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Abstract: A good number of studies appears recently dealing with Copto-Arabic Historiography offering new findings or new insights, but also a few text-editions or mere translations. We feel opportune to provide a comprehensive survey of this literature, including a brief outline of the production of the earlier Melkite authors of the 10th-11th centuries, who had a real impact on later Coptic historiography and were together rightly appreciated by Muslim historians. By the way, we will record the Ethiopian translation of a few of those texts between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries and the impact they exerted over their own historiographic production.
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Resumen: Recientemente, han aparecido un buen número de estudios sobre historiografía copto-árabe que han ofrecido nuevos descubrimientos o nuevos conocimientos, pero también algunas ediciones de textos o meras traducciones. Nos parece, pues, oportuno proporcionar información exhaustiva sobre esta literatura, incluyendo una breve reseña de la producción de los primeros autores melquitas de los siglos X-XI, la cual tuvo un impacto real en la historiografía copta posterior y que los historiadores musulmanes apreciaron con acierto. Por cierto, registraremos la traducción etíope de algunos de esos textos entre los siglos XIV y XVI y el impacto ejercido sobre la producción historiográfica local.
It was among the Melkites of Egypt and Northern Syria, between the middle of the 4th/10th century and the first half of the 5th/11th century, that appeared the first great histories written in Arabic by Christian authors. Only three centuries later, that Coptic historians writing in Arabic emerged, in the frame of their literary golden age and similarly divided between Egypt and Syria, then under the control of the same kings. Certain writings of a historiographical nature are certainly found among them before this, but nothing 'professional' and in any case of somewhat limited scope.

Arabic historiography of Christian origin began also in al-Andalus in that tenth century, involving however the translation or «Mozarabic» reworking of a Latin history from before the arrival of the Arabs.1 Whatever the case, this history of Hurūshiyūsh (Orosius, c. 385-420) converted into Arabic was valued and employed by the Muslim historians of that period and others later, on account of the information it provided on non-Arabic Antiquity, whether biblical, Judaic, Persian, Greco-Macedonian or Romano-Byzantine. In fact, in the view of Muslim scholars, until quite late in Middle Ages (as we will see below), the contribution of Christian historiography was distinguished especially by its universal approach: a genuine history

---

or chronology of the world from Adam and Eve onwards – a world limited, obviously, to the Mediterranean Ecumene at large.  

To complete this general overview of medieval Christian Arabic World historiography, we must mention the unique case within the Syriac tradition, that of the great polygraph Gregory Barhebraeus (623-685 / 1226-1286), who produced an abridged Arabic version of his voluminous universal history written in Syriac.  

Antecedents of Melkite origin

In speaking of Copto-Arabic historiography, it is impossible to ignore Melkite works in Arabic, since they are widely quoted and it is through Coptic historians that they were known to the Muslim historians of the late Middle Ages. We therefore need to present them briefly.  

The first and most important of these histories is the Kitāb Naẓm al-jawhar («The String of the Pearls») by Sa‘īd b. Batrīq (« Patricius»), consecrated patriarch of Alexandria under the name of Eutychius towards the end of his life (321-328 / 933-940). Known and largely employed in Europe as the Annales, after its edition and translation by

2 We have to use these French quotation marks as the others could confuse with the marks used in the transcription of a few Arabic graphemes.


4 Joseph Nasrallah, Histoire du mouvement littéraire dans l’Église melchite: Contribuition à l’étude de la littéraure arabe chrétienne, vol. II/2 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989), pp. 49-55 and vol. III/1 (1983) (sic), pp. 167-175. To be read with the corrections and complements made by Samir Khalil in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 56 (1990), pp. 469-486. We will no more invoke this reference for each of the following items. The same with the paper of Pirone 2009.

E. Pococke (Oxford, 1658-1659), this universal history was well aware of the Muslim tradition, even if its author had recourse mostly to appropriate Christian and Byzantine sources. It had therefore been valued by Muslim historians right from the time of its writing, but also refuted by the writer’s younger contemporary, the Coptic bishop Sawirus b. al-Muqaffa’, on account of its pro-Chalcedonian apologetic tone, when he came to expose the history of Church Councils.” It was popular in Northern Syria, and may therefore have been used by the Latin chronicler William of Tyre in the 12th century, before being extensively employed by the great Coptic historians of the following century, object of our present contribution. A first version was enlarged by the writer himself, before undergoing a series of reworkings and additions in Antioch throughout the first half of the 11th century.

