

JOURNAL OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

1924

Q.353.397

PART III.—JULY

The Earlier History of the Arabian Nights

By D. B. MACDONALD, Hartford, U.S.A.

IT is unfortunate that almost all investigators of the origin and development of the Nights have been, more or less, under the spell of that quite modern recension which Zotenbergs first identified and called "la redaction égyptienne" (hereafter ZER). In the numerous Egyptian prints derived from the I Būlāq edition (Būlāq, A.H. 1252=A.D. 1835), in the Calcutta edition of the same recension (II Calcutta, A.D. 1839-42), in at least two Beyrouth editions (Salhani and Adabiya Press), this recension has attained to the dignity of a Vulgate, and of it most people, even most Arabists, think when they refer to the Arabian Nights. This almost subconscious assumption was the great obscuring element in Lane's mind and with De Goeje in his Britannica article on the Nights. From this point of view it is especially unfortunate that Zotenbergs did not publish any further researches; he was evidently on his way to complete freedom of attitude. August Müller, in his "Sendschreiben" to De Goeje ("Zu den märchen der tausend und einen nacht," Bessenberger's *Beiträge*, xiii, pp. 222-44; cf. too his more popular article, "Die Märchen der Tausend und eienen Nacht" in *Der Deutsche Rundschau*, xiii, 10, July, 1887, pp. 77-96), had evidently reached such freedom even before Zotenbergs *Notice (Notices et Extraits*, xxviii, 1, pp. 167-320) appeared; and the same

JRAS. JULY 1924.

23

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

holds good of Stanley Lane-Poole in his recast and expansion of Lane's "Review", added to the "Bohn" edition of Lane's translation (vol. iv, pp. 303-22).

In the following notes, by-products of my very broken work for some years past on an edition of the Galland and Vatican MSS. of the Nights (hereafter G and V), I begin with as few presuppositions as I can. I recognize that the Nights has assumed many very different forms and that, perhaps, the title "Nights" is the only thing common to them all. I make no attempt to take account of all my predecessors or to write a history of the long investigation which begins with Galland's *Dédicace* and the notes in his *Journal*.¹ I pick out the elements in that history, brought to light by different investigators in the past, which seem to me significant, and I bring them into relation with what little discoveries I have myself made, and the views which I have come to hold. Much of this work has had to be preliminary—a clearing, as it were, of the ground. Thus Zotenberg cleared the Vulgate out of the way, and I may venture to claim that I have myself cleared away two of the greatest sources of obscurity and confusion in Habicht's so-called Tunisian recension (this *Journal* for 1909, pp. 685-704) and the I Calcutta edition (Browne Volume, pp. 304-21).² And, above all, these notes centre round the evidence which minute verbal study of G has furnished, as it is beyond question the oldest considerable mass of a Nights text which has yet come to light.

In my preceding article in the Browne Volume I began with the extant MS. evidence and worked back. I now begin with

¹ There is a good outline of such a history in the first 20 pp. of J. Oestrup, *Studier over tusind og en nat*, 1891. See also a French résumé of this book with other notes on the Nights by the late Émile Galtier in *Mémoires . . . de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire*, t. xxvii, pp. 135-94, Cairo, 1912.

² May I ask my readers to strike out, in that article, the words (p. 313, l. 11), "In this he follows an Arabic preface to"? I unhappily trusted my memory and it misled me. The Persian preface to I Calcutta is not represented in the Russell MS., but the Arabic introduction to I Calcutta is verbatim in that MS.

the oldest *external* evidence and work down towards the MSS. That oldest external evidence is certainly contained in Emmanuel Cosquin's criticism of De Goeje's hypothesis. The great Dutch Arabist suggested (*Britannica*, 9, 10, 11, under "Thousand and One Nights", fuller in *De Gids* for September, 1886) that the frame-story of the Nights and the story of Esther in the Old Testament both went back to the same old Persian folk-tale. This suggestion was and is, perhaps, still very widely accepted, but so competent a folklorist as Cosquin had no difficulty in showing ("Le Prologue-Cadre des Mille et une Nuits," *Revue Biblique*, Jan.-April, 1909)¹ that the frame-story is fundamentally of Indian origin. Further, he analysed it into three quite distinct elements—(i) a husband in despair at the treachery of his wife recovers joy and health in learning that a high personage is equally unfortunate; (ii) a super-human being is tricked by a woman, although he keeps her in close confinement; (iii) an inexhaustible conteuse ingeniously escapes a danger which menaces either her or her father or both, p. 4/268—and proved the separate existence of these in Indian storiology. Still further, through a curious accident of translation, the existence of one of these in India before A.D. 251 can be shown. And again, still further, these elements passed into the folk-lore and literature of Europe apart from the Nights. But most striking of all is the proof that the Prologue to "The 101 Nights", a comparatively little-known companion collection to "The 1,001 Nights", and one preserved in only a small number of MSS., gives the first and most important element in a form much nearer to the Indian story, which is that of the young man, famed for his beauty, who becomes ugly because of a concealed sorrow, and thus incurs danger. That is, the framework of "The 101 Nights" is not a later imitation of that of "The 1,001 Nights", but is nearer to the original.²

¹ Now also in the posthumous collected volume, "Études Folkloriques," pp. 265-347.

² I do not attempt here to give details. For these, see Cosquin and Gaudefroy-Demombynes, cited below.

Since Cosquin wrote his masterly study, a translation of "The 101 Nights" by Gaudefroy-Demombynes from MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale has appeared ("Les Cent et Une Nuits Traduites de l'Arabe," E. Guilmoto, Paris [no date], pp. xvi, 352). He based his version on Fonds arabe 3660, but used the other two in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds arabe 3661, 3662, and also a very incomplete MS. belonging to René Basset. All these are quite modern and of Maghribi origin. Another MS., also Maghribi but said to be several centuries old and on parchment, was in the possession of Sainte Croix Pajot in 1842, and certain stories from it, translated by him, were inserted in "Les Mille et un Jours," an omnium gatherum published at Paris by Pourrat Frères in that year and also later (Nos. 309, 310 in Chauvin's *Bibl. ar.*, iv, pp. 122, 221). This MS. had been given to Pajot by "le scheik Reffaa-Effendi, directeur de l'école des langues au Cairo . . . il était, dit il, depuis plusieurs siècles dans sa famille" (p. 8); its present ownership is unknown (Gaudefroy-Demombynes, p. 252, note). The text of two stories in MS. 3660 was published in 1888 by Florence Groff in her "Contes Arabes Extraits des MSS. de la Bibliothèque Nationale" (Paris, Leroux). There is also a Berber translation of this collection which has been described by René Bassot in the *Rev. des Trad. Pop.*, vi, pp. 449-58.

It will be seen that the evidence for this shorter collection is all very modern and of the extreme West. Even the Cairo MS. was of Maghribi origin, and we have no real assurance as to its age. Yet the Prologue agrees in part with the geographically and chronologically remote Indian story much more nearly than does the Prologue of our Nights ; also, in another detail it is in close accord with the description in the *Fihrist*, to which I shall come immediately (Cosquin, pp. 25-7/291-3). In Hajji Khalifa, No. 11289 (Flügel's edition, vol. v, p. 356), there is, however, another trace of this collection. There we

مائة ليلة للشيخ فهد بن عبدالعزيز وهو مائة **read**,

ابن بكر. This is, evidently, "le philosophe Fermas ou Fehras" who tells the stories to a king in MSS. 3661 and 3662 (Demombynes, pp. I, 351). I owe this reference to a note in Chauvin's *Bibl. ar.*, iv, p. 121. Further, Gaudefroy-Demombynes has added to his translation a very rich apparatus of folk-lore and historical notes. In one of these (pp. 13-24) he has described yet another collection with yet another version of this same Prologue. It is in Fonds arabe 3655, fols. 36 ff., and begins with the Indian story, to which Cosquin directed attention, of the man with the beautiful face, but follows it up with quite different stories of men who had similar experiences and closes with the 'Ifrit and his chest.

Whatever view we may take of Cosquin's criticism on De Goeje's hypothesis of a connexion of origin between the Prologue of the Nights and the Book of Esther and of the relation of both to Persian national legends, there can be no question that it has removed the origins of the Nights into the world of folk-lore tales and out of that of literary tradition. These Indian folk-lore elements may have left India at a sufficiently remote period to have become nationalized in Persia, worked up with native Persian legends—if "native" is applicable to any such things—and Persian names, and even to have furnished the basis for Esther. As the bounds of our folk-lore knowledge widen, so frontiers vanish for its tales. Literary tradition, such as the origin of "Kalilah wa-Dimnah", is, of course, another thing.

In this new light the Nights loses, too, its uniqueness ; it becomes the one, among several similar collections, which has achieved the greatest success. "The 101 Nights" and at least one other collection have a more primitive form of the Prologue, as we have seen, than is found in any MS. of "The 1,001 Nights" at present known, even although the forms of the Prologue of the latter vary greatly in different MSS. (cf. e.g. Zotenberg's *Notice*, pp. 10/176 ff.).

It is true that all stories, however "literary", go back in

the last analysis to folk-lore elements ; but here the folk-lore elements are much nearer than we had imagined, and as the Nights goes on its way, assuming different forms, we see it changing and developing under continued folk-lore influence. The stories which are gradually inserted in it existed earlier in independent forms and these forms were often of a markedly popular character. There is a good illustration of this in the picaresque stories about 'Alī az-Zaiqaq, Aḥmad ad-Danaf, Ḥasan Shūmān, Dalīla al-Muhtāla with her daughter Zainab, etc., which appear in ZER, Nights 698-719; see e.g. II Calcutta, vol. iii, pp. 416-79. Galland already knew of a separate version in 12 volumes ; see the extract from his Journal quoted by Zotenberg in his *Notice*, p. 29/195. There are, too, a number of MSS. in European libraries and several modern prints, evidently for popular reading. For details on these, see Chauvin's *Bibl. ar.*, v, p. 248. I have myself four prints : one (Beyrouth, 1866) the author of which is said to be Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Maṣrī ; another, carefully expurgated but evidently of the same recension, although the author is not named, of Beyrouth, 1894 ; the third and fourth are professedly by the same author, but are of a different recension, and have many Egyptian colloquialisms ; one was lithographed in Cairo in 1297/1880, and the other printed from type at Cairo, 1324/1906. These are all much fuller than the form in the Nights, which consists only of certain incidents with some references left standing to othersunnarrated ; the complete romance is a very curious combination of the picaresque and the pseudo-historical. Some form of it evidently existed in the time of the Egyptian historian Abū-l-Mahāsin (d. A.D. 1470), for he mentions (ed. Juynboll, ii, 305) Aḥmad ad-Danaf as a figure in popular romance, and suggests that his original was a certain Ḥamdi of the tenth century A.D. But, of course, it is illegitimate to take this, as does De Goeje in his Britannica article on the Nights, as a reference to the extracts which have been taken into ZER and to deduce that the Nights in that form must have existed before 1470.

