitic Khārijite views, not without reason, as the excellent paragraph in Goldziher's *Muhammedanische Studien*, I, 138 f., will show him who takes the trouble to read it. On this point the cruel Yazid ibn Abī Muslim, whom we have met before, trapped the good man. A well-known chief of the Khārijites, Jawwāb the Ḍabbite, had been caught and was in Ḥajjāj's prison. Yazid suggested to al-Ḥajjāj that he might order Ṣāliḥ in person to execute this rebellious man, saying, "If he does it, the Khārijites will be free of him and will kill him; if he refuses, al-Ḥajjāj will kill him."

With much hesitation and many qualms of conscience, fearing, he said, for the safety of his daughters, Ṣāliḥ felt constrained to perform the deed in every way abhorrent to his soul.

Al-Ḥajjāj's own disquieting doubts about Ṣāliḥ are disclosed in Jahshiyārī's pretty tale (34=17b) that one day al-Ḥajjāj said to Ṣāliḥ: "See here! I've thought about you, and I find that your property and your blood are wholly in my power, so that I would be guiltless if I laid hold of them." Ṣāliḥ replied: "The worst of the matter is, God bless the Amīr, that this word comes after thought." Whereupon al-Ḥajjāj laughed and said nothing further. And nothing further or worse than has been related happened to Ṣāliḥ in Ḥajjāj's lifetime.

With Yazīd ibn Abī Muslim in charge of the finance bureaus after Ḥajjāj's death, Ṣāliḥ's existence must have been one of trembling terror. Happily it lasted, with the life of al-Walid I, only for nine months. Then came Ṣāliḥ's one brief rise to a position of rank and power.

With the advent of Sulaimān, Abdalmālik's second son, to the caliphate in February, A.D. 715, a complete change, practically a reversal of Moslem policy in the eastern half of the empire, sets in. The heroic size, the power and influence of al-Ḥajjāj, is indicated by the fact that this house-cleaning deals in its beginning almost exclusively with his affairs. His person was not involved. He had died, as he had fervently prayed, before Walid. But his works and his ways, his creations and his creatures, with the one notable exception of Ṣāliḥ, all with incredible speed now became anathema.

As Ḥajjāj's successor Sulaimān appointed Ḥajjāj's bitterest enemy, Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab, whom Sulaimān himself had for some years harbored in his own home and protected from well-deserved punishment. Yazīd was that day's "civilized" edition of a great tribal lord, a lover of luxury and display, hospitable to a fault, improvident with money when he could lay hands on it, grown fat with city life, and yet withal a lover of showy action rather than thoughtful organization. In 'Umar's day he would have been of those, who, offered an appointment, said: "For taxation, no; for campaigning, yes" (Ṭab., I, 2642, l. 8). So, no sooner than appointed, he schemed; for he was also a schemer and a wire-puller like his father before him.

The essence and the upshot of his scheming is stated with beautiful clarity and brevity by Jahshiyārī (44 f.=22b/23a). As the immediate successor to Ḥajjāj's harsh but conscientious severity in tax collection he feared that, if he dealt rigorously with "his people" in enforcing the law, they would blame him (even more than they were blaming Ḥajjāj); if he relaxed in rigor, then his collection of taxes would fall short of Ḥajjāj's results. So he asked Sulaimān to be excused from the tax business and suggested for it Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Abd al-raḥmān. And Sulaimān acted on his suggestion (cf. Ṭab., II, 1306 f.).

While under al-Ḥajjāj Ṣāliḥ had been little more than chief clerk and superintendent of the tax office in Wāsiṭ (*Ṣāhib dawāwīn*, Mubarrad, *Kāmil*, 346), he now became treasurer-general of 'Irāk with a caliphal appointment in his

pocket, subject directly to the caliph's orders and responsible to him only, a close second in rank to Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab himself (Mubarrad, *loc. cit.*; Bilādhurī, *Futūḥ*, 348, ll. 4 f.; Ṭab., II, 1282 f., 1305; Yāqūt, *Buldān*, I, 643; Ibn al-Athīr, V, 6 f., 13; Ibn Khallikān [ed. Cairo, 1275], II, 402 f., tr. De Slane, IV, 185 f.; Ibn Khaldūn [ed. Būlāq, 1284], III, 69). The measure of his new rank is indicated by the sudden swelling of the number of historians who now take notice of him. Yet neither for him nor for Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab does rule over the ʿIrāq seem to have included Khurasān, as it had for al-Ḥajjāj. When Yazīd finally succeeds in wheedling this out of Sulaimān, it is he and not Ṣāliḥ who has charge of its finances as well as its war and its cult (Ṭab., II, 1314, ll. 12 f.; Balʿamī's Persian, tr. Zotenberg, IV, 218 f.). Still the powers conferred on Ṣāliḥ, as will be seen, were very great. His acceptance of the commission, which perhaps he could not easily have declined, and his acts and experiences under it reveal in the full glare of publicity the strength and the weakness in the armor of his character and position.

He was in Wāsiṭ before the pompous Muhallabid arrived. The story of the great man's arrival is told with evident relish by Madāʾinī, quoted by Ṭabarī (II, 1307 f.). His approach was announced in the city, and the people went out to meet him. Ṣāliḥ was told: "This is Yazīd! The people have gone out to meet him." But Ṣāliḥ did not go out until Yazīd was near the city. Then Ṣāliḥ went forth, dressed in a rough woolen shift open at the throat and a little yellow *dabūsiyah* (cape or cap?), accompanied by four hundred Syrians. When he met Yazīd, he kept pace with him, and when they had entered the city, pointed out a house and said: "I have placed this house at your disposal." So Yazīd stopped there, but Ṣāliḥ went on to his own residence. Ṣāliḥ then kept Yazīd short and allowed him independent control over nothing at all. When Yazīd took a thousand trays to give a banquet, Ṣāliḥ held them up, until Yazīd said: "Book their price against me!" Yazīd bought much furniture and signed requisition vouchers for it; but Ṣāliḥ would not certify them. So they were returned to Yazīd, and he became angry and said: "This is what I have done to myself!" It wasn't long before Ṣāliḥ himself arrived. Yazīd gave him a broad welcome, but he sat down and said: "What are these requisitions? The taxes won't stand for them. A few days ago I certified for you a requisition of 100,000, and I lost no time in issuing provisions for you. Then you demanded cash for the army, and I gave it to you. But this! Nothing will stand for this! The Commander of the Faithful will not agree to it, and you will be called to account for it." Yazīd patted him on the back and, smiling, said: "Now, Abū al-Walīd, pass these vouchers this once!" He finally said: "Well, all right, I will pass them; but don't you do that to me anymore!" And Yazīd said: "No!" Such treatment and such a situation naturally disgusted a man like Yazīd. In contrast with al-Ḥajjāj, he was petty in seeking revenge. He had appointed his brother Ziyād governor of ʿUmān, a dependency of Baṣrah, and to him he gave instruction that in writing to Ṣāliḥ he should, as to a man of lower social standing, address him by his bare name, not, as he himself had done when he was wheedling his one extra voucher out

of him, by the honorific *kunya*, "Father of al-Walid" (Tab., II, 1283). For the rest he sought and found with Sulaimān escape to Khurasān, where he could squander the portion of a thousand men on a single slave girl (Tab., II, 1313), but thereby launched himself from the frying-pan into the fire, as one may read elsewhere.

Šāliḥ knew what he was talking about when he cautioned Yazīd against spending more than he could account for to the caliph, and he knew what he was doing when he refused to connive with the great man in squandering public funds in the ʿIrāk. He had received his training under al-Ḥajjāj and under him had more than once seen what happened in such cases. With this we note another feature in which the Marwānids' time differed essentially from that of the Sufyānids. Not that these older Arabs had not known how to shake down a delinquent enemy by torture or the threat of it, or even, when they found it convenient, to flog and torture a man without hope or need of a shakedown. But the older stories are for the most part milder, of rarer occurrence, not infrequently with a comic turn. There is no joke in such things in this new regime. Even the beduin in their feuds and raids had become "civilized" and had learned to slit the bellies of captive women (Wellhausen, *Reich*, 130; Bilādhuri, *Ansāb*, V, 327), just as today they have learned to use armored cars and sub-machine-guns and to murder with these like gangsters. Of no caliph before Sulaimān do we find a tale like that told in Ṭabarī (II, 1338), where, returning from a pilgrimage with a company of poets, he makes rare sport of having four hundred Greek captives, as they are brought before him, butchered with largely dull, haphazard swords by inexperienced swordsmen. It is, indeed, Abū ʿUbaidah who is responsible for this tale, but even he has not its like previous to this.

Now this same Sulaimān hated al-Ḥajjāj like poison. Al-Ḥajjāj was dead, but great and honored men who had been in the service of al-Ḥajjāj were living. Šāliḥ himself had been a faithful servant under al-Ḥajjāj but of too lowly estate for his fame to have spread widely among the Arabic upper classes. Indeed, only the Muhallabid's needs had for the first time lifted him out of the ruck into hazardous recognition and a perilous position of power. Now he received caliphal orders to use these powers with much more subtle and distasteful brutality than had been demanded of him in his severest test under al-Ḥajjāj. One accusation could always be brought with success against any governor or general who was to be disgraced—failure to deliver to the caliph the share due him from any province's income. Such investigations were made and the resulting trials managed by the treasury department, of which, in the ʿIrāk, Šāliḥ was the head. Early in his brief hour of glory we find the hapless man involved in such affairs.

