Christian Sources in al-Maqrīzī's *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar 'an al-bašar**

Mayte Penelas
Tenured Researcher
Escuela de Estudios Árabes, CSIC (Spain)
orcid: 0000-0001-9261-7494

Abstract

It is widely known that al-Maqrīzī relied extensively on the work by the Coptic author Ibn al-ʿAmīd for the chapter on the Copts included in his *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭaṭ*. Some scholars have assessed that the text known as *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*, which was compiled by a Christian from al-Andalus, was also a major source for large fragments of al-Maqrīzī's *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*. More recently, it has been argued that al-Maqrīzī also relied on those two Christian sources for his last major work, *al-Ḥabar 'an al-bašar*. In this article, I intend to offer a more comprehensive survey of the use of both sources by al-Maqrīzī. By providing a good many examples, I aim to demonstrate that al-Maqrīzī built on them entire sections or long passages of his books, but also turned to them frequently to add in short reports, variant versions, a date, a *nasab*, or any information he considered relevant to his work.

Keywords

Orosius, *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*, al-Maqrīzī, Ibn al-ʿAmīd

1. Preliminary remarks

Over the last few decades several studies have assessed the attention that medieval and early modern Muslim historians paid to non-Muslim peoples, particularly the Christian West.¹ These studies have challenged Bernard Lewis's view that Muslim historiography despised non-Muslim societies, particularly European ones, and as a result showed little or no concern for their history and culture.² Bernard Lewis regarded the interest in the history of "alien peoples or cultures" by Muslim historians like al-Masʿūdī (d. 345/956) and al-Bīrūnī (d. ca. 440/1048) as "few and unrepresentative" exceptions.³ I think that there is no need to go further into the view expounded by Lewis – and others before and after him – of which an excellent overview is offered by Nizar Hermes in *The [European] Other In Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture* and

* This article was prepared in the framework of the project *Local contexts and global dynamics: al-Andalus and the Maghreb in the Islamic East*, AMOI (FFI2016-78878-R AEI/FEDER, UE), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, and co-directed by Maribel Fierro (ILC-CCHS, CSIC) and Mayte Penelas (EEA, CSIC). Revision of the English text by Nicholas Callaway.

¹ See e.g. Di Branco, *Storie arabe di Greci e di Romani*; Hermes, *The [European] Other in Medieval Arabic Literature*; König, *Arabic-Islamic Views of the Latin West*.

² In *The Muslim Discovery of Europe, Islam and the West*, and elsewhere.

³ Lewis, "The Use by Muslim Historians of non-Muslim Sources", p. 183.

Daniel König in *Arabic-Islamic Views of the Latin West*.⁴ Likewise, this article does not aim to provide further evidence that these “exceptions” were neither so few nor so unrepresentative. Its primary focus is on the use of non-Muslim sources by Muslim historians, and more specifically by one of them: Taqī l-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), the prominent Egyptian scholar of the Mamlūk period.⁵

The use of non-Muslim sources by medieval Muslim historians has also received scholarly attention. As regards Christian sources, two of them have been mentioned as used by Muslim authors, including al-Maqrīzī and his elder contemporaries Ibn Ḥaldūn (d. 808/1406) – who was his teacher – and al-Qalqaṣandī (d. 821/1418). I am referring to the text known as *Kitāb Hurūṣīyūṣ* and Ibn al-‘Amīd’s (d. after 678/1279–80) *al-Mağmū‘ al-mubārak*, both of which were used firsthand by Ibn Ḥaldūn and al-Maqrīzī. Al-Qalqaṣandī also relied on Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work directly, but the material from *Kitāb Hurūṣīyūṣ* included in his *Ṣubḥ al-a‘šā* was borrowed via Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *Kitāb al-‘Ibar*.

Kitāb Hurūṣīyūṣ (henceforth KH) is an Arabic compilation based on various Latin sources. It is preserved in a *codex unicus* housed at Columbia University (X, 893.712 H), which lacks five intermediate leaves and two or more leaves at the end.⁶ This manuscript contains a universal history up to Roman emperor Valens (r. 364–378), but originally the work extended to Heraclius (r. 610–641) and included a final chapter devoted to the Visigothic kingdom in the Iberian Peninsula up to the Arab conquest (93/711). Its compiler was a Christian living in late 9th-century or early 10th-century al-Andalus, who used Orosius’s (early 5th c.) *Historiarum adversus paganos Libri VII* as his principal source of information, and completed and continued the Orosian narrative by turning to other sources, most notably the Bible and Isidore of Seville’s (d. 636) *Chronica Maiora*. Via the so-called – not quite properly – Arabic Orosius a good deal of geographical and historical information reached a number of Arab authors living between the 4th/10th and 9th/15th centuries from al-Andalus to Egypt. And here is where its importance mainly lies.⁷

Al-Mağmū‘ al-mubārak (The blessed collection), by the 13th-century Coptic writer al-Makīn Ġirġis Ibn al-‘Amīd (henceforth IA),⁸ is also a universal history covering the period from Creation to the year 658/1260. While there are many extant manuscripts of this work, most contain only one of the two parts into which it can be divided.⁹ The first part, which remains unedited, covers the pre-Islamic period to the eleventh year of Heraclius’s reign. Thomas van Erpe (Erpenius, d. 1624) edited and translated into Latin most of the second part up to year 512/1118. Claude Cahen edited the last fragment of the work, from 602/1206 (with mention of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s birth) to 658/1260 (with mention of Quṭuz’s death and Baybars’s accession to power). Since Cahen’s edition begins from the year 602/1206, the fragment covering the period between 512/1118, where Erpenius’s edition ends, and 602 also remains unedited.

With regard to the manuscripts containing the first part of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘*, almost a century ago Gaston Wiet classified them into two recensions, one

⁴ Hermes, *The [European] Other*, p. 1–10; König, *Arabic-Islamic Views*, p. 16–22. See also Matar, *Europe Through Arab Eyes*, p. 6–9.

⁵ For a complete overview of al-Maqrīzī’s life and works, see Bauden, “Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Maqrīzī”.

⁶ On the lost contents of KH, see Penelas, introduction to *Kitāb Hurūṣīyūṣ*, 87–89; Penelas, “Fuentes no identificadas y contenidos no conservados del Libro 7 del Orosio árabe”, esp. p. 754 and 764–780.

⁷ For an overview of KH’s authorship, sources, reception, etc., see Penelas’s introduction to her edition.

⁸ Cahen and Coquin, “al-Makīn b. al-‘Amīd”; Heijer, “Coptic Historiography in the Fāṭimid, Ayyūbid and Early Mamlūk Periods”, p. 88–95; Moawad, “Al-Makīn Ġirġis ibn al-‘Amīd (the elder)”.

⁹ See Moawad, “Al-Makīn Ġirġis ibn al-‘Amīd (the elder)”, p. 569.

shorter than the other.¹⁰ Wiet thought that Ibn al-‘Amīd’s original work, the vulgate, was the short version, represented by most manuscripts (among them, *Pococke 312* of the Bodleian Library [16th c.]¹¹ and *arabo 168* of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana [16th c.]), whereas the extended version, represented by manuscript *arabe 4729* of the Bibliothèque nationale de France (19th c.), would be a subsequent reworking. However, Martino Diez has convincingly argued that the short version is a *muḥtaṣar* (compendium) of the long version, as noted by Ibn al-‘Amīd himself in the introduction to his work.¹² Furthermore, manuscript *arabe 294* of the Bibliothèque nationale de France¹³ has elements in common with both the short and the long versions.¹⁴ It is therefore evident that Wiet’s classification of the IA testimonies is in need of a thorough reexamination.

For the present article I have used manuscripts Vat. ar. 168 (V), BnF ar. 294 (B), and BnF ar. 4729 (P). I have also consulted the 17th-century manuscript *arabe 4524* of the Bibliothèque nationale de France (V²), which, as far as I have been able to assess, contains the same recension as V but without many of the latter’s mistakes and omissions.

As stated above, Ibn Ḥaldūn and al-Maqrīzī relied heavily on both *Kitāb Kurūṣiyūš* and Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘ al-mubārak*. This question has been dealt with by a number of scholars, including Walter J. Fischel, André Ferré, and Martino Diez.¹⁵ The three of them have focused on the use Ibn Ḥaldūn and/or al-Maqrīzī made of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work.

In the introduction to my edition of KH and elsewhere, I have argued that Ibn Ḥaldūn made extensive firsthand use of KH for his *Kitāb al-‘Ibar*, as did al-Maqrīzī for his *Kitāb al-Mawā‘iz wa-l-i‘tibār fī dīkr al-ḥiṭaṭ wa-l-āṭār*, commonly shortened as *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*.¹⁶ However, whilst Ibn Ḥaldūn used the source rather freely, al-Maqrīzī remained much more faithful to it, to such an extent that the *Ḥiṭaṭ* text enables us to reconstruct several lacunae in the Columbia manuscript. Almost the same can be said as regards al-Maqrīzī’s last major opus, *al-Ḥabar ‘an al-bašar*.¹⁷ Thus, in the introduction to his edition of the *Ḥabar* section devoted to the Persian history, Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila

¹⁰ See Wiet’s lengthy footnote in Maspero, Fortescue and Wiet, *Histoire des patriarches d’Alexandrie*, p. 219–222.

¹¹ *Bibliotheca Bodleiana Codicum Manuscriptorum Orientalium*, ‘Codices Manuscripti Arabici’, num. DCLXXXIII.

¹² Diez, “Les antiquités gréco-romaines entre al-Makīn ibn al-‘Amīd et Ibn Ḥaldūn”, p. 128–130.

¹³ This manuscript is a factitious codex, formed by fragments from different copies dating from the 14th century and the 16th century.

¹⁴ This manuscript shares many fragments with the short version (the so-called vulgate), including some of those mentioned by Diez, “Les antiquités gréco-romaines”, p. 128–135. This is clearly the case with the beginning of the work: B, fols. 3r–5r (part is repeated in fols. 7r–8r); V, fols. 1v–2v; cf. P, fol. 1r. Likewise, B (fol. 127r) and V (fol. 104v) contain the passage on the Greek alphabet (cf. P, fol. 82v). Nevertheless, B also has many fragments closer to the long recension, such as the passage on Socrates’s final argument for the immortality of the soul (B, fols. 127v–128r; P, fols. 83r–83v; cf. V, fols. 105r–105v), or the *Testimonium Flavianum* (B, fol. 163r; P, fol. 108r), which is missing from V (cf. fol. 132). We will see further examples later on.

¹⁵ Fischel, “Ibn Khaldun’s use of Historical Sources”; Ferré, “Ibn al-‘Amīd al-Makīn”; Diez, “Les antiquités gréco-romaines”, p. 135–140.

¹⁶ Penelas, introduction to *Kitāb Hurūṣiyūš*, p. 77–81.

¹⁷ The publication of this work is in progress within Brill’s “Bibliotheca Maqriziana” (BIMA) series, edited by Frédéric Bauden. Till now, three volumes of al-Maqrīzī’s *al-Ḥabar ‘an al-bašar* have been published: *Vol. v, Sections 1–2: The Arab Thieves*, ed. and trans. Webb; *Vol. v, Section 4: Persia and Its Kings, Part 1*, ed. and trans. Hämeen-Anttila; and *Vol. v, Section 6: The Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Franks, and Goths*, ed. and trans. Penelas. A rather faulty edition of the whole work by Ḥālid Aḥmad al-Mullā al-Suwaydī and ‘Arif ‘Abd al-Ġanī was published in 2013.

states that KH is the “second main source for this part” (after al-Ṭabarī’s [d. 310/923] *Kitāb Tārīḥ al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*), and that the quotations in *al-Ḥabar* “help in reading some illegible words and passages” in KH and “enable us to reconstruct parts of the missing text”.¹⁸

KH was also one of the main sources for *al-Ḥabar* ‘an *al-bašar*’s section on the Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Franks, and Goths. However, in this case, the material from KH was known to al-Maqrīzī through the corresponding fragment in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-Ibar*, of which this section is an almost exact reproduction. Nonetheless, it seems that al-Maqrīzī turned to KH directly at least twice, in order to complete the information provided by Ibn Ḥaldūn with regard to the chronology of Cleopatra VII (*al-Ḥabar* V/6, §37) and the *nasab* of Constantine the Great (*al-Ḥabar* V/6, §177).¹⁹ Apart from the section on Persian history, al-Maqrīzī relied on KH directly for other parts as well, as we will see below.

What I have said regarding the use al-Maqrīzī made of KH to write *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar* is also true for al-Maqrīzī’s use of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘ al-mubārak*. It is well known that Ibn al-‘Amīd was the main authority of al-Maqrīzī for the fragment on the patriarchs of Alexandria in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, but also for other parts of this work. As regards *al-Ḥabar*, IA is, alongside KH, the principal source for the section on the Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Franks, and Goths, but, again, via Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-Ibar*. It is noteworthy that al-Maqrīzī does not mention Ibn al-Ḥaldūn at all in *al-Ḥabar* (and only three times in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*), but he frequently mentions both KH and Ibn al-‘Amīd, as well as Ibn al-‘Amīd’s sources, including other Christian authors such as Ibn al-Baṭrīq (d. 328/940), al-Manbiḡī (d. after 330/942), and Ibn al-Rāhib (d. ca. 689/1290).²⁰

In what follows I intend to offer further evidence that both KH and IA were among the sources al-Maqrīzī had at his disposal when writing *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar*,²¹ and that he turned to them over and over again not only to compose lengthy passages of these works, but also in order to add in short reports or even single facts.²²

2. KH in al-Maqrīzī’s *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭaṭ*

Let us begin with how al-Maqrīzī used KH for his most famous work, *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, which is primarily concerned with Cairo but also contains many chapters on Egypt in general, as well as a great deal of material directly or indirectly related to the subject dealt with. When relevant, in the present section I will also refer to *al-Ḥabar*’s dependence on KH, and to the dependence of both *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar* on Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘*.