It was Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṭākī (a later nisba-surname) – a relative of Ibn Baṭrīq, perhaps – born at Fuṣṭāt Misr probably around 370/980-1 and having emigrated to Antioch in 405/1014-5, who brought with him the latter’s Tārīkh. He had begun a continuation of it, up from the year 326/937-8, while in Egypt, and even undertook still there a thorough reworking of it, before he carried on with an enhanced version when in Antioch. In the form it reached us in the manuscripts, the writing breaks at the year 425/1033-4. However, there is some indications that it could have been carried on beyond this date.

A certain text transmission of this Dhayl or Ṣila ("Sequel, Continuation") have annexed it to its predecessor, so that the first standard edition by Cheikho with others (1909) appeared as Pars posterior of Eutychius’ Annales. This is far to be accidental, because the great biographer Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a (d. 668/1269-70) and the Coptic historian Ibn al-Rāhib (see below) echoed this situation and

---

8 We cannot dwell here on the discussion about the identification or not of the chronicler with the homonym physician and theologian baring the kunya Abū al-Faraj (d. after 458/1066).
consequently attributed to Ibn Baṭrīq the treatise on ecclesiastical computation explicitly mentioned by Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd in his own chronicle – treatise believed to have never seen the light of day. Ibn al-Rāhib precisely transcribed long passages from it in his recently discovered and evaluated Kitāb al-Tawārīkh.⁹

Ibn Baṭrīq had a competitor in the person of his contemporary co-religionist Mahbūb ibn Qustantīn al-Manbijī,¹⁰ alias Agapius, bishop of Mabbug/Hierapolis, deceased after 330/942: date of the (fortuitous?) interruption of his universal history. Its title has been erroneously distorted in manuscripts, editions and works of reference in Kitāb al-Unwān («Book of the Title»), while this work is simply a K. al-Tārīkh without a specific title.¹¹ Divided into two large sections (before and after the birth of Christ), it was composed in a cultural and linguistic setting very similar to that of al-Anṭākī. It was soon appreciated by persons of culture.¹²

---

⁹ A. Sidarus & S. Moawad, «Un comput melkite attribuable à Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṭākī: Extraits conservés dans le K. al-Tawārīḥ d’Abū Šākir b. al-Rāhib», Le Muséon 123 (2010), pp. 455-477. Apart from an exposition of the course of our common research, we give there the edition of virtually all the extracts transcribed in that work, thus restoring part of the lost text. One should now refer to the recent edition by Moawad (Mu’awwaḍ 2015). See also Sidarus 2016a, pp. 71-74 (# 13).

¹⁰ This nisba is sometimes found corrupted to al-Manījī, especially in editions of Muslim chronicles.

¹¹ GCAL II, pp. 39-41 (# 9), updated now by M.N. Swanson in CMR 2 (2010), 241-245, s.v. «al-Manbijī». For the use made by Ibn al-Rāhib (with a few additional data), see Sidarus 2016a, pp. 94-95 (# 25).

¹² The famous physician and translator Qusṭa b. Lūqā (d. 912) should have written also a world history, meanwhile lost; GCAL II, p. 31; Nasrallah, Histoire..., II/1, p. 52. Further, a claimed Maronite chronicle is pointed out for the 4th/10th century in Rosenthal 1968, p. 108.
Earlier Histories of Coptic Tradition

Previous to any Arabic language history in Egypt, we have two cases in Coptic which date from the beginning of Arab-Muslim rule and contain, consequently, some information on that period. The first instance is the Byzantine-style universal chronicle of Bishop John of Nikiu (died shortly after the 1st/7th cent.), so written a short time after the arrival of the Arabs. Then, a number of individual contributions to the collective annals of the Church, known as the History of the (Coptic) Patriarchs of Alexandria, which continued until the middle of the 5th/11th century, when Arabic took over.

The two works have been translated into Arabic, although the Arabic version of the first has been lost, together with the Coptic original, surviving only in a defective and incomplete Ethiopian version, without leaving any apparent trace in later Egyptian historiography, including that of the Copts themselves. By contrast, the translation of the History of the Patriarchs undoubtedly had a great impact on later writers in matters of Church life, as we shall have occasion to assess. Undertaken towards the end of the eleventh century by the Alexandrian official Mawhūb b. Manṣūr b. Mufarrij al-Iskandarānī, this translation was the point of departure for a new range of contributions in Arabic, with significant socio-political concern, before taking the form of brief, essentially anonymous, patriarchal notes, from the middle of the 7th/13th century onward.

---

13 Curiously enough, in Radtke’s standard work (1992, pp. 133-138), where the former Melkite historians are briefly presented, it is stated (p. 133) that no autochthonous – read: Coptic – Christian historiography exists at all.

