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ABSTRACT

In the preparation of this thesis I have endeavored to examine the history of Lebanon during the Crusader and Mamluk periods as presented by three Maronite historians who represent the Maronite historiographic tradition in the fifteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth centuries. The study has been made in view of the future use of the works of these historians for the reconstruction of a period in the internal history of Lebanon which has remained so far obscure and unknown.

Aside from giving brief biographies of the three historians in question (Jibra'il ibn al-Qila'i, d. 1516, Istifan ad-Duwaighi, d. 1704, and Tannus ash-Shidyaq, d. 1856) and discussing at length the circumstances under which they wrote their histories and their purposes as historians, I have given detailed synopses of their historical works and analyzed their histories independently. In the course of this analysis I have sought to establish historical facts which they ment
or to which they allude by studying these facts and taking, into consideration any mention or allusion to them by non-Maronite historians (Moslems, non-Maronite Eastern Christian and Western Christians) and by other Maronite historians, the general setting of the history of the Middle East in the Crusader and Mamluk periods in which they fit. Some of the facts I have established definitely, but many others only by probability.

After making an independent analysis of each of the three historians, I have tried to assess the value of their works, independently and conjointly, as sources for the history of Lebanon in the Crusader and Mamluk periods.

This thesis, on the whole, has been concerned with the establishment of historical facts concerning the history of Medieval Lebanon and the exercise of judgement on the worth of Maronite historiography in so far as it deals with this history. It has been prepared as a basis for the reconstruction of the history of Lebanon in the four centuries preceding the Ottoman conquest in 1516 which, so far, have been practically completely ignored. It is hoped that the work done in this thesis will open the way to further research on the subject.

Kamal S. Salibi

London, April 10, 1953.
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In the general use the term "Lebanon" denotes either the modern Republic of Lebanon or the Mountain (the latter being usually referred to as "Mount Lebanon", or "the Lebanon"). In this thesis the term is used in a particular sense to denote the area covering both, Mount Lebanon and the stretch of the Phoenician coast extending from Nahr al-Bārid, north of Tripoli to Nahr al-‘Ulī, north of Sidon - roughly, that part of the modern Lebanese Republic that lay within the boundaries of the County of Tripoli and the Baronies of Beirut and Sidon in Crusader times, and within the niyāba of Tripoli and the wilāyās of Beirut and Sidon (in the niyāba of Damascus) in the Mamlūk period.

The term "Maronite Lebanon" is sometimes used to imply that part of Lebanon that lay roughly north of Antiliās, where there was (and still is) a large concentration of Maronites. The use of the term with this geographical connotation, however, is not frequent; and the term is generally used to denote the Maronite community in Lebanon. Likewise, the term "non-Maronite Lebanon" is used as a collective term for the Dr and Moslem (orthodox and heterodox) communities in Lebanon. * 

* This term, as used in this thesis, does not include the non-Maronite Christian communities in Lebanon (Melchites and Jacobites). These communities are only mentioned in this thesis in as far as their relations with the Maronites are concerned, while dealing with the history of Maronite Lebanon. The Maronite historians whose works are considered did not deal with the internal history of the Jacobites and the Melchites, and only mentioned their relations with the Maronite
The map of the feudal provinces of medieval Lebanon attached to this thesis will help the reader locate the villages, towns, provinces, and rivers of which mention is made. This map, however, merely gives a rough representation of the boundaries of the Lebanese feudal provinces in the period under consideration, and does not take into consideration the changes that took place during that period.

In giving the names of places in Lebanon and of Lebanese characters, I have attempted to transliterate them according to the Lebanese pronunciation. Other Arabic names are rendered according to an accepted Arabic transliteration. In cases where a place name has an accepted English form (like Beirut, Tripoli, and Jubail), I have used the accepted form, except when rendering composite place names. Thus, "Beirut" is given as the name of the city; but "Nahr Bairūt" and "Ṣāḥil Bairūt" are given as the names of the river and the province called after the city.

Unless otherwise stated, the translations rendered in this thesis are mine.

Kamal S. Salibi
London 1953
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The study of the works of the Maronite historiographers is essential to any attempt to understand the history of Lebanon between the advent of the Crusaders to Syria and its conquest by the Ottomans. Such works, together with those of the few other Lebanese historian dealing with this period, provide the main body of source material on it.

In general, what is found in non-Lebanese sources about the internal history of Lebanon in the later Middle Ages serves to substantiate the facts found in the Lebanese sources, but only adds a small amount of information to them. To the Arabic chroniclers of the Zangid, Ayyūbid, and Mamlūk periods Lebanon was important only in so far as it was a border province of the Islamic empire that was particularly susceptible to attack from the sea and by the coastal route. They took no interest in its internal history except when they mentioned help offered by the Lebanese mountaineers to the Crusaders or the Mongols, or the suppression of a revolt of the heterodox Moslem communities that inhabited the northern and central slopes of the mountain.
Eastern Christian chroniclers rarely mentioned Lebanon, in spite of the fact that it was largely inhabited by Christians belonging to the different Christian communions of the East. The Crusader historians, likewise, did not reflect at length or its local history, although the country fell under Frankish domination for the greater part of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is true that several of them occasionally mentioned the Maronites of Lebanon, who were perhaps the most faithful allies the Franks found in Syria; but they did not dwell on the role played by those Maronites in particular event and virtually ignored their internal political history. A number of pilgrims and missionaries who visited the Holy Land during and after the Crusader period, while enumerating and describing the various native Christian sects of Syria, commented on the religious condition of the Maronites, sometimes giving indications of their numbers and the general aspect of their political life; but the later pilgrims and missionaries tended to repeat what previous ones had noted, and they did not always record their own observations.

The importance of the study of Maronite sources has been realized by modern historians of Lebanon, and the publication of the classics of Maronite historiography has been undertaken by scholars in Lebanon since the end of the nineteenth century. The historical works of Jibrāʾīl ibn al-Qilāʾī and Iṣṭifān ad-Duwaiḥī, the founder and the first great author of the Maronite historiographic tradition, have all appeared in print; but the
critical study of those works and of others is still in its infancy.

The most important work that has been done on the subject so far has been Georg Graf's survey of Maronite historiographical literature in his *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*. By listing an appreciable number of Maronite historical works available partly or fully in manuscript, in print, or in quotation by later authors, and by attempting a critical treatment of the more important of those works, Graf contributed greatly to the facilitation of the study of the literature; but his survey has been incomplete and his critical treatment inadequate. In the edition of Ibn al-Qilāʾī's main historical work, *Mādiha ʿala Jabal Libnān* (Poem on Mount Lebanon), Būlus Qaraʾīī attempted an analytical study of it; but many of the conclusions he reached are untenable.

The present study is neither a history of Maronite historiography nor a survey of Maronite historical literature dealing with the history of Lebanon in the period of Crusader and Mamluk domination (c.1100-1516). Its purpose is to analyse the history of Lebanon in this period as presented by three leading figures of the Maronite historiographic tradition, Ibn al-Qilāʾī, Duwaiḥī, and Tannūs ash-Shidyāq. Before pro-

---

2. Būlus Qaraʾīī's conclusions will be considered below in the chapter on Ibn al-Qilāʾī's history.
ceeding to the study of the work of those historians, however, it is important to consider briefly the scope and general characteristics of Maronite historiography, the factors giving rise to it, and the conditions under which it developed.

The traditional historiography of the Maronites seems to have originated as an expression of Maronite national pride. As a small, closely-knit community surrounded by enemies, the Maronites have been, in general, deeply interested in their own history, taking pride in having retained their national identity through centuries of vicissitudes. This, doubtless, has been a major factor in driving them to examine the events and conditions of their past. The Maronite church is, perhaps, the smallest of the communions of Eastern Christianity; and although not the oldest, it was among the first to begin a tradition of attachment to and finally of union with Rome. Centralized and strongly localized in the almost inaccessible northern slopes of Mount Lebanon, it was never subjected to the direct politics of Islam to the same extent as the other Eastern Christian churches. The Maronites, through centuries of Moslem rule, remained comparatively free of Moslem tutelage in their mountains. Their awareness of these facts has contributed to the formation of their national pride which they expressed in their historiography.

1. G. Graf considered the Maronites as the Eastern Christian community that held the highest rank in historiography. See G. Graf, Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur, III, p. 306.
Another factor contributing to the rise of Maronite historiography, which is somewhat related to the first, has been the strong Maronite desire to rebut the historical evidence pointing to their heretical origin and the denials of their original and unbroken orthodoxy and union with Rome by Western writers and by other Uniates. The Maronites were originally a monothelitite communion; and it was only in the late twelfth century that they became permanently attached to Rome. William of Tyre, the Crusader chronicler, had related the event of their union, to which he was contemporary;¹ and later writers referred to his history when they discussed the conversion of the Maronites from monothelitism. Moreover, during the three centuries that followed their union with Rome in c.1180, there were several anti-Catholic movements among their clergy and laity which, although never ultimately successful, were widespread enough to make pilgrims and missionaries who visited Lebanon in this period doubt their orthodoxy. Faced with denials of their original and unbroken orthodoxy, Maronite scholars, starting with Ibn al-Qilāʾī (d.1516), reverted to the history of their community for evidence to refute them.

Little is known about Maronite historiography before Ibn al-Qilāʾī. Graf listed only two Maronite historical works written before the fifteenth century: A Church history written

¹ See below, pp. 184–185.
in the thirteenth century by the monk Yūḥanna (Yūḥanna ar-Rāhib al-Mārūnī)¹ and an early fourteenth century history of the monastery of Mār Shallīṭā Maqbis in Kisruān (1194-1307) by Tādrus, archbishop of Ḥama - a brief historical sketch which must have once formed part of a larger work by the same author. Iliās of Mfād, a contemporary of Ibn al-Qilāṭī to whose work Duwaiḥī made reference,³ appears to have been a chronicler of some importance; but his work, if it still exists, is yet to be discovered.

Ibn al-Qilāṭī, who lived in the latter half of the fifteenth century and died the year of the Ottoman conquest, is the earliest Maronite historian of note whose works are still largely available. As a historiographer he was concerned exclusively with the history of his own community and with that of the Church. The main aim of his work was to prove to the "misled" Maronites of his day that their church had always been in communion with Rome, and that the calamities that had occasionally befallen their community in the past were demonstrations of divine wrath brought about by their temporary lapse into the heresy of their neighbours. For this purpose he wrote Mādiḥa ʿala Jabal Libnān, a fanciful rendering of the history of his community from an indefinite period in the past, a

3. For further mentions of Iliās of Mfād, see below, pp.
golden age of orthodoxy and material prosperity, until his own day, and several tracts and poems on the history of the Church and on the development of the various Christian heresies and schisms.

With Duwaihī, however, the scope of Maronite historiography, in so far as it dealt with the history of Lebanon, was widened. The Maronites of Ibn al-qlā‘ī’s day were an isolated community owing political allegiance to their own muqaddams, or chiefs, who paid their tribute to the Mamlūk government. They were little concerned with their Moslem and Druze neighbours except for the memories of open hostility in the past. Duwaihī on the other hand, lived in a Lebanon that had been brought wholly under the suzerainty of one Druze family — the Maʿnids. Already before his time, in the early years of the seventeenth century, Fakhr ad-Dīn II of Maʿn had succeeded in bringing under his control the whole of Lebanon, as well as the Biqā‘ and Galilee.¹ The boundaries between Maronite and non-Maronite Lebanon had become less definite; and one of the most important Maronite feudal families, the Khāzins, had been the staunch supporters of the Druze amir.² It is not surprising, therefore, to find that although Duwaihī was mainly concerned with the history of the Maronites and the Maronite church, as Ibn al-qlā‘ī had been, and although a considerable part of his work was devoted to the polemical defence of the perpetual orthodoxy

¹ H. Lammens, La Syrie, précis historique, (Beirut, 1921), II, pp. 72-74.
² Ibid., II, pp. 71-72 and 81.
of his community, he took some interest in the political history of the other communities of Lebanon and of that part of the world in which Lebanon was located.

Ibn al-Qilāʿī and Duwaiḥī were both clergymen, and so were almost all the Maronite historiographers before the beginning of the nineteenth century. Even during the nineteenth century and up to the present day Maronite historiography continued to be largely a clerical historiography, with the polemical defence of the original and unbroken orthodoxy of the Maronites as its dominant feature.

With the nineteenth century, however, the lay Maronite historian appeared and the polemical tradition became less pronounced. Living in an age when Lebanon had already become an issue of international politics, historiographers like Ṭāmim ash-Shidyāq and Ḥaidar ash-Shihābī were little interested in Church history and in theological polemics, and concentrated on the political history of their country. Shihābī occasionally mentioned the role played by the Maronites in Church Councils in Rome, repeating what Duwaiḥī had written about such events, but his history deals mainly with feudal Lebanon. Shidyāq, on the other hand, showed no concern at all with Church history. In Akhbār al-aʿyān fi Jabal Lubnān, a history of the various feudal families of Lebanon, he dealt with the origins and genealogies of those families and with the internal political history of Lebanon under their leadership at a time when Lebanese feudalism as a political system had already matured and was
approaching its downfall.

The founders and early masters of the Maronite historiographic tradition were educated in Italy; but the tradition which they started and developed flourished mainly in Lebanon and remained largely unexposed to Western critical approach until the late nineteenth century. Maronite historians who had received the benefits of Western scholarly discipline wrote their history for their countrymen who were unfamiliar with this discipline. The validity of their history remained unchallenged and they tended, therefore, to become naively dogmatic in their assertions and denials of historical fact. The isolation of the Maronite historiographic tradition, besides, was conducive to the interdependence of Maronite historians who tended, in general, to repeat each other and to draw on each other's conclusions.

1. There were Maronite historians like Murhij ibn Nimrūn, or Nairūn (Faustus Naironus, d. 1712) and Yūsuf Shāmūn as-Simʿāni (Joseph Simonius Assemani, d. 1768) who lived mainly in Italy (the former was born in Italy) and wrote in Latin. These historians, however, cannot be considered strictly as belonging to the traditional school of Maronite historiography whose authors lived for the most part in Lebanon or its neighbouring countries and wrote in colloquial and/or classical Arabic. Apart from the fact that Faustus Naironus (Dissertatio de origine, nomine, ac religione Maronitarum, Romae 1679) and Assemani (Biblioteca Orientalis, Romae 1719) wrote their main historical works in Latin, presumably for Western scholars, they were only interested in the origins of the Maronite and the Maronite church and did not consider Maronite or Lebanese history on the whole, as the historians of the school of Ibn al-Qilāṭi and Duwaiḥī did. Assemani's journal (Gauininyyāt) and his accounts of the Maronite councils of his day are important sources for the history of the Maronite church in his day; but they are documentary rather than historiographical sources. For Faustus Naironus, see Graf, op. cit., III pp. 359 et seq. For Assemani, see ibid., III, pp. 444 et seq.
Besides, the very factors that had given rise to Maronite historiography were responsible for its most serious weaknesses. In their eagerness to demonstrate the glories of the past of their community, Maronite historians betrayed in their work a naive tendency to overestimate both the autonomy which the Maronites enjoyed in the period of Frankish and Mamlûk domination and the role they played in the events of the Crusader and Mamlûk periods. This is particularly true of Ibn al-Qilâšî who went to the extent of not drawing the distinction between those of his heroes who were Maronite chiefs and those who were Frankish lords. When he spoke of the lords of Jubail he made no hint to the effect that they were not Maronites but Franks. On the other hand, when he related the Mamlûk expeditions against Kîsuânîn in 1292 and 1305 which were directed mainly against the heterodox Moslems and the Druzes of that province, he seemed to believe that they were directed almost exclusively against the Maronites, and that it was the Maronite muqaddams alone who defeated the armies of the Moslems in the first expedition.\footnote{See below, pp. 91 et seq.} Duwaihî, who showed a remarkable critical spirit while relating certain events, and whose polemics reveal a keen and well-trained mind, was not entirely free of this naive approach to the political history of his community. Maronite historians showed the same tendency
when they dealt with the history of non-Maronite Lebanon and tended to ignore the fact that the country fell under foreign domination throughout the period the events of which they related.

Far more detrimental to the validity of their history was their zeal to prove the original and unbroken orthodoxy of their church and to refute all the evidence against it. All the Maronite historians who considered the history of their church were very critical of historical facts and events that threw doubt on its perpetual orthodoxy and accepted too readily any evidence that supported it, no matter how weak. Some of them distorted historical facts almost beyond recognition to suit their hypothesis.

The value of Maronite historiography as a source for the history of Crusader and Mamlûk Lebanon does not lie so much in intrinsic qualities of objectivity or fulness of scope as in the relative poverty of other sources. The greater number of the Maronite historians whose works are still available lived and wrote in Ottoman times and were not contemporary to the events they related of the previous periods. Ibn al-Qīlāʿī, who died the year of the Ottoman conquest, gave a first hand account of the religious conditions prevailing in Lebanon during his lifetime, but this account does not form the greater part of his history. The main body of Maronite historical works that deal with the period under consideration belong to the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. For the history of
Maronite Lebanon in this period Maronite historians depended on the works of older historians like Ibn al-Qilāʾī and Iliās of Mād, and on those of Duwaiḥī, who collected a considerable amount of information for this history from fragmentary historical information about particular events recorded by scribes on religious books or found in inscriptions. For the history of non-Maronite Lebanon they referred to the history of Ibn Sibāṭ (d. 1520), a Druze from Ālāi who was in the service of the Tanūkhīd amirs of the Gharb, who incorporated in his work much information about the history of the Tanūkhīs, and to other family histories of Moslem and Druze feudal dynasties. The picture those Maronite historians presented of medieval Lebanon had little continuity; for it was, in general, only the more important events about which they found any information in their sources. Besides, when dealing with the history of the Maronites they interpreted this information to suit their preconceptions; and although they had no preconceptions about the history of the non-Maronite feudal dynasties, the sources from which they obtained their information on it were not wholly dependable.

1. The history (Tārīkh) of Ibn Sibāṭ is found in a unique manuscript in the American University of Beirut (second volume only), numbered MS 956.9 I 13. The available volume gives the history of the years 526-926 A.H. (1131-1519 A.D.).

2. Ibn Sibāṭ, relying on Sāliḥ bin Yahya (Tārīkh Bairūt wa akhhr al-umarāʾ al-Buhturiyyin min Bani al-Ghārīb, ed. Lou Cheikhho, Beirut, 1927), gave the history of the Gharb province from the point of view of the Tanūkhīd family. The history of the Anšābī family, rivals of the Tanūkhīs in the Gharb, which is so far known only through Shidyāq's history, gave a different and a rival point of view. For a fuller discussion of the differences between those two histories of the Gharb see the chapter on Shidyāq's history, below.
Ibn al-Qilāšī, to whom all later Maronite historians referred, seems to have woven a considerable amount of legendary material into his history, although he had access to some written sources. The same seems to have been true of Maronite historians who followed him and imitated his historical zājaliyyāt (colloquial poems), like Archbishop Iliās ibn Ḥannā of Ḥdīn and Patriarch Yūsuf al-Ĥāquirī,2 Duwaihī, the first Maronite historian to attempt a critical approach to the history of his community in the later Middle Ages, incorporated in his work much of the fragmentary historiographic material found in church books and inscriptions. For his history of non-Maronite Lebanon he made use of the history of Ibn Sībāt. His own work was utilized and expanded by later historians like Yūsuf Marūn ad-Duwaihī (d. 1780),3 Yūhannā Bādinjānā (1768),4 Antūn Qaiyālā

1. Archbishop Iliās ibn Ḥannā of Ḥdīn was the uncle of Istifān ad-Duwaihī. He died in 1659. He wrote a zājaliyya about the history of the Maronites in 1606 (in Par. syr. 275), in which he dealt with the same themes as Ibn al-Qilāšī. See Graf, op. cit., III, p.335.

2. Yūsuf al-Ĥāquirī, an old student of the Maronite College in Rome, became bishop of Sidon in 1626 and Maronite Patriarch in 1642. He died in 1648. He wrote a zājaliyya about the wars between the Melchites and the Maronites towards the end of the seventh century, part of which still exists in quotation by Duwaihī (Tarikh al-tâ'a'īfa al-mārūniyya, Beirut 1890, p.82). Graf lists no other works by him. See Graf, op. cit., III, p. 339.

3. Yūsuf Marūn ad-Duwaihī was also an old student of Rome. He was the author of a treatise in praise of the Maronites in which he considered their origin, their early history, and their Patriarchs (Sbath Fihris 1438). See Graf, op. cit., III, pp. 467-468.

(1768), and Philip Jumayyil (d. 1796), as well as by Yusuf ad-Dibs (d. 1907), the last of the great masters of the clerical school of Maronite historiography. In the early nineteenth century lay Maronite historians like Ḥaidar ash-Shihābī and Ṭannūs ash-Shidyāq used other non-Maronite family histories — those of the Shihābs and the Arslāns — as sources for the history of non-Maronite Lebanon, while depending mainly on Istifān ad-Duwaiḥī for their history of the Maronites.

In spite of their short-comings, the works of these historians, apart from the few other Lebanese histories, form the most important sources for the history of Lebanon in the later Middle Ages. The study of those works, therefore, is vital for the understanding of this history which, in itself, is essential for the understanding of the history of Lebanon under Ottoman domination; for it was in the Crusader and Mamluk periods that the tradition of local feudal government in Lebanon developed and matured, and that the earliest relations between Christian Lebanon and Western Europe, which were to be of great importance in the later history of Lebanon, were established.

The purpose of this study is to examine the history of

2. Graf mentioned Philip Jumayyil among the Maronite historians who utilized and expanded Duwaihī’s history (ibid., III, p. 307), but he mentioned nothing about his life or his work. I have not come across any of his works.
3. Ibid., p. 307. Some of the works of Yusuf ad-Dibs, who was Archbishop of Beirut, have been used in this study. See Bibliography.
Crusader and Mamluk Lebanon as given by Ibn al-Qilāṭī, Duwaihī, and Shidyāq, each of whom may be considered as the best representative of his period of Maronite historiography. The history of each will be examined in the light of the other available sources on the history of Medieval Lebanon, where such examination is possible, and the factor of the respective historian's approach to the various events he related will be taken into consideration. Unfortunately, only part of the events with which Maronite historians dealt are mentioned or touched upon adequately by other sources. This is particularly true of events in the political history of the Maronites. Those facts which are only related by Maronite historians cannot be established with certainty and will, therefore, be considered in the light of the general pattern of the history of Lebanon and of the history of the Medieval Near East.
CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF JIBRA'IL IBN AL-QILA'I

In 1516, the year the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Lebanon brought to an end that period in the history of Lebanon with which this study is concerned, Jibrail ibn al-Qila'i, Maronite bishop of Cyprus, died in Nicosia. He had been the first Maronite known to have gone to Rome for purposes of study. He had also been the first Maronite known to have collected and recorded information about the history of his people from the beginning of the Crusades to his own day. The historical material found in his letters and his zajaliyyat was used by later Maronite historians; and his various works are still of great importance for the information they give about that obscure period in Lebanese history - the period of Crusader and Mamluk rule.

Jibrail bin Butrus al-Lihfid, known as Ibn al-Qila'i and sometimes also as Ibn Ghuriyya, was born in Lihfid, a village in the neighbourhood of Jubail, in the niyab (province) of Tripoli, towards the middle of the fifteenth century. He was called Ibn al-Qila'i and Ibn Ghuriyya because his father had built:

1. Istifan ad-Duwaihi, Tarikh al-azmina (Beirut, 1950), p. 237. Hence this work will be referred to as Duwaihi, T.A.
2. P. Dib, "Maronites", in Dictionnaire de theologie catholique, X, p. 47. Ibn al-Qila'i studied in Italy before the establishment of the Maronite College in 1584. See below, p. , fn.
3. The biography of Ibn al-Qila'i was given by Istifan ad-Duwaihi in Tarikh at-ta'ifa al-marduniyya (hence T.T.M.), pp. 412 and 417-424. For his biography see also Yusuf ad-Dibs, Al-jami al-mu'assal fi tarikh al-mawarina al-mufassal (Beirut, 1905), pp. 310-311; P. Dib, loc.cit.; and Louis Cheikho, "Les poetes arabes chretiens apres l'Islam" (Arabic) in Al-Mashriq, XXV, 1927, pp. 266-267.
a house among the ruins (qilāf)\(^1\) in the farm of Ghūriyya, near Liḥfiḍ.\(^2\) His early education was entrusted by his parents to Ibrāhīm Draī,\(^3\) a Maronite priest, with whom he studied Syriac and Arabic.

Jibrā’īl’s parents did not plan for him a clerical career. When he reached manhood they arranged for his marriage to a good-looking relation; but his engagement was soon to be broken because of an eye disease he contracted at the time.\(^4\) This was a great disappointment to Jibrā’īl. Turning away from the world, he decided to devote the rest of his life to the service of the Church and the pursuit of learning.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) In classical Arabic, qilāf, the plural of qal’a, means fortresses. In colloquial (Lebanese), however, it is used to mean ruins.

\(^2\) Duwaiḥī, T. T. M., p. 412.

\(^3\) That is how the name is given by Ibn al-Qilāfī in one of his poems. The passage in which the name is given is quoted below, p. 23, fn. 3. Duwaiḥī, loc. cit., gave the name as Ibrāhīm bin Duraī. Throughout this study I will attempt to transliterate place and personal names according to the Lebanese pronunciation, wherever that is relevant, except in such cases where there is an established spelling (e.g. Beirut, Sidon, Jubail).

\(^4\) Ibn al-Qilāfī’s eye disease was, apparently, cured later on. At the end of his poem in praise of Mār Nuhrā (St. Lucius), he wrote: (Madihat Mār Nuhrā, found in two copies in MS Bkerke 13).

This poem was written by the slave, the guide, Ibn al-Qilāfī of Liḥfiḍ.

The light of his eyes, which had been spoilt,

Was cured by the intercession of Mār Nuhrā.

\(^5\) Ibn al-Qilāfī described his ascetic outlook on life in the following verses (Abyāt li ibn al-Qilāfī ‘an al-‘ulūm wa’l- burūj /Verses by Ibn al-Qilāfī about the sciences and the constellations/, MS Bibliothèque Orientale 15, p. 38):

Let him who wants to follow me and take my advice

Not own on Earth of the things that are found

Except the book, and studying in the realm of paper

In hope and fear, hesitating without shame.
Accompanied by two other young Maronites, Yūhannā (who is occasionally referred to as Juan) and Fra Francīs, and with the help of Fra Gryphon, the famous Franciscan missionary to the Maronites, Jibrā'īl ibn al-Qilāʾī was sent to Jerusalem where he and his companions joined the Franciscan order. In 1470 they were sent to Rome where they took orders. They remained in Italy for many years and studied Latin, theology, and science. Later Ibn al-Qilāʾī was to boast to his countrymen about the scope of the learning he acquired in Italy in the opening lines of one of his zajaliyyāt:

Your slave, my brethren, has travelled and gained experience।
He lived in villages, cities, countries, and lands।
He was born in the land of Syria, in the province of Tripol।
And studied in books beyond the seas।
His wisdom he speaks forth in the Greek tongue।
And of Frankish learning he has an extensive knowledge।
Through it he has come to know the roots of the sciences।
And has become acquainted with philosophy and theology.3

In 1493 Ibn al-Qilāʾī returned from Italy as a priest in the Franciscan order. On arriving in Lebanon, he went to visit the Maronite patriarch, and then went to Jerusalem with Fra Francesco Suriano who was then superior of the Franciscans

1. For Fra Gryphon see H. Lammens's monograph "Frere Gryphon et le Liban au XVème siècle" in Revue de l'Orient Chrétien, IV, 1899, pp. 68-104.
2. Francesco Suriano, Il trattato de Terra Santa e dell'Oriente (Florence, 1900), pp. 70-71; F. Bib, loc. cit.
3. Abyāt fī‘l-ābrāj wa‘l-aflāk wa‘l-ayyād al-mutahārīka, (Verses on the constellations, the orbits, and the inconstant feast days), in MS Bibliothèque Orientale 15, p. 47. The name of the author of this poem is not given in it; but it is probable safe to assume that he is Ibn al-Qilāʾī because of his description of himself and because the poem is found in a collection of Ibn al-Qilāʾī's poems. F. Suriano, loc. cit., said that Ibn al-Qilāʾī conducted his studies in Venice.
in the Holy Land.¹ Suriano had been visiting the Maronite patriarch, since Pope Alexander VI had ordered him to send some of his learned monks to visit the Maronite patriarch regularly and to report on the condition of his people.

During his brief stay in Lebanon after his return from Rome Ibn al-Qilä‘î was alarmed by the number of Maronites whom he found attracted by Jacobite missionary activity. Many Maronite clerics and laymen, led and encouraged by ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Ayyūb, the muqaddam of Bsharrāy and the most powerful of the Maronite lords, had fallen under the influence of the Jacobite missionaries and embraced the monophysite faith;² and although the patriarch and the greater part of the Maronite clergy had remained faithful to Rome, they were unable to arrest the spread of this heresy.

Ibn al-Qilä‘î, moreover, noticed that Jacobite propaganda was being spread among the Maronites largely through education. The ignorance of the Maronites at the time, and particularly their ignorance of doctrinal matters, was their main point of weakness, and the Jacobite missionaries were taking advantage of it. Ibn al-Qilä‘î decided, therefore, to combat

¹. Fra Francesco Suriano, a Venetian by birth, was elected Superior of the Franciscans of Terra Santa on May 24, 1493. He probably, thus, accompanied Ibn al-Qilä‘î on his journey back from Rome and visited the Maronite patriarch with him. His first term of office as Superior ended in 1495; but he was re-elected to the same office in 1514. C. Golubovich, Serie cronologica dei Reverendissimi Superiori di Terra Santa (Jerusalem, 1898), pp. 35 and 43.

². The spread of the anti-Catholic movement in Maronite Lebanon in the late fifteenth century will be discussed later in this chapter. Below, pp.104 and seq.
the Jacobite missionary activity with its own weapons. Realizing that the zajal was the best and most attractive means for spreading education among his countrymen, Ibn al-Qilā'ī made full use of it. Throughout the remaining years of his life, poems written in the Lebanese vernacular on medicine, science, astronomy, history, hagiology, Church history, and theology poured prolifically out of his tireless but prosaic pen.

Ibn al-Qilā'ī, however, did not concentrate wholly on the spread of popular knowledge among his lay countrymen. With equal vigour he sought to bring a better knowledge of the Catholic Faith to the Maronite clergy. He wrote and translated from Latin many works on theology, Church discipline, ritual, and dogma. He also wrote numerous letters to Maronite clergymen and notables, rebuking those who had strayed from Roman orthodoxy, warning those who were about to stray, and expounding orthodox doctrines to the faithful.

After he had arrived in Jerusalem with Fra Francesco Suriano, Ibn al-Qilā’ī started his campaign to arrest the spread of the monophysite heresy among his people with the writing of his first major work, Mārūn at-ṭūbānī (Mārūn the Blessed).¹ The purpose of this book, which may be generally described as a work of theology, was to enlighten the Maronite clergy about the principles of Roman orthodoxy and to inform

¹. Mārūn at-ṭūbānī has not been published. It exists in a unique manuscript in the Vatican Library (Vat.arab. 640, ff. 1-193, Karsh. 1574). I have had the occasion to examine this manuscript personally.
them about the previous state of relationship between their church and the Apostolic See.

The book is divided into three parts. The first part entitled Muhdi al-akhlāq (the guide of character), is composed of eight classical Syriac works on theology, followed by Arabic translations of seven letters sent by the Popes of Rome to the Maronite patriarchs.

1. These works on theology, the texts of which are given in the Syriac original, are by Severianus of Jabala (ff.5v-8v), Cyrillicus of Alexandria (ff.8v-10r), Pope Leo the Great (in a Syriac translation, ff.10r-16v), Yaqūb as-Sarūjī (ff.16v-17v), Ephraem (ff.17v-18r), Isaac of Antioch (ff.18r-19r), again Isaac of Antioch (ff.19r-23v), and again Ephraem (ff.23v-26r). For a more detailed description of these works see G. Graf, op. cit., III, pp. 318-319. The texts of these works are the only part of Mārūn at-tūbānī which is in Syriac and not in Arabic.

2. Duwaihi, who described Mārūn at-tūbānī (T.T.M., pp.417-418), said that Muhdi al-akhlāq contained translations of the fourteen papal letters sent to the Maronites in the past. In his letter to Patriarch Shamūn, dated November 6,1494 (p.101) Ibn al-Ḳilāfi mentioned that there were fourteen papal letters in Qannubin. Perhaps this accounts for Duwaihi's mistake in the number of letters translated in Mārūn at-tūbānī. The seven translated letters are, in the order in which they appear in the book, from Innocent III (1198-1216), dated 121 (ff.26v-29v); from Calixtus III (1455-1458), dated 1455 (ff.30r-30v); from Nicholas V (1447-1455), dated 1447 (ff.30v-31r); from Eugene IV (1431-1447), two letters dated 1441 and 1439 respectively (ff.31r-32r and 32r-33v); from Paul II (1464-1471), dated 1469 (ff.33v-35v); and from Leo X (1513-1521), dated 1515(ff.35v-37v). The translation of this last letter must have been added later to the book, either by Ibn al-Ḳilāfi himself or by a later copyist, since it had not yet been written when Ibn al-Ḳilāfi wrote Mārūn at-tūbānī (c. 1495). A letter from Alexander IV, dated 1256, is mentioned by Ibn al-Ḳilāfi (ibid., ff.29v-30r) as having been sent to the Maronite patriarch, but its translation is not given. The Latin texts of all these letters, except that of the letter from Eugene IV dated 1439, were published by Tubiyyā al-‘Anaissi (Tobiae Anaissi, Bullarium Maronitarum, Romae, 1911). Ibn al-Ḳilāfi translated these letters from the original copies which were found in his day at Qannubin (See Ibn al-Ḳilāfi, Letter to Patriarch Shamūn, p. 101).
The second part, which Ibn al-Qilā'i called Thabāt as-sidq (the constancy of the truth), is introduced as follows:

I begin the second book about the belief of the people of Mārūn and their constancy in the lap of the Church of God.... First, against those who disturb the above-mentioned people and say that they were not originally following the Franks.¹

Instead of proceeding, however, with polemics against those who denied the original orthodoxy of the Maronite Church, Ibn al-Qilā'i went on to give chronological tables of the Popes and the Roman and Byzantine emperors.

The third and last part of Mārūn at-tūbānī, entitled Jihad al-īmān (the militancy of the Faith), contains theological polemics against the Jacobites and the Melchites and a catechism of Roman orthodoxy, followed by an appendix dealing with matters of ecclesiastical discipline.

Ibn al-Qilā'i sent the finished work to the Maronite patriarch Sīmān Buṭrus al-Ḫadathī (also known as Shamūn, 1492-1524). With it he sent a zajaliyya describing his contact with Ḍabd al-Munṣīm, the heretical muqaddam of Baharayy, on his return from Rome and calling back to Rome those Maronites who, like Ḍabd al-Munṣīm, had been attracted to the heresy of the Jacobites. On the whole, the poem was meant to serve as

¹. MS Mārūn at-tūbānī, fol. 39r. By "the Franks" Ibn al-Qilā'i meant the Roman Catholics of the West. The title of this second part of the book, Thabāt as-sidq, is misleading since, in spite of this brief introduction, this part of the book is not concerned at all with doctrinal points.
a preface to the book *Mārun [at-ṭūbānī]*; and, although Ibn al-Qilārī did not mention the book by name in the poem, he described it as follows:

It is built on four foundations:
- The first is from the Syriac books;
- The second gives the histories of the times in spiritual and temporal matters;
- The third goes deep in learning against the Jacobites, and also the Greeks.
- As for my fourth book, I began it about the acts of the Councils; but I could not finish it in detail.

Because it is a very long book and this volume is not enough for it.

1. Duwaihi, who related the story of the writing of *Mārun at-ṭūbānī* (*T.T.M.*, pp.417-418), said that Ibn al-Qilārī sent it to Patriarch Shamīn, and that he sent with it a mimar (poem) from which Duwaihi quoted some verses. From these verses which Duwaihi quoted, the poem is identified as *Tabki kull man zāgh fan al-imān* (rebuke to everyone who has strayed from the faith), a zajaliyya by Ibn al-Qilārī which was published by Ibrāhim Harfūsh in *Al-Manāra*, II, 1931, pp. 748-756, 805-813, and 904-907, from the unique manuscript in MS Bkerke 13. The dedication of *Mārun at-ṭūbānī*, as it appears in this poem, is to Butrus IV Ibn Hassān. Ibrāhim Harfūsh, who edited the poem, concluded that Ibn al-Qilārī had not dedicated the poem and the book to Patriarch Shamīn but to his uncle and predecessor, Butrus Ibn Hassān (1468-1492). (See *Tabkit...*, p. 904). It must be remembered, however, that all the Maronite patriarchs add the name Butrus to their original names, and that Shamīn, having been the nephew of Butrus ibn Hassān, was also an Ibn Hassān, although it is not clear why Ibn al-Qilārī should call either of them Butrus IV. Ibn al-Qilārī, besides, did not return to Lebanon until 1493, after the death of Butrus ibn Hassān. It may be added here that *Tabkit...* has been called by Duwaihi elsewhere *Madiha fan al-tadīn qasādu ramiṣ-zawān bain al-Mawārin* (poem about those who intended to throw tares among the Maronites); *T.A.*, p.237.

2. The word used by Ibn al-Qilārī is Rūm, meaning Greeks, by which he meant Melchites.

3. Ibn al-Qilārī, *Tabkit...*, pp. 902-903. He also mentioned in this poem the names of three clergymen whom he wanted to read and examine his book, among whom was Ibrāhim Draīf, his old teacher (*ibid.*, p.812):

> My words are about the priest Ibrāhim
> Who, by fancy, was surnamed Draif.
> I am his student in the understanding and the pronunciation of the Syriac tongue...
Two years after his return from Rome and the writing of Marún at-ṭubānī, Ibn al-Qilā'ī, at the request of Patriarch Shamʿūn, returned to Lebanon to visit the patriarch and the Maronite people and to preach Catholic doctrines. The letter in which he answered the patriarch's summons is an interesting document, and it reveals Ibn al-Qilā'ī's superior and condescending attitude towards his people. The letter is dated November 6, 1494; and Ibn al-Qilā'ī's tone in it is not that of a loyal subject of the Maronite patriarch, but of a Franciscan monk accepting a burdensome task:

Your sanctity (he said) wrote against my will to our head and manager, the Superior of Zion to send my humble self to your service this winter. For the sake of your sanctity I have not refused what you asked for.... Being bound by holy obedience, I shall return to your service in trouble and spiritual fatigue, with or without a companion; and that is what none of the monks of St. Francis, except my humble self, has accepted.... Moreover, because of my love for you and my longing for your salvation, I can say that I have sought this appointment myself, because I found you straying in your minds, lacking in foundation, and not holding fast to the faith of your fathers and the ancient among you who received this faith from the Church of God after much strife and argument... 1

Ibn al-Qilā'ī kept on preaching Catholicism to his people and trying hard to bring them back to orthodoxy until 1496. In three years he wrote 465 letters to the Maronites, 2

1. Ibn al-Qilā'ī's letter to Patriarch Shamʿūn has already been referred to (see above, p. 21, fn. 2). It was published by İbrahim Harfüş in Al-Manāra, III, 1932, pp. 99-106, 176-183, and 260-263, from a copy of the letter made by İstifān ad-Duwaitī. This quotation is from p. 100.
apart from the zajaliyyāt and the books which he kept on writin
and translating throughout his lifetime. Most of the letters he
wrote are no longer extant; but the following quotation from
a letter he wrote to Jirjis ar-Rāmi, a Maronite priest and
formerly a friend of Ibn al-Qilā‘ī who had become heretical,
gives an idea of the tone of Ibn al-Qilā‘ī’s letters:

What qualification do you have, 0 lost one, to discourse
with the learned or to expound the books of the doctors?
When did a council or dispute take place before you that
you may dare say: “We attended and we saw”? Enough for
you your first disgrace in having had your baptism and
ordination anulled, and the denial of your religion and
your faith. And if you say "no", I answer that you were
baptized in the faith of your Maronite fathers, and through
it you became a Christian and were ordained a deacon and
a priest; for baptism is the basis of the religion of the
Christians. You denied the religion of your fathers in
which you were baptized; and your baptism, religion,
ordination, and priesthood were anulled. You became in
the same rank, you and the Jew.... And if you say:"I am
a Maronite", I say to you: "You lie in saying so. You are
a spy among the Maronites".... For you are like the beast
that was tamed and became wild again....

Ibn al-Qilā‘ī’s unquenching zeal for the Catholic Fai
and his remarkable capacity for hard work were, no doubt, facto
that contributed to his appointment as head of the Franciscan
order in Cyprus. He left Lebanon, accordingly, and took residen
cence in the monastery of the Holy Cross in Nicosia. In 1507,

1. Ibid., pp. 422-423. The letter is only available as quoted
in full by Duwaihi in ibid., pp. 422-424.
2. The Franciscan monastery of Nicosia (Santa Croce, or Holy
Cross) was first mentioned in the first half of the thirteen
century. In 1426 the soldiers of Barsbay, the Mamluk sultan,
destroyed this monastery and massacred all its monks; but
by 1468 it was already restored by the Franciscans. The
monastery, however, does not seem to have been fully restored
and it was razed again at the time of the Ottoman conquest
of Cyprus (1571) and its traces disappeared. The present
monastery of the Holy Cross dates from 1592. See G. Golubovic
Serie...., pp. 231-232.
when Yusuf al-Kizvāna, Maronite bishop of Cyprus, died, Jibrā'īl ibn al-Qilāʾī was ordained to succeed him in the office. He remained in this position until his death in 1516.

Ibn al-Qilāʾī was by far the most learned Maronite of his day. Of the two other Maronites who had gone to study in Italy with him none none lived long enough to achieve any lasting fame. Nothing is known about Francis, who seems to have died young before having attained priestly rank.1 Yuhannā, known as Fra Juan the Maronite, had been apparently a brilliant student in Italy, but he was drowned in a storm as he was on his way back from Rome with Ibn al-Qilāʾī.2 In his day, therefore, Ibn al-Qilāʾī was the only Maronite who had received the benefits of Western learning. He claimed to be versed not only in history, but in theology and philosophy.3 He also claimed a knowledge of astronomy and mathematics, of astrology, and of medicine. In one of his poems, he wrote:

Take my counsels, O reader;
Penetrate to the depths of my secrets;
Read my book and gain understanding.
Enjoy through it the way of medicine,
For in it there are gifts of grace.
Let him who wants to protect himself [against disease] Study this essay.

1. F. Suriano, op. cit., p. 71. He called him Francesco. In Lebanon the name is still current as Francis, hence the form of it given above.
2. Duwaihi, T.A., p. 220. Ibn al-Qilāʾī wrote an elegy about his drowned school-mate and travelling companion. It was published by G. Manache in Al-Mashriq, XVIII, 1920, pp. 252-256 (hence, Ibn al-Qilāʾī, Elegy). Ibn al-Qilāʾī, according to Duwaihi, was saved from drowning in the storm by a miracle.
3. See above, p. 18.
He will get to know the roots of the plants
And will prepare medicines from them...
He will be able to tell the times
In which there will be misfortune;
And the calculations of the months and hours
Will be within his knowledge.2

Ibn al-Qilāʾī was a prolific writer. Istifān ad-Duwaiḥī gave a list of his works in Tarikh al-azmina. Some of the works cited in this list are identifiable with works of Ibn al-Qilāʾī which are still to be found preserved in the Lebanese monasteries, in the Vatican library, and in the Bibliothèque Orientale of Beirut. Others have either been irretrievably lost or are still awaiting discovery.

It would be interesting to examine Duwaiḥī's list of Ibn al-Qilāʾī's works:

Ibn al-Qilāʾī did not only help his community during his lifetime, but also after his death in the writings which he bequeathed.... He wrote a book of Church law

1. In the available manuscript of the poem (Bibliothèque Orientale 15, Karsh. 1684) the word appears as batata (potato). This is definitely a mistake for nabātāt (plants). Apart from the fact that the potato was not known in Lebanon in Ibn al-Qilāʾī's day (it was first mentioned in Europe, to our knowledge, in 1584 - see article on "potato" in the Encyclopaedia Brittanica), the word batata does not rhyme with the words dawayāt (medicines) and sadāt (lords), which precede it in the rhyme sequence. The word batata, which resembles in writing the word nabātāt, must have been substituted for the latter word by a copyist.

2. This quotation is from Abyāt fi 't-tibb wa'l-falak (verses on medicine and astronomy). It is found in manuscript in Bibliothèque Orientale 15, pp.103-104.
1. Two books by Ibn al-Qilâ'î on Church law exist. The first is entitled Nāmūs al-kanîsa al-muqaddasa al-antâkiyya (the law of the holy church of Antioch). G. Graf listed three manuscripts of this work: Vat.arab. 639 (1574), Borg.arab. 137 (1574-5), ff.98r-329r, and ʿAin Waraga 29. The second book is a shortened adaptation of this work entitled Nāmūs Kaniṣat Rûmiya (the law of the Church of Rome). A manuscript of this work is found in the Vatican (Vat.arab. 642; 1640). I found the eighth par of this book (Thāmin kitāb fī nāmūs Kaniṣat Rûmiya) in a manuscript containing works of theology and Church law by Ibn al-Qilâ'î in the monastery of Sharfeh (Sharfeh 9/41). The manuscript is entitled Majmūʿat li Ibn al-Qilâ'î fī l-lâhūt al-adabî (a collection of works by Ibn al-Qilâ'î on moral theology) and it is not dated. This work is a translation from one or more works on the subject in Latin. See G. Graf, op.cit., III, pp.313-315.

2. A book by Ibn al-Qilâ'î found in manuscript at the Vatican Library (Vat.arab. 641) bears the title Kitāb al-mawârips (the book of sermons) and seems to be the same as the book listed by Duwaihi as Kitāb fīza (book of a sermon). The book is dated 1637. Another collection of sermons by Ibn al-Qilâ'î which may be a copy of the same work, is found in the monastery of Mār Shallīṭa Maqīṣ, and is dated 1658. The Vatican manuscript includes a long letter from Ibn al-Qilâ'î to the people of his hometown, Lihfīd, dated December 12, 1493, exhorting them to stand by the true Faith. This letter is followed by fifty short sermons, explaining various passages from the Gospels and calling the faithful to do virtuous deeds. See Graf, op.cit., III, pp.322-323.

3. By the books on the history of the Popes and the history of the kings of Rome Duwaihi must have meant the second part of Mārūn at-ṭūbānī (Thabāṭ as-ṣidq), which gives chronologi­cal tables of the Popes and the Roman and Byzantine em­perors. See above, p.22.

4. To my knowledge, no such book by Ibn al-Qilâ'î is found, except if Duwaihi was referring to the third part of Mārūn at-ṭūbānī, which is entitled Jihad al-imān (see above, p.22). This is probably the case, since Duwaihi described Jihad al-imān elsewhere (T.T.M., pp.417-418) as dealing with the unbroken union of the Maronites with Rome. Actually it begins with a polemic against the Jacobites and proceeds to give a list of heresies. The Maronites are not mentioned among the heretics. This negative proof of the perpetual orthodoxy of the Maronites may have been considered by Duwaihi as the main thesis of Jihad al-imān.
logy, and a book on the orthodox Faith and the secrets of the life of Christ. He is also the author of some five hundred letters which he wrote to his compatriots to make them hold fast to the faith of Saint Marun and the Roman Church. He also composed several poems (madâyîh): about the secret of the Holy Trinity and the Divine Incarnation.

1. A compendium of theology in six books, dealing with the Oneness and Trinity of God, the work of Creation, the Incarnation of the Word, virtue and vice, and the sacraments, respectively, is found in manuscript in the Vatican Library (Vat.arab. 643, karsh. 1576). The third book is lacking in this copy. MSS Aleppo 127 (Lâhût Ibn al-Qilâîî au arkan din an-Nâsârâ, the theology of Ibn al-Qilâîî or the foundations of the religion of the Christians) and 128 (the latter dated 1687) may be copies of the same work (G. Graf, op. cit., III, p.312). The first part of MS Sharfeh 9/41, which lacks seven pages at the beginning, appears from its contents to be another copy of the same work.

2. See preceding footnote. By this work Duwaihi may have meant parts of the book on theology discussed in the above footnote.

3. Very few of Ibn al-Qilâîî's letters still exist in manuscript. Graf listed nine letters by Ibn al-Qilâîî which he found (ibid., III, pp.323-324). These are: a. a warning to the Maronites about Alishâf of al-Hadath, Ibn Sha'ban of Hîrîn, and Samia of Lî fis, who were spreading the Jacobite heresy (Vat.arab. 640, ff.203r-205v), b. Letter to Patriarch Shamfûn (see above, p.24), c. Letter to the priest Jîris ar-Râ'mî (see above, p.25), d. Letter to Dâûd, bishop of Lî fis, dated December 23, 1495, about the sacraments (Vat.arab. 640, ff.194r-202v and Sharfeh syr. 7/10, 3, karsh. 1571), e. Letter to the people of Lî fis (Vat.arab. 644, ff.182v-194v and Borg.arab. 136, ff.148v-160r), f. Letter to a friend, exhorting him to be patient and forbearing (Vat.arab. 644, ff.259v-262r and Borg.arab. 136, ff.222v-224v), g. Letter of consolation to a sick brother, with 12 prayers (Borg.arab.136, ff.10v-13v), h. Letter to the Maronites on penitence (ibid., ff.13v-30r). i. Letter about Mount Lebanon, what has happened, and what will happen in it, written to an unknown brother (ibid., ff.225r-236v), Borg. arab. 136, in which most of these letters are found, was not available at the Vatican Library when I was in Rome, although it was listed in the catalogue.

4. The zâjaliyya about the Holy Trinity and the Divine Incarnation was founded, according to Anîs (see appendix I to Hurûb al-muqaddamin, p.64), in a manuscript in the Vatican Library (Vat.syr. 249, karsh. 15th. cent.) which was lost during the Napoleonic occupation of Rome. Graf (op.cit., III, p.313) described it as a tract. Duwaihi may have meant the poem on the Triadion (Vat.syr. 214, karsh. 1592). See Graf, op.cit., III, p.331.
about the life of Christ and His Mother under the Cross, about the Two Natures of the Lord and the Two Wills in One Godhead, about the knowledge of the Faith (film al-imân) and the propagation of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, about the Pure Lady, the Mother of Salvation, about the stories of the Apostles, about Constantine the Great and the beginning of Christianity, about the four /ecumenical/ Councils and St. Marûn of Antioch, Abraham the Friend of God, and St. Nuhrâ as-Samarî, St. Georges of Lydda, St. Simon of Jubail, St. Shina the Thief, Barbara of Ba'albak, and Euphrosine of Alexandria.

1. I found the zajalîyya on the life of Christ and of His Mother under the Cross in several copies in MS Bkerke 13 and 251 (now all placed under 13) and in MSS Bibliothèque Orientale 15 (pp. 112 et seq.) and Vat. syr. 231, ff. 41r-41r. It was published in Al-Manâra, III, 1932, p. 269. See Graf, op. cit. III, p. 332.

2. In the first part of MS Sharfeh 9/41 there is a rendering of the Catholic Creed in colloquial poetry. Could this be the poem of film al-imân? Graf (op. cit., III, p. 331) listed a poem on the Church and the orthodox Faith (Vat. syr. 249, II, 2) which was found in the lost manuscript of Ibn al-Qilâ'î works (see above, p. 29, fn. 4).

3. Several poems on the Apostles are found in manuscript in Bkerke 13.

4. Manuscripts of this poem are found in MSS Bibliothèque Orientale 15 and 16 and in Bkerke 13. It was published in Al-Manâra, VII, 1936, pp. 653-663 and 767-779 by Ibrahim Harfush from a manuscript in a private collection.

5. By Marûn of Antioch Duwaihi must have meant Yûhannâ Marûn, first patriarch of the Maronites. Two sections of this poem are preserved in Duwaihi, T.T.M., pp. 78 and 372, the first about Yûhannâ Marûn and the second about the Lateran Council of 1215. Duwaihi called it there Mimar fan al-majâmi' (Poem on the Councils). Graf listed a poem by Ibn al-Qilâ'î on the Councils (op. cit., III, p. 331). Are they the same?

6. I have found two copies of this zajalîyya in Bkerke 13 and 251. A passage of it has already been quoted. See above, p. 17, fn. 4.

7. I have found two copies of this zajalîyya in Bkerke 13 and 251.

8. This must be St. Simon Stylites (Mar Sim'ân al-'Amûdî). I have found in Bkerke 13 a zajalîyya about this saint.

9. A manuscript of this poem is found in Bkerke 13.
and on the history of Kisruān,¹ and about those who intended to sow tares among the Maronites,² and about his friend Fra Juan the Maronite,³ and about the nun who renounces her order,⁴ and about the knowledge of the orbits, constellations, and /astronomical/ measurements;⁵ and he is also the author of a number of poems about the sciences, about the soul, about repentance, about death,⁶ and about the forms of marriage, and others which we do not mention for brevity.⁷

From this impressive list of Ibn al-Qilāʿī's works, it appears that his historical writings only formed a minor part of his work. Most of his writings dealt with ecclesiastical and theological subjects; and when he wrote history he did not confine himself to the history of the Maronites and the Maronite church. One of his longest historical zajaliyyāt deals with the story of the rise of Christianity and the conversion of Constantine the Great.

¹. From the quotations given by Duwaiḥī from Madīhat Kisruān (poem on Kisruān), in T.T.M., pp.389 and 419-420, this poem is identified as the Madīḥa ʿala Jabal Libnān, which exists in several manuscripts, and has been published (See Graf, op.cit., III, p.330, and above, p.6, fn.2).

². This is Tabkt... (see p.23, fn.1).

³. This is the elegy written by Ibn al-Qilāʿī on the death of his friend Yūḥannā. See above, p.26, fn.2.

⁴. A manuscript of the zajaliyya about the nun who renounces her order (Ar-rāḥiba al-Ṯālīʿa) is found in Ashqut 9. It was published in Al-Mashriq, XVIII, pp.751 et seq.

⁵. This must be the zajaliyya referred to above, p.18 and loc. cit., fn.3.

⁶. I found a madīḥa ʿala 'l-maut (poem on death) in Ekerke 13. The manuscript contains also other poems which may have been Ibn al-Qilāʿī's, but which do not have the name of the author in their text or at the end, as Ibn al-Qilāʿī's zajaliyyāt usually have.

The language used by Ibn al-Qilāḍī in his prose writings differed from the language he used in his poetical works. When he wrote prose in his letters and in his original and translated theological works he used classical Arabic, a language of which he had an imperfect knowledge. Apart from the fact that his orthography is often incorrect,¹ his syntax and his idiom are foreign to Arabic, recalling both the Lebanese colloquial with its Syriac affinities, which was his mother tongue, and Latin, the language he had used in his academic life in Italy. When he wrote poetry, on the other hand, he used the colloquial Arabic dialect of Lebanon which, in his day, seems to have differed little from the modern Lebanese dialect. He also followed the Lebanese colloquial prosody, which is nearer to the Syriac than to the classical Arabic prosody;² but his verse is often rough and unpolished and many of his strophes are difficult to scan.

Having been one of the first three Maronites known to have gone to the West to study, Ibn al-Qilāḍī was among the first Maronites to get a first hand acquaintance with Western theology and to read what Western authors had written about the religious origins of his people. Accordingly, he became the first Maronite to act as a Catholic missionary to his own

---

1. Some of the recurrent mistakes in Ibn al-Qilāḍī's orthography may have actually been usage in the tradition of Karshūni writing – the writing of Arabic in Syriac script.
2. Ibn al-Qilāḍī's favourite meter was the mimar, which was composed of four heptasyllabic strophes, the first three of which rhymed together, the fourth strophe carrying the rhyme throughout the poem.
people and the first to set out to disprove the heretical origins of his community, as stated by Western and Eastern Christian historians, and to establish the theory of the unbroken orthodoxy of the Maronites.

When still in Italy with his friend Yūḥannā, Ibn al-Qilāṭī had already started the defence of the Maronites against the denial of their original orthodoxy. In the elegy which he wrote about the death of Yūḥannā, he described the arguments both of them had had with the learned of the West on the subject:

They said in the schools:
Let us argue with Fra Juan
And let us dispute with his friend,¹
And we shall prove ourselves right....
They wanted to say about us
In a great hidden secret
That we had been heretical
In olden days.
The monk Hannā² answered,
And every man of learning was made dumb:
The minds were puzzled by /his learning/,
And reason and sight became absent.³

The polemical defence of the perpetual orthodoxy of the Maronites and their unbroken union with Rome, which was first attempted by Ibn al-Qilāṭī, became a tradition of Maronite history writing which has continued to the present day.⁴ Ibn al-Qilāṭī himself used it very effectively when was was a Franciscan missionary to his own people, to preach to them the

---

1. By "his friend" Ibn al-Qilāṭī meant himself.
2. Hannā is the shortened form of Yūḥannā, the name of his drowned friend.
4. The last great exponent of the theory of the perpetual orthodoxy of the Maronites was Yusuf ad-Dibs (d.1907). See Joseph Debs (Yusuf ad-Dibs), Perpetuelle orthodoxie des Maronites (Arvas, 1900).
necessity of keeping in union with Rome and of preserving the Faith of the Catholic Church as their forefathers had done since the establishment of the Maronite church. In all his historical works this missionary spirit is present. In fact, the purpose for which he wrote his historical works was to prove to the Maronites their unbroken orthodoxy and union with Rome and to show them that their occasional lapses into the heresies of their neighbours were invariably followed by national catastrophes.

Thus, the history of Ibn al-Qilāṭi, strictly speaking is not history. His aim in writing it was not to convey to his readers a factual picture of the past and its relation to the present. By means of historical material which, in many cases, he distorted and mixed with legend, he sought to prove to his people that the Roman Faith was the orthodox Faith, that the Maronites were orthodox by origin, and that the preservation of their original union with Rome was not only beneficial but absolutely necessary. It was with this aim in view that Ibn al-Qilāṭi wrote Madiha ʿala Jabal Libnān (also known as Tarīkh Kisruān or Madīḥat Kisruān),1 his most important historical work.

Nevertheless, although the history which Ibn al-Qilāṭi wrote was not history but propaganda, it appears that he had written sources from which he drew information about the past

1. See above, p.31 and loc.cit., fn.1.
of his community. For example, seven letters from the Popes to the Maronite patriarchs, dating from 1215 until his own day, are found in translation in his book Mārūn at-ṭūbānī. There is no evidence in his writings to show that he used any Crusader chronicles as references, although it seems unlikely that he could have spent over twenty years in Italy without having come across such chronicles as those of William of Tyre and Jaques de Vitry, not to mention later and contemporary works. Other than the pontifical letters, his sources for the history of Maronite Lebanon must have been local Maronite sources which have since been lost. That such sources did exist is definite. In the Madīḥa ḍala Jabal Libnān Ibn al-Qīlāṭī said in the opening lines:

How the ages change!
And how the minds are puzzled by them?
Were it not for what is found in writing
No one would have spoken of them.
But the chronicles tell us
Of what has taken place in our native lands
And about those who were before us
Dwellers in Mount Lebanon. 2

And again, at the end of the poem:

It is completed, written in tears
And taken out from chronicles,
Relating the history of six hundred years that have passed -

The age of Mārūn in Mount Lebanon. 4

1. See above, p. 21, and loc. cit., fn. 2.
2. Ibn al-Qīlāṭī, Madīḥa..., p. 10.
3. By "age of Mārūn", Ibn al-Qīlāṭī meant the age of the followers of Mārūn - the Maronites.
4. Ibid., p. 72.
It is possible to guess the nature of those sources - "chronicles" (tawārikh) - to which Ibn al-Qilā'ī referred. A great part of them may have been the notes on contemporary events written down by copyists on Gospels and Church books. Sources of a similar nature, mostly about periods after Ibn al-Qilā'ī, are still to be found in the monasteries of Lebanon. It is not unreasonable to suppose that similar notes about older historical events existed at the time of Ibn al-Qilā'ī. Besides, considering the fact that works of history like those of Yūḥannā ar-Rāhib al-Mārūnī and Tādrus of Ḥamā still exist, it is likely that other such early chronicles were still to be found at the time of Ibn al-Qilā'ī. It is not unlikely either that histories written in verse, like Ibn al-Qilā'ī's, existed from a previous period. Church documents of historical importance also appear to have been found in Ibn al-Qilā'ī's time. He himself referred to such a document while speaking of an oath of allegiance to Rome taken by a group of Maronite clergymen and notables in Tripoli, supposedly in 1215:

They swore and put down their signatures
To an oath/ that the Faith of Peter would satisfy them,
And that no heretic would any more corrupt them
Or live in Mount Lebanon.
Two hundred and seventy men signed the agreement.
Their signatures are written on paper,
And there is no doubt about their names:
They are still found at the present day.2

1. See above, p.6, and loc. cit., fn.1, and 2.
2. Ibn al-Qilā'ī, Madīna..., p.28.
The historical work of Ibn al-Qilā'ī on which attention will be centered in this study is the Madīha ala Jabal Libnān. Other works that will be considered are the zajaliyya entitled Tabkīt kull man zāgh an al-īmān,\(^1\) and the letter dated November 6, 1494, which Ibn al-Qilā'ī sent to Patriarch Sham'ūn. Passages of historical importance from Ibn al-Qilā'ī's non-historical works and sections of his lost historical works found in quotation by later authors will also be considered in the discussion of his history.

The Madīha ala Jabal Libnān (hence Madīha...) is Ibn al-Qilā'ī's longest poetical work and the one that most nearly approaches the proportions of the epic.\(^2\) It consists of 294 quatrains (verses of four strophes).\(^3\) Since the poet mentions in it the death of muqaddam 'Abd al-Mun'im of Bsharrāy who died in 1495,\(^5\) the poem must have been written after that.

1. See above, p.23, fn.1.
2. Manuscripts of the Madīha... are found in Bibliothèque Orientale 15 (Karsh. 1684), Bkerke 13, and Vat.syr. 210 (Karsh. 1654). See Graf, op.cit., III, p.330. Only sections of it are found in the known Bkerke manuscript, and the Bibliothèque Orientale manuscript lacks six pages from the beginning (pp.7-24) of the MS are lost). While inspecting the badly kept collection of manuscripts in Bkerke numbered as Bkerke 13, I found another manuscript of the poem. I showed it to Mgr. M. Rajji, librarian of Bkerke, and he identified it as the writing of Mgr. Shibli, Archbishop of Beirut (d.1917). The copy is in Arabic script, and Mgr. Shibli must have copied it from an older manuscript of the poem in Bkerke which has since been lost. The published edition (Ḥurūb al-mugaddamīn Bait Shabab, 1937) depended on the Vatican MS, on the Bibl. Orient. MS, and on manuscripts in private collections.
3. This in the published edition.
4. Madīha..., p.63. The mention of ‘Abd al-Mun'im's death might have been an interpolation, although there is no evidence to support this possibility.
date. The poem on the whole is a sermon addressed, seemingly post-mortem, to 'Abd al-Mun'im, and to those Maronites who were attracted to the monophysite heresy with him.

Ibn al-Qila'i's free and romantic rendering of history in the Madīha... gives the poem another point of resemblance to the epic. Its theme is the struggle of the amirs and the muqaddams of the free Maronites of Lebanon against Moslem invaders. Numerous Church events are woven into this theme. The chronological order of events is incorrect in many places and there are several clumsy anachronisms. There seems to be no sharp line of division in the poem between authentic history and the poet's repetition of popular traditions. Nevertheless, the poem is rich in local colour and is one of the few known sources on the history of the Maronites in the period with which it deals. If used carefully, considerable information about that history can be acquired from it.

The Madīha... can be divided for purposes of study into fourteen sections, according to subject matter.¹

The first section ² serves as an introduction to the poem. Ibn al-Qila'i gave in it a description of a golden age in Maronite Lebanon. He assigned no date to this golden age

---

¹. This line of division was taken up by Būlus Qara'īlī in his edition of the poem. He divided it into fourteen sections and attached to each section the relevant part of a nineteenth century summary called Mukhtāṣar tārīkh ibn al-Qila'i (hence Mukhtāṣar...). This Mukhtāṣar... will be considered later in this study.