Orosius/Harūšiyūš²³ is mentioned by name eight times in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* – all of them in the first volume of Fu’ād Sayyid’s edition. In one instance, al-Maqrīzī (Table 1, #5) provides a more detailed reference, quoting KH as “the translation of the book of the

¹⁸ Hämeen-Anttila, introduction to *al-Ḥabar* V/4, p. 3 and 13.

¹⁹ Penelas, introduction to *al-Ḥabar* V/6, p. 15.

²⁰ On this, see Ferré, “Ibn al-‘Amīd al-Makīn”, p. 64–65, 70–71; Heijer, “Coptic Historiography”, p. 90–93; Penelas, introduction to *al-Ḥabar* V/6, p. 17–19.

²¹ For *al-Ḥabar*, I mainly focus on the parts edited within the BIMA series, as the 2013 edition is not totally trustworthy (see footnote 17). However, when necessary, I refer to the 2013 edition.

²² As far as I have been able to assess, al-Maqrīzī did not rely on KH and IA for other works, at least not in a general and extensive way.

²³ Orosius’s name is always transliterated with *fatha* on the *hā*’ in the Columbia manuscript, as well as in various places in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s and al-Maqrīzī’s works.

Andalusī Orosius on the description of the empires and wars” (*tarğamat kitāb Harūšiyūš al-Andalusī fī waṣf al-duwal wa-l-ḥurūb*). The table below lists the places where KH is explicitly mentioned.

Table 1

	<i>Al-Ḥiṭaṭ</i> , I	Contents of the passage	KH
1	p. 26–27	measurement of the earth at the request of Julius Caesar	1, §§56–62
2	p. 36	limits of Lower and Upper Egypt ²⁴	1, §§23–24
3	p. 140	course of the Nile river	1, §§23 and 110
4	p. 382	the Banū Fālīq b. Dārīš, rulers of Egypt in Abraham’s time	1, §180 ²⁵
5	p. 388–389	Busiris (Nūšarduš) and Vesozes (Baruwayh), kings of Egypt ²⁶	1, §§243 and 296
6	p. 409	Alexander’s construction of Alexandria	3, §82
7	p. 418	the Ptolemaic kingdom	various places (see below)
8	p. 648	Ušmūn b. Qibṭ, first king of the Egyptians ²⁷	1, §§172–173 ²⁸

The first quotation from KH in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* is found very early on, in the chapter entitled “On the form of the earth and the situation of its climates”. The passage taken from the Arabic Orosius – but not stemming from the Latin Orosius – deals with the description of the earth that Julius Caesar reportedly commissioned from four wise men. This passage, which is also included in *al-Ḥabar* in a chapter under a similar title,²⁹ is ultimately based on the *Cosmographia Iulii Honorii* (4th/5th c.).³⁰ According to the Arabic version, it took the four wise men approximately thirty years to calculate the number of known seas, islands, mountains, countries, regions, and rivers. After recording these figures, only KH (1, §§63–116) offers some information on the rivers (source, mouth, length, and additional information for a few important rivers, such as the Sygaton/Sygogan, the Danube, and in particular the Nile – the longest passage by

²⁴ The three-line passage (in Sayyid’s edition) is an extract from a longer fragment in KH (from Oros., *Hist.* 1, 2, 27–34).

²⁵ In KH the name is spelled “Mālīn b. Dār.š”. The source of this passage is unknown, but it certainly has some relation with the passage on the Egyptian kings in al-Mas’ūdī, *Murūğ al-ḡahab*, I, p. 337. The same holds true for the report on Ušmūn b. Qibṭ (#8). See also footnote 27.

²⁶ “Nūšarduš” and “Baruwayh” are the spellings for Busiris’s and Vesozes’s names in KH and some of the copies of al-Maqrīzī. See Wiet’s edition of *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, III, p. 64, n. 1 and 2. For these and other names, Sayyid’s edition gives the same spellings as those in Badawī’s edition of KH, which are in accordance with the Latin names but not with the extant Arabic text (Ūrūsiyūs, *Tārīḥ al-‘ālam*, p. 115 and 117).

²⁷ According to al-Mas’ūdī’s *Murūğ al-ḡahab* (I, p. 337), Qibṭ and Ušmūn were both sons of Mišr b. Bayšar b. Ḥām b. Nūh. This genealogy of Ušmūn is also mentioned in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 647.

²⁸ See footnote 25.

²⁹ *Al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and ‘Abd al-Ġanī, I, p. 128–129.

³⁰ Ed. Riese, in *Geographi Latini minores*, p. 21–55.

far). The information on the rivers is missing from both *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar*, with an exception: the *Ḥiṭaṭ* chapter on the Nile contains an excerpt from the KH passage. Otherwise, al-Maqrīzī provides a version almost identical to that of KH.

Of the two recensions of the *Cosmographia* (A and B) distinguished by its editor, Alexander Riese, the Arabic version belongs without a doubt to B, which was the recension that circulated in the Iberian Peninsula.³¹ This is evident, for example, in the passage on the Nile (Table 1, #3), which is included in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* but in the chapter devoted to this river, as noted. The *Ḥiṭaṭ* passage is made up of material from two different places in Book 1 of KH: §23 and §110, based on Orosius's work and the *Cosmographia Iulii Honorii*, respectively. The paragraph from the *Cosmographia* is especially long, and al-Maqrīzī leaves out the whole description of the Nile's course by simply saying, "he [Orosius] mentions its source until it arrives at the sea".

KH 1, §23 (< Oros., *Hist.* 1, 2,28–31)

ونهر النيل الذي مخرجه من ريف بحر القلزم ثم يميل إلى
الموضع الذي يدعى مشلون ثم يميل إلى ناحية الغرب
فتصير في وسطه جزيرة تسمى ميرون وآخر ذلك يميل إلى
ناحية الشمال أعني الجوف فيسقي أرض مصر. وقد قيل إن
مخرجه من عين فيما يجاور الجبل المسمى اذلنته ثم يغيب
في الرمال ثم يخرج غير بعيد فيصير له محبس عظيم ثم
يساير البحر المحيط على قفار الحبشة ثم يميل على اليسار
إلى أرض مصر. فبحق ما يظن بهذا النهر أنه عظيم إذ كان
أطراذه ومجراه على ما حكينا...

Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 140

وقال في كتاب هروشيوش: نهر النيل مخرجه من ريف
بحر القلزم ثم يميل إلى ناحية الغرب فيصير في وسطه
جزيرة وآخر ذلك يميل إلى ناحية الشمال فيسقي أرض
مصر. وقيل إن مخرجه من عين فيما يجاوز الجبل ثم
يغيب في الرمال ثم يخرج غير بعيد فيصير له محبس
عظيم ثم يساير البحر المحيط على قفار الحبشة ثم يميل
على اليسار إلى أرض مصر، فبحق ما يظن بهذا النهر أنه
عظيم إذ كان مجراه على ما حكيناه.

KH 1, §110 (< Iul. Hon., *Cosmogr.*, p. 48–52)

نهر النيل وهو الذي يسمى ياؤن مخرجه خفي ولكن ظاهر
إقباله من أرض الحبشة ويصير له هنالك محبس عظيم
مجراه إليه مائتا ميل (...) وماء نهر النيل عكر مرمل وهو
عذب دفي (...) وكثيرا ما يوجد في نهر النيل التماسيح
وإقبال النيل من أرض الحبشة ليس يختلف فيه أحد وعدة
أمياله من مخرجه المعروف إلى موقعه مائة ألف وتسعين
(كذا) ألفا وتسعمائة وثلاثون ميلا.

قال: ونهر النيل وهو الذي يسمى ياؤن مخرجه خفي ولكن
ظاهر إقباله من أرض الحبشة ويصير له هنالك محبس
عظيم مجراه إليه مائتا ميل. وذكر مخرجه حتى ينتهي إلى
البحر. قال: وكثيرا ما يوجد في نهر النيل التماسيح وإقبال
النيل من أرض الحبشة ليس يختلف فيه أحد وعدة أمياله
من مخرجه المعروف إلى موقعه مائة ألف وتسعون ألفا
وتسعين مائة وثلاثون ميلا. وماء النيل عكر مرمل عذب
دفي. انتهى

I consider it worth noting that, on the basis of the information provided by KH, al-Maqrīzī sometimes adds chronological information by making his own calculations. This is clearly the case in reports 5 and 8 of Table 1.

According to *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* (I, p. 388–389) Busiris was king of Egypt 107 years after "the drowning of the Pharaoh of Moses", and Vesozes 328 years after this event. Neither 107 nor 328 is found in KH. The first figure (107) is the difference between *anno mundi*³² 3795 – the year of the world closest to the report on Busiris according to KH (1, §238) – and AM 3688 – the year of the world in Moses's time (KH 1, §211). As regards 328, it is the result of subtracting 3688 from 4016 – the year of the world closest to the report on Vesozes (KH 1, §293).

Likewise, al-Maqrīzī says that the year of the world in the time of Serug, during whose rule Ušmūn b. Qibṭ reigned over Egypt, was "2905, that is, 663 years after the Flood" (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 648). Whilst AM 2905 is found in KH (1, §172), the other figure

³¹ On this, see Penelas, "Contribución al estudio de la difusión de la *Cosmografía* de Julio Honorio en la Península Ibérica".

³² The source for the *anno mundi* dates is Isidore's *Chronica*.

is not. Al-Maqrīzī obtains 663 by subtracting 2242 – the year Noah “entered the boat” according to KH (1, §140) – from 2905.

In the section devoted to Alexander the Great, al-Maqrīzī mentions Orosius once, just to repeat verbatim the KH compiler’s apology for not describing in detail Alexander’s construction of Alexandria, so as not to make his book excessively long (Table 1, #6). However, with the exception of the last paragraph, KH is the source for the whole section (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 407–411). To compose it, al-Maqrīzī excerpted information from different parts of Book 3 of KH.³³ At the end of the passage, he unequivocally ascribes it total credibility, stating, “This is the truth on Alexander’s story. Do not pay attention to anything that differs from it”.

KH is also the source for most of the section on the rulers of Alexandria after Alexander (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 418–422). For this section, al-Maqrīzī had to go through four books of KH (3, 4, 5, and 6, out of seven) in order to pick out the scattered reports on the Ptolemaic rulers from Ptolemy I to Cleopatra VII.³⁴ Unlike the section on Alexander, here the material from KH is supplemented with information from other sources, which al-Maqrīzī introduces using anonymous formulae such as *qāla ḡayruhu* (another said), *wa-yuqāl* (it is said), and the like, or with no formula at all. For example, from al-Mas‘ūdī’s *Murūḡ al-ḡahab* al-Maqrīzī borrows Ptolemy I’s depiction as “wise, learned, leader, ruler, and the first to acquire falcons and to play with and tame them” (*ḥakīm ‘ālim sālīm mudabbir wa-huwa awwal man iqtanā al-buzāt wa-la ‘iba bihā wa-ḡarrāhā*), as well as several of the rulers’ nicknames and the report that attributes the *Almagest* to Ptolemy IV Philopator.³⁵

The longest report (and the most interesting for the purposes of the present article) is the one devoted to the “last” of the Ptolemies, Cleopatra VII. Only the short initial paragraph – which informs of her succession to power, and of the duration of both her reign and the Ptolemaic dynasty – has been taken from KH (6, §§1, 33). The rest is based on Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Maḡmū‘ al-mubārak*.³⁶ In a few lines al-Maqrīzī recounts Caesar’s dispatch of two generals to conquer Egypt, his killing of Cleopatra’s two children and the general who married her, and how she poisoned herself. Al-Maqrīzī offers a more detailed version of this episode in his *Ḥabar* (V/6, §66), also on the authority of Ibn al-‘Amīd but via Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-‘Ibar*.³⁷ By contrast, the *Ḥiṭaṭ* passage mainly focuses on the works carried out by Cleopatra in Egypt, which are also mentioned in *al-Ḥabar* but according to the *‘Ibar*’s shortened version as shown next.

Al-Ḥiṭaṭ, I, p. 421

ويقال إنها كانت ذات حزم ومعرفة وتديبر وإنها حفرت خليج الإسكندرية وأجرت فيه الماء من مصر وبنت بالإسكندرية أبنية عجيبة، منها هيكل زحل وعملت فيه صنما من نحاس أسود. وكان أهل مصر والإسكندرية يعملون له عيدا في اليوم الثاني والعشرين من هاتور ويحج إليه اليونانيون من سائر الأقطار ويذبحون له ذبائح لا

Al-Ḥabar V/6, §§65–66

وكانت حازمة، حفرت خليج الإسكندرية في الثالثة من ملكها وجرى فيه الماء وبنت بها هيكل زحل والفاصوص وبنت بأخميم مقياسا للنيل وبنت مقياسا آخر بأنصنا (...) فحصنت منه بلادها وبنت حائطاً من الفرماء إلى النوبة بشرقي النيل وحائطاً آخر من إسكندرية إلى النوبة وهو حائط العجوز.

³³ From KH 3, §§37–41, 45, 58–60, 72–79, 82–86, 108–109. The main source is Orosius’s *Historiae*, with some information from Isidore’s *Chronica*. For detailed information on the source of each paragraph, see Penelas, introduction to *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*, p. 108–109.

³⁴ KH 3, §§114, 124–126, 128–130; 4, §§1–2, 67, 87–89, 107, 161–163, 168–170, 183; 5, §§25, 39, 52, 84, 86, 88; 6, §§1, 33. Most of the information on the Ptolemaic rulers is drawn from Isidore’s *Chronica*. Detailed information on the source of each paragraph in Penelas, introduction to *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*, p. 109–114.

³⁵ Al-Mas‘ūdī, *Murūḡ al-ḡahab*, I, p. 280–282.

³⁶ B, fols. 143r–144r; V, fols. 120r–121r; P, fols. 94r–94v.

³⁷ Ibn Ḥaldūn, *al-‘Ibar*, III, p. 459.