14 Latest clarification with updated bibliography by Sidarus 2016b, pp. 34-35.

15 Against the tradition which always invokes Sawīrus b. al-Muqaffa’ (V/X cent.), this new state of affairs has been clearly demonstrated by J. den Heijer in his monography (1989), now an indispensable reference. He incorporated the essential in his double entry in the CopEnc, s.vv. «History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria» and «Mawāḥib b. Maḥṣūr b. Mufarrij». See now Den Heijer & Pilette 2013. See also Den Heijer 1996, pp. 69-77, and the brief notices on the personages involved in the collective enterprise, in CMR 2-3 (2011-2012). Supplementary observations in Sidarus 2016a,
Before moving to the historians proper, we may also mention a collective work, paralleling the History of the Patriarchs, that is the History of Churches and Monasteries.\textsuperscript{16} It would have originated towards the end of the 6\textsuperscript{th}/12\textsuperscript{th} century with Abū al-Makārim Sa'd-Allāh b. Jirjis b. Mas'ūd, who may have compiled and developed earlier material. At the start of the next century, the initial work turned into a multi-layered text regarding the historical religious topography of Egypt, with diverse information on the neighbouring regions. This necessarily included the history of cities and localities, thereby relating that guidebook with elements scattered throughout the chronicles of John of Nikiu and of ʿIbn al-'Amīd (see below), but especially to the anonymous compilation described at the end of this article. We may say, finally, that civil and political history could not fail to leave its mark on the various contributions – among which figures the input of Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Armanī, who for a long time lent his name to an earlier truncated text witness.

At the same time, doubtless still alien to the venture of his two younger co-religionists, a certain bishop Abīm (Abraham?) produced a universal History ending in the year 614/1217-18, and of which nothing in particular is known. It seems to have existed in a Copto-Arabic manuscript noticed in the 30's of last century, all trace of which has been lost.\textsuperscript{17} The form of the bishop's name suggests Upper Egypt and one wonder about its relationship with the Ṭārīkh li-ḥād al-

\textsuperscript{16} Den Heijer 1996, pp. 77-81. The reported article in footnote 53 about the influence of the History of the Patriarchs was meanwhile published in Parole de l'Orient 19 (1994), pp. 415-439. See also Sidarus 2007, pp. 207-209, where reference is made to a similar lost writing for which the supposed author is somehow controversial (GCAL II, pp. 427-428, # 129).

\textsuperscript{17} GCAL II, pp. 436 (# 131.4), where MS Sbath Fihrist no 4 is referred.
Ṣaʿīdīyyīn which figures among the sources of Ibn al-Rāhib (Sidarus 2016a: 96-8, # 26), who effectively inaugurates the new cycle of Copto-Arabic historiography.

It was indeed in the frame of the Golden Age of Copto-Arabic literature, beginning in the second quarter of the 7th/13th century (Sidarus 2010), that the Copto-Arabic universal histories appeared, harmonising Byzantine and Arab-Muslim traditions, universal chronology and local annals, as much socio-political and Islamic in general as about ecclesial life proper. Over time, in the 8th/14th century, the activity of these historians tended towards integration – at once stylistic, thematic and methodological – within the dominant Arab-Muslim historiography. In this movement, we see the Copts affirming themselves through an effort to perceive the whole of the Ecumene and its history, in which their particular ethnic religious group was inevitably caught up. This was thanks to a frank universal openness instead of a process of inwardness or isolation, which the adverse experiences they actually suffered could explain.

Abū Shākir Ibn al-Rāhib’s Kitāb al-Tawārikh

Nushūʿ al-Khilāfa Abū Shākir b. (Buṭrus) al-Rāhib b. al-Muhadhdhīb (c. 602-695 / 1205-1295) is an illustrious representative of the Golden Age of medieval Coptic Arabic literature. He belonged to a prominent family of notables, men of Church who were also senior civil servants in the Ayyubid state. He himself held a high office in financial administration of the Armies Ministry (Dīwān al-Juyūsh) and was a deacon serving the patriarchal al-Muʿallaqa church in Fuṣṭāṭ Miṣr (Old Cairo). The somewhat late literary output of our polymath was limited to the period between 655/1257 and 669/1270, after he left state

---

18 Sidarus 1975, pp. 9-25, of which a new version was given in Idem 2017, together with the synthesis s.v. «al-Muhadhdhīb, Banū» in EI-3 (2018).
The historical work of Ibn al-Rāhib is not the so-called *Chronicon orientale*, falsely ascribed to him since its first disclosure in Europe in the mid-seventeenth century. It is but the large handbook on chronography and history entitled *Kitāb al-Tawārīkh* (655/1257), uncovered and studied more than forty years ago and which inaugurates at the same time the literary endeavour of the author and the Coptic Arabic historiographic cycle proper we are dealing with here.

