Studia Orientalia 114

TRAVELLING THROUGH TIME

Essays in honour of Kaj Öhrnberg

Edited by

Sylvia Akar, Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila
& Inka Nokso-Koivisto

Travelling through Time: Essays in honour of Kaj Öhrnberg
Edited by Sylvia Akar, Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila & Inka Nokso-Koivisto
Studia Orientalia, vol. 114, 2013

CONTENTS

I HISTORY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

II FOOD FOR THOUGHT

FOREWORD

Who was it that first suggested we should celebrate the 70th anniversary of our teacher and friend Kaj Öhrnberg, Phil.Lic., with a volume of studies in the fields he is interested in? Whoever it was, the idea was adopted by all and sundry as soon as it was expressed, and willingly at that. The editorial committee organized itself immediately and all those who heard about the plan were enthusiastic.

This is indicative of Kaj Öhrnberg's person. Over the years, he has been teaching and helping people around him. You need a bibliographical reference? Ask Kaj, he'll provide you with one and volunteer half a dozen others that just occurred to him might be relevant. Want someone to read your manuscript? Send it to Kaj, he'll be certain to read it carefully, comment on it and, at the same time, he'll routinely mark your misspellings and check your references. Need some help with Russian sources, Caucasian place names, history of Oriental studies? It is to Kaj we have always turned for help, advice, and sometimes even consolation when things were going awry. Under normal circumstances, many of the articles printed in this volume would first have been sent by their authors to Kaj for comment and corrections.

It is not only the people in his immediate surroundings that Kaj Öhrnberg has always helped. Our first circular concerning the Festschrift drew enthusiastic responses from Spain, Russia, Scandinavia, and other countries whose scholars he has been in contact with. Everybody was willing to, waiting to, and wanting to contribute. Contributions started flowing in almost immediately.

There were willing contributors galore, yet some we had to turn down. Early on we had decided that the Festschrift should be thematic and the themes discussed should reflect the scholarly interests of the honoree. His intellectual interests cover a lot more than just the topics he has been writing about – his love of Chinese cultural history, Spanish red wines, and Russian literature is well known to his friends – but we decided to limit the Festschrift to Arabistics and a few other topics he has himself been working with. Without this limitation, there would have been many others to join in and contribute.

For someone not privileged to know Kaj Öhrnberg personally, this collection of articles may perhaps provide a faint image of the person it celebrates. There are some more personal articles at the beginning of the volume. The rest have been selected because we think Kaj Öhrnberg might be interested in their topics. The wide scope of the articles reflects his equally wide interests. There are arti-

xii

cles in English, German, French, and Spanish and there could as well have been several other languages, all of which Kaj Öhrnberg effortlessly reads.

But having said this, there remains one problem ahead. Always willing to help, Kaj Öhrnberg never pushes himself into the front line and he never particularly enjoys the limelight. How can we lure him into some occasion where his friends might come together to celebrate him and present him with the first copies of this Festschrift? We are still working on that …

June 2013 in Helsinki

Sylvia Akar, Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila & Inka Nokso-Koivisto

AL-KISRAWĪ AND THE ARABIC TRANSLATIONS OF THE *KHWADĀYNĀMAG*

Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila

University of Helsinki

The history of the Book of Kings tradition in the Middle Persian original(s) and Arabic and Modern Persian translations and rewritings is tangled.[1] It begins with one or more *Khwadāynāmags* written in Middle Persian in the sixth century. During the eighth to tenth centuries these were several times translated into, or retold in, Arabic while the Persian tradition dwindled. In Arabic, the tradition started living on its own and the early translations were freely modified and excerpted for a variety of historical works.

When Modern Persian literature developed during the tenth century much Arabic material was translated back into Modern Persian, while something may also have trickled down directly from Middle Persian sources, by now obscure to most Muslim Persians but still read by a diminishing number of Zoroastrian scholars. At the same time, the oral tradition preserved stories belonging to the same cycle and partly of greater antiquity than the *Khwadāynāmags*. Finally, towards the end of the tenth century the Persian poet Firdawsī created in Persian from this material a great epic, the *Shāhnāma*. Soon after, al-Thaʿālibī covered the same ground in Arabic prose, perhaps aware of Firdawsī's epic, which had just come into circulation, though by then it had not achieved the fame it was destined to have in later centuries. The disappearance of most of the relevant texts makes it precarious to say much about the development of this tradition between the *Khwadāynāmag*(*s*) of the sixth century and the works of Firdawsī and al-Thaʿālibī around the year 1000. There is a gap of almost half a millennium to be filled.

In tenth-century sources, a Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kisrawī, or Khusravī, sometimes pops up, but we know little about his life and activities.[2] The aim of this paper is to discuss the scant evidence at our disposal and to shed at least some light on this shadowy character, even though in the end we still have to admit that we are far from knowing who he was and what he did.

To understand Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā's role in the Book of Kings tradition, we have to begin with a close reading of our main sources. Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī, *Ta'rīkh* (pp. 9–10), may be taken as a starting point:[3]

> Their [the Persians'] chronologies are all confused, not sound because they have been transmitted after 150 years[4] from one language into another[5] and from a script where the numbers are equivocal into another language where the numbers are also equivocal. In this chapter, I have had to take recourse into collecting variously transmitted copies (*nusakh*),[6] of which I have come across eight, namely:
>
> H1. *Kitāb Siyar mulūk al-Furs*, translated/transmitted (*min naql*)[7] by Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ

---

2 Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā does not seem to have attracted much attention from modern scholars. Baron von Rozen's Russian article from 1895, summarized by J. Kirste (1896) and, later, Arthur Christensen in his *Les types du premier homme* I: 64–68 and II: 81–82 (1917–1934), as well as his *L'Iran sous les sassanides* (1936: 54–55), and further quoted through these by Dhabīḥullāh Ṣafā in his *Ḥamāsa-sarāyī* (AHŠ 1374: 88–89), Ruknaddīn Humāyūnfarrukh in his *Shāhnāme o-Firdawsī* (AHŠ 1377: 746–747), and many others, is still our main source on him. Mario Grignaschi's notes on him in (1969) and (1974) seem to be the most recent substantial contributions to al-Kisrawī studies, although Grignaschi's main aim was to study ps.-al-Aṣmaʿī's *Nihāyat al-arab*. Adhkāī's notes to his edition of al-Bīrūnī's *Āthār*, pp. 555–563, especially pp. 559–560, are also of value. Mohsen Zakeri (2008: 30–35) conveniently summarizes in English what is found in several Persian studies, but contributes little new. Carl Brockelmann, GAL I: 158, mainly uses Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* and Rozen (1895). Brockelmann's claim that al-Kisrawī is quoted by al-Jāḥiẓ is erroneous: al-Kisrawī is only quoted by ps.-al-Jāḥiẓ in his *Maḥāsin*, whereas in the real works of al-Jāḥiẓ, Mūsā ibn ʿĪsa- al-Kisrawī is not even once mentioned, as far as I have been able to verify. The other al-Kisrawī to be discussed in this article, ʿAlī ibn Mahdī, is occasionally said to have transmitted from al-Jāḥiẓ, see, e.g. al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfī* XXII: 244.

3 For Ḥamza, see Mittwoch (1909). All translations from Arabic and Persian are my own, except for the quotation from Ibn Isfandiyār's *History*.

4 It is not clear what this number refers to.

5 This shows that the following discussion concerns Arabic translations, not the Middle Persian original(s).

6 The term used by Ḥamza is inconveniently vague, as it may refer to different versions, redactions and rewritings of the same book or to copies of different works. As Grignaschi (1974: 89 and 104) appropriately emphasizes, the Book of Kings tradition was very much alive in the 9th and 10th centuries and even the contents of one book were continuously modified by corrections, additions and influences from other sources.

7 *Naqala* is another difficult term as it may equally well refer to translating or transmitting. Rozen's (1895) attempt to read a detailed difference between *naql*, *jamʿ* and *iṣlāḥ* is entirely hypothetical.

H2. *Kitāb Siyar mulūk al-Furs*, translated/transmitted (*min naql*) by Muḥammad ibn al-Jahm al-Barmakī

H3. *Kitāb taʾrīkh mulūk al-Furs*, which was taken from the Treasury (i.e. the Caliphal library) of al-Maʾmūn[8]

H4. *Kitāb Siyar mulūk al-Furs*, translated/transmitted (*min naql*) by Zādōye ibn Shāhōye al-Iṣbahānī

H5. *Kitāb Siyar mulūk al-Furs*, translated/transmitted (*min naql*) or compiled (*aw jamʿ*) by Muḥammad ibn Bahrām ibn Miṭyār al-Iṣbahānī

H6. *Kitāb Taʾrīkh mulūk Banī Sāsān*, translated/transmitted (*min naql*) or compiled (*aw jamʿ*) by Hishām ibn Qāsim al-Iṣbahānī

H7. *Kitāb Taʾrīkh mulūk Banī Sāsān*, corrected (*min iṣlāḥ*) by Bahrām ibn Mardānshāh,[9] the *mōbad* of Kūrat Sābūr of the province of Fārs.

When I had collected them I compared them with each other until I managed to compile what is correct in this chapter.

As will later be shown, the missing eighth author is Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kisrawī. Ḥamza's list may be compared with that of al-Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 99 (ed. Adhkāʾī, p. 114; tr. Sachau 1879: 107–108):

Abū ʿAlī Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Balkhī al-Shāʿir[10] has told in (his) *Shāhnāme* the story about the origin of mankind differently from what we have narrated. He claims to have revised his report on the basis of the following:

B1. the *Kitāb Siyar al-mulūk* by ʿAbdallāh Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ [H1]

B2. and by Muḥammad ibn al-Jahm al-Barmakī [H2]

B3. and by Hishām ibn al-Qāsim [H6]

B4. and by Bahrām ibn Mardānshāh, the *mōbad* of the city of Sābūr [H7]

B5. and by Bahrām ibn Mihrān al-Iṣbahānī [= H5?].

These he collated with what Bahrām al-Harawī al-Majūsī brought him.[11]

---

8 As such, finding a manuscript in an old treasury is a topos in Arabic literature (cf. Grignaschi 1969: 15), but in this case we should not hasten to judge it a mere topos. Cf. also the story of the book found in 113/732 in the treasuries (*khazāʾin*) of Persian kings and translated for the Caliph Hishām (al-Masʿūdī, *Tanbīh*, p. 106; tr. Carra de Vaux 1896: 151).

9 Read so, as in ed. Gottwaldt, p. 9. Note that this author is also quoted for matters other than Sasanian, so that a title more general than *Kitāb Taʾrīkh mulūk banī Sāsān* (H7) would seem more appropriate, if we do not want to postulate that he wrote two different works, one on the Sasanids, and one on Iranian history more widely. The passage is probably corrupt and the title may originally have belonged to the missing work of Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā, cf. below.

10 Cf. de Blois 1992: 67–68, but note that among the possible names of Daqīqī one finds Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad and, according to some, he was born in Balkh, cf. de Blois 1992: 105–108.