تحصى كثرة. فلما ظهرت ملة النصارى في الإسكندرية
جعلوا هيكل زحل كنيسة ولم تزل إلى أن هدمتها جيوش
المعز لدين الله عند قدومهم من المغرب إلى أرض مصر
في سنة ثمان وخمسين وثلاث مائة من سني الهجرة
النبوية.
ويقال إن كلوباطرة هي التي بنت حائط العجوز بمصر،
ويشبه أن يكون هذا غير صحيح. ويقال إنها بنت مقياسا
بمدينة إخميم ومقياسا آخر بأنصنا.

Of the IA copies I have used, only V (fol. 120v) offers the following fragment, which is partly found in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and/or in *al-ʿIbar/al-Ḥabar*:

وهذه الملكة كان لها حزما كبيرا ومعرفة³⁸ بالأمور وتدبير حسن وسياسة وفي السنة الثالثة من ملكها حفرت...³⁹

The *Ḥiṭaṭ*'s expanded account of the construction of the Temple of Saturn (Kronos) is based on a later passage in Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Maḡmūʿ*,⁴⁰ specifically, the passage about Alexander, patriarch of Alexandria (d. 328), who converted the pagan temple into a church dedicated to the Archangel Michael.⁴¹ In the chapter on the Copts, al-Maqrīzī reproduces the IA passage rather faithfully, giving there the correct date for the annual feast: 12 Hātūr instead of 22 Hātūr (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, IV, p. 982). Again, the narrative is closer to V (fols. 168r–168v) than to B (fol. 213v) and P (fols. 146v–147r).

At the end of the *Ḥiṭaṭ* passage on Cleopatra al-Maqrīzī explains the meaning of her name, which is said to be “*al-bākiya*”, that is, ‘the weeping [woman]’. This also derives from IA, which has “*al-bākiya ʿalā l-ṣaḥra*”, ‘the [woman] weeping on the rock’. In line with Ibn Ḥaldūn's *al-ʿIbar* (III, p. 459), *al-Ḥabar* offers a different meaning for the name: “*al-sākina ʿalā l-ṣaḥra*”, ‘the [woman] dwelling on the rock’ (V/6, §65).⁴²

In addition to the fragments examined so far, there is also material that al-Maqrīzī drew from KH without mentioning it, at least not under the name “(Book of) Orosius”. As Sayyid has noted, he quotes “*Tārīḥ madīnat Rūma*” (History of the city of Rome) to introduce a short report on the Roman emperor Hadrian (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, III, p. 469), which is an almost literal reproduction of KH (7, §§108–109).

KH is a major source for the passages devoted to two other Roman emperors, Diocletian and Constantine. The one dealing with Diocletian (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 710–711) is included in the section “On the Coptic Era”, as the Coptic calendar starts from the year of Diocletian's accession to the throne in 248 CE.⁴³ This passage is primarily built on KH and Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Maḡmūʿ*, with some information from Abū l-Fidā's (d. 732/1331) *al-Muḥtaṣar fī aḥbār al-baṣar* or a related source.⁴⁴

³⁸ This word – missing from V – has been restored with the aid of V², p. 143.

³⁹ B (fol. 143v) and P (fol. 94r) lack all the words between *wa-hāḍihi* and *ḥafarat*.

⁴⁰ B, fol. 213v; V, fol. 168r; P, fol. 146v; V², p. 192.

⁴¹ It is the first attested instance of a pagan temple being converted into a church. See Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity*, p. 209–210.

⁴² “Cleopatra” actually means ‘father's glory’.

⁴³ The “Diocletian Era” is also known as “Era of the Martyrs” because the last major persecution against the Christians took place under this emperor.

⁴⁴ Abū l-Fidā's *al-Muḥtaṣar* seems to have been al-Maqrīzī's source for, among other pieces of information, the notion that Diocletian started to reign “in the middle of the year 595 from Alexander”, and that Diocletian was “the last of the kings of the *rūm* to worship idols” (*āḥir man ʿabada al-aṣnām min mulūk al-rūm*). Cf. Abū l-Fidā, *al-Muḥtaṣar*, I, p. 67: *āḥir ʿabadat al-aṣnām min mulūk al-rūm*. Also in the abridgment and continuation of Abū l-Fidā's work by Ibn al-Wardī (d. 749/1349), *Tārīḥ*, I, p. 53.

Al-Maqrīzī says that Diocletian did not belong to the ruling family (*kāna min ġayr bayt al-mulk*), which seems to be an allusion to a story included in *al-Ḥabar* (V/6, §163) that al-Maqrīzī took from Ibn Ḥaldūn's *al-'Ibar* and the latter from Ibn al-'Amīd's *al-Mağmū'*.⁴⁵ According to the *Ḥabar* narrative, Diocletian was the official responsible for the horses under the emperor Carus, and the latter's daughter fell in love with him. When her father and brothers died in war,⁴⁶ the *rūm* made her their queen, whereupon she married Diocletian and handed power over to him. This story is related to the Diocletian legend belonging to the Basilides cycle, which was widespread in the Coptic historiographical tradition.⁴⁷

In *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* al-Maqrīzī provides two accounts of Diocletian's Great Persecution, the first based on IA (B, fol. 207r; V, fol. 161r; P, fol. 184r), and the second on KH (7, §206). Between the two, al-Maqrīzī inserts other reports, most of which have been taken from KH, including Diocletian's death as a consequence of "severe illnesses that filled his body with worms and caused his teeth to fall out".⁴⁸ This non-Orosian account of Diocletian's cause of death bears a striking similarity with that found in Ibn al-Baṭrīq's *al-Tārīḥ al-mağmū'*.⁴⁹

The *Ḥiṭaṭ* report on the tenth persecution against the Christians taken from KH is followed by a passage that informs us about the time elapsed between Alexander the Great and Diocletian, and between Diocletian and the Hegira. The source of this passage seems to be IA, although neither of the copies I have used gives exactly the same information as al-Maqrīzī.⁵⁰

	<i>al-Ḥiṭaṭ</i> , I, p. 711	V, fol. 162v	B, fols. 208r–208v
Alexander – Diocletian	594 years, 11 months and 3 days	594 years, 11 months and 3 days	594 years and 333 days
Diocletian – Hegira	338 lunar years and 39 days	none	100,409 days, that is, 337 solar years and 320 days

As shown in the table above, with regard to the time elapsed between Alexander and Diocletian, the version of V is exactly the same as *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*'s. Actually, B also gives the same information, but phrases it differently, since 333 days is equal to 11 solar (30-day) months and 3 days. As regards the time between Diocletian and the Hegira, this information is missing from V,⁵¹ whilst the B variant is probably due to corruption in

⁴⁵ Ibn Ḥaldūn, *al-'Ibar*, III, p. 498 < Ibn al-'Amīd, *al-Mağmū'* (B, fols. 207r–207v; V, fols. 160v–161r; P, fol. 142r).

⁴⁶ Same version as V², p. 184: *fa-lammā māta abūhā wa-qutīla fī l-ḥarb wa-iḥwatuhā* (when her father died, and he was killed in war alongside her brothers...). According to B and P, only "her father" was killed in war. V has a corrupt reading: *"fa-lammā māta abūhā wa-qutīla (?) aḥīhi fī l-ḥarb"* (when her father died, and his brother was killed in war).

⁴⁷ See Schwartz, "Dioclétien dans la littérature copte"; Papaconstantinou, "Historiography, Hagiography, and the Making of the Coptic 'Church of the Martyrs'", p. 80.

⁴⁸ From KH 7, §211. *Al-Ḥiṭaṭ* also records Achilles's rebellion in Egypt (< KH 7, §§200, 203); and Sābūr's defeat at the hands of Diocletian's general (< KH 7, §204). The latter report refers to Galerius's defeat of the Sasanian king Narseh at Satala (298 CE). See Oros., *Hist.* 7, 25, 11.

⁴⁹ Ibn al-Baṭrīq, *al-Tārīḥ*, ed. Cheikho, I, p. 117; ed. Breydy, p. 63–64. Elsewhere I have discussed the similarities between KH and Ibn al-Baṭrīq's *al-Tārīḥ*, which supply evidence of the use of common eastern sources and hence constitute a further testimony of the circulation of eastern works among the Christians from al-Andalus. See Penelas, "Fuentes no identificadas", esp. p. 757–764.

⁵⁰ The information is missing from P, fol. 143r.

⁵¹ Also from V², p. 185.

the transmission of the text: 337 solar years plus 320 days makes 123,325 days, not 100,409. We find a clue to the clarification of this question in *al-Ziğ al-kabīr al-ḥākīmī* by Egyptian astronomer Ibn Yūnus (d. 399/1009),⁵² the authority used by Ibn al-ʿAmīd for this passage. Ibn Yūnus gives “123,409 days (...), that is, 338 *fārisiyya* years and 39 days”;⁵³ hence, the same figures as al-Maqrīzī, although with an important qualification: Ibn Yūnus’s calculation is based on 365-day years, not lunar (*qamariyya*) years.

The chapter on the Coptic Era is followed by one dealing with the calendar of the “ancient Copts” (*al-qibṭ al-uwal*; namely, the ancient Egyptian calendar), which is in turn followed by a chapter on the Coptic festivals. On the occasion of the Feast of the Cross, which commemorates Helena, mother of Constantine the Great, finding the True Cross, al-Maqrīzī introduces some information on Constantine (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 721–723). Unlike the passage on Diocletian, this one mostly derives from KH (7, §§212–223).⁵⁴

The *Ḥiṭaṭ* passage contains some of the medieval legends about Constantine, specifically, his conversion to Christianity after being miraculously cured of leprosy by Pope Sylvester I, and the vision of the cross in a dream that eventually led him to win his enemy. Between the two legends, *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* introduces other reports from KH, including an account of the opposition Constantine encountered from the people of Rome when he promoted the Christians (*ahl al-Masīḥ*) and degraded the idol-worshippers (*ʿubbād al-awṭān*). Al-Maqrīzī says that his confrontation with them is described in “*Tārīḥ Rūma*” (The History of Rome).

Both legends are also included in *al-Ḥabar*, but the latter’s version is much shorter, in accordance with the *Ibar* text (III, p. 508). With regard to the first legend, *al-Ḥabar* provides a good summary of the lengthy KH account (7, §§215–216), which runs as follows in English translation:

Orosius says: Constantine son of Constantius was a pagan, cruel to the Christians. He banished the patriarch of Rome, and the latter cursed him, whereupon he [Constantine] was afflicted with leprosy. As a treatment, he was prescribed to plunge into [a bath with the] blood of children. For this purpose, he gathered a number of children together, but then, he felt pity for them and let them go. After a dream in which he saw someone who urged him to follow the example of the patriarch, he recalled the patriarch to Rome. He recovered from leprosy, and thereafter converted to Christianity (*al-Ḥabar* V/6, §188).

Al-Ḥiṭaṭ (I, p. 721–722) offers an expanded version of this legend – albeit shorter than the KH text – including the name of the pope (patriarch of Rome), who is referred to as “*Šalbaštar al-usquf*” (the bishop Sylvester). This and other legends from the *Vita Silvestri*⁵⁵ are found at KH, some of them added to the *Vita* narrative at a late stage.⁵⁶

As regards the legend according to which Constantine saw the cross in a dream and was instructed to mark with it his weapons and clothes in order to defeat his enemies,

⁵² King, “Ibn Yūnus”. For Ibn Yūnus’s *al-Ziğ* I have used manuscript BnF arabe 2495, which was copied by Michel Sabbagh in 1809 on the basis of manuscript Leiden Or. 143 (*olim* 1057).

⁵³ BnF arabe 2495, fol. 12v. The days are expressed in the *abjad* notation: ١٢٠.

⁵⁴ The KH passage on Constantine is the longest non-Orosian interpolation among those included in Book 7 of KH. On this passage, see Penelas, introduction to *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*, 60–62; Schilling, “Die Konstantinslegende in mozarabischer Überlieferung” (German translation of the passage at p. 344–354). On the non-Orosian material of Book 7 of KH in general, see Penelas, introduction to *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*, 59–66; Penelas, “Fuentes no identificadas”.

⁵⁵ On the legendary *Vita Silvestri*, see e.g. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, p. CIX–CXX; Coleman, *Constantine the Great and Christianity*, p. 161–172.

⁵⁶ Penelas, introduction to *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*, p. 60–61.

neither *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* nor *al-Ḥabar* offers a word-by-word rendering of the KH text, but the *Ḥiṭaṭ* version is, again, much closer to it:

KH 7, §223

Al-Ḥiṭaṭ, I, p. 722

Al-Ḥabar V/6 §§190⁵⁷

وتظاهر له في منامه عذب وينود على
حكاية الصليب وقائل يقول له "إن
أردت أن تظفر بمن خالفك فاستعمل
هذه العلامة في جميع برك وشكلك".

ورأى في منامه كأن بنود شبه الصليب
قد رفعت وقائلا يقول له "إن أردت أن
تظفر بمن خالفك فاجعل هذه العلامات
على جميع برك وشكلك".

ثم رأى في منامه عذبا وينودا على
تمثال الصليبان وقائل يقول "هذه
علامة الظفر لك".

In the chapter on the Copts, al-Maqrīzī's *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* includes another version of this legend based on Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Maḡmūʿ*. The beginning of the *Ḥiṭaṭ* account is more similar to the abridged recension.

Al-Ḥiṭaṭ, IV, p. 979

V, fol. 164v (V², p. 188)

B, fol. 210r (P, fol. 144r)

فرأى في منامه كواكب في السماء
على هيئة الصليب وصوت من
السماء يقول له "احمل هذه العلامة
تنتصر على عدوك".

وفي تلك الليلة رأى قسطنطين في نومه
كوكبا في السماء على مثال الصليب
وقائل يقول له "احمل هذه العلامة
تنتصر على عدوك".

وفي تلك الليلة رأى قسطنطين كواكبا
(كذا) في الجو على تمثال الصليب
وقائل يقول "احمل هذه العلامة تنتصر
على عدوك".