Further, it so happens that we have quite an old MS. of a story which shows that story on the border line of passing over from independent existence to incorporation in a recension of the Nights. It is the Story of Sūl and Shumūl, which was edited by C. F. Seybold with a German translation from the unique MS. in the Tübingen University Library ("Geschichte von Sul und Schumul . . . herausgegeben von Dr. C. F. Seybold" . . . Leip., Spiegatis, 1902). Seybold assigned the MS. to, at latest, the fourteenth century and thought it of Syrian origin. The latter point is probably correct and separates the MS. sharply from the almost certainly Egyptian G ; of the date we cannot be so assured. Seybold's edition covers 104 printed pages ; on pp. 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 25, 28, 32 come divisions into Nights, and in this part اَيُّهَا الْمَلِك is the form of address. From p. 35 to the end there are no divisions into Nights, but at intervals come قال قال الرَّاوِي and

يَا سَادَة صَاحِبِ الْحَدِيث ; finally, on p. 104 comes a Night ending. The Night divisions are strikingly like those in G and are thus of a form in which the number of the Night can be added, in syntactical independence, as a rubric ; and in this MS., though spaces have been left for numbers, these have not been inserted. Thus, p. 21 :—

وَادْرُكْ شَهْرَازَادَ الصَّبَحَ فَسَكَتَتْ عَنِ الْحَدِيثِ قَالَ
دَنِيزَادَ مَا أَحْسَنَ حَدِيثَكَ وَاعْجَبَهُ قَالَ اللَّيْلَةُ الْقَابِلَةُ
أَحَدِثْكَ بِأَحْسَنَ وَاعْجَبَ إِنْ عِشْتَ وَابْقَانِي الْمَلِك

[Space of a couple of lines for number of Night.]

فَمَا كَانَتِ اللَّيْلَةُ الْقَابِلَةُ قَالَ دَنِيزَادَ لَا خَتَّهَا شَهْرَازَادَ بِاللهِ

عليك يا اختاه ان كنتي غير نائمه فأتعمى للملك حديث
السول والشمول قالت حبّا وكرامة بلغتني ايها الملك
السعيد آن . . .

In other places *فاما كانت زعموا* is omitted and a *بلغتني* stands instead of *بلغتني*. All this means, I take it, that the scribe of this MS. had decided to adapt the story to insertion in a recension of the Nights. He therefore transcribes it and breaks it into Nights as he goes, omitting the other *Rāwī* references. But he does not insert the numbers of the Nights, as that could only be done when the story was put in its place in the recension. When rather more than a third through, his patience fails, and he transcribes his MS. as it lies before him—those who have had much to do with such MSS. will not find this strange; then he finishes in style, with an elaborate Night-ending in which the king looks forward to killing Scheherazade when he has got all her stories. Evidently the MS. was never actually part of a recension of the Nights, as the numbers would then have been inserted.

Similar examples of Arabian Nights stories existing in an independent and more original form could easily be multiplied, and perhaps, in the light of such cases, it is not too daring to suggest that the presumption with regard to each story in the Nights is that it existed first in such independence and even in a fuller form. Such a position will, I think, in the sequel be found tenable even for the earlier stories of the Galland recension which, from childhood's associations, we commonly think of as peculiarly *the Arabian Nights*. We must, therefore, completely depolarize our minds as to what lies behind the phrase, "Thousand and One Nights." It denoted very different things at different times; and it is the object of the present paper to attempt some guess as to what those different

things were. Further, it may be for clarity to distinguish three stages in this process: first, the simple folk-lore elements current orally and in the memories of the peoples; secondly, these elements worked up and used in stories by conscious literary artists, whether reciters or writers; thirdly, these stories incorporated in specific recensions of the Nights. For myself, I think that the compilers of the different recensions of the Nights stole their brooms ready made.

In the annals of Hamza of Isphahan (finished 350/961) there is a passage (ed. Gottwaldt, pp. 41 f.) which is often brought into connexion with this story-literature. In it he does not mention the Nights, and, although he does mention the Book of Sindibād and of Shimās and others, it is from an entirely different point of view than that of folk-lore or even of literature. He says, if I understand the passage rightly, that when, after the death of Alexander, the rule fell into the hands of the *mulūk at-tawā'if*, "they ceased from war and from mutual contention among themselves and one of them would overcome another only by difficult questions. In their days were composed the books which are now in the hands of the people, such as the Book of Marūk (?) and the Book of Sindibād and the Book of Barsanās (?) and the Book of Shimās and the like, about 70 books in all. And they continued in this way until there had reigned of them twenty-odd kings, in the number of whom he whose aspirations urged him to warlike expeditions was exceptional." This is exactly the situation in the Story of Ahīqār, where the king of Egypt wars against Sennacherib of Assyria by means of difficult questions and the wise Ahīqār has to be brought from prison to answer them. For Hamza of Isphahan, therefore, these books were a form of practical philosophy, and the stories in them were *amthāl*, apogees, stories told as examples or illustrations of situations or precepts; for the distinction see my article, "Hikaya" in the Leyden *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. ii, p. 304. Several of these collections have since, in one form or another, invaded the Nights, and even the Story of Ahīqār has been

taken up into one recension of the Nights, but that meant a distinct fall in their social standing; they had passed from being the instructions of the wise and prudent to being the entertainment of the masses. This change is, I think, indicated even by Hamza when he speaks of them as "now in the hands of the people" (*fī aidi-n-nās*) instead of those of kings and their councillors. Finally, it follows from all this that Hamza's not mentioning the Nights here is no evidence that he did not know any book of that name. He was not dealing here with books of amusement. That Hamza knew some form of a Nights must be taken, considering his date, as almost certain. He was much more a student of literature and philosophy than a historian, although his *Annals* is, unfortunately, his only printed work. See on his literary activity Eugen Mittwoch in *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin*, xii, pp. 109-69, and ZA, xxvi, pp. 270 ff. Professor Mittwoch is about to publish an edition of his *Khurāfāt al-‘Arāb*.

But in the *Muřūj adh-dhahab* (commonly translated "The Golden Meadows") of Mas'ūdī (d. 345/956) we have an undoubted reference to the Nights; or, perhaps better, to a "Nights". Mas'ūdī (ed. Barbier do Meynard, vol. iv, pp. 89 f.; ed. Būlāq, A.H. 1283, vol. i, p. 297) is speaking of the lying stories made up or developed by pseudo-traditionalists and by the *quissāṣ* on such subjects as Iram Dhāt al-‘Imād and of how they made them to be pleasing and even historically accepted, first with kings and then with the masses of the people; he has, of course, to put the matter discreetly, as many such stories went back to traditional authorities of the first rank. He then goes on:—"These are like the books transmitted to us and translated for us from the Persian [in some MSS. Pehlevi], Indian, and Greek, the origin of which was similar to these, such as 'The Book of *hazār afsāna*', or, translated from Persian to Arabic, 'of a thousand *khurāfas*', for *khurāfa* in Persian is called *afsāna*. The people call this book 'A Thousand Nights and a Night' [or in some

MSS. of Mas'ūdī 'A Thousand Nights']. It is the story of the king and the wazīr and his daughter and her nurso (*dāya*) [other MSS. read 'and of her slave girl', *jāriya*, and some read, 'and of his two daughters'], whose names are Shīrāzād and Dīnāzād [these names are given in many forms in the MSS., as also in the MSS. of the Nights]. And such as 'The Book of Farza and Simās' [again many forms of the names in the MSS.; cf. *Fihrist*, p. 306, l. 2, and Chauvin, *Bibl. ar.*, vol. ii, pp. 216 ff.] with what is in it of stories of the king [or kings] of India and the wazīrs, and such as 'The Book of Sindibād' and other such books."

The Arabic word *khurāfa* has been left untranslated above because of the several meanings which it has assumed; I shall return to it more than once below. We have, then, this passage of Mas'ūdī, not only in the two editions cited, but also quoted textually in four separate MS. forms in De Sacy's "Mémoire sur l'origine du recueil de contes intitulé Les mille et une Nuits", *Académie des Inscriptions*, vol. x, reprinted in "Mémoires d'histoire et de littérature orientale", Paris, 1832, pp. 216, 239 ff. To these De Sacy added a fifth, his own "texte restitué", which does not agree exactly either with Barbier do Moynard's text or with that of Būlāq. But out of them all it is plain that Mas'ūdī knew a Persian book called *Hazār Afsāna*, "The Thousand Stories," that it had been rendered into Arabic, and that the Arabic form was popularly called "Thousand and One Nights". Further, it is plain that the framework story resembled that of our Nights, but was not quite the same. The characters in it were the king, his wazīr, the wazīr's daughter, and the nurse of the daughter. But it is very curious that this is a combination which can be paralleled in different forms in Indian storiology. Cosquin (pp. 28, 294 ff.) has given a number of similar "cadres", Jain, Siamese, Javanese, Laotian, all linking up together and pointing back to an early Indian form with this combination of characters. Finally, the names as given by Mas'ūdī are suggestively Persian. Shīrāzād can easily be

for Chihrāzād, "of noble race," while Dīnāzād means "of noble religion", and De Goejo has shown in his articles already referred to, in *De Gids* (p. 4) and in the Britannica, how Mas'ūdī connects these very names with the Jewish girl whom Bahman Ardashīr married, and who was the mother of Princess Homāi whom the *Fihrist*, as we shall see, connects with the origin of the *Hazār Afsāna*. Thus (vol. ii, p. 129) Mas'ūdī gives Shahrazād as the name of this Jewish girl, and in another passage (vol. ii, p. 122) he calls her Dīnāzād, while in vol. i, p. 118, he tells how a king of Persia married a captive Jewish girl, had a child by her, and caused her people to return to their own country. Again, Firdawsī (vol. v, p. 11, of Mohl's transl.) calls Homāi herself Shahrazād, as also does Tabarī in his *Tārīkh* (i, p. 689). Evidently those Indian folktales have become very closely mixed up with Persian and even Jewish¹ legendary history. Such a broad conclusion, in spite of Cosquin's pleasant sarcasm, seems certain.