². This section is in 24 quatrains. Madīha..., pp.10-12.
and it is not clear whether he meant to describe the earliest
days of the Maronites in Lebanon (their strife with the Umayyads
in the seventh and eighth centuries) or Maronite Lebanon under
Crusader rule in the twelfth century. Probably he did not
mean to describe any age in particular but was merely giving an
idealized picture of heroic times in Lebanon — before the
Maronites had started giving way to the heretical views of their
neighbours and before they had become subjected to the Moslem
yoke — when

The Patriarch had authority
And the ruler was a man of courage,
And both of them were brothers
In virtue and in the Faith.

The second section tells the story of an amīr of
Baskinta, a village on the southern slopes of ʻAnnīn, his succes-
sful raids on the Biqāʿ, and his murder at the hands of enemy
envoys in the village of Qab Iliās in the Biqāʿ. This section

---

1. The Mukhtasar begins the description of the golden age as
follows: "When the Moslems first entered the land of Syria the
Maronites used to live in Mount Lebanon and rule in the
mountains and the neighbouring coastlands." (Mukhtasar..., p.9). This signifies that according to the Mukhtasar... the
golden age was in the seventh and early eighth centuries.
Qaraṣī, on the other hand, in the notes he gave to the poem
(Hurūb..., p.10) and in the introduction (ibid., pp.4-5),
believed that Ibn al-Qilāʿī meant to describe twelfth century
Crusader Lebanon, when the Maronites were helping the Cru-
saders against the Moslems. The probability is that Ibn al-
Qilāʿī did not mean to describe any particular age, but was
merely giving a poetical description on a mythical golden
age in Lebanon.

2. Madiḥa..., p.11.

3. This section is in six quatrains. Ibid., p.13.
is followed by a narrative of the crusade of the amir's nephew, Muqaddam Sim'an, who was made king (malik) of Al-Khārija, the province later known as Kisruān, by the "king" of Jubail and the Maronite patriarch. 1 The fourth section, which follows, continues the narrative with the story of Amir Kisrā, successor of Sim'an, and his war with the Moslems, adding that Al-Khārija had its name changed to Kisruān after him. 2 With this section the first part of the poem, which deals with the Maronites victorious, comes to an end.

The second part of the poem, which deals with the misfortunes that accrued to the Maronites after they started falling into heresy, begins with the fifth section. 3 The first quatrain in this section foretells the nature of its contents and the contents of the sections that follow:

Satan, the father of heresy,
Finding the people of Marūn happy,
Was covetous, and threw them into misfortune
Through [The teachings] of two monks.

The story of the two monks follows. Their heretical teachings, which were accepted by the patriarch Lūqā of Bnahrān brought about dissention among the Maronites who, weakened by this dissention, became an easy prey to the armies of the

1. Ibid., pp.15-16. Ibn al-Qilā'ī mentioned that the patriarch was from Ḥalāt. The Mukhtasar... called him Gregorius al- Ḥalātī (1130-1141). If this is true then the events of this section took place in the twelfth century.
3. Ibid., pp.21-23.
4. The identity of this patriarch will be discussed later in this chapter. See below, pp.81-82.
Moslems, who came to Lebanon because they knew of the disunity and destroyed Kisruān. The description of the destruction of Kisruān that is given appears to be a description of the events of 1305.

The sixth section tells of the visit of the Maronite patriarch, Armīā al-ʿAmshīṭī, to Rome in 1215. According to Ibn al-Qīlāḥī, the purpose of this visit was to ask the Pope for indulgence because of the errors into which the Maronites had been led by the two heretical monks. This section ends with an account of the meeting of 270 Maronite notables and clergymen in Tripoli, where they swore allegiance to Rome. The last quatrain gives 1230 as the date of the death of Patriarch Armīā.

The seventh section begins by telling of the spread of heresy in Jībbet al-Munaitra and its breaking away from Jubail. Next Ibn al-Qīlāḥī told the story of an exiled sultan who was well-received by a monk in Lebanon and who, after his restoration, showed his gratitude to the Maronite monks by granting money to the Maronite monasteries and by sending funds to build Qannūbīn, which later became the seat of the Maronite patriarchate. The destruction of Al-Ḥadath, east of Tripoli,

---

1. For the discussion of the events of the year 1305, see below, pp. 97-100; 158-163; and 195-197.
2. Madīna..., pp. 25-28. This section is in 38 quatrains.
3. Ibid., pp. 42-45. This section is in 27 quatrains.
4. The term Jībbeh, which is probably of Syriac extraction, is used in Lebanon for mountainous provinces. Al-Munaitra (La Moinestre) is a town in the mountains, east of Jubail. It was an important town in the county of Tripoli in Crusader times.
by a Moslem army is next related. The last part of this section tells of the appointment of a new muqaddam in Bsharry who was at the same time a shidyāq (subdeacon).

The fall of Tripoli to Qalaun in 1289, followed by the fall of Jubail, is the subject of the next section. The two sections that follow deal with the victory of the muqaddam of Mount Lebanon over the Moslem armies after the fall of Tripoli (actually in 1292). A very detailed description of the battle, the guerilla strategy of the muqaddams, and their sharing of the booty, is given. The eleventh section centers around the martyrdom of the Maronite patriarch Jibrā'il of Hajulā, who was burnt by the Moslems outside Tripoli in 1367. Ibn al-Qilāʿī proceeded after that to describe the return of the Maronites to orthodoxy after their lapse to heresy for which he insisted, they were punished by persecution at the hands of the Moslems.

With the twelfth section the last part of the zaja-liyya begins. This section describes the falling into heresy of the muqaddam Ābd al-Munṣim in the days of Ibn al-Qilāʿī. At

---

2. The rank of shidyāq in the Maronite church is the clerical rank below that of shammās (deacon).
3. Madiha..., pp.47-48. This section is in 15 quatrains.
4. Section ix (22 quatrains) and section x (19 quatrains) are in ibid., pp.51-54 and 55-56 respectively.
5. See below, pp.91 et seq. and 153 et seq.
6. Madiha..., pp.59-62. This section is in 23 quatrains.
8. Madiha..., pp.63-66. This section is in 29 quatrains.
the beginning of the section, Ibn al-Qilāʾī wrote down the following note:

These events I recorded myself, I, Jibrāʾīl al-Qilāʾī, who asks for repentance and prayer.

The last two sections¹ are addressed by the author to ʿAbd al-Munṣim and to the town of Bsharrāy respectively. It is in those two sections that the missionary purpose of the poet becomes clear. In them, Ibn al-Qilāʾī called Bsharrāy and its heretical muqaddam back to orthodoxy and to union with Rome. He addressed ʿAbd al-Munṣim as follows:

Get up and look after your soul
And wipe out Baradaeus² from your records.
Drive out the foreigners³ from your realm,
Because the foreigner has no faith.
And if a thousand foreigners be with you,
Your Lord and your country are against you.
From where can you hope for assistance?
From God, or from the weakness of man? . . . . ⁴

He then proceeded to address Bsharrāy:

Bsharrāy, have fear and be horrified!
Bsharrāy, weep and wail!
Bsharrāy, repent and make a stand
Against him who has strayed from the Faith . . . .
Bsharrāy, you have come to a miserable state:
You are now a deserted wilderness.
The old in you has come to destruction.
Build the new on the Faith . . . .

---

1. Section xiii (24 quatrains) and section xiv (20 quatrains) are in ibid., pp.66-69 and 69-72 respectively.
2. Jacob Baradaeus (sixth century) was the man who organized the Monophysite church in Syria. The Monophysites of Syria came to be known as Jacobites after him.
3. By foreigners Ibn al-Qilāʾī meant the Jacobites, foreigners in Maronites Lebanon.
4. Ibid., p.66.
Repent, O Bsharray,
And drive out the foreigners;
And be contented with your husband, O free one:
Mārūn has married you in earnest.
He laid your foundations and built you;
He raised you and gave you rule over your neighbours.
Never has he departed and deserted you.
Why did you become the mistress of a cream-cheese vendor?\(^{1}\)

In the published edition of the Madīna..., the poem is accompanied, section by section, by an explanatory summary (Mukhtaṣar tārīkh) which Qaraǰī found in a nineteenth century manuscript of the poem.\(^{2}\) Qaraǰī did not know who was the author of this Mukhtaṣar. Graf believed him to be Ibn al-Qilā‘ī himself.\(^{3}\) Actually this Mukhtaṣar was written by an anonymous nineteenth century Maronite historian (c. 1863), and its original manuscript is found in the Bibliothèque Orientale in Beirut.

\(^{1}\) Ibd., pp.69-70. The vendor of cream-cheese was Mūsā ibn ʿAtṣha (or Ibn ʿAtṣhiyya), a monophysite missionary from Tripoli, who came as a vendor of cream-cheese to Bsharray and won the favours of ʿAbd al-Munṣim. Duwaiḥi, T.T.M., p.418. Apparently Ibn ʿAtṣha was originally a Copt from Egypt. I.Y. Daiđ, Jāmī‘ al-ḥiḍar ar-rāḥima fi ibṭal daʿwī al-Mawārinā (Cairo, 1908), p.293.

\(^{2}\) B. Qaraǰī, Huruz..., pp.7-8. The manuscript, in Karshūnī script, is in a private collection. Qaraǰī believed it to have been copied from an older manuscript.

\(^{3}\) Graf, op.cit., III, p.328.

\(^{4}\) Bibliothèque Orientale 57, ff.15-18. The whole manuscript is a sketch book in which the anonymous author wrote down a few historical sketches and other bits of information. It contains, other than the Mukhtaṣar, chronologies of the Popes, Roman and Byzantine emperors, and European kings (until approximately 1860), sketches on ancient history, the history of Church Councils, a history of the old churches of Lebanon, a list of learned Maronites, astronomical calculations (p.22, the date used for the calculations is 1863), a history of the village of Mrād, a history of the Bšbuš family (probably the author’s own family), and a list of Lebanese saints. The book is not dated. From its contents it can be concluded that the author was a Bšbuš, that he came from Mrād (both not certain), and that he was a contemporary of Ernest Renan whom he knew personally and whom he helped in excavations in the Jubail district. As far as I know, I was the first to identify the Mukhtaṣar in this MS as the original. It ends with the events of 1305. The published edition ends with 1495, as the poem does.
Its author introduced it as follows:

Since the history of the venerable lord, the Archbishop/Jibrail al-Qilâ'î, is written in poetry, and since its Arabic is weak and full of errors, as was the language of those days in Lebanon, although he was the most correct of the historians of the Mountain and the first among them..., I meant to paraphrase the history of this Ibn al-Qilâ'î, the historian, in prose, and to make it as easy to understand as possible.¹

This Mukhtasar is interesting in so far as it shows how the history of Ibn al-Qilâ'î was interpreted by later Maronite historians. The author of the Mukhtasar gave dates and names which serve at times as clues to the understanding of the poem, but which at other times, by their inaccuracy, increase the mistakes and the anachronisms which abound in the Madîha... The contents of this Mukhtasar will be used in the analysis of Ibn al-Qilâ'î's history.

The second historical work of Ibn al-Qilâ'î which will be considered in this study is the zajaliyya entitled Tabkît kull man zâgh gân al-îmân. Unfortunately, this poem is not available in its entirety. The published edition includes the parts of it found in the unique manuscript in Bkerke, to which the editor added in the relevant place a quotation which Duwaihî cited from the lost part of the poem.² Three more quatrains concerning the identity of Tūmâ al-Kafartâbî, a late eleventh century Maronite cleric, which seem to belong to this

¹ Ibid., f. 15. Hence this work will be referred to as MS Mukhtasar....
² Seven pages are missing from the manuscript (Bkerke 13), those being pp. 226–232. The quotation from Duwaihî (11 quatrains) is made from T.T.M., pp. 418–419, and is found on p. 808 of Tabkît... in brackets.
poem, are quoted by Duwaihi. 1

Both in language and in poetic structure, this poem is similar to the Madīha... It is written in quatrains in which the first three strophes rhyme together, the last strophe carrying the rhyme "ni" throughout the poem (the rhyme of the Madīha... being "ān"). Three of the verses which are available are composed of three, and not the usual four strophes. 2 The strophe is heptasyllabic and the rhythm, like that of the Madīha..., is what is known as Aphramī (Ephraemite: like the hymns of St. Ephraem, the Syriac hymn-writer). 3

Including the quotations found in Duwaihi, 135 quatrains of this poem are available. Originally the poem must have consisted of some 185 quatrains. 4

The poem begins with a description of the untruthful claims of the heretical leaders, whose names Ibn al-Qilāʿī did not give. 5 The opening lines run as follows:

1. Duwaihi, T.T.M., p.339. Duwaihi said the quotation was from a mimar about the heretics (no other than Tabkit...). Both the subject, meter, and rhyme point to the fact that it is part of the poem.
2. Tabkit..., p.806 (two verses) and 813 (one verse).
3. The strophe of the lēḥn Aphramsī scans with three trochaic feet followed by a monosyllabic foot, which accounts for the seven syllables of the meter.
4. The poem in the Bkerke MS occupies pp.224–244 (20 pages), of which 7 pages are lost. In the 13 remaining pages there are 121 quatrains. This gives an average of just over 9 quatrains to the page (the poem is not written in verse form, the verses being separated by points). This would make the total approximately 130 quatrains to which a few more should be added to make up for the fractions.
5. Tabkit..., pp.805–806. The description is in 13 quatrains.
The words of the truthful about duties
Defeat the liar's intentions
And heal those rendered weak by disease
With enlightening spiritual knowledge.
About the Faith my words are clear –
They are in Aphrami verses.
In them the truthful is praised;
And / by them / the liar is baffled.

The poem then proceeds to a description of the truth
of the teachings of the son of the Church (ibn al-bī'a) who is
Neither crooked nor twisted / in his beliefs/.
He is a light, like a candle.
His soul is pure, and not surfeited
With worldly distractions.

What originally followed this description is not
known; but from the quotation found in Duwaihi's Tarikh at-tā'īf
al-marunyya about Tūmā al-Kafartabi it seems that at least
part of the fifty odd lost verses were concerned with the diffe-
rent people who sought to convert the Maronites to heresy – a
history of heretical movements among the Maronites. 2

In the next available section, found in quotation by
Duwaihi and included in the published edition, Ibn al-Qilā'ī
described the heretical condition in Mount Lebanon under
Mugaddam 'Abd al-Mun'im on the poet's return to his homeland
in 1493. In the last quatrain of this part, Ibn al-Qilā'ī
began to tell of his contact with 'Abd al-Mun'im. Fortunately,
in Tarikh at-tā'īf a al-mārūnīyya, Duwaihī gave a paraphrase of

1. Only 11 quatrains of this description are available, of the
   last of which there exist only 2½ strophes. Ibid., p.807.
2. The lines quoted in Duwaihi, T.T.M., will be cited and
discussed later. See below, p.52.
the continuation of this section, which gives the story of the personal contact between Ibn al-Qilāṭī and 'Abd al-Munṣīm, the last part of which is again available in the original verse. Henceforward the rest of the poem is available in its entirety.

After having told the story of his contact with 'Abd al-Munṣīm, Ibn al-Qilāṭī proceeded to describe his book Mārūn at-ṭūbānī and to tell of the purpose for which he wrote it. Finally, after mentioning the dedication of his book to the Maronite patriarch, he enumerated all the Maronite clergymen whom he considered orthodox and whom he wanted to read Mārūn at-ṭūbānī. The last two quatrains of this section have the tone of a finale:

I am remembering at present
Before the High [Lord]
The monks of the valley of Qannūbīn
And others who are select priests,
With all the people of our country:
May the Lord save them from error —
The boys, the girls, the men, and the women —
And make them steadfast in the Faith.

The poem, however, does not end here. A panegyric to Jamāl ad-Dīn Yūsuf, son and successor of 'Abd al-Munṣīm Ayyūb, who succeeded his father as muqaddam in 1495, follows. Yūsuf, unlike his father, was orthodox in his views. Considering that

1. This story is not found in the published edition of T.T.M. Ibrāhim Harfush, the editor of Tābkit..., quoted it (p. 209) from a manuscript of T.T.M. found in the monastery of Kraim (Dair al-Kraim) in Juniya, north of Beirut.
5. Duwa'īhī, loc. cit.
the poem was written in 1494, before Ibn al-Qilâ‘î had come to serve the patriarch at Qannûbîn and before the accession of Jamâl ad-Dîn Yûsuf,¹ this panegyric must have been added to the poem later by the author.²

The last work of Ibn al-Qilâ‘î which will be considered in this study as a work of history is his letter dated November 6, 1494, to Patriarch Sham‘ûn.

Ibn al-Qilâ‘î began the letter by accepting the patriarch's summons to spend the winter with him in Qannûbîn.³ Then he cited the number of times the Maronites had taken oaths of allegiance to Rome.⁴ This is the section of the letter which is relevant to the purpose of this study. The rest of it discusses the sacraments of the Church and is of no direct historical interest.

In his historical works Ibn al-Qilâ‘î dealt only with the history of the Maronites, when he considered the history of Lebanon. He only mentioned the other religious communities of Lebanon when they had anything to do with his own community. It is difficult to date the earliest events recorded in his history. He used very few dates, and one has to guess the other:

1. Tābkit... must have been written shortly after Mârûn at-ţubâni, which was written and sent to the patriarch in 1494. Dūwajî, T.A., p.221.
2. Tābkit..., pp.906-907. This panegyric is in 11 quatrains. It is full of praise for the muqaddam and prayers that he might live long and be victorious. It strongly differs in tone from the rest of the poem.
4. Letter to Patriarch Sham‘ûn, pp.102-106.
from the contents of his history or by synchronism, where that is possible.

One of the earliest events which Ibn al-Qilāʾī discussed was the murder of the amir of Baskintā in Qab Iliās:

The prince lived in Baskintā.
He sent his soldiers on a surprise raid,
Looted the Biqāʾ in one strike,
And killed its men and its women.
He went up and lived in Qab Iliās
And set soldiers and guards.
The Biqāʾ was trodden under the hoofs of his horses
And his news reached the sultan.

The sultan sent him presents with envoys.
The prince, unsuspecting, sat with them to a meal,
While soldiers, who were getting prepared behind them,
Attacked him before he could expect it.
They killed him, and many of his soldiers
And many of his choice men were slain.

The soldiers of the sultan set fire to Qab Iliās
And took possession of the Biqāʾ from that date.
What caused this calamity was the drinking of wine
And the dancing of a maiden in the prince's presence.

When the captains of his soldiers heard of that
They threw off obedience and broke their oaths of allegiance

They deserted him, and he was killed,
And they buried his body in Qab Iliās.
They did not record his name in the chronicles
Because he died while he was drunk.

The Mukhtasar ventured to identify the sultan who was responsible for the death of the amir of Baskintā as having been ʿAbd al-Malik bin Marwān (685-715), adding that ʿAbd al-

1. In the published edition of the Madiha... (p.13) his title appears as malik (king). In a quotation of this passage given by Duwaihi (T.T.M., p.73), it appears as amir (prince or commander), which is more probable. Besides, the line scans better with amir (which is pronounced mir in the Lebanese vernacular): "Sakan ʾl-mir ʾl-Baskintā"

2. Qab Iliās is a town built on an elevation to the west of the Biqāʾ, at the foot of Mt. Lebanon.

3. Madiha..., p.13. *In the general usage of the period, the Arabic title malik (here translated freely as "king"), denoted a ruler, with no implications of sovereignty. The title was usually applied to local rulers (e.g. the Ayyubid provincial rulers of Syria). The title was used by Ibn al-Qilāʾī for the Frankish lords of Jubbaj, among others (see below).
Malik's reign synchronized with that of Justinian II, who also came to the throne in 685. Istif'ân ad-Duwaihi repeated this story, calling the murdered prince Yuhannâ, amir of Mount Lebanon. He further said that this amir was killed by order of Justinian II because he had refused to cease raiding the borderlands of the Moslem empire, as the agreement Justinian II had had with 'Abd al-Malik bin Marwân specified. 

Haidar ash-Shihābī disagreed with both the Mukhtasar... and Duwaihi on the date of the event by assigning to it the date 135 A.H. (752 A.D.). The unfortunate hero of the incident was, according to him, the muqaddam Iliās of Mount Lebanon, who raided the Biqā' and was killed by order of the wālī (governor) of Damascus in the days of Abū’l-‘Abbās as-Saffāh, the first Abbāsid caliph. 

He further added that the village in which the muqaddam Iliās was killed was called Al-Mrūj; and that it started being called Qab Iliās (short for Qabr Iliās - the grave of Iliās) after Iliās was buried in it. That the name of the amir in question should have been Iliās is not unlikely, considering the tell-tale nature of the name of that village.

1. MS Mukhtasar... fol. 15r. In this MS, the identification is crossed out but still visible. In the published edition of the Mukhtasar... (Hurūb..., p.12) it appears fully.
4. Muhîbbî, Khulasat al-athar fî ayyân al-qarn al-hâdî 'asâr (Cairo, 1284 A.H.), IV, p.427, gave the name of the village as Qabr Iliās. Yâqūt, Muqjam al-buldān (Leipzig, 1870) said that Qabr Iliās an-nabi (the grave of Iliās the prophet) is found in the Biqā'. Ibid., I, p.699. See also Shidyāq, Akhbar al-ayyān... (Beirut, 1959), p.32. What is popularly believed to be the grave of the muqaddam Iliās in Qab Iliās is in reality a Roman shrine for some trinity carved in the rock above the village.
Qara'ilî believed that the murder of the amir of Baskintâ took place in the early twelfth century and gave two reasons for this belief. Firstly he said that, aside from this one incident, all the other events related by Ibn al-Qilâcî in the Madîha... follow each other in regular succession, beginning with the third section, the events of which took place in the days of Patriarch Gregorius al-Ḫalâtî (1130-1141), and ending with the narration of events contemporary to the author of the poem. Secondly, he continued, Ibn al-Qilâcî mentioned that mugaddam Simʾân, the hero of the following section, was the nephew (sister's son) of the murdered amir, his immediate predecessor, and that Kîsra, the hero of the fourth section, was the maternal uncle of Simʾân, hence the brother of the anonymous amir of Baskintâ. Qara'ilî argued that since Simʾân and Kîsra were such close relatives of the amir, and since they lived and fought in the early twelfth century, he must have been killed in the early twelfth century, which would make his story precede the other events related in the poem in correct chronological order, preventing a jump from the seventh century to the twelfth.

This argument is not acceptable. For one, Ibn al-Qilâcî, contrary to what Qara'ilî supposed, did not follow correct chronological order in the poem, as will be shown later.

1. T. Canaissî, Silsila..., p. 17.
2. See the relevant passages in the Madîha..., pp. 15 and 16.
3. This argument is found in Hurūb..., pp. 4-6.
His statement about the relationships of Simʿān and Kisrā to the murdered amir are not to be taken as necessarily correct and dependable. In this case they seem to be more than doubtful. It is safe to suppose that Ibn al-Qilāʾī was repeating three stories which years of popular tradition had strung together as a unit. The murdered amir of Baskintā, who may have been called Iliās, was probably one of the Mardaite amirs of Lebanon who raided the Biqāʾ and Syria in Umayyad times and whose raids had to be stopped according to the agreement made between Justinian II and ʿAbd al-Malik bin Marwān.¹ There is not enough evidence about him and the event of his murder to establish his identity with more certainty.

In general, this first story told by Ibn al-Qilāʾī in the Madīha... is, in some ways, characteristic of his history writing. It is told with remarkable brevity and with no attempt to fix a date to it. Ibn al-Qilāʾī gave it a double purpose: first, to show how the Maronites lost control of the Biqāʾ, and second, to preach against the pleasures of the flesh - the amir having been deserted by his own officers and men and left to be killed by the enemy because he had disgraced himself by getting drunk and by watching a "maiden" (by which term the author of the Mukhtasar... understood "whore")² dance.

² MS Mukhtasar...; fol.15r.
He ended the story by apparently excusing his ignorance of the name of the amir by stating that, because he died drunk, his name was not recorded.

Perhaps the earliest figure of the Crusader period with whom Ibn al-Qilā'ī dealt was Tūmā, the Maronite archbishop of Kafarṭāb, a town in northern Syria, south of Aleppo, and the seat of the diocese of Aleppo. This Tūmā wrote a book, Al-maqāliyat al-qašr (the ten doctrines) about the number of the Wills of Christ, in which he championed the monothelite view.\(^1\) In the introduction of his book an unknown copyist wrote the following:

We inform you, brethren, that at one time, in the years of Alexander, son of Philip, the Greek, 1400 \(^2\) A.D.,\(^3\) writings and correspondence were exchanged between the patriarch of the Greeks in the city of Antioch, the Anbā' Yūḥanna, and Anbā' Tūmā, Maronite archbishop of the diocese of Aleppo, may we benefit by the blessing of their prayers. Amen, Amen. They were debating the correct doctrines of the Christian religion and the belief of the Holy Faith in finding One Will and Two Wills in our Lord, the Lord Christ, glory be unto him. And after many letters had been exchanged between them, Anbā' Yūḥanna, patriarch of Antioch, wrote a letter and sent it with a messenger to Anbā' Tūmā, the archbishop of the Maronites, to Kafarṭāb, a town in the diocese of Aleppo, in which he protested against him; because whoever does not believe that in our Lord, the Lord Christ, there are Two Wills, is erring. And he began to find error in the belief of Anbā' Tūmā in the One Will of our Lord, the Lord Christ. Then Anbā' Tūmā stood in prayer and supplication to the mercy of the Lord Christ, asking help from Him to show the justice of the Holy Faith. Then a heavenly wisdom came to him and he began to refute the letter of Anbā' Yūḥanna word by word,

---

1. The work, written in Arabic, was published from MS Par. syr. 203 in Al-Manāra, VII, 1936, pp. 347 et seq., by Philip as-Samrānī.

2. Anbā' is an old title of reverence given to high church officials in the Eastern churches. At present it is only used in the Coptic church.
disproving the Two Wills and establishing the One Will.
And he proved through this, through his enlightened belief
in the Two Natures and One Will, the divinity and humanity
of our Lord, the Lord Christ, united without division,
every Nature preserving its own character.¹

From this it is understood that Tūmā was the Maronite
archbishop of Aleppo and that he was a monothelite, defending
this view against the diothelite claims of the Greek Orthodox
patriarch of Antioch. Another paragraph in this same introd-
tion related the visit of Tūmā to Lebanon (1104-1109) where a
Maronite priest of Frashaᶜ, a village in north Lebanon,² asked
him to rewrite his defence of monothelitism, the original of
which had been burnt by Anbā Yūḥannā. It is further mentioned
in the introduction that the stay of Tūmā in Lebanon was
prolonged because of the siege of Tripoli by the Crusaders.³

Although it is clear from this introduction to Al-maqālāt
al-Cašhr that Tūmā of Kafartāb was a Maronite archbishop who
lived among his fellow Maronites in Lebanon for several years,
and that he was a monothelite,⁴ Ibn al-Qilāᶜī refused to accept
the fact that he was a Maronite. Since Ibn al-Qilāᶜī's primary
purpose was to prove the original and unbroken orthodoxy of his
community, he could not stand by and allow the monothelitism of
a twelfth century Maronite archbishop to bear witness against
it. With the dogmatism of a man used to having his words
accepted without question, he stated on a note which he wrote

². I have not been able to locate the village of Farshaᶜ, neither
has anybody else been able to do so to my knowledge. Possibly,
the name given is a misnomer for another village.
³. Ibid., p.350.
⁴. For further reference, see Graf, op.cit., II, pp.98-100.
on a copy of Ḥalā'at al-ṭabir found at the time of Duwaihi in Qannūbin,¹ without giving any reasons in support of his statement, that Tūmā was no Maronite:

This Tūmā was not a Maronite, neither did the Maronites have an archbishop in the diocese of Aleppo. He is rather an Easterner² from Harān, brought up in Mārīn.³ The Jacobites exiled him, so he came to Mount Lebanon and admitted belief in the Two Natures so that he would be received by the Maronites. When he got this reception⁴ he began to teach that in Jesus Christ there was One Will; and some accepted his teachings, not knowing his errors.

Ibn al-Qīlāṭī made a similar comment on Tūmā al-Kafartābī in Tabkīt..., apparently after describing the heretical views of the monothelites:

They were followed by Tūmā of Harān.
From his story the truth appears.
In the diocese of Aleppo he was an archbishop,
But his see was not Simonian⁴
You tell me he is from Mārīn:
You have increased my interest in him now.
Mārīn is the dwelling-place of devils —
Nestorius and Jacob are its inhabitants.⁵
By saying that he came to Mount Lebanon
You bore witness that he came to preach heresy;
And Mārūn, in his present simplicity,
Will listen to him who is a Jacobite.⁶

Did Ibn al-Qīlāṭī have any basis for this judgement which he passed on Tūmā al-Kafartābī? Probably not. Apparently

---

¹. This note is found in quotation by Duwaihi in T.T.M., p.339. The manuscript on which it is found, if it still exists, must be sought in Bkerke where all the books formerly in Qannūbin are to be found. I have not had the occasion to check it.
². Mashriqi (Easterner), probably meaning Jacobite.
³. Harān and Mārīn are two cities in northern Syria with large Jacobite populations.
⁴. Simonian (Simonian), from Simon Peter, alleged founder of the sees of Rome and Antioch; hence orthodox.
⁵. Meaning Nestorians and Jacobites.
⁶. Duwaihi, T.T.M., p.339. This passage, in the lost part of Tabkīt..., is only available as quoted by Duwaihi.
a firm believer in the maxim that the end justifies the means, he did not hesitate, it seems, to falsify historical facts to prove the unbroken orthodoxy of the Maronites. The two passages quoted make no reference to any source other than Al-maqālāt al-ṭashr, except when Ibn al-Qilāḍī stated that Tūmā came from ʿAram and was educated in Mārdīn.¹ The conclusion that he was no Maronite, and a missionary of heresy to the Maronites of Lebanon appears to have been purely Ibn al-Qilāḍī’s own.²

In his letter to Patriarch Shamīn, Ibn al-Qilāḍī, again trying to prove the unbroken orthodoxy of the Maronites, wrote that the Maronite patriarch received the crown and the staff from Rome after Gaudefroy de Bouillon had taken Jerusalem from the Moslems. It is not clear from the text whether Ibn al-Qilāḍī meant that the patriarch himself went to Rome in 1099 or whether his envoys went with the envoys of Gaudefroy. Duwaihī, who quoted Ibn al-Qilāḍī, believed the latter to be true; and the way he rendered the relevant passage in quotation, which differs from the available original, shows clearly that the latter meaning was meant.³ In the original, however, the passage is vague and runs as follows:

Before... with king Gaufrado who saved Jerusalem from the hands of the Moslems and with envoys, Patriarch Yusuf al-Jirjisī to Rome and received the crown and staff.⁴

---

1. I have not been able to find supporting evidence about these facts from works other than Ibn al-Qilāḍī’s.
2. Duwaihī, who discussed the identity of Tūmā al-Kafartābī, depended for his conclusions solely on Ibn al-Qilāḍī. See below, pp.188-190.
4. Letter to Patriarch Shamīn, pp.103-104. Note the lack of verb. I have attempted to reproduce in my translation the same vagueness found in the original.
It is possible that what Duwaihi understood from this passage was originally meant by Ibn al-Qilaği; but it is certain from the context of Ibn al-Qilaği's letter that, unlike what Duwaihi seems to have believed, no letters exchanged between Pope Paschall II (1099-1118) and Patriarch Yusuf al-Jirjisī were available in Ibn al-Qilaği's day to support or clarify this story. The date of the event must have been 1099 or 1100, the latter date having been given by Duwaihi, since Gaudefroy died in 1100, after having conquered Jerusalem in 1099.

As far as the person of Patriarch Yusuf al-Jirjisī is concerned, nothing is known about him except what can be deduced from this passage about him in Ibn al-Qilaği's letter. Duwaihi said that his seat was in the village of Yânūh, a village in Jibbet al-Munaitra. That he did come into direct or indirect contact with Pope Paschall II and that he did receive from him a crown and a staff is not unlikely, although there seems to be no evidence outside Ibn al-Qilaği to prove it. It is certain that the Maronites did come into active contact with the Franks, however, as early as 1099, and their patriarch may have communicated with the Pope at that time.

1. Ibn al-Qilaği, in his letter (ibid., p.101), stated clearly that letters exchanged between the Popes and the Maronite patriarchs for the last 282 years were still found in 1494. This would make the date of the earliest letter c.1212 - in the time of Innocent III and Patriarch Armia al-Amshiti. A letter from Innocent II to Armia, dated 1213, is mentioned by Amansi (Bullarum Maronitarum, p.1).

2. Duwaihi, loc.cit.


4. See below, pp.176-ff.
The second occasion on which a contact between a Pope and a Maronite patriarch took place was related by Ibn al-Qilāʾī, again in his letter to Patriarch Shamʿūn:

And before... you swore allegiance to Rome at the hands of Cardinal Gulielmo, the legate of the Pope of Rome to your people. The leaders of your clergy and the learned in your community met him; and your patriarch used to be called Gregorius of Ḥalāt. And there they put down their signatures, the great and the small, and swore that they would be obedient to the Pope of Rome and steadfast in his Faith. 2

It does not seem that there is any mention outside Ibn al-Qilāʾī of any papal envoy to the Maronites called Gulielmo. Duwaiḥī repeated this story depending solely on the information cited above from Ibn al-Qilāʾī, and gave the event the date 1131, the first year of the pontificate of Innocent II. 3 Likewise, the Mukhtagar... of Ibn al-Qilāʾī associated the name of Gregorius of Ḥalāt with that of Innocent II who ascended the papal throne in 1130. 4

It is probable that this story given by Ibn al-Qilāʾī has some basis of truth. It is by no means unlikely that at the time of Innocent II (1130-1143) the papacy had tried to bring the Maronite church into its fold, and that some form of relationship was established then between the Maronite patriarchate and Rome, just as such a relationship had been established

2. Letter to Patriarch Shamʿūn, p.102.
4. MS Mukhtagar..., fol.15v.
between the Armenian church in Jerusalem and the Roman See
during the pontificate of Innocent II. In that case it would
have been probably Albericus, Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, who had
been sent by Innocent II to Antioch in 1139 "to investigate
the trouble which had arisen in the church at Antioch between
the Lord Patriarch and his canons",1 and who received the sub-
mission of the Catholicos of the Armenians to Rome in Jerusalem
the following year,2 who came into contact with the Maronites
and received their submission to Rome. Ibn al-Qilāṭī might
have called him Guelielmo (William) by mistake, because the Latin

1. William of Tyre, A history of deeds done beyond the sea
(translated by E.A. Babcock, New York, 1942), II, p.110.
2. Albericus, Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia (d.1148), a Benedictine
monk, was born in Beauvais in France in 1090. He was made
Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia by Innocent II in 1138. In 1139 he
was appointed to examine the conduct of Rodolph, patriarch
of Antioch. At a council held in Antioch on November 30,
1139, Rodolph was deposed and cast in prison. Albericus then
went to Jerusalem and presided over a council there on Easter
Tuesday, 1140, in which the Armenian Catholicos took part.
They discussed various doctrinal points in which the
Armenians differed from the Roman Church, and the Catholicos
promised to change those doctrines to conform with their
Roman counterparts. Albericus died at Verdun in 1148. See
N.J. O'Malia, "Alberic of Ostia", in The Catholic encyclopa­
dia (London, 1913), I, p.159. Also "Alberico, O.S.B.,
cardinale-vescovo di Ostia", in Encyclopaedia Ecclesiastica
(Milano, 1942), I, p.94, "Alberico, vescovo di Ostia", in
Encyclopaedia Italiana (1929), II, p.164, and "Alberic,
cardinal-eveque de Ostia", in Dictionnaire de l'histoire
et geographie ecclesiastique, I, pp.1407-1408. For the
councils of Antioch (1139) and Jerusalem (1140) see Charles-
Joseph Hefele, Histoire des Conciles d'apres les documents
originaux (traduite et augmentee par Dom. H. Leclercq, Paris,
1912), V; Council of Antioch, pp.743-746, and Council of
Jerusalem, p.746. The Maronites may have come into contact
with Albericus in Jerusalem, since there were Maronites in
that city. If what Duwaihi said (T.T.M., p.356) about the
Maronites having met the papal legate in Tripoli is true,
then the Maronites may have met Albericus while he was on
his way to Antioch in 1139. There is no direct evidence to
that, however.
patriarch of Jerusalem at the time was known by that name.\(^1\) Again there is no documentary evidence given by Ibn al-Qilā\(\overline{\text{i}}\) in support of his narrative. It is certain, however, that no permanent union between the Maronites and Rome was established before 1180.\(^2\)

The stories of Mugaddam Sim\(\text{cān}\) and Amir Kisrā, which are found in the third and fourth sections of Ibn al-Qilā\(\overline{\text{i}}\)’s Madīha...,\(^3\) are interesting illustrations of the military help offered by the Maronite chiefs to the Crusaders.

Sim\(\text{cān}\) appears to have been an ardent soldier of Christianity. Right after the murder of his maternal uncle, the amir of Baskinta, in Qab Iliās (so Ibn al-Qilā\(\overline{\text{i}}\) said), he won a victory against the Moslems at Al-Mrūj, a village on the eastern slope of Mt. Śannīn, near Baskinta. For thirty years, said Ibn al-Qilā\(\overline{\text{i}}\), he continued fighting the Moslems. Forced finally to retreat northwards from Antiliās, a town just north of Beirut, the Maronites, led by Sim\(\text{cān}\), fortified themselves at Nahr al-Kalb (the Dog River), where a battle was fought in which the Moslems were utterly defeated.

After winning this victory, Sim\(\text{cān}\) went to visit the ruler of Jubail (malik Jubail). On the way he was joined by the Maronite patriarch who, Ibn al-Qilā\(\overline{\text{i}}\) remarked, was from Hālāt,

\(^1\) The patriarch of Jerusalem at the time was Guillaume I of Malines (1130-1145). See L. de Mas Latrie, "Les patriarches latins de Jerusalem", in Revue de l'Orient Latin (R.O.L.), I, (1893, pp.16-41), p.18.

\(^2\) See below, chapter on Duwaiḥī, pp.184 et seq.

\(^3\) Madīha..., pp.15-16 and 18-19.
a village in the neighbourhood of Jubail. They were both well-received by the Malik, who sent after forty bishops "from the Druib to the Shuf" to anoint Sim'an malik of Al-Kharija, a province between Nahr al-Kalb and Nahr Ibrahim (Adonis river), later known as Kisruan. The Malik finally dismissed Sim'an with many presents; and Sim'an kept on fighting the Moslems until he died in Baskinta.

Shihabi thought the wars of Muqaddam Sim'an against the Moslems belonged to the ninth century, and gave the date 258 A.H. (874 A.D.) to the battle of Nahr al-Kalb. It has been mentioned before that Shihabi gave the date 752 A.D. to the murder of Ilias, the Amir of Baskinta, who was supposedly the uncle of Sim'an who fought in 871. Kisra, he continued, the uncle of Sim'an and brother of Ilias, travelled to Constantinople in the reign of Justinian II, who came to the throne in 685. This classic of disorderly chronology makes clear the undependability of the dating of Shihabi.

It is more likely that Sim'an was one of the Maronite auxiliaries to the Franks. Jubail did not fall to the Crusaders until April 28, 1104, when Raymond de Saint Gilles took it from Banu 'Ammar, Jubail having been their southernmost dependency. Considering that Ibn al-Qila'i described in detail the visit of

1. Druib is a village in the north of Lebanon, east of Tripoli. Shuf is a province in central Lebanon, inhabited mainly by Druzes. The expression used by Ibn al-Qila'i signifies all northern Lebanon, which is Maronite.
Sim'ān to the Christian ruler of Jubail who had him consecrated
malik of Al-Khārija and who provided him with money, horses,
camels, and men, it seems that Sim'ān was one of the native
vassals to the lord (seigneur) of Jubail.

If the wars of Muqaddam Sim'ān belong to the Crusader
period, then the guess of the author of the Mukhtasar... that
the patriarch who came from Ḥalāt was Gregorius al-Ḥalātī,
who was contemporary to Pope Innocent II, would be correct,
since no other Maronite patriarch of the period came from Ḥalāt.
Actually, because there is no record of any other Maronite
patriarch who came from that village, the fact itself that
the patriarch in question came from Ḥalāt suggests the period
of the events under consideration, Gregorius Al-Ḥalātī having
been patriarch between 1130-1141.

It is not clear why the author of the Mukhtasar... called the lord of Jubail Yusuf (Joseph). There was no
Crusader ruler of Jubail by that name. If Muqaddam Sim'ān
was a contemporary of Gregorius al-Ḥalātī, then the lord of
Jubail at the time would have been either Hughe I (1127-c.1135)
or Guillaume II (1139-1159). Nahr al-Kalb, where the greatest
of Sim'ān's battles seems to have been fought, was at the time
(c.1132) the southernmost frontier of the County of Tripoli.

1. Madiha..., p.16.
2. MS Mukhtasar..., fol.15v.
3. Ibid.
4. See tables back of R. Grousset, op.cit., III.
5. Ibid., I, p.367.
It was thus a vulnerable point and the victory won there against Moslem raiders and attributed to Simcan was a likely event, although there seems to be no mention of it elsewhere.

As for the identity of Muqaddam Simcan, Gregory the priest, the twelfth century Armenian chronicler, made mention of a certain Simon (same name as Simcan) who is probably identifiable with Ibn al-Qilā'ī's hero. While relating the events of the years 1140-1141, Gregory said:

A warrior belonging to the nation of the brigands called Simon, who bore a grudge against the Count of Edessa, took Ain-tab from him by surprise. He kept this place in his possession for one year, and then gave it back to him with the intercession of the Prince of Antioch.

Ed. Dulaurier, who edited Gregory the Priest's chronicle, with a French translation, suggested that the nation of brigands, to which Simon belonged, were no other than the Mardaites (or Jarājima) of Lebanon. He added that Michael the Syrian, while speaking of the advent of the Mardaites to Lebanon also called them "brigands". If this is true, he concluded, then there were Maronites in the Latin army in Syria, and Simon was one of them.

1. Ed. Dulaurier, translator (French) and editor of the chronicle of Gregory the Priest, read the Armenian word to mean assassin or brigand. Actually, the word found in the Armenian text is written wrongly and has no meaning in the form in which it stands. See Ed. Dulaurier's note 2, p. 155 of Gregoire le Pret Continuateur de Matthieu d'Edesse, Chronique (Receuil des historiens des Croisades, Historiens arméniens, I, Paris 1896 pp. 152-202).


3. Ain-tāb was a fortified town of importance between Aleppo and Antioch.

4. Raymond de Poitiers (1136-1149), first husband of Constance, daughter of Bohemond II. See tables back of R. Grousset, op. cit., III.

5. Note by Ed. Dulaurier, in Gregory the Priest, op. cit., p. 155, fn. 2.
Dulaurier does not appear to have heard of Ibn al-Qilāʾī's Muqaddam Simcān who, aside from bearing the same name as Gregory's warrior, was also active in the same period (c. 1130-1141) and appears to have been a soldier of note. All the scanty evidence available points to the fact that they were the same person, a Maronite chieftain fighting in the Crusader army.

Simcān, according to Ibn al-Qilāʾī, was succeeded by his uncle Kisrā, whose "sword was a cross on the battlefield", and whose armour bore the sign of the cross. This Kisrā went to Constantinople (İstanbül) to swear allegiance to the emperor, who consacrated him malik of Mount Lebanon by placing a sword above his head. The emperor also gave Kisrā a coat of armour and princely apparel, and gave him power to appoint governors to the provinces. On arriving back at the harbour of Tabarjā, south of Jubail, he was met by his soldiers who, in his honour, called Al-Khārija"Kisruān," after his name.

Ibn al-Qilāʾī continued the story of Kisrā by relating his relations with a certain Kāmil, muqaddam of Liḥfīd. Kāmil, an ardent Crusader and a knight of the lord of Jubail, used to

1. B. Qaraḍāḡī, in his edition of the Madīḥa... (p.18, fn.5) note that the Crusaders carried swords the handles of which were in the form of a cross and (fn.6) that they wore crosses on their armour. Thus, he concludes, Kisrā was a Crusader knight.
2. This is the name with which Ibn al-Qilāʾī referred to Constantinople. This form appears in many Mamlūk chronicles.
3. Madīḥa... p.18.
4. Ibid., p.19.
5. Ibid., p.19, verse vi reads: malik
   I am the knight of the malik of Jubail.
   He has taught me how to ride the horse.
cross the mountain and raid the land of Bākalbāk in the northern
Biqā'. Hearing of his exploits, Kīsrā decided to make him his
knight. Kāmil refused Kīsrā's offer, explaining to his envoys
that he was the knight of the malik of Jubail, and that he
feared the wrath of his liege lord should he accept Kīsrā's
offer. Again Kīsrā tried to win the alliance of Kāmil, this
time by asking for the hand of Kāmil's daughter for his son in
marriage. Kāmil had to consult his lord about it and, the
malik of Jubail having given his consent, the marriage of Kāmil's
daughter to Kīsrā's son took place.

At that time, Ibn al-Qilāī added, Mas'ūd, the muqad-
dam of Ḥbālīn, near Jubail, built the church of St. Stephen
(Mar Istifān) in the neighbouring village of Gharfīn.¹

The story of Kīsrā is an interesting illustration of
the relations of the native Christian knights of Lebanon and
their Frankish overlords in the Crusader period. It is futile
to try to determine whether Kīsrā was the maternal uncle of
Simān or not; but it seems definite that he did belong to the
Crusader period. He carried a cruciform sword, his armour had
a cross on it, and he paid homage by having a sword raised
above his head. Kāmil, a knight of the lord of Jubail, had to
follow the Western feudal custom of consulting his lord before
arranging for the marriage of his children. It is not clear
why Ibn al-Qilāī made Kīsrā travel to Constantinople to pay

¹. Ibid., p. 19.
homage to the Byzantine emperor instead of paying homage to the lord of Jubail or the Count of Tripoli. It is possible that Ibn al-Qilāṭī was confusing between the Crusader and the Byzantine periods, since in the latter period the Mardaite chiefs of Lebanon were under the suzerainty of the Byzantine emperors. In both those periods the Christian inhabitants of Lebanon were fighting for a Christian power against the Moslems. On the other hand, popular tradition may have made the hero travel to add romance to his character, a tradition which Ibn al-Qilāṭī preserved in his poetical rendering of the story.

Although Ibn al-Qilāṭī discussed events of the period before 1215, he gave neither sources nor dates for such events. He related them chaotically, with the result that they appear to be myths rather than history. The visit of Patriarch Armia al-Amshīṭī to Rome in 1215 is the earliest event in the narration of which Ibn al-Qilāṭī used dates and referred to written sources. On the other hand, he missed the significance of Armia's visit to Rome by confusing it with the visit of another Maronite patriarch to Rome, a patriarch who was also called Armia, and by assigning to the visit a cause other than its real one.

As an introduction to Patriarch Armia's visit to Rome in 1215 Ibn al-Qilāṭī related the story of the destruction of Kisruan by the Mamlūk army, which actually took place in 1305. This event, according to him, had been the result of the internal religious division among the Maronites caused by the heretical preachings of a monk from Yanūḥ and another from Dair Nbūḥ, who

1. Dair Nbūḥ is a village in Az-Zawiya, the northernmost province of Mount Lebanon.
were supported by the patriarch, Lūqa of Bnahrān. Taking advantage of the weakness resulting from this religious division, the Moslem armies came to Lebanon and destroyed and burnt Kisruān. The Rāfida (Ithnā-'asharī Shī'a) of Kisruān and the Druzes of the Shūf were likewise worsted by the Moslems. Turkoman military colonies were eventually established in the country to keep it in submission.¹

Ibn al-Qilāʿī's account of the destruction of Kisruān will be discussed in its proper place. It was mentioned here because he considered it an issue of divine wrath brought about by the heretical inclination of the Maronites which necessitated the voyage of Patriarch Armīā to Rome to atone for it.² According to Ibn al-Qilāʿī, the malik of Jubail, in fear that the excommunication of the heretical Maronites would bring about greater misfortune to the country, called the Maronite patriarch and ordered him to go to Rome at his (the malik of Jubail's) expense to ask for the annulment of the excommunication and to return with papal blessings for his people. The patriarch, therefore, went to Rome immediately, dressed as a pauper and accompanied by a deacon from Hābīl,³ leaving the bishop Tādrūs of Kfūfū in charge of his flock.

On arriving in Rome, Armīā appeared in the Pope's

1. This description of the destruction of Kisruān appears in ibid., pp.21-25. It will be considered later in more detail. Actually the expedition of 1305 was not primarily directed against the Maronites but against the heterodox Moslems and the Druzes of Kisruān.
2. The account of Armīā's voyage is given in ibid., pp.25-28.
3. Hābīl is a village in the neighbourhood of Bātrūn (Botrys).
presence in his pauper's attire, and was only recognized to be the patriarch of the Maronites by the papal legates who had been to the East. On seeing his miserable condition the Pope wept and asked him who had robbed him of his clothes; whereupon Armia showed him the Gospel he was carrying and answered that it was the Gospel that had made him undertake the journey to the presence of the Pope:

He held out the Gospel and showed it to him:
This, he said, is what gives me delight,
And what made me deserve the honour
Of seeing your Holiness—
To receive blessing at your feet,
To offer submission, and to kneel before you.
I want to live and die in your presence,
Making no dispute with my human reason.
My people offer submission to you
And kneel before your feet in obedience.
Whatever you order they will listen to you
In matters of belief and faith.
I have been sent to visit your Holiness
And to live under the hoof of your horse,
O you, who has called yourself Vicar of Jesus,
Pour out blessings on me from your bounty.
Successor of Peter, bear not spite,
Nor send a man away when he kneels before you.
Do not expel him who approaches your Holiness,
Nor send a repentant to the fires of Hell.
If I had sinned, I come now repenting,
And I do not intend to return in disappointment.
It is a duty of your Holiness, yea, a duty
To wipe off the tears from the eyes of the penitent.¹

The Pope, impressed by Armia's piety, answered his requests; and after Armia had stayed in Rome for five years and six months, he gave him leave to return to Lebanon, sending with him a certain Cardinal Guilielmo who carried the papal seal

and was entrusted with the preparation of a statement of the submission of the Maronites to Rome. The patriarch and the cardinal, said Ibn al-Qilāʿī, left Rome on January 3, 1215, and arrived in Tripoli in March of the same year. The ringing of church bells summoned the Maronite notables to Tripoli to meet them and to receive papal blessings. There they took an oath and put their signatures to a statement declaring that they would be faithful to the Roman Church and would not be attracted to heresy. 270 signatures, said Ibn al-Qilāʿī, were affixed to the statement. He ended this section by giving the date of Armia's death, saying that he died in 1230 and was buried in Maifūq.

The visit of Patriarch Armia al-'Amshīṭī to Rome in 1215 is a historical fact. He went there in answer to the summons from Innocent III (1198-1216) to attend the fourth Lateran Council which was held in Rome beginning from November 11, 1215. In a list of the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops present at the Council, the Maronite patriarch is mentioned as "Patriarcha seu Primas Maronitarum"; and a copy of the circular letter sent by Innocent III on April 19, 1213, summoning the Church leaders of the East and the West to "repair to the Council in two and a half years, the first of November, 1215", which

1. Ibid., p.27.
2. Ibid., p.28.
3. See above, p.36.
is addressed to "Patriarca Maronitarum Hieremiam", is still in existence.\(^1\) Crusader historians like Jaques de Vitry\(^2\) and Oliver of Paderborn\(^3\) mentioned the presence of the Maronite patriarch at the Lateran Council.

It is strange to find that Ibn al-Qilāṭī, having stated that Patriarch Armia remained in Rome for five years and six months, added that his departure from Rome was on January 3, 1215 (which should be interpreted, according to the Gregorian Calendar, as 1216).\(^4\) Actually, the date January 3, 1215 (1216) appears on a bull which Innocent III addressed to Armia whilst he was still in Rome, granting him various privileges,\(^5\) a bull which Ibn al-Qilāṭī himself rendered in an incorrect Arabic translation.\(^6\) Ibn al-Qilāṭī, thus, seems to have held that Armia left Rome with "Cardinal Gulielmo" immediately he had received the bull from the Pope, which is not unlikely, although there seems to be no other reference to the date of Armia's departure from Rome. On the other hand, it is clear from Ibn

---

4. In the Middle Ages, before the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar in 1582, New Year's Day started generally on March 25. See article "New Year's Day" in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, eleventh edition.
6. Ibn al-Qilāṭī, MS Marūn at-ṭūbānī, fol.26v-29v.
al-Qilāṣi's translation of the bull that he believed it to have been the letter in which the Pope invited the patriarch to attend the Lateran Council. Ibn al-Qilāṣi also added in a note following his translation of the bull that Armia, having received it, went to Rome and attended the Lateran Council; and that on his return from Rome he brought with him another papal Bull which Ibn al-Qilāṣi did not find. The bull which he translated, however, is definitely the one which was given to Armia in Rome and which he brought back with him to Lebanon. The fact that Armia had attended the Council is mentioned in it:

As for you, O brother Patriarch, who because of your great devotion has visited personally your mother, the Holy Catholic Church and attended the General Council, we wish to grant you and your people, who have newly renewed their allegiance to the Roman Church, special grace....

1. Ibn al-Qilāṣi translated the passage given in the text (see above on this page, and fn. 3) as follows: "We desire you, O brother Patriarch, for the great love of your mother, the Holy Catholic Church, to visit her in person and to attend the General Council and receive special grace for your people who have newly returned to the obedience of the Church of Rome." Ibid., fol. 28v.

2. The note reads as follows: "Patriarch Armia received this letter and went to the city of Rome where he gave an account of all what his people believed in. He attended a Council, and brought back with him a letter with new graces. That letter we did not find; but Pope Alexander IV mentioned it in his letter, and after 41 years he sent a letter inquiring in it about the condition of the Maronites...." The letter of Alexander IV (See T. Anaissi, op.cit., pp. 9-13) was dated February 14, 1256. Since it was written 41 years after the bull which Innocent III gave to Armia on the latter's departure from Rome, the date of this bull must be 1215—the very bull which is under discussion. The quotation is from MS Mārūn at-ṭūbānī, fol. 29v.

The fact that Ibn al-Qilâ'i mentioned the date of Armia's arrival in Tripoli as March, 1215 (1216) is a further indication that Armia left Rome almost immediately after his business with the Pope had been completed. Ibn al-Qilâ'i was probably relying on some source when he gave that date.

The bull addressed by Innocent III to Armia is a document of great importance to the history of the Maronites, and it clarifies the story of the visit of Armia to Rome. It opens with expressions of joy because the Maronites had returned to union with Rome after they had been "like wandering sheep, not properly understanding that the Catholic Church was the one spouse of Christ,...that Christ was the one true Shepherd, and, after Him and through Him, that Peter was His Apostle and Vicar... whose faith, and that of his successors, the Roman pontiffs, cannot fail, as the Lord had promised that he shall confirm his brethren in their faith."  

The bull then proceeds to relate the fact that Cardinal Peter, priest of the church of St. Marcellus, was sent by Innocent III to the Maronites, and that he had met their clergymen and notables at Tripoli where, in his presence, they swore allegiance to Rome.  

---

1. T. Anaissi, op.cit., p.2. The translation of this passage is found in H.K. Mann, op.cit., XII, p.70.
2. T. Anaissi, op.cit., p.3.
that meeting, apart from the patriarch, were enumerated as "Yūsuf, archbishop of Mār Asiā, Tādrus, bishop of Capharphio (same as Kfūfū?) and a great number of clergymen and laymen who owe \( \text{The patriarch/} \) obedience". These Maronites, the bull adds, took an oath of allegiance to Rome out of their own free will before the people of Tripoli and a gathering of (Latin) clergymen.

The bull then proceeds to give corrections of Maronite belief and ritual. These corrections, it adds, had already been made by Cardinal Peter:

\[
\ldots\text{That you believe without doubt what the Roman Church holds, which is: that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as it proceeds from the Father, since both of them are Spirit, as it is clear from the holy testimonies and the true proofs; that you use this manner in baptism, which is that the invocation of the Trinity is made once in the three immersions; that you shall receive the sacrament of confirmation from bishops alone; that only oil and balsam shall go into the preparation of the Chrism; that every one of you shall confess his sins to his own priest at least once every year, and that you receive the sacrament of the Eucharist with devotion at least three times a year; that you shall believe that in Christ there are two wills, one divine and one human; that in the Mass (in altaris Sacrificio) you shall not use chalices of glass, wood, or brass, but ones of tin, silver, or gold; and you shall have bells to distinguish the hours and to call the people to church.}\]

Next, the bull confirms Patriarch Armīā in his see in Yānūh, and also confirms the archbishops of Mār Asiā, and Esharrāy, Bsharrāy, and the bishops of Al-Munaiṭra, Rishīn, Capharphio,

1. Ibid., p.3.
2. Ibid.
and 'Arqa. A list of the feasts to be celebrated by the Maronite church follows.

The last part of the bull is very significant:

We also establish laws according to the precepts of the holy law, that whoever lays his hand on a Maronite cleric in daring and violence shall fall under the pains of excommunication, and like one who is excommunicated, he shall be evaded by everybody until he pays his due and so receives the benefit of absolution from the authority of the Apostolic See. As for you, O brother Patriarch,...,¹ we grant you the Apostolic authority to absolve those Maronite who had fallen under the above sentence because they had raised their hands in daring against the clerics, except if there had been mutilation of the limbs or effusion of blood, or the laying of hands in violence on a bishop or an abbot....²

From the text of this letter some interesting conclusions can be derived concerning Ibn al-Qila'awi's narrative of the visit of Armia to Rome and its precedents. Some kind of religious division had, apparently, taken place among the Maronites before their reunion with Rome at the hands of Cardinal Peter (not Guglielmo, as Ibn al-Qila'awi called him), in the course of which the rebellious party had attacked several clergymen (among whom there were bishops and abbots), sometimes mutilating them or killing them in the attack. This rebellious party must have been composed of those Maronites who did not approve of their patriarch's policy of union with Rome. The rebellion may have been started and led by some dissident members of the Maronite clergy, as the reference of Ibn al-Qila'awi

¹ The passage omitted here is the passage quoted above, p.72.
² T. Anaissi, op.cit., p.4.
to the heretical monks of Yānumh and Dair Nbuḥ suggests. It is understood from the bull also that the meeting of the Maronite patriarch, clergymen and notables with the envoy of the Pope at Tripoli to offer their oaths of allegiance to Rome did not take place in March 1215 (1216), as Ibn al-Qilāʿī said, after the return of the patriarch from Rome, but several years earlier probably in 1203, since Cardinal Peter was sent by Innocent III as his legate to the East at the time of the fourth Crusade (1202-1204).  

Tādrus of Kfūfū (or Kfarfū - Capharphio), besides, who was mentioned by Ibn al-Qilāʿī as having run the affairs of Patriarch Armīn during the latter's absence in Rome, is mentioned twice in the bull, which proves that he was a historical person and no legend. Nothing is mentioned, however, about his having been appointed by Armīn to take charge of his affairs during his absence.

It appears from this analysis that some points in Ibn al-Qilāʿī's narrative of the relations of the Maronites with Rome about the time of the fourth Lateran Council have a basis of truth. The reconciliation of the Maronites to Rome at the time was preceded by religious division among the Maronites - a division which seems to have virged on civil war. Patriarch

1. Peter of Capua (1150-1209), priest of the church of St. Marcellus, was sent by Innocent III in 1203 with the fourth Crusade (1202-1204) as his legate to the East. The meeting in Tripoli, thus, probably took place in that year. T. Anaissi, Silsila..., p.21. F. Suriano, op. cit., pp.68-69; called him Peter of Malphi, and gave the same story.
Armiā al-'Amshīṭī did go to Rome and, some years before his departure thither, he and his clergymen and notables had met a legate of the Pope at Tripoli and had sworn allegiance to Rome before him. These facts are given by Ibn al-Qilāʾī, although he gave them in the wrong chronological sequence.¹

On the other hand, Ibn al-Qilāʾī had included in his narrative facts that have no historical validity. Armiā's visit to Rome was not preceded by the Mamlūk expedition against Kisruān (1305). He was not sent there by the lord of Jubail but was summoned to be present at the Lateran Council by Innocent III himself. What led Ibn al-Qilāʾī to commit these blunders? Was it merely poetic license?

Bulus Qaraʾlī adequately explained these blunders by supposing that Ibn al-Qilāʾī was confusing between two Maronite patriarchs called Armiā, both of whom went to Rome, the first in 1215 and the second in 1283.² The second Armiā, who went to Rome in 1283, was Armiā ad-Damilṣāwī (1282–1297).³ A note in his own handwriting was found by Ţubiyyā al-‘Anaissī, written on a Syriac Gospel in the Medici Library in Florence. This note

¹. There is nothing to disprove that Armiā was accompanied on his return from Rome by a Cardinal Gulielmo, although I have not found it possible to identify him. In his letter to Patriarch Shamūn (p.102) Ibn al-Qilāʾī did not mention him, and gave the name Gulielmo only to the legate (Albericus of Ostia?) who came into contact with the Maronites at the time of Gregorius of Hālāt, c.1140.
³. T. ‘Anaissī, Silsila..., pp.24–27. Damilṣā is a farm in the neighbourhood of ‘Amshīṭ. That, suggested Qaraʾlī, may have helped to cause the blunder in Ibn al-Qilāʾī's narrative of mixing between the two patriarchs.
runs as follows:

In the year 1590 of the Greeks (1279 A.D.), on February 9, I, the humble Armia, came from the blessed village of Damilsa to the monastery of Our Lady in Maifūq in the land of Allij, which is in the province of Matmūn, to our lord Mār Buṭrus, patriarch of the Maronites, and he ordained me with his holy hands and made me archbishop of the holy monastery of Kaftūn on the banks of Nahr Ibrāhīm (actually Nahr al-Jauz), and I remained there four years .... And after the passing of the four years the lord (amir) of Jubail sent for me and the bishops, the heads of the churches, and the clergymen, and they cast a lot which fell on me; and they made me patriarch in the holy monastery of Hālāt. Then they sent me to the great city of Rome and I left our brother, the Archbishop Tādrus, to direct the flock and to take care of its affairs.

Tubiyā al-ʿAnaissī referred also to another document in which the name of Armia ʿad-Damsāwī appears. This was a testimony concerning the attempts of Guy II, lord of Jubail, to take Tripoli from its ruler, Count Bohemond VII. The testimony runs as follows:

On February 26, the year 1282, in the fortress of Naphina, which is near Tripoli, the Prince of Antioch and the Count of Tripoli and the undersigned witnesses met and declared that Guy, lord of Jubail, incited by the Master of the Templars, William of Beaujeu, tried three times to occu-

2. It is interesting to note that the monastery of Kaftūn was mentioned in Masalik al-ʿabsār as a beautifully situated monastery where seekers of pleasure found a pleasant resort. The monastery had an orange grove and its oranges were sold in Tripoli. Al-Umarī, Masālik al-ʿabsār fi masālik al-amṣār (Cairo, 1924), 1, p. 335.
3. Hālāt is a small village near Jubail.
5. It is unnecessary here to go into the details of the wars of Guy II and Bohemond VII. The former was captured in 1282 and put to death by the latter. The following document might have been a testimony used in court against him. For a full discussion of this matter see R. Grousset, op.cit., III, pp. 685–691.
6. Ibid., pp. 686 et seq.
The name of Patriarch Armiā ad-Damilsāwī (Frater Jeremie Patriarcha Maronitarum) appears at the bottom as a witness, along with Ibrāhīm, archbishop of ‘Arqā, and Yūḥannā, archbishop of Rishāṭīn.

From these two texts it is clear that there was a second patriarch called Armiā, and that he was sent to Rome by Bohemond VII, Count of Tripoli (1275-1287), who was at the same time lord of Jubail (from 1282). Another coincidence is that whereas in the days of the first Armiā the bishop of Kfūfū (or Kfarfū) was called Tādrus, in the days of the second Armiā there was an archbishop by that name who was left in charge of the affairs of the Maronite church whilst the patriarch was in Rome.