KH, *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* in the passage on Constantine, and *al-Ḥabar* all mention Constantine's vision of the cross in his sleep after reporting the emperor's victory over the Goths (*al-qūṭ*) in the 20th year of his reign. KH adds that the emperor made them cross the Danube river (7, §222). This account is related to the version of the legend recorded in the *Visio Constantini*,⁵⁸ according to which it was during the campaign against the barbarians on the Danube frontier, in the seventh year of his reign, that Constantine had the vision of the cross.⁵⁹ This is also the version contained in an 11th-century martyrology from the Silos Abbey contained in manuscript BnF, nouv. acq. lat. 2179,⁶⁰ fol. 166r.

By contrast, Ibn al-ʿAmīd's account of the legend is more similar to the version recorded by Lactantius (d. ca. 325) in *De mortibus persecutorum* (and by others),⁶¹ which links the story to Constantine's decisive victory over Maxentius at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge (312 CE).

The *Ḥiṭaṭ* account of the vision of the cross is followed by a report on Helena's search for relics and building of churches, which is also dependent upon KH (7, §§223). Next, *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* includes the legend of Helena finding the cross with the assistance of Macarius of Jerusalem,⁶² which is also found in the chapter on the Copts (IV, p. 983) and in *al-Ḥabar* (V/6, §185). The three accounts have been probably taken from Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Maḡmūʿ*,⁶³ but neither of them offers a text entirely faithful to the source; indeed, the three are quite different from one another in several ways. The *Ḥabar*

⁵⁷ Version identical to Ibn Ḥaldūn, *al-Ibar*, III, p. 509.

⁵⁸ The *Visio Constantini* is the introduction of the Judas Kyriacos legend of the *Inventio Sancta Crucis*, originally written in Greek in Jerusalem, most likely in the first half of the 5th century. The *Visio Constantini* was added to the Kyriacos legend early on. See on this, Fowden, "The Last Days of Constantine", esp. p. 159; H.J.W. Drijvers and J.W. Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross*, esp. p. 20–27.

⁵⁹ *The Finding of the True Cross*, p. 36 (Syriac text), p. 54 (trans.).

⁶⁰ Millares Carlo, *Corpus*, p. 170, no. 266.

⁶¹ Lact., *Mort. pers.* 44, 5. See also e.g. Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 339), *Vit. Const.* 1, 28–29.

⁶² This is the first version of the story of the discovery of the True Cross. It is found, among others, in Rufinus of Aquileias's (d. 411) *Historia Ecclesiastica* (10, 7–8) – a Latin translation of the lost Greek text included in Gelasius of Caesarea's (ca. 390) *Church History*. See H.J.W. Drijvers and J.W. Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross*, 13–14.

⁶³ V, fols. 168v–169v; B, fols. 213v–214v; P, fols. 147r–147v.

passage reproduces the *Ibar* text (III, p. 507) to the letter, so it is no wonder that its version differs from the others. However, even the two versions included in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* are different from each other, and this is due to the fact that al-Maqrīzī shortened the source text, but he did so in a different way for the chapter on the Coptic Feasts and for the chapter on the Copts.

For *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, al-Maqrīzī's method is clear: he extracted from KH the material that was relevant to his work, particularly – albeit not exclusively – concerning Egypt. He relied on this source not only to write entire sections or long passages, but also to add a small report or a fact, which reveals a deep knowledge of his source. This is clearly illustrated by the above examples, to which we can now add the report on the ten Plagues of Egypt (*al-ḡawā'ih al-ʿašr*), which was taken from KH (I, §225) and inserted in the fragment on Moses (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, IV, p. 931). At the beginning of the present section, I have listed in Table 1, and then discussed, the *Ḥiṭaṭ* passages where KH is quoted as Orosius/Harūšiyūš. I have presented then the passages that I have identified as stemming from KH although this source is not explicitly mentioned (notably, those devoted to emperors Diocletian and Constantine the Great), but I have hardly any doubt that *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* contains more passages taken from KH than those presented here.

3. KH in al-Maqrīzī's *al-Ḥabar* 'an al-bašar

In the previous section, which focuses on how al-Maqrīzī used KH for his *Ḥiṭaṭ* in particular, I have discussed some reports that are also included in his *Ḥabar*. However, with one sole exception, all of them were borrowed from Ibn Ḥaldūn's *al-Ibar*. The only passage al-Maqrīzī took directly from KH is the one based on the *Cosmographia Iulii Honorii*, which is not included in the *Ḥabar* section dealing with the Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Franks, and Goths. In this part – built mostly on Ibn Ḥaldūn's *al-Ibar* – al-Maqrīzī mentions KH almost 60 times, as Harūšiyūš/Harūšiyuš. The prior section on the Israelites⁶⁴ also contains a number of quotations from KH, again via Ibn Ḥaldūn's *al-Ibar*.⁶⁵

Apart from this, al-Maqrīzī extensively relied on KH for the section of *al-Ḥabar* on Persian history, as its editor Hämeen-Anttila has demonstrated. However, in this case, al-Maqrīzī used KH firsthand, citing it explicitly ten times as Harūšiyūš/Harūšiyuš, and on four occasions as “Tārīḥ (madīnat) Rūma”. In one instance al-Maqrīzī uses the expression “*qāla Harūšiyūš fī kitāb waṣf al-duwal wa-l-ḥurūb*” (Orosius says in the book of the description of the empires and wars), which is almost identical to the above-mentioned expression used in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*.⁶⁶ KH is al-Maqrīzī's source for a great deal of material on the Achemenids from Cyrus to Darius III, as well as on Philip II of Macedon, Alexander the Great, and Olympias. In the introduction to his edition of this part, Hämeen-Anttila provides an exhaustive list of the paragraphs taken from KH, along with the reference to the corresponding paragraph(s) in KH.⁶⁷ The following table offers a much less detailed view, but it gives a good idea of the extent to which al-Maqrīzī relied on KH for this section.

⁶⁴ *Al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and ʿAbd al-Ġanī, VI, p. 229–282.

⁶⁵ Ibn Ḥaldūn, *al-Ibar*, III, p. 208–329.

⁶⁶ See Hämeen-Anttila, introduction to *al-Ḥabar* V/4, p. 26.

⁶⁷ Hämeen-Anttila, introduction to *al-Ḥabar* V/4, p. 13–14.

<i>Al-Habar</i> V/4	KH
§108	1, §§246–247
§§146–151	2, §§34–37, 40, 42, 46–47, 55; for the missing part in KH, see Oros., <i>Hist.</i> 2, 6,1–9
§§155–167	2, §§55, 45, 48–52, 56–61, 65–74, 86, 97, 113, 116; 3, §§25, 28, 63, 70
§§173–177	3, §§71–80, 82–86
§§180–190	3, §§36–39, 41, 45, 58–60, 73–80, 82–86, 92, 95–109
§236	3, §§40, 133

As *al-Habar* contains material also included in *al-Hiṭaṭ*, we could surmise that al-Maqrīzī took from the latter those passages that he would also incorporate into his last major work, *al-Habar*. While this seems to have been the case, there is no doubt that he also used KH to add further information. Not only does *al-Habar* contain a great deal of material that is not found in *al-Hiṭaṭ*, but also it offers a more extended version of the parallel passages. This is clearly observed in the passages concerning Philip II of Macedon and his son and successor Alexander the Great. In the following example, extracted from the account of Philip II's death, *al-Hiṭaṭ* and *al-Habar* contain an abridged and very similar (almost identical) version of the source text, but *al-Habar* provides some information (highlighted in bold) that is not included in *al-Hiṭaṭ*.

KH 3, §§59–60

فبيناه قبل العرس بيومين يحدث قواده في مجلس له إذ سئل في بعض الحديث أي الميتات أحق أن يتمناها الإنسان. فقال: "الواجب على الرجل الشريف القوي الظافر المجرب -يريد نفسه- ألا يتمنى الموت إلا بالسيف فجأة لنلا يعذبه المرض وتسمجه العلة وتحل قوته الأوجاع". فعجل له ما تمنى به في ذلك العرس وما ضره استخفافه بالآلهة الذين كثيرا ما امتهن هياكلهم بالغارة عليها فما جزوه بميتة مستنكرة ولا بعاقبة مستفظة.

فأين الذين يزعمون أن البلاء أصابهم لتركهم عبادة الأوثان من تذكر قصة فلبش وأن عاقبته كانت على مثال أمنيته.

Al-Hiṭaṭ, I, p. 408

وجلس قبل العرس بيومين يحدث قواده إذ سئل عن أي الموتات أحق أن يتمناها الإنسان. فقال: "الواجب على الرجل القوي الظافر المجرب -يريد نفسه- ألا يتمنى الموت إلا بالسيف فجأة لنلا يعذبه المرض وتحل قوته الأوجاع". فعجل له ما تمنى في ذلك العرس.

وذلك أنه حضر لعبا كان على الخيل بين ولده الإسكندر وختنه الإسكندر فبينما هو في ذلك غافله أحد أحداث الروم بطعنة فقتله بها ثائرا بأبيه عندما تمكن منه منفردا.

Al-Habar V/4, §181

وجلس قبل العرس بيومين يحدث قواده إذ سئل "أي الميتات أحق أن يتمناها الإنسان؟" فقال: "الواجب على الرجل الشريف القوي الظافر المجرب -يعني نفسه- ألا يتمنى الموت إلا بالسيف فجأة لنلا يعذبه المرض وتحل قوته الأوجاع". فعجل الله له ما تمنى به في تلك العرس.

وذلك أنه حضر لعبا بين الخيل بين ولده الإسكندر الأعظم وبين خاله الإسكندر بن ثراوش. فبيناه في ذلك غافله أحد أحداث الروم واسمه شريبون بن أفليميون بطعنة فقتله بها ثائرا بأبيه عندما تمكن منه منفردا.

Ibn Ḥaldūn also took from KH a fragment on the Persians.⁶⁸ However, there is no doubt that Ibn Ḥaldūn and al-Maqrīzī quoted this source independently: al-Maqrīzī not only draws much more material from KH than Ibn Ḥaldūn, but also offers a version that is

⁶⁸ Ibn Ḥaldūn, *al-Iḥḥār*, III, p. 385–388.

much more faithful to it.⁶⁹ In this regard, Hämeen-Anttila has pointed out the “remarkably little overlap between the passages of KH al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Ḥaldūn have used for their respective chapters on Persians, Alexander, and the Greeks before Alexander”.⁷⁰

In addition to the passages mentioned up to this point, al-Maqrīzī relied on KH at least other three times, for the fragments dealing with the descendants of Noah, the Tower of Babel, and Constantine the Great’s successors up to Jovian.

For the passage on the descendants of Noah,⁷¹ al-Maqrīzī quoted KH through *al-‘Ibar* (III, p. 26 and 32),⁷² but he most likely turned to KH to add further material.⁷³ In the case of the report on Nimrod building the Tower of Babel (*al-mağdal*),⁷⁴ there is no doubt that al-Maqrīzī is quoting KH directly since – except for the omission of an unnecessary sentence – the *Ḥabar* passage is a verbatim copy of the KH text (1, §§169–171).⁷⁵

By contrast, the third passage⁷⁶ is not only an extremely abridged version of the KH account (7, §§224, 230–234, 236), but also a very inaccurate one, possibly due to the fact that KH gives the same spelling, “Yulyān”, for the names of the Roman emperors Julian (the Apostate) and Jovian, which may have led al-Maqrīzī into confusion.⁷⁷

As noted above, the *Ḥabar* text is usually so faithful to its source that it can be used to reconstruct (with a great deal of certainty) many lost or illegible fragments in KH. Thus, *al-Ḥabar* contains a valuable indirect testimony of part of the two largest lacunae in the single extant copy of KH. One of them corresponds to the last chapter of KH, on the Goths (*al-Ḥabar* V/6, §§366–377), which al-Maqrīzī borrowed from Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-‘Ibar* (III, p. 561–567).⁷⁸

The other one, which al-Maqrīzī took from KH firsthand, is the passage dealing with Cyrus the Great dividing the rivers Gyndes and Euphrates into rivulets, his conquest of Babylon, and the beginning of the description of this city (*al-Ḥabar* V/4, §§146–147).⁷⁹ This passage was included in the lost five-leaf fragment of Book 2 of KH, immediately preceding the first preserved leaf (MS Columbia, fol. 47). The passage is also found in the “Mozarabic Universal History”⁸⁰ contained in codex 2003/2 of the Museum of Raqqāda.⁸¹ Notwithstanding the differences between the *Ḥabar* and the Raqqāda texts (surely due to the Raqqāda compiler’s liberties with his sources), there is no doubt that both are dependent on KH. In fact, not only the *Ḥabar* version is

⁶⁹ The passage on Perseus, common to *al-‘Ibar* and *al-Ḥabar*, is illustrative in this regard. See KH 1, §246; Ibn Ḥaldūn, *al-‘Ibar*, III, p. 385–386; al-Maqrīzī, *al-Ḥabar* V/4, §108.

⁷⁰ Hämeen-Anttila, introduction to *al-Ḥabar* V/4, p. 14–15, n. 49.

⁷¹ *Al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and ‘Abd al-Ġanī, I, p. 338 and 339.

⁷² In both *al-‘Ibar* and *al-Ḥabar*, Orosius’s name is transliterated with an initial *alif* in this particular place.

⁷³ KH 1, §§154–156, 161 and 164.

⁷⁴ *Al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and ‘Abd al-Ġanī, I, p. 342.

⁷⁵ The main source is Isidore’s *Chronica*, 22 and 24, with some information from Genesis 11.

⁷⁶ *Al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and ‘Abd al-Ġanī, VI, p. 158.

⁷⁷ It is also possible that the copy used for the 2013 edition is corrupted in this place.

⁷⁸ See Penelas, “Fuentes no identificadas”, p. 771–780.

⁷⁹ See also Hämeen-Anttila, introduction to *al-Ḥabar* V/4, p. 24–26.

⁸⁰ Edited and translated into Italian by Levi Della Vida, “Un texte mozarabe d’histoire universelle”, p. 144–145 (Arabic text), 175–176 (trans.). See also Penelas, “El *Kitāb Hurūṣiyūš* y el «Texto mozárabe de historia universal»”, p. 147–150.

