

Chapter Title: Introduction

Book Title: Al-Maqrīzī's al-Ḥabar 'an al-bašar, Vol. V, Section 4: Persia and Its Kings, Part I

Book Author(s): Al-Maqrīzī

Book Editor(s): Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila

Published by: Brill. (2018)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctv2gjwvjv.7>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.



JSTOR

Brill is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Al-Maqrīzī's al-Ḥabar 'an al-bašar, Vol. V, Section 4: Persia and Its Kings, Part I*

Introduction

1 al-Maqrīzī and the *Ḥabar*

The Egyptian historian Taqī l-Dīn Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Maqrīzī (766/1364–845/1442) wrote his last work, *al-Ḥabar ‘an al-bašar*, towards the end of his life to complete his historiographical *œuvre* by adding to it this history of the world in pre-Islamic times.¹ The six-volume² work was begun in 836/1433 and the third volume was completed in 844/1441.³ It seems, though, that before the completion of the third volume, al-Maqrīzī had collected materials for the remaining parts, too, although the final parts of the text show signs of hurried composition: towards the end of the present part al-Maqrīzī’s quotation technique slightly changes and in at least some later parts al-Maqrīzī is satisfied to quote through Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *Ta’rīḥ* some of his ultimate sources, which in earlier parts he had quoted directly (see below).⁴

The whole text will be edited in parts in *Bibliotheca Maqriziana*. This volume covers the history of pre-Islamic Iran from the Creation to and including the Ašgānians. The part on the Sāsānians will be edited in a separate volume.

2 The Pre-Islamic History of Iran in Arabic and Persian Sources

During the ‘Abbāsīd translation movement, beginning, in fact, in the Late Umayyad period and continuing for some two centuries, a huge number of Greek and Syriac works on philosophy and science were translated into Arabic.⁵ At the same time, Arabs became acquainted with Biblical history through

1 For a detailed discussion of al-Maqrīzī and the *Ḥabar*, see Bauden (2014) and id. (forthcoming).

2 Five of the volumes are extant as al-Maqrīzī’s holographs, see Bauden (forthcoming).

3 Bauden (2014): 197.

4 After the plan of editing this work in the *Bibliotheca Maqriziana* had been conceived by Frédéric Bauden and the editorial work of the present volume had begun, a very deficient edition by Ḥālīd Aḥmad al-Mullā al-Suwaydī and ‘Arīf ‘Abd al-Ganī (2013) appeared. The edition leaves much to be desired, especially in its sixth volume, which, in addition to being ridden with other mistakes, leaves blank a large number of Persian and other names which the editors were unable to read. Their edition, 6:45–130, covers the same ground as the present edition.

5 For the translation movement in general, see Gutas (1998) and Ullmann (1970), id. (1972), and

both Jewish and Christian sources in a variety of languages, including, perhaps even most importantly, oral sources.⁶

This part of the translation movement largely ignored history (and literature, for that matter). Herodotus, Thucydides, and other Greek historians remained virtually unknown to the Arabs and no Latin sources were translated into Arabic. Likewise, sacred history rarely met factual history. Sacred history transmitted Biblical names, events, and legendary chronologies, but only in some individual cases related these to factual history.

But there was also another branch of this translation movement. Contrary to their attitudes towards Greek and Syriac historical works, Late Umayyad and Early 'Abbāsid translators were keenly interested in Persian history.⁷ This may partly be due to many of them being themselves of Persian origin and there was probably an element of early nationalistic feelings in transmitting the history of their country to the Arabs.

Be that as it may, a rather large number of Middle Persian historical works were translated into Arabic by translators such as Ġabalah b. Sālīm⁸ and, especially, Ibn al-Muqaffa' (d. ca. 139/756).⁹ Most of the original texts and all of their early translations have, however, later been lost. Among Middle Persian historical books that we know to have been translated are the following:

-
- id. (1978). For detailed information on the individual translations, see *GAS* I–IX. Specifically on Aristotle, see also Peters (1968a) and id. (1968b).
- 6 For the translations of the Bible, see Griffith (2013). Christian Arabic intracommunal literature (see Graf [1944–1953] and Thomas [2009ff.]) contains historical information, but had little influence outside the Christian community and few Muslim authors came to use it.
- 7 For the early importance of translations from Middle Persian, see Gutas (1998): 25–60. For general overviews, see Bosworth (1983) and Latham (1990). For translations, especially of historical works, from Middle Persian, see Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming a), Chapter 2. See also Cereti (2001) for Middle Persian literature in general. For Persian influence on Arabic culture in general, see also Hovannisian-Sabagh (1998).
- 8 For Ġabalah, see Shahīd (1984): 408–410. In Ibn al-Nadīm's *al-Fihrist*, 305, he is called the secretary of Hišām, and Barthold (1944): 140, takes this to imply that he was probably the secretary of the Caliph Hišām b. 'Abd al-Malik (r. 105–125/724–743), not the historian Hišām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbī, as had been suggested. This would date him to the Late Umayyad period and he would have been one of the earliest translators.
- 9 For Ibn al-Muqaffa' in general, see Gabrieli (1932); Kraus (1933); Lecomte (1965): 179–189; van Ess (1991–1997), 2:22–36; and "Ibn al-Muqaffa'," in *ET*², 3:883–885. See also Cassarino (2000) and Kristó-Nagy (2013).

1. the *Ḥwadāynāmag* (*Sīyar mulūk al-ʿAğam*; *Ḥudāynāmah*);
2. *Ayādgār ī Zarērān*;¹⁰
3. *Kārnamag ī Ardašīr ī Pābagān* (*Kārnamağ Ardašīr*);
4. *Kitāb al-Sakīsarān*;
5. *Kitāb al-Baykār*;
6. *Kitāb Rustam wa-Isfandiyār*;
7. *Kitāb Bahrām Šūbīn*;
8. *Kitāb Bahrām wa-Narsī*.¹¹

Several of these seem to have centred on the Sistanian heroes, the most famous of whom was Rustam, the central character of Firdawsī's *Šāhnāmeḥ*.¹²

Although the translations were lost, they influenced the nascent Arab-Islamic worldview,¹³ and Persian history became part and parcel of Arab-Islamic historiography. Arabic and Classical Persian world histories tend only to give full attention to three historical traditions, those of sacred history, Persian history, and Arab-Islamic history.

Some authors did add chapters on India, China, Byzantium, Western Europe, Turks, Mongols, and other countries and peoples,¹⁴ but these tend to remain comparatively brief and, what is more, they had little effect on the overall organization and understanding of world history.

When it comes to pre-Islamic Persian history, the model adopted by Arabic historians and based on that of the *Ḥwadāynāmag*, as it seems, combines

10 Arabic title unknown. For the translation, see Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming a), Chapters 1.2.1 and 4.6.

11 The Middle Persian titles of nos. 4–8 are not known, although in some cases they may with some certainty be reconstructed. Note also that, strictly speaking, the Middle Persian title of no. 1 is a conjecture, see Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming a), Chapter 1.1.1. For references and comments on these, and other, translations from Middle Persian, see Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming a), Chapters 2.2.1–2.

12 Note, however, that his later fame in Classical Persian literature should not be retrojected back on 8th- and 9th-century Arabic literature, see Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming b) and id. (forthcoming a), Chapter 5.1. Al-Maqrīzī, too, largely ignores the Sistanian part of Persian history, concentrating instead on the kings and their deeds.

13 See Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming a), Chapter 3, especially 3.6.

14 Among the earliest to do so were Ḥamzah al-Iṣfahānī and Šāʿid al-Andalusī, for both of whom see below. In Iran, the monumental work of Rašīd al-Dīn Faḡl Allāh (d. 718/1318) is perhaps the most valiant effort to include other historical traditions. Ibn Ḥaldūn (d. 808/1406) and al-Maqrīzī also endeavoured to open wider vistas for world history with their works.

mythical and legendary East Iranian history with the factual history of the Arsacids and Sāsānians, almost completely ignoring the Achaemenids and Seleucids and the factual history of Iran until Alexander the Great.¹⁵

Typically, this model divides pre-Islamic Persian history into four categories, or classes, of kings related to each other by family ties, viz.:

1. the Pišdādians;
2. the Kayanids;
3. the Ašgānians;¹⁶
4. the Sāsānians.

The transitions were explained to have taken place without major interruptions in the dynastic principle. The first Kayanid king, Kay Qubād, was considered to have been the son of Zaw, the last Pišdādian King. The transition over to the Ašgānians was safeguarded by making Alexander the Great the son of Darius the Elder (see below) and by taking his successors, the Petty Kings, to have been scions of the earlier aristocracy. The Sāsānians, further, were derived from Sāsān, the oldest son of Darius the Elder, who had been surpassed in the line of succession in favour of Darius the Younger. Hence, the Sāsānians represented a return to the legitimate royal line before Alexander. A line of succession, thus, ran from Gayōmart, the first man and the first king, down to Yazdagird II, killed in 651, the last Persian king before the Arab conquest of Iran. This model is broken only by some usurpers (especially al-Ḍahḥāk and Afrāsiyāb) whose reigns were considered interregnums and who were taken to task for the interruptions and confusions in the continuous chronology. After their reigns, the kingship always returned to its legitimate owners.¹⁷

The Ašgānians are not much more than a list of names, and the Seleucid interlude in Persian history is virtually ignored. The line of history moves from Alexander directly to the Parthians, with few historical or even legendary

15 Cf. also Rosenthal (1975): 59, translating from Ibn Ḥazm's *Marātib al-'ulūm*.

16 I.e., the Arsacids/Parthians. In this model of history, Alexander is mainly seen in his role of putting an end to the previous dynasty. The Seleucids are almost ignored, and the Parthians are seen as one line of the Petty Kings, who ruled small kingdoms in Iran after Alexander.