11 Whether this refers to a book by this Bahrām or merely to his oral knowledge is not clear. We should beware of automatically assuming that this was a book, especially as this Bahrām is not mentioned on the other lists.

Al-Balkhī/al-Bīrūnī, thus, omits the anonymous al-Ma'mūn manuscript and the Zādōye version and, like the preserved manuscript of Ḥamza's *Ta'rīkh*, does not mention Mūsā ibn 'Īsā al-Kisrawī.

Both lists may further be compared with Ibn al-Nadīm's list of Persian translators in the *Fihrist* (ed. Tajaddud, p. 305; ed. Fluegel, p. 245; ed. Fu'ād Sayyid II: 151; tr. Dodge 1970: 589). Ibn al-Nadīm's list is somewhat confused and it has never been properly discussed. The subchapter is entitled "The Names of the Translators from Persian into Arabic"[12] and it begins with the mention of Ibn al-Muqaffa' and others who have just been discussed by Ibn al-Nadīm and who do not seem to have been specifically or solely working with the *Khwadāynāmag*. The list ends with Isḥāq ibn Yazīd, after which there follows a sentence which can be understood in two different ways, according to how we choose to vocalize the verb NQL: "among what he translated (*fa-mimmā naqala*) – or: among what was translated (*nuqila*) – was the *Sīrat al-Furs* known as the *Khudānāme" – the title has been variously distorted (ed. Tajaddud: ḤD'D-*nāme*; ed. Fluegel: *Ikhtiyār-nāme*; ed. Fu'ād Sayyid: *Bakhtiyār-nāme*; tr. Dodge follows Fluegel), but the emendation is obvious. Isḥāq's name is not found on the other lists and nothing is known about him.

After this the text continues: *wa-min naqalat*[13] *al-Furs*, followed by the list of names discussed below. The formulation "and from among translators of the Persians" is odd and superfluous, coming under a heading *asmā' al-naqala min al-fārsī ilā l-'arabī*. The list that follows seems to give names known from other sources as Book of Kings transmitters and translators. The passage should, perhaps, be emended to *wa-min naqalat* [*Siyar mulūk*] *al-Furs*. Another possible, and perhaps even more probable, emendation would read (emendations in boldface): *Isḥāq ibn Yazīd, naqala min al-fārsī ilā l-'arabī. fa-mimmā nuqila: Kitāb Sīrat al-Furs al-ma'rūf bi-*Khudāynāme. wa-**mim**man naqalahu [[al-Furs]]: Muḥammad ibn al-Jahm*, and so on. By adding a preposition, changing one *tā'marbūṭa* into H, and striking out one word (or, alternatively, emending it to *min al-fārsī*), one arrives at a more coherent reading ("Isḥāq ibn Yazīd: he translated from Persian into Arabic. [New paragraph:] Among what was translated was the *Kitāb Sīrat al-Furs*, known as *Khwadāynāmag*. Among those who trans-

---

12 Here the term "translators" is unequivocal because of the mention of the languages, but one has to remember that Ibn al-Nadīm probably did not see these works and he may well have been, and probably was, mistaken in some cases. For example, he also lists (ed. Tajaddud, p. 305; ed. Fluegel, p. 244; ed. Fu'ād Sayyid II: 151; tr. Dodge 1970: 589) al-Balādhurī among the translators from Persian into Arabic, which is less than credible.

13 With a *tā'marbūṭa*.

lated it were Muḥammad ibn al-Jahm, etc."). In both cases, the unknown Isḥāq ibn Yazīd should be struck from the list of translators of *Khwadāynāmag*.[14]

However that may be, the following list seems to give translators/transmitters of the *Siyar* – the absence of Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ is explicable by his having been mentioned a couple of lines earlier. The names listed are:

N1. Muḥammad ibn al-Jahm al-Barmakī [H2]
N2. Hishām ibn al-Qāsim [H6]
N3. Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-*Kisrawī[15]
N4. Zādōye ibn Shāhōye al-Iṣbahānī [H4]
N5. Muḥammad ibn Bahrām ibn Miṭyār al-Iṣbahānī [H5]
N6. Bahrām ibn Mardānshāh, the *mōbad* of the city of Sābūr [H7]
N7. ʿUmar ibn al-Farrukhān.[16]

There can be little doubt but that Ibn al-Nadīm is here dependent on some source or sources that belong to the same tradition as that used by Ḥamza, or on Ḥamza himself, even though he does not mention Ḥamza by name.[17] The only additional names are Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā and ʿUmar ibn al-Farrukhān.

There are still three further sources to be considered. The anonymous Persian *Mujmal al-tavārīkh* mentions (p. 2) among its sources the collection of Ḥamza (*majmūʿe-ye Ḥamza ibn al-Ḥasan al-Iṣfahānī ke az naql-e …*), who transmitted from the works of:

M1. Muḥammad ibn al-Jahm al-Barmakī [H2]
M2. Zādōye ibn Shāhōye al-Iṣfahānī [H4]
M3. Muḥammad ibn Bahrām ibn [Miṭyār al-Iṣbahānī] [H5]
M4. Hishām ibn Qāsim [H6]
M5. Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā [al-Kisrawī][18]
M6. *o-kitāb tārīkh-e pādishāhān* [*ke*] Bahrām ibn Mardānshāh *mōbad-e* Shāpūr [*az bilād-e*] *Fārs bīrūn āvurde-ast*. [H7]

---

14 For Isḥāq, see also Adhkāʾī 2001: 561.

15 Ed. Tajaddud has al-KRWY and ed. Fluegel al-Kurdī, but both seem obvious corruptions from al-Kisrawī. Ed. Fuʾād Sayyid II: 151, has correctly al-Kisrawī, but it seems the edition has been systematically "corrected" without consulting the manuscripts or marking the "corrections" as such, which considerably lessens the scholarly value of this otherwise useful edition.

16 ʿUmar ibn al-Farrukhān is the only one about whom there is a comment (*wa-naḥnu nastaqṣī dhikrahu fī l-muṣannifīn*). For his identity, see below.

17 On p. 154 (ed. Tajaddud; ed. Fluegel, p. 139; ed. Fuʾād Sayyid I: 432; tr. Dodge 1970: 305) Ibn al-Nadīm does mention Ḥamza and several of his books, but the *Taʾrīkh* is not among these.

18 Not mentioned by Ḥamza on the list of his sources, but quoted later.

The list admittedly depends on Ḥamza. The lack of H1, Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, is again explicable by his having been mentioned immediately before Ḥamza, the repetition being avoided by dropping the name from Ḥamza's list. Further, the al-Maʾmūn manuscript (H3) is dropped, once again presumably as an anonymous work which had less authority.[19] The addition of Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā will be discussed below.

The fifth list is found in Balʿamī's *Tārīkhnāme* I: 5.[20] The list is partly confused. Balʿamī quotes the following as his authorities:

BL1. *Shāhnāme-ye buzurg-e* Ḥamza-ye Iṣfahānī[21]

BL2. *pusar-e* Muqaffaʿ *yaʿnī* ʿAbdallāh [H1]

BL3. Muḥammad ibn al-Jahm al-Barmakī [H2]

BL4. Zādōye ibn Shāhōye [H4]

BL5. *nāme-ye* Bahrām ibn Bahrām [= H5?]

BL6. *nāme-ye Sāsāniyān*

BL7. Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Khusrawī[22]

BL8. Hāshim *o*-Qāsim [*sic*] Iṣfahānī[23] [H6]

BL9. *pādishāhān-e Pārs*[24]

BL10. Zādōy-e Farrukhān *mōbad-e mōbadān*.[25]

The sixth and final list is that given in the so-called *Older Preface* to the *Shāhnāme*. The text of this list is slightly confused. I will use the most recent edition by Monchi-Zadeh (1975: 9), comparing it with the translation by Minorsky (1956: 173), who followed Qazvīnī's older edition:[26]

---

19 The last words of M6 come curiously close to Ḥamza's description of the manuscript taken (*al-mustakhraj*) from al-Maʾmūn's Treasury (H3). Note that in the *Older Preface* (cf. below) the items of al-Maʾmūn's manuscript and Bahrām ibn Mardānshāh follow each other (OP9–OP10), which makes it possible that the list of the *Mujmal* is corrupt and the al-Maʾmūn manuscript has been dropped by mistake, which would make the last words an attempt to make sense of the corrupt passage.

20 = *Tārīkh-e Balʿamī*, p. 4. Despite the different title, this is the same book, but as there are major differences in the manuscripts, both editions will be cited when needed. For the problematic history of the text, see Peacock (2007).

21 The title does not quite match the brevity of Ḥamza's *Taʾrīkh*, but there is no reason to suppose another book by him. More probably the title has been mistakenly taken from, e.g. the next item, BL2.

22 *Tārīkh-e Balʿamī*, p. 4, reads *nāme-ye Sāsāniyān-e* Mūsā-ye ʿĪsā-ye Khusravī, thus making BL6 and BL7 one item. Cf. below.

23 *Tārīkh-e Balʿamī*, pp. 4–5, reads Hāshim ibn Qāsim. Note the form of the first name (instead of Hishām) in both editions.

24 If we read OP8 and OP9 together, this would be the title of the anonymous al-Maʾmūn manuscript [H3].

25 *Tārīkh-e Balʿamī*, p. 5, reads Farrukhān *mōbad-e mōbadān-e* Yazdagird. Cf. N7 and OP12.

26 The latter has unfortunately been unavailable to me.

OP1. *nāme-ye pusar-e* Muqaffaʿ [H1]

OP2. (*nāme-ye*) Ḥamza-ye Iṣfahānī

OP3. Muḥammad-e Jahm-e Barmakī [H2]

OP4. Zādōy ibn Shāhōy [H4]

OP5. *nāme-ye* Bahrām-e [Mihrān-e] Iṣfahānī [= H5?]

OP6. *nāme-ye Sāsāniyān-e* Mūsā-ye ʿĪsā-ye Khusravī[27]

OP7. Hishām-e Qāsim-e Iṣfahānī [H6]

OP8. *nāme-ye shāhān-e*[28] Pārs

OP9. *az ganj-khāne-ye Maʾmūn*[29] [H3]

OP10. Bahrām-e Shāh-e Mardān-e Shāh-e Kirmānī [H7]

OP11. Farrukhān, *mōbadhān mōbadh-e* Yazdagird-e Shahriyār

OP12. Rāmīn *ke bande-ye* Yazdagird-e Shahriyār *būdh*.[30]

We can now compare the six lists with each other:

	Ḥamza	Balkhī	Fihrist	Mujmal	Balʿamī	Older Preface
Ḥamza	*	–	–	*	BL1	OP2
Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ	H1	B1	*	*	BL2	OP1
Ibn al-Jahm	H2	B2	N1	M1	BL3	OP3
anon./Maʾmūn	H3	–	–	–	–	OP9
Zādōye	H4	–	N4	M2	BL4	OP4
Muḥ. b. Bahrām	H5	B5(?)	N5	M3	BL5(?)	OP5(?)
Hishām	H6	B3	N2	M4	BL8	OP7
b. Mardānshāh	H7	B4	N6	M6	–	OP10
Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā	–	–	N3	M5	BL7	OP6
al-Farrukhān	–	–	N7	–	BL10(?)	OP11(?)
pādishāhān/Pārs	–	–	–	–	BL9	OP8
Rāmīn	–	–	–	–	–	OP12

The table speaks rather clearly. Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ's absence from Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* and the *Mujmal* is easily explicable, as he has been mentioned a few lines earlier in both sources and his absence from this list merely avoids repetition.

