

COLLÈGE DE FRANCE – CNRS
CENTRE DE RECHERCHE D’HISTOIRE
ET CIVILISATION DE BYZANCE

TRAVAUX ET MÉMOIRES
19

STUDIES
IN THEOPHANES

edited by
Marek JANKOWIAK
&
Federico MONTINARO

*Ouvrage publié avec le concours de la fondation Ebersolt
du Collège de France*

Association des Amis du Centre d’Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance
52, rue du Cardinal-Lemoine – 75005 Paris
2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Hommage à Gilbert Dagron	V
Abbreviations	IX
Marek JANKOWIAK & Federico MONTINARO, Introduction.....	1

The authorship of the *Chronicle* 7

Warren TREADGOLD, The life and wider significance of George Syncellus	9
Constantin ZUCKERMAN, Theophanes the Confessor and Theophanes the Chronicler, or, A story of square brackets.....	31
Marek JANKOWIAK, Framing universal history: Syncellus' canon and Theophanes' rubrics	53
Andrzej KOMPA, In search of Syncellus' and Theophanes' own words: the authorship of the <i>Chronographia</i> revisited.....	73
Jesse W. TORGERSON, From the many, one? The shared manuscripts of the <i>Chronicle</i> of Theophanes and the <i>Chronography</i> of Synkellos	93

Transmission, transcription, translation 119

Filippo RONCONI, La première circulation de la « Chronique de Théophane » : notes paléographiques et codicologiques.....	121
Bronwen NEIL, Theophanes Confessor on the Arab conquest: the Latin version by Anastasius Bibliothecarius	149
Juan SIGNES CODOÑER, Theophanes at the time of Leo VI	159
Federico MONTINARO, The <i>Chronicle</i> of Theophanes in the indirect tradition.....	177
Anna-Marija TOTOMANOVA, The <i>Chronicle</i> of Theophanes the Confessor in the Slavic tradition	207

Theophanes and early Byzantine history 237

Roger SCOTT, The first half of Theophanes' <i>Chronicle</i>	239
Irina TAMARKINA, Veneration of relics in the <i>Chronicle</i> of Theophanes	261
Geoffrey GREATREX, Théophane et ses sources sur la guerre d'Anastase I ^{er} contre les Perses .	269
Bernard POUDERON, Théophane, témoin de l' <i>Épitomè d'histoires ecclésiastiques</i> , de Théodore le Lecteur ou de Jean Diacrinoménos?.....	279
Anna KOTŁOWSKA and Łukasz RÓŻYCKI, The battle of Solachon of 586 in light of the works of Theophylact Simocatta and Theophanes.....	315
Salvatore COSENTINO, La perception du domaine économique dans la <i>Chronographie</i> de Théophane.....	327

Theophilus of Edessa 353

Robert G. HOYLAND, Agapius, Theophilus and Muslim sources.....	355
Muriel DEBIÉ, Theophanes' "Oriental source": what can we learn from Syriac historiography?	365
Maria CONTERNO, Theophilus, "the more likely candidate"? Towards a reappraisal of the question of Theophanes' "Oriental source(s)"	383
Andy HILKENS, Before the Eastern source: Theophanes and the late Syriac Orthodox chronicles, 4 th -6 th centuries	401

Theophanes and recent history 415

Stephanie FORREST, Theophanes' Byzantine source for the late seventh and early eighth centuries, c. AD 668–716	417
Lee MORDECHAI, The last century of Theophanes' <i>Chronicle</i> : a statistical approach	445
Dmitry AFINOGENOV, Style, structure, and authorship of the hypothetical source of Theophanes for the reigns of Leo III and Constantine V.....	467
James HOWARD-JOHNSTON, Theophanes on the recent past: the crisis of 782 and its antecedents	473

Index 491

Sources.....	491
Manuscripts	506
Names and places.....	507

ABBREVIATIONS

AASS	<i>Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur, vel a catholicis scriptoribus celebrantur</i> , Venetiis 1734-1940.
ACO, ser. sec.	<i>Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum. Series secunda</i> , ed. R. Riedinger, Berlin 1984.
ADLER – TUFFIN	<i>The Chronography of George Synkellos : a Byzantine chronicle of universal history from the Creation</i> , transl. with introd. and notes by W. Adler and P. Tuffin, Oxford 2002.
ADSV	<i>Античная древность и средние века</i> . Екатеринбург.
Agap.	<i>Kitab al-'unvan : Histoire universelle écrite par Agapius (Mahboub) de Menbidj</i> , éd. et trad. par A. Vasiliev, Paris 1906–16 (PO 5, 4; 7, 4; 8, 3; 11, 1), PO 8.
Anast.	<i>Theophanis Chronographia. 2, Theophanis vitas, Anastasii bibliothecarii Historiam tripartitam, dissertationem de codicibus operis Theophanei, indices continens</i> , rec. C. de Boor, Lipsiae 1885 (2 nd éd., Hildesheim – New York 1980).
AnBoll	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i> . Bruxelles.
AnTard	<i>Antiquité tardive</i> . Turnhout
BCH	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i> . Paris.
BHG	<i>Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca</i> , 3 ^e éd. mise à jour et considérablement augmentée, Bruxelles 1957.
BMGS	<i>Byzantine and modern Greek studies</i> . Leeds.
BSl.	<i>Byzantinoslavica : revue internationale des études byzantines</i> . Praha.
Byz.	<i>Byzantion : revue internationale des études byzantines</i> . Wetteren.
Byz. Forsch.	<i>Byzantinische Forschungen : internationale Zeitschrift für Byzantinistik</i> . Amsterdam.
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i> . Berlin.
CCSG	<i>Corpus christianorum. Series Graeca</i> . Turnhout.
Cedr.	<i>Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope</i> , ab I. Bekkero suppletus et emendatus (CSHB 4), Bonnae 1838-1839.
CFHB	<i>Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae</i> .
Chron. 1234	<i>Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens. 1</i> , ed. I.-B. Chabot (CSCO 81. SS 36), Parisiis 1920.
Chron. Paschale	<i>Chronicon Paschale</i> , rec. L. Dindorfius, Bonnae 1832.
Const. VII, <i>Three treatises</i>	Constantine Porphyrogenitus, <i>Three treatises on imperial military expeditions</i> , introd., ed., transl. and commentary by J. F. Haldon, Wien 1990.
CSHB	<i>Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae</i> .
CSCO	<i>Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium</i> . Louvain. SS : <i>Scriptores Syri</i> .
CTh	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i> .

