




Maciej Czyż (Wrocław)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9160-9847>  
e-mail: [maciej.czyz@uwr.edu.pl](mailto:maciej.czyz@uwr.edu.pl)

## SOME ALTERNATIVE TRANSLATIONS OF THE CHRONICLE OF AL-ANṬĀKĪ\*

**Abstract.** The paper proposes numerous possible changes to the French translation of the chronicle of Al-Anṭākī. The proposed corrections are based on Arabic editions (including neglected variant readings of the manuscripts) and the author's Polish translation of the said chronicle.

**Keywords:** Al-Anṭākī, translation, Byzantium, Bulgaria, Tao, Al-Ḥālidīyyāt, Arabs, Fatimids, Druzes

The chronicle of Yaḥyā ʾal-Anṭākī<sup>1</sup>, the continuation of the chronicle of Eutychios (Saʿīd Ibn Biṭṛīq), valued for its precision and objectivity, is crucial for understanding the history of Muslim Middle East (ʿAbbāsids, Fāṭimids, Ḥamdānids and Buwayhids) and Byzantium in the 937/938–1034 period (Fāṭimids since 873/874). The original text of the chronicle was longer, but the part covering years 1034–1066 has been lost. The sources of Al-Anṭākī (Ṭābit Ibn Sinān, Ibn Zūlāq, Al-Šimšāṭī, Al-Musabbihī, Symeon the Logothete, *Vita Christophori*, and others not known by name) were established by J.H. Forsyth<sup>2</sup>. The manuscripts of the chronicle included:

\* I would like to dedicate this article to my dear friend George and Y. Lev, Sh. Jiwa and B. Vest as a sign of gratitude for their kindness and their works I admire.

<sup>1</sup> In this article, I use ISO (International Standards Organisation) transcription, in which ʾ indicates alif maqṣūrā, and a concaved sign over a vowel (Ā) shows its elision. I wish to thank D. Hendrix for his proofreading, and to J. Dybała, PhD and Prof. T. Wolińska for being so generous and understanding concerning the length of the article.

<sup>2</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle (938–1034) of Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṭākī*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1977, p. 34–200. Concerning Symeon the Logothete, Forsyth does claim that



- A. P (15<sup>th</sup> c.?), originally from Sinai, now in a public library in Petersburg. It contains a large number of distorted words.
- B. B (18<sup>th</sup> c.), now in the National Library in Paris (Arabic ms no 291<sup>2</sup>). Often it is used as the basis of the edition, even if other options are better.
- C. L (19<sup>th</sup> c., copied from a copy that burned shortly afterwards), now in the Oriental Library in Beirut (Arabic ms no 2). It is often similar to S.
- D. S (19<sup>th</sup> c.), now in the Asiatic Museum in Petersburg.
- E. C (17<sup>th</sup> c., based on one from 13<sup>th</sup> c.), which belonged to Ḥ. Zayyāt from Alexandria, but vanished after his death and its content is only known through the first edition of this chronicle. It is the only manuscript covering the period of 1027–1034, and it often differs from the other manuscripts, providing interesting alternatives. In this article, I will mention some variants from this manuscript that were omitted in translations.
- F. A recent copy of a manuscript from late 13<sup>th</sup> c. It belonged to the convent of St Anne in Jerusalem, and was copied from the same late 13<sup>th</sup>-c. manuscript as C, but disappeared (Arabic ms no 63)<sup>3</sup>.

There are several editions and translations of the chronicle. There is a partial edition (concerning the reign of Basil II) and Russian translation of baron V.R. Rozen (von Rosen)<sup>4</sup>; a complete edition, based only on some of the now available manuscripts, by L. Cheikho, B. Carra de Vaux & Zayyāt (cetera: Cheikho)<sup>5</sup>; a full edition by I. Kratchkovsky & A. Vasiliev (cetera: K&V), as well as their French translation, finished (part 3) by F. Micheau and G. Troupeau (cetera: M&T)<sup>6</sup>; a full edition by ʿU. Tadmuri (a compilation of the earlier editions); as well as an Italian translation by B. Pirone<sup>7</sup>,

---

Al-Anṭākī used his chronicle as a source (p. 187), but does not mention that in fact he mentioned him directly, although as a famous hagiographer: YAḤYA-IBN-SAʿĪD DʿANTIOCHE, *Histoire de Yahya-Ibn-Saʿīd dʿAntioche continuateur de Saʿīd-Ibn-bitriq*, ed. et trans. I. KRATCHKOVSKY, A. VASILIEV, Turnhout 1932 [= PO, 24] (cetera: K&V2), p. 402.

<sup>3</sup> YAḤYA-IBN-SAʿĪD DʿANTIOCHE, *Histoire de Yahyā Ibn Saʿīd dʿAntioche*, ed. I. KRATCHKOVSKY, trans. F. MICHEAU, G. TROUPEAU, Turnhout 1997 [= PO, 47, fasc. 4, no 212] (cetera: K&V3), p. 376–377. I provide manuscripts' call numbers if they were assigned.

<sup>4</sup> В.Р. РОЗЕН, *Император Василий Болгаробойца*, Санкт-Петербург 1883.

<sup>5</sup> ANTIOCHENSIS YAḤIA IBN SAʿĪD / AL-ANṬĀKĪ YAḤYĀ IBN SAʿĪD, *Annales*, [in:] EUTYCHIUS PATRIARCHA ALEXANDRINUS, *Annales*, ed. L. CHEIKHO, B. CARRA DE VAUX, H. ZAYYAT, Beryti-Parisiis-Lipsiae 1906 (Louvain 1962) [= CSCO.SAr, 7] (cetera: CHEIKHO).

<sup>6</sup> YAḤYA-IBN-SAʿĪD DʿANTIOCHE, *Histoire de Yahya-Ibn-Saʿīd dʿAntioche continuateur de Saʿīd-Ibn-bitriq*, ed. et trans. I. KRATCHKOVSKY, A. VASILIEV, Turnhout 1924 [= PO, 18] (cetera: K&V1); K&V2; K&V3. I would like to use this opportunity to thank Prof. Micheau for her splendid lectures in Paris.

<sup>7</sup> YAḤYĀ AL-ANṬĀKĪ, *Cronache dell'Egitto fatimide e dell'impero bizantino (937–1033)*, trans. B. PIRONE, Bologna 2018 (first edition 1997; cetera: PIRONE). Apart from other issues mentioned in the text, I would like to indicate Pirone accidentally omitted information between XV 23 and 24, concerning an attack on the holy Black Stone in Mecca and the nomination of vizier Al-Ġarġarāʾi.

and my own Polish one<sup>8</sup>, which is soon to be published. My own English translation of Al-Anṭākī is in progress. A full English translation is long overdue, as the chronicle is a prime source for both the central and the Eastern politics of Byzantium, vastly superior in the second aspect to Skylitzes, Leo the Deacon, Armenian, or other Arab sources, not to mention Psellos. This absence has resulted in some publications on Byzantine history in ignoring Al-Anṭākī<sup>9</sup>, and sometimes even great Byzantinists who use it have misinterpreted its content<sup>10</sup>.

This article aims to present some possible minor corrections to the French translation of the chronicle, which is a great translation overall, but it can be improved at times, especially since it often omits the variants of ms C. One major mistake is how it places the alternative text of some of the manuscripts concerning the civil war in Syria<sup>11</sup> at the end of the chronicle, instead of incorporating it in the main text or placing it in a footnote, likely leading readers to overlook it. Apart from this, maps, translation of titles and *nisbas* (indicating the origin of the people in question) would be a valuable addition<sup>12</sup>. Since I do not know Russian or Italian, I am unable to judge the quality of the translations in these languages, but<sup>13</sup> I referred to the Italian translation in the footnotes.

<sup>8</sup> M. CZYŻ, *Bliski Wschód w kronice Yahyi al-Anṭākiego*, PhD thesis presented at the Oriental Studies Faculty of Warsaw University 2015, under the supervision of Prof. P. LEWICKA.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. J. ROMANE, *Byzantium Triumphant. The Military History of the Byzantines 959–1025*, Barnsley 2015 (note that Al-Anṭākī is the single most important source for Byzantine wars in the East in this period); J.L. NORWICH, *Byzantium: the Apogee*, London 1992.

<sup>10</sup> C. HOLMES, *Basil II and the Governance of Empire (976–1025)*, New York 2005, p. 332, n. 67 claims that Bourtzes was disappointed with his reward for conquering Antioch, which was smaller than expected because of the fire that destroyed it. However this is misleading, because it does not mention that Nikephoros II learned about the burning of Antioch only after having Bourtzes rewarded, and it is only then that the grudge between them occurred (K&V<sub>1</sub>, p. 825). Also her (p. 382, n. 186) description of why Eli[jah], the patriarch of Alexandria, opposed the nomination of Agapios as the patriarch of Antioch is plainly wrong, as it was not because he was *far too junior*. Au contraire, it is because he was a bishop already, and not a simple priest or monk (K&V<sub>2</sub>, p. 378–389). About this issue, see M. CZYŻ, *The Correspondence between the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, Agapius and Elijah*, [in:] *The Artistic Traditions of Non-European Cultures*, vol. XI–XII, ed. H. RUBINKOWSKA-ANIOŁ, M. WIDY-BEHIESSE, Warszawa–Toruń 2024, p. 13–30. Also, the Mirdasids were a dynasty, not a tribe (p. 478, n. 88). E. MCGEER, *Sowing the Dragons' Teeth*, Washington 1995, p. 357–358 misrepresents the account of Al-Anṭākī about the battle of Tubbal (ʿAzāz/ʿAzāz), cherry-picking from it to conform to the account of Skylitzes. About this issue, see M. CZYŻ, *The Syrian Campaign of Romanos III Argyros*, SAMAI 6, 2021, esp. p. 254, n. 153.

<sup>11</sup> K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 472, 538.

<sup>12</sup> It is sometimes important, as it indicates, e.g., which Ismāʿīli figures came from the East, thus showing the extent of Fāṭimid influence, or the influence of the origin on theological positions. An example of taking this into account can be found in: M.G.S. HODGSON, *Al-Darazī and Ḥamza in the Origin of the Druze Religion*, JAOS 21.1, 1962, p. 17. It is not always visible without translating the *nisbas*.

<sup>13</sup> With the help of my mother (who has been an Italian teacher).

## Geography

Many of the corrections I present concern proper names, especially place names. For example, in the West, before he arrived in Tripoli, future caliph Al-Mahdī visited a place called Al-Ṭāḥūna (الطاحونة; *the mill*)<sup>14</sup>. B. Pirone places it near Constantiniana, but it is geographically impossible for Al-Mahdī to travel to Tripoli (in Libya) through it, as it is a city in Algeria. Moreover, Pirone misreads Yāqūt, who mentions Al-Ṭāḥūna as a place in Constantinople, and not as a place close to Constantiniana<sup>15</sup>. Al-Ṭāḥūna could be a distorted name Ṭalamūya (طلموية; probably Ptolemais, today Ṭulmayṭa (طلمينة)). Yāqūt mentioned Ṭalamūya as a town between Alexandria and Barca (Barqa, today Al-Marğ), as well as one of the two *coasts* of the region of Barca (Cyrenaica)<sup>16</sup>. It seems to fit the description, as it is on the way from Egypt to Tripoli, in Cyrenaica, which is one of the few inhabited places on the way, and the presence of mountains along the road, as well as rivulets west of the city, makes it a fine place for an ambush. On the other hand, other sources mention this place as Al-Ṭāḥūna as well<sup>17</sup>, and it is mentioned as the 17<sup>th</sup> out of 21 stages of travel between Barca and Alexandria by Al-Muqaddasī. The one before it is Kanāis al-Ḥarir/al-Ḥadīd (*The Churches of Silk/Iron*), probably Ra's al-Kanā'is (*The Cape of the Churches*) today, and the ones after it are Dāt al-Ḥumām (today distorted into Al-Ḥammām) and Būmīna (Abū Mīnā)<sup>18</sup>. Thus Al-Ṭāḥūna was located somewhere around modern Egyptian villages of Al-Ḍa'ba, Tilāl al-'Alamayn, and Sīdī 'Abd al-Raḥmān, and this is a more probable interpretation, as it would also mean Al-Mahdī was attacked just after leaving the Delta and entering the Sahara, as well as its proximity to the hills is more pronounced than elsewhere before Cyrenaica.

Apart from this, Al-Anṭākī mentions that Sayf al-Dawla, after being defeated by Leon Phokas, spent the night in *al-ḥawānīt* (الحوانيت; *taverns*)<sup>19</sup>. K&V do not translate this word and treat it as a place name<sup>20</sup>. Such a city did exist, but far away in Lower Iraq<sup>21</sup>. Cheikho corrects it to *al-ḥawāniq* (الخوانق)<sup>22</sup>, that is the

<sup>14</sup> K&V 1, p. 752.

<sup>15</sup> PIRONE, V, 14, n. 21. But YĀQŪT, *Mu'ğām al-Buldān*, vol. IV, Beirut 1397/1977 (cetera: YĀQŪT), p. 4.

<sup>16</sup> YĀQŪT, vol. IV, p. 39 and vol. I, p. 389.

<sup>17</sup> AL-QĀḌĪ ĀL-NU'MĀN, *Iftitāḥ al-Da'wa*, ed. F. AL-DAŠRĀWĪ, Tunis–Algier 1986 (cetera: AL-NU'MĀN), p. 161; IBN AL-'ADĪM, *Zubdat al-Ḥalab min Tārīḥ Ḥalab*, ed. Ḥ. AL-MANŠŪR, Beirut 1996 (cetera: IBN AL-'ADĪM Z); IBN AL-AṬĪR, *Al-Kāmil fī āl-Tārīḥ*, vol. V, Beirut 1414/1994 (cetera: IBN AL-AṬĪR), p. 18.

<sup>18</sup> AL-MUQADDASĪ, *The Best Divisions for Knowledge of the Regions. Aḥsan al-Taqašim fī Ma'rifat al-Aqālīm*, trans. B. COLLINS, Reading 2001 (cetera: AL-MUQADDASĪ), p. 202–203.

<sup>19</sup> K&V 1, p. 782.

<sup>20</sup> As does M. CANARD, *Sayf al Daula. Recueil des textes relatifs à l'émir Sayf al Daula le Ḥamdanide avec annotations, cartes et plans*, Alger 1934, p. 381, n. 3.

<sup>21</sup> G. LE STRANGE, *Description of Mesopotamia and Baghdād, Written about the Year 900 A.D. by Ibn Serapion*, JRASGBI 1895, p. 46, n. 11.

<sup>22</sup> CHEIKHO, p. 117.

gorges (of the Ceyhan River). It makes sense, as gorges were a natural shelter for defeated armies<sup>23</sup>.

Pirone makes a number of vocalisation errors, such as Tayzīn instead of Tīzīn<sup>24</sup>, Šihyāwn instead of Šahyūn (Zion)<sup>25</sup>, Ibn al-Dīrānī instead of Ibn al-Dayrānī (from Armenian *Deranik*)<sup>26</sup>.

One of the most interesting changes that can be introduced concerns John Tzimiskes' expedition to Syria in 975. John Tzimiskes raided Syria and (29 May 975) captured Ba'labakk (in Lebanese Al-Biqā'/Bekaa Valley). The Damascenes ransomed themselves with a yearly tribute of 60,000 dinars. Tzimiskes summoned Alftakīn, the ruler of Damascus, so he visited him with four *gūlāms*. This is followed in mss PC by a short sentence. In three editions of Al-Anṭākī, this sentence is interpreted differently. Cheikho only mentions it in a footnote and does not seem to see any use for it. The possible translation of Cheikho's rendering of this text (لقبه بكامد, *laqqabahu bi-k-ām-d?*) is *so he gave him the title of K-ĀM-D*, but *kāmid* does not appear to have any suitable meaning (*sad, swarthy, dull in colour*). K&V do not annotate the first letter of the second word with any dot, which results in a lack of full translation: *he met him...* (لقبه بكامد, *laqiyahu ?-k-ā-m-d*). Tadmurī, on the other hand, takes Cheikho's text, but corrects one letter (لقبه بكامل, *laqqabahu bi-kāmil*), obtaining the meaning *he gave him the title of Perfect*, but the lack of *al-* (*the*) definite article makes it unlikely<sup>27</sup>. The reading I propose is a mixture of Cheikho and K&V (لقبه بكامد, *laqiyahu bi-Kāmid*), and it can be translated as *he met him in Kāmid*, a city further into the Bekaa Valley, which fits the context<sup>28</sup>. This gives more precise information concerning the issue P.E. Walker discussed in his splendid article, and shows that the relation of Ibn al-Qalānīsī saying that Tzimiskes camped on the outskirts of Damascus and visited it himself, is not true<sup>29</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> E.g. Skleros also sheltered in gorges after defeat: JEAN SKYLITZÈS, *Empereurs de Constantinople*, "Basile et Constantin", XVI, 9, trans. B. FLUSIN, Paris 2003 (cetera: SKYLITZES), p. 273. As for PIRONE, VII, 38 & n. 73 treats both as city names. Skylitzes, Leo, Ibn al-Aṭīr, Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Miskawayh, Yāqūt, and Al-Hamaḍānī do not provide a solution.

<sup>24</sup> E.g. K&V1, p. 806; PIRONE, VII, 101; YĀQŪT, vol. II, p. 66.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. K&V2, p. 369 make it Šihyūn (Sihyoun); PIRONE, IX, 24. There is no Ā there, and it is grammatically unlikely before a sukūn. Pirone refers Yāqūt, but the edition I have does not mention this place (YAḤYĀ IBN SAʿĪD IBN YAḤYĀ ĀL-ANṬĀKĪ, *Tārīḥ Al-Anṭākī āl-maʿrūf bi-šilat tārīḥ Awṭīḥā*, ed. ʿU.ʿA. TADMURĪ, Tripoli (Lebanon) 1990 (cetera: TADMURĪ), p. 162, n. 9 also refers to Yāqūt, but does not distort this name). This name is interesting in the context of the Byzantines wrongly calling this part of Syria Palestine (LEO THE DEACON, *History*, IV, 10, trans. A.-M. TALBOT, D.F. SULLIVAN, Washington 2005, cetera: LEO) and (albeit almost certainly fabricated later) letter of John Tzimiskes falsely claiming he reached Palestine (MATTHEW OF EDESSA, *Armenia and the Crusades. Tenth to Twelfth centuries. The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, I, 18, trans. A.E. DOSTOURIAN, Lanham–New York–London 1993).

<sup>26</sup> E.g. K&V3, p. 462 (the vocalisation of M&T is correct); PIRONE, XV, 28.

<sup>27</sup> CHEIKHO, p. 146; K&V2, p. 368; TADMURĪ, p. 162.

<sup>28</sup> CHEIKHO, p. 146; K&V2, p. 368; TADMURĪ, p. 162.

<sup>29</sup> P.E. WALKER, *The "Crusade" of John Tzimiskes in the Light of New Arabic Evidence*, B 50, 1980, p. 317, n. 49; IBN AL-QALĀNĪSĪ, *Dayl Tārīḥ Dimašq*, ed. H.F. AMEDROZ, Beirut–Leyden 1908, p. 13.