17 The same idea of dynastic legitimacy was later extended to Islamic Persian dynasties by creating clearly artificial genealogies deriving their origins from legitimate rulers of pre-Islamic Iran. Thus, e.g., *Ṭabaqāt-e Nāširī*, 1:190 claims that the Ṭāhirids descended from Manūchihr.

details in between. The lack of information on the Achaemenids and, especially, the Parthians has raised discussion as to why these dynasties were ignored or even suppressed in Sāsānian historiography. The question is, to my mind, wrongly put. There was no indigenous historiography before the Sāsānian historians started writing their works in the sixth century.¹⁸ It seems reasonable to assume that by that time they had scarce information on events that had taken place some 1,000 to 300 years earlier and that had not been recorded in writing, as far as we know.¹⁹ It is perhaps more to be wondered at that later historians knew the names of the Parthian kings in the first place. Herodotus' knowledge of Greek history some 1,000 to 300 years before his time is even more minimal.

Al-Maqrīzī adopts the historical worldview ultimately going back to the Middle Persian *Hwadāynāmag* and its Arabic translation(s). As in these sources, for al-Maqrīzī the history of Iran consists of a continuous line of kings, with occasional interruptions. The story begins with the first human being, Gayōmart (*al-Ḥabar* §§ 4–25), who is often considered to have been the first king, too. Al-Maqrīzī, however, formally begins the chapter on the Pīšdādians only with Hūšang (§ 26). The Pīšdādians, in turn, give way to the Kayanids (§ 107), whose rule was ended by Alexander the Great (§ 168), thus confusing, or equating, the Kayanids and the Achaemenids.

Alexander the Great, whose history goes back to the *Alexander Romance*,²⁰ is in theory tied up with the earlier dynasty by family ties, but in practice portrayed through his campaigns rather than his kingship. Like his predecessors, al-Maqrīzī does not make a difference between the Parthian period and the

18 Cf. Huyse (2008): 150–153. The birth of written historiography relates to the birth of Pahlavi literature in general, which seems to have taken place in the sixth century: evidence for Pahlavi literature before this is speculative. Van Bladel (2009): 23–63, has strongly, but not quite convincingly, argued for the 4th-century existence of Hermetic texts in Pahlavi. The dating of Middle Persian texts is notoriously difficult as the manuscripts are extremely late, usually no earlier than the 18th century, and the copyists, many of whom no longer properly understood the language, have made it difficult to date the extant texts on stylistic and linguistic bases.

19 The Achaemenids, Sāsānians, and to some extent Parthians did leave a number of historical inscriptions, but there are no signs of a historiographical literature having developed in their wake. For the inscriptions, see Hintze (2009) and Huyse (2009).

20 The *Alexander Romance* is widely dispersed in various Oriental languages. For a general picture, see the articles in Stoneman et al. (2012). For the Arabic tradition, see Doufekar-Aerts (2010) and Zuwiyya (2001). For the Hebrew *Alexander Romance*, see, e.g., Kazis (1962) and van Bekkum (1986). For the Armenian version, see Wolohojian (1969).

Greek successor states about which he obviously knew little,²¹ taking all rulers between Alexander and the first Sāsānian king, Ardašīr, as one group, the Petty Kings.

The most important kings of the third dynasty are the Ašġānians (*al-Ḥabar* § 247). Here, the text comes closer to factual history, even though al-Maqrīzī, like the Arab-Islamic tradition in general, has little to say about any of the kings of this group. Islamic historiography in general and specifically al-Maqrīzī are well informed about the fourth dynasty, the Sāsānians. This fourth part will be edited in a separate volume of the *Ḥabar*.

As shown by his division of the Persian part into chapters, this is the primary division of Persian history for al-Maqrīzī. In § 6, however, he also mentions a quinquipartite division, from Gayōmart to Manūšīhr to Kay Qubād and from there to the Ašġānians and the Sāsānians. This model stems from Šā'id al-Andalusī's *Ṭabaqāt al-umam*, and al-Maqrīzī quotes it without comment, but otherwise adheres to the more common quadripartite division.²²

In comparison to most historical works written in Arabic or Persian, al-Maqrīzī's *al-Ḥabar* deviates from this paradigm by including much material from the Arabic translation of Orosius' *Seven Books*. This brings in the dynasty of the Achaemenids (§ 166), who are usually only known through the *Alexander Romance*. Orosius was familiar with Greek historiography, providing a short account of the Persian Wars and giving the background for Alexander and Philip. Orosius was also well informed about the Achaemenids and the *Alexander Romance* in a version that differed from those current in Arabic literature. Al-Maqrīzī added these to his *Ḥabar*, albeit in an abbreviated form (see below).

Al-Maqrīzī makes an effort to fuse together these two historical traditions and critically considers the situation on basically sound principles. After discussing the two conflicting versions of history he opts for relying on that of the Persians themselves as Orosius is to him the historian of the Greeks and Romans, rather than the Persians (*al-Ḥabar* § 168). The underlying principle of relying on the native tradition is obviously sound, even though the result in this case is not, as the Persians had lost almost all traditions from the Achaemenid period and foreign sources—in this case, Orosius' Latin text—do, indeed, come closer to factual history than the Persians' own tradition.

Like most other historians, al-Maqrīzī endeavours to synchronize the various historical traditions by making equations between the main characters. This he

21 Some of them are briefly discussed in his chapter on Greek and "Roman" history, cf. MS Fatih 4340, fols. 233^a–253^b.

22 For a competing quinquipartite division into Pišdādians, Kayanids, Aškānians, Sāsānians, and *Akāsīrah*, beginning with Nūšīrwān, cf. *Ṭabaqāt-e Nāšīrī*, 1:131–173.

does in this part of the *Ḥabar* in three ways. He equates mythical and legendary characters of Persian national history with Biblical characters. Secondly, he equates some of the Achaemenids with Kayanid kings. Thirdly, like many earlier authors he equates a series of characters from Persian national history with South Arabian rulers.

We come across this synchronizing tendency already in the lost translation of the *Ḥwadāy-nāmag* by Ibn al-Muqaffa' in the mid-eighth century, as we know from fragments of the translation and references to it.²³ Persian kings and the early prophets of Islam, mainly derived from Biblical history, were synchronized either in the framework of prophets, as al-Ṭabarī did, or of kings, as al-Dīnawarī did,²⁴ thus dating the kings to the times of the prophets or vice versa.²⁵

Almost all historical works take part in the discussion whether some Persian kings could or should be equated with characters known from Islamic sacred history. Al-Maqrīzī is rather reserved in this, though himself equating Adam and Gayōmart, once even slightly changing the text of his source so as to offer this as a fact whereas the source had given it as the opinion of some Persians only.²⁶

In the same vein, al-Maqrīzī discusses the position of Zoroaster and whether to consider him as a prophet—as had been done by many²⁷—or not. In this case, he takes a rather negative stance (*al-Ḥabar* §§ 8, 135–138, 141), although in the final analysis leaving the question open. But the implication is rather strong that he does not accept this view. Another religious character, Buddha, is discussed in passing, although his name has been confused with that of Bīwarāsf (*al-Ḥabar* § 8).

Both in the *Ḥabar* and most other Arab-Islamic world histories, Alexander is part of Persian national history. Alexander forms both a break with the earlier tradition and a continuation through the fabricated story (*al-Ḥabar*

23 See Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming a), Chapter 3.7.

24 For al-Dīnawarī, cf. Grignaschi (1969) and id. (1973); Pourshariati (2010); Jackson Bonner (2015). The contents of the *Aḥbār al-ṭiwāl* are conveniently summarized in Pourshariati (2010): 253–260.

25 Al-Ṭabarī switches over to follow the Islamic Empire at the time of the Prophet Muḥammad, making the change to an annalistic form coincide with the establishment of the *Hiğrī* calendar.

26 See *al-Ḥabar* § 6 and note 93 thereto. See, however, also *al-Ḥabar* § 3, where, on the contrary, Gayōmart is only said to have been the first human being according to the Persians.

27 E.g., al-Maqrīzī, *al-Bad'*, 3:149, cf. Hämeen-Anttila (2012): 154–155.

§ 211) which makes him the brother of the last Kayanid/Achaemenid king. A similar case is the bridging of the gap between the Kayanids/Achaemenids and the Sāsānids through claiming for Ardašīr a lineal descent from the eponymous Sāsān, son of Darius the Elder.

In this paradigmatic model for pre-Islamic Persian history, the pre-Sāsānian factual history of Iran is virtually ignored, with few exceptions. The major exception is, of course, Alexander the Great, whose life was known to the Arabs and Persians of the Islamic period through versions of the *Alexander Romance*.

The *Romance* was received in the Islamic world through the early Syriac translation.²⁸ Already in ps.-Callisthenes, Alexander had come to be seen as a Persian king, so that the dynastic principle of kingship could be safeguarded. This was done by taking him to have been the unacknowledged son of Darius the Elder and, hence, a legitimate successor to Darius the Younger. Also his marriage to Roxanne (*al-Ḥabar* § 171) followed this agenda of repatriating Alexander, as it were.

Alexander also ties up with the Qurʾānic Dū l-Qarnayn, mentioned in the Qurʾān (*al-Kahf*) 18:83–98, and identified by many with Alexander.²⁹ Alexander also drew into the sphere of history his famous teacher, Aristotle, and al-Maqrīzī breaks his historical narrative in order to add a lengthy passage (*al-Ḥabar* §§ 237–246) on the great sage and the First Teacher, as he was called in Islamic philosophy.