Ḳutaibah ibn Muslim, the conqueror of Khurasān, whom we shall meet again later on in this study, was one of the greatest, perhaps the very greatest, of al-Ḥajjāj's governors and military leaders. He greatly mistrusted Sulaimān's intentions, as he had reason to do, and in the early months of Sulaimān's first year committed practical suicide by a clumsy attempt to incite a

hopeless revolt, in which he met his death at the hands of the men of his own army. For the interval before this news reached the west we have another vivid and highly probable tale from Madā'inī (Ṭab., II, 1286). It was a tale current in the well-known town of Anbār on the lower Euphrates, from which many secretaries came. There Madā'inī heard it, as reported from the mouth of its hero, the Anbarite Tawbah. This man said that he had been sent by Ṣāliḥ to Ẹutaibah to look into Ẹutaibah's affair. He traveled alone, his mission being secret. A talkative Asadite joined him on the way, to his evident displeasure. Tawbah's too patent secretiveness fostered his companion's curiosity. Some unnamed omen crossed their path. The man suggested that Tawbah must be on an ominous mission. Tawbah divulged nothing but kept on his way. At Ḥulwān, at the entrance into the Zagros Mountains, the news of Ẹutaibah's death met him.

The fate that awaited, but did not meet, Ẹutaibah overtook another of scarcely less merit than Ẹutaibah himself. A conscientious conqueror of Sind, i.e., the Panjab, for al-Ḥajjāj and al-Walid was Muḥammad, son of al-Ḳāsim, son of Muḥammad, son of al-Ḥaḳam, son of Abū 'Aḳil, according to Yāḳūt (Buldān, III, 349) a cousin, by this genealogy (Bilādḥurī, *Futūḥ*, 436), rather a cousin's son to al-Ḥajjāj himself. Early in life he attracted the great viceroy's attention. When he was but seventeen, al-Ḥajjāj had wanted to give him in marriage his own sister, but she preferred an older man. He had done good work for his great uncle in Persia, among other things building up Shīrāz. Finally, to succeed nearly half-a-dozen inefficient and unsuccessful governors and generals on the Indian frontier, al-Ḥajjāj sent thither his active young relative with an army equipped down to needles and thread. The expedition cost al-Ḥajjāj 60,000,000 dirhams. Muḥammad did so well in the Indus region that al-Ḥajjāj had no reason to regret his investment. He conquered cities and rulers who opposed him; graciously accepted the submission of those who did not; left undestroyed, except in places taken by force, the Bud-dha shrines and temples, which he adjudged should be tolerated on an equal footing with Christian churches, Jewish synagogues, and Magian fire temples; and in general governed so well that on his departure the Hindus set up a portrait statue of him in his memory. Yet the returns amounted during al-Ḥajjāj's lifetime to exactly the double of the expenditure. An elephant which was sent to Wāsiṭ may have been a mere oddity; but the Indian buffaloes, which Muḥammad sent in great numbers, together with their herders, the Zutt or Jat (perhaps the ancestors of the Gypsies), spread all over the Near East and proved a useful breed of domestic animals.

No sooner was Sulaimān on the throne than he (apparently not the Muḥal-labid) sent his own man to replace so successful a governor in the rich province which he had practically carved out for himself. Opposition here was possible with much greater chance of success than for Ẹutaibah in Ḳhurasān. The loyal Muḥammad seems never to have dreamt of it. For such loyalty he and many of his clan, the family Abū 'Aḳil, who had served under him, were brought in fetters to the prisons his uncle had built in Wāsiṭ and there turned

over to the tender mercies of the never quite trusted old servant of al-Ḥajjāj, Abū al-Walīd Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbdalrahmān, now lord chief treasurer of the two ʿIrāqs.

Exactly what happened in those prisons is not described in detail, though in the Arabic books at hand the event is referred to four or five times, most explicitly by Bilādḥurī (*Futūḥ*, 440 f.), then by Ṭabarī (II, 1282, and again 1283), following Ṭabarī by Ibn al-Aṭḥir (IV, 425, and again, V, 6 f.), and, finally, by Ibn Khallikān (II, 402 = De Slane, IV, 185). All that we are told is that Ṣāliḥ, by a process neither speedy nor honorable, tortured these people to death, with ʿAbdalmalik ibn al-Muhallab assisting as official supervisor. It will presently be seen that the torture most probably consisted in flogging. It was done by order of the caliph; so Ṣāliḥ might have performed the job with an easy conscience, which, nevertheless, as will be shown later, was not the case. In one respect Ṣāliḥ may even have found a bit of joy in the event. A brother of Muḥammad, named al-Ḥajjāj (Ṭab., II, 1711, ll. 7 f.; Murgotten in his translation of the second half of Bilādḥurī's *Futūḥ*, 224, n. 2, calls him a cousin) had killed Ṣāliḥ's brother Adam, a Ḳharijite like Ṣāliḥ himself, but probably more aggressive and violent in his persuasion. Of this matter we know nothing further. The tale as told leaves the impression that Ṣāliḥ witnessed the horrible scenes with very mixed feelings, that the sympathies of his highly complicated personality were painfully drawn in more than one direction, that what joy he found here was overshadowed by fear and horror.

A few more pleasant moments which came to him in the brief period, at most two years and a half, of his power are recorded. For one thing, Baṣrah now needed once more, far more than in the latter years of al-Ḥajjāj's rule, a proper residency. As viceroy, once he had secured Ḳhurasān, Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab was playing the absentee landlord both in his home town Baṣrah and in Kūfah. Lieutenant-governors in both places begin to play a larger role than in the days of al-Ḥajjāj, until presently Sulaimān's successor in the caliphate once more makes a clean separation of the two principalities. Ṣāliḥ presented the case of Baṣrah to Sulaimān. What he had to report, as we have seen, was that al-Ḥajjāj had torn down the palace of unburnt brick which he had built and that ʿUbaidallāh's red-clay palace was ruined by neglect, so that the people were carrying off door frames and other usable materials from the deserted and crumbling ruin. Sulaimān gave the necessary order, and it must have been a proud moment in Ṣāliḥ's life when he could raise on the foundations of ʿUbaidallāh ibn Ziyād's "Red Palace" the first residency in Baṣrah to be built of baked brick and gypsum⁴ and with a roof higher than the previous one had been. There can be no doubt that he did his job well, without graft, and at the lowest possible figure, more cheaply than any of his predecessors or successors could or would have done.

The only smile recorded in Ṣāliḥ's entire history came to him by the act of

⁴ The terms used for baked and unbaked bricks are the same as those used in older Babylonia, as mentioned by Dubberstein, *AJSL*, LVI, No. 1 (1939), 32, n. 58. This is a well-known fact. A full comparison of older and more recent technical terminology in these regions has not yet been made; it might prove useful as well as interesting.

another secretary, whose fame later overshadowed, not altogether justly, that of Šālih. Madā'inī in Bilād_hurī's *Futūḥ* (464 f.) has a story eminently trustworthy because it goes back through only one transmitter to ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Muḳaffaʿ himself and because of its very human likelihood. Rōzbih, later ʿAbdallāh, son of Dādōē the Mutilated (*Muḳaffaʿ*, by torture for infidelity in tax perception under al-Ḥajjāj, not under Khālīd al-Ḳaṣrī), was of the Baṣransian Persians, who were in the tax offices with and like Zād_hanfarrūḳ and his family. He must have been born at least fifteen or sixteen years before 100 A.H. = A.D. 718/19, the earliest date allowed by F. Gabrieli (*RSO*, XIII, No. 3 [1932], 245) on the very uncertain and late calculation of Ibn Khallikān. For, on his own authority, in our story he was serving as deputy under Šālih, when Šālih was treasurer-general of the ʿIrāk, and that cannot have been later than September or October, 99 A.H. = A.D. 717. More fitting for this and for all the known facts and accomplishments of his life would be the probability of his birth about A.D. 700 = 81 A.H. His own, his father's, and his social environment's patriotic Persianism steeped him early in life in Persian lore. With evidently youthful enthusiasm he applied this knowledge to gain a bit of favor when he was employed in the offices of Šālih, where he was receiving some of that training which later made him a master of Arabic epistolary style and clear, intelligible prose. He had heard or read that Chosroes II, displeased with the smell of the parchments upon which his budget was laid before him, had ordered that thenceforth these parchments be scented. On similarly scented parchment he delivered his account sheets to his master, Šālih, who laughed and said, "I liked no other to bring them to me," adding (seriously, for had he not smiled?) "on account of his knowledge of Persian affairs."

This is probably the last known appearance of Šālih in the light of publicity except for the lurid flare that places into burning relief his shameful and painful death. Except for that he now sinks once more into the obscurity whence he had come. In the last week of September, A.D. 717, another reversal of policy shook still further the foundations of the great Arabic empire. The new ruler, the first to be placed on the throne by a king-making theologian, was a first cousin of the two who preceded and the two who followed him, ʿUmar II, son of ʿAbdalazīz, who was ʿAbdalmalik's brother. His father, his uncle, and his grandfather had grown up in court circles in Medinah, and we have seen that that fact produced important changes in policy and procedure in the young, then half-grown, empire. This man was reared in slightly later Medinensian circles, who misspent their days in debating societies injecting into pious theological phrases poisonous criticism of every governmental act which they were not permitted to perform. The resultant ruler for the next two and a half years is, in general, unduly overpraised in the Mohammedan world, and he has at times been treated with undue contumely in the Christian West. Wellhausen's attempt at a vindication in the very middle of his *Reich* is worth an hour's reading of anybody's time. Even Wellhausen, however, cannot make of him a genius of government like Muʿāwiyah or Ziyād, nor a

great ruler like ʿAbdalmalik and al-Ḥajjāj. His intentions were “of the best.” He wanted to convert everybody to the finest brand of the best religion in the world, Islām; to put every Moslem on the relief roll for as much as up to then every Arab had been getting; and to abolish for all good Moslems, which was soon to be everybody, all shameful and painful taxes—only the ground, common and not private property, was to pay rent, not taxes. Aside from this last proposition, this was the nearest approach of the early Arab-Moslem empire to the pinnacle of present-day politics in our own paradise. With it ʿUmar ibn ʿAbdalazīz was privileged to celebrate in millennial fashion the centenary of the empire. It was a noble experiment nobly conceived. Mass conversions, among Berbers, Soghdians, Turks, and others were the order of the day. ʿUmar wrote his doubting governor of Khurasān to pay and pay, and, if his own provincial treasury did not hold out, he would help things along from the federal strongbox at Damascus. With this we have touched one of the troubles of that “new deal.” Despite all his efforts to create his own machinery and to keep it moving, it had to be inaugurated largely with the trained officials and functionaries of the old regime, who were not wholeheartedly convinced of the reasonableness and feasibility of all details in the new program. Some of the most unreasonable partisans of the glory that was passing had, of course, to be purged. Such a one, above all, was Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab, who was incontinently clapped into prison and kept there for the rest of the reign. With him his second in command, Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbdaraḥmān, vanishes from the scene. He was not imprisoned, for, on the one hand, he was a *maulā* Moslem, not an Arab, and, on the other, in the sincerely pious ʿUmar’s reign no charge of wrongdoing could be trumped up against so painfully conscientious an accountant. But he had been trained by al-Ḥajjāj, and he had served with Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab, and that was enough to remove him from office, though ʿUmar was certainly unable to replace him with any man better or even nearly as good. He simply disappears for the space of ʿUmar’s reign from the records. That means, that for this time, with old age approaching—he must have been well above sixty—he retired into private life, and that, for a man like him, meant obscurity.