- DAI* Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, greek text ed. by Gy. Moravcsik, english transl. by R. J. H. Jenkins (CFHB 1), Washington 1967².
- De cer.* *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De cerimoniais aulae Byzantinae*, e rec. J. J. Reiskii (CSHB), Bonnae 1829-1840.
- DOP* *Dumbarton Oaks papers*. Washington.
- EHB* *The economic history of Byzantium : from the seventh through the fifteenth century*, A. E. Laiou, ed.-in-chief (Dumbarton Oaks studies 39), Washington DC 2002.
- EI* *Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, Leiden – Paris 1913-1938.
- EP* *Encyclopédie de l'Islam, nouvelle édition*, Leiden – Paris 1954-2009.
- Evagr.* *The Ecclesiastical history of Evagrius, with the scholia*, ed. with introd, critical notes and indices by J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, London 1898.
- ΕΦΣ* *Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*.
- FHG* *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, Paris 1841-1872.
- GCS* Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Berlin.
- Gen.* *Iosephi Genesisii Regum libri quattuor*, rec. A. Lesmueller-Werner et I. Thurn, Berolini 1978.
- Georg. Mon.* *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, corr. P. Wirth, Stuttgartiae 1978.
- Georg. Sync.* *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica*, ed. A. A. Mosshammer, Leipzig 1984.
- GRBS* *Greek, Roman and Byzantine studies*. Durham.
- HOWARD-JOHNSTON*, *Witnesses* : J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Witnesses to a world crisis : historians and histories of the Middle East in the seventh century*, Oxford 2010.
- HOYLAND*, *Seeing Islam* : R. G. HOYLAND, *Seeing Islam as others saw it : a survey and evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian writings on early Islam* (Studies in late antiquity and early Islam 13), Princeton NJ 1997.
- HOYLAND*, *Theophilus* : R. G. HOYLAND, *Theophilus of Edessa's Chronicle and the circulation of historical knowledge in late antiquity and early Islam* (Translated texts for historians 57), Liverpool 2011.
- JHS* *The journal of Hellenic studies*. London.
- JÖB* *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik*. Wien.
- JÖBG* *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*. Wien.
- Joh. Eph., HE* *Iohannis Ephesini Historiae ecclesiasticae pars tertia*, ed., interpretatus est E. W. Brooks (CSCO 106. SS 3), Parisiis, Lovanii 1935, 1936.
- LP* *Le Liber pontificalis*, texte, introd. et commentaire par L. Duchesne, 2 vol., Paris 1886 et 1892 ; III avec additions et corrections de L. Duchesne, C. Vogel éd., Paris 1955-1957.
- Mal.* *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, rec. I. Thurn (CFHB 35), Berolini 2000.
- MANGO, Who wrote* the Chronicle : C. MANGO, Who wrote the Chronicle of Theophanes?, *ZRV* 18, 1978, pp. 9–17, republished in *Id.*, *Byzantium and its image*, London 1984.

- MANGO – SCOTT *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor : Byzantine and Near Eastern history AD 284–813*, transl. with introd. and comment. by C. Mango and R. Scott with the assistance of G. Greatrex, Oxford 1997.
- MANSI *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florentiae – Venetiis 1759-1798. [réimpr. Paris 1901 et Graz 1960].
- Methodius, *Vita Theophanis : Methodii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Vita S. Theophanis Confessoris e codice Mosquensi n° 159*, ed. B. Latyšev = *Методія Патріарха Константинопольського життє Преп. Теофана Исповѣдника*, издалъ съ введеніємъ, примѣчаніями и указателями В. В. Латышевъ (Записки Россійской Академіи Наукъ. 8^e série = Mémoires de l'Académie des sciences de Russie, classe historico-philologique 13/4), Петроградъ 1918.
- MGH Ep., LL *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Epistolae, Leges*. Berlin.
- Mich. Syr. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199)*, éd. et trad. par J.-B. Chabot, 1, *Traduction livres I-VII*; 2, *Traduction livres VIII-XI*; 3, *Traduction livres XII-XXI*; 4, *Texte syriaque*, Paris 1899–1924 (réimpr. Bruxelles 1963).
- MTM *Monographies de Travaux et mémoires*. Paris.
- Niceph., *Chron.* *Chronographia brevis = Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον : Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula historica; accedit Ignatii Diaconi Vita Nicephori*, ed. C. de Boor, Lipsiae 1880, p. 79-135.
- Niceph., *Brev.* *Breviarium = Ἰστορία σύντομος : Nikephoros, patriarch of Constantinople, Short history*, text, transl. and commentary by C. Mango (CFHB 13), Washington DC 1990.
- ODB *Oxford dictionary of Byzantium*, A. P. Kazhdan ed. in chief, New York 1991.
- PG *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, accur. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1856-1866.
- Photius, *Bibl.* *Photius, Bibliothèque*, texte établi et trad. par R. Henry, Paris 1959-1991.
- PLRE *The prosopography of the later Roman Empire*, by A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale & J. Morris, Cambridge 1971-1992.
- PmbZ *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*. Berlin – New York 1998-.
- PO *Patrologia Orientalis*. Paris.
- Proc., *Aed.* *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia. 3, 2, De aedificiis cum duobus indicibus et appendice*, recognovit J. Haury, Lipsiae 1913, addenda et corrigenda adiecit G. Wirth, Lipsiae 1964.
- Proc., *BP* *De bello Persico = Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia. 1, De bellis libri I-IV*, recognovit J. Haury, Lipsiae 1905, addenda et corrigenda adiecit G. Wirth, Lipsiae 1962, p. 1-304.
- Proc., *BV* *De bello Vandalico = Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia. 1, De bellis libri I-IV*, recognovit J. Haury, Lipsiae 1905, addenda et corrigenda adiecit G. Wirth, Lipsiae 1962, p. 305-552.
- Ps. Sym. dans *Theophanes continuatus*, p. 601-770.
- RE *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart – München 1894-1997.
- REB *Revue des études byzantines*. Paris.