The suburb of Al-Karḥ is located (south-)east, and not west, of Baghdad<sup>30</sup>. An independent city of Al-Karḥ is indeed located (north-)west of Baghdad, but the suburban status and strong Shiism of the eastern Al-Karḥ leave no doubt that Al-Anṭākī made a mistake, just like in calling king David III of Tao the paternal uncle of Bagrat III of Georgia (in reality, the grandfather of David III was the grand-grand-grandfather of Bagrat III)<sup>31</sup>. Such mistakes should be indicated in the footnotes, and the translators ignore them.

There are two mentions of *Abāriya/Bāriya*<sup>32</sup> in the text<sup>33</sup>. While secondary sources assume it is Veria (Beroea)<sup>34</sup>, if one compares the text with Skylitzes<sup>35</sup>, it is clear it is Triaditza/Sofia, as the story is essentially the same, save for the place name: Basil II besieged the city, then returned to the defile before it and was defeated by the Bulgarians, and the revolt of two Bardases occurred shortly after it. Later the city was destroyed by Basil (likely in revenge for the aforementioned debacle), which is also mentioned by Skylitzes as referring to Triaditza<sup>36</sup>. The identification of *Abāriya* with Veria makes the story of Al-Anṭākī seem strange, as it is not located behind a defile, it was in Byzantine hands before (although it was temporarily captured by the Bulgarians<sup>37</sup>), and the destruction of an old Byzantine city would make no sense. Yet a change of identification makes Al-Anṭākī's story perfectly sound. The mistake of Al-Anṭākī is likely due to the fact that the next personal expedition of the emperor, which started the conquest of Bulgaria, peacefully captured Veria<sup>38</sup>. Strangely, this identification was overlooked by N. Adontz in his detailed description of the rule of Samuel<sup>39</sup>.

Other mentions of Al-Anṭākī concerning the Bulgaria are slightly distorted as well: while some of the information about Silistra (Zaysirā/Ṭaysirā/Ṭilsirā / ظايسيرا / طاييسيرا / طلسيرا → Ṭilistrā / طلسترا → Ḍilistrā / ضلسترا or Ṣilistrā / صلسترا, similar to Dristra

<sup>30</sup> K&V2, p. 360; PIRONE, VIII, 71 ignore this issue.

<sup>31</sup> K&V3, p. 460, 462, <https://www.royalhouseofgeorgia.ge/genealogy/> [8 IX 2025].

<sup>32</sup> LS *Arābiyya*.

<sup>33</sup> K&V2, p. 419 & 431.

<sup>34</sup> B.P. ПОЗЕВ, *Имнепамоп...*, p. 228–231, n. 183.8; G. SCHLUMBERGER, *L'Épopée Byzantine*, vol. II, Paris 1900, p. 54, n. 1.9; St. RUNCIMAN, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, London 1930, p. 228, n. 1; PIRONE, X, 129, n. 141.

<sup>35</sup> SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVI, 12, p. 276–277. Also LEO, X, 8, p. 213–214; the place of the fight is confirmed also by J. ZAIMOV, T.A. LYAAGHT, *The Bitolya Inscription of the Bulgarian Autocrat Ivan Vladislav (1015–1018)*, NZSJ 6, 1970, p. 7–8.

<sup>36</sup> SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVI, 25, p. 287.

<sup>37</sup> LEO, X, 10, p. 217.

<sup>38</sup> SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVI, 27, p. 287. The peaceful capture of it and the shortness of the Bulgarian rule make its destruction even more unlikely.

<sup>39</sup> N. ADONTZ, *Samuel l'Arménien, roi des Bulgares*, [in:] *Études Armeno-Byzantines*, ed. IDEM, Lisbonne 1965, p. 360.

& Silistra, rightly identified by K&V<sup>40</sup>) indeed concern this city<sup>41</sup>, some of them refer to Preslav, the capital of Bulgaria (it is called the capital and the place where the tzars were captured by the Ruthenians<sup>42</sup>, as well as the place where the Byzantines captured them from the Ruthenians, while the capital was Preslav and Skylitzes claimed it is there that the tzar was captured by Byzantium<sup>43</sup>). This mistake probably arose due to the fact that Silistra was the seat of the Bulgarian patriarch at that time<sup>44</sup>, and due to their geographical proximity: before capturing Preslav, the Ruthenians captured the cities along the Danube<sup>45</sup>, and when Tzimiskès captured Preslav, he went from there to Silistra<sup>46</sup>. Thus it appears that Al-Anṭākī merged the two cities into one.

Similarly, Al-Anṭākī likely was unaware that Komitopoulos was not just Samuel, but the entire family, so he did not notice the succession of Gabriel Radomir. He was partly aware that Komitopoulos (Gabriel) was the son (*ḡulām* meaning a boy or a son) of Samuel, but he did not distinguish them, thus he transferred the name of Samuel to the previous ruler Peter, while making Samuel his *ḡulām* (meaning a slave soldier or servant, as he imagined Bulgaria as being similar to the Middle East). On the other hand, John Vladislav is called by the name of his father: Aaron. Al-Anṭākī says that he was of royal origin, which may be understood as that he thought he descended from the previous dynasty, but is not wrong, as his father Aaron was a Komitopoulos and thus belonged to the ruling family (he was murdered by his brother Samuel<sup>47</sup>). It is also noteworthy that in the case of John Vladislav, Komitopoulos (القمتوفلس) is distorted into Al-Qumṭūriyās (القمتورياس), as if the copyist was aware it is a different person. Al-Anṭākī, however, is wrong concerning the death of John Vladislav.

This is all important for asserting the credibility of Al-Anṭākī concerning the events in Bulgaria and overall. C. Holmes wrote that the information Al-Anṭākī gained on the warfare in Bulgaria is *extremely limited*<sup>48</sup>, and usually does not try to

<sup>40</sup> And by PIRONE, VII, 118, n. 174.

<sup>41</sup> The siege of Ruthenians inside it, mentioned K&V 2, p. 348, corresponding to SKYLITZES, “Jean Tzimiskès”, XV, 5, p. 242–243; LEO, VII–IX, 1–12, p. 128–200; NESTOR, *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, trans. S.H. CROSS, O.P. SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR, Cambridge–Georgetown 1953 (cetera: NESTOR), p. 87–90.

<sup>42</sup> K&V 1, p. 813.

<sup>43</sup> K&V 2, p. 348; SKYLITZES, “Jean Tzimiskès”, XV, 9, p. 249.

<sup>44</sup> R. BROWNING, *Dorostolon*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. I, ed. A.P. KAZHDAN, Oxford–New York 1991, p. 653.

<sup>45</sup> NESTOR, p. 84–87.

<sup>46</sup> SKYLITZES, “Jean Tzimiskès”, XV, 10, p. 250.

<sup>47</sup> SKYLITZES, “Jean Tzimiskès”, XVI, 11, p. 275.

<sup>48</sup> C. HOLMES, *Basil II...*, p. 38, another critical assessment p. 48, but accepting his importance in some aspects (p. 48–49, 426). Her accusation of repetitiveness, because of a mention of two four-year periods of war with the Bulgarians, is negated by (mentioned by her, p. 48, n. 70) M. WHITTOW,

make sense or use of it. The Bulgarian relation of Al-Anṭākī is perhaps not *excellent*, containing *true revelations*, as Adontz claimed<sup>49</sup>, but it is not a fairy tale, as G. Ostrogorsky described it<sup>50</sup>; his narration is valuable, but has to be confronted with other sources, as he confused the names, probably because he relied on oral accounts, and the names were exotic for him, just like the names of Fāṭimid rulers for Skylitzes, who mistook Al-Ḥākīm for his father Al-‘Azīz (*Azizios*)<sup>51</sup>. Such mistakes occur elsewhere in the text, for example Zoe (Zu’ī زئي) is called Irene (ايريني), but, in this case, this is probably a mistake of the copyists, because ms P<sup>1</sup> retains a middle form: Rīnī (ريني)<sup>52</sup>, and it is unlikely Al-Anṭākī did not know the name of a Byzantine ruler. The issue of Abāriya was first discovered by M.A. Lipowsky, who was actually criticised, without deliberation, by G. Schlumberger for *confusing Veria with Sofia*<sup>53</sup>.

Rulers of Bulgaria			
Arabic	Transcription	Direct translation	Interpretation
شموئل	Šamū’il	Samuel	Peter I <sup>54</sup> , one time Samuel <sup>55</sup>

*The Making of Orthodox Byzantium (600–1025)*, Houndmills–London 1996, p. 389, who indicates the number is not far from truth. N. ADONTZ, *Samuel...*, p. 371, n. 51 sees it as an error, echoing the duration of the previous expedition (and is probably right); but it is not a simple repetition of the same information.

<sup>49</sup> N. ADONTZ, *Samuel...*, p. 347.

<sup>50</sup> G. OSTROGORSKY, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. HUSSEY, Oxford 1968, p. 301, n. 2.

<sup>51</sup> SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVI, 33, p. 290.

<sup>52</sup> K&V3, p. 486, n. 15.

<sup>53</sup> G. SCHLUMBERGER, *L’Epopée...*, vol. II, p. 54, n. 1. M.A. LIPOWSKY, *De l’histoire de la lutte gréco aux X<sup>e</sup> et XI<sup>e</sup> siècles*, JMIPR 11, 1891, p. 136. Most of these information and more I presented (sadly in Polish) in M. Czyż, *Bulgaria w kronice Yahyi āl-Antākiego*, [in:] *Poznań Bałkany. Historia – polityka – kultura – języki*, ed. K. TACZYŃSKA, A. TWARDOWSKA, Toruń 2016, p. 13–30.

<sup>54</sup> K&V1, p. 813 (to be compared to “Jean Tzimiskès”, XVI, 5, p. 242 and earlier); K&V2, p. 349 (corresponding to SKYLITZES, XVI, 9, p. 249); K&V2, p. 348 (corresponding to SKYLITZES, XVI, 10, p. 249, but partly, as Al-Anṭākī merges Silistra with Preslav and thus claims the tzars were captured only after Silistra, while Skylitzes claims Boris was taken in Preslav); K&V2, p. 418 (corresponding to SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVII, 11, p. 275). The identification of Samuel with Peter was first discovered by N. ADONTZ, *Samuel...*, p. 387. However Adontz’s claim that *Samuel* means Roman as well, out of confusion between Simeon and Samuel, is a complete mistake, as Roman is never called by Al-Anṭākī by any name. Note that K&V simply translate the names, and PIRONE, VII, 118, n. 174 limits himself to doubts if the Samuel in question is Samuel Komitopoulos, and later on to simply translating or transcribing the names (XIII, 45).

<sup>55</sup> K&V3, p. 406 describing Komitopoulos (Gabriel) as the son of Samuel, but the context is confused. When referring to the third party of Al-Anṭākī, I give the number of the page with the Arabic text, and the translation is found on the next page, unless indicated otherwise.

Rulers of Bulgaria			
Arabic	Transcription	Direct translation	Interpretation
Sons of Peter I (called Samuel)			Boris II
			Roman <sup>56</sup>
القمطوفلس	Al-Qumiṭūfulus	Komitopoulos	Samuel (Komitopoulos) <sup>57</sup>
القمطورياس (القمطوبلس/ القمطوبولس؟)	Al-Qumṭūriyās (Al-Qumiṭūbulus/ Al-Qumiṭūbūlus)	Komitopoulos	Gabriel Radomir, son of Samuel <sup>58</sup>
هرون	Hārūn	Aaron	John Vladislav, son of Aaron <sup>59</sup>

The reading of (الأميناڤوين) *Al-Amīnāfwīn?*, PR (الأميناڤوين) *Al-Amīnyāqwīn?* without the dots of Q and Ī) in the edition of K&V, more so (الأرميناڤوين) *Al-Armīnāqwīn?* in the edition of Tadmuri) as Armeniakon is very unsure<sup>60</sup>, both because R letter is missing, and because it is mentioned as land given to Skleros after the revolt, alongside Ra'bān (a Syrian city, today Araban in SE Turkey), and one would thus expect a place of similar importance and geographical location as Ra'bān, and that is not the case. Moreover, it would be very unwise to give a former rebel an entire major theme. Psellos mentions lands that were assigned to him, but without any details<sup>61</sup>; Ibn al-Aṭīr says he was assigned the lands he (already) had in his hands, but without naming any<sup>62</sup>; and Skylitzes, Al-Rūdrāwārī give few details<sup>63</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> See earlier references, as Peter (*Samuel*) is mentioned just as the father of (unnamed) Boris and Roman, and they are described only as his sons.

<sup>57</sup> E.g. K&V2, p. 446–447 about Ouranos fighting Samuel in Bulgaria, mentioned also by SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVI, 23, p. 285–286, although the placement of these battles suggests perhaps this information of Al-Anṭākī refers to the fights of Xiphias.

<sup>58</sup> K&V3, p. 406; SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVI, 35, p. 292. Discovered before me by N. ADONTZ, *Samuel...*, p. 388.

<sup>59</sup> K&V3, p. 406; SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVI, 35, p. 292. The identification is accepted by C. HOLMES, *Basil II...*, p. 419. N. ADONTZ, *Samuel...*, p. 388 *de facto* accepts it as well.

<sup>60</sup> K&V2, p. 427; TADMURĪ, p. 212. It is described as an unidentified locality by J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 442. W. SEIBT, *Die Skleroi*, Wien 1976, p. 56 confines himself to transcribing the name.

<sup>61</sup> MICHAŁ PSELLOS, *Kronika*, I, 26–29, trans. O. JUREWICZ, Wrocław 1985 (cetera: PSELLOS), p. 11–13 (esp. I, 29, p. 13).

<sup>62</sup> IBN AL-AṬĪR, vol. V, p. 466.

<sup>63</sup> SKYLITZES, “Basile et Constantin”, XVI, 19, p. 282–283; ABU SHUJĀ‘ RUDHRAWARĪ, HILAL B. MUHASSIN, *Continuation of The Experiences of The Nations*, trans. D.S. MARGOLIOUTH, London 1921 (cetera: RUDHRAWARĪ), p. 117 (Eng. p. 119: they confirmed him in his *governorship*, not *lieutenancy*). Pirone, X, 162, n. 148 is also cautious in this matter.

Another geographical correction concerns a place that David, king of the Georgians, was the master of (التي, ʾLTĪ)<sup>64</sup>. Cheikho corrects it to (الني), *Al-Nī*, pronounced *Annī*, similar to Ani, thus Tadmurī identifies it as this city<sup>65</sup>. In theory, this should not be possible linguistically. There is no reason why the first part of this proper name should be written as a definite article *al-*. Some may think that the *casus* of Alexandria is analogous, but that is not the case, because first of all, *al-* in Alexandria is not there because of its presence in Alexander name, but due to the same grammatical reason that makes Constantinople *Al-Qusṭanṭīniyya*, and not *Qusṭanṭīniyya*: to make an adjective a proper name, just like *-iyya* ending is not a rendering of *-ia* of Alexandria, but is there to create a *nisba* adjective. The dropping of *al-* from Alexander already occurred with the name Alexander (*Iskandar*), which is confirmed that Alexandretta (*Iskandarūna*) is usually written without *al-*, both by Al-Anṭākī<sup>66</sup> and by Yāqūt<sup>67</sup>. Thus Alexandria is not a simple Arabisation of this place name<sup>68</sup>, but a grammatically Arab place name, albeit derived from a foreign given name. While such a case does not occur in other sources concerning analogous names, e.g. Athenes, there is a very analogous case in the chronicle, that is Anatolikon (Al-Nāṭulīq, pronounced *Annāṭulīq*)<sup>69</sup>. However this is not only a form not present in any of the manuscripts, but something impossible historically. David did not own Ani; it was a separate state, annexed by Byzantium on a separate occasion<sup>70</sup>. K&V read this word as Al-Tay (*Al-Tai*)<sup>71</sup>, thinking it is Tao/Taik, the Georgian kingdom of David. *Al-* is present in some Arabic place names, but only to change a common name into a proper one, e.g. *baṣra* is a rugged ground or small stones; Al-Baṣra is a city in Iraq whose name is derived from this word. *Ribāt* is a kind of an inn or a border fortification, and Al-Ribāt is the capital of Morocco. Adding *al-* to non-Arabic proper names, which are defined already, is contrary to Arabic grammar, but it does not stop Al-Anṭākī from doing it sometimes<sup>72</sup>. But *Al-Tay* form does not suit either the Georgian (Tao; the last letter is different) or the Armenian (Taik; the last letter is missing) forms of the name of this kingdom,

<sup>64</sup> CHEIKHO, p. 170; K&V2, p. 429, n. 6 (ms C changes L into K: الكتي, but it is a clear typo); TADMURĪ, p. 214.

<sup>65</sup> PIRONE, X, 157, n. 143 claims that *al-Tayy* is an erroneous form of Ani as well.

<sup>66</sup> K&V1, p. 814.

<sup>67</sup> YĀQŪT, vol. I, p. 182.

<sup>68</sup> Also note that *al-i* is not pronounced the same as *ali*.

<sup>69</sup> E.g. K&V2, p. 373. PIRONE, X, 8 believes it is Anatolia, but XV, 31, n. 32 he considers it could be (YĀQŪT, vol. V, p. 252) Nāṭulīn, some obscure city/land close to (*in*) Constantinople, which is clearly unlikely.

<sup>70</sup> SKYLITZES, "Constantine Monomaque", XXI, 8, p. 361–362; J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 577–581; A. TER-GHEWONDYAN, *The Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia*, trans. N.G. GARSOĪAN, Lisbon 1976, p. 122.

<sup>71</sup> The same interpretation in E. HONIGMANN, *Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinisches Reiches*, Bruxelles 1935, p. 155.

<sup>72</sup> E.g. K&V3, p. 492, *al-* is added to the name of Spondyles.

and, moreover, the Arabic rendering of foreign names usually makes the vowels long<sup>73</sup>, albeit it is not always true in this chronicle. Moreover, mss BLS call this place a *city*, which does not fit Tao. It should be read as Ultī, that is Olti (Arabs do not distinguish between O and U), the name of the capital of Tao<sup>74</sup>.

The name *Al-Ḥālidiyyāt*<sup>75</sup> is mentioned thrice by Al-Anṭākī. For the first time when it was given to Skleros alongside Anzitene<sup>76</sup>, and for the second and third times when Basil II, after defeating Phokas at Chrysopolis, sent Taronites to Trabzon (Trebizond), who gathered men there and went towards the Euphrates (perhaps heading for Taron). Phokas asked the king of Tao for help. He sent men who were joined by two patricians, *sons of Bagrat*, who defeated Taronites. Both Tao and them sent 1000 men. But both them and the ruler of Tao denied Phokas further help when the news of Chrysopolis reached them<sup>77</sup>. Later on a Byzantine commander killed one of the *sons of Bagrat*, and exiled the second one. The first mention suggests a land close to Anzitene (which is located by the Euphrates), and the second mention a place somewhere south of Trabzon to the north, the Euphrates to the south, and Georgia to the east. The third mention suggests it was west of Tao. The first mention indicates it was a Byzantine province<sup>78</sup>, but the second and third suggest a separate entity, since its rulers are named *lords* (*ṣāhibs*), the same title as the king of Tao, and are shown as neutral in the war until Phokas'

<sup>73</sup> Currently it is transcribed as Tāw(u): [https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/مملكة\\_الابيريين](https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/مملكة_الابيريين) [29 VI 2025].