The next witness to a Nights is the *Fihrist*. In the first *Fann* of the eighth *Maqāla* we are given information about the tellers of Night-stories (*asmār*) and of *Khurāfāt*, fictions told for amusement, and about the names of the books compiled out of these.—Muhammad ibn Ishāq [i.e. the author of the *Fihrist*] said : The first who made separate compilations (*sannafā*) of *khurāfāt* and made books in which to put them

¹ This raises a much wider and an exceedingly interesting question in the history of literature, but one only indirectly connected with the present subject. It illustrates, however, the interdependence of supposedly quite different fields of research. To put it shortly, the thesis could be maintained that there is evidence of the existence among the Hebrews—or Jews—of a distinct class of foreign story, of Persian origin, and that this class is much older than has been commonly supposed. The individuals in it which can at present be identified are four—Esther, Tobit, the story of Aḥiqār, the Frame Story of the Nights. These are all connected by specific links of names or events, and the date of the group is shown by the existence of Aḥiqār in Egypt and in Aramaic on papyrus fragments of the fifth century B.C. The fates of the individuals have been singularly diverse. Esther got into the Hebrew canon; Tobit into the Greek canon; Aḥiqār still exists as a chapbook in the Near East and is in one recension of the Nights; the fourth is our present subject. All this suggests that the transmission of the Indian folk-lore elements must lie very far back.

and laid them up in libraries and in some gave speaking parts to beasts were the early Persians. Thereafter the Ashghānian kings, who were the third dynasty of the kings of Persia, gave themselves thereto. Thereafter that [branch of literature] increased and spread in the days of the Sāsānian kings, and the Arabs translated it into the Arabic tongue, and the eloquent and the rhetoricians took it up and corrected it and wrote it in elegant style and constructed, according to the idea of it, what resembled it. The first book, then, which was made according to this idea was "The Book of *Hazār Afsāna*", which means "a thousand *khurāfāt*". The cause [or the motif, *sabab*] of that was that one of their kings, whenever he had married a woman and passed a night with her, killed her on the morrow. So he married a girl of royal descent, possessed of understanding and information, who was called Shahrazād. Then after she had come together with him, she began telling him *khurāfāt* and carrying the story along at the finish of the night in such a way as to lead the king to preserve her alive and that he would ask her in the second [or the following] night about the completion of the story, until she had passed a thousand nights, while he at the same time was having intercourse with her as his wife, until she was given a child by him, which she showed to him, informing him of the stratagem she had used with him. Then he admired her understanding and inclined to her and preserved her alive. And the king had a *qahramāna* who was called Dīnāzād, and she assisted her in that. And it has been said that this book was composed for Humāni, daughter of Bahman; and they make, with regard to it, other and different statements.

Muhammad ibn Ishāq said :—The sound view—if it be the will of Allah!—is that the first to whom stories were told at night was Alexander the Great. He had people who made him laugh and told him *khurāfāt*, not seeking pleasure by that, but only to be vigilant and on his guard. After him the kings used for that purpose "The Book of *Hazār Afsāna*". It contains a thousand nights and less than two hundred stories,

for the stories are often told in it during a number of nights. I have seen it complete several times and it is in reality a worthless book of stupid [literally, frigid] stories.

Muhammad ibn Ishāq said :—Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn 'Abdūs al-Jahshiyārī, the author of the *Kitāb al-wuzarā*, began to compose a book in which he made choice of a thousand stories (*samar*) out of the stories of the Arabs and the Persians and the Greeks and others, each part complete in itself, not joined to another. He called into his presence story-tellers (*musāmīrūn*), and took from them the best of what they knew and could recite, and he chose from the books compiled of stories (*asmār*) and of *khurāfāt* what was to his taste and was superior. So he brought together for himself out of that 480 nights, each night a separate story (*samar*) containing 50 leaves, more or less. But death overtook him before he had finished what was in his mind, of completing a thousand stories. I have seen a number of parts of that [collection] in the handwriting of Abū-t-Tayyib, the brother of ash-Shāfi'i.

This is the testimony of the author of the *Fihrist*, writing between A.H. 377 and 400, or perhaps slightly later. The

meaning seems clear, although I am not sure that صُنْفٌ means exactly "compiled", or that سَمَارٌ, *samar*, has not passed over entirely from "story told at night" to simply "story told by a professional story-teller". The language of the *Fihrist* has not yet been studied for itself, and will have difficulties for its future translator. It will be noticed that the confederate of Shabrāzād is a *gahramāna*, manageress, duenna, of the king, and bears the slave-name Dīnārzād, with Dunyāzād as a variant reading in one MS. Ibn Ishāq also knows the story that the book was composed for Homāi, or Khunāni, or Humāni (there are different forms of the name), daughter of Bahman. The same story appears to have been told, too, by the writer of an anonymous preface to the *Shāhnāma* of Firdawsi. The same anonymous writer tells

that the *Hazār Afsāna* was versified by a certain Rastī at the court of Maḥmūd of Ghazna. See A. Müller, in his "Send-schreiben", p. 224; De Goeje, "De Arabische Nacht-vertellingen," in *De Gids*, p. 2; Payne, vol. ix, p. 279; Burton, vol. viii of 12 vol. ed., p. 67, note 3; I cannot verify farther. All these, except Burton's reference to James Atkinson, the translator of the *Shāhnāma*, p. x, seem to go back to Wallenbourg's "Notice sur le *Schāhnāmè* de Ferdousi et traduction de plusieurs pièces relatives à ce poème", Vienna, 1810, p. 52, a book which is inaccessible to me. [See, now, note at end of this article.]

But it is certain that in the time of Ibn Ishāq the Persian *Hazār Afsāna* existed and contained 1,001 nights and less than 200 stories—say five nights to a story. In the Frame-Story we can be certain of Cosquin's third point only (see p. xxx above), and not of even that entirely, for there is no mention of any father to be saved. The book was fairly common. A marginal note in an old hand in the principal Leyden fragment of the *Fihrist* (Lin Flügel's apparatus) says, "I have seen it in four volumes and it is called 'A thousand nights and a night'." This is evidently a reference to an Arabic translation; but it is attached, in the *Fihrist*, to Ibn Ishāq's description of the *Hazār Afsāna*. It can hardly be a reference to any form of our present Nights, which would have filled much more than four volumes. Ibn Ishāq's judgment on the Persian book is not to be taken as that of the ordinary Muslim 'ālim. The present-day 'Ulamā, of course, with the rarest exceptions, have no use for the Nights, but Ibn Ishāq had a far more catholic range of interest and a sounder taste; his book makes that evident. We may believe him, I think, that the *Hazār Afsāna* was really of very little value.

The Jahshiyārī mentioned above is a perfectly well-known writer who died in A.H. 331. He is mentioned in the *Fihrist*, p. 12, l. 23, and he has a paragraph to himself on p. 127, ll. 22–4. He is there said to have belonged to the class of secretaries (*kātib*s), of compilers of historical anecdotes

(*akhbāriyūn*) and of writers of formal official letters, mostly in rhymed prose (*mutarassilūn*). Among his books was one on wazirs and secretaries, a collection of anecdotes, which has survived and is in the Vienna library, and another on prosody. For other references to him see Flügel's commentary to the *Fihrist*, pp. 6, 54, 149, and Alfred Wiener, "Die *Faraj ba'd ash-Shidda*—Literatur," Strassburg, 1913 (Trübner), p. 49, note 3. All these, however, add little information. Much more important are the references by Massignon, in his "Quatre Textes" (Paris, 1914), p. 7.

His book, even in its uncompleted form, must have been of enormous extent. A collection of 480 stories of 50 leaves each would make up 24,000 leaves. On p. 115 of the *Fihrist*, l. 12, we are told that the *Aghānī* filled 5,000 leaves, and the printed text of the *Aghānī* in the Būlāq edition fills 3,850 pp. Jahshiyārī's collection, therefore, must have been nearly five times the length of the Būlāq 20 volume *Aghānī*, and each of his stories would have taken up over 58 pages of the *Aghānī* print. This, it is plain, was no collection of anecdotes. Al-Mas'ūdī (*Murūj*, vol. viii, p. 249) makes mention of another book by Jahshiyārī containing "thousands of leaves".

The reference to the "parts" in the handwriting of Abu-t-Tayyib, the brother of ash-Shāfi'i, is very puzzling. There are precisely similar references in the *Fihrist* to the hand of this brother of an ash-Shāfi'i, p. 64, l. 14; 65, ll. 2, 18; 72, l. 13; 92, l. 8; but as Jahshiyārī died in A.H. 331 and the ash-Shāfi'i died in 204, it is plain that this scribe cannot have been a brother of the founder of the legal school. The *Fihrist* knows another ash-Shāfi'i, p. 214, ll. 1-3, who is distinguished from the Imām by his full name.

On p. 308, ll. 9-12, the author of the *Fihrist* closes this *Fann* on the *khurāfāt* and *asmār* with a significant remark, "Muhammad ibn Ishāq said:—The *asmār* and *khurāfāt* were much desired and beloved in the days of the 'Abbāsid Caliphs and especially in the days of al-Muqtadir (A.H. 295-320); so the professional scriveners (*al-warrāqūn*) compiled and forged

[them], and of those who made them up was a man known as Ibn Dilān¹ (بن دلآن?), whose name was Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Dilān, and another who was known as Ibn al-'Atṭār, and many besides."

He is here looking back on the close of a period. Part of the great literary and intellectual flowering under the early 'Abbāsids had been in stories of different kinds. The sources of these had been Arab, Persian, Byzantine Greek, and Indian. At first the authors and translators of these stories had been reputable writers who did not hesitate to put them out under their own names. They could say that these were traditions of the old days in the desert, or that they had been taken from the wisdom of the ancient Greeks or Persians or Indians. Such translated books brought their own reputations with them, and had behind them learned names; and in the case of the genuine Arab stories it was hard to distinguish between tradition and fiction. Thus in the *Fihrist* (p. 307) there is a section giving the names of lovers whose stories (*al-hādīth*) had passed into night-stories (*samar*). Further, the *Fihrist* (p. 306, ll. 9 f.) gives the names of four writers of established reputation, all mentioned at length elsewhere in the *Fihrist*, who had produced such stories. These appear to have lived towards the end of the second century of the Hijra. Still later, on p. 313, in a section on miscellaneous books, the composers or compilers of which are not known, the author gives a list of 25 *khurāfāt* known only by *laqab*. I suppose he means that these are stories whose only connexion with a hypothetical origin is by a nickname occurring in them. There follow two sections of books on *battālin* and *mughaffilin* in which the names of the heroes are given, although not those of the authors.