But even in these halcyon days his nemesis was creeping upon him and drawing desperately near. Among the unctuous caliph’s most surprising appointments was that of the Fazārite ʿUmar ibn Hubairah to the governorship of the Jazīrah, i.e., Mesopotamia. He was a man sufficiently prominent in the stirring events of his day to deserve the long genealogy registered by Ibn Doreid (173, ll. 6 f.). Ibn Doreid calls him a Syrian in intelligence and tongue. The character sketch of Wellhausen (*Reich*, 199–201) is a classic. Throughout his life he remained a North Arabic tribesman in feeling and code of honor, with the added touch of civilized cruelty characteristic of his time. He was a warrior by the grace of God and had been admiral of the great fleet which took part in the unsuccessful, yearlong siege of Constantinople. Perhaps the general tendency of ʿUmar II to restrict the wars of conquest had something to do with his employment on the Byzantine border, but chiefly occupied with

internal affairs. In administration he had the good, hard sense to coin good, full-weight silver, so that his coinage with that of two successors was accepted by the Abbasids in payment of taxes (*Bilādhurī*, *Futūh*, 469).

ʿUmar II died February 9, A.D. 720 = 101 A.H. He was succeeded by the proud, debonair, and self-indulgent Yazīd II, the third son of ʿAbdalmalik to ascend the caliphal throne. This meant another reversal of policy, with none of the sincere conscientiousness in it, which had, in spite of its faults and errors, characterized the rule of his predecessor. First of all the empire was once more shaken to its foundations by a great internal revolt. As a prelude a little *Kharijite* band, with whom ʿUmar had reasoned in peaceful debate, now took to arms and were annihilated only by men and measures quite incommensurable with their numbers. Then Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab, escaping from prison when he heard of ʿUmar's mortal illness and the imminent succession of his mortal enemy, Yazīd II, came to Baṣrah. His personal, family, and tribal prestige brought under his banner all the eastern half of the empire, except *Khurasān*. The peril became so great that the caliph's brother Maslamah, field marshal of the empire and leader of the forces with whom ʿUmar ibn Hubairah had besieged Constantinople, was called to the rescue with all the imperial resources placed at his disposal. With this supreme effort the revolt was put down, Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab being killed in battle.

For a brief time Maslamah was left in absolute charge of the reconquered territory including its treasury. This soon proved too great a drain on the imperial treasury, and Maslamah was replaced by the financially more reasonable ʿUmar ibn Hubairah. His chief job for some time was to hunt down, wherever they might be found, all attainable members of the great clan of Muhallab, of whom but few were left alive. In this situation *Jahshiyārī* (53 f. = 27a/b) tells us that Ibn Hubairah, determined to collect and to manage the taxes of his great province in his own way, was disturbed by the thought of Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbdalraḥmān, whom Yazīd II held in high esteem. He conferred with his secretary, an ʿAnbarite named ʿAbadah, on ways and means to put Ṣāliḥ out of the way. ʿAbadah had to confess that an honest and rightful cause against Ṣāliḥ could not be found, but he did find for Ibn Hubairah in Ṣāliḥ's books a debit of 600,000 dirhams against Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab, for which there were no receipts.

Forthwith Ibn Hubairah wrote to the caliph that he had a complaint against Ṣāliḥ and asked that the old treasurer of the Muhallabid be committed to him for investigation. Ṣāliḥ, who seems to have been residing at court, was called into conference by the caliph. He was sure of his own innocence and certain of the flawless correctness of his accounts. He said: "By God, he has no cause for action against me. I left the ʿIrāk in such shape that a dumb man born blind would know exactly what was there." The incredibly thoughtless caliph thereupon turned him over to his expectantly gloating governor.

No sooner had he arrived than Ibn Hubairah began to conduct the "investigation" under torture. Now a glimpse of the precise and self-righteous man's conscience is revealed to us. With every blow that fell, he cried: "This

is just retribution. With the like of this was I wont to torture people." Then Ibn Hubairah used "the Fazārite blow." What this was exactly I do not know. Extremely cruel it must have been. It was taught to Ibn Hubairah by Iyās ibn Mu'āwiyah (ibn Qurrah the Muzanite), whom the pious 'Umar II had appointed *Qādī* in Baṣrah (Tab., II, 1347); from whose justice the poet Farazdaq had fled in terror (Aghānī XIX, 50, cf. VII, 14), though Ṭabarī solemnly lists his *kunyah* with the pious grandsons of the prophet's companions (Tab., III, 2556); whose father, the son of a companion (Ibn Doreid, 112, ll. 5-7) and a traditionist cited by al-Thawrī (Yāqūt, *Buldān*, IV, 861), to the horror of his fellow-Kūfans, gouged out with his turning spearpoint the eye of a Mukhtarite, considering such men for such action more lawful game than Turks and Dailamites (Bilādhuri, *Ansāb*, V, 254). When this blow fell, Ṣāliḥ could honestly say: "With this I never tortured anyone." When Ibn Hubairah thus went on and on, finally three friends of Ṣāliḥ's offered to buy him off, whatever the price. 'Umar's secretary reported to them that they must furnish cash. They asked: "Before night?" The secretary carried the question before 'Umar ibn Hubairah, but he would not see them and returned no reply, though they waited until dark and only then went away. When morning came, Ṣāliḥ was dead.

Arabic historians are at times pretty partial, as are those in other tongues. On the whole they are surprisingly full and fair, even when their report is not very complimentary to themselves and their people. More than most historians in other tongues they enable those of us who can see it to write history not merely as a register of dead facts, but as living, human reality. Yet the episode just mentioned is not frequently touched upon by them. The more surprising is this human note in the rather pedantic philologist al-Mubarrad. In his *Kāmil* (ed. Wright, 346 f.) he reports what, in spite of his evident sympathy with Ṣāliḥ, is a bit of nasty, heresy-hunting gossip, that at his last gasp he was thrown out on an ash heap and there at the moment of death was heard to make the Khārijite confession of faith. There is no malice, but perhaps a bit of schoolmasterly stupidity, in al-Mubarrad's repetition of this foul gossip. Without a trace of malice al-Mubarrad (561) once more mentions Ṣāliḥ among "a multitude of notable men" who were attracted to the Khārijite faith.

This is the end of Ṣāliḥ and apparently of his line and his entire family. What happened to the son he had, probably named, as his *kunyah* indicates, al-Walīd, whether this or another was the son whom according to *Ḳuḥdhum* he favored and tried to push forward, when and how he or they perished or vanished into utter obscurity, we have not found in the books at our command. That he had a brother we know, and we have heard something of how he perished. For the rest, like Ibn al-Muḳaffa', Abū al-Walīd Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Abd al-raḥmān remains a sad, lonely figure, outstanding, of most extraordinary ability, rising for his moment to heights far above the average, then melting completely out of sight. His was not one of those scribal families, of which we

know a great number, some of them by cities like ʿAnbār and Baṣrah, which tended to perpetuate themselves for generations.

His memory was revered and preserved by his students, apprentices, and successors, noteworthy men, though for the most part of lesser stature than himself. The authors of books most interested in his most memorable and lasting work, Bilād_hurī, Ṣūlī, Jahshiyārī, Ibn Shādhān, and Nuwairī, are all members of the secretarial class. Of the men who received their training immediately from him, we have seen that Ibn al-Muḳaffaʿ remembered him with pleasure, though that pleasure was characteristically tinged with slightly supercilious cynicism; to Ibn al-Muḳaffaʿ's mind he himself was superior to the old master, and his estimate may from some, though by no means from all, points of view be correct. Two of his immediate students came near, quite contrary to any intention or volition on their part, to eclipsing his name and stealing his fame. Of these, we mention first the most intimate friend of Ibn al-Muḳaffaʿ, in steady loyalty of character and still more in practical ability greater than that famous man, Abū al-Muhājir ʿAbdalḥamīd ibn Yaḥyā, *mawlā* of al-ʿAlāʾ ibn Wabḥ, the ʿĀmirite. He is the man who adjudged Ṣāliḥ a very great man, a very great secretary, and the greatest benefactor of all secretaries. He seems to be the first man in the Arabic Moslem empire, perhaps the only one, who bore the title "vizier." He certainly was more than a *mere* secretary, he was in most difficult times and circumstances the intimate friend and counselor of one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest, as well as the last of the Marwānid Umayyad caliphs, Marwan II, and he chose ignominious death with his lord and loyal master in preference to escape by desertion of a hopeless cause and a mean life after him. He is the man singled out as the one who translated the journals of the tax office from Arabic to Persian in ʿAbdalmalik's time by Mustawfī Ḳazwīnī in the *Tarīkh-i-Guzīda* ("Gibb Series," XIV, 1, 273), though Ḳazwīnī lists him again (or does he consider these two distinct men?) on page 288 under Merwan II fifty years later. Ḳazwīnī, of considerable importance for his own, Mongol, times—his book was finished in A.D. 1332—is in general ill informed and full of errors in the section of his history which deals with the Umayyads.

