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INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

The following pages contain the record of the Imām Ahmed ibn Hanbal and of a struggle 1) with which he stood connected, whose issues were so great as to warrant a close study of all that is involved in the movement. The history of Dogma in Islām as written by Western writers has given us an idea of the questions which were being disputed at this time, and the outward history of events has recorded in very meagre outline the most important public occurrences of our narrative; but there has been, so far, no use made of the rich opportunity presented in the biography of Ahmed ibn Hanbal to see the theological controversies of Islām in their connection with the outward history of the State. This kind of historical study is the more interesting, because from it we are enabled to understand the relation of the State to religion at that time, and the place occupied by religion and its teachers in the State.

1) The Miḥna. This term, meaning in general usage a ‘testing’ or ‘trial’, whether by the accidents of fortune or the actions of men, is often used (together with the third Form of the verb مَكَحَل with reference to a religious test with a view to obtaining assent to some particular belief or system of beliefs. We find this special usage largely illustrated in the records of the Muʿtazilite inquisition, the account of which is to appear in the sequel. It is also found in the accounts of the Orthodox inquisition under the Khalif Kāhir 200 years later. Most commonly, the whole persecution extending from the year 218 A. H. to 234 A. H. is called the Miḥna.
We have referred above to the issues of the Miḥna, as the persecution inaugurated by al-Maʿmūn is called. The importance of them lies in the fact that they settled the orthodox character of Islām for all following ages; and in the preservation of orthodoxy lies the preservation of Islām itself, in our judgment. Had Rationalism succeeded in bringing about by persecution a general abandonment of orthodoxy, it is probable that the principle of free thought, without recognition of authority, would have had a disintegrating effect within Islām itself, and would have made it much more susceptible to modifying and reforming influences from without; so that, in time, we should have seen standards of faith and life, which contravene our reason as the Korān and Tradition do, given up for something more satisfying to reason and moral judgment. We need not enter into the question whether any good came from the preservation of orthodoxy, further than to say that if Islām was to continue to be Islām, to preserve orthodoxy was the best way to accomplish such a result.

We ought to give Rationalism credit for having asserted the principle, un-Islāmic though it be, that thought must be free in the search for truth. The abuse of free-thinking, however, in a love of speculation for speculation's sake, and in an inordinate desire of controversial victory is, in the history of this period, abundantly exemplified.

Ahmed ibn Hanbal during his whole career subsequent to the death of the Imām al-Shāfiʿī (204 A.H.) was the most remarkable figure in the camp of Mohammedan orthodoxy, and during the course of the Miḥna did more than any other individual to strengthen the resistance of his party to the repressive efforts of the Khalifs and their officers. He stood for the standing or falling of orthodoxy in its time of trial; and there is little exaggeration in the statement, made more than once concerning him, that 'all men were looking to him for an example, that as he decided on the test as to the Korān being applied to him, so they might follow'.

We have some interesting circumstantial evidence of
Aḥmed’s position and influence among the people from the way in which he was treated by the Khalīfs. Al-Maʿmūn had made up his mind to cite him to appear with the first seven men to whom he put the test, but even the violent bigot Aḥmed ibn Abū Dowâd the Chief-Kāḍī advised his master not to summon him, doubtless recognizing that success with the seven men would be much more difficult should Aḥmed be with them, and feeling that the result of their trial would better determine whether or not it would be wise to attack one greater than they. Al-Maʿmūn’s letter to his governor in Baghdād after the latter had examined the doctors treats with gentleness Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, when one reads what he had to say about most of the other doctors there alluded to. In the case of al-Muʿṭasim, we must bear in mind that he did not scourge Aḥmed until he had exhausted every means to save him, by threats, arguments and entreaties. He declared that had al-Maʿmūn not ordered him to deal with him and such as he, he would have had nothing to do with the infliction of the punishment. Furthermore, the scourging took place in the court-yard of the palace unknown to the mass of the people, who stood outside waiting for the announcement as to how the trial had ended. As soon as they suspected that their Imām was being tortured, there was a tremendous excitement; and it seemed as if the Khalīf’s palace would become an object of assault, when al-Muʿṭasim had Aḥmed’s uncle ʿĪsḥāk brought out, and had this man falsely intimate to them that he had not harmed his nephew in the least. To make himself still more secure against the danger of a popular uprising, al-Muʿṭasim kept Aḥmed within the precincts of the palace until the evening, and then dressed him up in gala costume and sent him under cover of dusk to his dwelling. We may consider it as significant of Aḥmed’s standing among the people that there were no further attempts to coerce him during the remaining fifteen years of the Mīḥna, though we are assured that he was active in teaching and as popular as he ever had been, or even more
so. Al-Wâthik’s treatment furnishes some evidence to shew how he regarded Aḥmed’s influence. We are told that, despite the urging of Ibn Abû Dowâd, he would not cite Aḥmed for examination before him, but sent word to the Imâm to remove from his country; a good proof that Aḥmed had great power with the people. The biographer adds that he does not know whether the Khalif refrained from dealing with Aḥmed because of admiration for his steadfastness, or because of fear that evil consequences might come upon him should he lay violent hands upon so holy a man. For al-Mutawakkil we need say little here. His attention to Aḥmed and the messages which he sent him point clearly to his popularity and influence.

The religious sentiment in the Muslim populace had not much sympathy with the loose views and free living of the liberal teachers. Hence it was that they idolized as they did a man like Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal. His intense devotion to the things most venerated and cherished by the people: God, the Prophet, the Korân, the Tradition, the Sunna of the Prophet, and the Communion of the Faithful, endeared him to the mass of the common folk. He was, also, a remarkable example of an effort which always excited reverence in the breast of the Muslim, namely, the effort ‘to bring himself near to God and thus secure a good reward from him’. Those who are familiar with the stock expressions of Mohammedan piety will understand what this means in the case of a sincere and earnest religionist. Judging by the record of a host of extravagant visions of blessedness in Paradise which men had of the Imâm Aḥmed after his departure from the world, one cannot doubt that all good Muslims believed him to have obtained even more than the good reward for which he had hoped.

That Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal has come to be regarded as the founder of the Ḥanbalite Madhhab, or School, is not to be wondered at, though it is not because of any intention on his part, as far as I can see. He was a great saint and defender of orthodoxy, and it is due to this fact that his pupils and
admirers, after his death, sought to give form to their master's teachings and compacted themselves into a sect or school of theology. I do not believe that Ahmed himself had the idea that such would occur. That a school was formed spontaneously is a testimony to the powerful impression of the man's personality upon his own age and that following. The things which the Muslims reckon to Ahmed's praise are his personal life, his intensely orthodox teaching, and his maintenance of his teaching in the face of persecution. He was learned in only one direction, that is, in the Korán, Tradition, the Consensus of usage and opinion among the Faithful. These things he knew thoroughly; of worldly learning he does not appear to have had any great store. The kind of knowledge he had, supplementing great courage and firmness and much natural shrewdness, was his effective weapon in the controversial warfare which he had to wage. Ahmed's great book the Musnad is the best monument to that knowledge in which he especially excelled. It exercised such an influence, in itself and in the works derived from it, for the maintenance of Tradition in its worthy place as a basis of theology, that its author's career ought to be known. We will then see the real life which was so steadying in its effect upon Mohammedan religious thought, and which was but followed up in its effect by the book which it produced.

Some native biographers and historians have noticed the man and the persecution in which he suffered for his faith with too flattering recognition of Ahmed's worth and services. Others whose interest is more secular and who record, for the most part, only the outward events of civil history have often passed over the religious movement of Ahmed's time with little or no notice. But there is a significance about the man and the movement which the greatest of the chroniclers, such as Tabari, have not been slow to recognize. Abu'l-Mahásin, who professes to be writing the annals of Egypt, but whose interest in religious persons and events is evident on almost every page of his work, has done full
justice to the general course of events in connection with the Miḥna and to the public career of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal.

In the narrative which follows, I have sought to give the connected story of my subject’s life from its beginning to its close. The account expands, however, at that point where his life becomes a factor in the public history of the time, in order that we may have a fair impression of the whole course of religious events then transpiring, and may, also, see more clearly Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal in the arena where he, more than elsewhere, won for himself that great fame which has placed him among the chief heroes and saints of his faith.

It should be remarked that European writers have too often written their accounts in a spirit of antipathy toward the orthodox theology of Mohammedanism, and have given more than a due share of commendation to the Muʿtazilites (Rationalists). They were, it is true, advocates of the freedom of thought, but were, none the less, in many cases, too self-indulgent and pleasure-loving to be credited with the highest moral aims or earnestness. It is doubtful whether, in most instances, their championship of free thinking was from any lofty conception of what constitutes true freedom. It would appear to be rather the motive of convenience that moved them to take the course they took. They preached the gospel of Freedom because they felt the Law and the Commandment to impose an inconvenience upon them, so that they could not do as they wished. All praise is due to the sincere men who loved freedom and sought it as the right of every man, but the sequel will shew not many of such men in that field of history which it covers.

The characters of the four Khalifs al-Maʾmūn, al-Muʿtaṣim, al-Wāṭhik and al-Mutawakkil will receive some additional light from the narrative which follows; as a result, probably that of the first and last named will receive a different judgment from that which has been passed hitherto. Al- Maʾmūn, the scholar and patron of scholars, the first free-thinking Khalif who took a real interest in religion, will be more fully discovered as a man intolerant toward those who
differed from him, even to the degree of becoming an intense persecutor. As to his liberal tendencies, it is not likely we shall find any reason to change our judgment. He had a quick and very capable mind, and hated to be fettered. He believed he had the right to think to the full extent of his opportunity, and to make opportunity for mental ranging—where he had none. Had he stopped at this point, he would have presented to us a record of great service to his fellow-men accomplished by moral means; but when he rejected what he deemed a spiritual tyranny, only to turn spiritual and physical tyrant himself, the pure quality of his early aspirations is for us sadly spoiled.

Al-Mutawakkil is a Khalif whose character cannot possibly be what European historians have made it out to be—darker than the plague of darkness itself. He was orthodox, but his treatment of liberals will easily bear comparison with his predecessors' treatment of the orthodox theologians; while the attitude he assumed toward Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal does not present to us a man without redeeming qualities. It is not to be understood that we condone his terrible treatment of individuals, and the gloating satisfaction with which he sometimes related his own barbarities. Nor would we soften terms over his treatment of Jews and Christians. But the man was a fanatical religionist, and many of his deeds must—be viewed from the religious standpoint to a greater extent than they have been heretofore.

It will be seen that, in regard to some other points, I have indicated in a footnote here and there a difference of opinion from some of the modern authorities whose works have been consulted. But, none the less, I avail myself of the present opportunity to say that the books of scholars like Steiner, von Kremer, Houtsma and Goldziher have been of great service to me, and that I am fully appreciative of the service their contributions have rendered to our knowledge of that period of Mohammedan history with which my sketch professes also to deal.

In my work I have derived most of the material used
from three manuscripts in the Library of the University of Leiden; 1) Cod. 311a, which, with its companion Cod. 311b, represents the 5th and 4th vols, respectively, of a five volume Ms. of the حلية الإيّار or حلية الإوليا’ of Abû Nu’aim Aḥmed ibn Abdallah al-Ṭispahâni (d. 450). 2) Cod. 73a, which was not in the University collection of Mss. at the time that Dozy prepared his Catalogue, and is, therefore, not described. Its companion volume, Cod. 73b Gol., is however described. The two volumes form together one transcript of the work of Tāju’l-Dīn Abdu’l-Wahhāb ibn’l-Subkî (d. 771), entitled طبقات الشمالية: 3) Cod. 1917, which is likewise not described in the University Catalogue, but will be found in the Catalogue of Landberg, “Catalogue de Manuscrits arabes provenant d’une Bibliothèque privée à el-Medîna et appartenant à la Maison E. J. Brill, Leide”, p. 53, Cod. 188, Aḥmed el-Maqrīzî († 845) مناقب أحمد بن حنبل.

The biography of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal in Abû Nu’aim is found pp. 138—161 and in al-Subkî pp. 132—143. I have made most extensive use of the former of these two, as being the most detailed and circumstantial account of my subject’s life. It is the oldest account of the three, and shews that fact in the amount of gossip and personal detail which it records, and which the later accounts have omitted. The narrative in al-Subkî affords a great deal of matter touching Aḥmed’s part in the Miḥna, but not so much for the biography before and after that time. Al-Maḳrīzî’s contribution is almost sure to be a portion of his Mokaffa, and is a good piece of biographical writing, well-arranged, concise in expression, and covering fully the life and relations of Aḥmed. Considered as a literary production, it is a better account than that of Abû Nu’aim, because of its compactness and system; but, for one who is gathering materials to compose a sketch having itself a similar purpose to Maḳrīzî’s, as might be expected, the more diffuse narrative of Abû Nu’aim, with its accumulation of traditional accounts bearing on many minor points in Aḥmed’s career, has much more to offer.
As is pointed out in a footnote Tabari’s Annales have been followed for the letters of the Khalif al-Ma’mûn. The same source, also, has afforded some useful information touching matters of more public interest during the progress of the Miḥna.

My endeavor has been to use the materials gathered from these and other sources in such a way as to make many witnesses contribute each something complementary to the testimony of his fellows, and yet have the whole convey the impression of a continuous narration.

To my greatly esteemed Professor, Doctor M. J. De Goeje, Professor of Arabic in the University of Leiden, I am indebted for direction, advice, and encouragement without which it would have been impossible to have accomplished the result that is here presented. I am very thankful to him for this, as also for his great courtesy as Interpres Legati Warneriani in placing at my disposal the three manuscripts which have been used in the preparation of the work.

Leiden, Febry 4th, 1897.

WALTER M. PATTON.
Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal was born in the month of Rabi‘ the first, 164 A. H. 1). The home of his parents was in Khorasan 2). His father Moḥammed ibn Ḥanbal was one of the descendants of a captain in the Abbaside army in Khorasan which fought to overthrow the Omayyads 3). The family left Khorasan to take up residence in Baghdād, however, and Aḥmed was born a few days or months after their arrival in the latter city 4). We are not informed what family his parents had beside himself, and in none of the sources of information to which I have had access is there, excepting of a brother of his father’s, 5) Ishāk ibn Ḥanbal 5) and a son of this man, Ḥanbal ibn 6) Ishāk ibn Ḥanbal 6), any mention of a relative of his father’s or his own generation. His lineage was of pure Arabic stock 7) from the family of Shaibān of the great tribe of Bekr ibn Wā’il. Aḥmed is rarely called ‘ibn Moḥammed’, the name

1) Ibn Chall. Nō. 19, Dhahabī, Liber Class. 8, Nō. 18, Abu’l-Maḥāsin I, 735 ff.
2) Jācūt II, 777.
3) Abū Nu’aim, Leiden Ms. 311a, 1506, خراسان
6) Abu’l-Maḥ. II, 76; cf. p. 26, l. 5 infra.

وَفَلَى اِبْنَاءَ قَوَادِ خَرَاسَان

معين ما رأيت خيرًا من أحدث ما انتشر على نفقة العربية ولا ذكرها
of his paternal grandfather taking the place of that of his father, probably from the fact that the latter died at thirty years of age while his son was still in infancy. On the death of the father, the responsibility for ‘Ahmed’s care and training devolved upon his mother, whose name and history we do not know 1).

Years of Study and we know merely that he continued to reside in Baghdad until the year 179 A. H. In this year, when fifteen years of age, he began the study of the Tradition 2). He first went to the lecture-room of Abdallah ibn al-Mubârak, who came to Baghdad for the last time in 179 A. H. He was too late in going, however, as Ibn al-Mubârak had left the city to take part in an expedition to Tarsus 3). Malik ibn Anas, too, died in the very year in which ‘Ahmed began to study; and the latter used to say that he had been deprived of Malik ibn Anas and Hammâd ibn Zaid, but that God had given him in their place Sofyân ibn ‘Uyaina and ‘Ismâ’il ibn ‘Ulayya 4). His first teacher was Hushaim ibn Bashir al-

1) That ‘Ahmed’s father did not die before his boy was born will appear from the following: Abû Nu‘aim, p. 138 b, وَتَوَفَّى إبُو مُحِمَّد بُن حَنَيْل وَلِهِ ثَلَاثَةٌ سَنَةٌ فِي بُيُتِّهِ أَمَّهُ قَالَ إِبُو كَانَ قَدْ تَغَبَّ أَذْنَىٰ الْجُحُوِّ

2) Dhahabi, Lib. Class. 8, No. 18.

3) Abû Nu‘aim, 138 a, وكان ابن المبارك قُدِّمَ في هذه السنة وعُيِّن إِلَى مُجَلِّسِهِ فِي اِلْمَسْجِدِ وَذُعِبَتْ إِلَى الْمَعْرِضِ فَتَوَقَّى مِنْهَا سَنَةٌ أَحَدِي وَثَمَانِينَ.

4) Al-Maqrizi, p. 2, وكان رَضَى بِتَنَاسِفٍ عَلَى عَمَدِ اِجْتِمَاعِهِ بِالْإِلَامِ، مَالِكُ لَانَ مَالِكٌ رَضَى تَوَقَّي السَّنَةَ الْمُنْهَيَةِ لِلْإِلَامِ إِمَّامُ فِي هِيَا لِلْحَدِيثِ وَهِيْ سَنَةٌ تَسْعَ وَسَعِينَ وُمَلَّأَةٌ فَكَانَ يُقَلِّلُ فَتَنَا مَالِكُ فَأَخْلَفَ اللَّهِ.

Sulami, to whom he went in the year 179. With Hushaim he studied in this year and, then, to continue more particular instructions in difficult traditions, he went in the year 180. From Hushaim’s dictation he wrote the كتاب للحَجّ, containing about 1000 traditions, a part of the تفسير, the قُصّاء and some minor writings. He is said to have learned from this teacher in all more than three thousand traditions 1).

For the study of tradition he visited Kûfa and Baṣra, Mecca, Medina, Yemen, Syria and Mesopotamia 2) and among the other teachers under whom he studied were Sofyân ibn ‘Uyaina († 198), 3Ibrâhîm ibn Sa‘îd al-Kaṭṭân († 198), Waḵî († 196), Ibn ‘Ulayya († 193), Ibn Mahdî († 198), Abd al-Razzâk († 211), Jarîr ibn Abd al-Hamîd († 188), al-Walîd ibn Muslim († 194), 4Alî ibn Hîshâm ibn al-Barîd, Mu‘tamar ibn Suleimân († 187), Ghundar († 193), Bîshr ibn al-Mufaḍḍal († 186), Ziyâd al-Bakâ‘î, Yahîya ibn Abû Zâ‘ida († 182), Abû Yûsuf the Kâqî († 182), Ibn Numair († 234), Yazîd ibn Hârûn († 206), al-Ḥasan ibn Mûsâ al-5Ashyâb († 209), 6Ishâk ibn Râhawaih († 238), 6Alî ibn al-Madînî († 234), and Yahîya ibn Ma‘în († 233) 3).

He studied with al-Shâfi‘i the Fîkh and the ‘Usûl al-Fîkh 1). We do not know much of the history of Aḥmed until the year 218 A. H. is reached. In that year the Mihna was begun by the Khalîf al-Ma’mûn and Aḥmed comes at once into prominence. He must have been studying with Abû Yûsuf the Kâdî before 182 A. H. when Abû Yûsuf died. His personal intercourse with al-Shâfi‘i began in 195 A. H., when the latter came to Baghdad, and lasted till 197 A. H., when al-Shâfi‘i went to Mecca. After a break it was renewed in Mecca, and after that, probably, for a brief space of time in Baghdad, when al-Shâfi‘i returned there for a month in 198 A. H. before finally taking his departure from ‘Irāk 2). We know that Aḥmed was in Baghdad in this year. Wakî ibn al-Jarrâh he knew very intimately before his death in 197 A. H. Aḥmed had such familiarity with this man’s traditions that he gave his son liberty to take any of Wakî’s books that he pleased, and told him that, if he would give him any tradition whatever from it, he would give him the ‘Isnâd for it, or, if he would give him the ‘Isnâd, he would give him the tradition. Wakî had his tradition from Sofyân from Salama, but Aḥmed seems to have been able to add to his own teacher’s knowledge in respect to the traditions of Salama 3). With Sofyân ibn ‘Uyaina he studied in Mecca

1) Al-Maḳrīzī, p. 2, واصله
3) Al-Subkî, p. 132, وقّل قتلبته بن سعيد كان وكيّع إذا كانت العتمة ينصب معه أحمد بن حنبل فيقف علی الباب فيدكره فأخذ ليلة بعكس الدباب ثم قتل يابا عبد اللد [أحمد] أريد أن ألقى عليه حدید حسب قد قال هات على كيفيت عن سفيان عن سلمة بن كبيب
before 198 A.H., in which year Sofyān died. We have no means of fixing the exact date when he studied with Sofyān. It was, no doubt, on the occasion of a pilgrimage, for Ahmmed performed the Hajj five times in all 1). It was also during the residence of al-Shāfi‘ī in Mecca, in all likelihood, for we have it recorded that ‘Ishāk ibn Rāhawaih on two occasions disputed there with al-Shāfi‘ī during Ahmmed’s residence there, and it would seem also in his presence 2).

The following incident is characteristic of the man. While in Mecca, Ahmmed’s clothes and effects were stolen during his absence from his lodgings in the hours when he was engaged in study with his teacher (Sofyān). On his return, the woman of the house told him of the theft, but his only enquiry was as to whether the writing-tablets had been preserved. On learning that they had, he asked for nothing more. Still, owing to the torn state of his clothes, he was forced

1) al-Nawawī Biog. Dict., p. 144, l. 16.
2) al-Subkī, pp. 157, 158.
to remain away for several days from the lecture-room, until
the anxiety of his fellow-students led them to seek him out
and put him in the way of earning a little money to procure
a change of garments. Their proffered gifts or loans he would
not on any account accept 1).

Abd al-Razzāk ʿAhmed first met in Mecca. On one of his

1) Abū Nuʿaym, 143 a, حددت النهائى على تنا ʿأحمد قائل، أصل علي بن عبد الله بن احمد [ بن حنبل ] من حفظه قال تنزنا مبكتة
دارا وكان فيها شيخ يكى بن بكر بن سبعة وكان من اهل مكة قال
نزل علينا ابن عبد الله في هذه الدار وانا غلام قال فقلت امى ام�
عندما الرجل فأخذه فانه رجل صاحب فكنت أخدته وكان يخرج
يطلب للحديث فسرق معاشه فهرب فقلت له أمى دخل
عليه دليل قال وما سأل عن شيء غيرها (142 a) حددنا سليمان بن احمد
قائنا عبد الله بن احمد بن حنبل تنا على بني ʿلهم بن بدر قال كان
لما جار فخرج البناء كنا فقتل اتعزى على هذى دخل قالنا نعم هذى
خط احمد يعني حنبل فقلنا له كيف كتب ذلك قال كنا بمكن
مقيمين عند سفيان بن عبيد بن عبد الله بن حنبل ابدا لم نه
ثم جمعنا اليه نسال عنه قال لنا امبل الدار الذي هو فيها هو في
ذلك البيت فقتنا اليه والباب مردون عليه وإذا عليه خلقان فقلنا
بابا عبد الله ما خبره فنترك منه امبل قال سقئت ثياب قلنا
معنى دناير فمن شئت خد قرضا وان شئت صلة قال ان يفعل
قلت تكتب لي بابره قال نعم فخرجت دينارا وان ان باخذه وقال
اشترى لي ثوب وأقطع مافظف فمالما أنه يأتمر بنصف ويرتدى بالنصف
الآخر وقال جدوى ببقيته ففعلت فانتبعت ببري قلته لا فهذا خظه
pilgrimages Yahya ibn Ma' in accompanied Ah med 1), and they made up their minds that, after the completion of the pilgrimage, they would go to San'ā in Yemen and study Tradition with Abd al-Razzāk. On arriving at Mecca they met with the teacher, who had, like themselves, come to perform the Hajj. Yahya ibn Ma' in introduced Ahmed to him, and, after making known their wish to study with him, an appointment was made by Ibn Ma' in in accordance with which they should receive his instructions in Mecca instead of going to San'ā. Ibn Ma' in told Ahmed of this and the latter asked him why he had made such an arrangement. His reply was that it would save a month's journey each way and all the expenses of the trip. Ahmed, however, declared that he could not allow such considerations to overcome his pious resolutions, and, in the end, they did go to San'ā and received there the traditions. He suffered great hardships on the way thither, for, though offered money sufficient to enable him to travel in comparative comfort, he refused to take it and hired himself to one of the camel drivers of a caravan going to the place. At San'ā, likewise, he lived in penury and suffering, though help was tendered him such as would have secured him against anything of the kind. Abd al-Razzāk himself said that Ahmed remained with him almost two years, and that when he came he offered him money, saying that the country was one where trading was difficult and to gain his livelihood would be impossible. Ahmed was inflexible, however, saying that he had a sufficiency for his needs. The traditions which he had from this teacher were those of al-Zuhri from Sālim ibn Abdallah from his father and the traditions of al-Zuhri from Sā'id ibn al-Musayyib from Abu Huraira. Ahmed was fortunate in having studied with Abd al-Razzāk before the year 200 A.H., for his reputation as a sound traditionist was impaired after that date. It is in keeping with Ahmed's character that he should, as we are informed, have put into practice every tradition which he

1) Abu'l-Feda, Annales, Reiske ed., II. 186.
learned from Abd al-Razzâk, even to one in which the Prophet is represented as giving to Abû Taibâ, a surgeon, a dinâr for cupping him. Following this example Ahmed, too, asked to be cupped and gave the surgeon a dinâr 1).

1) al-Mâkridî, p. 7.
With Ishâk ibn Râhawaih, who is called in the Kitâb al-Fihrist (I. 230) a leading Ḥanbalite, he corresponded for a length of time, until Ishâk took a letter of recommendation which Yahya ibn Yahya had written for him to Abdallah ibn Tâhir, and received from the latter because of it both money and high position 1).

When still a youth Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal was held in reverence as an authority on the Tradition, and in the assemblies of the sheikhs was looked up to with great respect 2). We do not know when his most

---

1) al-Nawawi Biog. Dict. ١٢٩ ff. cf. al-Subki, p. 156

2) Abû Nu‘aim, ١٤٤

---

...
active period of teaching and literary work occurred, but he was established as the greatest traditionist of his time when al-Ma’mūn introduced the Miḥna, and continued to teach until shortly after al-Wâthîk came to the Khalifate when he was forced to give up teaching. He may have resumed teaching for a year or so after al-Mutawakkil came to power, but in 237 A. H. when he went to the camp he took an oath never to tell a tradition in its integrity as long as he lived, a vow which he appears to have kept 1).

His Works. In regard to his books we know on the whole very little. He left at his death twelve loads and a half of books all of which he had memorized 2). The names which have come down to us are the following: كتاب العلم - كتاب البیان - كتاب الناسخ والمنسوخ - كتاب التفسیر - الغرافص - كتاب الفصائل - كتاب المسائل - كتاب الأشربة - كتاب الآیان - كتاب المناسک - كتاب الرد على الیمیمیة - كتاب طاعة الرسول - كتاب المسند.

The Musnad. Of one book, his great work, the Musnad, we have more definite particulars. It comprised the testimonies of more than 700 Companions of the Prophet, and was selected and compiled from 700,000 traditions (or according to another account from 750,000) and contained 30,000 (in some accounts 40,000) traditions. Ahmed boasted that whatever was in it was a reliable basis for argument, and that what was not contained in it was not to be regarded as a sound basis. He looked upon this book as an imâm which was to settle all differences of opinion about any Sunna of the Prophet 4). It has always had the greatest reputation in Mo-

---

1) Cf. Chapter II near the end; Chapter III near the beginning.
2) al-Nawawi, Biog. Dict. ١٩٤٥.
3) Kitâb al-Fihrist I, ٦٧٩.
4) al-Subki, p. ١٣٣, ١. ٢٠, &c.
hammedan theological circles, and has been used as a basis of many smaller works and as a source of information by many authors. Its immense size and the very inconvenient method of its arrangement have, however, done a great deal to prevent its becoming much more used than it actually has been. In fact, it has been rarely mastered by any one individual, and perhaps as rarely transcribed by one person. Hence it is that, whereas there are a number of partial copies of the work, only one complete manuscript is known to-day 1).

The Musnad as compiled by Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal is no longer extant 2), nor does it seem to have survived his own age; for Abū Abd al-Rahmān Abdallah Aḥmed’s son, who edited, with some additions of his own, the work of his


الله صلَّم فارجعوا إليه فإن كان فيه ولا ليس حاكية.... فقال علمت
هذا الكتاب اسمًا إذا خرج الناس في سنة عن رسول الله صلَّم رجع
الله وقال إيمان خرج ابن المسند من سبعمائة ألف حديث خلف أبو موسى
المدني وله يخرج إلا عُمِّ ثبت عليه منزلته ودَبَّانَتَه دون من طَعَنَ
في امانته فذكر بإسناده إلى عبد

[Cod. has these points. Read الله ابن الإمام أحمد رحمة الله عليهما قل سالتم ابن عباد العزيز.]

ابن ابن قال لا خرج عنه في المسند شيء لا مرأ حديث المواجه كانت خلف أبو موسى فما عدد احاديث المسند فلم أزل
أسمع من اتجاه الناس فإنا أربعون ألفا لا أقلا على ابن منصور بن
زيد أحدهم قال آنا أبو بكر للفتيب قال ابن ابن الأنظده لا يمكن في
الدنيا ارود على إيه من يعي عبد الله ابن الإمام أرد لأنه سمع

المستود وهو ثلاثون ألفا والتفسير وهو مائة ألف وعشرون ألفا الع

The sum 40000 for the traditions is that given in the Kitāb al-Fihrist I, 439, 1. 22.
father after his death\textsuperscript{1}), speaks of what he heard from his father, what he read to his father from his own copy of the original page, and what he had gathered from books and papers belonging to his father, as being embodied in the edition which he had made\textsuperscript{2}). In some cases he says that he ‘thinks’ he had a tradition from his father in such and such a form, in such and such a manner of communication, or under such and such a heading. These evidences seem to point to the absence of any book which could have been used to verify what he had in mind. The Musnad as now preserved to us is in the revised form given it by the editorial labours of Abdallah ibn Aḥmed. It is mentioned, further, that an edition of the Musnad with certain supplementary traditions by the editor was made by Abū ʾOmar Moḥammed ibn Abd al-Wahīd († 345). A commentary in eighty sections making together ten volumes was prepared by Abu ʾl-Ḥasan ibn Abd al-Hādī al-Sindī († 1139); an epitome called al-Durr al-Muntacad min Musnad Aḥmed was compiled by Zain ad-Din ʾOmar ibn Aḥmed al-Shanīmā al-Ḥalabī\textsuperscript{3}) and, finally, an edition of the Musnad ordered alphabetically according to the names of the Companions of the Prophet from whom the traditions take their origin was made by the Jerusalem scholar Abū Bekr Moḥammed ibn Abdallah al-Maḵdīsī: ترتيب مسند أحمد بن حنبل على حروف المعاكم\textsuperscript{4}). A printed edition of the work, based chiefly on a manuscript in the Library of the Sādat Wafā’iya at Cairo was issued in 1896\textsuperscript{5}).

The great work according to the boast of Aḥmed himself was intended to be encyclopaedic in its aim, as far as traditions related to the Sunna of the Prophet were concerned. It apparently attempts to comprehend everything which in

\textsuperscript{1) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 472, 504.}
\textsuperscript{2) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 497.}
\textsuperscript{3) Ḥaj. Ḥal. V, 534 f.}
\textsuperscript{4) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 470.}
\textsuperscript{5) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 468.}
the author’s judgment could possibly contribute to a complete notion of what the Sunna was. All the reliable materials coming down from the Companions were meant to be included within the book. Hence, only the very broadest tests were applied to the traditions which were accepted by the author. The main criterion was that the Isnâd must be sound; that is, no man whose reputation for truthfulness or religious character was deemed unsatisfactory could be allowed to validate a tradition ¹). The test of conflict with clear teaching of the Prophet elsewhere found was also applied, but not with the most thorough consistency ²); and, finally, the duplicate traditions were excluded, though here, also, Aḥmed’s practice was not uniform ³). In a work of such an aim we expect to find and in this work do find all kinds of traditions: those relating to ritual, legal precedents, moral maxims, fables, legends, historical incidents and biographical anecdotes ⁴). Furthermore, we cannot find the same order which is observed in the great collections of al-Bokhârî and Muslim. Their material was much less in quantity than Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal’s and much narrower in its scope. They had a purpose much more special in view, which permitted of a real system being observed. But Aḥmed’s aim was simply to store up genuine traditions and nothing more ⁵).

In such a collection, too, as that found in the Musnad any one acquainted with the genesis of Mohammedan tradition can understand that there would appear all sorts of inconsistencies and contradictions. Such, in fact, are found in the book. Sayings are attributed to the Prophet which never could have been uttered by him. He is represented as having prescience of events occurring long after his time, and as lending his countenance to views whose later origin

---

¹) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 478 & note 1); v. note 4, p. 19.
³) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 481.
⁵) v. note 4, p. 19.
is clearly known; opposite opinions and parties alike find their support in distinct traditions of the Musnad 1). It might seem that there was room to question the honesty of the author who would thus leave all kinds of discrepancies in his work; but reflection will shew that a dishonest man would hardly admit or allow to remain in his compilation such things, and that the aim of Ahmmed, comprehensive and unscientific as it was, sufficiently accounts for whatever of miscellaneous or contradictory character there appears. It is quite likely, too, that the Musnad was a collection brought together during many years, and one to which labor was not continuously devoted by the compiler. In the use of the work, also, after its completion there probably was no continuity observed. He would read a portion now and a portion again, a portion to this one and a portion to that one (only three persons are said to have heard it complete from Ahmmed himself). These facts would make it difficult for him to have in mind and eye the whole work at one time, so as to perceive the mutual harmony or discrepancy of the parts of which it was composed. He, thus, might easily admit and with difficulty correct such inconsistencies as those of which we have spoken. With his aim, as we conceive it, however, inconsistencies made very little difference. He was but collecting sound traditions, and not supporting particular opinions or movements. It was not his idea to constitute himself a harmonist. Dishonesty in connection with any of the contents of the Musnad lies properly with other and earlier authorities than Ahmmed. We have no record of his having been charged with fabricating traditions during his lifetime 2). His great fault was the uncritical aim and method. Even in the Isnâds, where he was supposed to be an excellent critic,

2) During the trial before al-Mu’taṣīm it was not objected that any of his traditional arguments were unsound. When he was charged with plagiarizing a tradition (which he had not there cited), he was angry and took pains to put his adversaries to confusion. Cf. a passage in the long Arabic note in Chapter II.
he appears to have been rather liberal. There are found lists of authorities with anonymous individuals even as the first sources of the traditions cited; a few names are given credit, also, who do not stand as reputable authorities in the opinion of many theologians. In the cases of most of the latter Ahmed, however, makes a special note to the effect that he sees no reason to refuse the traditions furnished by them. And, lastly, he favours at times the Kuṣṣāṣ, who, while not altogether discounteraned as authorities, were not held in great repute 1).

Abdallah, Ahmed's son, did his part as editor with great conscientiousness, noting carefully his own additions to the materials gathered by his father, and inserting corrections and glosses with explicit statement of his own authorship of them. The traditions which he added to the Musnad appear to have been afterwards brought together by him in a separate book which bore the title زرائدة مسند الإمام أحمد بن حنبل لولدنه عبد الله الراعد. In some cases where Abdallah had heard a tradition found in the Musnad from another teacher as well as his father, he wrote a note to that effect when putting in the tradition concerned 2).

During his lifetime Ahmed read the Musnad to his sons Sāliḥ and Abdallah and to his uncle Ishāk ibn Ḥanbal, and they alone formed the favoured circle who heard the complete work from the lips of its author 3).

As may be inferred from what has been already said,

1) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 471 f, 478 f; Cf. De Goeje, Gloss. Belādhori and Gloss. Fraggm. Hist. Ar. ِْٓ. The Kuṣṣāṣ having as storytellers no very serious aim were naturally enough in discredit with serious traditionists, but it may well have been that such men actually furnished some sound traditions. According to the critical method then in vogue, the soundness of such traditions would depend upon their contents to some extent, but more upon the Isnāds.

2) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 501 ff. Abdallah is said to have made additions, likewise, to his father's كتاب الرعد.