But the *musāmirūn*, or professional story-tellers, were in a different situation. These had their temporary and oral

¹ There is a *kātib* Dilān in Ibn Miskawayh's *History*, Gibb Memorial, vol. v, p. 574, l. 4.

reputations, but with the ceasing of their public appearances their names vanished too ; their names were as evanescent as those of the mass of actors and public entertainers with us. The forms which their stories had assumed in their memories and on their lips might possibly have been fixed by such eccentric amateurs of their art as Jahshiyārī ; but otherwise ran every risk of being lost. Those who know the Muslim East will recognize that this is a situation perpetually recurring and existing to this day. In 1908 I was so fortunate as to pick up in Damaseus a number of scrappy MSS. from the library of a deceased *hikawātī*, and their nature and condition were eloquent of the methods of his class. In Bagdad, in the third century of the Hijra, the public demand for such stories had risen beyond the supply of the reputable writers or of the oral performances of the public reciters. So, according to the passage already translated from the *Fihrist*, the professional scrivenors filled the gap. These were, in general, anonymous, although the *Fihrist* gives two names, otherwise unknown to us. Naturally, this competition drove writers of reputation off the field, or, at least, into anonymity. Their art lost standing, and the public, in fact, wanted amusing and interesting stories with as little art to them as possible. So I have heard a coffee-house audience in Cairo protest to a story-teller when he wished to deviate from his story into poetry. They wanted things to happen and jokes to be cracked and had no use for die-away love chantings, however artistic. So, too, in Bagdad contact with the professional jester and entertainer (*mudhik*) affected the standing of the story-teller. See on these the *Fihrist*, pp. 140 ff., and especially the case of Abū-l-'Anbas (p. 151, l. 23 f.) and his standing partly as astronomer and partly as boon companion of al-Mutawakkil and purveyor of *bāh*-literature. Pp. 151-3 of the *Fihrist* are very significant as to this declension. Some other sides of the same literary situation will be found in my article "Hikāya" in the Leyden *Encyclopedia of Islam*. The result of it all was that stories in Arabic lost caste and became anonymous.

It may be worth while in connexion with this to note that the authority quoted by al-Mufaddal b. Salama, in his *Fākhir* (see below) for "stories of Khurāfa", is an Ismā'il b. Abān al-Warrāq, whom I cannot find in the *Fihrist*. He, in his turn, quotes authorities ; but I cannot find any of their names either. Yet al-Mufaddal b. Salama evidently regards him as a reputable authority. It is allowable to conjecture that he is the *rāvī* who d. 263, a native of Bait Lihyā (*Yāqūt*, i, p. 780). He occurs also in *sanads* in Tabarī's "History" (Leyden ed., ser. i, p. 89; ser. iii, p. 2373).

We have seen that the author of the *Fihrist* uses for these stories the two terms *asmār* and *khurāfāt*. The classical use of *asmār* and his very different use have become plain ; but what were *khurāfāt* ? According to the lexicons (Lane, p. 726b.; *Sīhāh*, s.v.; *Lisān*, x, p. 412, ll. 18 ff.) a *khurāfa* is a "pleasant and strange fictitious story". The commonest explanation is that Khurāfa was the name of a man who was carried off by the Jinn and, on his return, told wonderful tales about them. This is supported by traditions from Muhammad, in one of which the Prophet asserts, or is made to assert, that what Khurāfa told was true. But the general consensus seems to have been that there could be no reliance on a *hadīthu Khurāfa* ; the phrase is used twice in that way in Ma'dāni's *Amthāl* (ed. Cairo, 1310, i, p. 131; ii, p. 188). In the usage of the *Fihrist* there is evidently no condemnatory meaning ; it is simply a pleasing fiction, and *kharrafā* means to produce such pleasing fictions. Later it came to mean ridiculously impossible stories as opposed to those which are fictitious but pleasing ; thus in Dāmirī's *Hayāt al-hayawān*, i, p. 185, l. 31, and ii, p. 101, l. 25 of ed. Cairo, 1313. At present it is only in the African Tripoli, apparently, that it has survived as the normal word for "story" ; see Stumme, "Märchen aus Tripolis."

But the most important passage for our purpose on *khurāfāt* is in the commentary by ash-Sbarīshī on the *Maqāmāt* of

al-Harīrī.¹ At the end of Maqāma IV Ḥarīrī calls the tale just told by Abū Zaid *khurāfatuhu* "his *khurāfa*", and says that the audience found it wonderful, i.e. they admired it. There is no context to determine whether Ḥarīrī (d. A.H. 516) thought that a *khurāfa* was simply a wonderful and incredible story, or was a story told with refined literary art, for there is another derivation which regards the word as parallel in formation to *fukāha* from *fākiha* and meaning "choice plucked fruits". See Lane on the whole root and De Sacy's Arabic commentary on this passage. The source for this interpretation, both in Lane and in De Sacy, seems to be al-Muṭarrizī, who died A.H. 610; his *Mughrib* was used by Lane, and his commentary on Ḥarīrī by De Sacy. He is a very late authority for a new interpretation in lexicography, although a good authority for the usage and ideas of Ḥarīrī's time. I suspect that his interpretation is based on a mis-transcription of *nakhl* as *nahl*. The *Lisān* traces the story of Khurāfa to Ibn al-Kalbī, apparently Hishām ibn Muhammad al-Kalbī who died A.H. 204 or 206; cf. Brockelmann, i, p. 139, and *Fihrist*, pp. 95 ff.

Sharīshī (d. A.H. 619) comments as follows (ed. Cairo, 1314, i, pp. 56 f.):—*Khurāfatuhu* means his diverting narrative (*hadīthuhu al-mulhī*). "A *hadīth* of Khurāfa" is a proverb current on the tongues of the people in ancient and in modern times to express any narrative with no truth in it. It occurs in the proverbs of al-Mufaddal² with a *sanad* leading up to 'Ā'isha, that she said to the Prophet, "Narrate to me the story of Khurāfa (or a *hadīth* Khurāfa)." So he said, "Khurāfa was a good man and he informed me that he went out one night and a party of three of the Jinn met him and took him prisoner. One of them said, 'We will let him off,' and another,

¹ I have since found this same series of stories with another about Khurāfa in the *Fākhir* of al-Mufaddal ibn Salama (ed. C. A. Storey, Leyden, 1915, pp. 137–40). This was evidently Sharīshī's source; but I translate Sharīshī's text with some variants and corrections from the edition of the *Fākhir*. I return below to al-Mufaddal's date.

² For al-Mufaddal's authority here see top of p. 371.

'We will kill him,' and another, 'We will enslave him.' While they were taking counsel as to him, lo! there came upon them a man [meaning evidently a human being], and he said, 'Peace be upon you!' They said, 'And upon thee be peace!' He said, 'And what are ye?' They said, 'A party of the Jinn; we took this man prisoner, so we are considering about him.' Then he said, 'If I narrate to you a wonderful narrative, will ye make me a partner in him with yourselves?' They said, 'Yes.' He said, 'I was in prosperous circumstances, then they ceased and I was ridden with debt. So I went out, fleeing, and a terrible thirst befel me; so I journeyed to a well and alighted that I might drink. Then some one called out to me from the well, "Stand!" so I went away from it and did not drink. But the thirst overcame me and I returned; then he called out to me. Again I returned a third time and drank and paid no attention to him. Then he said, "O Allah! if it is a man transform him into a woman, and if it is a woman transform her into a man." And lo! I was a woman. I went to a certain city and a man married me and I bore him two children. Thereafter I returned to my own country, and I passed by the well of which I had drunk and I alighted. He called out to me as he had called at first, but I drank and paid no attention to him. So he prayed as at first, and I became a man as I had been. Then I came to my own country and married a wife and begat on her two children. So I have two sons of my loins and two of my womb.' They said, 'This is wonderful; thou art our partner.' Then while they were taking counsel, lo! there came upon them a bull, flying; and when it had passed them, lo! a man with a staff (*khashaba*) in his hand, searching in its traces (*yahṣiru fi athrihi*; the *Fākhir* has *yuhdiru*, 'running'). He stopped beside them and saluted, and they returned the salute. And he inquired of them, and they answered him as they had answered their fellow. So he said, 'If I narrate to you a story more wonderful than this, will ye make me a partner in him with yourselves?' They said, 'Yes.' He said, 'I had a paternal uncle who was

wealthy. And he had a beautiful daughter and we were seven brothers. And my uncle had a calf which he reared : but it escaped. So he said, " Whichever of you will bring it back shall have my daughter." So I took this staff of mine and girt myself and searched in its traces (the *Fākhir* reads as above). I was a youth (*ghulām*) and I have grown gray ; but I have not overtaken it and it is not wearied (*yakillu* ; *Fākhir*, *yankillu* ?). Then they said, ' This is a wonder ! Sit, and thou shalt be our partner.' While they were taking counsel, lo ! thereto came upon them a man mounted on a mare, and behind him a youth (*ghulām*) on a stallion. He saluted, as his two fellows had saluted, and they returned his salutation as they had returned it to his two fellows. Then he inquired of them and they informed him. He said to them, ' If I narrate to you a narrative more strange than this, will you make me a partner in him with yourselves ? ' They said, ' Yes.' He said, ' I had an evil mother '—then he said to the mare on which he rode, ' Was it thus ? ' and she said with her head, ' Yes '—he said, ' and I suspected her with this black slave ('abd) '—and he pointed to the horse on which his *ghulām* rode [and said to it], ' Was it thus ? ' and it said with its head, ' Yes.' ' So I sent one day on one of my affairs this *ghulām* of mine (I follow the *Fākhir* here, *ghulāmū*) who is riding ; but she shut him up with herself. He fell asleep (*fa'aghfā*) and saw in his sleep as though she uttered a cry, and lo ! there was a large field rat (*juradh*) which had come out. She said, " Bend down thy head (*usjud*) !" and he bent it down. Next she said, " Plough (*ukrub*) !" and it ploughed. Next she said, " Thresh (*udrus*) !" and it threshed. Next she summoned a handmill (*rahan*) and it ground a cupful of *sawīq*. She brought it to the *ghulām* and said to him, " Take it to thy master." He brought it to me, but I used guile towards the two of them until I had made them drink the cupful, and lo ! she was a mare and he was a stallion.' He said, ' Was it thus ? ' The mare with her head said, ' Yes,' and the stallion with his head said, ' Yes.' Then they said, ' This is the most wonderful thing

we have heard ; thou art our partner.' So they agreed and freed Khurāfa." Then he came to the prophet and told him this narrative. So whatever occurs of jesting narratives is referred back to Khurāfa to whom this narrative goes back (*sāhibu-l-hadīh*).—

In the version of the *Fākhir* the magic scene is somewhat different ; but not, I think, better. It runs after the appearance of the large field rat :—" She said, ' Cleave ! ' and it cleft (*makhara* used of a ship in the water ; not, so far as I know, of ploughing). Next she said, ' Repeat ! ' and it repeated (*karra* ?). Next she said, ' Sow ! ' and it sowed (*zara'a*). Next she said, ' Reap ! ' and it reaped (*haṣada*). Next she said, ' Thresh ! ' and it threshed (*dāṣa*)."