The Achaemenids remained almost completely outside of this model of history, with the exception of the downfall of their dynasty that was documented in the *Alexander Romance* and, through it, became part of the received history of Iran. Other minor exceptions are formed by the few cases where Biblical history, especially the events in the *Book of Esther* and the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, tangentially touched Persian history.

This brought with itself the question of harmonizing the earliest history of Iran, based on East Iranian legendary history, with the little that was known from the West. The most common solution was to consider the Achaemenids, as well as the few Babylonian and Assyrian rulers who were known by name, real or invented, as vassal kings or governors of Babylon under the legendary East Iranian kings (cf. *al-Ḥabar* § 106). The less common option was to identify the two (cf., e.g., *al-Ḥabar* § 168).

28 Contrary to a rather common opinion, it is very likely that there never was a Middle Persian version of the *Alexander Romance* and the Persians received the *Romance* through Arabic. For a full discussion, see Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming a), Chapter 2.3.

29 Al-Maqrīzī discusses this identification at length, coming to the conclusion that the two are not be equated (*al-Ḥabar* §§ 225–226).

There was one external source al-Maqrīzī used that disturbed this model. This was the Arabic Orosius (*Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*), which was translated directly from Latin with many omissions and several additions, possibly in the tenth century. It influenced few later authors, but was extensively used by Ibn Ḥaldūn in his *Taʾrīḥ* and al-Maqrīzī in his *Ḥabar* and, to a far lesser extent, in his *Ḥiṭaṭ* (cf. below).

3 al-Maqrīzī's Sources

In this part of the *Ḥabar*, al-Maqrīzī uses a good variety of Arabic sources for his synthesis of Persian national history.

His main source is *Kitāb Taʾrīḥ al-rusul wa-l-mulūk* by Abū Ğʿfar Muḥammad b. Ğarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), a general history which in its pre-Islamic part is arranged according to prophets, with Persian kings being inserted into this framework. Al-Maqrīzī relies heavily on al-Ṭabarī almost throughout, the first quotation coming in *al-Ḥabar* § 19 and the last in the very last paragraph, § 269, major continuous blocks being quoted in §§ 27–34, 58–87, and 90–102. Al-Maqrīzī builds most of his text on al-Ṭabarī, but even where he relies primarily on another source, such as the Arabic Orosius, he inserts relevant passages from al-Ṭabarī, as in §§ 146–190, which mainly derives from Orosius, but has material taken from al-Ṭabarī in §§ 152–154 and 169–171. As al-Maqrīzī organized his text according to the Persian kings, not the prophets, he had to excerpt relevant passages from different parts of al-Ṭabarī's work and reorganize these according to his own grid.

The second main source for this part is the *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*, the Arabic translation of Paulus Orosius' *Historiarum adversum paganos libri vii*, which provides material for *al-Ḥabar* §§ 108, 146–151, 155–167, 173–177, and 180–190. This source is of particular interest because it has only been preserved in one defective copy, and al-Maqrīzī's text helps to fill in some of its lacunae. It will be studied in more detail below.

Ḥamzah al-Iṣfahānī's (d. 350/961 or 360/971) *Taʾrīḥ sinī l-mulūk*, written in 350/961 or a year after,³⁰ is a concise chronological study of world history, the first and largest part of which is dedicated to pre-Islamic Iran and based on Arabic translations of very good pre-Islamic sources.³¹ This part is much used

30 See *Taʾrīḥ*, pp. 144, 179, 183.

31 See Hämeen-Anttila (forthcoming a), Chapter 3.6.

by al-Maqrīzī, major blocks of Ḥamzah's text being quoted throughout the text, from *al-Ḥabar* §§ 10–18 to §§ 255–259.

Abū Rayḥān al-Bīrūnī's (d. about 442/1050) history of ancient nations, *al-Āṭār al-bāqiyah 'an al-qurūn al-ḥāliyah*, is used to provide additional information on especially Gayōmart, chronology, and Alexander, being the source for *al-Ḥabar* §§ 20–23, 106, 178, 227–232, and 260–264. Abū 'Alī Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Miskawayh's (d. 421/1030) general history, *Tağārib al-umam*, contains an extensive section on pre-Islamic Iran (*Tağārib al-umam*, 1:61–168) and it is used especially towards the end of this part (*al-Ḥabar* §§ 49, 194, 199, 233–235, 247–249, and 251–254), providing additional information on Alexander and the Petty Kings. In the manuscript Aya Sofya 3116 of *Tağārib al-umam*, vol. I, there is a note by al-Maqrīzī indicating that he made a resumé of the work in 844/1441, the very year in which he finalized the third volume of the *Ḥabar*.³²

All the remaining identified sources for this part of the *Ḥabar* are only used for a limited part of the text. The beginning (*al-Ḥabar* §§ 4–9) is based on Šā'id al-Andalusī's (d. 462/1072) history of science, *Ṭabaqāt al-umam*, defining the Persians as a nation and giving some general information on them in a nutshell.

Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah's (d. 668/1270) biographical dictionary of doctors (and philosophers), *Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*, provides a long chapter on Aristotle (§§ 237–246). This chapter is very similar to the resumé of the same text which we have in the Liège notebook (MS 2232), fols. 22^b–26^b, of al-Maqrīzī.³³ Al-Mubaššir b. Fātik's (5th/11th century) collection of wise sayings, *Muḥtār al-ḥikam wa-maḥāsīn al-kalim*, is culled for parts of *al-Ḥabar* §§ 191–210, possibly through Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah's work, though with several other sources intervening and providing additional material for these paragraphs.³⁴

Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's (d. 257/871) book on the conquest of Egypt, *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-aḥbāruhā*, has been used by al-Maqrīzī for the discussion whether Dū l-Qarnayn should be identified with Alexander the Great (*al-Ḥabar* §§ 212–231), and the historian Abū l-Ḥasan al-Mas'ūdī's (d. 345/956) *al-Tanbīh wa-l-išrāf* is the source for a passage on the definition of the term Irānšahr (*al-Ḥabar* §§ 88–89). Al-Maqrīzī may also have used the same author's *Murūğ al-dahab* § 534 for a short note in *al-Ḥabar* § 15, although the brevity of the quotation (explicitly by al-Mas'ūdī, but no book identified) makes it impossible to verify this.³⁵ It should also be noted that this has been written in the margin of the

32 For al-Maqrīzī's use of Miskawayh, see Bauden (forthcoming).

33 For this book, to be edited in the *Biblioteca Maqriziana*, see Bauden (2003).

34 Sayings are notoriously difficult to attribute to their sources when not quoted in large blocks, so not all of the material need come, at least not directly, from al-Mubaššir's book.

35 The information does not seem to derive from al-Mas'ūdī's *al-Tanbīh*.

holograph, as an afterthought. It is also possible that the historian Ibn al-Aṭīr's (d. 637/1239) *al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rīḥ*, 1:290, is quoted in *al-Ḥabar* § 200, but as the quotation is neither explicit nor exact this is far from certain. Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209), *Mafātīḥ al-jayb* 21:166 is quoted in § 221 but I have been unable to verify whether this is a direct or an indirect quotation.

In his *Ḥiṭaṭ*, 1:399–417, al-Maqrīzī had covered large parts of Alexander the Great's history, partly based on the same sources. Knowing his methods, it is quite possible that in writing the *Ḥabar*, al-Maqrīzī has used former notebooks of his, which he had already used when writing the *Ḥiṭaṭ*. This would explain the major overlaps between his two books (see *al-Ḥabar* §§ 175–176, 180–186, and 215–221). However, the *Ḥiṭaṭ* itself cannot be considered his source for this passage, as al-Maqrīzī sometimes quotes the original sources more extensively in the *Ḥabar*.

In later parts of the *Ḥabar*, al-Maqrīzī uses some of these sources through Ibn Ḥaldūn's *Ta'rīḥ*, but this does not seem to be the case in the part edited here.

4 al-Maqrīzī and Orosius

The Arabic translation of Paulus Orosius' *Historiarum adversum paganos libri vii* ("The Seven Books of History against the Pagans"), *Kitāb Hurūšyūš* (KH), has received some scholarly attention, mainly centred on the question of the identity of the probably 10th-century translator(s) of the work and the possible ideological motives behind the changes that can be detected between it and the original Latin text.³⁶

This translation is only preserved in one defective copy in Princeton. There are two editions, one by Badawī (1982) and the other by Penelas (2001a). Badawī's edition leaves much to be desired. That by Penelas is much better, but even it cannot, in most cases, fill in the numerous lacunae of the defective copy.

Penelas (2001a): 67–81, lists the posterior influence of KH. The cases of Aḥmad al-Rāzī (d. 344/955), *Aḥbār mulūk al-Andalus* and the *Crónica Pseudo-Isidoriana* (13th century, possibly dependent on al-Rāzī's *Aḥbār*) are open to discussion (Penelas 2001a: 67–71). The case of Ibn Ḡulḡul (d. 384/994), *Ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā' wa-l-ḥukamā'* is also complicated (Penelas 2001a: 71–73). With al-

36 Cf. Levi della Vida (1954), Penelas (2001a), id. (2001b), and id. (2009), as well as Sahner (2013), all with further bibliography. See also König (2015): 161–164, and van Koningsveld (2016): 19–22.