- ROCHOW, *Byzanz im 8. Jh.* : I. ROCHOW, *Byzanz im 8. Jahrhundert in der Sicht des Theophanes : quellenkritisch-historischer Kommentar zu den Jahren 715–813* (Berliner byzantinische Arbeiten 57), Berlin 1991.
- RSBN *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*. Roma
- SC Sources chrétiennes. Paris.
- Socr. Sokrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, hrsg. von G. C. Hansen, mit Beiträgen von M. Širinjan (GCS. Neue Folge 1), Berlin 1995.
- Soz. Sozomène, *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres I-II*, texte grec de l'éd. J. Bidez, trad. par A.-J. Festugière (SC 306), Paris 1983; *Livres III-IV*, texte grec de l'éd. J. Bidez, trad. par A.-J. Festugière, rev. par B. Grillet (SC 408), Paris 1996; *Livres V-VI. Livres VII-IX*, texte grec de l'éd. J. Bidez, G. C. Hansen, trad. par A.-J. Festugière et B. Grillet (SC 495, 516), Paris 2005, 2008.
- Strat. *Mauricii Strategicon*, ed. et introd. instruit G. T. Dennis, germanice vertit E. Gamillscheg (CFHB 17), Wien 1981.
- Sym. Log. *Symeonis magistri et logothetae Chronicon*, rec. S. Wahlgren (CFHB 44, 1), Berlin – New York 2006.
- Syn. CP *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi, adiectis synaxariis selectis, Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, éd. H. Delehaye, Bruxelles 1902 [réimpr. Louvain 1954].
- Theod. Lect. Theodoros Anagnostes, *Kirchengeschichte*, hrsg. von G. Ch. Hansen (GCS. Neue Folge 3), 2., durchges. Auflage, Berlin 1995.
- Theoph. *Theophanis Chronographia*, rec. C. de Boor, Lipsiae 1883-1885 [réimpr. Hildesheim – New York 1980].
- Theoph. 2 voir Anast.
- Theoph. cont. *Theophanes continuatus*, ex rec. I. Bekkeri (CSHB), Bonnae 1838.
- Theoph. Sim. *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae*, ed. C. de Boor, ed. correctiorem cur. P. Wirth, Stutgardiae 1972.
- TIB Tabula Imperii Byzantini. Wien.
- TLG Thesaurus linguae Graecae. University of California.
- TM *Travaux et mémoires*. Paris.
- TREADGOLD, *Middle Byzantine historians* : W. TREADGOLD, *The middle Byzantine historians*, New York 2013.
- VV *Византийский временник*. Москва.
- Zon. *Ioannis Zonarae Epitomae Historiarum libri XVIII*, ex rec. M. Pinderi ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst (CSHB 31), Bonnae 1897.
- ZRVI *Зборник радова Византолошког института*. Београд.

AGAPIUS, THEOPHILUS AND MUSLIM SOURCES

by Robert G. HOYLAND

For two centuries Byzantinists have known and written about an “eastern source” that was used by the three Christian chroniclers Theophanes the Confessor (d. 818), Dionysius of Tellmahre (d. 845) and Agapius of Menbij (wr. 940s) for some of their information on events in the realm of the Muslim caliphate.¹ In recent times this “eastern source” has come to be identified with the historical work of Theophilus of Edessa (d. 785), who served as an astrologer in the court of the caliphs al-Manṣūr (754–75) and al-Mahdi (775–85). Dionysius and Agapius actually cite him as a source for their own compositions and so it looks like an open and shut case. I have contributed to that idea by giving to my translation of the common material found in the three aforementioned chroniclers the title of “Theophilus of Edessa’s Chronicle”.² However, my intention in making this material available was not to say that the question is now solved and that we can reconstruct the “original” text of Theophilus’ chronicle, but rather to highlight the complexity of the transmission of this shared body of historical information and to provide an aide to further investigation of its nature and scope.

It is evident that there is a common “eastern source” underlying the chroniclers of Theophanes, Dionysius and Agapius, and to my mind still the best contender for its author is Theophilus. Yet it is equally clear that each of them substantially reworked it—abbreviating, expanding, refashioning and supplementing it—and so it is very difficult to determine its exact content. Many aspects of its format are also unclear. What language was it in—Syriac or Greek? Did it principally treat secular events or also church affairs? Why are its contents so diverse: short notes about natural phenomena and long anecdotes about political and military machinations, pro-Byzantine propaganda and insider insights on the third Arab civil war. It has been asserted that it possessed a detailed chronology,³

1. For references and further discussion of the issues raised in this paragraph see the introduction to my *Theophilus*, pp. 1–38.

2. I would have called it something along the lines of “A translation of notices common to the chroniclers Theophanes, Dionysius and Agapius,” but that would not have appealed to the marketers of the book.

3. J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, The Mardaites, in *Arab-Byzantine coins and history*, ed. by T. Goodwin, London 2012, pp. 27–38, here at pp. 28–9; M. JANKOWIAK, The first Arab siege of Constantinople,

and yet the three later dependent chroniclers tend to employ their own dating systems and their dates often do not tally.⁴ Given these uncertainties Muriel Debié and Maria Conterno are right to urge caution and to insist on a more circumspect approach towards the “eastern source” until there has more careful investigation of its contents and transmission.⁵

I have said most of what I want to say on this subject in the introduction to my aforementioned book, but I still have some unfinished business in connection with Agapius that I would like to conclude here. Firstly, the Florence manuscript (Biblioteca Laurenziana, Orientali 323) that is the unique witness to the Islamic period of Agapius’ chronicle has been restored since 1912, when Alexander Vasiliev and Louis Cheikho used it to produce their editions. Folios that were stuck together because of humidity, and so “could not be transcribed nor photographed” and were “illegible,” can now be read once more with relative ease.⁶ This particularly concerns folios 98^v–100^v and 104^v–106^v, which deal with the reigns of Mu‘āwīya I (661–80) and ‘Abd al-Malik (685–705) respectively. I edited and translated these folios in an appendix to my book on Theophilus, but there are other places in the manuscript where water damage, though less extensive, obliged Cheikho and Vasiliev to omit sentences and which can now be reinstated from the restored manuscript. This is particularly the case for folios 97^r–98^r, which treat the first six years of Mu‘āwīya’s caliphate, and so I edit and translate them below. Another reason for singling out this section is that it serves to illustrate an important point about Agapius, namely that the “eastern source”/Theophilus is by no means his sole informant. In these folios in particular, but also at other points in his narrative, he makes heavy use of one or more Muslim sources, presumably because Theophilus had little to offer at these points. We cannot precisely identify this Muslim material, for though almost every notice has a counterpart in a Muslim source (and often close correspondence in

TM 17, 2013, pp. 237–320, whose table on p. 261 illustrates nicely that Theophanes, Dionysius and Agapius mostly use their own dating systems (Theophanes principally uses the Annus Mundi, Dionysius Seleucid years, and Agapius Hijri dates and regnal years of caliphs), even where their dates tally. It is worth pointing out that Marek Jankowiak’s masterly study on the siege of Constantinople ca. 670 was only required because the dating of it in Theophanes, Dionysius and Agapius was so awry.