⁸¹ In addition to the “Mozarabic Universal History” the Raqqāda codex contains three Christian texts of an apologetic-polemical nature. On this, see Penelas, “A New Arabic Version of the Dialogue between Patriarch Timothy I and Caliph al-Mahdī”; Penelas, “Un nuevo testimonio de la circulación de obras orientales de apologética cristiana en al-Andalus”.

much more faithful to the source text than the one contained in the “Mozarabic Universal History”, if compared to the Latin Orosius,⁸² but, more importantly, some words that are illegible in the Raqqāda codex, due to its very damaged state, can be read with the aid of *al-Ḥabar*.

To end this section, I would like to point out that *al-Ḥabar* also includes in volume 6 – devoted to the prophets – the above-mentioned passage on the Plagues of Egypt.⁸³ As was the case with *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I am (almost) certain that the Egyptian author took from KH further material for this volume (and for others).⁸⁴ Needless to say, a thorough and rigorous study of this issue will be more easily feasible when a critical edition of all the volumes of *al-Ḥabar* exists.

4. Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘ al-mubārak* in al-Maqrīzī’s *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar*

As has been noted, al-Maqrīzī used *al-Mağmū‘ al-mubārak* by the 13th-century Coptic historian Ibn al-‘Amīd for both *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar*. As was the case with KH, al-Maqrīzī borrowed material from Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work via Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-‘Ibar* to inform the section of *al-Ḥabar* dealing with the Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Franks, and Goths. However, he seems to have relied on *al-Mağmū‘* directly for the passage discussing the beginning of Heraclius’s reign (*al-Ḥabar* V/6, §§256–257), included at the end of the first part of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work.⁸⁵ In this section Ibn al-‘Amīd is also mentioned by name almost 60 times.

Apart from this, the Coptic historian is quoted at least once in *al-Ḥabar*, in the fragment devoted to the *aṣḥāb al-kaḥf* (People of the Cave) – the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus in the Christian tradition – in volume 6. At the end of the passage, al-Maqrīzī inserts the story of the seven young men (*al-sab‘a al-fitya*) as narrated by “Ibn al-‘Amīd and other historians of the People of the Book” (*wa-ḡayruhu min mu‘arriḥī ahl al-kitāb*). It is a rather long and accurate account based on the IA fragments devoted to Decius – during whose reign the youths hid in a cave and fell asleep – and to Theodosius the Great – during whose time they awoke.⁸⁶ There is no doubt that al-Maqrīzī relied on Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘* directly for this legend, and that his model provided an account closer to the abridged recension (ms V) than to the long one (ms P, and ms B).⁸⁷

The *Ḥiṭaṭ* chapter on the Copts also contains a report on the *aṣḥāb al-kaḥf* (IV, p. 978), but it is very different from the passage inserted in *al-Ḥabar*: on the one hand, it is a much shorter account of the legend; on the other hand, Quranic material (Qur 18: 11 and 25) was added to the information provided by Ibn al-‘Amīd.

In *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work is quoted once as “*Tawārīḥ al-naṣārā*” (Chronicles of the Christians), in a passage which tells about the tribute of twenty thousand dinars that Aḥmad Ibn Ṭulūn exacted from Patriarch Michael III (d. 907), and recounts how

⁸² Oros., *Hist.* 2, 6,1–9. As regards the preserved fragment in KH (2, §§34–35), the three texts are almost identical. See Penelas, “*El Kitāb Hurūṣiyūš* y el «Texto mozárabe de historia universal»”, p. 149.

⁸³ *Al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and ‘Abd al-Ġanī, VII, p. 159.

⁸⁴ For example, it is most likely that al-Maqrīzī took Samuel’s *nasab* from KH. See *al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and ‘Abd al-Ġanī, VII, p. 206. Cf. KH 1, §§327.

⁸⁵ See Penelas, introduction to *al-Ḥabar* V/6, p. 13, 19–20.

⁸⁶ *Al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and ‘Abd al-Ġanī, VII, p. 378–379.

⁸⁷ V, fols. 156v–157r, 178v, 179r–v; P, fols. 139v, 154r–v; B, fols. 203v–204r, 223v, 224r–v.

the Christians had to sell some churches and other properties (III, p. 513). This report is also found in the chapter on the Copts (IV, p. 1004).⁸⁸

We find an interesting reference to Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work in the rough copy (*musawwada*) of *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* preserved at the Topkapı Museum.⁸⁹ After the aforementioned passage on emperor Hadrian taken from KH under the title “Tārīḥ madīnat Rūma”, al-Maqrīzī quotes “the scholars of the People of the Book” (‘*ulamā’ ahl al-kitāb*’) to introduce further information on this emperor (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, III, p. 469–470), but the source of what follows is not KH. In the *musawwada* of his work, al-Maqrīzī says that he took the information “from an old notebook (*kunnāš qadīm*) on the events from Creation until the Prophet’s *hiğra*”. Al-Maqrīzī is no doubt referring to the first part of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū’*, from which the report on Hadrian has been taken.⁹⁰

In the previous pages some examples have been presented which demonstrate that al-Maqrīzī relied extensively on Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū’*, although not as extensively as on KH. I will now offer two additional passages that further illustrate how al-Maqrīzī made use of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work in both *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar*. I will begin with *al-Ḥabar* before returning to *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*.

4.1. The *Ḥabar* passage on the philosophers’ laments over Alexander

I will now turn to a passage in *al-Ḥabar* that discusses the laments of the philosophers at the tomb of Alexander the Great. The report on Alexander’s death, and the immediately preceding one on Alexander’s invasion of India and China (*al-Ḥabar* V/4, §§200–201), which are part of the pseudo-Callisthenes tradition in Arabic,⁹¹ seem to be based on al-Mubaššir b. Fātik’s (5th/11th c.) *Muḥtār al-ḥikam*,⁹² possibly through Šams al-Dīn al-Šahrazūrī’s (7th/13th c.) *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ*.⁹³ The narrative of Ibn al-‘Amīd presents similarities with al-Mubaššir’s and al-Šahrazūrī’s, although Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū’*⁹⁴ contains some elements that are absent from them but present in *al-Ḥabar*. For example, in paragraph 201 of Hämeen-Anttila’s edition, al-Maqrīzī uses “*wa-qīla*” (and it is said) to introduce the sentence “*bal asara malik al-šīn al-aqšā wa-malik al-šīn al-adnā wa-malik al-sind*” (Nay, Alexander took as his prisoners the king of the Further China, the king of the Nearer China, and the king of Sind), which is found in the IA shortened version,⁹⁵ but not in al-Mubaššir’s *Muḥtār al-ḥikam* or al-Šahrazūrī’s *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ*.

⁸⁸ There is another quotation from “Tawārīḥ al-našārā” (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 648), although, in this case, the source is not Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū’* but a Coptic Synaxarium. Al-Maqrīzī informs us that when the child Jesus and his mother entered al-Ušmūnayn (anc. Hermopolis), a statue representing a horse supported by four pillars fell to the ground and broke into pieces. An expanded account of this report is provided a little earlier (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, I, p. 625), where its source is referred to as *Kitāb al-Sinaksār*.

⁸⁹ See on this Bauden, “Maqriziana IX”; Sayyid, *Al-Maqrīzī wa-kitābuhu al-Mawā’iz*, p. 96–98.

⁹⁰ B, fols. 191r–192r; V, fols. 142v–143r; P, fols. 130r–130v; V², 163–164.

⁹¹ For a complete survey of the Arabic tradition of the *Alexander Romance*, see Doufika-Aerts, *Alexander Magnus Arabicus*.

⁹² Al-Mubaššir, *Muḥtār al-ḥikam*, p. 234–237 and 240. Al-Mubaššir offers a shortened version of the Arabic Alexander. See Doufika-Aerts, *Alexander Magnus Arabicus*, p. 25; Cottrell, “Al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik and the α Version of the *Alexander Romance*”.

⁹³ Al-Šahrazūrī, *Nuzhat al arwāḥ*, p. 225–229. See also Cottrell, *Le Kitāb Nuzhat al-Arwāḥ*.

⁹⁴ B, fols. 132r–134v; V, fols. 109v–112r; P, fols. 86r–88r. For an English translation based on the Ethiopic version, see Budge, *Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great*, p. 367–376.

⁹⁵ V, fols. 110v; V², p. 130 and 131. The translation is by Hämeen-Anttila.

Al-Ḥabar next contains a passage comprising fifty Funeral Sentences pronounced by wise men over the golden coffin in which Alexander's body lay, including his mother's words of gratitude for their comforting sentences (*al-Ḥabar* V/4, §§202–204).⁹⁶ The *Ḥabar* passage is a compilation of sentences from three different sources, which are combined together to form a large selection. These sources are al-Mas'ūdī's *Murūḡ al-ḡahab*, possibly via Ibn al-Aṭīr's *al-Kāmil fī l-tārīḥ*;⁹⁷ al-Šahrastānī's (6th/12th c.) *al-Milal wa-l-niḥal*, possibly via al-Šahrazūrī's *Nuḡḡat al-arwāḥ*;⁹⁸ and Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Maḡmūʿ*.⁹⁹

Table 2

Funeral Sentences ¹⁰⁰	Source(s)
0–1	al-Mas'ūdī/Ibn al-Aṭīr
2–3	Ibn al-ʿAmīd
4	Ibn al-ʿAmīd and al-Mas'ūdī/Ibn al-Aṭīr (?)
5	Ibn al-ʿAmīd and al-Šahrastānī/al-Šahrazūrī
6–7	Ibn al-ʿAmīd
8–10	al-Šahrastānī/al-Šahrazūrī
11–25	Ibn al-ʿAmīd
26–36	al-Mas'ūdī/Ibn al-Aṭīr
37	al-Šahrastānī/al-Šahrazūrī
38–44	al-Mas'ūdī/Ibn al-Aṭīr
45–49	al-Šahrastānī/al-Šahrazūrī
50	Ibn al-ʿAmīd

The table above displays the distribution of the sentences according to their sources. Of the fifty Funeral Sentences included in *al-Ḥabar* twenty-two were drawn from *al-Maḡmūʿ al-mubārak*. Many of those sentences are only found in Ibn al-ʿAmīd's work, including Aristotle's, Antiochus's, Diogenes's and Bārūs's¹⁰¹ sayings, as well as many

⁹⁶ The collections of Funeral Sentences over Alexander's coffin enjoyed great popularity in Arabic literature. Through translations to Spanish of Ḥunayn b. Iṣḥāq's (d. 260/873) *Nawādir al-falāsifa* and al-Mubaššir's *Muḥtār al-ḥikam*, the Funeral Sentences reached the West, where they also became a widespread theme. See Brock, "The Laments of the Philosophers over Alexander in Syriac", esp. p. 205–207; Doufekar-Aerts, *Alexander Magnus Arabicus*, p. 123–128; Seleznyov, "The Laments of the Philosophers over Alexander the Great According to the Blessed Compendium of al-Makīn ibn al-ʿAmīd", p. 103–105.

⁹⁷ Al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūḡ al-ḡahab*, I, p. 270–272; Ibn al-Aṭīr, *al-Kāmil*, I, p. 288–290. Ibn al-Aṭīr usually offers a faithful version of al-Mas'ūdī's text, but there is some evidence indicating that al-Maqrīzī borrowed from *al-Kāmil* the sentences stemming from *Murūḡ al-ḡahab*. Alexander's mother's sentence is an illustrative example in this regard (Table 2, #44).

⁹⁸ Al-Šahrastānī, *al-Milal*, p. 331–332; al-Šahrazūrī, *Nuḡḡat al-arwāḥ*, p. 229–230.

⁹⁹ B, fols. 134v–135v; V, fols. 112v–113r; P, fols. 88r–88v. The passage is edited and translated by Seleznyov, "The Laments of the Philosophers", p. 109–114.

¹⁰⁰ Numbers indicate the order of the sentences in *al-Ḥabar*. Number 0 corresponds to the eldest's words inviting the rest to pronounce sentences of consolation and warning.

¹⁰¹ Without diacritical points in the *Ḥabar* manuscript (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Fatih 4340, fol. 120v). Ibn al-ʿAmīd, *al-Maḡmūʿ*, ms V: Nārūs; mss B and P: Yārūs.

anonymous sentences (*qāla āḥar*, ‘another said’) and Alexander’s mother’s words that close paragraph 204 of Hāmeen-Anttila’s edition. Other sayings are found in one or two of the other sources, but the wording and the order of the sentences indicate that twenty-two were taken from Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘* directly.

For sentences 4 and 5, al-Maqrīzī relied on more than one source. Sentence 4, uttered by “q.līmūs” (Polemon or Philemon), runs as follows:

فقال أفليموس: ”هذا يوم قد أقبل من شره ما كان مدبرا وأدبر من خيره ما كان مقبلا. فمن كان باكيا على من زال ملكه فليبك“.

This sentence is found in al-Mas‘ūdī’s *Murūğ al-ḡahab*, al-Šahrastānī’s *al-Milal*, and Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘*, all three of which offer a very similar version. However, on the one hand, only *al-Milal* and *al-Mağmū‘* mention the philosopher’s name; and, on the other hand, the second part of the sentence is not found in Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘*, at least not in the copies I have used.¹⁰² From this, we may conjecture that al-Maqrīzī relied on Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work for the first part of the sentence, which he completed by turning to al-Mas‘ūdī’s, or rather Ibn al-Aṭīr’s.¹⁰³

As regards sentence 5, delivered by Plato II, al-Maqrīzī offers Ibn al-‘Amīd’s version first, and then introduces al-Šahrastānī’s by saying “*fī riwāya*” (in another version):

وقال أفلاطن الثاني: ”أيها الساعي المغتصب! جمعت ما لزمك أوزاره وعاد على غيرك هناؤه.“ وفي رواية: ”جمعت ما خذلك وتوليت ما تولى عنك فلزمتك أوزاره وعاد على غيرك مهنؤه وثماره.“

The second version is also found in al-Šahrazūrī’s *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ*, but not in al-Mubaššir’s *Muḥtār al-ḥikam*. Al-Šahrazūrī’s passage on the philosophers’ laments brings together material from al-Mubaššir’s *Muḥtār al-ḥikam* and al-Šahrastānī’s *al-Milal*. In fact, it is likely that al-Maqrīzī borrowed from al-Šahrazūrī’s *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ* the sentences that the latter seems to have drawn from *al-Milal*, as both al-Šahrazūrī’s work and al-Maqrīzī’s lack some of the same sentences that are included in *al-Milal*.