The second of the men trained by Ṣāliḥ who became an innocent usurper of his place in history is Ḳaḥdham, perhaps to be read, as voweled in the Jahshiyārī manuscript, which Mẓik published, Ḳuḥdhum. This case is perfectly transparent. The reason for this error lies wholly and solely in the slovenliness as a quoter and the carelessness as a historian of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi, author of the *ʿIkd*, whose fame and popularity exceeds its merit, and which in consequence was designated *al-Farīd*, "the Unique." In the story of Ṣāliḥ it has been shown that Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi knew the essence of that story perfectly well, though somewhat sketchily. This is as it should be. For, though Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi in Spain is rather farther west of the scene than Mustawfī Ḳazwīnī is east, he, who died in 940, is much nearer in time, and in *his* Spain the history of the Umayyad caliphate must have been pretty well and generally known. It is inexcusable on his part, for more than one reason, that in an-

other place (II, 208) he lists secretaries who rose from humble beginnings to high estate and names among them "Ḳaḥḍham, grandfather of al-Walīd ibn Hishām al-Ḳaḥḍhamī" as "the one who converted the dīwāns from Persian into Arabic." No greater weight of authority is conferred upon this statement by the fact that the much later Ḳalkāshandī, who died in 1418, in his voluminous handbook for secretaries (Vol. I, first printing, p. 26; second printing, p. 40), quotes this alone and not the other version from the *ʿIḳd* and further corrupts it by writing al-Ḥajjāj for al-Walīd. It is far less excusable that Björkman should class this egregious error as a "tradition" of equal value with the well-authenticated story of Ṣāliḥ. It is perfectly clear what Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi has done; he cited the historian and omitted the historical person, and so substituted the authority for the subject of the story.

For, as Ṣūlī shows, the major authority, in fact, just about the sole authority and, as has been shown, an excellent and thoroughly reliable authority for the transfer of the finance department in its central bureau of the eastern half of the Arabic empire, the richest half financially, from Persian into Arabic by Ṣāliḥ, who thereby became the creator on the basis of sound and expert Persian practice of a method and system of accounting in Arabic, elements and technical terms of which carry through to the present day, and the founder of a simple, straightforward, intelligible prose style of the bureaus from whom the great stylist Ibn al-Muḳaffaʿ himself learned his art—the real authority for the authentic history of this memorable event is the Ḳaḥḍhamite. Samʿānī, who dislikes his weaker biblical efforts (Yaḳūt, *Buldān*, IV, 798, where he describes him as of Persian barbarian, i.e., non-Arabic descent), yet lists him pretty prominently in his genealogical encyclopedia of traditionists as the first number under Ḳāf followed by Ḥā. Thence we learn that he was an inhabitant of Baṣrah and died there in 222 A.H. = A.D. 837. He is quoted as an authority by most of the earlier writers used in this sketch. Jāhiḻ may well have known him personally. He is used most judiciously by Bilādḥurī as his major source for the early history of Baṣrah. There and in the tax offices of the ʿIrāḳ he is thoroughly at home and reliable, for he is Abu ʿAbdalraḥmān al-Walīd, son of Hishām, son of Ḳaḥḍham or Ḳuḥḍhum.

Ḳaḥḍham or Ḳuḥḍhum is of the *mawālī* of Baṣrah of the third generation, not, like Ṣāliḥ, of the second. He is, following Jahshiyārī (61), Ḳaḥḍham or Ḳuḥḍhum (not Kahram, as De Slane believed the faulty text of Ibn Ḳhallikān should be read, IV, 442, 448), son of Abū Sulaim (rather than "Abu Sulaimān," Jahshiyārī, 34; certainly not simply "Sulaimān" or "son of Sulaimān," as in Ibn Ḳhallikān and De Slane, *loc. cit.*), son of Ḍhakwān, a *mawlā* of Abū Bakrah, one of the oldest settlers of Baṣrah, whose family we have met with Ziyād and his son. His family was, therefore, naturally connected with the tax bureaus. There Ḳaḥḍham or Ḳuḥḍhum appears as one of the most promising students or apprentices trained by Ṣāliḥ (Jahshiyārī, 34). He did not rise to prominence until after Ṣāliḥ's death. It may be an accident that the first and greatest governor of the ʿIrāḳ for Hishām, son of ʿAbdalmalik (January 26, 724—February 6, 743) Ḳhālīd al-Ḳasrī did not employ him in

any prominent position. In spite of his ability it is possible that Khālīd did not consider him the right man for such a place. It was under Khālīd's successor, appointed late in Hishām's reign, May, 738, to succeed the deposed Khālīd, Jūsuf ibn ʿUmar, a cousin's son of al-Ḥajjāj, a harsh and cruel man of most uncertain temper, that Ḳaḥḍhum reached the pinnacle of his career. His story thenceforth is known from Jahshiyārī (61-64), supplemented by Bilādhurī (*Futūḥ*, 350 = Yaqūt, *Buldān*, I, 644), Ṭabarī (I, 2838; II, 1739), and Ibn Khallikān (quoting Madāʾini, II, 539 = De Slane, *loc. cit.*). He held no caliphal appointment, though for a moment he just missed one by an eyelash. Yūsuf simply employed him as the secretary closest to his person and as his confidential agent. The nearest definition of a definite function assigned to him by Yūsuf is found in Bilādhurī and rests upon his own statement, that he was placed in charge of the old Arab army pay roll. He permitted himself to be used by Yūsuf in an attempt to secure by intrigue from the caliph an order placing Khālīd's person, already imprisoned, wholly into Yūsuf's power. Though Ḳuḥḍhum had influence at court, perhaps too much for Yūsuf's comfort, the attempt was only very partially successful—permission to torment Khālīd for one day but under no circumstances so as to lead to his death. That was not very satisfactory to the dour and bloodthirsty Yūsuf. Yūsuf began to seek occasion to vent his ill temper on Ḳuḥḍhum and to flay him with foul words. Ḳuḥḍhum's son ʿUmar, favored and pushed forward by Ḳuḥḍhum, even as Ṣāliḥ had once tried to build up an unworthy son, proved distasteful to Yūsuf and had to be removed from his sight. By a ruse Yūsuf discovered that in case of his temporary absence from his province the caliph would place Ḳuḥḍhum in charge of the finances. This shows that the caliph never actually did so and that the suspicious Yūsuf certainly never gave Ḳuḥḍhum full control over or insight into the entire finance bureau. But, whatever Ḳuḥḍhum's positions had been up to this point, they must have been lucrative, for it presently becomes clear that he was a very rich man. For, when Yūsuf now discharged Ḳuḥḍhum and imprisoned young ʿUmar, Ḳuḥḍhum had enough money to buy off ʿUmar and enough sense in addition to take refuge immediately in the Meccan sanctuary, where he was able to remain in safety during the last three years of Hishām's reign. He escaped a moment of grave peril when Hishām's successor, the irresponsible Walīd ibn Yazīd, was persuaded by his maternal uncle Yūsuf ibn ʿUmar to issue an order that Ḳuḥḍhum be delivered up to him. The order was issued to another maternal uncle of the caliph, then governor of the Ḥijāz, but not so astute a man, nor quite so inordinately and meanly cruel as Yūsuf. Ḳuḥḍhum succeeded in wheedling this good man into delaying execution of the giddy young caliph's order until, within very few months, this great poet on the caliphal throne met a most timely sudden end. Where and how Ḳuḥḍhum spent his time during the ensuing years of civil war and disorder history sayeth not. He managed to save life, a respected place in Baṣrah society, and a comfortable living to pass on to a son, Hishām, a grandson al-Walīd, and a great-grandson ʿAbd-rahmān, which carries his family in round numbers down to about A.D. 850.

Now this is a man of considerable ability and extraordinary cleverness, luckier than Ṣāliḥ, but otherwise not remotely in the same class as Ṣāliḥ. His chief merit is that through his intimate knowledge and statements we have a clear picture of Ṣāliḥ, his accomplishments, and how he, under al-Ḥajjāj, initiated the Arabization of the entire administration of the Moslem empire.

Doubt expressed and disseminated by not too well-informed but much-advertised and influential Western historians, or historians in Western languages, as to whether this process was initiated in Syria or the ʿIrāq has no real foundation in authenticated facts. For the transfer of the tax records from Greek into Arabic, Bilādhurī, followed by Māwardī and Nuwairī, gives the date 81 A.H. = A.D. 700. Nuwairī and Māwardī name as authority for the curious story al-Madāʿinī (died somewhere between 830 and 845) though Bilādhurī, so far as yet published, does not mention him in this connection. For the transfer of the tax records of the ʿIrāq, Jahshiyārī names the year 78 A.H. = A.D. 697. There is no good reason to doubt either; on the contrary, there is excellent reason to accept both, the only exact dates not connected with other notable events which are mentioned in the rather large, though of course not exhaustive, mass of literature at hand. Bilādhurī, indeed, connects Ṣāliḥ's feat and his displacement of Zādhānfarrūkh with the latter's death in 701. This would necessarily place the change in the ʿIrāq after that in royal Syria. It may be that this had some weight with Bilādhurī, though that is less probable in his case than it is in the case of Ibn Khaldūn, who in his *Muḳaddamah* (244) simply re-writes the history of this event, as he does much else, to suit his theory of the social process and progress in civilization. The fact is that Bilādhurī in the *Futūḥ* simply knows no exact date for this transfer in the ʿIrāq and so hazards a guess in connecting it with Zādhānfarrūkh's death. It has been shown that not Ṣāliḥ but Mardānshāh was appointed to the position that Zādhānfarrūkh held at the time of his death and that Bilādhurī's statement on this point is wrong. For Jahshiyārī's definite date no reason can well be assigned other than that it happened that way and he knew it. And the story, as written above, shows that it is in no wise impossible, rather exceedingly probable, and fits known circumstances at least as well, if not better, than Bilādhurī's guess. It will be interesting to see what Bilādhurī has in the *Ansāb* when the volume containing that story appears.