3) v. note 4, p. 19.
the great work of Ahmed is not arranged with any reference whatever to the subjects of the traditions it includes. Such an arrangement is found rather in that kind of tradition-collections called Musannafs, a class of works which properly belongs to a later development of Arabic literature than these Musnads. The latter class, of which Ahmed’s book is representative, is ordered according to the earliest authorities or first sources of the traditions cited, and according to the localities where the author obtained his materials. In such an arrangement we would expect to find traditions bearing a particular colour and evincing a similar tendency brought together, according to the predilection or bias of the original authorities or of the localities made responsible for the traditions. This feature, which is almost inevitable in employing such a method, is a mere accident of the classification, and forms no part of the author’s intention. Such a miscellaneous arrangement and the mass of the materials brought together made these Musnads of little general value as works of reference on account of their inconvenience, and led to such an undertaking as that of al-Maḳdisī to bring a more convenient order into the book of Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal. It does not diminish the awkwardness of his work, either, that the traditions of the same primitive authority should be found, some in a section classified according to the names of the men, and others in one or more sections classified according to the places in which the materials were gathered 1).

The order of the Musnad of Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal, as found in the recently published Cairo edition, is as follows;
Vol. I, pp. 2—195, Traditions of ten Companions of the Prophet, including the first four Khalifs.


The well-known Companions.


Vol. IV, pp. 2—88, Traditions of Medînans.

Vol. IV, pp. 88—239, Traditions of Syrians.

Vol. IV, pp. 239—419, Traditions of Kûfans.


Vol. VI, pp. 29—467, The Women. (In pp. 383—403 of this section are put in some traditions من مسند القبلاء.)

It should be carefully borne in mind that each one of the sections enumerated, as well as the whole work, is called a Musnad, e. g. The Musnad of the Meccans, the Musnad of the Anṣâr etc. Such is a general description of the long famous Musnad of the Imâm Ahmed.

Ahmed's Pupils. We have the names of some of those who heard the Tradition from him, among whom were his teachers Abd al-Razzâk, Ibn Mahdî and Yazîd ibn Hârûn. Other pupils were Abu’l-Walîd, ‘Ali ibn al-Madînî, al-Bokhârî, Muslim, Abu Dâûd, al-Dhuhiî, Abu Zur’â al-Râzî, Abu Zur’â al-Dimashkî, Ibrâhîm al-Ḥarbi, Abu Bekr Ahmed ibn Moḥammed ibn Hânî al-Ṭâ’î al-Athrâm, al-Baghawi, Obaidallah ibn Moḥammed Abu ʿl-Ḳâsim (his last pupil خرُوج), Ibn Abî Dunya, Moḥammed ibn Ishâk al-Ṣaghânî, Abû Ḥâtîm al-Râzî, Ahmed ibn Abî ʿl-Hawârî, Mûsâ ibn Hârûn, Ḥanbal ibn Ishâk, Othmân ibn Saʿîd al-Dârîmî, Hajjâj ibn al-Shâʾîr, Abd al-Malik ibn Abd al-Hamîd al-Maimûn, Bâkî ibn Makhlad al-Andalusî, Yaʿqûb ibn Shaiba, Duḥaim al-Shâmî and his own sons Abdallah and Šâliî.) His method of teaching was to read the tra-
ditions from a book rather than recite them 1). He is not known to have taught in any other way except in the case of about one hundred traditions 2). He adopted this method notwithstanding the fact that he had everything committed to memory and was generally regarded as being almost the first ḥāfiz of his time. On one occasion when he was delivering the tradition to some of his pupils, after they had learned it by heart, and were preparing to write it, Ahmed exclaimed, ‘the book is the best ḥāfiz’ and with that he started up and brought a book 3). His wish probably was to verify his memoriter recitation.

Ahmed does not appear to have taken money from his disciples, either for his services as a teacher or for the writing materials etc. which he furnished 4).

Relations For al-Shâfi‘i he always entertained the most affectionate regard. His testimony to him was that none in his day carried an ink-bottle or touched a pen but there was resting upon him an obligation to al-Shâfi‘i 5). For thirty years he declared he had never prayed a prayer without offering in it a petition for his friend, and on his son’s asking him what kind of a man al-Shâfi‘i was that he should pray for him so regularly, he replied that al-Shâfi‘i was like the sun to the world and like good health to mankind 6). Al-Shâfi‘i, too, seems to have had a great

---

1) Mahāsin II. 328. I have added from al-Subkī, p. 133, l. 18, cf. Dhahabī Liber Class. 8, No. 69.
2) al-Nawawi, Biog. Dict. 144. يقرّر (عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل) ما رأيت لبّ في حفظه حدّث من غير كتب الّا باتّ من مائة حديث
5) al-Nawawi, Biog. Dict. 151.
respect and affection for Ahmed. He is said to have declared, 'O Abu Abdallah, whenever a tradition from the Messenger of God is sound in your judgment, tell it to us that we may conform to it'. Ahmed is reported as saying that al-Shâfi‘î told him that he (Ahmed) was more learned in the sound traditions than himself, and that his (al-Shâfi‘i’s) desire was to know from him what he regarded as sound so that he might adopt it. Ahmed’s son Abdallah declared that, wherever al-Shâfi‘î says in his book ‘a trustworthy person told me that’, or ‘a trustworthy person related that to me’, he refers to his father. Abdallah said, further, that the book which al-Shâfi‘î composed in Baghdad was more correct than the book which he composed in Egypt, because, when he was in Baghdad, he asked Ahmed and the latter suggested corrections to him, but when he was in Egypt and was inclined to adopt a weak tradition there was no one to correct him 1. Al-Shâfi‘î

1) Abû Nu‘aim, 140δ, ...
went to Egypt in the year 198, stayed probably two or three months and then returned to Mecca, whence he took his final journey to Egypt in the end of 199 or the beginning of 200. In 'Irāk he composed the Book of the Hajj. His first visit to Baghdaḍ was in the year 195; he left there for Mecca in 197 and returned for a month to Baghdaḍ in 198 1). Al-Shāfi‘ī said, ‘I left Baghdaḍ and did not leave behind in it any one greater as a fākīh, or one more pious, self-denying, or learned than ‘Alīm al-Ma‘ṣūm 2).

Other Contemporaries. Al-Haitham ibn Jamīl, one of ‘Alīm al-Ma‘ṣūm’s teachers in Baghdaḍ, thought highly of his pupil’s authority. On one occasion he was told that ‘Alīm al-Ma‘ṣūm differed from him in regard to a certain tradition and his reply was, ‘My wish is that it may shorten my life and may prolong ‘Alīm al-Ma‘ṣūm’s life’ 3). It is worthy of note that ‘Alīm al-Ma‘ṣūm gave apparently unreserved credit to Yazīd ibn Hārūn. Yazīd ibn Hārūn as a traditionist. At one time Mūsā ibn Ḥīzām al-Tirmidhī was on his way to Abū Suleimān al-Jūzajānī to ask him some question about the books of Mohammed ibn al-Ḥasan when ‘Alīm al-Ma‘ṣūm met him and enquired whither he was going. On learning his object, ‘Alīm al-Ma‘ṣūm remarked

2) al-Subki, p. 132, l. 9.
3) Abu Nu‘aim, 141 a, 3).

كان من الأسئلة التي سأل الشيخ فيغيّر عليه ولم يكن بمصر من يغيّر عليه
بذا فتجرد إلى الخبر ضعيف كل وسمت ات يقل استفاد منه الشافعي
ما لم تستفاد منه.

الشافعي فيما رواه حاملة خرجمت
من بغداد وما خلفت بها أفقها ولا أروع ولا أعظم ولا أعظم من أحمد
فتمنا فيهما فقيل له خالفك في عهد كل من خالفت قلنا أحمد بن
حنبل قال ودعت أن نقص من عمر وزاد في عمر أحمد بن حنبل
that it was a very strange thing that Ibn Ḥizâm should be ready to accept the testimony of three persons leading up to Abû Ḥanîfa, and yet refuse that of three authorities forming a chain of tradition to the Prophet. Ibn Ḥizâm did not grasp Ahmed’s meaning and asked for an explanation. Ahmed answering said, “You will not receive the Isnâd ‘Yazid ibn Hârûn’ said, Ḥomaid told me from Anas, saying, the Messenger of God said’; and, yet, you receive the Isnâd ‘Such an one said, Moḥammed ibn al-Ḥasan told us from Ya’kûb from Abû Ḥanîfa’”. Mûsa adds that he was so impressed by the force of what Ahmed said that he engaged a boat at once and went to Wâsîṭ to receive the Tradition from Yazid ibn Hârûn). When Ahmed himself went to study with Yazid, on the other hand, Yazid ibn Saʾid al-Ḵaṭṭân enquired for him, and, on learning where he had gone, exclaimed, ‘What need has he of Yazid?’ This was interpreted to mean that Ahmed was more fit to be the teacher than the scholar of Yazid ibn Hârûn.

1) Abû Nuʾaim, 144 8, [Cod. كنت اختلف في لي سليمان الخزاعجي (ال분زالي) في كتب محمد بن الحسن. فاستقبلته احمد بن حنبل عند الفسر فقال لي الى ابيه فقلته إلى ابيه سليمان فقال لي احمد العاجب منكم تركتم الى النبئ صلتم ثلاثة وقيلتم على ثلاثة الى لي حنيفة. فنقلته كيف يقال]

2) Abû Nuʾaim, 140 a, [قال (عبد الله) سمعت ابيه يقول كنت مقيما على يحيى بن سعيد القطن ثم خرجت الي الواسط فسأل يحيى بن سعيد عني فقالوا خرج الي الواسط فقال أي شيء يصنع]
'Ali ibn al-Madini not only shewed great respect for Aḥmed, but received it, likewise, from him. It is said that when 'Ali came to Baghḍād he took a leading place among the traditionists, and at such times as men like Aḥmed and Yaḥya ibn Ma’in and Khalaf and al-Mu’aiti were in difference of opinion on any point the voice of 'Ali was regarded as decisive. Aḥmed out of respect never called 'Ali by his proper name, but always by his kunya Abu ʻI-Ḥasan 1). While Aḥmed was regarded as the best faqīḥ of his time, Ibn al-Madini was said to have superior knowledge of the different views held as to traditions 2), and to be the most learned of the doctors of his day, as Yaḥya ibn Ma’in was the one who wrote the most, and Abū Bekr ibn Abū Shaiba was the greatest ḥāfiz 3).

Yaḥya ibn Ma’in of Tradition from Yaḥya was healing for troubled breasts. He said, also, that Yaḥya ibn Ma’in was a man whom God created for the express purpose of exposing the lies of liars; and any tradition which Yaḥya did not know was no tradition. When he died Yaḥya left behind him one hundred and fourteen cases and four casks of books. This is in harmony with what has just been said as to his having written more traditions than any of his contemporaries 4).

2) al-Subki, p. 185, l. 1. 
3) al-Nawawī, Biog. Dict. ḥāfiz.

2) al-Subki, p. 185, l. 1. 
3) al-Nawawī, Biog. Dict. ḥāfiz.

2) al-Subki, p. 185, l. 1.
3) al-Nawawī, Biog. Dict. ḥāfiz.
One of the contemporaries of Ahmed ibn Hanbal was al-Husain ibn Yazid Abû 'Alî al-Karâbîsî († 245 A.H.) This man was well known both as a faqîh and as a traditionist. At first, he was a disciple of the Ra'y school, but, later, inclined to the views of al-Shâfi'i, became a student of his teachings and received authorization 1) to teach what he had learned. The Khatib al-Baghdâdi tells that he was much disesteemed (lit. was very rare) as a traditionist because he had acquired a bad name with Ahmed ibn Hanbal. This was owing to his strong leaning toward dialectical theology (علم الكلام 2), in general, and, more particularly, to his application of dialectics in order to come to his conclusions touching the Korân. He was a professed believer in the uncreated existence of the Korân, but could not satisfy Ahmed ibn Hanbal by his profession of this doctrine, and much less by his utterances on the symbolic expression of the Korân in articulate human sounds (لغط القرآن 3). He appears to have trifled somewhat in his treatment of subjects that were to minds such as that of Ahmed in the highest degree sacred and serious. For example, his declared faith in the created nature of the Lafz al-Korân was on one occasion told to Ahmed, who, though the profession was in full accord with his own conviction, declared it heresy, because the process by which it had been reached was that of reasoning and not that of submission to traditional authority. Ahmed’s judgment on him was made known to al-Karâbîsî, who changed his declaration of faith and professed that the Lafz al-Korân was uncreated as well as the Korân itself. Naturally enough,

2) For origin and use of the term كلام vid. Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 87 f.; cf. Shahrastâni, Haarbr. transl’n II. 388 f.
3) The Lafz al-Korân is used here with reference to the enunciation of the Korân in human speaking; in the following paragraph we have taken it to have a wider scope.
this pleased Aḥmed no better and he vigorously declared that this, too, was heresy. The whole quarrel, as one can readily see, was with the method of al-Karābīsī, far more than with his theological conclusions 1).

1) al-Subkī, p. 172 "المسين بن علي بن يزيد أبو الکربابیسی کان، اما جلیلا جامعا بین الفقہ وجلیدیت تنفّقه أولا على مذهب اعمل الرأی ثم تنفّق الشافعی. (قال داود الاصبوانی) قال لي حسين الکربابیسی لما قدم الشافعی الى بغداد تقدمت فقلت له تایس لي ان اقرأ عليه الكتاب ذاذا وقل خذ كتب ترجمة الکتب فقد اجتهدت لنک فاختذها اجارة فكل التنزیب حديث الکربابیسی يعبر جدا وذلك أن أحمد بن حنیل كان يتکلم فيه بسبب مسالة الفظ ونحو أيضا كان يتکلم في أحمد فتخرج الناس اخذ عنه لهذا السبب قالت كان أبو الکربابیسی من متكلمي اهل السنة استاذ في علم الاقلام كما هو استاذ في الحديث والفقه وله كتب في المقالات قال أبو الکربابیسی فنون الدين في كتاب غایة المرام على كتابه في المقالات معنی المتكلمين في معرفة مذاعب الفجوارج وسائر 일을 الاقوام قلت المروی أنه قبیل الکربابیسی ما تقل في القرآن فإن كلام الله غیر مخلوق فقال له السائل فما تقول في لفظ القرآن فإن فظلك به مخلوق فنیس السائل إلى أحمد بن حنیل فشرح له ما جرى فقال هذة بدعه والذى عندنا أن أحمد رضی اشتر بقوله هذة بدعه إلى الباب على مسالة الفظ وليست مما يعنى الور وخصوص الور في ما لا يعنی من علم الاقلام بدعه فكان السکوت عن الاقلام ضادا اجمل وأولی ولا يشی بأحمد رضی الله أنه يقدم ان الفظ للخروج من بين الشفطین قدم ومقاله للمسین هذة قد نقل مثلها عن الباباری ولفیث بن أسد المکاسبی ومحمد بن نصر الموروزی وغيرهم وسبكون لنا عودة في ترجمة الباباری الى الاقلام في ذلك ونقل ان احمد ما قال هذة بدعه رجع السائل الى المسین 3
We have interesting evidence of the doctrinal sympathy between al-Bokhārī and Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal. A jealous rival of al-Bokhārī in Nīsâbūr charged the latter with heresy on the point of the Lafẓ al-Ḳorān, and the imputation was taken up by many. But it is clear that al-Bokhārī’s silence on the question, from reluctance to be drawn into any reasoning on a point for which there was so little evidence pro or con in Tradition, was the only ground for suspecting his orthodoxy. His belief, as well as that of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, was that the Ḳorān itself was not created, but the Lafẓ al-Ḳorān, by which he understood the human acts of writing,

فقال له تلفظه بالقرآن غير مخلوق فعند الله ما ضعف إلى أخذ فعهد مقالة للحسيين ثانيا فإنكر أحمد أيضا ذلك وقال عبد الله أيضا بدعة وهذا يدل على ما نقله من أن أحمد اشتر بقوله هذه بدعة إلى اقلام في اصل المسطرة ولا فكريف ينكر اثبات الشيء وتفهيم قائمهم ما قلناه فهو الفقدان على الله تعالى وقق قل أحمد نقول فنقول الصواب عدم اقلام في المسطرة رأسا ما لا يمنع الى اقلام حاجة مسحة وسما يدلانم أيضا على ما نقله فإن السلف لا ينكرون أن لفظنا حادر وأن سكته إنهما هو عن اقلام في ذلك لا عن اعتقادا أن الرواة رواه أن الحسيين بلغه كلام أحمد فيه فقال لافل مسألة حتى يقول أحمد بإخلاصها فيكره فنقول لفظي بالقرآن مخلوق وعذرا للكلية قد ذكرها كثير من الشرفاء وغيرهما النازحين في ترجمة الامام أحمد وفي ترجمة الامام أحمد فانظر إلى قول الامام أحمد فيها ان مكلف به يكفر الامام أحمد فيما يعتقده لا يختلفها وإنما انكر أن يتكلم في ذلك إذا تأملت ما سطرونه ونقولن قول شيخنا في غير موسع من تأريخه أن مسطرة اللفظ ما يرجع الى قول جمء عرفت أن الرجل لا يدرى في هذه المضايقة ما يقول وقد أكثر هو واتباعه من ذكر جمل بن صفوان وليس قصد

لا جعل الخ
reading, reciting and all other acts connected with the use or preservation of the revelation, was created 1).

1) al-Subki, p. 214, 35

ورد الشافعي نيسابور اذهبوا إلى هذا الرجل الصالح فسعيوا منه فذهب الناس إليه وقبلوا عليه السلام منه حتى ظهر للعلم في مجلس الشافعي فصل عن ذلك وتكلم فيه قال أبو إسحاق بن علي ذكر لجماعة من المشافع أن محمد بن إسحاق بن ورد نيسابور واجتمعوا عليه. حسناً بعض المشافع فقال لا إكلال للميثات أن محمد بن إسحاق يبطل اللفظ بالقرآن خلقهما فامتخذهما فلا أن صبر الناس قام لله رجل فقال إليا عبد الله ما تقول في اللفظ بالقرآن خلقهما وهو غير خلقهما فارض عنه وليجبن فلا سأل مفريع عنه ثم أتى فانفتست السيدة البخاري وقال العبد صلى الله عليه وسلم: وفعل العباد خلقهما والامتنان بصدقة فشغب السجدة وشغب الناس وتفرقوه عنه وفقد البخاري في منزله قال محمد بن يوسف الفيدي سمعت محمد بن إسحاق يقول للعبدي ففعل العباد خلقهما حدثنا على بن عبد الله ثنا مروان بن معاوية ثنا ابن ملك عن ربي عن حذيفة قال قول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: إن الله يصنع كل صنع وصنعته وسمع عبيد الله بن سعيد يقول ما زلت إسمع أنكما يقولون أن فعل العباد خلقهما قال البخاري حركتنما واصطحابنا وكتبتما خلقهما فاما القرآن المكتوب الموصى في المصانف المسمور المكتوب الموصي في القلب فهو كلام الله ليس بخلق كل الله تعالى بل هو إيات بينات في صدور الذين أوتوا العلم والكل يقال فلان حسن القراءة ولا يقال حسن القرآن ولا روى القرآن وإنما ينسب إلى العباد القراءة لأن القرآن كلام الله البديع والقراءة فعل العبد وليس لاحد أن يشرع في أمر الله什么都 علم كما زعم بعضهم أن القرآن بالقرآن والفقناه في شء واحد والتماسكه في المثل أو القرآة
Mohammed Another of Ahmed’s companions, whose highest compliment was that he resembled the great Imám, was Mohammed ibn Aslam Abū Ḥusain al-Kindi al-Tūsī
This man was an earnest opponent of the Jahmi and Murji sects, of the former because they professed that...
the Korân was created, of the latter because they held that faith was mere profession without the inward trust and experience of the heart. The argument which he adopted toward the Jahmîa was that of the Korân verses in which God speaks in his own person to Môhammed announcing his Mission, and to Moses declaring himself to be his Lord and the Lord of the worlds. In the former case it is implied that if the word of the speaker be not that of God, Môhammed's Mission is called in question. If it be the word of God, then it is eternally potential in him and inseparable from any true conception of him, and, therefore, it must be uncreated. In the case of Moses, if the speaker to him be a creature, then Moses himself and the worlds also, have a second lord, — for one Lord is admitted without question, — and the professors of such a doctrine are at once convicted of Shirk (شرك); but, supposing God to have really spoken, then we have again the proceeding forth of a word which we must not regard as created with its utterance, but rather as an inseparable adjunct of the Divine Knowledge, for how otherwise could the Divine Knowledge become efficient or communicative? The sin of the Jahmîa is their Shirk; this is the result of the reasoning, and without reasoning, from the standpoint of the orthodox apologist, they are guilty, as well, of forging a lie against God (افتراء) by declaring that God did not speak to Moses though the Korân says he did.

Against the Karramîya Murji'a Ibn Aslam maintained the

Shahrastâni Haarbrücker's transl'n I, 89; Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma &c. pp. 102, 123 f. On the Murji'a v. Houtsma, De Strijd &c. pp. 34 ff., 40; Shahrastâni, Haarbrücker's transl'n I, 156 ff. The Murjite belief as presented in Houtsma, p. 36, differs from that set forth by Môhammed ibn Aslam, but agrees with the second class of the Karramite sects (Houtsma, p. 39) and with the Şifatiya Karramîya (Shahrastâni, Haarbr. transl'n I, 119 ff., especially p. 127). Ahmed ibn Hanbal, it will be remembered, composed two works bearing the titles, respectively, كتاب الینان, and كتاب الینان, vid. p. 19.
doctrine that faith is a gift of God to the heart, a gift of illumination and of spiritual adornment, by means of which it is disposed to believe in God, his angels, his books, his messengers, the resurrection, the day of judgment, the final account, in foreordination to good and evil, in paradise and in hell-fire. This faith is given only to those upon whom God is pleased to bestow it, and is not complete without both the testimony of the lips as, at once, its expression and its confirmation, and the acts of the bodily members as the evidence that the confession of the lips and the antecedent faith of the heart are genuine. The testimony of the lips has for its subjects the things believed on by the heart. These it declares to be true; and, more specifically, it gives the formal confession that there is no God but Allah and that Mohammed is his Prophet and his Messenger. The acts of the members lie in the performance of such things as God prescribes and in the abstention from such things as he forbids. These points are supported by arguments from the Korân and Tradition; but by this man, as by others of the strict orthodox party, there is stress laid, as well, on arguments outside of either of these sources. For example, it is said by Mohammed ibn Aslam that, should the Murjite view be proved correct, then the Prophet and the first Khalifs, who had not spent their whole lives in the confession of Islam, but who had had true faith, notwithstanding, might be held inferior to any mere babbler of the sacred formulas who had been occupied long enough with his task. Those (also called Murjia') who held that works were the measure and substance of faith are opposed, too, and the argument of disparagement to the early worthies is applied here, likewise.

Mohammed ibn Aslam was a believer in the eternal existence of the Divine attributes, but we have no record

of his method of proving his position in this respect, nor have we any exposition of what it involved 1).

1) Abū Nuʿaim, 162 a ff,
Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal had a predilection in favor of mystics and ascetics, but toward one of these, al-Ḥārith ibn al-Muḥāsibī, he conceived a strong antipathy because this man was said to use reasoning in theological matters. The reconciliation between

Mystics and Ascetics.
Al-Ḥārith ibn al-Muḥāsibī.

...
them does not seem to have ever been openly effected; but there is a story to the effect that Ahmed took the opportunity of secretly hearing al-Ḥārith, when the latter with
his companions had been invited to a feast, and that he was then convinced that his earlier impressions of the man, however just when formed, did al-Ḥārith some injustice at
that time. The change in Ahmed’s opinion does not seem to have been complete or to have saved al-Muḥāsibī from loss of credit in Baghdād, for, at his death in 243 A. H., only four people attended his funeral. It is possible that this may, however, be explained as the consequence of some pious wish which he had expressed 1).

With Bishr al-Hafi († 226) and with al-Sari al-Sak
Aḥmed stood on terms of intimate friendship. He counted it his high privilege, indeed, to have seen some of the most holy men of his time in possession of little else than their piety and poverty. Those whose names are recorded beside the
Cloned are Abdallah ibn Idris († 192) Abû Dâûd al-Ḥafārī and Ayûb al-Najjār 1).

Dâûd ibn 'Alî, the founder of the Zahirite school, († 270) was one of Ahmed’s pupils. There was made to Ahmed a very unlikely report against him to the effect that he had been teaching in Khorasân that the Korân was created (by fashioning that which already existed (حکمت)), and that his Lâfz al-Ḳorân was created (by being made from nothing (nihâl)). This influenced Ahmed so that he refused to receive him, and we have no knowledge that he afterwards changed his decision; but the Zahirites are known to have been even more strict than Ahmed on the uncreated nature of the Korân, and it may be assumed that Dâûd did not long continue to be suspected by him. It is to be remarked that the informant of Ahmed was Moḥammed ibn Yaḥya al-Dhuhlī, the same man who in jealousy accused al-Bokhârî of heretical views on the Lâfz al-Ḳorân. Further, it should be noted that the incident is said to have occurred during the lifetime of Ishâk ibn Ṭuhawaih († 238 A. H.) when Dâûd must have been a comparatively young man. If the account be true his views must have undergone

1) al-Maqrîzî, p. 1

[Note: The following text is in Persian and is not translated.]
change during the remaining years of his life. He was born in 202 A. H. and died in 270 A. H. 1).

Ibrāhīm In the year 218 A. H. there died in Egypt ibn Ismā‘īl Ibrāhīm ibn Ismā‘īl Abû Ishâk al-Asadī al-Mu’talīzī, known as Ibn ‘Ulayya. He was a professor of the doctrine that the Kūrān was created and had discussions about Fīkh with al-Shāfi‘ī in Egypt, and with Aḥmed ibn Hanbal in Baghdad about the Kūrān. Aḥmed regarded him as a dangerous heretic 2). The Ibn ‘Ulayya al-Akbar whose name figures in the history of the Mīhna under al-Ma‘mūn, appears to have been a different person, who was of orthodox reputation hitherto. Taken together with the similarity of the names, the seeming readiness with which Ibn ‘Ulayya al-Akbar complied with the test as to the Kūrān’s creation might suggest, however, that he was in some way related to the party here mentioned. But this is only hypothetical.

II.

MĪHNA. In the beginning of the second century of Islām — Historical al-Ja‘d ibn Dirham, teacher of the Khalif Marwān II, — Development held the doctrine that the Kūrān was created, and, — at that time, imaginative adversaries of the belief declared themselves to be able to trace the steps of Tradition by which the heresy was to be carried back from Ja‘d to Lebīd, a Jew, whom the Prophet had declared to have bewitched him and thereby produced in him a sickness 3). However the doctrine came to him, Ja‘d was put to death by Khālid ibn — Abdallah, Governor of ‘Irāk, at the command of the Khalif — Hishām. After this we hear no more of the doctrine until the — time of the Abbaside Hārūn al-Rashīd 4). The account of the

1) Goldziher, Zahiriten, p. 134. The incident is also found in al-Subkī, p. 232.
2) Abu‘l-Mahāsin I, 647.
3) Weil, Mohammed, 94, note 121.
4) Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 101 f.
historical development (of the doctrine of the creation of the Korân) ¹) which led up to the inquisition under al-Ma'mûn and his successors is given by Abu'l-Faraj ibn al-Jauzî, († 598 A. H.) as follows: Men did not cease to follow the good rule of the fathers of Islâm and their confession that the Korân was the uncreated Word of God, until the Mu'tazilites (freethinkers) ²) appeared, professing the creation of the Korân. This they did secretly until the time of al-Rashîd. Then, they ventured to teach their view more openly, until al-Rashîd said one day, 'I have heard that Bishr al-Marîsî ³) says that the Korân is created; now, verily, if God give him into my hand, I will kill him in such a way as I have never yet killed anyone'. On learning this Bishr remained hidden for about twenty years during the days of al-Rashîd. (This would carry back his public profession of the doctrine in question to about 173 A. H.) When al-Rashîd died, the matter remained in the same position during the time of his son al-Amin; but when al-Ma'mûn succeeded, some of the Mu'tazilites led him astray and made the doctrine of the creation of the Korân to appear plausible to him ⁴).


²) On the name Mu'tazila and the rise of the sect, vid. Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten, 25 f.; Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 51. On the history of the sect, Steiner, 48 ff.; Dozy, Het Islamisme, 183, 184. On their doctrines, Maçoûdi VI, 20 ff.; Steiner, 3 ff.; Houtsma, 55, 80, 89, 121 f.; Haarbrücker's transl'n of Shahrastânî I, 40. On their doctrine of the Korân, Steiner, 75 ff.; Houtsma, 104 f.

³) Von Hammer, Lit. Geschichte III, 205; Abu'l-Mahî, I, 647 and note 9; Ibn Chall. N°. 114; Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten, 78. He is called by Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 79 (cf. note 1), one of the leading Murjites of his time. By Shahrastânî, Haarbr. I, 94, he is called, as the result of false pointing of the letters, Bishr ibn Attâb, instead of Bishr ibn Ghiyât al-Marîsî. For his views vid. Shahrastânî, Haarbr. I, 161, 162, cf. I, 243.

⁴) al-Ma'ârîzî, p. 3, فصل في مکمل الاملام رضي الله عنه وما وقع فيها، على سبيل الاختصار قل للحافظ أبو الفرج بن التاجوري لم يزل الناس على قولون السلف وقولون أن القرآن كلام الله غير خلق حتى ذُبِّغت...
It is reported that the Imâm al-Shâfî'i, before his death in 204, had a dream, in which he was forewarned by the Prophet of the trial, in years to come, of Ahmed ibn Hanbal for the sake of the Korân. He is alleged to have sent word to Ahmed informing him of the communication he had received, and report says that Ahmed, on reading the letter, exclaimed, ‘I hope that God will verify that which al-Shâfî'i says’ ¹). We may, probably, infer from

¹) al-Makrîzî, p. 3.
this incident that the doctrine of the creation of the Koran had already begun to make some stir when al-Shâfi‘î was in Baghdâd, and that Ahmed was at this early stage a vigorous opponent of the tenet.

Al-Ma‘mûn. The interest of al-Ma‘mûn in theology is emphasized by all the historians 1). He had been thoroughly trained in the knowledge of Tradition, of the Koran sciences, and of the Koran itself from early childhood, and had had among his teachers Mâlik ibn Anas, Hushaim ibn Bashîr and his own father 2). His ability as a pupil soon brought him

1) Cf. Abu’l-Mahâsin I, 644; Hammer-Purgstall, Lit. Gesch. III, 26; al-Suyûtî, Tarikh al-Kholafâ, Calcutta, 1857, p. 310; Dozy, Het Islamisme, 1880, p. 152. The notices of al-Ma‘mûn’s character found in al-Subkî, p. 144, and al-Makrizî, p. 3, are in accordance with the accounts found in the works just mentioned.

2) Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 13, says that al-Ma‘mûn first
to a foremost place as a theologian, but a mind less eager for much wider ranging than was afforded within the narrow bounds of the orthodoxy of Islam, soon shewed its sympathy with the revived philosophy which had begun to be popular under the dominion of the Khalifs, and with the different branches of Arabic letters and sciences. Following his bent of mind 1), he gathered to his court from different parts of his empire, philosophers and men of more liberal tendency of thought than had been found among the companions of his predecessors 2). Al-Ma'mûn, however, is not looked upon as a man naturally impious nor was his interest in sacred subjects one merely controversial in its character. It is related of him that he used to complete 33 recitations of the Korân in the month of Ramaḍân 3). He also gave special gifts of money to relieve the needs of the teachers of Tradition, and all accepted of his beneficence except Ahmed ibn Hanbal 4). The letters written by al-Ma'mûn in connection with the Mihna, however, do not give us a favorable impression of his character. The orthodox historians say that his companions at Court were wholly responsible for al-Ma'mûn's attended the lectures of the Mutakallims and later took an interest in orthodoxy. He does not cite his authority for the remark, and it does not harmonize with what I have been able to gather from the authorities I have consulted. They invert the order, and I have followed them in my narrative.

1) Steiner (Die Mu'taziliten, p. 16) expresses the opinion that the tendency toward liberal theological views, which was so strongly advanced by the influence of the Greek Philosophy, had already set in before the Arabs became acquainted with Greek philosophical thought.

2) For the patronage of letters and philosophy by the Abbaside sovereigns — with its direct effect in the rise of the men of the Kalâm, and its indirect or reactionary effect in increasing the zeal in study of the men of the Traditions, vid. Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 86 f.

3) Goldziher, Moh. Studien II, 58, 59; Von Kremer, Herrsch. Ideen d. Isl. 301, note 15; Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten, 6, note 5; Al-Subki, p. 144,

4) Abû Nu'aim, 143 b,
he oppressed in theology, and for the consequent persecution of the stricter theologians on which he entered. It would appear to be more in accordance with the facts, to say that al-Ma‘mûn himself found the atmosphere of orthodoxy oppressive and sought relief by surrounding himself with men whose minds were of his own liberal cast ¹). That these men should then put forth this or that doctrine is not so much to be considered as that the Khalif himself found heterodoxy a more congenial environment than orthodoxy. That Alîmed ibn Abî Dowâd, the Chief-Ḳâdı, was responsible for the inquisition known as the Miḥna may be said ²); but it should not be forgotten that before Ibn Abî Dowâd obtained his ascendancy over the mind of al-Ma‘mûn, the latter would himself have set on foot the Miḥna for the creation of the Ḳorân had he not been afraid to do so. The Khalif’s public adoption of the doctrine of the Ḳorân’s creation dates from Rabi‘ I, 212 A. H. (827 A. D.) ³).

The following incident shews clearly the state of al-Ma‘mûn’s mind previous to this date. Yazîd ibn Hârûn, who is mentioned in connection with the incident, died in 206 A. H., six years before al-Ma‘mûn publicly professed the doctrine that the Ḳorân was created, and twelve years before the beginning of the Miḥna. Yaḥya ibn Aktham related; “Al-Ma‘mûn said to us, ‘If it were not for Yazîd ibn Hârûn I would assuredly make public declaration of the doctrine that the Ḳorân is created’. On this one of his courtiers said, ‘Nay! but who is Yazîd ibn Hârûn that the Commander of the Faithful

¹) Cf. Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 108.
³) Ṭab. III, 199.
should fear him?‘ His reply was, ‘I am afraid, it publicly, that he will retort upon me, and make him at discord in their opinions, and thus there will come trouble, to which I am averse’. One of those who were present then said to al-Ma’mûn, ‘I will make trial of the matter with Yazid ibn Hârân’. So this man went down to Wâsit and, coming upon Yazîd in the Mosque, said to him, ‘O Abû Khâlid, the Commander of the Faithful greets thee and would inform thee that he wishes to make public declaration that the Korân is created’. Yazîd answered, ‘You lie against the Commander of the Faithful! If you speak the truth, wait here until the people come together to me’. So next day when the people came to him, the Khalif’s messenger repeated what he had said the day before, and asked, ‘What have you to say about the matter?’ Yazîd retorted, ‘You have lied against the Commander of the Faithful. The Commander of the Faithful will not force men to profess that which they have not hitherto known, and which none of them has ever professed’. After this passage the man returned to the Commander of the Faithful, told him of the result, and acknowledged that al-Ma’mûn had been more accurate in his forecast than he himself had been. Al-Ma’mûn replied, ‘He has made jest of you’.

1) al-Ma‘ârizî, p. 3 [قل쁜 مكين بن اکثم قلى لنا] المامون لولا مكان يزيد بن عروين لأظهرين القول بخلاف القرآن فقال له بعض جلسانه وماى يزيد بن عروين حتى يتفقية أمير الموميين فقال لن اخاف أن أظهره يزيد على فباختلف الناس وتكون فتنة وناما أنفسنه قال الرجل للمامون ان أخبرتك من يزيد بن عروين خرج إلى واسط فجاه إلى يزيد فدخل عليه المساجد فقال يابة شاهد ان أمير الموميين يفتك السلام وبيقره له ان يزيد ان أظهر القول في ان القرآن مخلوق فقال له كذبت على أمير الموميين فإن
The public adoption of the doctrine that the Korân was created was conjoined with the public declaration of the superiority of 'Ali over Abû Bekr and 'Omar. Al-Ma'mûn was a pro-‘Alyite Khalif ¹), even as al-Mutawakkil, who revoked the royal edict announcing the Korân’s creation, was an anti-‘Alyite Khalif. The Shyites were, in fact, Mu'tazilites in theological opinion, and it is not surprising that the ruler who gave out their tenet touching the Korân should, at the same time, prefer their great leader before the orthodox Abû Bekr and his successor, even as it is not surprising that the ruler who revoked their tenet should restore to the orthodox Khalifs their primacy. Political capital was made out of both events by partisans, but in both cases it seems to us that the intention of the Khalifs was primarily to effect a religious reform ²).