<sup>74</sup> Today it is called Oltu due to the Turkish vowel harmony, which changes I into U after O in the previous syllable.

<sup>75</sup> It is unlikely to be an Arabic name, despite its seemingly Arabic form and meaning (*the eternal*s, *the Chaldian* or *the [lands] of Ḥālid* (such possibility was considered before me by B.P. РОЗЕН, *Император...*, n. 12, p. 80–81)), because of the geographical distance of the described events from the Arab-inhabited areas. The name itself is plural, which is rare, but Al-Anṭākī puts other geographical names in plural as well, e.g. Syria: K&V 1, p. 735 (however, Al-Ḥālidiyyāt are plural in some other sources. The plurality may be an argument against them being a city). E. HONIGMANN, *Die Ostgrenze...*, p. 53 thinks it is to distinguish it from Al-Ḥālidiyya village by Mosul; but it was not renowned, and many cities shared the same Arabic name without any problem. As for Ḥālid name, there were 9<sup>th</sup>-c. Arab Šaybānid governors of Armenia named Ḥālid and his son Muḥammad Ibn Ḥālid (A. TER-GHEWONDYAN, *The Arab Emirates...*, p. 28), but this interpretation would be unlikely (why would it be used?) and would not explain the first occurrence of this name. Also note that Al-Ḥālidiyyāt bears resemblance to Ḥilāt (Ahlāt), which is located close to Taron, but only vaguely, and it was in Muslim hands.

<sup>76</sup> W. SEIBT, *Die Skleroi...*, p. 36 makes a mistake (which is also likely why he conflates Al-Ḥālidiyyāt with Kaloudia), claiming that Asolik refers to these territories as by the Ceyhan River and Malatya, because he mentions the areas that were the centres of Skleros' rule at the beginning of the revolt (he was declared emperor in Malatya, and his first victory was over Ceyhan: K&V 2, p. 372–373), and not the areas he governed before: STEP'ANOS TARŌNEC'I, *The Universal History*, XIII, 14 & n. 219, trans. T. GREENWOOD, Oxford 2017 (cetera: STEP'ANOS).

<sup>77</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 436–437 convincingly argues that they rather withdrew due to a conflict with the other Georgian states, but he also (p. 438) indicates that the small number of troops they sent indicates they were cautious and not fully committed to Phokas.

<sup>78</sup> IBN AL-'ADIM Z, p. 75 also mentions it, in 956, as a province lead by a patrician B-R-KĪL.

direct appeal to Tao. It was close geographically and politically to Tao, as acting in unison with it<sup>79</sup>, but also in a Byzantine sphere of influence (hence the titles), and the name of the rulers suggests an Armenian or Georgian origin. Thus either the two mentions refer to separate entities, some change occurred in their status, or (less likely) an inappropriate term for their rulers, or name, was used. K&V transliterated the name only, but it likely should be read as Chaldia, which was first suggested by Adontz<sup>80</sup>, and repeated by Tadmuri<sup>81</sup>. The Chaldia theme is located relatively far north of Anzitene, but the wider ducate of it was much closer<sup>82</sup>. It lies in NE Byzantium, which fits the context of the war between Byzantium and Tao, but as Trabzon is located in this theme, this suggests (less likely) that either the rulers of Chaldia switched sides, or that the two brothers did not rule this theme, or rather not its entirety, as Taronites' landing and gathering forces there are shown as unopposed. Perhaps the name of Chaldia was extended to some neighbouring lands outside direct Byzantine rule. That would not be unusual; note the Byzantine theme of Iberia. And there is a possible reason for this. Asolik mentions that Basil II ceded the *kleisoura* [of] Khałtoyarič/Xałtoyarič<sup>83</sup>, Čormayri, Karin/Erzurum,

<sup>79</sup> Y.A. RABAVILAS, *The Real Objectives of Byzantium's Foreign Policy towards Georgia during the Reign of Basil II (978–989 and 1021–1022)*, Вка 38, 2023–2024, p. 90 surmises they were lieutenants of David for (probably) the same reasons that I pointed out. Some of his other claims are questionable, though. He claims (p. 94) that the expedition of Constantine VIII was a proof that Byzantium wanted to take entire Georgia, while mostly ignoring the explanation of Al-Anṭākī (K&V3, p. 484), that it was but a response to Georgian attack (also, he mistakes Niketas with Simon: Aristakes, *History*, V, trans. R. BEDROSIAN, <https://www.attalus.org/armenian/a3.htm> [22 VI 2025]). He claims Tao never received Karin; but it is more likely it received it, but was deprived of it after its support for B. Phokas, when a Byzantine army crushed the two sons of Bagrat. While it is not explicitly stated by Al-Anṭākī, it is unlikely Tao would be left unpunished (apart from being annexed by the Empire after the king's death), and, as Aristakes claims, the rule over Karin was not only not hereditary, but a reward for loyal obedience, a condition which was broken.

<sup>80</sup> N. ADONTZ, *Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance*, [in:] *Etudes...*, p. 233.

<sup>81</sup> TADMURĪ, p. 214. K&V2, p. 372, 424–425, 429. PIRONE, X, 7, n. 9 does not translate the name in the main text, but claims it is the theme of Chaldia in a footnote. He claims that Yāqūt mentions it in its singular form. Indeed, Al-Ḥāliḍiyya is mentioned by him, but as a village in Mosul province (YĀQŪT, vol. II, p. 338–339; confirmed by search at <https://ar.lib.eshia.ir/40581/1/3> [10 VI 2025]). B.P. ПОСЕЙ, *Имнепамоп...*, n. 12, p. 81 mentions this, that (not in the edition, but in the manuscripts) Al-Makīn mentions the same form as Al-Anṭākī. Rozen does not mention in which place, and the word is not present neither in the part up to the end of the Achaemenids (Al-Ḥāliḍiyya is mentioned, but the editors correct it to Al-Ġālāya, Galatia: AL-MAKĪN, *Universal History*, trans. M. DIEZ, Leiden 2024, p. 262–263) nor in the Islamic part of his history (AL-MAKĪN, *Ta'riḥ al-Muslimin min Šāḥib Šarī'at al-Islām Abī āl-Qāsim Muḥammad ḥattā āl-Dawla āl-Atābakiyya*, ed. 'A.B. ḤASAN, Cairo 2010), so I cannot compare it. I thank A. Streletsky for the translation of the text of Rozen.

<sup>82</sup> Also, C. HOLMES, *Basil II...*, p. 326 n. 56 claims that sigillographic evidence shows that *command over both the northern and central sections of the frontier could be vested in a single individual*.

<sup>83</sup> A. TER-GHEWONDYAN, *The Arab Emirates...*, p. 9 treats these two words as two separate place names. J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 490 describes it as *obscure*. As E. HONIGMANN, *Die Ostgrenze...*, p. 54 noticed before me, this name is a partial match for Chaldia, but

Basean, and Sewuk-Berdak, *which is Mardali*, Hark' and Apahunik', to the king of Tao during the revolt of Skleros, in exchange for their support against him<sup>84</sup>. Some of these lands at least bordered the Chaldia theme, and were part of the Chaldia ducate, as they included Iberia theme (Karin). This explains the presence of an entity tied to Tao, yet called Chaldia, and not containing Trabzon. Forsyth describes Al-Ḥālidiyyāt as a not yet identified locality in Armenia<sup>85</sup>. W. Seibt interestingly identified Al-Ḥālidiyyāt with Kaloudia<sup>86</sup>, a (city and) a minor theme on the Western bank of the Euphrates, south of Melitene. Kaloudia fits the Arabic name less than Chaldia, but is close to Anzitene, with which Al-Ḥālidiyyāt is paired in the first mention of Al-Anṭākī, and lies by the Euphrates, in the context of which it appears the second time. Yet it has other names (Qalauḍiyya, Arqalūdiyya)<sup>87</sup>, and it does not explain the fact that *the sons of Bagrat* are presented as separate rulers, apparently not dependent on Phokas, and acting in unison with Tao. It is important to note that it is a place too far to have been included in the areas transferred to Tao, as it lies west of Melitene. Al-Muqaddasī mentions Al-Ḥālidiyyāt<sup>88</sup>, but vaguely. He describes the road from Silvan (Mayyāfāriqin) to Constantinople through Muş (Müş) and unidentified Qunb, Sinn Nuḥlas (probably Sinn Nuḥās, which is also how B. Collins reads it; *the Tooth of Copper*, as there are copper deposits in this region, and as it is a seemingly Arabic name, one should expect 3, not 4, letters of the root), saying that it is the *cross[ing]*<sup>89</sup> of the roads of Karin

that seems coincidental. He identifies it with Kağhdarig (Kağdaric), which he places (p. 151, n. 3 & map 3, which shows all the regions listed, also those unknown to Forsyth, S or W of Tao) close to Aşqal'a (Aşkale), a place where a road towards Bayburt and Trabzon separates from the road between Erzurum and Erzincan. Such place is mentioned as Kağdaric-1 Ulyā (*the Upper Kağdaric*), a place in the Ottoman sancak of Erzurum, by Ü. KILIÇ, *Osmanlı hâkimiyetinde idari ve askeri yönleri ile Erzurum Sancağı (XVI.–XVII. yüzyıllar)*, [in:] Prof. dr. Salim Cöğce Armağanı. "Türk Tarihine Adanmış Çileli Bir Ömür", ed. A. CEYLAN, Ankara 2017, p. 863, but the local place names were probably changed in the Republican period. On the other hand, Kağdaric-1 Süfla (*the Lower Kağdaric-1*) is mentioned by (inaccessible, but visible in Google search) site <https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr> [10 VI 2025] as a village through which Kara Su flows, to become the Euphrates there by uniting other rivers. This means it is located somewhere NE of Melitene. The editor of STEP'ANOS, III, 15, n. 233 places Xaḥtoyarič at the confluence of the Euphrates and Şart'ama rivers. Aristakes (<https://www.attalus.org/armenian/a2.htm#3> [22 VI 2025]) mentions it at the border of Karin, and STEP'ANOS, III, 43 claims that Basil returned from Tao via Karin and Xaḥtoyarič, so it was on straight road from it. Y.A. RABAVILAS, *The Real Objectives...*, p. 88 believes it supports his claim that the king of Tao never received these lands. But not every possession (esp. comparable in size) of the king of Tao would immediately start being called Tao; it had a different legal status (lifetime possession), and it was likely lost by the king of Tao before, at the end of Phokas revolt, anyway.

<sup>84</sup> STEP'ANOS, XIII, 15, and the hagiography of ss. John & Euthyme: J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 388.

<sup>85</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 375.

<sup>86</sup> W. SEIBT, *Die Skleroi...*, p. 36.

<sup>87</sup> E. HONIGMANN, *Die Ostgrenze...*, p. 245.

<sup>88</sup> <https://ar.lib.eshia.ir/40523/1/150/الخالدييات> [10 VI 2025]; AL-MUQADDASĪ, p. 127.

<sup>89</sup> An unusual use of *cross* in the meaning of *crossing*.

(Qālīqalā/Erzurum), of Mantzikert (Malāzkird/Malazgirt), of Muş, and of Al-Ḥāli-diyyāt, 2 stages, and then continues the description of the road: Samūqamūš, Colonea (Qulūniyya/Şebinkarahisar) and Neocaesarea (Nifšāriyya → Niqšāriyya; Niksar), etc. The text, as Rozen remarks, seems corrupted. The mentioned cities form a route, albeit an arched one, back to Silvan, so either, if we see them as a route (which is made less likely by repeating *the road* of each time), one would expect Al-Ḥāli-diyyāt to be somewhere between Muş and Silvan, perhaps west to them<sup>90</sup>, or, if we see them as a rectangle with roads meeting in Sinn Nuḥās, somewhere much further NW. Rozen believes the crossing of the roads of the aforementioned cities must have been in Taron, so Al-Ḥāli-diyyāt is in this province<sup>91</sup>. Yet it is Sinn Nuḥās that is this cross[ing], not Al-Ḥāli-diyyāt, and it would have been too close to Muş (itself in Taron) to fit the description. Nevertheless it should be noted that Al-Ḥāli-diyyāt is mentioned here in the context of cities, which may, but does not necessarily, suggest it is a city itself; this would make more sense for Kaloudia than for Chaldia, unless we accept the link between Xaḥtoyarič name and Al-Ḥāli-diyyāt (which is an idea Adontz had before me<sup>92</sup>), or assume it is one of the cases, like Egypt or Syria, where the name of the region is applied to its capital. Ibn Ḥurdādbih mentions Al-Ḥāli-diyya (in singular) as located, aside from Charsianon (unlike it, it is called *the province of*) opposite Muslim Malatya (Malatya/Melitene), and in the context of Melias and Paulicians, temptingly close to Kaloudia. But since he wrote it in the late 9<sup>th</sup> c., it cannot refer to Kaloudia, as it was outside Byzantine control at the time. He also says Karin was far north, facing Armeniakon, *some of the province of Al-Ḥāli-diyya*, and it (less likely Karin) was close to Paphlagonia, *adjacent to the land* (he means *sea*, as seen later) of the Khazars<sup>93</sup>, which is

<sup>90</sup> As there is not much space in between; but overall this makes this version less likely.

<sup>91</sup> V B.P. РОЗЕН, *Император...*, n. 12, p. 80.

<sup>92</sup> N. ADONTZ, *Tornik le Moine*, [in:] *Etudes...*, p. 304–305 claims that the name of Chaldia was extended to it due to its vicinity, but a better explanation is that it previously belonged to the duchy of Chaldia. Note that Adontz makes a mistake speaking of *two sons of Bagrat, the lord of Chaldia* while quoting Al-Anṭākī. It is [...] *the two lords of Chaldia*. C. HOLMES, *Basil II...*, p. 320 repeats his error, together with his conclusion; her description does not come directly from the sources, but rather requires several other assumptions (of Adontz, whom she mentions subsequently) she does not mention, perhaps due to a lack of space.

<sup>93</sup> The Sea of the Khazars usually signifies the Caspian Sea (e.g. AL-MUQADDASĪ, p. 306), but in this context it is the Black Sea. Which is enlightening for the otherwise confusing mention of Al-Anṭākī that Ruthenians raided Constantinople and reached Bāb Aqrūbulī (باب أقرؤبلي) in the Sea of Khazars (K&V1, p. 727 and the same in A.A. VASILIEV, *Byzance et les Arabes*, vol. II, trans. M. CANARD, H. GRÉGOIRE, Bruxelles 1950, p. 91). Bāb means (*the*) *gate (of)*, and that is how M&T translate it. But they leave Aqrūbulī just transcribed, while it can be easily read as Acropolis (of Constantinople), which fits the context. In this case, the Sea of Khazars would have been the Black Sea, and it would have been a story of the same raid (which is far more likely). There is a possibility that this sentence describes another raid, which reached Derbent (called then *The Gate of Gates* (Bāb al-Abwāb (باب الأبواب)), on the shores of the Caspian Sea. But the context of Constantinople and the lack of similarity between the names apart from the *bāb* element go against this option. As for PIRONE, II, 18

confused, but shows Al-Ḥālidiyyā's adjacency to Karin. The description of the lands bordering Armeniakon clearly identifies it as Chaldia, placing it between Charsianon and the sea<sup>94</sup>. In another article, Adontz claimed that Al-Ḥālidiyyāt referred to Derxene/Derzene/Derjan<sup>95</sup>. He relies on another mention of Asolik, where John Pörtiz (whose issue will be discussed subsequently) fought Čordvanel (Č'ortuanēl/Tzordvaneli), nephew of Tornik the Monk, an outstanding ally of Phokas in revolt, who took over Taron<sup>96</sup> and Derxene. Assuming Pörtiz is Al-Ġākirūs, this means Al-Ḥālidiyyāt could be some part of Derxene and/or Taron. But this assumption is contrary to Al-Anṭākī, who calls them the rulers of Al-Ḥālidiyyāt before they aided Phokas. Also, while Derxene did belong to the ducate of Chaldia, Taron did not even border it. Moreover, while I do not doubt it is a description of the same events, it is at odds with Al-Anṭākī. Only one person, not two brothers, is mentioned (maybe because only one survived the war). He does not appear to be linked with Tao, but, most of all, he is an ally of Phokas from the start, while the two brothers aided him only when Tao did, and left him when it did, which signals that their claim to Al-Ḥālidiyyāt had not depended on the revolt, because, others wise, they would have had nothing to lose and would have supported him to the hilt. Much depends on who the brothers were; Schlumberger and Honigmann think they are the sons of Bagrat, son of Ashot, that is the nephews of Taronites whom they fought<sup>97</sup>. But would it make sense to call him just Taronites, if they belonged to the same family<sup>98</sup>? One should rather believe Asolik and Adontz. It should be noted that the brothers' kinship with Tornik the Monk explains both their link to Tao and why they received some of the former Chaldian territory. Tornik the Monk was a past Georgian general, to whom Basil II and his brother appealed during the revolt of Skleros, sending him to Tao to obtain, in exchange

---

and n. 29, he believes it is a Caspian city, yet he translates it as Acropolis. And a Greek name in that region should be judged peculiar. He also considers "correcting" it to Ġrūbulī, without any explanation given. The Gate of Acropolis could refer to the Gate of Eugene (Yalı Köşkü Kapısı), the Gate of St. Barbra (Topkapı. This is the most likely option), Değirmen Kapı and Demirkapı. Vide: R. JANIN, *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Paris 1950, p. 484, map I (some typos in the Turkish names were corrected).

<sup>94</sup> IBN ḤURDĀDBIH, *Al-Masālik wa-āl-Mamālik*, ed. M.J. DE GOEJE, Leiden 1889, p. 254–255, 258. Ibn Ḥawqal seems of no use for this matter.

<sup>95</sup> N. ADONTZ, *Les Taronites en Arménie...*, p. 234, also J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 436.

<sup>96</sup> Which may have been the aftermath of the battle against Taronites.

<sup>97</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 436/460, n. 139.