Bakrī (d. 487/1094), *Kitāb al-Masālik wa-l-mamālik*, we are on firm ground and *KH*'s influence on it is indubitable (cf. Penelas 2001a: 73–74).³⁷

Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Ḥimyarī (8th/14th century) quotes *KH* a few times in his *al-Rawḍ al-mi'ṭār* (Penelas 2001a: 74–76), but possibly indirectly, at least once through the anonymous *al-Istibṣār fi 'aḡā'ib al-amṣār* (6th/12th century). More important is the anonymous *Texto mozárabe de historia universal* (c. 1300, Penelas 2001a: 76–77), which, despite its poor condition, fortunately preserves an important passage on the walls of Babylon, which can be compared to al-Maqrīzī, *al-Ḥabar* § 147, discussed below.³⁸

The number and/or accuracy of these previously detected fragments is limited and their value for the reconstruction of the poorly preserved *KH* is marginal. With two later historians we come to more substantial quotations. The first is the famous North African historian Ibn Ḥaldūn (d. 808/1406), who quotes *KH* extensively in his *Ta'riḥ* (*Kitāb al-Ibar*),³⁹ through which *KH* is further quoted by al-Qalqašandī (d. 821/1418) in his *Ṣubḥ al-a'šā*. As shown by Fischel (1961), (1967), Ibn Ḥaldūn probably used *KH* while in Egypt and the quotations are so similar to the preserved unicum that he may well have used the very manuscript we still have.⁴⁰ Ibn Ḥaldūn's quotations are extensive and sometimes enable us to fill in minor lacunae in the preserved manuscript, which Ibn Ḥaldūn must have had at his disposal when it was in a better condition than it now is.⁴¹

KH is also quoted five times by al-Maqrīzī in his *Ḥiṭat*.⁴² There has been some discussion as to whether the short quotations have been directly taken from *KH* or through intermediate sources.⁴³ As we now know that al-Maqrīzī had access to *KH* when writing his *Ḥabar*, we could argue that it is probable that he already had it at hand when writing the *Ḥiṭat*, which could be supported by the fact that the few quotations there are very literal. On the other hand, as we shall see, it may also be that al-Maqrīzī got hold of a copy of *KH* only after having started

37 Ferré (1986) discusses al-Bakrī's sources.

38 The passage has been studied by Levi della Vida (1954), but without reference to al-Maqrīzī.

39 Penelas (2001a): 77–79; Levi della Vida (1954). See the Index to vol. 2 of the *Ta'riḥ*. There is rather little overlap between Ibn Ḥaldūn's and al-Maqrīzī's quotations of *KH* in the part edited here.

40 Levi della Vida (1954): 105; Penelas (2001a): 77 and footnote 291.

41 Penelas (2001a): 79.

42 Penelas (2001a): 79–81. Doufekar-Aerts (2010): 29, also refers to al-Maqrīzī's possible use of *KH*.

43 This is resumed in Penelas (2001a): 79.

collecting materials for the *Ḥabar*. The quotations in the *Ḥitaṭ* are, in any case, unfortunately few and none of them coincides with any of the lacunae of *KH*.⁴⁴

While these quotations have been known for up to several decades, al-Maqrīzī's *al-Ḥabar* has hitherto not been realized to contain very extensive quotations from *KH*, mostly in an accurate form, as we can see comparing the existing parts of the texts. Luckily, many of the quotations contain passages that fall into the lacunae of the unique manuscript of *KH* and, hence, enable us to reconstruct parts of the missing text.

Most of the quotations from *KH* occur in the part of the *Ḥabar* edited here. There are also a number of quotations in the chapter on the Kings of the Israelites (*al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and 'Abd al-Ġanī, 6:229–282) and the Greeks and Romans, fols. 233^a–253^b of the holograph MS Fatih 4340,⁴⁵ not edited in this volume.⁴⁶ In addition, occasional quotations from *KH* are to be found elsewhere in the *Ḥabar*.⁴⁷ *KH*, 134–146 and 169–188, are extensively excerpted for the part of the *Ḥabar* edited here, and there are a few further quotations coming from other parts of *KH*. The lacunae and illegible words of *KH*, 134–146, can to a large extent be filled in by the aid of the *Ḥabar* and elsewhere the quotations in the *Ḥabar* help in reading some illegible words and passages in the *KH*. Further research, feasible once all volumes of the critical edition of the *Ḥabar* have appeared, may add some passages, but on the basis of MS Fatih 4340, fols. 76^b–136^b and 233^a–264^b, and the edition of the *Ḥabar* by al-Suwaydī and 'Abd al-Ġanī, it would seem that al-Maqrīzī restricted his use of *KH* mainly to the part on pre-Sāsānian Persian history, the chapter on the Kings of the Israelites, and the short chapter on Greeks and Romans. This is understandable, considering the contents of *KH*.

The following lists the passages in this volume that have been taken from *KH*:⁴⁸

§ 108 *wa-qāla Hurūšiyūš* (67–68, §§ 246–247)

§ 146 *qāla Hurūšiyūš fī Kitāb wasf al-duwal wa-l-ḥurūb* (134, § 34—lacuna in *KH*)

§ 147 cont'd (134, § 34, lacuna)

44 Penelas (2001a): 80–81.

45 *Al-Ḥabar* (ed. al-Suwaydī and 'Abd al-Ġanī), 6:282–326.

46 This section is currently being edited and translated by Mayte Penelas for the *Bibliotheca Maqriziana*.

47 See *al-Ḥabar* (ed. al-Suwaydī and 'Abd al-Ġanī), 1:128, 129. The Indices of the edition are as unreliable as the edition itself.

48 The page and paragraph numbers in brackets refer to *KH*.

- § 148 *qāla* (134–135, §§ 35–37)
 § 149 *qāla* (135–136, §§ 40, 42)
 § 150 cont'd (136, § 42)
 § 151 *qāla* (137, 138–139, §§ 46–47, 55)
 § 155 *wa-fi kitāb Hurūšiyūš* (138, 137, §§ 55, 45, 48–50)
 § 156 *qāla Hurūšiyūš* (138–139, §§ 51–52, 56)
 § 157 *qāla* (139–140, §§ 57, 60)
 § 158 cont'd (140, §§ 60–61)
 § 159 cont'd (140–141, §§ 61, 65)
 § 160 cont'd (141, § 66)
 § 161 cont'd (141–142, §§ 66–67)
 § 162 cont'd (142–143, §§ 67–68)
 § 163 cont'd (143, § 69)
 § 164 cont'd (143–144, §§ 69–70)
 § 165 cont'd (144–145, §§ 71–73)
 § 166 *qāla Hurūšiyūš* (145–146, 151, 157, §§ 74–75, 97, 114, 116)
 § 167 *qāla* (169–170, 179, 180, §§ 25–26, 28, 64, 71)
 § 173 *wa-qāla Hurūšiyūš* (180–181, §§ 71–74)
 § 174 cont'd (181, §§ 74–76)
 § 175 cont'd (181–182, §§ 76–78)
 § 176 cont'd (182–183, §§ 78–83)
 § 177 cont'd (183–184, §§ 83–86)
 § 180 unattributed (171–172, §§ 35–38)
 § 181 cont'd (177–178, §§ 58–60)
 § 182 *wa-qad dakara fi Ta'riḥ Rūmah* (180–181, §§ 73–74)
 § 183 *qāla fi Ta'riḥ Rūmah* (181–182, §§ 74–78)
 § 184 cont'd (182–183, §§ 78–82)
 § 185 cont'd (182–183, §§ 78–83)
 § 186 cont'd (183–184, §§ 83–86 + cf. §§ 91–92)
 § 187 *qāla fi Ta'riḥ Rūmah* (186, §§ 96–97)
 § 188 cont'd (186–187, §§ 98–103)
 § 189 cont'd (187–188, §§ 104–106)
 § 190 cont'd (188, §§ 106–109)
 § 236 unattributed (173, § 40)

The number and length of these quotations are impressive. In this part, al-Maqrīzī quotes a much larger selection from *KH* than does Ibn Ḥaldūn.⁴⁹

49 To take but one example, the passage on Babylon in *al-Ḥabar* §§ 146–148, discussed below, is lacking from Ibn Ḥaldūn's work. There seems to be remarkably little overlap between

Hence, he cannot have received his *KH* material indirectly through Ibn Ḥaldūn's work. There are, to my knowledge, no other sources, either, that could have transmitted this material to the *Ḥabar*. Obviously, al-Maqrīzī had one of the rare copies of *KH* at his disposal, probably the same copy that had already been used by Ibn Ḥaldūn some time earlier in Egypt and, further, probably the very manuscript that we still have, although now in a more defective form.

There is a striking contrast to the chapter on the Kings of the Israelites, where al-Maqrīzī suddenly relies heavily on Ibn Ḥaldūn. A comparison between the beginning of the chapter (*al-Ḥabar*, ed. al-Suwaydī and 'Abd al-Ġanī, 6:229–231) with Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Ta'riḥ*, 2:168–173, proves this beyond the slightest doubt. Ostensibly, al-Maqrīzī quotes a variety of old sources, but he does this in the very same order as Ibn Ḥaldūn and, except for some abbreviations, the passages are almost identical. It should be emphasized that the following list covers the whole text of *al-Ḥabar*, 6:229–231, and there is no text which derives from any other source or was written by al-Maqrīzī himself:

Source as indicated	The <i>Ḥabar</i>	From Ibn Ḥaldūn
unidentified	6:229	2:168–169
unidentified	6:229	2:170–171
al-Ṭabarī	6:229	2:171
Wahb b. Munabbih	6:229–230	2:171
al-Ṭabarī	6:230	2:171–172
Ibn Ḥazm	6:230	2:172–173
Hurūšiyūš	6:230	2:173
al-Ṭabarī	6:230–231	2:173
Ġirġīs b. al-'Amīd	6:231	2:173
etc.		