For six years al-Ma'mûn was undecided as to whether or not he should make the tenet that the Korân was created obligatory upon his subjects; finally, when he had deposed Yahya ibn...
Aktham, in the year 217 A. H., from the Chief-‡adi’s office 1) and appointed A§med ibn Abi Dow‡ad as his successor, he was encouraged to take the step by his new favorite until, in the last year of his life 218 A. H., he ordered the application of the Mi§na, or test 2).

Ibn Abi Dow‡ad, who held a position of great power under the three Khalifs, al-‡Ma‘mûn, al-‡Mu‘ta§im and al-Wâthik, and was the most vigorous advocate of the Mi§na during their reigns 3), is pictured in the accounts given by the orthodox biographers of A§med ibn ‡Hanbal in much too unfavorable a light. He was a learned man, gifted in the Kalâm, — he studied the Kalâm with Hayyâj ibn al-‘Alâ al-Sulami, a pupil of Wâcil ibn‘Atâ 4), — and was the first who publicly employed it in speaking before the Khalifs, though he refrained from employing it in the presence of Ibn al-Zayyat the Vizier. The Khalif al-‡Mu‘ta§im was completely under the power of Ibn Abi Dow‡ad.

2) p. 52, note 2.
3) Steiner, Die Mu‘ta§iliten, 78.
4) for Wâcil ibn ‘Atâ cf. Dozy, Het Islamisme, 133 f.; Steiner, Die Mu‘ta§iliten, pp. 25, 50. Houtsma (De Strijd etc. 103) says that Wâcil ibn ‘Atâ does not appear to have taught the creation of the Korân.

[ Cod. no points; cf. Abu‘l-Ma§asin, I 475, 733 ]
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و لا انتقل منه وكان كرمسا مصدقا وفيه يقول بعضهم أن نست مسالى كل دهر، محسوس امجد بن أبي دو†، وما درفت في الافق الاّ، ومن جدوك راحلتى وزادى، يقيم الظن عندك والأماني،

[ Cod. Abu‘l-Feda Ann. II, 678, corrects as in text ]

و قلم ركابى في البلاد
He entered the service of al-Ma'âmun in the year 204 A. H., on the recommendation of Yahya ibn Aktham, and at this Khalif's death was warmly recommended by him to his successor, al-Mu'tasim. In the very beginning of al-Mutawakkil's reign Aḥmed was paralyzed, and his son Mohâmed was made Chief-Ḳâdi in his place, but was deposed in the same year, 232 A. H. Ibn Abî Dowâd was an eloquent man and a poet whose praises were loudly celebrated by poets and others. He was, also, a man of large generosity, and a lover of good living and entertainment 1). In contrast to this estimate of the man is the representation of him as an impetuous, ignorant and narrow bigot, which we find in most of the orthodox accounts. In 236 or 237 A. H. Ibn Abî Dowâd came into disfavor at the Court, and was imprisoned and his property confiscated; later, he was sent to reside in Baghdâd, where he lived till his death. Both father and son died in disgrace in the year 240 A. H., the son twenty days before his father 2).

The first step taken by al-Ma'âmun to secure conformity to the view which he had adopted was to send a letter to his lieutenant at Baghâd, Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm, cousin of Ṭâhir ibn al-Ḥasan, ordering him to cite before him the kâdis and traditionists, and to demand of them an answer to the test as to the

---

1) On the luxurious life of the chief Mu'tazila cf. Houtsma, De Strïjïd etc. 81 f.; Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten, 10 infra.

له يقول لك امير المومنين ما تقني في ابن ابي دوار في ماله فلا بجيب في ذلك بشيء وجعل يعقوب وعشاب خبرانه بما يحدث في امير ابن ابي دوار في كل يوم ثم احدر ابن ابي دوار الى بغداد بعدما اشهد عليه ببيع ضياعه
creation of the Korân. This letter ran as follows 1): That which God has laid upon the imâms of the Muslims, their Khalîfs, is to be zealous in the maintenance of the religion of God, which he has asked them to conserve; in the heritage of prophecy, which he has granted them to inherit; in the tradition of knowledge, which he has asked them to hold in charge; in the government of their subjects according to right and justice, and in being diligent to observe obedience to God in their conduct toward them. Now, the Commander of the Faithful asks God to assist him to persevere in the right way and to be energetic in it, to act justly, also, in those interests of his subjects over which God by his grace and bounty has appointed him to have rule. The Commander of the Faithful knows that the great multitude, the mass of the insignificant folk, and the vulgar public, who, in all regions and countries, are without insight and deep reflection, and have not a method of reasoning by means of such proof as God approves under the guidance which he gives, and no enlightenment by the light of knowledge and its evidences, are a people ignorant of God and too blind to see him, too much in error to know the reality of his religion, the confession of his unity and the belief in him; perverted, also, so as not to recognize his clear tokens, and the obligation of his service; unable to grasp the real

1) The text on which I have based all the translations of the Khalîf Al-Ma'mûn's letters in relation to the Mihna is that found in the Leiden edition of Tabari's Annales III (2nd vol.), mîn mîn. It has the appearance of being a verbal copy of the letters, while the text in Abu'l-Mahâsin I, mîn min, De Goeje, Fragm. Hist. Arab. II, mîn, Abu'l-Feda Annales II, 154 f., and in al-Subki, 136 ff. represents the letters in greatly abridged form. The later writers appear to have used Tabari for their text, for all shew much the same variations from the extended form of the letters found in his work; that is, where they furnish the same portions of the letters (for some of the authorities mentioned have abridged more than others, and in some there is but one or, it may be, two letters found). The above mentioned authorities, beyond the help already gathered from the collation with Abu'l-Mahâsin, do not afford any assistance to improve the text found in Tabari.
measure of God, to know him as he really is, and to distinguish between him and his creation, because of the weakness of their views, the deficiency of their understandings, and their turning aside from reflection and recollection; for they put on an equality God and the Korân which he has revealed. They are all agreed and stand unequivocally in accord with one another that it is eternal and primitive, and that God did not create it, produce it, or give it being; while God himself says in his well-ordered Book, which he appointed as a healing for what is within the breasts and as a mercy and right guidance for the believers, ‘We have made it a Korân in the Arabic tongue’) and everything which God has made he has created. He says, also, ‘Praise be to God who created the heavens and the earth and made the darkness and the light’ (2). He speaks also thus, ‘We will tell thee tidings of that which went before’ (3); he says here that it is an account of things after whose happening he produced it, and with it he followed up their lead. Then he says, ‘A book whose verses were well-ordered, and, then, were divided by order of a Wise and Knowing One’) Now, for everything that is ordered and divided there is one who orders and divides; and God is the one who orders well his Book and the one who divides it, therefore, he is its creator and producer. They, also, are those who dispute with false arguments, and call men to adopt their view. Further, they claim to be followers of the Sunna, while in every chapter of God’s Book is an account, which may be read therein, that gives the lie to their position, declares their invitation [to adopt their opinions] to be false, and thrusts back upon them their view and their religious pretensions. But they give out, in spite of that, that they are the people of the truth and the [real] religion and the communion of believers, all others being the people of falsehood, unbelief and schism; and they boast themselves of

---

1) Korân, 43. 2.  
2) Korân, 6. 1.  
4) Korân, 11. 1.
that over their fellows, so deceiving the ignorant, until persons of the false way, who are devoted to the worship of another God than Allah, and who mortify themselves for another cause than that of the true religion, incline toward agreement with them and accordance with their evil opinions, by that means getting to themselves honour with them, and procuring to themselves a leadership and a reputation among them for honorable dealing. Thus they give up the truth for their falsehood, and find apart from God 1) a supporter for their error. And, so, their testimony is received, because they [sc. the ignorant or people of the false way] declare them [sc. those who pretend to be the people of the truth] to be veracious witnesses; and the ordinances of the Korân are executed by them [sc. those who pretend to be the people of the truth] notwithstanding the unsoundness of their religion, the corruption of their honour, and the depravation of their purposes and belief. That is the goal unto which they are urging others, and which they seek in their own practice and in [their] lying against their Lord, though the solemn covenant of the Book is upon them that they should not speak against God except that which is true, and though they have learned what the condition is of 'those whom God has made deaf and whose eyes he has blinded. Do they not reflect upon the Korân? or are there locks upon their hearts?' 2) The Commander of the Faithful considers, therefore, that those men are the worst and the chief in error, being deficient in the belief in God's unity, and having an incomplete share in the faith — vessels of ignorance, banners of falsehood, the tongue of Iblis, who speaks through his friends and is terrible to his enemies who are of God's religion; the ones of all others to be mistrusted as to their truthfulness, whose testimony should be rejected, and in whose word and deed one can put no confidence. For one can only do good works after assured persuasion, and there [really] is assured persuasion

only after fully obtaining a real possession of Islâm, and a sincere profession of the faith in God's unity. He, therefore, who is too blind to perceive his right course and his share in the belief in God and in his unity, is, in other respects, as to his conduct and the justness of his testimony, still more blind and erring. By the life of the Commander of the Faithful, the most likely of men to lie in speech and to fabricate a false testimony is the man who lies against God and his revelation, and who does not know God as he really is; and the most deserving of them all to be rejected when he testifies about what God ordains and about his religion is he who rejects God's testimony to his Book and slanders the truth of God by his lying. Now, gather together the kadís under thy jurisdiction, read unto them this letter of the Commander of the Faithful to thee, and begin to test them to see what they will say, and to discover what they believe concerning the creation of the Korân by God and its production by God. Tell them, also, that the Commander of the Faithful will not ask assistance in his government of one whose religion, whose sincerity of faith in God's unity, and whose [religious] persuasion are not to be trusted; nor will he put confidence in such a man in respect to what God has laid upon him and in the matter of those interests of his subjects which he has given into his charge. And when they have confessed that [sc. that the Korân is created] and accorded with the Commander of the Faithful, and are in the way of right guidance and of salvation, then, bid them to cite the legal witnesses under their jurisdiction, to ask them in reference to the Korân, and to leave off accepting as valid the testimony of him who will not confess that it is created and produced, and refuse thou to let them [the kadís] countersign it. Write, also, to the Commander of the Faithful the reports that come to thee from the kadís of thy province as to the result of their inquisition and their ordering that these things be done. Get acquainted with them and search out their evidences, so that the sentences of God may not be carried out, except on the testimony of such
as have insight into real religion and are sincere in the belief — in God’s unity, and then, write unto the Commander of the Faithful of what comes of it all.

And this letter was written in the month of Rabī’ I, 218 A. H., and al-Ma’mūn set out on his last expedition to the frontiers, and about four months before his death. It must be confessed that the spirit of the document is that of the bigot, — rather than that of a broad and liberal mind. Nor can we suppose that a man of al-Ma’mūn’s character would let a document of this kind be composed in any spirit but his own. Its indications all point to arrogant intellectual self-sufficiency coupled with a contempt of opinions different from those held by himself. The contemptuous Khalif would appear to have been convinced by those about him that he could now safely terrorize the orthodox, securing assent to his own views from such as were weak enough to be frightened by his threats or tortures, and blotting out the obstinate ones from the face of the earth, when they were found incorrigible. This letter was sent to all the provinces. The copy of that which was addressed to Kaidar, governor of Egypt, is practically the same as that elsewhere. whose translation has been given, but it did not reach Egypt until the month of Jumādā II. The Kādi in Egypt at this time was Hārūn ibn Abdallah al-Zuhri. He gave in his assent on the test as to the Korān being applied to him, as did also the constituted witnesses except some whose testimony was by their refusal rendered invalid. Kaidar had made a beginning with the examination of the fākīhs and `ulamā, but had evidently adopted no harsh measures, when the news of al-Ma’mūn’s death came to him in the month after the receipt of the order for the Mīḥna. On the receipt of this news the inquisition was suspended 1).

There is mention of some trials for the sake of the Korān at Damascus, but there, as well as in other provinces, little appears to have been done, for the notices are

very slight; and, from the way in which Abu'l-Maḥāsīn's record reads, one might infer that the order for the Miḥna to places outside of ʿIrāk and Egypt came later than to those places. If this inference be just the time of the inquisitor in these other parts must have been short, at least, in the Khalifate of al-Maʿmūn. It is to be concluded, too, that the success of the persecution at Baghdād led al-Maʿmūn to order a general introduction of the Miḥna throughout his empire.

*Damascus.* In the year 218 A.H., al-Maʿmūn went in person to Damascus, probably on his last expedition to Asia Minor, and personally conducted the testing of the doctors there concerning the freedom of the will (عَدَل) and the divine unity, the second of which in his view involved a test as to the creation of the Korān i). The governor of Damascus under al-Maʿmūn, as well as under his successors, al-Muʿṭasīm and

---
1) al-Jaʿqūbī II, 571, The Muʿtazila called themselves the Ahluʿt-Tauḥīd waʿl-ʿAdl, the men of the Divine Unity and Righteousness, chiefly for the reason that they, on the one hand, rejected the orthodox view of the Divine attributes and of the Korān as out of harmony with the unitarian faith of Islām; and held, instead, that the so-called attributes were only empty names, or were not real and distinct existences, but particular presentations of the Divine essence itself: that is, God as wise, God as powerful, etc. They, on the other hand, rejected the orthodox doctrine of the Divine foreordination of the actions and destinies of men as inconsistent with the absolute righteousness of God, and held that the human will was free, and man thus the determiner of his own destiny. Hence it is that in polemic literature Ahluʿt-Tauḥīd waʿl-ʿAdl has a much more special meaning than that indicated in the beginning of this note, generally standing for those who believe, 1) in the non-existence of the attributes of God or their identity with his essence, and in the creation of the Korān (أَلِالْقُرْآنَ). 2) in the freedom of the will (َعَدَل); cf. Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 55, 92, 133, Steiner, Die Muʿtaziliten, 30, 50 and note 3); Shahrastānī, Haarbrücker's transl'n I, 39, 42.

If Jaʿqūbī be correct, Houtsma's statement (p. 108) "dat hij [al-Maʿmūn] niet den vrien wil ook meteen [with the creation of the Korān] als staatsdogma vaststelde" must be modified. The probabilities are in favour of the Khalif's having done what Jaʿqūbī says, though we, in general, do not find Jaʿqūbī a very satisfactory authority as far as the Miḥna is concerned. His usual accuracy in recording events is seemingly wanting at this point.
al-Wathik, was Ishâk ibn Yahya. During the Khalifate of al-Mu'tasim, that Khalif wrote him a letter ordering him to urge the Miḥna on the people under his authority. He, however, dealt leniently with them in regard to the order he had received. In 235 A.H., this man was appointed governor of Egypt by al-Mutawakkil 1).

Kûṣa. When the order came to Kûṣa there was a great assembly of the sheikhs in the general mosque of the city, and, on the Khalif's (the name of the Khalif is not given) letter being read to them, the feeling was against yielding to the order it contained. Abû Nuʿaim al-Faḍl ibn Dukain, a Kûṣite, who died in 219 A.H., said that he had met over 870 teachers, from the aged al-Aʿmash to those who were young in years, who did not believe the Korâん to be created, and that such teachers as were inclined to the heterodox view were charged by their fellows with being Zindiks (atheists) 2). Abû Nuʿaim ibn Dukain was present at the opening of the Miḥna in Kûṣa. This fact shews us the approximate date of the event there, for this man, as we have said, died in the year 219 3).

The result of the letter of al-Maʿmûn to Baghdâd was to produce, as we may justly conjecture, a feeling of resistance, the most zealous inciter of

---

1) Abuʾl-Maḥ. I. 711 f.
2) On the origin of the name and its use among the orthodox v. Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 75.

---
which would be Ahmed ibn Hanbal 1). Still, al-Ma’mûn did not yet venture to apprehend the latter. His next step was one which was calculated to shew him just how far he was safe in going in his enforcement of conformity to his views.

Second He wrote a second letter to Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm, the governor of ‘Irâk, ordering him to send seven of the leading traditionists of Baghdad that he might test them himself. For his purpose, this was a sagacious move. Away from the moral support of their fellow-traditionists, and face to face with the state of the Court and the terrors which the Khalif brought to bear upon their minds, resistance was much more difficult than it would have been at Baghdad. And the compliance of these leaders being secured, smaller men needed not to be feared. The name of Ahmed ibn Hanbal was, at first, upon the list bearing the names of the seven referred to, but was erased at the instance of Ibn Abi Dowâd, — at least, so the latter claimed 2).

Those now summoned 3) to the Court were Moḥammed ibn Saʾd the secretary of al-Wâkidî, Abû Muslim the amanuensis of Yazîd ibn Hârûn, Yaḥya ibn Maʾîn, Zuhair ibn Ḥarb Abû Khaithama, Ismâʾîl ibn Dâūd, Ismâʾîl ibn Abî Masʿûd and Ahmed ibn Ibrâhîm al-Daurâkî. These seven men all yielded assent under the pressure which al-Maʾmûn used with them. Having obtained his desire, the Khalif sent the men back to Baghdad, where Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm, acting under al-Maʾmûn’s orders, had them repeat their confession before the faḵîhs and traditionists 4).

Its Effect. The fall of these seven men from orthodoxy was a source of much grief to Ahmed ibn Hanbal. His judgment

1) The Baghdad people had in the year 215, and even earlier, protested against al-Maʾmûn’s heterodoxy touching the Korân, cf. Abuʾl-Maḥ. I, 631.
2) Vid. p. 82.
3) Ṭabarî III f, text of letter not given.
4) Ṭabarî III f. A biographical notice of Moḥammed ibn Saʾd is found Ibn Chall. N°. 656; of Yaḥya ibn Maʾîn, al-Nawawī, Biog. Dict. p. 628; of Ahmed ibn al-Daurâkî, Dhahabî Ṭabaḵât 8, N°. 98; of Zuhair ibn Ḥarb, id. 8, N°. 23. I have not been able to find notices of the other three.
was that if they had stood their ground nothing more would have been heard of the Miḥna in Baghdād. Al-Maʾmūn would have been afraid to deal harshly with them seeing they were the leading men of the city; but, when they gave way, he had little hesitation in dealing with others 1). Their assent was by themselves excused on the ground of Taḵīa (exemption from observance of religious duty when it involved risk of execution if they had not done so. Yahya ibn Maʾin 2), which was used to confess that this was the case 2). It was unfortunate that the seven leaders proved themselves too weak, for it is not unlikely that their firmness might have deterred al-Maʾmūn from prosecuting further his effort for uniformity of belief; and after his death, the succeeding Khalifs were not such as would likely have revived an inquisition like this when it had once been given up.

Third A third letter from the Khalif was now sent to Baghdad to Ishāk ibn Ibrāhīm the governor. Its text was as follows 3): That which God has a right to expect from his vicegerents (khalifs) on his earth [and] those entrusted by him with rule over his servants, upon whom he

---

1) al-Maḵrīzī, p. 4, 阿尔-麦克里齐，第4页，4
2) al-Subkī, p. 137, 阿尔-苏尔克伊，第137页
3) Tabarī III, 117 ff. 泰巴里 III，第117页
has been pleased to lay the maintenance of his religion, the care of his creatures, the carrying out of his ordinance and his laws, and the imitation of his justice in his world, is that they should exert themselves earnestly for God, do him good service in respect to that which he asks them to guard and lays upon them, make him known by that excellency of learning which he has entrusted to them and the knowledge which he has placed within them, guianight him the one who has turned aside from him, bring lious him who has turned his back on his command, mark on their subjects the way of their salvation, tell them aboue the limits of their faith and the way of their deliverance, and protection, and discover to them those things which are hidden from them, and the things which are doubtful to them [clear up] by means of that which will remove doubt from them and bring back enlightenment and clear knowledge unto them all. And [part of that which he claims of them is] that they should begin that by making them go in the right way, and by causing them to see [things] clearly, because this involves all their actions, and comprehends their portion of felicity in this world and the next. They [the Khalifs] ought to reflect how God is one who holds himself ready to question them about that for which they have been made responsible, and to reward them for that which they have done in advance and that which they have laid up in store with him. The help of the Commander of the Faithful is alone in God, and his sufficiency is God, who is enough for him. Of that which the Commander of the Faithful by his reflection has made plain, and has come to know by his thinking, and the great danger of which is clear, as well as the seriousness of the corruption and harm which will come to religion thereby, are the sayings which the Muslims are passing round among themselves as to the Korân, which God made to be an imâm and a lasting monument for them from God’s Messenger and elect Servant, Moḥammed, and [another thing is] the confusedness of the opinion of many of them about it [sc. the Korân] until it has seemed good in their
opinions and right in their minds that it has not been created; and, thus, they expose themselves to the risk of denying the creating by God of all things, by which [act] he is distinguished from his creation. He in his glory stands apart in the bringing into being of all things by his wisdom and the creation of them by his power, and in his priority in time over them by reason of his being Primitive Existence, whose beginning cannot be attained and whose duration cannot be reached. Everything apart from him is a creature from his creation, — a new thing which he has brought into existence. [This perverted opinion they hold] though the Kôrân speaks clearly of God’s creating all things, and proves it to the exclusion of all difference of opinion. They — are, thus, like the Christians when they claim that ‘Isá ibn Maryam was not created because he was the Word of God’ 1). But God says, ‘Verily we have made it a Kôrân in the Arabic language’ 2); and the explanation of that is, ‘Verily we have created it’, just as the Kôrân says, ‘And he made from it his mate that he might dwell with her’ 3). Also, it says, ‘We have made the night as a garment and the day as a means of gain’ 4). ‘We have made every living thing from water’ 5). God thus puts on equal footing the Kôrân and these creatures which he mentions with the indication of ‘making’. And he tells that he alone is the One who made it, saying, ‘Verily it is a glorious Kôrân (something to be read) on a well-guarded table’ 6). Now, he says that on the supposition that the Kôrân is limited by the table, and only that which is created can be limited (by surrounding bounds) 7). He says, likewise, to his Prophet, ‘Do not move in it thy tongue to make haste in it’ 8). Also, ‘That which came to them was a newly created religion (ذکر) from their Lord’ 9).

1) cf. Sura 112; cf. Steiner, Die Mu‘taziliten, p. 90 and note.
2) Kôrân, 43. 2. 3) Kôrân, 7. 189.
4) Kôrân, 78. 10. 5) Kôrân, 21. 31.
6) cf. Kôrân, 85. 21—22.
7) cf. Shahrastânî, Haarbrücker’s transl’n I, 72, l. 20 ff.
8) Kôrân, 75. 16. 9) Kôrân, 21. 2.
has,' ‘And who is a worse liar than the man who inventeth
tlie against God or charges his verses with being false’ 1).
He tells, too, about men whom he blames because of their
lying, in that they say, ‘God has not sent down [by reve-
lution] to men anything’ 2). Then, by the tongue of his Mes-
enger he declares them liars, and says to his Messenger,
‘Say, who sent down the book which Moses brought?’ 3).
So God calls the Korân something to be read, something
to be kept in memory, a faith, a light, a right guidance,
a blessed thing, a thing in the Arabic language, and a nar-
ration. For he says, ‘We relate unto thee a most beautiful
narration in that which we reveal unto thee, — this Korân’ 4).
Furthermore, he says, ‘Say, surely, if men and jinns were
gathered together to bring forth such as this Korân, they
could not bring forth one like it’ 5). Also, ‘Say, bring ten suras
fabricated like it’ 6). Also, ‘Falsehood shall not come up to it
either from before or after it’ 7). Thus, he puts [at least, by
possibility] something before and after it, and so indicates that
it is finite and created. But these ignorant people, by their
teaching concerning the Korân, have made large the breach
in their religion and the defect in their trustworthiness; they
have also levelled the way for the enemy of Islâm, and
confess fickleness and heresy against their own hearts,[going
on] even till they make known and describe God’s creation
and his action by that description which appertains to
God alone, and they compare him with it, whilst only
his creation may be the subject of comparison. The Com-
mander of the Faithful does not consider that he who pro-
fesses this view has any share in the real religion, or any
part in the real faith and in well-grounded persuasion. Nor
does he consider that he should set any one of them down
as a trustworthy person in regard to his being admitted as

1) Korân, 6. 21.
2) Korân, 6. 91.
3) ibid.
4) Korân, 12. 3.
5) Korân, 17. 90.
6) Korân, 11. 16.
7) Korân, 41. 42.
or as one to be relied upon in speech or report, or in the exercise of authority over his subjects. Now, if any of them seem to act with equity, and to be known by his straightforwardness, still, the branches are to be carried back to their roots, and the burden of praise or blame is to be according to these. Thus, whosoever is ignorant in the matter of his religion, concerning that which God has commanded him in reference to his unity, he, as regards other things, is still more ignorant, and is too blind and erring to see the right way in other matters. Now, read the letter of the Commander of the Faithful unto thee to Ja’far ibn ‘Isâ and Abd al-Rahmân ibn Ishâk the kâdî, and cite them both to answer for their knowledge respecting the Kûrân, telling them that the Commander of the Faithful in the affairs of the Muslims will not ask the assistance of any but those in whose sincerity of faith and whose belief in God’s unity he has confidence; and that he has no belief in God’s unity who does not confess that the Kûrân is created.

And, if they profess the view of the Commander of the Faithful in this particular, then, order them to test those who are in their courts for the giving of evidence touching rights of claimants, and [order them] to cite them to answer for their profession in respect to the Kûrân. He who does not profess it to be created, let them declare his testimony invalid and refrain from giving sentence on what he says, even if his integrity be established by the equity and straightforwardness of his conduct. Do this with all the kâdîs in thy province, and examine them with such an examination as God can cause to increase the rightmindedness of the rightminded, and prevent those who are in doubt from neglecting their religion. Then, write unto the Commander of the Faithful of what thou hast done in this matter.

Citation of Following out the instructions of this letter, Ishâk the Doctors ibn Ibrâhîm summoned to his presence a number of the fâkîhs, doctors and traditionists 1). Among

1) Tabari III, ll.41 ff. is followed throughout the passage.

When these men were brought before Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm, he read to them twice al-Ma’mûn’s letter until they grasped its meaning and, then, asked them for their assent to the doctrine which the Khalif propounded. At first, they tried subterfuges and would neither affirm nor deny that the Ko-

Bishr ibn al-Walid. him put the test was Bishr ibn al-Walid. ‘What dost thou say respecting the Koran?’ he asked; and Bishr replied, ‘I have more than once made my view known to the Commander of the Faithful’. Ishâk said, ‘But this letter is a new thing from the Commander of the Faithful. What is your view?’ Bishr answered, ‘I say the Koran is the Word of God’. Ishâk. ‘I did not ask thee for that. Is it created?’ Bishr. ‘God is the creator of everything’. Ishâk. ‘Is not the Koran a thing?’ Bishr. ‘It is a thing’. Ishâk. ‘And, there-

1) Abu’l-Mâh. I. 638 and al-Mâkrî, p. 4, supply the name of Sajjâda
2) Abu’l-Mâh. I, 665, supplies the name of Sa’dawaih.
fore, created?’ Bishr. ‘It is not a creator’. Ishâk. ‘I did not ask for this. Is it created?’ Bishr then confessed that he had yielded as far as he could yield, and could give no further answer; he contended, moreover, that the Khalif had given him a dispensation from speaking his mind on the subject. The governor now took up a sheet of paper that lay before him and read and explained it to Bishr. Then, he said, ‘Testify that there is no God but Allah, one and alone, before whom nothing was and after whom nothing shall be and like to whom is nothing of his creation, in any sense whatsoever or in any wise whatsoever’1). Bishr said, ‘I testify that and scourge those who do not testify it’. Ishâk then turned to the secretary and said, ‘Write down what he has said’.

\textit{Abi ibn Abi} Turning next to ‘Alî ibn Abî Muqâtîl he asked for his confession. He replied, ‘I have told my opinion about this to the Commander of the Faithful more than once, and have nothing different to say’. The written test was then read to ‘Alî and he gave the confession it required. Then the governor said, ‘Is the Korân created?’ ‘Alî answered, ‘The Korân is God’s Word’. Ishâk, as in the case of Bishr, told him he had not asked for that, and ‘Alî answered, ‘It is the Word of God; if, however, the Commander of the Faithful command us to do a thing we will yield him obedience’. Again, the scribe was bidden to record what had been said.

The next was al-Dhayyâl whose replies were in the same strain as those of ‘Alî.

\textit{Abu Hassan}. In the reply of Abu Hassân there is something naïvely submissive. ‘The Korân is the Word of God’, he said, ‘and God is the creator of everything; all things apart from

1) Houtsma (De Strijd etc. 108 infra) seems to imply that this written credo, which was to be subscribed by those to whom it was put, contained a confession that the Korân was created. As Tabari presents the case the document demanded only a profession of faith in God’s unity. Its purpose was evidently to support the separate oral test as to the Korân. None seem to have had any scruples about giving assent to the written test, while all would have avoided the other, had it been possible.
him are created. But the Commander of the Faithful is our imâm, and through him we have heard the whole sum of learning. He has heard what we have not heard, and knows what we do not know. God also has laid upon him the rule over us. He maintains our Hajj and our prayers; we bring to him our Zakât; we fight with him in the Jihâd, and we recognize fully his imâmate. Therefore, if he command us we will perform his behest, if he forbid us we will refrain, and if he call upon us we will respond. Ishâk said, ‘This is the view of the Commander of the Faithful’. Abû Ḥassân rejoined, ‘True! but sometimes the view of the Commander of the Faithful is one concerning which he gives no command to people, and which he does not call upon them to adopt; if, however, you tell me that the Commander of the Faithful has commanded thee that I should say this, I will say what thou dost command me to say, for thou art a man to be trusted and one on whom reliance is to be placed in respect to anything you may tell me from him. If, then, you order me to do anything, I will do it’. The governor’s reply was, ‘He has not commanded me to tell thee anything’. Abû Ḥassân said, ‘I mean only to obey; command me and I will perform it’. Ishâk said, ‘He has not commanded me to command thee, but only to test thee’. The examination of Abû Ḥassân ends here.

Ahmed ibn Hanbal. In the case of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Bakkâ al-Asghar suggested to Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm that he should ask him about the expression of the Korân, ‘He is the Hearing and Seeing One’, which Aḥmed had used in his confession. Aḥmed, in harmony with the principles of men of his class, answered only, ‘He is even as he has described himself’. Being further pressed to explain the words, he said, ‘I do not know; he is even as he has described himself’. He was firm in adhering to the confession that the Korân was the Word of God, and would add nothing to it by way of compromise or admission. Those who were examined subsequently all followed Aḥmed’s example, except Kutaiba, Obaidallah ibn Moḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, Ibn
'Ulayya al-Akbar, Ibn al-Bakkâ, Abd al-Mun'im ibn Idrîs ibn Bint Wahb ibn Munabbih, al-Muẓaffîr ibn Murajjâ, another man not a fākîh who happened to be present, Ibn al-Ĥmar and the 'Omarî Kâdi of al-Raḳkâ. The answers of these are not furnished us but the implication seems to be that they compromised themselves. On this occasion when Aḥmed perceived the assent of his companions as the test was applied he was intensely angry 1). Ibn al-Bakkâ al-Akbar also compromised himself, but not fully, and with better grace than some of his fellows, for he stood on the ground of the Ƙorân text in making the admissions which he made. These admissions were that the Ƙorân was, on the one hand, something ‘made’ (مَلْحَدُثُ،) and, on the other hand, something ‘newly produced’ (مَلْخَلْتُ). For the former position the text adduced was one cited by the Khalîf in arguing that the Ƙorân was created (مَلْخَلْتُ،), namely, Kor. 43 : 2, ‘Verily we have made it a Ƙorân (reading) in the Arabic language’. For the latter position the text was, likewise, one cited by the Khalîf in his argument, Kor. 21 : 2, ‘What came to them from their Lord was a newly produced religion (ذَكْر*)’. Ishâk asked Ibn al-Bakkâ if the term مَلْخَلْتُ were not the same in meaning as مَلْحَدُثُ.

1) Abû Nu‘aim, 1466.

{Aīb in Ĥnim, 2. 2-1: 2. Verily we have made it a Ƙorân (reading) in the Arabic language. For the latter position the text was, likewise, one cited by the Khalîf in his argument, Kor. 21 : 2, ‘What came to them from their Lord was a newly produced religion (ذَكْر*). Ishâk asked Ibn al-Bakkâ if the term مَلْخَلْتُ were not the same in meaning as مَلْحَدُثُ,}
and he answered that it was. ‘Then the Korân is created (مَخَلَوق)’ said the governor. ‘Nay, that I will not say. I say it is something made (مَجْعَول)’, was the answer.

After all the other cases had been disposed of Ibn al-Bakkâ al-Asghar remarked that ‘the two kâdîs’, whom we assume to be Abd al-Rahmân ibn Ishâk and Ja’far ibn Isâ, should be examined; but the governor said they held to the same profession as the Commander of the Faithful. Ibn al-Bakkâ suggested that if they were ordered to tell their opinion it could be reported to the Khalif for them. The governor, however, seems to have been determined to avoid the examination of the two kâdîs, probably, to save one who may have been his own son from exposure and humiliation. He simply said to the provoking questioner, ‘If thou wilt serve as witness 1) before them thou shalt know their opinion’.