<sup>98</sup> The name sons of Bagrat does not have to necessarily denote their father, but could be their family name, just like, e.g., Maleinos is son of Maleinos, Tzimiskes is son of Tzimiskes, etc. (K&V1, p. 771–772). It is more logical to name them by their family name than direct fatherhood as well, unless Bagrat was already mentioned – and he was not; J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 436/460, n. 139. В.П. РОЗЕН, *Император...*, n. 12, p. 80 had the same idea before me. Yet, in this specific case, it does indicate their father.

for the aforementioned territorial concessions, the reinforcements that were crucial for the defeat of the rebel<sup>99</sup>. It makes sense that some of these lands were given to his family<sup>100</sup>. The issue of Tornik's family was extensively analysed by Adontz, based on several memorials and John Lazaropoulos. While I have some doubts about some of his analysis that would go beyond the scope of this research, I accept his general conclusions: Tornik had a brother named Bagrat, and his sons were named Bagrat and Čordvanel<sup>101</sup>. One must conclude that this Bagrat (or his sons directly) received some part of Chaldia in exchange for the services of his brother, most likely as Georgian vassal(s); these lands could have been Χαλtoyarič, but probably more as well, as it alone would not be able to provide 1000 men mentioned by Al-Anṭākī. His son Čordvanel and his brother captured more lands (more of Derxene<sup>102</sup> and Taron) during the revolt of Phokas, but had their original land they hoped to keep by abandoning the rebel. It is his brother Bagrat who was killed by the Byzantines, since Čordvanel later served the Byzantines and was taken prisoner by Muslims<sup>103</sup>.

<sup>99</sup> ΣΤΕΦ'ΑΝΟΣ, III, 244. The issue also appears in *the Georgian Chronicle*: N. ADONTZ, *Tornik le Moine...*, p. 299–300.

<sup>100</sup> Apart from this, N. ADONTZ, *Tornik le Moine...*, p. 309 claims that the family of Tornik came from the region of Karin. I do not see it as certain. The Armenian cross inscription could refer to someone else of the same first of the two names and patronym, living in those times, and these lands could not belong to Tao before they were transferred to it during the revolt of Skleros, as they are too far west. Or the cross could have been raised after the land came into control of the family, after the revolt. If Tornik really came from there, he would not have been a Tao subject prior to the cession, and his Georgian link, attested and crucial for the story, would have been in question. Also (although it goes against my penultimate point as well), why would he, still being a Tao subject, not a Byzantine one, date his cross by Byzantine rulers? As for the hagiography of SS. John & Euthyme mentioning he became a monk in his motherland, it should not be read as that his origin was not in Tao, but to the contrary: that he became a monk there, before moving to Byzantine monasteries (the context in P. PEETERS, *Un colophon géorgien de Thornik le Moine*, AB 50.1, 1932, p. 370, against the cautious idea of the author, supports my claim. Note that the author furnishes other proofs Tornik was of Armenian origin, but Asolik, himself Armenian, claimed he was from Iberia (Georgia)).

<sup>101</sup> N. ADONTZ, *Tornik le Moine...*, p. 310–316. Lazaropoulos mentions the names of the brothers (*commanders of Persarmenia*) and that, on the request of Phokas, they invaded Trabzon, passed Paipert (Bayburt) and camped at Steno ("Strait", which should be interpreted as mountain pass; today it is Mačka in the main road through the Pontus Mountains south of Trabzon: Γ. ΧΡΙΣΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ *et al.*, *Ιστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους*, vol. IX, Ἀθήναι 1979, p. 332. This confirms my conjecture that the brothers intercepted Taronites as he was passing the Pontos Mountains). Note that their rule over Χαλtoyarič would make their expedition against Trabzon geographically natural: N.M. ΠΑΝΑΓΙΟΤΑΚΗΣ, *Fragments of a Lost Eleventh-Century Byzantine Historical Work?*, [in:] *Φιλελλην, Studies in Honour of Robert Browning*, ed. C. CONSTANTINIDES, N.M. ΠΑΝΑΓΙΟΤΑΚΗΣ, E. JEFFREYS, A.D. ANGELOU, Venice 1996, p. 348. I thank A. da Rocha for this book and K. Takirtakoglou for translating this fragment, identification of Steno, providing me with one article on this issue, etc.

<sup>102</sup> As Χαλtoyarič is in Derxene, either all of it was in Tao's hands already (less likely), or the brothers captured the rest during the revolt.

<sup>103</sup> ΣΤΕΦ'ΑΝΟΣ, III, 37 (his supposed death III, 43 and n. 605).

The place where Buwayhid Ṣamṣām al-Dawla was imprisoned by his brother Šaraf al-Dawla could be corrected, as Tadmurī suggests, from Šīrāz (شیراز) to Sīrāf (سیراف), a coastal city in the same region of Fārs/Persis. He bases it on Al-Rūdrāwarī, but this author does not mention Sīrāf itself, but rather a fortress in its province<sup>104</sup>.

K&V mention the presence of Amalfitans in Egypt<sup>105</sup>, as they read the word in question as *Al-Malāfiṭa* (الملافيطة). But ms C and edition of Cheikho<sup>106</sup> read it as *al-qalāfiṭa* (القلافيطة), that is *caulkers*<sup>107</sup>. It is thus crucial to compare the reading of the name Amalfi in other sources. Ibn Ḥawqal names the city Malfi<sup>108</sup>, which does not fit the *Al-Malāfiṭa* form, yet it is attested in an anonymous letter to the caliph Al-Āmir from Cairo Geniza and in *A Letter to a Muslim Friend* by Paul, the bishop of Sidon, which makes no doubt that it refers to the Amalfitans<sup>109</sup>. I believe that the adjective form was not created directly from the name of the city, but rather from European adjectives, e.g. *amalphanus*. As A. Roberts notices<sup>110</sup>, this form is somewhat analogous to the noun *Amrikān* derived directly from the adjective *American*, and not from the name America (*Amīrikā*, dialectally *Amrikā*) itself. Yet note that ms C often makes the most sense of all<sup>111</sup>, and its testimony can be

<sup>104</sup> K&V2, p. 432; TADMURĪ, p. 216, n. 5; RUDHRAWARI, p. 149 (the association of this event with another person in the index on p. 127 is an obvious mistake). See also p. 134, where an unnamed fortress in Fārs/Persis is mentioned as the place of Ṣamṣām al-Dawla's banishment, p. 160, where he is imprisoned in an unnamed fortress which, as the context indicates, was located somewhere in the general region of Šīrāz (the capital of Fārs, which Sīrāf belonged to), and p. 161, where it is mentioned that (after he was released) Ṣamṣām al-Dawla came to be in (*ḥaṣala fi*) Šīrāz, which probably suggests he was previously imprisoned somewhere else. PIRONE, X, 174, n. 161 indicates something which occurred to me as well: that the next sentence, mentioning Šaraf al-Dawla taking Šīrāz and Baghdad, suggests Tadmurī is right (because how could Šaraf al-Dawla exile his brother to a place he has not taken yet). But this relies on the intuitive, but false assumption of the chronological order, which is directly negated by the previous sentence, which mentions taking Baghdad, which clearly was not captured twice (as well as it is unlikely to hold Sīrāf without holding Šīrāz). Thus the next, ending sentence should not be seen as a subsequent action, but as a summary of the paragraph.

<sup>105</sup> K&V2, p. 448.

<sup>106</sup> CHEIKHO, p. 178, n. 15.

<sup>107</sup> PIRONE, XI, 30, n. 38 speaks of the two possibilities.

<sup>108</sup> IBN ḤAWQAL, *Kitāb Ṣūrat al-Arḍ*, ed. J.H. KRAMERS, Leiden 1938, p. 202.

<sup>109</sup> V. VON FALKENHAUSEN, *Il Commercio di Amalfi con Costantinopoli e il Levante nel secolo XII*, [in:] *Amalfi, Genova, Pisa e Venezia. Il commercio con Costantinopoli e il vicino Oriente nel secolo XII*, ed. O. BANTI, Pisa 1995, p. 24, n. 28. I thank A. Roberts & L. McMahon for their article, and also M. Diez & D. Moroz for their comments.

<sup>110</sup> In private correspondence.

<sup>111</sup> E.g., other manuscripts give a fantastic number of 200,000 Georgian soldiers blinded by Basil II, but ms C speaks of 200 only (K&V3, p. 460, n. 6). M&T not only ignore that, but mistranslate *min aṣḥābihi*, *his comrades* (soldiers), as *his subjects*, as speaking of 200,000 blinded soldiers would be patently absurd. Ms C solves this problem. PIRONE, XV, 27, n. 27 gives a detailed comment, but is too gentle, describing number 200 as merely *more plausible*, especially since he speaks of two hundred thousand *aristocrats*. Also, while other manuscripts mention the return of (all) the population

preferred. On the other hand, Byzantine ships could have gone up the Nile<sup>112</sup>, but their (and the caulkers', who would not need to travel away from the ships) presence in Miṣr (the capital of Egypt) is less likely than in the coastal ports<sup>113</sup>. It is important for the history of trade between Italy and the East.

While Al-Anṭākī mentions that Al-Ḥākim summoned the Tamīm Arabs from the deserts of Syria to help him against the Sunni revolt of Abū Rakwa, the name of the tribe should be corrected to Ṭayy/Tayyi', because Tamīm lived in Iraq<sup>114</sup> and were thus not subject to Al-Ḥākim, while the one that answered this call was Al-Mufarriġ Ibn al-Ġarrāḥ, the leader of Ṭayy, which indeed lived in Syria. This issue was ignored by translators<sup>115</sup>.

Although this is unsure, I propose that *K-f-r-bā* (كفريا) in the West, where John, the Jacobite patriarch, was exiled<sup>116</sup>, can be corrected to *Kafarnā* (كفرننا), that is Kavarna, a coastal city in Bulgaria. The synodal decree of Constantinopolitan patriarch Alexios mentions the monastery of Ganos (Gaziköy in Thrace) as the place of John's confinement<sup>117</sup>, which is supported by Michael the Syrian, who

---

of Mopsuestia from the Muslim lands after the economic situation improved following the Byzantine conquest, while ms C mentions, much more reasonably, only of *some* of the inhabitants returning (K&V1, p. 797, n. 8), which K&V and PIRONE, VII, 79 ignore.

<sup>112</sup> It is noteworthy that the warships that were to fight Byzantium were not launched on the seashore, but in a shipyard in the agglomeration of Miṣr: K&V1, p. 780.

<sup>113</sup> Especially since if their ship had accompanied them, they would have been sleeping in it, and not on land.

<sup>114</sup> M. LECKER, *Tamīm b. Murr*, [in:] *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition* (cetera: EI2), vol. X, ed. P.J. BEARMAN, Th. BIANQUIS, C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, W.P. HEINRICHS, Leiden 2000, p. 175.

<sup>115</sup> K&V2, p. 476, 478; PIRONE, XII, 75, 81 and n. 91.

<sup>116</sup> K&V3, p. 490.

<sup>117</sup> A.M. ROBERTS, *Heretics, Dissidents, and Society. Narrating the Trial of John bar 'Abdun*, DOP 72, 2022, p. 130. The author (p. 134–136) is also completely right in assuming that *the heretic refused* refers to John refusing to acknowledge the Seven Holy Councils, and not to the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch refusing to participate in John's trial, as M&T think. But he seems wrong in assuming (p. 135) that *fa-* indicates a change of subject here (Kazimirski does mention such usage, but in dialogues). Note that sudden changes of grammatical subject are frequent in this chronicle, so there is no reason to overthink this issue. *Fa-* can, however, mean *but*, apart from its usual meanings (see Kazimirski). His idea (p. 136) to correct *heretic* (الأرطوقي) to *Antiochene* (الأنطاكي) is too large and unnecessary. D. GYLLENHAAL, *Byzantine Melitene and the Social Milieu of the Syriac Renaissance*, DOP 75, 2021, *passim*, esp. p. 225, n. 109 believes Al-Anṭākī referred to the Chalcedonian patriarch, and brings up two important points. One, which also occurred to me, is that the next reference to John is with his full name and title, which may seem strange if the previous one also referred to him. But such situations do occur in Al-Anṭākī, e.g. K&V3, p. 444 Al-Ḥākim is mentioned a number of times by pronouns, and then he is mentioned by his full name; p. 436 he is the subject of one sentence, and yet his name is repeated in the next one; p. 492 *king Romanos* is the subject of a number of actions, and then he is unnecessarily repeated as *the king*, even though the subject does not change; p. 494 Aleppo is mentioned by pronouns, and then as *the city*. More importantly, Michael the Syrian (MICHEL LE SYRIEN, *Chronique*, XIII, 6, vol. III, trans. J.-B. CHABOT, Paris 1905 (cetera: MICHEL

calls it G'ws/Gaius/Gayos<sup>118</sup>. Bar Hebraeus (correctly: Bār ʿIbrāyo) adds to that *at the border of the Bulgarians* (Abbeloos/Lamy) or *in the region of the Bulgarians* (Assemani and prof. M. Abdalla, who claims it means *inside the borders of the Bulgarians*)<sup>119</sup>. The difference, as Prof. W. Witakowski<sup>120</sup> explains, springs from A&A's surmise of *səyamē* sign, reading it in plural: *ba-ṭhūmē*, while A&L assume its lack, reading it in singular: *ba-ṭhūmā*. But Gayos is mentioned as a mountain in Macedonia in another reference<sup>121</sup>, which confirms it is Ganos. However John's place of exile could have changed, especially since Michael of Tinnīs mentions a monastery on one of the islands close to (one day away from) Constantinople instead<sup>122</sup>. Kavarna did exist at this time<sup>123</sup>, although we do not know what it was called (some claim it was originally called Karvuna, but others ascribe this name to modern Balchik<sup>124</sup>) or if there was a monastery there (but Al-Anṭākī does not mention one).

M&T ignore a C addition<sup>125</sup>, which mentions, apart from Tinnīs & Damietta, two more places in which attires were produced for Caliph Al-Ḥākīm: Tūna<sup>126</sup> and *B-NĪL-H* (*Banīla/Bunayla/Banaylā*<sup>127</sup>), a place which does not seem to be mentioned by any other source. The only city in Egypt whose name is remotely reminiscent of this one seems to be Al-Balaynā/Al-Balayna. It is an old city, but too

---

LE SYRIEN), p. 139) describes the good relations between the two patriarchs, and that Michael refused to attend. However it is a hagiography, in which respect of people even of a different creed is supposed to emphasise the sainthood of John. Moreover, Michael lived after Al-Anṭākī, and he (or the hagiographer of John) could have misunderstood his account, and further embellished it. And if the Chalcedonian patriarch Nicholas refused to sign the decision (unlike his successor), it is perhaps due to what the author himself mentions (p. 225), the independence of the patriarch of Antioch from the one in Constantinople.

<sup>118</sup> MICHEL LE SYRIEN, XIII, 6, vol. III, p. 144; A.M. ROBERTS, *Heretics...*, p. 134, n. 131. Because *kafar-* is a typical beginning of village names in Syria, albeit the place is described by Al-Anṭākī as *in the West*, the author mentions Kafarbayyā (in Cilicia), but concludes it does not match.

<sup>119</sup> GREGORIUS BARHEBRÆUS, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, vol. I, ed. J.B. ABBELOOS, Th.J. LAMY, Lovanium 1872, p. 429–430 & n. 3 of the Latin text. I thank M. Abdalla & M. Woźniak-Bobińska for their help, as well as M. Klimiuk, K. Moycho & B. VEST, *Geschichte der Stadt Melitene und der umliegenden Gebiete*, vol. II, Hamburg 2007, p. 1217, who supports the A&A version.

<sup>120</sup> In private conversation. I express my gratitude.

<sup>121</sup> B. VEST, *Geschichte...*, vol. II, p. 1217.

<sup>122</sup> SAWĪRUS IBN AL-MUḤAFFAʿ, *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*, vol. II.2, ed., trans. A.S. ATIYA, Y. ʿABD AL-MASĪḤ, Le Caire 1948, p. 218–219, 144–145 (ar.).

<sup>123</sup> St. WAKLINOW, *Kultura staro-bułgarska*, trans. K. WIERZBICKA, Warszawa 1984, p. 167.

<sup>124</sup> [https://www.olkas.net/lemmata/41\\_Kavarna](https://www.olkas.net/lemmata/41_Kavarna) [1 VI 2025]; [https://www.olkas.net/lemmata/30\\_Karvuna](https://www.olkas.net/lemmata/30_Karvuna) (?) [1 VI 2025]. PIRONE, XVI, 3, n. 3 names it Kafarbā and has unnecessary doubts if *Al-Maḡrib* is simply the *West*, despite the context of the usage of this term (K&V2, p. 430, n. 12, also in the context of the Balkans) and that Byzantium did not own any land in Maghreb at that time.

<sup>125</sup> K&V2, p. 503, n. 15. PIRONE, XII, 152 ignores this addition as well.

<sup>126</sup> AL-MAQRĪZĪ, *Al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, vol. I, ed. M. ZAYNUHUM, M. AL-ŠARQĀWĪ (written: AL-ŠARQĀWĀ), Cairo 1998 (cetera: AL-MAQRĪZĪ Ḥ), p. 510 confirms producing caliphal attires there.

<sup>127</sup> Banīla is surrounded by city names, so interpreting it as *bi-Nīlihi*, *in/by its Nile/indigo*, would not fit the context, and the pronoun would have been in the wrong gender.

remote, as it is located in Upper Egypt. Interestingly, Al-Maqrīzī mentions the wars between the kings of Al-Balaynā and Al-Faramā (Pelusium) as responsible for the emergence of the Al-Manzila Lake that surrounds Tinnīs and Tūna<sup>128</sup>.

Tall Ḥāṣid (تل حاصد) should be corrected to Tall Ḥāṣil (تل حاصل), as it is an actual village of a similar name, meaning (*The Hill of the Reaper* changed into *The Hill of the Obtainer*) and location. This change was considered by earlier editions and translations already<sup>129</sup>.

### Given names

Due to the mentions in Skylitzes<sup>130</sup>, I believe that *Ibn al-Balaṅtis* (ابن البلنطس), a K&V correction based on Ibn al-‘Adīm<sup>131</sup>, should be translated as (*son of*) Balantes. The manuscripts of Al-Anṭākī name him *Ibn al-Balaqṭis* (البلقطس; PBS), *Ibn al-Balaṭṭis* (البلططس; L) and *Ibn al-Ṭalaqṭis* (التلقطس; C). Cheikho corrects it to *Ibn al-Bāḡan-itīs* (الباعنطس), and K&V consider reading it as *son of Arabanitis*<sup>132</sup>, because of a person with a similar surname in *DAI*<sup>133</sup>, but he occurs in a different context, and this interpretation goes too far from the original spelling. Also, Dādān (دادان), the name of an ancestor of a major Fāṭimid *dā‘ī*, could be corrected to Zādān (زادان) or Zadān (زدان)<sup>134</sup>, as well as the name of Fāṭimid vizier Ibn Ṣāḥir (ظاهر) al-Wazzān to Ibn Ṭāḥir (طاهر) al-Wazzān<sup>135</sup>.

Al-Anṭākī mentions an army sent by Basil II to Al-Ḥālidiyyāt. It was led by *Al-Ġākīrūs* (الجاكروس)<sup>136</sup>, whom Forsyth described as a mysterious figure,

<sup>128</sup> AL-MAQRĪZĪ Ḥ, vol. I, p. 498.

<sup>129</sup> K&V 3, p. 396 (ms B *Tall Ḥāṣ*, mss PLS *Tall Ḥāṣ(ṣ?)*) and 397, n. 48; TADMURĪ, p. 320, n. 7; PIRONE, XIII, 25, n. 24.