4. This problem is ignored by HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Mardaites* (quoted n. 3), and JANKOWIAK, *Siege*, (quoted n. 3). Howard-Johnston presents Theophilus as faced with the choice of using either an “annalistic format” or a “sloppy dating system,” but of course there were other options available to him (I have suggested elsewhere—*Seeing Islam as others saw it*, Princeton 1997, pp. 406–7—that Theophilus may have wanted to write a secular classicising history, like his contemporary Nicephorus, and this genre did not use an annalistic format). As for Howard-Johnston’s point that it is hard to explain why Dionysius would have used Theophilus’ history if it was not annalistic, it is well known that historical works are few for the period 630–750, so it may have been a case of *faute de mieux* (Dionysius does explicitly accuse Theophilus, among others, of chronological inexactness).

5. See their contributions to this volume and M. Conterno’s recent book *La “descrizioni dei tempi” all’alba dell’espansione islamica : un’indagine sulla storiografia greca, siriana e araba fra VII e VIII secolo*, Berlin 2014.

6. Agapius Episcopus Mabbugensis, *Historia universalis*, ed. L. Cheikho (CSCO. Scriptores Arabici. Ser. 3, 5), Paris 1912, pp. 350 and 355; *Kitab al-‘Unwan, histoire universelle écrite par Agapius (Mahboub) de Menbidj*, éd. et trad. par A. Vasiliev (PO 7), Paris 1911, p. 458. The same lacunae also feature in the abbreviated version produced by ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salām al-Tadmuri (*Al-muntakhab min Ta’rikh al-Manbij*, Tarabulus 1986), since he is relying on Cheikho’s edition.

wording), it does not conform as a whole to any one of our extant texts. All we can say with some confidence is that its focus and stance suggest that it is of Syrian provenance and exhibits some pro-Umayyad tendencies.⁷

Secondly, a close comparison of Agapius (A) and Theophanes (T) reveals that there are many occasions when they share information that is not in Dionysius (D). In the extract I edit below this is true of the reports about Mu'āwiya's favourable treatment of the westerners over the easterners and the raids of Busr ibn Arṭāt and 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālid, including the latter's settlement of Slavs in the region of Apamaea. There are also many times across the period 630–750 when Theophanes and Agapius differ in details from Dionysius:

- Capture of Arwad: T and A start by saying that on hearing of Roman forces moving against him Mu'āwiya sails to Arwad to besiege it (HOYLAND, *Theophilus*, pp. 134–5).
- Battle of Phoenix: T and A say that relatives of a trumpeter⁸ destroy Arab ships (not in D) and that the sea was dyed with blood whereas D speaks of dense spray (*ibid.*, pp. 141–4).
- Constantine V and Artabasduš send envoys to the caliph Walīd II in Damascus: in T and A, but not in D (*ibid.*, pp. 239–40).
- Yazīd III is called Deficient by T (*ho leipsos*) and A (*al-nāqīš*), but tyrant by D (*ibid.*, pp. 245, 248–29).
- 'Umar II writes a letter to Leo III on religion: in T and A, but not in D (*ibid.*, p. 216).

What is significant here is not so much that Dionysius differs on all of these points, but that Theophanes and Agapius agree on all of them. It may be that this shared material comes from Theophilus' chronicle and Dionysius chose to omit it or to go his own way, or it may be that Theophanes and Agapius used a different version of Theophilus to Dionysius, or even that they both had access to a minor additional source not available to Dionysius. As with so much else to do with these crucial Christian chroniclers, further study will be required before a solution can be proffered.

7. Consider, for example, the notice about 'Abd al-Malik commanding a raid when he was only sixteen years old (see note 31 below), which is not found in any extant Muslim source. However, there is implied criticism of Mu'āwiya in the notices about his use of a *minbar* and his dealings with the family of 'Alī.

8. Theophanes has “two Christ-loving brothers, sons of the trumpeter,” whereas Agapius has “two brothers of a man called the trumpeter.” It looks like Agapius has conflated “Christ-loving brothers, sons” into just “brothers.”

EDITION OF AGAPIUS, MS LAURENZIANA, ORIENTALI 323, FOL. 97^r-98^v⁹

(97^r)¹⁰ بويح الحسن بن علي في سنة احدى واربعين للعرب. سار معوية <الى> العراق وخرج اليه الحسن بن علي فالتقيا بمسكن من ارض السواد ناحية الأنبار واصطلحا بكتاب وشروط وشهود. ودخل معوية الكوفة وخطب بها وبايعه الناس. واستخلف على الكوفة ورجع الى الشام. وأقر معوية فضالة بن عبد<ي>د على قضايه. ورجع الحسن بن علي الى المدينة فقبل له ما فعلت. فقال كرهت الدمار. رايت اهل الكوفة قوما لا يثق بهم أحد. وقد لقي أبي منهم أمورا وما انتفع بهم في شيء ولا يصلحون لشيء. وحج بالناس عتبة بن ابي سفيان. فلما استوثق الملك (97^v) معوية وتقلد من يثرب الى دمشق واستولى على الدنيا كلها بعد ان كان عاملا عشرين سنة وذلك في سنة اثنين وسبعين وتسع مائة لذي القرنين واحدى واربعين للعرب وتسع عشرة سنة لقسطوس ملك الروم. وظهرت الحرورية وعمار من رأي ساير المسلمين وان من خالفهم على ضلالة وانهم احق بالملك من غيرهم. ولما استولى الملك لمعوية قدم على اهل المشرق أهل المغرب لطاعة أهل المغرب له ومناصبه اولئك كاتباه له.

