important collection of his own. However, the pieces of information given in biographical works etc., fortuitous as they are, concerning private libraries of literary men of the first millennium in Iraq, carefully collected by the author, well disposed and fully documented, constitute as a whole a really fascinating reading.

The author begins with some introductory remarks about the *warraq* and the *wirdqa*, the copyist, his art and utensils, the bookbinding, the book-market, the preservation of book-collections by *waqf*, and their destruction by fire and water. According to his aim of writing he then gives a survey of the temple and palace archives of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires (p. 42-76), and goes on with the libraries of the Christian monasteries (p. 78-100). The history of the Islamic libraries makes up the main body of the volume (p. 101-276), and is disposed as follows: P. 1 libraries of the caliphs in Bagdad (p. 101-125); P. 2 the libraries of Ādudaddaula, Arslān šāh and Badraddin Luṭluḍ) in Mosul (p. 126-129); P. 3 public libraries of mosques, madrasa’s, shrines, academies etc. (p. 130-176); P. 4 libraries of the viziers (p. 177-188); P. 5 private libraries (p. 189-230). Elaborate indices increase the usefulness of the book.

That the learned author has been able to use sources which are hardly at the disposal of most Western scholars, articles in Arabic periodicals etc., gives his book a special value. It will be followed by a second volume dealing with the time from 1000 A.H. to the present day.

B. Lewin.


It seems that the first vol. of ʻAzzāwī’s great work has not found the appreciation it deserves, neither in his country, nor abroad. However, the objection which I happened to hear in Iraq, that the work was not a modern one, is applicable only to the introduction. Indeed, this latter does not go beyond the conventional circle of ʻAdnān and Qaḥṭān and of the legendary tales from ancient Arabia. In Europe the war has left the book unnoticed. As to myself, I have only been able to refer to it briefly in *Die Beduinen* by M. Freiherr von Oppenheim, I, 385 f. — Of course, the two works deal with the same subject, but their aims are rather different. ʻA. starts from the tradition of the tribes, he wants to solve the problems of genealogy; for him (as for Ibn Khaldūn before him) this is no idle game, but a means to strengthen the solidity of the tribes. Furthermore, he wants to describe the tribes with all their divisions down to the smallest units, with all their Shaikhs etc. For good reasons he refrains from figures, as all notes about the strength of the tribes, at least the nomadic ones, are based on mere estimates. — In *Die Beduinen*, however, the history of the tribes is depicted against its geographical and political background, the present conditions are described only as far as they are of general interest. The aim is to explore two things: the migration lines and the poles, between which human life oscillates in Arabia and its borderlands: settlement on the cultivated land and return to the desert.

The present vol. deals with the nomadic tribes, viz. Shammar, ʻAnēze, Dhafir, ʻHarb, one section of whom stayed for some years in Iraq, and ʻSlāb (Ṣluba). — ʻA.’s description of the origin and immigration of the Shammar differs in two points from that in *Die Beduinen*, I, 130-158. Firstly, he sticks to the widespread opinion that the ʻAbda-section descends from Qaḥṭān. However, he does not see that Qaḥṭān does not mean here the ancient genealogical conception, but the tribe Qaḥṭān, newly formed in the Middle Ages, and particularly its section ʻAbīda. I myself cannot see in this anything but an etymological fairy tale, as long as it is not confirmed by other evidence. — The second point refers to the Ghurair, cf. *Die Beduinen*, I, 273. ʻA. looks upon this
tribe as a precursor of the first wave of Shammar. But the two reasons given by him, viz. the existence of a Shammar-subsection of the same name, and the battle cry of the Ghurair: Sanā'īs!, are mutually exclusive. For the Shammar-subsection Ghurair forms part of the Aslam-section, whereas Sanā'īs is the battle cry of the Ābda-section. (The question will be dealt with in detail in the 3rd vol. of Die Beduinen).

As far as the groups who remained in Arabia are referred to, Ā. sometimes turns to Qalb gastrat al-'Arab by Fuād Ḥamza. However, in this book the lists of tribes taken from European works are frequently transcribed incorrectly and other lists are disfigured by numerous misprints.

The origin of the two Shaikhly houses of the Dhafir is obscure. The Ibn Swait are said to be Șlubá (the parias of the desert), the Bā Drāc to be descendants of emancipated slaves. There are verses, in which the partners themselves charge each other with this origin. Ā. thinks this is the effect of neighbourly mischief, of which the Bedouin have always been fond. It is, indeed, hardly believable that the Ibn Swait have arisen from the very depths of Bedouin society, though respectable chiefs in Transjordania really descend from the low class of the ʿIhtaim). But why should the Bā Drāc not descend from emancipated slaves? They would not be the only "Mawâli" among the Bedouin, cf. Die Beduinen, I, 306; II, 209b.

The chapter about the Șlubá as a protest against many phantastic statements in European literature (EI included) is very satisfying. But the problem of the Șlubá, whom Ā. incorrectly confuses with the ʿIhtaim, can not be solved by the assertion that they differ in no way from the Bedouin, except the fact, that they practise things despised by the Bedouin.


Contrary to the first vol., the second yields no conclusive statement and possibly can not do so. For the tradition of Kurdish tribes is poor and vague, as the frame of genealogy is missing. This is the consequence of the nature of those tribes: While the Arabic tribe is based on consanguinity, or rather on its fiction, the Kurdish tribe is a local community ruled by a foreign nobility. This nobility know their ancestors fairly well, but the genealogical idea is spoiled partly by dynastic considerations (three families, ruling one after the other and not tied by relation, took the name Bābān), partly by the continued vitality of old legends. Though the medieval idea that the Kurdish nobility descend from Arabic and Persian dynasties is no longer effective, the idea equally old that they descend from Khālid ibn al-Walīd, originating in Botān and Siirt, has spread far to the south (Bābān, Pişider). The common people, on the other hand, trace back the descent of Kurdish to modern Arabic tribes (ʿAneze, Shammar, Ţai of Shamāmīk, but also Asad, p. 174).

ʿAzzāwī refers to these ideas in his excellent description of the structure of the Kurdish tribe and by his continual observation of the connection between local and tribal names. — Neither in this vol., nor in the first, does he want to give a picture of historical events, for which he refers to his History of Iraq and to his still unprinted works about the history of Erbil and Sulaimāniyyah. — There is some new information, though, especially with regard to the Bilbās, it is based on a ms. of Qawm al-farag bāṣa ṣaṣ-ṣidda (Turkish, rhymed chronicle?) by Yūsuf al-Maulawī (died 1153/1740). — As to the question of the origin of the Zarā, already dealt with by Minorsky, EI s.v. Kurd, Uşnū, ʿAzzāwī turns to the Aya Sofya ms. of Masālik al āṣār, which he thinks is the first copy. But he is mistaken. For only the reading of the Paris ms.: Zarāriyyah agrees with the meaning walad ad-dāḥab, which Quatemère has corrected into w. ad-dāḥab, not the reading of the Aya Sofya ms.: Zarāriyyah.