As a last example, sentence 14 serves to illustrate, first, that al-Šahrazūrī took this sentence from al-Šahrastānī’s *al-Milal*, and not from al-Mubaššir’s *Muḥtār al-ḥikam*; and secondly – and more relevant for this study –, that al-Maqrīzī took it from Ibn al-‘Amīd’s text, and not from al-Šahrastānī/al-Šahrazūrī.

Al-Mubaššir, *Muḥtār al-ḥikam*, p. 241

وقال آخر: كان الإسكندر بالأمس يقدر على الاستماع ولا نقدر عنده على الكلام فاليوم نقدر عنده على الكلام ولا يقدر على الاستماع.

Al-Šahrastānī, *al-Milal*, p. 331; al-Šahrazūrī, *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ*, p. 230

وقال مطور: قد كنا بالأمس نقدر على الاستماع ولا نقدر على القول واليوم نقدر على القول فهل نقدر/تقدر على الاستماع؟

Ibn al-‘Amīd, *al-Mağmū‘* (B, fol. 135r; P, fol. 88r)¹⁰⁴

وقال آخر: قد كنا بالأمس نقدر على الاستماع منك ولا نقدر على الكلام بين يديك وأما اليوم فنقدر أن نتكلم ولا تقدر أنت أن تسمع.

¹⁰² Neither is the second part of the sentence found in the Ethiopic version of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work. See Budge, *Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great*, p. 377.

¹⁰³ The sentence is also included in al-Mubaššir’s *Muḥtār al-ḥikam* and al-Šahrazūrī’s *Nuzhat al-arwāḥ*, but their version is considerably longer.

¹⁰⁴ V (fol. 112v) and V² (p. 133) give a version slightly different.

Al-Ḥabar contains yet another sentence, in paragraph 205 of Hämeen-Anttila's edition. It is "another version" (*riwāya*) of what Alexander's mother said over her son's coffin. For this and the following paragraphs on Alexander, the narrative returns to al-Mubaššir's *Muḥtār al-ḥikam*/al-Šahrazūrī's *Nuḥḥat al-arwāḥ*, and other Muslim sources. However, al-Maqrīzī did not completely leave out Ibn al-ʿAmīd's work, and turned to it for the passage on Alexander's age at death and the duration of his reign (*al-Ḥabar*, V/4, §219).¹⁰⁵

4.2. The *Ḥiṭaṭ* chapter on the Copts

I have left for the end the fragment of *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* on the Coptic history, which has received much scholarly attention because of its dependence on Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Mağmūʿ*. Here I will present new findings based on my own research using four copies of IA, which I hope will provide further insight into the contents and sources of this fragment.

The fragment drawn from Ibn al-ʿAmīd's work is inserted into the lengthy chapter devoted to the Copts (IV, p. 964–1086). The introductory section of this chapter (IV, p. 964–966) contains general information of a genealogical nature stemming from several sources, among which only Ibrāhīm b. Waṣīf Šāh (*ca.* 330/941–2) is mentioned by name.¹⁰⁶ Other sources include al-Hamdānī's (d. 334/945) *al-Iklīl*,¹⁰⁷ and KH (1, §§149–164). From the latter source al-Maqrīzī extracted some information on the peoples descending from Sem, Ham and Japheth based on Isidore of Seville's *Etymologies* (9, ch. 2). Al-Maqrīzī's main authority for the following section, on the religion of the Copts before their conversion to Christianity (IV, p. 966–968), is Ibn Waṣīf Šāh.¹⁰⁸

Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Mağmūʿ* is the main source for the two following sections, which deal with the history of the Egyptian Copts after their conversion to Christianity, before and after the Arab conquest of Egypt (IV, p. 968–1014).

For the beginning of the section entitled "On the entry of the Egyptian Copts into Christianity" (IV, p. 968–996)¹⁰⁹ al-Maqrīzī also relied on other sources, including *al-Muḥkam wa-l-muḥīṭ* by Ibn Sīda of Murcia (d. 458/1066) for the etymology of *naṣārā*.¹¹⁰ This is followed by a passage on Jesus's name and life, which combines material from the Islamic and Christian traditions. This is clearly the case with the account of Jesus's *apparent* crucifixion (IV, p. 971). To the material borrowed from Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Mağmūʿ*¹¹¹ al-Maqrīzī added some words ("rafaʿahu Allāh ilayhi", "fa-ṣalabū allaḏī šubbiha lahum") that clearly evoke the Quranic text (Qur 4: 157–158), so as to give the passage an Islamic veneer.¹¹²

From this point onward, Ibn al-ʿAmīd is al-Maqrīzī's main authority by far. After discussing Jesus's resurrection and ascension, the Pentecost, the dispersion of the

¹⁰⁵ Ibn al-ʿAmīd, *al-Mağmūʿ*: B, fol. 135v; V, fols. 113r–113v; P, fol. 88v; V², p. 134.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. al-Masʿūdī, *Aḥbār al-zamān*, p. 183.

¹⁰⁷ Al-Hamdānī, *al-Iklīl. Erstes Buch*, p. 29–30.

¹⁰⁸ See al-Masʿūdī, *Aḥbār al-zamān*, p. 126–128, 131, 184, 187, 201.

¹⁰⁹ Ibn al-ʿAmīd's *al-Mağmūʿ*: B, fols. 147r–257v; V, fols. 123r–211r; P, fols. 96v–176r.

¹¹⁰ Ibn Sīda al-Mursī, *al-Muḥkam*, VIII, p. 199.

¹¹¹ B, fols. 162r–162v; V, fols. 131v and 132v; P, fols. 107r–107v.

¹¹² The account of Jesus's miracles (*al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, IV, p. 971) based on Qur 3: 49, and the aforementioned report on the People of the Cave (IV, p. 978), are further examples.

apostles to spread Christianity, and the seventy apostles, al-Maqrīzī mentions the “four sees of the Christians” (*al-karāsī al-arba‘a allatī li-l-naṣārā*), namely, Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch.¹¹³ For Antioch, Rome and Jerusalem, after recording the accession of Evodius, Linus and Simeon, respectively, al-Maqrīzī says, “after him, the patriarchs/bishops inherited the patriarchate/bishopric one after another”, or a similar formula.

Only in the case of Alexandria, *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* lists all the patriarchs after Anianus (the successor of Mark the Evangelist) as they appear in Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘*, recording in many cases (albeit without a fixed pattern) the duration of their rule, their date of death, and their age at death, as well as some of the reports furnished by Ibn al-‘Amīd. Al-Maqrīzī does this up to Coptic patriarch Benjamin I (d. 662) and Melkite patriarch Cyrus (d. 642), during whose patriarchates Islam entered Egypt. Here the first, unedited, part of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘* ends.

The enumeration of the Coptic patriarchs from Benjamin I and his successor Agathon (d. 680) to Athanasius III (d. 1261) continues in the following section, which deals with the Egyptian Copts under Islam (IV, p. 997–1014). Most of this section corresponds to the part of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work edited by Erpenius, that is, until Macarius II (d. 1128). In this section, al-Maqrīzī introduces a great deal of material on the Coptic rebellions taken from Abū ‘Umar al-Kindī’s (d. 350/961) *Wulāt Miṣr*, or *Umarā’ Miṣr* as al-Kindī’s work is quoted in a previous chapter of *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* specifically devoted to this issue (I, p. 212–214).¹¹⁴

Everything indicates that al-Maqrīzī’s authority for the part corresponding to the unedited fragment of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘* (that is, from the point where Erpenius’s edition stops [512/1118] to the point where Cahen’s edition begins [602/1206]) continues to be Ibn al-‘Amīd. Many reports on the patriarchs from Gabriel II (d. 1145) to Mark III (d. 1189) are found at the *Chronicon orientale*,¹¹⁵ which is a reworking of the historical sections of *Kitāb al-Tawārīḥ* of Ibn al-Rāhib,¹¹⁶ one of the chief authorities of Ibn al-‘Amīd. The first patriarch mentioned in the fragment edited by Cahen (years 602–658/1206–1260) is John VI (d. 1216), and the last, Athanasius III.¹¹⁷ In *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* the passage on Athanasius III is followed by two reports regarding the Christians.¹¹⁸ The second one – dealing with the destruction of the Church of Mary in Damascus after the victorious battle of Quṭuz against the Mongols in the Battle of ‘Ayn Ḡālūt in 658/1260 and the tribute Quṭuz exacted from the Christians – closes this section of *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*. Ibn al-‘Amīd does not add much further material.

The source of the following section on the “*wāqi‘at al-naṣārā*” (lit. ‘event of the Christians’) – a series of Bahrī Mamlūk campaigns against the Copts (*ḍimmīs* in general) –¹¹⁹ may not be Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū‘*, as it covers events that took place between 692/1293 and 755/1354, that is, after the Coptic author’s death. Neither do the sections dealing with the divergences between the Christian sects and with certain

¹¹³ Al-Maqrīzī mentions the bishopric of Jerusalem, but not Byzantium’s. The same holds true for the fragment on the patriarchs of Alexandria in al-Qalqaṣandī’s *Ṣubḥ al-a‘šā*, which is otherwise very different from *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*’s. See al-Qalqaṣandī, *Ṣubḥ al-a‘šā*, V, p. 308–321; Tisserant and Wiet, “La Liste des patriarches d’Alexandrie”.

¹¹⁴ Al-Kindī, *The Governors and Judges of Egypt or Kitāb El ‘Umarā’*, p. 73–74, 81, 94, 96, 116–117, 119, 192, and *passim*.

¹¹⁵ Pseudo-Ibn al-Rāhib, *Chronicon orientale*, p. 139–141.

¹¹⁶ See Sidarus, “Copto-Arabic Universal Chronography”.

¹¹⁷ Cahen, “La « Chronique des Ayyoubides »”, p. 128–129, 162.

¹¹⁸ Cahen, “La « Chronique des Ayyoubides »”, p. 165, and 175–176.

¹¹⁹ See Little, “Coptic Conversion to Islam under the Bahrī Mamlūks”; Megally, “Waq‘at al-naṣārā”.

Christian rituals and feasts stem from Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work. The source of both sections is al-Muṭaḥhar al-Maqdisī’s (fl. 355/965) *Kitāb al-Bad’ wa-l-tārīḥ*.¹²⁰

The two sections that close the chapter, which deal with the Christian monasteries and churches respectively, are based on a variety of sources, but al-Maqrīzī occasionally turned back to Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū’* to add relevant information. This is clearly the case with the reports regarding the building of the Monastery of al-Quṣayr by Arcadius (IV, p. 1030)¹²¹ and the Monastery of al-Ṭūr by Justinian I (IV, p. 1058).¹²²

There is no doubt that al-Maqrīzī extensively used Ibn al-‘Amīd’s *al-Mağmū’* for the chapter on the Copts, but, on which recension did he rely? For most of the examples presented so far, the *Ḥiṭaṭ* text is closer to the abridged recension, represented by manuscripts V (Vat. ar. 168) and V² (BnF arabe 4524). However, in some cases, it is closer to P (BnF arabe 4729), which represents the long version, or even B (BnF arabe 294), which lies in between.¹²³ The issue is in fact rather complicated, and it will not be solved until a critical edition of Ibn al-‘Amīd’s work has been made, as Martino Diez has stated.¹²⁴ I will now offer some examples that further illustrate the complexity of this issue.

According to Wiet, the chapter on the Copts is based on a manuscript “*complétée et retouchée*” with Ibn al-Baṭrīq’s *Kitāb al-Tārīḥ al-mağmū’*, such as P.¹²⁵ Wiet presents a few passages that are found in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* (henceforth referred to as Ḥ) and P, but not in the manuscripts of the abridged version. It is important to note that they are not found in B either. Thus, Wiet observes that only P (fol. 167r) names the Melkite patriarch Zoilus (r. 541–551), who is also mentioned in Ḥ (IV, p. 992), but not in the other IA copies (B, fol. 242v; V, fol. 197r). After the Jacobite patriarch Damian (d. 605), Ḥ (IV, p. 994) gives information on three Melkite patriarchs, who are mentioned only in P (fol. 169r) *before* Damian: Athanasius, 5 years; Yūḥannā al-Qā’im bi-l-ḥaqq, 5 months (Ḥ) or 5 years (P); Yūḥannā al-Qā’im bi-l-amr, 11 years.¹²⁶

Wiet also mentions the report regarding the separation, under Justinian, of the Nativity and the Epiphany (*giṭās*), which were initially celebrated together on 6 January. Actually, this is mentioned in all the manuscripts I have consulted,¹²⁷ but, as Diez has observed,¹²⁸ only P (fol. 167r) and Ḥ (IV, p. 991–992) say that the Armenians (*al-arman*) are still “of this opinion” (*‘alā ḥādā l-ra’y*), that is, they continue to celebrate both feasts on the same day.

To the examples provided by Wiet, many more can be added that show a clear relationship between Ḥ and P, of which I will now offer several.

Only P (fol. 160v) and Ḥ (IV, p. 989) inform us that the separation between Melkites and Jacobites after the Council of Chalcedon (451) took place in year 193 “of the Martyrs” (P) or “of Diocletian” (Ḥ).¹²⁹ On this point, B (fol. 232r) and V (fols. 187r–

¹²⁰ Al-Maqdisī, *al-Bad’*, IV, p. 42–48 (Arabic text); 40–46 (French trans.).

¹²¹ B, fol. 226r; V, fols. 180v–181r; P, fols. 155v–156r.

¹²² B, fol. 243v; V, fols. 197v–198r; P, fols. 167v–168r.