Where the two stories, that of the ʿIrāq and that of Syria, are told in immediate sequence and not, as in Bilādhurī, many pages apart, Jahshiyārī, Ṣūlī, the *Fihrist*, and Ibn Shādhān place the ʿIrāq first; Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi in both places, Māwardī and Nuwairī (both probably, with Bilādhurī, placing Ṣāliḥ's feat after Zādhānfarrūkh's death), and Ibn Khaldūn invert the order.

Now, though ʿAbdalmalik, the *Fihrist* notwithstanding, knew the great Greek Christian Sarjūn ibn Manṣūr, not the Greeks but the Persians are to his mind the real masters of bookkeeping and accounting. Sarjūn's successor, who will presently be named as the man who made the transfer for ʿAbdalmalik, was an able man, long in office and held in high honor; but no one, especially no secretary, speaks of him in the terms of praise applied to Ṣāliḥ,

most significantly, by the last great secretary of the last Umayyad caliph who ruled in Syria.

The Syrian story, moreover, in both forms in which it is told is clearly secondary. Both forms, which may in the last analysis be one, show ʿAbdalmalik seeking a pretext to retire and displace the great and constant old master Sarjūn, while al-Ḥajjāj did not, and did not have to, furnish any pretext for the removal of Zādhānfarrūkh, less highly esteemed at court, of less merit to the dynasty, and less continuous in service. When the matter is viewed in this light, the detailed story told by Madāʾinī, Bilādhurī, Māwardī, and Nuwairī is less ridiculous and improbable than Hitti would have us believe. The less drastic form of Jahshiyārī and Ṣulī simply mentions some unnamed slackness, dilatoriness, or remissness on the part of the old man, something that suggested to ʿAbdalmalik the presumption on Sarjūn's part that he was indispensable, something that was making him disgusting and unbearable to ʿAbdalmalik. With this in mind, ʿAbdalmalik having before him the precedent and example set by al-Ḥajjāj and Ṣāliḥ, it is anything but impossible that in Sarjūn's offices a slovenly scribe used urine to replenish his dried-up inkwell instead of water not so conveniently at hand and that that was the last straw, the very excuse, which ʿAbdalmalik had been looking for.

The manner in which ʿAbdalmalik now acted shows further a sort of awe and reverence in which Sarjūn was held at court, to which the situation of Zādhānfarrūkh at the court of al-Ḥajjāj was certainly not wholly parallel. ʿAbdalmalik does not broach the matter with Sarjūn. He discusses it with another secretary in a different department, a younger man whom he had found for himself and not inherited from the Sufyānids, who was, therefore, much nearer to his person and counsels, though Sarjūn may have been, as Theophanes states, a man of influence and consequence. In Bilādhurī's account he is named, briefly, but correctly so far as it goes, Sulaimān, son of Saʿd. Jahshiyārī (35 = 18a, cf. 43 = 22a and 51 = 26a) gives us the full name correctly as Abū Thābit Sulaimān, son of Saʿd, the Khushanite. On page 48 a scribal error makes the father's name Saʿd. The error is not that of Jahshiyārī himself, for Jahshiyārī distinguishes clearly between our man and Sulaimān, son of Saʿd, the *mawlā* of al-Ḥusain, who is said, perhaps erroneously, to have performed secretarial service to Muʿāwiyah (23 = 12a). Ṭabarī also has the correct form in his list of scribes, somewhat defective in the printed edition (II, 837 f.), distinguished from Sulaimān, son of Saʿd, the Ḥarashite (II, 1905). Moreover, both Ṭabarī (II, 839 and 1789) and Jahshiyārī (66 = 33b) know the son of Ibn Saʿd, *Thābit*, as an important secretary in the short caliphate of Yazīd, son of al-Walīd, to whom we must presently recur. Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi knows only al-Ḥusain's *mawlā* and puts him in the place of the Khushanite. Ṣulī has the correct name of Saʿd as the father but also makes him (in the Cairene text) the *mawlā* of al-Ḥusain. Aghānī (VI, 137) tells from Madāʾinī the same story as Ṭabarī, II, 1789; the first edition prints Ḥasanite, when the author had very probably written, as printed in Ṭabarī, Khushanite. Al-Nadīm in the *Fihrist* has made a sad mess of an attempt to improve on Bilā-

dhurī. He has the father's name right but makes him Ḥusain's *mawlā* and dates the translation in Hishām's reign, though he knows the man's position in ʿAbdalmalik's administration and knows further that "some say" the change took place under ʿAbdalmalik. Māwardī follows Bilādhurī. The conscientiously full Ibn Shādhān has, according to Enger, "Abū Thābit Sulaimān ibn Saʿīd, *mawlā* of Ḥusain," but knows his position. Nuwairī (VIII, 199) has Sulaimān ibn Saʿd with Bilādhurī. Ibn Khaldūn has Sulaimān ibn Saʿd but makes him the governor of Urdunn. The case is clear. The correct name is Sulaimān ibn Saʿd, the *Khushanite*, i.e., as Ibn Doreid (318, cf. 314) states briefly and clearly, a member of Khushain, a great sept living in Syria of the Shamīs, a clan of the Banī Jarm, a subtribe of the Kalbite Qudāʿah. The man's father had certainly been a Christian, and he may well have been. But he was an Arab, not a Greek. He was clearly an able man, the post he held at ʿAbdalmalik's court being that of secretary for the official communications or rescripts. That means that he knew Arabic well. He knew Greek as well, for the proposition he makes to ʿAbdalmalik to rid him of Sarjūn is that he will turn the tax-bureau's books and records into Arabic. This was easier than Šālih's job had been. On the one hand, he had Šālih's work for a model; on the other, he was in a position to estimate and demand as expenses for the work one year's tax income of the Urdunn province, which turned out to be 180,000 *dīnars*, gold coins, a respectable sum, though the Urdunn was in this respect the least of the provinces of Syria. He completed the job in less than a year unbeknown to Sarjūn, who was then confronted with the *fait accompli*, and himself and his clerks thenceforth dispensed with. Sulaimān's greatest reward was his appointment to the secretaryship for the finances of the whole of Syria. In this position he remained continuously until the pious ʿUmar II deposed him for unknown reasons, about 100 A.H. = A.D. 718/19. Yazid II reinstated him (Jahshiyārī, 51), probably very soon after his accession early in 720, and no change is recorded until Yazid's death early in 724. Thereafter Sulaimān disappears from the records. Twenty years later his son appears for one brief moment on the stage of public affairs, but in the ensuing troubles which ended in the downfall of Syria the family drops from sight.

The change in the official records spread to Egypt, as is credibly stated by both al-Kindī, *Governors and Judges*, 58 f., and Maḳrīzī's *Khīṭaṭ*, I, 98 (as quoted by Wellhausen, *Reich*, 137, n. 1), in the first full year of the reign of al-Walid I, 87 A.H. = A.D. 706. Curiously, both say that these records had up to that time been kept in Coptic. This seems not to correspond with what is known from the papyri, the bulk of which come from Egypt, but quite possibly we may not have in such papyri as accident has preserved for us any of those official books which came under the eye of the governor-general.

Later authors have a way of at least allowing, sometimes definitely stating, that the entire change was made in al-Walid's reign. This may refer to the completion of the change in the great central provinces, as it has just now been described. It may be, too, that such statements are derived from minor provincial offices, where quite naturally its introduction was delayed.

For the outlying greater provinces no evidence is at hand for the mode of procedure in North Africa and Spain. On Khurasān we have a precious bit of clear evidence in Jahshiyārī (65 = 33*a*). In 124 A.H. = A.D. 741/42 the fanatical Yūsuf ibn ʿUmar sent from the ʿIrāk an order to Naṣr ibn Sayyār, the last Umayyad governor of Khurasān, thenceforth no longer to employ as functionaries or secretaries any polytheist whatever. This is the first religious note of this sort that is met with in the process. Jahshiyārī then goes on to say that the first man who transferred the systems of accounting from Persian to Arabic in Khurasān was Iṣḥāk ibn Tulaik, the secretary, a man of the Banī Nahshal (both known clans of this name, as found in Ibn Doreid, 143 and 150, belong to the great confederation of Tamīm), who was with Naṣr ibn Sayyār and was very close to him.

The change thus described as fully, as accurately, and as humanly, as the literature at hand permits was a momentous one. Becker minimizes it when he says (*EI*, II, 7) that it influenced not even 1 per cent of the population. The clerks and secretaries affected were, indeed, to begin with, few. But the great transfer signalized as a fact and emphasized the feeling that this Arabic movement had settled down to stay. Henceforth whoever wanted employment and advancement in the government service had to know Arabic and know it well. Access to governmental authorities or instances, whether for influence or redress in a matter so closely connected with so great a number of people as are taxes, demanded in increasing measure, patent to all, knowledge of Arabic. The entire process is a very different one from that which Hitti so briefly describes, relying almost entirely on the quite unreliable Ibn Khaldūn and rejecting Bilādhurī, as he knows and understands him. It is curious but natural that in the last great province affected, in far-off Khurasān, a reverse movement, from Arabic to Persian written in the Arabic alphabet, soon sets in.

With other things which interested the poet-caliph, al-Walīd ibn Yazīd (February 6, 743—April 17, 744), and were sent to him from the East, we may, rather must, consider here, as a sort of precursor of this reverse current by which Arabic is again largely invaded by Persian, a curious episode concerning his successor, Yazīd ibn al-Walīd (April 17–September 25, 744), which has been made a moot question by Herzfeld's public statements, with which this essay was set in motion.

The very first thing that must be clearly stated is the fact that the ephemeral caliph Yazīd III, ibn al-Walīd, only partially recognized during his five months on the throne at Damascus, was the first Umayyad caliph to ascend the throne whose mother was not a freeborn, noble Arab woman but a slave taken captive in far-off border wars and sent to the harem of the much-wived al-Walīd I as a concubine, freed and accepted as at best a wife of the second rank, when she bore a son recognized as his own and therefore as a prince of the royal house by the royal father. There had been other sons of concubines before him, much abler and in every way more outstanding men, great generals and governors, who nevertheless did not and could not aspire to the

caliphal throne, because of their concubine mothers, according to early Arab ideas and unwritten law baseborn whatever their lineage. Yazīd III's occupation of what was left of the Umayyad throne after the murder of his cousin, al-Walīd ibn Yazīd, was the first break in this prideful Arabic customary law.