Chauvin has already noted (*Bibl. ar.*, v, p. 150, note 1) that a similar scene to that in the story of Badr Bāsim is in the *Kothā Sarit Ságara* (transl. C. H. Tawney, vol. ii, pp. 167 f.). I give it here from Tawney :—" When I did not find you there I entered the house of a certain woman to lodge, as I was worn out, and gave her money for food. She gave me a bed, and being tired I slept for some time, but then I woke up, and out of curiosity I remained quiet, and watched her, and while I was watching, the woman took a handful of barley and sowed it all about inside the house, her lip trembling all the time with muttering spells. Those grains of barley immediately sprang up and produced ears ; and ripened, and she cut them down, and parched them and ground them, and made them into barley-meal. And she sprinkled the barley-meal with water, and put it in a brass pot, and after arranging her house as it was before, she went quickly to bathe. Then as I saw that she was a witch, I took the liberty of rising up quickly : and taking that meal out of the brass pot, I transferred it to the meal-bin, and I took as much barley-meal out of the meal-bin and placed it in the brass vessel, taking care not to mix the two kinds, etc." The woman gives him that in the brass pot ; eats herself of that in the bin, and becomes a she-goat, which he sells to a butcher.

From the *Fākhir*, then, it is plain that Sharīshī's authority, whom he calls only Mufaddal, was Abū Tālib al-Mufaddal b. Salama b. 'Āsim (*Fihrist*, pp. 73 f.), whom Brockelmann (vol. i, p. 118, No. 8) appears to have confused as to date with his son Muhammad (De Slane's *Ibn Khallikan*, vol. ii, pp. 6-10; ed. Cairo, 1310, vol. i, p. 460). This al-Mufaddal could not have died as late as A.H. 308, and the *floruit* which De Sacy gives him ("Anth. Gram.", p. 130, note 62) of A.H. 250 is probably correct; with this Storey agrees.

The tale of the redemption of Khurāfa from the Jinn by means of three wonderful stories, told from their own experience by three chance-met travellers, is exactly the first story of the Nights, that of the Merchant and the Jinnī, which occupies Nights 1-7 in the Galland MS. According to Chauvin, *Bibl. ar.*, vi, p. 23, it has been studied by Oestrup, "Studier over tusind ag en nat," pp. 64-6, 149,¹ and by Basset in *Rev. d. trad. pop.*, xvi, 28-36. But the three stories which are told are quite different from those in the Nights, although two of them are found elsewhere in the Nights. It has often been remarked that Shahrazād certainly did not put her best foot foremost in her story-telling and that this first experiment of hers is in a different class entirely from the story of the Fisherman and the Jinnī, which immediately follows. Further, even in the East, there has evidently been much dissatisfaction with the three intercalated stories, for they vary greatly in the MSS. The conjecture may at least be hazarded that this story is all that is left of an early form of a non-Persian and Arabic Nights. It is found, apparently, in all the MSS. which give the beginning of the Frame-Story, and it is of pronounced desert and Arabic type. It thus contrasts at once with the Frame-Story, with its evident Persian origin and Persian names.

Again, we may, I think, legitimately combine this with certain facts that the *Fihrist* gives us:—(i) That the first Arabic Nights was a straight translation of the Persian *Hazār*

¹ In Galtier's abstract, pp. 143, 152.

Afsāna, although later it fell into the hands of litterateurs and rhetoricians who took it up and variously improved and expanded it; (ii) That it was a comparatively small and common book in which every story averaged only a little over five nights; (iii) That, in the opinion of the author of the *Fihrist*, it was a worthless and stupid book. From this we seem driven to posit, as the first Arabic Nights, a comparatively small book, the stories as well as the Frame being of marked Persian character, much like those in the various forms of the Book of Sindibād. Was there, then, formed from this another book, Arabic in type as well as language, but of about the same length as to the whole book and also as to the stories? Our present Frame-Story with this first Story would, then, be all that was left of that recension. This Story of the Merchant and the Jinnī certainly fits that hypothesis in its shortness and general poverty, and it is otherwise very difficult to explain how it stands in such pride of place. From the extant MSS. it is plain that a would-be compiler of the Nights often began with a quite small portion which had reached his hands and added to that such stories as he chose. Thus in the Reinhardt MS. in the Strasbourg University Library the first 73 pages are our best MS. representative of ZER; but thereafter we have an entirely separate recension not found elsewhere; and in the Wortley-Montague MS. in the Bodleian we have the G recension to the end of the Porter Cycle and thereafter chaos. See my "Classification" in the Browne Volume, pp. 318 f.

I return to the three stories told by the three chance-met travellers in al-Mufaddal's narrative. The first—of the well which changes sex—is a very widely spread folk-lore story which assumes many different forms and which has found its way into ZER as part of The Seven Wazirs. Chauvin, *Bibl. ar.*, viii, p. 43, gives ample details on its occurrence elsewhere. It is evidently of Indian origin. The second—of the fugitive bull—has no connexion that I know with any story that has ever been taken into the Nights. I fancy that the folklorist

would look for it under the class of competition in lying—the class exists in Arabic. I am not sure about the “staff” which the youth takes with him. It is *khashaba*, which can mean anything made of wood, but I do not remember it used elsewhere of an ‘asā. Is it a yoke? The third story is much more interesting. The essential part is the scene in which the magic *sawīq*, or parched meal, is prepared, and it at once suggests the similar scene in the Story of Badr Bāsim in the Nights, where the Queen Lāb similarly prepares magic *sawīq*. I give this from G, Night 267, vol. iii, fol. 69a; with which V, a transcript here from G, agrees verbatim. The scene occurs in ZER in I Būlāq, vol. ii, p. 261 top; II Calcutta, vol. iii, p. 582 (these two are identical verbatim); Breslau, vol. x, p. 58. This last was taken by Fleischer from a Gotha MS. and corrected by I Būlāq; the text is almost the same as in I Būlāq, but not quite. Another slightly divergent text of ZER is in the Sallani Beyrouth edition, vol. iv, p. 209. G runs as follows:—

فَلَمَّا كَانَ نَصْفُ الْلَّيْلِ قَامَتْ مِنَ الْفَرَاشِ وَالْمَلَكُ بَدْرُ
مُتَبَّهٌ وَهُوَ يُظْهِرُ أَنَّهُ نَائِمٌ وَفَتَحَ عَيْنَهُ الْوَاحِدَةَ لِيُنَظِّرَ مَا
تَفْعِلُ فَوَجَدَهَا أَخْرَجَتْ مِنْ كَيسٍ مِنْ تَرَابِ أَحْمَرٍ
وَفَرَشَتْهُ فِي وَسْطِ الْقَصْرِ وَادًا هُوَ نَهْرٌ جَارِيٌّ وَاخْدَتْ كَفَّ
شَعِيرٍ وَبَدْرَتْهُ بِجَانِبِ النَّهْرِ عَلَى التَّرَابِ وَسَقَتْهُ مِنْ دَلْكَ
الْمَاءَ فَصَارَ زَرْعٌ مُسْبِلٌ فَلَخْدَةٌ وَحَصْدَةٌ وَطَحْنَتَهُ فَصَارَ
سُوقٌ ثُمَّ شَالَتْهُ وَاتَّ إِلَى جَانِبِ الْمَلَكِ بَدْرٍ وَنَامَتْ إِلَى

الصَّبَاحِ

“Then when it was the middle of the night she rose from the bed while King Badr was vigilant. He was making an appearance of sleep, but he opened one eye to observe what she was doing. So he found that she took out of a bag some red earth and spread it in the midst of the *qaṣr*, and lo! it was a flowing river. Then she took a handful of barley and scattered it beside the river upon the earth and moistened it from that water. Then it became seed product in the ear, and she took it and reaped it and ground it and it became *sawīq*. Thereafter she laid it by and came beside King Badr and slept till morning.”

To be really and essentially the same, two scenes could hardly be more different. If anything, al-Mufaddal’s tale is more picturesque. The magical apparatus is more detailed and various, and the field rat which must bend down its neck to have the plough put upon it is a touch of more than folklore. For the folk-lore association of the *juradk*, see it and also *fa’r* in Damiři’s *Hayāt al-hayawān*; it would suggest an adulterous woman and also plenty, and so fits this context. Finally, it is noteworthy that al-Mufaddal makes no reference to the Nights in any form, although we should have expected something of the kind in this context. It seems almost unescapable that he did not know our Nights. The other story associated in the *Fākhir* with the name of Khurāfa is a story of the desert to enjoin hospitality, and the only “wonders” in it are worked by two unnamed visitors who are received hospitably in one case and repulsed in the other. It is thus a moral apologue.

The next chronological point at which the Nights—or a Nights—comes to the surface is in a comment by al-Maqrizi on certain events in the caliphate of al-Āmir bi-aklūm Allāh, Fātimid Caliph of Egypt A.H. 495–524. He fell in love with and married a Badawī girl in the Sa’id and built for her pleasure a palace on the Island of Rōda which, on account of her Badawī origin, was called the Hawdāj, or camel litter. Naturally there was a Badawī cousin who followed her and

with whom she had adventures and exchanged poetry. It is like the story of Maisūn, who married Mu'āwiya. And the people told many tales of them which passed down in oral traditions (*riwāyāt*), and a certain al-Qurṭubī in a "History" (*Ta'rīkh*) compared these to the stories of al-Baṭṭāl and of the *Alf laila wa-laila* (*qad akthara-n-nāsu fī ḥadīth al-Badawīya . . . ḥattā ṣārat riwāyatuhum fī hādha-sh-sha'n ka-ahādīth al-Baṭṭāl wa-Alf laila wa-laila wa-mā ashbaha dhālik*).

This occurs in al-Maqrīzī's *Khitāṭ* in two passages (I ed. Būlāq, 1270, vol. i, 485; vol. ii, p. 181; II ed. Cairo, 1325, vol. ii, p. 376; vol. iii, p. 290). Al-Maqrīzī, who died A.H. 845, quotes at length from Ibn Sa'īd in his book, *Al-muḥallā bil-ash'ār*, who was in Egypt 640-8 and who died 673 or 685 (Brockelmann, i, p. 336, 3), and Ibn Sa'īd, in his turn, quotes this remark from the *Ta'rīkh* of an al-Qurṭubī. Practically the same citation from Ibn Sa'īd and al-Qurṭubī occurs in al-Maqqarī's *Nafh at-ṭib*, ed. Dozy, vol. i, pp. 653 f. Al-Maqqarī died A.H. 1041.