No similar cases can be shown in the part edited here, and the overlaps of *KH* quotations in the two sources are limited. It seems hard to avoid the conclusion that these parts have been written at different times, probably so that when writing the chapter on the Kings of the Israelites al-Maqrīzī either no longer had *KH* at hand and had to rely on Ibn Ḥaldūn, or he no longer had the

the passages of *KH* al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Ḥaldūn have used for their respective chapters on Persians, Alexander, and the Greeks before Alexander.

energy or time to go through a variety of sources but was satisfied with quoting everything through Ibn Ḥaldūn. It has to be remembered that the *Ḥabar* was his last work, the text he was still working on when he died.⁵⁰

5 al-Maqrīzī's Use of Sources

In general, al-Maqrīzī's quotation techniques vary according to his needs. *Al-Ḥabar* §§ 81–83, derives from al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḥ*, 1:225–228, and shows how accurately al-Maqrīzī is able to quote when he wishes to do so. Identical (or nearly so) passages have been set in bold and the changes discussed in the footnotes:

§ 81 قال الطبري: وقد زعم بعض نسائي الفرس أن نوحا عليه السلام هو أفريدون.⁵¹ وزعم بعضهم أنه هو ذو القرنين صاحب إبراهيم الخليل⁵² الذي ذكره الله تعالى في كتابه. وقال بعضهم: هو سليمان بن داود عليهما السلام.⁵³ وتزعم الفرس أن بين أفريدون وبين جم شيد خمسة عشر أباً.⁵⁴ وذكر هشام بن الكلبي أن أفريدون التاسع من ولد جم شيد⁵⁵ وكان مولده بدنباوند نفرج حتى ورد منزل الضحاك فأخذه فأوثقه. وملك مائتي سنة ورد المظالم وأمر الناس بعبادة الله تعالى والإنصاف والإحسان ونظر إلى ما كان الضحاك غصب الناس من الأرضين وغيرها فرد ذلك كله على أهله إلا ما لم يجد له أهلاً فإنه أوقفه على المساكين.

50 It could also be argued that the chronology should be inverted and that al-Maqrīzī has first written his chapter on the Kings of the Israelites based on Ibn Ḥaldūn and only through it became acquainted with *KH*, later hunting down a copy of the book and using it directly for the chapter edited here. This would, however, leave unexplained why he quoted through Ibn Ḥaldūn also other sources that he certainly had at his disposal even earlier, such as al-Ṭabarī, and then stopped doing so.

51 The manuscript reads Sulaymān, which is a simple error.

52 Al-Maqrīzī has here dropped the words "*allaḍi quḍiya lahu bi-Bīr al-Sab*".

53 Five lines of text from al-Ṭabarī were dropped, consisting of a somewhat irrelevant aside ("I mention Afrīdūn here only because ...").

54 The passage is slightly abbreviated and the numeral seems to be corrupt: al-Ṭabarī's "ten" fits the following better than al-Maqrīzī's "fifteen".

55 In the beginning of the sentence, up to this point, there are some abbreviations and reformulations of the text. Thus, e.g., al-Ṭabarī reads: "*qad huḍḍittu 'an Hišām ...*" which al-Maqrīzī changes to "*dakara Hišām*". This is clearly to avoid the misunderstanding that it was al-Maqrīzī himself who had been told this on the authority of Hišām. The rest of the paragraph is taken verbatim from al-Ṭabarī.

§ 82 ويقال إنه أول من سن الصوافي وأول من نظر في الطب والنجوم وأنه كان له ثلاثة بنين اسم الأكبر سَرم والثاني طُوج والثالث إيرج وأنه تخوف ألا يتفقوا وأن يبغى بعضهم على بعض. فقسم مملكته بينهم أثلاثاً وجعل ذلك في سهام كتب أسماءهم عليها وأمر كل واحد منهم فأخذ سهماً. فصارت الروم وناحية المغرب لِسَرم وصارت الترك والصين لطوج وصار لأيرج العراق والهند. فدفع التاج والسريرة إليه. ومات أفريدون فوثب على إيرج أخواه فقتلاه وملكا الأرض بينهما ثلاثمائة سنة.⁵⁶

§ 83 وتزعم الفرس أن لأفريدون عشرة آباء كلهم يسمى أثنفيان. وإنما فعلوا ذلك خوفاً من الضحاك على أولادهم لرواية عندهم بأن بعضهم يغلب الضحاك على ملكه ويدرك منه ثأر جم. وكانوا يعرفون ويميزون بألقاب لقبوها فكان يقال للواحد أثنفيان صاحب البقر الحمر وأثنفيان صاحبة البقر البلق وأثنفيان صاحب البقر الكذي.⁵⁷ وقيل: إن أفريدون أول من تسمى بالكيفية فقبل له كي أفريدون. وتفسير كي التنزيه كما يقال روحاني. يعنون به أن أمره مُخْلِصٌ مُنَزَّهُ يتصل بالروحانية. وقيل: معنى كي من البهاء وأن البهاء تغشى أفريدون حين قتل الضحاك.⁵⁸

Likewise, most of the quotations from Ḥamzah al-İşfahānī's *Ta'riḥ* are accurate and differ only minimally from the edited text, which also implies that al-Maqrīzī has used Ḥamzah directly, as an intermediate source would most probably have caused more differences. The whole of *al-Ḥabar* §12, e.g., is quoted by al-Maqrīzī from Ḥamzah, *Ta'riḥ*, 10, as exactly as any scribe would do when merely copying a manuscript.

On the other hand, in §§ 55–56 Ḥamzah, *Ta'riḥ*, 27, is freely quoted.⁵⁹ In the following excerpt, exact, or almost exact, quotations have been set in bold:

56 Only minor changes in the whole paragraph, no abbreviations.

57 Here al-Maqrīzī drops nine lines of text which partly duplicate what he had said in *al-Ḥabar* §80. He takes the story up again from al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḥ*, 1:228, l. 3.

58 Very slight changes, e.g., one short variant definition of *kay* has been (perhaps accidentally) dropped.

59 In assessing his accuracy, one has to keep in mind that in some cases the manuscripts at al-Maqrīzī's disposal need not have been identical with the present editions and the manuscripts on which they are based. Hence, some of the few differences may be due to al-Maqrīzī quoting from a different manuscript tradition.

55 وقال حمزة: وتزعم الفرس أن جم شديد عقد قنطرة على دجلة فبقيت إلى (أن) خربها الإسكندر بن قلبش لما غلب على ملك فارس. ثم إن الملوك راموا إعادتها فلم يطيقوا ذلك فعدلوا حينئذ إلى عقد الجسر على دجلة فاستمرت إلى آخر وقت. وإن أثر القنطرة لم يزل في حافة دجلة الغربي من مدينتي المدائن إلى أثناء دولة الإسلام.

§ 56 وتزعم الفرس أنه لما ملك الأرض ودانت له الإنس والجن وسخر له إبليس. أمره أن يخرج ما في ضمير الإنسان إلى العيان فعلبه الكتابة. وتزعم أيضاً أنه هو اختط مدينة طيسفون وهي أكبر المدائن السبع وأنه ملك الأقاليم السبعة ستمائة وست عشرة سنة. ثم هرب من بيوراسف مائة سنة.

Thus, most of the text in these paragraphs is a free paraphrase of the original, not an exact quotation. Further examples of al-Maqrīzī's quotation technique may be found by comparing, e.g., *al-Ḥabar* §§ 80, 81, 83, 90, and 169–170, with his sources indicated in the footnotes to the edition.

When it comes to *KH*,⁶⁰ al-Maqrīzī's quotation technique changed in the course of writing the *Ḥabar*. In the earlier parts of the text edited here, al-Maqrīzī quoted more exactly than he did in the later parts, the change occurring somewhere around § 180. At the same time, al-Maqrīzī's manner of referring to *KH* also changes, which implies that he has excerpted *KH* at two different times. In § 182, al-Maqrīzī starts quoting Orosius as “*fī Ta'riḥ Rūmah*”, instead of “*qāla Hurūšiyūs*” or “*fī kitāb Hurūšiyūs*” as he had done hitherto. At the same time, the paper used in the holograph changes from § 180 (fol. 115^a) until § 246 (fol. 131^b). This passage contains the chapters on Alexander, Aristotle, and Greek history, thus forming a separate entity. Moreover, § 179 alludes to the beginning of the history of the Ašgānians, which starts in § 247. Thus, §§ 180–246 seem to have been written independently of the parts preceding and following it, which form, strictly speaking, the history of Iran into which the “Greek” section has been inserted.⁶¹

That *al-Ḥabar* §§ 180–246 and the rest of the text were composed at different dates is also shown by the duplications in the *Ḥabar*. §§ 182–185 largely repeat, almost verbatim, what was said in §§ 174–176, slightly abbreviating the text of *KH* in both times, but in different ways. This implies that there was a longer period of time between excerpting *KH* for §§ 174–176 (and earlier paragraphs)

60 The same partly holds true for the quotations from Ḥamzah, too.

61 Alexander had, of course, been included in Persian national history long before al-Maqrīzī, but in *KH* he is introduced as a “Roman” or Greek character.

and again for §§ 182–185 (and later paragraphs up to and including § 246). The main differences have been set in bold in the following excerpts:

§ 174 وكان جميع عسكره ائتين وثلاثين ألف فارس وستين ألف راجل. وكانت مراكبه خمس مائة مركب وثمانين مركبا. فلقد كان في أمره أعجوبة إذ كان يقدم نفسه في مثل هذه القلة على تحريك كبار ملوك الدنيا فضلا عن غلبته. وكان في عسكر دارى ملك الفرس في أول ملاقاته إياه ست مائة ألف مقاتل فغلبه الإسكندر بشدة صبر المجذونيين واستبسألمهم للموت إلى ما كانوا فيه من شدة عزمه وسعة حيله. فلم يزل الإسكندر في تلك الوقعة يصار الفرس بأصحابه حتى غلب عليهم. وكانت إذ ذاك على الفرس وقية شعاء ونكبة دهياء قتل فيها منهم عدد لا يحصى ولم يقتل من عسكر الإسكندر إلا مائة وعشرون فارسا وتسعون راجلا. ثم مضى الإسكندر إلى المدينة التي كانت تدعا يومئذ عوذبانه وهي اليوم تدعا شرذش فحاصرها حتى افتتحها وغلب عليها فهدمها واتهب ما فيها. فبيناه في ذلك بلغه أن دارى ملك الفرس قد عبأ وأقبل نحوه بجمع عظيم يخاف أن يلحقه في ضيق الجبال فقطع من يومه نحو من مائة ميل وأجاز جبل طوره في سرعة عجيبة ومضى حتى بلغ مدينة طرسوس وكاد يهلك في النهر الذي يدعا جتيم إذا فرط عليه برد النهر حتى انقبض عصبه ووقف على الهلاك.