Another interesting fact to note, which probably added to Ibn al-Qila‘ī’s confusion was that in 1283, the year the second Armiā was sent to Rome, there was a Mamluk attack on Jibbet Bsharray in the course of which Ḥadath al-Jibbeh, one of the main towns of the province, was destroyed by the Moslems, as were several other towns and villages of the district.

This event, related with dates by Duwaiḥī, is also

1. B. Qara‘ī, op. cit., pp.35-36. Quotation translated by him from Anaissī, Corpus documentorum Maronitarum, No.28, P.29, where it is given in Latin and French. Bohemond VII (1275-1287) was both Prince of Antioch and Count of Tripoli.
2. Considering that the date of the document quoted above is before March 25, the year should be taken as 1283, according to the Gregorian Calendar. Armiā thus left for Rome the year Bohemond VII took Jubail from Guy II.
touched upon by Ibn al-Qilā'ī in the Madīḥa..., where its narrative is awkwardly inserted within the narrative of other events, as will be shown later. He gave it no date:

Mugaddam Būlus and Attir Masūd,
Whose likes in excellence never arose,
Went out of Al-Ḥadath in full armour.
Like heroes they entered the battlefield.
They routed the soldiers of Islam,
And their news reached Damascus.
For seven years they fought the Moslems,
And their news reached the sultan.

Then a man from Ibraisat\(^1\)
Came to the Moslems\(^2\) and promised them \(\text{[saying]}:\)
"Let it be my lot to take for you
This village with ease."
They gave him presents and promised him wealth,
And learnt from the dishonest man.
He went to the muqaddam \(\text{[of Al-Ḥadath]}\) and preached his\(^7\) heresy,\(^3\)

And the spirit of the devil was established in him.
The muqaddam followed his heresy
And the fires \(\text{of Hell}\) caught on to his body.
He obeyed \(\text{the heresy}\), and so did his neighbours —
The men of the village and the women.
The Moslems entered \(\text{their village}\) with ease
And slaughtered them as sheep are slaughtered,
Leaving no man among them.
They killed men, women, and boys.
From that time Al-Ḥadath was destroyed,
After it had been a town of twenty-seven hundred.
For seven years the Moslems fought,
And their news reached the sultan.\(^4\)

One non-Maronite source in which the story of the

---

1. Ibraisāt is a village in Jibbet Bsharray, near Al-Ḥadath.
2. Tayyā, meaning Banū Tayy — the Arabs or Moslems. The form of the word is Syriac, the "ā" at the end standing for the definite article "al" in Arabic. It should be translated "the Tayy" — "the Arabs", or "the Moslems".
3. The meaning of the line is vague. This is the best meaning I could find in it:
   دخل لاشتهينه(العظام) في العمال
   طاعلاشتهينه في مقاله
   والفّار على في ابدائه
4. Madīḥa..., p.44.
destruction of Al-Ḥadath is hinted at in the biography of Sultan Qalāūn (1277-1290), which is found in manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Among the events of the year 1283 A.D. Qalāūn's biographer mentioned the arrest of "the patriarch of Al-Ḥadath":

The arrest of the Patriarch of Al-Ḥadath in the Land of Tripoli

It happened that there was in the land of Tripoli a patriarch who became strong, swelled with pride, and rebelled. The ruler of Tripoli and all the Franks feared him. He won over the people of those mountains and the people of those valleys who were straying in their religion; and his power continued to grow until he was feared by every neighbour. He fortified himself in Al-Ḥadath and held his nose high with pride.... And it happened that the governors (an-nuwwāb) of Syria tried to get him several times but could not find him. Then the Turkomans went to him in his place and managed to capture him; and they brought him back a miserable prisoner.... And the Moslems were freed from him and became safe from his wickedness; and his capture was a great conquest - greater than the conquest of a rampart of a fort.

This passage also offers a clue to the solution of another problem in Ibn al-Qīlatī's narrative of the events under discussion: the identity of Patriarch Lūqā of Bnuhrān who, according to Ibn al-Qīlatī, supported the heretical movement of the monks of Yanūḥ and Dair Nābūḥ. Duwaiḥī, while relating the story of the destruction of Al-Ḥadath by Qalāūn in 1283 in his chronology of the Maronite patriarchs, mentioned that

1. I have translated this quotation from a photostat reproduction of pp. 94-95 of MS 1704 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, which is entitled Tashrif al-ṭusūr bi sirāt aṣ-ṣultan al-Malik al-Manṣūr in Al-Manāra, V, 1934, P.204. I have found no mention of this event in any of the other Arabic chronicles I consulted.
after Patriarch Daniāl al-Ḥadshīṭī, who died in 1262 in Maīfūq, \(^1\)
Lūqā, a man who came from a village in Jibbet Bsharryāy called Bnuhrān, took over the patriarchal see by force. Duwaihī made no mention, on the other hand, of Armīā ad-Damīṣāwī, who had been made in the same year Patriarch of the Maronites in the monastery of Ḥālāt by the initiative of the Count of Tripoli Lūqā, apparently, was an anti-patriarch. He must have been the patriarch who fortified himself in Al-Ḥadath, was feared by the ruler of Tripoli, and was taken prisoner and probably put to death by the soldiers of Qalāūn, since nothing is known about him after 1283. That the ruler of Tripoli and the Franks were afraid of him is understandable, since he must have been the leader of that faction of the Maronites who, perhaps, disapproved of the interference of the Frankish rulers in the election of their patriarchs, and were thus anti-Frankish and, apparently, anti-Roman too.

Thus, all the facts used by Ibn al-Qilāʾī in his narrative of the visit of Armīā to Rome are correct, except that some of them concern the visit of another patriarch called Armīā who visited Rome in 1283, and whose person has apparently been identified by Ibn al-Qilāʾī as well as by other early Maronite historians with the first Armīā. The only fact related

\(^1\) T. Ḥanīṣī, Sīlsīla... p. 24.
by Ibn al-Qilâci in this respect which does not apply to the visit of either of the two patriarchs to Rome is the destruction of Kisruân in 1305; but this event must have been confused by Ibn al-Qilâçi with the destruction of Al-Hadath in 1283 which preceeded, or was simultaneous to, the journey of the second Armia to Rome.

After noting the date of Armia al-ÆAmshiti's death, in 1230, Ibn al-Qilâçi mentioned a Maronite patriarch from Shâmât, who was originally a monk in Wâdi Almât, and who had been taken by relatives from Râmât to live in Kfaifân¹ because of the troubles that were taking place at the time.² These troubles which caused the Maronite patriarch to change his residence were touched upon by Ibn al-Qilâçi with remarkably inexplicit brevity:

Jibbet al-Munaitra dissented.
It did not remain with the malik (of Jubail).
With the people of Lîfid, it became heretical.
And made a muqaddam and an archbishop of its own.³

It is difficult to make out from this brief description what these troubles were. The patriarch to whom Ibn al-Qilâçi referred, however, was Daniâl of Shâmât (1230-1239), the successor of Armia al-ÆAmshiti, who had to leave his seat in

¹ All four villages mentioned here are in the province of Jubail. Kfaifân has an interesting old monastery named after St. Cyprian. Wâdi Almât is the only village of the district which is still wholly populated by Mitwâlis, who moved into the district in the early sixteenth century. See Lammens, La Syrie..., II, pp.67-68.
² Madiha..., pp.42-43.
³ Ibid., p.42.
Maifūq and go to the monastery of St. Cyprian (Mar Qubriānūs) in Kfaifān because of troubles that were taking place in his day. Later he moved to the monastery of Mār Yūhannā Mārūn in Kfarḥai,¹ and in 1236 he was living in the monastery of St. Georges of Kafar (Mār Jirjis al-Kafar) in the province of Jubail.²

No more was said by Ibn al-Qilācī about Dāniāl of Shāmāt. Awkwardly changing the subject in the Madīna..., he began telling the story of a sultan who gave endowments to the monasteries of Maronite Lebanon and the results of these endowments:

A valley of the river Qādīshā,³
A sultan, travelling in exile, passed by.
A monk invited him to have dinner.
He marvelled at the life of the monks.
God helped him, at the time,
And he returned to his throne like the sultans.
He sent money to build Qannūbin⁴
In remembrance of the kindness of the monks.
The sultan was generous
And he gave a firman to the monks⁵
That whoever should live among the cliffs of the Qādīshā valley
Will live at the expense of the sultan.⁶

---

1. Kfarḥai is a village in the province of Batrūn where Mār Yūhannā Mārūn, first patriarch of the Maronites, was supposedly buried.
2. T. Ėnaissî, Silsila..., p.22 and Duwaḥî, S.B., p.230. Duwaḥî cited references to his conclusions which were restated by Ėnaissî.
3. Qādīshā (Syriac: the holy) is the name given to the upper course of Nahr Abī Ḍalīl which pours at Tripoli.
4. From approximately the beginning of the fifteenth century to the nineteenth, the monastery of Qannūbin, in the Qādīshā valley, was the seat of the Maronite patriarchs. At present it is their summer residence. It is said that it was originally built in the fourth century (Qannūbin = coenobium) in the reign of Emperor Theodosius, but it has been reconstructed several times since then.
5. The term firman (Persian for order, or decree) appears in many Mamlūk chronicles, although its usage is usually associated with the Ottomans.
6. Madīna..., p.43.
Because of these endowments, Ibn al-Qilāṭī continued, the Qāḍīshā valley became a thriving abode for many people; and among those attracted to live in it was a group of forty men who "wore sack-cloth and monkish garments" (al-mish wa'il-qūsāl) and pretended to be ascetics, but who were in reality wicked men who made armed attacks on Christians and killed them, and who "established a place for women". These impostors took residence in Al-Farādīs, near the village of Bān; and for some time the people of Jibbet Bsharrāy did not know of their evil deeds and intentions. When it was discovered that they were not ascetics but evildoers, however, they were done away with in one night. Ibn al-Qilāṭī did not state whether they were killed or simply driven out of the country.

The sultan who endowed the monasteries of Qāḍīshā was, possibly, Sultan Barquq (1382-1398) who, according to Duwaihī, passed through Bsharrāy during the period of his dethronement (1389-1390) and was received by the abbot of Qannūbīn. The whole event will be discussed later at greater length in the chapter of Duwaihī's history. As for the band of forty impostors who came to dwell in Al-Farādīs and who were expelled there from, no historian other than Ibn al-Qilāṭī seems to have made any mention of it. It seems that they were not Christians, since

1. It is not clear what Ibn al-Qilāṭī meant by this.
3. See below, pp. 199-201.
Ibn al-Qilâqi noted that "they never forgave a Christian". Possibly they were heterodox Moslems from the neighbouring country (the northern Biqâ or Ad-Dnayya, north of Bsharrây). The Mukhtâsar... gave the date 1242 for their coming to Lebanon. The source of this date is not known; but if the coming of this band of "forty men" to Jibbet Bsharray followed the endowment of the monasteries by Barqûq in 1390, as Ibn al-Qilâqi said, then the date given by the Mukhtâsar... is wrong.

The narrative of these events is followed in the Madîha... by the account of the destruction of Al-Ḥadath, which has been already dealt with. This, in turn, is followed by an account of the appointment of a muqaddam in the province of Bsharrây to defend the province against "heresy and the Egyptians". It appears from the context of this part of the Madîha... that this muqaddam was appointed after the expulsion of the evildoers from the Qâdîshâ valley. The Mukhtâsar... gave the date 1250 (?) for his appointment.

This muqaddam was given the title of Al-Kâshif (the inspector). He was at the same time a shidyâq (subdeacon) and, as such, had spiritual as well as temporal authority, which

---

1. Madîha..., p.43.
2. MS Mukhtâsar..., fol.17r.
3. Madîha..., p.44.
4. MS Mukhtâsar..., fol.17r.
5. The title of kâshîf (pl. kushshâf) was used by the Mamlûk government to denote governors of provinces of the second order. See Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie a l'époque des Mamelouks (Paris, 1923), p.xxxviii and Qalqashandî, Subh al-afshâr fî ginâ'at al-inshâ (Cairo, 1914), IV, p.15. A kâshîf was an amir tablakhâna.
required him to inspect the condition of the clergy.\(^1\)

This muqaddam of Bsharrāy, who is usually referred to as Ash-Shidyāq al-Kāshif, must have been the shidyāq Yaʿqūb bin Ayyūb who, according to Duwaiḥī, was made muqaddam of Bsharrāy by Barquq in c.1390.\(^2\) The fact that he bore the title of kāshif, a title used by the Mamluks for the governors of minor provinces (Bsharrāy was a sub-province of the niyāba of Tripoli)\(^3\) seems to indicate that, unlike what the author of the Mukhtāṣar believed, he belonged to the Mamluk and not to the Crusader period. Shidyāq Yaʿqūb bin Ayyūb's descendants continued to be muqaddams of Bsharrāy until the sixteenth century; and Muqaddam ʿAbd al-Mun'im himself was one of his descendants.\(^4\)

Ibn al-Qīlāṭī added that Ash-Shidyāq al-Kāshif governed the country stretching from Ḍirān to Aiṭū (the southernmost and northernmost points of Jibbēt Bsharrāy), and that in his days no heresy could spread in the country.\(^5\)

The section that follows in the Madīḥa... deals with the fall of Tripoli to Qalāūn in 1289.\(^6\) Ibn al-Qīlāṭī did not

---

\(^1\) Madīḥa..., pp.44-45.
\(^2\) Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.190. See below, p.199.
\(^3\) Jibbēt Bsharrāy was a wilāya of the niyāba of Tripoli, under the Mamluks. See Caudet-Troy-Demomblyes, La Syrie a l'èpoque des Mamelouks (Paris, 1923), p.226. Qalqashandi, Subh al-
\(^4\) Qalqashandi, Subh al-
\(^5\) Umari, At-tafrīf bi'l-mustalāh ash-
\(^6\) Mādīḥa..., p.45.
\(^7\) Tbid., pp.47-48. Ibn al-Qīlāṭī did not give the date of the fall of Tripoli.
give the date of the event. The cause of the fall of Tripoli, according to him, was the fact that the son and successor of Ash-Shiidayq al-Kāshif, Sālim, was not as loyal to the Faith as his father had been, and had become heretical:

After him came his son Sālim, A mugaddam with a tyrannous nature: Ambitious, a lover of money, and oppressive. The country was annoyed by him. Not content to stay in [his own province], He started going out to other countries And gave refuge to whoever came to him; And his secrets became known to his neighbours. He paid no heed when he was told That he was not being cautious. A Jacobite spy caught him unawares And threw him in the pit of heresy. Another blow came to him from elsewhere: /Melchites/ from Haurān who came to live in Al-Irbeh, Brought with them deadly /errors/ in their water-bags And poured them in Mount Lebanon.... /So/ all the people rose firmly against him And his soldiers threw off their allegiance to him. He was forsaken and excommunicated, And had to seek refuge among the Jacobites. The Moslems heard of [his] excommunication, And their soldiers were in Damascus. They came quickly to Tripoli And no man stood against them... They kept on besieging the walls For six months,... Verily, God, to spite the wicked, Will give Tripoli to the Moslems....

Next Ibn al-Qilāʿī related the story of a priest from Mār Asia, in Jibbet Bsharray, who prophesied to the besiegers

1. Yaʿqūb ibn Ayyūb did not have a son called Sālim. I have not come across any mention of a mugaddam Sālim elsewhere. He may have been a mugaddam of Bsharray in the last years of the Crusader period.
2. Haurān is a district in Syria, south-east of the Anti-Lebanon and south of Damascus. Part of its population is Moslem and part Melchite. Several Lebanese Christian families, mostly Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholic, trace their origin from there.
3. Al-Irbeh is a village in the high Matn, near Shuwair. It is not in Jibbet Bsharray. Perhaps there was another village by the same name in the latter province.
of Tripoli that the city would fall to them in February. When, he continued, this prophesy came true, the Moslems made the priest chief officer of the treasury (diwan alа 'l-kis)\(^1\) and overwhelmed him with presents.

Ibn al-Qilāfi then proceeded to give a brief account of the fall of Jubail.\(^2\) Its malik, Yūhannā, he said, in fear that his city would end the same way as Tripoli, started giving away his lands in fiefs to the Moslem officers until Jubail was denuded of its lands. Finally, in fear of a Moslem attack, he embarked for Cyprus with the people of the city and their animals after having set fire to the city. When the Moslems attacked Jubail, they found its gates closed and its deserted houses in flames.

Unlike what Ibn al-Qilāfi believed, Tripoli did not fall to Qalāūn in the month of February but on April 26\(^3\) (or 27\(^4\)), 1289. Besides, Qalāūn did not besiege the city for six months. Some Moslem sources gave the date of the start of the siege of Tripoli as March 25, 1289, which gives the siege a

---

1. This is the term given by Ibn al-Qilāfi. It is not official terminology. Diwan alа 'l-kis signifies literally "office (here officer) of the purse".
duration of just over a month. Other sources give the date of the start of the siege variously as February 24, March 10, and March 17. The siege, thus, would have lasted two months by the longest estimate.

As for Ibn al-Qīlāṭī's account of the fall of Jubail, there is a basis of truth in it. Whereas the rest of the County of Tripoli, after the fall of the capital, was evacuated by the Franks and taken over by Qalāūn's army without fighting, Peter, son of Guy II of Jubail, the last of the Embriacs of Jubail, seems to have kept his province for some time by entering into close vassalage with the sultan. This is probably what Ibn al-Qīlāṭī was referring to when he inverted the situation by stating that the lord of Jubail (whom he mistakenly called Yūḥannā) started giving away his land in fiefs to the Moslems to ward off their attack. It has not been found out how long the lord of Jubail kept his position as vassal of the Mamlūk sultan, if he actually did so, before leaving the city. In 1307 he is spoken of as a refugee in Cyprus.

1. Maqrīzī (Sulūk..., I, p.747) said that Qalāūn left Damascus for the siege of Tripoli on Safar 20, 688 A.H. (March 15, 1289), but did not give the date of the start of the siege. Ibn Taghrībardī (Nujūm..., VII, p.321) said that the siege was started on Rābi‘ I (March 25). The same date was given by Abū‘l-Fidā (Abulfedae, Annales Muslenici, Hafnée, 1794, V p.90). Ibn Ḥabīb, Tadhkirat an-nabīn fi ayyām al-Mansūr wa banīh (MS Brit. Mus. 7335), fol.19v,said that the siege of Tripoli lasted 33 days, which, considering that Tripoli fell on April 27, would give the date March 25 for the start of the siege.

4. Possibly Peter both entered into vassalage with the Mamlūk sultan and gave away fiefs to the Mamlūk officers.
It is interesting to note that, in relating the history of Maronite Lebanon in the Crusader period, Ibn al-Qilaṭī drew no distinction between Frankish and Maronite figures, apart from the Popes and their envoys. King Gaudefroy, actually, is the only Frankish lay figure whose name Ibn al-Qilaṭī gave in a distinctly European form: Gaufrado. Neither the count of Tripoli nor the lord of Jubail, who are the most often mentioned Frankish figures, are ever spoken of as non-Maronites. The uninformed reader of the Madīḥa... is liable to reach the conclusion that the Maronites did not only have their šiefs, the muqaddams in their mountains, but also maliḳs in Tripoli and Jubail.

In correct chronological sequence to the fall of Tripoli to Qalāūn in 1269, Ibn al-Qilaṭī went on to describe, again without giving a date, the victory of the muqaddams of Mount Lebanon over the Mamlūk expedition against Kūsruān organized in 1292, during the reign of Al-Ashraf Khalīl, son of Qalāūn (1290-1294).

The account of this victory forms the most elaborately descriptive section of the Madīḥa..., apart from the description of the Golden Age of Maronite Lebanon with which it opens. Details of the battle of the muqaddams with the Moslems are given. Ibn al-Qilaṭī, however, did not relate the victory of the muqaddams as a successful defence against an expedition directed against them. He considered it rather as a revenge of the Lebanese Christians for the fall of Tripoli and Jubail to the Moslems:

1. See below, chapter on Duwainī, pp. 153 et seq.
The muqaddamin of the mountains heard /the news/. They rang the bells and met.
On each of the Madfuûn and the Fîdar they placed, by lot, Two thousand of the brave.
Thirty thousand soldiers descended From the rainy mountains;
And the Moslem, 2 strolling below, 3
Found death waiting /for him/ on the battlefield. 4

This is followed by a detailed account of the battle and a list of the names of the Maronite heroes who distinguished themselves in the fighting. 5 Muqaddam Khâlid of Mîsimshî 6 is the first hero mentioned. After him the names of Sinân and Sulaimân of Aîlîj 7 appear. These are followed by the names of Sa‘âda and Sarkîs of Liîfid, and finally by Akkâr and his brother Mâsrûr, whose hometown is not mentioned. These heroes and many others, with their followers, completely routed the Moslem army, and the Moslems were forced to leave Jubail. The only muqaddam killed in the battle was Bînyammîn (Benjamin), muqaddam of Hîrdîn. 8

In the meantime, Kurdish soldiers who had come to

1. The Madfuûn and the Fîdar, south of Batrûn and of Jubail respectively, are rivers that formed the northern and southern boundaries of the province of Jubail. They are small streams that run only in the rainy season.
2. Ibn al-Qîlâtî usually personified the Moslems as "Hamdân", a proper noun derived from the same root as Muhammād (HMD), which lends itself to the rhyming sequence of the Mâdîna... ("än" - to rhyme with Libnân).
3. In the text it reads "kharîj yutkhattār", literally meaning "strolling outside".
5. Ibid., pp. 52-53.
6. Mîshmîsh is a village in the province of Jubail.
7. Aîlîj is another village in the province of Jubail.
8. Hîrdîn also is a village in the province of Jubail.
the rescue of the routed Moslem army from the south were taken by surprise by the soldiers keeping guard on the Fidār river, to the south of Jubail, and their armaments were taken away from them. As for the soldiers keeping guard on the Madfūn, south of Batrūn, they concentrated their efforts on stripping the armaments from the Moslem soldiers fleeing north, and finally entered Batrūn. At last, after the victory was completed, the muqaddams and their soldiers retired from the battlefield to divide the booty among themselves in the neighbourhood of Mad, a village not far from Jubail:

They took four thousand horses
And armaments and spears beyond counting;
Gold and silver in the balance.
They divided the whole among thirty thousand,
And every muqaddam received a lot:
There were thirty muqaddams...
Except for the one who had fallen in heresy.¹
At first they kept him a lot;
But the patriarch sent word
That he should receive no benefits
Because he had fallen from the Faith.²

This event will be considered in greater detail in the chapter on Duwaihī's history; but it is important to note here that, contrary to what Ibn al-Qilāṭī seems to have believed, it was the Moslems, and not the muqaddams of Mount Lebanon, who were the aggressors in this incident. The muqaddams did not

¹ The reference is to Sālim, muqaddam of Bsharrāy, whose lapse into heresy had, according to Ibn al-Qilāṭī, led to the fall of Tripoli.
² Ibid., pp. 53-54.
descend on the Moslem armies in revenge for the fall of Tripoli and the coastal towns to the Mamluks. It was the Mamluks who attacked the mountains of Kisruan (which stretch northwards from the province of Kisruan to the province of Jubail); and the Lebanese mugaddams were the victorious defenders.\(^1\)

The meeting of the mugaddams and their soldiers near Mr\add to divide the booty among themselves, which Ibn al-Qil\addi described, is an interesting illustration of one aspect of military life among the medieval Maronites, and points to the importance of the village of Mr\add as a meeting place of the chieftains.

A nineteenth century history of Mr\add, written by the author of the Mukhtasar of Ibn al-Qil\addi, has the following to say about the political position of that village in medieval Maronite Lebanon:

> The Marada\(^2\) of Lebanon used to meet in that village to hold councils and exchange views. They made it the main village of the provinces of Jubail, Al-Batrün, and Jibbet /Bsharray/. In 1302, the amir Hānā, amir of Jubail,\(^3\) built towers in that village, that is to say he restored the towers to the west of the place known as Al-Marada (?).

\(^1\) See below, pp. 153 et seq.

\(^2\) Marada (Mardaites: rebels) is the name given to the Byzantine military colonists in Lebanon, whose raids on the empire of the Umayyads necessitated a treaty between 'Abd al-Malik and Justinian II (See above, p. 53, fn1). Possibly the mugaddam among the Maronites are descendants of those Mardaites. Maronite authors like to call the Maronites of the later Middle Ages by that name.

\(^3\) The author of this history made the same mistake as Ibn al-Qil\addi in giving the name of the lord of Jubail. It is not clear where he got the date 1302.

\(^4\) This is the best reading I could make of the name of the place.
that is, the place where councils used to be held for protection from the Moslems.¹

The village of Ḍād is very near to the coast and to the river Madfūn, which formed the boundary between the provinces of Jubail and Al-Batrūn. It falls also midway between Antiliās and Nahr al-Barid, which were the southernmost and northernmost coastal points in medieval Maronite Lebanon. This central geographic position must have contributed to making Ḍād the meeting place of the muqaddams of Maronite Lebanon, where they met to discuss matters of common interest and, as can be concluded from Ibn al-Qīlāʿī, to divide among themselves what booty they gained from the enemy in time of war.

The strong position of authority occupied by the patriarch among the medieval Maronites can also be seen from Ibn al-Qīlāʿī's account of the meeting of the muqaddams in Ḍād. One word from him, and Muqaddam Sālim was deprived of his share in the booty.

The events that follow in Ibn al-Qīlāʿī's account illustrate further the authority and influence enjoyed by the patriarch in temporal matters. After depriving Sālim of his share in the booty, the muqaddams decided to find another muqaddam of Bsharrāy. The story of the appointment of this new muqaddam, in Ibn al-Qīlāʿī's own words, runs as follows:

¹. This history of Ḍād is found on ff. 24-25 of MS Bibliothèque Orientale 57. The quotation is from fol. 25.
Antar, muqaddam of Al-Ăqūra,\(^1\)  
Said: "Another will replace him,  
And the patriarch will choose another  
To be an inspector of the Faith."  
His comrades\(^2\) agreed to his words  
And sent the patriarch his share (of the booty).\(^3\)  
In Kfarḥāl the meeting took place  
In a great congregation of people.\(^4\)  
/Then/ a child spoke in the Syriac tongue  
Saying: "Niqūla the Centurion\(^4\)  
Is now passing in Aqbat Ḥirūnā\(^5\)  
On his way to meet your holiness."  
The patriarch heard, and asked /the child/:  
"Whose son is /Niqūla/, and who are his grandsires?"  
/The child/ answered: "He who chose and sent him  
Knows who the man is."  
After hearing what the child had to say,  
/The assembled people/ waited silently  
/Until/ lo! News came that Niqūla  
Had distinguished himself on the battlefield!  
Niqula had found on the river Rishin\(^6\)  
A group of Moslem/soldiers/ roaming around.  
Alone, he killed twenty of them,  
And rode on horse-back to the patriarch.  
He offered /the patriarch/ four horses  
And said: "Somebody woke me up at night  
Saying: 'arise and bring up  
This spoilt generation in Mount Lebanon!'  
While I was coming to consult your holiness /about this vision/  
I found enemies in your neighbourhood.  
I knew the horses they rode were not yours,  
And, through the Faith, I won a victory against them.\(^6\)

---

1. Al-Ăqūra is one of the most important villages in the province of Jubail, to the extreme east of it. Muqaddam Antar of Al-Ăqūra, the ancestor of the present Baṣbūs family in Lebanon, was apparently one of the leading muqaddams of Maronite Lebanon in his day. See History of the Baṣbūs family, MS Bibliothèque Orientale 57, F.25.  
2. In literal translation, "the brothers".  
3. It is not clear whether this was the patriarch's share or Muqaddam Sālim's share.  
4. Ibn al-Qilāš used the Syriac term Qentrōnā (Lat. centurio) which means centurion, or captain of a hundred. The al- at the end is the definite article. It is not clear what Ibn al-Qilāš meant by calling Niqūla a centurion. Possibly the term in his day meant simply a warrior or a leader of men, and did not have the real significance of Qentrōnā.  
5. Aqbat Ḥirūnā is a place in north Lebanon, east of Tripoli.  
6. Rishin is the northernmost tributary of the river Ḍalshā (modern Abī ʻAlī). The meaning of rishin (Syriac) is "the source of the fountain".
The booty I have brought to you;
And here am I, /standing/ in submission between your hands.
The secret is between you and me(?).
Give me rule from your holiness.

On hearing Nigūlā's speech, the patriarch and the muqaddams "prayed over him and gave him the sword" and made him muqaddam of Bsharrāy. His rule in Bsharrāy, Ibn al-Qilāṭī continued, began with the expulsion of the heretics (monophysites?) from the province. For forty years, he concluded, there was peace and prosperity in the country, and the name of Lebanon became well-known, in Rome and elsewhere, for the orthodoxy of its people.

Actually, the victory of the Lebanese mountaineers over the Moslem army in 1292 was not followed directly by anything like forty years of peace and prosperity in Christian Lebanon. In 1300 and 1305 two other expeditions were sent against Kiu ruān, the second of which ended with the utter defeat of the mountaineers - Christian, Rāfiḍa, and Druzes. Ibn al-Qilāṭī described the expedition of 1305 and its disastrous results before describing Patriarch Armīā's visit to Rome. After dealing with the heresy of the two monks, of Yānuḥ and of Dair Nūḥ, and the disunity that resulted in Lebanon from their teachings, Ibn al-Qilāṭī said:

1. Madīha..., pp. 54-55.
2. Ibid., P. 56.
3. See below, chapter on Duwwāḥ, pp. 158 et seq.
King Barquq heard of that
And a closed door lay open to him.
He sent soldiers with banners
To lay siege in Mount Lebanon.
They found the country internally divided,
Its inside soiled with heresy,
Its king puffed up with pride,
And obedience and faith lacking....
As for Al-Malik az-Zahir,
He wrote to the governors and the soldiers
To send a company to lay siege
And to spend from the Sultan’s money.
And whoever would cut a tree from Kisruan
Was to receive ten dinars from the Sultan’s money.
For seven years the infidels held on
Until they entered the country....
The war continued for eight months
And blood flowed in the market-places;
And no side was victorious, and no side was defeated;
But the Sultan’s soldiers decreased in number.
The Moslems became afraid of defeat;
One Christian would kill ten of them.
So before getting cornered,
They set the forests on fire....
They cut the fruit trees and the wild,
And they set fire to the country from all four sides.
Only those in the fort of Micrab were saved,
But their flesh was scorched and their eyes were blinded.

1. The regal name of Barquq was Al-Malik az-Zahir. Actually these events did not take place in the days of Barquq, but in the days of An-Nasir bin Qalaun, as will be shown below.
2. Ibn al-Qila’i gave the term as niyyab, colloquial plural of nā’ib (nayib), which should be nuwwab in the classical plural.
3. This is a great exaggeration on the part of Ibn al-Qila’i. Kisruan was not besieged for seven years before the Moslem army could break into the country. The expedition actually started in July, 1305, and ended in January, 1306. See below, pp.162-163.
4. The expedition, which started on July 25, 1305, and ended on January 5, 1306, lasted a little over five months. Here again Ibn al-Qila’i made a slight exaggeration.
5. Micrab is a village in the province of Jubail. Remnants of an old fort are still to be found in it.
It seems that the destruction of Kisruan in 1305 was the worst calamity that befell Maronite Lebanon in the later Middle Ages, although the expedition on the whole was directed mainly against the Rāfidā and the Druzes of Central Lebanon. The country, as a result of the expedition, said Ibn al-Qilāʾī, became "wild and deserted", and Turkoman colonies were established in it:

The thieves in it became many,
And it became deserted and wild.
Turkoman guards (akhfār) came to it
And became its inhabitants.č

From the pen of the same anonymous author of the Mukhtasar of Ibn al-Qilāʾī and the history of Māʾād, the names of some of the monasteries and churches destroyed by the Moslems at the time of the expedition of 1305 (and that of 1300) are preserved.2 Tādrus of Ḥamā, who gave an account of this expedition, said that the leaders of the Lebanese mountaineers against the Moslems at the time were the Druze chieftains of the house of Billamač.3

Ibn al-Qilāʾī said that the sultan who ordered the expedition of 1305 against Kisruan was Al-Malik az-Zāhir Barquq, who came to the throne in 1382, and at the same time placed the event before Amriā’s voyage to Rome in 1215. Duwaiḥī noticed this mistake and made the following comment on it:

1. Ibid., p.25. See below, p.163.
2. History of the Old Churches of Lebanon, ff.18–19 of Ms Bibliothèque Orientale 57.
3. Tādrus of Ḥamā, Nakbat Kisruān...; p.86.
This destruction was not in the days of Patriarch Armiā, who was in the days of the Ayyubid dynasty, nor in the time of Al-Malik az-Zāhir Barqūq, who was of the dynasty of the Circassians/Burji Mamlūks, 1382-1517, but at the time of Az-Zāhir Baibars and his successors of the Turkish dynasty /Baḥrī Mamlūks, 1250-1382/ which came between the two.¹

Considering that Duwaiḥī related the events of the expedition under the year 1307,² it is clear that he meant that the expedition took place in the reign of An-Nāṣir Muḥammad bin Qalāūn (1294-1340)³ who was mistakenly called Sultan Muḥammad Barqūq az-Zāhir by Tādrus of Ḥamā.⁴ Ibn al-Qilāṭī, who probably read the history of Tādrus of Ḥamā who had written in the early fourteenth century, seems to have taken the name as he found it in his history, omitting the "Muḥammad", the only correct part of the name as it appears in that history.

The theory of Bulus Qaraḍī, who supposed that the expedition against Kisruān actually did take place before the voyage to Rome, at the time of another Al-Malik az-Zāhir (Ghāzī, son of Salāḥ ad-Dīn al-Ayyūbī, who was sultan of Aleppo, 1186-1216),⁵ has nothing to support it except the chronological sequence of events in Ibn al-Qilāṭī's Mādīḥa..., which is quite unreliable.⁶

---

2. Ibid., p.377 and T.A., p.163.
3. Muḥammad bin Qalāūn was a sultan of the Baḥrī Mamlūks, and thus one of the successors of Baibars.
4. Tādrus of Ḥamā, loc.cit. Probably the name, as it appears, is an interpolation, since Tādrus of Ḥamā probably lived and died before the accession of Barqūq in 1382.
5. Qaraḍī, Ḥurūb..., p.31.
In the Madīḥa... the story of the appointment of Muqaddam Niqūlā, about whom nothing seems to be known from other sources, is followed by the story of the martyr death of Patriarch Jibrā'īl of Ḥajūlā.

The Franks who had been driven by the Mamlūks away from Syria and had established themselves in Cyprus did not cease to attempt a return to Syria. They continued to conduct naval raids against the coastal towns of the Mamlūk empire. Sidon and Beirut, on the Phoenician coast, suffered greatly from their raids.¹

In 1366, after a strong naval raid which the Latin King of Cyprus conducted against Alexandria, a reaction took place in the Mamlūk domains against Cypriot aggression, which took the form of persecutions of the Christian clergy within the precincts of the empire.² What nature these persecutions took in Maronite Lebanon is not clear; but it seems that on April 1, 1367, the Maronite patriarch, Jibrā'īl of Ḥajūlā, was burnt alive by the Moslems at Ṭīlān, outside Tripoli.³ Duwaiḥī, who related the story of the patriarch's martyrdom, made reference to an elegy written about the death of the patriarch by the patriarch's nephew.⁴

¹ Salīḥ bin Yahiya's Tārīkh Bāirūt... is full of the stories of the different raids carried out by the Franks of Cyprus against the coastal towns of Lebanon and the role played by the Tanukhíd amirs of Beirut in the defence of the coast against these raids. See also H. Lammens, La Syrie..., II, pp.18-19. Several of the raids were carried out by the Genoese fleet, sometimes operating from Cyprus.


³ Duwaiḥī, T.T.M., p.387, and T. Ānaisī, Sīsīlā..., p.27. Ḥajūlā is a village in the province of Jubail.

⁴ Duwaiḥī, loc.cit. Also below, pp.198.
Ibn al-Qilaawi did not give the story in the way in which critical research reveals it. In his characteristic way he introduced it by describing a heretical movement among the Maronites which counted among its leaders the Maronite patriarch who preceeded Jibrail of Hazulah in the patriarchal see. This is not impossible, but there seems to be no other reference anywhere, except in the Madīha..., about a heretical patriarch who was followed by Jibrail of Hazulah. Nothing is known about Yūhannā, who seems to have preceded him as patriarch, except that he was alive and in office in 1357.1 Anaissī gave him the dates 1339-1357, and Jibrail of Hazulah the dates 1357-1367;2 but, except for the date of the latter's death, none of the other dates are certain.

Completely ignoring the real cause of the persecution of the Eastern Christian clergy by the Mamluks, which was the naval raid of the King of Cyprus on Alexandria,3 Ibn al-Qilaawi began the story with the conversion to heresy of a certain monk called Alīshāc, in the days of Muqaddam Niqūlah. This Alīshāc, Ibn al-Qilaawi said,4 went east (probably to Mardin in northern Syria, a center of the Jacobite church) and came back a heretic. After his return to Lebanon he started preaching the Jacobite heresy. In punishment for his sins, he fell to

2. T. (Anaissī, op.cit., p.27.
3. See below, pp.197-199.
his death one day while walking out of his cell.

The death of Alīshāʿ, however, did not end the story. His heretical teachings had brought about trouble in Jibbet Bsharrāy. Even the patriarch, who had been heavily bribed by the heretics, had joined the heretical movement and had consented to the persecution of the bishops who clung to their orthodoxy. The people of the province of Jubail, who were steadfast in their faith, renounced the authority of the patriarch, but remained faithful to the orthodox Muqaddam Niqūlā.

Hearing of the dissension among the Maronites, the Moslems started spreading out in their country, taking over many villages by the sword, converting many Christians to Islam, and establishing igtāʾs in the country.

On the death of the heretical patriarch, Ibn al-Qīlāʾī continued, he was succeeded by Jibrāʾīl of Ḥajūlā, who was orthodox, and who died a martyr's death at the stake. Forty Christians, he added, bore false testimony to his heresy and his adultery. Because of that, God's wrath was kindled and he gave the Maronites over to the hands of Ishmael (the Moslems), who enslaved them, destroyed their churches, and burdened them with taxes.

This is the story as Ibn al-Qīlāʾī gave it. It may

1. See ibid., p. 59, verses vi, vii, and viii.
2. An igtāʾ (pl. igtāʾāt) was a land grant given to a soldier (jundī) or an amīr in return for military service. It was not hereditary as a rule, although it tended to be so in Lebanon.
be noted that a monk by the name of Alishā appears to have been living in 1404.¹ Could it have been that he was the same monk Alishā mentioned by Ibn al-Qilāš as having been a heretic who died before the martyrdom of Jibrāʾil of Ḥajūlā in 1367?

After describing the misfortunes that befell the Maronites as a result of their having followed the heretical teachings of the monk Alishā, Ibn al-Qilāš proceeded in the Madīḥa... to relate how they were saved from heresy by Aimeric, monk of the Order of the Friars Preachers (Dominicans).² He said:

They were looked after, and that fire was put out, By Aimeric, of blessed memory. He rebuked them in outspoken speech, And they obeyed him and returned to the Faith. He fished them with the net of Christ? And brought them blessings from Rome.... The patriarch, who dwelt in Our Lady of Hābil,³ Knew well all that was in the Gospels. He was also a learned man And wrote poems about the Faith. They remained steadfast in the faith of Mārūn, And the proud were made humble, And the enemies were reconciled,⁴ Until the coming of Ibn Shābān. Yūḥannā al-Jāji was Patriarch. He received a crown from the Pope and was blessed by him. He sent a legate to the Council, and did not go himself; And the Maronites remained steadfast under his guidance.⁶

¹ Duwaiḥī, S.E., p.348 and T.T.M., pp.384-385. ² This is how he is described by Ibn al-Qilāš in Letter to Patriarch Shamūn, p.102: "Qanūn al-ikhwā al-wāṣīzin". ³ Meaning the monastery of Our Lady of Hābil. Hābil is a village in the province of Jubail. ⁴ Ibn Shābān, as will be seen later, was the heretical Mūqaddam of Hirdin at the time of Ibn al-Qilāš. ⁵ The Council of Florence (1439). See Duwaiḥī, T.T.M., pp.388-392 and below, pp.209 et seq. ⁶ Madīḥa..., pp.61-62.
Nothing seems to be known about Aimeric, who brought the Maronites back to orthodoxy at the time of Patriarch Yuḥannā al-Ẓājī (1404–1445), except that he was a Dominican Friar. From the context of the quotation cited above from the Madīna... it appears that Aimeric brought the Maronites back to orthodoxy at the time of the Council of Florence in 1439, which was the Council to which Yuḥannā al-Ẓājī sent a representative.2

In the letter which he sent to Patriarch Shamʿūn, however, Ibn al-Qilāʿī stated that Aimeric reconverted the Maronites to orthodoxy before the Council of Florence, and that it was Fra Juan, Franciscan abbot of Beirut,3 who represented Yuḥannā al-Ẓājī at the Council of Florence.4 He added also that he had actual signed documents to prove the point.5

1. T. Anaïssi, op. cit., p. 28.
2. See above, p. 104, fn. 5.
3. The Franciscans first established themselves in Beirut in the first half of the thirteenth century. They had a monastery attached to the famous old church of the Saviour (at present the Serail mosque) in which they served. With the fall of the last remnants of the Latin Kingdom in Syria to Al-Ashraf Khalīl in 1291, they lost their position in the city, and many of the monks of the Franciscan monastery were killed. Soon, however, they returned and took over again their church and their monastery. They were already re-established there in 1345. By the end of the fifteenth century the Franciscan monastery in Beirut was one of the largest Franciscan establishments in Syria. P. Girolamo Golubovich, Serie..., pp. 216–217.
5. Ibid., p. 101.
There exists in quotation by Duwaihi a section of an unfinished poem, the last one written by Ibn al-Qila‘î, describing the role of the Maronites at the Council of Florence, a Council which was held by Pope Eugene IV to deal with the question of the union of the Greek and Eastern churches with Rome. ¹ This section runs as follows:

Yes, the Church has truly laboured
To unify and to confirm.
Her enemies had lied to her
Copts, Greeks, and Armenians.
Pope Eugene sought/ to call/ that synod;
And, after him, Pope Pius²
Wrote, confirmed, and made peace.
Five hundred ducats a day
/Pope Eugene/ spent on them, without regret:
For three years the Council continued³
With debates, writings, and oaths.
First the Greeks argued
With the Franks, and were defeated.
The Copts were struck low /by defeat/, And so were the Armenians after them.
Patriarch Yūhannā al-Jājī
Wrote and declared: "I am a Latin".⁴
He deserved the staff and the crown....
His enemies lied about him
/Saying/ that the Maronite faith is corrupt.
Messengers and legates were sent to him,
And he deserved to wear the ring....
The people of Mārūn alone
Remained steadfast in the Faith by his side;
And their descendants remained steadfast after them
As they had sworn and spoken.⁵

¹ Creighton, A history of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the sack of Rome (London, 1897), II, pp. 240-353. See also C.-J. Hefele, op. cit., pp. 1010-1106, for full accounts of the Council of Florence.
² Pope Pius II (1456-1464), the first Pope by that name to follow Eugene IV.
³ The Council of Florence continued in Florence until 1442; then it continued in the Lateran in Rome until 1444.
⁴ The actual word is Franji (Frank), which signifies here Latin, or Roman Catholic.
⁵ Quotation from Duwaihi, T.T.M., pp. 397-398.
The role of the Maronites at the Council of Florence, which was considered in greater detail by Duwaiḥī, will be further discussed in the chapter on his history.

The last part of Ibn al-Qīlāṭī's history of the Maronites, that part to which he was a contemporary, is the most reliable part of his history. It provides historians with a spot of clarity in a history which is generally vague, being mainly the result of guess-work based on a few cornerstones of fact. This part of Ibn al-Qīlāṭī's history is found mainly in Tabkīt... and in the Mādiḥa... His few available letters also help in making it clear.

At the opening of the last three sections of the Mādiḥa..., Ibn al-Qīlāṭī stated that he had recorded their events himself — that their contents were the results of his own observation. Then he proceeded with the story of the heretical revolt that started in Maronite Lebanon during his absence in Italy.

Yūḥannā al-Jājī, he began, was followed in the patriarchal office by Yaʻqūb al-Ḥadāthī (1445-1468) who, in turn, was followed by the patriarch in whose days the heresy of Ḥabd al-Muʻīnīm of Bsharrāy (1472-1495) developed. This patriarch who is not named by Ibn al-Qīlāṭī in the Mādiḥa..., was Butrus bin Yūsuf Ibn Ḥassān al-Ḥadāthī (1468-1492) who died just

1. See above, p. 43. Mādiḥa..., p. 63.
2. T. Anaissī, op. cit., p. 29. His full name is Yaʻqūb Butrus bin ʻĪd al-Ḥadāthī.
before Ibn al-Qilāʾi's return from Italy. Abd al-Munim, Ibn al-Qilāʾi added, died in his heresy, and the patriarch at the time was in Qannūbīn. Ibn al-Qilāʾi then proceeded to relate the conversion to heresy of another mountain chieftain — Ibn Sha'ban, mugaddam of Hirdīn:

Ibn Sha'ban was in Hirdīn, And from him three heretics were descended. He was originally of the Greek faith, And afterwards he became a Maronite. A wicked Jacobite missionary came to him Called Tīsa, with the rank of an archbishop. Tīsa converted to heresy the weak and the dishonest — Ibn Sha'ban and the people of Hirdīn — And they started, in the devil's way, To teach boys and girls together, To cross themselves with one finger, And to deny the Fourth Council,

And the orthodox king, Marcian. Ibn Sha'ban died and was followed by his son Who was even a worse heretic than his father. His mind had strayed from the Faith, And he sought to humiliate those who refused to follow him. Satan sought to lead him astray And occupied his mind with evil thought Ibn *Atsha7 won him over by flattery And sent him the book of heresy9

1. Madīha..., p.63.
2. Symbolizing the One Nature of Christ.
3. The Council of Chalcedon, which anathemized the monophysite heresy, was the fourth Ecumenical Council (451 A.D.).
5. Marcian (450-457) was Roman Emperor in the East. In his reign the Council of Chalcedon was held. Ibn al-Qilāʾi called him simply Malik.
6. The name of Ibn Sha'ban's son is not given by Ibn al-Qilāʾi. It does not seem to be given by any other source.
8. The meaning of this line "Ibn *Atsha jammal qadruh" is not clear. This is a rendering of a possible meaning.
With two men accused of heresy
Who had been expelled from the ranks of the clergy,
Neither learned nor ordained—
They had left Liḥfīd when they were boys.
They were accused of erring belief
And had run away from the monastic order...  

The key to the understanding of this passage and of what follows in the Madīḥa... is to be found in Duwaiḥī's Tārīkh al-azmīna. From this history, it is learnt that the two heretics from Liḥfīd who helped in strengthening the heresy of the muqaddam of Ḵīrdīn were Sāmī and his son Ḫirjīṣ. Duwaiḥī mentioned nothing about their having been agents of Mūsā ibn Ṭāṭsha, the Jacobite missionary, as Ibn al-Qilāṭī implied, nor did he mention anything about the relations between Ibn Ṭāṭsha and the muqaddam of Ḵīrdīn. Duwaiḥī only spoke of Ibn Ṭāṭsha as the man who managed to convert Muqaddam Ḥābd al-Munʿīm of Bsharrāy to the Jacobite faith.

The Monophysite missionary who started this heretical movement among the Maronites was, according to Duwaiḥī, the priest Nūḥ al-Baqūfānī, who later became Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch (1493–1509). Several years before 1487, Nūḥ came from Jerusalem to Lebanon and lived in Al-Farādis, south of Ḳīnīn in Jibbet Bsharrāy. There he attracted to his company several.

1. Madīḥa..., p. 63.
3. Ibid., p. 217.
4. Ibrahim Harfush, introduction to Tabkīt..., Al-Manārā II, 1931, p. 753. Baqūfā was a village near Ḳīnīn. At present it is a ruin.
5. These events are narrated by Duwaiḥī under the year 1487, as an introduction to the events that took place in that year.
seekers of knowledge, among whom were Īsā (the archbishop Īsā mentioned by Ibn al-Qilāṭi) and Ibn Sha'bān of Ḫirḍīn, Mūsā and Hannā, sons of Ibrāhīm al-Baqūfānī, Samiā and his son Jirjis of Liḥfid, Mūsā from the village of Mūsā,¹ and others like them. Nūḥ led away these Maronites from Latin orthodoxy and, at the hands of Dioscorus, Jacobite bishop of Jerusalem, he had them ordained members of the Jacobite regular and secular clergy.²

Except for Īsā and Ibn Sha'bān, Ibn al-Qilāṭi only mentioned Samiā among the disciples of Nūḥ al-Baqūfānī:

Because of Samiā and his companions
We have not had a day with a sunrise of blessing.³

Nūḥ al-Baqūfānī, likewise, is not mentioned by Ibn al-Qilāṭi. He spoke of Samiā as having lived as a monk in Al-Farādīs and as having made of his disciples missionaries to spread heresy, mainly among women, and he added that it was Samiā who converted (Abd al-Munṣīm to the Monophysite faith.⁴

In the Madīḥa... the account given by Ibn al-Qilāṭi about the heretical movement among the Maronites of his day is vague. He concentrated more on delivering sermons to his hometown, Liḥfid, to Bsharray, and to (Abd al-Munṣīm, pleading for a return to orthodoxy,⁵ than on giving the facts of the heretical movement. In Tabkīt..., the story of (Abd al-Munṣīm's

---

¹ I have not been able to locate the village of Mūsā. Probably it was a small village in Jibbet Bsharray.
² Duwhihi, T.A., p. 218.
³ Madīha..., P. 64.
⁴ Ibid., p. 65.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 64-72. As it has been noted above, Ibn al-Qilāṭi mentioned the death of (Abd al-Munṣīm in the Madīha..., which means that it was written after the latter's death. Ibn al-Qilāṭi's address to (Abd al-Munṣīm must have been, therefore, a post-mortem address.
conversion is given more clearly. Describing events that took place in Lebanon after his return from Italy, Ibn al-Qila'ī said:

When I arrived in Mount Lebanon,
I found that tares had been sown in it;
\(\text{And}\), in the words of a Jacobite scholar,
The teacher is the root of heresy;
Ibn 'Atsha, a cream-cheese vendor,
Who originally came from the land of the Jacobites,
Sent with some monks
A book written in Syriac and Arabic.
He sent it to be delivered
To the lord 'Abd al-Mun'im
Who, in a wicked temporal rule,
Used to exile from the country
Whoever spoke against him,
Confiscating all his belongings,
Depriving him of his son and daughter,
And cutting his neck if he \(\text{cared}\) protest.
From exile and the cutting of necks
Fear was established in the province.
Jacob entered under the threshold
And started preaching unopposed.
The book of Ibn 'Atsha was the study of 'Abd al-Mun'im.
The Jacobites brought him a saddle for his horse.
They came and attended his wedding feast;
And, through him, they spread their heresy.
He recognized the heresy with them
And denied the basis of the Faith....
Jacob took possession of the country
And spoilt the faith of the Christians....
I heard of this misfortune\(^4\)
\(\text{And}\) began to write letters of opposition.
I received from him a sickening answer:
He threatened me with the danger of death.\(^5\)

---

1. *bayt ashnān* was explained by Ibrahim Harfūsh as cream-cheese vendor. Ashnān, he said, was the plural of *shanān* which, in Lebanese colloquial, means a kind of cream-cheese. See *Tabkīt*..., p. 80, fn.
2. The reference is to Jacob Baradaeus.
3. Ibn al-Qila'ī seems to be referring to the fact that the Jacobites won 'Abd al-Mun'im's favours by offering him gifts.
4. "Misfortunes" is my translation of the word *a 'rid*.
When Ibn al-Qilāʾī was threatened with death by ʿAbd al-Munʿīm, so he continued, he went to visit the muqaddam in person and warned him about his doctrinal straying, giving him proofs about the true Faith. To his warnings and proofs ʿAbd al-Munʿīm simply answered that the beliefs he held were not of his own creation, but that they were found in the book which Ibn ʿAtshā had given to his uncle, Muqaddam Rizq-Allāh. ¹ To this ʿAbd al-Munʿīm added that he was a mere layman who did not understand religious matters, and was not, therefore, qualified to argue with Ibn al-Qilāʾī about such matters. Hearing his answer, Ibn al-Qilāʾī asked to see the book. ʿAbd al-Munʿīm refused to show it to him. He hid it, and asked Ibn al-Qilāʾī to have lunch with him. After lunch Ibn al-Qilāʾī asked again for the book, that he may read it and refute the heretical doctrines found in it; but again his request was refused. ²

Ibn al-Qilāʾī then continued:

I left him, and bid him farewell.
He did not make me hear angry words,
But /rather/ offered me drink and food;
But he did not give me the book.
I am grateful for his kindness,
And my heart and good regards are well-inclined towards him.
My intention /was/ to start the present essay ⁴
By refuting the words of /Ibn ʿAtshā’s book/. ³

---

¹ Previously in the poem it was said that the book was sent by Ibn ʿAtshā to ʿAbd al-Munʿīm himself, and not to Rizq-Allāh, his uncle and predecessor.
² This part is found only in a paraphrase by Duwaihī, which is included in the published edition of Tabkīt...., p.809. See also above, pp.47-48.
³ This is my translation of Wa ʿl-qalb maʾhu wa ʿl-khāṭir (literally, "the hearts and the regards are with him").
⁴ The word is qaul (speech), referring to Marūn at-ṭūbānī.
⁵ In the original, it is simply "the words of the Jacobite."
But I do not know what is in it, nor can I estimate the amount of heresy it contains; so in this book, which I am now starting, I will simply preach my religion and my faith.

After that, Ibn al-Qilāḥī proceeded to introduce his book, Mārūn at-ṭūbānī.

Ibn al-Qilāḥī himself mentioned that his visit to Ābd al-Munṣim took place on his return from Italy. It must have taken place, therefore, in 1493. The dates of the previous events mentioned by him, dealing with the conversion of Ābd al-Munṣim to heresy, cannot be determined. According to Duwaih, as it has been mentioned above, they belonged to a time previous to 1487.

From the accounts of the heretical movement in Jibbet Bsharrawy which Ibn al-Qilāḥī gave in the Madīḥa... and in Tabkīt..., some conclusions can be derived concerning the nature of that movement. These conclusions may be of further help to the understanding of the nature of the previous heretical movements among the Maronites.

It is clear from Ibn al-Qilāḥī's accounts that in his day the Jacobites were carrying on a remarkably active propaganda in Maronite Lebanon, a propaganda which met with considerable success. The evidence found in the Madīḥa... concerning earlier Monophysite movements within the Maronite community points to the fact that this Jacobite missionary activity had already started long before his time, probably in the late thirteenth

1. Tabkīt..., p.809.
century (the heresy of the monks of Yāmūn and Dair Nbuḥ). ¹

This may have been a reflection of the condition of the Christians in the Mamlūk empire outside Lebanon. Those Jacobites who came to Lebanon and sought to convert the Maronites to their communion were probably fleeing from Syria to Lebanon because of the persecutions in the Moslem East after the fall of Frankish power in Syria and the defeat of the Mongols, the potential allies of the Franks. Although falling indirectly under Mamlūk domination and paying taxes to Egypt, Maronite Lebanon was never in the full sense part of the Mamlūk empire. In its provinces a tradition of local autonomy seems to have persisted, and its local feudal families continued to hold their provinces and to administer justice among their subjects. The Maronites, in general, underwent little persecution. It is not strange, therefore, to find Jacobites and Greeks (whom Ibn al-Qila‘i mentioned as having come to Lebanon in the days of Muqaddam Sālim) infiltrating into the country of the Maronites and trying to get the natives of the country, or at least their feudal lords, reconciled to their presence among them. They seem to have attempted to achieve this purpose by preaching the doctrines of their respective churches to the Maronites who, having been heretical by origin, were not insusceptible to such preaching.

¹. These monks, according to Ibn al-Qila‘i, held the Monophysite view that Christ had no human soul, and that His Nature was not capable of feeling and suffering. Madīḥa..., p.24.
Of the heretical movements known to have spread among the Maronites in the Mamlūk period not enough is known to give a clear picture of their nature. The last of those movements, to which Ibn al-Qilāʿī was contemporary, is the only one for which a first hand account is available, although it is brief and incomplete; and some points about it are clear. The Jacobite missionaries who started it were not exclusively clergymen. Some of time, like Ibn ʿAtsha, who was a cream-cheese vendor, were laymen. Education, which seems at the time to have been badly neglected among the Maronites, was a favourite organ which those missionaries used to spread their religious beliefs. ʿAbd al-Munʿīm, according to Duwaiḥī, studied reading with a Jacobite priest. 1 Nūḥ al-Baqūfānī taught eager Maronite students in Al-Farādis, and later converted them to the Jacobite communion. 2

The most eager supporters of the Jacobites among the Maronites seem to have been the muqaddams. Muqaddam ʿAbd al-Munʿīm of Bsharray and Muqaddam Ibn Shaʿbān of Ḥirdīn and his son and successor were the most thoroughgoing supporters of the Jacobites in Ibn al-Qilāʿī's day. These muqaddams were probably receiving material benefit from the Jacobites, in return for permission to reside in their provinces and for protection from persecution by the orthodox Maronites. It is clear from Ibn al-Qilāʿī that they received presents from them. Coming, as they must have come, from the coastal cities and from the towns

and cities of the interior, the Jacobites must have possessed wealth unknown to the peasant Maronites, and this wealth they seem to have carried with them to Lebanon. The conversion of the muqaddams could not have been a doctrinal conversion. *Abd al-Mun'im himself, according to Ibn al-Qilâ'ī, confessed that he was only a layman and, as such, could not understand and discuss religious matters. Members of the lower orders of the Maronite clergy, like Samiā and his son Jirjis of Liḥfid, joined the Jacobite church, like the two muqaddams, in the hope of reaching a higher rank in the clergy and of gaining greater benefit from both the Jacobites and their patrons, the muqaddams.

The two groups among the Maronites who opposed the Jacobite propaganda seem to have been the leading clergymen, who were jealous of losing their authority in the country, and the peasants, who must have ached at seeing the foreigners established and gaining power in their country while they remained powerless in the background. It was the latter group, the people of Iḥdin, who, according to Duwaiḥī, expelled the Jacobites out of Jibbet Eshārāy by force in 1488.

Ibn al-Qilâ'ī was not only the historian of the monophysite movement of his time. He also played the leading part

1. Duwaiḥī, T.A., pp.218-219. See also below, pp.204-5 for a discussion of the event. The conclusions given above about the relations of the Jacobites with the different classes among the Maronites represent my own interpretation of the facts of the heretical movement as they are available through the writings of Ibn al-Qilâ'ī and Duwaiḥī.
in opposing it and in bringing the heretical Maronites of his
day back to Roman orthodoxy. His own biography is an essential
part of the history of the Maronites in his day. The letters
of warning which he sent to his community, besides, reflect
on its religious condition, and in them the names of some of
the leading heretical Maronites of the last years of the fif­
teenth century are to be found. 1

As a historian, however, Ibn al-Qīlāṭī was not accu­
rate. His interest lay not so much in the recording of histo­
rical facts as in the preaching of Roman orthodoxy. He was
a priest and a missionary before being a historian and a poet.
Yet, although his history abounds with anachronisms, biased
interpretations, as well as traditional and legendary material,
and although he used his history to draw his two favourite mo­
rals - the unbroken orthodoxy of the Maronites and the neces­
sity of their union with Rome - his historical works are of
great importance to the historian of Maronite Lebanon. In the
blurred glimmers that they give of the history of the Maronites

1. Already in the opening part of this chapter Ibn al-Qīlāṭī’s
letter to the heretical Jirjis ar-Rāmī has been mentioned
and quoted. In a letter which he wrote to the people of
his hometown, Liḥfid, Ibn al-Qīlāṭī mentioned the names of
Samiā and Jirjis and of Dāūd, the archbishop of Liḥfid,
who pretended “that his heart and his mind is always with
them”, but who was actually a Jacobite who wanted to convert
them all to heresy (Vat. arab. 640, quoted by Anaissi in
Hurūb..., pp. 80-81). He also wrote a letter to this arch­
bishop Dāūd (see above, p. 29, fn. 3). In a letter of warning
which he wrote to the Maronites (Vat. arab. 640, ff. 203r-
205v) he mentioned a certain Alīshāʿ of Al-Hadath (the
pickpocket of Al-Hadath, see fol. 205r, col. 11) along with
Ibn Shaʿbān of Qirdīn, as one of the leading heretics.
in the Crusader and Mamlūk periods, they faintly reveal to the modern historian what would have remained in almost complete darkness.

The figure of Ibn al-Qilāʾī as a historian, however, recedes to the background before that of İstifān ad-Duwaihî. Drawing on Ibn al-Qilāʾī, as well as on more delicate and fragmentary material, Duwaihî was the first Maronite historian to attempt a true historical solution to the puzzle of the medieval history of the Maronites.
CHAPTER III

THE HISTORY OF İSTİFÂN AD-DUWAİHÎ

Before the seventeenth century there was no true history writing among the Maronites. The works of the historians who came before Duwaihî, "the father of Maronite history", ¹ were fragmentary and contained more legend than fact. They were far from giving a full and coherent picture of the past. Duwaihî was the first to set out to write a complete history of his people. A man of keen intelligence and a graduate of the Maronite College of Rome, he was well-fitted by natural ability and training to deal with the semi-legendary fragments of historical information that lay in the various monasteries of Lebanon.

İstifân ad-Duwaîhî was born in the village of İhdin,² probably in May, 1629.³ His father, Mikha'il ad-Duwaîhî, was

---

² İhdin is a village in the mountains of northern Lebanon, east of Tripoli. It was an important village in Jibbet Basharay.
³ Neither Duwaîhî, in his autobiographical sketch in his Book, Tarîkh al-madrassa al-märûniyya fi Rûmiya (Al-Mashriq, XXI, 1923; pp.209-216 and 270-279, hence T.M.M.R.), nor his biographers have given the date of his birth. Duwaîhî said he left for Rome at the end of his eleventh year (T.M.M.R., p.212). Sim'ân Awwâd, his contemporary biographer, fixed the date of his departure as 1641 (Tarjamat Mar İstifân ad-Duwaîhî, pp. x-xxvii of Duwaîhî, T.T.M., p.x), which makes the year 1629 the year of his birth. S. Awwâd, however, said also that when Duwaîhî died in 1704 he was seventy-nine years old (ibid., p.xxv), which makes the year 1625 the date of his birth. An anonymous biographer, whose biography of Duwaîhî was published by I. Harfûsh in Al-Mashriq, V, 1902, pp.686-696, said that Duwaîhî was born, consecrated patriarch, and died in the month of May. This makes the date May, 1629, the probable date of his birth. Tautal, in
the son of a priest, al-Qiss Mūsā ad-Duwaiḥī,¹ and his mother, Mariam, was also a Duwaiḥī.²

After finishing his elementary education in his native village, Istifān was sent to Rome by his uncle, the archbishop Iliās ad-Duwaiḥī. He was then nearly twelve years of age. He arrived in Rome in June, 1641, and was enrolled as a student in the Maronite College,³ where he showed exceptional merit in studying philosophy and theology. He graduated on April 3, 1655.⁴

Upon his graduation, at the proposal of a Maronite professor, Ibrāḥīm al-Ḥāqilānī (Abraham Ecchellensis), the College of Propaganda selected him to be a missionary, and he

---

his introduction to Tarikh al-Azmina, gave August 6, 1630 as the date of Duwaiḥī's birth (p.1). This would make his age at the time he left for Rome less than eleven. We cannot tell from where Tautal got this date.

2. S. Awwāḍ, op.cit., P.x.

The Maronite College in Rome was founded in 1584 by Gregory XIII in accordance with the wish of the Maronite patriarch Mīkhā’īl ar-Ruzzī. It was at first intended to establish the College in Cyprus, but the Ottoman conquest of the island in 1570–1571 made it impossible. The College was managed by the Jesuits until 1773, and thereafter by secular priests. During the Napoleonic wars (in 1803), when Rome was invaded, the College was closed and its work was carried on by the College of Propaganda. In the late nineteenth century Leo XIII restored the College. See P. Dib, "Maronites", cols. 61–2 and Louis Cheikho, "La nation Maronite et la Compagnie de Jesus aux XVe et XVIIe siècles" (Arabic, in Al-Mashriq, XXI, 1923), pp.69 et seq.