<sup>130</sup> SKYLITZES, “Constantine, fils de Léon”, IX, 13, p. 177 & “Jean Tzimiskès”, XV, 2, p. 240.

<sup>131</sup> IBN AL-‘ADĪM Z, p. 74–75. On the second page, he mentions his name or title (الرسن) Al-R-S-T, but I do not know how to interpret it. In the context of Ani hypothesis, one has to exclude the possibility of it being Orestes or Aristos, because such a name is written differently, for example by Al-Anṭākī: K&V 1, p. 803.

<sup>132</sup> K&V 1, p. 774. PIRONE, VII, 12, n. 33 does not provide any new information, and A.A. VASILIEV, *Byzance et les Arabes...*, p. 97 just calls him *son of Al-Balaṅtas*.

<sup>133</sup> CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*, XLV, 133, ed. Gy. MORAVCSIK, ed., trans. R.J.H. JENKINS, Washington 1967: Arrhabonitis.

<sup>134</sup> K&V 1, p. 748. K&V indicate (n. 4) that the name is written differently by various sources. The first alternative is taken from W. MADELUNG, *Manṣūr al-Yaman*, [in:] *EI2*, vol. VI, ed. C.E. BOWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS, Ch. PELLAT, W.P. HEINRICHS, Leiden 1991, p. 438–439. The second alternative is from the best informed source: AL-NU‘MĀN, p. 2. PIRONE, V, 3 (V.1.3.) does not mention alternatives.

<sup>135</sup> AL-MAQRĪZĪ, *Itti‘āz al-Ḥunafā’*, vol. II, ed. Ğ. AL-ṬAYYĀL, Cairo 1416/1996 (cetera: Al-Maqrīzī I), p. 44. Al-Maqrīzī was better informed, as he used the semi-official and detailed chronicle of Al-Musabbihī.

<sup>136</sup> K&V 2, p. 429. N. ADONTZ, *Les Taronites en Arménie...*, p. 233 and J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 464 leave it as an *Al-Ġākīrūs* and its equivalent. Note that there must be a vowel

not mentioned by any other source<sup>137</sup>. I surmise *al-* should be exempted from interpretation, and *Ā* interpreted as the similar L letter (اللكروس)<sup>138</sup>. Then we can read it as *Al-Ġalukirūs*: Galokyros. Note that usage of G instead of K does happen, e.g. Galipoli (Gelibolu) was sometimes called Kalipoli, and in this very chronicle, *al-ġātuliq* is the alternative spelling of *katholikos*<sup>139</sup>. Kalokyros was a contemporary name. Skylitzes mentions Kalokyros (Delphinas), killed by Basil II for supporting Bardas Phokas (so he cannot be him), and another Kalokyros, who was a son of a *strategos* of Cherson, and was sent by Nikephoros II to the Ruthenians, to convince them to attack the Bulgarians, but later on tried to convince them to attack Byzantium and to make him the emperor. Subsequently, he escaped to Ruthenia<sup>140</sup>; he is unlikely to be Galokyros. But since Delphinas was killed in the aftermath of the Chrysopolis battle<sup>141</sup>, and Al-Anṭākī's Galokyros appeared with his army in the aftermath of this clash, and that of Abydos, perhaps Al-Anṭākī mixed the names associated with this war. Tadmurī identifies *Al-Ġākirūs* with *John Portez (Portiz)*<sup>142</sup>, which is based on Adontz and Asolik<sup>143</sup>. My interpretation gives an explanation on why his name is different in this chronicle.

The name *Biḡās*<sup>144</sup> should be read Pegasios. It was suggested already by Honigmann<sup>145</sup> and is supported by this, that Skylitzes mentions Skleros' associate of this name, who became the commander of Nicaea<sup>146</sup>.

سباع is *Ibn Sibā'*, not *Ibn Sabbā'*<sup>147</sup>. *Sabbā'* is a grammatical form of a profession, or often repeated action, making it someone who *makes seven*, or strikes from afar, or attacks like a ferocious beast, or steals. But if it was a name of a profession, it would have been defined by *al-*. On the other hand, *sibā'* means *ferocious beasts, lions*, and it does function as a proper name<sup>148</sup>, making *al-* unnecessary.

---

between K and R, because Arabic does not usually tolerate two consecutive letters with a *sukūn*, thus it should not be read as Al-Ġākrūs, but, e.g. as Al-Ġākirūs.

<sup>137</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 465.

<sup>138</sup> Conf. the aforementioned case of Ṭāysirā/Ṭilsirā corrected to Ṭilistrā.

<sup>139</sup> K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 488. Note that it is also in the context of Georgia.

<sup>140</sup> SKYLITZES, "Nicéphore Phocas", XIV, 20, p. 232–233; "Jean Tzimiskès", XV, 5, p. 242–243, XV, 9, p. 248; "Basile et Constantin", XVI, 17, p. 280–281.

<sup>141</sup> And there is no doubt about that, as a column commemorating his execution stood there in the 11<sup>th</sup> c.: C. HOLMES, *Basil II...*, p. 267, n. 50, citing Symeon the New Theologian.

<sup>142</sup> TADMURĪ, p. 214, n. 5. Repeated by PIRONE, X, 168, n. 154.

<sup>143</sup> STEP'ANOS, III, 28, p. 290, n. 488. The translator, on the basis of III, 34, identifies J. Portiz with John Chaldos (or, as N. ADONTZ, *Tornik le Moine...*, p. 305 calls him, of *Chaldia*; the origin of Portiz surname he describes as unclear), which ironically sounds similar to Al-Ḥālidīyyāt. May it be that yet another mistake was made, and the two brothers were linked to Chaldia in place of the man they defeated?

<sup>144</sup> K&V<sub>2</sub>, p. 466. PIRONE, XII, 47, n. 57 only transcribes the name and enigmatically claims *the Arabic form is Biḡās*.

<sup>145</sup> E. HONIGMANN, *Die Ostgrenze...*, p. 108, n. 6. Also C. HOLMES, *Basil II...*, p. 268.

<sup>146</sup> SKYLITZES, "Basile et Constantin", XVI, 7, p. 271.

<sup>147</sup> K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 386.

<sup>148</sup> E.g. <https://islamic-content.com/t/8126> [1 VI 2025]. PIRONE, XIII, 5 gives the correct form.

K&V call the Georgian minister *R-FĀD-S* (رفادس), in PS: *R-FĀR-S* (رفارس), in ms B and Cheikho's edition: *R-FĀD-S* (رفادس)<sup>149</sup>. G. Narimanishvili from the Free University of Tbilisi<sup>150</sup> indicates one should correct it to *Zviad(us)* (زفادس)<sup>151</sup>, a popular Georgian name.

### Byzantine trivia

There is also a number of small corrections concerning Byzantine emperors. According to K&V, Romanos I died on Thursday, 10 July 1259/948<sup>152</sup>. But it reads *al-ḥāmīs ‘ašar* (the fifteenth), not *al-ḥāmīs al-‘āšir* (Thursday, the tenth), and it would not have been Thursday anyway. Thus the former emperor died five days later than K&V claim. Note that the Muslim calendar date, provided alongside the Seleukid one, claims he died on 14 July 948<sup>153</sup>. Additionally, Forsyth rightly corrects the date of Caliph Al-Mu‘izz's death from 18 November to 18 December 975, based on the second mention of Al-Anṭākī and other sources<sup>154</sup>. There is a number of other small adjustments that can be made to dates provided by Al-Anṭākī, which I consider presenting in a separate study.

K&V translation says Nikephoros concluded a peace with the Ruthenians, *who became his allies*. But the Arab text says *and they were his supporters*, not that they *became* them. K&V thus distorted the meaning of the sentence to fit the context, but there is a simpler solution. One should believe ms R, which omits a dot, turning حزباً (*party*, that is *supporters*) into حرباً (*war*, that is *enemies*). Nikephoros concluded peace with the Ruthenians *who* (until then) *were his enemies*<sup>155</sup>.

Al-Anṭākī writes about the people Theophano gathered against Nikephoros Phokas: *yaṭīq bihim* (يثق بهم) *whom (Nikephoros) trusted*. But Cheikho corrects it to *taṭīq bihim* (تثق بهم) *whom she trusted*<sup>156</sup>, and that is much more likely when it comes to the context of the sentence.

The description of Nikephoros Ouranos as (العفلس) was not translated by K&V, and even the letters were not recognised (they are missing dots)<sup>157</sup>. On the basis of the shape of the word, and the mention of Al-Rūḍrāwarī<sup>158</sup>, who describes

<sup>149</sup> K&V3, p. 466.

<sup>150</sup> In a private conversation. I also thank him for an answer concerning the Kura River.

<sup>151</sup> PIRONE, XV, 37 calls him Rafādas.

<sup>152</sup> K&V1, p. 741.

<sup>153</sup> PIRONE, III, 12 translates it right.

<sup>154</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 77.

<sup>155</sup> K&V1, p. 813 and n. 7. Note a partial analogy in context of Ruthenians: K&V2, p. 423.

<sup>156</sup> K&V1, p. 829; PIRONE, VIII, 29. SKYLITZES, "Nicéphore Phocas", XV, 22, p. 235 simply says *her men* in this context, which suggests people she trusted. But LEO, V, 6–7, p. 136–137 mentions that it was Tzimiskes who chose them, and they are described as *his fellow conspirators*, which does not support any of the versions.

<sup>157</sup> K&V2, p. 446; PIRONE, XI, 27 transcribes it as *Qyqls*.

<sup>158</sup> RUDHRAWARI, p. 28 (ar. 29).

Oouranos as *kanikleios* (*al-kāniklī* الكانكلي) I identify this word as *kanikleios* (*al-qaniqlis* القنقلس)<sup>159</sup>.

M&T describe Basil II's attitude towards Abū ʾl-Hayḡā', the defeated pretender to the throne of Aleppo, as enigmatic *using concealment towards him*, due to the more obvious grammatical interpretation of *dārā* as the III form of DRY root. But it is also a peculiar III form of DR' root (see Kazimirski), which has more fitting meanings: either making someone go away, chasing him away, or treating someone sweetly, flattering him, but sometimes hiding hatred at the same time<sup>160</sup>.

Al-Anṭākī mentions the freeing of the trade of Aleppo with *neighbouring* lands of the Romans, and so it is translated by M&T. But the wrong gender of the word *al-muḡāwirūn*, which is masculine personal plural, while the lands are feminine singular, indicates it is accidental repetition of the same word used in the previous line, referring to correspondence with Byzantine governors. One should trust mss CPLS, omitting this word<sup>161</sup>. This indicates that the trade between Aleppo and Byzantium was not necessarily limited to a local one.

The son of Bardas Phokas, Nikephoros, is described by Al-Anṭākī as *al-mu'awwaḡ*<sup>162</sup>, which may mean being bent/crooked in character (*sinful*<sup>163</sup>) or physically. K&V translate it both ways (*deceitful, crooked-necked*), but the author must have meant only one of them; Forsyth and Pirone chose the second<sup>164</sup>. Adontz and H. Gregoire devoted an entire article to this sobriquet, but, while they do mention a similar description of Nikephoros' neck in Byzantine chants and Armenian sources, they believe K&V were influenced in their translation by Schlumberger, and say Al-Anṭākī did not mention the neck. Yet in a further mention, Al-Anṭākī does call Nikephoros *al-mu'awwaḡ al-ruqba*, that is *crook-necked*<sup>165</sup>, but the third part of Al-Anṭākī, where this mention occurs, was not yet published at that time. This led them to consider, albeit with doubt, the *extremely ingenious* claim of P. Peeters, that the mention of the neck is due to the Armenian translation of the Phokas family name. But the occurrence of this sobriquet in a contemporary Arabic text, which does not seem to have Armenian sources, makes Peeters' claim even more dubious, and the lack of the mention of the neck would not make Al-Anṭākī's description fit his claim anyway<sup>166</sup>.

<sup>159</sup> This word was ignored by E. McGEER, *Tradition and Reality in the "Taktika" of Nikephoros Ouranos*, DOP 45, 1991, p. 130, n. 8, who mentions a seal, ascribed to him by V. Laurent due to his name and by Forsyth, who, according to McGEER (p. 130, n. 7) gave the most detailed description of these events. But N. ADONTZ, *Samuel...*, p. 363, n. 38 made the same discovery before me.

<sup>160</sup> K&V 3, p. 392. PIRONE, XIII, 18 claims that Basil *denied having seen him*, perhaps *refused to see him*, which is merely a surmise.

<sup>161</sup> K&V 3, p. 404, n. 8.

<sup>162</sup> K&V 2, p. 424.

<sup>163</sup> It does not refer to him being crooked due to being a rebel, as there is no reason why Al-Anṭākī would be so supportive towards Basil, and single out Nikephoros out of many others.

<sup>164</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p.144–145435; PIRONE, X, 157.

<sup>165</sup> K&V 3, p. 462.

<sup>166</sup> N. ADONTZ, H. GREGOIRE, *Nicéphore au col roide*, B 8, 1933, p. 203–212, esp.144–145210.

After it was mentioned that Basil II used to moderate himself in food and drink, Al-Anṭākī writes (وترثيه لازما الحمية)<sup>167</sup>. M&T, accepting Cheikho's correction of the first word into (وزيه), translate it as *and (in) clothes, proving his great zeal*. But *lāziman* is not *proving* nor *displaying*, nor anything similar, but rather *persevering* in something. And it is more likely that the author meant *ḥimya*, that is *abstinence* (especially in eating), or a *diet*, and not *ḥamiyya*, *zeal* (it could also be *ḥammiya*, that is *thermal waters*). And if so, it would be more likely that the information between two mentions of a diet should refer to the diet as well, and not to clothes. The correction seems likely and partly corresponds to the description saying that Basil asked to be buried in modest clothes in the very same fragment, and, as M&T mention, to what Psellos wrote about Basil limiting himself in clothing as well<sup>168</sup>. But – unless it is a C variant that Cheikho did not ascribe to it – it seems too big an interference in the text, as it would require omitting one letter. One may better correct it to (وترثيه) *and (in) his self-adorning*. But it is unnecessary, and (وترثيه) means that he was firm, did not move, or was set in order. This fits the context: *he kept limiting himself in his food and drink, and was firm in it, persisting in diet all his life*<sup>169</sup>.

When Romanos III demanded that the two young emirs of Aleppo exchange the city for other lands, he was not just *sure of their quick reply*, as M&T claim, but of a *positive* one, because *reply* in Arabic implies agreement<sup>170</sup>. This is important because, together with other factors, it suggests Aleppo was not the main goal of Romanos, as is commonly assumed – because he would not need to gather a massive army if he was sure none would be necessary. And while the low quality of soldiers may seem to be an indication that he did not plan to use his army in the field, his message to the Ṭayy tribe indicates he planned to go at least as far as Palestine<sup>171</sup>.

<sup>167</sup> K&V3, p. 482, n. 18.

<sup>168</sup> PSELLOS, I, 4, p. 3–4 mentions that Basil was moderate in eating and drinking since the revolt of Skleros; I, 22, p. 10 he mentions that Basil used to restrict himself in clothing as well, did not use necklaces, diadems, shining chlamyses framed with purple, or excessive rings, or even multicoloured attire (this would fit the *adorning* correction). He also mentions he enjoyed the pleasures of baths, which would fit the possible mention of thermal waters (which nevertheless I find unlikely); I, 27, p. 12 he mentions his purple shoes; I, 31, p. 14 he mentions that he used purple dress, but not from shining purple, but a dark one, with few pearls; and that he did not use gems nor pearls (mentioned as the most valuable stones).

<sup>169</sup> PIRONE, XV, 70 accepts the correction of Cheikho, but translates the rest as that Basil kept *regime* (diet?) all his life.

<sup>170</sup> K&V3, p. 494. Cf. e.g. K&V3, p. 436.

<sup>171</sup> K&V3, p. 496; M. CZYŻ, *The Syrian Campaign...*, *passim*, esp. p. 246–247. PIRONE, XVI, 14 translates it as that Romanos *recommended* a quick reply. There is not enough of a linguistic basis for this translation. Albeit M&T and I assume *ta'akkada* is a verb, and equals *kāna muta'akkidan*, and it can also be a *maṣḍar*: *ta'akkud*, and be a continuation of a list of *maṣḍars* several lines prior, indicating what the letter of the emperor contained. Then it would mean that the letter included *making (one-self) sure* of a speedy reply/agreement. And only then Pirone's interpretation is remotely possible. But other *maṣḍars* listed refer to Romanos as the subject, and not the two emirs.

Concerning the sending of troops to Aʿzāz by Romanos III, *wa-tabaʿa ḡālika āl-tāʿifa āl-mutaqaddara wa-ḡamāʿa(t ...)* should be corrected to *wa-tabaʿa tilka āl-tāʿifa āl-mutaqaddara ḡamāʿa(t ...)*, that is the gender of the pronoun should be corrected, and one *wa-* conjunction removed. Without this change, it is *and this was followed by a well-prepared detachment, people attached to the army, and its (mixed) swarm*, which M&T try to make sense by relating *this* to the previously mentioned detachment sent to Aʿzāz; but it would mean two detachments were sent there, one after another, and the stronger one would not be in front. And that makes less sense<sup>172</sup>.

### Islamic trivia

According to the translation of K&V, the caliphate of Al-Muṭṭīʿ started on Friday. But the Arabic text says it was Thursday<sup>173</sup>.

The translation of K&V claims that Al-Manṣūriyya was founded and Al-Manṣūr moved there in 331 AH, but the Arabic text claims it was in 337 AH<sup>174</sup>. Nevertheless, the footnote of K&V translation gives the correct date of (11 July 948 – 30 June 949).

The edition of K&V rightly corrects *ṣūrahā* (صورها) to *quṣūrahā* (قصورها)<sup>175</sup>, thus telling that Ziyādat Allāh (the depraved Aghlabid ruler) built palaces, and not *walls*, but the translation ignores this correction and claims he built city walls<sup>176</sup>. Note that *its walls* should be *sūrahā* (سورها), and (صورها) is *ṣuwarahā*, that is *its images*, but mistakes between Ṣ and S often occur in this chronicle, also concerning this specific word<sup>177</sup>. It is significant, as one translation suggests Ziyādat Allāh prepared for the war, and another that he amused himself (which fits the context).

According to the translation of K&V, the letters sent from Egypt asked to *beware the influence* of Al-Mahdī in the Maghreb<sup>178</sup>. But the text *al-mukātabāt [...] bi-āl-inḡār bi-nufūd Al-Mahdī ilā hunāka* must be translated as meaning that the letters were warning about the *arrival (penetration)* of Al-Mahdī in the Maghreb. The preposition *ilā* (*to*, not *in*) points to that<sup>179</sup>.

<sup>172</sup> K&V3, p. 496. PIRONE, XVI, 19 is very far from the original, saying the attack Romanos planned was entrusted to a handful or squad of reinforcements, etc.

<sup>173</sup> K&V1, p. 744. PIRONE, IV, 1 gives the right day.