But who was the al-Qurṭubī who made the comment and the comparison? The name is naturally very common, and the late Mr. John Payne ("The 1,001 Nights," vol. ix, p. 302) considered that he was "apparently" Abū Ja'far b. 'Abd al-Haqq al-Khazrajī al-Qurṭubī. I do not know what led Mr. Payne to this conclusion and, farther, to the statement that he was "author of a history of the Khalifs". Professor Asín has been so good as to send me a copy of the biography of this al-Qurṭubī from the *Jadhwat al-iqtibās* of Ibn al-Qādī (lithographed Fez, A.H. 1309, p. 70), and from it is plain that he was not a historian but an authority on technical legal traditions (*ḥadīth* and *riwāya*). I venture, therefore, to conjecture that the "al-Qurṭubī" who refers to a Nights was the al-Qurṭī mentioned by Brockelmann in his *Nachträge*, vol. ii, p. 698, foot, and p. 699. He wrote under the last Fātimid Caliph al-'Ādīd (A.H. 555-67) a history of Egypt which Ibn Sa'īd used in his *Kitāb al-mughrib* (Tallquist, "Geschichte der

Ikhshiden," 105).¹ This would mean, then, that a Nights, of some kind or other, was well known in Egypt in Fātimid times.

But the history of "the stories of al-Baṭṭāl" should make us cautious as to broad judgments. It is certain that there existed in Arabic a class of stories of the *baṭṭālin*: "Ritterromane" Fleischer called them ("Kleinere Schriften," iii, p. 226). Of these the *Fihrist*, in its section devoted to books whose composer or compiler is not known, gives a list of 19, the titles consisting of the names of the heroes (p. 313, ll. 14-19).² Further, it is evident from the above that these stories existed and were well known in Egypt in the sixth century A.H. and were apparently connected with a single individual called al-Baṭṭāl. In our Nights (i.e. ZER) I know only one reference. In the "Story of Maryam the Girdle-maker", Night 885 (II Caleutta, vol. iv, p. 321; I Būlāq, vol. ii, p. 441, top), the wazīr who is sent by the king of the Franks, a mighty and crafty warrior, thief and Shaitān, is compared to Abū Muhammad al-Baṭṭāl, a name which does not occur in the list of the *Fihrist*. Apparently, for Egypt at least, *baṭṭāl* did not mean a knight "sans peur et sans reproche", but the western "bad man". But of these Arabic tales not one seems to have reached us, and Martin Hartmann (*Orientalische Litteraturzeitung*, 1899, 103 f.) can suggest as a parallel in Arabic only the Delheme Cycle which Lane described in his "Modern Egyptians", chap. xxi. See, further, on the Delheme Cycle, Chauvin, *Bibl. ar.*, iii, pp. 134 f.; a complete edition was printed at Cairo in seventy parts in 1327/1909. But there is still extant in Turkish a Baṭṭāl romance which Hermann Ethé translated under the title "Die Fahrten des Sajjid Batthâl. Ein alttürkischer Volks- und Sittenroman" (Leip. 1871, 2 vols.). Fleischer studied it from the point of view of history and Turkish literature ("Kleinere Schriften," iii, pp. 226-54) and

¹ I am glad to have the approval, in this identification, of Professor William Popper, of the University of California, the editor of Ibn Tāghrī Bārdī.

² See also p. 369 above.

George Hüsing from that of comparative, especially Persian, mythology, in his "Beiträge zur Rostamsage (Sajjid Battāl)" in *Mythologische Bibliothek* (V Band, Heft 3, Leip. 1913). For us the significant point is the complete vanishing from Egypt—and, indeed, from Arabic—of a romance, or a romance-type, which in the sixth century A.H. was quoted as parallel in popular favour with a form of the Nights. There would, therefore, be nothing impossible in a similar vanishing of the Fātimid Nights itself.

It is solid ground which we touch next in G, an actual MS. of the Nights. For the date of G there are various indications. Zotenberg (*Notice*, p. 6/171), judging by the character of the handwriting, felt that he could not err in putting it in the latter half of our fourteenth century, i.e. between A.H. 751 and 803; Nöldeke (*Wiener Zeitschrift*, ii, pp. 168 ff.) thought it was still older. We shall see, I think, that both of these estimates make the MS. too old. Further, various notes in G by readers give a *terminus ad quem*. Three of these are reproduced by De Sacy in the "Mémoire", p. 227, cited above, and a fourth, the oldest, is quoted by Zotenberg (*Notice*, p. 6/171). This last is dated A.H. 943 (A.D. 1536/7).¹ These notes were written when the MS. was at the Syrian Tripoli. But the MS. was in Aleppo in A.H. 1001 (A.D. 1592/3), for the latter part of V² was copied from it there in that year. Further, the Patrick Russell MS. and the William Jones MS., more remote descendants of G, were brought from Aleppo in the eighteenth century; see my "Classification" in the Browne Volume, pp. 310 f., 312 f. G itself was sent to Galland "de Syrie" after 1700. That G was written in Egypt seems almost certain; on that there will be more hereafter.

But there are certain indications of date in the MS. itself

¹ For completeness I add a reference to M. Paul Casanova, *Notes sur les voyages de Sindbad le Marin* (Paris, 1919), pp. 15, 65. He finds in the MS. another date, A.H. 682, which, I fear, I cannot accept.

² The first part of V to fol. 87b inclusive is not directly from G but from a somewhat illegible descendant, or collateral to G. The second part, in a quite different hand, is an immediate transcript of G, and the dated colophon was added to the second part.

which call for consideration. (i) The dates in the Story of the Barber. There are two quite exact indications in that story. (a) On the occasion when the barber so wearies the young man and hinders him from his appointment, he gives a precise date and a great many astrological details besides. The date is Friday, 18th Ṣafar, A.H. 653, and it is said to correspond with 7320 of the era of Alexander (Night 144 in G, vol. ii, fol. 50a). The year of Alexander is, of course, absurd; cf. on that era in Islam, Sachau's translation of al-Bīrūnī's *Āthār al-bāqiyā*, "Chronology of Ancient Nations," pp. 32, 136. The day of the week is also wrong: Ṣafar, A.H. 653, began Friday, March 12th, A.D. 1255; the 18th would, therefore, be a Tuesday. Of course, quite historical Muslim dates are often out by a day or two; but the difference here is too great; the day of the week is plainly a guess. In view of this I have not attempted to work out the astrological details. The date and reading are exactly the same in V (fol. 163a) and in Breslau (vol. ii, p. 227, Night 142). The text of Breslau here was copied directly by Ibn Najjār from G ("Classification," p. 317). In I Calcutta (vol. ii, p. 107), a derivative also, but remotely, from G, there is no date; the barber says only that the day is unlucky for meeting anyone. In II Calcutta (vol. i, p. 238, Night 29) the date is as above, except that it is 10th Ṣafar. But the text is evidently in confusion and some words are repeated. Ṣafar 10th, also, would have been a Monday. In I Būlāq the date is 10th Ṣafar, 763, and no year of Alexander is given. It is the text of II Calcutta, but edited.

(b) When the barber makes his apologia to the company against the story told of him by the young man, he narrates an incident which had happened to him in Bagdad. In G

وذلك اني كنت — (vol. ii, fol. 55b, Night 151) it begins:

ببغداد في زمن المستنصر بالله ابن المستضي بالله وكان الخليفة هو يوميء ببغداد وكان يحب الفقرا والمساكين

. ويجلس العاما والصالحين . . . In V(fol. 169a, Night 151) and in Breslau (vol. ii, p. 253, Night 149) the text is exactly as in G. In I Calcutta (vol. ii, p. 124, Night 143) this has become—
فلا يخفى عليكم ان خليفة بغداد كان يحب الفقراء والمساكين

. ويجلس العاما والصالحين . . . In II Calcutta (vol. i, p. 249, Night 31) the only difference from G is one of order, و كان هو الخليفة . . . In I Būlāq (vol. i, p. 94, Night 30) the text is completely edited and recast:—
وذلك انى كنت ببغداد—

ف ايام خلافة امير المؤمنين المتصر بالله وكان يحب الفقراء . . . والمساكين ويجلس العاما والصالحين . . . That

G, with its copies V and Breslau, is original here can hardly be in doubt. The difficulties found in G's reading were partly of date and partly of the construction of the phrase

وكان الخليفة هو يومئذ بغداد . . . The I take to be ضمير التأكيد (Wright³, vol. ii, p. 265) and its force is to

emphasize, "and the *Khalīfa* was at that time in Baghdād," not the governors who followed the capture and sack of the city by Hūlāgū in A.H. 656 (A.D. 1258).¹ There must also have been in the mind of the first teller of the story, and of his hearers or readers, that other al-Mustansir, who was taken up by the Egyptian Sultān Baibars and furnished with an army, but who was defeated by the Mongols and killed—or who at least vanished—in A.H. 660 (Weil, "Geschichte der Chalifen," vol. iii, p. 479 ff.; Quatremère's "Sultans Mamlouks de Makrizi", vol. i, pp. 78 ff., 171 f.). This may

¹ It is plain from *Mémoire*, p. 236, that De Saey understood the passage in this way.

be the cause, too, of the confusion in names, for the barber's al-Mustansir (A.H. 623–40) was the great-grandson, and not the son, of al-Mustadī' (566–75); and the last of the Caliphs, who was killed by Hūlāgū, was al-Musta'sim (640–56). It follows from all this that the Hunchback Cycle, in its origin, must be put after the fall of Bagdad and, as I shall now show, very considerably after that event, the memory of which lasted long. The insertion of that Cycle in a Nights may, again, have been long after the origin of the Cycle. Both origin and insertion came, therefore, after the time of Baibars, which makes all the greater the puzzle that that brilliant and romantic personality, to whose name a whole romance-cycle has been attached, should not figure anywhere in our ZER. Even the oldest part of that recension took shape after his time. On the Romance of Baibars and its relation to the different recensions of the Nights, see the Leyden *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. i, pp. 589 f.

(ii) Precise indications of locality are not common in the Nights; but in one story there is a series of them, almost all of which we can identify exactly and also date quite closely. The story is in the Hunchback Cycle, and is that told by the Christian broker, a Cairene Copt, of his transactions with the young man of Bagdad whose hand was cut off for theft, and contains the story told to him by that young man of his adventures in Cairo. In it the following localities are named: the Khān of al-Jāwali in the district of the Bāb en-Naṣr

(G, vol. ii, fol. 32b, l. 8); in G, ii, fol. 33b, l. 4, مصر is used for Cairo; the Khān of Masrūr (G, ii, fol. 33b, l. 5); Bain al-Qaṣrain (G, ii, fol. 33b, l. 7); قياسريه جركس (G, ii, fol. 33b, l. 9); the district called al-Habbāniya (G, ii, fol. 35a, ll. 10 and 14); قاعة بر كوت النقيب ابو شامة (G, ii, fol. 35a, l. 10); Bāb Zuwayla (G, ii, fol. 35a, l. 13); درب التقوى (G, ii, fol. 35a, l. 14).