4. This according to Duwaiḥī, T.M.M.R., p.212. S. Awwāḍ said that Duwaiḥī left Rome on April 3, 1654, approximately half a year after his graduation in 1653.
was sent back to Lebanon to carry out his duties.¹

For two years Duwaihi was a simple priest in his native village, Ihdin, where he started a school. Afterwards he was made head of the monastery of Rās an-Nahr. In 1657 he went to Aleppo with the newly appointed Syriac Catholic archbishop and stayed with him there for eight months, helping him in his affairs and preaching in the church of Mār Iliās. After returning to Lebanon he took residence in the monastery of Mār Yaʿqūb al-Ḥbāsh, after he had restored it from ruins, and stayed there for five years.²

In 1663³ he was sent to Aleppo as a missionary and preacher by the Maronite patriarch, Jirjis as-Sibʿili, where, it is said, he converted many Melchites, Nestorians, and

---

² Duwaihi, T.M.M.R., pp.212-213. The monasteries of Rās an-Nahr (also known as Mār Sarkis) and Mār Yaʿqūb al-Ḥbāsh are in north Lebanon, in Jibbet ʾBaḥarāy. The first is in Ihdin. The story of Duwaihi’s first visit to Aleppo is only given by Duwaihi. S. ʿAwwād made him stay in Ihdin until supposedly 1663, when he was sent for five years to Aleppo, returning in 1668 (op. cit., pp.xii-xiii).
³ S. ʿAwwād, op.cit., pp.xii-xiii, said that Duwaihi was sent to Aleppo, and returned in 1668 after having spent five years there. Duwaihi, in his autobiographical sketch, said that he went to Aleppo in 1657, stayed there 8 months (which most probably took him to 1658) and returned to Lebanon for five years, which also makes the date of his second departure to Aleppo 1663. Tautal, however (T.A., p.11), made the date of Duwaihi’s second departure to Aleppo 1662, which is less probable than 1663. We find, however, no mention of this five years stay in Aleppo in Duwaihi’s autobiographical sketch. He just skipped the five years of his life ending with 1668.
Jacobites to the Catholic faith. He remained there until 1668, when he left Aleppo to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Places with his mother and his brother, Mūsā. On his return from the pilgrimage in the spring of that year, he was made bishop of Nicosia in Cyprus by the patriarch.¹ For the next two years "he travelled among the parishioners of the Jibbeh, the Zāwiya, Ākkār, and Cyprus, working hard for their salvation."²

On May 20, 1670, following the death of Jirjis as-Sib’īlī, İstīfān ad-Duwaiḥī was elected to succeed him as Maronite Patriarch of Antioch³ by the Maronite bishops and notables. In 1672 he received the confirmation of Pope Clement X.⁴

Duwaiḥī proved a very efficient patriarch. He is sometimes spoken of as Lord Stephen the Great (Mār İstīfān al-Kabīr).⁵ He was a good organizer and enforced a strict

¹ Duwaiḥī, T.M.M.R., p.213. Duwaiḥī said he was made mutrān (archbishop) of Cyprus. Actually he was made usquf (bishop). Anon. Biog., p.666; S. ‘Awwād, op.cit., p.xiii; and Tautal (T.A., p.11) gave the correct title. Duwaiḥī referred to the date of his appointment as bishop as after Easter, 1668.
² Duwaiḥī, loc.cit.
³ S. ‘Awwād, op.cit., p.xiii, gave the date as June 12. Duwaiḥī gave it as May 20 (loc.cit.); and so did T. ‘Anaïsī, in Silsila..., p.44.
⁴ Duwaiḥī, loc.cit.; T. ‘Anaïsī, op.cit., p.44; S. ‘Awwād, op.cit., p.xiii. From ‘Awwād’s biography we understand that the Pope’s confirmation was delayed two years because the Maronites were not unanimous in their choice of Duwaiḥī as patriarch. The Khāzīns resented their not having been consulted about the election; but they were appeased. Apparently they had previously written to the Pope asking him not to send the confirmation and Pallium to Duwaiḥī.
⁵ T. ‘Anaïsī, op.cit., p.44. Mār is a Syriac title signifying "master" or "lord", and is used as a title for saints and patriarchs.
discipline on the clergy of the Maronite church. The metropolitans and the bishops, it is said, were not pleased with the new discipline and tried unsuccessfully at one time to have him removed from his see. Among other things, he revised the liturgical works and religious writings of the Maronite church, removing "what errors had been brought in by copyists and polemics," and wrote tracts expounding the sacraments of the Church. In 1709 he confirmed the rules of the Maronite monastic order.

When he died at Qannūbīn, the seat of the Maronite patriarchate, on May 3, 1704, he had already become a legend. His earliest biographer, the patriarch Sim‘ān Āwwād, who was proud to have been among those who knew him and spoke to him, had a lot to say about his ḥāyat or miracles, which both Maronites and Druzes seem to have accepted.

In physical appearance Īṣṭifān ad-Duwaiḥī was a man of medium height, with a broad face, a long beard, an aquiline

1. S. Āwwād, op. cit., p.xvii.
2. Ibid., p.xiii.
4. T. Ānaissi, Silsila..., p.45, and R. Shartūnî, Mukhtāṣar tāriḵ al-rabāḥa al-lubnāniyya (T.T.M., pp.262-277), p.268. the Maronite monastic order (Antonine) was confirmed by Duwaihi in 1700, five years after it had been established in 1695 (ibid., p.267), by Duwaihi himself. T. Ānaissi said that Duwaihi confirmed the rule of the order in 1695.
5. T. Ānaissi, loc.cit.
6. S. Āwwād, op.cit., P.xx.
mose, parted eyebrows, and bright eyes.\textsuperscript{1} He was an ascetic, living on a simple vegetarian diet, except in time of illness,\textsuperscript{2} and wearing clean but simple clothes.\textsuperscript{3} As the judge of his community he was fair, strongly rebuking those who offered him bribes;\textsuperscript{4} and while head of the church he attended to such small details as the appointment of a village priest.\textsuperscript{5} He was a very pious man and a tireless seeker of knowledge. When still a student in Rome he spent his Sundays and holidays visiting the churches and libraries of the city and copying everything he could find concerning the Maronites.\textsuperscript{6} He spoke of himself as having spent the two years between his appointment as bishop of Cyprus in 1668 and his accession to the patriarchate in 1670 "tiring himself in roaming about, examining books, and collecting historical data."\textsuperscript{7}

The writings of Duwaihî include not only histories but also religious works. It is for the former, however, that he is best remembered. These include three main works: a history of the Maronites (\textit{Tārīkh at-tā'ifa al-mārūniyya}); a general chronicle of the period between the coming of the Crusaders and the time of Duwaihî (\textit{Tārīkh al-azmina}); and a chronology of the Maronite patriarchs (\textit{Silsilat Baṭārikat at-}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p.xxv.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p.xii.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p.xx.
\item \textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p.xvii.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p.xiii.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Ibid., p.xii.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Duwaihî, T.M.M.R., p.213.
\end{itemize}
ta'ifa al-mârûniyya).

In Tarîkh at-ta'ifa al-mârûniyya Duwaihi discussed the historical and religious origins of his people and attempted to prove their unbroken orthodoxy and union with the Church of Rome. In the first part of this work, which is entitled Nisbat al-Mawârina (Origin of the Maronites), he dealt with the rise of the Maronite church and community until the eighth century. The second part, entitled Radd at-tuham wa daf' ash-shubah (Refutation of the accusations and disproof of the suspicions), is a polemical defence of the unbroken orthodoxy of the Maronites and their continuous attachment to the Holy See, which is rich in historical and biographical material. There is a third part entitled Ihtijâj 'an al-milla al-mawâriniyya (Protest for the Maronite sect), which is an apology for the Maronites, "clearing their ground from every heresy and refuting every accusation made against them by

---

1. Tarîkh at-ta'ifa al-mârûniyya (T.T.M.) was published in Beirut in 1890 by Rashid al-Khûrî ash-Shartûnî. It is to this edition of the work that we shall refer. The edition includes only the first two parts of the work (the historical parts), which are intercepted by an appendix including selections from Duwaihi's Târikh al-azmina (pp. 97-262), a selection from the history of Yusuf Marûn ad-Duwayhi (pp. 279-280), a history of the Maronite monastic order by the editor (pp. 262-277), and the minutes of the Maronite Council of 1596 (pp. 287-291), along with other passages of minor importance. The appendix is on pp. 97-291 of T.T.M.

2. Ibid., pp. 1-96.

3. Ibid., pp. 292-466.

4. Shartûnî, in his edition of T.T.M., did not include this part of it. It was published separately, however, in Al-Manâra, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV. In it Duwaihi took the different claims made about the theological doctrines of the Maronite church and refuted them one by one.
missionaries...". This last part, however, deals exclusively with theological polemics and is not, strictly speaking, of any historical importance. It shall not, therefore, be considered.

Duwaihî's purpose in writing Târikh ât-tâ'ila al-mârûniyya is made clear in the introduction as follows:

When I saw some historians take contradictory views about the origin of the Maronite nation and propound varying theories about it, I was carried by enthusiasm to write this brief work showing in it the truth about the origin of this nation, on the basis of fixed historical data and unelaborate and convincing proofs. I do not seek through that to win praise for this nation or to show its virtues and make known the honour of its first leaders. My real purpose is to clear it from the charges that have been brought against it, in fear that the truth might be overcome by falsehood.... The fact is that most of the foreigners who have written about the Maronite nation depended on hearsay (al-masmû'ât) and on the writings of some of our enemies; and they did not examine their information to differentiate its true from its false. Their words came, therefore, far from the truth, full of errors and contradictions. How, then, could their testimony be held against us when they have not mixed with any of our learned men nor spoken to our chiefs nor known our language so they could get acquainted with our books and extract from them our history?

This introduction reveals from the outset the polemical nature of the work as a whole.

Duwaihî set out to prove in Nisbat al-Mawârîna that the Maronites were called Maronites after the blessed Mârûn of Cyrus, the eponymous founder of the monastery of Mâr Mârûn on

2. Al-umma al-mârûniyya. I have translated umma here to mean nation.
the Orontes river, who died in the early fifth century, and that the monks of this monastery remained always faithfully attached to the Roman Church. A detailed account of the life of Mār Mārūn and his disciples is given. This is followed by an account of the life of Yūḥannā Mārūn as-Sarūmī, the semi-legendary founder of the Maronite church and its first patriarch who first took orders in the monastery of Mār Mārūn, hence his surname. The first part of the work ends with the death of Yūḥannā Mārūn on February 9, 707 and with the accession of his nephew, Qurush (Cyrus), to the patriarchate.

Duwaiḥī sums up the first part as follows:

The summary of what we have mentioned in this part is that the Maronite nation was not called by this name after a heretical Mārūn for there is not the least mention of such in all the church books; but that this nation was called Maronite after the monastery of Saint Mārūn, through Yūḥannā as-Sarūmī who took orders in it at first and finally sought refuge in it when he was persecuted by Justinian, because he had gone to Rome and received the rank of patriarchate from the Pope Sergius and held to his beliefs.

The second part, as Duwaiḥī himself described it, substantiates the unbroken orthodoxy of the Maronites and refutes all the "false" claims made against them throughout the centuries:

1. Ibid., pp. 17-52.
2. Ibid., pp. 53-96.
3. Ibid., pp. 91-92, mentioned the day of the month but not the year, which was taken from Anaissi, Silsila..., p. 14.
4. Ibid., p. 95.
5. Ibid., pp. 95-96. Pope Sergius was Sergius I (Saint Sergius, 687-701).
6. Ibid., p. 6. The quotation following is a continuation from the same page.
The proof to that is from three sources. The first is from what the great men of learning wrote in their works concerning the clarification of such problems. The second is from the writings of the learned men of the Maronite nation itself. The third is from the contents of the registers of the Popes of the great city of Rome and their letters which were sent in confirmation of the patriarchs...; for by giving those patriarchs the pallium of perfection they bore testimony to their true faith, and theirs was the best of testimonies.

This part is in nineteen chapters, arranged chronologically, not according to the date of the author of the accusation brought against the Maronites, but according to the date in which that author claimed that they had fallen into or been rescued from error or schism. This arrangement frequently coincides with the chronological sequence of the authors of those accusations because many of them spoke of the Maronites contemporary to them. This arrangement by date of event gives Radd at-tuham wa daf ash-shubah a sense of historical continuity which it easily could have lacked, considering that it is primarily a work of polemics, not a work of history.

The different chapters of this part are very similar in structure. Each is entitled Fi radd qa'ul... (in answer to the statement) or Fi ibtal da'wa... (in refutation of the claim), followed by the name of the author in question and the nature of his accusation.¹ Each chapter then begins with a

¹. An example of this is the title of chapter IX (p. 366) which runs: Fi ibtal da'wa Jibrail ibn al-Qilâ'i al-qâ'il anna 'l-batriark Luqâ tabi' maqalat Appolinarius bi qurb sanat 1300 (In refutation of the claim of Jibrail ibn al-Qilâ'i who said that Patriarch Luqâ followed the heresy of Appolinarius around the year 1300).
detailed statement of the accusation, sometimes preceded with a brief biographical note about its author. The rest of the chapter is devoted to its refutation, in the course of which much valuable historical and biographical material is used. When one author has more than one accusation to make against the orthodoxy of the Maronites, a separate chapter is given to each. Thus, the first five chapters are devoted to the claims of Sa'īd ibn Baṭrīq, a tenth century patriarch of Alexandria, who was one of the earliest historians to write about the Maronites.

Since concentration in this study is on the period between the beginning of the Crusades and the arrival of the Ottoman Turks in Syria, not the whole of Tārikh at-tā'īfa al-mārūniyya is relevant to its purpose. The first part, Nisbat al-Mawārīna, dealing with the origins of the Maronites up to the eighth century, is of minor relevance to this study, since it is only useful because it provides background material.

The second part, Radd at-tuhamā... on the other hand, is a work of great relevance. It is one of the greatest sources of information available on the religious and political history of the Maronites in the medieval period. The first five chapters, a refutation of Sa'īd ibn Baṭrīq, deal with the relations

---

of the Maronites to the christological controversies and, as
such, deal with the same period as Nisbat al-Mawārinā. With
the sixth chapter comes the discussion of men and events between
the year 1089 and the first years of the Crusades. The last
chapter with which this study is concerned is the fourteenth, dealing with the events of the year 1494.

The second work of Duwaihī which shall enter the
scope of this study is his general chronicle, known variously
as Tārikh al-azmina and Tārikh al-Muslimīn (History of the
Moslems). Some of the manuscripts of this work deal with the
period between the rise of Islam and 1699 or 1703. Others begin
with 1094 or 1095, approximately with the beginning of the
Crusades, and end with 1699. The published edition of the
work follows the latter group of manuscripts and fits the pur-
oppose of this study well, since this study is not concerned with
the pre-Crusader period in Lebanon.

2. Ibid., p.412.
3. The following chapter, ibid., pp.425 et seq., deals with the
events of the year 1525, which is beyond the scope of this
study.
4. This work was published by Al-Mashriq, XLIV, 1950, on the
occasion of the diamond anniversary of St. Joseph University
in Beirut under the title Tārikh al-azmina, 1095-1699 A.D.
It was edited with an introduction by Ferdinand Tautal, S.J.,
Beirut, 1951.
5. Graf, op.cit., III, p.370. The manuscripts consulted by
F. Tautal in his edition of the work (T.A., pp.iv-vii) are
the following: Bkerke 47 (Arabic, 1854, period c.622-1699),
Ghazīr MS (private collection, Karsh. 1780, period c.622-
1703), Bibliothèque Orientale (Karsh. 1797, period 1094-
1699), Kafarshakhna MS (private collection, Karsh. 1821,
period c.622-1699), Damascus 1474 (Arabic 1776, period
c.622-1675, addended until 1732), MS of the Lazarite fathers
in Beirut (Karsh. 1884, period c.622-1699), Vat.arab. 683
(Karsh. 1710, period 1094-1699), Vat.arab. 215 (Karsh. auto-
Tārīkh al-azmina is completely different in contents and structure from Tārīkh at-tā'ifa al-mārūniyya. In its structure it is a chronicle of the traditional type relating the events that took place year by year. The narrative is simple and uncritical and there are no polemics. In its contents it differs from Tārīkh at-tā'ifa al-mārūniyya in not being specifically a history of the Maronite church and Maronite community. It is a general chronicle of events that took place in the Near East with special reference to Lebanon and to the Maronites. Apparently this special reference was the purpose of Duwaihi. In his introduction he wrote:

When we went out in the year 1666 to look after the flocks with which we were entrusted, we found it a good idea... to collect some information from the books we came across concerning the countries in which we live. We meant to begin from the start of the Hijra, since the blessed father Yūhannā Mārūn took possession of the Antiochian see in the year 665 of our Lord which synchronizes with the year 66 of the Hijra. So we made up our mind and collected various information from the histories of the people of that age. But when we saw that most of the information was about foreign nations and that the part concerning our countries was meager and wrongly dated we decided... to make the beginning of this history from the year 1100 of the Incarnation of our Lord the Saviour, because it was about then that the occupation of the coasts of these countries by the Franks came about.
This passage also gives us information about the time Duwaiḥī started working on his history. In his autobiographical sketch as well he said that after he had been appointed bishop of Cyprus in 1668 he went round examining books and collected a book of history. Tautal, who edited the published edition of Tārīkh al-ʾazmīnā, believes that Duwaiḥī started writing on May 2, 1669 (1060 A.H.) because this date appears in Latin on page 47 of the first draft, which is found in the library of Bkerke. This seems quite probable.

Tārīkh al-ʾazmīnā is a simple and brief chronicle and Duwaiḥī neither sought to explain in it historical causation nor drew from it a sermon. He merely stated the main events of the years, occasionally mentioning the sources from which he took his information.

As a general chronicle the work is not so important. In so far as it deals with the general events that took place in the Near East it has nothing new to offer. In its stress on Lebanese and Maronite history, a field almost untouched by the other chroniclers of the Islamic world, it finds a high position as a history source. It is true that many of the years are listed without a mention of Lebanon and of the Maronites, especially in the earlier period in which the history of

2. Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.11. For the mention of this first draft manuscript see above, p.130, fn.5.
Lebanon was very obscure; but he does find enough material to fill the gap in most of the years. In the later years the proportion of Lebanese and Maronite history becomes higher and after the Ottoman conquest it becomes the dominant part of the chronicle.

The material about the Maronites is concerned with their religious, their political, their social, and their economic history. In some years Duwaihī merely mentioned the death and replacement of a patriarch, bishop, or mugaddam or the appointment of a new abbot. In others he wrote at length about the role played by the Maronites at a Church Council or the effects of a plague or drought on their social and economic life. At times he used the same material as in Tārīkh at-ta’īfa al-mārūniyya; but whereas there he used it as material for an argument, in Tārīkh al-azmina he placed it simply as historical fact.

Other than his two histories, Duwaihī wrote a chronology of the Maronite patriarchs, Silsilat Ba’tārikat at-ta’īfa al-mārūniyya.1 This work gives the chronological succession of the patriarchs of the Maronite church with biographical notes, where that is possible, and some historical notes. It begins with the patriarchate of Yūḥannā Mārūn and ends with the accession of the author himself in 1670.

1. The work has been published by R. Shartūnī, who also published T.T.M., in Al-Mashriq, I, 1898, from two manuscripts, one in the Bibliothèque Orientale in Beirut and one copied from manuscripts in Dair Luwaiza.
The work opens with a very short introduction followed by a note on the circumstances under which Yūḥanna Mārūn succeeded the monothelite Macarius as Patriarch of Antioch in 685 A.D. and received the Pallium from Pope Sergius. The author then proceeded with the enumeration of Yūḥanna Mārūn's successors.

The main sources from which Duwaiḥī drew his information about the patriarchs of the early Crusader period, and sometimes even for the Mamlūk period, were the notes written by copyists on copies of religious books, and the inscriptions found on church walls or thresholds. It seems to have been a custom among masons and copyists to inscribe on their works the names of the patriarch and the archbishop or bishop of their parish who held office at the time. Undoubtedly there are many errors in Duwaiḥī's chronology. Some of the patriarchs he listed are legendary figures of no historical identity. The author, besides, admitted having missed several patriarchs between the years 1130 and 1209 A.D.

Duwaiḥī did not use the same pattern of history writing in all his works. In Tarīkh al-azmina he followed the traditional form of the Arabic chronicle, narrating events in chronological order, giving the year, and sometimes even the

---

month and the day of each event. In *Silsilat baṭārikat at-ṭā'īfa al-mārūniyya* he enumerated the patriarchs of the Maronite church in succession, giving dates and some biographical and historical notes. The form of *Ṭārikh at-ṭā'īfa al-mārūniyya* differs broadly from both. It is more a discourse than a narrative. In the first part, *Nisbat al-Mawārina*, Duwaihī started by stating the different views held by historians about the ecclesiastical and ethnical origins of his people then proceeded to refute them and to state his own conclusions on the subject. In the course of his arguments there is a great deal of narrative; but the narrative parts are only fitted in into the main form of the work as illustration and clarification. The second part of the work, *Radd at-tuḥam...*, is written in pure polemical form, the author giving a proposition to be refuted at the beginning of each chapter and then proceeding to refute it. The narrative parts here are shorter than in *Nisbat al-Mawārina*, for whereas in the first part they stretch over several chapters, in the second part they occupy a stretch of varying length within each chapter, the author using them to back up his point or to show on what grounds the opponent's point is based.

The language used by Duwaihī in his writings has been adequately described by Ferdinand Tautal in his introduction to *Ṭārikh al-azmīna*.¹ His description, meant to be of

¹ Duwaihī, T.A., p.xiii.
the language of that particular work, is applicable to all the works of Duwaihi:

The language... differs with the different narratives and their sources. When he translates William of Tyre, the Latin original appears through the Arabic form in the construction of the words and phrases. When he copies from Ibn al-Athir and Abu 'l-Fida and the other Arabic historians his language comes out powerful in style, of sound idiom, and in keeping with the rules of grammar. When he resorts to the history works of the Mamluk and Turkish period, he adopts from them the foreign names for ranks of officials and instruments of war. When, however, he records the information he had got from the Lebanese tradition his language becomes very similar to the colloquial language, especially that used in the north of Lebanon, with many extra-lexical expressions.... There are many mistakes... in grammar and spelling which may have come either from the pen of the author or from that of copyists. Some of them could be explained if the colloquial dialect of northern Lebanon is taken into consideration, whereby the دل (d) and the داد (d) are both pronounced داد (d).

Duwaihi used in writing his history the classical Arabic language. Except in the sections where he copied from Arabic sources, his language was weak and suffered from a strong strain of the colloquial. This weakness in the language of the author could be easily understood. The main part of his education took place in Rome where the language of instruction was Latin and his training for the Maronite priesthood must have required a greater concentration of Syriac than on Arabic, Syriac being the liturgical language of the Maronite church.

The language of Duwaihi differed with the sources from which he drew his information about different events. These sources he frequently mentioned in the course of his narrative,
and at times he made extensive quotations from them. In general, they may be divided into two groups: the sources from which Duwaḥiḥ drew his Maronite history and those from which he drew his non-Maronite history.

Of the first group of sources, Duwaḥiḥ considered the best to be those histories written by the leaders of the community about it. In the introductory chapter of Tārīkh at-Ṭalīfa al-maḥrūniyya he wrote:

> When the historian is one of those in the fore-ranks of the nation of which he writes, his words are believed and he is preferred to others. That is because it requires great care and diligence to find out the truth about the annals of old times and it takes a man of high position in learning and intelligence to be able to get hold of it and extract from it what is true.

Then he proceeded to speak of Jibrā‘il al-Adnīṭī,2 Jibrā‘il as-Ṣihyaunī,3 and Ibrā‘īm al-Ḥaqīlānī, learned Maronites who reached high positions in Italy and France, all of whom discussed the origins of the Maronites and their perpetual orthodoxy but who, due to their having lived away from their native land, could not bring to completion what they set out to do.4 Finally he spoke of the sources from which he collected his material:

> That is why we visited all the churches and monasteries we could and found what there was of what we were after in

---

2. There is no mention of Jibrā‘il al-Adnīṭī in G. Graf's Geschichte..., neither have I been able to identify him or find any of his works in print or in manuscript.  
3. Jibrā‘il as-Ṣihyaunī (Gabriel Sionita) was born in Ḥdin in 1577 and studied in the Maronite College in Rome. He died in Paris in 1648.  
every book we could find. We also collected what was accessible to us of the letters of the Popes that were sent to the patriarchs. And we examined all the books of the church. And we spoke of the history of Syria from the beginning of the Hijra to our own time on the basis of what we saw in the books of the Christians and the Moslems.

The sources of Duwaihī's history of the Maronites can be subdivided into six groups: the older Maronite historians, the western chronicles and pilgrim and travel literature, the papal letters, the historical notes written by copyists on church books and copies of the Gospels, the material found in inscriptions, and the non-Maronite Eastern Christian histories and church books.

Of the Maronite authors to whom Duwaihī referred, Jibrā'īl al-Adnītī, Jibrā'īl as-Ṣihyaunī and Ibrāhīm al-Ḥaqīlānī have already been mentioned; but the Maronite historian to whose works Duwaihī referred most for the history of the late medieval period, and whom he quoted abundantly, was Ibn al-Qīlāṭī. Another Maronite writer whose claims Duwaihī refuted in a chapter devoted wholly for the purpose was Tūmā al-Kafartābī. Fragments of old Maronite histories

---

1. Ibid., pp.5-6.
2. Sihyaunī and Ḥaqīlānī were not historians. None of their original works, as cited by Graf (op.cit., III, pp. 351-353 and 354-358), are works of history. Duwaihī himself said (T.T.M., p.5) that they mentioned some points about the origins of the Maronites in the notes they added to their other works. The same applies to Adnītī who "spoke about the origin of the Maronites in the introduction of the book of the Syriac Mass".
4. See above, pp.54 et seq.
are occasionally mentioned and quoted by Duwaihi, most of which were in Syriac; and reference is also made to the history of Iliás of Mad.

Duwaihi drew on several types of Western historical works. The chronicles of the Crusader period were important: that of William of Tyre, which is quoted by Duwaihi and referred to on several occasions, and that of Jaques de Vitry, whom he called Ya'qūb Witrāk. The accounts of the pilgrims and travellers who had come to Syria and written about the eastern Christians are another important source. Among those pilgrims and travellers was Burchard of Mount Sion of whom Duwaihi spoke as having come to the Holy Land in 1222 and of having written a book about it (Descripção Terrae Sanctae).

Another was the "Frenchman Wilamó" who "came from his country to visit the Holy Land and wrote a book about the well-known religions and venerated places in the East". There are also

1. Duwaihi, T.T.M., pp.350-351. William of Tyre (c. 1130 – c. 1183) was the archbishop of Tyre, and one of the best known historians of the Crusades. See Bibliography.
2. Jaques de Vitry, d. 1240, was a French cardinal and historian. For his history, see Bibliography. See also R.Grousset, 35, 35.
5. All the evidence found in Duwaihi about the "Frenchman Wilamó" (T.T.M., p.358) points to the fact that he was no other than Guillaume Postel, the French visionary and philologist who visited Syria, as well as Turkey and Greece, before 1139, and again c.1549. Duwaihi (ibid., p.380) said that he depended for his information about the Maronites on the work of Arnaldus Albertinus, (bishop of Patti, who died in 1544, see below, p.140 fn. 14), and that he said that the Maronites returned to union with Rome in 1414. I have not found any mention of the Maronites in the two descriptions of the Holy Land by Postel which I have seen (Syriae
the Western works of theology and Church history in which
the Maronites were mentioned, like that of Arnaldus Albertinus
bishop of Patti, whose statement about the heretical origin
of the Maronites was refuted by Duwaihī in Ṣadd at-tuham...

The letters of the Popes to the Maronite patriarchs
are an important source of Duwaihī's history of the Maronites.
He used them mainly as proofs of the unbroken attachment of
the Maronites to the Holy See. In Ṭārikh at-ṭā'īfa al-
mārūniyya he gave his own translations of two of those letters.

Finally there are the short historical annotations
written on copies of the Gospels and other church books by
copyists and the inscriptions found on churches which served
Duwaihī as source material for those parts of his history.

---

1. Albertinus (Arnaldus or Hernando), bishop of Patti in Sicily
was born in Majorca. He was ordained bishop of Patti on
September 12, 1534, and on August 29 of that year he was
made president of the royal council of Sicily by Emperor
Charles V. He died on October 7, 1544, and was buried in
the cathedral at Patti. See J. Fraikin, "Albertini (Hernando
ou Arnaldo) eveque de Patti", in Dictionnaire
d'histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique, I, p.1590. I
have not been able to find his "two books about the heresies
and their authors", in which, according to Duwaihī (T.T.M,
p.380) the Maronites are mentioned.

2. The two letters translated by Duwaihī were the letter of
Innocent III to Archi (T.T.M., pp.361-365) and that of
Eugene IV to Yūhanna al-Bājī, dated 1439 (pp.393-395).
Duwaihī's translations of those letters are far superior
to those of Ibn al-Qilā'i.
that were most original. Sometimes he got from them the names of patriarchs or bishops who held office in a certain year and at other times the mention of certain events not mentioned elsewhere. Jacobite and Melchite church works sometimes provided Duwaiḥī with some material for his history, but their mention is rare.

The main source on which Duwaiḥī relied for his history of non-Maronite Lebanon in the Crusader and Mamlūk periods was the Tarīkh of Ibn Sibāṭ. Another historian whom Duwaiḥī quoted occasionally was Ibn al-Ḥarīrī whose work, Muntakhab az-zaman fī tarīkh al-khulafā' wa 'l-ʿulamā' wa 'l-aʿyān, has been recently lost. Very little information about the subject is found in general chronicles like those of Ibn al-ʿAthīr and Abu ʿl-Fidā, who were referred to by Duwaiḥī in his general history of the Near East.

The information found in the different works of Duwaiḥī about the history of Lebanon in Crusader and Mamlūk times is, like the sources, of two kinds: one dealing with non-Maronite (Moslem and Druze) Lebanon, and the other with Maronite Lebanon. These two "histories" will be dealt with


seperately. Only very rarely did Duwaihī attempt to link them together in his writings. He had them rather as two independent and seemingly unrelated narratives within the same works, differing in the degree of completion.

Duwaihī's history of non-Maronite Lebanon is to be found almost exclusively in *Tarīkh al-azmina*. It consists of several unrelated groups of events giving neither a complete picture of the structure of non-Maronite medieval Lebanon nor a continuous narrative of events. Neither did Duwaihī's choice of material denote any consistent purpose on his part to explain important events and turning points or to show how a state of affairs came about. At times he appears to have been picking his material at random to fill in the narrative of a year otherwise poor in events.

The first mention of non-Maronite Lebanon in Duwaihī comes in his narration of the events of the year 1100. In that year, he said, while Baldwin of Edessa was advancing on the coastal route to inherit the crown of his brother, Gaudefroy de Bouillon,1 the people of Beirut lay in ambush against him at Nahr al-Kalb; but Baldwin triumphed.

over them and proceeded on his way to Jerusalem. In 1101, Duwaihī continued, Raymond de Saint Gilles, Prince of Toulous; after having occupied Tartus, sent word to King Baldwin that the people of Beirut, Tyre, Sidon, and Acre were holding the coastal route against him at Nahr al-Kalb; whereupon the King advanced to Nahr al-Kalb, helped Raymond cross the river, and accompanied him to Jerusalem where they celebrated Easter. William of Tyre, from whose chronicle Duwaihī

1. Duwaihī, T.A., p.12. Fulcher of Chartres (Fulcherio Carνotensi), Historia Theresolymitana gesta Francorum in Jerusalem peregrinantum, vol. IV, pp.265-714 of Recueil des historiens des Croisades, Historiens Occidentaux (Paris 1869), p.373-374. S. Runciman, op.cit., I, pp.323-324. William of Tyre, with whose history Duwaihī was familiar and on whom he probably relied for information in this case, had the following to say about the event (William of Tyre, op.cit., I, pp.422-423): "The perilous way through this narrow defile of Nahr al-Kalb had been blocked so as to prevent its being crossed. For the natives of the locality, with the help of certain Turks from more distant parts, had combined at the point to hinder the march of Count Baldwin.... Dashing against them in a bold charge, he broke up their lines in the first onset, killed many of their number, and put the rest to flight". Ibn al-Qalānīsī (Dhaiْ tarikh Dimashq, Leiden, 1908, pp.138-139) did not mention at all the role played by the people of Beirut in this encounter. Besides, he said that the Moslems were victorious. T. Shidyāq (Akhbār al-ayān..., p.714) said that it was the amir of Beirut, 'Adud ad-Dawla of Arslan, who was responsible for the ambush. This will be discussed fully below, in the chapter on Shidyāq's history (See below, pp.243-249). H. Hagenmeyer ("Chronologie de la premiere Croisade: 1094-1100", in R.C.L., VIII, pp.366-369) supposes that the incident took place between the 23rd. and the 26th. of October, 1100.

probably got his information about this event, said that Baldwin, fearing that the march of Raymond and his men might be hindered at Nahr al-Kalb, went out with his forces to meet them and seized the pass beforehand. Shidyāq said that it was Aḏud ad-Dawla, the Arslānid amir of Beirut, who called the men of the coastal towns together to lie in ambush at Nahr al-Kalb against Baldwin in 1100 and against Raymond in 1101. His narrative of the event will be considered later, in the chapter on his history.

A gap of half a century followed in which Duwaiḥī made no mention of the internal history of non-Maronite Lebanon. When he got to the year 1160, he mentioned that Nūr ad-Dīn Zangī (1146-1173), Atabeg of Syria, had granted in that year several villages in the Bīqā', Wādī at-Taim, Sidon, and the Jird to Zahr ad-Dawla Karāma bin Buṭṭur, Tānikhīd amir of the Gharb, as an addition to his original iqṭā's in the Gharb. Nūr ad-Dīn, he added, gave Karāma also an allowance for the upkeep of forty horsemen to help in fighting the Franks. Duwaiḥī then mentioned Karāma's brother, 'Arf ad-Dawla, who, at the time, was holding 'Aramūn al-Gharb, a village south of Beirut.

2. T. Shidyāq, Akhbar al-alyan..., p.714. For a fuller discussion, see below, pp.249-250.
The question of Arf ad-Dawla, the brother of Karāma of Tanūkh, involves a confusion between the identities of this Arf ad-Dawla and a real or supposed Arslānid amir by that same name. It will be discussed at length in the chapter on Shidyāq's history. As for Karāma of Tanūkh, Ibn Ḥajjar mentioned that Nur ad-Dīn Zangi had granted him the Gharb in iqtāʾ, and that Karāma was a constant check on the activities of the Franks of Beirut. Šāliḥ bin Yahyā, who believed that Karāma moved his residence to the fort of Sarḥamūr in the lower Gharb after Nur ad-Dīn had taken over Damascus in 1154, cited two documents issued by Nur ad-Dīn to Karāma which, apparently, he found in the archives of the Tanūkhid family. The first of these is a marṣūm (decree), dated Rabiʿ I 14, 552 A.H. (April 27, 1157 A.D.):

The intelligent amir, Zahr ad-Dawla Mufīd al-Mulk, the Amir of the Gharb Karāma, may God Almighty prolong his power and his peace, is our mamlūk and our friend. Whoever obeys him obeys us; and whoever aids him in fighting the infidels does so to our pleasure and receives our thanks; and whoever disobeys him in this matter, or rebels against him, disobeys our orders and is deserving of punishment for his rebellion.

The second document is a manshūr (title-deed), dated Rajab 7, 556 (July 1, 1161):

1. See below, pp.259-261.
3. Šāliḥ bin Yahyā, Tarikh Bairūt..., pp.48-49.
When Amir Zahr ad-Dawla Shujā' al-Mulk Jamāl a-Ḥmr Abu'l-
Tīz Karama bin Buhtun at-Tanūkhī, may He prolong his
power, travelled to our Porte (bāb), may it become more
sublime, and sought protection in the Service and ap­
proached it, and came to the Just State! and sought its
service, his hopes were fulfilled and his demands were
answered; and this manshūr was issued to him, restating
the ancient respect, consideration, endearment, and high
esteem due to him and [setting for him provisions from
diwān al-istīfā], may God protect it, for an equipage
of forty horsemen, and whatever more he will be able to le
in case of war. And his iqṭā' shall include most of
the villages of the Gharb, Al-Gumaitra from the Bigā', Zahr
孱ār from Wādī at-Taim, Thalābāyā, also from the Bigā',
Barjā from Sidon, Al-Māṣir, Maṣāṣir al-Fauqā, Ad-
Dāmūr, / Shārūn, Majd al-Bāzā, and Kafartīmīma.2

It is interesting to note that Duwaihī, relying
probably on Ibn Sībāt,9 who gave the same information as Sālih
bin Yahyā, gave the year of Karāma's investiture as 1160
instead of 1161. Not taking into consideration the month

1. Nur ad-Dīn's regal title was Al-Malik al-Ādil (the Just
Malik). The "Just State" (ad-dawla al-ṣādila) refers to
his state.

2. This passage, not clear in the text of Sālih bin Yahyā, was
added by the author from MS Ibn Sībāt, p. 15. Diwān al
istīfā was the office of the mustawfī, a clerk who managed
the affairs of diwān al-jaš (or diwān al-qaṭā', which
was concerned with the grant and supervision of fiefs. For
his various functions, see Ibn Mammātī, Kitāb gawānin ad-
dawāwin (Cairo, 1943), p. 301; A. N. Poliak, Feudalism in
Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Lebanon, 1250-1900 (London,
1939), p. 20; M. Quatremére, Histoire des sultans mamlouks

3. In Ibn Sībāt, loc. cit., Az-Zahr al-Ahmār. Az-Zahr al-
Ahmar is a village in Wādī at-Taim.

4. Barjā is a village in Iqlīm al-Kharrūb, north of Sidon.
During the Crusader period this district fell in the
seigneurie of Sidon; and in the Mamlūk period it fell in the
wilaya of Sidon, a sub-province of the niyāba of Damascus.

5. Al-Māṣir (in Ibn Sībāt, Bāṣir) is a village in Iqlīm
al-Kharrūb, near Barjā, now known as Bāṣir.

6. Maṣāṣir al-Fauqā is a village in the Shūf.

7. Ad-Dāmūr is a coastal town, south of Beirut.

8. Sālih bin Yahyā, op.cit., p. 49. Ibn Sībāt, loc. cit.,
added the fact that the last three villages were in the
province of the Jīrād.

(Rajāb) of the Hijra year 556, he merely gave the Christian year in which the Hijra year began. The year 556 A.H. began on December 31, 1160.\(^1\)

On Jumādā I 27, 1166 A.D. (Jumādā I 29, 583 A.H./August 6, 1187 A.D.),\(^2\) Duwaiḥī continued, Salāḥ ad-Dīn al-Ayyūbī, having taken Beirut from the Crusaders, granted the Gharb as an ḵaqī to Karāma’s son, Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī, and appointed him to guard the ṭaghnr (harbour) of Beirut.\(^3\)

This event again is mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar.\(^4\) Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā said that after the fall of Beirut to Salāḥ ad-Dīn, the sultan lay his hand on the head of Ḥajjī, who had offered him his help in the siege of the city, and said: "Behold! We have taken your vengeance from the Franks;\(^5\) so let your heart be comforted! You shall remain in the place of your father and your brothers!" Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā added that Salāḥ ad-Dīn issued to Ḥajjī a manshūr, and he proceeded to quote part of it:

---

2. This is the date of the fall of Beirut to Salah ad-Dīn as given by Abū Shāma, Kitāb ar-raudata in fi akhbār ad-dawlata in (Cairo, 1876), p. 90. The wrong date given by Duwaiḥī is another example of how he did not take into consideration the day of the year while changing Hijra into Christian dates.
3. Duwaiḥī, T.A., p. 68. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā and Ibn Sibāṭ gave the date simply as Jumādā I, 583 (July-August, 1187). See Sāliḥ bin Yahyā, op. cit., pp. 51-52 and MS Ibn Sibāṭ, p. 42. Where Duwaiḥī got his date (Jumādā I 27) for the fall of Beirut is not clear.
5. The Franks of Beirut had murdered Ḥajjī’s brothers. See below, pp. 269-273.
The Amir Jamal ad-Dawla Ḥajī bin Karāma shall continue to hold what was already his of the mountain of Beirut in the district of Dāmūr when he arrived at the Royal Service (al-khidma as-sultāniyya), and when we were ascertained of what had befallen him at the hands of the infidels, may God forsake them. This is his property which he inherited from his father and his grandfather; and it consists of Sarhamur, Ḍain Ksūr, Ramṭūn, Ad-Dwair, Ẓīrṭa, Ḍīn Drāfīl, and Kafar-Kimmah. Written in the land of Beirut, in the last third of Jumādā al-ūlā, the year 583 (July-August, 1187).

Another gap of half a century followed in Duwaihī's history of non-Maronite Lebanon, after which he proceeded to say that in 1242 two sons of Ḥajī, Ṣajm ad-Dīn Muḥammad and Sharaf ad-Dīn ʿAlī, were killed in a place in Kṣurūn called Thaghrat al-Jauzāt, adding a note to the effect that the sons of Ḥajī were the first Tanūkhid amirs of the Gharb to move their residence from Ṣīrā to ʿAbāī. Duwaihī did not explain how and why the two amirs were killed in Thaghrat al-Jauzāt, neither did Ṣāliḥ bīn Yaḥyā and Ibn Sībat, both of whom gave the same date as Duwaihī; but both Ibn Yaḥyā and Ibn Sībat added that they had taken their information from records kept in the Tanūkhid family. After that, Duwaihī mentioned that in the year 1252 Al-Malik an-

1. Ḍain Ksūr and Ramṭūn are two villages in the lower Gharb.
2. Ad-Dwair is a village in the province of Ash-Shuḥfar, south of Beirut.
3. Ṣīrā and Ḍīn Drāfīl are two villages in Ash-Shuḥfar. The former is at present in ruins.
6. ʿAbāī is a village in the Gharb, not far from Beirut.
7. Ṣāliḥ bīn Yaḥyā, op. cit., p. 55 and Ibn Sībat, op. cit., p. 121. They give the date as Rabiʿ II 6, 640 Ḥ./October 3, 1242.
Nāṣir Yūsuf, the Ayyūbid ruler of Damascus (1250-1260), granted several villages of the Gharb and the village of Ad-Duwair in the Jird to Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī's grandson, Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī (II), the son of Najm ad-Dīn Muḥammad who was killed at Thaghrot al-Jauzāt.¹

This is all Duwaihi had to say about the history of non-Maronite Lebanon in the Crusader period. He resumed this history in the Mamlūk period starting with the year 1276.

In that year, he said, Sultan Baibars (1260-1277), having suspected that Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī II and his brother Saʿd ad-Dīn Khīḍr were corresponding with the Franks of Tripoli, had the two Ťanūkhid amirs imprisoned and deprived of their wealth.² Considering that they were released by Baraka Khān, the son of Baibars, soon after the latter's death, in 1278,³ and that, according to Ibn Yaḥyā and Ibn Sibāt, they remained in prison for a period of seven to nine years,⁴ their arrest must have taken place between 1268 and 1270 and not in 1276. Again, according to Ibn Yaḥyā and Ibn Sibāt, the amirs who were imprisoned by Baibars were three and not two in number, the third having been Zain ad-Dīn Sāliḥ bin ʿAlī.

¹ Duwaihi, T.A., p.125; Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op.cit., pp.55-56; and Ibn Sibāt, op.cit., p.132-133. Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, who had seen the manšūr of An-Nāṣir Yūsuf to Ḥajjī, gave its date as Safar 25, 650 (May 7, 1252). The villages granted to Ḥajjī in it were Arʿamūn, ʿAin Dārāfīl, Tīrdalā, ʿAin Ksūr, Ramṭūn, Qadrūn, Mṛṭghūn, As-Sībāḥiyāya, Sarḥamūr, ʿAināb, and ad-Duwair.

² Duwaihi, T.A., pp.139-140.
³ Ibid., p.141 and Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op.cit., p.71.
⁴ Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op.cit., p.69 and Ibn Sibāt, op.cit., p.185.
a cousin of the other two. The accusation, they added, was false and the alleged correspondence between those amirs and the Frankish rulers of Tripoli was a forgery made by a member of the family of Abū al-Jaish, traditional enemies of the Tanūkhīs. Tannūs ash-Shidyāq gave the year 1270 as the year of the forging of the correspondence and 1271 as the year in which the three amirs were arrested. Relying, like Duwaiḥī, on Ibn Sibāṭ for his information, Shidyāq made a better guess of the date.

Duwaiḥī proceeded, after relating the arrest of the three Tanūkh amirs, to tell about the raid on the Gharb in 1278 that followed the murder of Qutb ad-Dīn as-Sādī, a Mamlūk official from Damascus, in the village of Kafar‘īmmā. Qutb ad-Dīn had taken that village of the Gharb as an iqtā‘ from the Tanūkhīs just before he was found killed there; and Najm ad-Dīn Muhammad (II), the son of Hajjī II, was accused of the murder. As a result the army of Damascus, aided by tribesmen and soldiers from Ba‘albak, Sidon, and the Bīqā‘, sacked the Gharb and burnt it. All this happened while Hajjī II and the other two Tanūkh amirs were still imprisoned in Egypt. Soon after these events, Baraka Khān released them from prison and restored their iqtā‘s to them.

3. Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.141. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, op. cit., pp.75–77. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā gave the same date as Duwaiḥī. I have not found any mention of this event outside Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā and Ibn Sibāṭ, who repeated Ṣāliḥ’s version.
In *Tārikh al-azmina*, Duwaiḥī told of the fall of Tripoli to Qalāūn in 1287. In the context of the narrative, however, he said that Tripoli, having been taken by the Franks in 1109, remained under their rule for 180 years. This brings out the correct date for the fall of Tripoli, 1289, which Duwaiḥī also gave in *Tārikh at-tāifiya al-mārūnīyya*. Duwaiḥī's account of the fall of Tripoli is followed shortly after by an account of the fall of Acre, Tyre, Sidon, Beirut, Ṭahlīth, and Jubail to Al-Ashraf Khalīl, son of Qalāūn, in 1290 (actually 1291). The church of St. John in Beirut, he added, was turned into a mosque after the fall of the city and its walls were covered with clay.

In the days of Al-Ashraf Khalīl, Duwaiḥī continued, the jund al-ḥalqa of Tripoli left. Duwaiḥī, due to his defective knowledge of Arabic, had misunderstood the text of Ibn Sibāṭ from whom he was most probably getting his information. Ibn Sibāṭ said that in the year 689 A.H., when Al-

1. Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.146. See above, pp.89 et seq.
5. The jund al-ḥalqa (or ajnād al-ḥalqa) were one of the three principal corps of the Mamlūk army. They were a corps of free non-mamlūk cavalry—those knights who were in the sultan's service without being his freedmen. See David Ayalon, Studies on the structure of the Mamlūk army, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 1953, p.203, and A.N. Poliak, Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Lebanon, 1250-1900 (London, 1939), p.2.
7. MS Ibn Sibāṭ, pp.212-213.
Ashraf succeeded his father and took Sidon and Beirut, the iqṭās of the Tanūkhš, which Qalāūn had turned over to the jund al-halqa of Tripoli, were restored to them, and that they were set as guards on the darak (watchpost) of Beirut.\(^1\)

Duwaiḥī’s mistake was probably due to the use of the term kharaja al-iqṭā (the iqṭā was taken away) by Ibn Sibāt, Duwaiḥī understanding the term kharaja to mean "went out" or "left", as it is used to mean in everyday speech.

The restoration of the iqṭās of the Tanūkhš of the Gharb took place, according to Duwaiḥī, in the year 1293, "after the halqa of Tripoli had left".\(^2\) The Tanūkh amirs were then appointed on the darak of Beirut in three watches of thirty horsemen, each watch to guard the darak for one month under the supervision of the halqa of Ba‘albak, who likewise took monthly turns in three watches. A watch-tower (mangariyya)\(^3\) was built to keep watch on the sea, and a horse post relay,\(^4\) carrier pigeons, and fire

---

1. Šāliḥ bīn Yāḥyā, op. cit., p. 78.
2. Duwaiḥī, T.A., p. 153. The date, as noted above, is really 1291. See Šāliḥ bīn Yāḥyā, loc. cit. Šāliḥ said that it was in the days of Al-Asḥraf Khalīl, but did not give the exact date. Ibn Ḥajar, op. cit., II, p. 55, mentioned that the iqṭās of the Tanūkhš were taken away from them by Qalāūn and later restored to them by Al-Asḥraf Khalīl after the conquest of the coastal towns.
3. Šāliḥ bīn Yāḥyā, op. cit., p. 40. It appears there as manāgiyyā.
4. The stages of the barīd (horse post relay) were given by Duwaiḥī, starting from Beirut, as Al-Husain, Zibdil,Maisanūn, and Damascus. Qalqashandī (Ṣūbāh al-‘ashā, Cairo 1914, XIV, p. 382), who described the Beirut-Damascus barīd, gave the same stages, except that he gave the name of Zibdil as Zabdan (Zabadani, north-west of Damascus). The names given by Duwaiḥī and Qalqashandī are probably of the same town.
alarms\(^1\) were established to carry news from Beirut to Damascus. All this was done in fear of an attack by the Franks.\(^2\) This fear may have been provoked by a successful naval raid on Beirut in 1291 by the Franks of Cyprus.\(^3\)

Duwaihi dealt next with the two great raids on Kisruan in 1292 and 1305.

After relating the fall of Tripoli to Qalāūn in 1287 (actually 1289) in Ṭarīkh al-azmina, he said, quoting Ibn Sībāṭ, that Ḥusām ad-Dīn Lāgīn, the nāḥib of Damascus,\(^4\) wrote to Jāmāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī and Zain ad-Dīn bin ʿAlī, the amirs of the Ghurb, asking them to join Sunqur al-Mansūrī with all their men and to advance with him and his soldiers on Kisruan and the Jird. The purpose of this raid, the letter explained, was to rob the people of the Jird and

---

1. The fire alarms were lit over the mountains from Beirut to Damascus in six relays.
3. Sālih bin Yahyā, op.cit., p.79.
5. Shams ad-Dīn Sunqur al-Mansūrī al-ʿAsar, originally a mamlūk of Aidamur, the nāḥib of Damascus (670-676 A.H./1271-1277 A.D.), was made chief of the bureaucracy in Damascus (shadd ad-dawāʾīn) by Qalāūn. After the death of Qalāūn he held several important offices under his successors. He died in 709 A.H. (1309-1310 A.D.). See Ibn Ḥajar, Ad-durar al-kāmina..., II, pp.177-178.
Kisruān of the wealth, lives, and offspring, and to do away with their leaders. The reason Duwaiḥī gave for this raid was that the people of the Jird and Kisruān had helped the Franks at the time of the conquest of Tripoli.¹

The letter of Lāgin to the two Tanūkh amirs was seen and described by Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā.² According to his description, this letter was dated Jumādā I 7, 686 (June 20, 1287 A.D.), almost two years before the fall of Tripoli to Qalā‘ūn. The letter instructed Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī and Zain ad-Dīn bīn ʿAlī to rally with their men to the assistance of Shams ad-Dīn Sunqūr al-Manṣūrī and the Mamlūk army as soon as they receive the news of their advance to the Jird and Kisruān. The letter stated further that whoever takes a woman prisoner shall keep her as a concubine, and whoever takes a boy prisoner shall keep him as a slave; and that one dinār will be given for every head of a Jirdī or Kisruānī. The letter did not, apparently, state the reasons for this raid.

Ibn Sībāṭ, from whose history Duwaiḥī took his information about the event, mentioned this letter of Lāgin to the Tanūkh amirs without giving a date.³

¹ Duwaiḥī, T. A., pp. 148-149.
² Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op. cit., p. 58.
Apparently the expedition planned in 1287 against the Jird and Kisruān did not take place. The first Mamlūk expedition against Kisruān took place in 1292.

In Tarīkh at-tā'īfa al-mārūniyya Duwaiḥī related the first Mamlūk expedition against Kisruān, giving its year as 1293. In that year, he said, An-Nāṣir Muḥammad bīn Qalaūn, the Mamlūk sultan, sent orders to Āqush al-Afram, the nālīb of Damascus (699-709 A.H./1300-1310 A.D.), to Asandamur, the nālīb of Tripoli, to Sunqur al-Mansūrī, and to the amirs of the Gharb to bring their troops together and fight the people of the Jird and Kisruān. Duwaiḥī stated that he took this information from the history of Ibn al-Ḥarīrī. In Tarīkh al-aẓmīna, depending also on Ibn al-Ḥarīrī, Duwaiḥī said that in 1302 Āqush al-Afram, Asandamur, and Sunqur a-

2. Āqush al-Afram was not nālīb of Damascus in 1293. He succeeded Saif ad-Dīn Qibjaj in this position in 699 A.H. (1300 A.D.) and was in turn succeeded ten years later by Qarāsunqur al-Mansūrī. H. Lacoste, Les gouverneurs de Damas..., P.7. Also Ibn Ḥājar, op.cit., I, pp.396-398.
3. Asandamur became nālīb of Tripoli in 701 A.H. (1301-2 A.D.) Before that he was an important amir in Damascus. It is not clear when he left Tripoli; but he held after it the niyāba of Ḥamā. He was killed in 721 A.H. (1321 A.D.). Ibn Ḥājar, op.cit., I, pp.387-388.
Mansūrī (actually Sunqurshāh al-Mansūrī, the nālīb of Ṣafad)\footnote{See above, p. 155, fn. 4.} advanced on the Jīrd and Kisorūn with their armies, but were defeated badly.

Actually, there were two expeditions against Kisorūn and the Jīrd before the great expedition of 1305. The first was in July, 1292, during the reign of Al-Malik al-Ashraf Khalīl b. Qalāūn. In that year Baidarah, the nālīb as-saltāna (vice-roY) of Al-Ashraf Khalīl in Egypt, advanced with the greater part of his army against Kisorūn by way of the coast. He was met and routed by the people of the mountains of Kisorūn. The amirs accompanying Baidarah on this expedition accused him of having received bribes from the enemy, and of having purposely failed the expedition; and on his return to Damascus he was met by the Sultan who rebuked him mildly for his failure.\footnote{Mazrūzī, Sūlūk..., I, p. 779. M. Quatremere, Histoire des sultans mamlouks de l'Égypte, II (Paris, 1842), P.742. K. V. Zettersteeen, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamluken-sultane in den Jahren 690-741 der Higra nach Arabischen Handschriften (Leiden, 1919), P.20. Sāliḥ b. Yāhū, op. cit., pp.29-31. All three sources gave the date as 691 A.H. Sāliḥ b. Yāhū added that the expedition took place in the month of Sha'ban (July, 1292).}

The second expedition against Kisorūn took place in 1300, during the second reign of An-Nasīr Muḥammad b. Qalāūn. On July 9 of that year, Aqūsh al-Afram, the newly appointed nālīb of Damascus, set out for Kisorūn to make up for the previous defeat of the Mamlūk armies there. With him were the nālībs of Ṣafad, Ḥamā, Ḥums, and Tripoli, and
their soldiers. The fighting continued for six days, after which the Kisruānīs asked for peace. They were forced to give back all what they had taken in loot from the Mamlūk army in 1292, and to pay a tribute of 100,000 dirhams.¹

Judging by the fact that in each of Tārikh al-azmān and Tārikh at-ta'īfa al-mārūniyya Duwaiḥī gave the same account of a Mamlūk expedition against Kisruān, he seems to have considered both expeditions to have been one, although he gave two different dates, 1293 and 1302, both dates being wrong. Duwaiḥī's mistake may have originated in the accounts given by Ibn al-Hārīrī about the two expeditions. Since Ibn al-Hārīrī's history is no longer available,² this point cannot be determined definitely.

Although Duwaiḥī gave the names of the leaders of the expedition on the year 1300, the account he gave about both expeditions was that of the expedition of 1292 - the one in which the Kisruānīs were victorious. The men of the mountains, he said, pounced down on the Moslem soldiers and defeated them. Duwaiḥī added that the two sons of Muḥammad bin Karāma, Ahmad and Muḥammad, were killed in the battle

¹ Maqrīzī, op. cit., I, pp. 902-903. K.V. Zettersteen, op. cit., pp. 80-81. Both gave the date as Shawwāl 20, 699 (July 9, 1300). See also A. Quatremère, op. cit., pp. 170-171. In his translation of Maqrīzī, Quatremère gave the amount of the tribute to be paid by the Kisruānīs to the Mamlūks as 200,000 dirhams.
² See above, p. 141 and loc. cit., fn. 1.
against the Jirdīs and Kīsrūānīs;\(^1\) and that the Jirdīs and Kīsrūānīs followed up their victory by burning several villages of the Gharb.\(^2\)

It is interesting to note that in both his accounts of the expedition of 1292 Duwaihī was attempting to bring together the Moslem version of Ibn al-Ḥarīrī and the Maronite version of Ibn al-Qīlāṭī.

Duwaihī continued his narrative with the year 1304.\(^3\) In that year, he said, Āqūsh al-Afram sent Sharīf Zain ad-Dīn bīn Ādānī\(^4\) to the people of the Mountain and Kīsrūān to reconcile them to the Tanūkhīds and to bring them back to obedience. In the same year a second mission was sent

---

1. These amirs, the sons of Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī bīn Muḥammad of Tanūkh (not Muḥammad bīn Karāma, as Duwaihī said) were killed in the expedition of 1305. MS Ibn Sībāt, p.229, and Sāliḥ bīn Yāḥyā, op.cit., p.100. The two amirs were killed in Ṣibāl, in Kīsrūān, not in ʿAbāl, in the Gharb, as it appears in Duwaihī, T.T.M., p.376. Duwaihī's mistake here must have been due to the similarity between the names of the two villages.

2. There is no mention of the burning of several villages of the Gharb by the Jirdīs and Kīsrūānīs outside Duwaihī. How true it is cannot be determined.

3. Duwaihī, T.A., p.162. In T.T.M. the attempt at reconciliation with the Jirdīs and Kīsrūānīs is omitted and the author proceeded directly to relate the events of the expedition of 1305, which he related under the year 1307, as will be seen later.

4. In Shidyāq, Aḥḥābār al-aṣyaḥ..., p.720, his name is given as Zain ad-Dīn Muḥammad bīn Ādānī. Zain ad-Dīn Muḥammad bīn Ādānī al-Ḥusainī (in Ibn ᴴᵃഹᵃContentPane, his title is given as Muḥyī ad-Dīn) wa maqīb al-ashrāf in Damascus. He was born in 1229 (626 A.H.) and died in 1322 (722 A.H.). Ibn ᴴᵃاه rwěri, ᴴᵃاد-durar al-kāmini..., IV, p.47.
to them headed by Taqī 'd-Dīn Ibn Taimiyya and Amir Bahā' ad-Dīn Qarāqūsh; but both missions failed to achieve their ends. The ṣulamā', therefore, decreed that the Jīrd and Kīsrūn should be destroyed since their inhabitants had routed the Moslem army in the first expedition and had refused to come back to obedience. For that purpose, soldiers were collected from every part of Syria and preparations for an expedition against Kīsrūn continued to be made until the end of that year.

The visits of Ibn 'Adnān, Ibn Taimiyya, and Qarāqūsh to Kīsrūn took place in Dhul Hijja, 704 (June–July, 1305). Duwayhī misunderstood partly the purpose of those visits. He stated that one of the aims of Ibn 'Adnān, Ibn Taimiyya, and Qarāqūsh was the reconciliation of the Jīrdīs and the Kīsrūnīs to the Tanūkh amirs of the Gharb. Ibn Sibāt, from whom Duwayhī took his information about the event, said that the purpose of those missions was the ḥīlāh (reformation) of the Jīrdīs and Kīsrūnīs, by which he meant a reformation of

1. Ibn Taimiyya (Ahmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm, Taqī 'd-Dīn) was born in Harrān in 661 A.H. (1263 A.D.) and died in Damascus in 727 A.H. (1328 A.D.). He was a theologian of the Ḥanbalite school, and was renowned for his asceticism. Among other things, he was known for his struggles against the heterodox Moslems of the mountains of Lebanon and the Nuṣairīyya. See H. Laoust, Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taki-d-Din Ahmad B. Taimiya, canoniste (Cairo, 1939). For his biography, see ibid., p. 11. Al-Kutubi, Fawāt il-wafayāt (Būlāq, 1866), p. 49, gives his biography and enumerates his works.

2. I could not identify Bahā' ad-Dīn Qarāqūsh. Maqrīzī (op. cit., II, p. 12) called him Bahā' ad-Dīn Qarāqūsh al-Maṣūrī. He seems to have been an important amir in Damascus.


their religious beliefs. Duwaïhi, using the same word islāh, understood by it sūrah (reconciliation, peace-making), and concluded that the purpose of those missions must have been, partly, to reconcile the Jirdīs and the Kisruānīs to the Tanūkhs of the Gharb.¹

The Jird and parts of Kisruān² were inhabited in the late Crusader and early Mamlūk periods by Mitwālis (Rāfīḍa or Ithnā asharī Shī'a), Nuṣairīs, and Druzes,³ all three groups being heterodox Moslems hostile to their Sunni Moslem neighbours. In the mountainous region of Central Lebanon they found an almost impregnable place of

---

¹ For further discussion of this point, see below, pp.296. As for the mission of Ibn Taimiyya to Kisruān, it is known that Ibn Taimiyya was a vigorous opponent of heterodox ² Islam, both in its doctrinal and its political aspects. He preached and took part in the expedition against the Rāfīḍa, Nuṣairīs, and Druzes of Kisruān in 1305 (See H. Laoust, op. cit., pp.124-5, for a discussion of Ibn Taimiyya's attitude towards the heretical Moslems of Kisruān). In his book, Kitāb minhaj as-sunnah..., he attacked both the doctrinal beliefs and the perfidious politics of the Rāfīḍa and their likes. He accused them of having assisted the pagan Tartars and the Christian Franks against the Moslems "in the fourth and seventh centuries". He also accused them of considering religions as political parties and schools of thought, of which any may be followed, and of corrupting good Islamic beliefs to an abominable extent. See Ibn Taimiyya, Kitāb minhaj as-sunnah annabawiyya fi madq kalām ash-shī'a wa'l-qadariyya (Būlāq, 1903), pp.2-5. ²

² For Kisruān in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, included large parts of what later became the province of the Maṭn. See Appendix.²


---

* Many villages which fell in the province of Al-Maṭn in the early nineteenth century (at the time of Shidyāq) were mentioned by ⁴ Sāliḥ bin Yāḥyā and Ibn al-Qilāṣ among the villages of Kisruān.
refuge from persecution by the Sunnī state and an ideal center for guerilla warfare and raids. While the Moslem state was absorbed in its defence against Frankish and Mongol attack, the heterodox Moslems of central Lebanon achieved internal independence and, since it was to their interest that the Moslem state should be kept busy with its enemies, they occasionally lent a hand to the Franks and the Mongols. In 1300, a few years before they were finally reduced to obedience, they had attacked the Moslem army after it had been routed by the Mongols. 1 From the history of Tādrus of Ḥamā, it appears that the leaders of the heterodox Moslem inhabitants of Kisuğān and the Jird were the Billemās, 2 a Druze family which rose again to play a part in the history of Lebanon in later Ottoman times.

After the fall of the last Crusader possessions to Al-Ashraf Khalīl in 1291, an expedition, which had apparently been planned before the fall of Tripoli by Qalāūn, was sent against the Jird and Kisuğān to reduce its rebel population to obedience. The expedition failed badly. A second expedition, that of 1300, was more successful, but its effects did not last. In the year 704 A.H. (1304-1305 A.D.) a revolt broke out in the Jird and Kisuğān against Mamlūk

2. Tādrus of Ḥamā, op.cit., p.86. See also above, p.99.
rule. Attempts to bring them back to obedience by peaceful means failed. Ibn Taimiyya, the chief exponent of the state doctrine, and a great theologian of the Ḥanbalite school, who had himself led the mission to bring back the Kisruānīs and the Jirdīs to obedience peacefully, preached their reduction by force, and wrote letters himself to the different parts of Syria calling the faithful to join the expedition.