وفي السنة الثامنة كانت غزوة اللان من ارمينية. وفيها هزمت الروم هزيمة عظيمة وكان صاحب الغزو بسر بن ارملة قتل عدة من البطارقة وسبا (sic) واستباح المسلمين من دار الروم وهي أول سبية سبوها. واستعمل معوية على ال<شامية> عبد الملك بن مروان وهو يومئذ ابن ست عشرة سنة. فركب عبد الملك البحر وامر معه علي جميع الناس عبد الرحمن بن خالد بن الوليد ويقال بسر بن ارملة. وفيها ولي مروان بن الحكم المدينة وجعل على القضا عبد الله بن نوفل بن الحارث بن عبد المطلب. وفيها سار بسر بن ارملة الى المدينة ومكة واليمن. (98^r) وقتل عبد الرحمن وقتم ابني عبد الله بن العباس بن عبد المطلب. وفيها قتل ابو ليلا (sic) الخارجي بسواد الكوفة. وفيها حج عتبة بن ابي سفيان بالناس.

وفي السنة الثالثة لمعوية كانت غزوة بسر بن ارملة الروم دفعة ثانية وسبا بها وهزمت الروم وبلغوا قسطنطينية. وفيها كتب معوية الى مروان بن الحكم بان يستعد الحج بالناس فحضر الموسم وقام به. وفيها مات عمرو بن العاص بمصر يوم الفطر وكان قد عمل على مصر في خلافة عمر بن الخطاب اربع سنين وفي خلافة عثمان ثلث سنين وعشرة اشهر وفي خلافة معوية سنتين ونصف. فولى معوية ابنه عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص مكانه سنتين.

وفي السنة الرابعة لمعوية سبأ عبد الرحمن بن خالد بن الوليد بارض الروم وبلغ المسلمون اقلونية من ارض الروم. وفيها عمل معوية المقصورة بالشام وعملها مروان بن الحكم بالمدينة. وفيها أخرجت المنابر الى المصلا (sic) في العيدين وكان الأمر يخالف هذا لان الخلفاء كانت تخطب في الاعياد في المصليات على ظهر الارض. وفيها حج بالناس معوية ونزل المدينة في داره. (98^v) فأتاه الحسن بن علي وعبد الله بن جعفر وابن عباس يسئلونه الوفا بما كان ضمنه للحسن وشرطه على نفسه فقال لهم اما ترضون يا بني هاشم وقد أقرر لكم وقد قتلتم عثمان. فذهب ابن عباس يتكلم فمنعه الحسن. ثم عاوده الكلام فاعاد القول الاول. فلما رآه ابن عباس غير منتهي اقبل عليه فقال أما ما تلقيتنا به من سوء فهو فيما بين مراقبتك

9. Agapius writes *hamzas* sparingly and erratically, and I only insert them where he has done so. Agapius is also a little erratic in his use/placing of diacritical marks; I have omitted vowel marks since it would clutter the text too much (Agapius does use them, though again erratically), and I have put the dots that distinguish letters in the correct places unless it is evident that Agapius has actually made an error rather than just been negligent/careless.

10. The beginning of the Arabic text here corresponds to line 7 of folio 97^r; before this the MS is perfectly legible.

في خلقتك وأنت والله أولى به منا. وأما قولك انا قتلنا عثمان فأنت والله قتلته وأنت الان توهم الناس انك تطالب بدمه. وانكسر معوية وانقطع من الجواب.

وفي السنة الخامسة لمعوية وقع الخلف بين النصارى في أمر المسيح له المجد وكان فيهم من يقيمه يوم الشعانين وفيهم من يقيمه الاحد الجديد. وفي هذه السنة غزا عبد الرحمن بن خالد الروم وسبا سبيا كثيرا وأخرج معه من الصقالبة الذين كانوا بارض الروم خلقا وأسكنهم رستاقا من رساتيق فامية.

وفي السنة السادسة لمعوية غزا بسر بن ارقاة الروم وسبا منهم خلقا واستباح مدنهم ثم عاد في السنة التي بعدها وسبا ايضا سبيا كثيرا.

TRANSLATION

(97^r) Allegiance was given to al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī.¹¹ In the year forty-one of the Arabs Mu‘āwiya travelled to Iraq and al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī went out to him. They met at al-Maskin, in the province of al-Sawād, in the region of al-Anbār.¹² They came to an agreement with a written text, conditions and witnesses; Mu‘āwiya then entered Kufa and delivered a sermon there.¹³ The people gave allegiance to him and he, having left a deputy in Kufa, returned to Syria. Mu‘āwiya placed Faḍāla ibn ‘Ubayd in charge of his judiciary.¹⁴ Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī returned to Medina. He was asked what he had done and he said: “I hated (to spill) blood and I saw that the men of Kufa were a people not even one of whom could be trusted, and indeed my father encountered trouble from them. He derived no benefit from them at all and they were of no good for anything.”¹⁵ ‘Utba ibn Abī Sufyān led the people in pilgrimage.¹⁶ When Mu‘āwiya was sure of the rule, (97^r) he relocated it¹⁷ from Yathrib to Damascus;¹⁸ he was now in control of the whole world

11. This is the last entry in Agapius for year AH 40/AD 660–61 (cf. Tab 2.1; Mas 300). Al-Ḥasan was the eldest son of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, son-in-law of the prophet Muḥammad. ‘Alī was portrayed by later Islamic tradition as the fourth legitimate caliph, although his opponent Mu‘āwiya retained control of most of the reins of power during ‘Alī’s putative reign (656–60). Some of ‘Alī’s supporters hoped that his son al-Ḥasan would continue the struggle, but he was disinclined to do so.

12. IK 187(summer 41/661). Tab 2.2-7 narrates the deal between al-Ḥasan and Mu‘āwiya across the years AH 40 and 41; he agrees that al-Ḥasan returned, with his brother al-Ḥusayn, to Medina.