---

27 Minorsky takes these as two separate items: the Book (Minorsky, though, reads *Rāh* "Path") of the Sasanians *and* Mūsā.

28 Here I follow what seems to be in Qazvīnī's edition, instead of Monchi-Zadeh's *pārsiyān*.

29 So Monchi-Zadeh, but this could also be read together with the previous item, OP8.

30 For Rāmīn, see Adhkāʾī 2001: 555.

The anonymous manuscript "from the Treasury of al-Ma'mūn" may not have been considered authoritative enough by those later authors who omitted it.

If we equate al-Balkhī's Bahrām ibn Mihrān with Ḥamza's Muḥammad ibn Bahrām ibn Miṭyār, or consider him Muḥammad's father, then Zādōye's absence from al-Balkhī's list is probably accidental as it would seem that al-Balkhī has otherwise merely copied the list from Ḥamza, possibly from a manuscript from which Mūsā's name had already been dropped. On the other hand, the resemblance of the two lists might itself be accidental, in which case Zādōye's absence from the list merely means that he was not used by al-Balkhī, who really used, or at least had seen, the other sources he mentioned. However, I am ready to opt for the first explanation. In that case al-Balkhī's seemingly impressive list turns out to have been copied from Ḥamza.

Finally, the additional name in Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist*, 'Umar ibn al-Farrukhān (N7), needs some discussion. Ibn al-Nadīm says (*Fihrist*, p. 305) that he will discuss this author later. He does, in fact, discuss the astronomer 'Umar ibn al-Farrukhān al-Ṭabarī on p. 332 (ed. Tajaddud; ed. Fluegel, p. 273; ed. Fu'ād Sayyid II: 232; tr. Dodge 1970: 649–650).[31] This 'Umar was a well-known astronomer who died around 200/816 and worked with astronomical texts. Nowhere is he credited with any interest in history.

As it seems that Ibn al-Nadīm has more or less lifted the list of N1–N6 from an earlier source (cf. below), we may doubt whether he had any manuscript evidence for his seventh author either. In his stead, we find in Bal'amī's *Tārīkhnāme* and the *Older Preface* another Farrukhān, labelled a *mōbad* (BL10, OP11). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the three sources are speaking about the same person, especially as on two lists he is mentioned in the same place, after Bahrām ibn Mardānshāh (N6, OP10). A *mōbad* would be a much more probable person to work with Persian history than an astronomer, who, it must be admitted, could, of course, be interested in chronology, but the odds seem very much against the astronomer 'Umar ibn al-Farrukhān, even though we know that he did translate Greek astronomical texts through Middle Persian.[32] If the *mōbad* is the translator, Ibn al-Nadīm's 'Umar ibn al-Farrukhān would turn out to be a wild guess and an unsuccessful attempt by Ibn al-Nadīm or his source to identify an otherwise unknown Farrukhān by equating him with a famous astronomer.

---

31 With a short note on him in pp. 327–328 (ed. Tajaddud; ed. Fluegel, pp. 267–268; ed. Fu'ād Sayyid II: 215; tr. Dodge 1970: 640–641). For his biography, see Ullmann 1972: 306–307.
32 Adhkā'ī (2001: 557) tries to identify 'Umar ibn Farrukhān with 'Umar Kisrā, for whom see the Appendix, but is not convincing. He, furthermore, ignores the biographical material on 'Umar Kisrā.

Ḥamza lacks Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā, who he does soon after quote *in extenso* (pp. 16–21). Al-Kisrawī's book can hardly be equated with the anonymous manuscript from al-Maʾmūn's Treasury, as the *Older Preface* gives on its list both and as most sources would indicate Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā to have lived somewhat later (cf. below).

Ḥamza also claims to be listing eight sources while actually naming only seven.[33] This provides us with a key to this problem. Mūsā's book has been accidentally dropped from this list of Ḥamza. Comparing the order of the items listed in the various sources, we may surmise that Mūsā either was listed before Hishām (Balʿamī, the *Older Preface*) or after him (the *Mujmal*, Ibn al-Nadīm).

If we take *nāme-ye Sāsāniyān* to be the title of Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kisrawī's book in the *Older Preface*, as read by Monchi-Zade (OP6), and in *Tārīkh-e Balʿamī* – it would fit the supposed contents of the book (cf. below) – the missing of Mūsā's name from Ḥamza's list could be explained as a copyist's error. For the original "*nāme-ye Sāsāniyān* by al-Kisrawī and (another book by) Hishām" the copyist inadvertently dropped al-Kisrawī's name and the following title, thus reducing the number of authors from eight to seven. In the *Mujmal* and the *Fihrist*, though, it should be emphasized, Hishām comes *before* Mūsā, not *after* him, which makes this explanation problematic. Thus, we cannot be sure whether *Kitāb Taʾrīkh mulūk Banī Sāsān* (*nāme-ye Sāsāniyān* in the Persian translation) was the title of his book. Another possibility is that he was listed before Bahrām ibn Mardānshāh (H7) and the title of his book was annexed to Bahrām after his name had been dropped. The title does not fit the contents of all Bahrām ibn Mardānshāh quotations in the sources (see n. 8).

The analysis of these lists has an important consequence for the question of the Arabic translations of the Book of Kings.[34] There is no specific reason to doubt Ḥamza's, or the other authors', reliability, yet one cannot refrain from

---

33 Rather surprisingly, few scholars, except for Rozen (1895) and Mittwoch (1909: 122, n. 4) have commented on this. Gottwaldt himself ignores this in both his edition (pp. 8–9), and his translation (1848: 6–7), and neither does the new edition of the *Taʾrīkh* comment on this. Rosenthal (1968: 93), calls al-Kisrawī "one of the translators" of the *Xwadāynāmag* and quotes *Taʾrīkh* (p. 16; erroneously p. 17 in Rosenthal, n. 1), but without reference to the *Fihrist*, from where this information actually comes. Likewise, Gutas (1998: 40) takes al-Kisrawī as a translator of the *Khwadāynāmag*, but only quotes Ḥamza where he is not mentioned as such. Zakeri (2008: 32–33) lists him as a translator mentioned by Ḥamza, which he is not, and wrongly introduces the al-Maʾmūn manuscript (H3) as the missing eighth version. Rypka (1959: 152) mentions Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kisrawī's translation of the *Khwadāynāmag* aside that by Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ as the two most important of these translations, but without explaining where this information comes from.

34 For example, Daniel (2012: 110) enumerates the names on this standard list as found in Balʿamī's *Tārīkhnāme* and, taking Balʿamī's words at face value, writes: "Balʾami consulted a broader range of sources about ancient Iran, written and oral, in order to emend Tabari's text." In the light of the present study this would not seem a felicitous formulation.

noting that the list of eight names (H1–7 + Mūsā) is repeated from one source to the other, mainly in the same order and with few changes or additions, which makes one doubt whether the authors who listed them really had used, or even seen, them, or whether they just lifted the list from an earlier source to include it in their own book to show off their meticulous scholarship, much like a modern scholar would lift an impressive list of scholarly references from an earlier study without actually having read them.[35] It seems that we only have Ḥamza's word for the existence of some of these translations or reworkings. However, I will not discuss the other translators in this article any further.

Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kisrawī is, thus, firmly established on this list, but what was his book like?[36] It has been shown that even Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ's "translation" of the *Khwadāynāmag* was actually a rewritten version of Persian history, synchronized with Islamic sacred history, not a simple translation of any Middle Persian text(s).[37] The term *naqala* is ambivalent and Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā hardly "translated" anything, at least for this work, but more probably wrote a Persian history which may have had notes synchronizing it with the sacred history or he may as well have written a rather dry chronology, as far as we can deduce from Ḥamza's *Taʾrīkh* (for other sources, see below). Whether Mūsā was even able to use Middle Persian texts in the original language is questionable. At least in the long quotation in Ḥamza's *Taʾrīkh* he is speaking of Arabic translations (cf. below).[38]

The possible contents of this lost book may now be discussed in the light of the admittedly rather sparse evidence.

In Ḥamza's *Taʾrīkh* (pp. 16–21), there is a long quotation, or perhaps partly a paraphrase, from al-Kisrawī's book. This is our most reliable and the only unproblematic piece of evidence as to the contents and date of this lost book. However, one has to remember that Ḥamza himself was interested mainly in chronology and his selection may, thus, give a distorted picture of what his sources really contained. But at least we know that, perhaps among other mate-

---

35 Actually, we will see that something like this did happen in the case of al-Kisrawī's purported translation of the *Sindbād-nāme*, see n. 67 below.
36 Rozen attempted to answer this in his article (1895), classifying al-Kisrawī's work as an embellished version of the *Khwadāynāmag*, with additions from, e.g. Indian sources. This has been accepted by many scholars, but it has two basic flaws that render it unacceptable. Rozen ignored the fact that not all al-Kisrawī quotations necessarily come from Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā (cf. below) and he made much of the terminological difference between *naql*, *jamʿ* and *iṣlāḥ* without basing his argument on facts or established usage. For the latter point, cf. also Zakeri 2008: 28–29.
37 Cf. Umīdsālār AHš 1381.
38 Grignaschi (1969: 38) rejects Baron von Rozen's theory that Mūsā had translated the story of Balāsh from Middle Persian. Grignaschi's suggestion that the translator of this story may have been Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ is merely a conjecture.

rials, Mūsā's work contained chronological information. The beginning of this passage deserves to be translated *in toto*:

> Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kisrawī has said in his book: I looked into the book called *Khudāynāme*, which is the book that, when translated from Persian into Arabic, is called *Ta'rīkh*[39] *mulūk al-Furs*. I repeatedly looked into copies (*nusakh*) of this book and perused them minutely, finding that they differ from each other. I was unable to find two identical copies. This is because the matter had been confused by the translators of this book when they translated it from one language to another.[40] When I was together with al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-Hamadānī al-Raqqām in Marāgha at (the court) of its ruler (*ra'īs*) al-ʿAlā' ibn Aḥmad [the text continues to tell how they collated the overall lengths of the third and fourth dynasties with the Alexandrian era as found in astronomical tables].[41]

At the end of the passage quoted from Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā (pp. 20–21), there is an important note on the chronology of pre-Sasanian Kings. Whereas al-Kisrawī seems very proud of his accuracy when it comes to Sasanian history,[42] he admits that he did not study the earlier period in such detail, claiming that Alexander's misdemeanour in Persia had disrupted the tradition so that no accuracy in earlier chronology is possible:[43]

> I have not concerned myself with the chronologies of the Ashghānian kings before the Sasanians because of the misfortunes that occurred at the time of those kings. Namely, when he had conquered the land of Babel Alexander envied the sciences that they [i.e. the Persians] had acquired, such as no nation had been able to acquire. He burned all their books he was able to find and then turned to killing their *mōbads* and *hērbads* and learned and wise men and those who, among their other sciences, preserved their chronologies, until he

---

39 I do not wish to overdo the case and exaggerate the importance and exactness of Mūsā's use of terminology, but one might ask whether there might be in Mūsā's usage a conscious difference between *ta'rīkh* and *siyar*, the former referring to chronology, the latter to narrated history.