¹²³ See above, footnote 14.

¹²⁴ Diez, “Les antiquités gréco-romaines”, p. 136.

¹²⁵ In Maspero, Fortescue and Wiet, *Histoire des patriarches d’Alexandrie*, p. 219 (n. 2).

¹²⁶ Cf. B, fol. 246r; V, fol. 200r. Cheikho’s edition of Ibn al-Baṭrīq’s *al-Tārīḥ* (I, p. 209; not in Breydy’s edition, p. 112) mentions Athanasius (5 years) and Yūḥannā al-Qā’im bi-l-ḥaqq (11 years).

¹²⁷ B, fol. 242r; V, fol. 196v; P, fols. 166v–167r.

¹²⁸ Diez, “Les antiquités gréco-romaines”, p. 136.

¹²⁹ We find a similar example in the passage reporting the renovation of two churches in Alexandria by the Copts. Only Ḥ (IV, p. 994) and P (fol. 168v) say that this event took place in the year 248 of Diocletian/the Martyrs. B (fol. 244v) and V (fol. 199r) read “*wa-ḥi ḍālīka al-zamān*” (and in that time).

187v) include several hypotheses on the etymology of *al-ya 'qūbiyya* (Jacobites), which H offers a bit later (after mentioning Dioscorus's death in exile [454] and Proterius's accession to the patriarchate). This passage is not found in P (fol. 160v),¹³⁰ which, however, is the only copy to state that after Dioscorus "the see of Alexandria remained vacant during the reign of the king Marcian", although, according to Ibn al-Baṭrīq,¹³¹ Dioscorus was replaced by Proterius (d. 457). H does not provide the name of the authority (it only says "*qīla*", 'it is said'), but the rest is almost identical.¹³²

As regards Proterius, all the copies record that he was killed by the people of Alexandria. Only P (fol. 161r) and H (IV, p. 990) add that, after killing him in the church, the mob brought his body to the stadium built by Ptolemy (*i.e.* the Lageion), and set it on fire.¹³³

Likewise, only P (fol. 162r) and H (IV, p. 990) report that, in the time of Zeno, Sāwīrus¹³⁴ fled to Wādī Hubayb, and Timothy II Ailuros (d. 477) returned from exile, only to die two years later. According to both P and H, his successor Peter III (d. 489) was patriarch for eight years, seven months and six days.¹³⁵ B (fol. 234r) and V (fol. 189v) give a round "eight years".

H (IV, p. 991) says that Jacob Baradaeus (d. 578) roamed all around calling for the creed he declared to be the right one (*al-amāna allatī za 'ama annahā mustaqīma*). Only P (fol. 166r) contains this report.¹³⁶

From the above examples, it is evident that H and P (long version) are based on the same recension. However, other examples presented earlier show that the same holds true for H and V (short version). As noted, Diez has already observed that the issue is more complex than as presented by Wiet, as demonstrated by the above passage on the etymology of the Jacobites, which is found in V (and B) but not in P, as well as by the report on the Fast of Heraclius (*ḡum 'at Hiraql*, lit. 'the week of Heraclius').¹³⁷ According to Diez, the *Hīṭaṭ* account (IV, p. 996) is here closer to the vulgate contained in manuscript Pococke 312. I have not consulted this manuscript, but I can say that *al-Hīṭaṭ* offers an abridged version, and a quite different one from the three copies I have used. B (fols. 256v–257r) and V (fols. 210r–210v) contain an almost identical version, with slight variants. The P version (fol. 175v) is similar but contains a few textual differences, some of which are also found in H.¹³⁸

To complicate matters even further, the wording and the narrative order in H is, in many cases, the same as in B and P, in contrast to V. This is clearly the case with the passage dealing with the conversion to Christianity – in Constantine the Great's time – of a group of Jews, who stated that the true Torah was that "which the 70 interpreted" (*hiya allatī fassarahā al-sab 'ūn*, *i.e.* the Septuagint). The wording in H (IV, p. 983–984) is clearly closer to B (fols. 216r–216v) and P (fols. 148v–149r) – albeit shorter – than to V (fols. 171r–171v; also V², p. 195); moreover, the H passage is included in the same place as in B and P, that is, before the report on Helena sending money to Edessa

¹³⁰ See Diez, "Les antiquités gréco-romaines", p. 136.

¹³¹ Ibn al-Baṭrīq, *al-Tārīḥ*, ed. Cheikho, I, p. 182.

¹³² Cf. B, fol. 232v; V, fols. 187v–188r.

¹³³ Also in Ibn al-Baṭrīq, *al-Tārīḥ*, ed. Cheikho, I, p. 184; ed. Breydy, p. 96–97. Cf. B, fol. 233r; and V, fols. 188r–188v.

¹³⁴ Probably Timothy III Salophakiolos (d. 481).

¹³⁵ Cf. Ibn al-Baṭrīq, *al-Tārīḥ*, ed. Cheikho, I, p. 185.

¹³⁶ Cf. B, fol. 241r; V, fol. 195v.

¹³⁷ Diez, "Les antiquités gréco-romaines", p. 136.

¹³⁸ For example, P and H add "incense" (*al-baḥūr*) to "gospels", "crosses" and "lighted candles" among the things with which the Christians of Jerusalem received Heraclius.

to build churches and Constantine's injunction against the Jewish people, whereas in V it is found after this report.

V (fol. 141r) gives a very short account of Domitian's reign, thereby lacking the information on patriarch Anianus's death, Avilius's patriarchate, and Kedron's accession to the patriarchate. All this information is recorded not only in H (IV, p. 976) and P (fol. 128v) but also in V² (p. 161), which indicates that the short recension also included it, and either the copyist of V overlooked it, or it was already missing from the model. Anianus's date of death and Avilius's accession to the patriarchate are also absent from B (fol. 189v), but, in this case, there is no doubt that the omission is due to homoioteleuton.¹³⁹

Notwithstanding these examples (and others), throughout this article I have presented some passages where H's account is closer to V than to B and P. And the chapter on the Copts is no exception.

As shown in the table below, H and V give the same information for the duration of the patriarchates of Eumenes (d. 141), Maximus (d. 282), and Theonas (d. 300), which differs from that given in B and P.¹⁴⁰

	H, IV, p. 976, 978	V, fols. 144v, 158r, 159r	B, fols. 192v, 204v, 206r	P, fols. 130v, 140r, 141r
Eumenes	10 years and 4 months	10 years and 4 months	13/12 years	13 years
Maximus	12 years	12 years	18 years	18 years
Theonas	9 years and 9 months	9 years and 9 months	19/20/9 years	19 years

The *Ḥiṭaṭ* passage (IV, p. 977) on the composition of *Ḥisāb al-abuqī* (Calculation of the Epact)¹⁴¹ to determine the date of Easter is closer to V (fol. 146r). Both H and V contain some statements that are missing from B (fol. 195r) and P (fol. 132v). For example, at the end of the passage they add that it was on Easter that the Messiah's resurrection from the dead took place – in Christian belief, as al-Maqrīzī is quick to point out (*fīhi qiyāmat al-Masīḥ min al-amwāt bi-za'mihim*) – and that the apostles/disciples (H: *al-ḥawāriyyūn*; V: *talāmīd*) had ordered its celebration every year at that time.

The *Ḥiṭaṭ* passage on the Council of Nicaea (IV, p. 980–981) is also closer to V than to B and P. This is illustrated by the following excerpt from *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* (IV, p. 981), where the fragments only found in H and V (fol. 167r) are highlighted in bold.¹⁴²

¹³⁹ The like word causing the omission must have been “Alexandria”. Previously, B (fol. 186r) had provided the correct information as to the duration of Anianus's patriarchate and his date of death.

¹⁴⁰ Another example regards Theophilus I (d. 412), of whom H (IV, p. 986) says that he was patriarch of Alexandria for 27 years and died on 18 Bāba. B (fol. 223v) and P (fol. 154r) give 28 years for the duration of his patriarchate, and the same date of death. V (fol. 178v) mentions this patriarch but does not provide that information, no doubt owing to homoioteleuton (the like word is “Tāwfilā”). The information is found at V² (p. 203), which gives the same figure for the duration of the patriarchate as H, namely, 27 years.

¹⁴¹ This treatise is commonly attributed to patriarch Demetrius I (d. 232). See Samir, “Book of Epact”.

¹⁴² Cf. B, fol. 212v, and P, fol. 146r.

ومنهم من قال: المسيح وأمه إلهان من دون الله وهذا قول المرايمة من فرق النصارى. ومنهم من قال: بل الله خلق الابن وهو الكلمة في الأزل كما خلق الملائكة روحا طاهرة مقدسة بسيطة مجردة عن المادة، ثم خلق المسيح في آخر الزمان من أحشاء مريم البتول الطاهرة، فاتحد الابن المخلوق في الأزل بإنسان المسيح فصارا واحدا. ومنهم من قال: الابن مولود من الأب قبل كل الدهور غير مخلوق وهو جوهر من جوهره ونور من نوره¹⁴³ وإن الابن اتحد بالإنسان المأخوذ من مريم فصارا واحدا وهو المسيح، وهذا قول الثلاث مائة وثمانية عشر.

In short, the information on the Coptic history in al-Maqrīzī's *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* is based primarily on Ibn al-'Amīd's *al-Mağmū'* and supplemented with material from other sources – an observation that is nothing new. Furthermore, when comparing *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* with the three IA copies I have used, we observe that the *Ḥiṭaṭ* text is sometimes closer to the short recension, represented by V (and B), and other times to the long one, represented by P (and B). I can therefore merely reiterate Diez's statement that only a critical edition of Ibn al-'Amīd's *al-Mağmū'* will shed light on its textual tradition, and will enable us to ascertain which recension al-Maqrīzī used.

5. Conclusion

In this article, I hope to have demonstrated, through the examples provided, that al-Maqrīzī used the so-called *Kitāb Hurūshiyūsh* and Ibn al-'Amīd's *al-Mağmū'* extensively to write his most famous work, *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, and his last major work, *al-Ḥabar*. This subject has attracted scholarly interest previously, but I have intended to offer here a more comprehensive survey of the kind of information al-Maqrīzī took from these two Christian sources, and how he used them.

To recapitulate, al-Maqrīzī used both KH and IA as reference works, on which to build whole chapters or sections (or large parts of them), or in order to add small pieces of information he considered relevant to his work – either a short report, a variant version of a report, or simply a *nasab*, a date or the years elapsed between two events (sometimes by making his own calculations on the basis of the information provided by KH and IA). That Ibn al-'Amīd was the main authority of al-Maqrīzī for the information on the patriarchs of Alexandria included in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* is widely known, but al-Maqrīzī also used IA as a source for other passages of different lengths included in both his *Ḥiṭaṭ* and his *Ḥabar*. Such a passage as that on the laments of the philosophers over Alexander included in *al-Ḥabar* shows that al-Maqrīzī regarded IA as a source on par with the Muslim sources on which he also relied for this passage, even recording the IA version rather than others in the case of parallel sentences. When it comes to KH, al-Maqrīzī relied on it for entire sections of his works (the fragments devoted to Alexander, the Ptolemaic dynasty, and Constantine the Great in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, or the large fragments from KH in the section on Persian history of *al-Ḥabar* are illustrative in this regard), and took from it a great deal of supplementary material for passages based primarily on other sources (including for the chapter on the Copts). Furthermore, among the examples provided, there are a number of passages that were produced by combining material from KH and IA (for example, those devoted to Cleopatra, Hadrian, and Diocletian in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*).

As for the parallel passages in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ* and *al-Ḥabar*, some of the above examples evidence that al-Maqrīzī did not necessarily rely on the former when, later in life, he composed similar passages for the latter. Or rather, if he did look back at his former

¹⁴³ Further on, B (fol. 213r) and P (fol. 146v) read:

وأثبتوا أن الابن مولود من الأب قبل كون/كل الخلائق وأن الابن من طبيعة الأب غير مخلوق.

work (as seems to have been the case in some instances), he also turned to his original source in order to add information and offer an expanded version. The same holds true for a number of passages that are repeated in two places within the same work.

By using KH and IA, al-Maqrīzī was following in the steps of his elder contemporaries Ibn Ḥaldūn and al-Qalqaṣandī, who – with their respective working methods and peculiarities – also relied on KH and IA either to supplement the information provided by their main source(s), or as main sources of information for those specific sections on which Orosius/Harūṣiyūš “historian of the *rūm*” and Ibn al-‘Amīd “historian of the Christians” were regarded – on account of their religion and/or origin – as best informed.

Bibliography

- Abū l-Fidā', Ismā'īl b. 'Alī, *al-Muḥtaṣar fī aḥbār al-bašar*, al-Qāhira, al-Maṭba'a al-Ḥusayniyya al-Miṣriyya, 1325/1907, 4 vols.
- Bauden, Frédéric, “Maqriziana IX: Should al-Maqrīzī Be Thrown Out with the Bath Water? The Question of His Plagiarism of al-Awḥādī's *Khiṭaṭ* and the Documentary Evidence”, *Mamlūk Studies Review*, 14 (2010), p. 159–232.
- “Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī”, in *Medieval Muslim Historians and the Franks in the Levant*, ed. Alex Mallett, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2014, p. 162–200.
- Bibliothecae Bodleianae Codicum Manuscriptorum Orientalium*, a Joanne Uri confectus, pars prima, Oxford, e Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1787.
- Brock, S.P., “The Laments of the Philosophers over Alexander in Syriac”, *JSS*, 15 (1970), p. 205–218.
- Budge, E.A. Wallis, *The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great, Being a Series of Translations of the Ethiopic Histories of Alexander by the Pseudo-Callisthenes and Other Writers*, London, C.J. Clay Budeand Sons, 1896.
- Cahen, Claude, “La « Chronique des Ayyoubides » d'Al-Makīn b. al-‘Amīd”, *Bulletin d'études orientales*, 15 (1955–1957), p. 109–184.
- Cahen, Cl. and R.G. Coquin, “al-Makīn b. al-‘Amīd”, *EF*².
- Coleman, Christopher Bush, *Constantine the Great and Christianity. Three Phases: The Historical, the Legendary, and the Spurious*, London, The Columbia University Press, 1914.
- Cottrell, Emily, *Le Kitāb Nuzhat al-Arwāḥ wa Rawḍat al-Afrāḥ* de Shams al-Dīn al-Shahrazūrī l'Isḥrāqī : composition et sources, PhD thesis, École pratique des hautes études (5ème section), 2004.
- “Al-Mubaššir ibn Fātik and the α Version of the *Alexander Romance*”, in *The Alexander Romance in Persia and the East*, ed. Richard Stoneman, Kyle Erickson and Ian Netton, Groningen, Barkhuis Publishing – Groningen University Library, 2012, p. 233–253.
- Di Branco, Marco, *Storie arabe di Greci e di Romani. La Grecia e Roma nella storiografia arabo-islamica medievale*, Pisa, Pisa University Press, 2009.
- Diez, Martino, “Les antiquités gréco-romaines entre al-Makīn ibn al-‘Amīd et Ibn Ḥaldūn. Notes pour une histoire de la tradition”, *Studia graeco-arabica*, 3 (2013), p. 121–140.
- Doufika-Aerts, Faustina, *Alexander Magnus Arabicus. A Survey of the Alexander Tradition through Seven Centuries: from Pseudo-Callisthenes to Šūrī*, Paris – Leuven – Walpole MA, Peeters, 2010.