13. Tab 2.9; Yaq 2.256; Mas 300–1.

14. Tab 2.205; Mas 302.

15. Tab 2.3 and 2.9 has al-Ḥasan give a speech deriding the Iraqis while still in Iraq.

16. IK 189; Tab 2.16; Yaq 2.284. Oddly al-Tadmurī, *Muntakhab* (quoted n. 6), p. 67, emends ‘Utba to ‘Anbasa.

17. It is not clear what the main clause is, since the sentence starts “when...” but then each subsequent verb is preceded by “and.” Al-Tadmurī, *Muntakhab* (quoted n. 6), p. 65, solves the problem by adding the word *jalasa* (“sat down,” so Mu‘āwiya sat down [on his throne] and [...]), but it is not present in the MS. I have translated “relocated it” on the assumption that *taqallada* is a copyist’s mistake for *naqala-hu* (the *hu* referring to *al-mulk*) and because it fits the sense.

18. That Mu‘āwiya relocated the headquarters of Muslim rule to Damascus is reported also by Theophanes and Dionysius (HOYLAND, *Theophilus*, p. 148) and by a Maronite chronicle (Mu‘āwiya “placed his seat in Damascus and refused to go to the seat of Muḥammad”: SCWSC, p. 32).

after having been governor for twenty years. This was in the year nine hundred and seventy-two of Dhū l-Qarnayn,¹⁹ forty-one of the Arabs and year nineteen of Constans, king of the Romans.

There appeared the Harurites.²⁰ They were those who thought that the rest of the Muslims and whoever opposed them were in error²¹ and that they were more deserving of the kingship than anyone else. Mu'āwiya, when he took charge of the kingdom,²² favoured the people of the west over the people of the east because of the obedience of the westerners to him and the open enmity towards him of those (the easterners) in their writing to him.²³

In the second²⁴ year (42/662–3) there was a raid of the Alans from Armenia.²⁵ Also in it²⁶ the Romans suffered a major defeat; the commander of the raid was Busr ibn Arṭāt²⁷ and he killed a number of patricians. He took captives and let the Muslims take plunder

19. This is the Islamic name for Alexander the Great, thus indicating the Seleucid era. Year 972 in this era equates to October 660 – September 661, which overlaps with AH 41 (May 661 – April 662) and year 19 of Constans. The Maronite chronicle (*SCWSC*, pp. 31–2) places Mu'āwiya's accession in July (probably 661, for though it says AG 971/660, it records a frost on Wednesday 13th April of “the following year,” and this would only be correct for 662). Muslim sources give a slight range of spring-summer 661 (late 40 to early 41), which probably reflects the fact that different groups recognised him at different times. There is a preference for Dhū l-Qa'da 40 (March 661) for his acclamation in Kufa (e.g. *Yaq* 2.256) and Rabī I 41 (July 661) for his acclamation in Palestine/Syria (e.g. *Mas* 301).

20. These were originally supporters of 'Alī, but then, according to Muslim sources, they become disenchanted with him and at a place called Ḥarūrā' in southern Iraq they deserted him (*kharaḥa* 'an-hu), and hence the names of Harurites and Kharijites. For further details and references see *EI*, Ḥarūrā' and Khāridjites. Tab 2.17–21 also treats the Kharijites at this point, as do Theophanes and Michael the Syrian (HOYLAND, *Theophilus*, pp. 149–50).

21. This sentence as it is in the MS (*wa-'ammār man ra'ā sā'ir al-muslimīn wa-anna man khālafahum 'alā ḡalāla*) does not make sense. So as to give a clear English rendering I have read it as *wa-hum man ra'ū anna sā'ir al-muslimīn wa-man khālafahum 'alā ḡalāla*, but this is probably not exactly what the original said.

22. Al-Tadmurī, *Muntakhab* (quoted n. 6), p. 66, emends to *istawā*, i.e. “when the kingdom had stabilised,” which reads more naturally in the Arabic.

23. The MS clearly has *kātiban la-hu*, which does not seem to fit here either grammatically or semantically, but it is difficult to think what is intended. Possibly it was a marginal note that subsequently became incorporated into the text. This notice has a parallel in Theophanes, pp. 347–8: “He humiliated the men of Persia while exalting those of Syria [...] The wages of the Syrians he raised to 200 gold coins while those of the Iraqis he lowered to 30 gold coins.”

24. Reading *al-thāniya* rather than *al-thāmina* (“eighth”) as appears in the MS.

25. Tab 2.16 (42/662–3), though he says that it was the Muslims who raided the Alans. The latter were a people speaking an East Iranian language in the northern Caucasus region; see *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, online edition, s.v. Alans.

26. In my *Theophilus*, p. 152, I took the *fi-hā* to refer to the raid (*ghazwa*) of the Alans, but it is more likely that it refers to the year (*sana*), meaning that this was another event of that second year of Mu'āwiya. Note that Tab 2.16 records these same two events together in the same notice and with similar wording (“In this year the Muslims raided the Alans and they also raided the Romans, inflicting a terrible defeat on them and killing several patricians”).

27. Agapius always writes this man's name incorrectly as Bishr ibn Arṭāt rather than Busr ibn Abī Arṭāt; he was of the Qurayshi clan of Banū 'Āmir, a staunch ally of the Umayyads and a renowned general. See *EI*, Busr b. Abī Arṭāt.

from the abode²⁸ of the Romans. It was the first captives they took.²⁹ Mu‘āwiya appointed over the winter campaign³⁰ ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān,³¹ who was at that time sixteen years old, and he then took to the sea. Together with him, Mu‘āwiya put in command of all the soldiers ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālid ibn al-Walīd,³² and some say Busr ibn Artāt. Also in it Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam³³ became governor of Medina and he appointed over the judiciary ‘Abdallāh ibn Nawfal ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib.³⁴ Also in it Busr ibn Artāt travelled to Medina, Mecca and Yemen,³⁵ (98^r) and he killed ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and Qutham, two sons of ‘Abdallāh ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib.³⁶ Also in it Abū Laylā the rebel was killed in the Sawād of Kufa.³⁷ Also in it ‘Utba ibn Abī Sufyān led the people in the pilgrimage.³⁸

In the third year of Mu‘āwiya (43/663–4) there was a second raid of Busr ibn Artāt against the Romans in which he took prisoners; the Romans were defeated and they (the Muslims) reached Constantinople.³⁹ Also in it Mu‘āwiya wrote to Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam that he should prepare to lead the people in pilgrimage and so he attended and organized the season.⁴⁰ Also in it ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ died in Egypt, on the day of the Fiṭr;⁴¹ he had

28. There is damage to the MS at this point and the words “from the abode” (*min dār*) are not certain.

29. Perhaps this means that it was the first captives taken during that year’s raiding expedition or the first of many that Busr and his men were going to take in the course of their raids.