Fourth Letter. Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm then wrote to al-Ma’mûn a detailed account of the answers received, and after a delay of nine days again summoned the doctors to hear the Khalif’s reply. The following is a version of the letter 2); —

The Commander of the Faithful has received your answer to his letter touching that which the ostentatious among the followers of the Kibla and those who seek among the people of religion a leadership for which they are not the right persons, believe about the doctrine of the Korân, in which letter of his the Commander of the Faithful commanded thee to test them, and discover their positions and put them in their right places. Thou dost mention thy summoning of Ja’far ibn Isâ and Abd al-Rahmân ibn Ishâk on the arrival of the Commander of the Faithful’s letter, together with those whom thou didst summon of those classed as faqîhs and known as doctors of Tradition and who set themselves up to give legal

---

1) ان شهدت عندهما بشهادة
2) Tabari III, 1145 ff.
decisions in Baghdâd, and [thou dost speak of] thy reading unto them all the letter of the Commander of the Faithful. [Thou hast mentioned], too, thy asking of them as to their faith touching the Korân and [thy] pointing out to them their real interest; also, their agreeing to put away anthropomorphic conceptions and their difference of view in the matter of the Korân; further, thy ordering of those who did not confess it to be created to refrain from Tradition and from giving decisions in private or in public. [Thou hast mentioned], too, thy giving orders unto al-Sindî and Abbâs the client of the Commander of the Faithful, to the same effect as thou didst give orders concerning them unto the two kâdîs, even the same which the Commander of the Faithful prescribed to thee, namely, the testing of the statutory witnesses who are in their courts. Again, [thou hast mentioned] the sending abroad of letters unto the kâdîs in the several parts of thy province that they should come to thee, so that thou mightest proceed to test them according to that which the Commander of the Faithful has defined, whilst thou hast put down at the end of the letter the names of those who were present and their views. Now, the Commander of the Faithful understands what thou hast reported, and the Commander of the Faithful praises God much, even as he is the One to whom such belongs; and he asks him to bless his Servant and his Messenger, Moḥammed, and he prays God to help him to obey him, [sc. God] and to give him [sc. the Khalif], by his grace, effectual aid in his good purpose. The Commander of the Faithful has also thought over what thou hast written relating to the names of those whom thou hast asked about the Korân, and what each of them answered thee touching it, and what thou hast explained as his view. As for what the deluded Bishr ibn al-Walîd says about putting away anthropomorphic conceptions, and that from which he keeps himself back in the matter of the Korân's being created, while he lays claim to leave off speaking on that subject as having had an engagement [to that effect] with the Commander of the Faithful,
Bishr has lied about that, and has acted as an unbeliever, speaking that which is to be refused credit and false; for there has not passed a compact or exchange of opinion in respect to this or any other matter between the Commander of the Faithful and himself, more than that the Commander of the Faithful told him of his belief in the doctrine of the Ikhlâṣ [i.e. the belief in the unity of God] and in that of the creation of the Korân. Call him before thee; tell him what the Commander of the Faithful has told thee in the matter; cite him to answer about the Korân and ask him to recant; for the Commander of the Faithful thinks that thou shouldst ask to recant one who professes his view, seeing that such a view is unmixed infidelity and sheer idolatry in the mind of the Commander of the Faithful. Should he repent, then, publish it and let him alone; but, should he be obstinate in his idolatry and refuse in his infidelity and heterodoxy to confess that the Korân is created, then behead him and send his head to the Commander of the Faithful. In the same way, also, deal with Ibrâhîm ibn al-Mahdî. Test him as thou hast tested Bishr, for he professes his view and reports about him have reached the Commander of the Faithful; and, if he say that the Korân is created, then publish it and make it known; but, if not, behead him and send his head to the Commander of the Faithful 1). As for 'Alî ibn Abî Muḥātîl, say to him, “Art thou not the man who said to the Commander of the Faithful, ‘Thou art the one to declare what is lawful and unlawful’? and who told him what thou didst tell him?” the recollection of which cannot yet have left him [sc. 'Alî]. And as for al-Dhayyâl ibn al-Haitham, tell him that what should occupy his mind is the corn which he formerly stole in al-Anbâr, when he administered the government in the city of the Commander of the Faithful, Abu’l-Abbâs2); and that, if he were a follower in the footsteps of his forefathers, and went in their ways only, and

pushed on in their path, surely he would not go off into idolatry after having believed. As for Aḥmed ibn Yazīd, known as Abūl-ʿAwwām, and his saying that he cannot well answer about the Korān, tell him that he is a child in his understanding, though not in his years,—an ignoramus; and that, if he do not see his way clear to answer he shall see his way clear to answer when he is disciplined, but should he not do it then, the sword will follow. As for Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal and that which thou hast written about him, tell him that the Commander of the Faithful understands the import of that view and the manner of his conduct in it; and, from what he knows, he infers his ignorance and the weakness of his intellect. As for al-Faḍl ibn Ghānim, tell him that what he did in Egypt, and the riches which he acquired in less than a year are not hidden from the Commander of the Faithful, nor what passed in legal strife between him and al-Muṭṭalib ibn Abdallah about that; for a man who did as he did, and who has a greedy desire for dinārs and dirhems as he has, can be believed to barter his faith out of desire for money, and because he prefers his present advantage to everything else. [Remind him] that he, besides, is the one who said to ʿAlī ibn Hishām what he did say, and opposed him in that in which he did oppose him. And what was it that caused his change of opinion and brought him over to another? And as for al-Ziyādī, tell him that he is calling himself a client of the first false pretender in Islām in whose case the ordinance of the Messenger of God was infringed. It is in harmony with his character that he should go in the way he goes. (But Abū Ḥassān denied that he was a client of Ziyād or of anyone else, adding that he had the name of Ziyād [ibn abīhi] for some other reason) ¹). As for Abū Naṣr al-Tammār, the Commander of the Faithful compares the insignificance of his understanding with the insignificance of his business [date-merchant]. And as for al-Faḍl ibn al-

¹) This parenthesis represents a gloss in Ṭabarī III, 389, ll. 6—8, (line 7 read ُ想知道 for ُ想知道).
Farrukhân, tell him that by the doctrine which he professes respecting the Korân he is trying to keep the deposits which Abd al-Rahmân ibn Ishâk and others entrusted to him, lying in wait for such as will ask him to undertake trusts, and hoping to increase that which has come into his hand; for which there is no recovery from him, because of the long duration of the compact and the length of time of its existence. But say to Abd al-Rahmân ibn Ishâk, ‘May God not reward thee with good for thy giving of power to the like of this man and thy putting of confidence in him, seeing that he is devoted to idolatry and disjoined from belief in God’s unity!’ And as for Moḥammed ibn Ḥâtim, and Ibn Nūḥ, and him who is known as Abû Maʾmar, tell them that they are too much taken up with the devouring of usury to grasp properly the doctrine of the divine unity, and that, if the Commander of the Faithful had sought legal justification to attack them for the sake of God, and make a crusade against them on the sole ground of their practice of usury and that which the Korân has revealed concerning such as they, he surely might have found it lawful; how will it be, then, now that they have joined idolatry to their practice of usury, and have become like the Christians? And as for Aḥmed ibn Shujâʾ, tell him that not long ago thou wast with him, and thou didst extort from him that which he confiscated of the riches belonging to ʿAlî ibn Hîshâm; and [tell him] that his religion is found in dinârs and dirhems. And as for Saʿdawaih al-Wâsiṭî, say to him, ‘May God make abominable the man whose ostentatious preparing of himself for a ‘colloquium doctum’ on Tradition, while hoping to gain honour by that and desiring to be a leader in it, carries him so far that he wishes for the coming of the Mîḥna, and thinks to ingratiate himself with me by it; let him be tried; [if he yield] he may still teach Tradition. And as for him who is known as Sajjâda and his denying that he heard from those traditionists and faḳîhs with whom he studied the doctrine that the Korân is created, tell him that in his preparing of date-stones and his rubbing in order to improve
his sajjāda ¹), and likewise in his care for the deposits which ʿAlī ibn Yahya and others left in trust with him lies that which occupies his attention so that he forgets the doctrine of the divine unity and that which makes him unmindful [of it]. Then ask him about what Yūsuf ibn Abī Yūsuf and Mohammed ibn al-Ḥasan used to say, if he have seen them and studied with them. As for al-Ḵawārīrī, in what has been made known of his doings, in his receiving of gifts and bribes, lies that which sets in a clear light his real opinions, the evil of his conduct and the weakness of his understanding and his religion. It has also reached the Commander of the Faithful that he has taken upon himself the [settlement of] questions for Jaʿfar ibn ʿĪsā al-Ḥasanī; so, order Jaʿfar ibn ʿĪsā to give him up, and to abandon reliance upon him and acquiescence in what he says. And as for Yahya ibn Abd al-Raḥmān al-ʿOmarī, if he were of the descendants of ʿOmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, it is well known what he had would answer. And as for Mohammed ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ʿĀsim, if he were an imitator of his ancestors, he ²) Houtd not profess that profession which has been related of him ³). He is yet a child and needs to be taught. Now, the Commander of the Faithful is sending to thee also, him who is known as Abū Mushir ⁴), after that the Commander of the Faithful has cited him to answer in his testing about the Korān; but he mumbled about it and stammered over it, until the Commander of the Faithful ordered the sword to be brought for him, when he confessed in the manner of one worthy to be blamed. Now, cite him to answer about his confession; and, if he stand fast in it, then, make it known and publish it. But those who will not give up their idolatry, and profess that the Korān is created, of those whom thou hast named in thy letter to the Commander of the

1) Callous patch of skin on the forehead produced, when genuine, by oft-repeated religious prostrations; when an imposture, by rubbing the skin.

2) Ṭabarī, III, 149. read حکم.

3) d. 218 A. H. Dhahabī Tabakāt 7, N. 62.
Faithful and whom the Commander of the Faithful has mentioned or refrained from mentioning to thee in this letter of his, except Bishr ibn al-Walid and Ibrāhīm ibn al-Mahdī, send them all in bonds to the camp of the Commander of the Faithful in charge of a watch and guards for their journey, until they bring them to the camp of the Commander of the Faithful and deliver them up to those to whom the delivery has been ordered 1) to be made, so that the Commander of the Faithful may cite them to answer; and, then, if they do not give up their view and recant, he will bring them all to the sword. The Commander of the Faithful sends this letter by extra post [courier's letterbag] instead of waiting till all the letters have been gathered for the post, seeking to advance in the favor of God by the decree he has issued and hoping to attain his purpose, and to gain the ample reward of God thereby. So, give effect to the order of the Commander of the Faithful that comes to thee, and hasten to answer by extra pi'at [v. above] about that which thou hast done, not waiting, he the other letter-bags, so that thou mayest tell the Commander of the Faithful of what they will do.

Recantation of the Doctors.  

On this letter being read all of those mentioned in it recanted, with the exception of Aḥmed ibn Hanbal, Sajjāda, al-Ḵawārīrī and Moḥammed ibn Nūḥ al-Maḍrūb. These four were then cast into prison in chains and next day were again brought before the governor and given a chance to recant. Of this chance Sajjāda availed himself and was set free 2). The following day, also, they were brought from the prison and given another opportunity to yield, which Obaidallah ibn ʿOmar al-Ḵawārīrī embraced and received his liberty. Thus Aḥmed and Moḥammed ibn Nūḥ alone of those cited to appear remained firm in their faith; the others Aḥmed always excused on the ground of the Takīa

1) Variant یویرن adopted in the translation.  
2) Abu’l-Mah. 1, 738, says Sajjāda ‘stood firm in the Sunna’.
as supported by Korân, 16. 108, ‘Except him who is forced, though he have no pleasure in it, while his heart rests in the faith ¹).

and are supported by Korân, 16. 108, ‘Except him who is forced, though he have no pleasure in it, while his heart rests in the faith ¹).

Ishâk the governor now wrote a letter giving the results of his examination of the doctors ²). Shortly after this, al-Ma’mûn ordered Ishâk ibn Ibrahim to send Ahmed ibn Hanbal and Mohammed ibn Nûh in chains to him to Tarsus. On their journey when they were in the neighbourhood of al-Anbâr Abû Ja’far al-Anbârî crossed the Euphrates to see Ahmed in the khan where he was lodged, and reminded him of his responsibility as the leader to whom all men looked for an example. If he answered favorably, they, too, would assent to the doctrine; but should he refuse to assent, a great many, if not all, would be held back from recantation. He told him, besides, to remember that death would come to him in the natural course of things, and exhorted him, in view of what he had said, to maintain the integrity of his faith ³).

1) Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 69 and note; al-Makrîzî, p. 4, ³.)

2) al-Makrîzî, p. 4, ³.)

3) al-Makrîzî, p. 4, ³.)
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4) al-Makrîzî, p. 4, ³.)
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7) al-Makrîzî, p. 4, ³.)

8) al-Makrîzî, p. 4, ³.)

9) al-Makrîzî, p. 4, ³.)
In pursuance of the Khalif’s order the two unyielding theologians were borne on camels from Baghdâd, Ahmed’s companion in the mahmal being a man called Ahmed ibn Ghassân. As they were on the way Ahmed told his companion that he had a firm conviction that the messenger of al-Ma’mûn, Rajâ al-Ḥiḍârî, would meet them that night; and, in fact, Rajâ al-Ḥiḍârî did meet them and the prisoners were transferred to his care, but he was not allowed to proceed far with his charge before the news of the Khalif’s death relieved him of the obligation to bring the men to Tarsus. When he had conducted them as far as Adhana, and was just setting out with them at night, a man met them in the gate of the town with news that al-Ma’mûn had just died at the river Bodhandhûn [Ποδανθόν] in Asia Minor, after leaving as a last charge to his successor to prosecute vigorously the Miḥna 1).

1) Abû Nu’aim, 147 a, 147 b, (al-Subkî, p. 139, cf. al-Makrizî, p. 4 infra, a fuller account),
In the meantime, al-Ma’mūn had received a word that those who had recanted had done so claiming the Takia as a justification, in accordance with the dispensation granted in the Korân to such as are forced to confess a false faith, while their hearts continue to hold fast to the true. This, of course, meant that what the Khalif believed and had pronounced to them was false, a conclusion with which he was by no means satisfied, and, therefore, wrote again to Ishâk, [Ahmed had previously prayed for a Divine interposition to demonstrate that he was in the right way].

Al-Ma’mûn rejects the Plea of Taﬁa Offered by the Doctors.

بِضَيَاقَةٍ وَضَحَّاءٍ ۚ وَاۡذَا رَجَّهَا ٱلْحَصَصَارِي ۡقَدْ أَقِبَلْ عَلَىٰ نَا فَقَلَ سَمِدَت يَبِابَا ٱبْنُ ٱللهِ ٱلْقُرآنِ كَلَّامُ ٱللَّهِ ۡغَيْرُ خَلْقُ ۚ قَدْ مَاتَ وَلَّٰهُ إِمَّٰرُ ٱلسُّهُمَمَهُ،

فَلَمَّا صَرَّنَآ إِلَى ٱلْمَنْتَٰدَةِ وَرَحَلَنَا مِنْهَا وَذَلِكَ فِي حِجَّةِ ٱلْلِّيْلِ فَتَّجَعَ لَنَا بِلُبُّهَا فَلْقِنَا رَجُلٌ وَخُصِّيَ خَارِجُونَ مِنَ الْبَابِ وَهُوَ دَاخِلُ فَقَلَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ مَرَأَةٌ قَدْ مَاتَ الْرَّجُلُ قَالَ إِبِى وَكَنَّى أَنَى امْعَنُ امْعَنُ أَنْ لاَ أَرَاهُ قَالَ إِبِى الْفَضْلُ صَالِحُ فُسَادُ إِبِى وَحَمَّدَ بِنْ نَجَى ٱلَّذِينَ وَقَدْ عَلَى ٱلنَّاسِ وَجَّهَتْ نَعْمَى ٱلْمَأُمِّ مُنَّا ۚ فَخَلَقَ فَرِّيَّةَ فِي إِقْبَالِهِمْ إِلَى ٱلْسَّرِّقَةِ وَأَخْرِجَهَا مِنَ الْرَّقَةِ فِي سَفِينَةٍ مَعَ قَمَّةٍ مُّكَبِّسِينَ فَلَمَّا صَرَّنَا بَعَانَاتٍ توُقِّى مَاكَبَّسِينَ بِنْ نَجَى رَجُلُ ٱللهِ وَتَقَدَّمَ إِلَى فِلْسَلِّي عَلَىٰ هُمْ صَرَّنَآ إِلَىٰ إِبِى الْبَغْدَادِ وَهُوَ مَقْبُولُ فِي ٱلسَّلِّي بِالْبَيْسِرِيَّةَ إِبِى مُنَّا كَثِيرُ ٱلْبَيْسِ في دَارِ اكْتُرِبُتِ يَدُلُّ عَلَى ٍذَمَةَ ۖ ثُمَّ نَقَلَ بَعْدَ ذَٰلِكَ إِلَى حَبْسِ ٱلْمَعَامِلَةِ فِي دَرِّ ٱلْمُسْلِلِي فِي ٱلسَّلِّي مِنْذَ اخْتُدِى وَحَمَّلَ إِلَىٰ إِنْ ضَرَّبْنَ وَخَلَى ٱنْٰثَى ثَقَاةَ وَعَشْرِينَ شَهَرًا قَالَ الْقُلمَنَآ إِلَىٰ إِبِىٰ بُيُوْرَٰنَ يَأْكُلُ لَهُُّ فيُرْقَ أَمَّنَآ بَرَأَا فِيْذِهِبَ بِهِ ٱلْيَدَ إِلَى السَّجِّيَّينَ

ibn Ibrāhīm to tell Bishr ibn al-Walīd and the others who had pleaded that their case was similar to that of ʿAmmār ibn Yāsir contemplated in the Korān’s dispensation to recusants, that there was no similarity between the cases. He had openly professed a false religion, while at heart a Muslim; they had openly professed the truth while in their hearts believing what was false. To settle matters they must all be sent to Tarsus, there to await such time as the Khalīf should leave Asia Minor. The following men were therefore sent after Aḥmed and his company: Bishr ibn al-Walīd, al-Faḍl ibn Ghānim, ʿAlī ibn Abī Muḥṭārī, al-Dhayyāl ibn al-Hai-tham, Yaḥya ibn Abd al-Raḥmān al-ʿOmarī, ʿAlī ibn al-Jaʿd, Abuʾl-ʿAwwām, Sajjāda, al-Ḵawārīrī, Ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn ʿĀṣim, Išḥāk ibn Abī Isrāʾīl, al-Naḍr ibn Shumail, Abū Naṣr al-Tammār, Saʿdawāyah al-Wāṣīṭī, Moḥammad ibn Ḥātim ibn Maimūn, Abū Maʿmar, Ibn al-Harsh, Ibn al-Farrukhān, Aḥmed ibn Shujāʿ and Abū Hārūn ibn al-Bakkā. They received the news of the Khalīf’s death when they arrived at al-Raḵḵa, and, on the order of ʿAnbasa ibn Išḥāk, the Wāli of the place, were detained there until they were sent back to Baγhdād in charge of the same messenger as had brought them thence. On arriving at Baghbād, the governor Išḥāk ordered them to keep to their dwellings 1), but afterwards relaxed his severity toward them and allowed them to go abroad. Some of those who had been sent, however, had the temerity to leave al-Raḵḵa and come to Baγhdād without having obtained permission. As might have been expected, they suffered for their boldness when they reached the latter place, for Išḥāk punished them. Those who thus procured trouble to themselves were Bishr ibn al-Walīd, al-Dhayyāl, Abuʾl-ʿAwwām and ʿAlī ibn Abī Muḥṭārī.

---

To return to Ahmed and his companion Mohammed ibn Nūḥ. These two were now sent back to al-Raḳḳa where they, also, remained in prison until the oath of allegiance was taken to the Khalif al-Muʿtaṣim. After this event, they were taken in a boat from al-Raḳḳa to ʿĀnāt, at which place Mohammed ibn Nūḥ died, and Ahmed, after performing the offices of the dead over his friend, was brought back in bonds to Baghdād 1). At first, he was imprisoned, as it appears, in the street al-Yāṣirīya for some days. From there he was transferred to the Dār al-Sharshir near to the Dār ʿUmāra and lodged in a stable belonging to Mohammed ibn Ibrāhīm (brother of Išḥāḳ) which had been rented as a place of detention. It was very small and his stay there was short. He took sick in Ramadān, and was then transferred to the common prison in the Darb al-Mausiliya 2).

Among those who stood faithful in the inquisition during

---

1) See preceding note, p. 82, i. Houtsma (De Strijd etc. 106) says that Mohammed ibn Nūḥ, as well as Ahmed ibn Hanbal, was scourged by al-Muʿtaṣim, but he, in fact, never appeared before that Khalif.

2) al-Subkī, p. 139, says that Mohammed ibn Nūḥ, as well as Ahmed ibn Hanbal, was scourged by al-Muʿtaṣim, but he, in fact, never appeared before that Khalif.
the Khalifate of al-Ma’mûn, but whose name has not yet appeared, was ʿAffân ibn Muslim Abû Othmân, whom the Khalif and Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm his lieutenant in Irâk, in penalty for his refusal to obey the order to recant, deprived of the stipend which each of them granted to him. When asked what he had to say in reply to the demand made on him, he answered by reciting Sura 112, and enquiring whether that were created. His people were very angry with him for leaving them without means of support, for he had about 40 persons dependent on him. But the very day his stipend was cut off, a stranger brought to him a purse of 1000 dirhems (his stipend from al-Ma’mûn had been 500 per month), and promised him that he should receive the same amount each month from the same source. He died in Baghdâd in 220 A. H. During his life he was one of the leading men in Baghdâd and a friend of Ahmed’s who had much influence with him 1). Another to whom the Miḥna was applied in

1) al-Mâkrizi, p. 13,
Abū Nu‘aim al- this Khalifate, and who did not yield was Faḍl ibn Dukain.

When al-Ma‘mūn’s letter came to Kūfa he was told of its purport and exclaimed, ‘It means only beating with whips’; and, then, taking hold of a button of his coat, he said, ‘to me my head is of less consequence than that’. Of his trial we have no particulars, but he, at all events, does not appear to have died a violent death. He died in 219 A. H. 1).

Ali ibn al-Madīnī is classed with those who sur-
renders their faith at the time of the Miḥna, ap-
parently about the beginning of its course. He bitterly re-
gretted his weakness, however, and was firmly reestablished
in the orthodox faith before his death in 234 A. H. 2).

1) al-Makrizi, p. 13.

2) al-Subki, p. 185.

وكان على المدينين ممن أجاب إلى يقول بخلاف، 185

القرآن في المكّة فنقم ذلك عليه وزيد عليه في القول والأشياء

اعتنى أنه أنهما [إنها] [Cod.]

فقال في أسقف أن أمير الموميين اسم ان لم تجبه بقطع عنك ما
بجى عليك وأن قطع عنك أمير الموميين قطعنا عنك خصاً أيضاً
فقلت ل قل الله تعالى وف أليسية رفعكما و ما توعدون [22.
فسكت عن أسقف وانصرفت فسر ابو عبد الله وجيبي ومس كان
حاتمراً فلما رجع إلى دارة عذبه أعلى بيته وكان اربعين نفساً فبعد
قليل دين عليه بالبلان فدخل ومعه كيس فيه الف مرم فقال
بما عشته تثبت الله كما ثبت الدين وهذا لك في كل شهر
وقال الامام أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة لما جاءت المتكنة
إلى الكوفة قلل ل امسد بن ييئس البقر ابا نعيم فقل له فلقيته فقلت
له فيلم انا لى صرف الاسباط [so Cod.] ثم اخذ زربته وقال راسي
اهمه على من هذا

Abū Nu‘aim al-Faḍl ibn Dukain was a Shyite according
to Shahrastānī, Haarbrücker’s transl’ I, 218.
In the common prison Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal was confined for a considerable time, the whole period, from the time of his arrest until he was set free after being scourged by al-Muʿtaṣim, being twenty-eight months. While in the prison he used to lead the prayers with the inmates, and engaged in the study of books which were provided for him by his friends. His good friend Būrān did him the kindness to send him daily cold water, by means of a boat.

During the first part of his imprisonment, his uncle Ishāk ibn Ḥanbal spoke to the officials and attachés of the governor seeking to secure a release of his nephew from prison; but, failing to obtain any satisfaction, he appealed to Ishāk ibn Ibrāhīm in person. With a view to securing from Aḥmed a modification of his position, Ishāk then sent his chamberlain to the prison with Aḥmed’s uncle, ordering him to report whatever might pass between them. When they came to the prison, Ishāk ibn Ḥanbal urged his nephew to yield an assent to the doctrine which was being pressed upon him. He reminded him that his companions, with much less reason, had recanted and that he had justified them in doing so on the ground of the Taḥā. Why then should he not recant? After much fruitless disputation, they made up their minds to leave him in prison; and he went on to say that imprisonment was a matter of very little concern to him — a prison or his own house it was all the same. To be slain with the sword, too, was not a matter which caused him great anxiety; the one thing that he feared was to be scourged. If that should befall him, he could not answer for his holding out against it. One of the prisoners then reminded him that in the case of scourging he need have no fear, for after two strokes of the whip, he would never know where

وَقَالَ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُشَامُ بْنُ أَبِي شُيَبَةَ سَمَعتُ عَلَى الْمُدِينِي يُقُولُ قَبْلُ مَوْتِهِ بِشَهِيْدِيْنَ الْقُرَانِ كَلَامُ اللَّهِ غَيْرُ مُخْلُوقٍ وَمِنْ قَالَ مُخْلُوقٌ فَهُوَ كَافِرٌ
any that might follow would strike him. With this assurance the remaining anxiety of Ahmmed was completely dispelled.

Another Citation before
Ishāk ibn Ibrahim.

On the 17th of Ramadān, 219 A. H., that is, fourteen months from the time that he was stopped when on his way to al-Maʿmūn, he was brought from the common prison to the house of Ishāk ibn Ibrahim, being bound with a single chain on his feet. While he was confined in the house of Ishāk ibn Ibrahim, the latter sent

1) al-Maqrīzī, p. 5.
to him every day two men to reason with him; their names were, respectively, Aḥmed ibn Rabāḥ and Abū Shuaib al-Hajjām. These two men used to argue with him, and, finding him immovable, as they turned to go away each day they called for an extra chain to be placed upon his feet, until, finally, there were four chains upon them. One of the discussions which Aḥmed had was about the Knowledge of God. He asked one of the two inquisitors for his opinion on the subject, and the man said that the Knowledge of God was created. On hearing this Aḥmed called him an infidel, and, though reminded that he was casting insult upon the messenger of the Khalif, he refused to withdraw the charge. Aḥmed’s reasoning was that the names of God as symbols of his attributes were in the Ḍorān; that the Ḍorān was part of the Knowledge of God, which is one of his attributes; that, therefore, he who pretended that the Ḍorān was created had denied God, and, also, that he who pretended that the names of God were created had denied God. Here the argument seems to be: The names of God are not created; but the names of God form some part of the Ḍorān; therefore, it follows that some part of the Ḍorān, at least, is not created.

On the fourth night after he had been removed to the house of Ishāk ibn Ibrāhīm, the messenger Muṭaṣīm. of the Khalīf al-Muṭaṣīm, Bughā al-Ḳabīr, arrived after the last prayer, bringing the command of the Khalīf to Ishāk to send Aḥmed to him. When Aḥmed was brought in to Ishāk before going to al-Muṭaṣīm, the governor addressed him, reminding him that it was his life which was at stake, and that the Khalīf had sworn that he would not kill him with the sword, but would scourge him stroke after stroke, and would throw him into a place where no light would ever reach him. Then, the governor proceeded to argue with him regarding the Ḍorān, quoting the text, ‘Verily, we have made it a Ḍorān (reading) in the Arabic tongue’, and he asked him, if there could be anything made unless it were created. Aḥmed answered with
another text. ‘He made them like grass to be eaten’, and asked the governor, if he would conclude from such a text anything about their being created. In this case the argument turns upon the fact that the word َحَجَّلَ does not, necessarily, include the meaning of حُلِّفَ.

Preparations were then made for bringing Ahmed to al-Mu'tasim. The interest of Bugha, the messenger of the Khalif, in his prisoner and his cause was no very intelligent interest. He inquired of Ishak ibn Ibrâhîm’s messenger what Ahmed was wanted for, and, on learning, he declared that he knew nothing about such things; that the limits of his faith as a Muslim did not extend beyond the declaration that ‘there is no God but Allah, that Mohammed is the Apostle of God, and that the Commander of the Faithful is of the relationship of the Prophet of God’. At the gate of the royal park they disembarked after a short trip on the Tigris. Ahmed was taken out of the boat and put upon a beast, from which he was in danger of falling off, owing to his helplessness because of the weight of his chains. He was brought under these circumstances into the palace precincts ¹ and made to alight at a house in a room of which he was confined, without any lamp to enable him to see at night ². During the night

¹) al-Mu'tasim’s palace was in the eastern part of Baghdad (vid. Ja‘qûbî, Bibl. Geogr. VII, 100, 17). The general prison, if in the Darb al-Mufadjal (but v. p. 85, note 2), was in the same quarter and Ishâk the governor’s residence may not have been at any great distance from this general prison. In any case it is clear that the trial and scourging took place in Baghdad, where Ahmed was well-known and had many admirers. Hence the popular demonstration against the Khalif when Ahmed was flogged.

²) Abû Nu‘aim, 1476 f. حديثنا محمد بن جعفر وعلى بن أحمد ولحسن بن محمد قالوا كان محمد بن اسماعيل كنا أبو الفضل صالح ابن أحمد بن حنبل قال ابي رقأ الله لما كان في شهر رمضان ليلة سبع عشرة خلت منه حُسْوَت من الساكين إلى دار إسحق.
he is said to have had a vision of Ḥalîm ibn Asim, and in-

ابن ابرعيم وانا مقيّد بقيد واحد يَوْجَهُ الى في كل يوم، رجلان
سماعاً إيه قلاب أبو الفضل وما مهد بين رياح وابو شبيب اللحاج
[الحاج، بالحاج] بكمالهانى و_indexes_4
الانصرف تبقي فقدت به فمكتب على هذه رسالة ثلاثية أيام
وصار في رجلين ارختي أبهايا قلاب في [قلقلي.
[COD. al-Makrizi
له يا كافر كفرت فقال له الرسول الذي كان يُحضر معهم من قبل
ابي سهانة هذا رسول امهمة أمان قال فقتله له ان هذا قد
كفر وكان صاحبه الذي يتجلى به خارجًا فلما دخل قال له ان
عذًا زعم ان علم الله مخالوق فنسل الرسول كمالهانى عليه ما قال ثم
انصراً قال ابى راسم الله في القرآن، دان الرسول من علم الله فقير
ان القرآن مخالوق فهو كافر ومن زعم ان اسماء الله مخلوقة فقد كفر
قل الله رحمه الله فلا كاشم الكبلة [لبيلة
[COD. الرابعة، بعد العشيرة
الاخرة ووجه المعتمم ببغاء الى اشلاق بن افعيم بجرة بالحمل فادخلت
على اشلاق قلقاً له يا ابكار انها وأمها نقبن أنك قد حلف
لا يقتلك بالسيف وان يضربه ضرباً بعد ضرب وان يلبكي في
وضع لا ترى فيه الشمس البيس قد قال الله تعالى: انا جعلت تم تراني
[2 43-43] القايكين جعلونلا وهو مخلوق قال ابن قتلة له قد
قال الله فاجعلهم كجعف مساكم [5 105.
[COD. انقلتالي، فقل انلهوا
به قل لابي رخى الله فانلفت الى الشاطىء دقلة وأحترم الى الوضع
المعرف بباب البستان ومقيل بعضاً الكبير ورسول من قبل اشلاق قال
قلب بغا لما حمله الماء قالي بالفارسية، ما ترى مون من هذا الرجل قال
interpreted it as being of good omen, assuring him of exaltation (علو) and protection from God (العمة).

The next morning he was led to the palace in his chains and brought before the Khalif. On this occasion, there were present with the Khalif Ahmed ibn Abī Dowād and his companions. It is said that

1) al-Maqrizi, p. 4. With a few exceptions which are indicated, the narrative is now drawn from this source until we reach p. 111; cf. Abu'l-Feda Annales II, 168. There is a short and mutilated account of the proceedings before al-Mutašim in al-Ja'fūbi II, 576, 577.

2) Abū Nu'aim, 148 ff. The few exceptions which are indicated, the narrative is now drawn from this source until we reach p. 111; cf. Abu'l-Feda Annales II, 168. There is a short and mutilated account of the proceedings before al-Mutašim in al-Ja'fūbi II, 576, 577.
when al-Mu'tasim first saw Ahmed, he said to those about
him reproachfully, 'Did you not pretend that this was a
الرجل [الرجل]

Cod. ١٠٩

but if we read the correction is obviously necessary; i. e. ‘pointing to the man in whose dwelling I had been lodged’.
فيقولون يا أمير الموميئين إذا توجّهت لحاجة علمنا وقبب وإذا كلما نبتثت أيّة دأرًا ما عهدنا تقول فيقول نظرو فتقول يا أحمد في عليكم شفيع فسأل رجل منهم أراك تتذكر الحديث وتناوله فقلت له فيما تقول في قول الله تعالى: "يوصيكم الله في أولادكم للذّكر مثل حَظ الآثريَّين" [12] فقل: خص الله بها الموميئين قال فقلت له ما تقول أن كان أنا أو عبدًا أو يهودًا أو نصرانيًا فسكت قال إنما احتاجاجت عليه بهذا لاتم كانوا يحتاجون على بطاقة القرآن ولقوله أراك تتذكر الحديث وكان إذا انقطع الرجل اعتراض ابن اب دواد يبول والله يا أمير الموميئين لثني اجابه ثم أحب إليه من مائة ألف دينار ومناة ألف دينار وفِي عدُّ ما شاء الله اليد من ذلك ثم أمَّم بعد ذلك بالقيم وخلة في واد عيد الرحمن في.getIntูกو ببيننا [فينبا كلام كبير وفُجِّر خلال ذلك يقول تدعوا اسجد بن اب دواد فقول نذلك الديك فخَّوَّجه فتَكَّمل قَلَمًا طال بنا المسجد قام ورُدِّت إلى الموضوع الذي كنت فيه وقضَّان الرجلان اللذان كنا عدوى بالأمس فعلًا يتكاثمان فدار ببيننا كلام كبير فلما كان وقت الافطار جرى بطول على تَحْكَم مما ألق به في أول الليلة فاتخروا وتعلَّمت وجعلت رسِّهُ فتلقَّاه سبب بن عمار فيمصي الده فيئيتي [بيئيتي] دِراسة على نحو ما كان في أول ليلة فجاء ابن اب دواد فقال له إنه قد حلف أن يصبر صبرًا بعد صبر وان يَاكُبِسْك في موضع لا ترى فيها الشمس فقلت له فأنا أصنع حتى إذا كاتب أن أصحاب قلبت تَلَحُّقَت أن يحدث في هذا اليوم ـ امِّي شيء وفقد كانت أخرجت تَكِيى من سَأَرَبَّيْي فشددت بـ الانتباه اجعلها بها إذا توجّهت السيدة فقلت لبعض من كان معًا.
الموكل بي أريد لي خيباطاً خبيط فشذدت بها الاقتتالfadعبت
النكة في سراويلي وليستها كراغية إن يحدث شيء من أمرى فاتىروى
فلما كان في اليوم الثالث أدخلت عليه وليوم حصير فجعلت أدخلى
من دار الى دار وليوم معلم السيف وقى معلم السباط وغير ذلك من
السي، والسلاج وقد حشيت الدار بالحِجْنَد وشد يكن في اليومين
الماضيين كبير احد من ولاة حتى إذا صرت اليه قال ناظروه وكلموم
فعادوا مبكر مناظرتهم فدار بيننا وبين كلم كثيئ حتى إذا
كان في الوقت الذي كان يخلو بي فيه ناحيش ثم اجتمعوا
وشارموه ثم ذكاك ودعائنا فلا بي وعبد الربك فقال ل ويجك يا
اهدا أنا والله عليك شفيفق واحشي لأشفيك مثل شفقتى على
هؤلاء أمين فاقنطت يا أمير المؤمنين أعطني شيئا من كتاب الله
او سنة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فلمما فالمكلما وطال المجلس قال
عليك لعنة الله لقد كنت طمعت فيك خدورة خضاره ثيابه اسکبهم
قال فاحذت قسمحت ثم خلطت ثم قال العقابيين [قال ل العقاريين
والسباط فجىء بعثماميين جبال، بالعيابيين] والسياط فقال ان وجد كان
صار الى شعرتان من شعر النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم فاصرتهما في
كم فصبت فنظر اساتط ببتهب ارضاً للسمى في كم قميصي فوجه
قالت شعر من

[Cod. Margin, variant]

إلى ما هذا مصرور في كم قميصك [كمك]
شعر النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم وسعى بعض القوم الى القميص ليبصره
في وقت ما اصط في الوعابيين فقال لم لا تخروه انرووه عنده قال ان
ظنت أن هذه درى على القميص الأحق لسبب الشعر الذي كان فيه
في صبرت بين الوعابيين وشذت يدي وجيئ بكرسي قوطن له وابن
ب دواء قائم على رأسه والناس اجمعون قيام مستحسح حرار فقل ل

انسان مَمَّن شَذَّناكُ حَذُّ نَابِيِّ الإِخْلَاصِيَّينَ يِبَدِّكْ وَشُدُّهُ عَلَيْهِمَا فَلَمْ
َأَقْهَنُ مَا قَالَ تَلَّمْ تَلَّمْ قَالَ لَهُمْ يِلَّهُمْ تَلَّمْ تَلَّمْ قَالَ لَهُمْ
َأَبَوِ الْفَصِّل وَلَمْ يَبْلَغْ إِبْنِهِ الْلَّهُ يَتَوَجَّعُ مِنْهُمَا فِي الرُّسُقِ إِلَّا أن
َتَوَفَّ قَالَ تَلَّمْ لِلْجَلَّالِيَّنِ تَقَدَّمْوا فَنَظَرْتُ إِلَى السَّيَّاقِ فَقَالَ إِنَّهُ يَتَوَجَّعُ قَالَ تَلَّمْ
َقَالَ تَقَدَّمْوا فَقَالَ لَهُمْ إِنَّهُمَا أَوْجَعُ قَطْعَ الْلَّهُ يَدَكَ تَقَدَّمْ فَضَرَبَ
َسُوْطَيْنِ تُرْتَنَّى قَالَ تَلَّمْ لَهُمْ جَزَاءُ سُوْطَيْنِ تُرْتَنَّى قَالَ تَلَّمْ
َسُوْطَيْنِ تُرْتَنَّى فَلَمْ يَبْلَغْ وَحَدًا بَعْدِ وَحَدٍ فِيْضِرْنِينَ سُوْطَيْنِ
َمَن تَنَانَى قَالَ تَلَّمْ حَتَّى يَبْلَغْ وَحَدًا قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا. كُلُّهُمَا قَالَ تَلَّمْ
َتَقَنُّ نَفْسَكَ وَيُنَانِى اجْتَنِبْ أَطْلِقْ عَنَّكَ بِيْهَدٍ قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا
َيَقُولُ لِي وَيَكُّهَلْ كَأَنْهَا رَاسَكَ قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا أَنْ تَقَنُّ نَفْسَكَ وَيُنَانِى
ِبِيْهَدٍ قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا. كُلُّهُمَا قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا. كُلُّهُمَا قَالَ تَلَّمْ
َخُذْ نَابِيِّ الإِخْلَاصِيَّينَ بِيْدَكْ وَشُدُّهُ عَلَيْهِمَا فَلَمْ
َأَقْهَنُ مَا قَالَ تَلَّمْ تَلَّمْ قَالَ لَهُمْ يِلَّهُمْ تَلَّمْ تَلَّمْ قَالَ لَهُمْ
َأَبَوِ الْفَصِّل وَلَمْ يَبْلَغْ إِبْنِهِ الْلَّهُ يَتَوَجَّعُ مِنْهُمَا فِي الرُّسُقِ إِلَّا أن
َتَوَفَّ قَالَ تَلَّمْ لِلْجَلَّالِيَّنِ تَقَدَّمْوا فَنَظَرْتُ إِلَى السَّيَّاقِ فَقَالَ إِنَّهُ يَتَوَجَّعُ قَالَ تَلَّمْ
َقَالَ تَقَدَّمْوا فَقَالَ لَهُمْ إِنَّهُمَا أَوْجَعُ قَطْعَ الْلَّهُ يَدَكَ تَقَدَّمْ فَضَرَبَ
َسُوْطَيْنِ تُرْتَنَّى قَالَ تَلَّمْ لَهُمْ جَزَاءُ سُوْطَيْنِ تُرْتَنَّى قَالَ تَلَّمْ
َمَن تَنَانَى قَالَ تَلَّمْ حَتَّى يَبْلَغْ وَحَدًا قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا. كُلُّهُمَا قَالَ تَلَّمْ
َتَقَنُّ نَفْسَكَ وَيُنَانِى اجْتَنِبْ أَطْلِقْ عَنَّكَ بِيْهَدٍ قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا
َيَقُولُ لِي وَيَكُّهَلْ كَأَنْهَا رَاسَكَ قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا أَنْ تَقَنُّ نَفْسَكَ وَيُنَانِى
ِبِيْهَدٍ قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا. كُلُّهُمَا قَالَ تَلَّمْ وَحَدًا. كُلُّهُمَا قَالَ تَلَّمْ
قال فجاءوني بسربيع فقالوا لي أشرب ونقيباً فقلت لا أعطر قر جيء بني
الى الدار أسافك بن أبي عبد الله مباذة الدهر فقلت لهما الدهر باب
فقال أبا سماحة سبحين وأبا عبد الله فزقيد من دينه فقلت قد صلى
عمر رضي الله عنه وجرحه يتعفف دما فسكت ثم خلله فسارة إليه الفنف
ووجه إلى بدر من الساكنين مي يبرص الشرب والاجراحات
[الحدى]
وعيسلج منها فنظر الله فقلت أنا والله لقد رأيت من ضرب الفسوات ما
رأت ضرباً أشد من هذا لقد جرّ عليه من خلفه ومن قدمه ثم
أنخل مينلا في بعض تلك الجراحات وقال لا ينجب فجعل يشبهه
وجوه وهو صبري ثم ينكب
يعيسلج ما شاء الله ثم قال له أن ها هنا شيئا آربي أن اقطعه في
مجهود جعل يعلق اللحم بها ويقطعه يسكي منه وهو صابر
بذلك يهمد الله في ذلك فبراً منه ول يبيل يتوجع من مواضع منه
وكان ابناه الدهر بيني في ظهره الالي نحن رضاه الله، قال أبو الفضل
سمعت ابن يقبل والله لقد أعطيت المجهود من نفسي ولم يكانت
إني من هذا الأمر كافية لا على ولا لي قل أبو الفضل وابن شريك أحد
الرجلين اللذين كان معه وقد كان هذا الرجل يعي صاحب الشافعي
صاحب حديث قد سمع ونظر تر جآئن بعد فقال ابنه ابن رحمة
الله على أبي عبد الله ما رأيت أحداً يشببهه لقد جعلت
اقول له في الوقت ما يوجه الله في أبى عبد الله أنت صائم
وانت في موضع تقيبة وقائد عطش فقال لصاحب الشراب نأولى
ناولة قدحها فيه مأك وثلب خذله فنظر إليه هنية رده عليه قال
جعلت اعذب الله من ضربه على الماء والتراب وما عمو فيه من
هول قل ابن الفضل وكنت النمس واحتال أن أوصي الله طعاماً أو
young man, but this man is not young' [his age was 54]¹). The Khalif, on his entering, commanded him to draw near and bade him sit down. Then Aḥmed asked permission to speak, and, having received it, put the question, 'To what did the Messenger of God give invitation?' The Khalif said, "To the testimony 'that there is no God but Allah'.' Aḥmed replied, 'I testify that there is no God but Allah'; and, after he had professed his adherence to the five cardinal points of Islām, the Khalif told him that if he had not been apprehended by his predecessor in the Khalifate he would not have taken any action against him. Then, turning to Abd al-Rahmān ibn Ishāk, al-Muʿtasim asked him if he had not given him command to abolish the Miḥna. On hearing this, Aḥmed was overjoyed, supposing that it was really the Khalif's intention to deliver his subjects from the objectionable test. Following this, there was disputation, in which the Khalif ordered Abd al-Rahmān ibn Ishāk to take a part. This man then put the question to Aḥmed, 'What dost thou say about the Korān?' Aḥmed returned him no direct answer, but, in turn, asked him 'what he had to say about the Knowledge of God'. To this Abd al-Rahmān made no reply. During the Miḥna this question was, with Aḥmed, a favorite device in argument and one by means of which he generally put his opponents in embarrassment. The force of the argument lies in the fact that the Korān is declared to be knowledge from God, and Aḥmed and such as he regarded this as equivalent to its being inseparable from the Knowledge of

1) al-Maḳrizi, p. 50.