- Drijvers, Han J.W. and Jan Willem Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross: The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac*, introduction, text and translation, Leuven, Peeters, 1997.
- Duchesne, L., *Le Liber Pontificalis*, tome premier, Paris, Ernest Thorin, 1886.
- Eddé, Anne-Marie and François Micheau, *Al-Makīn Ibn al-‘Amīd. Chronique des Ayyoubides (602-658/1205-6–1259-60)*, Paris, Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 1994.
- Ferré, André, “Ibn al-‘Amīd al-Makīn, chrétien d’Égypte. Source importante d’Ibn Khaldūn”, in *En hommage au père Jacques Jomier, O. P.*, ed. M.-T. Urvoy, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002, p. 61–71.
- Fischel, Walter J., “Ibn Khaldun’s use of Historical Sources”, *SI*, 14 (1961), p. 109–119.
- Fowden, Garth, “The Last Days of Constantine: Oppositional Versions and Their Influence”, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 84 (1994), p. 146–170.
- Haas, Christopher, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*, Baltimore – London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Al-Hamdānī, Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan, *Al-Iklīl. Erstes Buch. In der Rezension von Muḥammed bin Našwān bin Sa‘īd al-Ḥimyarī*, ed. Oscar Löfgren, Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells, 1954.
- Heijer, Johannes den, “Coptic Historiography in the Fāṭimid, Ayyūbid and Early Mamlūk Periods”, *Medieval Encounters*, 2 (1996), p. 67–98.
- Hermes, Nizar F., *The [European] Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture. Ninth-Twelfth Century AD*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Ibn al-‘Amīd, al-Makīn Ġirġīs b. Abī l-Yāsir, *Tārīḥ al-muslimīn min šāhib šarī‘at al-islām Abī l-Qāsim Muḥammad ilā l-dawla al-atābakiyya, id est, Historia saracenica*, ed. T. Erpenius, Leiden, ex Typographia Erpeniana Linguarum Orientalium, 1625.
- Ibn al-Aṭīr, ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī, *al-Kāmil fī l-tārīḥ*, Bayrūt, Dār Šādir, 1399/1979, 13 vols.
- Ibn al-Baṭrīq, *al-Tārīḥ al-maġmū‘*:
- *Eutychii Patriarchæ Alexandrini Annales*, ed. L. Cheikho, Leuven, Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1962 (reimp. of the edition Beirut 1906–1909);
- *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien*, ed. M. Breydy, Leuven, in aedibus E. Peeters, 1985.
- Ibn Ḥaldūn, Abū Zayd ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, *Kitāb al-‘Ibar wa-dīwān al-mubtada’ wa-l-ḥabar fī ayyām al-‘arab wa-l-‘aġam wa-l-barbar wa-man ‘āṣarahum min dawī l-sulṭān al-akbar*, ed. Ibrāhīm Šabbūḥ et al., Tūnis, al-Dār al-‘Arabiyya li-l-Kitāb – Dār al-Qayrawān li-l-Našr, 2006–2013, 14 vols.
- [Pseudo-]Ibn al-Rāhib, *Petrus ibn Rahib. Chronicon orientale*, ed. L. Cheikho, Leuven, Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1960 (reimp. of the 1903 Beirut edition).
- Ibn Sīda al-Mursī, Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī, *al-Muḥkam wa-l-muḥīt al-a‘zam fī l-luġa*, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ḥusayn Naṣṣār et al., al-Qāhira, Ma‘had al-Maḥṭūṭāt bi-Ġāmi‘at al-Duwal al-‘Arabiyya, 1958–1999, 12 vols.
- Ibn al-Wardī, Zayn al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar, *Tārīḥ Ibn al-Wardī (Tatimmat al-Muḥtaṣar fī aḥbār al-bašar)*, Bayrūt, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1417/1996, 2 vols.
- Al-Kindī, Abū ‘Umar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, *The Governors and Judges of Egypt or Kitāb El ‘Umarā’ (El Wulāh) wa Kitāb El Quḍāh of El Kindī*, ed. Rhuvon Guest, Leiden – London, Brill – Luzac & co., 1912.

- King, David A., "Ibn Yūnus", in *Encyclopaedia of the History of Science, Technology, and Medicine in Non-Western Cultures. Volume 1: A-K*, ed. Helaine Selin, Berlin – Heidelberg – New York, Springer, 2008, p. 1124–1125.
- Kitāb Hurūṣiyūš (Traducción árabe de las Historiae adversus paganos de Orosio)*, ed. Mayte Penelas, Madrid, CSIC – AECl, 2001.
- König, Daniel, *Arabic-Islamic Views of the Latin West. Tracing the Emergence of Medieval Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Levi Della Vida, Giorgio, "Un texte mozarabe d'histoire universelle", in *Note di storia letteraria arabo-ispánica*, ed. Maria Nallino, Roma, Istituto per l'Oriente, 1971, p. 123–192.
- Lewis, Bernard, "The Use by Muslim Historians of non-Muslim Sources", in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis and P.M. Holt, London, Oxford University Press, 1962, p. 180–191.
- *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, New York – London, W.W. Norton & Company, 1982.
- *Islam and the West*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Little, Donald P., "Coptic Conversion to Islam under the Baḥrī Mamlūks, 692–755/1293–1354", *BSOAS*, 39 (1976), p. 552–569.
- Al-Maḡdisī, al-Muṭaḥhar b. Ṭāhir, *Kitāb al-Bad' wa-l-tārīḥ. Le Livre de la création et de l'histoire de Muṭaḥhar ben Ṭāhir El-Maḡdisī*, ed. and trans. Cl. Huart, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1899–1919, 6 vols.
- Al-Maḡrīzī, Taqī l-Dīn Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad, *El-Mawāʿiz wa'l-iʿtibār fī dhikr el-khitat wa'l-âthâr*, ed. Gaston Wiet, Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1911–1927, 5 vols.
- *Al-Mawāʿiz wa'l-iʿtibār fī dhikr al-ḥiṭaṭ wa-l-âṭâr*, ed. Ayman Fuʿād Sayyid, London, Al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation – Centre for the Study of Islamic Manuscripts, 1434/2013, 6 vols.
- *Al-Maḡrīzī's al-Ḥabar ʿan al-bašar, Vol. V, Section 4: Persia and Its Kings, Part I*, ed. and trans. Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2017.
- *Al-Maḡrīzī's al-Ḥabar ʿan al-bašar, Vol. V, Sections 1–2: The Arab Thieves*, ed. and trans. Peter Webb, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2019.
- *Al-Maḡrīzī's al-Ḥabar ʿan al-bašar, Vol. V, Section 6: The Arab Thieves*, ed. and trans. Mayte Penelas, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2020.
- *Kitāb al-Ḥabar ʿan al-bašar fī ansāb al-ʿarab wa-nasab Sayyid al-bašar*, ed. Ḥālid Aḥmad al-Mullā al-Suwaydī, ʿĀrif ʿAbd al-Ġanī, Bayrūt, al-Dār al-ʿArabiyya li-l-Mawsūʿāt, 1434/2013, 8 vols.
- Maspero, Jean, Ad. Fortescue and G. Wiet, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'Empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des Eglises Jacobites (518-616)*, Paris, Librairie Édouard Champion, 1923.
- Al-Masʿūdī, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī, *Aḥbār al-zamān*, Bayrūt, Dār al-Andalus, 1416/1996.
- *Murūğ al-ḡaḥab wa-maʿādin al-ḡawḥar*, ed. Qāsim al-Šamāʿī al-Rifāʿī, Bayrūt, Dār al-Qalam, 1408/1989, 4 vols.
- Matar, Nabil, *Europe Through Arab Eyes, 1578–1727*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Megally, Mounir, "Waqʿat al-naṣara", *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, VII, 2316b–2319a.
- Millares Carlo, Agustín, *Corpus de códices visigóticos. I. Estudio*, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Gobierno de Canarias/UNED, 1999.
- Moawad, Samuel, "Al-Makīn Jirjis ibn al-ʿAmīd (the elder)", in *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History. Volume 4 (1200–1350)*, ed. D. Thomas, A. Mallett et al., Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2012, p. 566–571.

- Al-Mubaššir b. Fātik, *Muḥtār al-ḥikam wa-maḥāsin al-kalim* (Los Bocados de Oro), ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Badawī, Madrid, Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos, 1377/1958.
- Papaconstantinou, Arietta, “Historiography, Hagiography, and the Making of the Coptic ‘Church of the Martyrs’ in Early Islamic Egypt”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 60 (2006), p. 65–86.
- Penelas, Mayte, “Contribución al estudio de la difusión de la *Cosmografía* de Julio Honorio en la Península Ibérica”, *Al-Qanṭara*, 22 (2001), p. 1–17.
- “El *Kitāb Hurūṣiyūš* y el «Texto mozárabe de historia universal» de Kairuán: contenidos y filiación de dos crónicas árabes cristianas”, in *¿Existe una identidad mozárabe? Historia, lengua y cultura de los cristianos de al-Andalus (siglos IX–XII)*, ed. C. Aillet, M. Penelas and P. Roisse, Madrid, Casa de Velázquez, 2008, p. 135–157.
- “A New Arabic Version of the Dialogue between Patriarch Timothy I and Caliph al-Mahdī”, in *Cultures in Contact: Transfer of Knowledge in the Mediterranean Context*, ed. Sofía Torallas Tovar and Juan Pedro Monferrer-Sala, Córdoba – Beirut, CNERU-CEDRAC, 2013, p. 207–236.
- “Un nuevo testimonio de la circulación de obras orientales de apologética cristiana en al-Andalus”, *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia*, 11 (2014), p. 75–113.
- “Fuentes no identificadas y contenidos no conservados del Libro 7 del Orosio árabe. Nuevos datos para su identificación”, in *Promissa nec aspera curans. Mélanges offerts à Madame le Professeur Marie-Thérèse Urvoy*, ed. Georgio Rahal and Heinz-Otto Luthe, Toulouse, Presses Universitaires de l’Institut Catholique, 2017, p. 753–780.
- Al-Qalqašandī, Šihāb al-Dīn Abū l’Abbās Aḥmad, *Ṣubḥ al-a‘šā fī šinā‘at al-inšā’*, al-Qāhira, al-Maṭba‘a al-Amīriyya, 1331–1338/1913–1919, 14 vols.
- Riese, Alexander, *Geographi Latini minores*, Heilbronn, 1878.
- Al-Šahrastānī, Tāğ al-Dīn Abū l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad, *Kitāb al-Milal wa-l-niḥal. Book of Religious and Philosophical Sects*, ed. William Cureton, London, Society for the Publication of Oriental Texts, 1846.
- Al-Šahrazūrī, Šams al-Dīn Muḥammad, *Tārīḥ al-ḥukamā’ qabla zuḥūr al-islām wa-ba‘dahu “Nuzhat al-arwāḥ wa-rawḍat al-afrāḥ”*, ed. ‘Abd al-Karīm Abū Šuwayrib, Paris, Dar Byblion, 2007.
- Samir, Khalil, “Book of Epact”, *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, II, 409a–411b.
- Sayyid, Ayman Fu‘ād, *Al-Maqrīzī wa-kitābuhu al-Mawā‘iz wa-l-i‘tibār fī ḍikr al-ḥiṭat wa-l-āṭār*, London, Al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation, 1434/2013.
- Schilling, Alexander M., “Die Konstantinslegende in mozarabischer Überlieferung”, *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia*, 6 (2009), p. 339–373.
- Schwartz, J., “Dioclétien dans la littérature copte”, *Bulletin de la Société d’Archéologie Copte*, 15 (1958–1960), p. 151–166.
- Seleznyov, Nikolai N., “The Laments of the Philosophers over Alexander the Great According to the Blessed Compendium of al-Makīn ibn al-‘Amīd”, *Scrinium*, 10 (2014), p. 97–114.
- Sidarus, Adel, “Copto-Arabic Universal Chronography. Between Antiquity, Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The *K. al-Tawārīkh* of N. al-Khilāfa Abū Shākir Ibn al-Rāhib (655 Heg. / 973 Mart. / 1257 Chr. / 1569 Alex. / 6750AM)”, *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia*, 11 (2014), p. 221–250.
- Tisserant, E. and G. Wiet, “La Liste des patriarches d’Alexandrie dans Qalqachandi”, *Revue de l’Orient Chrétien*, 23 (1922–1923), p. 123–143.

Ūrūsiyūs, *Tārīḥ al-‘ālam*, ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Badawī, Bayrūt, al-Mu’assasa al-‘Arabiyya li-l-Dirasāt wa-l-Našr, 1982.