



جامعة الموصل
كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية
قسم التاريخ

الخلفاء العباسيون من خلال كتابي تاريخ المكين لابن
العميد وتاريخ مختصر الدول لابن العبري
(١٣٢ - ٣٣٤ هـ / ٧٤٩ - ٩٤٥ م) (دراسة مقارنة)

رندا محمد جليل حسين

رسالة ماجستير
تاريخ الإسلامي

بإشراف
الاستاذ المساعد

الدكتورة رنا صلاح طاهر طاقة

Abstract

Islamic history is full of a large number of books that talked about the caliphs from the first Rashidun caliph to the last Abbasid caliph. These works varied in their approach and style in presenting the historical material of the caliphs. The year on which he stops, such as the book “The History of the Messengers and Kings” by al-Tabari, and others made the matter of the caliphs a major subject for his author.

As for our tagged topic (The Abbasid caliphs through the two books History of the Muslims by Ibn al-Amid and Tarekh Mukhtasar al-Dawla by Ibn al-Abri ١٣٢-٣٣٤ AH / ٧٤٩-٩٤٥ CE, a comparative study), it has its own specificity among these works. Two Christian historians are considered among the most important historians of the People of the Book, so the study was to study the texts that were mentioned in their books about the Abbasid caliphs, and to make a comparison between them and what was mentioned by Muslim historians, and to clarify what texts were chosen by them and what they cared about showing and what they neglected to mention from texts mentioned by Islamic sources and linking This is the events of the life of historians to deduce the reason that prompted them to omit some important incidents.

After comparing what was mentioned in the two books about the Abbasid caliphs, we found that there was a difference and agreement in some details, and each historian had his own way of presenting the material, so the way of Ibn al-Ameed was distinguished by his mentioning the name of the caliph, his lineage, his mother's lineage, and his lineage in relation to those who preceded him from the caliphs, and then after that he mentions the most prominent The events of the era of the caliph he is talking about and at the end of his rule he mentions the place of his death and sometimes he mentions the cause of his death and then his biography and ministers, and he mentions what the Christian historians mentioned of the events that took place during the era of the caliph he is talking

about, while Ibn al-Abri did not mention the genealogy of the mother of the caliph or his lineage with regard to who preceded him but mentions a brief prelude to what happened before the caliph took over and how he reached power, then he mentioned the most prominent opponents who deviated from the obedience of the caliphate during the era of each caliph. If natural disasters or earthquakes occurred, he mentioned it. who is talking about.

One of the advantages of historians' writing when they mention any opposition or Kharajji on behalf of the state is the connection between the motives they mention as a reason for his departure with the personality and morals of historians. We often find Ibn al-Amid when he mentions the motives of any opponent that we find in their nature religious and moral reasons, and this is a reflection of Ibn al-Amid's vision of the events with his own nature, while Ibn al-Abri mentions religious motives as well as political motives for Ibn al-Abri's interest in political rather than religious events.

If we judge which of the historians had his writings closer to the Muslim narration and their method, we would find that Ibn al-Ameed is closer than Ibn al-Abri in that, since when he mentions the Messenger (may God bless him and grant him peace), he mentions praying for him and saluting him, and when he mentions any of the Rightly Guided Caliphs he says (Radhi God is on his behalf) and also for some of the caliphs, he says the phrase (commander of the believers) as if he was an Arab Muslim historian, while Ibn al-Abri did not do that but adhered to his origin and religion.

Although historians realize that what they write is for an Arab audience, we sensed, through the narrations they wrote about the Abbasid caliphs and the events that took place during their reign, Ibn al-Amid's impartiality and his lack of inclination to any category of bad Muslims or Romans, or even his inclination to any of the The doctrines of Muslims without another, and this is what we have seen of his lack of mention of the quarrels that took place between the Hanbalis and the Shafi'is during the reign of the Caliph Al-Radi. His keenness on his

commitment to neutrality, but his blame for Irini (as her name came to him) the Queen of the Romans who gave the ransom to Rashid and surrendered and described him as insignificant. This was also shown by his mention of the Roman attacks on Muslim lands while he did not mention the Muslims' response to these attacks although the Muslims' response It was greater and their victory was sometimes greater, showing us the truth of his feelings for the Romans who are of the same religion as him.

In a rare few, we see historians criticizing the narratives they mention. For example, we see when they mention the Abbasid caliphs who came after al-Mutawakkil and the Turks' control of the reins of affairs.

University of Al Mosul

College of Education for the Humanities

History Department



**The Abbasid Caliphs Through The Books “The
History of Al-Makin” By Ibn Al-Ameed and “The
History of Mukhtasar Al-Dawla” By Ibn Al-Abri
(١٣٢-٣٣٤ AH / ٧٤٥-٩٤٩ AD)**

Randa Muhammad Jalil Al-Shumaisi

Master Thesis

History/ Islamic history

**Supervised by
Assistant professor**

Dr. Rana Saleh Taher Taqatan