Yazīd was a prince of the royal house, but, first, there was a bar sinister on his escutcheon and, second, he was very much a younger son, unheard of, except perhaps for a display of piety and adherence to Ḳadarite doctrines accounted orthodox and favored in some parts of Syria, until suddenly he aspired to the caliphate. He is enumerated in eighteenth place among the nineteen sons of al-Walīd, listed with Ṭabarī's death notice on al-Walīd (II, 1270). Of three only is the mother named or described as a free Arab woman. Yazīd is of the sixteen who are summed up under the term "by various mothers." With Yazīd's death as caliph, Ṭabarī names her but calls her "mother of a lad," *umm walad*, the technical term for a concubine as described above (II, 1874).

Yazīd was no poet like the cousin he had murdered to take his place. Yet on occasion he could astonish his followers by dropping from piety into a bit of poetry (Ṭab., II, 1791). He met the blot on his escutcheon by a boyish, boasting couplet, which I have not observed before Ṭabarī (II, 1874), but which then becomes a part of the regular stock in trade for Arabic historians down to Suyūṭī and perhaps later. It runs very simply:

I'm the son of a Chosroes, and my father is Marwān;
A Caesar is my grandsire, and my grandsire is Khākān.

With this goes a Persian name for his mother, whose variants caused by difficulties in Arabic writing and ignorance of Persian need not detain us, and, almost as a matter of course, a genealogy; she is, quoting Hishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Kalbī with Ṭabarī, "Shāhāfrīd, daughter of Fairūz, son of Yazdajird, son of Shahrīyār, son of Chosroes." This genealogy occurs before Ṭabarī, e.g., Yaḥḳūbī, II, 401, in shorter form. It is referred to and expanded in a curious way by al-Mubarrad in his *Kāmil* (300). Among famous "mothers of lads" in the early Arabic social register he mentions a wife of al-Ḥusain, named "Sulāfah, of the children of Yazdajird, of known lineage, one of the choicest of women." This is a very suspect person in general, and suspicion is not allayed by the name and description. Sulāfah is not a Persian name but an Arabic noun used for excellent wine or the choicest part of anything; etymologically it suggests a long past and a known lineage. On this lady al-Mubarrad then proceeds to add, almost necessarily, that it is said, "Sulāfah was the paternal aunt of the mother of Yazīd . . . or her sister." Mas'ūdī's *Murūj al-dhahab* are worth looking into (ed. Barbier de Meynard, VI, 31 f., with n. 1 on p. 32, printed on p. 490; the text of a recent Cairo edition, brought out in 1346 A.H. = A.D. 1927/28, is much less good at this point). Mas'ūdī adds little of value on the mother of Yazīd, except that he is the first Arabic author found by us to state that Yazīd is the first son of an *umm walad* to become ruler of the state. According to the French scholar's note, the late Mirkhond (III,

150) calls her Māhāfrīd and gives a full genealogy; apparently, the later the author, the longer the genealogy. More important is the careful and well-informed Masʿūdī's statement that the mother of Yazīd's brother Ibrāhīm, who succeeded him, was also a "mother of a lad," named Rairah, or Barīrah, or Badīrah, or Deīreh, or Barbarah (perhaps Greek and most likely of the lot), or Barīrah, or (*loc. cit.*, n. 2, from the ʿUyūn, 148) Niʿmah. Neither the Mirkhond text cited nor the anonymous ʿUyūn, somewhat earlier, published by De Goeje in *Fragmenta hist. Arab.*, is in our library. Neither our library nor this writer has the money to buy them, if attainable, and it is hardly worth while to spend effort and money to secure them on a loan for so small an additional contribution to our knowledge as they might render at this point. In this connection, however, it is proper to warn against Suyūṭī. His short note, quoted from the *Kitāb al-Awāʾil* of Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (*Tārīkh al-Khulafāʾ* [ed. Cairo, 1305 A.H. = A.D. 1888], p. 85), is in a general way right. His gleeful display of specious knowledge on the mother of Yazīd (pp. 98 and 110) is for the most part of doubtful value or altogether wrong. Particularly unhappy is his attempt to correct the careful Šūlī's statement that up to his time the only known mother of two caliphs (al-Hādī and al-Rashīd) was Khaizurān. Suyūṭī's most patent error in the cases he cites to the contrary is that on the lady under discussion here, whom he makes the mother of both Yazīd and Ibrāhīm. Masʿūdī knew better, but Justī, in the frequently quoted *Namenbuch*, was led astray by Suyūṭī, and others relying on Justī might be.

Ibn al-Aṭhīr (V, 235) is the first author to come to our notice who extends the genealogical scheme by trying to figure out the exact meaning of Yazīd's boastful claim. His words are: "He makes Kaīsar and Khākān his two grandfathers, because the mother of Fairūz, son of Yazdajird, was the daughter of Kisrā Shīrūyah, son of Kisrā, and her mother was the daughter of Kaīsar, and the mother of Shīrūyah was a daughter of Khākān, the king of the Turks." Ibn al-Aṭhīr does not disclose his source for this astounding information. Ibn Khallikān (I, 455 f.; De Slane, II, 209 ff.) in the biography of Zain al-ʿAbidīn Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī, son of al-Husain, quotes from three sources. The first is al-Zuhri (Muḥammad ibn Muslim, 50-124 A.H. = A.D. 671-742), a court theologian and traditionist for the Umayyads, older contemporary of Yazīd III, who died just about two years before Yazīd's brief reign. He makes the wife of al-Husain, who was the mother of Zain al-ʿAbidīn, "Sulāfah, daughter of Yazdajird, last of the kings of Persia," and at the same time "paternal aunt of the mother of Yazīd," whose capture in Khurasān he then proceeds to tell, as will be related presently. The second of Ibn Khallikān's sources is the story of al-Mubarrad's *Kāmil*. The motive and purpose of this story are in Ibn Khallikān's version, to this writer's mind, clearer than in Wright's text of the *Kāmil*. There are three daughters of Yazdajird; they go by the grace of ʿAlī one each to a son of Abū Bakr, to a son of ʿUmar, and to a son of ʿAlī—none to ʿUthman, Marwān, or Muʿāwiyah. The mantle of Persian royalty is dropped on the proper shoulders. The first two families presently dissipated into thin air. ʿAlī's family continues to the present day as strong claimants

to the divine right of kings, *shereefs* of Mecca in the ʿIrāk, the Imām in Yemen, the Franco-British Agha Khan, etc. The Ummayyads come very late to this honor, as they were largely late-comers, or regarded as such, into true Islam. Ibn Khallikān's third source, the still very early and reliable Ibn Ḳutaibah in the *Kitāb al-Maʿārif*, has information of a very different sort. He says briefly and to the point that Zain al-ʿĀbidīn's mother was a woman of Sind (the Panjab), named Sulāfah (explained above) or Ghazālāh ("she gazelle"), names given to favored concubines and courtesans. Barhebraeus is a shrewd courtier and in his Arabic history (ed. Pococke, 211 = Latin, 136; Sālḥānī, 204) omits the Shirūyah of Ibn al-Athīr and simply says: "The mother of Fairūz was the daughter of Kisrā," etc. The Persian Mustawfī Ḳazwīnī says briefly: "His mother was a granddaughter of Yazdagird, son of Shāhriyār." The Christian Eutychius, in Arabic, Saʿīd, patriarch of Alexandria from 933 to 939 (*CSCO*, Ser. III, VII, 46 f.; ed. Pococke, 390 f.), has a different form of the genealogy and of the distich. The text seems badly preserved, and it is not necessary that we follow or discuss here the errors. He first develops the paternal line from Yazīd through al-Walīd and ʿAbdalmalik to Marwān, and then says: "His mother was a Persian, Shāhāfrīd daughter of Fairūz Kisrā, king of the Persians, son of Yazdagird, son of Shāhriyār, and her grandmother was a daughter of Maurīk, king of Byzantine Rome. Accordingly, he says, 'I'm a son of a Kisrā and a son of Marwān, and Maurīk is my grandsire and my grandsire is Sāsān (or Shāshān).'" The interest of the Christian author with the Greek name in the Christian Roman Empire is manifest. For the rest all of this represents the polite, loyally Ummayyad, court form of the genealogy compressed in the couplet.

With this assiduously courtly genealogy there seems to have gone a gentler tale of how Shāhāfrīd was made captive and how she came to the well-stocked harem of al-Walīd, a tale that omitted details and was more like that of Ibn Khaldūn (*History* [ed. Bülāḳ, 1284], III, 63) and Ibn Taghribardī (ed. Juynboll and Mathes, I, 251). With Yazīd ibn al-Walīd, though his pretext for killing his cousin had a similar, only somewhat stronger, flavor, Persian courtly politeness and cosmetics seem to enter in thereto unheard-of measure into Ummayyad court life. That is certainly one major meaning of the flattering story reported by Ibn Ḳutaibah in the *Uyūn al-Aḫbār* (ed. Cairo, I, 93 f.; ed. Brockelmann, 117; according to Brockelmann also in Jāḥiẓ, *Bayān*, I, 41 f., and *ʿIqd*, I, 129). With the second-rate but prolific and prosperous jingle-rhyme poet, the Basrensian Tamīmīte known as the Omanite (Agh., XVII, 78-83), we are given a glimpse at this Persianizing trend from the days of the last Ummayyads, Yazīd and Ibrāhīm, sons of al-Walīd, and Marwān II, through early Abbasid times to the half-turn toward a new, refined sort of Arabization which marked the latter part of Hārūn al-Rashīd's reign after the destruction of the Barmecides.