ابلس قد اتفرجوا من هذة السند هذا شيطان مكذول

رجيحاً أو رغيفين في هذه الأيام فلست أقدر على ذلك راحل
حصره، فإن تفكّدتم في هذه الأيام وعلمتم نظرتكم عليه، وحكمتم ما لا تكون في كلمة وما طلبت أن أحداً يكون مثل شجاعةك وشدة قلبك. قدس
الله روحه.
God. 'If this Knowledge', say they, 'be uncreated then the Korān must be uncreated'. Another point which Abū-ral-Raḥmān urged was that 'God existed when a Korān did not exist'; to this Aḥmed replied with the same argument, 'Did God exist and not his Knowledge?' 1).

During the passage between Abū-raḥmān ibn Ḥūṣain and Aḥmed, the latter asked Abū-ral-Raḥmān what his master al-Shāfiʿi had taught him about the ritual washing of the feet, and Ibn Abī Dowād, in great astonishment, exclaimed, 'Behold a man who is face to face with death indulging in questions over Fīkh!' 2).

One of those in the room recited a tradition of Imrān ibn Ḥuṣain that God created الذکر and the Korān; to this Aḥmed answered that he had the tradition from more than one authority in the form, 'God wrote الذکر'. The bearing of this tradition as corrected by Aḥmed is to the effect that the substance and words of the Korān were not created but that the earthly record was. Another tradition which was adduced was that of Ibn Masʿūd, 'God did not create in paradise, hell, heaven and earth anything greater than the Throne verse' (Korān 2. 256). Aḥmed's rejoinder was that the creation applied only to paradise, heaven, hell and earth, but

1) al-Maḳrizī, p. 6, فقال ل ṣعيد الراجح كن الله ولا قران فقلت له أكان الله ولا علم فامسكا ونزو زعم ان الله كان ولا علم كفر للحسن يقول ادخل احمد بن حنبل على الخلافة، وعندنا ابنابي داود وابو عبد الرحمن الشافعي فاجلس بين يدي للخليفة وكان عمرو عليه وقد كانوا يصرحوا عنف رجلين فنظر احمد للabi عبد الرحمن الشافعي فقال ابي شيء شده ليخاف اي الشافعي في المسح فقال ابنابي داود انظروا رجله عدو هذا يظلم لضرب العنف: ينظر في الفقه;

2) Abū Nuʿaim, 1446.
did not apply to the Korân — a construction which is admissible ¹).

Someone introduced the verse, ‘What came to them of 

\[\text{ذَکْر} \]

from their Lord was a thing newly produced’, and asked, 

‘Can anything be newly produced unless it be created?’ 

Ahmed said the Korân, Sura 38, declares, ‘By the Korân, 

\[\text{الذِّکْر} \]

the possessor of 

\[\text{ذَکْر} \]

is the Korân but there is in that other ( \[\text{ذَکْر} \] ) no article. Here the argument is to shew 

\[\text{ذَکْر} \]

and the Korân are identical in meaning, but 

\[\text{ذَکْر} \]

without the article is not identical with the Korân. Con- 

sequently, no argument can be based upon the declaration 

that 

\[\text{ذَکْر} \]

was newly produced.

The words were cited, ‘He is the creator of everything’. 
Against this Ahmed quoted, ‘Thou dost destroy everything’; 
and he added, ‘Dost thou destroy except what God wills?’ 
The argument is that the term ‘everything’ must be under- 
stood in harmony with declarations as to the unoriginate 
character of the Korân found elsewhere within the Book itself.

It is said that, in the course of the discussion, Ibn Abî 
Dowâd lost his patience because Ahmed insisted on keeping 
to the Korân and the Tradition. Ahmed’s defence was to 
the effect that his course was justifiable, for Ibn Abî Do- 
wâd was putting a construction upon the Korân with which 
sincere minds could not agree, and, failing to agree, the men 
were being cast into prison and loaded with chains. With this 
Ibn Abî Dowâd called upon the Khalif to ask his kâdis 
and fâkihs if Ahmed were not a man misled, misleading

---

¹) al-Mâkîrizî, p. 6, [Kor. 2. 256] 

قال ابن عبد الله فقلت إنا وقع في خلف على للجنة والنار والسماء والارص 

ولم يقع على القرآن
and heretical. On his enquiring of them they declared he was such. On this occasion Ahmed repeatedly protested to the Khalif that his opponents were not adhering to the authorities which alone could settle such disputes.\(^1\) Indeed, Ahmed seems to have been the most vehement of all the disputants. Ibn Abi Dowâd shewed his zealot spirit, likewise, by frequently interjecting his opinion. On the first occasion of his interference, Ahmed did not answer him, and, when al-Mu' tasim rebuked him for it, he replied that he was not aware that Ibn Abi Dowâd was a man of learning.\(^2\)

When it came to the time of closing the Khalif bade all present arise; and after the session was ended, the Khalif and Abd al-Rahmân ibn Ishâk had a private conference with Ahmed, in which al-Mu'tasim mentioned to him the punishment he had visited upon his own private tutor Ŝâlih al-Rashidi for opposing him in regard to the Korân. He complained, too, that Ahmed had not given him any chance to learn his views or their vindication. Abd al-Rahmân, however, explained that he had known Ahmed for thirty years as a pious Muslim who observed the Hajj and the Jihad and was a loyal subject of the Khalîf. In view of what Abd al-Rahmân said, and of what he himself had heard of Ahmed’s answers, al-Mu’tasim then exclaimed, ‘Surely, this man is a fâkîh! surely, he is a man of learning [‘âlim]! and I would that I had men such as he with me to take part in managing my affairs, and to effectually answer the advocates of other religions’. He, further, professed himself ready to suspend at once all action against Ahmed, and to support him with all his power, if he would but give him the very slightest

---

1) cf. Dozy, Het Islamisme, 152.
2) al-Maqrizi, p. 6.
mission as a ground for doing so. To this Ahmed made answer in harmony with what he had said before, asking for some justifying passage from the Korân or from the Tradition of the Prophet.

This closed the first day's proceedings, and Ahmed was sent back to his place of confinement, where two men, one a follower of al-Shâfi'î and a certain Ghassàn, of the following of Ibn Abî Dowâd, visited him and engaged in conversation and disputation with him until the next morning. In the meanwhile, the evening meal was brought in and the two visitors partook; but Ahmed, though strongly pressed and though suffering from hunger, would not touch anything. Before the audience of the next day Ibn Abî Dowâd himself brought a message from the Khalif enquiring as to whether Ahmed had changed his mind or not. Ibn Abî Dowâd, also, expressed his personal sorrow at his arrest, especially in view of the Khalif's resolution not to execute him with the sword, in case he should refuse to recant, but to scourge him stroke after stroke until he should be brought to a change of mind or should die under the lash. He assured Ahmed that the Khalif al-Ma'mûn had written his name among the first seven who were summoned, but that he had been instrumental in securing its erasure 1). To all these persuasions Ahmed replied with the same plea for some satisfactory ground from either the Korân or the Tradition on which to base a change of faith. The man in whose house he was detained, Ahmed ibn 'Ammâr, was, also, sent to him repeatedly with messages from the Khalif, but all in vain.

Second Day. On the second day, the proceedings were much the same as those of the previous audience. Whenever they used the Korân or a tradition of recognized authority Ahmed shewed himself ready to meet them, and appears to have been fully able to hold his own. When, however, they adopted any other method of argument, he refused absolutely to recognize the validity of their proofs, and maintained a

1) cf. p. 64.
stubborn silence. He carried this practice out so thoroughly that his opponents complained to the Khalif that, when ever the argument was in his favor he had his answer ready, but, on the contrary, whenever it went in their favor he simply challenged the testimonies which they adduced. It seems to have troubled him that they should have insisted, as they sometimes did, on the letter of the Korân; and, to shew them that they ought not to be too slavish in their adherence to the Korân, he asked one of the disputants what he had to say about the text, ‘God commanded you concerning your children, the male’s portion shall be the portion of two females’. The man replied that the text related specially to the believers. Aḥmed then asked him, what would be the rule if the man were a murderer, a slave, a Jew or a Christian. To this his opponent made no answer. This argument Aḥmed apologized for using on the ground of their annoying manner of argument with him; and it would appear from this case that he was prepared to follow the text of the Korân as closely as practical necessity would allow, but admitted the need, in special cases, of modification or expansion by means of additional light from some other source. This additional light he apparently would have borrowed only from well-established Tradition.

On this day, as on the previous one, Aḥmed Ibn Abî Dowâd, whenever opportunity offered, took an active part in the discussion. In one of Aḥmed ibn Hanbal’s three examinations in this trial, probably in the first or second, when he had declared his faith in the Korân as uncreated, it was retorted upon him that he was setting up a similar being to God (dualistic view). His reply was, ‘He is one God, eternal; none is like him and none is equal. He is even as he has described himself’. At the close of this session a private conference between the Khalif, Abd

1) Steiner, 77, cf. 90 f.
2) al-Maḍīrī, p. 4,
al-Rahmān and Aḥmed again occurred, to which Aḥmed ibn Abī Dowād was afterwards called in. At its close, Aḥmed was returned to the place of detention, and the history of the first night was repeated. Messengers came and went, and the two men who had been with him before came back and stayed with him through the night. Before the next day came, Aḥmed had a premonition that an issue would surely be reached at the coming session, and prepared himself for it.

Third Day. When the messenger came the next day Aḥmed was brought to the palace of the Khalif, and his fear began to be confirmed as he saw the great display of pomp and of armed men, apparently prepared for some special occasion. First, there was an audience, in which the learned men disputed with him, and then followed another private conference in which the Khalif, as before, besought Aḥmed to yield, in however slight a degree, so that he might grant him his freedom. The Khalif assured him of his having as much compassion for him as he would have for his own son Ḥārūn in such a case. Aḥmed’s reply was the invariable one, asking for some ground for a change of faith adduced from the only sources which he recognized as authoritative. Finally the Khalif lost all patience when he saw that his hopes of a ground for leniency toward his prisoner were to be disappointed, and he ordered him to be taken away and flogged. The flogging then ensued. Before it occurred, a little knot was noticed in the sleeve of Aḥmed’s kamīš, and he was asked what might be the explanation of it. He said that it held two hairs of the Prophet 1). On learning this Ishāk ibn Ibrāhīm saved

القرآن وضرب بالسياط يقول القرآن كلام الله غير مخلوق فاذنا قيل
له الفول بذلك يُؤده إلى التشميح يقول أحد صمد لا شبيه له ولا
عله وهو كما وصف به نفسه

the kamış from being destroyed. Before and during the course of the flogging, the Khalif sought to secure from Ahmed a recantation, and seems to have been moved by compassion for him, though equally moved by a determination to drive him to repent of his obstinate refusal. Ibn Abī Dowâd and the leaders who were with him did their best, however, to move the Khalif to put Ahmed to death. When bound, Ahmed complained to the Khalif that the punishment he was inflicting upon him was unlawful according to the declaration of the Prophet, who had said that the blood and possessions of any man who confessed that there was no God but Allah, and that he was God’s Messenger, were inviolable. Ahmed Ibn Abī Dowâd, thinking his master inclined to weaken out of admiration for Ahmed’s spirit and courage and from the conviction wrought by his arguments, reminded al-Mu’tasim that, if he yielded, he would certainly be said to oppose the doctrines of the former Khalif al-Ma’mūn, and men would regard Ahmed as having obtained a victory over two sovereigns, a result which would stimulate him to assume a leadership fraught with evil consequences to the dominion of the Khalifs 1). As he was bound to the whipping-posts the iictors, one hundred and fifty in

1) al-Makrizi, p. 7, 
الإمبري المومئين ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لا يحل دم إمرء مسلم يشهد ان لا الله إلا الله وان رسول الله إلا باحذري ثلاث للهدية وقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان القاتل النفس حتى يقبلوا لا الله إلا الله فلا قلها عصموا مني دماءكم وأموالتكم فلم تستحك كلمى وعلم أن شئا من عدا يا إمبري المومئين اذكر وتوشك بين يدي الله وجل كتوبي بين يديك يا إمبري المومئين راقب الله فلما رأى المعتصم نبود إلى عبد الله ونصمه له ان لا يعبد الله فخشي ابن من دواد من رافته
number it is said, advanced in turn and each struck him
two strokes and then went aside 1). At first, with each stroke
Ahmed uttered a pious ejaculation, concerning the exact
tenor of which the accounts vary 2). There is an apocryphal
story to the effect that, after he had been struck twenty-

1) al-Subkî, p. 136.

2) al-Maqrîzî, p. 8.

---

... and each struck him two strokes and then went aside 1). At first, with each stroke Ahmed uttered a pious ejaculation, concerning the exact tenor of which the accounts vary 2). There is an apocryphal story to the effect that, after he had been struck twenty-

1) al-Subkî, p. 136.

2) al-Maqrîzî, p. 8.
nine strokes, Ahmed’s nether garment threatened to fall to the ground, but that it was miraculously restored to its place and fastened securely, in answer to a prayer which
he uttered. Some of the accounts go even so far as to say that a hand of gold was seen to go out from under his upper garment and adjust what was deranged 1). As the flogging progressed, Ahmed lost consciousness under the blows, and was removed in an unconscious state into a room near by. Meanwhile, the crowd outside the Palace court became moved with anger at the Khalif’s treatment of Ahmed, perhaps, too, the report of his collapse had reached them; in any case, they were preparing to attack the Palace, when the Khalif ordered the suspension of the punishment. This order was due, it is likely, more to the fear of the multitude on the part of al-Mu’tashim than to any other cause. One account relates that, even after Ahmed was brought in unconsciousness to the room, his torturers continued their abuse by trampling upon him with their feet. When consciousness came back he was offered sawîk for the purpose of producing vomiting, but he refused to take it. Subsequent to this, he was removed to the house of Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm, where, after a short detention, he was set free, and went to his own dwelling. The date when all this occurred was within the last ten days of Ramaḍân 219 A. H., though the particular day is not known 2). Ahmed does not seem to have harbored blame against the Khalif for having done what he did, and, afterwards, declared that he had no ill-will against any of those who had taken part in his persecution.

Sequel to the Scourging. In his own dwelling he was visited by the prison physician and treated until he was cured of his wounds. The scars, however, remained on him to the day of his death; and he never ceased to suffer from the dislocation of his wrists, which was brought about by neglect to take hold, as he was advised to do, of the upper parts [lit. teeth] of the whipping posts. When he failed to do this the principal weight of his body was suspended from the wrists. After the scourging, al-Mu’tashim brought

1) vid. foregoing note. 2) Ibn Chall. No. 19.
out Ishāk ibn Ḥanbal (Āḥmed’s uncle) to the people, and
asked them to witness that he would testify that he [the
Khalif] gave over to them their ʿImām without hurt or damage
to his body. It is said that if the Khalif had not caused this
deception to be practised, the people would have risen in in-
surrection. As it was however, they were calmed and evil
consequences were averted. It was the wish of Ibn Abī Dowād that Āḥmed should now be imprisoned; but al-
Muṭaṣim was angry at the suggestion, and commanded his
lieutenant Ishāk to set Āḥmed free. It is probable, that in
this instance, likewise, fear of a popular uprising deterred
the Khalif from continuing to use severe measures against his
prisoner. As matters stood al-Muṭaṣim gave him the gala dress,
and as already related had him sent to his dwelling; and, as long as he was confined to his house, had his lieutenant
Ishāk enquire every day about his condition. The gala clothes,
however, Āḥmed sold and distributed the price in alms 1).

1) al-Maḳrīzī, p. 8, صل فيما وقع له رضي الله عنه بعد انقضاء
الخينة قال ابن أبي حاتم سمعت إيا زريعة يقول دا المعتصم بإسحاق
عمه أحمد بن حنيبل ثم قال للناس تعرفونه طلوا نعم قل فانظروا اليه
البس هو صبيغ البدن [i.e. ‘Look ye at him. Thou, Ishāk ibn Ḥanbal, Is
he, Āḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, not sound in body?’ Ishāk, thereupon, nodded as-
sent. Supply after إسحاق اسم, البدن Theré, and after
علما قول فانظروا اليه].

ولو لاهن فعل ذلك لوقع شر لا يقدر على دفعه فلما قال قد سلمته
البكم صبيغ البدن غدا الناس وسكتوا وكان ابن أبي دواد يحاول
لللتفيفة على حبس ابن عبد الله وعدم أطلاقه وقيل يا أمير المومنين
احبسة فانه فغصب المعتصم وقال لنائبه يا اسحاق اطلقه قال أبو
عبد الله فلا يعد بدآ من أن يحمله فلما لا ذلك لكان قد
حبسني وقال المعتصم لم يلبس هذا كما وصفتم قل البيهقي وذلك
انتم وضعوا من قدرا وقللوا وصغروه عند إنا فلما شاعده ورأى ما عندهه
It is related that he remained only sixteen days at the Camp, and during this period used altogether as food a rub' of sawīk (i.e. four handfuls of parched barley ground to meal). He took every night a dram of water and every third night a handful of sawīk. So much wasted was he by these experiences that it was a full six months after his return home before he seemed like himself again 1).

During the short governorship of al-Muzaffar ibn Kaidar, who succeeded his father in Egypt, there came to him a letter from the Khalif al-Mu'tasim ordering a renewal of the Miḥna. Al-Muzaffar tested the doctors in pursuance of the order he had

1) Abū Nu'aim, 1420 f. 本文的阿拉伯文部分无法正常显示。
received, but it brought him only an increase of the troubles of his short term of authority, and of the success of the test we know nothing 1). After him we have no specific record of trials for the Korán in Egypt, but it is sure that al-Buwaiti underwent an examination in Egypt in the reign of al-Wâthik. A little later on his case will be again noticed. In the year 231 A. H. al-Wâthik sent a letter to his governors commanding the revival of the inquisition 2). It must have been in the examinations which followed this command that al-Buwaiti was cited to answer for his faith 3).

Al-Subki is, probably, right when he asserts that al-Mu’tašim had not the learning which qualified him to decide whether the doctrine of the Korán’s creation was right or wrong, and that the prosecution of the Miḥna by him was due, in great part, to the charge which was left him in the testament of al-Ma’amûn, and to the moving spirit among those by whom he was surrounded 4).

We do not hear of any further action against Ahmed on the part of this Khalif. He died in the year 227 A. H.

Al-Wâthik After the death of al-Mu’tašim and the accession and Ahmed of his son Hârûn al-Wâthik, Ahmed became a very popular teacher, and was much resorted to. Al-Hasan ibn ‘Alî the Kâdi of Baghdâd noticing this wrote to Ibn Abî Dowâd of the circumstance. Ahmed ibn Hanbal, however, heard of what had been done, and of his own will refrained from teaching, before any action was taken against him. Ibn Abî Dowâd once again tried to persuade al-Wâthik to per-

---

4) al-Subki, p. 145.

1) تل الميرخون ومع كونه كان لا يلبدري شيئا من العلم جمل الناس على القرأن خلف القرآن قالت لابن اخاه المامون
2) ردت عليه بذلك وانضم الى ذلك القاضي أحمد بن أبي داود وامتثاله من فقهاء السنما
secure Ahmed, but was unsuccessful. The Khalif let Ahmed alone; whether he was moved at all by admiration for him, or by a superstitious fear that something might happen to him should he lay violent hands on so holy a man, does not clearly appear 1). It is reported of al-Wâthik in relation to the Mihna that he did not personally wish it, but that the stimulus applied by his minister did not leave him much opportunity to escape from the work in which the latter was so zealous. The greater probability, as far as Ahmed ibn Hanbal enters into consideration, is that al-Wâthik, like his predecessor, feared a popular outbreak should anything further be visited upon the Imam. And, for the reason that he wished to please all parties, he took the course of asking Ahmed to leave Baghdad, and dwell at a distance from him. Ahmed, however, did not go away; he simply withdrew into a comparative seclusion, which he maintained for the greater part of his remaining life.

1) al-Makrizi, p. 8 f. 2) vid. p. 114.
in 231 A. H. It is said that he gave this order, notwithstanding the fact that he had withheld his father al-Mu'tašim from the application of the Miḥna ¹. We have no record of those who were subjected to this examination, beyond the names and accounts of one or two who would not confess the doctrine of the Korān's creation and suffered for their faith.

Ahmed ibn Naṣr al-Khuza'ī 

The best known of those who suffered under this Khalif was Ahmed ibn Naṣr ibn Malik al-Khuza'ī ² from the city of Merv, who was of one of

2) v. Kremer, Herrsch. Ideen des Isl. 243; Weil, Chal. II, 341 f.; Dozy, Het Islamisme, 156; al-Sujūtī, Tarikh al-Kholāṣa, 346; al-Ja’qūbī, II, 589; Ṭabarī, III,


ⁿᵃᵐᵃ ᵃˡ-ᵗᵃ愫 말씀

ناصر فكان من أهل الدين والصالح والأثائرين بالمعرف سمع فلذا

مـي مالك بين أمين وغيره ورء عليه سوي بمن معين وغيره دعاه

الونتف إلى القيام بخلاف القرآن فابن قاسم بضرب عنقه فسرب وجعل

راسه إلى بغداد فنُصب في الجانب الشرقي لمما وفي الجانب الغربي لمما

وأَما جسدِه فصلِه بِسَرَت مَن رأى وروى للخوض أبو الفرج بسنده الم

إبراهيم بين سمعي قال كان أحمد بن ناصر خُلِّي وفقا في بئس

وصلي رأسه أخبرْت أن الرأس يقرأ القرآن فصيحت فثبت بقرب من

الرس وهي لم قال أبوه في حظاه فلما غدت العيون سمعت الرأس

يقرأ القرآن أَمَّا أَحْسَبَ النَّاسَ أن يتركون أن يقولوا آمنا وهم لا يقتنون

فانتشر جدلٌ ثم رايتاه بعد ذلك في المقام وعليه

السناد والاستيقي وعلى رأسه تاج فقلت ما فعل الله به قال غفر

لي وادخلت الجنة قل الرزوي سمعت إيا عبد الله أحمد بن حنبل

ذكر أحمد بن ناصر فقال رحمه الله ما كان إخاه لقد جاد

بنفسه
the leading families of his tribe. One of his teachers was Mālik ibn Anas and of his pupils one was Yaḥya ibn Maṣʿīn. Ibn Naṣr was, at first, left unmolested, but afterwards was apprehended for a cause that will be presently shewn. He was, according to Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, a man of noble spirit, and we know from other sources that he was of distinguished ancestry, both his father and grandfather having held high places under the Abbāside khalifs. At the same time, he had a great name among the orthodox traditionists and was himself a man of staunch orthodox belief. For this reason, he had a deep hatred toward the Khalif and Ibn Abī Dowād, and openly defied both by his bold profession that the Ḫorān was the uncreated Word of God. When the people of the quarter of Baghdād known as ‘Amr ibn ‘Aṭā saw his temper and considered his rank, they induced him to lend his moral and, it may be, also his material support to a conspiracy against the Khalifate. It was all arranged that the city of Baghdād was to be taken on a certain night, when the drunkenness of some of the conspirators on the night previous to that which had been appointed led them to give the signal for the attack on that night, with the result that the mass of the confederates did not respond, and the leaders of the conspiracy were at once arrested by order of the acting-governor, Moḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm, their arrest being due to the turning State’s-evidence of one of the subordinate plotters. Strangely enough, when brought before al-Wāthik, the latter asked Ibn Naṣr nothing about his part in the incipient insurrection, but began, instead, to question him about the Ḫorān and the actual seeing of God on the day of Resurrection 1); perhaps, because the case against him on this count was much stronger than it would have been on that of sedition. When al-Wāthik questioned him about his belief relative to the Ḫorān, he, however, in reply, would give nothing but that he believed it to be the Word of God.

1) al-Wāthik had forbidden his subjects to profess either of these beliefs, Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 109.
One rather inflated tradition represents that Ibn Abî Dowâd urged the Khalif to give his prisoner a delay, as he was an old man temporarily out of his senses and would come to a better mind if allowed time. Al-Wâthik in the tradition appears as rejecting this view, and as declaring that Ibn Naṣr’s unbelief had disciplined him to the view he had expressed. Whatever may be the truth of this story, the trial had not proceeded far when the Khalif called for the execution carpet and the sword Samsama; and, desiring to be allowed to personally strike off the obstinate infidel’s head, as he expected to be rewarded by Heaven for disposing of him, he was allowed to try to despatch the martyr. He could not accomplish it, however, and Sima al-Dimashkî had to come to his aid and dispose of the man. The head was then ordered to be sent to Baghdâd; where for some days it was exposed to view in the eastern part of the city, and then for some days in the western part, after which it was fixed up permanently in the eastern portion. The execution occurred on the second last day of Sha‘bân, 231 A. H., and the trunk and head remained exposed to public view for six years, until the Khalif al-Mutawakkil ordered them to be taken down, and handed over for burial to Aḥmed ibn Naṣr’s relations 1).

A fabulous story, to the effect that the head, after being exposed, recited the Korâñ until it was buried, is equalled by another which relates that, long years afterwards, a hunting party found the body and head of Aḥmed ibn Naṣr buried in the desert sand, and that there was not the slightest indication of decay upon them 2).

2) al-Subki, p. 142 f. Read خطير حتى رأى سبيلًا في قبره [خطير].
Nu’aim ibn Ḥammād was another who held out. He was the fourth of a quartette who came from Merv and endured with steadfastness the Miḥna; the first was ʿAhmed ibn Ḥanbal and the others, Moḥammad ibn Nūḥ al-Maḏrūb and Aḥmed ibn Naṣr. Nu’aim ibn Ḥammād studied Tradition a great deal in the Hijāz and ʿIrāk and went, afterwards, to Egypt. In the Khalifate of al-Wāthik, he was brought from Egypt and examined; and, not satisfying the demand made upon him to confess the Korān to be created, he was thrown into prison where he died 1).

Abū Yaʿkūb Abū Yaʿkūb, Yūṣuf ibn Yahya al-Buwaiṭī, the pupil of al-Shāfiʿī to whom he entrusted his circle of scholars at his death, was imprisoned for his refusal to acknowledge that the Korān was created, and died in prison 232 A.H. One of his fellow Shāfiʿīites, al-Rabiʿ ibn Suleimān, relates that he saw al-Buwaiṭī in his chains, and heard him saying, ‘God created the creation by ‘Kun’ [Be!], but, if ‘Kun’ be created, then it is as if a created thing created what was created 2). By God! I will die in these thy chains, that...

1) al-Maḵrizī, p. 11, and al-Makrīzī, p. 11, κ.
2) ‘Kun’ is here employed as synonymous with a manifestation of the Heavenly Word of God (as explained later in the present work). Al-Buwaiṭī seems to have been in full agreement with his master al-Shāfiʿī, and the latter in turn with ʿAhmed, as far at least as the Korān was concerned (cf. p. 49 and Abū’l-Mah. I, 686). The discussion of ‘Kun’ in Houtsma, De Strijd etc., 129, seems to look toward other views than those held by the orthodox at the time of the Miḥna.
those coming after us may know that men have died in their bonds for this cause; and, if I go in to him [al-Wâthik], I will declare the truth before him'. From prison he wrote to al-Rabî’ ibn Suleimân entrusting him with the care of his circle of pupils, and bidding him be faithful to them 1).

The remaining history of the Mihna in the reign of al-Wâthik is shortly told. There is one incident which is in keeping with the fanatical bigotry shewn by Ahmed ibn Abî Dowâd in his efforts to establish the doctrine that the Korân was created. In the year 231 A. H., it was proposed to ransom 4600 prisoners from the Greeks, when Ibn Abî Dowâd suggested that they should ransom only such as admitted the creation of the Korân, and that these should each receive two dinârs on their release. This was actually done, and a small number of prisoners, who could not bring their consciences up to the point of meeting the test, were left unredeemed in the hands of the Greeks 2).

1) Hammer-Purgstall, Lit. Gesch. III, p. 200, No. 1050; al-Sujûtî, Tarîkh al-Khol. 350; Abu’l-Feda Ann. II, 132; Fihrist I, 212; Abu’l-Mahâsin, I, 686; al-Maqrîzî, p. 11, "واما ابو يعقوب يوسف بن يحيى البويضى فأريد من هذه القول خلف القرآن فامتنع فكَبَس الى ان مات سنة اثنتين والاثنين ولتتين قال الربيع بن سليمان صاحب الشافعي رابط البويضى على بغل في عنقه عُلَى في رجليه قيد وبين الغل والقيد سلب إلّه حديد فيها طودة وزنها أربعون رتلا وهو يقول انما خلق الله للفُلْق فَكَبَس [cf. Kor. 6, 72]

Al-Wâthîk is generally considered to have given up the doctrine of the Miḥna before his death, and an incident 1) which we may accept as fundamentally true, accounts for its surrender. Ibn Abî Dowâd caused to be brought before the Khalif a sheikh of Adhana on the charge of heresy. The Khalif bade him discuss the question of the creation of the ÌKorân with Ibn Abî Dowâd, but the old man objected on the ground that Ahmed ibn Abî Dowâd was a Sabaean and was too unsound in his views to spend words upon. At this al-Wâthîk began to be very angry, but the sheikh promised to prove his points, if the Khalif would but give close attention to the discussion which was to take place between them.

To begin with, the sheikh asked Ibn Abî Dowâd if his view were to be looked upon as an essential of the believer’s creed. The latter answered that it was to be so regarded. Then the sheikh pointed out that God, having sent Moḥammed with a revelation to his people, the Messenger of God did not leave unpublished any part of the Divine Message. Ibn Abî Dowâd allowed that Moḥammed had fully delivered the Message. His opponent then asked, if (on the basis of the revelation made through him) the Prophet had called upon men to accept the doctrine of the ÌKoran’s created existence. Ibn Abî Dowâd gave to this no answer, and the sheikh claimed from al-Wâthîk one point established in proof of his charges. The Khalif allowed the point.

The second step was the quotation of ÌKorân 5.5, ‘This day have I completed for you your religion and perfected my grace upon you’; and the sheikh asked how any new doctrine could be justifiable in view of such a passage. Ibn Abî Dowâd did not attempt a defence of his position against this assault upon it, and the sheikh claimed his second point, which al-Wâthîk conceded him.

In the third place, the old man asked if the Prophet had known the doctrine now propounded, and if he had ever invited men to accept it. Ibn Abī Dowāḍ claimed that Moḥammad knew the doctrine, but he would not answer the question as to whether the Prophet had made its profession obligatory upon the believer or not. Here the sheikh claimed his third and final point. But he did not stop here. He argued that, allowing Moḥammed to have known the doctrine in point and the early Khalifs to have known it; seeing that both he and they had been satisfied to refrain from obliging men to confess the tenet of the Қorān’s creation, was it the part of a modern zealot to do what they had not done? Supposing they did believe as he did, was it not his part to keep his belief a mere private opinion as they had done, instead of forcing people to think as himself? A companion of the Khalif al-Muhtadī who tells this story says that al-Muhtadī, who was present on the occasion, gave up the doctrine of the creation of the Қorān from this time, and that al-Wāthik ordered the sheikh to be at once set free, and, apparently, himself believed no longer as he had believed relative to the Қorān. Other accounts say that al-Wāthik changed his view before he died, and, in the connection where it occurs in the Arabic record, the testimony of al-Muhtadī is cited to shew that the incident above given occurred toward the end of al-Wāthik’s Khalifate 1).