30. This word is missing in the MS after the definite article (except for a hint of an ascendant letter, perhaps an *aliph*), and *shātīya* / “winter campaign” is only a guess based on the fact that one campaign has already been mentioned for this year, and if this was the summer campaign then only the winter one is left. However, other words are possible; Marek Jankowiak suggested to me *al-baḥr*, meaning the naval forces, which recurs at the end of the sentence.

31. This is the future caliph ‘Abd al-Malik (685–705). This is not mentioned by the extant Muslim chroniclers and may reflect the fact that Agapius made use of a pro-Umayyad/Syrian source no longer extant.

32. This is the son of the famous conquest-period general Khālid ibn al-Walīd (d. 642); he is described as “commander of the Arabs of Emesa” in the Syriac Maronite chronicle (*SCWSC*, p. 33).

33. This is the future caliph Marwān I (684–5) and father of ‘Abd al-Malik.

34. Tab 2.16. He was known as the first judge of Medina and called by some “the first judge of Islam” (Ibn Qutayba, *Ma‘ārif*, ed. T. ‘Ukasha, Cairo 1992, 1.558).

35. There is space for another line here, and there are traces of letters, but they look as though they are simply the imprint from the bottom line of the facing page resulting from the water damage that this manuscript suffered. As regards the sense of the passage it is not evident that any words are missing.

36. This should read ‘Ubaydallāh ibn al-‘Abbās; thus Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rikh Dimashq* (ed. ‘A. al-‘Amrawī, Beirut 1995), 10.151: “He (Busr) killed ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and Qutham, two sons of ‘Ubaydallāh ibn ‘Abbās.” Cf. Tab 2.22: “Busr ibn Abī Artāt travelled to Medina, Mecca and Yemen [...] He killed everyone who was said to have helped against (the caliph) ‘Uthmān.”

37. This may refer to Abū Laylā ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Jarrāḥ (nephew of Abū ‘Ubayda ibn al-Jarrāḥ, the first Muslim governor of Syria), who fought for the caliph ‘Alī at the Battle of the Camel, but it is unknown whether he subsequently revolted. The word for rebel here is *khārījī*, which can mean rebel in general or specifically one of those who turned against ‘Alī at Ḥarūra’ (see note 20 above).

38. Yaq 2.284, but IK 190 and Tab 2.27 say it was ‘Utba’s brother, ‘Anbasa ibn Abī Sufyān, who led the pilgrimage in this year.

39. IK 190; Tab 2.27 (al-Wāqidī specifies that Busr reached Constantinople); Yaq 2.285; Theoph., p. 348.

40. IK 190; Tab 2.27; Yaq 2.284.

41. I.e. the day on which the end of the fast of Ramadan is celebrated (in AH 43 = 6 January, 664).

governed Egypt during the caliphate of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb for four years and during the caliphate of ‘Uthmān for three years and ten months and during the caliphate of Mu‘āwiya for two and a half years. Mu‘āwiya appointed his son, ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, (as governor of Egypt) in his place for two years.⁴²

In the fourth year of Mu‘āwiya (44/664–5) ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn Khālīd ibn al-Walīd took prisoners in the land of the Romans and the Muslims reached Koloneia⁴³ of the land of the Romans.⁴⁴ Also in it Mu‘āwiya made the *maqṣūra* in Damascus and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam made it in Medina.⁴⁵ Also in it the *manābir*⁴⁶ were brought out to the prayer-place (*al-muṣallā*) on the two feasts;⁴⁷ the (customary) way was contrary to this, for the caliphs (before Mu‘āwiya) used to give the sermon on the feasts in the prayer-places on the surface of the ground.⁴⁸ Also in it Mu‘āwiya led the people in pilgrimage⁴⁹ and stayed at Medina in his residence.

(98^v) Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī, ‘Abdallāh ibn Ja‘far and Ibn ‘Abbās⁵⁰ came to him asking him to be true to⁵¹ what he had vouchsafed to al-Ḥasan and what he had stipulated on himself. He said: “Are you not satisfied, o sons of Hāshim, when I ensure for you (your

42. Yaq 2.264; Mas 303. Tab 2.27–8 has almost the same wording as Agapius for the whole of this notice except that he has ‘Amr serve “two years minus one month” under Mu‘āwiya. He notes that al-Wāqīdī estimated ‘Abdallāh’s governorship at “about two years.”

43. *qlwnyh*: modern Şebinkarahisar in Pontus, which is the Black Sea region of modern Turkey. After this notice about Koloneia the editions of Cheikho, Vasiliev and al-Tadmuri, which had been patchy, now halt completely, since the MS was for them, as Vasiliev states in a footnote here, “totally illegible.”

44. IK 191; Tab 2.67; Yaq 2.285 (*qlwnyh*’*qlwnyh*). There is a long account of a campaign that ‘Abd al-Rahmān led in Anatolia in year 4 of Mu‘āwiya (AG 975) in the Maronite chronicle (SCWSC, pp. 33–5); see also Theoph., p. 348.

45. This is also stated by Tab 2.70 and Yaq 2.265 (“Mu‘āwiya made the *maqṣūra* in the mosque [of Damascus]”), but without comment. A *maqṣūra* is usually explained as a separate enclosure in a mosque established for the use of the ruler. Muslim sources mostly agree that Mu‘āwiya was the first to deploy one, but al-Balādhurī (*Futūḥ al-buldān*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Leiden 1866, pp. 347–8) says that Ziyād ibn Abihi, Mu‘āwiya’s governor of Basra, was the first to do so and he implies that it allowed Ziyād to pass from his palace directly to the mosque (of Basra) without having to pass through his subjects. This is likely to have been the purpose of Mu‘āwiya’s *maqṣūra* in Damascus too (F. B. FLOOD, *The great mosque of Damascus: studies on the makings of an Umayyad visual culture*, Leiden 2001, pp. 120–1, 149–50, 169–71). Muslim sources tend to explain the adoption of the *maqṣūra* as a response to a specific incident, such as infiltration of the mosque by a rebel or a dog (Ibn Qutayba, *Mā‘ārif*, 1.553).