The details of the expedition that followed were related by Duwaihī, who gave Ibn al-Ḥarīrī and Ibn Sibāt as references, under the year 1307. Actually it took place in 1305. The people of the Jird, he said, led by Druze amirs (the Bellama's) were badly defeated at Saufar, a village in the Jird situated on the Damascus highway, by Ḥūṣn al-Afram and his army. The victors then followed them to Kisruān, ravaging the countryside, destroying the churches, and

1. H. Lacoust, op. cit., p. 60.
2. Ibid., pp. 124-125.
4. Maqrizi, op. cit., II, p. 14. (Quatremere, op. cit., II, i, pp. 252-253). Maqrizi gave the date of the start of the expedition as Muharram 2, 705 (July 25, 1305). In Quatremere's translation it appears as Muharram 8 (July 31). Sālih bin Yahyā gave the date as Muharram 2 (op. cit., p. 32). Duwaihī gave the date as Muharram 2, 1307. MS Ibn Sibāt gave the date as Muharram 2, 705.
6. None of the Moslem historians mentioned the destruction of churches in the expedition.

* See above, p. 99. Tādrus of Ḥamā, op. cit., p. 86
uprooting the vineyards on their way. Finally, on Jumādā II 18, 705 (January 5, 1306), after the utter defeat of the Kīsruānīs, their country was given in iqṭā' to Mamlūk amirs from Damascus. 2

Duwaiḥī proceeded to say that in the year 1307, 3 after the defeat of the Jīrdīs and the Kīsruānīs, the Turkoman Āssāf family was settled on the coast of Kīsruān and their watch (dārak) was fixed between Antiλiās, north of Beirut, and Al-Mu'āmalta, on the frontier of the muṣāmala (province) of Tripoli. Their duties were to check the passports of everybody who passed in the pass of Nahr al-Kalb and to forbid suspicious persons from passing. The passports were valid if they were signed by the mutawallī or the amirs of the Chārāb. 4

With the end of the second expedition against Kīsruān and the settlement of the Turkoman Āssāfs on its coast the period of full Mamlūk domination in Lebanon began.

1. The battle, according to Maqrīzī (op. cit., II, p.15 and Quatremere, op. cit., II, ii, p.253) lasted eleven days.


3. Sāliḥ bin Yahyā (op. cit., p.42) gave the date as 706 A.H. (1306-1307 A.D.).

4. The mutawallī was the governor of a wilāya, which was a subdivision of a niyāba. Here Duwaiḥī probably meant the mutawallī of Beirut. Beirut, in Mamlūk times, was a wilāya of the niyāba of Damascus. See Gaudfroy-Demombynes, La Syrie..., p.74. Also Qumarī, Taʾrīf..., p.179 and Qalqashandī, Subh..., IV, pp.110-111.

The redistribution of the iqṭāʾs in Syria and Egypt in the year 1313 was the first event mentioned by Duwaiḥī in this period. 1 Although his main source, Ibn Sībāʿī’s history, dwells at length on the reinvestiture of the Tanūkhs with their old iqṭāʾs in that year, 2 Duwaiḥī made no mention of it. In the year 1315, he continued, the amīr Nāṣir ad-Ḍīn Al-Ḥusayn of Tanūkh (1269-1350) 3 built a great house in Abāī with a tower, a bath, and a garden, and supplied it with water. 4

Duwaiḥī next came to the year 1333 (really 1334 – Dhu’l-Ḥijja 734 A.H.). 5 In that year, he said, a Genoese naval squadron attacked Beirut with the purpose of capturing a Catalan ship in its harbour. There were two days of fighting in the city, and the Genoese were successful and achieved the purpose of their raid. The nāʾib of Damascus, Tankīz, 6 was displeased and sent for the amīrs of the Gharb

2. MS Ibn Sībāʿī, pp.245-250.
3. Sāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., p.129. Under Al-Ḥusayn, the supremacy of the Tanūkhs over the other feudal families in Lebanon was fully established.
4. Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.168. The house was not built in that year, nor was it completed in a single year. It was built over the period 1294-1350. Sāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., p.112. Al-Ḥusayn’s father, Saʿd ad-Ḍīn Khīḍr, started building it.
6. Tankīz (Saif ad-Ḍīn Abū Saʿīd), formerly a mamlūk of Al-Ashraf Khalīl, was made nāʾib of Damascus in Ṣaḥīḥ II, 712 (August, 1312 A.D.). As nāʾib of Damascus, he became a very powerful figure, and ruled his niyāba almost independently. He was finally removed from his office and arrested in Dhu’l-Ḥijja 23, 740 (June 20, 1340 A.D.). He died, probably poisoned, early in the following year, just over the age of sixty. Ibn Hajar, Ad-durar al-kāmina...I, pp.520-527 and H. Lacouœ, Les gouverneurs de Damas... pp.8-9.
and the Turkomans of Kisruān and punished them for failing to protect the coast against attack.¹

Ten years later, in 1344, Ibn Subh, a muqaddam of the Bīqāʾ, raided Wādī at-Taim and burned thirteen villages there. That is all Duwaiḥī had to say about the event.²

Shidyāq, however, said that the amir of Wādī at-Taim at the time was Ḥusain ibn Saʿd of the Shihāb family and that the muqaddams of the Bīqāʾ were incited by the Mamlūk government against the Shihābs because they suspected Ḥusain's allegiance.

In the following year, 1345, Duwaiḥī said, quoting Ibn Sībāṭ, the Mamlūk government, in fear of a naval attack from Cyppus, started a project of ship-building in Beirut under the direction of Baidamur al-Khwārizmī,⁴ and the Tanūkhās and the Assāfs were ordered to take residence in Beirut and to help the army of Syria (ṣaṣṣar ash-Šām) in guarding the

---

¹ Duwaiḥī, T. A., p. 172.
² Ibid., p. 177. I have found nothing about this particular Ibn Subh outside Lebanese historians. Ibn Tillūn, however, mentions the muqaddams of the Bīqāʾ belonging to this family very frequently in his history of the tenth Hijra century. See H. Laoust, Les gouverneurs de Damas...
³ T. Shidyāq, Akhbar al-aṭyāb..., pp. 48-49.
According to Śāliḥ bin Yahyā, this project of ship-building in Beirut was started by the great amir Yalbughā after the naval raid on Alexandria by the Franks of Cyprus on Muharram 13, 767 (October 1, 1365), and that it was left unfinished after Yalbughā's death in Rabī‘ II, 768 (December, 1366). It is not clear why Duwaiḥī gave the date wrongly as 1345.

In 1355, Duwaiḥī continued, there was a successful Frankish naval raid on Sidon in which much booty was taken and which cost the government of Damascus a great deal in

---

2. Duwaiḥī also mentioned that Yalbughā was responsible for this project. Yalbughā bin 'Abdallāh al-Khāssakī an-Nāṣīrī, an amir of a thousand under An-Nāṣir Ḥasan (1347-1351 and 1354-1361), led a conspiracy against the Sultan and had him killed. In 1363 he deposed his successor, Al-Manṣūr Muhammad, and put Al-Aḥṣaf Shabbān (1363-1376) on the throne. For three years Yalbughā was the real master of Egypt, until he was killed by the Sultan in December, 1366. Ibn Ḥajār, Ad-durar al-kāmil, IV, pp.438-440.
3. The Cypriot fleet left Cyprus on October 4, 1365 and reached Alexandria on October 9. The governor of the city was absent on a pilgrimage and his deputy, Janghārā, was incompetent. The Franks landed the following day. The city was taken by storm and much plunder was taken. Alexandria was sacked for three days, many of its buildings and homes were burnt, and many of its inhabitants were massacred. On October 16, the Franks evacuated the city. See Sir George Hill, A history of Cyprus, II, The Frankish period, 1192-1432 (Cambridge, 1948), pp.330-334. Ibn Ayyās (Badaʾiʾ az-zuhur fi waqāʾiʾ ad-dhūrūr, Cairo, 1311 A.H., I, p.274), after relating the event, giving the date as Saḥfar 13 (October 29), said that after the sack of Alexandria by the Franks Yalbughā ordered the building of ships in Alexandria for a naval expedition against Cyprus. Ibn Ḥajār (op.cit., IV, p.438) said also that Yalbughā ordered the building of 100 ships for an attack on Cyprus, after the Frankish raid on Alexandria. As far as I know, Śāliḥ bin Yahyā was the only historian to mention that the project of ship-building extended to Beirut.
4. Śāliḥ bin Yahyā, loc.cit. H. Lammens, La Syrie..., pp.6-8.
ransoms. ¹

A slight complication in the fortunes of the Tanūkhīs in 1373 is mentioned by Duwaihi. ² In that year, he said, a part of the Gharb was granted in iqṭāʾ, probably by the nāʾib of Damascus, to the chief of the khāṣṣakīyya,³ a man by the name of Tabtaq (or Tubtuq). The amīr Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ bin Khāṭr, however, managed with much difficulty to annul this grant.⁴

The events that took place in Lebanon following the dethronement of Al-Malik az-Zāhir Barquq (1382-1398) and his replacement by Ḥājjī (1389-1390) were next to be dealt with by Duwaihi,⁵ again with Ibn Sībat as his reference.

In 1388, Duwaihi said, Barquq sent an army from Egypt to put down the rebellion of Yalbughā an-Nāṣirī⁷ and

---

¹ Saʿīd bin Yahyā, op. cit., p. 34, related the event without giving a date. Ibn Sībat, op. cit., p. 304, gave the date 757 A.H. Duwaihi related the event in T.A., p. 183.
² Ibid., p. 186.
³ The khāṣṣakīyya were those Mamlūks who were chosen from among the sultan’s personal guard to form his corps elite. They served in the palace and the royal stables and accompanied the sultan on ceremonial occasions. See Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie..., pp. xxxii and 1.
⁴ The event is related by Ibn Sībat in op. cit., p. 304.
⁵ Duwaihi, T.A., pp. 189-190. Duwaihi gave 1388 as the date of both the dethronement and the restoration of Barquq. Actually these events stretched over the years 1389-1390.
⁷ Saʿīfd-Dīn Yalbughā an-Nāṣirī was nāʾib of Aleppo under As-Sāliḥ Ḥajjī (1381-1382), the last of the Bahri Mamlūk sultans. When Barquq came to the throne in 1382 he removed him from this position and imprisoned him in Alexandria; then set him free and made him nāʾib of Aleppo in 1388. Later that year, on hearing that Barquq had sent an order by the barīd to remove him again from the niyaba, he rebelled, made himself complete master of Aleppo by occupying its fort, and approached the other amirs of Syria.
Timurbughā Mintāsh¹ in Syria.² The latter, with the help of

to join him in rebellion against Barquq. Having won over the Syrian amirs to his side and defeated the Egyptian army near Damascus (in 1389), Yalbughā proceeded to Egypt and reached Cairo early in the month of Jumādā II, 791 (May, 1389). Barquq was dethroned and imprisoned in Al-Karak, in southern Syria, and Yalbughā put Hajji back on the throne with the title of Al-Malik al-Manṣūr. After that Yalbughā himself was defeated in battle and imprisoned by Mintāsh, his former ally, who thus became practically the ruler of the Mamluk empire. In 1290, however, Barquq escaped from prison, defeated Mintāsh at Shaqhab, and returned to the throne. Yalbughā was released from prison and reinvested with the niyāba of Aleppo. In Sha'ban of that year (July, 1390) he was removed to the niyāba of Damascus. The following year he was killed in Aleppo by order of the Sultan. Ibn Ḥajar, Ad-durar al-kamānī,..., IV, pp.440-442. H. Leoût, Les gouverneurs de Damas..., p. 16. For his death, see Ibn Ayas, Badūnī az-zuhur..., I, p.296.

1. Timurbughā Mintāsh al-Ashrafi, known generally as Mintāsh, was originally a mamluk of Al-Ashraf Sha'ban (1363-1376). Barquq made him nāʿib of Malatia, a subdivision of the niyāba of Aleppo, which fell to the east of Aleppo, in the northernmost part of Mamluk Syria, in 1386. There he rebelled against Barquq and was defeated by Yalbughā, the nāʿib of Aleppo. Later he joined Yalbughā in the rebellion against Barquq in 1389 and, after the dethronement of Barquq and the restoration of Hajji, he defeated Yalbughā and imprisoned him in Alexandria. The following year he was defeated by Barquq, who had escaped from prison. After Barquq had reestablished himself as sultan, he besieged Mintāsh in Damascus. Mintāsh was forced to flee and join Naṣir, a bedouin Arab amir who had joined the rebellion against Barquq. With Naṣir he defeated Barquq's army at Hums, and attempted vainly the conquest of Aleppo. In 1391 he attacked Damascus alone and was defeated; so he returned to Naṣir. Approached by Barquq with many promises Naṣir betrayed Mintāsh and handed him over to the Sultan, who imprisoned him in Aleppo. There Mintāsh remained until he was executed in 1393. His head was paraded in Cairo and hung on Bab Zawila. Ibn Ḥajar, op.cit., IV, pp.364-366.

2. Duwaiḥī said that the army was commanded by Jarkas al-Khalīlī. Ibn Ḥajar (op.cit., IV, p.441) mentioned Jarkas al-Khalīlī among the commanders of the army. Duwaiḥī, however, gave the date 1388 to the event. Actually the battle between Barquq's army and that of Yalbughā and his fellow rebels took place on Rabī' I 11, 791 (March 10, 1389 A.D.). See ibid. Duwaiḥī gave the date 1388 wrongly to all the events concerning Barquq's dethronement and restoration.
the army of Syria, the Arab tribes, and the people of the Jird and Kisruān, were victorious, killed Jarkas al-Khalīlī, the commander of Barquq's army, and advanced on Egypt. Barquq was deposed and imprisoned in Al-Karak, in southern Syria, and Ḥājjī was made sultan in his place.

The deposal of Barquq was followed by troubles in Lebanon between the Tānikhīd amirs of the Gharb, who were on the side of the deposed sultan, and the Kisruānīs and

1. Yalbughā approached the amirs of Syria and won them over to his side, against Barquq. Mīnṭāsh was among those amirs. See foot-note on Yalbughā, p. 168, fn. 7.
2. Naṣir, one of the most powerful Arab chieftains in Syria, joined Yalbughā in rebellion against Barquq. Ibn Ḥajar, op. cit., IV, p. 366.
3. Duwaiḥī, relying on Ibn Sībāt, mentioned the people of the Jird and Kisruān among the allies of Yalbughā. Although Mamlūk chronicles do not mention all the part played by them in these events, it is not at all improbable that they did join Yalbughā's rebellion. Yalbughā may well have wooed the heterodox malcontents of the Jird and Kisruān, who had suffered defeat and persecution at the hands of the Mamlūk State, to join him in rebellion against the established State.
4. Jarkas ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Khalīlī, a mamlūk of Turkoman origin, was one of the powerful amirs in Egypt during the early reign of Barquq. He was made amīr akhur (chief of the stables), a commander of a thousand, and mushir ad-dawla (commander in chief?) by Barquq. He was killed in battle outside Damascus in 1389. Ibn Ḥajar, Inbaʾ al-ghumr fī anbāʾ al-tūmār (MS Brit. Mus. 7321), fol. 70r.
5. Barquq was deposed and Ḥājjī restored on Jumāda II 5, 791 (June 1, 1389). Ibn Ayās, op. cit., I, p. 274.
6. Mamlūk chronicles did not mention the help offered by the Tānikhīd amirs of the Gharb to Barquq.
7. Duwaiḥī and Ibn Sībāt called the Kisruānīs ʿushrān al-barr, ahl Kisruān (the tribes of the land, the people of Kisruān). The origin of the name ʿushrān al-barr for the Kisruānīs is not clear.
the *Assásf amirs,* who were on the side of Yalburghā and Mintāsh. The *Assásfs and their followers,* said Duwaihī, attacked the Tanūkhid amirs, killed some ninety of them, and looted several of their villages. However, after Barquq had managed to escape from prison and had defeated the nā'ibs of Ghazza, Damascus, and Aleppo, his soldiers marched against the Turkomans of Kīsruān and defeated them at Jūrat Mintāsh, in Zūq Mīkā'īl, on the coast of Kīsruān. In this battle two of the *Assásf amirs,* 'Alī and his brother 'Umar, were killed. The Turkomans of Kīsruān were badly defeated and their village were looted by Barquq’s soldiers. Soon after, Barquq was restored to the throne.

Ibn Sibāt gave very much the same story, except that he lay more stress on the relations between Barquq and the amirs of the Gharb. Sāliḥ bin Yahyā also wrote about these events at length, giving the year of Barquq’s dethronement correctly as 791 A.H. (1389 A.D.). Duwaihī related all these events under the year 1388 (790 A.H.). Actually they stretched over the years 1389-1390.

1. Duwaihī and Ibn Sibāt called the Turkomans of Kīsruān awlād al-āmā (sons of the blind man). Actually these amirs only came to be called *Assásfs after the Ottoman conquest, after the name of the head of the family at the time of the conquest.

2. Ibn Sibāt gave the date as 792 A.H. (1390 A.D.). Mamlūk chroniclers did not mention this raid by Barquq’s soldiers against the Turkomans and the people of Kīsruān.


Mamlûk chroniclers who dealt with the history of Barquq's deposition and restoration made no mention of the role played by the Tanûkhid amirs of the Gharb, the Turkoman amirs of Kisruân, or the Kisruânîs and the Jîrdîs in the events that centered round them. That the Tanûkhîs helped Barquq after he had left Al-Karak, however, is not unlikely. They seem to have rallied to his cause, like many others, in the hope of future gain in their position and their iqṭârs. Likewise the Turkomans of Kisruân must have been among the amirs whom Yalbughâ called to join in the rebellion against Barquq. Yalbughâ may have also attracted the malcontent heterodox Moslem population of the Jîrd and Kisruân, who had suffered much persecution at the hands of the Mamlûk State, to join in the rebellion, with promises of future indulgence. If that was the case, it is not surprising to find Barquq reasserting the authority of the State over them after his restoration.

Duwaihî did not have much to say about internal events in non-Maronite Lebanon in the Burjî Mamlûk period (1382-1516) after the restoration of Barquq. He said nothing about the subject until he came to the year 1445. In that year, he said, "Izz al-Dîn Șadaqa bin Sharaf al-Dîn loggedin of Tanûkh died," adding that he was "a man of great authority and ruled over the area extending from the frontiers of Tripoli to the frontiers of Safad, by the consent of the mutâwallî
of Beirut to protect the sea from the Franks. Then he continued to say that between Sadaqa and the Al-Ḥamra family there was considerable political enmity.

A change in the family holding of the office of shaikh (elder or mayor) in Al-Munaitra in 1482 was mentioned next. In that year, said Duwaiḥī, the family of Al-Mustarḥīy replaced Banū Qisās in that office. Both families were probably Miṭwālīs.

Duwaiḥī first mentioned the Maʾnīds while relating the events of the year 1505. In that year, he said, the nāʿīb of Damascus sent the dawādār (bearer of the inkpot) Juān Bāk (Jānibāk) Al-Franjī to raid the Biqāʾ. The raid was unsuccessful, and the dawādār and some three hundred of his men were killed. The nāʿīb of Damascus died just before starting on a second expedition against the Biqāʾ. His successor, Sibāy al-Ashrafi, soon after his appointment,

---

2. See below, chapter on Shidyāq's history, pp. 313 et seq.
4. Ibid., p. 226.
5. In 1505 the nāʿīb of Damascus was Arikmās (January, 1505-May, 1506). See H. Laoust, Les gouverneurs de Damas..., pp. 106-116. Actually, as will be shown below, the expedition of which Duwaiḥī spoke took place the previous year and was conducted in person by the nāʿīb Qānsīh al-Burj.
7. Sibāy al-Ashrafi entered Damascus as its nāʿīb on Muḥarram 9, 912 A.H. (June 1, 1506 A.D.). He disappeared soon after Ǧānbirdī al-Ǧazālī, the last Mamlūk nāʿīb of Damascus, was appointed to succeed him on Shaʿbān 5, 922 (September 3, 1516). Ibid., pp. 116-143.
arrested Fakhr ad-Dīn ʿUthmān of Maṣn, amir of the Shūf, who died in the following year - Rabīʿ II, 912 (August-September, 1506).

From other Lebanese sources it is understood that the raids of the nāʿib of Damascus were directed against this ʿUthmān.1 Shidyāq added that ʿUthmān was released soon after his arrest and was sent back to his country with due honour.2

From Duwaiḥī's account, it is understood that it was the direct predecessor of Sībāy al-Ashrāfī who was responsible for the unsuccessful expedition against the Bilād, in which the dawadār Jānībāk al-Faranjī was killed, and that the expedition took place in 1505. Ibn Tūlūn (1475-1546), who wrote a history of the governors of Damascus and was contemporary to the event, said that the expedition started from Damascus on Dhuʿl-Qaʿda 2, 909 (April 17, 1504), and that it was led in person by Qānṣūh al-Burj, a nāʿib of Damascus who assumed office on Rabīʿ I 1, 907 A.H. (September 14, 1501), not by Arikmās, who was the direct predecessor of Sībāy in the niyāba of Damascus. The dawadār, Ibn Tūlūn added, was one of the two Damascus officials who, alone, did not join the expedition.3

1. Haidar ash-Shiḥābī, Al-Ghurar al-hisān... p.556. He gave the date as 910 A.H. (1504-1505 A.D.).
2. Shidyāq, Akhbār al-ayyān... p.301.
Ibn Tulun said further that when Qanṣūh reached the Biqāʿ he found that Nāṣir ad-Dīn Ibn Ḥanash had taken flight, thus implying that the expedition was directed against this Ibn Ḥanash, the muqaddam of the Biqāʿ, who had apparently rebelled. Finding that he had taken flight, Qanṣūh burnt his house in Mashghara, a village to the west of the Liṭānī river, in the Biqāʿ, and devastated several villages of the region.

On Muḥarram 13, 910 A.H. (June 26, 1504 A.D.), Ibn Tulun continued, Ibn Ḥanash returned from his flight; and, finding Jānibāk al-Faranjī, the dawādār of Qanṣūh, in the Biqāʿ, he killed him, along with several shaikhs of the villages of that region. Qanṣūh wanted to send another expedition against Ibn Ḥanash to avenge the murder of the dawādār; but on July 30 he fell mortally ill and could not carry out his plans, since he died ten days later.¹

Later in his history, while relating the events of the niyāba of Sībāy al-Ashrafi, Ibn Tulun said that Sībāy left Damascus for the Biqāʿ on Muḥarram 27, 912 (June 19, 1506), less than three weeks after his arrival in the city as māʾib, with the purpose of arresting Ibn Ḥanash. He returned thence on Rabīʿ I 6 (July 27).²

¹. Ibid., pp. 99 and 100. Qanṣūh al-Burj died on Safar 26, 910 A.H. (August 8, 1504 A.D.).
². Ibid., p. 117.
Although Ibn Tulun mentioned the expeditions of Qansūh al-Burj and Sibāy al-Ashrafi against the Biqā', which were events contemporary to him, he did not make any mention of Fakhr ad-Dīn Othmān of Ma'ān in the brief account he gave of those expeditions. It is definite that his arrest was not the primary object of either expedition. That he was arrested by Sibāy in 1506, however, is by no means unlikely. He may well have been an ally of Ibn Hanash, the muqaddam of the Biqā' against whom the expeditions were actually directed.

The death of Amir Yunis of Ma'ān in 1511 is the last event mentioned by Duwaihi about non-Maronite Lebanon before the Ottoman conquest in 1516.

There is nothing new or unique in the information Duwaihi gave about the history of non-Maronite Lebanon in the Middle Ages. Most of what he had to say about the subject is found in greater detail in older sources like the histories of Ibn Sibāṭ and Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā. He offered no interpretation of this history and the dates he gave were often wrong, to a greater or lesser degree. However, by placing the history of non-Maronite Lebanon side by side with the history of Maronite Lebanon, although he rarely attempted consciously to link the two together, he was doing something that had never been done before.

Duwaihi's history of Maronite Lebanon is his most

original contribution as a historian. In compiling it for the first time from the various snatches of information found in the different sources, he showed remarkable ability in his choice of material, its arrangement and criticism, and the conclusions he derived from it.

Duwaihi's history of the Maronites in the Crusader period is mainly concerned with their religious history. He did give some information, however, about the political relations between the Maronites and the Crusaders.

Duwaihi cited two instances in which the Maronites offered military aid to the Franks in the early years of the Crusaders. The first was in 1099. In that year, he said, as the Franks were advancing from Antioch to Jerusalem, they stopped near 'Arqa' and there celebrated Easter on April 7. Whereupon the Christians of Mount Lebanon came down to bid them welcome, helped them with provisions, and guided them on their way to Jerusalem.  

Duwaihi must have taken his information about this event from the chronicle of William of Tyre who wrote about the help offered by the Syrian Christians of Lebanon (by whom he probably meant the Maronites) to the Crusaders in 1099:

1. 'Arqa (Archas) is a town near Tripoli on the northern coastal plain of Lebanon, not far from the sea. It was at the time an important fortified town.
High up on the lofty range of Lebanon, whose towering summits rise far above those cities on the east which I have just mentioned, lived certain Syrian Christians. These people had come down to offer their congratulation to the pilgrims and to pay them their tribute of brotherly affection. Since they were well-acquainted with the country all about, the leaders called these people and consulted with them, as experienced men, about the safest and easiest way to Jerusalem. In all good faith the Syrians carefully considered the advantages and all the length of the various routes leading thither and finally recommended the shore road as the most direct.  

The second instance related by Duwaihi in which Maronite help was offered to the Crusaders was in 1111. In that year, he said, when the Persian hosts crossed the Euphrates and advanced into Syria as far as Shaizar, in the vicinity of Aleppo, Tancred, Prince of Antioch (1104-1112), calling the help of Baldwin, King of Jerusalem, Bertram, Count of Tripoli (1108-1113), and the Christians of the Mountains, advanced against them; whereupon the Persians

1. By "Syrian Christians" William of Tyre probably meant the Maronites. He must have been depending on earlier Crusader historians while relating this event (see Raimund de Aguilers, Historia Francorum qui caperunt Jerusalem, R.H.C.Occ. III (Paris, 1866), p.288). The earlier Crusader historians do not seem to have known the Maronites by their proper name, and to have referred to them as the Syrian Christians of Lebanon.

2. William of Tyre, op.cit., I, p.330. Raimund de Aguilers (loc.cit.), who was contemporary to the event, said that the Syrian Christians of Lebanon considered three routes to Jerusalem: the Damascus route, on which food was plentiful but water was scarce, the route by way of the mountain, on which food and water were plentiful but which was difficult for the beasts of burden, and the coastal route, on which the Franks might encounter opposition from the local Moslem population. The coastal route was finally chosen. See S. Runciman, op.cit., I, p.275.
Duwaiti, in relating this event, quoted William of Tyre. The latter, however, who related the event, did not mention that the "Christians of the Mountains" had anything to do with it.²

It is not clear from what sources Duwaiti obtained his information about the military aid offered by the "Christians of the Mountains" to the Franks in 1111. It is known from contemporary sources, however, that the Maronites continued to be of help to the Crusaders throughout their stay in Syria. William of Tyre spoke of them as "a stalwart race, valiant fighters, and of great service to the Christians in the difficult engagements which they so frequently had with the enemy".³ Jaques de Vitry said that they were numerous, used bows and arrows, and were swift and skillful in battle.⁴ Of the Arab historians, Ibn al-Athir spoke of the help rendered to Raymond de Saint Gilles by the Christians of the neighbourhood of Tripoli and those of the Mountains


2. William of Tyre, loc.cit.

3. Ibid., II, p.459.

in his unsuccessful siege of Tripoli in 1102.\(^1\) It is very likely, therefore, that the Maronites did help the Crusaders in 1111, probably as a contingent of the army of the Count of Tripoli, although it is possible that in this particular case Duwaihi was not depending on a reliable source but simply adding a Maronite tradition to the words of William of Tyre.

Duwaihi mentioned another instance in which the "people from the mountains surrounding Tripoli" (probably the Maronites) helped the Crusaders, this time against Nur ad-Din Zangi in 1163.\(^2\) In that year, he said, when the armies of the Franks were in Egypt,\(^3\) Nur ad-Din advanced on Tripoli and was defeated by the Franks of that city with the help of the "people from the mountains".\(^4\) Again it seems that other sources did not mention the help offered

\(^1\) Ibn al-Athir, Al-Kam̄il fi 't-tawāri̇kh (Cairo, 1303 A.H.), X, p.120.

\(^2\) Duwaihi, T. A., pp.65-66. Duwaihi gave the date wrongly as 1164. For sources giving the correct date see the following note.

\(^3\) In 1163 King Amalric had set out on an expedition against Egypt. See S. Runciman, op. cit., II, p.367.

\(^4\) The main sources for this event are William of Tyre (op. cit., II, p.306) and Ibn al-Athir (Al-Kam̄il . . . , XI, p.170). The former gave the date 1163 and the latter 558 A.H. (1162-1163 A.D.). See also S. Runciman, loc. cit., referring to William of Tyre and Ibn al-Athir. Neither of those two contemporary sources mentioned the help offered by the Lebanese mountaineers in the repulse of Nur ad-Din's attack. The people of Tripoli were not alone when they fought Nur ad-Din back. Bohemond III of Antioch and Constantine Coloman, the Imperial general, as well as several other Frankish lords had come to their rescue. See S. Runciman, loc. cit.
by those "people from the mountains" to the Franks in this particular event, although it is not unlikely that such help was offered.

Duwaihī also mentioned two instances in which the "men of the mountains" of the neighbourhood of Tripoli defeated Baibars. The first instance was in 1264, when Baibars took Qulaiṣāt and Arqā. Duwaihī added that the sultan wanted to besiege Tripoli; but the "men of the mountains" descended on him and defeated him. In this instance Duwaihī was definitely referring to the Maronites (or, more generally to the Christians of northern Lebanon), since he proceeded to say that these "men of the mountains" had built churches on the coast.

Ibn ʿAbd az-Zahir, the biographer of Baibars, said that the fort of Qulaiṣāt was taken on Ramadān 4, 664 A.H. (June 9, 1266 A.D.); and that after it was taken and destroyed a general raid on the whole county of Tripoli "from the frontier of Tripoli to near Arṣuf" followed. Ibn ʿAbd az-

---

1. Qulaiṣāt is a town between Tripoli and Arqā, near the coast. It was fortified in Crusader times.
3. Duwaihī said that the "men of the mountains" had built churches in Ḥaṣrāʾīl and on the coast, "and had escaped the tyranny of the Egyptians so much so that in the church of St. Sabas in the village of Ḫḍā, in the province of Batrūn, they painted pictures on its northern walls and paved it, as it is apparent from the inscription of the painter which is dated the year 1573 S.E. [7262 A.D.]". Ibid.
4. MS Ibn ʿAbd az-Zahir, Siḥrat Baḥbars, pp.156-158. The manuscript, an almost complete abridgement of Ibn ʿAbd az-Zahir biography of Baibars, was found by J. K. Maasī in the Istanbul Library. I have not been able to find its date. There are a few pages missing at the beginning; and
Zāhir did not mention anything about the intention of Baibars to besiege Tripoli which was frustrated by the defeat of his soldiers at the hands of the Lebanese mountaineers. An abortive attempt at the conquest of Tripoli at the time does not, however, appear to have been improbable.

The second instance was, according to Duwaiḥī, in 1266. In that year, he said, Baibars raided the country of Tripoli, cut its trees, destroyed its irrigation system, and devastated twenty-four of its villages; but when the men of the mountains "poured down" on him, he went to Ḥūṣn al-ʿAkrād (Crac des Chevaliers), and from there proceeded to Antioch, which he took by storm after a four days' siege. From this it is understood that Baibars called off the raid on the country of Tripoli in fear of the Lebanese mountaineers.

Ibn ʿAbd az-Zāhir mentioned this raid in his account of the events of the year 666 A.H. (1267-1268 A.D.). It would be interesting to take into consideration his account of it:

Mention of the advance of the Sultan to Tripoli and his raid on it. Bohemond [VI, 1251-1275], the ruler of Tripoli, had agressed greatly against the land of Islam and had occupied the country in his neighbourhood, that having been after the end of Ayyūbīd rule5 and the rest of the pages are unnumbered. I used my own numbering of the pages, according to the pages of the manuscript as they appear in the microfilm kindly lent to me by Prof. Lewis.

1. As far as I know, no other Arabic historian mentioned it either.
3. Baʿd zawāl al-ʿayyam an-ʿNāṣirīyya (after the end of Nāṣirīd days), the reference being to An-ʿNāṣir ʿAlā ad-Dīn Yūsuf, the last Ayyūbīd sultan of Aleppo (1236-1260) and of Damascus (1250-1260).
Mongol occupation of Syria. He had been among the greatest helpers of the Mongols, and the one who was the strongest in overcoming the Moslems. So the Sultan advanced from Damascus to Ba'labak, and from there he advanced to Tripoli by way of the mountains of Ad-Dinniyā for the prince had made the roads rough. He arrived in Tripoli in the middle of Sha'bān (c. April 30, 1266) and he encamped near the city. And the Sultan continued to ride against Tripoli, while the soldiers engaged skirmishes with its inhabitants. And a group of the soldiers advanced on the Franks of Al-Hadath, and they looted those mountains; and the soldiers gained booty and took several caves by the sword; and when the prisoners were brought before the Sultan he ordered that all of them should have their heads cut off. The trees were cut down, the churches pulled down, and the water canals and the Roman canal of Tripoli, which had no like in greatness, were destroyed; and the Sultan divided the booty among the soldiers and left Tripoli on Sha'bān 29/May 15, 1266.

In this case also Ibn 'Abd az-Zahir made no mention of the defeat of the soldiers of Baibars at the hands of the Lebanese mountaineers; but the fact that he did not mention it does not exclude its possibility. It is only natural that the eulogistic biographer of Baibars should ignore his minor failures. On the other hand, the fact that he mentioned the town of Al-Hadath, a town in the heart of Maronite Lebanon, and the destruction of churches, makes it clear that the Maronites did have encounters with the army of Baibars.

1. The modern name for this mountainous district to the northeast of Tripoli is Ad-Dnayya.
2. Maqrizi (Suluk..., I; p.566) said that Baibars arrived in Tripoli in the middle of Sha'bān, 666 A.H., and that he left the country after having finished his raids on Sha'bān 14, 666 A.H. (!).
3. The meaning of this passage in the text (wa jarrada jamā'a-tun min al-Faranj Al-Hadath) is vague. This is the best interpretation I could make of it.
4. MS Sirāt Baibars, pp.207-213. A similar account is found in Maqrizi, loc. cit., which appears to be a summary of the account given by Ibn 'Abd az-Zahir. See R. Grousset, Histoire des Croisades, III, p.640: "Dans son expedition contre
Duwaihi next related the raid of Qalāūn on Jibbet Bsharrāy in 1283. Duwaihi got his information about this event from two prayer books, one written in the year 1594 S.E. (1283 A.D.), the year of the event, and the other written in 1815 S.E. (1504 A.D.), well over two centuries later. Duwaihi summed up this event from the information he found in those two prayer books as follows:

In the month of May the Moslem soldiers advanced for the conquest of Jibbet Bsharrāy. The army went up east of Tripoli through the valley of Hīrūnā and layed heavy siege to Ihdin. After forty days the village was taken in the month of June. The soldiers looted, killed, and kidnapped; and they pulled down the fortress (qal'a) in the center of the village and the stronghold (hīṣān) that was on the top of the mountain. Then they moved to Bqūfā and took it in July. They got hold of all its notables and burnt them with the houses; and they looted and kidnapped, and razed the village to the ground. And after massacring the inhabitants of Ḥāṣrūn and Kafarsārūn in the church, they advanced on the twenty-second of August to Al-Hadath. Its people escaped to Al-ʿĀṣīl, an impregnable cave in which there was a water cistern; and the soldiers killed those they could.


1. See chapter on Ibn al-Qīlāḥī, above, pp.79-81.
2. This prayer book, said Duwaihi, was written in Qṭīn ar-Rawūdir, a village in the neighbourhood of Al-Hadath, near the monastery of Mār Yūḥannā, which is known as Dāīr Mār Abūn. The abbot of that monastery at the time was Bishop Ibrāhīm al-Hadathī. Duwaihi, T.A., p.145.
4. There were, apparently, several caves in Mount Lebanon which were specially prepared for refuge by the population in case of attack. Ibn ʿAbd az-Zāhir (see above, p.182) mentioned the taking of several caves by the sword. Here it is found that the cave was provided with a water cistern.
find and destroyed Al-Ḥadath; and they built a tower (burj) facing the cave and stationed in it soldiers to watch over [those who had taken refuge in it]. And as they could not take the fort (galī) of Ḥūqā, which faces Al-Ḥadath, Ibn Sabḥā, of Kafarsghāb, advised them to draw to it [the water of] the spring that is over Bsharrāy, and to set it on [the fort]; so they took it with the power of the water, because it is within the cliff. And they permitted Ibn Sabḥā to wear a white turban and to be served by slaves. And when the soldiers repented their evil deeds, they built the monastery of the Lady of Ḥūqā for the residence of the monks; and it is near the fort (burj) which was in the cliff.

This event has been previously discussed in this study in the chapter on Ibn al-Qilā'ī's history. The raid of 1283 may have been conducted as a preliminary expedition to the conquest of Tripoli in 1289. Its aim, probably, was to make it impossible for the Franks of that city to receive help from the Maronites of the neighbouring mountains against the Moslem army, as they had done in the past.

In dealing with the religious history of the Maronites in the Crusader period, Duwaihī's primary aim was to refute the claim of William of Tyre, who said that the Maronites renounced the monothelite heresy and joined the Church of Rome in approximately 1180. The wording of this claim, which has been quoted time and again by Church historian, runs as follows:

At this time, while the kingdom of Jerusalem was enjoying a temporary state of peace, . . . a race of Syrians in the province of Phoenicia, near the Lebanon range.

1. Duwaihī, T.A., p.146. All the place names mentioned in this passage are in Jibbet Bsharrāy.
who occupied the territory near the city of Jubail, underwent a wonderful change of heart. For almost five hundred years these people had followed the heretical doctrines of a certain Maro, from whom they took the name of Maronites. They separated from the Church and the faithful and had adopted a special liturgy of their own. Now, however, by divine leading, they were restored to their right minds and abandoned their heresy. They repaired to Aimery, the Patriarch of Antioch, the third of the Latin patriarchs to preside over that church, and denounced the error by which they had been so long enslaved, and returned to the unity of the Catholic Church. They adopted the orthodox faith and prepared to embrace and observe with all reverence the traditions of the Roman Church....

The heresy of Maro and his followers is and was that in our Lord Jesus Christ there exists, and did exist from the beginning, one will and one energy only.... To this article they added many other pernicious doctrines after they separated from the number of the faithful. Now, however, as has been stated, they repented of all their heresies and returned to the Catholic Church under the leadership of their patriarch and several of their bishops....

The question of the original monotheletism of the Maronites, which Duwaihī refuted, is not within the scope of this study. His refutation of William of Tyre's inference that the Maronites entered into communion with the Church of Rome for the first time in 1180, however, is of

1. In the English translation, as in the original, it is given as fifty years. In the Old French translation (R.H.C.Occ., I), p.1076, it is given as 500 years. The Old French version appears to be more plausible, since 500 years back from c.1180 gives the date c. 680, the approximate date of the foundation of the Maronite church in Lebanon.

2. Aymeri or Haimery, also called Amaury and Amalric, of Limoges, a Frenchman from the province of Limousin, became Latin patriarch of Antioch in 1142. He probably died in 1196 and was succeeded by Pierre of Angouleme. L. de Mas Latrie, "Les patriarches latins d'Antioche", in R.O.L., II, 1894 (pp.192-205), pp.193-194.

is of vital interest and throws light on the relations between
the Maronites and the Franks in the early Crusader period.

Duwaiḥī cited two cases before 1180 in which the
Maronite patriarch had communicated with the Pope. The first
was in 1100 when the Maronite patriarch, Yusuf al-Jirjisī,
who was residing in the village of Yānūḥ, sent his envoys
with those of Gaudefroy de Bouillon to the Pope, Paschall II,
and received from the Pope the crown and the staff.¹ The
second was in 1131, when Pope Innocent II sent letters to
the Maronite patriarch, Gregorius al-Ḥālātī, with Cardinal
Gulielmo,² whereupon the Maronite bishops met the Cardinal at
Tripoli, swore to obey the Pope and to hold to the Catholic
faith, and set their signatures to an oath of allegiance to
Rome.³ In both these cases Duwaiḥī referred to Ibn al-Qilā‘ī’s
letter to Patriarch Shamʿūn, in which Ibn al-Qilā‘ī had cited
the number of times the Maronites had renewed their allegiance
to Rome.⁴

¹ Duwaiḥī, T.T.M., p.355; T.A., p.11; and S.B., p.309. See
above, pp.57 et.seq.
² Probably Albericus, bishop of Ostia, not Cardinal Gulielmo.
see above, p.60.
  See above, pp.59 et.seq. The event probably took place
  in 1139 or 1140, not 1131.
⁴ Duwaiḥī quoted those passages that referred to these events
added to Ibn al-Qilā‘ī’s account that Cardinal Gulielmo
carried with him letters from the Pope, and that he met the
chiefs of the Maronite clergy at Tripoli. Both these detail
are not found in Ibn al-Qilā‘ī’s letter. Duwaiḥī went still
further to explain the situation by saying that when, in
1130, Honorius II (1124-1130) died, two Popes were elected
in his place, those being Innocent II and Anacletus. The
latter was triumphant (see K. Mann, The lives of the Popes...
IX, pp.4 et seq. The schism ended with the death of Anacletus
As it has been pointed out above, it is not at all improbable that there were two contacts between the Maronites and the Papacy before 1180, although there seems to be no evidence outside Ibn al-Qila'ī and Duwaihi to the effect. It has been shown above that the Crusaders and the Maronites had come into contact with each other as early as 1099, and that the Maronites had offered military help to the Franks on many occasions. It is unlikely that they could have continued to live and fight with the Franks for over eighty years without being influenced by their religious beliefs and practices. The "wonderful change of heart" that took place, according to William of Tyre, in 1180 must have started much earlier, possibly as early as 1099 when the Maronites had their first contact with the Crusaders.

Aside from those two cases, Duwaihi mentioned that in the year 1112 (or during the reign of Baldwin I, 1100-1117, as he mentioned elsewhere)\(^1\) the Maronites in Lebanon started using brass bells instead of planks of wood to call the faithful to church, and wealthy people started building churches, monasteries, and schools.\(^2\) Ibn al-Qila'ī, in his letter to

---

1. Ibid., p.27.
2. Ibid., p.22.
Patriarch Shamūn, wrote that it was in the days of Queen Constance, who had given the Maronites the grotto of the Holy Cross and altars in the various churches of Jerusalem, that the Maronites started using brass bells, in the manner of the Catholic Church.¹ This Queen Constance, of whom Ibn al-Qilāṭi spoke, was the wife of Robert, King of Naples and Sicily (1309-1343).² The use of church bells by the Maronites, however, was mentioned much earlier by Jaques de Vitry:

Hence, whereas all Eastern prelates save only the Latins do not use rings and pontifical mitres, nor carry pastoral staves in their hands, nor use bells, but are wont to call the people to church by using a wooden board with a staff or hammer, these aforesaid Maronites, in token of their obedience to Rome, follow the customs and rites of the Latins.³

Thus, Duwaihī was right in fixing an earlier date than Ibn al-Qilāṭi for the adoption of the use of bells by the Maronites. The date 1112 is not unlikely.

Duwaihī devoted a whole chapter in Radd at-tuham... to prove that Tūmā al-Kafartābī, whose case has already been discussed in the chapter on Ibn al-Qilāṭi's history, was not a Maronite; and to show that even if he were a Maronite his monothelitic views were not representative of the Maronite belief.⁴ He denied the Maronitism of Tūmā solely on the basis of the groundless testimony of Ibn al-Qilāṭi.⁵ After quoting the passages from Ibn al-Qilāṭi which refer to Tūmā

al-Kafartābī, he said:

Following this testimony, all difficulties which arise from the fact that Tūmā al-Kafartābī, a Maronite archbishop, was a monothelite disappear. I mean he was not a Maronite, but he was one who intended to sow the tares of heresy among the Maronites.2

Duwaiḥī further added that, granting that Tūmā was a Maronite, his belief in the One Will, in that case, was the result of his reading of the history of Eutychius (Ibn Baṭrīq) who had said that the Maronite church followed the teachings of the monothelite monk Mārūn.3 Besides, in the introduction to Tūmā's book, Al-maqālāt al-‘ashr, it was stated that a priest from the village of Farsha had asked him to rewrite his book, the original of which had been burnt by the Melchite patriarch, Anbā Yūḥanna.4 Referring to this statement Duwaiḥī concluded that when Tūmā came to Lebanon to "sow the tares of heresy", his teachings were rejected by the Maronites there, and that he only succeeded in spreading his heresy in the village of Farsha. He argued that "if Al-maqālāt al-‘ashr had been accepted by Patriarch Yusuf al-Jirjis, his archbishops, and the officials of his see Tūmā would not have written it to the church of Farsha, which is a small village, and refrained from writing it to the Patriarchal church or to the other holy churches and monasteries.5

Like Ibn al-Qilāq, Duwaiḥī had no factual grounds

1. See above, p. 56.
4. See above, p. 55.
on which to prove that Tūmā al-Kafartābī was not a Maronite. Duwaiḥī, however, seems to have realized that; for although he accepted Ibn al-Qilāʿī's statement that Tūmā was not a Maronite, he dwelt at length on the possibility of his having been a "misled" Maronite. Considering the evidence already examined about the relations of the Maronite church to Rome before 1180, this second possibility suggested by Duwaiḥī may have some basis of truth. Tūmā al-Kafartābī may have represented a certain section among the Maronites who still held on to their monothelite beliefs while the Maronite church in general tended towards doctrinal and ritual conformity with Rome. This possibility is strengthened by a quotation given by Duwaiḥī from a Jacobite church book:

And the sects refused to believe; so you said with them, O Maronites, two Natures and two Essences and two Wills. And there are some among them who said one Will.

To which Duwaiḥī added that those who believed in the One Will were people like Tūmā al-Kafartābī and Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib and others who were dwellings among the Jacobites; while those who believed in the Two Wills were the Maronites of Lebanon.

1. Duwaiḥī, T.T.M., p.343. Duwaiḥī also quoted the same passage in ibid., p.87, with one variation, placing the "one Will" before the "two Wills". I have not found the original.

2. Duwaiḥī said that Abu'l-Faraj 'Abdallāh Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib was a Maronite and a monothelite and that he died in Iraq in 1140 (T.A., pp.46-47). Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib was a philosopher, physician, monk, and priest who lived in Baghdad in the first half of the 12th century and died in 1143. He was a Nestorian, not a Maronite, and was not inclined to monothelitism. See G. Graf, op.cit., II, pp.160-177.
Duwaihi, thus, had a case in refuting the claim of William of Tyre that the Maronites were first converted by Aimery in approximately 1120; but his case does not go as far as he wanted it to. Although the conversion of the Maronites might have started much earlier than William of Tyre would have had it, monothelitism did not die overnight among the Maronites but persisted among them for a very long time.

In trying to disprove William of Tyre’s version of the conversion of the Maronites to Catholicism, Duwaihi, moreover, attempted an untenable explanation of the conversion of 1120. Turning away from the evidence of William of Tyre, who was a contemporary to the event, he went back again to the letter of Ibn al-Qila‘i which has been referred to above. In this letter Ibn al-Qila‘i wrote that the Maronites of Jerusalem took an oath of allegiance to Rome. Duwaihi explained that this event mentioned by Ibn al-Qila‘i took place at the time when Aimery was in Jerusalem (c. 1153-1160).2 After the Lateran Council of 1179, he said, which was held by Pope Alexander II (actually Alexander III, 1159-1181) after the schism which followed the death of Pope Hadrian was brought to an end in 1277, letters from the Pope were brought back by the bishops of the East who had attended the Council to King Baldwin (Baldwin IV, the Leper, 1175-1185) and to Aimery.

Patriarch of Antioch. On receiving these letters Aimery, the King of Jerusalem and other officials and clergymen of the realm swore allegiance to Alexander II. Like the other Christians, Duwaihi continued, the Maronites who were in Jerusalem swore allegiance to Pope Alexander alone. He went further on to say that it was only the Maronites of Jerusalem who had taken the oath and that neither the Maronite patriarch nor his bishops, who had always been good Catholics, had anything to do with the matter. The date of this oath, as given by Duwaihi, varies between 1179, 1180 and 1182.1

This version of the story is in complete disagreement with that of William of Tyre, who was living at the time and who took part in the Lateran Council of 1179.2 William said distinctly that the Maronites, led by their patriarch and several of their bishops repaired to Aimery, Patriarch of Antioch, and accepted union with Rome at his hands. Aimery had left Jerusalem in approximately 1160.3 The Maronites of Jerusalem might have taken part in the paying of allegiance to the triumphant Pope Alexander. It is clear, however, that the Maronites in 1180 or 1181 did enter into a formal union with the Church of Rome, a union which was not there before; although some preliminary understanding might have been reached between the Catholic Church and the Maronites before that time.

Nearly thirty-five years after the conversion of the Maronites at the hands of Aimery, their patriarch, Armia al-Amshiti, went to Rome and attended the Lateran Council held by Innocent III in 1215. Duwaihi said that Innocent III, on his accession in 1198, had sent his legate with letters to the Maronite Patriarch and that Armia, in company with two bishops and several minor clergymen, had met the legate in Tripoli and had offered obedience there to the Pope and to his successors in the See of Rome. Later, he said, the patriarch left for Rome in person and attended the Lateran Council.1

Duwaihi, furthermore, quoted in full the bull addressed by Innocent III to Armia.2 This bull, as it has been noted above, stated that the Maronites had been once "like wandering sheep, not properly understanding that the Catholic Church was the spouse of Christ..." and proceeded to explain points of faith and ritual to the Maronites, calling upon them to accept the teachings of the Catholic Church. Having noticed that this letter insinuated that the Maronites had previously been heretics, Duwaihi explained the fact away by saying that

1. Duwaihi, T.T.M., pp. 359-360. In S.B., p.311 and T.A., p.102, he gave the date of Armia's accession to the Patriarchate mistakenly as 1209. Cardinal Peter of Capua, the papal legate must have met him at Tripoli in c.1203 (see above, p.76). Duwaihi did not notice this mistake. T. 'Anaissi (Silsila, pp.19-21) gave the date of Armia's accession as 1199. The visit of Armia to Rome has been discussed fully in the previous chapter, pp.70 et seq.

2. Duwaihi, T.T.M., pp. 361-5. For this letter see chapter on Ibn al-Qila'i, above, pp.73 et seq. Duwaihi gave his own translation of this bull from Latin, which is far more correct than Ibn al-Qila'i's.
it was the Melchites who had misinformed Innocent III about the true faith of the Maronites.¹

The formal conversion of the Maronites by Aimery and the presence of their patriarch at the Lateran Council of 1215 were the two main events Duwaiḥī discussed concerning the relations between the Maronites and Rome while Lebanon was under the rule of the Franks. That was not all he had to say, however, about the history of the Maronite church in that period. He gave the chronology of the patriarchs of that church, as far as he could make it out from the scanty material that was available to him. He also attempted to determine the changes of residence of the patriarchs, which appear to have been several. The building of new churches and the restoration of old monasteries are also occasionally mentioned.²

The political history of the Maronites after the Mamlūks had completed the conquest of the Phoenician coast in 1391 differed greatly from their history in the Crusader period. Under Frankish rule the Maronites were the most privileged among the native communities of Syria.³ They were the stalwart race of valiant fighters of whom William of Tyre and the other Frankish chroniclers spoke. Even their fellow Eastern Christians praised

their prowess and the great help they offered to the Franks.\(^1\)

Under the Mamlūks their privileged position was lost. The Mamlūks, furthermore, fearing that the Maronites would assist the Franks in effecting a second landing on the Phoenician coast,\(^2\) sought to break their defences and weaken their power. Already before the conquest of Tripoli, in 1283, Qalaūn had sent an expedition against Jibbet Bsharrāy, the heart of Maronite Lebanon, which resulted in the utter defeat of the Maronites, the capture of their patriarch, and the destruction of several of their forts.\(^3\)

Moslem historians who related the expeditions of 1292 and 1305 against Kīsrūān said that these expeditions were

1. The Armenian chronicler Hayton (obit. c. 1308-1315), nephew of Hethoum I, King of Armenia (obit. 1268), praised the valour of the Maronites as follows: "Les Marromins... habitent entour le mont Liban, et vers les parties de Jerusalem, e sont bones gens d'armes.... [ils sont] poi de gent; e entre iaus y a des vaillans homes d'armes et de bons seignors." Further on, he added: "E eu mont Liban sont Crestiens habitans, bons sergans, entor Xlm, qui grant aide donroient as pelerins, e maintes foiz se sont relevez au soudan (sultan), e ont fait damage a sa gent." Hayton, *La flor des estoires de la terre d'Orient* (Old French version R.H.C.Arm., II (Paris, 1906), pp.134-5 and 245.

2. Hayton (Ibid., pp.247-250), who drew a plan at the end of his history for the reconquest of the Holy Land by the Franks, described the way in which the Franks should advance to Jerusalem. The last stage of the conquest, he said should go as follows: "E se les enemis eschivassent la bataille, les Crestiens porroient venir a Tripoli droitement en IIII jours de Damas, et porroient refaire la cite de Triple, e les Crestiens qui sunt eu mont Liban donroient grant aides as pelerins; dont les Crestiens qui tenent la cite de Triple porroient apres conquerre le royaume de Jerusalem, o l'aide de Deu." Ibid., p.250. Underlining mine. Louis de Rochechouart, Bishop of Saintes, who went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1461, came in contact with the Maronites who were then still asking if the Christians were going to re-conquer the Holy Land. "Journal de voyage de Louis de Rochechouart...", *R.J.L.*, I, 1893 (pp.168-274); p.257.

conducted against the Rāfiqa, the Nusairīs, and the Druze of the district. Modern historians who have considered these expeditions followed the view of the Moslem chroniclers, stating further that the defeat of the heterodox Moslem communities of Kisruān was favourable to the Maronites who were thus enabled to move further south into the devastated districts of Kisruān which had become depopulated. ¹ Although this may have been true in the long run, Maronite historians state clearly that the Maronites shared in both the victory of 1292 and the utter defeat of 1305. ² Ibn al-Qilāʾī seems to have believed that it was the Maronites alone who defeated the Mamlūk army in 1292; and that the expedition of 1305 was directed wholly against them. ³

Duwaiḥī, drawing on both Ibn al-Qilāʾī and the Moslem and Druze historians (Ibn al-Ḥarīrī and Ibn Sibāṭ), brought together the purely Maronite and the non-Maronite accounts of the expeditions. While relating the expedition of 1292, ⁴ he paraphrased Ibn al-Qilāʾī's account of the battle of Jubbāl in which the Maronite muqaddams proved their valour. ⁵

---
² Like the Druzes (see above, p.160) the Christians of Lebanon, according to Hayton, killed and took captive the Mamlūk soldiers escaping through their country before the advance of Ghāzān Khān in 1300. See Hayton, op.cit., p.195. This was also mentioned by the Gestes des Chiprois (see R. Grousset, op.cit., III, p.745, fn.3).
³ See above, pp.91 et seq. and 98 et seq.
⁵ See above, pp.91 et seq.
When he related the expedition of 1305, he mentioned the destruction of churches in Kisruān.¹

The history of Tādrus of Ḥamā, the only available Maronite source which was possibly contemporary to these events shows clearly that there was a thriving Christian population in Kisruān before the defeat of its heterodox Moslem population in 1305.² Tādrus added that in the great expedition against Kisruān "not a monastery, church, or fort...was saved from destruction, excepting the church of Mar Shallīṭā.... And after several years Christians from every region started coming into the country".³

Duwaiḥī added that in 1309, a few years after the destruction of Kisruān, troops encamped near Bsharṭayy and caused great damage to the whole district.⁴ These troops passed by Bsharṭayy, probably on their way from Damascus to Tripoli.⁵

The persecution of the Maronite clergy by the Mamlūks in 1366 is the event discussed next by Duwaiḥī.⁶ It was, he said, the result of several Cypriot and Genoese naval raids of Beirut and Sidon and of the two great fires of Damascus (1339 and 1353 A.D./740 and 754 A.H.) for which the

---

¹ Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.163.
² Naṣārā is the word used by Tādrus. He did not mention the Maronites in particular, but they were implied.
³ Tādrus of Ḥamā, op.cit., pp.85-86.
⁴ Ibid., p.88.
⁵ Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.166.
⁶ Hādīr ash-Shihābī, Al-ghurar al-hisān..., p.484. The date is given by him as 710 A.H. (1310 A.D.). I have not come across other mentions of the event.
⁷ Duwaiḥī, T.T.M., pp.386-387.
Christians were blamed.\textsuperscript{1} The direct cause of the persecution, he continued, was a naval raid by the Franks of Cyprus on Alexandria, to which the Mamlūk government retorted by persecuting the Christians living within the Mamlūk Empire.\textsuperscript{2}

Here Duwaiḥī quoted Yaḵūb, the archbishop of Iḥdīn in the year of the persecution, who related the event on a copy of the Gospels which he made while fleeing from the persecution:\textsuperscript{3}

> In this date \(\overline{1677}\ S.E./1366\ A.D.\)\textsuperscript{4} the King of Cyprus went out to Alexandria and looted it, killing its men and taking its young prisoner. So the sultan of the Moslems got angry with the Christians and took their chief clergymen and imprisoned them in Damascus. Then I, the humble Yaḵūb of Iḥdīn by the name of Archbishop, ran away and left them, and the Lord Christ helped me, and I copied \(\overline{\text{these Gospels}}\) while I was running away.

During these persecutions, said Duwaiḥī, the Maronite patriarch, Jībdāʾīl of Ḥajūlā, was arrested and burnt alive outside Tripoli\textsuperscript{5} on April 1, 1367. Duwaiḥī referred here to an elegy written by the patriarch's nephew, who gave April 1 as the date of his uncle's execution.\textsuperscript{6}

Ibn Ḥajar, in his biographical sketch of Yalbughā al-Khāṣṣākī,\textsuperscript{7} said that after the raid of the Franks of Cyprus

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] Ibn Sibāṭ, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 267-268, 301, and 305. I could find no mention of the fire of 754 A.H. in Ibn Sibāṭ. The date of the first fire is given as 739 A.H.
\item[2.] See above, p. 101. For the Cypriot raid on Alexandria, see above, p. 166, fn. 3.
\item[3.] Duwaiḥī, \textit{T.T.M.}, p. 386. The original is in Syriac, given by Duwaiḥī with an Arabic translation.
\item[4.] Duwaiḥī gave the equivalent of the date in the Seleucid Era variously as 1365 and 1367 of the Christian era. (\textit{T.A.}, p. 185, \textit{T.T.M.}, p. 387, and \textit{S.B.}, p. 347. Actually the raid on Alexandria took place in October, 1365. See above, p. 166, fn. 3.
\item[6.] Duwaiḥī, \textit{T.T.M.}, p. 387.
\item[7.] See above, p. 166, fn. 2.
\end{itemize}
on Alexandria Yalbughā began preparations for an attack on the lands of the Franks, and that he "confiscated [for the purpose] all [the wealth] of the Christians and the monks, and collected what wealth was found in all the monasteries". It seems definite, if the testimony of the archbishop of Thdīn is taken into consideration, that the persecution of the Christians that followed the raid on Alexandria was not confined to Egypt, and that it greatly affected the Maronites of north Lebanon.

In contrast to the persecutions of 1366, Duwaiḥī mentioned the endowment of the monastery of Qannūbīn by the Mamlūk Sultan Barqūq in 1388. In that year (actually 1390), he said, when Barqūq left prison and travelled in Syria in the guise of a dervish, he came to Bsharrāy and appointed the shidyāq Yaʿqūb bin Ayyūb mujaddam of the district. Barqūq then went down to the monastery of Qannūbīn where he was hospitably received by Buṭrus, the abbot of the monastery. In repayment for his hospitality, the Sultan gave Buṭrus a firman excusing the monastery from taxation and giving it precedence over all the monasteries of the district.

1. Ibn Ḥajar, Ad-durar al-kāmina..., IV, p.438.
3. Barqūq left prison in Al-Karak in 1390. See above, p.168, fn continued from previous page.
4. I have not found in any history other than that of Duwaiḥī that Barqūq left Al-Karak disguised as a dervish. Barqūq did not escape from Al-Karak. He made himself master of the fortress before leaving it to fight his way back to the throne. See Ibn Ayās, op.cit., I, pp.280 et seq. It is not clear where Duwaiḥī got his information from.
Ibn al-Qilāḥ, as it has been shown above, said in the Madīha... that a sultan who was passing through the valley of Qādisīhā was invited to dinner by a monk; and that the sultan showed his gratitude for the monk's hospitality, after he was restored to the throne, by issuing a firman giving benefits to all the monks (by which he meant all the monks of the Qādisīhā valley), and by sending money to build Qannūbīn.¹

Duwaiḥī, who referred to Ibn Sibāt's history for the repercussions that took place in non-Maronite Lebanon during and after the period of Barqūq's dethronement and restoration, and who used Ibn al-Qilāḥ's history extensively in dealing with the history of Maronite Lebanon, must have been using one or more other sources when he related the story of Barqūq's endowment of Qannūbīn.² Ibn al-Qilāḥ did not mention any names when he related the story of the deposed sultan who endowed Qannūbīn. He did not give any dates either; but simply placed the event before his account of the fall of Tripoli. He did not mention that the sultan was garbed as a dervish. Duwaiḥī not only gave the name of the sultan, but also said that the event took place in 1362 (in mistake for 1390). He added further that the sultan appointed Yaḥbū ibn Ayyūb muqaddam of Bsharrāy, issuing for him a title to the effect inscribed on a sheet of brass (gāfiḥa min nuḥās). A

¹ Ibn al-Qilāḥ, Madīha..., p.43. See above, pp.84-86.
² I have not found any possible sources which Duwaiḥī might have used in his narrative of the event and from which he obtained information about the endowment of Qannūbīn and the appointment of Yaḥbū ibn Ayyūb as muqaddam.
similar brass sheet, he added, was issued for the monastery of Qannūbin, excusing the monastery from taxation. Besides, he said that the sultan was received by the priest Butrus, abbot of Qannūbin.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine the truth of this story. The Mamlūk chroniclers did not mention at all that Barquq went to Bsharry, or to north Lebanon after leaving Al-Karak. He may, however, have done so. Although it is impossible, apparently, to establish Duwaihi's story as fact with the available information, it is yet unlikely that it has no basis of fact.¹

It must be added here that Duwaihi said further on that Ya‘qub bin Ayyūb died in 1444, after he had been mugaddam of Bsharry for approximately 62 years.² This would make 1362, and not 1390, the year of his appointment. If this was the case then he could not have been made mugaddam by Barquq in 1390, except if the latter had merely confirmed him officially in his position.

Ya‘qub, on his death in 1444, was succeeded in the mugaddamiyya by his three sons, Sīfa, who was surnamed Zain

---

¹ Of the Mamlūk sultans who were deposed and restored Barquq was the most likely to have gone to Bsharry, since seven months elapsed between the time he left Al-Karak (Dhu‘l-Qa‘da, 791) and the date of his restoration (Jumada II, 792). See Ibn Hajar, MS Inbā’ al-ghumr..., ff. 67v and 72v. The others were moved back from prison to the throne almost immediately, or remained throughout in Egypt during the period of their deposition.