40 This is a crucial sentence as it shows that Mūsā worked with translations, not versions of the original Middle Persian text. Whether he knew Middle Persian or not cannot be deduced from this or any other passage.

41 On p. 17, he mentions the town Bājarwān which, it might here be anticipated, was the place of origin of Abū ʿUbayda's family. Rosenthal (1968: 93) claims that Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā's telling us that he attempted to synchronize Persian and Seleucid chronologies may be taken as indirect evidence to the effect that this synchronization had not been done in the *Khwadāynāmag* or, to be more exact, in the earliest Arabic translations of the book. However, it is more probable that only the systematic correlation of the two chronologies was new in Mūsā's book. Occasional synchronizations there may well have been.

42 Ḥamza, though, (*Ta'rīkh*, p. 21) undermines our confidence on al-Kisrawī and accuses him, too, of chronological mistakes. Nöldeke (1879: 401) does not much appreciate al-Kisrawī's efforts in creating a Sasanian chronology, but criticizes him heavily.

43 See Gnoli 2000 for the questions of early Zoroastrian chronology.

had killed them all. This he did after he had translated (*naqala*) what he needed of their sciences into Greek. After this, during all the days of the Ashghānians, also known as the Party Kings, the Persians remained obscure (*ghāba*), having no one to bring back knowledge or to be concerned with any kind of wisdom until their luck (*dawla*) returned to them with the appearance of Ardashīr.

When Ardashīr confirmed the kingship for himself, he started counting time from his own accession. After him, the Sasanian kings followed his way and each of them counted time by his own regnal years, which has caused confusion in their chronologies. What an excellent idea it was that the Arab kings decided to count their years continuously, from the beginning of the *hijra* onwards.

The passage implies that al-Kisrawī may not, except in broad outlines, have discussed this period at all, at least not in chronological terms. It would be somewhat strange to see an author first undermine his own authority and then delve into this period. Possibly, the book of al-Kisrawī was restricted to the Sasanian period only, which would speak for taking *Kitāb Ta'rīkh mulūk Banī Sāsān* (H6) as its title.

In the rest of his work, Ḥamza is unfortunately vague in identifying his sources, usually using expressions such as *kutub al-siyar, baʿḍ al-ruwāt, zaʿamat al-Furs, wa-fī akhbārihim*, and so on.[44] Thus, we cannot know whether he used any other parts of al-Kisrawī's book or, in fact, whether al-Kisrawī's book was merely a chronological list. In one of his chapter headings Ḥamza seems to imply (p. 50) that his main sources were, in any case, Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ and Ibn al-Jahm: "Chapter Five of the first Book narrating things which are in the *Khudāynāme* but which Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ and Ibn al-Jahm did not relate." Then he gives a passage which he had "read in a book translated from a book of theirs entitled *al-Ābistā* (*Avesta*)".[45] It should be noted that he does not say anything about his six remaining sources, of which only Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā is quoted in the book and was thus certainly used by Ḥamza. It may well be questioned whether Ḥamza had, in fact, had at his disposal all, or even any, of the remaining books he lists or whether he, too, is merely copying some older source.

Ḥamza's *Ta'rīkh* provides us with our only unproblematic and reliable source of information on Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā's book and its contents. An "al-Kisrawī" is also

---

44 Ḥamza, (*Ta'rīkh* p. 49), briefly resumes the contents of "*kutub al-tawārīkh wa'l-siyar*", but it is unclear whether al-Kisrawī's book contained some or any elements mentioned by Ḥamza, who writes: "Few of these short stories about kings with which I have filled this chapter (referring to the preceding pages) are to be found in books on *ta'rīkh* and *siyar*, the rest are found in their other books. Their (i.e. the kings') letters and testaments and such things in books of history I have left out of this book."

45 The information that follows is not concerned with Sasanian history, so the lack of reference to Mūsā's name is to be expected.

mentioned or quoted in a few other sources, but rarely identified more exactly, and his identity remains uncertain, as there is also another al-Kisrawī, ʿAlī ibn Mahdī, who at least in some cases may be the person meant.

Ps.-al-Jāḥiẓ, *Maḥāsin*, quotes al-Kisrawī – always without a first name – three times (pp. 53, 242, 359). The first two passages concern Sasanian history. The first (p. 53, from al-Bayhaqī, *Maḥāsin*, p. 534) is a brief saying by Kisrā ibn Hurmuz, the second (pp. 242–251) a long romantic story about the Indian marriage of Balāsh ibn Fīrūz, containing two framed animal stories, material that hardly had a place in the royal *Khwadāynāmag* of the Sasanians.

Balāsh usually receives scant interest in historical sources.[46] An important exception is ps.-al-Aṣmaʿī, *Nihāyat al-arab*,[47] which seems to be where al-Kisrāwī took this story from, and then either he or the anonymous author of the *Maḥāsin* abbreviated it.[48] The story is also referred to in the *Mujmal* (p. 72),[49] where the anonymous author mentions that he had read it in the *Siyar al-mulūk* (*dar Siyar al-mulūk khwāndam*). As the al-Kisrawī quotations in the *Maḥāsin* and the *Nihāya* are the only preserved versions of this story, the passage should be given due attention. Usually, the quotations from the *Siyar al-mulūk* in the *Mujmal* and in other sources are all too hastily taken as quotations from Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ's work. This, however, is ungrounded and each quotation should be studied separately. It is, of course, possible that Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ's influential text contained this story, but in that case one might wonder why it was taken up by so few later sources. A less-known al-Kisrawī would understandably be quoted by only few. On the other hand, it should be emphasized that when al-Kisrawī is quoted by name (and translated into Persian) in the *Mujmal*, this is always done through Ḥamza (pp. 2, 85,[50] 87, 88). Hence, there is no evidence to show that the author of the *Mujmal* would have had al-Kisrawī's book to hand.

---

46 Ḥamza gives him just three lines (*Taʾrīkh*, p. 44), al-Ṭabarī a page (*Taʾrīkh* I: 882–883; tr. Bosworth 1999: 126–127) and al-Masʿūdī in his *Murūj* less than one line (§619). See also al-Thaʿālibī, *Ghurar* (pp. 584–586); Firdawsī, *Shāhnāme* VII: 31–47 (the rather long passages concentrates on the duel between Sūfrāy and Khwashnavāz); al-Masʿūdī, *Tanbīh* (p. 101) (tr. Carra de Vaux 1896: 145); Gardīzī, *Zayn al-akhbār* (p. 94). It might be added that the story is not found in the *Sindbād-nāme*. There is also a story about Bahrām Gūr and the daughter of the King of India in, e.g. Firdawsī, *Shāhnāme* VI: 581–595, but only the topic of Indian marriage links these two stories.
47 See Grignaschi 1969: 65–66 (beginning of the text) and 34–39 (discussion of the relations between *Nihāyat al-arab* and al-Kisrawī's book). The story is also found in the Persian translation of the *Nihāya* (Grignaschi 1974: 84, n. 2), which proves its existence in the early version(s) of the *Nihāya*. For the *Mujmal*, see below.
48 However, as the date of the *Nihāyat al-arab* is controversial, it is not impossible that the borrowing was the other way round.
49 Cf. Rozen 1895: 172.
50 Here erroneously ʿĪsā ibn Mūsā.

It is difficult to contextualize the Balāsh story. Though set in a historical context, it differs from the tone of the other Books of Kings, whether in Middle Persian, Persian or Arabic, which contain few framed stories and give more emphasis to the epic-heroic than to the romantic-gnomic material, with Firdawsī an exception. Hence, it remains doubtful whether the passage could stem from any translation/rewriting of the *Khwadāynāmag*. The book of al-Kisrawī may, of course, have been far from the main stream of the Book of Kings tradition and contained more novelistic and romantic material than many other representatives of the tradition, as suggested by Rozen (1895), but it should be emphasized that his hypothesis rests solely on the identification of al-Kisrawī in this passage with Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā, which is far from evident.[51]

The final passage transmitted from al-Kisrawī in ps.-al-Jāḥiẓ, *Maḥāsin*, comes in the Chapter *Maḥāsin al-nayrūz waʾl-mihrajān* (p. 359 ff.) and probably continues until p. 365.[52] It is concerned with the *nawrūz* (= *nayrūz*). The passage contains an important description of the ceremonies of the *nawrūz* and the *mihrajān*, mentioning also songs, some of them obviously epic, which were sung in the presence of the King.[53] This passage might well come from the Book of Festivals, *Kitāb al-aʿyād waʾl-nawārīz*, attributed to ʿAlī ibn Mahdī al-Kisrawī (cf. below). As it is somewhat uneconomic to suggest that the anonymous author of the *Maḥāsin* derived material from two different al-Kisrawīs,[54] one should consider the possibility that all quotations come from the same al-Kisrawī. The first quotation could well be from Mūsā's book and the second, too, is not inconceivable as part of his book, even though the part preserved by Ḥamza consists of a rather dry chronology and the Book of Kings tradition of the time does not seem to have included very much romance. The third passage is the most difficult to fit into Mūsā's work. The establishment of *nawrūz* and *mihrajān* quite centrally belongs to the Book of Kings tradition, but later rituals do not. ʿAlī ibn Mahdī's book, on the other hand, would be an excellent place for this third

---

51 In the *Maḥāsin*, this story is followed by two other Persian stories, which may have been derived from the same source. For a discussion of these, see Grignaschi (1969: 35–39; 1974: 103–104), who comes to the reasonable conclusion that these stories were not taken from the *Nihāya*, which makes it improbable that they would derive from al-Kisrawī's book.

52 The next chapter, *Maḥāsin al-hadāyā* (pp. 365–383), begins with an anonymous *qāla* and contains Persian material, mainly discussing presents to be given during these originally Persian festivals. It may, partly, be derived from al-Kisrawī, too.

53 On the oral transmission of Persian epic poetry, cf. e.g. the articles in Melville & van den Berg (2012) and Yamamoto (2003). Olga Davidson's studies, e.g. Davidson (2006), should be read with some care, as the author is somewhat determined to prove her point and tends to ignore all contrary evidence.