Transmitted in late manuscripts, it is a collection of two distinct parts plus an appendix, joined together without any formal transition and artificially divided into 51 chapters (*abwāb*) of unequal length and varying internal composition. The threefold division of the historical part proper offers a systematic chronological overview, divided into three chapters or sections (ch. 48-50): world history until the rise of Islam, followed by Islamic and then Coptic ecclesiastical annals. The whole is introduced by an extensive treatise on astronomy, calendaristics, and ecclesiastical reckoning (*aboqti*; part I, ch. 1-47).

---


20 By A. Ecchellensis (Paris, 1651). Details on this primary work with its threefold reedition and the standard edition by L. Cheikho in the CSCO series (Beirut/Leuven, 1903), in Sidarus 1975, p. 27, n. 1-2 and 44, n. 45; Sidarus 2014, pp. 223, n. 2. As explained below the *Chronicon* represents but a recast of only a part of the true work.

21 This book title is to be understood at the same time as «eras or chronological systems» and a «set of chronologies».


23 Now edited by Mu’awwad 2015 (edition of the rest is forthcoming, as well as a German translation of the whole). This part in particular was translated from the Ethiopic version and technically commented by the eminent historian of ancient and oriental astronomy O. Neugebauer (see next footnote).
The Appendix or chapter 51 gives a historical and dogmatic sketch of the first general Councils of the Christian Church.

Ibn al-Rāhib’s work was translated into Ethiopic between 1524 and 1540 from a prototype much earlier than the surviving manuscripts of the original Arabic text.\(^{24}\) It was popular among the Ethiopians, as demonstrated by the dozen copies in which it is transmitted, in addition to independent extracts and various avatars. Thus, the reckoning section or Part I exercised a significant influence on local practices of computation, as manifested by a series of tables or treatises of the kind known as Ḥasābā Abushakār, or simply Abushakār.\(^{25}\)

The sources of the K. al-Tawārīkh were recently revised and analysed in detail.\(^{26}\) To summarise, the author mentions explicitly some thirty different texts, some of them quite unknown. For the primeval, antique and general Christian history, alongside the Biblical and extra-biblical or Judaic texts, including the mediaeval Josippon, one finds many Patristic and Canonical Church writings, as well as Christian Arab writers from the various confessions, with an emphasis on the Melkite historians displayed above. Obviously, the traditional Coptic History of the Patriarchs provided a great deal of information for ancient and later history, ecclesiastical in particular. Meanwhile, for the astronomical and reckoning sections, the author makes use of Ptolemaios’ *Almagest* and, without explicitly quoting them, the classical Islamic astronomers: al-Khwārizmī, al-Bīrūnī, Ibn Yūnus and


\(^{25}\) Neugebauer, *Abu Shaker’s «Chronography»*, pp. 9-10 and 173. Previous works of the author on the topic are listed in the bibliography there, as well as in the entry «Chronography» by S. Uhlig in *EncAeth* 1 (2003), pp. 733a-737a. More details (not considered in both studies) on the transmission of these specific texts and their literary history in Sidarus 1975, pp. 56-58.

\(^{26}\) Sidarus 2016a. See also Mu’awwaḍ 2015, pp. 23-35.
others. For the specific Islamic chronology, general or local, the author claims that he consulted a good number of historians, but similarly without specific mention or citation. Nonetheless, as in the case of his contemporary Ibn al-'Amid, for the ancient period, we must assume some epitomes and continuations of al-Ṭabarī’s *Annals* current in Medieval Egypt.27

One cannot close this chapter on Ibn al-Rāhib as historian without a few words on the *Chronicon orientale*, which is generally attributed to him and is frequently invoked in historiographical essays or works related to Egypt or the Copts since the mid-seventeenth century, as stated above.

Actually, two years after the composition of the *K. al-Tawārīkh*, in 1259, the historical sections or Part II were reworked by an anonymous writer into an abridged, and sometimes modified, untitled form. When A. Ecchellensis believed he had discovered in the *Chronicon* the historical work of Ibn al-Rāhib so often mentioned in al-Makīn Ibn al-'Amid’s historical work (see below), he asserted this on a comparison of the two manuscript texts known to him. Now, we have been able to personally attest that it is rather the original text of Ibn al-Rāhib that his contemporary knew and extensively quotes. Otherwise, the real relationship that exists between both texts has twice been discussed by us.28