² Duwaihi, T.A., p.207.
(Zain ad-Dīn ?),

Qamar, who was surnamed Badr (Badr ad-Dīn ?), and Mazhar. These were followed by Sīfa’s son, (Abd al-Mun‘im, who died in 1469 and was followed by his nephew Rizq-Allāh bin Jamal ad-Dīn bin Sīfa. After giving the names of these muqaddams, Duwaiḥī added that in their days there was so much comfort and prosperity in Lebanon, that many people from the neighbouring countries, among whom there were many Jacobites, came over to live in Bsharry and the other towns of northern Lebanon. As an illustration of the prosperity of Lebanon at the time, Duwaiḥī cited that in the churches of Bsharray there were as many altars as there were days in the year, that there were 1200 cows and bulls in Al-Ḫadath and 70 mules in Ḫadin, and that the number of copyists at the time with whose works he was familiar was over 110.

In 1472, Duwaiḥī continued, Rizq-Allāh died and his

1. Duwaiḥī said simply that Sīfa was surnamed Zain and that his brother Qamar was surnamed Badr. Probably he meant that they were surnamed Zain ad-Dīn and Badr ad-Dīn. Such honorary names, although usually associated with Moslems, were not uncommon among the muqaddams of Bsharray. Muqaddam Rizq-Allāh’s father was called Jamal ad-Dīn (see text above), and Yūsuf, son and successor of (Abd al-Mun‘im Ayyūb, as it has been seen before, was surnamed Jamāl ad-Dīn.

2. Duwaiḥī, loc.cit.

3. Ibid., p.213. See genealogical table of the muqaddams of Bsharray in Appendix II, below, p.332.

4. Thus, Duwaiḥī said, “the sons of Jumā left (Ain Haliā and moved their residence to Bsharray; the sons of Shāhīn emigrated from (a town in Syria, in the region of Damascus, and took residence in the village of Ḥagrūn; the curate (khūri)Ḥannā and the priest (qiss) Ḩliyyā and their brother the shidyāq Ḫirjis, the sons of Al-Ḥajj Ḥasan, moved from Nablus to Ḥadshūt (in Jibbet Bsharray); and the priest Ya’qūb and his companions from the land of Ethiopia came as monks to reside in the monastery of Mar Ya’qūb Ḫadin, and it became known as the monastery of the Ethiopians (Dair al-Ḫbāsh) after them” Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.214.

5. Ibid.
great nephew, 'Abd al-Mun'im Ayyūb, became the-mugaddam of Bsharrāy. 1 With his accession the influence of the Monophysites became very strong among the Maronites of Bsharrāy. 'Abd al-Mun'im had been taught reading by a Jacobite priest. Realizing that his orthodoxy was not strong, the Jacobites managed to win his favours with presents. He built them a church near his house in Bsharrāy after the name of Barsaumā, one of their saints. Several Maronites were won over to Monophysitism by those Jacobites, to the great alarm of the Maronite patriarch who tried in vain to bring them back to orthodoxy. 'Abd al-Mun'im, on the other hand, threatened anybody who would annoy the Jacobites and their proselytes with exile and the confiscation of property. 2 This led in 1487 to a rising which ended with the expulsion of the Jacobites from Jibbet Bsharrāy in 1488. 3 Duwaiḥī gave the details of this rising in which the greatest role was played by the Maronites of Ihdīn, his native village. In 1493, Duwaiḥī continued, Jibrā'il Ibn al-Qilāği returned from Rome and tried to bring 'Abd al-Mun'im and his followers back to the paths of orthodoxy "by spoken and written word". 4

With the death of 'Abd al-Mun'im in 1495 the troubles came to an end. His son and successor, Jamāl ad-Dīn

1. Ibid., p. 215.
2. Ibid., pp. 217-218.
3. Ibid., pp. 220-221. Ibn al-Qilāği served Duwaiḥī as one of his sources. See the discussion of these events in the previous chapter.
Yūsuf, was orthodox in his faith.  

The spread of the Monophysite heresy in Jibbet Bsharrāy has already been discussed. Duwaihī referred mainly to Ibn al-Qilāṭī's Madiha āla Jabal Libnān and Tabkit kull man zāgh ḍan al-imān for its history. Duwaihī, however, did not give his sources for the rising among the Maronites of Jibbet Bsharrāy that led to the expulsion of the Jacobites from that district, and event which is not related by Ibn al-Qilāṭī. Duwaihī gave the following account of this event:

In 1468 the Jacobites were expelled from Jibbet Bsharrāy; for when the bishop Yaʿqūb and the notables of Ḥdīn knew and were assured that the priest Yaʿqūb and the Ethiopians who were living in the monastery of Mār Yaʿqūb were in the monastery, they warned them several times to correct their religious beliefs. When they paid no heed to those warnings, they ordained the priest Ibrahim bīn Hāblas a bishop and sent him to the monastery. (The Ethiopians), not bearing to have him direct their affairs; left for the valley of Ḥadshīt and took residence in the monastery of Mār Jirjis, which became known as the monastery of the Ethiopians (Dair al-Ḥbāš), after them, under the protection of the shidyaq Jirjis ibn al-Ḥajj Ḥasan. Shidyaq Jirjis, the šaiḥkh of Ḥadshīt, and Muqaddam ʿAbd al-Munʿim, who followed his counsels, took up the cause of the Ethiopian monks; and as they were not strong enough to attack the people of Ḥdīn, they sought the assistance of the sons of Zaʿzū, the muqaddams of Bshinnātā. The latter called together the people of Ad-Dnayya and marched towards Ḥdīn (qasādū Ḥdīn) on Sunday morning.  

1. Ibid., p. 221.  
2. Yaʿqūb was the bishop of Ḥdīn (1463-1513).  
3. The priest Yaʿqūb and the Ethiopians had come to live in the monastery of Mār Yaʿqūb in Ḥdīn previously. See above, p. 202, fn. 4.  
5. Bshinnātā was a town in Ad-Dnayya, apparently the seat of the muqaddams of the district.  
7. Duwaihī only said it was on Sunday morning, and did not give the date.
Hearing of their approach, the people of Ḥādin lay in ambush against them at Ḥanīnā; and when the people of Aqī-Ḍnayya came down from the mountain they fell on them and killed them in the field (marja) of Tūlā. When the Jacobites heard the news, they were filled with fear and dispersed, some of them going to Ḥirḏīn, some to Kafar-Ḥurā, and some escaping by sea to Cyprus. As for the priest Yaqūb and his companions, they went to the monastery of Mār Mūsā in the wilderness.

The details which Duwaiḥī gave in his account of this event show that he had one or more adequate sources.

In 1510, Duwaiḥī went on to say, Many Maronites emigrated to distant countries. The reason for this emigration he said, was the excess of tyranny, by which he probably meant the fiscal tyranny of the last Burjī Mamlūk sultans. He proceeded to say that from Jubail alone 120 people left for Cyprus in a ship. The names of some of the emigrants are given. Many of those emigrants, however, returned to their country, having found that Christian rule in Cyprus (under the Venetians, 1489-1570) was even worse than Moslem rule at home. Here Duwaiḥī took his information, as he himself said, from the history of Iliās of Māḏād.

---

1. This is the only place in Tārīkh al-azmina where Ḥanīnā is mentioned. I have not been able to identify the place, but it is probably near Ḥādin, in Jībbet Bsharrijāy.
2. Tūlā is a village in Jībbet Bsharrāy (not to be confused with another Tūlā in Al-Batrūn).
3. Kafar-Ḥurā is a village in Az-Zāwiya, on the lower course of Nahr Abī ʿAlī.
4. Duwaiḥī, T.A., pp.218-219. I have not been able to identify the monastery of Mār Mūsā in the wilderness (Mār Mūsā fī ʿl-barrīyya).
5. For the Venetian administration in Cyprus, see Hill, History of Cyprus, III, pp.765 et seq. No mention of the Maronites.
6. The history of Iliās of Māḏād, it has already been said, is not found at present. In his history of Māḏād, the anonymous author of the Mukhattaṣar ... (MS Bibliothèque Orientale 57, fol. 25), who seems to have depended largely on Iliās of Māḏād, said, referring to his history, that in 1500 there was a great deal of tyranny and scarcity in Lebanon, and
The religious history of the Maronites under Mamlūk rule was dealt with at great length by Duwaiḥī. His main purpose in writing it was to prove that the Maronites, throughout this period, were faithful to Rome. The bulk of the material about this subject is found in Radd at-Šuqam. *

Pilgrims and papal legates who visited Lebanon during this period gave a viewpoint on the orthodoxy of the Maronites at the time which is quite different from that given by Duwaiḥī. Although it is unlikely that the Maronites ever broke from Rome after their conversion by Aimery in 1160, their attachment to the Holy See after the departure of the Crusaders from Syria does not appear to have been firm. An incident like that which took place in the days of Muqaddam ‘Abd al-Mun‘īm goes to show that even though the Maronite church may have been as strictly orthodox as Duwaiḥī insisted it was, the Maronites in general were not particularly attached to this orthodoxy and were readily drawn into the heresy of their Monophysite neighbours.

Brother Felix Fabri, who made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1484, gave the following description of the Maronites:

particularly in the province of Jubail; and many families left that province for Cyprus, Ḍakkkār (north-east of Tripoli) and Bilād Bishāra (south Lebanon), and many people died. He added that the people of Ḥasdīt (?), the villages of Jubail, and the villages of Ḫalʿatul-Batrūn went to Cyprus. The event, as mentioned by Duwaiḥī under the year 1510, appears in T. A., pp. 227-228. Duwaiḥī also mentioned that Pope Leo X wrote to Leonardo, Duke of Venice, requesting him to treat better the Maronites who were in Cyprus, after hearing the complaints of Patriarch Shamīn. For the letter of Leo X to the Duke of Venice, see T. Anaissi, Bullarium Maronitarum, p. 31. The letter is dated September 13, 1515.
There dwell in Jerusalem Christians called Maronites, who are heretics, and believe that Christ has only one will and one energy. They ring bells as we do whereas all other Eastern Christians call people to church by beating on a board. In their common talk they use the Saracen tongue, but in their services the Chaldean. Once they came back to the one Church, but have long since fallen away therefrom.

Many who write concerning these Eastern Christians say that they are free from heresies, and praise their simplicity of life. This was indeed true in old times—two hundred years ago—but since then all of them, save only the Latins, have become tainted with the worst of errors, and become daily more so; for they have no doctors or preachers of the Catholic faith.

Francesco Suriano agreed with Felix Fabri in his description of the Maronites. "Since then [1302], as time went on," he wrote, "many errors and sundry heresies grew among them." Father Pietro Verniero, a Franciscan monk who died in 1660, spoke of the Maronites as follows:

Although..., due to the influence of the Jacobites, they had relapsed from time to time into some errors, they all came back promptly to render obedience to the Apostolic See and, in every case, they were soon relieved from these errors by the help of the learned and holy fathers... as in the year 1215, with the help of Aimery, then Patriarch of Antioch..., and in the year 1450, with the help of Fra Gryphon and Fra Gabriele ibn al-Qila'i of the Lesser Brothers and finally in the year 1579 and 1580 by the help of the fathers Giovan Battista Eliano and Giovanni Bruno, the Jesuits, legates of Pope Gregory XIII.... For that reason they never deserved to be called schismatics and heretics.

2. See above, p.19, fn.1.
3. F. Suriano, Il trattato..., p.69.
It is quite understandable that the Maronites, who had been attached to Catholicism by the Franks, should have reverted to heretical doctrines after the departure of the Franks. Their will to be brought back to the Catholic traditions by Latin missionaries, however, and the fact that some Maronites, like Ibn al-Qilāʿī, went to Rome and returned as missionaries to their own people, show that the Maronites were not conscious that their continual relapses into heresy were leading to a break with Rome. It is possibly because they lacked a firm link with Rome after the Crusades were over that the Maronites, every now and then, fell under the influence of the Jacobites.

In writing the history of the Maronite church after the departure of the Franks, Duwaiḥī attempted to disprove the claims made by certain church historians and Western travellers that the Maronites had to be reconverted to Catholicism on several occasions because they had broken with Rome.

He began by refuting the claims of Wilamo (Guillaume Postel)\(^1\) and Arnaldus Albertinus\(^2\) (the former referring to the latter) that the Maronites, after having been converted to Catholicism and after their patriarch had attended the

---

1. See above, p.139, fn.5. His claim is quoted verbatim by Duwaiḥī.
2. See above, p.140, fn.4. His claim is also quoted verbatim by Duwaiḥī.
Lateran Council of 1215, returned to their original heresy and broke off from the Church and were therefore excommunicated by the Council of Constance.¹

Duwaihī's refutation of this claim is adequate. The Council of Constance, he said, which was held in 1414, was not concerned with the affairs of the Eastern churches. It was held, rather, to consider the problems concerning the Papacy and the Empire, and to examine the heretical views of John Wycliff and John Hus.² It had nothing to do with the Maronites. Duwaihī suggested that the authors of this claim may have written the Council of Constance by mistake instead of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, which was held in Constantinople in 680 at which, according to Saīd bin Batrīq, the Maronites were anathematized for their Monothelitism.³

Next Duwaihī refuted the claim that the Maronites were reconverted to Catholicism at the Council of Florence in 1439⁴ along with the Jacobites, Syrians, and Chaldaeans.⁵ According to Duwaihī, this could not have been true because the Maronites were already in union with Rome at the time.

Duwaihī's version of the role played by the Maronites at the

---

¹ The claims of "Wilamo" and Albertinus are quoted by Duwaihī in T.T.M., p.380. He refutes them in ibid., pp.381 et seq.
⁴ See above, p.106, fn.1.
⁵ Duwaihī, T.T.M., pp.388 et seq.
Council of Florence runs as follows:

The Patriarch Yūḥannā al-Jāǰi 1404-1445 had succeeded to the Antiochian see before the meeting of the fathers at Florence had come about; but he could not send for confirmation from Rome because of the dangers of sea travel and no one who knew the language of the Franks could be found to undertake the journey. Then Fra Juan, the superior of the Franciscan monks in Beirut, came to him and informed him that his term of office was over and that he wanted to return to the land of the Christians. So the Patriarch sent him as a legate to the head of the Apostolic See and ordered him to ask for his confirmation and to bring him back the pallium of office from Pope Eugenius IV. Fra Juan, therefore, went over to Florence to attend the Council and to inform the Pope about the matter. The Patriarch and the leaders and important men of the Maronite community had sent with letters asking for confirmation, as was the custom, and stating clearly that they would obey and accept all that the fathers at the Council would legislate. Their letters continued to be preserved in Rome until the days of Bishop Jibrā’īl ibn al-Qilāǰī, as he himself bears witness in the letter he wrote to the Patriarch Shamʿūn al-Ḥadāthī saying: "For two hundred and eighty-two years, even up to our own days, your oaths of allegiance and your signatures have been found at the hands of Fra Ṣmyphon and Fra Alexander and Fra Simon in Rome, and before them at the hands of Fra Juan, the superior of the Franciscans of Beirut and the legate of your patriarch, Yūḥannā al-Jāǰi, to the Council of Florence." And when Eugenius was assured of the good faith of the Maronites he confirmed Yūḥannā al-Jāǰi as head of the see of Antioch and sent to him with Fra Juan, his legate, a crown and a staff, as Ibn al-Qilāǰī says in Madīḥat Kisruːn:

"Yūḥannā al-Jāǰi was Patriarch.
He received a crown from the Pope and was blessed by him.
He sent a legate to the Council and did not go himself;
And the Pope confirmed him as the shepherd of the people of Märūn.²

Here again, Duwaihī's refutation is feasible. He relied on Ibn al-Qilā‘ī and on the letters sent by Eugene IV to Yūḥannā al-Jājī in 1439 and 1441, which he gave in his own Arabic translation.\(^1\) It is very possible that a request for confirmation by the Maronite patriarch through his legate at the Council of Florence, which had met to reconcile the Eastern Christians to Rome, was interpreted by the contemporary Church historians as a reunion with Rome of a sect that had been heretical beforehand.\(^2\) This interpretation, however wrong, became the official Roman interpretation. To disprove it, Duwaihī quoted a letter sent by Pope Nicholas V (1447-1455), dated 1447, to the Maronite patriarch Ya‘qūb al-Ḥadathī (1445-1458), successor of Yūḥannā al-Jājī. This letter shows that Nicholas V believed that the Maronites had joined the Catholic Church at the Council of Florence. Duwaihī must have missed the whole point in it when he quoted it thus:

> And we ask you, O brother, and request you in \(\text{the name}\) of our Lord Jesus Christ to try your utmost possible to walk in the steps of your predecessor, preserving the unity that was brought about in the time of our afore-mentioned predecessor /Eugene IV/ and in keeping to what was contracted between you and your community and us and the Roman Church. For we are following the ways of our afore-mentioned predecessor and we hope... that we shall continue in this unity. And if you keep to it, we

---

3. Underlining mine.
promise you, O brother, with all that we and this church can afford of help and blessings.

The Council of Florence was an important event in the history of the relations of the Maronites with the Roman Church. Although Duwaihi made a good case for the orthodoxy of the Maronites at the time of the Council, Roman opinion was against it. However, after the Council of Florence, there was no longer any doubt about the orthodoxy of the Maronite church. Lammens suggested that the word "errores" which authors used about the Maronites did not signify doctrinal errors but simply abuses of practice. "The most decided adversaries of the perpetual orthodoxy of the Maronites," he said, "must agree that since the Council of Florence their beliefs have been absolutely irreproachable."  

In the period following the Council, the Franciscan monks in Beirut and Jerusalem, upon the suggestion of the Popes, made frequent visits to the Maronite population whose condition, according to the reports of those monks, was wretched. Among those Franciscan brothers, Gandolph of Sicily, Gryphon of the Flanders, and Alexander Ariosti of Bologna were the most outstanding. A fourth Franciscan who deserves particular note

2. Lammens, "Fra Gryphon...", p. 87.
in this respect was the Maronite historian Jibrâ’il ibn al-Qilâ‘î whose role in combatting the Monophysite influence that was spreading among the Maronites in the last quarter of the fifteenth century has already been discussed.

The next claim which Duwaihî refuted was the claim that the Maronites were brought back to the true faith and to union with Rome by Fra Gryphon in 1450. Duwaihî said that this could not have been the case since Yûhannâ al-Jâjî had been confirmed by Eugene IV in 1439, Nicholas V having born testimony to that and to the patriarch’s orthodoxy in his letter to Ya‘qûb al-Ḥadathî, Yûhannâ’s successor, in 1447. During the whole of Fra Gryphon’s stay in Syria, Duwaihî continued, the Maronite patriarchs were Yûhannâ al-Jâjî and Ya‘qûb al-Ḥadathî, both of whom were orthodox in their faith. 2

Duwaihî was right in his refutation of this claim. What Fra Gryphon did was not to convert the Maronites to Catholicism but to educate them religiously, correcting the abuses of practice which had crept into the Maronite church through the years. 3 Among other things, he prepared a questionnaire for the confession of the ignorant. 4

1. Duwaihî gave this claim, made by Murqus al-Ashbûnî (Mark of Lisbon?) in T.T.M., pp.399-400. F. Suriano said that Fra Gryphon came to Lebanon from Palestine in 1462 and stayed there for ten years, converting the Maronites and extirpating their heresies. Il trattato..., pp.69-70. Lammens said that Gryphon came to Lebanon in 1450 with Fra François of Barcelona and that he merely corrected abuses in the Maronite church. "Fra Gryphon...", pp.79 and 87.
nate church itself, apparently, felt the need for religious education. The Maronite patriarch had asked the Pope Paul II (1464-1471) to provide him and his people with some necessary religious instruction. After a similar demand a few years later, Pope Sixtus IV (1471-1484) appointed, in 1475, Fra Pietro of Napoli, the vicar general of the Franciscan order in Lebanon, as his commissioneer to the Maronites, to be followed in this office by his successors. ¹ Duwaihi mentioned that in 1475, upon the insistent demands of the Maronites, Sixtus IV had asked the vicar general of the Lesser Brothers (Franciscans) to send one or two of his monks to visit the Maronites and to give them the necessary instruction. ²

The correspondence between Pope Leo X (1513-1521) and Patriarch Sham'un (1492-1524) brings to a close the history of the Maronites in the Mamlük period. Duwaihi dealt in detail with this correspondence. ³ In 1513, he said, Patriarch Sham'un sent his legate to Rome to ask for confirmation from Leo X. The legate carried with him a letter from the vicar general of the Franciscan order in Beirut which praised the orthodoxy of the Maronites, their obedience to Rome, and their patience in bearing the tyranny of the Moslems. Leo X was pleased with Sham'un's request for confirmation and with the good recommendation his legate carried with him; and the Pope

1. P. Verniero, Croniche..., p.27.
3. Ibid., pp.229-232.
sent a letter for him with the legate asking for information about the various practices of the Maronite church.  

The following year Shamʿūn sent his legate again to Rome (March 8, 1514, 1515 according to the Gregorian calendar) with a letter expounding to the Pope the doctrines and usages of the Maronite church and its unbroken union with Rome and asked for certain favours. Moreover, he returned letters sent previously by the Popes to his predecessors. At the same time, Father Francesco Suriano, the superior of the Franciscans in Jerusalem, sent a letter to Leo X bearing testimony to the orthodoxy of the Maronites and their obedience to Rome, adding that they only differed from the Roman Church in some usages of the Eastern churches which had been allowed them by the Roman See through the intercession of Fra Gryphon.

In 1515, Leo X sent Shamʿūn his confirmation and his other requests, exhorting him to change certain practices in his church. The letter which the Pope sent him, which Duwaiḥī described, was full of praise for the Maronite church which, "like the rose among the thorns," had managed to preserve its orthodoxy amid infidels and heretics. The Pope

1. This letter (T. Anaissi, Bullarium Maronitarum, pp. 27-29) is dated May 25, 1514.
2. The letter of Leo X which arrived before the second departure of Shamʿūn's legate to Rome is dated May 25, 1514. See above footnote. Duwaiḥī did not give the exact date of the first departure of Shamʿūn's legate, saying simply that he left in 1513. It may have been early in 1514, according to the Gregorian calendar.
3. This explains why the Papal letters sent to the Maronites, which were found at Qannūbin at the time of Ibn al-Qīlāʿī, are no longer found in the Maronite patriarchal archives.
further sent a letter in that year to Francesco Suriano asking him to pay frequent visits to the Maronite patriarch and to his people and to guide them in doctrinal matters when such guidance was needed. In his book, *Il trattato di Terra Santa e dell'Orient*, Suriano spoke of his appointment as the commissioner of Leo X to the Maronites:

Finally, for the same cause, Pope Leo X sent me as his commissioner... in the year of the Lord 1515, with many presents of cloth and clothing, and vestments of gold and brocade. From this affair followed great honour from God, the salvation of those people, and the commendation of the Apostolic faith, to the praises of the Omnipotent God, amen, amen.¹

This is by no means all that Duwaihī had to say about the religious history of the Maronites in the Mamlūk period. He gave many more details about the Maronite church, its patriarchs, its bishops, and its relations with Rome. Only the main points have been discussed in this study. This part of Duwaihī's history of Lebanon before the Ottoman conquest is the most complete. It was the part in which he was, perhaps, most interested and for which he had most sources. His refutations of the claims made against the orthodoxy of the Maronites in the Mamlūk period have a sound basis, unlike his refutation of the claim of William of Tyre.

On the whole, Duwaihī's religious and secular history of the Maronites forms the most important part of his work. It is the part to which he paid most attention and which was

his main contribution as a writer of history. He tapped sources that had never been touched, or perhaps even known. In fact, he was writing for the first time the history of his people. In contrast, his general history of the Near East and his history of non-Maronite Lebanon merely restate the Arabic historians.

There are, it is true, mistakes in Duwaihī's history of the Maronites. His dates and his conclusions are, in some instances, dubious. His insistence on the absolute and continuous orthodoxy of the Maronites and on their unbroken union with Rome led him, at times, to wrong interpretations of facts. His history, however, is still a monumental piece of research work that shows his diligence and his critical powers as well as his remarkable ability to compile a coordinated and intelligible history from fragmentary information. It is for this reason that Duwaihī fully deserved to be called the father of Maronite history.
CHAPTER IV
THE HISTORY OF TÅNNÙS ASH-SHIDYÅQ

Following the Napoleonic expedition to Egypt and the rise of Muḥammad ʿAlī Pasha, Lebanon and its feudal families became important pieces in the game of nineteenth century international politics. The political history of Lebanon and the history of its feudal families became, thus, the focus of attention to the contemporary historian of Lebanon. Church history and the polemical defence of the perpetual orthodoxy of the Maronites, which had been the main topics dealt with by older Maronite historians like Ibn al-qilāʿī and Duwaiḥī, dwindled in importance. It is therefore surprising to find that with the nineteenth century came the rise of the Maronite lay historian. This historian paid little attention to the history of his community as such, or to the history of the Maronite church. Instead, he dealt with the history of Lebanon as a political unit, and with the history of its feudal families as its component parts.

Tānnūs bin Yūsuf ash-Shidyāq is, perhaps, the best representative of this new type of Maronite historian.

Since the early seventeenth century, if not earlier, the family of Ŵännūs ash-Shidyāq had been clerks in the service of the Lebanese feudal princes of various religious
Some of them had been teachers. They represented thus a class among the Maronites which, without being clerical, shared with the clergy the monopoly of learning, before the nineteenth century missionary activity had brought education to the ordinary layman.

As clerks of the amirs, the Shidyāqs, like the other families that followed their profession, formed a second class aristocracy that had the right to use the title of shaikh.

Maṣūr as-Shidyaq, the grandfather of Ṭannūs, left Kisruan in 1741 and went to Baalbak, where he entered the service of a Mitwālī amir, Ḥaidar Al-Ḫarfūsh. Two years later he moved to the Bīqā', and finally to Al-Ḫazimiyya, in the neighbourhood of Beirut. In 1755 he was engaged by Amir Mulḥim as-Sihābī as manager to his nephew, Qāsim Umar, whom he accompanied to Istanbul to seek in vain for the young amir the governorship of the Shūf and Kisruan. In 1763, after having spent several years in southern Lebanon, Maṣūr was called again by Qāsim Umar to his service, and he moved his residence to Ḥadath Beirut. Since then Al-Ḥadath became the

1. Ṭannūs as-Shidyaq, Tarīkh wa afrā' al-banī ash-Shidyāq, pp. 4-7. The manuscript of this unpublished work of Shidyāq was kindly lent to me by Mr. Kamil Chidiac of Hadath Beirut. This work will be hence referred to as MS Family history.
2. Ibid., p.7.
3. In the letters which Ṭannūs received from his brother Fāris, which are found in the possession of Mr. Kamil Chidiac, Ṭannūs is always addressed as Shaikh. Another clerical family that had the right to this title were the Yāzijīs. It must be remembered that shaikh was also the title of the Lebanese feudal families who were not amirs or mūgaddams.
4. Ibid., pp.6-13. This Al-Ḥadath must not be confused with the town in Jibbet Bsharray that bears the same name.
permanent home of the Shidyāqs.

After Qāsim Īmar’s death in 1768, Manṣūr became guardian of his children for one year, after which he went into the service of two other Shihābī amirs. His second son, Abū Ḥusain Yūsuf, who had entered the service of those two amirs, apparently, with his father, remained in their service after his father’s death in 1793. Yūsuf remained in the service of Amir Sayyid ʿAhmad, one of those amirs, and of his son Amir Salmān, until 1805, when he was called to the service of yet another Shihābī amir, Ḥasan Īmar, and was asked by him to return to ‘Ashquf, the ancestral home of the Shidyāqs in Kisruān.

Yūsuf had five sons: Ṭānnūs, Manṣūr, ʿAsʿad, Gālib, and Fāris. Of those five, three were destined to fame. The youngest, Fāris (d. 1887), who was later converted to Islam and adopted the name of Ahmad Fāris, was to become one of the most outstanding figures in Arabic letters in the nineteenth century. ʿAsʿad, the third son of Yūsuf ash-Shidyāq, was among the first Maronites to be converted to Protestantism by the missionaries. He became a Protestant in 1825 and, in the following year, was handed over to the Maronite patriarch by his brother Manṣūr. By order of the patriarch, he was imprisoned and tortured; and he died a martyr’s death in prison in 1830, aged 33. He is still remembered as the first and, perhaps, the only martyr of Protestantism in the Levant.1

1. According to Ṭannūs, his brother Manṣūr was also a man of letters and wrote many books in Syriac and Arabic. Ibid., p. 46.
Tannús, the eldest of the five, became the best known Maronite historian of the first half of the nineteenth century. He was probably born in 1794.¹ When he was some ten years old, his father went to live in Kisruān; and in 1809 Tannús began to study Syriac and Arabic grammar with a certain Yūsuf al-Ḥkayyim in Ghustā, a village in the neighbourhood of Jūniya.²

Shidyāq's tutoring in Ghustā had to be stopped the following year. Towards the end of 1809 his father had been appointed by Amir Bashīr II, the wāli of Lebanon, as tax-gatherer in Shuwair, a village in the Matn province; and the following year he was also put in charge of taxation and conscription in Zahla, a small town in Ash-Shūf al-Bayyāqi. Yūsuf ash-Shidyāq, therefore, left Ashqūt and went back to his home in Al-Ḥadath. There Tannús taught his brother Aṣ'ad what Syriac and Arabic grammar he had learnt at Ghustā.

In 1813 Tannús went to resume his education at 'Ain Waraqa,³ but he was forced to discontinue his studies

¹ There is no mention in MS Family history of the date of Tannús's birth. Considering, however, that Aṣ'ad died in 1830 at the age of 33 (born 1798) and that Manṣūr died in 1842 at the age of 46 (born 1796), Tannús, being older than both, and probably in direct precession, must have been born in approximately 1794.
² Ibid., p.22.
³ The college of 'Ain Waraqa (founded in 1789 by Aṣ'ad Chandūr) was the most important Maronite institution of higher education in the early nineteenth century. Most of the men in Lebanon who rose to distinction in the world of letters in the first half of the nineteenth century (e.g. Buṭrus al-Bustānī) had their schooling in it. It was a monastic foundation. It made a point of encouraging the study of Arabic literature, and also taught, among other things, Syriac and Latin and the canonical sciences. See G. Antonius The Arab awakening (London, 1938), pp.38 and 47.
there because he was a subject to headaches. The following year, therefore, he enrolled his brother As'ad at 'Ain Waraqah; and in 1818, after As'ad had left school, Tannūs studied with him moral philosophy (ilm adh-dhimma).\textsuperscript{1}

Tannūs never had the chance to devote any extensive span of his youthful years to study. As early as 1810, after one year's tutoring in grammar, he was engaged by a Shihābī amir, Salmān al-ʿAlī, as a clerk, and he accompanied that amir to the province of Shuḥdar, south of Beirut, to assist in conscripting soldiers for the army of Bashīr II. In 1818 he decided to become a merchant, and the following year he went to Damascus to purchase goods for his shop; and, at the same time, he was charged by the Shihābī amirs to carry out for them a small political mission in that city.\textsuperscript{2}

Although Tannūs remained a merchant all his life, he never had a chance to devote all his time to his commerce. He was used as an agent and a spy by the Shihābī amirs and became well versed in the political intrigues of his day. In 1822 he took part in the fighting during the struggle between Bashīr II and the wāli of Damascus;\textsuperscript{3} and, as a soldier, he reached as far north in Syria as Shaizar.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1} MS Family history, pp.26-27.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., pp.27-28.
\textsuperscript{3} H. Lammens, La Syrie..., II, pp.144. Shihābī, op. cit., pp.981 et seq.
\textsuperscript{4} MS Family history, pp.33-36.
Tannūs seems to have been a man of many responsibilities. His father's death in 1821 left him in charge of his mother, his two sisters, ʿAdlā and Wardiyya, and his youngest brother, Fāris. Later, a wife and two sons, Fāris and Naja, were added to the family;¹ The deaths of his brothers Ghalib (in 1840) and Mansūr (1842) brought three more infants to his charge.² His commerce, on the other hand, does not seem to have prospered, and his account book, which is still found in manuscript, shows a deficit for most of the years between 1821 and 1856.³

Tannūs needed an additional income to meet the expenses of his family. This he found in teaching and copying books. The names of several books which he seems to have copied in his excellent hand appear among the sales in his account book.⁴ Fees from students he taught also appear in this book.⁵

---

¹ The date of Tannūs's marriage does not appear in any of the available documents. For his sons, see MS Family history, p.2. Fāris, his first child, died in infancy.
² Ibid., pp.45 and 46. Ghalib left one son, and Mansūr left two sons, Zāhir and Bishāra.
³ MS Mufakkarat Tannūs ash-Shidyāq, in the American University of Beirut, MS 647.1, Sh 55. The expenses into which he went for his family after his father's death in 1821 (MS Family history, p.33) were meticulously recorded in this account book.
⁴ See MS Mufakkarat..., I, pp.10 and 119, for examples of such books. One such book, which was not sold, is still found, copied by Tannūs ash-Shidyāq. It is called Kitāb al-bayyināt and is in the possession of Mr. Kamil Ghidaq. It is probable, though not certain, that the other books listed among the sales in the Mufakkarat... were of his own copying. On Kitāb al-bayyināt, Tannūs's name does not appear.
⁵ From the Family history we learn the names of some of the students whom Tannūs ash-Shidyāq taught: In 1825 he taught Arabic to two Americans in Beirut (ibid., P.37). In 1826
Another source of income which Ṭannūs depended on was medical practice.¹ In 1823 he started studying medicine. How he went about that is not clear. In 1829, however, he started practising medicine.²

In spite of all his responsibilities, Ṭannūs never ceased, throughout his life, to improve his education which had been neglected during his youth. Aside from medicine, he studied logic in 1832,³ Turkish and Italian in 1835,⁴ science (film at-ṭabīqa) in 1848,⁵ and jurisprudence in 1849.⁶ In that last year he also studied elocution (bayān) with Nāṣīf al-Yāzījī, the well-known Lebanese man of letters of the first half of the nineteenth century.⁷

Ṭannūs died in 1861,⁸ two years after the publication of his main historical work, Akhbar al-aʾyān fī Jabal Lubnān.

---

he taught grammar to two young Shihābī amirs and to his brother Fāris (p.38). Five years later, in 1831, he taught Arabic to Carlos and Mauritus Craus (?), sons of a Spanish general resident in Egypt, who had come to Lebanon for a year (p.41). In 1847 he taught grammar to two other Shihābī amirs, and two years later he was teaching four more Shihābis (pp.48-49). In 1850 he taught Arabic to an Italian called De Marchi/⁹(p.49).

1. Ibid., p.36.
2. Ibid., p.39.
3. Ibid., p.41.
4. Ibid., p.44. Shidyāq also knew Persian. G. Graf (op.cit., IV, pp.295 et seq.) listed a Persian-Arabic dictionary among his works.
5. MS Family history, p.48.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
He appears to have been a man of a remarkably kind and helpful disposition whose honesty and scrupulous character made him unfit to earn his living except by a lifetime of very hard work. He was a heavy pipe-smoker, and tobacco featured prominently among the expenses in his account book. In the years 1821-1822, while serving in Amir Bashir's army, he took heavily to hashish; but on leaving the army he gave up the habit.¹

Unlike his brothers As'ad and Tannūs, one of whom became a Protestant and the other a Moslem, Tannūs remained a Maronite all his life, in spite of his having come into contact with the Protestant missionaries. He was a pious man, and made many donations to the Maronite church. In the family history which he wrote, he showed his attitude towards his brother's conversion to Protestantism, his imprisonment, and his martyr-death, which was both sympathetic and mildly reproachful.²

It is not clear what was the urge that drove Tannūs to writing. It cannot be ascertained whether he derived any material benefit from his writings or not. He began writing, apparently, in 1833 when he summarized Duwaihi's Nisbat al-Mawārīna, the first part of Tarīkh at-tā'īfa al-mārūniyya.³

1. MS Mufakkarat..., pp.34-56, under expenses.
2. MS Family history, pp.38-40. Tannūs tried his best to make his brother recant and return to the Maronite church; and his final opinion was that As'ad's mind had given way and that he was, as such, not responsible for his actions.
3. Ibid., p 41. I have neither been able to find nor to locate a copy of Shidyaq's summary of Nisbat al-Mawārīna.
and wrote a dictionary of extra-lexical Lebanese Arabic.\(^1\) The following year he summarized a book called *Ghayat al-itqān*.\(^2\) In 1835, after having studied Turkish for one year, he started writing a book on the Turkish language and its grammar.\(^3\) It is not known whether he ever finished it.

In 1844 Tannūs ash-Shidyaq started working on another dictionary of some kind.\(^4\) Four years later, in 1848, he made a summary of Duwaihī's *Tāríkh al-azmina*, which is still found in manuscript.\(^5\) In that same year he wrote a history which he called *Tāríkh mulūk al-ʿArab waʾl-Ṭālām* (History of the kings of the Arabs and Islam)\(^6\) which, unfortunately, is no longer to be found. In 1850 he finished the history of his family (*Tāríkh wa aṣmāl bani ash-Shidyaq*),\(^7\) which is the main available source for his life; and in 1855 he completed his main historical work, *Akhbar al-aʿyān...*, to which he added a section about the natural and political geography of Lebanon.\(^8\)

---

1. Ibid. I have not been able to find a copy of this dictionary. Dr. Eli Smith, the American Protestant missionary, reported having seen it in the *Z.D.M.G.* in 1854 (*Z.D.M.G.*, IX, 1855, p.269). Graf mentioned a manuscript of it in the possession of the Shidyaq family (*G. Graf*, *loc. cit.*).
2. *MS Family history*, p.42.
3. Ibid., p.44.
4. Ibid., p.48.
5. The manuscript of Shidyaq's Mukhtasar of *Tāríkh al-azmina* is in the possession of Mr. Kamil Chidiac. The date appears as 1845.
7. Ibid., p.49.
8. Ibid., p.49, in a note added probably by the author's nephew, Zahir ash-Shidyaq, who was the original owner of the *MS* in the library of Mr. Kamil Chidiac.
Shidyāq also wrote poetry. In his family history he quoted the opening and closing lines of an elegy he wrote on the death of his uncle. Later on in the family history, he mentioned that in 1856 he started polishing his poetical works. If the lines he quoted from his elegy are to be taken as a sample of his poetry, it must have been poor.

In his introduction to the summary of Duwaiḥī's Tārīkh al-azmān, Shidyāq made clear his interest in the purely political and secular history of Lebanon and his break with the Maronite tradition of ecclesiastical historiography:

Finding that the history of the Maronite patriarch, Ḫāfaṣ Ḫāfaṣ ad-Duwaḥi of Ḫin, is, to a large extent, truthful in what it relates, but that he had dealt at length with the history of churches and monks, and only briefly considered the history of the lay leaders and notables, having included [In his work] unnecessary bits of information and stories that bore the reader, I removed from it what was undesirable, keeping [only] what is of interest. I rearranged its wrong dates, preserving only the essence of it. I [also] polished its sentences and vocabulary, rendering in good Arabic its vague terminology....

Thus, with all his personal piety, Shidyāq had little interest in the "history of churches and monks". His interest lay more in the history of "lay leaders and notables" - the old Lebanese feudal families whose history was, to a large extent, the history of Lebanon, since the Ottoman conquest.

1. G. Graf, op. cit., IV, p. 296, mentions a collection of Shidyāq's poems in a private collection. I have not been able to find it.
2. MS Family history, p. 27.
3. Ibid., p. 49.
4. MS Mukhtāṣar tārīkh ad-Duwaḥi, p. 1.
The feudal lords, whose family histories Shidyāq sought to trace, were not only the men whose family histories formed a large part of the history of Lebanon. They were also the employers of Shidyāq and many of his kinsmen. Like other members of his family, he had served them as a clerk and had instructed their young. He must have had, therefore, a personal interest in their history.

These feudal families were, in the majority, non-Christian, although the ruling branch of the Shihāb family had, for reasons of political expediency, accepted the Christian faith. Other Shihābs were Moslems. The Īmāds, the Jānblāṭs and the Talḥūqs were Druzes. The Khāzins of Kisruān, perhaps the most powerful of the Maronite feudal families at the time, did not allow their religious affiliation to prejudice them in their political activities. Previously they had been responsible for the upbringing of a Druze amir, the famous Fakhr ad-Dīn II of Ma’ān, and had remained his staunch supporters throughout his reign. The political atmosphere in which Shidyāq lived was thus a secular one in which sectarianism was of political rather than religious significance. Maronite and non-Maronite Lebanon, Christian and Druze Lebanon, were no longer divorced from each other, each leading its own independent historical life. Since the Ottoman conquest they had grown increasingly entangled and, with the accession of Bashīr II in 1788, were already one lay historical unit. The Maronite patriarch himself had become
more a political than a religious leader.

This change in the times did not only reflect itself in the difference in subject matter between the histories of Duwaihi (and, more so, Ibn al-Qila'i) and Shidyāq. The difference in the Arabic language used in their respective writings is another reflection of this change. The early nineteenth century witnessed the revival of the Arabic language in its classical form at the hands of Lebanese Christians. Men like Nasif al-Yaziji, Butrus al-Bustani, and Ahmad Faris ash-Shidyāq, the brother of the historian, were laying the foundations of modern Arabic literature. With the growth of the lay spirit among the Maronites, and among the Lebanese Christians in general, the use of Syriac in writing declined tremendously. Lebanese colloquial and semi-colloquial, as well as pseudo-classical Arabic, which had served as media of expression for Maronite authors since the time of Ibn al-Qila'i, and up to the eighteenth century, and which were written generally in Syriac script (Karshuni), were replaced by classical Arabic; and although Karshuni script persisted for a time, it remained the exception rather than the rule.

Ṭannūs ash-Shidyāq wrote in correct classical Arabic. His style has no particular beauty, but he made a negligible number of orthographical and grammatical mistakes. His handwriting in Arabic, that of a member of a family of clerks, is very neat and easy to read. He also used some Moslem clichés. His summary of Duwaihi's Tarikh al-azmina opens with the
familiar Qur'anic phrase, "In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate".

The only work of Shidyāq with which this chapter will deal is his history of Lebanon entitled Akhbar al-a'yan fi Jabal Lubnān. This work, in its final form, was completed in 1655; but it seems to have been started several years before. Eli Smith, then an American Protestant missionary in Lebanon, described the book in a letter he wrote to the Z.D.M.G. on August 23, 1647, adding that its price was 1000 Turkish piasters, or nine pounds Sterling. He gave the title of the book in German as Geschichte des Libanon (History of Lebanon). In another letter, dated June 11, 1855, he said that Ṭannūs ash-Shidyāq had rewritten and expanded his history of Lebanon, and that Buṭrus al-Bustānī had brought it to the American Press in Beirut to have it printed. Eli Smith, who was in charge of the American Press, added: "We take no responsibility for the correctness of the work".

Apparently Buṭrus al-Bustānī had the book printed on his own responsibility. On June 13, 1855, the first and second parts of Akhbar al-a'yan... dealing with the natural and political geography of Lebanon and with the genealogies of its feudal families, appeared in print. The third part, dealing with the history of Lebanon under the rule of the

---

1. See above, p. 226.
2. Relevant passages from this letter were published in the Z.D.M.G., III, 1849, p. 121.
different dynasties, left the press on May 26, 1659; and with it the work became complete.

In *Akhbār al-aṭyān...*, Shidyāq dealt with the period of Lebanese history starting from approximately the beginning of the Arab conquest and ending with 1655. He did not, however, divide his subject chronologically and deal with it in periods, but took every family alone and gave its history from the time of its first appearance to the date of its extinction, or to his own day. Families which held for a time the wilāya of Lebanon, or part of Lebanon, were dealt with twice. The first time Shidyāq only considered their genealogy and their family history. The second time he considered the history of their wilāya.

The work, as it appears in its printed form, is in 770 pages.¹ It is divided into three parts:

In the first part,² Shidyāq considered the natural and political geography of Lebanon, in five chapters. In the first chapter³ he gave a general description of the bound-

---

¹. The last page of the published edition is numbered 720. This, however, is due to the fact that in the printing of the second part several passages were omitted, which necessitated the reprinting of these passages and several duplications of page numbers. All in all 25 pages are duplicated, which gives an extra 50 pages. Thus, the first page of the third part, which is numbered 201, should be numbered 251. I have followed the correct, not the printed, page-numbers in my references.

². *Akhbār al-aṭyān...,* pp. 6-34.

aries and population of Lebanon. In the second \(^1\) he enumerated the eight main towns of the Phoenician coast (Tripoli, Al-Batrūn, Jubail, Junīya, Beirūt, Sidon, Tyre, and Acre), only the first five of which fell within the boundaries of Lesser Lebanon (Jabal Lubnan, or Mount Lebanon), and gave a brief historical notice about each of them. The third chapter \(^2\) was devoted to the description of the courses of the nine principal rivers of Lebanon: Nahr Abū 'Alī, Nahr al-Jauz, Nahr Ibrāhīm, Nahr al-Kalb, Nahr Antiliās, Nahr Bairūt, Nahr ad-Dāmūr, Nahr al-Ūlī, and Nahr al-Qāsimiyyya, or Al-Līṭānī. In the fourth chapter \(^3\) the political geography of Lebanon was considered and its feudal provinces enumerated and described in detail. This chapter is the most important in the first part of *Akhbār al-afyān* ... since it gives a systematic and detailed description of the extent and boundaries of the feudal provinces of Lebanon and the names of the different families that held them. The fifth chapter \(^4\) is simply a table giving the respective male population of the different provinces and dividing them according to religious affiliation. This table, which gives rough statistics about the population of Lebanon at the time of Shidyāq, would be of interest to the

---

study of nineteenth century Lebanon.

The second part of Akhbār al-āṣyān...¹ deals with the genealogies of the feudal families of Lebanon, relating the main historical events in which members of those families played a leading or important part. As an appendix to this part² Shidyāq gave an abridged form of the history of his own family which he had previously written independently.

Shidyāq dealt with the feudal families of Lebanon in three groups: the Maronite families, the Druze families, and the Moslem (Sunnī and Mitwālī) families.³ To each of these families he devoted a separate chapter. It is interesting to note here that Shidyāq grouped the Shihāb amirs (originally Sunnī Moslem) and the Billama‘ amirs (originally Druze), the greater number of whom had become Maronite, among the Maronite feudal families.

The last and longest part of Akhbār al-āṣyān...⁴ deals with the wālis or governors of Lebanon. The position of governor in Lebanon was granted to the leading member of the strongest and most influential feudal family in the country by the Ottomans, and before them by the Mamlūks, and the position remained hereditary in that family until its downfall or its extinction. Sometimes there were more than

one governor, each controlling part of Lebanon.

Shidyāq, in this last part of his history, began with the narration of the events that had taken place in the governorship of the Mardaite amirs and muqaddams in northern Lebanon. After that he proceeded to give, in separate chapters, the events of the governorships of the families that held the wilāya at some period in their history, those being the Tanūkh, the Maʾnids, the Turkoman Assāfs, the Kurdish Sīfas, the Shihābs, the Arslāns, and the Billamaʿs.

At the beginning of his book, Shidyāq gave a list of the sources, and the authors on whose works he depended in writing his history. He listed these sources very briefly as follows:

2. Ahmad bin Shibāṭ (Ibn Sibāṭ), the faqīḥ of the Gharb, from Alai.
3. Patriarch Iṣṭīfān ad-Duwayhi of Ḥīdīn, from his history of the Crusades2 and the origin of the Maronites.
4. Amir Hādīr Ahmad ash-Shihābī of Lebanon3
5. The priest Hananiyya al-Munaiyar of the Zuq.4

---

1. The histories of the different wilāyas appear in Akhbār al-aṭyān as follows: The Mardaites, pp.251-278; the Tanūkh, pp.278-293; the Maʾnids, pp.297-305; the Assāfs, pp.396-399; the Sīfas, pp.399-408; the Shihābs, pp.408-696; the Arslāns, pp.696-749; and the Billamaʿs, pp.750-770.
2. By Duwayhi's history of the Crusades Shidyāq meant Tārikh al-azmīna which, in several of its copies, starts with the history of the first Crusade.
3. Amir Hādīr Ahmad ash-Shihābī, to whom reference has already been made, was born in 1760 and died in 1835. Shidyāq knew him personally, and Shidyāq's youngest brother, ʾAfrīs, helped him (Shihābī) in copying his main historical work, Al-ghurar al-ḥisān fī tārikh hawādith az-zaman (MS Family history, p.37. That was in 1824). See G. Graf, op.cit., IV, pp.294-295.
4. Hananiyya al-Munaiyar, a Melchite historian and poet, was born in Zuq Maṣbah (Kisruʿān) in 1757 and died in 1820. In 1774 he became a monk in the Melchite monastery of Ash-
6. The two histories of Amir Fakhr ad-Din by As-Safadi* and Al-Lubnani.1
7. The history of Master Butrus Karama of Homs.2
8. The priest Yusuf as-Simfani of Hasrun.3
9. The Sidon Court collection of Shihab genealogies.4
10. Some Maronite genealogies from books printed in Italian and Syriac.5
11. Some genealogies and stories, in print, about the beginning of the story of the Jahlats.6
12. Genealogies of the Druze shaikhs and their histories, as related verbally by Shaikh Khaṭṭār Talhūq.7
13. The genealogies of the Khāzin and Ḥubaish shaikhs, related verbally by Patriarch Būlus Mas‘ad.8

Shuwayr. His historical works include a history of the Shuwayr monastic order (Tārīkh ar-rahba al-Hannāwiyya al-mulagābaba bīsh-Shuwayriyya, MS Bibliothèque Orientale 41) and a history of the province of the Shu in Lebanon from 1697-1807 (Ad-durr al-marsuf fī tārīkh Janbal ash-Shu‘f), MSS Ashqüt 2 and Bibliothèque Orientale 42. See G. Graf, op. cit., III, pp. 242-244.

1. Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Khālidī as-Safādī (d. 1625) wrote a history of the emirate of Fakhr ad-Dīn Ma‘n (Tārīkh Fakhr ad-Dīn bin Ma‘n). See C. Brockelmann, op. cit., II (Leiden, 1949 edition), p. 373. Neither Brockelmann nor Graf list a history of Fakhr ad-Dīn by "Al-Lubnani".

2. Butrus Karama, a Catholic Melchite poet, was born in Homs in 1774 and died in 1851. His Tārīkh, which is referred to by Shidyāq, has not been found. See G. Graf, op. cit., IV, pp. 302-305.

3. For Yusuf as-Simfānī (Joseph Assemani), see above, p. 9, fn. 1.

4. I have not been able to find the original of this official Shihāb genealogy; but a German translation of it was published by Prof. Fleischer ("Über das syrische Fürstenhaus Benu-Schihāb - Geschlechtsregister der Fürsten Benu-Schihāb von dem hochgelahrten Sejjīd Ahmed El-Bezrī, Muftī der von Gott behüteten Stadt Saidā") in Z.D.M.G., V, 1851, pp. 46-59.

5. I have come across no such books in the course of my research. Such genealogies may be found, however, in some of the books published by Maronite scholars in Europe in the eighteenth century.

6. I have not been able to find a copy of the printed genealogy of the Žahlāt family. It is, however, not relevant to this study, since the Žahlāt family first appeared in Lebanon in the Ottoman period.

7. Shaikh Khaṭṭār Talhūq belonged to the Druze family that held the upper Ghurb, with their centers at 'Alalī and 'Aitāt, since the early eighteenth century. From Shidyāq's account book, it appears that Shidyāq had a lot to do with this family.

8. Patriarch Būlus Mas‘ad was consecrated patriarch in 1854 and died in 1890. T. 'Anaissī, Silsila... pp. 69-70.
14. My notes from the year 1820 until the last year of my history.

15. The history of Al-Jazzār, by Nīqūlā at-Turk of Dairān.2

Most of these sources, which are listed by Shidyaq after his preface to Akhbār al-ayān..., are not relevant to the Crusader and Mamlūk periods of Lebanese history, with which this study is concerned. It is interesting to consider the sources on which Shidyaq relied for the history of this period.

The earliest history which Shidyaq used as a source for the history of Lebanon, in the Crusader and Mamlūk periods, was Ibn al-Qilāʾī's Madīha ḥallā Jabal Libnān, the first classic of Maronite historiography. Two other such classics which Shidyaq used extensively were Buwaihi's Tarīkh at-tā'īfa al-Marūniyya (of which he seems to have been only the first part) and Tarīkh al-azmina, of both of which he had previously made summaries.3 Another Maronite history which Shidyaq seems to have used, although he did not list it among his sources, was the Risāla (letter, or treatise) of Yūsuf Mārūn ad-Duwaihi.

1. I have not found the historical notes of Shidyaq in the collection of his effects found in the possession of Mr. Kamil Chidiac, nor in any of the Libraries to which I have had access. It is possible that they still exist in a private collection.

2. Nīqūlā at-Turk ad-Dairānī, an orthodox Melchite, was born in Dair al-Qamar in 1763 and died in 1828. His history of the French expedition to Egypt was published with a French translation by Alix Desgranges (Histoire de l'expédition des Français en Égypte par Naqoula El-Turk). See G. Graf, III, pp. 251-252. He did not write specifically a history of Al-Jazzār, Pasha of Acre (1775-1804). It is probably to his history of the French expedition that Shidyaq referred; since Al-Jazzār was contemporary to it and defended Acre against Napoleon.

(d. 1780), on which he depended, apparently, for his list of the Mardaite amirs. Except for Ibn Sibāt, whose history formed one of Shidyāq’s main sources for this period, Shidyāq used no non-Maronite histories. True, Amir Ḥaibar ash-Shihābī was only a Maronite of second generation conversion, and his history, which Shidyāq used extensively, where it is concerned with Lebanon, deals mainly with the history of the non-Maronite feudal families, of which the Shihābs were one during the greater part of their history; but he was, on the other hand, conscious of his Maronite faith and made some mention of Maronite church history and of Mardaite history—although in the latter he made grave mistakes. Thus, in as far as the historians on whose works he depended go, Shidyāq was truly in the tradition of Maronite historiography. It must be remembered that Duwaihī also used Ibn Sibāt for his history of Crusader and Mamlūk Lebanon.

Another group of sources which Shidyāq referred to were the family genealogies, some of which were recorded and others transmitted by oral tradition. It cannot be determined how true either of those two categories of genealogies were, although it is only reasonable to suppose that the recorded

---

1. See above, p. 13, fn. 3. Risālat al-Khūrī Yūsuf Mārūn ad-Duwaihī (thus the title appears in T.T.M., p. 280) has not been published as a whole; but the section of it relevant to the history of the Mardaite amirs has been published by R. Shartūnī in the appendix to Iṣṭīfān ad-Duwaihī’s Tārikh at-talīfa al-mārūniyya (pp. 279–280).

2. See below, pp. 241.
ones are more to be relied upon, especially those that had been confirmed and witnessed by judges and responsible people over the generations. Of the genealogies transmitted orally to Shidyāq were those of the Maronite feudal families of Khāzin and Ḫubaish, both of which belonged to the Ottoman period, and those of the Druze shaikhs, the families of all of whom, except the Talhūqs (according to Shidyāq), also belonged to the Ottoman period.

Most of the recorded genealogies to which Shidyāq referred existed in print in his day, like those of the Maronite families, some of which were printed in Syriac and others in Italian,¹ and those of the Jānblāṭs and the Shihābs, both of which were printed in Arabic.² The genealogy of the Arslān amirs was available to Shidyāq in a very old manuscript,³

1. All the Maronite families with which Shidyāq dealt separately belonged to the Ottoman period; and their history, as such, is of no relevance to this study.
2. See above, p. 235, fn. 4. From Shidyāq's account of the published edition of the Shihāb genealogy (Akhbār al-a'īyān... pp. 65-66) it appears that it was copied and published by order of Amir Fāris Sayyid Ahmad Mūlim ash-Shihābī, a contemporary of Shidyāq, sometime in the first half of the nineteenth century, before the appearance of Akhbar al-a'īyān ..., from the original which used to be preserved in the Sidon Court. The published copy bears the signatures of the following witnesses to the authenticity of the copy made from the original (no date given): the mufti of Sidon, the naqīb al-ashrāf of Sidon, and the nāṭib of Sidon.
3. Although not mentioned by Shidyāq in his list of sources, the genealogy of the Arslāns was mentioned by him at the end of each of his two chapters on the Arslāns (ibid., pp. 146 and 748-749). A full description of it is given on the latter pages. This genealogy, said Shidyāq, was an ancient one (I have not seen it, and I doubt whether it still exists, I know of nobody who has seen it). It was preserved by the Arslān amirs as an heirloom, and bore the signatures of witnesses to its authenticity at various dates. The first part of it was recorded by Muḥsin bin Husain at-
and that of the Tanūkh amirs must have been available to him from Ibn Sibāṭ's history, the latter having copied it from the history of Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā.

Relying on older Maronite sources, on Ibn Sibāṭ, and on a whole series of family histories and genealogies, Shidyāq produced a historical work that differs sharply in form from both, the works of Ibn al-Qilāṣī and those of Duwaihī. Akhbār al-aʿyān... has nothing of the fanciful epic form of the Madīha ʿalā Jabal Libnān; and, likewise, it is neither written in the chronicle form of Tārīkh al-azmina nor in the polemical form of Tārīkh at-tāʿifa al-mārūniyya.

Although Shidyāq cited events chronologically within each chapter, the chapters themselves run chronologically parallel to each other, and are only continuations of each other in the sense the governorship of Lebanon, or of parts of Lebanon, passed in time from one to the other of the principal feudal families, and that the holdings of families that were exterminated, or became extinct, passed on to other families.

Akhbār al-aʿyān... is not a chronicle, but a geographical, historical, and genealogical survey of the component parts of feudal Lebanon. It can only artificially

---

الثال (القرن الثاني م.هـ)، ويلقب من السهو، إلى 142 م.هـ (759-760 م.م.). هذه التسلسل الزمني وتم تسجيلها من خلال عدد كبير من الأدوار واللوكارن الشهيرين في أ.ه. 190، 252، 269، 303، 363، 453، 503، 583، 670، 714، 782، 833، 926، 1012، 1095، 1147، و 1211. الاسماء من مختلف الأشخاص الذين كتبوا هذه الأوراق في هذه الأوقات جميعاً من شيدياق.
be divided into pre-Ottoman and post-Ottoman periods. Taken as what it was meant to be, it forms an uninterrupted, though not complete, picture of Lebanon under the rule of the local feudal dynasties.

Shidyāq was the first Lebanese historian known to have attempted the drawing of such a picture. His work, in its scope, has remained unique until today. Besides, he was the first Lebanese historian known to have furnished his work with a full section on the natural and political geography of his country, and with statistics concerning the religious communal divisions of its population.

Shidyāq's history of the Maronites of Lebanon before the rise of the modern Maronite feudal families after the Ottoman conquest, is little more than an abridgement of Duwaihī's history. True to the Maronite tradition, he carried the history of his people back to the days of early Arab rule in Syria, when the Marda'ites of Lebanon were raiding the borderlands of the Umayyad empire. At that time, he stated, AmirYūsuf was the ruler of Jubail.  

1. Shidyāq's chapter on the political geography of Lebanon was the main source on which I based the map of the feudal provinces of Lebanon attached to this thesis.
2. For references about the Marda'ites, see above, p.53, fn.1. The muqaddam class among the Maronites were probably their descendants (above, p.94, fn.2). Shidyāq referred to the Maronites of that period as Marda'ites, as Maronite historians usually do.
3. MS Mukhtasar Ibn al-Qilā'ī, fol.15v, and above, p.63. Duwaihī, T.T.M., p.69, mentioned an amir of Lebanon by the name of Yusuf, depending on a manuscript history in Syriac, copied in 1315 from an older manuscript.
and Amir Kisra was the ruler of Al-^Asiya (or Al-Kharia), later known as Kisruan after his name, with his seat at Baskinta. The seemingly legendary story of Yuhanna Marun and of his two nephews, Kuru (Kurush) and Ibrahim, the last of whom became the amir of Lebanon, is given. Then follows a list of the names of the Mardaite amirs of Lebanon which Shidyāq must have taken from the Risala of Yusuf Marun ad-Duwaihi. Apart from the muqaddams of Basharry, the descendants of Shidyāq Ya'qub ibn Ayyub, all these amirs whose names Shidyāq listed appear to have been figures of legend. The names of some of them: Yusuf, Yuhanna, Bakkhus, and Sim'on, appear to have been taken from the histories of Ibn

---

2. Shidyāq, loc. cit.; Duwaihi, T.T.M., pp. 53 et seq.
3. Risālat al-Khuri Yusuf Mārūn ad-Duwaihi, in T.T.M., pp. 279-280. Shidyāq did not give the dates of the amirs, although Yusuf Mārūn ad-Duwaihi gave them. In the latter’s list, the amirs of Lebanon (in the provinces of Jubail and Al-Batrūn) who lived during the Crusader and Mamlūk periods before the rise of the muqaddams of Basharry in the later fourteenth century are listed as follows: Musā and Butrus (from 1090 – 1190), Bakkhus and Ya'qub (until 1215), Sham'un (until 1239), his son Ya'qub (until 1296), his nephew İstifān (until 1352), Musā and Yuhanna (until 1399), and Yusuf al-'Abdālī (until 1400). See ibid., p. 279.
4. See Appendix II.
6. Ibn al-Qilā'ī, Madīha..., p. 42, and Tādrus of Hamā, op. cit., p. 65. The latter gave him the name of Kawālijār Bakhūs (Chevalier Bakhūs). Possibly he was the same as Ibn al-Qilā'ī's Muqaddam Bakkhus, and that this character was a Frank and not a Maronite. Tādrus of Hamā said he was the kawālijār of the King of France.
al-Qilāfī and of Duwaihī. In general, nothing is said about the character or deeds of these princes to make them more than mere names. Even their dates are not given; and in such cases where a doubtful date is given to a doubtful event, Shidyāq in general did not attempt to give the name of the amir in whose days the event took place, or who participated in it, except in such cases where he copied from Duwaihī.

Obviously relying on Duwaihī's Tārīkh al-azmīna, Shidyāq related the story of the first contact between the Maronites and the Crusaders at Arqa in 1099, the role played by the Maronites in the defeat of the Saljūq troops at Shaizar in 1111, the contact between Louis IX and the Maronites in 1250, the defeat of Baibars at the hands of the Maronites in 1264 and 1266, the sack of Ḥind and Al-Ḥadāth by Qalāūn in 1283, the help offered to the Franks by the Maronites while Qalāūn was besieging Tripoli in 1287, and the expedition

---

5. Shidyāq, op.cit., pp.258-259; Duwaihī, T.A., pp.145-146. See above, pp.79-81 and 183-184. Shidyāq here mentioned the year 1283 as that of the death of Baibars and the accession of Qalāūn. Actually Baibars died in 1277; and Qalāūn succeeded in 1279, after the brief reigns of Baraka, son of Baibars, and of Salāmish. See S. Lane-Poole, Mohammadan dynasties (Paris, 1925), p.81.
6. Shidyāq, op.cit., p.259; Duwaihī, T.A., p.148. See above, pp.151 et seq. Shidyāq apparently took the date 1287, instead of 1289, the correct date of the siege and fall of Tripoli, from Duwaihī's Tārīkh al-azmīna.
of Aqūsh al-Afram against Kisruān in 1307. In relating the first and unsuccessful Mamlūk expedition against Kisruān in 1293 (actually 1292), he drew on Duwaihī's account of the expedition as it is found in Tārīḫ at-ṭā'līfa al-mārūniyya, and made the same mistakes. Also relying on Duwaihī, Shidyāq next proceeded to deal briefly with the dynasty of the muqaddams of Bsharrāy, having noted previously that in 1400 primacy among the Maronite feudal princes moved from Jubail and Al-Batrūn to Jibbet Bsharrāy.

The brevity and inadequacy with which Shidyāq dealt with the history of the Maronites in the Crusader and Mamlūk periods is not without a reason. Shidyāq's intention was not so much to write a history of Lebanon as it was to write a history of the various feudal families that dominated the country from the early Middle Ages to his own day. The lack of adequate sources on the genealogy and the history of the Maronite feudal families that governed native Maronite Lebanon

2. Shidyāq, op. cit., pp. 269-261; Duwaihī, T. T. M., p. 376. See above, pp. 155 et seq. Shidyāq, relying on Duwaihī's Tārīḫ at-ṭā'līfa al-mārūniyya, made the same mistakes as Duwaihī. He gave the date of the expedition as 1293 instead of 1292 and stated that the expedition was ordered by An-Nāṣir bin Qalāūn instead of by Al-Ashraf Khalīl. The names of the leaders are also given wrongly, as in Duwaihī, T. T. M.
4. Ibid., p. 36.
during the period under discussion must have been the reason that made him skim speedily over the period, giving the bare minimum of historical fact and an uncritic list of the so-called Mardaite amirs and muqaddams.