54 Grignaschi (1974: 103) does not exclude this possibility though.

fragment, the second would fit another book of his, *K. al-Khiṣāl* (see below), as would the first. Attributing all the three passages to ʿAlī ibn Mahdī may be easier than attributing them to Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā,[55] although the problem remains that we should posit two separate books as the sources for the three quotations. There is also a further problem. Ibn Isfandiyār's *History of Ṭabaristán*, for which see below, again confuses the picture by giving us some ground for asking whether the Book of Festivals was, after all, by ʿAlī ibn Mahdī or could it have been authored by Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā.

Much of the material in this third quotation is unique, even though, in general terms, for example, al-Bīrūnī, *Āthār* (pp. 215–233; ed. Adhkāʾī, pp. 263–289; tr. Sachau 1879: 199–219) and Gardīzī, *Zayn al-akhbār* (pp. 345–355), resemble it in their descriptions of these festivals, but the resemblance may well be merely due to the common object of description and not be evidence for any textual dependence. The verse by Abū Tammām, quoted in the *Maḥāsin* (p. 360), is commonly found in the historical tradition that is dependent on al-Ṭabarī's *Taʾrīkh*, but in the *Maḥāsin* there is an interesting variant in the first hemistich (*wa-kaʾannahū l-Ḍaḥḥāku fī fatakātihī*), against which all other sources have the standard version (*bal kāna kaʾl-Ḍaḥḥāki fī saṭawātihī*), which is also the *Dīwān* recension.[56] This seems to point to an independent line of transmission, even though one cannot exclude the possibility of later manuscript corruption.

Al-Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, contains three quotations from al-Kisrawī (pp. 119, 129–131, 223 = ed. Adhkāʾī, pp. 135, 144–146, 273 = tr. Sachau 1879: 122, 127–128, 208). The first two quotations are explicitly taken from Ḥamza (*Āthār*, p. 119: *wa-ammā Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī fa-innahu ḥakā ʿan Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā*) and paraphrase, condense and criticize *Taʾrīkh* (pp. 16–21).

However, the third passage (p. 223; ed. Adhkāʾī, p. 273; tr. Sachau 1879: 208)[57] mentions a new character: *wa-qāla l-Kisrawī: samiʿtu al-mūbadh al-Mutawakkilī yaqūlu*. This passage is not found in Ḥamza's *Taʾrīkh* – which shows that this book was not the sole source for al-Bīrūnī's al-Kisrawī material[58] – and this

---

55 To this one might add that the al-Kisrawī quoted in al-Bayhaqī's *Maḥāsin* (pp. 349, 399, 534, 567), a book sharing large elements with ps.-al-Jāḥiẓ, as shown by van Vloten in the preface of his edition of ps.-al-Jāḥiẓ, *Maḥāsin* (pp. ix–xi), is without doubt ʿAlī ibn Mahdī.

56 See Abū Tammām, *Dīwān* (pp. 309–310); al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh* (I: 201) (> al-Thaʿālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 35; Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muntaẓam* I: 135); al-Masʿūdī, *Tanbīh* (p. 88; tr. Carra de Vaux 1896: 127); Ibn al-Faqīh, *Mukhtaṣar*, p. 279 (tr. Massé 1973: 334); etc.

57 It is not quite clear where the quoted passage ends.

58 I find it improbable that this passage would simply have fallen out from the preserved text of Ḥamza.

informant of al-Kisrawī is little known.[59] The passage concerns the *mihrajān* and, likewise, is unattested elsewhere. This passage might equally well come from ‘Alī ibn Mahdī al-Kisrawī’s Book of Festivals, as the personal name of al-Kisrawī is not given in this case. In any case, the third quotation comes from another source than Ḥamza’s *Ta’rīkh*, which is the source for the first two quotations.

Finally, there is an interesting passage in Ibn Isfandiyār’s (written in 616/1216), *History of Ṭabaristán* (p. 36), which gives us reason to reconsider the authorship of the Book of Festivals:

> the stories told concerning Bívarasp [...], which were enquired into by the Caliph ‘Abdu’lláh al-Má’mún, and [what happened] in the reigns of Hurmuzd and Khusraw Parwíz, the Sásánian kings, and the story of Músá b. ‘Ísá as-Sarwí, which are related in the *Book of Pírúz-Mihrján*, and other similar legends are here omitted as incredible and unauthenticated.[60]

The otherwise unknown “story of Mūsā ibn ‘Īsā al-Sarwī” seems clearly out of place in a “Book of Pīrūz-Mihrajān”, as a book by any such title would be concerned with ancient Persian history. More probably, the name should be read as al-[K]SRWY, i.e. al-Kisrawī, and the passage should be understood as a story (told) *by* Mūsā ibn ‘Īsā, not a story *about* him. The title “the Book of Pīrūz-Mihrajān” is also corrupt. It is attested nowhere else and is clearly a mistake for “the Book of *Nayrūz and Mihrajān”, the first words differing in the Arabic script only in diacritical dots and the conjunction *o* being often left unwritten in early texts.[61] Even with these emendations, though, this would still be our only source attributing this text to Mūsā ibn ‘Īsā, whereas all other sources attribute it to ‘Alī ibn Mahdī.

Finally, we come to the question of Mūsā ibn ‘Īsā’s identity. The long quotation from him in Ḥamza, *Ta’rīkh* (pp. 16–21), provides us with the basic facts of his life. Mūsā was familiar with many copies of the *Khwadāynāmag*, but he is (*Ta’rīkh*, p. 16) speaking about Arabic translations, not the Middle Persian original(s). He collaborated with al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-Hamadhānī al-Raqqām in Marāgha, when the town was under al-‘Alā’ ibn Aḥmad. They collated various chronologies, using *Zīj al-raṣad*, to create a more reliable chronology of Persian history. Mūsā also

---

59 For Zardusht ibn Ādharkhwar, alias Muḥammad al-Mutawakkilī, see Adhkā’ī 2001: 483–484; Zakeri 2008: 33–34. The identification is based on Ḥamza, *Tanbīh* (pp. 21–24). For a discussion of the passage transmitted on al-Mutawakkilī’s authority in Ḥamza, *Tanbīh*, see also Lazard 1971: 361–362.

60 Originally, this book was only available to me in Browne’s abridged translation. When this article was being printed I received a copy of the edition of *Tārīkh-e Ṭabaristān*, which (p. 83) confirms my emendations.

61 So emended also by Humāyūnfarrukh 1377 ᴀʜš: 747.

quotes (*Kitāb*) *al-Siyar al-kabīr* and (*Kitāb*) *al-Siyar al-ṣaghīr* (*Taʾrīkh*, p. 20), which shows that he was depending on at least two different redactions.[62]

Al-ʿAlāʾ ibn Aḥmad al-Azdī's governorship of Marāgha gives us some firm ground for dating Mūsā. Al-ʿAlāʾ died in 260/874 when Governor of Ādharbayjān.[63] This would date Mūsā's activity with Sasanian chronology probably in the 860s or early 870s. If he is the al-Kisrawī who transmitted from *al-mōbad al-Mutawakkilī*, this would, in its part, confirm Mūsā's date around 870.

Ibn al-Nadīm's list of translators/transmitters of the Books of Kings has already been discussed, but he also knows two other books by Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā (*Fihrist*, ed. Tajaddud, p. 142; ed. Fluegel, p. 128; ed. Fuʾād Sayyid I: 396; tr. Dodge 1970: 280), neither of which presumably contained specifically Persian material, namely:

-K. Ḥubb al-awṭān

-K. Munāqaḍāt man zaʿama annahu lā yanbaghī an yaqtaḍiya l-quḍāt fī maṭāʿimihim biʾl-aʾimma waʾl-khulafāʾ[64]

He is also credited with these two books in Ismāʿīl Pāshā's *Hadiyyat al-ʿārifīn* (p. 477), where we have some additional pieces of information. First, he is called Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Baghdādī[65] *al-adīb al-shahīr biʾl*-Kisrawī and, secondly, he is stated to have died in 186, which is an all too early date in comparison with all the other evidence. We might consider an emendation to *286, though it remains unclear where Ismāʿīl Pāshā got the date from.

Besides knowing his *al-Ḥanīn ilā l-awṭān* ([*sic*], GAL S I: 945, *sub* 237)[66] Brockelmann credits Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā with a translation, or version, of *Sindbād-nāme* (GAL S I: 237), but this seems to be a wild guess with little real foundation.[67]

62 See also Rubin 2008: 59–60.

63 al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh* III: 1886 (= tr. Waines 1992: 161–162). According to al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh* III: 1668 (tr. Saliba 1985: 130), he was Governor of Armenia in 252/866.

64 For this book, see Crone & Hinds 1986: 87, where Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā is taken as a contemporary of Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ and much is made of this title. The authors, however, give no evidence for such an early date for Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā. See also Tillier 2009: 585.

65 In *Rijāl* literature one finds occasional, rather unknown Mūsā ibn ʿĪsās, who are said to come from Baghdad, but none of these is likely to be identical with al-Kisrawī. Still, it is possible that this has led Ismāʿīl Pāshā to consider also al-Kisrawī a Baghdadian.

66 Zakeri 2007, I: 53–54, claims that *al-Ḥanīn ilā l-awṭān*, usually attributed to al-Jāḥiẓ, is, in fact, by Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā. Zakeri does not explain his claim, which seems to be based on Meier (1937: 20, n. 1), who refers to MS Aya Sofya 2052, fols 77b–84b. For the attribution of this text, see also Pellat 1984: 138.