Al-Mutawakkil began to reign in 232, and the Mīḥna continued to exist for two years in his reign, being brought to a close in the year 234. The whole term of its duration was, thus, from the last year of al-Ma‘mūn, 218 A.H., to the second or third year of al-Mutawakkil, 234 A.H. In the latter year, al-Mutawakkil stopped the application of the test, and by public proclamation throughout the Empire forbade men on

1) Steiner, 78, says al-Wāthik brought the Mīḥna to a close. But the truth is that he went no further than to change his view in relation to the Қorān and to purpose abrogating the test. His death prevented him from actually carrying his purpose into effect.
pain of death 1) to profess the creation of the Korân. At this there was great rejoicing everywhere. Men praised the virtues of the Khalîf, and forgot his vices; prayers for blessing upon him were heard on all sides and his name was mentioned with those of the good Khalîfs Abû Bekr and Omar ibn Abd al-Azîz. Two things alone were remembered against him by his Muslim subjects, both of which occurred in the year 236 A.H. The one was the permission granted for the sack of Damascus to the Turkish soldiery (the event however did not happen); and the other, the destruction of the tomb of al-Ḥosain together with the buildings round about it, and the conversion of the land into fields 2).

Taking a general survey of the inquisition 1) inaugurated by al-Ma’mûn, and carried on by the two succeeding Khalifs, we can say that as an attempt to stamp out by force moral convictions it was a failure from the start; for, in the Muslim world as everywhere else, there was an admiration and a moral support accorded by the great body of the people to those who suffered persecution, such as might have led men far less sincere than Ahmed ibn Hanbal to stand out against a tyrannous crusade of repression 2). That the principles of the strictest orthodox

انَّهُ آمَرَ بِهِدَمَ قَبْرِ الْحَسَنِ وَعَدَّمَ مَا حَوَلَّهُ مِنَ الْمُدُورَ أَلْيَنَ يَعْمَلُ مُنَازِعٌ

ومع الناس من زرائه وحُرُث وقُبِّي صَحْرَاء فَنَأَمَّلَ المُسْلِمُونَ لِذَلِكَ

وَكَتَبَ أَهْلُ بَغْدَادَ شَنْمَهُ عَلَى الْمِلِيْتَانَ وَالْمُسَاجِدَ

الْمَكْرِزِيُّ،ِل.ِمَسْتَكِلَّ عَلَى الْلَّهَ صَنْطًا،ِأَنْ لَنْ يُنْظَرَ أَيْضًا رَأْيُ الْلَّهِ بِهِ الصُّنْتَةَ وَكَشَفَ تَهْلُكُهُم فَشَكِرَ

الْجَبَلَ عِنْدَ مَا فَعَلَ فَمَّا ذَكَرَ بَسْنَدَهُ الْمُحَمَّدُ بِنَ خَلْفَ تَلَّ كَانَ

إِبْرَاهِيمُ بِنَ مُحَمَّدٍ الْمُقْضِيُّ قَانِتْيُ الْبُصْرَةَ يَقُولُ الْجَعْلَةَ ثُلُّاثَةُ أَبِي بَكْرٍ

قَانِتُ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ حَتَّى اسْتَجَابَا لِهُ وَعَمِرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ رَّ رَّ مَعْنُوْرَ بَيْ

امِيَةَ وَالْمَتْنُوْلَ مَكَّيِّي الْبَيْتِ وَأَذْهَرُ الصَّنْتَة

1) A short account of the Miḥna and its issues is to be found, Dozy, Het Islamisme, 154 ff.

2) Houtsma (De Strijd etc. 106 f.) appears to make the motive for the resistance of the orthodox theologians to their rationalistic opponents one of religious policy. If they surrendered the doctrine of the uncreated nature of the Korān, the hope of the universal spread of Islam would have to be given up. I have not found this motive alleged in any of my sources, but can well believe that it may have been a secondary, though not a primary one. The primary motive was altogether personal. Ahmed and those who stood with him had a simple belief, incapable of analysis, in the eternity and unoriginateness of the Korān; they hoped, too, for a reward if they maintained their faith at all costs, and feared grave spiritual consequences should the doctrine be given up. The honor of God, the Divine Legation of the Prophet, the unique and ineffable dignity of the Korān, and, finally, the everlasting well-
as blar of which Ahmed was the leading representative, would not win their way in the following generations of Islam because they had been killed out by persecution, but because a more liberal and enlightened sentiment had been introduced into the Muslim commonwealth; because the yoke this Puritanism would have imposed was one which people could not bear amid the practical concerns of everyday life; and because the system rested upon casuistries, which, though deductively perfect, were false in their premises and could never have satisfied the untrammeled common sense of men. The inquisition only retarded the development of freer and purer conceptions among the adherents of the religion of the Prophet. But the retardation was not an unmixed evil. It checked, for a time, a philosophical movement, to give it a theological and religious concern, without which the Muslim people would have had for their teachers men indifferent to practical questions of religious life and observance, and unsympathetic in their attitude toward popular theological conceptions.

Of the men, persecuting and persecuted, connected with the Miḥna, Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal comes out with the greatest credit to himself. Bishr ibn al-Ḥārith al-Hāfi had a saying that God had cast Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal into the crucible and he had come out pure gold. Ahmed’s method of argument was no more unsound than that of his opponents 1).

being of their own souls and the souls of those who looked to them for an example — these are expressed motives for the orthodox apologetic, which in some cases became a defence of conviction even unto death. The faith in the Divine and uncreated nature of the Koran lay at the root of all their arguments and actions in this defence. In the historical instances of such a resistance as this the personal element of conviction, rather than any considerations of religious policy, has been the moving principle of the defence which has been put forward.

1) The statement of Houtsma (De Strijd etc. 106) would give the impression that the orthodox when in disputation with their opponents had no arguments worth mentioning to offer, and were quite incapable of dealing with those who stood against them. Judging from a modern point of view neither side had very strong points; but, judged from a Muslim standpoint, the
They had, on philosophical grounds, declared the in- as well as the attributes of God, to be created; but, w.e they opposed him, they sought to convict him of error on his own ground, and by his own method of proof, and he seems to have had the better of them in most of their word passages. The arguments used were childish enough, but not more so for him than for them. The fact that he had earnest convictions to defend, and that many of those who stood against him had been either frightened or bribed into taking their present stand, stood him in good stead, and must command our respect as we, to-day, review the whole historical scene in which he is a figure.

As to al-Ma'mūn, he evidently disliked the slavishness of orthodoxy, and was impatient at its many absurdities; but he shewed at the same time how easy it is for a learned man to display a disdainful and narrow spirit toward the unlearned, for a philosopher to become a dogmatist, and for an advocate of liberal views to become a tyrant toward those of stricter beliefs.

Ahmed ibn Abî Dowâd was a man whom one finds it difficult to credit with earnest convictions. His first master, al-Ma'mûn, may be credited with acting in the belief that he was right and in the consequent wish to secure the general adoption of his opinions; but his minister will not be misjudged if we look upon him as actuated by contempt and violent hatred toward men of strict life and toward zealous advocates of religious duties, whose puritanism appeared in his eyes to be but pharisaic hypocrisy. He is not disputations which are recorded in these pages shew that the orthodox had the great arguments of the Word of God and the Tradition, and could wield these as well or better than their opponents. Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm the governor, Abd-al-Rahmân ibn Ishâk, and al-Mu'tašim are all said to have been impressed by the force of what Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal said and the way in which he said it. Steiner (Die Mu'taziliten, 8) says that the Mu'tazila used the Kâf interpreting it allegorically and giving their reasonings a philosophical cast. Houtsma, (De Strijd etc. 80) speaks of the Mu'tazila as being, in general, men lacking in earnestness and given to dialectic trifling in disputation.
as black a character as the partisans of Ahmed ibn Hanbal would represent him to be, but I have met no record of his connection with the Miḥna which shews him as other than arbitrary and unfeeling, except the isolated reference in the trial of Ahmed ibn Naṣr the conspirator whom al-Wāthīk put to death. There, as we have already seen, Ibn Abī Dowâd suggests, when al-Wāthīk grows angry with Ibn Naṣr for persisting in his belief, that the prisoner is an old man whose mind is deranged, but who will see differently when he has had time to come to himself. This account, be it remarked, occurs in al-Subki’s Ṭabaḵāt (life of Ahmed ibn Hanbal), where Ibn Abī Dowâd finds from the author an apology for his acts in more than one instance, but in each case the apology is a personal opinion of the author of the book, rather than well supported historical tradition. In earlier accounts, and in later as well, Ibn Abī Dowâd is put before us as an able man, with eminent social qualities, but with a persecuting spirit in administration; and, though we have said that al-Maʾmūn wished to enforce the Miḥna before he really did so, we must remember that he actually did not do so of his own motion, but that it was Ibn Abī Dowâd alone who turned the scale which brought about the long tyranny of sixteen years ending shortly after al-Mutawakkil’s accession. We can believe too, that had it not been for him the Miḥna would have lapsed for want of interest or from positive distaste on the part of al-Muʾtaṣim or al-Wāthīk.

For al-Muʾtaṣim’s part in this movement we have not much to say. He found no pleasure in the wretched business of persecuting men’s convictions, and clearly shewed by Ahmed’s case that, had it not been for obligations which he held to be inviolable, he would have had nothing to do with the enforcement of the test as to the Korān.

Al-Wāthīk, as to his part in the Miḥna, is in somewhat greater degree a return to al-Maʾmūn. Like his predecessors he, too, was dominated by Ibn Abī Dowâd. The re-
corded cases, very few in number, of those whom he tried for the Korân evince cruelty as a feature of this Khalif's character, and that of Aḥmed ibn Naṣr, in particular, is positively brutal 1).

Not much can be said in favor of those who yielded in the Miḥna. The assent of the first seven who were summoned to the Khalif's presence was the fatal factor which led to the following up of the persecution. Still, it was not the less weakness in those who recanted afterwards that they should have been terrified into submission. The doctrine of the Taḥṣīla was generously applied to them by their friends and companions, and, no doubt, saved them a great deal in the estimation of the public; but their course was not felt by themselves to have been creditable, and bitter was the regret of men like Yahya ibn Maʿin that the sword should have frightened them into surrender of a doctrine which was felt to be the truth. It is the fault of an age of controversy that theological opinions are based too much on the logic of words, and not upon verities from which the moral and intellectual judgment cannot separate itself. This was the case with the doctrine of the unoriginate nature of the Korân. Its evidences were simply words, and it was only an exceptional character like Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, who had seen the purely speculative question of the Korân's origin in relations, the maintenance of which seemed to him to involve the very existence of his religious life and faith, to whom a surrender of his opinion became of transcendent moment. Others had not the same great conception of the question that he had, they knew it only as one of the controverted points in the polemic which was going on about them. The surrender of it might be a victory for an adversary, but it was worth making for the sake of one's life. Those who yielded took, at a later date, a more serious view of what they had done, but, at the time when they

1) In the account of Aḥmed ibn Naṣr's execution, p. 118, we have suppressed the more harrowing features.
committed the act of denying their own confession, it appeared as simply a question of yielding an unessential point and acknowledging themselves beaten. Even their plea of the Taḵia cannot be taken as rendering this explanation nugu-
tory; though it might seem to suggest that they looked upon
their act as one involving the cardinal sin of apostasy, to
which sin the Taḵia stood specially related. This plea was but
an excuse used for effect upon the people, and was not, of
course, an explanation of how they came to do what they
had done. Āḥmed ibn Ḥanbal excused them on this ground,
but his excuse contemplates the act after its commission and
finds grounds of pardon for it. It does not offer any expo-
sition of its inward cause and significance. The Taḵia itself
might render impossible the proving of an act to be apo-
stasy, for it could often be urged that a man’s apostasy was
but in word, while in heart he was sound in the faith.

Notwithstanding the testimony of historians to al-Muta-
wakkil’s cruelty, it cannot be said that he ever shewed any
unkindness or impatience with Āḥmed ibn Ḥanbal. He might
have been provoked to acts of harshness by Āḥmed’s peev-
ishness had he allowed himself to yield to the provoca-
tion, but he was, instead, constantly kind and thoughtful
of the old man’s comfort and welfare. He does not appear
to have been as intolerant in matters of religion as his
predecessors, unless his hostility to ‘Alyite movements be
counted as of a religious character 1). We are justified, in my judgment, in assuming that the interest in religion and theol-
ogy which he shewed was not that of a persecuting partisan
of a political faction, but of a sincere though fanatical re-
ligious bigot 2). His connection with orthodoxy was, because—
free from any immediate and violent display of persecuting spirit 3), hardly from a political motive. Counter persecution

---
3) Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 113 infra.
would surely have followed the persecution already past, had al-Mutawakkil desired to make capital out of his connection with orthodoxy. It is more likely that his relation to theology and religion is to be explained by temperament and revulsion of feeling from the course of his predecessors. The latter, indeed, had already shewn strong signs that, personally, they were weary of the inquisition. They, however, still accorded in their theological views with the persecuting party and were subject to their influence. Al-Mutawakkil was, apparently, a Shâfi‘ite 1). None will deny that his theological position made him friends as a result, but, however black his record may be, and whatever there may be to blame in his narrow bigotry, we think that his intention was only to reform abuses in religion as he saw them 2).

---

III.

In the early years of al-Mutawakkil's reign there were those who sought to injure Aḥmed with the Khalif 3). One report, in particular, was

---

1) al-Sujâṭī, Tarikh al-Khol. 359.
2) Nearly all European writers impute political motives to this Khalif, as well as to al-Ma'mūn when he inaugurated the persecution. It may be admitted that al-Mutawakkil recognized the futility of persecution as long as the great mass of his subjects were of orthodox sympathies (Houtsma, 112); but the fact, which appears to be well established, that al-Mutawakkil was personally orthodox in his theological convictions, as well as the other facts which have been noticed in the text, would seem to fully account for what he did. It is nowhere stated in the original sources which I have consulted that he had any other motive than that of personal religious preference. Out of this personal ground sprang his intention to bring about a restoration of orthodoxy. His antagonism to 'Alyites, too, was more that of a fanatical representative of certain views than that of a man who hoped to make himself more popular with the majority by the step he took. The public feeling when he destroyed the tomb of al-Ḥusain shews this.

3) Abū Na'aim, 150 b ff. (This source is now followed with a few exceptions which are noted).

ذاكرُ "درود كتاب المتولٍء بما كُتِب في أولاً ثم..."
that he had charged with Atheism the predecessors of
the Khalif — a report which the latter did not appear to con-
sider very seriously, for he is said to have ordered the man

**النص**

**بما العالم الناس أنه قد قبى منك ما يصنع إحد الفضائل وأذا قوته رفيع.

قال فقال لي صدقته يا علي، قال أبو الفضل ثم أخرى أبي ليلى، ومعنا حرس معين النفاط فلما أضاء الفجر قال يا صاحب معاك أن أطاعه قلت

نعم قال اعتاب فاعظًا، دعاً، دعاءً...

قال أبو الفضل وقصر أبي في خروجه إلى العسكر وقال تفسير الصلاة في أربعة

برد في ستة عشر شمساً وصلت به يوما العمر فقال لي طولت بنا

العمر تفاوتا في الركعة مقدار خمس عشرة آية، وكتب أصل به في

العسكر، فلما صرتا بين الحاكمين قال لنا يعقوب أقيمهم ثم وجه إلى

الموكب بما عمل فدخلنا العسكر وأبي ملك صر الملاس ورمه مغطى فقال

له يعقوب أكب رأسه يابا عبد الله فكشف ثر جما، وصيف يزيد

الدار فلما نثر الناس وجمعهم قال ما عولا قالوا أحمد بن حنبل

فوجه إليه بعد ما جاز بعجبي بن قرامة فقال يقره السلام وقبل

للعلم الذي لا يعترف به Público البعد قد علما ما كان حال

ابن أبي دود، نبغي أن تعقل بما يجب لله ومصي بعجبي قال أبو

الفضل ابن أبي دار إياهًا في على تبين، فقال قد امر لكم أمبر

المؤمنين بعشرة آلاف مكان التي فرقة [ابوكم] وأمركم ان لا يعترف به ذلك

فيهم ثم جماه، محمد بن مغومة، فقال أن امبر المؤمنين يكتر ذكر

وقبل تفعيل عاجلا تأخذت فقال انا ضعيف ثم وضع أصبعه على بعض

استناء فقال أن بعض الناس يتحرك وما أخبرت بذلك وليلد ثم وجه

السيدة ما تقول في بييمين انتظارًا، أذكرت احتراماً الأخرى فسقطت

فُّندق فقال أن كان أطَّر بعينه ومصع بذده وساد تمه يكول
who made it to be flogged for trying to injure a good subject.

ستين سنة حتى إذا كان في آخر عرفة بليت بل ما أحسنني
سلمت من دخول علي هذا الغلام كيف يلبس يجيء علي في نضحك
من وقت تقع عيني عليه إلا أن أخرج من عندنا ثم قال يا صالح
وجَّهَ هذه الغياب الها بهدف رجاء ويتصرّى بهما ولا يشترى أحد
منكم شيئا قال أبو الفضل فوْجَّهَت بها إلى يعقوب بن النهيذمان فباعها
وخرق ثمها وبقيت عندي الفلتوما ثم اخبرنا أن الدار التي عو
فيها كان فيها إينان فقال الكثرب رَّقَّةَ الْمَوْكَبَ بِهِمْ النُّجُوم لبستعنى
لي من هذه الدار فكتبنا رقة فانرتول ان يُقَعُ منها ووجه اللى
قبي قبروا متى من منزلنا فسل ان يَرَأى منها ووجه اللى
باينته درّم فصائر الها وأجحري لنا مائدة وثقل وضرب للبعش وشرب
الطبري فلما رأى الخيش والطبري أخى نفسه عن ذلك الموسع
والله نفسه على مصرينة له

وجعل يُواصل يُطْرَفَ كل ثلاث على ذئب سُينِيق
فمكتب خمس عشرة يُطْرَف في كل ثلاث ثم جعل بعد ذلك يُطْرَف
ليلة ليلة لولا يُطْرَف إلا على رغيف فكان إذا جرى بالمستعنى توضع في
انعزال نكى لا يراها فلا كل من حصر فكان إذا جهد للسُّينِيق
خُرْقات فسَعِه عليها صّدره وفِى كل يوم يُوجه إليه باب
ماسوية فينظر إليه ويقول يبا عبد الله إنما أميل اليك
وإلى احتماك بلما بُكِّى علة إلا الصّعف وناقة السُّرَ بُفْقِال له
ابن ماسوية انما أتما عيدها ولكن دعُب لِلْمَلِك: [اللِّدْل]. قائله يبيعين
وجعل يجيده بالشيء ليسيره فيقه وقطع له يُلمع دراعة وطلبساتا
سواه ... وكان رُبّما سار إليه يجيده وهو يُملع في الحفريز
حتى يفرَّ ويجيء على بُن لَّهُم فِينْزِرْ سِيفهٍ وَقُلْنَسْوَته وَيَدْخِل عَلَيهِ وَامَرَ المِنْتَوْكُل أَنْ نُشْتَرَى [١٢٤٩] لَسَّنا دَارَ فَقَالَ يَا صَالِحٌ قَلِتَ لَمْ يَبِكَ قدْ أَنْزِلَت لِلْمَعْلُومَ بَعْضُهُ كَانَ مُقَطَّعًا بِئِينَ وَبِهِمْ إِنَّمَا يَرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُصَيَّبُوا عَذَّا الْبَلَدِ لَمَّا وَمَسَكِنًا فَمَذَكَّر قَلْ يَدْفَع شَرِي الْمَارِدَحَتَى أَنْذَفَع وَسَارَ إِلَى صَاحِبِ الْمَنْزِل فَقَالَ اعْطِيِّكَ كَلَّ شَهْرَ ثَلَاثَةٍ لاَيِّ مَكَانٍ أَفََّالَةَ فَقَلَتْ لَا أَفْعَلَ وَجَعَلَتْ رُسْلَ المِنْتَوْكُل تَأَنِّيهِ يُسَلِّمْهُ عَنْ حَسْبَهُ فِينْصُرْفُونَ [١٢٥٠] الْيَدِ وَيَقُولُونَ عِنْو صَعِيفَ فَوَقَخَ لَهُ لَمْ يَكُونَ إِلَّا تَعَجِّبَ بِمَوْقَعِهِ لَا بَعْدُ مَنْ أَنْ بَرَكَ فَسَكَتَ فَذَا خَرَبْوَا قَلَ اسْتَأْجَرَ مَنْ قَوْمِهِ لَا بَعْدُ مَنْ أَنْ بَرَكَ وَمَا عَلَمْتُهُ أَنَّهُ لَا بَعْدُ مَنْ أَنْ بَرَكَ وَكَانَ فِي هَذِهِ دَارَ حَاجَتَكَ صَغِيرَةٌ [١٢٥١] صَغِيرَةٌ فِي هَذَا بِيْتَكَ فَقَالَ لَمْ أَدْخَلْكَ وَلَمْ تُسُرِّجْوَا لَسَّراَجًا فَأَخْلَدْنَا لِيِفَهَا يُغْقَبْ فَقَالَ إِبْلَا عَبْدُ اللَّهٍ امْبَرِيْهِ الرَّحْمَٰنِيْنَ مَشْتَاقُ الْبَلَدِ وَيُقُولُ إِنَّ الْيَوْمَ الَّذِي تَصِيرَ إِلَى فِيْهِ اِيْ يَوْمٍ عِنْوٍ حَتَى اسْتَرِحَ فَقَالَ ذَا الْبَيْكَ فَقَالَ يَوْمُ الْآبَاءِ يَوْمٌ خَالٍ وَخَرْجٍ يُقْوَبُ فَلَمَّا كَانَ مِنْ الْغَدِّ حَسَا فَقَالَ الْمَسْتَرِيْيِ إِبْلَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ امْبَرِيْهِ الرَّحْمَٰنِيْنَ يُقْرَأُ عَلَيْكَ الْسَّلَامِ وَيَقُولُ قَدْ أَعْفَيْتُكَ عَلَى لَبَسْ السَّوْدَ والرَّكْبَةِ إِلَى وَالَّيَةِ الرَّجْفَةِ وَالْمَادَّ فَأَنْ شَمَدتُ فَلْبِسَ القُطْنَ وَأَنْ شَمَدتُ فَلْبِسَ الْعَبْرَةَ فَجَعَلَ يُحْمِدَ اللَّهُ عَلَى ذَلِكَ . . . . . . . . . . كَرُرُتُ [١٢٥٢] الْعَهْدَ كَانَ مُسْوَلًا [١٢٥٣] وَقَدْ قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَ يَا بَيْتَكَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَوْ ذُو الْعَقْوَةَ [١٢٥٤] أَنْ لَا أَحْدَثَ حَدِيْثًا تَدْعَى إِبْدَا حَتَّى الْقُطْنَ الَّذِينَ لَا أَشْتَذُّ مَنْكَهُ إِلَّا أَحْدَثُهُ لَقَالَ آنَ نَّلْهُ عَلَى هَذَا الْبَيْتِ رَاجَعُوْنَ وَأَخْضِرَ المِنْتَوْكُلَ بِذَلِكَ وَقَالَ إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُونَ
إن أحدث فيكون هذا البلد جَمِيساً وإنما كان سبب الذين أثبوا بهذا البلد لما أعطوا واتمروا فاكُدروا وكانوا يدخلون عليه فيتكلمون وهو مَعْمَض العين يتعلَّل وضَعِف شدُيداً فكلوا يخبرونه فيتوجَّع لذلك وجعل يقول والله لقد تمنيت الموت في الامر الذي كان وإلى لاتميت الموت في هذا وذلك أن هذا فتنة الدنيا وكان ذلك فتنة الدنيا ثم جعل يَضّم اصابع يده ويقول لى كنت نفسى في يدي لارسلتني ثم يفتتح اصابعه وكان المتكول يوجه اليه في كل وقت يسعته عن حاله وكان في خلال ذلك يروى لى بالمال فيقول يَسَّر اليمين ولا يُعَلَّم شيخًا فغَفَّت لهما يريد من أن كان عُلَوًا يعبرد الدنيا فما يبَعَّد وقَالوا للمتكول أنه كان لا يأكل من ضعافه ولا ينشاء على شراكة ويحرم الذين تشرب فقال لى لو نشر المعتصم لم أخفى منه قال أبو الفضل ثم ان اقترب إلى بغداد وخلت عبد الله عندما فادى عبد الله قد قدم وجهة بثياب التي كانت عندنا فقلت ما جاء بسك قال قال لا أجد وقيل لصالح لا تخرج [ابةر]. فاتتم كنتم أفقيتي والله لى استقبلت من أمرى ما استبدرت ما اخرجت واحدا منكم معي لولا مكانتكم لتم كان توضع عذة السَّائدة ولم يُغَشَّى عبد الغفار وجميع الأجراء قال أبو الفضل فكتبت اليه علمه ما قال في عبد الله فكتبت إلى خطه بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم احسى الله عافتنك ودفع عنه كَل مكروه ومسكرذ الذي جمل على الكتاب الابك والذي [لى] قلت لعبد الله لا يأتينى أحد منكم رجاء إن ينقطع ذكرى ويتخل فأنكم إذا كنتم عاهنا فكذا ذكرى وكان يجتمع البلد قوم ينقلون اخبارنا وقد يَكُنَّ نَسغُر وأعانى بالى انك ان أقتمت [اقمت] فلا تأتيني انت ولا اخرى فهو رضائى فلا
تاجعل في نفسه الا خبيرة والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته، قال أبو الفضل ثم ورد إلى كتاب آخر خطبه يذكر فيه بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم احسن الله عفيفتك [أبو علي] ودفع عنك السوء برحمته كتابتي البك وانا في نعم الله مظاهره واستدعه اثمامها والعون على أداء شكرها قد انكرت عمنا عقد انما كان حبس من عاقتنا لما أعطى فقبلوا وأجرى عليهم فتساءل في الحكذا الذي صاروا انيه وحدثوا ودخلوا عليهم فذكه كانت قيود فتسل الله ان يعيدنا من شرح ويخلصنا فقد كان ينبغي لكم لو قد قدرتمون بالموالكما وأطيعكم لهان ذلك عليكم للذين ان فيه فلا يكير عليكم ما اكتب به الامام قالوا بيوتكم فلعل الله ان يخلصني والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله ثم ورد غير كتابه السي بخطه بنحو من هذا فلما خرجنا من الجسر رفست المائدة والفرش وكل ما اقيم لنا قال أبو الفضل وأوصي وحيدة بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم *هذا ما اوصي به احمد بن حنبيل اوتحى انده يشهد ان لا الله الا الله وحده لا شريك له وان محمد عبده ورسوله ارسله بالهدى ودين الله القائم على الدين كله وَلَتْوَ كَرَى الْمُشْرِكِينَ [ت. 61: 33] وَأَوْحِيَ مُنِ اطْعَامُ مِنْ أَغْلِبِهِ وَقَرَأْتِهِ أَنْ يُعْبِدُوا اللَّهَ فِي الْعَبْدِيَاتِ وَيَحْكُمُونَ بِحَكْمِ اللَّهِ وَكَلِمَتِهِ وَبَشَّرُوا مَنْ خَيْمَةَ دِينَارًا وَوَعْدُ مَدَى نَكَاهُوا من جمعه المسلمين وفاوتشي ان رضيت بالله وربا ونالسلام دينا وباكتمان على الله عليه وسلم نبيا وافتشي ان تعبد الله بن محمد المعرف بدوران على ذاكوا من خمسين دينارا وهو مصدق فيما قال فيقيق ما له على من علة الدار ان شاء الله فادعواعظم ولد صالح وعبد الله ابنه [أبو] احمد بن حنبيل كل
An invitation from the Khalif to Ahmed to visit him was brought to him before the end of the year 235 A. H. by Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm 1), who on this occasion asked Ahmed’s forgiveness for the part which he had taken in the scourging under al-Mu’tasim. Ahmed, in reply, assured him that he had fully forgiven all who had sought his hurt, or participated, in any way, on that occasion. Ishâk then proceeded to ask Ahmed for his own private satisfaction about the Korâne, and the latter expressed himself, as he uniformly did, to the effect that it was the uncreated Word of God. Ishâk then asked for the proofs of the statement, and Ahmed, in answer, cited Korâne 7. 52, ‘Are not the Creation and the Command his?’ and pointed out that in the passage a distinction was made between the Creation and the Command. The ‘Command’ 2), in controversies of this kind refers to the eternal and heavenly Word of God, just as does ‘Kun’, on page 119. Ishâk said, ‘The Command is created’. ‘What!’ exclaimed Ahmed, ‘the Command created! Nay, it creates that which is created’. Ishâk then asked, ‘Who has handed down in Tradition the view that it is not created’? Ahmed answered, “Ja’far ibn Moâmmad, who said, ‘It is neither a creator nor a created thing’ 3). Then, this conversation being ended and Ishâk having secured Ahmed’s agreement to go to the camp, it was not long before he was on the way thither; but, for some unexplained cause, orders came while the

1) Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm, the governor of ‘Irâq, as well as Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm al-Mausîlî, the favorite of the Khalifs, died in 235 A. H. The one referred to in the text is, of course, the former.

2) This appears to be not only an authentic tradition, but, as well, the clearest and most direct which was offered by the orthodox in support of their view.
journey was in progress for him to be returned to his home. It is altogether likely that a suspicion of 'Alyite leanings in 'Āhmēd ibn Ḥanbal afford an explanation of this fact. As will presently appear, 'Āhmēd was two or three times accused of such leanings to this Khalif.

In the year 237 A.H., information was given to the Khalif charging 'Āhmēd with having sent one of his companions to meet an 'Alyite who was coming to him from Khorasān. On hearing this, the Khalif wrote a letter to Abdallah ibn Isḥāḵ, governor of Baghdad, (who had succeeded his brother Moḥammad and his father Isḥāḵ ibn Ibrāhīm in the office) asking him to inquire of 'Āhmēd as to the truth of the charge laid against him, and, also, to search his premises and make sure in the matter. In pursuance of these directions, Abdallah sent his chamberlain Muẓaffar and the postmaster Ibn al-Kalbi 1), together with women who were to examine the women’s apartments, to carry out the orders which had come to hand. When they were come and had read to 'Āhmēd the Khalif’s letter, he protested that the report was without foundation, and that he was in all respects a loyal subject 2). The searching of the premises, too, revealed nothing to substantiate the charge against him.

The result was reported to the Khalif, and a day or two later, there came a letter from 'Alī ibn al-Jahm 3) to 'Āhmēd saying that the Khalif was fully satisfied of the groundlessness of the report, and that it had been fabricated by heretics with the design of injuring him. The letter of 'Alī intimated, likewise, the Khalif’s wish that 'Āhmēd should

1) For employment of postmasters in this sort of detective service vid. Houtsma, 71.
2) 'Āhmēd had been keeping to his house up to this time, following the orders of Isḥāḵ the former governor. On theologians keeping to their houses cf. Goldziher, Moh. Stud. II, 94. On the similar practice by the so-called Kaʿada (still-sitters) cf. Houtsma, De Strijd etc., 26 f.
Second Invitation from al-Mutawakkil.

visit him, and advised that a messenger was on the way with a gift of money from the Khalif. The day following the arrival of the letter the messenger, Ya'kūb Ḵausarra, arrived bringing, in official form, the invitation already alluded to, and handing over the sum of 10,000 dirhems as the royal gift (جائزهٔ). Ya'kūb then went away, telling Aḥmed that he would return next morning for an answer to his message. That night was a sleepless one for Aḥmed. The gift of al-Mutawakkil, which he had given into the charge of Šāliḥ his son, troubled him greatly. Finally, he made up his mind to be rid of the money altogether, and, rising betimes in the morning, he summoned persons whom he ordered to take portions to the descendants of the Muhajirūn and Anṣār and to the gneial poor, until the whole sum received had been paid out. It was a great grief to him that now at the end of his life, after he had successfully resisted anything of the kind for so long a time, he was to be forced to be a compromised pensioner on the bounty of the Khalif, a relationship which he with all his might sought to avoid, and from which after this he succeeded in keeping himself almost entirely free to the very end of his days. When word came to the Khalif of Aḥmed’s action, ʿAlī ibn al-Jahm prevented his master’s displeasure by the explanation that such a man as Aḥmed had no need of money, for his living consisted but of a crust of bread.

In a short time, Aḥmed was on his way to the Khalif. Of the journey nothing of special interest is recorded, save that he availed himself of the legal provision that the prayers might be shortened while travelling, and that he, interpreting the provision as positive and not merely permissive, on one occasion complained that Šāliḥ his son had made the prayers too long. Arrived at the camp, he was first lodged in the house of Īṭāḵh 1), and word was sent to his sons from the Court that an allowance of 10,000 dirhems had been appointed

1) v. p. 144, note 2.
to be given them, in place of the money which had been given away by their father. It was, at the same time, specially ordered that their father should not be told of the matter. Al-Mutawakkil now sent his greeting to Ahmed, and congratulated him on his escape from the attempts of his enemies to involve him in suspicions. If we may believe the record, and we probably may, al-Mutawakkil also expressed his pleasure at Ahmed's presence, as he wished to consult him in the matter of Ibn Abî Dowâd, who had just fallen into disgrace'). Very soon a wish of the Khalif was made known to Ahmed that he should remain with him to teach Tradition and give up the idea of returning to Baghdaḍ. Especially did the Khalif desire him to undertake the teaching of al-Mu'tazz, his favorite son 2). From all this Ahmed tried to excuse himself on the ground of physical infirmity, pointing to his loose teeth and other evidences of age and weakness. He declared his belief to be that the invitation and entertainment were, together, parts of a conspiracy to keep him in restraint — to make him a prisoner while yet the guest of his Sovereign. And he vowed a vow that he would never as long as he lived tell another complete tradition. Some say that this vow extended over the last eight years of his life; but if he came to the Khalif in 237 A.H., and took upon him the vow in order to escape detention where he was, the duration of its binding force was a little over four years. It may be that the vow was taken when al-Wâthik requested him to leave Baghdaḍ, for we know that he ceased to teach during the latter months of that Khalif's reign; still, as a matter of fact, we have in this case more than eight years, and, on the whole, it seems desirable to date his final cessation of teaching from the time of this visit to al-Mutawakkil, when he was 73 years of age and, as we really know, a man much weakened in his physical constitution.

1) vid. note 2, p. 56.
2) al-Sujûtî, Tarîkh al-Khol. 357.
It appears to have been some time before Aḥmed was summoned to the Palace; but, in the meantime, the Khalif shewed a friendly interest in him and evinced a respect for his learning by submitting to him questions for his judgment upon them. One of these was the following: Supposing two animals to be fighting with their horns, and the one mortally wound the other; may the wounded animal if slaughtered be used for food? Aḥmed’s answer was that, if the animal shewed signs of life by moving its eyelids and by switching its tail, and if its blood was still flowing and not congealed, it might be slaughtered and eaten.

His Visit to the Palace. At last, he was ordered to appear in the presence of the Khalif’s son al-Muʿtazz. It was a sore affliction to Aḥmed when Yahya ibn Khakān came to fit on him the Court costume, but he was induced to allow it to be put upon him, though put it on himself he would not. On this occasion, Yahya ibn Khakān told the sons of Aḥmed that a stipend of 4000 dirhems per month had been ordered to be paid to them, but that their father was not to know of it. On arriving at the Palace, Aḥmed was well received, though there is but a very scant notice of the audience. After his return to his lodgings from this first visit to his new protégé, he felt badly over the sin he thought he had committed in wearing the fine clothes he had been obliged to put on; and, at once removing them, he ordered his son Šāliḥ to send them to Baghdād, where they were to be sold and their price given to the poor. His own family he forbade to reserve any of the garments for their personal use; but, notwithstanding, Šāliḥ kept the bonnet. Aḥmed’s peace of mind was much disturbed at this time, also, over his prospective visits to the Sovereign himself, and the charge he should have as tutor to the Khalif’s son; for it seems that al-Mutawakkil did not, at first, take into consideration the vow which Aḥmed had taken not to tell Tradition perfectly.

It is not likely that he really appeared before al-Mutawakkil at all; at least, we have nothing to shew that he
did, nor have we any evidence that he actually had the charge of the Khalif’s son. Al-Mu‘tazz, at the time of Almed’s arrival at Surramanra, was not more than six years of age, if as old as that 1).