46. *Minbar* is usually translated as pulpit, but it is a borrowing from Ge‘ez (*manbar/mabbar*), where it appears in late antique royal inscriptions with the meaning of seat/throne, and so it is possible that *minbars* were initially for sitting rather than standing.

47. Yaq 2.265 has almost the same wording: “He brought out the pulpits to the prayer-place (*al-muṣallā*) on the two feasts.” Presumably this refers to *‘id al-adḥā* and *‘id al-ḥiṭr*, the two principal Muslims feasts which come at the end of the pilgrimage (*hajj*) and of the fast of Ramadan respectively.

48. Yaq 2.283 says that Mu‘āwiya made his pulpit (*minbar*) five steps higher than that of Muḥammad’s.

49. IK 191; Tab 2.70; Yaq 2.284.

50. These were the three leading men of the Hashimite clan of Quraysh. ‘Abdallāh ibn Ja‘far was a nephew of ‘Alī ibn Abi Ṭālib and ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Abbās was a cousin of the prophet Muḥammad.

51. It looks like there are two dots over the middle letter, i.e. *al-waqā’* (“protection”), but it is more natural to read *al-wafā’*.

lives),⁵² even though you killed ‘Uthmān?’ Ibn ‘Abbās was about to speak, but al-Ḥasan stopped him. Then he (Mu‘āwiya) resumed speaking and reiterated his original statement. When Ibn ‘Abbās saw that he was not going to stop, he went up to him and said: “As for the evil that you (claim to) have received from us, it is for you to look into your own nature,⁵³ but you, by God, are more appropriate (to be accused of it) than us. As for your statement that we killed ‘Uthmān, rather it is you, by God, who killed him and now you are making people believe that you are seeking (vengeance) for his blood”.⁵⁴ Mu‘āwiya was subdued (by this) and he refrained from answering.⁵⁵

In the fifth year of Mu‘āwiya (45/665–6) dissension occurred among the Christians on the subject of Christ, glory be to Him. Some of them celebrated the Resurrection on the Feast of Hosannas (Palm Sunday), and some celebrated the Resurrection on the day of the New Sunday (the first Sunday after Easter).⁵⁶ Also in this year ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālīd raided the Romans and took many prisoners, and he brought out with him a great number of the Slavs who were in the land of the Romans and settled them in one of the villages of Apamaea.⁵⁷

In the sixth year of Mu‘āwiya (46/666–7) Busr ibn Artāt raided the Romans and took captive a number of them and plundered their cities;⁵⁸ then he returned the next year and also took many captives.⁵⁹

52. Both Ya‘qūbī and Ibn Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī (see note 55 below) have “your blood” (*dimā’akum*), i.e. your lives, which makes good sense here, and it is likely that this word has dropped out of Agapius. One should probably also assume that Agapius’ verb here should be in the fourth form (*uqirri*) rather than the second (*uqarrir*); cf. Ya‘qūbī in note 55 below.

53. There is a kink in the pen stroke linking the “q” and the “k” of this word, so I have read *khilqatika*; but there are no dots above the kink, so one could disregard it as a letter and read *khulqika*.

54. This last statement would suit better the time before Mu‘āwiya became caliph, when his justification for standing against ‘Alī was that he was seeking justice for his kinsman ‘Uthmān.

55. Cf. Yaq 2.264–5: “Mu‘āwiya went on pilgrimage in the year 44 [...] and when he went to Medina a group of the sons of Hāshim came to him and addressed him about their affairs. **He said: ‘Are you not satisfied, o sons of Hāshim, that we safeguard (*nuqirri*) for you your blood even though you killed ‘Uthmān?’** [...] Ibn ‘Abbās said to him: ‘All that you say to us, Mu‘āwiya, (comes) from the malice within you, but that (evil you attribute to us) **is, by God, more appropriate** (to attribute) **to you. You killed ‘Uthmān** and then you set about lying to the people that **you were seeking his blood.**’ Mu‘āwiya was subdued by this.” Ibn Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī (*Kitāb al-bad’*, ed. C. Huart, Paris 1899–1919), 6.5: “When Mu‘āwiya was on pilgrimage, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn and Ibn ‘Abbās came to him and asked him to fulfil what he had vouchsafed. **He said: ‘Are you not satisfied, o sons of Hāshim, that we have spared (*nuwaffir*) you your blood even though you are killers of ‘Uthmān.**” Bold type indicates the same words or words of the same root.

56. This notice is from the eastern source (HOYLAND, *Theophilus*, p. 153).

57. That ‘Abd al-Raḥmān raided the Romans in this year is known to Muslim sources (e.g. IK 192; Tab 2.81; Yaq 2.285), but only Agapius and Theophanes mention the Slavs and their settlement in the region of Apamaea (HOYLAND, *Theophilus*, p. 152).

58. Cf. Theoph., p. 353: “Bousour made an expedition and, after taking many captives, returned home.” This is not recorded by Muslim sources, though Fasawī 1.34 says that he raided Adana (*al-Ma‘rifā wa-l-ta‘riḫ*, ed. A. D. al-‘Umārī, Beirut 1981).

59. There now follows a very lengthy account of the rebellion of Shapur against Constans and Mu‘āwiya’s involvement in it, which I edited and translated in my *Theophilus*, pp. 156–8 and appendix 3.

ABBREVIATIONS

- IK = Ibn Khayyāt, Khalifa (d. 240/854), *Ta'rikh*, ed. Akram Diyā' al-'Umarī, revised ed., Beirut 1977.
- Mas = Mas'ūdī, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al- (d. 345/946), *Kitāb al-tanbīh wa-l-ishrāf*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Bibliotheca geographorum Arabicorum 8), Leiden 1894.
- SCWSC = *The seventh century in the West-Syrian chronicles*, introd., transl. and annotated by A. Palmer, including two seventh-century Syriac apocalyptic texts introd., transl. and annotated by S. Brock, with added annotation and an historical introd. by R. Hoyland (Translated texts for historians 15), Liverpool 1993.
- Tab = Ṭabarī, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al- (d. 310/923), *Ta'rikh al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje *et al.*, Leiden 1879–1901.
- Theoph. (d. 818) = *Theophanis chronographia* rec. C. de Boor, Lipsiae 1883–1885.
- Yaq = Ya'qūbī, Aḥmad ibn Abī Ya'qūb al- (d. 284/897), *Ta'rikh*, ed. M. T. Houtsma, Leiden 1883.