<sup>174</sup> K&V1, p. 747. PIRONE, IV, 10 gives the right day.

<sup>175</sup> K&V1, p. 751.

<sup>176</sup> The same occurs in PIRONE, V, 12.

<sup>177</sup> K&V3, p. 476, n. 54 (mss P<sup>2</sup>S). I thank the reviewer for reminding me of this issue, as well the articles on the patriarch John.

<sup>178</sup> K&V1, p. 752.

<sup>179</sup> PIRONE, V, 15 has the same idea.

One should accept correction of Tadmurī (based on Ibn al-Aṭīr<sup>180</sup>) and add a preposition (الرجل الذي يدعو [إليه] أبو عبد الله منتسب إليه) *the man for whom Abū ‘Abd Allāh makes da‘wa descends from him*. The correction of K&V based on ms S (الرجل الذي يُدعى أبو عبد الله منتسب إليه) *the man who is called Abū ‘Abd Allāh descends from [or: is attributed to] him* is not convincing, and is not even used in K&V’s translation, which does imply the same addition as in Tadmurī, but seems a guess: *the man for whom Abū ‘Abd Allāh makes da‘wa is the same* (as the man who is in Siġilmāsa)<sup>181</sup>. This correction is of great value, as it could indicate that an eschatological role was ascribed to the future caliph Al-Qā’im from the beginning or may support B. Lewis’ idea that it was Al-Qā’im, and not Al-Mahdī, that was the actual Ismā’īlī imam<sup>182</sup>. But it is worth noting that, in another fragment, Al-Anṭākī claims Abū ‘Abd Allāh was making *da‘wa* for Al-Mahdī<sup>183</sup>.

The translation of K&V claims that the people abandoned the actual founder of the Fāṭimid state, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, because he neglected all the affairs<sup>184</sup>. It is a plain mistake, as the Arab text says they abandoned him, and (caliph Al-Mahdī) did not allow him to supervise<sup>185</sup> any matter (*wa-īnḥarafū ‘an Abī ‘Abd Allāh walam yaġ‘al lahu naẓaran fī šay’<sup>186</sup> min al-ašyā’*; because he did it all himself)<sup>187</sup>. This is important for the assessment of Abū ‘Abd Allāh and the internal history of the early Fāṭimid state, as well as for the assessment of Al-Anṭākī’s attitude towards the Fāṭimids<sup>188</sup>.

<sup>180</sup> IBN AL-AṬĪR, vol. V, p. 19.

<sup>181</sup> K&V 1, p. 753 and (the same translation) PIRONE, V, 18; TADMURĪ, p. 63.

<sup>182</sup> F. DACHRAOUI, *Al-Ḳā’im (bi-amr Allāh)*, [in:] *EI2*, vol. IV, ed. E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS, Ch. PEL-LAT, C. E. BOSWORTH, p. 458–459.

<sup>183</sup> K&V 1, p. 755.

<sup>184</sup> K&V 1, p. 756.

<sup>185</sup> Literally “make him supervise”.

<sup>186</sup> In the text *šamā* (شَمَى; no meaning apart from *šammā* being a colloquial name for smelling), which I correct to *šay’* (شَيْء, often incorrectly spelled شَيْء) the way CHEIKHO, p. 108 and TADMURĪ, p. 65 read it.

<sup>187</sup> PIRONE, V, 29 translates it similarly to K&V, saying that people turned away from Abū ‘Abd Allāh, as he did not think about their matters.

<sup>188</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 348–349 (also 195), despite being brilliant overall, repeats uncritically the error of K&V and lists it as one of the examples of Al-Anṭākī’s pro-Fāṭimid bias, which leads him to certainty that Al-Anṭākī drew his information from an Ismā’īlī source (aside from Ibn Zūlāq and Al-Musabbiḥī; p. 70, 140). Moreover, he claims that the mention that Al-Mahdī *exhibited* modesty and humility is an example of this alleged bias. But Al-Anṭākī did not claim Al-Mahdī *was* modest, but that he *exhibited* being so, for political gain. As for his source, the semi-official Fāṭimid description of these events praised Abū ‘Abd Allāh, did not mention any faults of his apart from following his brother in calcitrancy, and said that the same caliph who killed him prayed for him at his funeral and praised him, only condemning his brother: AL-NU‘MĀN, p. 316. And the descriptions of Al-Anṭākī seem independent from Al-Nu‘mān, for example he praises Caliph Al-Manṣūr a lot (K&V 1, p. 746–747), while AL-NU‘MĀN, p. 33–335 gives him the most modest description in size of the caliphs he mentions.

Next, significantly, correction concerns the mention of *Ka'la Ībn Aḥmad Ibn al-Faḥ*, the supposed ruler of Ifkān and caliph Al-Šākir bi-Āllāh<sup>189</sup>. As one can see in Al-Fāsī and Ibn Ḥaldūn<sup>190</sup>, this is in fact a distorted reference to two people: Ya'la Ībn Muḥammad Ibn Šāliḥ al-Yifrānī, the ruler of Ifkān (in Algeria), and Muḥammad Ibn al-Faḥ, known as Wāšūl Ibn Maymūn Ibn Midrār al-Šufrī, the ruler of Siḡilmāsa (in Morocco), who declared himself caliph. It appears that, while copying information from Al-Fāsī or their common source, Al-Anṭākī (or his early copyist) skipped a line or two<sup>191</sup>. Without this correction, the understanding of the dynamics in North Africa would be completely wrong.

K&V omitted a sentence in their translation<sup>192</sup>. It informs us that Al-'Azīz, before going to Syria to battle Alftakīn, left Ḡabr Ibn al-Qāsim as his deputy in Mišr<sup>193</sup>. This is a unique situation, because it is the only time that a Fāṭimid caliph led an expedition himself<sup>194</sup>, giving rise to the need for a deputy in the capital. This significant detail is not present in the most important extant source for the Fāṭimid history, *Itti'āz*, even though Al-Maqrīzī confirms this person existed (he was the commander of the Lower Police)<sup>195</sup>, as well as that the decision of Al-'Azīz was revolutionary: the entire population of the city went out to the caliph's Byzantine-silk tent, begging him not to go<sup>196</sup>.

K&V say Banḡūtakīn fought against Aleppo for *a year and 30 days* (سنة وثلاثين يوماً), and returned to Damascus in Raḡab (2 September – 1 October 992)<sup>197</sup>. According to mss BLS and Cheikho edition Banḡūtakīn fought against Aleppo for *a year and a month* (سنة وشهر)<sup>198</sup>. One should correct it to *thirty six days* (سنة وثلاثين يوماً). The author does not mention the year to which he refers. He says *of the year*, when the last mentioned year was 382 AH (and such a date I assumed). While over a year of fighting would indicate the next year, which would give the date of

<sup>189</sup> CHEIKHO, p. 113; K&V1, p. 770; TADMURĪ, p. 82.

<sup>190</sup> AL-FĀSĪ, *Kitāb al-Ānīs al-Muṭarrib bi-Rawḍ al-Qirtās fī Aḥbār Mulūk al-Maḡrib wa-Tārīḥ Madīnat Fās*, ed. K.Y. TÜRNBERĠ (C.J. TORNBORG), Ūbsāla (Uppsala) 1843, p. 55; IBN KHALDOUN (IBN ḤALDŪN), *Histoire des Berbères et des dynasties musulmanes de l'Afrique Septentrionale (Berbères)*, vol. II, trans. M. LE BARON DE SLANE, Alger 1854, p. 543.

<sup>191</sup> TADMURĪ, p. 82, n. 2 and PIRONE, VII, 2 & n. 1 correct the name to Ya'la Ībn Muḥammad, but are not aware of the reference to Ibn Midrār.

<sup>192</sup> K&V2, p. 391.

<sup>193</sup> PIRONE, X, 55 mentions this event.

<sup>194</sup> He started an expedition against Byzantium as well, but died on his way: K&V2, p. 450.

<sup>195</sup> AL-MAQRĪZĪ I, vol. I, p. 216. The Lower Police was the police stationed around the Lower Mosque (of 'Amr Ibn al-Āṣ).

<sup>196</sup> AL-MAQRĪZĪ I, vol. I, p. 242.

<sup>197</sup> K&V2, p. 439. PIRONE, XI, 6 distorts it further into *a year and three days*. Th. BIANQUIS, *Damas et la Syrie sous la domination Fatimide (359–468 / 969–1076)*, vol. I, Damas[us] 1986, p. 197 *de facto* assumes this date.

<sup>198</sup> M. CANARD, *L'Histoire des Hamdanides de Jazira et de Syrie*, Algiers 1953, p. 699, n. 249 had the same idea before me (سنة وثلاثين), and noted the problem was already mentioned by Rozen.

22 August – 20 September 993. The next date is 383 AH already. But if we assume that date, the return of Baṅğütakīn from Aleppo, as well as his expedition against Apamea, would take place in the same month (Rağab 383). Because he went from Aleppo in Rağab 383 (22 August – 20 September 993), but the capitulation of Apamea took place on 10 Rağab 383 (31 August 993) already, so Baṅğütakīn would have to leave Aleppo, go to Damascus, go north again, capture Apamea and Šayzar in an insufficiently short period of 22–31 August. There are several possibilities to explain this. First: that the information about a fight lasting for more than a year was wrong. And second that Baṅğütakīn took Apamea and Šayzar on another occasion<sup>199</sup>. Third is that Al-Anṭākī gave the wrong date. One can compare the text of Al-Anṭākī with the one of Ibn al-‘Adīm’s *Zubda*<sup>200</sup>. Ibn al-‘Adīm claims that Baṅğütakīn remained besieging Aleppo until the end of 382 AH, that is until 25 February 993. Thus he rested there for six months, which makes me wonder if we should not read *six months* (سنة وأشهر) instead of *a year and a month* (سنة وشهر). If we do, we achieve conformity between Al-Anṭākī and Ibn al-‘Adīm, but it would not fit with Rağab as the month in which Baṅğütakīn would return. The lack of conformity with Ibn al-‘Adīm can be explained by this, that he did not give a precise date – perhaps he was unsure of it (or it was Al-Anṭākī that added the mention of Rağab after misreading the common information and calculating the time). Secondly, but thanks to the correction to *thirty six days* the issue of Rağab is solved. According to Ibn al-‘Adīm, Baṅğütakīn came to Aleppo in *Ğumādā āl-Ūlā and (or?) Ğumādā āl-Uhrā*, that is between 5 July and

<sup>199</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 489–490 basing it on the mention of AL-MAQRĪZĪ I, vol. I, p. 275, claims that Šayzar was captured the previous year already, and its retrieving by Ĥamdānids is unlikely. But its capture that year is confirmed by IBN AL-‘ADĪM Z, p. 106, and it would have been strange for Al-Maqrīzī to be *the most reliable* in this case, taking into account his general ignorance of the matters of Aleppo (e.g. M. Czyż, *The Murder of Fātik and the Fatimid takeover of Aleppo*, [in:] *Bliski Wschód w świecie. Historia, polityka, kultura*, ed. M. WOŹNIAK-BOBIŃSKA, Łódź 2021, p. 29), and that Al-Anṭākī and Ibn al-‘Adīm are more detailed, contemporary and lived in the very region in question. Indeed, there was the expedition that Forsyth and Al-Maqrīzī mention, but that does not mean there were no others before it. The mention of Al-Anṭākī about the expedition of Baṅğütakīn in 393 AH is confirmed by Ibn al-‘Adīm. It is also not true, as Forsyth claims, that, according to Al-Anṭākī, Fātimid forces besieged Aleppo in the autumn of 383 AH, and that the pause in operations for the winter was ignored. There is no mention of the siege of Aleppo in 383 AH, but rather the battles in 383 AH are described, which is followed by the expression *and later* (which in fact suggests a significant amount of time passed), after which the attack on Aleppo is mentioned, and *the Battle of the Ford* that followed it, in 384 AH already. Thus his relation in this matter is exactly like Ibn al-‘Adīm’s. Why Ibn Zāfir mentions an attack on Aleppo in 383 AH, I cannot tell, since this volume is not available to me, but the expression used by it (quoted by Forsyth) is exactly as the one used by Ibn al-‘Adīm concerning the attack on Aleppo the previous year, and I see in the index (IBN ZĀFĪR, *Aḥbār al-Duwal al-Munqaṭi’a*, vol. II, ed. A.F. SAYYĪD, Madīnat Naşr 1417/1996, p. 501) that there is only a single page concerning B(M)anğütakīn in the entire book, so it was not something he discussed thoroughly and it is probably a mistake.

<sup>200</sup> IBN AL-‘ADĪM Z, p. 105–106.

1 September 992. This can fit the information about Baṅḡutakīn staying there for 36 days, for example 30 July – 2 September 992, that is until the first of Raḡab (the earliest date) or 3 August – 7 September 992 (the latest date with the beginning in Ġumādā āl-Ūlā) or 27 August – 1 October 992, that is until the 30 Raḡab (the latest date with Ġumādā āl-Uḥrā)<sup>201</sup>. He thus left Aleppo in Raḡab of 382, and returned to Apamea one year later, in Raḡab 383. This is the most likely version. The siege lasting for over a year was impossible, also because the people were already tired after the first siege, which lasted a month, and threatened the ruler that they would surrender the city if he did not find a solution<sup>202</sup>. So how could they last for a half a year or over a year?

K&V translate a fragment *wa-an yaḥliḥa kull insān bi-mā arāda wa-aḥabba min al-īmān bi-ha'ulā'* as *and that everyone would swear as he wanted and desired, according to the beliefs of a group he belonged to*<sup>203</sup>. It conveys the written message, but it is not precise. The exact translation would be *and that everyone would swear using what he wanted and liked from the belief those* (people, that is the caliphs and comrades of the Prophet).

*Which would be handed over*<sup>204</sup> to him is omitted from the description of the army the emir of Aleppo Ibn Lu'lu' (who eventually became a Byzantine subject) requested from the Fāṭimids<sup>205</sup>. This is, contrary to what it may seem, significant. Ibn Lu'lu' wanted reinforcements from the Fāṭimids, but to remain in control, being afraid of being totally annexed by them. And indeed, he got rid of their forces later on, when their task was done<sup>206</sup>.

M&T's translation of the quality of Ṣāliḥ ibn Mirdās (*tūl isā'atihi/lisānihi*) as *verve* is questionable. It either means long bad treatment, or long tongue (saying too much?)<sup>207</sup>. This explains why Ibn Lu'lu' detested him, which plays a role in the change of the dynasty in Aleppo.

When describing the man whom Caliph Al-Ḥākim ordered his black slave to rape, M&T follow a K&V correction of (المحری) to (المخري)<sup>208</sup> and translate it accordingly, as I did originally, as a vulgar swearword relating to excrements. But such a participle does not exist, nor do verb forms of this root in general. Moreover, Al-Anṭākī never uses swearwords<sup>209</sup>, and even in this description, he uses euphemisms, such as *urethra* for penis. However I am unsure of the actual

<sup>201</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 489 speaks about 1–14 Raḡab.

<sup>202</sup> IBN AL-'ADĪM Z, p. 105.

<sup>203</sup> K&V 2, p. 490. Similarly PIRONE, XII, 117.

<sup>204</sup> *Radda* is often used by the author in the meaning of handing over, not *returning*. e.g. p. 464, 470.

<sup>205</sup> K&V 3, p. 392.

<sup>206</sup> K&V 3, p. 394. PIRONE, XIII, 17 translates it as *that would reach him*, which is imprecise.

<sup>207</sup> K&V 3, p. 394. PIRONE, XIII, 22 translates it as *harm done for a long time*.

<sup>208</sup> K&V 3, p. 408, n. 41. PIRONE, XIII, 48 ignores this word and mistranslates *that he claimed he feels into that everyone imagined he feels*.

<sup>209</sup> *Backward/retarded* in K&V 3, p. 504 should be understood as an euphemism for *stupid*.

meaning. It could be (المحري; IV form), meaning *caused to diminish* (the I form being used about the diminishing of the Moon, thus it could be a pun as his posteriors were described as his *moon*, or could mean his humiliation). The IV form also means being suitable, fit for something, which could mean he was fit to be mistreated. Or it could also be corrected to V form (المتحري), which would mean that he was doing it (being raped) on purpose, which fits the description of him as dissolute and only *alleging* he was feeling pain. It could also mean he was resting in one place, or asking, but the way this word was used (*this...*) discourages from using these meanings. And Cheikho corrects the root to ĞRW/ĜRY, which, in the IV form, means having young ones or executing an order.

M&T omit yet another C addition<sup>210</sup>, which indicates the year that the Fāṭimids appeared in the Maghreb and that their origin was in the Levant.

Concerning why the Damascenes revolted around 1020–1021, the text of the edition says *imti'ādan li-* (...امتعضا لـ) *out of anger with* their governor, who was also the heir apparent of the Fāṭimid caliphate, and that is how M&T translate it; mss PBSR say *imtiġāṣan li-* (...امتغاصا لـ)<sup>211</sup>, but the VIII form of the MĜŞ root does not exist. The I form means piercing someone with a spear (Lane; Kazimirski adds to this having belly aches), and V means having aching stomach, or being hurt by a matter (Lane), or causing belly aches (Kazimirski). The VIII form should be reflexive to I, but its meaning in this case would be conjectural. One can surmise that the one who wrote this form believed it meant that they did it out of the (belly) pain they *made themselves feel for / on behalf of / because of* the heir apparent. I believe it should be understood as that they felt the pain for the sake of him, or it should be corrected to *imti'ātan li-* (...امتعاطا لـ), that is they revolted *due to unsheathing weapons for the sake of* (their governor), or after *imti'ādan li-* expression *mā ġarà li-* should be added<sup>212</sup>, making it “out of anger with what happened to” the heir presumptive. The reason for that is the context of the story. The heir apparent was loved by the people (as he allowed them to drink wine and listen to songs), and hated by the army (because he was stingy). When he allowed himself to be taken by the army to Al-Ḥākim, to be punished, a revolt against him would not make sense, while a revolt out of anger for his treatment would. The leader of the revolt was not his enemy, and joined forces with him subsequently when he was pardoned; he did disobey him, but only later on, as he did not want to stop fighting Fāṭimid forces<sup>213</sup>. Without this correction, the understanding of the revolt in Damascus is completely distorted.

<sup>210</sup> K&V 3, p. 414. PIRONE, XIV, 2 ignores it as well.

<sup>211</sup> K&V 3, p. 430, n. 44. PIRONE, XIV, 32 translates it the same way as M&T, as *due to strong resentment towards the heir apparent*.

<sup>212</sup> Such an expression (*imti'ādan li-mā ġarà*) is used by Al-Anṭākī elsewhere: K&V 3, p. 528.

<sup>213</sup> K&V 3, p. 428–430.

### Christian trivia

Al-Anṭākī mentions attacks on Christians on Friday, the day of holiday of St Lazarus<sup>214</sup>. But the holiday of Lazarus is always Saturday, so one should take into account mss BLS and the edition of Cheikho, which say it happened on *Friday, Saturday night*.