---


Al-Makīn Ibn al-‘Amīd’s Universal Chronography

Jirjis b. al-‘Amīd Abī al-Yāsir (...), usually referred to with his honorific title «al-Makīn», was born in Cairo in 602/1205-6, to a wealthy and well-known family descended from a merchant of Syro-Jacobite origin from Takrīt, North of Iraq. He had migrated to Egypt in the beginning of the twelfth century and settled in Sanbāṭ, North of the Delta, well merged into the Coptic community. Like his father (d. 636/1238-39) and other close relatives, or Ibn al-Rāḥib as explained above, Jirjis served as a high civil servant in the Dīwān al-Juyūsh in Egypt and later in Damascus, where he died in 672/1273-74.29 He is not to be conflated, as many people do, with his homonymous much younger relative, from the second half of the next century (d. after 801/1398-89), who was a physician, monk, priest and the author of the great philosophical theological summa with the name of al-Hāwī («Continens»).30

Ibn al-‘Amīd’s Tārīkh is generally known as al-Majmū‘ al-mubārak («The Blessed Compilation») following the indication of a few manuscripts. Other manuscripts, as well as his grand-nephew and continuator (see below) and most mediaeval historians, speak simply


29 This date, transmitted by mediaeval Muslim authors and which some scholars wanted to amend in 692/1293, was now assessed by Eddé 2018. On the author and his work, there is a lot of later studies listed in the last mise au point by S. Moawad in CMR IV (2013), 566-571. Add however apart from Eddé 2018: Pirone 2009; Sidarus 2013a, pp. 191-192 and 199-201; Idem 2014, p. 239, n. 39; Diez 2013 (the first 15 pages present actually the historical work as such together with the manuscript transmission!).

30 Translated into Ge’ez under the title Talmīd; EncAeth V (2015), col. 848b-849a (G. Colin). On the author himself, Ibn al-‘Amīd, the Younger, see now the important bio-bibliographic clarification by M.N. Swanson and A. Sidarus in CMR V (2014), pp. 256-263. New elements in Sidarus 2013a, pp. 201-202 and 208 (Addendum) or Idem 2016b, p. 37, n. 22; and ultimately in Idem 2018, pp. 300-304 (§ 1).
about a Tārīkh (Den Heijer 1996, pp. 88-95, # 6). It has two distinct parts: a world chronology like Ibn al-Rāhib going up until Emperor Heraclius (up to the eleventh year of his reign, the beginning of the Islamic era... ) and an Islamic one based on an annalistic frame typical for Muslim historiography, which ceases in 658/1260 with the Mongol fall on Damascus and the advent of the Mamluk sultan Baybars I. The ecclesiastical history is minimal, being distributed in the framework of both parts. Generally speaking, we are dealing with a merely civil and not confessional historiography!

According to the author’s prologue in some manuscripts of the abridged version, by some referred to as vulgata,31 after a first version which knew a rapid dissemination, he discovered new materials about world history and consequently reworked this part. Then a certain high dignitary asked for an abridged version of the whole. Until now, nobody has classified the more than 36 text witnesses according to this schema, apart from the short survey undertaken by Diez (2013, pp. 127-135) who is now working on a critical edition of this part. The new finds which enhanced the old History prove to be mostly related to Ibn al-'Amīd’s contemporary and coreligionist Ibn al-Rāhib and to his own sources, chiefly to Ibn al-Ṭaṭrāq and al-Manbijī. We may suggest therefore that the second enlarged version was produced after the events of 652/1260 and his imprisonment in Egypt in the same year, where he could have found the K. al-Tawārīkh finished just a few years before, in 655/1257. In this later recasting, however, the author did not extend the second Islamic part beyond 658/1260.

This second Part alone, just up to 512/1117-18 (!), was the first Arabic historical work to be published in Europe,32 and consequently the only basis for European readers to become acquainted with

---

31 See in particular Diez 2013, pp. 120-30 and Eddé 2018.
Islamic history until the edition and translation movement of the nineteenth century during the classical age of Orientalism. The final and most original part related to the Ayyubid dynasty is missed there and was published and studied only in the middle of the last century.\(^{33}\)

The first Part concerning the World (and Ancient Christian) History, provided alone in most of the manuscripts,\(^{34}\) remains still unedited, although it had such a great significance as a valuable source for later Muslim historians (Ibn Khaldūn, al-Qalqashandi, al-Maqrīzī and others) for Ancient History, be it Biblical, Jewish, Graeco-Roman, Byzantine, or Persian.\(^{35}\) Obviously, it was this part which interested the Ethiopians, who translated it into Ge’ez almost at the same time as Ibn al-Rāhib’s work.\(^{36}\) It was a real literary success, since many extracts or summarized segments served for the composition of some royal chronicles.\(^{37}\) Unfortunately this part Furthermore, the Tarīkā Wāldā ‘Amīd

---


\(^{34}\) One additional manuscript witness, never mentioned, is n° 16/II,1 of the Monastery of Sharfeh (Darūn, Harissa, Lebanon); see Sidarus 1975, p. 48.