§ 175 ثم إن دارى لاقاه بأبيّة في ثلاثمائة ألف راجل ومائة ألف فارس وأقبل في كثرة كان يفرغ لها الإسكندر فضلا عن غيره لكثرة من كان معه وقلة من كان مع الإسكندر. فلما التقى الجمعان واستحرق القتال باشر القواد الحرب بأنفسهم وتنازل الأبطال واختلف الطعن والضرب وضاق القضاء بأهله باشر كلا الملكين الحرب بأنفسهما الإسكندر ودارى. وكان الإسكندر أكل أهل زمانه فروسية وأشجعهم وأقواهم جسما. فباشراها حتى جرحا جميعا. وتمادت الحرب حتى انهزم دارى ونزلت الوقعة بالفرس فقتل من رجلهم نحو من ثمانين ألفا ومن فرسانهم نحو من عشرة آلاف وأسر منهم نحو من أربعين ألفا ولم يسقط من المجذونيين إلا مائتان وثلاثون راجلا ومائة وخمسون فارسا. فانتهب الإسكندر جميع عسكر الفرس وأصاب فيه من الذهب والفضة والأمتعة الشريفة ما لا يحصى كثيرة. وأصيب في جملة الأسارى أم دارى وزوجه وأخته وابنتاه. فطلب دارى فديتهن من الإسكندر بنصف ملكه فلم يجبه إلى ذلك. ثم إن دارى عبأ مرة ثالثة وحشد الفرس من عند آخرهم واستجاش بكل من قدر عليه من الأمم. فبيناه يعي ذلك بعث الإسكندر قائدا يدعا يرميون بن يوب مجذونيا في أسطول للغارة على بلد الفرس.

§ 176 ومضى الإسكندر إلى بلد سورية والشام فتلقاه هنالك كثير من ملوك الدنيا خانعين له فعفا عن بعض ونفى بعضا وقتل بعضا. ومضى إلى أحواز طرسوس حتى اقتتحها. ثم مضى منها فأصاب بلد جليجية وبلد رودس وبلد مصر وانتهب الجميع. ثم بلغ بيت الوثن الذي كان يدعا ليوبش وهو اسم المشتري وفي رجوعه من مكان الوثن ومسيره لمحاربة الفرس في المعركة الثالثة بنى مدينة الإسكندرية بأرض مصر. ثم إن داري لما يئس من مصالحته أقبل في أربعمئة ألف راجل ومائة ألف فارس فتلقى الإسكندر مقبلا من ناحية مصر في جوار مدينة طرسوس. وكان بينهما معركة عجيبة شنيعة اجتهدا من الروم على ما قد كانوا ضروهم واعتادوه من الغلبة والظفر واجتهدا من الفرس بالتوطين على الهلاك وتفضيل الموت على الرق والعبودية. فقل ما يحكى عن معركة كان القتل فيها أكثر منه في تلك المعركة. فلما نظر داري إلى أصحابه يتغلب عليهم ويهزمون عزم على استعجال الموت في تلك الحرب بالمباشرة لها بنفسه والصبر حتى يقتل مُعْتَرِضاً للقتل. فلطف به بعض قواده حتى سلوه فانهمزم. ففي تلك الواقعة ذهبت قوة الفرس وعزهم وتذل بعدا سلطانهم وصار بلد المشرق كله في طاعة المجذونيين وأذلت الفرس تلك الواقعة إذ لا لم يروا بعده الامتناع والمخالفة وانقطعوا مدة أربعمئة عام وخمسين عاما.

§ 182 ... ثم قتل جميع أختانه وأكثر أقاربه في وقت تعبته لمحاربة الفرس. وكان جميع عسكره اثنين وثلاثين ألف فارس وستين ألف راجل وكانت مراكبه خمس مائة مركب وثمانين مركبا.

§ 183 قال في تاريخ رومة: فلقد كان في أمره أعجوبة إذ كان يُقَدِّم في مثل هذه القلة على تحريك كبار ملوك الدنيا فضلا عن غلبته. وكان في عسكر دارا ملك الفرس في أول ملاقاته إياه ست مائة ألف مقاتل فغلبه الإسكندر بشدة صبر المجذونيين واستبسالهم للموت إلى ما كانوا فيه من شدة عزمه وسعة حيلته. فلم يزل الإسكندر في تلك الواقعة يصابر الفرس بأصحابه المجذونيين حتى غلب عليهم وكانت إذ ذاك على الفرس وقعة شنعاء ونكبة دهياء. قتل فيها منهم عدد لا يحصى ولم يقتل من عسكر الإسكندر إلا مائة وعشرون فارسا وتسعون راجلا. ثم مضى الإسكندر إلى مدينة شرذتن فحاصرها حتى افتتحها وغلب عليها فهدمها وانتهب ما فيها. فبينما في ذلك بلغه أن دارا ملك الفرس قد عبأ وأقبل نحوه بجمع عظيم. فخاف أن يلحقه في ضيق الجبال التي كان فيها فتقطع في يومه نحو من مائة ميل وأجاز في سرعة عجيبة تلك الجبال

ومضى حتى بلغ مدينة طرسوس. وكاد يهلك في نهر هناك لفرط برده حتى انقبض عصبه ووقف على الهلاك.

§ 184 ثم إن دارا لاقاه في ثلاثمائة ألف راجل ومائة ألف فارس وأقبل في كثرة كان يفرح لها الإسكندر فضلا عن غيره لكثرة من كان معه وقلة من كان مع الإسكندر. فلما التقى الجمعان وتواقفا واستحرق القتال بينهما وباشروا الحرب بأنفسهم وتنازل الأبطال واختلف الطعن والضرب وضاق القضاء بأهله باشر كلا الملكين الحرب بأنفسهما دارى والإسكندر. وكان الإسكندر أكل أهل زمانه فروسية وأشجعهم وأقواهم جسما فباشراها حتى جرحا جميعا. وتبادت الحرب حتى انهزم دارا ونزلت الوقيعة بالفرس. فقتل من رجالهم نحو من ثمانين ألفا ومن فرسانهم نحو من عشرة آلاف وأسر منهم نحو من أربعين ألفا ولم يفقد من أصحاب الإسكندر إلا مائتان وثلاثون راجلاً ومائة وخمسون فارسا. فانتهب الإسكندر جميع عسكر الفرس وأصاب فيه من الذهب والفضة والأمتعة ما لا يحصى كثرة وأصيب في جملة الأسارى أم دارا وامراته وأخته وابنتاه. فطلب دارا فديتهن من الإسكندر بنصف ملكه فلم يجبه إلى ذلك. ثم إن دارا عبأ مرة ثالثة وحشد الفرس من عند آخرهم واستجاش بكل من قدر عليه من الأمم. فبيناه يعيى لذلك بعث الإسكندر قائدا مجذونيا في أسطول للغارة على بلد الفرس.

§ 185 ومضى الإسكندر إلى الشام فتلقاها هنالك كثير من ملوك الدنيا خاضعين له فعفا عن بعض ونفى بعضا وقتل بعضا. ثم مضى إلى أحواز طرسوس وكانت مدينة زاهرة قديمة عظيمة الشأن. فحاصرها حتى افتتحها. ثم مضى فأصاب بلد رُودس وبلد مِصر واتهب الجميع. ثم بلغ إلى بيت وثن المشتري ليسأله عما كان يرمى به من عهارة أمه وجهالة أبيه. فدعا قيم الوثن وأمره سرا أن يجاوبه عنه بما أحب أن يظهر من قوله. وفي رجوعه من مكان الوثن ومسيره لمحاربة الفرس في المعركة الثالثة بنى مدينة الإسكندرية بأرض مصر وله في بنائها أخبار طويلة وسياسات كثيرة. ثم إن دارا لما يؤس من مصالحته أقبل في أربع مائة ألف راجل ومائة ألف فارس فالتقى الإسكندر مقبلا من ناحية مصر في جوار مدينة طرسوس. فكانت بينهما معركة عجيبة شنيعة اجتهدا من الروم على ما كانوا ضرّوه واعتادوه من الغلبة والظفر واجتهدا من الفرس بالتوطين على الهلاك وتفضيل الموت على الرق والعبودية. فقتل ما يحكى عن معركة كان القتل فيها أكثر منه في تلك المعركة. فلما نظر دارا إلى أصحابه يتغلب عليهم ويهزمون عزم على

استعجال الموت في تلك الحرب بالمباشرة لها بنفسه والصبر حتى يقتل معترضا للقتل. فلفظ به بعض قواده حتى سلّوه فانهم. ففي تلك الواقعة ذهبت قوة الفرس وعزهم وذل بعدها سلطانهم وصار بلد المشرق كله في طاعة الإسكندر. وأذلت الفرس تلك الواقعة إذلالا لم يرأسوا بعده وانقطعوا مدة أربع مائة عام وخمسين عاما.