67 Brockelmann does not give any basis for his claim that "von Mūsā rührt wahrscheinlich auch der Text des ins Griechische übersetzten Sindbadromanes her". This seems to be based on a careless reading of Nöldeke (1879: 521). Nöldeke suggested out of thin air two possible identifications of the Greek text's "Persian Mousos" (not Moses Persus, as in all later sources), one of them

Yāqūt (cf. below), at one point refers to Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā as al-Kisrawī al-Kātib. This is the only indication that he was a *kātib*, but as many of the translators from Persian as well as transmitters of Persian lore worked as government officials, this would, a priori, not be surprising. However, there is a possibility of confusion here, as al-Kisrawī al-Kātib would usually seem to be referring to ʿAlī ibn Mahdī. This, nevertheless, gives us some room for speculation. In his *Wuzarāʾ* (p. 407), al-Jahshiyārī mentions an otherwise unknown Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā ibn YazdānYRWDh, who was a scribe working for al-Faḍl ibn al-Rabīʿ (*kāna yaktubu liʾl-Faḍl ibn al-Rabīʿ*) during the Caliphate of al-Amīn.[68] It is not impossible that this scribe should be identified with our al-Kisrawī. His name proves that he was of Persian extraction, as we would suppose al-Kisrawī to have been, and like most translators from Middle Persian and transmitters of Persian lore were. Further, he worked as a scribe and we have every reason to believe, whether al-Kisrawī al-Kātib refers to him or not, that Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā came from the same circles, as did most of the others who worked within the Book of Kings tradition. Dating him to the period of al-Amīn (and supposing him to have lived on several decades after al-Amīn's death) tallies well with the known interest in the Book of Kings during the early to mid-ninth century (and even later). This identification would also count for the gentilicium al-Baghdādī given to him in Ismāʿīl Pāshā's *Hadiyya*, though one should not put too much weight on this rather suspect piece of information. Hence, the least we can say is that there is nothing to preclude this identification. On the other hand, of course, there is no positive evidence that Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kisrawī was the grandson of a certain YazdānYRWDh, and there is a slight temporal gap between the two. Hence, the identification remains highly speculative.[69]

This more or less sums up what we know about Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kisrawi. The other al-Kisrawī, ʿAlī ibn Mahdī, is also credited with one of the books attributed to his namesake, Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā, namely, *K. Munāqaḍāt man zaʿama annahu lā yanbaghī an yaqtaḍiya l-quḍāt fī maṭāʿimihim biʾl-aʾimma waʾl-khulafāʾ*, even in the

---

Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā, but concluded: "Aber keine dieser Vermuthungen ist sehr wahrscheinlich: Mûsâ ist ein ganz gewöhnlicher Name, und Beide sind wohl etwas zu spät." One cannot but agree with this conclusion, but Nöldeke's tentative identification, which he himself actually discards a few sentences after proposing it, has later been repeated *ad nauseam*, evidently without checking the original source. Hence, in addition to Brockelmann, e.g. Tafazzoli & Khromov (1999: 81), and Zakeri (2007, I: 113), repeat this claim. Grignaschi (1969: 35, n. 6) is more critical and his confusion between Nöldeke and Rozen seems to be only a slip. The case is like a modern equivalent to the case of Ḥamza's list.

68 Even this would exclude the date of Mūsā's death, 186, as given by Ismāʿīl Pāshā. His brother ʿAlī is mentioned in the same book on pp. 285, 300, 363, and 366.

69 A certain Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā al-Kātib, secretary to the uncle of Ibrāhīm ibn Jaysh, is quoted in al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh* (IX: 252; Cairo edition = tr. Kraemer 1989: 220) as an authority on a story about the accession of the Caliph al-Muntaṣir.

very same source (*Fihrist*, ed. Tajaddud, p. 167; ed. Fluegel, p. 150; ed. Fuʾād Sayyid I: 462; tr. Dodge 1970: 328). This shows how confused tenth-century authors were about the identity of al-Kisrawī.

ʿAlī ibn Mahdī is also credited in the same passage of the *Fihrist* with a *Kitāb al-aʿyād waʾl-nawārīz*, which is not extant but the title of which would imply that it contained material about the *Nawrūz* and, most probably, the *Mihrajān*, that is, the very kind of material which we have often seen transmitted on the authority of al-Kisrawī. As we have seen, though, *The History of Ṭabaristán* may attribute this book to Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā, but it is the only source to do so. Interestingly enough, al-Bīrūnī, *Āthār* (p. 31; ed. Adhkāʾī, p. 38; tr. Sachau 1879: 36), mentions a tractate by Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī on poems on the *Nawrūz* and the *Mihrajān*.

ʿAlī ibn Mahdī ibn ʿAlī ibn Mahdī al-Kisrawī Abū l-Ḥasan al-Iṣfahānī is mentioned in several biographical dictionaries. Yāqūt, *Irshād* (IV: 334–338), has an article on him, saying, among other things, that he was the teacher of the son of Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Yaḥyā ibn al-Munajjim and *aḥad al-ruwāt al-ʿulamāʾal-naḥwiyyīn al-shuʿarāʾ* at the time when Badr al-Muʿtaḍidī was the ruler of Isfahan (i.e. 283–289/896–902). Yāqūt seems to have (directly or indirectly) quoted from a work by Ḥamza (presumably his *Taʾrīkh Iṣfahān*, which he also quotes by the book title but without mentioning the author's name in *Irshād* IV: 338) and explicitly says that al-Marzubānī mentioned him, quoting also Ibn Abī Ṭāhir. He also mentions his close association with the *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*.[70]

Yāqūt, *Irshād* (IV: 336), specifically qualifies ʿAlī ibn Mahdī as *aḥad al-ruwāt liʾl-akhbār*, but unfortunately does not, in the whole article, quote anything that would link him with any Pre-Islamic Iranian material. ʿAlī ibn Mahdī's date, however, is not too late for him to be the al-Kisrawī quoted in any of the sources discussed above. Yāqūt also mentions the following works by ʿAlī ibn Mahdī:

---

70 See also al-Marzubānī, *Nūr al-qabas*, pp. 338–39; al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfī* XXII: 244–246; Toorawa 2005: 119. There is a brief unsigned article on him in the second edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. For ʿAlī ibn Mahdī as a transmitter of the *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*, see Wild 1965: 20, n. 65; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 48 (ed. Tajaddud; ed. Fluegel, 43; ed. Fuʾād Sayyid I: 115; tr. Dodge 1970: 95). Note that Ismāʿīl Pāshāʾs date (186) could easily be explained as an error for 286, which could be ʿAlī ibn Mahdī's year of death, although I have not been able to find this latter date in any source. In *Irshād* (IV: 3), Yāqūt quotes a passage < ʿAbdallāh ibn Jaʿfar < ʿAlī ibn Mahdī al-Kisrawī < Ibn Qādim *ṣāḥib* al-Kisāʾī. Al-Kisrawī is also mentioned in passing in *Irshād* (IV: 332), and a certain Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā (without a gentilicium) in V: 405. Neither of these passages contains any Iranian material. There are, of course, also other al-Kisrawīs, such as al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Qāsim or the brothers Sahlūn and Yazdajird ibn Mihmandār (for the last, see also Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 42, ed. Tajaddud; ed. Fluegel, p. 128; ed. Fuʾād Sayyid I: 396; tr. Dodge 1970: 280), quoted in al-Tanūkhī's *Nishwār* (VII: 207–208, 216; from the lost parts of the book, but reconstructable through *Faraj al-mahmūm fī taʾrīkh ʿulamāʾ al-nujūm*), but they seem irrelevant to this study.

1. *K. al-Khiṣāl*, a collection of stories (*akhbār*), wise sayings, proverbs and poems.[71]

2. *K. Munāqaḍāt man zaʿama annahu lā yanbaghī an yaqtaḍiya l-quḍāt fī maṭāʿimihim biʾl-aʾimma al-khulafāʾ*, mentioning that this work is also attributed to al-Kisrawī al-Kātib, i.e. Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā.

3. *K. al-Aʿyād waʾl-nawārīz*, the only work that would hint at an Iranian connection, although it could equally well have contained Arabic poems on these feasts, lists of presents suitable at them in the Islamic period, etc.

4. *K. Murāsalāt al-ikhwān wa-muḥāwarāt al-khillān*.

In Yāqūt's *Muʿjam al-buldān*, the only relevant[72] passage comes in the article on Tigris (II: 440–442) (also mentioned in the article on Sātīdamā III: 169), where there is a lengthy (and seemingly freely paraphrased) quotation (*via* al-Marzubānī) from ʿAlī ibn Mahdī al-Kisrawī on the origin and course of Tigris, introduced by: "Abū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad ibn ʿImrān ibn Mūsā al-Marzubānī: Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Hārūn gave me a sheet (*waraqa*) which he mentioned to be in the handwriting of ʿAlī ibn Mahdī al-Kisrawī." The passage contains geographical information, but nothing specifically Iranian.

This resumes the main relevant information on ʿAlī ibn Mahdī, who is much better known in the sources than his namesake.

As the bibliographical material shows, the works of these two al-Kisrawīs have been confused early on. At first sight, one would be tempted to attribute all the quotations related to Persian history to Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā, but the profusion of material on the *nawrūz* and the novelistic tendencies in the story of Balāsh may tip the balance in favour of ʿAlī ibn Mahdī, after all.

We may resume this article with a minimalist set of data on Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā. He is known to have worked with Sasanian chronology and to have written a book on Persian – or probably only Sasanian – history and he was active in the 860s. Of the two al-Kisrawīs only he is credited with a *Kitāb Ḥubb* (or: *al-Ḥanīn ilā*) *al-awṭān*. That much – or that little – we know, the rest is speculation.

---

71 For other books with the same or a similar title, see Zakeri 2007, I: 234–236. See also GAS II: 82. Ibn Shahrashūb (see Zakeri 2007, I: 235, no. 8) mentions a certain *Khiṣāl al-mulūk* by one Mūsā ibn ʿĪsā, which seems to imply yet another confusion between the two al-Kisrawīs.

72 Yāqūt also mentions an al-Kisrawī in *Muʿjam* III: 169.

REFERENCES

ABŪ TAMMĀM. *Dīwān = Sharḥ Dīwān Abī Tammām*. Ed. Shāhīn ʿAṭiyya, 1407/1987. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

ADHKĀʾĪ, Parvīz 2001. Preface. In: AL-BĪRŪNĪ, *Āthār*.

ANONYMOUS, al-Kisrawī. *EI2.*

BALʿAMĪ. *Tārīkhnāme-ye Ṭabarī*, I–V. Ed. Muḥammad Rawshan, AHŠ 1380. Tehran: Surūsh.

BALʿAMĪ. *Tārīkh*. Ed. Muḥammad Taqī Bahār Malik al-Shuʿarāʾ, AHŠ 1388. 4th edn. Tehran: Kitābkhāne-ye millī.

AL-BAYHAQĪ, n.d. *al-Maḥāsin waʾl-masāwī*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir.

AL-BĪRŪNĪ. *Āthār* = 1) *Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albêrûni*. Ed. Eduard Sachau, 1923. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenl. Gesellschaft/Brockhaus/Harrassowitz, repr. n.d. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir; 2) *al-Āthār al-bāqiya ʿan al-qurūn al-khāliya*. Ed. Parvīz Adhkāʾī, AHŠ 1380/2001. (Mīrāth-e maktūb 91) Tehran: Mīrāth-e maktūb.

DE BLOIS, François 1992. *Persian Literature: A Bio-Biographical survey begun by the late C.A. Storey*, V(1): *Poetry to ca. AD 1100*. London: Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

BOSWORTH, C.E. (tr.) 1999. *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, V: *The Sāsānids, the Byzantines, the Lakhmids, and Yemen*. Albany: SUNY Press.

BROWNE, Edward G. 1905. *An Abridged Translation of the History of Ṭabaristán (...) by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Isfandiyár*. (E.J.W. Gibb Memorial Series) Leiden: Brill/ Bernard Quaritch.

CARRA DE VAUX, B. 1896. *Maçoudi, Le Livre de l'Avertissement et de la revision*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.

CHRISTENSEN, Arthur 1917–1934. *Les types du premier homme et du premier roi*, I–II. (Archives d'Études orientales 14/1–2) Stockholm: Kungl. Boktryckeriet/P.A. Nordstedt & söner (I); Leiden: Brill (II).