It was a different matter with the Moslem and Druze feudal families. Unlike the medieval Maronite feudal dynasties whose authority and lineage had, by Shidyāq's time, been long extinct, some of these non-Christian families were still existing at the time of Shidyāq, as they continue to do so today; and the others had become extinct at a comparatively recent date. The main line of the Tanūkhid died out in 1633. The Alam ad-Dīn line of the Tanūkhid family, whose members were responsible for the extermination of their cousins, came to an end in 1711, after the battle of 'Ain Dārā between the Qaisi and Yamanī factions. The Ma'īnid family became extinct in 1697 when its last scion, Ahmad Mūḥīm, died without an heir. The earliest of those families

2. The battle of 'Ain Dārā, in 1711, was fought between the Qaisi and Yamanī factions in Lebanon and resulted in the utter defeat of the Yamanīs. The latter faction, led by the Alam ad-Dīn amirs, had been long intriguing against the Shihābs, leaders of the Qaisi faction and governors of Lebanon. With the help of the Qaisi Billama's, Amir Haidar ash-Shihābī (1706-1732) defeated the rival faction and exterminated the Alam ad-Dīn amirs. H. Lammens, La Syrie..., II, pp.94-95.
3. Ibid., II, p.92.
to become extinct were the 'Assāfs, descendants of the Turkomans of Kisruān, whose line died out in 1590.¹

As it has already been mentioned, Shidyāq had sources, which varied in their degree of dependability, for the history of these non-Maronite families.

Of these families the Arslāns were the first to come to Lebanon, at least according to tradition. Shidyāq said that they originally came from Maʿarrat an-Nuṣrān, and that they were settled in the mountainous region to the neighbourhhood of Beirut (the Gharb and Sāhil Bairūt) by Abū Jaʿfar al-Manṣūr, the Abbasid caliph (754-775 A.D.), in 759 (142 A.H.)² as a check to the raiding activities of the Mardaites of Lebanon. Arslān, the eponymous founder of this family, settled in Sinn al-rais, to the north of Sāhil Bairūt; his son Masʿūd later moving the family residence to Shwaifāt in 799.³ Arslān’s brother and his cousins settled elsewhere in Sāhil Bairūt and the Gharb, which seem to have formed at the time one province.⁴

Settled in the neighbourhood of Beirut, the Arslāns concentrated their efforts of fighting back the Mardaites

---

1. Ḳaṭīb al-Ṭurk, Ilk. 2, p. 267. Shidyāq, op. cit., p. 399. Duwāhī, T.A., p. 227. Aḥ-Shihābī, op. cit., p. 620. Muḥammad bīn 'Assāf, the last amīr of this family, was ambushed and killed near Bātrūn by Yūsuf Pasha Sīfa of Tripoli in 1590, and he left no heir.
2. Shidyāq gave both the Hijra and the Christian dates.
4. The villages in which they settled are mentioned as Sarāhmūr, Tīrdālā, Kafra, and 'Abai, all in the lower Gharb and the Shuhhar.
According to Shidyāq, they defeated these Mardaites in 791 and 875.

In 1088, Shujāʾ ad-Dawla ʿUmar bin ʿĪsā, the head of the clan, died and was succeeded by his son, ʿAḍud ad-Dawla ʿAlī, the first Arslānid amir of the period under consideration in this study.

The second of these families to have settled in Lebanon were the Tanūkhs who, like the Arslāns, were already settled in Lebanon when the Crusaders arrived. The Tanūkhs belonged to the same tribal stock as the Arslāns and, like them, they came to Lebanon from the neighbourhood of Maʿarrat an-Numān. According to Shidyāq, Tanūkh bin Qahtān, the eponymous founder of this family, moved from Maʿarrat an-Numān to Lebanon on his own initiative in 820, and settled with his clan in and around the Gharb, with Sarḥamūr as their chief's residence. The historical importance of this family does not seem to have been great at the time. Their historical importance began in 1147 when Mujir ad-Dīn Ābeg, the ʿĀtā ʿĀbeeg of Damascus (1139-1154), wrote to Buḥtūr, a descendant of Tanūkh and the founder of the Buḥturid line of the family.

---

2. Ibid., p. 702.
3. Ibid., p. 714. His genealogical name is: ʿAlī bin ʿUmar bin ʿĪsā bin Mūṣā bin Maṭūʿ bin Tamīm bin Al-Mundhir bin An-Numān bin ʿAmīr bin Hānī bin Masʿūd bin Arslān.
4. Ibid., p. 274.
5. Ibid, ʿAin Turīnī, op. cit., p. 770, said that the Tanūkhs were the first family to come to Lebanon from the neighbourhood of Aleppo, and gave the date 305 A.H. (918 A.D.) to their advent. Sālih bin Yahyā had nothing to say about the matter.
6. Shidyāq, loc. cit., and Sālih bin Yahyā, op. cit., p. 43, gave the genealogy of Buḥtūr as follows: Buḥtūr bin ʿAlī bin Al-Husayn.
ordering him to keep the villages he was holding in iqṭā' and to receive a stipend from the State coffers which he was to spend in his service.¹

Thus, at the beginning of the period under consideration in this study there were two Arab families settled in the vicinity of Beirut, both traditionally known to be descended from the same tribal stock, and both having come to Lebanon at approximately the same period. It cannot be said definitely whether those two families, on the arrival of the Crusaders, were Moslem or Druze. Shidyāq counted them both among the Druze feudal families.² To be sure, the descendants of both the Arslāns and the Tanūkhs³ are, at the present day, Druzes; but from the history of Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā and from that of Ibn Sībāṭ it appears that at least the Tanūkhs were Moslems, and that at least up to the time of Ibn Sībāṭ (d.1520). A mosque in Beirut bears the name of a sixteenth century Tanūkhd prince, Al-Mundhir. As for the Arslāns, their Druze affiliation is viewed sceptically by many of the conservative Druze families at the present day.

¹ Shidyāq, loc. cit. This event will be considered later in this chapter.
² The Qāḍī family of Ḍārumūn al-Gharb are known to be descendants of the Ḍārumūn branch of the Tanūkhd family. They are Druzes.
³ See previous foot-note.
The history of non-Maronite Lebanon in this period, as it is recounted by Shidyāq, is largely the story of the struggle for supremacy between the Arslāns and the Tanūkhs, and the relations between those two families and each of the Franks, the Mongols, and the Islamic states.

The first event of the Crusader period with which Shidyāq linked the name of a Lebanese amir was the attempt on the part of Duqāq, the Saljuq ruler of Damascus (1095-1103), to hold the coastal route at Nahr al-Kalb against the advance of Baldwin to Jerusalem in 1100.1 Completely ignoring Duqāq, Shidyāq said that it was 'Aḍud ad-Dawla 'Alī, the Arslānid amir of Beirut, who was solely responsible for the unsuccessful attempt to ambush Baldwin. The narrative of this incident appears in Akhbār al-a'yān as follows:

In 1100 Amir 'Aḍud ad-Dawla sent men to the cave of Nahr al-Kalb to lie in ambush against Prince Baldwin, the Frenchman, brother of Gaudefroy, King of Jerusalem, who was advancing to Jerusalem with a thousand men to inherit his brother's crown; but when Baldwin reached the ambush he fought them and defeated them, and proceeded on his way.2

Ibn al-Qalānishī, relating the same incident, made no mention of 'Aḍud ad-Dawla, nor of the men of the Phoenician coast, as having taken part in the ambush:

1. See above, p. 142.
2. Shidyāq, op.cit., p. 714.
When Godfrey was killed, his brother Baldwin the count, lord of al-Ruhā, set out for Jerusalem with a body of five hundred knights and footmen. On hearing the report of his passage, Shams al-Mulūk Dujāq gathered his forces and moved out against him, together with amir Janāh ad-Dawla, lord of Hims, and they met him near the port of Baʿriṭ. Janāh ad-Dawla pressed forward towards him with his askar, and he defeated him and some of his companions.

In William of Tyre's history, however, the narrative of the event stresses the role of the "natives of the locality" in attempting to check Baldwin's advance on the coastal route; but no mention is made of ʿAdud ad-Dawla as the leader of this ambush.\(^1\)

It is natural that ʿAdud ad-Dawla, as the leading chieftain of the locality, should have been responsible for the sending of native soldiers from Beirut to help stop Baldwin's advance at Nahr al-Kalb. It is unlikely that Shidyāq should have inserted his name out of his own initiative, without depending on any sources. Possibly his source was the history of the Arslān family, the information of which is only available through Akhbar al-ayān.\(^2\)

In the following year (1101), according to Shidyāq, ʿAdud ad-Dawla tried again to set an ambush at Nahr al-Kalb, this time against Raymond de Saint Gilles:

In the year 1101, when Prince Raymond, prince of Toulouse, was going to Jerusalem, ʿAdud ad-Dawla advanced to Nahr al-Kalb with men from Beirut, Tyre, Sidon, and Acre to hold the route. Raymond sought, therefore, the assistance

---


of King Baldwin, who arrived from Jerusalem with his soldiers. When he arrived at Nahr al-Kalb, ʿAdud ad-Dawla and his men retreated to Beirut and fortified themselves there, while the king returned to Jerusalem with Raymond. When the news reached Shams al-Mulūk Duqāq, the malik of Damascus, he wrote to the Amir ʿAdud ad-Dawla a letter making him the governor of Sidon, and giving him orders to fortify Sidon and Beirut; and the Amir sent Majd ad-Dawla Muhammad bin ʿAli, of Bani ʿAbdallah, to Sidon in his place, and he fortified both cities.1

Here again it is only probable that ʿAdud ad-Dawla, whom Shidyāq seems alone to have mentioned as having been responsible for the ambush, was actually responsible for it. As for his having been appointed governor of Sidon and Beirut, none of the available sources confirms or denies it. It may have actually been the case.2

From the account of Shidyāq, it seems that the hegemony of the Arslāns in the country in the neighbourhood of Beirut ended with the fall of that city to the Crusaders on May 13, 1110.3 It seems obvious that Shidyāq, who took his account of the fall of Beirut partly from Ash-Shihābī's history,4 was also depending on the Arslān family history. The Tanūkhid Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, whose family was not important at the time, dismissed the event in a few lines, mentioning that the siege of the city was strong and that, after it had

2. I have not come across the names of the governors of Beirut and Sidon at the time elsewhere.
been taken, there was much killing, kidnapping, and loot.† Shidyāq, who gave his account of the fall of Beirut to the Crusaders in his chapter on the history of the Arslāns, gave a host of the names of the Arslān amirs, and of others, who had been killed after the fall of the city. This account gives a glimpse of the fall of Beirut to the Crusaders as seen by its own governing class—an account that is different in content from the usual Western and Arabic accounts:

In 1110 Baldwin, one of the princes of France, gathered his armies and attacked Beirut, besieging it by land and sea. In the city there were ʿAḍud ad-Dawla² and some of

---

1. Sāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., pp.17-18. Ibn al-Qalānī, op.cit., pp.167-168, gave a long description of the fall of Beirut to the Crusaders, giving the date as May 13, 1110, without making any mention of the governor of Beirut being ʿAḍud ad-Dawla (he did not name him) and without mentioning the other Arslānid amirs. The account he gave of the fall of the city (H.A.R. Gibb’s translation, p.100), runs as follows: "The Franks now attacked both by land and sea with their entire force forces, on Friday 21st Shawwāl (13th May). they set up two towers against the wall and fought with utmost vigour. The commander of the Egyptian fleet was killed, together with a great host of the Muslims, and never before nor after did the Franks see a more hard-fought battle than this. The people in the town lost heart and became assured of their destruction. At the close of this day the Franks made an assault on the town and captured it mightily by the sword; the governor who was in it fled with a party of his troops; but he was brought to the Franks and put to death with all his companions, and they plundered all the treasure he had taken with him. The city was sacked, its inhabitants enslaved or made prisoner, and their goods and treasures confiscated."

2. Both Shidyāq and Shihābī (op.cit., p.317) gave the name as Shuṭaḍ ad-Dawla. Shuṭaḍ ad-Dawla `Umar, however, was the father of ʿAḍud ad-Dawla `Alī who, at the time, was the chief of the clan of the Arslāns, according to Shidyāq. Shidyāq must have copied the mistake from Shihābī’s account.
his relations. Finding that he could not take the city singlehanded, Baldwin called for the assistance of the Franks of the coast and of the Mardaite princes; and, answering his call, the Franks of the north assembled with the Mardaites in Jubail and the Franks of the south assembled in Marj al-Ghāzia. On the same day the two groups rose and attacked the Gharb in the morning, the northern group by way of the Jird and the southern group by way of the coast; and they looted it and burnt it, and whomsoever they found they killed or took prisoner. Only those among the people of the Gharb who were absent or in hiding were saved. Those of the amirs who were killed were Amir Mūsā bin Ibrāhīm bin Abī Bakr bin Al-Mundhir and his small children, Amir Qāsim bin Hishām bin Abī Bakr and his son, Amir Idris, Amir Mawdūd bin Sā'īd bin Qābūs and his two sons, Amir Asad and Amir Zuhair, Amir Mālik bin Muṣṭafā bin 'Amn, Amir 'Uba'id bin Miṣqad bin Ḥusām, Amir Yaḥyā bin Khādib bin Al-Husain bin 'Alī and his brother, Amir Yuṣuf, and Amir 'Alī bin Ḥālim bin Yuṣuf bin Fāris al-Fawārisi and his children, brothers, and cousins, with whom the line of descent of Banī Fawāris ended. Amir Thābit bin Ma'rūf bin 'Alī and his grandson, Amir 'Abd ar-Rahmān bin Fāns bin Thābit, were taken prisoner and later killed with the other prisoners after Beirut was taken, as will be seen later. Of the amirs who were in the Gharb only Amir Buhtur, son of Amir 'Aqūd ad-Dawla, remained alive, as his mother had hidden him in Aramūn until the departure of the Franks. The Franks then descended on Beirut, tightened its siege greatly, and took it by the sword, that being on April 23, its

1. Baldwin was helped in the capture of Beirut by Bertrand of Toulouse, Count of Tripoli, and by Genoese and Pisan ships (S. Runciman, op.cit., II, P.92). I have found nowhere any mention of the Mardaites helping Baldwin in the capture of Beirut.

2. I have found nowhere outside Shihābī and Shidyāq any mention of this.

3. Marj al-Ghāzia (in Shihābī, Burj al-Ghāzia) may have been the village of Al-Ghāziyya, south-east of Sidon. I have found nothing outside those two sources in support of this.

4. I have not found elsewhere any account of an attack by the Franks on the Gharb previous to the capture of Beirut. It is very possible, however. The list of the names of the amirs killed in this attack, given by Shidyāq, helps greatly in substantiating the truth of his narrative.

5. Banī Fawāris seem to have been a rival family to the Arslāns in the Gharb. At one time, one of them took over the governorship of the province for a time (Shidyāq, op.cit., p.711). After this point the enumeration of names in Shihābī ceases. Hence the names given are found solely in Shidyāq, probably copied from the Arslān family history.

6. This Buhtur may have been Buhtur of Tanukh, not an Arslānid amir at all. See below, pp.257 f.
siege having lasted two months. Five of the amirs were killed: the great Amir Aqūd ad-Dawla (All1, Amir Sālim bin Thābit bin Mārūf, Amir Abd al-Halīm bin (Ali bin Ṭūma, his son Saʻīd, and his brother, Amir Abd ar-Rahīm bin (All. Three of them were taken prisoner: Amir Khādīr bin (Ali bin Al-Husain, his son, Amir Al-Husain, and Amir (Ali bin Ṭūma bin (Ali, as well as others. On the second day Baldwin brought out all the prisoners outside the city and cut the necks of all of them. He then proceeded with his army by land and sea to Sidon and besieged it. Amir Majd ad-Dawla, who was there, as it has been mentioned, and the people of the city, despairing, made peace with the king and paid him twenty-thousand dirhams; whereupon Amir Majd ad-Dawla left the city in peace and Baldwin took it over. The Amir Majd ad-Dawla then came to the Gharb and found it in utter destruction.... He took to rebuilding the country

1. It is not clear where both Shihābī (op. cit., p. 318) and Shidyāq got this date from. Beirut fell on May 13, its siege having been started in February. S. Runciman, loc.cit.

2. According to Ibn al-Qalānisī (see above, p. 251, fn. 1) the governor of Beirut fled, but was later brought back to the Franks and killed. According to other sources, he fled by night through the Italian fleet to Cyprus, where he gave himself up to the Byzantine governor (S. Runciman, loc.cit., referring to Fulcher of Chartres and Albert of Aix). The massacre of the inhabitants of Beirut was conducted by the Italians, before Baldwin could restore order (S. Runciman, loc.cit.).

3. Majd ad-Dawla, as it has been mentioned above (p. 250) was not an Arslān. I have not been able to find a check on the name of the governor of Sidon from other sources.

4. Ibn al-Qalānisī (H.A.R. Gibb’s translation, pp. 100-101): "When the affairs of Bairūt had been set in order, King Baldwin departed with the Franks and encamping before the port of Sidon, sent an envoy to its inhabitants summoning them to surrender the town. They asked of him a respite for a space of time which they specified, and he granted them a respite, after exacting from them a sum of six thousand dinars to be paid to him as annual tribute, their former tribute having been two thousand dinars." Sidon capitulated on December 4. The notables of the town left with all their belongings to Damascus; but the poorer folk remained and became subjects of the Frankish king; who levied on them a tax of twenty thousand gold bezants. S. Runciman, op.cit., p. 93.

5. See previous Foot-note. I have found no mention in the sources I consulted about the governor of Sidon having gone to the Gharb after the fall of the city.
GENEALOGICAL TABLE

Showing the Amsānīd Amirs Killed During the Siege and After the Fall of Beirut to the Franks*

(After Shidyaq)

+ The names of the amirs killed are marked with the sign (+). I have not been able to trace some of the amirs who were killed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arslān</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahmūd</td>
<td>Mas'ūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwīsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munīhīj</td>
<td>Sulaimān</td>
<td>Mansūr 'Alī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Alī</td>
<td>Abū Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maqrūf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja'far</td>
<td>Thābit</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mūsā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sālim</td>
<td>Faras</td>
<td>'Abd ar-Rahmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abū Bakr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al-Mundhir</td>
<td>'Abd ar-Rahīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Abd al-Ḥalīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sāfīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maṭīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hishām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mūsā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qāsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Alī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Umar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muṣṭafā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Al-Mundhir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idrīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khīrīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Alī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mālik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mūsār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muṣṭafā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Al-Mundhir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yūsuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yahyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and to rehabilitate its people; and he took over its governorship.

In 1126, Shidyāq continued, Tughtigīn, the Atabeg of Damascus (1103-1126), wrote a letter to Majd ad-Dawla granting him the governorship of the Gharb and giving him several villages in ģāč. Majd ad-Dawla then began raiding Frankish territory until he was killed in Burj al-Barājīna, near Beirut, in 1127.

Although Majd ad-Dawla had a male heir, Amir ʿAbdallāh, the governorship of the Gharb, said Shidyāq, passed after his death back to the Arslānid family and was taken up by Nāhiḍ ad-Dīn Abūʾl-ʿAbdair Buḥṭūr, the son of ʿAdud ad-Dawla ʿAlī. It was probably the Tanūkhid Nāhiḍ ad-Dawla Buḥṭūr, however, who took over the governorship of the Gharb then, for it is at this point that Shidyāq started confusing between the Arslānid and the Tanūkhid amirs.

It is possible that Majd ad-Dawla was among the wulāt al-ṣātrak (governors of the marches) summoned by Tughtigīn in 1125-1126 (519 A.H.) to help in checking the Frankish raids on Haurān. This may explain Shidyāq's statement that Majd ad-Dawla received from Tughtigīn "a letter granting him the

---

2. Tughtigīn was an enfranchised mamlūk of Sultan Tutush, and afterwards, in 1095, was appointed atabeg to his son Duqāq, the Saljūq prince of Damascus, whom he succeeded. S. Lane-Poole, op.cit., p.161.
4. Shidyāq's confusion between the Arslāns and the Tanūkhids will be discussed below, pp.159-160. Nāhiḍ ad-Dīn Buḥṭūr of Arslān may never have existed; but possibly he was the namesake of the Tanūkhid Buḥṭūr, this giving rise to the confusion in Shidyāq between his progeny and that of the Tanūkhid Buḥṭūr.
governorship of the Gharb and giving him certain villages in iqṭāʿ. ¹

Majd ad-Dawla may have formally received from Tughtigin the iqṭāʿ of these villages and the governorship of the Gharb as an attraction to, or in repayment for, his military services.

In the meantime a third important family came from Syria and settled in the Shūf. These were the Maʿnīs, whose hegemony in Lebanon started soon after the Ottoman conquest.

According to Shidyāq,² Amir Maʿn al-Ayyūbī, the eponymous ancestor of this family, who had been unsuccessfully fighting the Franks in northern Syria, received orders from Tughtigin in 1120 ³ to move with his clan to the Biqāʿ, and thence to the mountains of Lebanon overlooking the coast, and from there to organize raids against the Franks of the coast.

1. Ibn al-Qalānīṣī, op. cit., pp. 212-213 (H.A.R. Gibb's translation, pp. 174-175): "In this year [A.H. 519] news arrived from the quarter of Baldwin, king of the Franks, lord of Jerusalem, of his assembling of troops and making preparations to invade the region of Haurān in the government of Damascus, in order to ravage and devastate it. He began to dispatch raiding parties to the districts near Damascus, placing them in sore straits, and laying ambushes on the roads for those who journeyed to them. On receiving confirmation of this news, Ṣāḥīr al-Dīn Atābek [Tughtigin] set about making preparations to encounter him.... He sent letters to the amirs, leaders and principal men of the Turkmen, informing them of the state of affairs, asking for their help against the Franks, and promising them generous treatment and reward.... And he wrote to the governors of the provinces [wulūt al-ṭurāf] to send him reinforcements of foot-soldiers... and a great host assembled to assist him." I believe wulūt al-ṭurāf should be translated "governors of the border provinces" or "the marches". For Baldwin's expedition against Haurān, see S. Runciman, op. cit., II, p. 174.


Ma'n, therefore, settled with his clan in B'aqlin (the Bahaelin of the Crusaders), in the Shuf, and allied himself with the Tanükhid Amir Buhtur, with whom he raided the Franks. To his country, Shidyāq added, many people flocked from those parts of Syria and Lebanon that had been occupied by the Franks.

Although it seems that no material is available, outside Lebanese sources, to check the event of the coming of the Ma'nids to Lebanon, this event, as given by Shidyāq, does not appear improbable. It is natural to suppose that the Moslem ruler of Damascus should have been interested in settling tribes in Mount Lebanon to check the advance of the Franks into his country from the west and the south-west.

At approximately the same date as the coming of the Ma'nids to Lebanon, another family, the Talḥūqs, which came originally from the Euphrates district to Syria with Ma'n al-Ayyūbi, moved to Wādī at-Taim, the southern part of the Biqā', and thence to Beirut. That is how Shidyāq described the coming of the Talḥūqs to Lebanon. It was in 1144, he continued, that they first settled in Ras Beirut. Later, 769-770, gave the same date as Shidyāq. Shidyāq did not mention Ain Tūrīnī among his sources. They may have both copied from the same source.

1. E. Rey, Les colonies franques..., pp. 510-511. Bahaelin, a village in the Shuf, was given to the Teutonic order by Julien of Sidon in 1257.
2. This shows clearly that Buhtur of Tanūkh was already the leading chief of the Gharb. See above, p. 254, fn. 4.
blood feuds with the neighbouring families forced them to leave Beirut to the nearby village of Al-Faijāniyya, and finally to settle in 'Aitāt, a village in the upper Gharb, which remained a center of the family until the present day. It was not, however, until 1711, after the battle of 'Ain Dārā, that the family received the title of shaikh. Up until that date the Talḥūqs appear to have been one of the minor feudal families of the upper Gharb.¹

Throughout the Crusader and Mamlūk periods it was the Arslāns and the Tanūkhs who played the leading part in the internal history of non-Maronite Lebanon. The Maʿnīds remained mainly in the background, and the Shihābs were not in Lebanon at all during this period.

In the year 1147, said Shidyāq, Mujīr ad-Dīn Ābeg (Būrid Atabeg of Damascus, 1139-1154) issued a mānshūr to the Arslānid Āmir, Nāḥīd ad-Dawla Abū l-‘Ashā’ir Buḥtūr, confirming his iqṭāʾ of the villages held by him and by his ancestors before him.² Elsewhere, Shidyāq mentioned under the same date the investiture of the Tanūkhid āmir, Nāḥīd ad-Dawla Abū l-‘Ashā’ir Buḥtūr.³ Nobody other than Shidyāq mentioned the investiture of the Arslānid Āmir Buḥtūr. The

---

2. Ibid., p.716. Shidyāq is the only historian who, to my knowledge, mentioned the investiture of this āmir.
3. Ibid., pp.274-275.
investiture of his Tanūkhid namesake, however, has been mentioned in other histories.¹ Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā gave a copy of the manshūr of Abég to Buḥtur of Tanūkh. This copy was probably found by him in the family archives, which have since been lost. The manshūr, in translation, runs as follows:

This noble writ has been issued to the great amir, Nāḥiḍ ad-Dawla Abīʾl-ʿAshāʾir Buḥtur bin ʿAlī bin ʿIbrāhīm bin Abī ʿAbdallāh, may God always support him, guide him, and level his ways, that he may abide with his old dues and what villages he holds, such as have been attributed to the name of his father and to his name. He may receive their dues, which he shall use to his own advantage and to strengthen himself for the service of the State. He shall also continue to hold the ḫāṣaṣṣ of the Gharb, in the mountain of Beirut; for he is known for his courage, his efficiency, his good character, and his honesty. As for the ruʿās and the peasants, may God strengthen them. It shall be their duty to listen to his commands and to obey him in whatever he may demand of them in regard to the payment of royal dues (al-huquq as-sultaṇiyya). As for him, his duty shall be to defend them and to bring their grievances to the governors (nuwāb), the officials (al-mutasarrifin), and the rulers (ashāb). Written in the middle third of Muharram, the year 542 (June, 1147).²

Non-Lebanese historians did not mention the investiture of Buḥtur of Tanūkh, but it appears from the accounts given of the year 543 A.H. (1148 A.D.) by Ibn al-Qalānīsī and Abū Shāma that Mujīr ad-Dīn had called on the help of

² The raʾis (pl. ruʿāsāt) was a notable who was in charge of local administration and police in his own locality, very much like a mayor. The Franks preserved this post for the local administration of both, the Moslem and the Christian natives. See Claude Cahen, La Syrie du nord à l'époque des Croisades... (Paris, 1940), pp. 461-462 and 456.
³ Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, loc. cit.
the Arab tribes and the governors of the marches to help ward off the Frankish attack on Damascus in that year.¹ "On the second day [after the attack]," wrote Ibn al-Qalānisī, "there arrived from the direction of the Biqā‘ and from elsewhere many archers..."² These archers may have been sent to the help of Ābeg by the amirs of the Gharb, after those amirs had been attracted to the service of Damascus by official land grants and by being recognized by the State as amirs of the Gharb.

It would be best at this point to attempt the unravelling of the confusion made by Shidyāq between the Tanūkh and the Arslān amirs.

According to Shidyāq, Buḥtur of Arslān died in 1157, leaving a son, ʿArf ad-Ḍawla ʿAlī.³ This ʿAlī, he continued, died in 1229, and his only surviving son was ʿālih, who became known as Abū l-Jaish Zain ad-Dīn.⁴

Shidyāq gave the genealogy of the descendants of Buḥtur of Arslān in each of the two chapters he wrote on that family in Akhbar al-ṣafān... In the first chapter⁵ he merely gave the names of Buḥtur Arslān’s descendants, and in the second⁶ he gave brief biographical notices on them, and some dates. It would be best to compare, for a start, the

² Ibn al-Qalānisī, op. cit., p.299.
³ Shidyāq, op. cit., p.717. For the genealogy, see ibid., p.140.
⁴ Ibid., p.718.
⁵ Ibid., pp.140-141.
⁶ Ibid., pp.717 et seq.
genealogical tables of the Tanūkhs that can be drawn from each of these two chapters with one of the Tanūkh family, as it appears in both, Akhbar al-a'yān... and Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā's history.

Shidyāq's first account of the progeny of Buḥtur Arslān can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buḥtur</th>
<th>ʿAli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbū l-Jaish Ṣāliḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buḥtur+1</th>
<th>Mufarrij Yusuf Masʿūd Shākir ʿAli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maḥmūd+</td>
<td>Mufarrij Mūsā Ibrāhīm Yusuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥamdān+</td>
<td>ʿUthmān Sulaiman+ Ibrāhīm+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwīsh+</td>
<td>ʿAbdallāh Masʿūd Bashīr+ Husain+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His second account, which gives obituary dates and titles for most of the amirs, can be tabulated as follows:

1. Names that are followed by the sign (+) are the names of amirs who died without leaving progeny.
On the other hand, the progeny of 'Ali bin Buhtur of Tanūkh, as it appears in Shidyāq,11 as well as in Sālih bin

1. Ibid., p. 719.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 720.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., pp. 720-721.
9. Ibid., p. 721.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., pp. 129 et seq.
Yahya, can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nahid ad-Din Buhtur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 1301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arf ad-Dawla</td>
<td>AlI, d. 1307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zain ad-Din Abi Salih</td>
<td>d. 1296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salih, father of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Aramun line of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhturids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams ad-Din Karima</td>
<td>Husain</td>
<td>Saif ad-Din</td>
<td>Mufarrij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 1307</td>
<td>d. 1349</td>
<td>d. 1336</td>
<td>d. 1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badr ad-Din Yusuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 13017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams ad-Din Karima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 1307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams ad-Din Karima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 1307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badr ad-Din Yusuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 13017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaf ad-Din Ali</td>
<td>Muhammad Ahmad</td>
<td>Ali Khalil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 13019</td>
<td>d. 1379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badr ad-Din Hasan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 1367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have collected Salih's version of the Tanukh genealogy from the various parts of his history, which is largely a commented genealogy. Pages from which I took the dates appear in the following footnotes.

2. Salih bin Yahya did not give the date of his death. Shidyag, p. 275, gave it as 1174, which is very doubtful. The point will be discussed later. See below, pp. 266-267.

3. Shidyag alone called him 'Arf ad-Dawla. Salih bin Yahya referred to him simply as 'Ali. Most of the titles of his descendants are found in Salih bin Yahya, but not in Shidyag.

4. Salih bin Yahya, p. 85. The date is given as A.H. Dabi' I 14, 695.

5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p. 83.
7. Ibid., p. 85.
8. Ibid., p. 87.
10. Ibid., p. 155.
11. Ibid., p. 156.
It appears certain that Shidyāq, in his history, identified to a great extent Abū'l-Jaish Šāliḥ of Arslān with Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ of Tanūkh, and called him Abū'l-Jaish Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ after his Tanūkhid namesake. His death, according to Shidyāq, took place in 1295, a date which he also gave for the death of Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ of Tanūkh.  

Abū'l-Jaish, according to Shidyāq, married Jamīla, daughter of the Tanūkhid amir, Najm ad-Dīn Muḥammad bin Ḫajjī bin Kārāma bin Buḥṭur. According to Šāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ of Tanūkh married Ṣādiqa, the daughter of the same Najm ad-Dīn Muḥammad. Although it is possible that Shidyāq was confusing again between the two amirs by making them marry the same woman, and that Jamīla was only a mistake for Ṣādiqa, it appears more probable that the two Šāliḥs married sisters, this fact having led to greater confusion between their characters.

Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā did not give a complete genealogy of the descendants of Abū'l-Jaish; but from his occasional mentions of their names some idea can be had about it. It appears from his account that there were two members of that family who bore the nick-name of Abū'l-Jaish, the first of

2. Ibid., p. 287. Šāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op. cit., p. 82, gave the date of Zain ad-Dīn's death as Rabīʿ II 8, 695 (February 15, 1296).
4. Šāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op. cit., p. 82.
5. Abū'l-Jaish (father of the army) is a nick-name. Šāliḥ bin Yaḥyā did not give his real name which, according to Shidyāq, was Šāliḥ.
whom was the son of Mufriḥ (or Mufarrij). There is no mention of a Buḥtur or a ʿAli as the direct ancestors of Abū ʿl-Jaish. It seems, therefore, that Shidyāq's confusion began with the first Abū ʿl-Jaish, whose real name must have been Ṣāliḥ. Confusing him with Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ of Tanūkh, Shidyāq attributed to him some of the ancestors and some of the descendants of the latter.

The part of the Abū ʿl-Jaish family tree that can be reconstructed from Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā's history appears to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mufriḥ (Mufarrij?)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abū ʿl-Jaish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mufriḥ2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū ʿl-Jaish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sinān3</th>
<th>Masʿūd4</th>
<th>ʿAlī5</th>
<th>Taqīd-6</th>
<th>Šād ad-Dīn (or Šādān)7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Najm ad-Dīn</td>
<td>ʿImād Shuṭāk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Najā6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaukab ad-Dīn</td>
<td>Musā9</td>
<td>Arslān10</td>
<td>Šārim ad-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shamūl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Shihāb ad- Dīn | (title?)12 | Din Daʿūd13 | name?)14 |

2. Ibid. Šāliḥ referred to a document in the writing of this Mufriḥ which he saw, and which was dated Rabīʿ I, 638 (1240 AD).
3. Ibid., pp.96 and 97.
4. Ibid., pp.94, 96, and 98.
5. Ibid., p.177.
6. Ibid., pp.72 and 98.
7. Ibid., pp.84 (fn.4), 85, 96, and 98.
8. Ibid., p.97.
9. Ibid., pp.94, 96, and 98.
10. Ibid., p.97.
11. Ibid., pp.96 and 97.
12. Ibid., pp.84, 85, 96, and 98.
13. Ibid., pp.96 and 98.
Considering that the second Mufriḥ in this genealogy was alive in c. 1240, it must have been his son, the second Abū'1-Jaish Sāliḥ, who was the contemporary and possibly the brother-in-law of Zain ad-Dīn Sāliḥ of Tanūkh who died in 1295.

It is not certain whether Shidyāq himself was responsible for this confusion, or whether it was his sources which were confused. It is important to remember, however, that at times it is Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, who admitted that there was a confusion between the genealogies of the family of Abū'1-Jaish and that of Zain ad-Dīn Sāliḥ of Tanūkh, who mistook Arslāns for Tanūkhs, as will be shown below. In such cases, Shidyāq's account can be used to check him.\(^3\)

With the available material it is impossible to reconstruct fully the genealogy of the house of Abū'1-Jaish. The confusion found in Shidyāq cannot be rearranged with the scanty information found about the matter in Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā's history. How correct either of Shidyāq's genealogies are cannot be clearly determined. It may further be noted here that Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā seems to have believed that the family of Abū'1-Jaish was a branch of the Ḥummaira (Al-Ḥamrā?) family from the Bīgā'. He mentioned nothing about their descent.

---

1. Ibid., p. 73.
2. Ibid., p. 47.
3. See below, pp. 285 et seq. for an example.
from the Arslâns. 1 It is possible that the house of Abû'l-Jaish claimed descent from the Arslâns, the original amirs of the Gharb, to strengthen their case against the Tanûkhs, whose rivals they remained throughout the Crusader and Mamlûk periods. If this is true, then the confusion about the descent of Abû'l-Jaish, as found in Akhbâr al-â'yân..., would have been caused by this attempt to forge a genealogy. The truth about this matter, however, cannot be fully established.

The main cause of the confusion found in the histories of both Şâliḥ bin Yaḥyâ and Shidyâq between the descendants of Abû'l-Jaish Şâliḥ and Zain ad-Dîn Şâliḥ, apart from their having the same name, may have been because both houses lived in 'Aramûn al-Gharb. Besides, members of each of the two houses had the same names.

As it has been said above, 2 it was Buhtur of Tanûkh, and not an Arslânid amir by the same name, who received the document of investiture from Mujîr ad-Dîn Ābeg in 1147. It

1. Şâliḥ bin Yaḥyâ, p.47. H. Lammens (La Syrie..., II, p.9) mentioned the Abû'l-Jaish family without saying that they were descendants of the Arslâns. He believed that they came to Lebanon at the time of the Crusades. A.N. Polyak, Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Lebanon, 1250-1900 (London, 1939), p.13, said that the modern Arslâns claim Banû Abûl-Jaish as their ancestors (referring to Shidyâq) and that they (also or therefore?) trace their ancestry to the pre-Islamic Arab kings of Al-Ḥîra (also depending on Shidyâq. Polyak, p.57). From the material available in Shidyâq and Şâliḥ bin Yaḥyâ, it appears that if there was any genealogical forgery it was made by Banû Abûl-Jaish, who, rightly or wrongly, claimed descent from the Arslâns.

2. See above, p.258.
is unlikely that Buhtur died in 1174, as Shidyāq said, for already in 1160, fourteen years earlier, Nūr ad-Dīn Zangi had invested his son, Karāma, with considerable iqṭāʾs, and with what seems to have been his father's position. Buhtur must have died before that date, possibly in 1157, the date which Shidyāq gave to the death of the presumed Buhtur of Arslān.  

In relating the investiture of Karāma bin Buhtur by Nūr ad-Dīn Zangi, Shidyāq repeated Duwaiḥī’s story almost word for word, giving the same date:

In 1160 (he said) the Malik Nūr ad-Dīn Zangi granted Karāma bin Buhtur Al-Qunaitra and Jilibāyā in the Biqāʾ, Az-Zahr al-Āḥmar in Wādī at-Taim, and Barjā, Al-Maʿāṣir al-Fauqiyya, Ad-Dāmūr, Shārūn, Majd al-Baʿnā, and Kafar-Simmā, and made provisions for him for forty horsemen to fight the Franks.

This event has already been discussed in the chapter on Duwaiḥī; but it is interesting to note how Shidyāq, in his confusion between the Tanūkhṣ and the Arslāns, understood the investiture of Karāma after what he supposed was the investiture of Buhtur of Arslān:

In the year 1157 (he said) the Amir Nāhiḍ ad-Dīn Abūʾl-ʿAshaʾir Buhtur of Arslān died, leaving a son, ʿAlī....

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 717.
4. Ibid., p. 275.
5. See above, pp. 144-147.
6. This event is related by Shidyāq in his history of the Arslāns.
So Al-Malik al-‘Ādil Nūr ad-Dīn granted the Gharb as an iqṭāʾ to Amir Zahr ad-Dawla Karama, known as Amir al-Gharb.

Mistaking Buhtur of Tanūkh for an Arslānīd amir by that name, Shidyāq understood from Nūr ad-Dīn’s marṣūm to Karāma in 1157 that after the death of the supposed Buhtur of Arslān, the iqṭāʾ of the Gharb passed over to the Tanūkhs. Actually Buhtur of Tanūkh himself had a son called ‘Alī who did not succeed to the iqṭāʾ of the Gharb, Shidyāq having mistaken him for an Arslānīd amir by the same name who did not succeed to the iqṭāʾ of his father (the presumed ‘Alī of Arslān, father of Abū’l-Jaish).

Previously Shidyāq had related that in 1151 Buhtur of Arslān had defeated the Franks at Ras at-Tīn, near Nahr al-Ghadīr, and had forced them to retreat to Beirut. Here again the hero must have been Buhtur of Tanūkh, although Śāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, not having mentioned any of the exploits of Buhtur of Tanūkh, did not mention anything about this battle.

After relating the death of Buhtur of Arslān and the investiture of Karāma of Tanūkh, Shidyāq proceeded to say that in 1162 the Fatimids of Egypt approached Ṣafī ad-Dawla ‘Alī of Arslān (who may well have been Sharaf ad-Dawla) ‘Alī of

2. This is the correct date of Nūr ad-Dīn’s first marṣūm to Karāma. See above, p.144.
3. Shidyāq, op.cit., pp.716-717. I have found nothing about the battle of Ras at-Tīn in other sources. Nahr al-Ghadīr is a winter stream that pours to the south of Beirut.
4. For the title of ‘Alī bin Buhtur, see Ibn Sibāṭ, op.cit., p.16 and the genealogical tree in Śāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, opposite p.40.
Tanūkh), who had failed to succeed to the iqṭā' of the Gharb, to incite the amirs of the country against Nur ad-Dīn. Nur ad-Dīn, Shidyāq continued, hearing of this, turned against ‘Alī. Unfortunately, the establishment of the truth of this fact from the available sources does not appear to be possible; but its mention in Akhār al-‘ayān... does give a hint about the intrigues that the Lebanese indulged in during the Crusader period.

According to Shidyāq this ‘Arf ad-Dawla later won back the good will of the Zangids and was granted the iqṭā' of the Gharb after the death of Karāma and the murder of his three grown-up sons by the Frankish ruler of Beirut. This last event in which, Shidyāq said, ‘Arf ad-Dawla ‘Alī played a part, was related in Akhār al-‘ayān... as follows:

The Amir Karāma died leaving four sons; and the three eldest among them made peace with the Frankish ruler of Beirut, who later killed them and attacked their fort and destroyed it. He then proceeded with his army

2. Shidyāq here gave no date to Karāma's death. Elsewhere (p. 275) he seems to have believed that he died after 1174, which is impossible. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā (p.54) declared that he found nowhere the date of birth or death of any of Buḥtur, ‘Alī, Karāma, or Hajjī.
3. If this event took place towards the year 1172 (see below, p.273), then the "ruler" of Beirut in question was neither of the house of Brisebarre (1110-1166) nor of the house of Ibelin (from 1197). In 1166 Gautier III, last Brisebarre lord of Beirut, sold his fief back to Amalric I, King of Jerusalem; and it remained crown domain until the fall of Beirut to Saladin in 1187. E. Rey, "Les seigneurs de Barut", R.O.L. IV, 1896, pp.15 and 17.
4. As it has been mentioned above (p.145), Karāma resided in the fort of Sarhamūr, not far from Beirut, to its southeast.
to ‘Aramūn where ‘Arf ad-Dawla ‘Alī bin Buhtur was living; and ‘Arf ad-Dawla ‘Alī rose to meet him with his men, and they fought. And as the Amir and his men were taking their stand on a high hill, they threw rocks and shot arrows at him, then descended on him from the mountain tops, defeated him, and scattered his men. The Amir then took over the īmāra alone.

When, however, the news reached Al-Malik as-Salih bin Nūr ad-Dīn (1173-1181),1 he wrote him a letter praising his courage and granting him the Gharb, as it had been granted to his sires and grandsires.2

Haidar ash-Shihābī, in al-ghurar al-hisān..., said that Sharaf ad-Dawla ‘Alī of Tanūkh held the route of Dāmūr against the Franks at ‘Aramūn.3 Although he gave no date, he appears to have been referring to the same incident related with more detail by Shidyāq. If Shihābī were right, it is strange indeed to find that Salih bin Yahyā did not avail himself of the opportunity of adding this heroic adventure to the deeds of his ancestors and his family in his history. Actually Salih bin Yahyā made no mention at all of the event, stating simply that after the sack of Sarḥamūr ‘Alī of Tanūkh was probably living in ‘Aramūn alone, while the rest of the Tanūkhid family took residence in ‘Abāl, after having stayed for a time in Tīrdalā.4 Neither did Salih say that ‘Alī of Tanūkh took over the īqtāl of the

---

1. Aṣ-Ṣalih Ismā‘īl succeeded his father Nūr ad-Dīn in 1173. See Lane-Poole, op. cit., p.163.
2. Shidyāq, op. cit., p.717. See also MS Ibn Sibāt, pp.41-42, on which Shidyāq depended.
4. Salih bin Yahyā, op. cit., p.54. Salih said that he heard this information from old people in his family.
Gharb after the murder of his three nephews, the sons of Karāma.

The sack of Sarhamūr and the murder of the sons of Karāma by the Franks were related by Shidyāq in his chapter on the history of the Tanūkhs as follows:

Amir Karāma died..., leaving four sons; and the eldest three made peace with the Frankish ruler of Beirut who was kind and friendly to them, and with whom they went hunting on several occasions. One day, however, he invited them to the wedding of his son in Beirut..., and when night came he asked them to a private session in the fort.... They entered the fort with a few of their attendants, and he killed them; and the next morning he went out with a company of Franks to the fort of Sarhamūr. On hearing of their approach the mother of the amirs escaped with her youngest son, Hájjī..., then seven years of age, who was later given the title of Jamāl ad-Dawla, and whose cousins, the sons of Amir ʿAlī, lived in Āramūn. As for the Franks, they looted the fort, destroyed it, and threw its stones in a valley. After a few days, Nur ad-Dīn Zangī wrote to Hájjī granting him the village of Jabʿa.3

The history of Ibn Sibāṭ4 was the main source from which Shidyāq got his information about this event. Among the non-Lebanese historians, only Ibn Ḥajar, to my knowledge, related the event:

The governor of Beirut used to attempt the siege of Karāma in his fort, but he was not capable of doing so. When, however, Karāma's sons grew up and developed a liking for hunting, he wrote to them and met them,

1. Ibid., p.52.
2. ʿSāliḥ bin Yaḥyā gave his title both as Jamāl ad-Dawla (p.51) and Jamāl ad-Dīn (p.50). The latter, however, he used more often.
3. Shidyāq, op. cit., p.275. Shidyāq took his account from Ibn Sibāṭ (pp.41-42), who in turn took it from ʿSāliḥ bin Yaḥyā (pp.50-52). I have not been able to identify Jabʿa.* Possibly it was a village in the Gharb that no longer exists.
4. See previous foot-note.

* It may have been a mistake for Ḥūm, a village to the south-west of Jazzīn, south-east of Sidon.
showing them great hospitality. Gradually he brought out his son, a youth, with them \( \text{to the hunt} \); then he told them: "I have decided to get him married, and I shall invite \( \text{to the wedding} \) the governors of the coast; so come and attend." The three eldest sons, therefore, went \( \text{to the wedding} \) and left their youngest brother in the fort. (The Franks) received them with candles and musical instruments; but when the hour of mid-afternoon came, (the governor of Beirut) took them unawares, arrested them, and arrested their attendants; and they were drowned. Then (the governor of Beirut) rode with his soldiers to the fort and took it, and the old woman (the mother of the amirs) left (the fort) with her youngest son, who was seven years old, and he was Hajji, the great-grandfather of Naṣir ad-Dīn al-Ḥusain.

Ibn Ḥajar (d. 1468)\(^2\) may have taken his information from Sāliḥ bin Yahya\(^3\), but he included a point not mentioned in the latter's history and at variance with the latter's narrative. Whereas Sāliḥ bin Yahya stated simply that when the three sons of Karāma were taken into the fort "it was the last that was known of them",\(^4\) Ibn Ḥajar had it that they were drowned.\(^5\)

The date of this event is vague. Shidyāq gave it no date, but placed it between the events of the year 1174 and those of the year 1187. Ibn Ḥajar gave no dates at all, his interest having been merely to relate something about the

---

1. Ibn Ḥajar, Ad-durar al-kāmina ..., II, p. 54.
3. Sāliḥ bin Yahya took part in the expedition against Cyprus in 1425. The date of his death is unknown. See in appendix to Sāliḥ bin Yahya, taken from Ibn Sibāt, p. 234. He must have died before Ibn Ḥajar.
5. I have not come across a mention of this event in any of the earlier Frankish and Arabic sources I consulted.

* Al-ʾaṣr*
ancestors of Nasir ad-Din al-Husain, with whom he was concerned. Salih bin Yahya, after relating the event, added:

It is said that this misfortune took place towards the end of the reign of Al-Malik al-Adil Nur ad-Din Zangi, Al-Malik al-Adil having died on Shawwal 11, 567 (June 6, 1172).1

As for what Shidyaq said about Hajji having received the grant of Jaba from Nur ad-Din after the murder of his brothers and the sack of Sarhamur, it does not appear from Salih bin Yahya’s account to have been put by Shidyaq, or by Ibn Sibat, whom Shidyaq copied, in the correct sequence. In Salih bin Yahya’s account the grant of Jaba to Hajji is related as a separate piece of information, added by the author after his narrative of the sack of Sarhamur:

I found among the old manshir a manshir to Hajji, which I wanted to mention here to prove that the afore-mentioned Hajji was already living in the last years of... Nur ad-Din. It is a manshir from Nur ad-Din in the name of Hajji, stating that Jaba, alone, was of the iqtad of Hajji bin Karama, Amir of the Gharb, and his relations; and the manshir had this iqtad in the names of eight individuals (anfar) who were, perhaps, Hajji’s jundis. The date of the manshir is the last day of Ramadân, 565 (June 17, 1170). Perhaps this manshir was written in the childhood of Hajji, as an addition to what was held by his brothers.1

Having dealt with the murder of Hajji’s brothers by the Franks of Beirut, Shidyaq proceeded to mention the investiture of Hajji by Salih ad-Din al-Ayyubi after the fall

2. Salih bin Yahya, op.cit., p.52.
of Beirut to him in 1187. This event has already been discussed before in the chapter on Duwaihī's history.¹

In dealing with the history of the Arslāns in the same period, Shidyāq said that when Salāḥ ad-Dīn al-Ayyūbī gave the Gharb in iqṭāʿ to Ḥajjī, Ārf ad-Dawla ʿĀlī who, according to Shidyāq, had been granted the Gharb by ʿAṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ismāʿīl bin Nūr ad-Dīn after the murder of Ḥajjī's brothers,² was greatly displeased. This, Shidyāq added, led to enmity between Ḥajjī and Ārf ad-Dawla.³

If it is to be supposed that Ārf ad-Dawla ʿĀlī was no other than Sharaf ad-Dīn ʿĀlī of Tanūkh, the brother of Karāma, there is nothing in ʿĀli bin Yaḥyā about any enmity between him and his nephew Ḥajjī. It is possible that ʿĀli bin Yaḥyā ignored an enmity the memory of which would have kept the Tanūkhid family divided on itself. It may have been for the same reason that ʿĀli bin Yaḥyā did not mention that Sharaf ad-Dawla ʿĀlī took over Karāma's iqṭāʿ after the murder of his son.⁴ On the other hand, it may have been that after the plight of the Tanūkh at the hands of the Franks of Beirut, and after the succession of a minor to the Tanūkhid iqṭāʿ, an Arslān amir stepped in and attempted to renew the lost dominance of his family in the Gharb. The

¹. Shidyāq, op.cit., pp.275-276. Also Duwaihī, T.A., pp.86 and MS Ibn Sīdāt, p.82. See above, p.147.
². See above, p.270.
restoration of this dominance to the Tanūkhs, in that case, would naturally have aroused his hostility. It is extremely unlikely that Shidyāq was making up the facts he gave in his history, although it is definite that he did get embarrassed with the different facts he had drawn from various sources. If, besides, the fact that an Arslānid amir tried vainly to take over the Tanūkhid īqtāʾ towards the end of the twelfth century is accepted, it would explain the rivalry between the Tanūkhs and the Arslāns in the latter half of the thirteenth.

Shidyāq further added that in 1195 (actually 1197),¹ when the Franks took Beirut again, Ḥajjī, in fear of misfortune, made peace with ‘Arf ad-Dawla ‘Alī.²

Shidyāq mentioned a letter sent by Nūr ad-Dīn al-Ayyūbī (Al-Afḍal Nūr ad-Dīn ‘Alī) of Damascus (1186–1196) to Ḥajjī urging him to fight the Franks and granting him the whole of the Gharb in īqtāʾ.³ Ibn Sībāt mentioned this letter with the date 590 A.H. (1193–1194 A.D.).⁴ Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā said he had come across a letter from Al-Afḍal, giving the same information as that mentioned by Shidyāq, and the date as Ramaḍān 16, 593 A.H. (August 2, 1197). By that time, it may be noted, Al-Afḍal was no more ruler of Damascus, having

---

¹ R. Grousset, op.cit., II, p.852. Amalric II retook Beirut in October, 1197. The wrong date given by Shidyāq must have been taken from Duwaiha (T.A., pp.95-96) who gave it as 1195.
² Shidyāq, op.cit., p.718.
³ Ibid., p.276.
⁴ MS Ibn Sībāt, P.67.
been succeeded by his uncle, Al-Adil Saif ad-Din Abu Bakr, in 592 A.H. (1196 A.D.).

Shidyaq, depending on Ibn Sibat, mentioned that at approximately the same time Al-Afdal sent an army to raid Beirut. Ibn Sibat had added that it seemed that Al-Afdal's letter was meant to call Hajji to his assistance.

Al-Afdal, according to Shidyaq, sent another letter to Hajji informing him that he had written to the Franks of Beirut asking them to keep Hajji in his old position. This letter, according to Salih bin Yahya, was sent to Hajji by Al-Aziz Imad ad-Din Uthman (Ayyubid sultan of Egypt, 1193-1198). Salih said that he had seen the letter, but did not give its date. He added: "This points to the truce with the Franks at the time, and shows that Hajji had complained to the Sultan about the behaviour of the Franks towards him."

Shidyaq did not give the date of Hajji's death; neither did Salih bin Yahya. The latter, however, said that he had come across a letter from Al-Aziz Uthman to Hajji dated Jumada I 25, 619 A.H. (July 7, 1222), which shows that

1. S. Lane-Poole, op.cit., p. 78.
2. Shidyaq, loc.cit.
3. MS Ibn Sibat, p. 67.
4. Shidyaq, loc.cit.
5. Salih bin Yahya, op.cit., p. 53. S. Lane-Poole, op.cit., p. 77. The sultan in question was not Al-Aziz Uthman. See below, fn7.
7. Ibid. If the date is correct, then the author of the letter was not Al-Aziz Uthman of Egypt. The Sultan of Egypt at the time was Al-Kamil (1218-1233) and that of Damascus was Al-Mu'azzam Isma (1218-1227). S. Lane-Poole, op.cit., pp. 77-78. MS Ibn Sibat, pp. 93-94, doubted the authorship of the letter on the same grounds and suggested that it was either Al-Kamil or Al-Mu'azzam who had written it to Hajji.
he was still alive at the time.

For the most part, the first half of the thirteenth century is, in Akhbar al-ayyan, a period on which very little information is given. The only event mentioned before the fourth decade was the death of 'Arfd-Dawla 'Ali of Arslān in 1229.\(^1\)

The first event of importance in the thirteenth century which is related in Akhbar al-ayyan... took place, according to Shidyāq, in 1246. In that year, he said, Al-Malik as-Sālih ʿNaṣr ad-Dīn al-ʿAyyūbī\(^2\) wrote to ʿNaṣr ad-Dīn Muḥammad, the son of Jamāl ad-Dīn ʿHājī of Tanūkh, a letter praising his obedience and his good services and giving orders that he should remain in his usual position, with an increase in the stipend allotted to him and to his followers. The letter also ordered Muḥammad bin ʿHājī to recruit to military service whomever he could. It informed him too of the Sultan's intention to visit the country (the Lebanese coast)\(^3\) and ordered Muḥammad to prepare for his reception.\(^4\) In that same year, Shidyāq continued, Muḥammad bin ʿHājī and his brother, ʿSharaf ad-Dīn ʿAlī, were killed in Thaghrat al-Jauzāt in Kīṣruqūn.\(^5\)

---

1. Shidyāq, op.cit., p.718. On this occasion Shidyāq gave ʿAlī's full name as 'Arf ad-Dawla Qiyām ad-Dīn ʿAlī, known as Arslān, son of Buhtur.
2. As-Sālih ʿNaṣr ad-Dīn ʿAyyūb was Ayyūbid sultan of Egypt (1240-1249). Lane-Poole, loc.cit.
5. Ibid. This event has been dealt with above, p.148.
The death of Muḥammad and his brother ʿAlī in Kisruṭn has already been dealt with. The date of their death, according to other sources, was 1242, not 1246. 1 If this be true, the manshūr of ʿĀṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb to Muḥammad must have been issued before 1242. Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā and Ibn Sibāṭ, both of whom gave the date of Muḥammad's death as Rabīʿ II 6, 640 A.H. (October 3, 1242 A.D.), gave the text of the manshūr with the date as Dhūʿl-Ḥijja 6, without giving the year; Ibn Sibāṭ adding that the year was not given in the original manshūr. 2 Considering that Dhūʿl-Ḥijja is the last month of the Hijra year, then the date of the letter must have been, at the latest, in 639 A.H. (May 19, 1242). Ibn Sibāṭ, however, copying from the same source as Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, doubted the date 640 A.H. which he found given to the death of Muḥammad. He made the following comment on it:

We found a historical note in the handwriting of some Tanūkhid in which it is mentioned that the sons of the amir of the Ghur, Najm ad-Dīn Muḥammad and his brother Sharaf ad-Dīn ʿAlī, 3 were killed in Thaghrat al-Jauzāt in Kisruṭn on Rabīʿ al-Ākhir 6, 640. Perhaps this is a mistake in the number because by that year Al-Malik as-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb had not yet taken Damascus. He took it in

1. Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.117; Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op.cit., p.55; and MS Ibn Sibāṭ, pp.121-122.
2. Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op.cit., pp.54-55 and MS Ibn Sibāṭ, pp.120-122.
3. In the available manuscript of Ibn Sibāṭ it reads "the sons of his brother Sharaf ad-Dīn ʿAlī". Ibn Yaḥyā has it simply as "his brother Sharaf ad-Dīn ʿAlī", and so do Duwaiḥī and Shidyāq, both of whom copied from a manuscript of Ibn Sibāṭ.
643 and went himself to Damascus in 644. And the correspondence between him and Amir Najm ad-Dīn Muhammad was perhaps in that year. The author of this historical notice may have forgotten to add the four to the forty. God knows best.2

Shidyāq, copying from Ibn Sībāṭ, discarded the date 640 and substituted in its place 1246 (644 A.H.), thus giving a more acceptable date to the death of Najm ad-Dīn Muhammad than Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, and likewise the probable date of the manshūr in question.

Shidyāq continued his history of the Tanūkhīs in this century by relating that in 1249 ʿĀṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb wrote a manshūr to Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ bin ʿAlī granting him, aside from the iqtāʿ inherited from his father (Baisūr, Majdaliyya, one third of Aramūn, Kaifūn, and ʿAl-Bīra, and their mazraḥās),3 new iqtāʿs in the west and south of "the mountain of Beirut", those being ʿAl-Qmāṭiyya, bmikin, Shimlāl (Shimlān),4 Btāthir,5 and Kafar-Cimmai, with their mazraḥās. This grant, said the manshūr, was given to him "because of his services and labours, and to encourage him to continue in guarding the thughūr entrusted to him in the west of the country."6

Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā said that the date of this manshūr

1. S. Lane-Poole, op.cit., p. 78.
2. MS Ibn Sībāṭ, pp. 121-122.
3. Baisūr, Majdaliyya, and Kaifūn are villages in the upper Gharb. I have not been able to identify ʿAl-Bīra. A mazraḥā (pl. mazārīk) is an area of cultivable land outside a village, but pertaining to it and cultivated by its people.
4. ʿAl-Qmāṭiyya, bmikin, and Shimlāl are villages in the upper Gharb.
5. Btāthir (modern Btātir) used to be the principal village of the Jīrd, in the time of Shidyāq.

*A term occasionally used by Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā and Ibn Sībāṭ to denote the Gharb (Jabal Baitūt).
was ṫaḥf II 19, 646 (August 12, 1248). 1

Elsewhere, Shidyāq said that ʿĀṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb issued a manshūr in his own handwriting to Abūʾl-Jaish Ṣāliḥ, son of ʿArf ad-Ḍawla ʿAlī, of Arslān, granting him certain villages in iqtā in recompense for his services and labours in guarding the thughūr. Shidyāq gave the same date, 1249, to this manshūr. 2 Could it be that Shidyāq was identifying in this case Abūʾl-Jaish Ṣāliḥ with Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ of Tanūkh, or did ʿĀṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb issue two manshūrs in the same year, one to the Tanūkhid amir and the other to the Arslānid amir? Probably it was a case of confusion between the two.

Proceeding with the history of the Tanūkhās, Shidyāq said that ʿAṭāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī, the son of Najm ad-Dīn Muḥammad, 3 who will henceforward be referred to as Ḥajjī II, received in

1. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., p.79, fn.3 (marginal note from the original manuscript of Ṣāliḥ's history).
2. Shidyāq, op.cit., p.718.
3. Genealogy of Tanūkhid amirs:

Karāma

Jamāl ad-Dīn

Ḥajjī I

/-----

Najm ad-Dīn

Muḥammad I

Shuraf ad-Dīn

ʿAlī

/-----

Jamāl ad-Dīn

Ḥajjī I

= Sād ad-Dīn

Khiḍr

/-----

Najm ad-Dīn

Muḥammad II

(Founder of the ʿAināb
Branch of the Buḥturids

Nāṣir ad-Dīn

ʿAl-Ḥusayn

(the Great)
1256 from Am-Naṣir Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn Yūsuf (Ayyūbid ruler of Damascus, 1250-1260) a manshūr renewing his iqṭāʾ of the following villages: ʿAramūn, ʿAin Drāfīl, Tīrdalā, ʿAin Ḥṣūr, Ramṭūn, Qadrūn, Mṛatghūn, Aṣ-Ṣībāḥiyya, Sarḥemūr, ʿAināb, ʿAin ʿNūb, and Ad-Duwāir. Both Ibn Sībāṭ and Ibn Yahyā, the latter of whom had seen the manshūr, gave its date as Ṣafar 25, 650 (May 7, 1252). This manshūr has already been discussed.1

Shidyāq next mentioned a manshūr issued by Al-Muṭīzz Alībāk (1250-1257, the first Bahrī Mamlūk sultan) to Ṣād d ad-Dīn Khīṭīr, brother of Ḥajjī II, granting him the iqṭāʾ of various villages outside the Gharb, in the Shūf, Wādī at-Taim, and Iqlīm al-Kharrūb.2 The date of this manshūr was given by Sāliḥ bin Yahyā and by Ibn Sībāṭ as Ṣafar I 27, 654 A.H. (April 24, 1256). Shidyāq dated it one year later.

1. ʿAināb is a village in the upper Gharb and ʿAin ʿNūb is in the lower Gharb. I have not been able to identify Ramṭūn, Qadrūn, and Aṣ-Ṣībāḥiyya (in Sāliḥ bin Yāḥyā, op.cit., p. 56, Aṣ-Ṣībāḥiyya). Mṛatghūn is in Sāliḥ Baʿīrūt. Louis Cheikho (Sāliḥ bin Yāḥyā, p. 56, fn. 1) said that most of those villages were in the lower Gharb.


3. See above, pp.148-149.


This manusūr from Aibak to Khiḍr helps to explain the next event related by Shidyāq. In the same year as the issue of Aibak’s manusūr, he said, Ibn Wadūd and Ibn Ḥātim came to the Gharb with soldiers, and brought with them tribesmen from Ba‘albak and the Biqā‘. They were met by the Tanūkh amirs and their men at Aītāt, in the upper Gharb, and the aggressors were badly defeated and looted.2

Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā wrote about this event as follows:

I found in the handwriting of one of my ancestors the following: "Ibn Wadūd and Ibn Ḥātim came to the Gharb with soldiers, and gathered against it tribesmen from the wilāyāt of Ba‘albak and the two Biqā‘. They were defeated and looted by the sons of the amir of the Gharb, who made peace with them and let them go. This battle took place in the village of Aītāt on the second day of Dhū‘-Qa‘da, 653 (December 3, 1255)." I heard, besides, from those who are informed, that Zain ad-Dīn Sāliḥ of Tanūkh... was the cause of their defeat, and that he acquired fame from this event.4

Shidyāq got the wrong date, 654 A.H., from Ibn Sibā‘.5

Having related this event, Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā proceeded to make the following comment on it:

1. I could identify neither of them. Probably they were the governors of the two Biqā‘, Al-‘Azīzī and Al-Ba‘albakki. An Ibn Ḥātim from Ba‘albak (Dā‘ūd bin Ḥātim, Al-Ḥarrani, Al-Ba‘albakki, Hanbalite doctor) was living in the thirteenth century, and died in 1280 (See Gaston Wiet, Les biographies..., p.144, no.1003).


4. Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op. cit., p.64.