The passages are very similar, yet exhibit certain significant differences. It would be rather difficult to understand how, had he written the text at one single time, al-Maqrīzī could have been unaware that he is repeating himself. It is worth noting that at times §§174–176 are closer to *KH* while at others §§182–185 are closer to it. Thus, *al-Ḥabar* §174 preserves the ancient name of Sardis, which is lacking from §183, but §185 contains the description of Ṭarsūs, missing from §176, while §176 retains the ancient name of Jupiter, which §185 lacks. These and similar cases clearly indicate that al-Maqrīzī has gone through the same passage of *KH* twice, in both times excerpting it in slightly different ways.⁶² In both passages, the only changes made vis-à-vis *KH* are abbreviations (if we exclude a few simple errors).

Al-Maqrīzī also occasionally quotes *KH* without indicating his source. This feature, though, does not only concern *KH*. Towards the end of the part edited here, al-Maqrīzī starts being less meticulous with his sources, which, as has been suggested above, may relate to the fact that the *Ḥabar* was written towards the end of his life.

The main changes made by al-Maqrīzī in the *KH* quotations may be assessed on the basis of those parts of *KH* which have been preserved. There is every reason to believe that the same holds true for the passages that fall into the lacunae of *KH*. The changes usually concern the following:

1. passages not relevant for al-Maqrīzī's main topic in this part, Persian history, have been omitted;
2. strange names (personal or otherwise) that are irrelevant for the main narrative have often been dropped;
3. passages are often slightly abbreviated;⁶³
4. there are some minor reformulations in syntax.

62 Some times al-Maqrīzī has abbreviated both passages in the same way. Thus, e.g., *KH*, 182, §79 mentions that the inhabitants of Ṭarsūs trusted that they would be helped by the people of Ifrīqiyyah, which is lacking in both *al-Ḥabar* §§176 and 185.

63 It might be added that there are next to no unmarked additions to *KH* in the paragraphs that should derive from it, as far as I can see.

The other quoted sources exhibit a similar pattern, with the quotations from Ḥamzah, Ṣā'id, and al-Ṭabarī being rather accurate in the first half of the part of the *Ḥabar* edited here, whereas the quotations from Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'ah and al-Ṭabarī in the latter half are often more radically abbreviated.

In *al-Ḥabar* §182 al-Maqrīzī himself refers to having abbreviated *KH*, saying: "In *The History of Rome (Ta'riḥ Rūmah)* Philip's wars and events have been told in detail, but we will not mention them here". This is clearly done because most of Philip's wars have no bearing on Persian history. Likewise, in §191 he writes: "This is a brief version of the stories about Alexander in *The History of the City of Rome*."

Let us now briefly study in some more detail the changes made by al-Maqrīzī when quoting *KH*.

Al-Ḥabar §180 is a good example of how al-Maqrīzī first gives an exact quotation from *KH* and then resumes the contents rather freely. The text begins with some lines of general introduction before the quotation from *KH* begins. In this case, the source of the quotation has not been indicated. The (almost) exact parallels have been set in bold:

§ 180 الإسكندر بن أمّنته بن هركلش الجبار بن الإسكندر الأعظم. ويعرف الإسكندر صاحب الترجمة بالإسكندر المقدوني. ويقال فيه الإسكندر الأعظم وهو يوناني. ومن الناس من يزعم أنه ذو القرنين الذي ذكره الله تعالى في القرآن والذي يظهر أنهما اثنان. فذو القرنين عربي والإسكندر يوناني وبينهما دهر طويل. وقد كان فلبش أبو الإسكندر ملكا ببلد مجذونية التي يقولها بعضهم: مقدونية بالقاف. وهي إحدى مدائن الروم وكانت ولايته في سنة ثلاث وعشرين وأربع مائة من بناء مدينة روما وكانت مدته في الملك خمسا وعشرين سنة استنبط فيها ضروبا من المنكر وابتدع أنواعا من الشر تقدم فيها كل من ولي الملك بها قبله. وكان في أول أمره قد جعله أخوه الإسكندر بن أمّنيه رهينة عند أمير من أمراء الروم يقال له أمّنته الأعظم فأقام عنده ثلاث سنين. وكان فيلسوفا فتعلم عنده ضروب الفلسفة ثم عاد إلى أخيه. فلما قتل اجتمع الناس على تولية فلبش وولوه أميرا بعد أخيه الإسكندر. فقام في السلطان مقاما عظيما وحارب الروم حتى غلبهم ودانوا جميعهم له بعدما كانوا متفرقين. ثم تخطى الروم وحارب عدة أمم وقتل منهم الآفا واستولى على مدائن كثيرة. فقوي واجتمع له جمع لا يقاد وجيش لا يرام. فأذل جميع أجناس الروم وذهبت عينه في بعض حروبه وعم البلدان بالغارات والهدم والسبي والنهب.

It is rather typical of al-Maqrīzī that he has dropped the name of the Roman people Aymunduh ruled. *KH* reads here: *‘inda amīr al-Ṭamāniyyīn wa-hum min al-Rūm al-jirīqiyyīn*. Al-Maqrīzī retains the name of Epaminondas but does not refer to the Thebans.⁶⁴

Al-Ḥabar § 176, already quoted above, heavily abbreviates *KH*, 182–183 (§§ 78–83). Al-Maqrīzī is able to squeeze *KH*'s twenty-eight lines of text into a mere nine lines. The same passage is quoted in *al-Ḥabar* § 185, which uses ten lines for the same text. As the two passages in the *Ḥabar* largely duplicate each other, they come together to a little less than half of the text of *KH*. But this is an untypically severe abbreviation.

In *al-Ḥabar* § 188, al-Maqrīzī abbreviates *KH*'s list of four Indian peoples, all with corrupted names (187, § 102, al-Raštaš, al-Fāṭūniyyīn, al-Mahrašiyyīn, and Ġarġaštīn, for the Latin Adrestae, Catheni, Praesidae, and Gangaridae),⁶⁵ into “several peoples of India”, thus doing away with strange names that have no bearing on the story. Similarly, he drops foreign names at the beginning and the end of this paragraph, while otherwise the text is an almost exact copy of the original.

The material presented in the *Ḥabar* luckily covers a great portion of the text that falls into the lacunae of *KH*, 134–146. The quotations, as far as they concern Persian history, may be expected to be very close to the original, mainly having undergone slight abbreviation and occasional mistakes that always occur when copying a text.

It seems evident that in quoting *KH*, al-Maqrīzī is usually only abbreviating the text but not otherwise changing it except in minor details, such as slight changes in prepositions or the addition of a personal name when the context is ambiguous. Hence, the *Ḥabar* may rather safely be used for reconstructing lost parts of *KH*.

Keeping this in mind, we may now briefly study *al-Ḥabar* §§ 146–148, which reproduces *KH*, 134–135, §§ 35–37, and the preceding text, which falls into a major lacuna of *KH*. *KH* lacks most of chapter 3, the whole of chapter 4, and the beginning of chapter 5 in a lacuna of several folia.⁶⁶ In the following excerpt of the *Ḥabar*, the passages present in the *KH* are bold; the rest of the text comes from the lacuna of *KH*, as we can see when comparing it with the Latin Orosius (Deferrari 1964: 52–54):

64 Cf. Deferrari (1964): 91.

65 Cf. Deferrari (1964): 106.

66 Cf. Penelas (2001a): 134, note 199, and pp. 88–89.

§ 146 وقال هروشيوش في كتاب وصف الدول والحروب: وفي بعض ذلك الزمان عظم سلطان جيرش أمير الفرس وهو الذي يقال فيه إنه كسرى الأول. وغلب على كل من حاربه فتوجه نحو أرض سُورِيَّة من مدينة بابل وهي إذ ذاك أكثر مواضع الدنيا مالا وأقواها أهلا. فعرض له دونها النهر الذي يدعى جيده وهو الثاني بعد الفرات وكان أحد فرسانه قد رام خوضه على فرس له أبهى أفراسه منظرا وأجملها صورة ثقة بالفرس فاعترقه النهر وذهب به وبالفرس. فتأسف جيرش الملك وغضب على النهر غضبا شديدا فأقسم بالأيمان اللازمة لا يرِيْمُهُ ولا يرحل عنه حتى يخوضه النساء ولا يبلغ ماءه منهن الركب. فرد إليه القوة واشتغل به أكثر تلك السنة حتى حفرت له الخنادق العظام وقسم ماءه على ثلاث مائة وستين جدولا وير قسمه.