The nature and multidimensional variety of the Ancient History, generally speaking, required the use of a wider range of sources. On the whole, directly or indirectly accessed, one will find much of the material used by Ibn al-Rāhib: Biblical and Para-Biblical writings; the Josippon or Gorionides; the Coptic History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria; Ibn al-Batrīq and al-Manbijī (Sidarus 2016a, pp. 92-96, # 24-25). As for this two writers, in particular, it is still necessary to discriminate between what was borrowed directly from them and what was transmitted through Ibn al-Rāhib. Regarding the alleged text witnesses from John Chrysostom and Epiphanius of Cyprus, sometimes jointly mentioned with the former Melkite writers..., they must have been read precisely in the K. al-Tawārīkh (Sidarus 2016a, pp. 98-101, # 27-28).

In opposition to these parallelisms and the questions they raise, Ibn al-‘Amīd’s Tārīkh or Majmū’ mubārak quotes or embeds quite original writings, such as some peculiar legends about Alexander the Great, some Latin Byzantine stories (Diez 2013, pp. 134-135), or...
Irano-Syriac material. In addition, we must also look for the sources of the excursuses on geographical topics or the history of the towns scattered throughout Ibn al-'Amid’s text, similar to what is to be found in John of Nikiu (see above) or in the anonymous composite Universal History about which we speak below.

Obviously, the kind of sources differs considerably from one part to another of the chronicle. The Islamic annals up to the year 592/1195-96 follow, or are inspired by, some epitome of the well-known Annals of Abū Ja’far al-Ṭabarī (224-310 / 839-923) joined to a continuation which could be the al-Tārīkh al-Ṣāliḥī of Ibn Wāsil (604-697 / 1208-1298). Otherwise, according to the mentioned scholars, the quality of Ibn al-'Amid’s chronicle competes with the historical reports written by the great Muslim historians of his time, including in the case of the Crusades, where no substantial disparity or viewpoint could be found under the pen of our Christian chronicler.

Al-Mufaḍḍal b. Abī al-Faḍā’īl on Bahrī Mamluk chronology

Al-Mufaḍḍal b. Abī al-Faḍā’īl was the grand-nephew of al-Makīn b. al-'Amīd and his continuator, as the full and rhymed title of his chronicle shows: Al-Nahj al-sadīq / wal-durr al- farīd / fīmā bāda Tarīkh Ibn al-'Amīd («The Pertinent Path and the Unique Gem concerning what comes after the Tārīkh of IA»). He died after 759/1358, the date of composition of the chronicle according to the unique manuscript witness, most probably an autograph. Al-Mufaḍḍal’s father al-'Itām


44 See the different studies of Claude Cahen referred to and presented by Eddé 2018. See further Hasan in his introduction to his edition (2010).

45 MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, arabe 4525, edited and translated in two successive endeavours: Blochet 1919-29 (up to the year 716/1316) and Kortantamer 1973. The later editor discusses the matter of autography on pp. 13-15. Meanwhile, the author of the new manuscript catalogue has confirmed this: Troupeau 1974, p. 11. The last notice on the
Abū al-Faḍā’īl was companion of his uncle (a brother of his mother) in the Damascene Ayyubid Dīwān al-Juyūsh. After a period in North Mesopotamia, he returned to Egypt, where his son seems to have held eventually a high civil charge, as evidenced, beside his family lineage and the respective laqab, by his intellectual interest and the style of his writing.

The Nahj is intended to continue the Chronicle of Ibn al-'Amīd, like it, with a basically annalistic structure in the favoured approach of the Muslim chroniclers of that time and without any specific Christian standpoint – apart from a few and merely descriptive notes on the Coptic patriarchs of the period. As such, it represents a valuable contribution as a contemporary of the Bāḥrī Mamluk period from 658-741/1260-1341 – with occasional episodes until 749/1348 – in Egypt and Syria, and was therefore studied and taken advantage of by the modern scholars who dealt with Mamluk history. Obviously, the chronicle could not ignore completely other parts of the Muslim Word, particularly the Mongol empire in Persia.

The sources of Ibn Abī al-Fadāʾil’s chronicle were studied by the aforementioned scholars; more accurately and holistically by Kortantamer. They all contradict the plagiarism claimed by Blochet of al-Nuwayri’s Nihāyat al-arab. Otherwise, with the exception of the three historians explicitly quoted by the author, they could not find any direct reliance on others, nor could they uncover the anonymous historian regularly invoked beneath the formula: qāla al-maʿarrīkh («the historian reports»).\(^{47}\) In any case, we should keep in mind the utterance that figures in the introductory heading of the work’s autograph: jamāʿahu li-nafsihi («compiled for his own use»). Coupled with the absence of any other text witness, this should explain why our Coptic author was totally ignored by later historians or biographers.