This change in the views and life of the Ummayyad dynasty is further reflected in a tale which Ṭabarī (II, 1246 f.) reports as traced back to the profligate jester and poet of the Marwānīd Ummayyads, Ḥamzah ibn Baid

(Aghānī, XV, 15–26). Kutaibah ibn Muslim, when he was in Khurasān (85 or 86 A.H. = A.D. 704/5 to 96 or 97 A.H. = A.D. 714/15), captured among the Soghdians a maid of the descendants of Yazdajird, and said: “Do you think the son of this girl will be a mongrel?” They (his officers) said: “Yes, he will be a mongrel in the opinion of his father.” So he sent her to al-Ḥajjāj, and al-Ḥajjāj sent her to al-Walid, and she bore him Yazid ibn al-Walid.

There is, however, a far less complimentary version of this tale. Since this is traceable in part, at least, to a well-known and much-quoted *mawla* of the Banī al-Muṭṭalib, Muḥammad ibn Ishāk ibn Yasār, the Medinensian, through Ghīyāth ibn Ibrāhīm and Madā'inī (Ṭab; I, 2873, ll. 3 ff. and 8), there may be in it something of malicious Abbasid, or less probably 'Alid, blackening of Ummayyad character. There is perhaps in it, and in a related tale connected with it, something of Persian aversion to the last Yazdagird, who lost them their independent kingdom. For there were, of course, Persians who hated this Yazdagird, as well as such who venerated him and established and named a sort of messianic era after him. Perhaps there is in it, also, as in Ḥamzah ibn Baid's tale, something of the rough verities of the soldier's camp life. Anyway it is a story worth telling and knowing, if one would know human history as it is. Ṭabari places it under the year 31 A.H. = A.D. 651/52, though its point reaches pretty clearly to 126 = 744. Merv, says the tale, is called *Khudah-dushman*, i.e., king's enemy. This statement in Ṭabari's version is left hanging fire for its motivation between a preceding, milder, and, in general, more sentimental report of Yazdajird's death and burial in the earlier year, which describes the ruler and people of Merv as hostile to the king, and to which it thus evidently belongs, and the following maliciously romantic tale, which makes the king appear as something of an enemy to Merv and is perhaps intended so to interpret the epithet of Merv in Arabic and later Persian fashion as a sentence, “The king is an enemy.” Yazdajird had used a woman in Merv, and she had borne him a boy, paralyzed on one side—the birth taking place, of course, after Yazdajird's death—and he was named al-Mukhdaj, i.e., “the Abortion.” To him children were born in Khurasān. Then Kutai-bah, when he conquered the Soghdians or others, found two maidens and was told: “These two are of the children of the Abortion.” So he sent the two or one of them to al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, and he sent her on to al-Walid ibn 'Abdalmalik, and to al-Walid she bore Yazid ibn al-Walid the Diminisher, an ambiguous epithet, which here does not refer to his cutting-down of the pay or gift roll but to the fact that he marks the end of Ummayyad rule, as, we shall see presently, Yazdajird (and his progeny) ominously mark the end of Sassanian Persia.

Before taking that up, it is well to register here two further occurrences of this tale, one a simple repetition by Ibn al-Aṭhīr (III, 93) and the other in Ibn Khallikān (I, 455), with interesting variants representing the court version, as reported by al-Zuhri, itself subtly ambiguous, as was Zuhri's attitude and position (Goldziher, *M. St.*, II, 38 f.). What makes it clearly related to our tale are the *two* girls, but it is full of courtly names and titles, etc., as

Zuhri tells it. Ḳutaibah ibn Muslim the Bāhilite was prince-commander of Khurasān. When he pursued the dynasty of the Persians (somewhat late in the day) and killed Fairūz, son of Yazdajird, he sent his two daughters to al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, the Thaḳāfite, at that time prince-commander of the Irāk and Khurasān with Ḳutaibah his lieutenant in Khurasān. So al-Ḥajjāj took one of the girls for himself and sent the other to al-Walīd ibn ʿAbdalmalik, and he begot with her Yazīd the Diminisher. This epithet and the explanation which follows cannot for chronological reasons be Zuhri's, but it may represent the opinion of Marwān II and his men, before he perished with the kingdom: "He was called the diminisher because he decreased the gifts (pay) of the army."

That not this but the one above given is the correct interpretation of the epithet is confirmed both by the similar epithet applied to "Fairūz, son of Yazdajird," in the noncourtly version of the story told just now, and by the tale which Ṭabarī (I, 1044 f.) reports from the guilelessly romancing "archeologist," Hishām ibn Muḥammad (ibn al-Kalbī). Chosroes Parwīz had eighteen sons (note that al-Walīd I had nineteen, eighteen beside the half-Persian Yazid, who according to one tale was classed by him as a mongrel or bastard). The eldest of them was Shahriyār, and Shīrīn (the famous, but in this story apparently sonless, favorite wife of Chosroes Parwīz) had adopted him as her son. Now the astrologers told Chosroes that to one of his sons would be born a boy, by whose means this courtly hall would be ruined and this kingdom perish (waste away, the same word that is used to describe Yazdajird's son, the Abortion, as paralyzed or wasted of one side); his mark would be a defect (the same word as used for Yazīd the Diminisher) somewhere on his body. For this reason Chosroes shut his sons off completely from women. So they remained a while having no contact with any woman, until Shahriyār complained about it to Shīrīn and sent her a message complaining of sexual desire and asking her to introduce to him a woman, or else he would kill himself. She sent in reply the message: "I cannot possibly introduce to you any woman, unless it be a woman so hideous as to go unheeded, one whom it will not be nice for you to touch." He said, "I do not care, so long as she is a woman." So Shīrīn sent him a maid, whom she had had scarified. Some claim that she was one of the daughters of their nobles, with whom Shīrīn had become angry for some reason (was the reason, perhaps, Chosroes himself?) and so had turned her over to the scarifiers. When she introduced her to Shahriyār, he used her, and she became pregnant with Yazdajird. By Shīrīn's orders she was kept in confinement until she had been delivered, and the matter of the child was kept secret from Chosroes for five years. Then Shīrīn noticed that Chosroes, growing old, was softening toward the young men; so she said to him: "Would you be happy, O king, if you saw a boy child belonging to one of your sons, whatever unpleasant or forbidden thing might be connected therewith?" He said: "I don't mind." So she gave orders, and Yazdajird was perfumed and decked out, and she brought him into the king's presence and said: "This is Yazdajird, son of Shahriyār." He called him to himself,

set him on his lap, kissed and fondled him, and loved him so dearly that he began to have him overnight with himself. Then one day, while the child was playing before him, he suddenly remembered what had been foretold, called the boy to him, stripped him of his clothing, examined him fore and aft, and discovered the defect on one of his haunches. Seized with a violent rage he lifted the boy up to dash him to the ground. But Shirīn clung to him and adjured him by God not to kill him, saying: "If anything does happen to this kingdom, it cannot be averted anyhow." He said: "This is, indeed, the ill-omened one of whom I was told. Take him out of my sight!" So she ordered him away, and he was taken to Sajistān. But some say: No, he was in the Sawād (the black bottom land of the ʿIrāk) with his nurse in a village called Khumāniyah.

This is not all, but it is the bulk and essence of what we knew (for some more, including a Kisrā or Khosrau, grandson of Yazdegerd, cf. Marquart, *Ērānsahr*, 68 f. and 133) about Zādhānfarrūkh, Ḳutaibah ibn Muslim, al-Ḥajjāj, and al-Walid in connection with the Persian princess Shāhāfrīd and her son Yazīd ibn al-Walid, until Herzfeld published from the Ibn al-Faḳīḥ manuscript at Meshhed the statement of Hishām ibn al-Kalbī that Ḳutaibah ibn Muslim (in Khurasān 85 or 86 A.H. = A.D. 704/5 to 96/97 A.H. = A.D. 715) in his victory over Pērōz, son of the Kisrā Yazdegerd (perhaps to be read "Kisrā, son of Pērōz, son of Yazdegerd"), took prisoner the Persian prince's daughter Shāhāfrīd. He sent her to al-Ḥajjāj, and he to al-Walid, whose son by her was the Yazīd, who was caliph in 744. Since al-Walid died early in 715, and al-Ḥajjāj in the middle of 714, it is calculated that this Yazīd at his death cannot have been less than thirty nor more than thirty-seven years old, though Ibn Ḳutaibah (*Maʿārif*, 186), and others after him, set his age as high as forty-two. The luggage of the "princess" (taken as booty, but evidently sent untouched, unopened, and in identifiable form to the ʿIrāk) was opened by al-Ḥajjāj, and a book, which he found in it, confiscated. This book was translated for al-Ḥajjāj by Zādhānfarrūkh (whose ideas on such translations have been set forth, and who died at the latest in 701, but, according to Herzfeld's Ibn al-Kalbī, translated the Sassanian tax lists for ʿAbdalmalik in 697 and was still in office under Walid, 705-15, and Sulaimān, 715-17). In translation the book turned out to be Zoroastrian, its contents "geographical character sketches" of Iranian lands, written originally for Kavādh I (roughly 488-531) to help him choose a site for a new residence. With a facetious phrase, to which he clings, Herzfeld calls it the "princess's Baedeker," revised to 705. When he, leaving Hishām ibn al-Kalbī behind and proceeding on his own knowledge, identifies this book with the *Ayātkārihā ʿē Shathrihā* of the *Bundahishn*, and the preserved and published fragment of the *Shathrihā ʿē Ērān*, as all part and parcel of the same book, which became a major source for the topographical notes on Sassanian Iran in Arab literature, that constitutes a real advance in our knowledge.

But Hishām ibn al-Kalbī by himself, as Jāḥiẓ, Bilādhurī, and others well knew, is not to be relied upon. That he wrote a hundred and forty books, and

that in his work Nöldeke and others have found and continue to find bits of valuable evidence not preserved otherwise, does not make him one of the first *and best*, nor a thoroughly reliable Arabic historian. He is simply another writer of big bad books, so prolific and well advertised that he would have qualified as an eminently successful occupant of many a professorial chair in almost any modern American university, including perhaps even the Harvard of Conant's doilies and our own *Saturday Evening Post*-ed Chicago. As Mr. Hutchins in one of his brightest moments has seen, perhaps just not quite clearly enough, few vested interests exist that are stronger and more firmly knit and intrenched than a guild of professorial authors, turned intelligentsia, writing and boosting one another's books, some good, many more big bad or indifferent. The books and statements of Abū Mundhir Hishām ibn al-Kalbī cannot be taken on faith and quoted as authority without a close and severe check. Herzfeld's trust in him is not well founded. It is a pity that in work as valuable as his it has misled him even into minor errors, such as those which have here become manifest.