§ 147 ثم مضى بالأعوان الذين قد كانوا اعتادوا الحفر إلى نهر الفرات الأعظم الذي كان بسَيْط مدينة بابل فأخذه على بُعد منها وحفر له حتى صرفه عنها. ولم يزل يقسمه على السواني والجداول حتى بين موضع جريته الأولى فأصاب مدينة بابل فأخذه منها وحفر له حتى صرفه عنها وهي التي كانت من عظمتها تكاد ألا تنزل من عمل الآدميين ولا مما يقدر على هدمه. وكان بنيان مثلها أو هدمها أمرا معجزا وهي المدينة التي زعموا أن ثمرود الجسيم أسسها وأن نين بن بالي وامراته شمرام أتما بنيانها. وكانت مدينة ضاحكة المنظر جميلة المنصب زاخرة البناء واسعة الفناء قد جمعت من كل جانب إلى رصافة بنيانها وإلى بهاء منصفها سهلة بطحاء ودَيْمُومَة فيحاء مربعة لها في كل تربع حصن عجيبان وساير ذلك من سُورها يكاد سامع خبره ألا يصدق به لفرط غلظه وكثرة ارتفاعه مائتا ذراع ارتفاعا وخمسون ذراعا عرضا في دُور أربع مائة وثمانين أشتادين وهو سدس ميل مبني بالآجر المرصص. وقد خندق حوله بخندق يجري فيه نهر الفرات. وفيه مائة باب نحاسا وسعة السور في أعلاه كسعته في أسفله. وقد بنيت في كلي جانبيه الأعلى مسكن للمقاتلة والحراز متصلة في جميع دُوره وفيها بين المساكن البرانية والداخلية فضاء يختلف فيه رُخ مقرون بأربعة أفراس وفي داخله ثمانية قصور قائمة الارتفاع عجيبة المنظر.

§ 148 قال: تلك مدينة بابل العظماء والكورة الشنعاء أول مدينة شيدها الآدميون بعد إقالة الله إياهم من الطوفان. أصبحت في وقت واحد مغلوبة مسيبة مهذومة وكان قد أتاها في ذلك الوقت كرواشيش أمير بلد ليذية المعروف بالقوة في عصره الموصوف بالبلاء في زمانه

ناصرها ومداً فانقلب مغلوباً وانصرف إلى موضعه مهزوماً. ثم إن جيرش الفارسي بعد اقتداحه بابل وهدمها وحكمه فيها مضى بعساكره إلى بلد ليدية فأصاب جميعه ولم يرم أحد مدافعته للذي دخلهم من رعبه في المحاربة الأولى. وأصاب كرواشيش الملك وحكم فيها بحكمه.

These fourteen lines of new text make it possible to reconstruct a substantial part of chapter 4 and the whole of chapter 5 of *KH*, further confirmed by the table of contents in *KH*, p. 7, which gives us a reliable, albeit brief, exposition of the contents of the missing parts.

In *al-Ḥabar* §148, where the text of *KH* has been preserved, the only abbreviation made by al-Maqrīzī is the dropping of the word *maḍmūmah* after *mahdūmah*, thus doing away with one of the two near-synonyms. The almost verbatim fidelity of *al-Ḥabar* §148 to *KH*, 134–135, §§35–37, gives credence to the fidelity of *al-Ḥabar* §§146–147 to the now mainly lost text of *KH*.

Finally, a word on the title of *KH*. The manuscript of *KH* lacks the title page, and the book is usually quoted as *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš*. In the *Ḥabar*, al-Maqrīzī uses two titles for it, either *Kitāb Hurūšiyūš* or *Ta'riḥ (madīnat) Rūmah*. Once, though, he may be quoting it by another title. §146 begins: *qāla Hurūšiyūš fī Kitāb Wasf al-duwal wa-l-ḥurūb*, “Orosius says in the Book of the Description of Dynasties and Wars”. However, a minor change in the text would make the sentence descriptive of the contents of Orosius’ book, not its title: *qāla Hurūšiyūš fī kitāb waṣafa (fīhi) l-duwal wa-l-ḥurūb* “Orosius says in a book (in which) he describes dynasties and wars.” Al-Maqrīzī also uses the same expression in *al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, 1:388 (*wa-ḍukira fī tarǧamat Kitāb Hurūšiyūš al-Andalusī fī wasf al-duwal wa-l-ḥurūb ...*). However, for the time being at least, we are well advised to retain the more conventional title of *KH*, *Ta'riḥ (madīnat) Rūmah*.

6 Description of the Manuscripts⁶⁷

This edition is based on the holograph MS Fatih (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi) 4340, fols. 76^b–136^b. The whole manuscript consists of 265 leaves, with 25 lines of text on most pages. Fols. 115^a–131^b are written on reused chancery paper that has lines written in a very large script. The paper has been rotated 90 degrees and al-Maqrīzī has written in the free spaces between the lines of

67 The manuscript descriptions rely in large part on Bauden (forthcoming).

the original text.⁶⁸ In this section there are 27 lines of text on each page. Most pages contain marginal additions in the hand of al-Maqrīzī.

Parts of §§ 228–230 are found in a loose unfoliated slip of paper written in al-Maqrīzī's hand and inserted between fol. 47 and fol. 48 of the holograph.

There is a lacuna of two leaves in the text between fols. 127 and 128, § 228 breaking after a couple of lines and the text continuing on fol. 128^a with § 237.

This lacuna has been filled in from MS A. 2926/5 (Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi), where the part edited here takes fols. 20^a–70^a (see plates 1–2), with 27 lines per page. The whole manuscript comprises 183 leaves plus three unnumbered leaves of Oriental paper (180×263 mm.). The manuscript belongs to a set of six volumes (MSS A. 2926/1–6). The manuscript is copied from the holograph, the marginal corrections of which have been inserted into the text.

The text is further found in the following manuscripts that have not been used for the edition:

Algiers, Bibliothèque nationale MS 1589 (see plate 5);⁶⁹ Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, MS 5251 *Tarīḥ*;⁷⁰ Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, MS Aya Sofya 3365, pp. 351–438 (see plates 3–4).⁷¹

7 Notes on the Translation

The *Ḥabar* consists of various layers of texts. Much of it is taken from other books, often in a modified, usually abbreviated, form and as such the constituent parts of the text date from between the tenth and fifteenth centuries, further containing quotations from 8th- and 9th-century authors and author-

68 See Bauden (2004).

69 Not seen, cf. Bauden (forthcoming) and Fagnan (1893): 439, no. 1589. The Persian section covers fols. 48^b–145^a.

70 Not seen, cf. Bauden (forthcoming) and *Fihris al-kutub*, 8:126. This is a modern copy made in 1353–1354/1934–1935 in seven volumes from the holograph and the photographs of the Istanbul manuscript available in Cairo.

71 Not seen, cf. Bauden (forthcoming). Copied from the holograph, containing on its 542 pages volumes 4 and 5 of the holograph. The manuscript has two separate parts (pp. 1–245; 246–542) by two different hands, bound in Mamlūk leather binding. The part concerned here has 31 lines of writing per page.

ities (e.g., through al-Ṭabarī's *Ta'rīḥ*). The whole text, moreover, refers to pre-Islamic times.

In some cases it is obvious that the understanding of al-Maqrīzī is not identical with that of the original author he is quoting and the latter, further, may not have correctly understood pre-Islamic Iran and its culture. In a few cases, we can see (e.g., *al-Ḥabar* §169 on Tīrī-Šīr) how al-Maqrīzī clearly misreads or misunderstands the text he is quoting.

In cases where there are simple mistakes, these have been corrected in the edited text with a note on the correction, but in others this would blur the meaning al-Maqrīzī gave to his text.

Two main principles have been followed in the translation. First, it translates the Arabic text of the edition, thus following the (relatively few) emendations that have been made to the text. Secondly, the translation aims at giving an idea how al-Maqrīzī and his contemporary audience would have understood the text, even in cases where the original author whom al-Maqrīzī quotes may have meant his text to be differently understood. In all major cases this has been discussed in the footnotes of the translation.

8 Names

The names in this volume present some problems. The writing of pre-Islamic Persian names tends to vacillate in Arabic (and Persian) sources in two different ways. On the one hand, many of the names have real variant forms, such as Afrīdūn, Afrīdūn, Farīdūn, and Farīdūn, which all are acceptable and attested in reliable sources, being all descendants of the Middle Persian Frēdōn, from Avestan Thraētaona.

On the other hand, there are mistaken forms, both those that are commonly attested in other sources (such as Yūdāsf and Azdašīr for Būdāsf and Ardašīr) and those that are more specific to al-Maqrīzī.

Such mistaken forms are valuable when studying the relations of texts, as they very often help to determine the exact source of a quotation, which is why the forms used by al-Maqrīzī have been kept in the Arabic text as they appear, with the exception of forms that are clearly simple mistakes.

In the translation, I have partly systematized the forms of the names in order to avoid unnecessarily confusing a reader who may not be familiar with Arabic. In the translation, I have kept an eye on the following principles:

1. Where the forms of the names only differ by diacritical marks, easily confused by scribes, the names have been standardized, thus, e.g., reading

- Afrīdūn in the translation, even where the text clearly has Afrīdūn, a form which is kept in the edition of the Arabic text;
2. names well known from Western tradition (Biblical, Greek) are given in their normal English form. Hence, the translation uses the forms Alexander, Noah, Darius, Nebuchadnezzar, and Xerxes, instead of the Arabic forms, which can be seen in the edited Arabic text. In cases where the identification of the names is not obvious or certain, the Arabic form is given in brackets;
 3. names of ancestors in longer genealogies are kept in their Arabic form. Hence, in the translation I write, e.g., Alexander, son of Philip, b. Amintuh b. Harkališ the Mighty (§180), giving the first two names, both of well-known persons who have a role to play in the book, in their standard English form, but the more distant forefathers have been left to stand as they are (instead of changing them into Amyntas and Hercules). In §188, Harkališ, on the contrary, is given in the standard English form, Hercules, as there he is an acting character, not a mere distant ancestor in a genealogy;
 4. a number of unrecognized or uncertain names have been left in the translation as they stand in the text.