Aḥmed’s next grievance arose when he learned that the house in which he was lodged had belonged to Īṭākh 2). On hearing this, he had a letter written to Mḥammed ibn al-Jarrāḥ, seeking that al-Mutawakkil would release him from the obligation to remain there. The Khalif granted this request, and then sought to engage another home for him, by asking some people to move out of the house which they were occupying. This Aḥmed did not wish and it was given up. Finally, a suitable place was hired for him at a rent of 200 dirhems. Here he was grieved at the luxury with which the house was furnished, and, leaving the finely furnished apartments, contented himself with a humble mattress which he had brought with him. The bountiful table which was placed at his disposal was, likewise, a great offence to him; a fact which we can readily believe, when we are informed that the landlord of the house offered Şāliḥ ibn Aḥmed a sum of 3000 dirhems a month for it, and was refused. Those of his family who were desirous of retaining the table were obliged to have it set down in the vestibule of the house, where he might not see it. He himself fasted most of the time, partaking only of a little sawīk and bread, until, at last, he was taken sick and the well-known physician Ibn Maṣūyah had to be sent to prescribe for him. He examined Aḥmed, assured him that ‘his trouble was not really a disease, but simply weakness and wasting of the body from lack of nourishment, and prescribed for him sesame oil, which he declared that he, as a Christian, was accustomed to give to the ascetics of his own faith when they had brought

---

1) He was born 232 A. H., Abu’l-Maḥ. II, 24.
2) Īṭākh the Turk killed 234 A. H., Abu’l-Maḥ. I, 702.
themselves to a similar condition. Ahmed at this time seems to have received every attention at the hands of al-Mutawakkil and those about him; though, it does not surprise us to find him sometimes refusing kindesses which were proffered.

Consulted at different times, attempts were made to draw from Ahmed an expression of opinion regarding Ahmed ibn Abi Dowad his former persecutor, who had now fallen from favor. But neither about the man, nor about his estates and their disposition would he express himself at all. Nor was he any more willing to hear reports of the public gossip about his old adversary and the course of action which had been adopted towards him 1).

Proposal to Buy a House for Him. After a time al-Mutawakkil proposed that Ahmed should buy a house for Ahmed, but the latter obstinately refused his consent to the proposal, and ordered his son Salih to be no party to such a project. In the end the idea was given up.

Ahmed again Consulted. The Khalif now began to urge that Ahmed should attend continuously on him, as had been urged to Attend on the Khalif his intention in bringing him from Bagdad. The day that he should begin had actually been agreed upon. Ahmed, however, never concealed from anyone how extremely distasteful to him the obligation was. His uncle Ishak ibn Hanbal also urged him to go in to the Khalif and offer him direction and cited the example of Ishak ibn Rahawaih, who had done this with Ibn Tahir (with advantage to himself). Ahmed replied that he did not approve of Ibn Rahawaih or his course, and that in his conviction to be near persons in authority or to keep company with them was to imperil faith and violate conscience. Even as it was, he did not feel himself safe from guilt. After Released. all this a message came from the Khalif releasing him from all obligation to appear before either himself or his successors, and from the wearing of the black

1) vid. note 2, p. 56; Abu’l-Mahb. I, 719.
Court costume. He might wear cotton or wool just as pleased him. It appears, in fact, to have been a general dispensation from fulfilling any requests from persons in authority which might be distasteful to him 1). Now, at last, he was released from his fear that they were going to make of him an attaché of the Court, and on this point had ease of mind. For his fellow-traditionists who remained at Court his feeling appears to have been one of censuring contempt. They were afraid to do that which would deprive them of their stipends from the Khalif, and, possibly, bring upon them much worse consequences. Ahmed had accomplished his end in securing his exemption from attendance at Court; not, however, by a direct refusal of the Khalif’s mandate, but by persistent excuses; by shewing a dislike to what he was expected to do; and by his discontent with the general arrangements which were made for him by al-Mutawakkil’s orders. He ob- structed as far as possible the royal wishes, but did not deny them.

Correspond-
ence with his Sons.

His two sons, Ṣāliḥ and Abdallah, now returned to Baghdad, and, after they had gone away, the fine furnishings of the house were removed, and the Khalif’s daily provision ceased to be provided. By Abdallah, who left him later than his brother, he sent word to Ṣāliḥ, telling him that both he and his brother were not desired to attend on him any further, for he regarded most of the

1) al-Maqrizi, p. 10.

وَكَانَ بِالْعَسَرِ يُنَاشِدُهُ وَيُسَلِّمُ الْمَخْلُوْثَ عَلَى الْخَيْبَةِ لِبِيْامْرَةَ وَبِنَاهَا وَقَالَ أَنَّهُ يُقَبِّلُ كَلَامَهُ هَذَا اسْتَخْفَى بِئْرَاهِمَ يَدْخُلُ عَلَى أَبِنِهِ طَافِرٍ فِيْمَرَةَ وَبِنِهَا فَقَالَ لَهُ أَبُو عَبْدِ اللَّهِ أَسْتِحْيِّي عَلَى بِئْرَاهِمَ رَأْسٍ وَأَنَا خُبْرُ رَأْسِ بِفَعَّالِهِ مَا لَهُ فِي رَوْيَتِي خَيرٌ وَلَا لَهُ فِي رَوْيَتِهِ خَيرٌ يُحْبَبُ عَلَى أَنْ رَأْبِهِ أَنْ آَمَرْهُ وَأَنْهَا الْمَلْدُوْنَ مَنْ تَأْمُونَ وَلِلْجِلْوِسِ مَنْ تَأْمُونَ نَكَى مُنْتَبَعِدُ مَنْ تَأْمُونَ مَا أَرَأَنَا نُسْلُمُ فَكِيْفُ لَوْ قَرَّنَا مَنْ
unpleasant experiences through which he had passed as due to their not supporting him in the stand he had taken and their want of active sympathy with his principles. Their acceptance of the Khalif's fine provision, if they came back, would bring him only into ill-favor with the public; and their acceptance of the Khalif's stipend, against his known wish and sense of duty, he considered a grave breach of filial piety. They both might go where they would with his prayers following them, but he desired that they should not cumber him further by their presence. Such was the tenor of his first two letters to his son Şâlih. In a third he reproaches his sons for not taking steps to secure his release from his unwilling detention. But he advises them to keep to their dwellings 1), and expresses the hope that God, by some means will open up his way.

Ahmed's Testament. While at the camp, Ahmed made his testament, which was as follows: In the name of God, the Merciful, the Gracious. This is the testament of Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal. He testifies that there is no God but Allah, alone and without fellow, and that Mohammed is his Servant and his Messenger whom He sent with the right guidance and the true religion, that he might make it known as the perfect religion, though the idolaters be displeased. He, further, testifies that those who obey his family and his relatives worship God among those who worship, praise him among those who offer praise and do good service to the Community of the Muslims. I, also, testify that I am satisfied with Allah as Lord, with Islam as a religion, and with Mohammed as Prophet. I, further, testify that Abdallah ibn Mohammed, known as Bûrân, has a claim against me for about fifty dinârs, and that he is to be credited in whatever he may say. Let what is due to him be paid from the rent of the house, if God will, and after he has been paid, the children of Şâlih and Abdallah, sons of Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal, are to receive, each male and female, ten dirhems,

1) p. 140, note 2.
after the payment of the money to Abû Mohammed. Witnessed by Abû Yusuf and Şâli̇h and Abdallah the two sons of Ahmed ibn Mohammed ibn Ḥanbal.

Permission
Granted to Re-
turn to Baghdâd. Khalif, with great kindness, acceded to his request and, not only allowed him to engage another dwelling, but sent to him one thousand dinârs that he might

---

1) Abû Nu‘aim, 153a, (The narrative now follows this source for a time.)
distribute it in alms. At the same time, he gave him leave to return home and ordered a pleasure barge to be given to him.
made ready to take him to Baghdâd; this last favor however, ʿAhmed declined, preferring to travel by land on account of risk to his health from the coldness of the river journey. When he left for home, al-Mutawakkil had a letter written to Moḥammed ibn Abdallah, the governor of Baghdâd, ordering him to deal kindly with ʿAhmed and take good care of him.

From the time of his return to Baghdâd, the story of ʿAhmed’s life is little more than a record of his differences with his family — in particular, with his sons Ṣâliḥ and Abdallah, and his paternal uncle Ishāk ibn Ḥanbal, — about the receiving of the Khalif’s stipends and gifts which came to them from time to time. He would block up the doorways between his sons’ houses and his own, when they expressed determination to accept the moneys, which they needed for the support of their families, and vigorously dissented from his view that their position was the same as his own, and that what was good for him was, likewise, good for them. For as long as two or three months together he would have nothing to do with his sons; and it was, apparently, only as their children in playing made their way into their grandfather’s house and touched a more sympathetic chord of his nature, or as the offices of his good friend Bûrân (Abdallah ibn Moḥammed) were called in that reconciliation was brought about. His uncle Ishāk certainly played a worthy part toward him. He pretended great friendship and complete deference to his wishes as to the receiving of money, and at the same time accepted it with the rest. When ʿAhmed discovered the dissimulation, he was very angry; and it was all to no purpose that Ishāk tried to excuse himself on the ground that he had used the money in giving alms, for he knew, and ʿAhmed knew, that he had not done so. ʿAhmed then ceased to worship in the mosque where his sons and uncle worshipped, and for the necessary prayers went to a mosque outside the city quarter in which he lived.

Harassed as they were by him, the members of ʿAhmed’s
family agreed once or twice to receive no more money; but, after a period of abstinence, the urgent needs of their families forced them to give up the self-denial and again claim their stipends. At last, Ḍūm went so far as to write to Yaḥya ibn Ḳhāṭān, telling him that he had made up his mind to request the withdrawal of the regular aid which was granted to his family. Ṣāliḥ anticipated his father, however, by informing the officer who was over that part of Baghdād in which they resided, and he succeeded in preventing Ḍūm’s letter from accomplishing its object. The aid was continued and, not only that, but all that was due to the family, 40,000 dirhems, being the undrawn stipend for ten months, was paid over to his sons. And, though the Khalif had ordered his officers not to inform Ḍūm of the payment, Ṣāliḥ himself sent word of it to his father. The old man, when he heard the message, exclaimed after a meditative silence, ‘What can I do when I desire one thing and God orders another!’

1) Abū Nuʿaim, 153b.
Again Suspect ed of 'Alyite Ingrimes. After Aḥmed’s return to Baghdād (the date of which we do not know) some talebearer reported to al-Mutawakkil the old slander that Aḥmed was harboring an 'Alyite. The Khalif sent word to Aḥmed of the report, and told him that he had imprisoned the man who made it until he should advise him as to what truth there was in the report, and direct him what to do to the man. Aḥmed answered asserting his ignorance of the whole matter, but advised that the man should be set free, as to visit him with death might bring affliction to many others who were no sharers in his crime.

A man whose name is given as Abū Ja'far ibn Dharīḥ al-'Ukbari relates that, in the year 236, (which appears to be a mistake, for the circumstances point to the time of the second accusation of harboring an 'Alyite, and this was after Aḥmed’s return to Baghdād from his visit to the camp in 237 A. H.) he sought Aḥmed to ask him some doctrinal question, but was told at his house that he had gone outside that quarter of the city to prayers. So Abū Ja'far sat down at the gate of the street to wait for his return. Presently, an old man, tall, with dyed hair and beard, and of a dark brown complexion, came up and entered the street, the visitor entering with him. At the end of the street, Aḥmed, for such it was, opened a gate and entered it, closing it after him and at the same time bidding his companion go his way. Just then, the latter noticed at the gate a mosque, in which an old man, also with dyed hair, was leading the prayers. When he had finished, Abū Ja'far asked a man who was at the prayers about Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal and why he had refused to answer him. The man re-
plied that Ahmed had been suspected of harboring an 'Alyite; that, on this account, the prefect of police had surrounded his dwelling with a cordon of police and then had proceeded to search it. For this reason he avoided speaking to people. The police had, however, found nothing to give substance to the suspicion which had been raised. Abū Ja'far, then, enquired who it was whom he had seen leading the prayers, and, on learning that it was Ahmed’s uncle Ishāk, he asked why Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal did not pray behind his uncle in this mosque which was near his own door. The man answered that he did not worship with his uncle, nor even his own sons, nor speak with any of them, because they had accepted the stipends and gifts of the Khalif 1).

1) Abū Nu‘aim, 142 a,
Al-Mutawakkil never ceased to shew his interest in Ahmed's welfare, and to make frequent inquiries about him. This was, for some reason which is hard to divine, most disagreeable to Ahmed; and he professed himself as preferring to die rather than have to live through such incessant attentions. Among the evidences of the Khalif's interest was a letter written by 'Obaidallah ibn Yahya on his account, asking Ahmed to write him his views on the Korân, not by way of assurance of his accordance with the opinion of the Sovereign, but merely for the information of the Commander of the Faithful. In reply Ahmed dictated to his son a letter to 'Obaidallah, in which he said:

1) Abû Nu'aim, 153 b, [Cod. no points]

أَلَّا كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ لِقَالَ إِنَّ يُبِلِّغَهُ السَّلَامُ وَيَسَعِيْهِ عَنْ حَالَةِ فَنَسَرُ، نَكْنِي بِذَلِكَ فِى أَخَذِهِ نُغْصَةً فَغَيْزَهُ [تَعْصِيْهُ] ﴿ۚ إِيَّكَ بِاللَّهِ لَوْ أَنِّي نَفْسِي فِي بُدِّي لآَرْسِلْتُهَا ﴾ وَبِضُمْ اصْبَعَهُ ثَمْ فَيَفْتَنُكُهَا

2) Abû Nu'aim, 153 b ff.

هَدَّنَا سُلِيمَانَ بِنَ أَحْمَدَ بِنَّا عَبْدُ اللهِ بْنَ اَحْمَدَ بِنَ حَنْبِلَ حُبُودٍ وَهَدَّنَا مُحْمَدٍ وَعَلِىٌّ وَقَالُوا شَنَّا مُحْمَدٍ بِنَ اَسْمَعِيْلَ شَنَّا مُحْمَدٍ وَقَالُوا شَنَّا مُحْمَدٍ بِنَ اَحْمَدَ بِنَ حَنْبِلَ قَدْ كُتِبَ عُبْيِدُ اللَّهِ بِنَ يَحِيٍّ إِلَيْ أَنْ رَجُلٍ اللَّهِ يُكْبِرُهُ أَنْ أمِيرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أمَرَّيْنِ أَنْ أَكْتَبَ الْبَيْكَ إِلَيْهِ عَنْ اَمِرَ الْقُرْآنِ لَا مُسِلِّطَةٍ إِمْتَكَانٍ وَلَكِنَّ مُسِلِّطَةٍ مَّعْرَفَةٍ وَبَصِيرَةٍ فَامْتَلِئَ عَلَيْ أَنْ رَجُلٍ اللَّهِ إِلَيْ عُبْيِبِدِ اللَّهِ بِنَ يَحِيٍّ وَحَدِّى مَا مَعْيَ أَحْدَ مَسْمَ عِلْمِ الرَّحْمَٕم اَحْسَنُ اللَّهُ عَلَّيْكَ أَلاَّ نُحْسِنَ لِلآمِرَ كِلَّهَا وَدَفْعَ عِلْمِ مَكَّةِ الْمَدِينَةِ وَالْأَخْرَةِ بَيِّنَتَهُ قَدْ كَتَبَتِ الْبَيْكَ رُضِىَ اللَّهُ بِنَعْكَ بِالْحَدُٕدِ سَلَّ عَلَى أَنْ يَّدَعُّ رَزَقَ اَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ فَقَدْ كَانَ النَّاسُ فِي خَوْصٍ مِّنَ البَاطِلِ وَخَالِفَةٍ شَهِيدٍ يَغْتَفِيْنَ فِيهِ حَتَّى اَفْضَتُ لِلخَالِفَةِ إِلَى
I ask God to continue his aid to the Commander of the Faithful, for men were in the depth of falsehood and immersed in violent differences of opinion until the Khalifate came to the Commander of the Faithful, and God banished by means of the Commander
of the Faithful every heresy, and took away from men the straitness and humiliation of the prisons. God has, thus, changed all that, and removed it through the Commander of the Faithful, [all of] which has made a great impression upon the Muslims; hence, they pray God to bless the Commander of the Faithful, and I ask God to hearken to all
good petitions for the Commander of the Faithful and to perfect [all] that for the Commander of the Faithful, that he may go on in his design; [I ask God] to help him, also, in that in which he is engaged. Now, it is related from Ibn ‘Abbās
that he said, ‘Do not smite God’s Book one part of it with another part, for that casts doubt into your hearts’. And it is told from Abdallah ibn ‘Omar that he said, ‘Some persons were sitting at the Prophet’s door, and some of them

عمر بن عبد العزيز قتل من جعل دينه غريباً للمحسومات أكثر

[Cod. 52] فأخبر بالخلنق ثم قال والامر

فاخبرنا أن الأمر غير الخلق وقال تعالى الرحمن علَّم القرآن خلق

الإنسان علَّم الحديث [3] فأخبر تعالى أن القرآن من

علمه وقال رأى ترضى عنك اليهود ولا النصارى حتى تتبعل منهم

ذل أن ترى الله هو الندي ومن أثبت أقوامهم بعد أن ذاك: أ新三板

[Cor. 2. 114] وقال

بمؤت الثديين أوتوا الكتاب بكيل آية ما تبعوا قوماً وما أثبت

نابع قومهم وما بعضهم بمثابة فتة بعض ولئن أثبتت أقوامهم من

بما جاء من العلم انك إذا نص الظالمين

[Cor. 2. 140] وقال

بذلك انزلناها حكماً عريباً ولئن أثبتت أقوامهم بعد ما جاء من
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were saying, Does not God say so and so? while others were saying, Nay! does not God say so and so? and the Messenger of God heard that, and went out — and it was as if pomegranates 1) had been burst over his face — and he said, ‘Was it this ye were commanded to observe, to smite God’s Book one part of it with another? The peoples who were before you erred thus, but ye have nothing to do with this. Observe what ye are ordered to do and do it; and observe what ye are forbidden to do and abstain from it’. It is related from Abû Huraira from the Prophet that he said, ‘Disputation about the Korân is unbelief.’ It is related from Abû Juhaîm, one of the Companions of the Prophet, from the Prophet that he said, ‘Do not dispute over the Korân, for disputation over it is unbelief.’ Abdâllah ibn ‘Abbâs said, ‘A man came to ‘Omâr ibn al-Khattâb, and ‘Omâr began to ask him about the people, and he said, ‘O Commander of the Faithful, so and so many of them recite the Korân (or, supply مَرَّةٌ: ‘Some of them have read the Korân so and so many times’).’ And Ibn ‘Abbâs said, ‘So I said, By God, I do not like them to vie with each other in rapid reading of the Korân, but ‘Omâr

[1] The seeds of the pomegranate, but often “the pomegranate” itself.

*Kor. 13. 37*
blamed me for saying this, and said, 'Stop! Hush!' I went down, then, to my dwelling afflicted and grieving [because he seemed to oppose my zeal for the Korān]. And, while I was in this state of mind, a man came to me and said, 'Answer the summons of the Commander of the Faithful.' So I went out, and lo! he was at the door waiting for me, and he took me by the hand, went aside with me, and said, 'What was that with which you were displeased in what the man said a little while ago?' I said, 'O Commander of the Faithful, when they indulge in this rivalry to see who can read fastest, they read with mumbling voice; and if they read with mumbling voice, they dispute with one another; and if they dispute with one another, they fall into discord; and if they fall into discord they fight with one another. He said, 'Very good! Verily, by God, I was concealing it [the same opinion] from anyone until you said it'. It is related from Jābir ibn Abdallah that he said, 'The Prophet was presenting himself to the men in the Mauķif [at Arafāt] and he said, Is there any man who will take me to his people? for the Koreish have refused me the right to make known the Word of my Lord'. It is related from Jubair ibn Nufair that he said, 'The Messenger of God said, You cannot return unto God by means of anything more excellent than that which went out from him. He meant the Korān'. It is related from Abdallah ibn Mas'ūd that he said, 'Write the bare Korān, but do not write in it anything except the Word of God'. It is related from 'Omar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb that he said, 'This Korān is the Word of God; give it, then, its proper place'. A man said to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, 'O Abū Saʿīd, when I read the Word of God, and think over it, I almost despair and give up hope'. And al-Ḥasan said, 'The Korān is the Word of God; the works of the children of Adam incline toward weakness and insufficiency, but work and be of good cheer!' Farwa ibn Naufal al-Ashjaʾi said, 'I was a neighbour of al-Khabbāb, who was one of the Companions of the Prophet, and I went out with him one day from the mosque, he holding me by the
hand, and he said, O you! draw near to God by means of that which you are able to use as means, but you cannot draw near to God by means of anything dearer unto him than his Word'. A man said to al-Ḥakam ibn Ḫayṣ, 'Uyaina, 'What leads the sceptics \(^1\) unto this [state of theirs]?' He said, 'Disputation'. Muḥamī ibn Kurra, whose father was one of those who came to the Prophet said, 'Beware of these disputations, for they spoil good works'. Abū Kīlama said (and he had met more than one of the Companions of the Messenger of God), 'Do not keep company with sceptics, (or he said, 'With disputatious people') for I do not feel secure that they will not plunge you in their error, and make obscure unto you a part of what ye know'. There entered two sceptics unto Muḥammed ibn Sirīn, and they said, 'O Abū Bekr, let us tell thee a tradition'. He said, 'Nay'. Then they said, 'Then let us recite unto thee a verse from the Korān'. He said, 'Nay; ye surely shall go away from me, or else I shall go away'. So the two men arose and went out, and one of those present said, 'O Abū Bekr, what was the matter, that a verse from the Korān might not be recited unto thee?' and Ibn Sirīn said to him, 'I was afraid that they would recite a verse unto me and would pervert it and that that should become fixed in my heart'. Muḥammed however, added, 'Had I known that I should be as I am now, I would certainly have allowed them'. A sceptic once asked Ayūb al-Sakhtiyānī, 'O Abū Bekr, I would ask thee just a word'; but he turned his back, and motioned with his hand, 'Nay; not half a word'. Tāus ibn Tāus said to a son of his, when a sceptic was speaking, 'O my son, put your fingers in your ears so that you shall

---

\(^1\) This word does not quite represent the idea of the original ًلاَّ الأَغْرَاء. These were a class of men who were not prepared to accept the religious systems of other persons, except as their own reasoning confirmed their positions. They were thus in the first instance sceptical and then eclectic, taking from different systems such views as they approved or 'desired' to take. The name Ahlu'l-ʾĀhwā 'men of desires', is thus appropriate. v. Shah-rastānī, Haarbrücker's transl'\textit{n} 1, p. 1 and note; Steiner, Die Muḥtaziliten, 6.
not hear what he says’. Then he said, ‘Run! Run!’ Omar ibn Abd al-ʿAzīz said, ‘He who makes his religion a butt for disputations is the most unsettled of men’. (Abūl Faḍl said, ‘I found it in a book of my father’s in his own handwriting, ‘Ismā’īl told us from Yūnus saying, I was told that Omar ibn Abd al-ʿAzīz said, ‘He who makes his religion a butt for disputations is the most unsettled of men’). Ibrāhīm al-Nakha’ī said, ‘These people shall have nothing laid up in store for them until there is with you an excellent provision’. Al-Ḥasan used to say, ‘The worst diseased person is the man diseased at heart’; he meant the desires [i.e. men of desires — sceptics]. Hudhaifa ibn al-Yamān said, ‘Fear God, O ye Reciters of the ʿKorān, and go in the way of those who were before you; for, if ye strive for precedence, ye have yet been preceded by a great distance, and if ye leave this way to the right or left ye have clearly committed error’. The letter went on to say: ‘I have omitted the mention of the Isnāds because of the oath that I previously swore, of which the Commander of the Faithful is cognizant. If it were not for that, I should have mentioned them [the traditions] with their Isnāds. The ʿKorān, too, has said, ‘And, if one of the idolaters seek protection of thee, grant him protection that he may hear the Word of God (Korān 9. 6). ‘Do not the Creation and the Command belong to him?’ (Korān 7.52). So he tells about ‘the Creation’, and then he says, ‘and the Command’, thus he tells us that the ‘Command’ is something else than ‘the Creation’ 1). Also, ‘The Merciful taught the ʿKorān, he created man, he taught him the explanation’ (Korān 55.1, 2, 3). Thus God tells that the ʿKorān is from his Knowledge (ʿilm). He, also, says, ‘And the Jews will not be content with thee, nor the Christians, until thou dost follow their religion. Say, ‘Verily the direction of God is the right direction; but, surely, if thou dost follow their passions and their desires, after that which has come to thee

---

1) cf. p. 119 and, also, p. 139.
of knowledge (علم) there is for thee from God neither friend nor helper’ (Koran 2.114). He says also, ‘Even if thou dost give to those to whom the Book has been given every sign, they will not follow thy kibla, and thou wilt not follow their kibla, and one part of them will not follow the kibla of the other part. And, surely, if thou dost follow their passions, after what has come to thee of knowledge (علم), in that case, thou art, verily, one of those who do evil’ (Koran 2.140). And also, ‘And, thus, we have sent it down as a decision in the Arabic language; and, surely, if thou dost follow their passions, after what has come to thee of knowledge (علم), there shall be for thee from God neither friend nor helper’ (Koran 13.37). Now, the Koran is from the Knowledge of God; and in these verses is a proof that that which came to him [the Messenger of God] is the Koran, according to his [God’s] saying, ‘And, surely, if thou dost follow their passions, after what has come to thee of knowledge (علم).’

It has been related, moreover, from more than one of those who went before us that they used to say, ‘the Koran is the Word of God uncreated’, and that is what I believe. I am no dialectical theologian; I approve of argument in a matter of this kind only by means of what is in God’s Book or a tradition from the Prophet, or from his Companions, or from those who followed them (Tabi’un), but, as for anything else, argument by means of it is not to be commended.

On one occasion, when al-Mutawakkil came to al-Shamsiya on his way to al-Madâ’in, it was expected that Ahmed and his family would come, or send, to pay their respects to him, but Ahmed would neither go himself nor would he

1) “Passions” in these passages represents the word ‘3-Ahwâ’ found in the name Ahlu’l-3-Ahwâ, so that the passages must be taken as condemning rationalism in theological matters.
Visit of Yahya allow Șâlih to go, for fear he should call at-
tention to himself. The result of this was that
the next day Yahya ibn Khaḳan came with a
great retinue to visit Aḥmed, bringing him greeting and
many friendly enquiries from the Khalif, who, at the same
time, besought the prayers of the Imâm. These last Aḥmed
assured Yahya were offered up every day for his master.
Yahya then offered him a thousand dinârs for distribution
among the poor. These, however, Aḥmed would not accept,
pleading exemption, as he did on other occasions, on the
ground that the Khalif had agreed to excuse him from
obligation to do anything that might be distasteful to him.
The money was finally given to Aḥmed’s sons.

Invitation from
Mohammed ibn
Abdallah ibn
Tâhir.

On another occasion, Mohammd ibn Abdallah ibn Țâhir besought Aḥmed to pay him a visit
and strongly urged his request. This invitation, however, Aḥmed also declined, offering as an excuse the
Khalif’s dispensation. After these incidents he took upon
himself a rigid fast, abstaining from all fat and, apparently,
from meat, for the record states that before this time he had
been provided with a dirhem’s worth of meat, from which he ate for a month! 1)

---

1) Abû Nu'aim, 155a.
In the course of events we have been brought now to the year 241 A.H. On the first day of Rabi’ I of this year 1), Ahmed was taken with a

*Ahmed’s Sickness and Death.*

 عليه وفُقَّل جِبْتُه واسِلَتْه عن حاله وَقَل امِّي الرَّحْمَة بِاللهِ الْكِرْمَة وَقَد ائتمب باللهِ حَالَتَه وَقَد أَنَبِيَتْهُ قَبْلَ عَلَى يَوْمٍ أَلَا وَأَنَا أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَى أَمَانِي النَّاس وَقَد أَنْبِي عَلَي...
fever attended with difficulty in breathing, and became so weak that his limbs would not support him. A physician came to see him, and prescribed for his sickness roast
pumpkin, with the liquor of the pumpkin to be taken as a drink. Ahmed asked particularly that this might not be prepared in the houses of either of his sons. As soon as it was learned that he was sick, people began to come in crowds to visit him, until it became necessary to close the door of the street; and the governor, hearing of the crowds,
considerately placed guards before the street door, while the family also placed guards before the door of the house. Only his physicians and such as he himself desired to see were then admitted. Among those who were thus allowed to see him was a neighbor, an elderly man with dyed hair and beard, on seeing whom Ahmed became greatly excited, and called the attention of those about him to this man as one who
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وجعل أولاده بُنِّكَبُون عليه وقبّلْه عليه قال صالح ورسل ابن أبي طاهر

يقول مسي صلى على أبيه قبلته أنا فلما سُنِّننا إلى الصحراء وجعلنا

ابن طاهر رُكِّبًا إلى الينا خروطات وغُرِّنا فلما وضع السرير تقدمت

للصلاة فجأة ابن طالوت وحمّد بن نصر وقبّصنا على يدي وقالا

الأمير فعّلُنا فغلبوا على و صلى ولم يعلم أكثر الناس بتقدمه

فلما كان من المغد وعلموا بذلك صاروا يأتون القبر افراحًا فيصلون

عليه ومكتووا على ذلك اسمه قيل ولده عبد الله وكننا نحن والهاشميون

صلبنا عليه داخل الندأ قال للنف سمعت عبد الوهاب الساحر يقول

ما بلغنا أن جميع كان في الجاهلية والسلام مثله حتى أن المواضع

التي وقف الناس فيها مُسْكَت وحُرِّزت فإذا هي نحو من الف الف

وحبسنا على السور كُو مس سينين الف امرأة وقال أبو زرعة بلغني

أن المتوكل أمر أن يمسح الموضع الذي وقف الناس فيه للصلاة على

أحمد بن حنبل فبلغ مقام الفى الف وخمس مائة الف وفتح الناس

ابواب المنارة في الشوارع والبيوت والحده وصاروا ينادون من

اراد الهضوء وقال أحمد بن الحسن المقتناي كنت ببغداد ونا في

بستان لصقِّي فيه فإذا بشيل ود وعلوا يقول فسمت علينا

وقلت أراكما من غير هذا البلد قلة نعم كن من جبل اللَّغَم

[اللَّغَم] حضرنا جنّرارة أحمد بن حنبل وما بقي أحد من الأولباء

[Cod.
was keeping alive the good rule of the Prophet'. Daily reports of the sick man's condition were now sent from Baghdād to the Khalif at the camp. These were never very encouraging, however, as Ahmed sank gradually day by day until he died. He seems to have borne his sickness with great fortitude, in which he was supported by a tradition of Tāús,
who is reported to have ‘disliked groaning in sickness’, on the ground that it was tantamount to complaining against God. Ahmed, therefore, was never heard to groan, except on the day in which he died. Two or three days before his death, he enquired for his purse, and asked his son Šalih to look what was in it. Šalih did so and found a solitary
dirhem. This his father directed him to use, together with some of the rent to be collected from the lodgers in his house, in buying dates to discharge an oath of almsgiving which he had taken upon himself. Šāliḥ carried out the order he had received, and returned to his father one-third of a dirhem, on receiving which Ahmed rejoiced at the prospect of dying as poor as he had lived.

The duration of his sickness was not long. The physician declared that grief and the hard ascetic character of his life had ruptured the internal organs of his body and could give the family little hope of his recovery. A characteristic incident occurred when he was being washed preparatory to the performance of the last devotions in which he took part. He was unable to speak, but, strong in the ruling passion of scrupulousness in the law, he made a sign that his sons who were washing him should wash between his fingers as well as on the back and front of them. When this was done, it is said that he rested quietly until he passed away. His prayers he performed to the very last, his sons assisting him in the rak'as. One of his last charges was that three hairs of the Prophet which he had in his possession should at his death be placed, one on each eye and one on his lips, and this was actually done 1). So he died. The date of the

event was Friday, the twelfth of Rabi‘ I, 241 A.H., his age being a few days, or it may be hours, more or less than seventy-seven years.

His Funeral. There was the most wonderful scene of grief all over the city of Baghâtûd, and even in distant places, when the news of his death became known. The scene at the funeral, on the afternoon of the day of his death, was one such as must have been seldom witnessed anywhere. The estimates of the number of those who attended are very discrepant. Some say 600,000 were present on the spot where the prayers were held over him; others say 2,500,000, and other figures fall between these two 1). It is said that there were 10,000, and some say even 20,000, converts to Islâm from the other religions on the occasion of Aḥmed’s death; but inasmuch as the family and others specially interested in him knew nothing of any such number, al-Subkî’s teacher Dhahâbî thought such figures to be absurd and that ten converts would be nearer the truth. The Emîr Ibn Ṭâhir wished to furnish the burial suit of Aḥmed but Ṣâliḥ refused to accept it, as he knew that his father when living would have been unwilling to accept any gift from the Emîr. The filial respect of Ṣâliḥ for his dead father’s wishes in regard to receiving gifts or attentions from persons of state now took very decided form. It was only by main force that his friends withheld him from displacing Ibn Ṭâhir in the official conduct of the prayers at the funeral 2). Indeed, it was not known by the people that Ibn Ṭâhir had prayed over Aḥmed, until the day after he was buried. When they knew they flocked in crowds to his grave in the cemetery of the Bâb-Ḥarb 3); so much so, that one man who attended the funeral, declared that it was a week before he was able to come near the tomb. His own family and the Ḥâshîmites also conducted prayers for him inside their own quarters on the evening of the day of his death 4). In the time of Ibn Challîkân the

tomb of Ahmed in the cemetery of the Báb-Harb was known far and wide and was much visited 1). At a later time, the raised work of the tomb was destroyed and the grave made level with the surface of the ground because of the undue reverence which was being shewn to it 2).

Among those who are said to have written of the Manâkib of Ahmed are Abu'1-Hasan ibn al-Munâdî 3), the Ḥâfīz al-Manda 4), al-Baiḥakî 5), Abû Ismâ'îl al-Ansârî, the Faḳīh Abû ʿAlî ibn al-Bannâ, commentator of al-Khurkî, the Ḥâfīz Ibn Nâṣîr, the Ḥâfīz Abu'l-Faraj ibn al-Jauzî 6), Abd al-Rahmân ibn Abî Hâṭîm al-Râzî and al-Ḥasan ibn Mūḥammad al-Khâllâl 7) 8).

IV.

His Family. The immediate descendants of Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal 9), except his two sons Ṣâliḥ and Abdallah, both of whom

1) Ibn Chall. N°. 19; vid. also al-Nawawi, p. 146.
3) al-Fihrist I, 38 f.; Dhahabî Ţabaḳât II, N°. 55.
4) Dhahabî, Ţabaḳât 13, N°. 29.
5) Ibn Chall. N°. 27; Dhahabî Ţabaḳât 14, N°. 13.
7) Dhahabî, Ţabaḳât 13, N°. 68. The others I have not been able to trace in the authorities at command.
8) al-Mâkhrizi, p. 18.
9) al-Mâkhrizi, p. 2.
were men of eminence, were not remarkable in their time. His eldest son was Şâliḥ, surnamed Abu'l Faḍl, who was born in the year 203. He related Tradition from his father and from Abu'l Walîd al-Ṭayâlisî and 'Alî ibn al-Madînî, and had as pupils his own son Zuhair, who died in 303, al-Baghwâ and Mohâmmed ibn Makhlad. Şâliḥ occupied the office of Kâdi of Ispahàn. His mother was 'Abbâsah bint al-Faḍl. His death occurred in the year 265 1). The second son was Abdallah Abû Abd al-Râhmân 2). He studied a great deal with his father, and studied, also, with Abd al-Âfâl ibn Ḥammâd, Yahya ibn Ma'în, Abû Bekr ibn Abî Shaiba, and many others. He was a man thoroughly conversant with

1) Ibn Chall. N°. 19, says 'Ramaḍân 266 A. H.'
Tradition and the arguments for it. The special distinction
which he enjoyed, however, was that of being the greatest
authority on the traditions of his father. It is related of him
that, when he was on his death-bed, he asked to be buried
in the quarter called commonly al-Ḥarbiya [or
القطيبة = the
quarter of the city or the plot of ground in which his house
stood?]. Those present asked him if he would not rather be
buried with his father in the cemetery at the Bāb-Ḥarb, but
he said he preferred to be under the protection of a prophet
whom he knew by trustworthy reports to have been buried
in al-Ḥarbiya to being under the protection of his father. He
died at the age of 77 in the year 290 A.H. 1) By a con-
cubine named Ḩisn Aḥmed had a third son, who was named
Ṣaʿīd and who became in time Ḧāḍī of Kūfa. By the same
mother he had, further, two sons Moḥammed and al-Ḥasan
and a daughter Zainab, and, likewise, by the same mother,
twin sons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain, who died soon after their
birth. Finally, he had another daughter whose name was Fāṭima. 2) This is all that is known of his family.

