famed for his *History of Aleppo,* and Abd Sháma (d. 665) wrote a well-known *History of Saladin and Nureddín,* taking a great deal from 'Imád addin. A. Müller has recently published (1885) Ibn abí Osaibia’s (d. 668) *History of Physicians.* The *History* of Ibn al-'Amíd (d. 675), better known as Elmacin (*q.v.),* was printed by Erpenius in 1625. Ibn Sa'íd al-Maghribí (d. 673 or 685) is famous for his histories, but still more for his geographical writings. The noted theologian NawawÍ *{q.v.;* d. 676) wrote a *Biographical Dictionary of the Worthies of the First Ages of Islam.* Pre-eminent as a biographer is Ibn Khallikán (d. 681), whose much-used work was partly edited by De Slane and completely by Wüstenfeld (1835- 40), and translated into English by the former scholar (4 vols., 1843-71).

Abu '1-Faraj, better known as Bar-Hebræus (d. 685), wrote besides his Syriac *Chronicle* an Arabic *History of Dynasties* (ed. Pocock, Oxford, 1663). Ibn 'Adhárí’s *History of Africa and Spain* hasbeen published by Dozy (2 vols., Leyden, 1848-51), and the *Kartás* of Ibn abí Zar' by Tornberg (1843). One of the best known of Arab writers is Abulfeda (d. 732), whose *Annales Muslemicæ* were published with a Latin version by Reiske (Copenhagen, 5 vols. 4to, 1789-94). The *History of the Time before Mohammed* has been published by Fleischer (1831). Not less famous is the great *Encyclopaedia* of his contemporary Nowairi (d. 732), but only some extracts are as yet in print. Ibn Sayyid an-Nás (d. 734) wrote a full biography of the Prophet ; Mizzí (d. 742) an extensive work on the men from whom traditions have been derived. We still possess, nearly complete, the great *Chronicle* of Dhahabí (d. 748), a very learned biographer and historian. A complete edition of the geographical and historical *Masálik al-Absár* of Ibn Fadlalláh (d. 749) is much to be desired. It is known at present by extracts given by Quatremère and Amari. Ibn al-Wardí (d. 749 or 750), best known by his *Cosmography,* wrote a *Chronicle* which has been printed in Egypt. Safadí (d. 764) got a great name as a bio­grapher. Yáfi'í (d. 768) wrote a *Chronicle of Islam* and *Lives of Saints.* Sobkí (d. 771) published *Lives of the Theologians of the Sháfi'ite School.* Of Ibn Kathír’s *History* the greatest part is ex­tant. For the history of Spain and the Maghrib the writings of Ibn al-Khatíb (d. 776) are of acknowledged value. Another history, of which we possess the greater part, is the large work of Ibn al- Forát (d. 807). Far superior to all these, however, is the famous Ibn Khaldún (d. 808), who proves himself a great thinker in the *Prolegomena to his Universal History.* Of the *Prolegomena* there are an edition by Quatremère (1858) and a French version by De Slane (1863). The latter scholar also published text and version of the *History of the Berbers,* and there is a poor Egyptian edition of the whole work. Of the historical works of the famous lexico­grapher Fírúzabadí (d. 817) only a *Life of the Prophet* remains. Makrizi (d. 845) is spoken of in a separate article ; Ibn Hajar (d. 852) is best known by his *Biographical Dictionary of Contem­poraries of the Prophet,* now in course of publication in the *Biblio­theca Indica.* Ibn 'Arabsháh (d. 854) is known by his *History of Tímúr* (Leeuwarden, 1767). 'Ainí (d. 855) wrote a *General History,* still extant. Abu Ί-Mahâsin (d. 874) wrote at length on the history of Egypt ; the first two parts have been published by Juynboll. Flügel has published Ibn Kotlubogha’s *Biographies of the Hanafite Jurists.* Ibn Shihna (d. 890) wrote a *History of Aleppo.* Of Sa- kháwí we possess a bibliographical work on the historians. The polymath Soyútí (d. 911) contributed a *History of the Caliphs* and many biographical pieces. Samhúdí’s *History of Medina* is known through the excerpts of Wüstenfeld (1861). Ibn Iyás (d. 930) wrote a *History of Egypt,* and Díyárbekrí (d. 966) a *Life of Mo­hammed.* To these names must be added Makkari (*q.v.)* and Hajji Khalifa, the famous Turkish bibliographer (d. 1068), who, besides his *Bibliographical Lexicon* and his well-known geography, the *Jihán-numa,* wrote histories, mostly in Turkish. He made use of European sources, and with him Arabic historiography may be said to cease, though he had some unimportant successors.