It was, perhaps, this same romancing writer of a great bulk of early Arabic literature, together with his own great interest in "geographical" and topographical "character sketches," which kept Herzfeld from seeing the fundamental character of the Pahlavi book which he has discovered for us. Such a book was certainly not written simply to help Kavādh choose a site for a new residence. Neither al-Ḥajjāj, when he chose the site for Wāsiṭ, nor al-Manṣūr, when he chose the site for Baghdad, nor al-Muṭasim, when he chose the site for Sāmarrā, knew or used such a book nor was one written for them. What al-Ḥajjāj was interested in having translated, and who did the work for him and then remained in office to the end of Sulaimān's reign, is perfectly clear from the historical records presented here. The tax records, the taxing and general financial methods, the secretarial technique for these things—that was what interested al-Ḥajjāj, that was what Ṣāliḥ ibn ʿAbdalraḥmān transferred into lucid and intelligible Arabic for him. These were the things that before that time only the *dihkāns* understood well, because it was the financial organization and management of the Persian empire, last revised in the time of Kavādh and Chosroes Anōshirvān, which was simply carried on in the Arabic empire. Exactly what it was that Ṣāliḥ translated, for which the secretaries now writing in Arabic blessed him for two and three and more generations, is nowhere clearly and fully stated. It cannot have been merely a matter of names and numbers. That he translated a book or a set of books for the instruction of scribes is nowhere recorded. Perhaps he distributed these instructions in leaflet (*ṣaḥīfah*) form or in guild fashion by word of mouth and example. If any book was translated, as Hishām ibn al-Kalbī maintains, it was not travel literature for a doubtful princess, and it was not Zādhānfarrūkh but Ṣāliḥ who did the translation for al-Ḥajjāj.

That there were such books of instructions for scribes in Pahlavi is probable in itself and is proved by the remnants we have, including Herzfeld's discoveries. Herzfeld is somewhat surprised, as who reading a Baedeker would

not be, to find that the qualities of regions or provinces and their inhabitants as described in his discovery are all bad ones, and he knows other descriptions of the same sort that run from bad to worse (*AMI*, IX, No. 2, 95, n. 3). Now that is pretty much what *Zādhānfarrūkh* does in the interview with al-Ḥajjāj inserted in the Introduction to Yāqūt's *Buldān*. These are the descriptions of tax officials. If, in such position, one set one's figures too high, one was held most unpleasantly to account for them, as was Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab for *Khurasān*, and many before and after him. It was natural for clever men in such positions, experienced in the routine of tax bureaus, to set their estimates and figures in the lowest possible brackets, so as to avoid as much as possible the constant pressure of the administrative and war departments of government for more and again more funds, and to avoid dire punishment, swiftly and remorselessly inflicted in those days, if their figures fell below the estimate or the previous record. Tax officials, and beside them almost no one else except a malicious enemy, would describe the districts and cities and inhabitants of their own country in terms running from bad to worse. This geographical handbook of memoranda (*Ayāt-karihā*) is a part of the Sassanian Persian handbook or book of instructions for secretaries, clerks, and scribes, chiefly of the treasury, which then as now constituted the major part of governmental management and administration. The so-called *Frahang i Pahlawīk* is another fragment preserved from this handbook. Its very name, *frahang*, means "instruction." It is, of course, clear at first sight that it is for the instruction of scribes, this section of the "instruction" dealing with difficult spellings and word forms, not only Semitic words used probably since near the great Darius' time to write Persian words, but odd, archaic Persian writings, etc. The opening section reminds one of Ṣūlī's earlier sections on the *bismillāh*, *amma ba^c d*, and, in general, initial formulas and forms of address. The other chapters are hardly general instruction for secretaries in general. The choice of subjects for them and of words in each chapter are properly explicable for the most part chiefly or only for use in the tax bureaus. Again a comparison with Ṣūlī's *Discipline of the Secretaries* suggests itself. Following the section much referred to in the first part of this study at the end of Part II, the entire Part III is headed *Wujūh al-Amwāl*, "Kinds of Property," i.e., subject to taxation. The contents of this part go beyond that heading, but under it we find, e.g., names and classifications of animals, according to age, etc., just as in the *Frahang*. Real estate and personal taxes, foodstuffs, and arithmetic may also be found in both. The comparison cannot here be developed in detail, but a comparison of such Pahlavi material for the instruction of the scribes for the tax bureaus as we have with Arabic books of a similar sort from Ibn al-Muḳaffa^c and Ṣūlī to Kālkashandī would constitute in itself an excellent dissertation for a live, alert, and able young man. It would mark a great step in advance for our knowledge of how history shifted from Persian to Arabic, and not merely from Greek and Latin, Syriac and Coptic to Arabic.

Two matters remain which must here be touched upon briefly. The first

is a case of *hyrzwum* ^{st-r}, *xwd-y*; in the other we hope in closing to turn away from sin and error, in Arabic both *khafa*, to new grace and light.

The first concerns the KZ inscription. On this the writer has made two public statements. In the first (*AJSL*, LIII, No. 2 [January, 1937], 126-44) he presented, as neutrally and objectively as possible, with the slender means in library and press material and funds at hand (about which many abroad still harbor exaggerated ideas), the text of the inscription. The reading was made from considerably larger photographs than the very limited number which it was possible to distribute in various centers of learning with the purpose of making available to as large a number of competent scholars as might be a still more objective text. With no colleagues near to consult, none in America (Herzfeld by letter refused to do so much as read what was given on the new find), the cards were laid on the table; not all, for lack of space, but enough to leave nothing hidden for those who had judicious eyes to see. With his eyes and evidently a lobe or two of his brain too "punch-drunk" from the effort to see and to report as mechanically as possible and without regard to meaning each separate sign, beginning in repeated readings from the rear and attempting from the lights and shadows of the larger photographs (these are three separate ones, with as yet no squeeze in our hands) to distinguish what might be mere cracks and rough spots on the stones, this writer knew perfectly well that he had not solved the riddle of the stones when he first published. With the eyefear of the photographs still upon him and little, except referential, use of them, he published an additional statement in *ZDMG*, XCI, No. 3 (1937), 652-72. Both are misquoted in a note of a former student of his, referred to in the Introduction. Another paper, on linguistic details in and out of the KZ inscription, is awaiting a few final touches for publication in the Jackson Memorial volume; it was written for the most part with no photograph and not even the writer's own transcription at hand. In the meantime attention must be called to the fact that Mrs. Mackensen's note was in the editor's hands before the end of November, that his conversation which led to a slight revision of that note took place two weeks before that, and that quotation of the editor's oral statement made in that note is on the date correct.

Now the editor has just this moment received a reprint, but before this had seen the original of Dr. W. B. Henning's brilliant solution of the riddle of the KZ inscription in *BSOS*, IX, No. 4 (1939), 823-49. It is obvious, without further words, that that solution is essentially correct. It is the triumphal inscription of *Shāhpuhr* I after the conclusion of his victorious campaigns against the Roman armies in the eastern half of the Roman Empire. With the early publication of this solution Dr. Henning has gained fresh laurels for his brow, which this writer manifestly never had and does not now have any intention to tarnish or to pluck. With this key, the geographical problems are relatively easy to unlock, and that has been done with great success by Dr. Henning. It is therewith obvious that these lists are not comparable with the

"Städteliste" from the archives of the royal tax bureau and do not list satrapies with their capitals, but do list, as they are nowhere else listed, the major towns taken and devastated in Roman territory on Shāhpuhr's campaigns. Dr. Henning is further to be congratulated on the speed and thoroughness with which he has mastered the English language, and almost the style and manner of the fine British scholars. Even with the help of the new code and school for the acquisition by refugees of local protective coloring, announced in the London Press Service of the *Chicago Tribune* (Vol. XCVIII, No. 6, Sunday, February 5, 1939, Part I, p. 3, cols. 3 f.), there will be few to rival and surely none to surpass Dr. Henning in this respect.

This confession must not be closed without making two further statements. Before Dr. Henning's publication came to hand, the writer had cognizance of two similar solutions found by students of the late, much-revered Andreas. The oldest of these, the dean of all Pahlavi scholars in the world today, keen and kindly Arthur Christensen, wrote the editor too late for incorporation of his statements in the *ZDMG* article, and even for the third paper, as first read at Bonn. He spoke to this writer in his scholarly home, and the writer knew of the paper to be read at Brussels, which at the last moment he found himself unable to attend. Perhaps the youngest of the Andreas students living is the very learned and able Kai Barr. By correspondence through a mutual acquaintance the writer knew that he also had seen the now very obvious solution in a similar way. This was not mentioned in personal conversation between the two most interested parties late in the spring of 1938. If it had been, the pages of *AJSL* would have stood open freely to Kai Barr at least as early as October, 1938. Now the cat is out of the bag, and it is to be hoped that, as so often before, even without this "priority of publication," his wonderful little country will find for this eminent and rising young scholar the place due to his ability and fitting for his own and his fine family's dignified life. The many faceted diamond of human nature is a complicated problem in optical mathematics. Science, the urge for truth, is one of these facets, not the only one, but one of many. Rays entering and leaving it are crossed and colored by many others, since the many facets are one indivisible whole, and no single facet can be isolated except by the poor device of logic, of doubtful value even for temporary use. Had confidence been placed in this editor's wholly sincere propositions, pangs of regret and misunderstanding might to a greater degree have been and still be avoided. This writer might, of course, have delayed publication like the revered Andreas, whose fruition comes only in his students. He considered his own the better course. Perhaps he was wrong. Perhaps he should have heeded the Polonius wisdom of Pāpak of the *Kārnāmak*: *Khvēštan varch ō avīn-būtīh mā apaspār*.