*Al-Muwaffaq Ibn al-Ṣuqāʾī, a professional historian*

Actually, Ibn al-ʿAmīd had an earlier continuator in the person of another Coptic colleague in Damascus: al-Muwaffaq Faḍl-Allāh b. Abī al-Fakhr b. al-Ṣ/Suqāʾī, referred to in Muslim biographical or historical works with the label al-Kātib al-Naṣrānī. He died in Damascus, almost a centenarian, in 726/1325, bequeathing a reputation as a competent and trusty official of the public financial administration, a chronicler worthy of trust, as well as a pious and noble Christian.\(^{48}\)

---

\(^{47}\) According to Kortantamer’s analysis (1973, pp. 27-29), Haarman’s opinion about the heavy dependence on Ibn al-Dawādārī’s *Kanz al-durar* for the limited timespan studied by him does not apply to the whole chronicle.

Adel Y. Sidarus

It is his contemporary from Damascus, Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī (698-764 / 1297-1363), transmitted by other historians, who informs that he had personally, before disposing of it, a handwritten copy by Ibn al-Ṣuqā‘ī in which he had copied the chronicle of Ibn al-ʿAmīd, «concluded in 658» (!), before adding to it a Dhayl («Sequel/Supplement/Continuation») going up to 720/1320, that is to say, some years before his death. Most regrettably, we have no evidence of such a copy nowadays.

Ibn al-Ṣuqā‘ī made rather a name for himself among historians of his time thanks to his three works in the genre of wafāyāt («obituaries or death notices») such as it was in vogue at the time. Only his Tālī Kitāb Wafāyāt al-ʿayān («Continuation of the book of obituaries of notable people») has survived. This continued, for the years 660-725/1262-1325, the well-known analogous work of Ibn Khallikān (618-81/1221-82), after having made an abridgement of it, lost to us today, like that on the musicians (muṭribūn). By coincidence, it is once again the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris which preserves a survived copy of the Tālī (MS arabe 2061). It had earlier been acquired by the

The same for Samir 1981, p. 40 and for Aziz A. Suryal in CopEnc., s.v. «Suqā‘i»]. Personally I would argue that the biographical notices concerning half a dozen of Coptic figures, including two monks and saints, and where the author seems familiar to the inner life of the Coptic Church, should reinforce the supposition. On the other hand, we do not know of mediaeval Melkite historians of some relevance after the ones displayed above. See also the presence of the Coptic language in his (alleged) quadrilingual Diatesseron.

49 See the introduction to Sublet’s edition, pp. XIII-XIV. See also Kabbab, «Al-Makīn...», pp. 287 fine – 288.

50 How far had Ibn al-Mufaddal knowledge of that first supplement? I had considered for a moment the possibility that the mysterious historiographer hidden behind the constant expression wa-qāla al-mu’arrīkh, in al-Mufaddal’s Nahj, could very well be this former colleague of his great-uncle. But as that formula continues beyond the date of conclusion of the Dhayl and the death of its author, the suggestion proves impossible.

51 Curiously, the manuscript does not figure in Troupeau’s new catalogue (1972-74).
celebrated biographer and all-round humanist Khalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī (696-764/1297-1363), and was extensively annotated by him before he included its details in his own monumental compilation Wāfī al-wafāyāt.\footnote{Other Muslim historians too quoted his work. See Sublet’s ed., pp. 233-37 and Samir’s book review, p. 184.}

The work reveals two distinct parts and stages. The first 300 biographical notices of people deceased between 658 and 717 A.H. are ordered alphabetically. After a formal colophon indicating the end of the work and its revision in 715 (sic), follow some fifty more necrologies in a different style, sequentially ordained according to the years 717-27. Obviously, the author continued his work gradually year after year without undertaking a final revision.