A word must be said of the historical romances, the beginnings of which go back to the first centuries of Islam. The interest in all that concerned Mohammed and in the allusions of the Koran to old prophets and races led many professional narrators to choose these subjects in place of the doughty deeds of the Bedouins. The increasing veneration paid to the Prophet and love for the marvellous soon gave rise to fables about his childhood, his visit to heaven, &c., which have found their way even into sober his­tories, just as many Jewish legends told by the converted Jew Ka'b al-Ahbár and by Wahb ibn Monabbih, and many fables about the old princes of Yemen told by 'Abid, are taken as genuine history (see, however, Mas'údí, iv. 88 *sq.).* A fresh field for romantic legend was found in the history of the victories of Islam, the exploits of the first heroes of the faith, the fortunes of 'Alí and his house. Even under the first Omayyads there were in the mosques of most great cities preachers who edified the people by stories about Islam and its victories, and there is ample evidence that these men did not stick to actual fact. Sho'ba said of them ‘ ‘they get from us a handbreadth of tradition and make it an ell.” Then, too, history was often expressly forged for party ends.

The people swallowed all this, and so a romantic tradition sprang up side by side with the historical, and had a literature of its own, the beginnings of which must be placed as early as the second century of the Flight. The oldest samples still extant are the fables about the conquest of Spain ascribed to Ibn Habib (d. 238), and those about the conquest of Egypt and the West by Ibn 'Abdalhakam (d. 257). In these truth and falsehood are mingled, as Dozy has shown in his *Recherches.* But most of the extant literature of this kind is, in its present form, much more recent ; *e.g.,* the *Story of the Death of Hosain* by the Pseudo-Abú Mikhnaf (translated by Wüstenfeld) ; the *Conquest of Syria* by Abd Ismá'íl al-Baçri (edited by Nassau Lees, Calcutta, 1854, and discussed by De Goeje, 1864) ; the Pseudo-Wákidí (see Hamaker, *De Expug­natione Memphidis et Alexandriæ,* Leyden, 1835) ; the Pseudo-Ibn Kotaiba (see Dozy, *Recherches)* ; the book ascribed to A'sam Kúfí, &c. Further inquiry into the origin of these works is called for, but some of them were plainly directed to stir up fresh zeal against the Christians. In the 6th century some of these books had gained so much authority that they were used as sources, and thus many un­truths crept into accepted history. (Μ. J. de G.)

TABERNACLE, the portable sanctuary of Israel in the wilderness wanderings. Critical analysis of the Penta­teuch *(q.v.)* teaches us to draw a sharp line between the old notices of the tabernacle contained in the pre-Deutero- nomic history book (JE) and the account given by the post-exilic priestly narrator. The latter throws back into the time of Moses the whole scheme of worship and ritual of which the second temple was the centre, and, as this scheme necessarily implies the existence of an elaborate sanctuary on the pattern of the temple, he describes a tabernacle of extraordinary splendour pitched in the middle of the camp, with an outer and inner chamber and a court­yard, and all the apparatus of sacrificial and atoning ritual, just as in the temple, only constructed of boards, posts, and curtains so that it could be taken down and moved from place to place. The whole description is ideal, as appears not only from the details but from the fact that the old history knows nothing of such a structure. The Chronicler indeed, who had before him the Pentateuch in its present shape, assumes that after the Israelites entered Canaan the tabernacle continued to be the one legitimate place of sacrifice until it was superseded by Solomon’s temple, and represents it as standing at Gibeon in the days of David and his son (1 Chron. xxi. 29 *sq. ;* 2 Chron. i. 3). But the book of Kings knows Gibeon only as “ the greatest high place” (1 Kings iii. 4).@@1

Again, the tabernacle of the Priestly Code is pre-emi­nently the sanctuary of the ark, bearing the name *mishkan hā'ēdūth,* “the tabernacle of the testimony,” *i.e.,* the habit­ation in which lay “ the ark of the testimony ” or chest containing the stones on which the decalogue was inscribed. But between Joshua’s days and the building of the temple the ark migrated from one tent or habitation to another (2 Sam. vii. 6 ; 1 Chron. xvii. 5), and at Shiloh it was housed not in a tent but in a temple (1 Sam. iii. 3, 15). And, while in the Priestly Code the tabernacle is the only legitimate sanctuary and its priests are the only legitimate priests, the whole history shows that no such restriction was even thought of till after the time of the prophet Isaiah.

With all this it agrees that the oldest parts of the Penta­teuch speak indeed of a tabernacle, but one of a quite different kind. The tabernacle of the Elohist (for of the two narratives—Elohistic and Jahvistic—which are com­bined in the so-called Jehovistic history only the former seems to mention it) is a tent which Moses pitched outside the camp (Exod. xxxiii. 7 *sq.*), and where Jehovah was wont to reveal Himself to him in the pillar of cloud, which descended for the purpose and stood at the door (Num. xi. 25; xii. 5; xiv. 10); it is therefore called ō*hel mō'ēd,* “the

@@@1 Two passages in the old history, which comprises the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, speak of the tabernacle (*ōhel mō'ēd)* ; but external and internal evidence show them to be interpolated (1 Sam. ii. 22 ; 1 Kings viii. 4).