I give above the references for G only, as I am primarily concerned with that MS., certainly our oldest witness for this story; others will come below as may be necessary. Every one who knows the topography of even modern Cairo will recognize at once that the story is placed between the Bāb en-Naṣr, on the north, through the great artery running south, of which the Bain al-Qaṣrain was part, out at the Bāb Zuwaila and south to the district called al-Habbāniya, the neighbourhood of the Birket al-Fil. It should be noticed that the hero of the story walks from the Khān Masrūr to the Bāb Zuwaila; but takes a donkey there and rides to his destination in the Habbāniya, evidently a longer and different journey.

For the Khān of al-Jāwali, Lane's note 11 to chapter v of his translation of the Nights can still be used as a reference. The passage of Maqrīzī—giving the life of al-Jāwali—is in the ii ed. (of Cairo, 1326), vol. iv, p. 247 f. As Jāwali died in A.H. 745 (A.D. 1344/5) the date of the story can hardly be pushed back before that date. On the Khān of Masrūr, see Lane's note 16; the reference to Maqrīzī is in vol. iii, p. 149 (ii ed. Cairo, 1326); but does not yield an exact date. The Qaṣāriya of Jarkas, or Jaharkas, is in Maqrīzī, vol. iii, p. 141; but I cannot explain the spelling Qayāṣirīya in G. It looks like a feminine *nisba* from the plural *qayāṣir*; the word has taken many different forms; see Dozy, "Supplément," s.v., II Calcutta, vol. i, p. 207; I Būlāq, vol. i, p. 77. As it was built A.H. 502 it gives no date for our story. Nor, do I think, does the Habbāniya, in spite of Lane's note 23. The name occurs in Maqrīzī, vol. iii, p. 216, and vol. iv, p. 273. In Maqrīzī's time—he died in A.H. 845 (A.D. 1441/2)—it was a district of gardens; but that need not exclude roads, walls, doors, and scattered houses, such as are in this story. The درب النقوى in this case, according to G, was on the درب النقوى and the hero, very curiously, had to alight from his donkey to go down the *darb*. As to the form and meaning of this

road-name I can only conjecture. What would literally suggest itself at once—the Road of Godly Fear—is completely against Cairene analogy. It may be a *nisba* from some Taqī ad-Dīn and to be pronounced Taqawī; it may be the *nisba* Thaqafī slightly corrupted. Ibn Najjār transcribed for Habicht exactly what he found in G (Breslau, vol. ii, p. 152); V conjectured النقوى (fol. 147a), but the scribe of V did not know the topography of Cairo and turned even the Bāb Zuwaila into a Bāb az-Zāwiya. ZER read المترى (II Calcutta, vol. i, p. 210; I Būlāq, vol. i, p. 78), a road of which there is no trace in Cairo. In consequence Stanley Lane-Poole has conjectured (article, "The Arabian Nights" in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1886, pp. 191 ff.; "Review" in the "Bohn" edition of Lane's "Arabian Nights", vol. iv, p. 318) المتنقى, a known road in Cairo described by Maqrīzī, vol. iii, p. 63, and has thence developed some considerations of date. This identification was adopted, without acknowledgement, by Burton in his Terminal Essay, vol. viii, p. 78 of the 12 vol. ed. of his Nights, but I cannot follow him in that. The Darb al-Munqadī was in the neighbourhood of the Azhar, according to Maqrīzī, and the topographical scheme of the story, leading to the Habbāniya in the south, is far too clear for such confusion. This must have been some very little *darb* in the midst of those southern gardens round the Birket al Fil. As to the vocalization and translation of the whole phrase قاعة بر كوت النقىب ابو شامة I am in doubt. If بر كوت is a proper name—as the translators seem all to take the بركات of the printed editions—the order is very curious, with Ahū Shāma at the end. I am inclined to conjecture that behind بر كوت, the reading of G, V, and

Breslau, there lies some corruption of a common noun, perhaps
 بَرْكَاتٌ. Even بَرْكَاتٌ is quite late as a proper name, and according to Professor Popper, in a letter, "does not become common until late in the ninth century A.H. in Egypt." [See, now, note at end of this article.]

It seems, then, to be certain that this story did not take its present form earlier than a very few years, at the most, before A.H. 745, and it may be considerably after that date. Of course there are chronological contradictions in the Cycle, as it is evidently made up of stories taken from different sources. Thus in the Story told by the Sultān of Cashgār's Steward, about the young man who had his thumbs cut off, the father of that young man is said to have lived in the days of Hārūn ar-Rashīd (G, ii, fol. 38a). De Goeje has already investigated the historical basis of this story in his "De Arabische Nachtvertellingen" in *De Gids*, Sept. 1886, pp. 12 ff. He translated from a MS. of the Chronicle of Ibn al-Jauzi; the same narrative is now in print in the ed. (Cairo, 1903) of the *Faraj ba'd ash-shidda* of at-Tanūkhī. This is a good example of the Nights story with an historical basis; but in the Nights it has been freely reconstructed and attached to the great name of Hārūn ar-Rashīd.

We seem, then, to be left with the conclusion that the Hunchback Cycle cannot be put appreciably before A.H. 745, and it may have been composed considerably after that date. Still later must have been its introduction into G or the G recension. The elaborate dating of the Barber's story was evidently because of the terrible associations of A.H. 656 for the whole Muslim world. I cannot date with the same security any of the other cycles in G. Yet there are one or two other indications which it seems worth while to give here. In the Frame-Story in G the hājibs seem to be more important officials than the wazīr. The Great Hājib (الحاچب الكبير) is left in charge by Shahriyār when he goes away (G, i, fol. 4a,

l. 4 from foot). His brother had previously left in charge "some of the hājibs" (G, i, fol. 1b). There were, therefore, a number of hājibs and one head hājib. The wazīr, in the Frame-Story, has charge of executions and is a purveyor. But in the Fisherman Cycle the hājibs are reckoned with mamlūks and stand while the wazīrs sit (G, i, fol. 20a, l. 7), and the wazīr is treated as the most important official and left in charge when the king goes away to investigate. Yet the Fisherman Cycle is the first long Cycle in G and follows the Frame-Story immediately, except for the very short stories of the Merchant Cycle. Further, the general position in the stories of the Nights is that the wazīr is the most important official in the court.

Apparently, however, the Frame-Story in G assumed its present form at a time when that had ceased to be the case; in other words, the redaction of the Frame-Story in G is later than the redaction of the stories in G. But to attempt to exactly fix its date would be very hazardous. Ibn Khaldūn, in his Prolegomena (ed. Quatremère, ii, pp. 9 ff.; De Slane's transl. ii, pp. 11 ff.), gives three situations which would fit: under the Mamlūk Turks in Egypt; under the Umayyads of Spain; under the later Muwahhidids. For the situation under the Mamlūks, see also De Sacy's extract from Maqrīzī in his "Chrest. Arabe," vol. ii, pp. 157 ff. The Mamlūk time would certainly fit best with the other indications of the provenance of G. This would put the date of the G redaction of the Frame-Story at any time between the middle of the seventh century A.H. and the Turkish conquest.

Again, the following little points may be worth noticing as to the Frame-Story in G. The orthography of the proper names is very careless; so much so that the scribe of V endeavours to correct the evident errors and inconsistencies. Also there are three mentions of the two daughters of the wazīr before they enter the story. When, thereafter, they really enter, they are introduced as though they had not been

mentioned before (G, i, fol. 6a, b). This suggests rough and careless recasting.

It is now, I think, clear that the Hunchback Cycle cannot have formed part of the Nights to which al-Qurtubī—or rather al-Qurtī—refers. He wrote, as we have seen, under the last Fātimid Caliph, al-Ādīd (A.H. 555–67), and that Cycle cannot be dated much before A.H. 745. And if it is urged that the reference to the Khān of al-Jāwālī is a later interpolation there can be no doubt that the whole Story of the Barber is built round the sack of Bagdad by Hūlāgū in A.H. 656. Further, in the Porter Cycle there is a reference which carries it, too, beyond al-Qurtī's date. At the beginning of the Story of the Second Calendar (G, fol. 47a; Night 40) that prince tells that part of his education was in the *Shātibīya*, the author of which died A.H. 590 (Brock, i, p. 409; Nöldeke, "Gesch. des Qorāns," pp. 337 f.).

It may now be well to tabulate the different forms of a Nights to which the above considerations have led us.

I. The original Persian *Hazār Afsāna*.

II. An Arabic version of the *Hazār Afsāna*.

III. A form in which the Frame-Story is taken from the *Hazār Afsāna*, followed by stories of Arabic origin, taking the place of the original Persian stories. These Arabic stories were short and insignificant, and I conjecture that the Merchant and Jinni Cycle in G belongs to them.

IV. The Nights of the late Fātimid period. This may have been the same as III; but it was evidently very popular in Egypt.

V. The Nights of which our oldest representative MS. is G. This was certainly quite a different book, as to the stories contained in it, from IV. It is closely akin to ZER, and also to all the other MSS. which have reached us, and for details on that varied kinship I refer to my "Classification" in the Browne Volume.

There remain two evident lines of investigation, neither of which, however, I can follow up at present to the end. (i) The

part of ZER parallel to G contains elements which show that the parent of ZER was more complete than G. That is, although the MSS. of ZER are all quite modern, they cannot be disregarded in any attempt to reconstruct No. V above. This is demonstrably certain; but the proof cannot well be given in detail until the text of G is printed. (ii) There is a group of widely scattered MSS.—I know at present six—which appear to be fragments of a recension in which the long Story of 'Umar ibn an-Nu'mān was introduced at a much later point than in ZER. It will be remembered that I stated in my "Classification", pp. 320 f., that this story had been introduced into ZER after the Story of Ghānim and after ZER had reached the full number of 1,001 Nights. I now describe, so far as my knowledge goes, the six MSS. forming this group.

I. A MS. in the Library of the Academia de la Historia in Madrid, Nos. xlxi^{1 & 2} in the Colección Gayangos in that library. I have already described it in detail in my "Classification", 308 f., and it is necessary here only to repeat that its present second volume is the third volume of a MS. of the Nights and contains parts v–viii, giving the story of 'Umar ibn an-Nu'mān with several intercalated stories; it is not divided into Nights. That this is not a MS. of ZER is evident from the arrangement of the stories, and from the fact that the whole, lost, second volume, containing parts iii and iv, preceded 'Umar an-Nu'mān. This MS. is modern and of Christian origin.