In the text of the guarantee of safety for the Christians of Jerusalem, the word *diyāra* should not be translated as *territories*, but as *monasteries*<sup>215</sup>, as it was translated elsewhere by K&V<sup>216</sup>, and even by M&T themselves<sup>217</sup>. This is important for the history of the monasteries of Jerusalem.

When it is mentioned which churches, monasteries and their possessions were not returned to Christians during the rule of Al-Ḥākim, one of the exceptions is *mā kāna minhā qad ḥaṣala li-man yatawaqqawna šarrahu min al-muslimīn*<sup>218</sup>. M&T think it means *that had been given to Muslims to protect them from poverty*, but while it seems plausible, and I temporarily accepted this interpretation<sup>219</sup>, *šarr* is *evil*, not specifically *poverty*, and it can be both evil done to them (as M&T interpret it) and done by them. The object of the second part of it is *they*, which either should be treated as impersonal as M&T do, or as earlier mentioned Christians, as I claim. It should be interpreted as *what got into the hands of those Muslims whose evil [the Christians] wary of (or: feared, or: guarded themselves from)*. This is very important for understanding the dynamics of the persecutions of Al-Ḥākim. Not everything depended on the ruler, and the order to return Christian property was not always respected; sometimes Christians did not press the issue, because they were afraid of Muslims' reaction<sup>220</sup>. Such a situation also occurred in the case of Jerusalem, where a special document was needed to convince Muslims to allow Christians to pray<sup>221</sup>, and the general hostility towards Christians existed irrespective of Al-Ḥākim's orders, which were rather an outcome of it than the cause of it<sup>222</sup>.

<sup>214</sup> K&V 1, p. 782. PIRONE, VII, 40 ignores this problem too.

<sup>215</sup> K&V 3, p. 436. PIRONE, XIV, 46 agrees with me.

<sup>216</sup> K&V 2, p. 488.

<sup>217</sup> K&V 3, p. 438.

<sup>218</sup> K&V 3, p. 438.

<sup>219</sup> I considered a similar possibility [...] *to protect them from evil*, while thinking it could also mean *that were defending their evil*. But it would fit I form, not V. See M. CZYŻ, *Sytuacja chrześcijan za panowania Kalifa Al-Ḥākima bi-Amr Allāha*, MA thesis written under the supervision of P. LEWICKA, Oriental Studies Faculty, University of Warsaw, 2007, p. 139.

<sup>220</sup> The interpretation of PIRONE, XIV, 49 seems to fit my opinion at least partly.

<sup>221</sup> K&V 3, p. 436.

<sup>222</sup> About the situation of Christians during and before the reign of Al-Ḥākim, see M. CZYŻ, *Al-Ḥākīm's Persecutions of Christians*, PO 39, 2014, p. 1–16; IDEM, *Byzantine Reconquista (10<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> Centuries) and the Attacks on Christians in the Lands of Islam (Egypt, Syria and Iraq)*, SCer 14, 2024, p. 369–388; S.A. ASSAAD, *The Reign of Al-Hakim Bi Amr Allah. A Political Study*, Beirut 1974, p. 93–107.

Concerning the persecution of Christians, when M&T translate the Biblical quote that God will never leave his people without *arkūn*<sup>223</sup>, they translate it as *chief*. Such an interpretation is mentioned by Lane (probably derived from *archont*). But how could Al-Ḥākīm, a Muslim, be the *chief* of Christians? One should rather see it as a distortion of *arkān*, which means *support*. The Biblical quotes Al-Anṭākī probably refers to a mention of God not *leaving his people*, not *leaving them a chief or support*, so they do not support any of the two possibilities<sup>224</sup>.

### Druze trivia<sup>225</sup>

A significant number of possible corrections could or perhaps should be made concerning the Druzes as well. The edition of K&V and M&T translation<sup>226</sup> omit a ms C addition, which replaces part of the text (since the story of people who were too scared to utter their plea before Al-Ḥākīm): *He was brought a note, and [it was written] in it: "We accepted oppression and tyranny, and not impiety and drollery. If you were given secret knowledge, tell us who wrote this page"*. This is important for a number of reasons. It is the only case in the entire chronicle of Al-Anṭākī that any poem is quoted (while Muslim chronicles brim with poetry), but it is also important for the history of political and folk customs in Medieval Egypt, and the popular attitude towards the rise of the Druzes and Al-Ḥākīm's tacit support for them.

M&T ignore ms C addition in their translation, which gives a precise number of early Druzes (16,000)<sup>227</sup>, important information for studying the rise of this sect<sup>228</sup>.

The translation (albeit the most intuitive) of Al-Ḥākīm often consulting Al-Hādī<sup>229</sup> may be corrected, because Al-Hādī considered Al-Ḥākīm to be divine, so how

<sup>223</sup> K&V3, p. 440.

<sup>224</sup> Dt 31.6 & 31.8, Heb 13.5–6, Is 41.8–16, including 41.10–11 & 13, Jo 14.18 (the last one is indicated by PIRONE, XIV, 53, whose translation, in this case, is the same as M&T's).

<sup>225</sup> Al-Anṭākī, albeit hostile towards the Druze, remains one of the chief sources on their origin, as recognised e.g. by M.G.S. HODGSON, *Al-Darazī...*, *passim*. J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 262.

<sup>226</sup> K&V3, p. 416; TADMURĪ, p. 337; CHEIKHO, p. 221. PIRONE, XIV, 5 omits this fragment as well.

<sup>227</sup> K&V3, p. 422, n. 31. PIRONE, XIV, 15 includes this mention in his translation.

<sup>228</sup> J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 236 claims the number was inflated (I do not think it is necessarily the case, as the Al-Fuṣṭāṭ agglomeration was the largest in the Muslim world (AL-MUQADDASĪ, p. 166–168. He mentions (p. 168) that 10,000 people prayed in front of the Lower Mosque alone, and he only believed it when he saw it himself), and the number could include people from outside it as well) and was used by Al-Hādī to make Al-Ḥākīm support his movement, which shows the potential importance of this mention, as well as supports the idea that Al-Ḥākīm was concerned with the number of Al-Hādī's disciples.

<sup>229</sup> K&V3, p. 422 and (the same) PIRONE, XIV, 15.

could he advise God. Perhaps *bi-āl-kuṭra* should not be understood independently as *often*, but rather as *concerning the numerousness* (of Al-Hādī's followers; but the lack of *al-* or a pronoun makes it less likely), which corresponds to the previous sentence, in which Al-Ḥākim used to ask Al-Hādī precisely about that; note that Al-Anṭākī often repeats the same information twice. This is important for understanding the relation of Al-Ḥākim with the early Druze.

Another important information about the Al-Ḥākim and the Druze may be derived from a possible correction of the part where the Druze, as M&T translate it, created a book similar to the (*fī ma'nā*) Quran<sup>230</sup>. It can also be understood as *about the (secret) meaning of the Quran*, which is, however, made less likely by their clear acts of disrespect towards it (alleged pissing on it) mentioned at the same time. Additionally, Al-Hādī accused Al-Darazī of being *ta'wīlī*, that is too preoccupied with the allegoric meanings<sup>231</sup>, which would perhaps not fit this claim, and Al-Hādī himself did not make use of the Quran or the older scriptures<sup>232</sup>. But note that this description is part of a long list of alleged faults of the Druzes, so it could have been one of the untrue accusations, and also, if the Druzes created a holy book, it would have been more known.

M&T claim that Al-Ḥākim, in a text ascribed to him by people, stated that he has already once admonished and threatened (*scared*) them that he would leave them<sup>233</sup>. While it is an opinion I once shared, especially since Al-Ḥākim did disappear eventually, and some believed he withdrew from people, I must conclude it is wrong, because there is no previous mention of him claiming he would leave them. Thus (*'alā*)<sup>234</sup> *mubāyana* should not be read as leaving, mentioned by Kazimirski, Lane, and Wehr, but according to a meaning only mentioned by Wehr, that is that he threatened people not to get into conflict with him, or not to contradict him, which fit other exhortations present in the text. This removes the suggestion that Al-Ḥākim planned his famous disappearance and is thus crucial for understanding the origin of the Druze<sup>235</sup>.

Yet another important correction concerning the relations between Al-Ḥākim, the Druze, and their Muslim opponents, as well as Al-Anṭākī's opinion of them, occurs in the place where one should accept the corrections of Ch of (ويفاوض المسلمين وينتبههم) *and he explains clearly / converses with the Muslims and points out to*

<sup>230</sup> K&V3, p. 422; PIRONE, XIV, 16.

<sup>231</sup> M.G.S. HODGSON, *Al-Darazī...*, p. 7–8.

<sup>232</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 16.

<sup>233</sup> K&V3, p. 424.

<sup>234</sup> The use of *'alā* instead of *min* here is puzzling, as *'alā* indicates for whom we are afraid, and *min* of what. But the usage of prepositions in this chronicle is sometimes peculiar, one could be distorted into another (من على), and this change does not favour either of the two translation possibilities, since both are something people were supposed to be afraid of, and not for.

<sup>235</sup> PIRONE, XIV, 20 omits the entire expression.

/ informs / warns them); into (وتفاوض المسلمون بينهم) and the Muslims conferred between themselves)<sup>236</sup>. M&T's translation as *addressing the Muslims, he emphasised*, while fine linguistically, does not fit the context, because it is preceded by a quite vague text ascribed to Al-Ḥākim, threatening people, and followed by *that his aim is to drive them to what Al-Darazī invited them to, and that his exasperation with them is but due to their aversion to it. And they talked about that a lot, and made poems accusing [someone] of disbelief<sup>237</sup>, sending them to him*. The long, vague text would be pointless if the author wanted, at the end, to express his point so directly. Moreover, the content of the text has already ended with an invitation to read it to everyone, so adding an additional point to it would be out of place<sup>238</sup>. Furthermore, Al-Ḥākim did support the Druzes, but not openly, because it was opposed even by his entourage<sup>239</sup>, so he would not state this goal so openly (although this text could have been a forgery). Moreover, it is grammatically a new sentence, and it is, at least in the edition, placed in a new paragraph. It is also important to note that this correction creates a typical for Al-Anṭākī repetition of information (*they conferred (...) and they talked much about that*). Moreover, the second verb (*they talked much*) is in plural already, which suggests<sup>240</sup> that *Muslims* are its subject, especially since no other subject is mentioned and M&T have to surmise it is the people of Miṣr.

The poems about Al-Ḥākim are described as *al-kufriyya*, *disbelieving/blasphemous*, which M&T translate as *abusive*<sup>241</sup>, but that is imprecise. One should understand it as *al-takfīriyya* (II form), the way Cheikho understood it in its correction of it to *yukaffirūnahu* (II) *fīhā*<sup>242</sup>, that is that these poems were accusing (Al-Ḥākim, but that is not openly said apart from in Cheikho's version) of disbelief due to his support of Al-Darazī, who claimed Al-Ḥākim was God. Note that Al-Anṭākī was in general surprisingly neutral concerning Al-Ḥākim, even praising him at times<sup>243</sup>, but was critical towards the Druze<sup>244</sup>, so he would not call the

<sup>236</sup> K&V3, p. 424, n. 69–71. One can also keep the present form (يفاض) without much difference in the meaning. As for (المسلمين), it can be a colloquialism, and not necessarily an indication that it is accusative. The only major difference is the third word. PIRONE, XIV, 21 agrees with me.

<sup>237</sup> This passage is discussed in the next paragraph.

<sup>238</sup> Unless it is Al-Anṭākī's commentary to the main text of the alleged letter of Al-Ḥākim.

<sup>239</sup> K&V3, p. 418.

<sup>240</sup> Verbs in Arabic, if written correctly, are always in singular unless the subject is already mentioned before them. But this is not a definitive proof, since 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural can have impersonal meaning.

<sup>241</sup> K&V3, p. 424.

<sup>242</sup> K&V3, p. 424, n. 75.

<sup>243</sup> K&V2, p. 515–516.

<sup>244</sup> K&V3, p. 420–422 he calls Druze beliefs *disbelief* (*kufur*, but he quotes popular opinion and describes the reaction of the chief judge) twice. J.H. FORSYTH, *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle...*, p. 344, 350–351 notes that, apart from the issue of the schism during the patriarchate of Eutychios (whom he believes to be his relative), his attitude towards the Druze is the most visible sign of his own prejudices in the chronicle. But note that the difference between the asceticism of Al-Ḥākim and the alleged

critique of Al-Ḥākīm for their support *blasphemous*<sup>245</sup>. This change gives us information about the content of these poems, about the popular attitude towards the Druze, and dispels false information about Al-Anṭākī's attitude towards these poems.

Another fragments that show Al-Anṭākī's attitude towards the Druze are two ms C additions, ignored by M&T, but not by Pirone. The first of them calls Druze convictions *hideousness*<sup>246</sup>. The second one mentions that the Turkish murderer of Al-Darazī was killed '*alā ḡanab ḡuliḡa lahu*. One can refer the verb to the killer, making it for *[the] offence/crime for the sake of which he was created*<sup>247</sup>. It would indicate Al-Anṭākī not only believed in fate, but also that the killing of Al-Darazī was divinely ordained, and thus, while remaining a crime, in a way rightful. It would give a rare glimpse into the religious views of the author, whose other works, devoted to religion, are seemingly lost. But the lack of definition of *offence* excludes this option. The second interpretation refers the verb to the *offence*, making it for *an offence that was forged for him*. Pirone translates it as *for the offence falsely attributed to him*. But his usage of *the (il)* and translating it as if this *offence* had a real existence may indicate that he thinks that the offence in question was the killing, and that it was wrongly attributed to the Turk. If so, that is not possible, as Al-Anṭākī himself states he killed him, and because the *offence* is not defined<sup>248</sup>. Instead one should understand it as that the Turk was killed on some other, undefined, made up charge, and that is because Al-Ḥākīm did not want to risk dissent by officially killing him for his actual deed, which, in the light of disdain for Al-Darazī, must have been popular. That is the only interpretation that is

---

licentiousness of the Druze (p. 265, n. 134) can be explained by the fact that the Islamic law had to be brought to a conclusion before it was abolished. And Al-Nasafī did mention that a period of abolishment of the law and relying on monotheism alone (and *monotheists* are how the Druze call themselves) would occur (see K. PACHNIAK, *Doktryny ismā'īlickie w dziełach Al-Kirmānięgo*, Warszawa 2004, p. 38–39), and antinomian tendencies did occur in Ismā'īlism before, e.g. the Qarmaṭians used to claim the Muslim law had ended (W. MADELUNG, *Al-Mahdī*, [in:] *EI2*, vol. V, ed. C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, B. BEWIS, Ch. PELLAT, Leiden–London 1971, p. 1236), and such tendencies were present also in the Fāṭimid branch of Ismā'īlism (J. DANECKI, *Podstawowe wiadomości o islamie*, vol. I, Warszawa 1998, p. 348). The law could have been the wall separating the happiness from torment (Quran 57:13; S.A. ASSAAD, *The Reign of Al-Hakim Bi Amr Allah...*, p. 163), but this means you can move beyond it. Additionally, the Druzes believed that Al-Ḥākīm's inconsistency is a sign of his divinity (M.G.S. HODGSON, *Al-Darazī...*, p. 14–15), and that a schism concerning morals may have existed among the Druze (p. 6–7). Also, the desecrations described by Al-Anṭākī may have well been true (p. 12), and that Al-Hādī did not use the Quran in his doctrine (while the Islamic law is derived primarily from it), and devised a new moral code (p. 16–17).

<sup>245</sup> PIRONE, XIV, 21 agrees with me.

<sup>246</sup> K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 420, n. 9.

<sup>247</sup> K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 420, n. 12.

<sup>248</sup> One could assume Al-Anṭākī did not consider it an actual fault and that is why he says it was *created/forged*. But it would require defined status of the *offence*, and is a perhaps too bold interpretation as well.

grammatically correct, and it gives important information on both the official and unofficial attitude of Al-Ḥākim towards the Druze.

M&T also omit in their translation a C addition mentioning (critical) songs being sung about Al-Ḥākim<sup>249</sup>, which is important not only for the history of the Druzes, but also for the history of music and political customs in the Fāṭimid Egypt.

According to M&T, the Byzantines *pursued the Muslims in their provinces and captured them, and they fell into oblivion and disappeared*. But why would they do that right at the end of a campaign against the Druze made in defence of Muslims persecuted and raided by them? Clearly, this sentence refers to the Druze, and not to (other) Muslims. And while there are other explanations, the problem most likely lies in that M&T, as they themselves admit, do not see use of the *minhum* preposition and pronoun that follow *Muslims*, and which refer to the Druze<sup>250</sup>. It is literally *Muslims out of / among the Druze* (meaning *Muslims being the Druze*) who were persecuted. While it is a strange way of saying that, as logically it would make more sense to speak of the Druze among Muslims, it is not unique in this chronicle, and an analogous expression occurs on the very next page, where Al-Anṭākī speaks of the Ṭayyites *from among* the Ġarrāḥids, even though all Ġarrāḥids belonged to the Ṭayy tribe, as its leading family<sup>251</sup>. Moreover, while Al-Anṭākī distinguishes the Druze from Muslims in this very fragment, they indeed were an offshoot of Islam, as well as Al-Anṭākī opposes individual Muslims with *the Muslims* in other parts of his chronicle<sup>252</sup>. This correction is absolutely crucial for the history of the Druze and Muslims under Byzantine rule<sup>253</sup>.

<sup>249</sup> K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 428, n. 10; 427 in the translation. And earlier mention of political songs p. 424. PIRONE, XIV, 25 refers to the songs as *compositions*.

<sup>250</sup> K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 520 and n. 34. PIRONE, XVI, 68 translates it the same as M&T.

<sup>251</sup> K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 522.

<sup>252</sup> K&V<sub>2</sub>, p. 467; K&V<sub>3</sub>, p. 530.

<sup>253</sup> The Byzantine massacre of the Druze took place in the Hills of Sumac (Ġabal al-Summāq). IBN AL-ʿADĪM, *Buḡyat al-Ṭalab fī Tārīḥ Ḥalab*, vol. I, ed. S. ZAKKĀR, Beirut [1988], p. 422; K.P. TODT, B.A. VEST, *Syria (Syria Prôtē, Syria Deutera, Syria Euphratēsia)*, vol. II, Wien 2015, p. 1168–1170 identify them with Ġabal al-Zāwiya (between Idlib and Ḥamāʿ, close to Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān). And this name is known by the local population, as the father of my local friend Malāḍ al-Šayḥ ʿAlī attested. This area is indeed devoid of the Druze. But there is another area, Ġabal al-Aʿlā (between Antioch and Idlib), that is inhabited by the Druze until now (<https://gulf2000.columbia.edu/maps.shtml> [4 IX 2025]; the blue spot in Ġabal al-Zāwiya is the Zayzūn Reservoir, and not Druzes), which they call the Hills of Sumac (e.g. <https://raseef22.net/article/1090357-البقا-في-سبيل-البقا-وتنازلات-في-سبيل-البقا> [4 IX 2025]). Both of these hills were on Byzantine-Muslim borderlands, but Al-Aʿlā were certainly more in Byzantine grip, right next to Antioch, and further from the centre of Fāṭimid power, Apamea, as well as closer to Aleppo, the province of which the Druze were supposed to raid. Thus how radical or effective the Byzantines were in the eradication of the Druze depends on this identification, but most likely the account of Al-Anṭākī is exaggerated and the Druze were brutally pacified, and not exterminated.