Concluding, we may note that in accordance with his profound attachment to the Christian faith – of which it is said that he knew by heart «the Torah, the Gospels and the Psalms» – our Coptic historian from Damascus is claimed, again according to al-Kutubī, to have composed a harmony of the four Gospels in four different languages: Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic and Greek. This does not appear to have come down to us.\footnote{See the introduction to the edition, p. XIV. Space does not permit the discussion of this complex and somewhat dubious information: do we have any metathesis: ‘iBRīj’/’aRaBī? In any case, in view of the double critical note of Samir (1980, p. 186 and 1981, p. 41; see above), the suggested existence by Sublet of a copy in MS Sbath 1029 turns out almost impossible. See now the recent description of the manuscript in point by Francisco Del Río Sánchez, Manuscrits de la Fondation Georges et Mathilde Salem d’Alep (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2008), p. 127, MS Salem 227 (compare with no. 218, p. 121).}

\textit{Abū al-Barakāt Ibn Kabar as historian}

Like most of the protagonists of the Golden Age of Coptic Arabic literature, Shams al-Ri‘āsa Abū al-Barakāt b. al-Akmal al-As‘ad b. Kabar (d. 724/1324) comes from a wealthy family from Old Cairo whose members held a relevant position in the civil service.\footnote{The best presentation of our man and his work is still Samir Khalil Samir, «L’encyclopédie liturgique d’Ibn Kabar et son apologie d’usages coptes»,}
himself held one such post, among others, as a private secretary to the Mamluk emir Baybars al-Mansūrī al-Dawādār (d. 725/1325). In 1300, he was ordained priest with the name Barṣawma, serving in the patriarchal Church called al-Mūallaqa.⁵⁵ In 1321, because of a mob’s attempt to lynch him, he took refuge with his old master.

The polymath who was Ibn Kabar is celebrated by his coreligionists of today, as well as by European orientalists, for his most focal Coptic Arabic vocabulary: al-Ṣullam al-kabīr (Scala magna),⁵⁶ together with the all-embracing ecclesiastic summa: Miṣbāḥ al-ẓulma («The Lamp for the Darkness»). He is also known for a range of homilies and speeches composed in the rhyming style (ṣaf’). However, the mediaeval Muslims historians report almost exclusively his involvement in the huge chronicle of his master: Zubdat al-fikra / fī Ta’rīkh al-Hijra, put down in some eleven volumes and ending in 723/1323, the major part of which giving a valuable account of the Bahrī Mamluk dynasty.⁵⁷ Moreover,
he provided a valuable epitome of this work: Mukhtasār al-Akhbār, attested in one manuscript but not sufficiently acknowledged as a genuine undertaking. His most original contribution must lie in the field of Pre-Islamic Universal History, a specific qualification of Christian historians, as seen above.

Actually, apart from this achievement, our encyclopaedist displays interest and ability in dealing with historical matters in his summa, such as the lives of the 12 Apostles and the 70 Disciples of Christ (ch. 4), the Christian literary history (ch. 7), or the World Chronology ending with the lives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria (last section of the last chapter).
There is an anonymous large scale universal history from the 14th century, ending with the Ascension of Christ as preserved in MS Paris arabe 300, which appears to be an end-of-era output.\textsuperscript{62}

Having thus far attracted little attention from researchers, this patchwork – copied in the Paris version by a number of hands and full of marginal notes – is far from being a compilation of the \textit{Annales} of Eutychius (Sa‘īd b. Baṭrīq), as Graf had affirmed (1947: 35), misled by the content of the first manuscript of 48 folios of that artificial bound codex. It seems, rather, to claim to recapitulate a large part of the earlier writings, which we have reviewed, beginning with the chronicles of world history, those of Ibn Baṭrīq, Ibn al-Rāhib and Ibn al-ʻAmīd in particular. But we also find there a little of the history and topography of cities, with the wonders related to «their talismans», and other stories of marvels. There are also apocryphal writings, such as the Vision of Daniel, the Infancy gospels, and various stories of the Apostles.

This compilation clearly merits detailed comparative analysis,\textsuperscript{63} not so much in order to shed further light on an original historiographical text, but rather to retrace, or even recover, snippets of ancient lost texts. All indications are that this historiography is limited to the Christian legacy proper. And even perhaps to that of the Copts in particular, to the extent that references to or quotations from the Melkite patriarch Eutychius seem to always be taken from the celebrated Coptic duo: Ibn al-Rāhib and Ibn al-ʻAmīd. In this sense, this literary epilogue is a reversal of the development of Coptic

\textsuperscript{62} It concerns the second manuscript of an artificial collection, fol. 62-501; Troupeau 1972, p. 264; Breydy 1983, pp. 46-47.

\textsuperscript{63} M. Breydy and A. Sidarus have done this in different contexts. The former in connection with the analysis of the textual tradition of the \textit{Annales}: Breydy 1983, p. 46. The latter, when studying the cycle of Alexander the Great among the Copts: Sidarus 2013b, pp. 483-484. It is certainly significant to meet Ibn al-ʻAmīd in this twofold research.
historiography in Arabic, which, as we have assessed here, developed in the direction of a universalistic openness and a successful integration within the general trends of Muslim historiography.
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