II. In the Tübingen University Library there is a MS. (No. 32) of this same romance, dated by Seybold (*Verzeichniss*, p. 75) at latest at the beginning of the sixteenth century; Wetzstein, in 1863, dated it as about 400 years old. It is a large folio with illustrations, and consists of 209 leaves out of an original 219 numbered 286 to 506; it professes to be a second volume (*kitāb*) of the Nights and part (*juz'*) vii to xiii; the Nights are 283–542. That is, the story in this MS. formed the second quarter of a recension of the Nights.

III. In the John Rylands Library there is another MS. of

this romance (Arabic 706). Like the Tübingen MS. it is very old (the suggested dates vary between A.D. 1500 and 1550); it, too, is a large folio with illustrations, and has lost quite a number of its leaves. These have been (in part only?) replaced in a modern hand or hands. Thus at the beginning there are seven inserted leaves in a hand which strikingly resembles that of Jean Varsy, a pupil of De Sacy, who transcribed the unique MS. of "Ali Baba", now in the Bodleian, which I published in this *Journal* (April, 1910; Jan. 1913; see especially p. 48 of the latter reference). These, by the catchword, connect immediately with the first surviving original leaf, bearing the original number fol. 31, which is now fol. 14. Very careful examination of the MS. would be necessary to determine exactly its original constitution—the leaves that have been lost and those which have been replaced—and at present I have only a very short description which I made myself in 1914 and eleven invaluable page photographs which I owe to the kindness and courtesy of Dr. Guppy. Some of my page references seem to be confused, but I think that the following description will hold. The MS. begins on the first of the inserted leaves in part vi of a recension of the Nights and with Night 255 (or 256). The numbering is very strangely expressed; "and when it was a night and two hundred five and fifty Dunyazād said,"

فَلَمَا كَانَتْ لِيَلَةٌ وَمَا يَتَيَّنُ خَمْسَةٌ
وَخَمْسِينَ قَالَتْ دُنيا زَادٌ . . .

Then follows the story of al-Khailakhān ibn Hāmān, a tale of sea-adventures like those of Sinbad. Of it I have photographs of four pages. On original fol. 31a, connected, as I have said above, by catchword, with the prefixed leaves, is part of a story told in the first person about marvellous birds, led by one with a human face, on a tree beside a fountain. To it a shaykh comes at sunset, riding on an ass, and the teller of the story is warned beforehand by a voice how to approach him. The story of 'Umar Ibn an-Nu'mān begins on original fol. 57a in

Night 281, and extends to the end of the MS. which ends on original fol. 263 in part xii. The story includes those of Tāj al-Mulūk and of Ghānim. I have photographs of original fols. 66a-68b, covering the beginnings of Nights 287 and 288. The Night formula is exceedingly simple and is not rubricated nor distinguished in any way. It runs:—

وَادْرَكَ شَهْرَ زَادَ الصَّبَاحَ فَسَكَنَتْ عَنِ الْحَدِيثِ فَلَمَّا كَانَ
لِيَلَةٌ مَا يَتَيَّنُ سَبْعَةٌ وَتِنَانِينَ قَالَتْ شَهْرَ زَادَ بِلْقَنِي إِلَيْهَا الْمَلِكُ
. . . السَّعِيدٌ.

This portion corresponds to II Calcutta, vol. i, p. 372, l. 2 from foot, to p. 380, l. 9, and Night 287, which is complete in it, extends to about 3½ pp. of II Calcutta. A Night in this part of II Calcutta varies from 6½ pp. to 12 pp. The recension seems to me more original and picturesque than that in II Calcutta, but not so grammatical.

IV. With the Rylands MS. corresponds very closely one in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, which Zotenbergh has described with admirable detail in his *Notice*, pp. 16/182-21/187. It is now numbered 3612 (ancien fonds arabe 1491 A) and is a single large folio of 408 leaves, 870 Nights in 29 parts, incomplete at the end and in different places in the middle, which contained, or was meant to contain, the full 1,001 Nights. It was written in the latter half of our seventeenth century and, according to Zotenbergh, was "un essai de constituer un recueil de contes divisés réellement en mille et une Nuits". In it part vi begins on fol. 138b and extends from Nights 251 to 268. It begins with the Story of Khailadjān ibn Hāmān (just as part vi in the Rylands MS.); this story ends Night 267, and

Night 268 begins the Story of the Two Old Men,

الْمَيْتَانُ
وَالْمَوْتَانُ.

Part vii begins fol. 152, contains Nights 269 to 286a, except 273 omitted by mistake, and has the close of the Story of the Two Old Men, the Story of Bāz al-Aschhab Abū

Lahab (Nights 269–76) and the beginning of the Story of ‘Umar ibn an-Nu‘mān (Nights 277–86a). Parts viii–xiv continue and finish this story with many intercalated stories, including those of Tāj al-Mulūk and of Ghānim, with many omissions and misnumberings of Nights. See Zotenberg’s detailed description, which should be compared, point by point, with the Rylands MS. It seems plain that a MS. of the Rylands recension lies behind this attempt in B.N. 3612 to form a complete collection of 1,001 Nights. In making such an attempt the numbers of the Nights would necessarily be disregarded to a certain extent; but the order of the stories and the numbering of the parts would survive.

But this MS. is interesting from another point of view. By some accident I omitted in my “Classification” to give its reading of the text passage; I do so now by the kindness of Monsieur Louis Massignon. It occurs in Night 18, fol. 15a, ll. 9–17, and runs:—

فحضر عنده فقال له انى احبيت ان اعمل شيئاً واظهرك
عليه وقد خطر بىالى ان انفرد بنفسى وابحث عن خبر هذه
البركه والسمك فى هذه الليلة ففى غداة الغد اجلس انت
على باب خيمتى وقل للامراء الملك متتشوش وامرني ان
لا اعطي احدا [اذن added in margin] بالدخول عليه ولا
تعلم احدا بقصتي قبل الوزير الامر وما قدر يخالفه تم ان
الملك انحزم واعتلل بسيفه وتطلع قد [من ? sic] على احد
الجبال الذى للبركه حتى صار على ظهرها ومشى بقية يومه
الى الصباح قوى عليه الحر وتوقد عليه البر ومشى

يومه وليلة الثانية للصبح فلاخ له سواد من بعيد ففرح به
وقال لعلى اجد من يخبرني بالقضية فقرب منه فوجده قصر
بنى . . .

The nearest to this is the Wortley-Montague MS. in the Bodleian (“Classification,” p. 318) which seems to be abbreviated from it. It is curious, also, that B.N. 3612 and the Wortley-Montague MS. both part from the G recension at the same point, the end of the Porter Cycle, and that both omit the stories of King Sindbād and his falcon, of the Husband and the Parrot, and of the Envier and the Envied. Wortley-Montague omits also the Story of the Prince and the Ogress. That there is connexion, then, between the early parts of these two MSS., hitherto standing each quite separato and alone, seems certain.

V. The Turkish translation of the Nights, which Zotenberg describes in his *Notice* (pp. 21/187–26/192), contains also in its vol. v the Stories of Khāladjān ibn Māhānī and of مِنْمَنْ and غُوثَانْ; but there these stand 150 Nights before the Story of ‘Umar ibn an-Nu‘mān.

VI. In the Library of Christ Church College, Oxford, there is a MS. of the Story of ‘Umar ibn an-Nu‘mān (C. 21). It is mentioned by Jonathan Scott in his edition of Galland (vol. i, p. x, ed. of 1811), and Mr. R. F. McNeile of Uppingham has been so good as to examine it for me. It is a small quarto of about a hundred leaves and the written portion of the page is about 7" by 4½". It begins with the beginning of part viii (called *fasl* and not *juz'*, as in the other MSS.) and covers from II Calcutta, vol. i, p. 398 foot to p. 496 foot. That means that the whole story must have begun, in this recension, in the middle of part vii, as the story begins in II Calcutta at the foot of p. 350. The MS. is divided into Nights, but they are

فَلَمَا كَانَتِ اللَّيْلَةُ
الْقَابِلَةُ قَالَتْ لَهَا أخْتَهَا يَا أخْتَهَا إِنْ كُنْتِ غَيْرَ نَائِمَةٍ فَاتَّمِي لَنَا
حَدِيثَكَ قَالَتْ جَبًا وَكَرَامَةً بِلِغْنِي إِيَّاهَا الْمَلِكُ . . .

It is evidently an inferior and somewhat abbreviated text, and its value is that it is another witness to this recension.

These MSS. then seem evidences of a distinct recension, and, as there is no trace in G of division into parts, this recension must have been different from that of G. But G is incomplete and leaves off, early in the Story of Qamar az-Zamān, with Night 281. Of the 160 pp. which that story occupies in II Calcutta, G gives the equivalent of about 20 pp. Therefore, to complete the story as it stands in II Calcutta would have added to G about 70 of its pages, or nearly another volume, and would have brought the Nights to about 344. But G was in its present mutilated condition before V was copied from it in 1592/3. So we are left in conjecture. I therefore venture to hazard as follows:—Suppose that in our fifteenth century G came from Egypt to Syria in its present incomplete state, i.e. ending in Night 281, and that it left behind in Egypt more complete sister MSS. from which our ZER is descended, can then (i) the Tübingen MS., or an ancestor of it, beginning the Story of 'Umar ibn an-Nu'mān with Night 283 and part vii, (ii) an ancestor of the Rylands MS., beginning the same story in Night 281, and (iii) an ancestor of B.N. 3612, beginning the same story in part vii and Night 277—can all these go back to an attempt to carry G on without completing the Story of Qamar az-Zamān? This is only a guess and other guesses are possible, but it meets the facts as we at present know them. Further progress will almost certainly depend on close examination of the Rylands and the Tübingen MSS.

May, 1923.

NOTE.—I have now been so fortunate as to pick up a copy of Wallenbourg's *Notice sur le Schāhnāmè*, and find that he says nothing about Ḥomāi, but that he does give a translation of a preface to the *Shāh-nāma* different from that quoted and used by Macan in his edition. This preface was evidently that which Mohl quotes as "préface No. 2" and which occurred in his MS. No. 5, a MS. dated A.H. 841 (vol. i, pp. xv ff. of the separate edition of his translation); and it is also in a MS. which will soon, I trust, be accessible on this side of the Atlantic. That this Rāsti, or Kārāsti, had dealings with the *Hazār Afsāna* at the court of Maḥmūd of Ghazna seems certain, although the *Fihrist* makes plain that it existed long before his time.

For كوت as a proper name, Professor Popper refers me to Ibn Iyās, ii, p. 166, where, under date A.H. 881, it seems to be the name of a Ḥabashi merchant of Kānem. My conjecture above, therefore, falls to the ground, but the name was evidently quite late. Did it have suggestions (social, political, racial?) for the original readers of G?

D. B. MACDONALD.

March, 1924.