Testimonies A few evidences of the esteem in which Aḥmed
of Esteem, was held will assist us to place him in the posi-
tion which he really occupied in the estimation of his
own and of following generations. His pupil Abū Zurʿa
said he had never met with any one in whom learning (عَلَمَ),
selldenial, knowledge of the law and general knowledge
(مَعْرِفة) were so combined as in his master 3). This is one
opinion out of a host of similar ones, all of which are ex-

1) Ibn Chall. N°. 19 says, '8th day remaining of Jumādā I, some say Jumādā II'.
2) cf. Abū Nuʿaim, 153 b, قال أبو الفضل صالح: ثم كتب لنا بشيء إلى بابوريسا فبلغه فاجأه إلى الكورة التي في الباب فقال يا صالح: انظر ما كان للحسين وم على قلبه به الخ The Ḫumm ʿAlî here referred to may be the Zainab or Fāṭima named above.
3) Abū Nuʿaim, 139 a, أخبرنا أبو بكر محمد بن أحمد بن محمد
ceedingly fulsome in expression, but still afford us the substantial truth of his high worth in the view of the men among whom he moved. By many testimonies he is placed at the side of the greatest doctors of İslâm in the ages which had preceded him, — Sofyân al-Thaurî, Mâlik ibn Anas, Abd al-Râhmân ibn Amr al-Auzâ‘î, al-Laith ibn Sa‘îd and Ibn ʿAbbâs. The regard in which Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal was held is also seen in the way in which he is cited as giving an opinion on the doctors of his time; as, for example, by al-Nawawî, biographies of ʿAlî ibn al-Madînî, Yazîd ibn Hârûn, Yahya ibn Sa‘îd al-Kaṭṭân, Yahya ibn Ma‘în; also Ibn Chullikân on Abû Thaur and Ishâk ibn Râhawaih. Al-Dhahabî, too, in his Ṭabaḵât adduces Aḥmed’s opinion in regard to the men of his time with great frequency and with evidence of much respect. It used to be held that, if Aḥmed discredited anybody, he could not fail to suffer for it in the eyes of people generally ¹). A noteworthy testimony is that of al-Ḥusain ibn ʿAlî ibn Yazîd al-Karâbîsî, a man with whose theological views Aḥmed had little sympathy. He said that those who spoke evil of Aḥmed were

¹) Abû Nu‘âim, 140 a, 470, a testimony of al-Husain ibn Yazid is noteworthy. A man with whose theological views Aḥmed had little sympathy said that those who spoke evil of Aḥmed were

The force of the passage is clear. For Ḍhahabî argues for Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal’s apportionment of esteem to the theologians of his time, 2, 140 a. Ibn Abî Nu‘aim, 140 a, 1. 2.
like people who tried to kick over the mountain Abū Қūbais with their feet 1).

*Ahmed as a faḳīḥ.* As a faḳīḥ he bore a great reputation among his companions, as well as with others in his own generation and the generations following. The reputation of ِAḥmed in Baghdād at the time of Abū Jaʿfar Moḥammad ibn Jarir al-Ṭabarī († 310 A.H.) is shewn by the anger of the Baghdād people that al-Ṭabarī should have omitted reference to ِAḥmed in his book upon ‘the Faḳīḥs and their distinctive doctrines’. His reason was that ِAḥmed was no faḳīḥ but rather a traditionist 2). The opinion was given out in his own day that he was a greater faḳīḥ than ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī 3). One traditionist in speaking of ِAḥmed’s authority on the subject of Tradition said that when ِAḥmed supported him in a tradition he was indifferent as to who might differ from him in relation to it 4). He was credited with extraordinary power of discrimination in the judging of sound and unsound traditions 5). The general impression that one gets from the biographical details which we have brought together in the present work, and from less important notices which could not with propriety be introduced into the narrative, is that ِAḥmed’s judgment on points of Fīkh was seriously reached and often shrewd, but always shewed narrowness. His general reliance upon the Қorān and the Tradition cannot be discredited from a Muslim standpoint, and was a safer course, viewed from that point of view, than any setting aside of such evidences in favor of individual judgment could have been 6).


٢ al-Nawawi, p. 1ff.

٣ cf. p. 28.

٤ cf. Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 95.
which vitiated his claim to direct men to sound and permanent positions in theology. Such was impossible with his method. Belief founded on the letter of any standard of faith will always be narrow, dogmatic and polemical. Life founded on the letter of any rule of conduct can be only hard and exclusive in character. Just but not genial; irreproachable, but unattractive — such is the life. Sincere and earnest and, with its own postulates, correct, but, still, wrong at its foundation and unsightly in its superstructure — such is the opinion.

We subjoin a few remarks about the traits of character and habits of life of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, with a passing notice of his personal appearance. He was abstemious in the extreme, so much so, in fact, that his life might be termed a continuous fast. He is reported never to have bought a pomegranate, quince or any other kind of fruit, unless it might be a melon or grapes, which he ate with bread. In eating his bread he frequently dispensed with the use of vinegar. It was often the case that his sons bought things which they deemed permissible or even necessary, but which were luxuries in his eyes; and to escape in such a case his strictures they hid the things from him altogether 1). It is said that when he appeared before Ishāk ibn Ibrāhīm after his long imprisonment in 219 A.H., Ishāk looked in the little basket which Aḥmed had with him and found his store of food to consist of two pieces of bread, a piece of cucumber and some salt 2).

He had a profound dislike to the receiving of money assistance from others, and took very little pains to secure assistance from others, and took very little pains to secure

---

1) al-Nawawī, p. 145.
2) al-Maqrīzī, p. 5.

بعت اسکان بن ابراهیم فاخد الحنبل الذَّي، فيه افطار ابن عبد الله فنظر الیه فاذا فيه رغغان وشيء من بهاء وملع نعاجم اسکان من ذلك.
money for himself. His happiest moments were those when he was left without a coin in his purse 1). His needs were few and his expenses next to nothing 2). We have had in the course of the narrative abundant illustration of his selfdenial and his preference for poverty, and, were it desirable to do so, much more of the same kind of incident could be furnished.

Characteristics. His demeanor was that of a man abstracted from the common concerns of life, though in questions of learning he always shewed the liveliest interest 3). He was a man of gentle nature, but capable of being roused to vehemence at the sight of injustice or wrong done to men or of impiety shewn toward God 4). That he was looked upon as a scrupulously just man, even among those who were not Muslims, is shewn in many ways. One incident may be mentioned. It is related that two Magian women had a dispute about an inheritance before a Muslim Kâdî, and when judgment had been rendered, the woman against whom the judge had decided said to him, ‘If thou hast decided against me according to the decision of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, I am content; if not, I will not acquiesce in it’. The narrator of the story thought it such a strong testimony to Aḥmed’s character that he told it far and near to those whom he met 5). Aḥmed’s aversion toward lightness,

1) al-Nawawi, p. 150.
3) Abū Nuʿaim, 138 b, حديثنا سليمان بن احريد قتلا أحمد بن حنبل 3
4) cf. pp. 73, 150.
5) Abū Nuʿaim, 141 a, حديثنا أني قتلا أبو حسن قتلا عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل حدثني نوح بن حبيب الفوّصي قال كأن عندنا
particularly in men of learning, was pronounced. On a certain occasion Yazīd ibn Ḥārūn was indulging in pleasant badinage with his amanuensis, when some one in the room gave a slight cough. Yazīd enquired who it might be that had given the apparent sign of disapproval, and, on being told that it was Aḥmed, he smote his forehead, and, turning to those nearest to him, asked them reproachfully why they had not told him of Aḥmed’s presence that he might have observed becoming gravity before him 1).

People used to say that Aḥmed himself was a touchstone or Mīhna. A versifier, Ibn Aʿyan, has the lines, ‘Ibn Ḥanbal is a safe test (Mīhna): By the love borne to Aḥmed the pious man is known; But when one is seen who defames him, Then be sure that his true character will be disclosed’ 2).

1) Abū Nuʿaim, 140 a, حدثنا سليمان بن احمد ثنا للحسن بن على المعيرو قل سمعت خلف بن سالم يقول قل كنا في مجلس يزيد ابن عروة فمرح بيد مع مستسلمه فتناولح احمد بن حنبل وكان في المجلس فقل بيد من المتناحح فقال له احمد بن حنبل فضرب يربى بيد على جبينه وقال ألا أعلمون أن احمد عاهنا حتى لا امرح

2) al-Subki, p. 134, قال (ابو جعفر محمد بن دينار الامام), انشدنا ابن اعين في الامام احمد بن حنبل رضي الله عنه

"أضحك ابن حنبل مكننة مأمونة
"وياكتب احمد يعرف المتناسک"
Religious Character. An indication of Ahmed's character from the religious point of view is found in the following verses, which are said to be of his composition and furnish the only discoverable trace of his poetic talent. 'Whenever thou art alone at any time, do not say I am alone, but say over me is a Watcher; And do not think that God is indifferent to what has passed by, and that what thou hidest from him is out of his sight. We give ourselves no care until sins follow upon the track of sins; But then! would that God would grant us repentance, and we would repent!')

It is said that he was wont to pray every day 300 rak'a, and that, even after he was scourged and his bodily weakness was extreme, he reached the number of 150 daily. He completed a recitation of the Koran once in every seven days. It was his custom at night after the last prayer of the day, to sleep for a short time, and then to arise and pray formal or extemporized prayers until the morning. 2)

---

1) Abû Nu'aim, 155 a.

2) Abû Nu'aim, 143 a.
When at home in Baghdâd he is said to have perseveringly kept to his house, so that none ever saw him, unless it were at public worship, at a funeral, or visiting the sick. He was scrupulous in his adherence to Tradition and to the ritual observances. We have already cited the incident of the ritual ablutions performed on him by his sons just before his death, when, though unable to speak, he made signs that they should wash between, as well as upon the front and back of his fingers.

Personal appearance, Ahmed was of beautiful countenance and of medium height. He used to dye his hair and beard with henna and katam, but not a

1) Abû Nu‘aim, 143 b.

2) vid. p. 171.
deep red, for in his beard were seen black hairs. He began the practice of dyeing his hair and beard when in his sixty-third year, and then wholly out of regard for the practice of the Prophet 1).

V.

His Views. Ahmed ibn Hanbal was a man whose peculiar temperament disposed him not only to the kind of life which he lived — intense, ascetic, and fierce in its protest against liberalism, — but also to those views and beliefs which were, to a certain extent, the springs of such a life 2). His beliefs were not entirely free from adjustment to the circumstances of his age, but the measure of accommodation was the least that could be made. In fact, look where we will in Ahmed’s life, and the elements of concession and compromise are never found to be present by his own wish, and, when found, their degree is the minimum possible.

Sources. We propose to generalize on the basis of the narrative already furnished and the few other sources of information accessible, in order to reach, if we can, a fair notion of the leading theological opinions or principles by which Ahmed ibn Hanbal directed his life. His testament, which has been given in the foregoing pages 3), is a very colorless document, and affords no view of his characteristic beliefs. The confession it contains comprises stock phrases, which might come from a Muslim of any kind or character. The letter to Obaidallah ibn Yahya, in an-

1) Ibn Chall. No. 19; Abû Nu‘aim, 1386, ابن عبد الله وخصب

2) Abû Nu‘aim, 1536, فدخلت إليه فاكتبته عليه وثقت له يا ابنته، و 없다 على نفسه الاسم فقلت يابني باتيني ما لا املكه

3) p. 147.
swer to the Khalif’s enquiry relative to the Ḫorān, has so much that is characteristic that we may credit it with representing accurately Aḥmed’s belief 1). The conversation on the Ḫorān with Iṣḥāk ibn Ibrāhīm is fully in the spirit of Aḥmed’s life, and lends us an interesting view of his faith as touching the Ḫorān 2). The trials before Iṣḥāk ibn Ibrāhīm and al-Muṭṭasim, with the conversations connected with them, furnish much light on Aḥmed’s opinions and the individual element which they contain 3).

The Ḫorān. First, Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal’s doctrine of the Ḫorān 4). The Ḫorān he asserted to be the Word of God, by which he meant the expression of God’s Knowledge, as such expression must be thought to be eternally present to God’s Being. Or, if we must modify this at all, it would be to say, that, as long as there has been present to God that which is objective to Himself, so long has there been a Word of God as the expression of his Knowledge. Before the Objective came into existence, the Word of God was potential in Him and not actual. This gives us the Eternity of the Word of God. Then, as the Divine Knowledge cannot be conceived to be without the eternal adjunct of symbolic expression, and as speech is to be looked upon as a faculty expressing itself in energy and not a creation, the Word of God is not only eternal but uncreated as well. It may be objected that a Word of God is not the point in question, but the Ḫorān, the Word of God as known to men. Be it noted, however, that the distinction between the written or otherwise presented Ḫorān and the heavenly and essential Word of God is clearly drawn 5). This, too, is

1) p. 155. 
2) p. 139. 
3) p. 93 ff. 
4) p. 101. cf. Goldziher, Ḥahīrīṭī, p. 138 ff. The Word of God was said by some of the orthodox to be an attribute of God, Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 103 f. cf. Shahristānī. All the evidence at command, however, shews that Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal’s belief was as I have set it forth. 
5) cf. von Kremer, Herrsch. Ideen d. Isl. 227; Steiner, Die Muṭṭazilīṭīn, 38 f. The accounts given of the orthodox view as to the Ḫorān differ from that which I have inferred Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal to have held. Nor does he
not drawn for the purposes of mere controversy, but represents, as we take it, a belief in the difference of extent between the visible and invisible Word of God. All the words spoken to Moses are the Word of God 1); certainly, not as belonging to the visible Korân, but as belonging to the one eternal Word of God. All God’s words to Mohammed and to the prophets are the Word of God; all those which were spoken to ‘Isâ ibn Maryam are equally the Word of God. And, in controversy, the words spoken to these various persons are used to prove the uncreated and eternal nature of the visible Korân, though they form no part of the Book. Why? Because they, with the substance of the Korân, are the revelations of the Eternal Word, not revelations coextensive with it but partial revelations. This leads to the doctrine that the Word of God is one as well as eternal and uncreated 2). It could not be one if the visible words were taken in evidence, but regarded as a faculty of expression, latent or energizing, belonging to a Being, we

seem to have been alone in his idea of the Korân, but had both among the learned and unlearned a large number who sympathized with his opinions. Most of those who have expounded the orthodox view make the distinction between the visible and invisible Korân and go no further, thus making the Book as known to men the equivalent of that preserved in Heaven. The great distinction to be drawn is between the visible Korân and the invisible Word of God, the latter being not an equivalent but infinitely more extensive than the former. The connection with the doctrine of the Logos as held by Syrian Christians (Houtsma 101, note 1) confirms the presentation of the Korân doctrine which is given in the text. The manifestation of the Logos in Jesus Christ is to be set over against the Heavenly and Uncreated Logos which is in the bosom of the Father. As for the ‘Well-guarded Table’ of the Korân, Sura 85, 22, (cf. Steiner 39 and note 5, also in the preceding account in these pages, p. 67) this, it is true, was an archetype of the visible Korân kept in Heaven, but, still, even this celestial archetype was not coextensive with the eternal and uncreated Word of God of which it was one manifestation. We thus think that the orthodox in Ahmed’s day held to three elements in their doctrine of the Korân: 1st, the Visible Korân; 2nd, the Heavenly Korân; 3rd, the Eternal Word of God.

1) p. 38.
2) cf. Goldziher, Zahiriten, p. 138 ff.; Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 129.
may see how the Word of God came to be looked upon as a continuous unity; or, as we may better express a fact in relation to a Being not knowing any succession of time, as a unity in an eternal present. Such a Word of God, considered both as to its thoughts and words, is necessarily without fault and infallible \(^1\)). The Word of God is, thus, Eternal, Uncreated, One and Infallible. This we conceive to have been the doctrine of the Ḫorān held by Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal and the theologians of his type. We have used modern expression to voice his ideas; the ideas, however, are not ours but his.

The Ḫorān, in terrestrial relations \(^2\)), is to be regarded as a manifestation of the One Word of God such as constitutes a revelation of the perfect religion, a means of salvation and a right guidance for men. In all the forms of its existence among men, written, recited or committed to memory, the substance and the unexpressed words in which the substance is embodied in God’s thought are eternal, uncreated, infallible \(^3\)). The human acts in relation to the substance and the words as found in connection with these human acts are temporal, created, fallible. This is the doctrine of the so-called Lafz al-Ḵorān.

This Ḫorān doctrine \(^4\)) is strongly suggestive of Pantheism, for the Word of God as spoken to Moses, to Moḥammed and as found in the Ḫorān is the One Word — not parts of it — coming to manifestation; just as the moon at its quarter may be called a particular manifestation of the moon, but not a part of the moon. The Pantheistic suggestion is much the same as that found in the Christian doctrine of the Logos, from Eternity resident in God, inseparable from a true conception of Deity, and proceeding to manifestation at the coming into being of Objective Existence.

---

1) cf. Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 101.
2) Zahiriten, as in note 2, p. 185, especially p. 141, l. 18 ff.; cf. present work, pp. 32 ff.
3) cf. Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 117 f.
4) cf. von Kremer, Herrsch. Id. d. Isl., 41. On the whole much like the doctrine of al-Asḥārī, Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 118.
We are now prepared to consider the doctrine of the Divine Unity. Ahmed ibn Hanbal was firm in his belief in the unity of God 1), and, when we keep in view the doctrine of the Koran which we believe him to have adopted, it is easy to understand with what vigor and conviction he would resist the charge of polytheistic heresy which his opponents sought to fasten upon him. We may, by the way, notice his belief in the eternity of the Divine attributes 2). His view, except in the case of the Divine Sovereignty and Knowledge, the attributes formally connected with the origin of the Koran, is stated but not elaborated in the sources to which I have had access. We have, however, in the case of the two attributes named sufficient data to enable us to arrive at his opinions. He stated, with all emphasis, that God could not exist without his Knowledge. And, though his adversaries declared that to make eternal and uncreated anything which was in thought separated from the bare idea of Deity was to make as many more deities as there were things so thought of 3), Ahmed, taking the concrete view of an unphilosophical mind, could not think of Absolute Being, except as involving all the fullness of a perfect, or yet to be perfected, finite creature, and a finite creature he could not think of except as having attributes. The Absolute was the infinite correspondent and correlate of the perfect finite.

The Anthropomorphic Attributes.

The same conviction evidently lay at the basis of Ahmed ibn Hanbal’s faith in the anthropomorphic attributes given to Deity in the Koran 4).

1) p. 106 infra. For the Mu'tazilite doctrine of the Divine Unity, vid. Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten, 50.

2) pp. 90, 101 f., 139; cf. a slightly different view, von Kremer, Herrsch. Id. d. Isl., 40 f.

3) For the Mu'tazilite view of the attributes of God, vid. Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten 50, 52, 59; Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 103, 124; Shahrastâni, Haarbriicker’s transl’n I, 71.

Puzzled by philosophical arguments the untrained mind, though resting on the analogy of perfect human being, and holding fast to this as the undoubted ground and explanation of the Korân’s anthropomorphisms, asserted its impotence to answer philosophizing objections by saying, ‘He is even as he has described himself, I will say no more than this’ 1). There was a much less arbitrary answer, which may not have been fully formulated in Alîmed ibn Ḥanbal’s mind any more than it was in that of Mūhammed himself, but which, had it been clear to the mind of either, would have seemed a blasphemy in its utterance, and would have involved inevitably a proof of the charge made by those who were arguing on the other side. This answer would have been to assert the literal truth of the Korân’s anthropomorphisms. Alîmed’s belief was anthropomorphic. That was the simple fact 2). And the Prophet’s was not the less so. The principle on which Alîmed formed his notion of Deity was essentially right, ‘the absolute is the perfection and infinitude of the perfect finite’; but his opponents properly objected to the giving of accidents of human nature, which may or may not be found when the human creature is in other environments, to the Being in connection with whom to speak of accidents and environments would be paradoxical and contradictory.

The fact of the matter in relation to these anthropomorphic attributes is that Alîmed ibn Ḥanbal had to set himself up not only, as his own apologist, but, also, as the apologist of the Korân and the Prophet, and he knew that — at least, so it

1) cf. Dozy, Het Islamisme, 136; an argument of the Ṣifatiya, Shahrestânî, Haarbrieker’s transl’n, I, 95.
2) cf. Goldziher, Zahiriten, p. 133, l. 24 ff. The so-called negative position of Mâlik ibn Anas and Alîmed ibn Ḥanbal in this connection is hard to understand (vid. Shahrestânî, Haarbrieker’s transl’n, I, 97, 114 f.). Refusing to accept the figurative meaning of the anthropomorphic expressions, and yet insisting on the real force of these same expressions, as Alîmed certainly did, how can passivity be conceived to exist in such minds? Insistence on the positive meaning, and yet not stating what the specific meaning was, though denying it to be figurative, leaves only anthropomorphism over.
seems to us. If Ahmed had believed differently from the Korân and Mohammed, its human author, the case would have been a hard one for him; but anthropomorphism existed in higher quarters. Ahmed had the Word of God to uphold, as well as his own theological character and he made the best defence that could be made under the circumstances. He asserted that God was describing himself, and who knew about himself more or better than he did? To such an argument there is no direct answer. One must follow the much more circuitous route of proving the apologist's conception of the Korân revelation to be wrong, and once this is done the controversy on minor points would be time lost. The allegorical interpretation of the anthropomorphic expressions appears to be justly repudiated by any man who wishes to expound the Korân according to the temper of the man who composed it, the temper of the men to whom it was first addressed, and the special intention actually present in the mind of Mohammed, as far as this can be learned.

Korân Interpretation. Hanbal's principle in the interpretation of the Korân is not a great one 1). He believed that the Korân was to be explained literally, except in cases where the Book itself indicated a limitation or modification of this method to be necessary, and in cases where a practical impossibility was involved. We say practical impossibility, for purely abstract necessity he was loth to admit as a regulating principle. There are so few ascertainable instances of allegorical interpretation on his part, that one can say that his general principle of hermeneutics governed him in dealing with the portions of the Korân which might seem to some to be figurative. The indications of the Book itself and practical necessity would determine for him the application of the literal or some other method to such passages. In all cases

1) cf. his use of texts pp. 72, 90 f., 101 ff., 106, 139, 162 f. For the freer method of the Mu'tazila, v. Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten, 79.
where the literal method had to he given up the interpretation handed down in Tradition ever found favor with Aḥmed. Closely allied with the interpretation of the ʿKorān is the question as to the authoritative source of doctrine and rules of conduct, where the ʿKorān fails to give sufficiently explicit directions. For Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal this lay in the Tradition. What had the Prophet said? What had the Prophet done? What had the Companions of the Prophet reported from him? Or, their Followers? Or, the second generation of Followers? What was the consensus of opinion and practice in the Muslim Communion? The admission of the Ḧiyās or of Raʾy was generally opposed, but admitted where there was no better help to be found 1). His monumental work, the great collection of traditions called the Musnad, had for its declared purpose the furnishing, in all conceivable instances, of sound traditional arguments to those who might resort to it 2). Its composition and the importance Aḥmed attached to it shew that Tradition next to the Word of God itself was the great rock on which he stood. Many testimonies go to prove that he was more tenacious of Tradition than any of the other doctors of his age 3). We find that when he forgave his persecutors it was because of a traditional interpretation of a ʿKorān verse 4).

1) Goldziher, Moh. Stud. II, 217, note 4; Sachau, Zur Aeltesten Gesch. d. Moh. Rechts, 17; Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 91 f.; cf. Goldziher, Ẓahrīten, 20, note 1. Houtsma’s words p. 92, l. 16 ff. seem to be too favorable to the Muʿtazila. Their interpretation of the ʿKorān as far as the attributes of God, the anthropomorphic expressions regarding God, and the predestination passages are concerned was wholly figurative, and we know how large a part of the polemic which they waged was over these points. The name Rationalists, or Freethinkers, is justly applied to the Muʿtazila and implies that the ʿKorān with them was authoritative, not absolutely or as far as practical necessity would admit, but only as far as the rational demands of human life and comfort and the fair requirements of human thought allowed.

2) p. 19.


4) Abū Nuʿaim, 150 a, قال أبو الفضل دخلت علي أبي يوما فقلت...
When the author of the Ḥilya relates that Ahmed was angry [غضبة لله] with those who weakened under the test in the days of al-Ma'mūn, he follows up the incident with a tradition of some of the Prophet's Companions having been very angry when they were called upon to give up any part of their religion 1). The author’s purpose in introducing the tradition where it stands, is to point out the analogy between Ahmed's case and that cited, and to justify Ahmed in view of what the Prophet's Companions had done. He may wish to intimate, also, that Ahmed acted knowing this precedent, and being stimulated by it to feel as he did.

The interpretation of Tradition also leaned to the most rigorous view. A provision for relief in exceptional cases he often made imperative in such

1) Abū Nuʿaim, 147 a.
instances, even if the persons concerned had no wish to avail themselves of the dispensation or the cases were in detail not the same as that originally provided for in the tradition. Hence, what was meant to be a relief became, instead, a burden 1).

The belief he held in the merit of good works 2) was so strong that a rigid exegesis of the Korān and of Tradition was the most natural thing to be expected of him. The same belief explains his persistent application of himself to a life of ascetic rigor and fasting 3). His love of the ascetic life, in its turn, throws light upon the mystic character of his piety and his faith in dreams 4). Solitude, hunger, and the absence of distracting comforts made the subjective life seem more real than the objective, and led Aḥmed to feel an aversion to a life such as other men lived; for in such a life the reality of the interior world which he had created for himself was shattered, and mysticism with its revelry of religious imagination dissipated 5).

2) cf. p. 164 and note 1 infra. Houtsma, De Strijd etc. 85, says that the close adherence to the letter of the Korān on the part of the orthodox revived a strict conception of life such as was found especially among the Hanbalites. But we would call attention to the fact that there was at this time a deep current of popular sentiment favoring a stricter religious life, and this great tendency of the life of individuals and of society at large expressed itself in high views of the Korān and a rigid interpretation of its precepts. The stricter conception of the Korān then reacted and gave definite form to the life tendency of the nation and its members. It was the conception of life that affected the conception of the Book which was the rule of life, rather than otherwise. Such is my reading of the circumstances, but Houtsma's explanation will also find many advocates.
4) al-Maḳrizī, p. 18, ونقل من كثير من السلف أنهم رأوا الله تعالى في المنام كأمام ابی حنيفة والإمام أحمد بن حنبل رضي الله عنهما cf. pp. 92 f., 82.
5) Abū Nuṣair, 142 b, قال [Cod. inserts [بیران ابن حمّد لابی}
This ascetic-mystic aspect of his character comprises for Relics, a reverence for relics, which has found expression once or twice in the course of the preceding narrative 1).

The doctrine of Faith expounded by his friend Mohammed ibn Aslam was, apparently, held by Ahmed ibn Hanbal, likewise. That is, that Faith is the spirit, is expressed by the lips, and is confirmed by the acts. His declaration that discipline and trial would serve to increase his faith favors such a view 2).

His attitude toward patronage and favors on the part of rulers was that of an extremist, but there can be no doubt that his high con-

1) Abû Nu‘aim, 144a.

2) note 2, p. 109; p. 151.

3) al-Makrizi, p. 12; cf. 144b.

The faith which was increased by his adversity appears to have been an inward exercise of the mind. cf. Mohammed ibn Aslam's view p. 38 f.
ception of his vocation as a teacher led him to keep as clear of compromise as possible 1). Surramanra would become his prison, he said, were he to stay there and teach while, at the same time, receiving the fixed salary of the Khalif 2). Ishâk ibn Râhawaih he said he would rebuke, if he ever saw him, for his truckling to the Emîr Abdallah ibn Ţâhir 3). The wilfulness of Aḥmed, doubtless, contributed to his opposition to a Court position; he was master of his own circle in his own way in Baghdâd, but at the Court such would have been impossible. And, then, his real hatred of easy and congenial conditions on the ground of religious principle presented a crowning obstacle 4).

The character of Aḥmed as a traditionist, and his aversion to generalization and deduction, prevented him from leaving behind any system of opinions. We may formulate for him in these days, but he would not have been willing to do so. Hence, the uninfluential character of the Ḥanbalite school. Their master's teaching was unsystematic, and much ground was lost ere his spirit and teaching could be put before the world in such a form as to accomplish any powerful effect. His personality in his lifetime and after his death was a great force in the Muslim world; and the personality seems yet to be as powerful in its influence as the opinions which he enunciated, though his following has never been great in comparison with that of the other three orthodox Imâms.

2) p. 142.
3) p. 145.
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168. أحمد بن الخمس المقامع
97. أحمد بن عمر
82. أحمد بن غسان
116, 118 f.
احمد بن يكبي تعلم النحو 181.
87. اسحاق بن ابراهيم بن مصعب
65, 81, 86 f., 98 f., 110, 112, 131, 178.
149. اسحاق بن حنبيل
89, 112, 146, 149, 153.
14, 18, 146.
99. ابن ابي اسثالب
12. اسخيل بن عليمة
176. الاسود النافعى
174. الاعلى بن حماد
63. الابعمش
181. ابن اعين
123. افریدون التكري
49. الاولي
30. انس
173. البخاري
133, 135.
157. ايوب السختيانتى
46. ايوب بن النجار
182. بشر بن الحوارث
49, 169.
ماحمد بن اسخيل (البخارى)
33, 35 ff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>{الحكم} بن {عبيدة}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>{حماد} بن {زيد}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>حمید</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>{حنبل} بن {اسکات}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, 192.</td>
<td>{ابو} {حنيفة}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>خلف بن سالم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>{الخیلاب}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>{ابو} {داواد} {الکفری}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>{ابو} {داواد} {الساجداتی}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>{دحیم} {الشامی}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>{ابو} {الدن}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>{الذینوری}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>{زهیر} {بن} {صالح} {بن} {احمیر}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>{زینب} {بنت} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>{سید} {بن} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>{سید} {بن} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>{سید} {بن} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>{ابو} {سیمیان} {الجوزاجی}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>{الشافعی}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- {الحكم} بن {عبيدة} نسب الى {حماد} بن {زيد} و{حمید}. {حنبل} بن {اسکات} و{ابو} {حنيفة} نسب الى خلف بن سالم.
- {ابو} {داواد} {الکفری} و{ابو} {داواد} {الساجداتی} و{دحیم} {الشامی} و{ابو} {الدن} و{الذینوری} نسب الى {زهیر} {بن} {صالح} {بن} {احمیر}.
- {زینب} {بنت} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل} و{سید} {بن} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل} و{سید} {بن} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل} و{ابو} {سیمیان} {الجوزاجی} و{الشافعی} نسب الى {الحكم} بن {عبيدة} و{حماد} بن {زيد} و{حمید} و{حنبل} بن {اسکات} و{ابو} {حنيفة} وخلف بن سالم و{ابو} {داواد} {الکفری} و{ابو} {داواد} {الساجداتی} و{دحیم} {الشامі} و{ابو} {الدن} و{الذینوری} و{زهیر} {بن} {صالح} {بن} {احمیر} و{زینب} {بنت} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل} و{سید} {بن} {امیر} {بن} {حنبل} و{ابو} {سیمیان} {الجوزاجی} و{الشافعی}.
عبد الله بن طاهر v. عبد طاهر 부분의 바람에 167.

أبو عطية الهاشمي

عباس بن مسكيه البندداني 110.

عبدا بن بلال

عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل 20، 28، 137، 149، 166 ff، 171، 174.

عبد الله بن ادريس 46، 166.

عبد الله بن اشكي 131.

عبد الله بن طاهر 18، 146.

عبد الله بن عباس 155.

عبد الله بن البازان 11.

عبد الله بن محمد (المعرفة ببروان) 83، 138، 192 ff.

عبد الرؤوس بن إياس 98، 99، 102.

عبد الرؤوس بن إياس 173.

عبد الرؤوس بن إياس 17.

عبد الرؤوس بن إياس 148، 154.

عبدا بن يحيى 56.

عبدا بن يحيى 99.

عبدا بن يحيى 86.

علقة بن قيس 176.

ابن عل بن اليمامة 173.

ابن عل بن اليمامة 166.

أبو عمرو بن عمرو 132، 133، 136.

أبو عمرو بن عمرو 176.

أبو عمرو بن عمرو 31، 87 ff، 174.

أبو عمرو بن عمرو 43، 155، 156.

أبو عمرو بن عمرو 123، 124، 157.

أبو غالب بن معاوية بن عمرو 151.

أبو غالب بن معاوية بن عمرو 28.

فاطمة بن يحيى بن حنبل 174.

القتال بن سهل 166.

ابن الفرج بن الجوزي 173.

فؤاد بن نوفل 156.

فصل الانتقام 191.

الفصل بن ديكن 63، 87.

ابن القاسم النصراني 44 ff.

أبو قلابة 157.

كرامة 39، 41.

ابن السكاحي 131.

أبو سليم 166 ff.

أبو ماسويه 135.

مالك بن إنس 11، 116.

المامون 49، 51، 53 ff، 65، 81، 82، 86، 109.
ابن مندة
موسى بن حزام
173.
109, 113.

أبو ناصر للإخوان
173.
نعميم بن حماد
119.

هارون الرشيد
49.
عشيما
12, 29.

هياح بن العلاء السلمي
55.
29.

الهشم بن جميل
115, 116, 119, 120.

الواضح
55.
واصل بن عطاء
170.

الروكاني
133.
وصيف
131.

وكيع بن الجراح
174.

أبو الوليد الطيباني
53.
يحيى بن خالد
134, 135 f, 151, 164.

يحيى بن سعيد القطان
30.
يحيى بن معين

يحيى بن الناصد
176.
يحيى بن هرثمة
133.

يحيى بن يحيى
18.
يحيى بن شداد
30, 53, 180.

يعقوب بن البكر المعتزل
135.
يعقوب المعروف بقوصر
132 f, 136.

يوسف بن يحيى البويطي
120.

المنتوكل
123, 124, 130 f, 148 f, 151 f, 154 f, 164, 167 f, 170.

محمد بن أبوهيم
85.
محمد بن أحمد بن حنبل
174.
محمد بن أحمد بن أبوهيم
131.
محمد بن أسلم
40 ff.

محمد بن الجراح
135.
محمد بن الحسن
30.
محمد بن حنبل
10, 11.
محمد بن سبئين
157.
محمد بن عبد الله بن طاهر

محمد بن خالد
174.
محمد بن معاوية
133.
محمد بن نصر صاحب الشرطة
153.
محمد بن نصر المروزي
33, 167 f, 170.

محكم بن نورج المضروب
81, 83.
محمد بن ياقبي الذهلي
35.
المرجحة
40 ff.

المرجحة
49, 55.
لمظر حاجب عبد الله بن أحمد
131.
معاوية بن قرة
134.
المعزولة
92 ff, 101, 104, 108 ff,
112 f, 114, 115, 131.

معمر
18.
73. أبو معمر القطبيعى
CORRIGENDA.

Page 3, line 5, Read Abî for Abû.

4, "3, " " " "  
19, n. 1, Read cf. p. 114 and p. 142.
23, n. 2, last line, Read cf. Arabic, p. 97, l. 2 ff.
28, line 6, Read al-Shâfî'i's for al-Shaﬁ'î's.
38, note, l. 4 infra, Read Shahrastânî for Shahrastâni.
46, line 2, Read Ayûb ibn al-Najjâr.
47, " 5, also Side-heading, Read al-Mu’tazili for al-
Mu’talizî.

53, last line, Read: made a jest.
70, line 6, Dele comma after “Sa’dawaih”.
73, " 2, Read Mużaffar for Mużaffîr.
75, " 12 infra, Dele comma after “him”.
83, " 11 " Read طبروس.
96, " 10 " " یعید for یعید.

102, " 4 " "  وکانوا  وکانوا.
109, " 5 " " باسرع باسرع.
172, " 17, Insert after “and”: — confirmed their judgment.
200, " 10 infra, Read al-Khabbâb for al-Khabab.