In conclusion, a closer look at the previous editions and translations of Al-Anṭākī enables a number of small corrections of the French translation, some of them more certain than others, among the most important of them interpretations of Balkan names in Al-Anṭākī, the correction of the date of death of Romanos Lekapeanos, a better explanation of the relation of Al-Mahdī and Abū 'Abd Allāh, distinguishing between Ya'lā Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Yifrānī, the ruler of Ifkān, and Muḥammad Ibn al-Faṭḥ, the ruler of Siḡilmāsa, who were lumped together by Al-Anṭākī into one person; recognition of Ibn al-Balantiš as Balantes, establishing the place where John Tzimiskes met with the ruler of Damascus Alftakīn as Kāmid, correction of the title of lord of Tao as the lord of Olti, interpretation of Al-Ḥālidiyyāt and Al-Ġākirūs names, correction of the length of the Fāṭimid siege of Aleppo, recognition of the title of Nikephoros Ouranos as *kanikleios*, and a number of corrections correcting the Druzes.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- AL-ANṬAKĪ YAḤYĀ, *Cronache dell'Egitto fatimide e dell'impero bizantino (937–1033)*, trans. B. PIRONE, Bologna 2018 (first edition 1997).
- AL-ANṬAKĪ YAḤYĀ IBN SA'ĪD IBN YAḤYĀ, *Tārīḥ Al-Anṭākī āl-ma'rūf bi-ṣilat tāriḥ Awtihā*, ed. 'U.'A. TADMURĪ, Tripoli (Lebanon) 1990.
- AL-FĀSĪ, *Kitāb al-Ānis al-Muṭarrib bi-Rawḍ al-Qirtās fī Aḥbār Mulūk al-Maḡrib wa-Tārīḥ Madīnat Fās*, ed. K.Y. TÜRNBERG (C.J. TORNBURG), Übsāla (Uppsala) 1843.
- AL-HAMADĀNĪ, *Takmilat Tārīḥ al-Ṭabarī*, [in:] AL-ṬABARĪ, *Tārīḥ*, ed. M.A. al-F. IBRĀHĪM, Beirut [s.a.].
- AL-MAKĪN, *Ta'rīḥ al-Muslimīn min Ṣāḥib Ṣarī at al-Islām Abī āl-Qāsim Muḥammad ḥattā āl-Dawla āl-Atābakiyya*, ed. 'A.B. ḤASAN, Cairo 2010.
- AL-MAKĪN, *Universal History*, trans. M. DIEZ, Leiden 2024.
- AL-MAQRĪZĪ, *Al-Ḥiṭaṭ*, vol. I, ed. M. ZAYNUHUM, M. AL-ŠARQĀWĪ (AL-ŠARQĀWĀ), Cairo 1998.
- AL-MAQRĪZĪ, *Ittī'āz al-Ḥunafā'*, vol. II, ed. Ć. AL-ṬAYYĀL, Cairo 1416/1996.
- AL-MUQADDASĪ, *The Best Divisions for Knowledge of the Regions. Aḥsan al-Taqāsīm fī Ma'rifat al-Aqālīm*, trans. B. COLLINS, Reading 2001.
- AL-NU'MĀN AL-QĀDĪ, *Iftitāḥ al-Da'wa*, ed. F. AL-DAŠRĀWĪ, Tunis–Algier 1986.
- ANTIOCHENSIS YAHIA IBN SAĪD / AL-ANṬAKĪ YAḤYĀ IBN SA'ĪD, *Annales*, [in:] EUTYCHIUS PATRIARCHA ALEXANDRINUS, *Annales*, ed. L. CHEIKHO, B. CARRA DE VAUX, H. ZAYYAT, Beryti–Pariisi–Lipsiae 1906 (Louvain 1962) [= *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Scriptores Arabici*, 7].
- ARISTAKES, *History*, trans. R. BEDROSIAN, <https://www.attalus.org/armenian/altoc.html> [22 VI 2025].
- BARHEBRĒUS GREGORIUS, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, ed. J.B. ABBELOOS, Th.J. LAMY, Lovanium 1872.
- IBN AL-'ADĪM, *Buḡyat al-Ṭalab fī Tārīḥ Ḥalab*, ed. S. ZAKKĀR, Beirut [1988].

- IBN AL-‘ADĪM, *Zubdat al-Ḥalab min Tārīḥ Ḥalab*, ed. Ḥ. AL-MANŞŪR, Beirut 1996.
- IBN AL-AṬĪR, *Al-Kāmil fī āl-Tārīḥ*, vol. V, Beirut 1414/1994.
- IBN AL-MUḤAFFA‘ SAWĪRUS, *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*, vol. II.2, ed., trans. A.S. ATIYA, Y. ‘ABD AL-MASĪḤ, Le Caire 1948.
- IBN AL-QALĀNISĪ, *Dayl Tārīḥ Dimašq*, ed. H.F. AMEDROZ, Beirut–Leyden 1908.
- IBN ḤAWQAL, *Kitāb Şūrat al-Arḍ*, ed. J.H. KRAMERS, Leiden 1938.
- IBN ḤURDĀDBIḤ, *Al-Masālik wa-āl-Mamālik*, ed. M.J. DE GOEJE, Leiden 1889.
- IBN KHALDOUN (IBN ḤALDŪN), *Histoire des Berbères et des dynasties musulmanes de l’Afrique Septentrionale (Berbères)*, vol. II, trans. M. LE BARON DE SLANE, Alger 1854.
- IBN ZĀFĪR, *Aḥbār al-Duwal al-Munqaṭī‘a*, vol. II, ed. A.F. SAYYID, Madīnat Naşr 1417/1996.
- LEO THE DEACON, *History*, trans. A.-M. TALBOT, D.F. SULLIVAN, Washington 2005.
- MATHEW OF EDESSA, *Armenia and the Crusades. Tenth to Twelfth Centuries. The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, trans. A.E. DOSTOURIAN, Lanham–New York–London 1993.
- MICHEL LE SYRIEN, *Chronique*, vol. III, trans. J.-B. CHABOT, Paris 1905.
- MISKAWAYḤ, *Tag̃ārūb al-Umam wa-Ta‘āqub al-Himam*, ed. S.K. ḤASAN, Beirut 1424/2003.
- NESTOR, *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, trans. S.H. CROSS, O.P. SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR, Cambridge–Georgetown 1953.
- PORPHYROGENITUS CONSTANTINE, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Gy. MORAVCSIK, ed., trans. R.J.H. JENKINS, Washington 1967.
- PSELLOS MICHAŁ, *Kronika*, trans. O. JUREWICZ, Wrocław 1985.
- RUDHRAWARI ABU SHUJĀ‘, B. MUHASSIN HILAL, *Continuation of The Experiences of The Nations*, trans. D.S. MARGOLIOUTH, London 1921.
- SKYLITZÈS JEAN, *Empereurs de Constantinople*, trans. B. FLUSIN, Paris 2003.
- TARŌNEC’Ī STEP’ANOS, *The Universal History*, trans. T. GREENWOOD, Oxford 2017.
- YAHYA IBN SA‘ĪD D’ANTIOCHE, *Histoire de Yahyā Ibn Sa‘īd d’Antioche*, ed. I. KRATCHKOVSKY, trans. F. MICHEAU, G. TROUPEAU, Turnhout 1997 [= *Patrologia orientalis*, 47, fasc. 4, no 212], p. 372–559.
- YAHYA-IBN-SA‘ĪD D’ANTIOCHE, *Histoire de Yahya-Ibn-Sa‘īd d’Antioche continuateur de Sa‘īd-Ibn-bitriq*, ed. et trans. I. KRATCHKOVSKY, A. VASILIEV, Turnhout 1924 [= *Patrologia orientalis*, 18], p. 699–833.
- YAHYA-IBN-SA‘ĪD D’ANTIOCHE, *Histoire de Yahya-Ibn-Sa‘īd d’Antioche continuateur de Sa‘īd-Ibn-bitriq*, ed. et trans. I. KRATCHKOVSKY, A. VASILIEV, Turnhout 1932 [= *Patrologia orientalis*, 24], p. 347–520.
- YĀQŪT, *Mu‘ğām al-Buldān*, Beirut 1397/1977.

## Secondary Literature

- ADONTZ N., *Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance*, [in:] *Etudes Armeno-Byzantines*, ed. N. ADONTZ, Lisbonne 1965, p. 197–264.
- ADONTZ N., *Samuel l’Arménien, roi des Bulgares*, [in:] *Etudes Armeno-Byzantines*, ed. N. ADONTZ, Lisbonne 1965, p. 347–408.
- ADONTZ N., *Tornik le Moine*, [in:] *Etudes Armeno-Byzantines*, ed. N. ADONTZ, Lisbonne 1965, p. 297–318.

- ADONTZ N., GREGOIRE H., *Nicéphore au col roide*, "Byzantion" 8, 1933, p. 203–212.
- ASSAAD S.A., *The Reign of Al-Hakim Bi Amr Allah. A Political Study*, Beirut 1974.
- BIANQUIS Th., *Damas et la Syrie sous la domination Fatimide (359–468 / 969–1076)*, vol. I, Damas[cus] 1986, <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ifpo.6437>
- BROWNING R., *Dorostolon*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. I, ed. A.P. KAZHDAN, Oxford–New York 1991, p. 653.
- CANARD M., *L'Histoire des Hamdanides de Jazira et de Syrie*, Algiers 1953.
- CANARD M., *Sayf al Daula. Recueil des textes relatifs à l'émir Sayf al Daula le Ḥamdanide avec annotations, cartes et plans*, Alger 1934.
- CHRISTOPOULOS G. et al., *Historia tou Hellēnikou Ethnous*, Athēnai 1979.
- CZYŻ M., *Al-Ḥākīm's Persecutions of Christians*, "Parole de l'Orient" 39, 2014, p. 1–16.
- CZYŻ M., *Bliski Wschód w kronice Yahyi al-Anṭākīego*, PhD thesis presented at the Oriental Studies Faculty of Warsaw University 2015, under the supervision of prof. P. LEWICKA.
- CZYŻ M., *Bułgaria w kronice Yahyi āl-Anṭākīego*, [in:] *Poznać Bałkany. Historia – polityka – kultura – języki*, ed. K. TACZYŃSKA, A. TWARDOWSKA, Toruń 2016, p. 13–30.
- CZYŻ M., *Byzantine Reconquista (10<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> Centuries) and the Attacks on Christians in the Lands of Islam (Egypt, Syria and Iraq)*, "Studia Ceranea" 14, 2024, p. 369–388, <https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.14.23>
- CZYŻ M., *The Correspondence between the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, Agapius and Elijah*, [in:] *The Artistic Traditions of Non-European Cultures*, vol. XI–XII, ed. H. RUBINKOWSKA-ANIOŁ, M. WIDY-BEHIESSE, Warszawa–Toruń 2024, p. 13–30.
- CZYŻ M., *The Murder of Fātik and the Fatimid takeover of Aleppo*, [in:] *Bliski Wschód w świecie. Historia, polityka, kultura*, ed. M. WOŹNIAK-BOBIŃSKA, Łódź 2021, p. 17–34.
- CZYŻ M., *The Syrian campaign of Romanos III Argyros*, "SAMAI" 6, 2021, p. 239–272.
- CZYŻ M., *Sytuacja chrześcijan za panowania Kalifa Al-Ḥākima bi-Amr Allāha*, MA thesis written under the supervision of P. LEWICKA, Oriental Studies Faculty, University of Warsaw, 2007.
- DACHRAOUI F., *Al-Ḳā'im (bi-amr Allāh)*, [in:] *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition*, vol. IV, ed. E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS, Ch. PELLAT, C.E. BOSWORTH, Leiden 1998, p. 457–459.
- DANECKI J., *Podstawowe wiadomości o islamie*, vol. I, Warszawa 1998.
- FORSYTH J.H., *The Byzantine-Arab Chronicle (938–1034) of Yahyā b. Sa'īd al-Anṭāki*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1977.
- GYLLENHAAL D., *Byzantine Melitene and the Social Milieu of the Syriac Renaissance*, "Dumbarton Oaks Papers" 75, 2021, p. 205–235.
- HODGSON M.G.S., *Al-Darazī and Ḥamza in the Origin of the Druze Religion*, "Journal of the American Oriental Society" 21.1, 1962, p. 5–20, <https://doi.org/10.2307/595974>
- HOLMES C., *Basil II and the Governance of Empire (976–1025)*, New York 2005, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199279685.001.0001>
- HONIGMANN E., *Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinisches Reiches*, Bruxelles 1935.
- <https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr> [10 VI 2025].
- <https://ar.lib.eshia.ir/> [10 VI 2025].
- [https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/مملكة\\_الأيبيريين](https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/مملكة_الأيبيريين) [29 VI 2025].
- <https://gulf2000.columbia.edu/maps.shtml> [4 IX 2025].

- <https://islamic-content.com/t/8126> [1 VI 2025].
- <https://raseef22.net/article/1090357> - دروز-جبل-السماق-في-إدلب-مكابرة-وصير-وتنازلات-في-سبيل-البقاء [4 IX 2025].
- [https://www.olkas.net/lemmata/30\\_Karvuna\(?\)](https://www.olkas.net/lemmata/30_Karvuna(?)) [1 VI 2025].
- [https://www.olkas.net/lemmata/41\\_Kavarna](https://www.olkas.net/lemmata/41_Kavarna) [1 VI 2025].
- <https://www.royalhouseofgeorgia.ge/genealogy/> [8 IX 2025].
- JANIN R., *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Paris 1950.
- KAZIMIRSKI DE BIBERSTEIN A., *Dictionnaire arabe-français*, Paris 1860 (2005).
- KILIÇ Ü., *Osmanlı hâkimiyetinde idari ve askeri yönleri ile Erzurum Sancağı (XVI.–XVII. yüzyıllar)*, [in:] *Prof. dr. Salim Cöhce Armağanı. “Türk Tarihine Adanmış Çileli Bir Ömür”*, ed. A. CEYLAN, Ankara 2017, p. 845–875.
- LANE E.W., *An Arab-English Lexicon*, <http://lexicon.quranic-research.net/index.html> [1 VI 2025].
- LE STRANGE G., *Description of Mesopotamia and Baghdād, Written about the Year 900 A.D. by Ibn Serapion*, “Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland” 1895, p. 255–316, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00144752>
- LECKER M., *Tamim b. Murr*, [in:] *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition*, vol. X, ed. P.J. BEARMAN, Th. BIANQUIS, C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, W.P. HEINRICHS, Leiden 2000, p. 175.
- LIPOWSKY M.A., *De l’histoire de la lutte gréco aux X<sup>e</sup> et XI<sup>e</sup> siècles*, “Le Journal du Ministère de l’instruction publique russe” 11, 1891, p. 120–141.
- MADLUNG W., *Al-Mahdī*, [in:] *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition*, vol. V, ed. C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, B. BEWIS, Ch. PELLAT, Leiden–London 1971, p. 1230–1238.
- MADLUNG W., *Mansūr al-Yaman*, [in:] *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition*, vol. VI, ed. C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS, Ch. PELLAT, W.P. HEINRICHS, Leiden 1991, p. 438–439.
- MCGEER E., *Sowing the Dragons’ Teeth*, Washington 1995.
- MCGEER E., *Tradition and Reality in the “Taktika” of Nikephoros Ouranos*, “Dumbarton Oaks Papers” 45, 1991, p. 129–140, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1291697>
- NORWICH J.L., *Byzantium: the Apogee*, London 1992.
- OSTROGORSKY G., *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. HUSSEY, Oxford 1968.
- PACHNIAK K., *Doktryny ismā’ilickie w dziełach Al-Kirmānīego*, Warszawa 2004.
- PANAGIOTAKES N.M., *Fragments of a Lost Eleventh-Century Byzantine Historical Work?*, [in:] *Φιλελλην, Studies in Honour of Robert Browning*, ed. C. CONSTANTINIDES, N.M. PANAGIOTAKES, E. JEFFREYS, A.D. ANGELOU, Venice 1996, p. 321–358.
- PEETERS P., *Un colophon géorgien de Thornik le Moine*, “Analecta Bollandiana” 50.1, 1932, p. 358–372, <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.ABOL.4.00765>
- RABAVILAS Y.A., *The Real Objectives of Byzantium’s Foreign Policy towards Georgia during the Reign of Basil II (978–989 and 1021–1022)*, “Буçavтiакá” / “Byzantiaka” 38, 2023–2024, p. 83–96.
- ROBERTS A.M., *Heretics, Dissidents, and Society. Narrating the Trial of John bar ‘Abdun*, “Dumbarton Oaks Papers” 72, 2022, p. 117–144.
- ROMANE J., *Byzantium Triumphant. The Military History of the Byzantines 959–1025*, Barnsley 2015.
- ROZEN V.R., *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojca*, Sankt-Peterburg 1883.
- RUNCIMAN St., *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, London 1930.
- SCHLUMBERGER G., *L’Epopée Byzantine*, vol. II, Paris 1900.

- SEIBT W., *Die Skleroi*, Wien 1976.
- TER-GHEWONDYAN A., *The Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia*, trans. N.G. GARSOĪAN, Lisbon 1976.
- TODT K.P., VEST B.A., *Syria (Syria Prōtē, Syria Deutera, Syria Euphratēsia)*, vol. II, Wien 2015, <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.28833733>
- VASILIEV A.A., *Byzance et les Arabes*, vol. II, trans. M. CANARD, H. GRÉGOIRE, Bruxelles 1950.
- VEST B., *Geschichte der Stadt Melitene und der umliegenden Gebiete*, vol. II, Hamburg 2007.
- VON FALKENHAUSEN V., *Il Commercio di Amalfi con Constantinopoli e il Levante nel secolo XII*, [in:] *Amalfi, Genova, Pisa e Venezia. Il commercio con Costantinopoli e il vicino Oriente nel secolo XII*, ed. O. BANTI, Pisa 1995, p. 19–38.
- WAKLINOW St., *Kultura staro-bułgarska*, trans. K. WIERZBICKA, Warszawa 1984.
- WALKER P.E., *The “Crusade” of John Tzimisce in the Light of New Arabic Evidence*, “Byzantion” 50, 1980, p. 301–327, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003417569-6>
- WEHR H., *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, trans. J.M. COWAN, <sup>3</sup>New York 1976.
- WHITTOW M., *The Making of Orthodox Byzantium (600–1025)*, Houndmills–London 1996, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24765-3>
- ZAIMOV J., LYAAGHT T.A., *The Bitolya Inscription of the Bulgarian Autocrat Ivan Vladislav (1015–1018)*, “New Zealand Slavonic Journal” 6, 1970, p. 1–15.

Maciej Czyż  
University of Wrocław