CHRISTENSEN, Arthur 1936. *L'Iran sous les sassanides*. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard/ Ejnar Munksgaard.

CRONE, Patricia & Martin HINDS 1986. *God's Caliph: Religious authority in the first centuries of Islam*. Cambridge: CUP.

DANIEL, Elton L. 2012. The Rise and Development of Persian Historiography. In: Charles MELVILLE (ed.), *A History of Persian Literature* X: *Persian historiography*: 101–154. London: I.B. Tauris.

DAVIDSON, Olga M. 2006. *Poet and Hero in the Persian Book of Kings*. 2nd edn. Costa Mesa: Mazda.

DODGE, Bayard (tr.) 1970. *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm: A Tenth-Century survey of Muslim culture*, I–II. NY: Columbia University Press.

EI2: *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 1960–2005, 2nd edn. Leiden: Brill.

FIRDAWSĪ. *Shāhnāme*, I–VIII. Ed. Djalal Khaleghi-Motlagh & Abolfazl Khatibi, 1987–2008. (Persian Text Series. New Series 1) NY: Bibliotheca Persica.

GAL, GAL S: Carl Brockelmann 1936–1944. *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, I–II + Supplementbände I–III. Leiden: Brill.

Gardīzī. *Zayn al-akhbār*. Ed. Raḥīm Riḍā-Zāde Malik, AHŠ 384. (Silsile-ye intishārāt-e Anjuman-e āthār o-mafākhir-e farhangī 346) Tehran: Anjuman-e āthār o-mafākhir-e farhangī 1.

GAS: Fuat Sezgin 1967–1984. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, I–IX. Leiden: Brill.

Gnoli, Gherardo 2000. *Zoroaster in History*. (Biennial Yarshater Lecture Series 2) NY: Bibliotheca Persica.

Gottwaldt, I.M.E. 1844–1848. *Hamzae Ispahanensis annalium libri X*. I: *Textus arabicus*. II: *Translatio latina*. Leipzig: Vogelii.

Grignaschi, Mario 1969. La Nihāyatu-l-'arab fī aḫbāri-l-Furs wa-l-'Arab (première partie). *Bulletin d'Études Orientales* 22: 15–67.

Grignaschi, Mario 1974. La Nihāyatu-l-'arab fī aḫbāri-l-Furs wa-l-'Arab et les Siyaru mulūki-l-'Aǧam du ps. Ibn-al-Muqaffa'. *Bulletin d'Études Orientales* 26: 83–105.

von Grunebaum, Gustav E. 1969. *Studien zum Kulturbild und Selbstverständnis des Islams*. Zürich: Artemis.

Gutas, Dimitri 1998. *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic translation movement in Baghdad and early 'Abbāsid society (2nd–4th/8th–10th centuries)*. London: Routledge.

Ḥamza, *Ta'rīkh sinī mulūk al-arḍ wa'l-anbiyā'*. 1) Beirut: Manshūrāt Dār maktabat al-ḥayāt; 2) see Gottwaldt 1844–1848.

Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī. *al-Tanbīh 'alā ḥudūth al-taṣḥīf*. Ed. Muḥammad As'ad Ṭalas, 1968. Damascus: Majma' al-lugha al-'arabiyya bi-Dimashq.

Humāyūnfarrukh, Ruknaddīn AHŠ 1377. *Shāhnāme o-Firdawsī: Pazhūhishī naw pīrāmūn-e Ḥakīm Abū'l-Qāsim Firdawsī o-Sulṭān Maḥmūd-e Ghaznavī*, I–II. Tehran: Asāṭīr.

Ibn 'Asākir. *Ta'rīkh Madīnat Dimashq*, XLIII. Ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū Sa'īd 'Umar ibn Gharāma al-'Amrawī, 1417/1996. n.p.: Dār al-Fikr.

Ibn Badrūn. *Sharḥ qaṣīdat Ibn 'Abdūn*. Ed. R. Dozy, 1846. Leiden: Luchtmans.

Ibn al-Faqīh. *Mukhtaṣar K. al-Buldān* = M.J. de Goeje (ed.), *Ibn al-Fakīh al-Hamadhānī, Compendium libri Kitāb al-Boldān*. (Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum V) Leiden (1885), repr. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir 1967.

Ibn al-Faraḍī. *Kitāb al-Alqāb*. Ed. Muḥammad Zaynhum Muḥammad 'Azab, 1412/1992. Beirut: Dār al-Jīl.

Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī. *Nuzhat al-albāb fī l-alqāb*, I–II. Ed. 'Abdal'azīz ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Sadīdī, 1989. Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd.

Ibn Isfandiyār. *Tārīkh-e Ṭabaristān*. Ed. 'Abbās Iqbāl Āshtiyānī, AHŠ 1389. (Intishārāt-e asāṭīr 524) Tehran: Asāṭīr. See also Browne 1905.

Ibn al-Jawzī. *al-Muntaẓam fī tawārīkh al-mulūk wa'l-umam*, I–X. Ed. Suhayl Zakkār, n.d. n.p.: Dār al-Fikr.

Ibn al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. *Ta'rīkh Baghdād*, I–XXIV. Ed. Muṣṭafā 'Abdalqādir 'Aṭā, 2011. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya.

Ibn an-Nadīm. *Kitāb al-Fihrist* = 1) *Kitâb al-Fihrist*, I–II. Ed. with comments by Gustav Fluegel, 1871–1872. Leipzig: Vogel; 2) Ed. Riḍā Tajaddud, ᴀʜš 1381. (Intishārāt-e asāṭīr 348) Tehran: Asāṭīr; 3) Ed. Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid, 1430/2009. I–II. London: Al-Furqan Islamic Heritage Foundation.

Ibn al-Najjār. *Dhayl Ta'rīkh Baghdād*, printed as vols XVI–XX of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *Ta'rīkh*.

ps.-al-Jāḥiẓ. *Maḥāsin* = Gerlof van Vloten 1898. *Le Livre des beautés et des antithèses attribué à al-Djahiz*. Leiden, repr. n.d. Amsterdam: Oriental Press.

al-Jahshiyārī. *al-Wuzarā' wa'l-kuttāb*. Ed. Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ, 1430/2009. Abū Ẓaby: National Library Abu Dhabi Authority for Culture & Heritage Cultural Foundation.

Kennedy, Hugh (ed.) 2008. *Al-Ṭabarī: A Medieval Muslim historian and his work*. (Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 15) Princeton: Darwin Press.

Kirste, J. 1896. Ueber das Khodāi-nāme. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 10: 323–326.

Kraemer, Joel L. (tr.) 1989. *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XXXIV: *Incipient Decline*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Lazard, G. 1971. Pahlavi, Pârsi, Dari: Les lengues de l'Iran d'après Ibn al-Muqaffa'. In: C.E. Bosworth (ed.), *Iran and Islam: In memory of the late Vladimir Minorsky*: 361–391. Edinburgh: EUP.

Leder, Stefan 1991. *Das Korpus al-Haiṯam ibn 'Adī (st. 207/822): Herkunft, Überlieferung, Gestalt früher Texte der aḫbār Literatur*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.

al-Marzubānī. *Kitāb Nūr al-qabas al-Mukhtaṣar min al-Muqtabas*. Ed. R. Sellheim, 1964. I [text]. (Bibliotheca Islamica 23a) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Massé, Henri 1973. *Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamaḏānī, Abrégé du Livre des pays*. Damascus: Institut français de Damas.

al-Mas'ūdī. *Murūj al-dhahab*, I–VII. Ed. Barbier de Meynard & Pavet de Courteille, rev. Charles Pellat, 1966–1979. (Publications de l'Université Libanaise. Section des études historiques XI) Beirut: Librairie Orientale.

al-Mas'ūdī. *Tanbīh* = M.J. de Goeje (ed.) 1894. *Kitâb at-Tanbîh wa'l-Ischrâf auctore al-Masûdî*. (Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum VIII) Leiden: Brill, repr. n.d. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir.

Meier, Fritz 1937. Stambuler Handschriften dreier persischer Mystiker: 'Ain al-quḍāt al-Hamaḏānī, Naǧm ad-dīn al-Kubrā, Naǧm ad-dīn ad-Dāja. *Der Islam* 24: 1–42.

Melville, Charles & Gabrielle van den Berg 2012 (eds). *Shahnama Studies*, II: *The Reception of Firdausi's Shahnama*. (Studies on Persian Cultural History 2) Leiden: Brill.

Minorsky, V. 1956. The Older Preface to the Shāh-nāma. In: *Studi Orientalistici in Onore di Giorgio Levi della Vida*, II: 159–179. (Publicazioni dell'Istituto per l'Oriente 52).

Mittwoch, Eugen 1909. Die literarische Tätigkeit Ḥamza al-Iṣbahānīs: Ein Beitrag zur älteren arabischen Literaturgeschichte. *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, XII(2): *Westasiatische Studien*: 109–169.

MONCHI-ZADEH, Davoud 1975. *Topographisch-historische Studien zum iranischen Nationalepos*. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XLI:2) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Mujmal al-tavārīkh wa'l-qiṣaṣ. Ed. Malik al-Shuʿarāʾ Bahār, n.d. 2nd edn. n.p.

NÖLDEKE, Theodor 1879. Rev. of "Baethgen, *Sindban*. Leipzig 1879". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 33: 513–536.

PEACOCK, A.C.S. 2007. *Mediaeval Islamic Historiography and Political Legitimacy: Balʿamī's Tārīkhnāma*. (Routledge Studies in the History of Iran and Turkey) London: Routledge.

PELLAT, Charles 1984. Nouvel essai d'inventaire de l'oeuvre ğāḥiẓienne. *Arabica* 31: 117–164.

AL-QALQASHANDĪ. *Ṣubḥ al-aʿshā*, I–XIV. n.d. Al-Qāhira: Wizārat al-thaqāfa wa'l-irshād al-qawmī.

ROSENTHAL, Franz 1968. *A History of Muslim Historiography*. 2nd rev. edn. Leiden: Brill.

ROZEN, V.R. 1895. K voprosu ob arabskich perevodach Chudâj-Nâme. *Vostočnyje zametki*: 153–191.

RUBIN, Zeev 2008. Al-Ṭabarī and the Age of the Sasanians. In: Hugh KENNEDY (ed.): 41–71.

RYPKA, Jan 1959. Geschichte der neupersischen Literatur bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts. In: Jan RYPKA (ed.), *Iranische Literaturgeschichte*: 69–337. (Iranische Texte und Hilfsbücher 4) Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

SACHAU, C. Edward 1879. *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*. London: Allen.

ṢAFĀ, Dhabīḥullāh AHŠ 1374. *Ḥamāse-sārāyī dar Īrān az qadīmtarīn-e ʿahd-e tārīkhī tā qarn-e chahārdahum-e hijrī*. Tehran: Firdaws.

AL-ṢAFADĪ. *al-Wāfī bi'l-wafayāt*, XXII. Ed. Ramzī Baʿlabakkī, 1983. (Bibliotheca Islamica 6v) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

SALIBA, George 1985. *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XXXV: *The Crisis of the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate*. Bibliotheca Persica. Albany: SUNY Press.

AL-ṬABARĪ. *Taʾrīkh* = 1) al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr. *Taʾrīkh al-Rusul wa-l-Mulūk*, I–XV. Under the general editorship of M.J. de Goeje, 1879–1901. Brill: Leiden. 2) I–XXI. Ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, n.d. (Dhakhāʾir al-ʿarab 30) Al-Qāhira: Dār al-Maʿārif. For translations, see BOSWORTH 1999; KRAEMER 1989; SALIBA 1985; WAINES 1992.

TAFAZZOLI, A., & A.L. KHROMOV 1999. Sasanian Iran: Intellectual life. In: B.A. LITVINSKY (ed.), *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, III: *The Crossroads of civilizations: AD 250 to 750*: 79–102. Delhi: Motilal Barsidass.

AL-TANŪKHĪ. *Nishwār al-muḥāḍara wa-akhbār al-mudhākara*, I–VIII. Ed. ʿAbbūd al-Shālijī, 1391–1393/1971–1973. n.p.

AL-THAʿĀLIBĪ. *Ghurar* = Hermann Zotenberg 1900. *Histoire des Rois des Perses*. Paris, repr. n.d. Amsterdam: Oriental Press.

TILLIER, Mathieu 2009. *Les Cadis d'Iraq et l'état Abbasside (132/750–334/945)*. Damascus: Institut français du Proche Orient.

TOORAWA, Shawkat M. 2005. *Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr and Arabic Writerly Culture: A Ninth-Century bookman in Baghdad*. (RoutledgeCurzon Studies in Arabic and Middle-Eastern Literatures) London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Ullmann, Manfred 1972. *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1 : Der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten, VI:2) Leiden: Brill.

Umīdsālār, Maḥmūd ahš 1381. Mulāḥaẓātī pīrāmūn-e Siyar al-mulūk-e Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ. Reprinted in: Maḥmūd Umīd-sālār, *Justārhā-ye Shāhnāme-shināsī*: 398–411. Tehran: Bunyād-e mawqūfāt-e duktur Maḥmūd Afshār.

Waines, David 1992. *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XXXVI: *The Revolt of the Zanj*. Bibliotheca Persica. Albany: SUNY Press.

Weipert, R. 2007. Abū ʿUbayda. In: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 3rd edn (*EI3*): 24–25. Leiden: Brill.

Wild, Stefan 1965. *Das Kitāb al-ʿAin und die arabische Lexikographie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Yamamoto, Kumiko 2003. *The Oral Background of Persian Epics: Storytelling and poetry*. (Brill Studies in Middle Eastern Literatures 26) Leiden: Brill.

Yāqūt. *Irshād al-arīb ilā maʿrifat al-adīb*. 1) I–VI. Ed. Aḥmad Shamsaddīn. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya; 2) I–VII. Ed. D.S. Margoliouth, 1923–1931. 2nd edn. (E.J.W. Gibb Memorial Series VI: 1–7) London: Luzac/Brill.

Yāqūt. *Muʿjam al-buldān.* 1) I–VII. 1995. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir; 2) I–VI. Ed. F. Wüstenfeld, 1866–1870. Leipzig, repr. n.d. n.p.

Zakeri, Mohsen 2007. *Persian Wisdom in Arabic Garb: ʿAlī b. ʿUbayda al-Rayḥānī (d. 219/834) and his Jawāhir al-Kilam wa-Farāʾid al-Ḥikam*, I–II. Leiden: Brill.

Zakeri, Mohsen 2008. al-Ṭabarī on Sasanian History: A Study in sources. In: Hugh Kennedy (ed.): 27–40.

APPENDIX

ʿUmar Kisrā

Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila & Ilkka Lindstedt

There remains yet a third author to be discussed. In his *Murūj*, al-Masʿūdī quotes five times (§§536, 538, 560, 600, 660)[73] a certain ʿUmar Kisrā always through a lost book by Abū ʿUbayda Maʿmar ibn al-Muthannā.[74] In *Murūj* § 536, al-Masʿūdī defines this ʿUmar as "famous in the knowledge of/about Persians and the stories of their kings so that he was given the *laqab* ʿUmar Kisrā" (cf. §538). In §560, he mentions Abū ʿUbayda's book on "*akhbār al-Furs*"[75] — a term we might almost expect to describe a *Siyar mulūk al-Furs*. In this passage he describes the contents of the book:

> In it he describes the classes of their kings,[76] early and late, and the stories about them, their speeches, the divisions of their genealogies, the description of the cities they built and the *kuwar* they made, the canals they dug and the noble families among them (*ahl al-buyūtāt minhum*) and how each group (*farīq*) of them marked themselves from among the Shahārija and others [...].

Al-Masʿūdī goes on to comment on the regnal years of the Party Kings, which shows that ʿUmar Kisrā was also interested in chronology.

In §660, the relation between Abū ʿUbayda and ʿUmar Kisrā is made explicit:

> Abū ʿUbayda Maʿmar ibn al-Muthannā has mentioned in his book on the stories of the Persians, a book he transmitted from ʿUmar Kisrā [...].

This ʿUmar Kisrā seems to be little attested elsewhere.[77] In Ibn al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh Baghdād* (X: 280–281), he is mentioned in the middle of an *isnād* and briefly characterized: "his *kunya* was Abū Ḥafṣ and he had knowledge

---

73 §986 is wrongly indexed s.v. Kisrawī. The word is there used as an adjective (*kisrawī*) in a verse by Abū Dulaf. On this verse, see von Grunebaum 1969: 130.

74 On whom, see GAL I: 103–104; GAL S I: 162; Weipert 2007: 24–25. Zakeri (2008: 36) also briefly discusses ʿUmar Kisrā and Abū ʿUbayda, but ignores the biographical material.

75 Abū ʿUbayda is not credited with a book by such a title in either GAS or GAL (cf. GAL I: 102; GAL S I: 162; GAS I, Index, s.v.). "*Fī kitāb lahu fī akhbār al-Furs*" seems to be a description of the contents of this book, not its title. Abū ʿUbayda's *Faḍāʾil al-Furs* may well be the book in question, cf. below.

76 These four classes, or dynasties, are defined in § 660.

77 In the Index to al-Masʿūdī, cf. al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj* (VII: 524) Pellat says that he has not found this ʿUmar Kisrā in any other source than in Ibn Badrūn's *Sharḥ qaṣīdat Ibn ʿAbdūn* (p. 31), where he is quoted from the *Murūj*.

of the stories of the Persians and the Kisrā kings (*mulūk al-akāsira*). This is where he got his *laqab* "Kisrā" from. Al-Haytham ibn ʿAdī transmitted from him."[78]

The *Dhayl* to this work by Ibn al-Najjār (XX: 134–135) contains a separate article (no. 1307) on him. There he is (originally) said to have been from al-Madāʾin.[79] He lived in Kufa, but came from Basra, and he was a *mawlā* to Banū Sulaym. He is connected with Persian lore and there is a story about how he received his cognomen Kisrā while he was in al-Ahwāz in the court of its Governor, Saʿīd ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Kūfī: having spoken of the wives of Kisrā he was caught unable to answer the question how many widows the Prophet had left. He was imprisoned until he had memorized this piece of Islamic lore.[80]

Abū ʿUbayda Maʿmar ibn al-Muthannā's historical book, which he transmitted from this ʿUmar, is not preserved. Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* does mention two books titled *Akhbār al-Furs,* one by Abū l-Ḥasan al-Nassāba Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim al-Tamīmī[81] (p. 127, ed. Tajaddud; ed. Fluegel, p. 114, ed. Fuʾād Sayyid I: 353; tr. Dodge 1970: 251: *K. Akhbār al-Furs wa-ansābihim*), the other (p. 112, ed. Tajaddud; ed. Fluegel, p. 100, ed. Fuʾād Sayyid I: 313; tr. Dodge 1970: 218) by al-Haytham ibn ʿAdī. But in the list of Abū ʿUbayda's works (pp. 58–60, ed. Tajaddud; ed. Fluegel, pp. 53–54; ed. Fuʾād Sayyid II: 150–152; tr. Dodge 1970: 116–118), there is no book of this title. There is a *Kitāb Khurāsān*, another entitled *Kitāb Rawshanqubād* (ed. Tajaddud, p. 60; ed. Fluegel, p. 54; ed. Fuʾād Sayyid I: 152; tr. Dodge 1970: 117),[82] but neither of these would seem to be a general work on Persian history. There is, however, a third title, namely, *Kitāb Faḍāʾil al-Furs*,[83] which will have to be considered.

In al-Qalqashandī's *Ṣubḥ al-aʿshā* (IV: 92),[84] there is a quotation from a book by this title, attributed to Abū ʿUbayd. This seems to be a mistake for Abū ʿUbayda,

---

78 He is not mentioned in Leder 1991.
79 Ibn al-Najjār takes this from Ibn al-Faraḍī's *Alqāb* (p. 178), which should be corrected accordingly.
80 The same story is told in Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh Madīnat Dimashq* (XLIII: 278), in an article on ʿAlī ibn Yazīd ibn al-Walīd. In addition, ʿUmar Kisrā is briefly mentioned in Ibn Ḥajar's *Nuzha* (II: 122; as ʿAmr Kisrā).
81 This Abū l-Ḥasan was known to Ḥamza, cf. Mittwoch 1909.
82 Fluegel reads Rūstuqbād and refers in his notes, *Fihrist* II: 33, to geographical works that mention such a place. The place name is also mentioned by Ḥamza, *Taʾrīkh* (p. 38), who gives Rustam-Kawādh as the ancient name and Rustuqābād (written RSYQ-ābād, so also in ed. Gottwaldt, p. 47, cf. tr. Gottwaldt 1848: 34 Ressicobad) as its contemporary name. This title does not appear in Dodge's translation and seems to have been dropped out, and footnote 114 belongs to this missing title. Fluegel's "corrected" reading has been adopted in Fuʾād Sayyid's edition (I: 152).
83 Dodge (1970: 117) translates this as "Excellencies of Persia (Excellencies of the Horse)". The latter rendering is improbable, as in book titles one mostly finds *al-khayl* instead of *al-faras*. See also Zakeri 2007, I: 265–266.
84 Cf. GAL S I: 167; Zakeri 2007, I: 265.

which is of common occurrence in Arabic texts. The contents of the quotation concern the building of Damascus by Bīvarasp and nicely fit the material transmitted by al-Masʿūdī. Even though the evidence is slight, it seems probable that the book in which Abū ʿUbayda transmitted material from ʿUmar Kisrā was his *Kitāb Faḍāʾil al-Furs* and this book should be considered an early history of Pre-Islamic Persia in the Book of Kings tradition.