5. MS Ibn Sibā‘, p.136.
This event took place in the days of An-Nāṣir Yūsuf, Sultan of Damascus, and the Turkoman Al-Mu‘izz Aibak, Sultan of Egypt. Between those two there was disagreement and war, while the Franks occupied the coastlands. The probability is that the Damascenes believed the amirs of the Gharb were on the side of the Egyptians, and, because of that, they organized an attack on the Gharb; one of the proofs to that being the afore-mentioned manshūr from Al-Mu‘izz Aibak in the name of Sa‘d ad-Dīn Khidr... It is perplexing to find that whereas Beirut is in the province of Damascus, the manshūr is Egyptian. The fact was that An-Nāṣir wanted to take Egypt and Al-Mu‘izz wanted to subdue An-Nāṣir; and the dispute between them remained until... they agreed that Syria, as far south as Al-‘Arish, will go to An-Nāṣir and that Egypt will go to Al-Mu‘izz, that having taken place in 653 (1255).

Aibak’s manshūr and the unsuccessful raid on the Gharb by Ibn Wadūd and Ibn Ḥātim, who must have been in the service of An-Nāṣir of Damascus, appear to be illustrations of the double-faced policy of the Tanūkhīs at the time. While struggle between the rising Mamlūk State in Egypt and the Ayyūbid State of Damascus over the control of Syria continued, they seem to have attempted to play on both sides. This is illustrated by the fact that whereas Ḥajjī II received the iqṭā’ of the Gharb from An-Nāṣir, his brother, Khidr, received the iqṭā’ of villages outside the Gharb from Aibak. There is also evidence in Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā that the Tanūkhīs were playing also on a third side—that of the Franks of

1. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, loc. cit. For the struggle between An-Nāṣir and Al-Mu‘izz Aibak, see M. Quatremère, Histoire des sultans Mamlouks, I, pp.15–61. For the agreement between them was concluded in A.H. 654 (1256). The terms of the treaty were that “Al-Malik al-Mu‘izz will possess, other that Egypt, that part of the coast (sāhil) of Syria which belonged to Al-Malik as-Sāliḥ Najm ad-Dīn Ayyūb; and that Al-Malik an-Nāṣir will not give refuge to any of the Bahri mamluks.” See ibid., p.61.
Beirut. 1

This policy followed by the Tanūkhs in the thirteenth century of playing on both sides in the hope of preserving their power at home is further illustrated by the role which, according to Lebanese historians, they played in 1260 at the battle of Āin Jālūt between the Mamlūks and the Mongols.

In 1259, 2 said Shidyāq, when the Ilkhāns took Damascus from An-Nāṣir, Amir Ḥajjī II and his cousin, Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ bin ʿAlī, went to Damascus and offered their submission to Kêtbughā, the new governor of Damascus appointed by Hūlāgū. When Al-Muẓaffar Qutuz (1259-1260), however, led the Egyptian army against the Mongols, the two amirs, not knowing which side will be victorious, decided that each of them will fight on one side. Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ went over to the Egyptian side, and Ḥajjī II remained with the Mongols in Damascus. At Āin Jālūt (September 3, 1260) 3 the mongols were defeated, and many of them took refuge in the mountains, where they were besieged by the Egyptians. In this siege Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ, fighting with the Mamlūks, distinguished himself as an archer; and after the victory was won by the Mamlūks, Qutuz ordered his death, having heard of his previous friendship with the Mongols; but his Mamlūk comrades stood for him and saved his life. 4

---

1. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., p.80.
3. Encyclopaedia of Islam, I, p.212, col.1, under "Āin Jālūt".
Shidyāq added that when Ketbughā occupied Damascus he issued a manshūr to Ḥajjī II confirming his old iqṭāʿs. Šāliḥ bin Yahyā gave the text of this document:

Possessor of the surface of the Earth, Hūlagū Khān, may his greatness increase…. It has been decreed by High Command… that the great Amir Jamāl ad-Dīn… Ḥajjī… shall continue to hold the iqṭāʿ allotted to him by the manshūr of An-Nāṣir, which he has.

The manshūr is dated Rajab 7, 658 (June 18, 1260). There is no evidence of a manshūr issued by Hūlagū to Ḥajjī’s cousin, Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ bin Ṭālī. Shidyāq related the story of Ḥajjī II and his cousin fighting each on one side at the battle of ‘Ain Jālūt from Ibn Sibāṭ, who took his account from Šāliḥ bin Yahyā. The latter related the story from an oral tradition related to him by older members of his family, and had no documentary evidence to support it. A second version of this same story is found in Akhbār al-aṣyān… in the chapter on the Arslāns, which Shidyāq may have taken from the Arslān family history. This version throws doubt on Šāliḥ bin Yahyā’s version, which Shidyāq also gave. In this second version of the story, Shidyāq said that it was Ḥajjī II and Abū’l-Jaish Šāliḥ, not Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ of Tanūkh, who approached Ketbughā after the latter had occupied Damascus. He mentioned no agreement between the two amirs to the effect that each of them should

3. Šāliḥ bin Yahyā, op. cit., p. 57.
4. Ibid., p. 65.
fight on one side, so that the one who would come out on the victorious side would intercede for the other. He said simply that when Qutuz came to the encounter of the Mongols, Abū'1-Jaish was fighting on his side and performed excellent feats of archery which saved his neck when Qutuz charged him, after 'Ain Jālūt, with having had dealings with the Mongols previously. When Ketbughā had occupied Damascus, Shidyāq continued, he had issued to Ḥajji II a manšūr confirming the iqṭās he held already. When, therefore, the Mongols were defeated at 'Ain Jālūt, Ḥajji was forced to share the imāra of the Gharb with Abū'1-Jaish; and later, when Ḥajjī, his brother, and his cousin Zain ad-Dīn Sālih were arrested and imprisoned by Baibars, the governorship of the Gharb fell completely to Abū'1-Jaish.¹

The truth of this version of the story is difficult to establish; but it appears to be the more probable one. The fact that Shidyāq mentioned the sharing of the governorship of the Gharb by a Tanūkh and an Arslānid amīr, which is mentioned neither by Sālih bin Yahyā nor by Ibn Sibāṭ, shows that Shidyāq was drawing on a third source, perhaps more dependable, and now unavailable. From this version of the story it appears that the Arslān amīr and the Tanūkh amīr went independently of each other to seek the favours of Ketbughā; and that when the latter failed in his purpose, he

¹ Shidyāq, op. cit., pp. 718-719. See above, p. 149, and below, pp. 238 et seq.
turned over to the side of the Mamluks who, true to their policy, later made him governor of the Gharb jointly with the Tanūkh amir, seeking through the appointment of the two rivals to the same position in the same province to keep full control of it by playing them against each other. Later, as it will be seen, the sons of the Arslān amir intrigued to have the leading Tanūkh amirs, and with them Hajjī II, imprisoned; which made him the sole governor of the Gharb for a short period.

Before proceeding to relate the imprisonment of the Tanūkh amirs, Shidyāq mentioned the manshūr issued by Baibars to Hajjī II in 1260, granting him the iqtā' of Ālā, Majd al-Baṣḥ, Shārūn, Aramūn, ‘Ain Drāfīl, Tīrdalā, Daqqūn, ‘Ain Ksūr, Qadrūn, Shimlāl, Mratghūn, Sarhamūr, Btallūn, ‘Aināb, Ad-Duwair, Btāthir, Baisūr, Kafarimmaī, Aitāth, and As-Sibāḥiyya. This manshūr, however, was not issued in 1260. It was dated Rajab 8, 659 (June 8, 1261).

1. Ālā is a village in the upper Gharb. At present it is a big town and a thriving summer resort. Since the early eighteenth century it was the seat of the Talḥūq shaikhs of the upper Gharb, along with Aitāth.
2. Shārūn is a village in the Jīrd.
3. Daqqūn (in Shidyāq "Drūn"; in other sources "Daqqūn") is a village in Ash-Shuhbar.
4. Btallūn is a village in the Jīrd.
5. Shidyāq, op. cit., p.278. As-Sibāḥiyya (in Ibn Sībat As-Sibāḥiyya) is not mentioned by Sāliḥ bin Yāhūd in this manshūr, but Ibn Sībat (p.155) mentioned it.
6. MS Ibn Sībat, p.155. Sāliḥ bin Yāhūd, op. cit., p.56, gave the date simply as 659, not mentioning the day of the month.
Next Shidyāq proceeded to relate the arrest and imprisonment of the Tanūkh amirs:

One of the sons of Abūl-Jaish, who were jealous of the two amirs Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajji and Zain ad-Dīn Sālih, wrote a letter in their name to the Frankish ruler of Tripoli asking him about matters that would lead to their arrest, should the Sultan come across the letter. The son of Abūl-Jaish made it so that the answer of the prince of Tripoli reached Al-Malik az-Zahir Baibars. On receiving it, Baibars was annoyed with the two amirs and ordered their arrest; and in the year 1271 he imprisoned Amir Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajji bin Muhammad, his brother Saʿd ad-Dīn Khidr, and Amir Zain ad-Dīn ʿAlī. Amir Zain ad-Dīn was imprisoned in Egypt, Amir Jamāl ad-Dīn in Al-Karak, and Amir Saʿd ad-Dīn in the fort of Ajlūn. Later, all three were brought together in the prison of Egypt.

The Tanūkh were not above suspicion of dealing with the Franks, as Shidyāq, Ibn Sibṭ, and Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā seem to have believed. The latter mentioned having come across a letter from the Frankish ruler of Sidon to Ḥajji II, without seeming to have realized the significance of this letter in showing the relations between the Tanūkh and the Franks:

1. A misprint in Shidyāq's text missed the sign of the double.
2. Bohemond VI Le Beau, Prince of Antioch (1251-1268) and Count of Tripoli (1251-1275). See genealogical table of the princes of Antioch, back of Grousset, op. cit., III.
3. A mistake for Zain ad-Dīn (Sāliḥ bin) ʿAlī.
4. The fortress of Ajlūn was a fortress of the jund of Jordan. It was built by ʿIzz ad-Dīn Usāma ibn Mungidh in 1184-1185. See Gaudefroy-Demeblynes, La Syrie..., p.66. Under the Mamlūks, it was the center of the niyaba of Ajlūn, a sub-province of the niyaba of Damascus. See ibid., p.179.
5. Shidyāq, op. cit., pp.278-279. Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op. cit., pp.59 and 66-71. MS Ibn Sibṭ, pp.184-188. This event has been discussed in the chapter on Duwailṭ. See above, p.149.
I came across a letter from the Frank, ruler of Sidon, stating that he had given the afore-mentioned Hajji a plot of land (shakāra) for the sowing of three ahrā' of wheat in the village of Damūr as his property and the property of his son, or whoever takes his place. Its date is Thursday, the year of Alexander 1567 (1256 A.D.).

Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā mentioned a similar letter from the Frankish ruler of Beirut, Humfroy de Mohfort (1264-1283), bestowing on Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ of Tanūkh a shakāra in Al-'Amrusiyya (in the neighbourhood of Beirut) on condition that he would not sell it nor give it away, that he would help him (mūsā adatuhu li ṣūhūbiyyatih), that he would send back to Beirut anybody who had escaped therefrom, not allowing him to stay in his country more than eight days, and that he would forbid anybody from his country to cause damage in the land of Beirut. The date of this letter was 1592 S.E. (1280 A.D.).

1. The name appears thus, and later in the same letter (passage not quoted) as Ḳe'nī. It appears to be the name "Renaud"; but Renaud of Sidon (d. c. 1202) was not the ruler of Sidon at the time. It was his grandson, Julien (1239-1260), who sold Sidon and Beaufort to the Hospitallers in 1260, who must have been responsible for this letter (See note by Chaikho in Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., p. 57 and genealogy of the lords of Sidon in R. Grousset, op.cit., II, back pages). Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā might have written his name as Renaud in short for Julien, son of Balian, son of Renaud.

2. Ahrā' (sing. hariyya?): granaries. The ahrā' were apparently utensils in which agricultural produces were stored. See Dozy and Quatremère, op.cit., I, p. 52, note 74. From this context it appears to have been used as a measure of capacity.

3. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā did not give the day of the month.


5. R. Grousset, op.cit., III, back pages, in the genealogy of the house of Ibelin. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā gave the name as Ḳe'nī. Humfroy, not an Ibelin, became lord of Beirut by marrying Echive, daughter of Jean II of Ibelin (1247-1264).

6. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., p. 80.
The imprisonment of the Tanūkh amirs and their release after the death of Baibars have already been discussed.\footnote{Above, p. 149.}

In 1283, Shidyāq continued, the sons of Abū'1-Jaish forged another letter, supposedly from Hajjī II, his brother Khīdr, and his cousin Ṣāliḥ (Shidyāq giving his name as ʿAlī, instead of Ibn ʿAlī), to the Franks of Sidon, stating that they shall remain faithful to their agreement with them. The sons of Abū'1-Jaish intended by that to have the Tanūkh amirs returned to prison or killed. A testimony, however, was produced against the truth of the forgery of the sons of Abū'1-Jaish, and their plans remained fruitless.\footnote{Shidyāq, op. cit., p. 280. MS Ibn Sibāt, pp. 199-200.}

Ṣāliḥ bīn Yaḥyā, who saw the testimony about the forgery of the sons of Abū'1-Jaish, described it as follows:

\begin{quote}
I have seen a testimony... dated Safar 23, 682 (May 26, 1283); and I would like to mention it here while relating what happened to the three amirs as a result of lies and forgery. The main part of its contents reads: "Its witnesses know that Taqī'īd-Dīn Najā bīn Abū'1-Jaish bīn Mufriḥ (Mufarrij?\footnote{MS Ibn Slba-J, pp. 199-200.}) is known for his falsehood, slander, and lies in his correspondence with the Franks and others in the names of the amirs Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ bīn ʿAlī and Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī and his brother... Saʿd ad-Dīn Khīdr. He is opposing them and seeking to cause them harm in every way. This Taqī'īd-Dīn want to Sidon and Acre at the beginning of Muḥarram, 682 (April 1, 1283) with forged letters in his writing in the names of the afore-mentioned amirs, without their knowledge about it. The witnesses of this testimony do not know that the afore-mentioned amirs are responsible to any of this." Its witnesses are from the village of Mīdān in the land of Sidon; and there are also signatures of witnesses in Turkish under their own....\footnote{Shidyāq called him Najā bīn Mufarrij bīn Abū'1-Jaish. See above, p. 261.} 
\end{quote}

\footnote{Ṣāliḥ bīn Yaḥyā, op. cit., pp. 72-73. Cheikho (p. 73, fn. 1) identified Mīdān as a village in Iqlim Jazīn, east of Sidon.}
After the failure of Taqī'd-Dīn Najā to incriminate the Tanūkh amirs in 1283, nothing is heard any more of the attempts on the part of the descendants of Abū'l-Jaish to do away with the Tanūkh. Until the end of the Mamlūk period they seem to have contented themselves with a subsidiary position, leaving the hegemony to the Tanūkh.¹

Shidyāq mentioned the sack of the Gharb in 1278, which took place while the three Tanūkh amirs were still in prison in Egypt.² In 1289, he continued, after the fall of Tripoli, the Tanūkh lost their iqṭās, but regained them later in the reigns of Al-Ashraf Khalīl and an-Nāṣir Muḥammad.³

In the chapter on Duwaiḥī's history it was explained that Qalāūn, after the fall of Tripoli, had taken the iqṭās of the Tanūkh and given them to the jund of Tripoli.⁴ This may have been an attempt at centralization on his part, by replacing the

1. Shidyāq said later that when the Ottomans conquered Syria in 1516, a descendant of Abū'l-Jaish, Jamāl ad-Dīn Ahmad of Arslān, having joined Al-Ghazālī, the nālīb of Damascus, in his treachery of the Mamlūks, was made by Al-Ghazālī the governor of the Gharb, the Matn, and the Jīrī, in the place of the Tanūkh, who had remained faithful to the Mamlūks. See above, p.150.
2. Ibid. p.279. See above, p.150.
3. Ibid., p.281.
4. Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā (pp.77-78), referring to the history of Ibn Abī'1-Haijā (Izz ad-Dīn Muḥammad bin Abī'1-Haijā) al-Hadhabānī al-Ṭūbīlī, d.700 A.H./1301 A.D., prefect of Damascus', historian, and poet. See Gaston Wiet, op. cit., p.364, no.2425). He said that in 657 A.H./1268 A.D. Qalāūn called for the amirs of the mountains and took their properties and iqṭās (except those of a certain Ibn al-Mūṭin); and that after the fall of Tripoli the Tanūkh iqṭās were given over to the halqa of Tripoli. Then he proceeded to tell how the Tanūkh received their iqṭās back in the reigns of Al-Ashraf Khalīl and An-Nāṣir Muḥammad. Poliak, op. cit., pp.26-27, depending on Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā (pp.77-78 and 90) and Ibn Hajār
provincial military aristocracy of the hinterland of the Lebanese coast with his own jund. Qalāūn may also have dis-
trusted the allegiance of the Tanūkahs (as well as of the other Mountain amirs)¹ because of their previous relations 
with the Franks and the Mongols. Whatever the case may have been, Al-Ashraf and An-Nāṣir reversed their father’s policy 
and returned the iqṭāʿs of the Gharb to the Tanūkahs; but this time they assimilated them into the corps of the ḫalqa.² 

Shidyāq next mentioned the restoration of the Gharb iqṭāʿs to the Tanūkahs in 1291, and the confirmation of this restoration by An-Nāṣir Muhammad in 1293.³ Sāliḥ bin

(II, p.55), made the following comment on these events: "On the occasion of the conquest of Tripoli in 1289, which 
made the Mamlūks much more powerful in the Lebanon, Qalāūn confiscated all the fiefs of the Lebanese chieftains who 
had no fixed military duties, except the communication of intelligence regarding the activities of the Crusaders and 
transformed them into the reserve of lands for the newly established al-ḥalqa of Tripoli. Afterwards the chieftains 
gradually recovered most of their fiefs, but this time they were created knights of al-ḥalqa or emirs of specified 
grades, ordered to maintain mamlūk troops corresponding to their rank, and made responsible for the watch of roads and 
shores in specified regions." On p.27, fn.2, depending on Sāliḥ bin Yahyā (op.cit., pp.97 and 98), Poliak added: "The more influential chieftains used to receive the humbler 
one into their service as mamlūks."

1. See previous foot-note.
2. See previous foot-note.
Yahya mentioned the manshur of Al-Ashraf Khalil to "Naṣir ad-Dīn Al-Husain and Shihāb ad-Dīn Ahmad, the son of his uncle Ḥajjī, who are new in the service of the ḥalqa of Damascus," dated Rabī' I 3, 691 (February 23, 1292). Šāliḥ also mentioned a manshur from An-Naṣīr Muḥammad to Zain ad-Dīn 'Ali (Šāliḥ bin 'Ali) accepting him back into his service and granting him several iqṭās, dated Dhū'l-Ḥijja 4, 693 (October 25, 1294). Shidyāq also added that when the iqṭās of the amirs of the Gharb were returned to them by Al-Ashraf Khalil in 1290 (actually 1292), two Arslān amirs, Saif ad-Dīn Mufarrij bin Yūsuf bin Abī'l-Jaish and his cousin (Imād ad-Dīn Mūsā bin Mas'ūd, were given iqṭās. Although there is no evidence outside Shidyāq to that effect, it must be noted that the latter of the two Arslān amirs was mentioned by Šāliḥ bin Yahya among the amirs who received iqṭās in the cadastre of 1313.

Shidyāq's account of the first raid on Kisruān and the Jīrd in 1295 is the same as the account given by Duwaihī in Tārikh at-Tā'īfa al-mārūniyya. After giving his account of this expedition, Shidyāq mentioned the dates of the deaths of Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ (1295), Jamāl ad-Dīn Ḥajjī (1297), and

1. Šāliḥ bin Yahya, op.cit., p.89.
2. Ibid., pp.79-80.
4. Šāliḥ bin Yahya, op.cit., p.94.
Saʿd ad-Dīn Khiḍr (1313). These dates, as they appear in Saʿlīḥ bin Yaḥyā, were Rabi’ II 18, 695 (February 14, 1296), Shawwāl 12, 697 (July 23, 1298), and Dhū’l-Qa’dā 12, 713 (February 28, 1314). The mistakes Shidyāq made in the years are due to the fact that he did not take into consideration the day of the year when he changed Hijra into Christian dates, and he always gave the Christian year in which the Hijra year in question started.

In 1302, Shidyāq continued, there was a Frankish attack on Dāmūr. Of the two sons of Ḥajjī who were there at the time of the attack, one, (Abd al-Ḥamīd, was killed, and the other, (Abdallāh, was taken prisoner. Five days later Amir Nāṣir ad-Dīn Al-Ḥusain bin Khiḍr, their cousin, ransomed (Abdallāh for 3000 Tyrian dinārs. Ibn Sibāṭ and Ibn Yaḥyā gave the date of this event as Wednesday, Jumādā I 8, 702 (December 29, 1302).

The expedition against Kisruān in 1305, which has been discussed at length in the chapter on Duwāiḥī’s history, was the next event related by Shidyāq:

2. Saʿlīḥ bin Yaḥyā, op.cit., pp.60, 63, and 62.
4. MS Ibn Sibāṭ, p.289. Saʿlīḥ bin Yaḥyā, loc.cit. It must be remembered that just over two months before this Frankish raid on Dāmūr, the Mamluks had conducted a naval expedition on Arwād and taken it from the Franks (Ṣafar 28, 702). See Quatremère, op.cit., II, ii, pp.195-196.
In 1304 (he said) Aqūsh al-‘Afram, the nālib of Damascus, sent to Kisruân and to the people of the mountains the Sharif Zain ad-Dīn b. Ādānī to reconcile them to the Tanūkh amirs of whom the people of Kisruân and the mountains had killed two amirs when the Tanūkh had sided with the Moslems at the battle of Jubail, and to bring them back to obedience. Aqūsh sent them next Taqī ad-Dīn b. Taimiyya and Amir Bḥār ad-Dīn Qarāqūsh; but they did not agree to make peace and refused obedience to Aqūsh. When the delegates returned, the ulema of Islam decided on killing the people of Kisruân and the mountains and on taking them into captivity because they had assaulted the armies of Islam at the battle of Jubail and because they had not returned to obedience. Aqūsh began to gather soldiers from all parts of Syria and continued the preparations for three years. In 1307 he marched on the mountain of the Jīrd and Kisruân with fifty thousand soldiers. They were met at ‘Ain Șa‘far by ten Druze amirs with ten thousand soldiers from the Jīrd. A great battle took place and the amirs were defeated. The soldiers then surrounded those invincible mountains and, dismounting, climbed them from all sides, treading on a land whose inhabitants never imagined anyone would reach. They destroyed the villages, cut the vines, pulled down the churches, and killed captive all the Druzes and Christians in that country. Finally Aqūsh commanded the Turkomans to settle on the coast of Kisruân. Their darak (watch-post) was from Anṣāliās to Maghārat al-‘Asād on the’ bridge of Al-Mu‘āmalātān; and they were divided into three groups, each hundred horsemen taking the watch for one month, and residing when they were on duty in the fort of Jūniya.

1. Elsewhere (Akhbār al-‘A‘yān..., pp.719-720), Shidyāq gave his name fully as Zain ad-Dīn Mu‘āmmad b. Ādānī. (See above, p.158, fn.4).
2. By the battle of Jubail Shidyāq meant the first expedition against Kisruân in 1293. The two amirs, it has already been said (above, p.158, fn.1) were not killed in the first expedition but in 1305. It may be further noted that Shidyāq took Duwawī’s interpretation of Ibn Sibāt’s narrative by saying that Ibn Ādānī, Ibn Taimiyya, and Qarāqūsh came to reconcile the Kisruānīs to the Tanūkh (See above, pp.159-160). Unlike Duwawī, however, who used the word islah (reformation) to mean Sulḥ (reconciliation), Shidyāq corrected his text and used the word Sulḥ instead of Duwawī’s (and Ibn Sibāt’s) islah.
3. Shidyāq, op.cit., pp.261-262. Note that Shidyāq gave the event the same wrong date (1307) as Duwawī.
Shidyāq gave the same dates for the visits of ʿAdnān and Ibn Taimiyya to Kisuʿān and for the expedition of Āqūsh as Duwaiḥī. Like Duwaiḥī, besides, whom he was copying, he mistook the purpose of the visits of Ibn ʿAdnān and Ibn Taimiyya to Kisuʿān and said that they came to reconcile the Kisuʿānis and the people of the mountains to the Tanūkhīs. Not finding any reason for such a reconciliation in either Duwaiḥī or Ibn Sibāṭ, Shidyāq concluded that the reason for the hostility between the Tanūkhīs and the people of Kisuʿān and the mountains was the fact that two amirs of the Tanūkhīd family had been killed by the Jirdīs and Kisuʿānis in the battle of Jubail (the expedition of 1292). Actually those two amirs (Najm ad-Dīn Muḥammad II and his brother, Shihāb ad-Dīn Ahmad, sons of ʿAjjī II) were killed in the expedition of 1305, the expedition under discussion; and it was only Duwaiḥī who believed that they were killed by the Jirdīs and Kisuʿānis in the supposed raid on the Gharb that followed the first expedition. It is interesting to note that although Ibn Sibāṭ mentioned the death of the two sons of ʿAjjī in the expedition of 1305, Shidyāq ignored it and followed Duwaiḥī’s version.

1. Shidyāq’s account of the expedition, in general, seems to have been taken from Tārīkh al-azmina. See Duwaiḥī, T.A., p.163. Also above, pp.158 et.seq.
2. See above, p.295, fn.2 and pp.159-160.
Like other Maronite historians Shidyāq did not understand the real causes and the significance of the expedition of 1305.

An interesting fact concerning this expedition is mentioned by Shidyāq alone. When, he said, Zain ad-Dīn Muḥammad bin ʿAdnān al-Ḥusainī came on his mission to Lebanon before the expedition, he stayed as the guest of the Arslānid amir Saif ad-Dīn Mufarrij; and the marriage of the latter to the former's daughter, Nafīsa, was arranged. Another interesting fact to note here is that Shidyāq gave in this passage the full name of Ibn ʿAdnān; whereas previously, in the above-quoted passage concerning the expedition, he gave it merely as Zain ad-Dīn ibn ʿAdnān. His full name is neither found in Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, nor in Ibn Sibāʿ, nor in Duwaiḥī. Shidyāq must have got it, directly or indirectly, from the Arslān family history.

Shidyāq devoted two separate chapters for the genealogy and history of the Turkomans of Kisruān, who later came to be known as Āl-ʿAssāf. These Turkomans, he said, were settled by An-ʿNāṣir Muḥammad and were at first in Al-Kūra.

2. Elsewhere (ibid., p.262) he said that they were settled in Kisruān by ʿAqūsh al-Afram after the expedition of 1305. See above, p.163, and Sāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op.cit., p.42.
Where Shidyaq got his information that these Turkomans were originally from Al-Kūra is not clear. They used to dwell, he added, in Zuq al-Āmiriyya, Zuq al-Kharāb, Zuq Maṣbaḥ, and Zuq Mikā'il, as well as in Āin Ṭurā and Āin Shiqqaq, in Kisruān. In 1345 Yalbughā al-Atābīkī ordered these Turkomans to live in Beirut and to assist the jund of Damascus in defending the city against the Franks. The genealogy of the Āssafīs which Shidyaq gave, however, started with Amir Āssār, who lived in the early years of Ottoman rule in Syria.

The cadastre of 1313 was the event next related by

1. Shidyaq, *loc. cit.* Duwaiḥī, *T.A.*, pp.177-178. See above, pp.165-166. This event must have taken place in 1365, not 1345, after the raid of the Franks of Cyprus on Alexandria, when Yalbughā started his project of ship-building in Beirut. Duwaiḥī also gave the wrong date.


3. Maqrīzī mentioned the cadastre (rawj) of Syria in 713 A.H. (1313-1314 A.D.). The cadastre, he said, ended in Dhū‘l-Ḥijja of that year (March-April, 1314). In this cadastre, he added, new deeds (mithālaḥ) were given to the amirs and jundīs of Damascus, the iqtāk of the niyāba of Damascus was increased, and several iqtāts were taken over by diwān al-khāṣṣa (the diwān administering the sultan’s private domain). See Maqrīzī, *Sulūk…*, II, p.127. A.N. Poliak (*op. cit.*, pp.23-25) made the following comment about the rawk of 1313 (and about the rawks in general): "The sultans struggled to make the fief-holders more and more dependent on the central government. At the beginning of the Mamlūk epoch we still find the influence of the Latin and Ayyūbid feudal systems, which made the fief-holders hereditary rulers of their respective regions. The means employed by the sultans to put an end to it was the rawk, i.e. redistribution of lands between the sultan and the feudatories. The idea was of Mongol origin, but the details of its execution were copied from the annual redivision of lands among the members of the village community. A speedy cadastral survey (kashf al-bilād) was made; then the estates were divided into royal and feudal; the feudal lands were redivided into the necessary number of fiefs of various grades, and the fiefs of each grade were redistributed by a drawing of lots among the knights and emirs of that grade. In al-rawk al-nāṣirī in Syria, Palestine, and the Lebanon in 1313."

*This is Poliak’s transliteration.*
Shidyaq. In 1313, he said, Mu'in ad-Dīn, the Ṽazir al-jaish,\(^1\) came to Damascus with the iqṭāʾs and dealt them out among the jund of Syria. Each took what was allotted to him; and the Tanukhs received new iqṭāʾs, aside from continuing to hold their old ones.\(^2\)

Shidyaq's account of the changes in the iqṭāʾs of the domains of al-khāṣṣ in Syria and in Palestine were... enlarged... by the addition of the fertile plain of Damascus and of the villages which were employed as stations of post-horses on the route from Damascus to Egypt. Even more important was the fact that the feudatories received now new fiefs consisting of small portions dispersed in various places, where the lords, moreover, were strangers." Poliak referred to Sālih bin Yahyā, to Maqrizī, to Ibn Hājar (II, p.171), to Ibn Ayās (I, p.159), to Zetterstéen (Beiträge..., p.160), and to Dhahabi (Duwal al-Islām, II, p.170).

1. The Ṽazir al-jaish was responsible for the allotment of the iqṭāʾs in Syria and Egypt under the Mamlūks, and for the laws concerning those iqṭāʾs. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie..., P.1xxii. Mu'in ad-Dīn bin Masūd bin Abī l-Fadl al-Ibn Hashīsh was born in 666 A.H./1267-1268 A.D. and died in 729/1328-1329 A.D. He was appointed Ṽazir al-jaish in Damascus in 712 and helped Sanjar bin Abūl'Awal al-Jawli in conducting the ṿauk of 1313 (Sanjar al-Jawli was governor general of Gaza; see Wiet, op.cit., p.157, no.1102). Previously, in 709, he had been appointed head of diwan al-jaish in Egypt. See Ibn Hājar, Ad-Durar al-kāmina..., II, p.171, and IV, p.403. Gaston Wiet, op.cit., p.397, no.2605. See also Maqrizī, loc.cit.

the Tanūkhs after the cadastre of 1313 does not differ from
the accounts found in Ibn Sibāt and in Šāliḥ bin Yahyā. 1

Apparently the rauk (cadastre) originally changed the Tanūkh

iqṭā‘s, 2 for after it Nāṣir ad-Dīn Al-Ḥusain, nephew of

Ḥajjī II, wrote to Tingiz, the nā‘ib of Damascus, explaining
to him that he and his relations, the other Tanūkh amirs,

who were responsible for the guarding of the thaghr of Beirut,
held their iqṭā‘s permanently as legal private property. 3

Nāṣir ad-Dīn Al-Ḥusain pleaded that it was unfair to
include the property of his family in the cadastre, because
their homes, their men, and their clan were on this property,
and they could not make use of any other. Besides, they
saved much expense to the State by having their own men
assist them in guarding the thaghr of Beirut. 4

This letter of Nāṣir ad-Dīn seems to have had its
effect. An-Nāṣir Muḥammad, after the situation had been
explained to him by Tingiz, ordered that the Tanūkhs should
continue to hold their old iqṭā‘s, and that whatever increases
are made in these iqṭā‘s should be met by increases in the

jundīs. Since, Shidyāq continued, the iqṭā‘s of the Tanūkhs

1. See previous foot-note.
2. Šāliḥ bin Yahyā, p. 89.
   bin Yahyā, pp. 91–92.
were doubled in size, the number of their jundîs, which had been 31, was likewise doubled and became 62.¹

Shidyâq gave the list of the Tanûkh amirs and the other amirs of the Gharb who received iqṭā'īs, which had been issued by dîwân al-jaîsh and dated Muḥarram 8, 714 (April 25, 1314).² The list, which Shidyâq took from Ibn Sîbât,³ gives the names of the amirs receiving iqṭā', enumerates the villages of their iqṭā'īs, and fixes the number of jundîs (tawâshiyya)⁴ they were expected to provide. The names of the following amirs appear in this list: Nâṣîr ad-Ḍîn Al-Ḥusain (20 jundîs); his brother, Izz ad-Ḍîn Al-Ḥasan (5 jundîs); Izz ad-Ḍîn Ḥasan bin ṣAlî bin Zain ad-Ḍîn ṣâliḥ (10 jundîs); Saîf ad-Ḍîn Mufarrij bin Yûsûf bin ṣâliḥ (10 jundîs); Ṣâliḥ ad-Ḍîn Sulaimân bin Ghâlîb⁵ (5 jundîs); Saîf ad-Ḍîn Ibrâhîm

2. Shidyâq, relating the events of the year 1313, gave the date only as Muḥarram 8. The full date is found in Ṣâliḥ bin Yahyâ, op. cit., p.94, and MS Ibn Sîbât, p.249.
4. Poliak (op. cit., p.13, fn.4): Tawâshiyya is a term used to denote the private mamlûks of the jund al-halqa and the amirs.
5. According to Shidyâq (op. cit., p.132) This Ṣâliḥ ad-Ḍîn Sulaimân was the ancestor of the Ṣâliḥ ad-Ḍîns who were responsible for the extermination of the Buḥturid Tanûkhs in 1633. According to Ṣâliḥ bin Yahyâ (genealogical tree facing p.40, and p.158) he belonged to a branch of the Tanûkhid family, a fact which Shidyâq accepted. Poliak (op. cit., p.13, fn.1) doubted the fact that the Ṣâliḥ ad-Ḍîns were descendants of Ṣâliḥ ad-Ḍîn Sulaimân (known as ar-Ramṭûnî) and that Ṣâliḥ ad-Ḍîn himself was a cousin of the Buḥturids, suggesting that the Ramṭûnîs (from Ramṭûn, a village in the Shuḥhâr) were a separate family. I have not found any conclusive evidence to show that what Ṣâliḥ bin Yahyâ and Shidyâq claimed was definitely untrue, although it does not appear to be undoubtful. As such, I propose to
bin Muhammad bin Hajji (5 jundis); Shams ad-Din Abdallah bin Hajji (4 jundis); 'Imad ad-Din Musa bin Mas'ud bin Abi'l-Jaish (3 jundis). The sum total of the jundis to be provided for by the amirs of the Gharb, according to this list, was 62.

Of the amirs mentioned in this list only the last, with three jundis, is an Arslan. All the rest were Tanukhs.

After giving the list of the amirs and of their iqta's after the cadastral of 1313, Shidyaq added that the amirs divided themselves into three groups (abdal), guarding the thaghr of Beirut in turn. The first badal included Nasir ad-Din Al-Husain, his brother Al-Hasan, and his cousin, Shams ad-Din Abdallah. The second badal was composed of Saif ad-Din Mufarrij, 'Izz ad-Din Hasan, and 'Alam ad-Din Sulaiman. Nasir ad-Din bin Sa'dan, another descendant of Abu'l-Jaish who was not mentioned in the list as having received iqta in 1314, his two sons, 'Imad ad-Din Musa bin Mas'ud, and a Tanukhid amir, Saif ad-Din Ibrahim, formed the third badal. To keep the balance of number between those three groups, five of the jundis of Nasir ad-Din Al-Husain served with the third badal.

consider this 'Alam ad-Din ar-Ramtuni tentatively as a Tanukhid amir until the opposite can be definitely proved. Poliak refers to Ibn Hajjar (Durar..., I, pp.540-541) and Manhal... (See Wiet, op.cit., p.125, no.856) for incomplete genealogies of Sulaiman that differ slightly from Salih bin Yahya. The difference in Ibn Hajjar is slight, and no definite conclusions can be based on it. I have not been able to see Manhal...

1. This 'Imad ad-Din Musa is the only Arslanid amir mentioned in this list.
2. Salih bin Yahya, op.cit., pp.84, 96, and 98. See above, p.264.
3. Shidyaq, op.cit., p.284. MS Ibn Sibat, pp.249-250 and
The Genoese naval attack on Beirut in 1333, which was the event next related by Shidyāq, has already been dealt with.\(^1\) So was the attack on Wādī at-Taim by Ibn Ṣubḥ, to which Shidyāq gave the date 1341.\(^2\)

Shidyāq, like Duwaiḥī, mentioned the fortification of Beirut by the Mamlūks in 1345 (actually 1365).\(^3\) He added, however, that the Arslāns were ordered to move their residence to Beirut along with the Tanūkhids and the Turkomans of Kīṣruʾān.\(^4\)

In 1349, Shidyāq continued, Zayn ad-Dīn Šālīh, son of Nāṣir ad-Dīn, received a letter from Damascus\(^5\) ordering

---

\(^{1}\) Shidyāq, op. cit., p. 285. See above, p. 164.

\(^{2}\) Shidyāq, op. cit., pp. 48-49. Also Shihābī, Al-ghurār ..., pp. 490 and 493. See above, p. 165.


\(^{4}\) Shidyāq, op. cit., p. 720.

\(^{5}\) The letter, according to Shidyāq, was sent by the amirs Masʿūd bin Al-Ḥujairī, Baida Mur (Taʿda Mur) al-Ḥājīb, Yalbughā, and Malik As (Ṣālih bin Ṣabī), op. cit., p. 167. Masʿūd bin al-Ḥujairī (or bin al-Ḥujair as Ibn Ḥajar called him) was born in 683 A.H. (1284 A.D.) and died in 754 (1353). He held the during his lifetime the niyābas of Ghazza and Tripoli several times, and took charge of the niyāba of Damascus after the murder of Arghūnshāh, until the next nāʿīb entered the city (Ibn Ḥajar, Durar ..., IV, p. 348).

Taḍa Mur al-Ḥājīb al-Ṯamālī, once an amir in Aleppo, was Ḥājīb (chamberlain) in Damascus under Arghūnshāh (ibid., II, p. 232). Yalbughā (in Ṣālih bin Ṣabī, Al-Mamlūk Yalbughā) must have been Yalbübughā al-Adilī, an amir of Damascus under Tankiz, the nāʿīb of Damascus (1322-1340). He remained an important amir in Damascus until 1353, and held * read Tlībughā
him to arrest *Iljibughā* al-Muẓaffarī, nā'ib of Tripoli, ¹

the nīyāba of that province during the absence of its nā’ib, Arghūn al-Kāmilī, in 1350 (ibid., I, p. 406). Malik Ās was another important amīr in Damascus and held, among other positions, the shadd ad-dawāwīn (chief of the bureaucracy) in that province. He died in 756/1355. (Ibid., IV, p. 357).

For Arghūnshāh, see the following foot-note.

1. Gaston Wiet, op. cit., p. 75, no. 522. Iljibughā al-Muẓaffarī was an amīr of high rank in the reign of Al-Muẓaffar Ḥājjī (1347-1351). He remained for a time in the royal service as an amīr mishwar (amīr of the sultan’s court protocol, Gaudefoy-Demombynes, La Syrie..., p. lvii and loc.cit., fn.1). Later he got into trouble with other amīrs and was sent, as a result, to Damascus, and finally made nā’ib of Tripoli. After remaining as nā’ib of Tripoli for one year, he went to Damascus on the pretext of hunting, killed its nā’ib, Arghūnshāh (Jumādā II 748 - 750 A.H./September, 1347 - 1349 A.D.), and tried to start a rumour that the nā’ib had committed suicide; and he produced a forged marṣūm from the sultan and tried to confiscate Arghūnshāh’s wealth. The amīrs of Damascus, however, defeated him in battle, and he returned to Tripoli with what he could take of Arghūnshāh’s wealth. Hearing of this, the sultan insisted on his arrest, and he was sent prisoner to Cairo where he died on the pale in Rābi’ II, 750/June-July, 1349. Ibn Ḥajar, Ad-durar al-kāmina..., I, p. 406. For Arghūnshāh, see E. Laoust, Les gouverneurs de Damas..., p. 11. Ibn Ayās said that Iljibughā came to Damascus, arrested Arghūnshāh, and produced the forged marṣūm from the sultan in justification of that. Later Arghūnshāh was found murdered in prison, and it was not known who killed him. Ibn Ayās added that the ṭashtar of Damascus went to Tripoli, defeated Iljibughā in battle, and brought him back a prisoner to Damascus, where they hanged him. See Ibn Ayās, Badā’i’ az-zuhūr..., I, pp. 192-193. Although neither Ibn Ayās nor Ibn Ḥajar mentioned the fact that Zain ad-Dīn Sāliḥ of Tanūkh received orders to hold the route against Iljibughā at Nahr al-Kalb, it is only probable that he did play a part in the arrest of Iljibughā as one of the jund al-halqa of Damascus. Sāliḥ bin Yahyā, who related the event, mentioned this fact. See below.
and Timurughā Mintāsh, and several of their mamlūks, and to hold the coastal route against them at Nahr al-Kalb. When, he continued, the nālib of Tripoli heard that Zain ad-Dīn was holding the route against him, he refrained from taking it.²

Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā gave a fuller version of the story.³

On Thursday evening, Rabī‘ I 23, 750 (June 11, 1349), he said, the nālib of Tripoli, Iljibughā Al-Muẓaffarī, arrived in Damascus with a forged marsūm from the Sultan to arrest and execute Arghūnshāh, the nālib of Damascus. After having done away with Arghūnshāh, he returned to Tripoli and rebelled. When the amirs of Damascus, having realized the forgery of the marsūm on which he acted, heard of his intention to advance from Tripoli along the coast, they sent a marsūm to Zain ad-Dīn to hold the route against his advance at Nahr al-Kalb. When, Ṣāliḥ continued, the Tanūkhīd amir held the route at Nahr al-Kalb, the nālib of Tripoli decided not to advance on that route. Finally he was arrested by the

1. See above, p.168, fn. 1. Mintāsh, who became nālib as-saltāna in the reign of Barqūq (1382-1398), and who played an important part in the dethronement of Barqūq (1389-1390), had nothing to do with this event. Shidyāq was getting confused between his rebellion in Malta before the dethronement of Barqūq (see above) and the rebellion of Iljibughā Al-Muẓaffarī. Actually the fellow-conspirator of Iljibughā against Arghūnshāh was "Al-Fakhirī the Younger" (Saif ad-Dīn Mankalibughā al-Fakhirī, who was nālib of Tripoli before Iljibughā? See Wiet, op.cit., p.382, no.2541).
3. Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op.cit., p.167.
(askar of Damascus and died at the pale (wussita). 1

In his chapter on the Arslāns, Shidyāq added that the Arslānid amir Nūr ad-Dīn Šāliḥ, son of Mufarrij, was among the amirs ordered to hold the coastal route against Iljibughā. 2

In 1350, Shidyāq continued, Nāṣir ad-Dīn Al-Ḥusain, who had laid the foundations of the greatness of the house of Tanūkh, died. 3 Šāliḥ bin Yahyā gave the date of his death as Shawwāl 13, 751 (December 14, 1350). 4 Previously, in 1348, he had retired from the position of chief amir of the Ghabr and was succeeded by his eldest son, Zain ad-Dīn Šāliḥ, 5 which explains why it was the latter who received the orders to help in the arrest of Iljibughā.

After relating the Tanūkh line of succession following the death of Nāṣir ad-Dīn Al-Ḥusain, Shidyāq continued the history of the Tanūkhis with the events of the year 1373 (actually 1365-1366):

In 1773 (he said), when Amīr Yalbughā al-Atābiki 6 sent Amīr Baidamur al-Khwārizmī 7 to Beirut, the Turkomans of Kišruān came to him and agreed to send a thousand men to Cyprus for the war, asking Baidamur to send with them

1. See above, p. 304, fn. 1.
3. Ibid., p. 286.
4. Šāliḥ bin Yahyā, op. cit., p. 129.
6. See above, p. 166, fn. 2. Yalbughā al-Atābiki was killed in 1366.
7. See above, p. 165.
a letter to Yalbughā, that some of them may go over to Egypt to take over the iqṭāʾs of the amirs of the Gharb. When Amir Saʿīd ad-Dīn KhūrDIR bin Al-Ḥasan bin KhūrDIR and Amir Saif ad-Dīn Yaḥyā bin Ṣāliḥ ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn heard of that, they went to Egypt before them. When the Turkomans arrived there, Yalbughā gave them the titles (mithālāt) for the iqṭāʾs of the amirs of the Gharb.

So the two ʿAmūṣ bin al-Tanūkhī amirs explained their case to the qādī ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn, the secretary of the chancellory (kātim as-sīr) 2 (The latter) pleaded for them before Yalbughā, in their presence, and told him: "These amirs are of the planting of the first kings (of Islam) ʿAlāʾ al-Ḥaṣr al-mulūk al-awālī). God forbid that they should lose what they have held from the first kings in your happy days!" Yalbughā then commanded that the titles of the Turkomans should be torn and that the amirs of the Gharb should be confirmed in their iqṭāʾs. 3

According to Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, these events took place in 767 A.H. (1365-1366 A.D.). Ṣāliḥ said that after the Cypriot attack on Alexandria Yalbughā sent Baidamur al-Khwārizmī to Beirut to build ships there and to send them to Cyprus. 4 The rest of the story, as told by Ṣāliḥ, goes

1. Saif ad-Dīn Yaḥyā is the father of Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā the historian. Zain ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ, his father, was still living at the time. He died in 1375. Shidyāq, op.cit., p.288. Before his death, in 1373, he had given his iqṭāʾ to his son Yaḥyā, Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā's father, as his father, Nāṣir ad-Dīn al-Ḥusayn, had done for him before his death in 1350. See Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, p.166. This may have been the reason why Shidyāq gave the event the date 1373 instead of 1365. He might have thought that since it was Yaḥyā who went to Egypt to have the family iqṭāʾ restored to him and to his relations, the event must have taken place after his father had given over his iqṭāʾs to him (after 1373).

2. In Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn bin Faql-Allāh, ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn Abūl-Ḥasan ʿAlī bin Yaḥyā bin Faql-Allāh, Al-Qurashi, Al-ʿAdawi, Al-ʿUmārī (d.1368) was secretary of the chancellory (kātim as-sīr or kāṭib as-sīr), the most important position in the wazirate, see Gaudfroy-Demombynes, La Syrie..., p.lxix and loc.cit., fn.2) in Egypt and belonged to a family who held this position in Egypt and Damascus during the fourteenth century. See Gaston Wiet, op.cit., p.217, no.1491, and p.248, no.1692.


4. See above, pp.165-166.
much the same as Shidyāq's version of it. ¹

These events took place in the days of Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā's father, Saif ad-Dīn Yaḥyā bin Ṣāliḥ, who was one of the amirs who went to Egypt to plead for the restoration of the family ɣtā'ṣ after they had been taken over from the Tanūḵhs by the Turkomans of Kīṣruʿān.

According to Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, the Turkomans of Kīṣruʿān had previously attempted, in 1361, to take over the Tanūḵh ɣtā'ṣ, and had succeeded in doing so for a very short time. ²

After relating an unsuccessful Genoese attack on Beirut in 1382, which Saif ad-Dīn Yaḥyā helped fight back,³ Shidyāq proceeded to relate the events that took place in Lebanon incidental to the rebellions in Syria that led to the deposition of Barqūq and to Barqūq's fighting his way back to the throne,⁴ in which the Tanūḵhs sided with Barqūq and the Turkomans of Kīṣruʿān took the cause of the rebels. These events have already been discussed in the chapter on Duwaiḥī's history.⁵ Shidyāq, however, added to Duwaiḥī's account that the Arslāns, along with the Tanūḵhs, were fighting on the side of Az-Ẓāhir Barqūq.⁶ When, he said, the Gharb

¹. Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā, op. cit., p. 168.
². Ibid., p. 177.
⁵. See above, pp. 167-171.
was sacked and burnt by the Turkomans of Kisruân and their friends in 1388 (actually 1390), eleven amirs of the house of Abû'l-Jaîsh were killed. The only survivor of this house was Saîf ad-Dîn Yahyâ bin Nûr ad-Dîn Şâlih bin Mufarrij, who continued fighting on the side of Barquq, and was finally granted by Barquq several iqṭâ‘s in compensation.

The events centering around the dethronement and the restoration of Barquq are the last mentioned by Shidyâq in the fourteenth century. The next event he mentioned belonged to the year 1413.

In that year, he said, in the reign of Al-Mulâyyad Shaikh (1412-1421), there was a Frankish naval raid on Dâmûr.  

---

1. Shidyâq gave a list of the names of the Arslân amirs killed in 1388 (1390), as follows: Nûr ad-Dîn Şâlih bin Mufarrij bin Yûsuf; his son, Tâj ad-Dîn Dâûd; Jamâl ad-Dîn ‘Abdallâh bin Uthmân bin Nâjî and his son, Shujhâ ad-Dîn ‘Ammâr; Izz ad-Dîn ‘Abd Allâh bin Nâjî; Nâsîr ad-Dîn Bashîr bin Yûsuf bin ‘Alî; Shihib ad-Dîn Ahmad bin Mas’ûd bin Uthmân; ‘Imad ad-Dîn Mûsâ bin Mas’ûd bin Abîl-Jaîsh and his son, Fâiq ad-Dîn Omar; Nâhîd ad-Dîn Abûl-Mahâsin bin Darwish bin Uthmân; Qutb ad-Dîn Khûzâ’a bin Mas’ûd bin Uthmân and his brother, Najm ad-Dîn As’âd. The only Arslân amir mentioned by Şâlih bin Yahyâ (p.197) among the dead of this raid is ‘Imad ad-Dîn Mûsâ bin Hassan bin Arslân (not bin Mas’ûd bin Abîl-Jaîsh), Şâlih remarking that this man was better than his ancestors.

2. "From 1404 until 1414, say the chroniclers Machaeraç, 636; Strambaldi, p.264; Amadi, p.498; Fl. Bustron, p.356/, the Sultan, who was on bad terms with the Emirs of Damascus, Tripoli, and Aleppo, had to endure constant raiding of his coasts by the King's Janus of Cyprus, 1398-1432/ fleet, which included a number of Catalans. The Cypriotes grew rich on the booty and the slaves which these raiders brought home.... In 1414 the Sultan, Sheikh Al-Muayyad, sought to put an end to these futile hostilities. He communicated with the King... and peace was proclaimed on 24 November 1414." G. Hill, A History of Cyprus, II, p.469. Hill added (ibid., fn.3), referring to Schefer, Bertr. de la Broquiere, p.xxxvi, that in 1413 an expedition organized in Cyprus landed between Beirut and Sidon at the mouth of Nahr ad-Dâmûr, but was repulsed.
Amir Saif ad-Dawla Yahyā of Arslān and his men went to their encounter and checked their advance along the coast until the Sultan, who was in Damascus at the time, advanced by way of the Biqā‘ to fight back the raid. Leaving his son, Jamāl ad-Dīn (Abdallāh, to check the advance of the Franks, Amir Yahyā set out to meet the Sultan in the Biqā‘, and invited him to stay for three days at his home in Shwaifāt. After that, the Sultan and the Amir advanced against the Franks and forced them to clear off the coast; and after the retreat of the Frankish vessels, Amir Yahyā accompanied the Sultan back as far as the Biqā‘. Before he returned home, the Sultan bestowed on him a robe of honour (khilā‘a), gave him the title (laqqabahu) of malik al-umarā‘, and made him governor of all the coastal districts (wa ḍama‘ ilaihi jamī‘ al-wilāyāt as-sāhiliyya). To this narrative of the event Shidyāq added that the Amir died in 1424 in Shwaifāt at the age of 58, leaving three sons: Jamāl ad-Dīn (Abdallāh, Ṣalāh ad-Dīn Mufarrij (also known as Saif ad-Dīn), and Fakhr ad-Dīn ʿUthmān.

1. Al-Muqayyad Shaikh left Cairo for Damascus on Muḥarram 4, 817 (March 26, 1414). H. Lacost, Les gouverneurs de Damas..., p.19. See also Nuṣūm... (Popper), VI, p.335. Also Ibn Ayās, op.cit., II, p.4 (early in 817 A.H.) and Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., pp.217-218, who gave the date as the end of Dhūl-Qa‘da, 816 (c. February 21, 1414).
2. The date appears as 1324, the third digit being obviously a misprint.
Saʿlih bin Yahyā made no mention of this event, to which he was contemporary, probably because no member of his family seems to have taken part in it. Ibn Sibāḥ mentioned it, without giving a date, placing it between the events of the year 816 A.H. and those of 824 A.H. (1413-1421 A.D.) during the reign of Al-Muṭṭayyad Shaikh. He described the incident very briefly, without making mention of the role played in it by Amir Yahyā of Arslān:

In the days of Al-Malik al-Muṭṭayyad Shaikh the Franks made an attack; and he rose and fought them at a place called ad-Dāmūr, between Sidon and Beirut, and defeated them.

Duwaihi, depending on Ibn Sibāḥ, repeated the latter’s account of the event, without making any of the additions found in Shidyāq.

In 1424, Shidyāq continued, Sultan Barsbāy (1422-1438) ordered preparations to be made for the conquest of Cyprus,3

---

1. MS Ibn Sibāḥ, p. 333. I have not found a mention of this event in the other Arabic chronicles I consulted (Ibn Taghribridī, Ibn Hajar, Zettersteeń (Beiträge...), Ibn Tulūn, and Ibn Ayās).
3. For the Mamlūk conquest of Cyprus see M. Mustafā Ziāda, The Mamlūk conquest of Cyprus in the fifteenth century (Arabic), in the Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Egyptian University, 1, 1933, pp. 90-113. Also G. Hill, A History of Cyprus, II, pp. 470 et seq. Shidyāq here was not referring to Barsbāy’s first expedition against Cyprus (August, 1424), but to the second expedition which was on a much larger scale and which set out from Tripoli, where the Egyptian fleet was joined by the Syrian contingent, on July 30, 1425. Saʿlih bin Yahyā, who took part in the expedition, gave an eye-witness account of it (see below).
and gave orders to the amirs of the Gharb to join in the expedition. Amir Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, the historian, answered the summons of the Sultan with a hundred men. After the expedition was over, the Mamlūk fleet proceeded from Cyprus to Egypt where the Sultan bestowed on Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā 200 dinārs and a khīltā. After having stayed in Egypt for a time, Ṣāliḥ went back to his country (by land) by way of Damascus.¹

Shidyāq took his account of the role played by Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā in Marsbāy’s expedition against Cyprus from Ibn Sībāṭ, who gave the date simply as 828 A.H. (1424-1425 A.D.).² Actually the expedition set out from Tripoli on Ramadān 14, 828 (July 30, 1425).³ It is not necessary for the purpose of this study to consider the expedition in detail. Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, who gave an eye-witness account of it, said that he was in charge of an old galley (ghurāb)⁴ manned with approximately 100 sailors and fighters:

The noble marṣūm arrived for the amirs of the Gharb to join the expedition; so I joined them as a captain (mugaddam) of an old ghurāb which had been built previously in Beirut. And I had with me nearly one hundred men, sailors (bahriyya) and fighters (mugātila); and

---
² Ibn Sībāṭ, pp. 337-339.
³ Ṣāliḥ bin Yahyā, op. cit., p. 222. See also above, p. 311, fn. 3.
⁴ See Quatremère, op. cit., I, p. 142, n. 15. The shānī or shānī (pl. shawānī), also known as ghurāb (pl. aghribā) is a galley. "It is rowed with 140 oars, and in it there are the rowers and the fighters", quot. Vat. arab. 267, fol. 82.
ghurāb was the best sailing among the other ghurābs.¹

Shidyāq related as an event of the year 1444 the raid of Amir Ḥājj ibn al-Ḥamrā² on the house of Izz ad-Dīn Sādaqa, the Tanūkhid amir, in Beirut. Ibn Sībāṭ, who gave 1444 as the date of the death of Sādaqa,³ a date which Shidyāq also gave,⁴ related the raid of Amir Ḥajj on Sādaqa’s house among the events of Sādaqa’s life, after giving the date of his death.⁵ Shidyāq, depending on Ibn Sībāṭ for his information about the event, thought that 1444 was the date of both, Amir Ḥajj’s raid and the death of Sādaqa.⁶

From Sāliḥ bin Yahya’s history it appears that the raid of Amir Ḥajj on Sādaqa’s house took place in 1425, during Sāliḥ’s absence in Cyprus. Sāliḥ said that he heard of the raid of Amir Ḥajj on Sādaqa’s house on arriving in Damascus from Egypt on Dhū‘l-Qa‘da 24, 828 (October 7, 1425), and that he had to return to the Gharb by way of Wādī at-Taim in fear of attack by Amir Ḥajj and his men in the Biqāʾ.⁷

After relating this incident, and Sādaqa’s death in 1444, Shidyāq added that the wilāya of Sādaqa was from the frontiers of the nīyāba of Tripoli to those of the nīyāba of

---

1. Sāliḥ bin Yahya, op. cit., p. 221.
2. Bani al-Ḥamrā were semi-bedouin fief-holders in the Biqāʾ in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. See Poliak, Feudalism . . . , pp. 12-13, depending on Shidyāq and on Sāliḥ bin Yahya, pp. 111, 154, 184, 225-226, and 231.
3. MS Ibn Sibāṭ, p. 343.
4. Shidyāq, op. cit., p. 293.
5. MS Ibn Sibāṭ, pp. 343-345.
şafad, and that he was in charge of the darak of Beirut. He identified him as the great-great-grandson of Naṣir ad-Dīn Al-Ḥusain. ¹ Şāliḥ bin Yahyā called him the mutawallī (governor) of Beirut. ²

Shidyāq did not relate any other events of importance concerning the history of the feudal families of the Gharb and the Turkomans of Kisruan before the Ottoman conquest. He simply gave the names, genealogies, and obituary dates of the amirs of those families for the remaining years of the Mamlūk period. ³ The next event of importance he mentioned was the conquest of Syria by the Ottomans and its effect on the different feudal families of Lebanon; but this event already lies beyond the period under consideration.

The discussion in this chapter has been mainly concerned with the histories of the families of the Gharb; but it must be remembered that Shidyāq also dealt with the history of the Shihābs and the Māns in the Crusader and Mamlūk periods. Of these two families the Shihābs were not yet in Lebanon. They were settled during the period under discussion in Wādi at-Taim, which did not form part of Mount Lebanon, as defined by Shidyāq. ⁴

The settlement of the Māns in the Shūf has already

1. Shidyāq, p.293.
2. Şāliḥ bin Yahyā, op.cit., p.226.
3. See map at back cover.
been considered. They do not seem to have played a role of importance during this period. It is with Fakhr ad-Dīn bin Uthmān, who became wālī of the Shūf towards the end of the fifteenth century, that the rise of Mānīd power in Lebanon began. His arrest and release by the nāḥīb of Damascus in 1505 has already been discussed in the previous chapter.

Although written towards the middle of the nineteenth century, Akhbār al-aʿyan... is an important source for the history of Medieval Lebanon. It is true that to a great extent it is a repetition of Ibn Sībāṭ, who, himself, had repeated the history of Sāliḥ bin Yāhūd; but Shidyāq, by drawing from other sources which have apparently been lost, added considerable information to the history of the period and, unintentionally, introduced several doubts on the history of Sāliḥ bin Yāhūd, the fullest quasi-contemporary source on the internal history of central Lebanon in the Crusader and Mamlūk periods.

1. Poliak (Feudalism..., p.13, fn.1) did not accept the tradition related by Shidyāq that the Mānīds were descended from a bedouin amir who allegedly settled in Lebanon in 1120. He argued that Sāliḥ bin Yāhūd did not know at all those members of this family who lived in the Mamlūk epoch according to Shidyāq. Depending on Ibn Yāhūd, who made one mention of a certain "Fāris ad-Dīn Miṣṣād ibn ʿĪzz ad-Dīn Paḍār il ibn Miṣṣād, muqaddam of the Shūf" (p.173), he reached the conclusion that the chieftains of the Shūf in the Mamlūk epoch were not the Māṇīs but the Banū Miṣṣād. It is not impossible, however, that, like in the Bīqāʾ, where there was more than one family of muqaddams (Poliak, p.12), so in the Shūf there were more than one. Although it is possible that Shidyāq was wrong in saying that the Mānīds were the amīrs of the Shūf in this period, there seems to be, as yet, no conclusive evidence to the contrary.

2. See above, pp.172-175.
Shidyāq did not reveal in his history his personal attitude towards any of the events or personalities he discussed; and no personal bias can be detected in Akhbar al-ā'lāyān... Shidyāq was essentially a compiler; and his history is an uncritical and confused collection of material from a number of sources, to none of which he seems to have shown a marked preference. The bias and tone that are found in his work come invariably from the source on which he was depending for a particular event. Thus, when he copied Ibn Sibāt, whose history of the Qarāb is biased in favour of the Tanūkhūs, he was uncomplimentary to the descendants of Abū'īl-Jaish (whose prowess he praised when he copied from the Arslān family history) and to the Turkomans of Kisruān, the rivals of the Tanūkhūs in the Mamlūk period. Likewise, many of the mistakes found in his history appear to have come originally from his sources.

Besides, Shidyāq did not attempt any interpretation of the material he compiled in Akhbar al-ā'lāyān... His originality as a historiographer is only shown in the form in which he cast his material,¹ and in the fact that he was the first Maronite (or Lebanese) historian to attempt the writing of a history of Lebanon as a whole, Maronite and non-Maronite, Christian, Druze, and Moslem, from the time of

¹. See above, pp. 239-240.
the Arab conquest to his own day.

Judged as a work of historiography, Akhbār al-aʿyān... is poor. It does not tell a consistent story. It is, however, the very fact that Shidyāq was little more than an uncritical compiler that makes his work such an important source for the history of medieval Lebanon. By bringing together the data he collected from different sources without attempting to sort out their confusion and to correct or reconcile their contradictions and inconsistencies, he seems to have preserved to a great extent the original nature of his source material; and it is a comparatively easy task for the historian today to sort out the material found in Akhbār al-aʿyān... according to its original sources and to analyse it accordingly.
Ibn al-Qilā'ī, Duwainī, and Shidyāq may be considered as the leading representatives of three main schools of Maronite historiography. Their works, notwithstanding their various defects, are indispensable as sources for the history of Lebanon in the Crusader and Mamlūk periods.

Ibn al-Qilā'ī, the earliest of those three historians and the founder of the Maronite historiographic tradition, established the form of the historical zajaliyya which a number of Maronite historians used after him. The aim of his historiography was not to establish the truth of facts of the past; and he does not appear to have exercised much critical judgement in the choice of the material he used in his history. Although the story he gave in his main work, the Madīha..., gives an impression of coherence and chronological continuity in its structure, an examination of the facts of the story reveals a number of such facts or groups of fact that are little related to each other, if at all, and which are usually placed in the wrong chronological sequence. Most of those facts in themselves have a basis of truth which, at times, is easy to discover; but Ibn al-Qilā'ī usually draped them with much legendary material, confused some facts with others, and introduced into some considerable distortion.
Duwaihi broke away completely with the zajaliyya
historiographical form of Ibn al-Qilāʿī, and established
the polemical and narrative forms of the clerical prose
school of Maronite historiography which survives to the
present day, although it is no longer as productive as it
had been in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He seems
to have been much more influenced by the academic training he
received in Italy than Ibn al-Qilāʿī had been; and the
influence of this training reveals itself in the quality of
his historical work. Duwaihi was also influenced by the
works of the Arabic historians which he read and referred to
when he wrote about the general history of the Near East in
the Crusader and Mamlūk periods - works like those of Al-
Kutubī, Abū’l-Fidā, Barhebraeus, and Al-Yūnīnī.¹ In Ṭārikh
al-azmīna the influence of those Arabic chronicles on Duwaihi's
historiography appears in the form of that work, which is the
traditional form of the Arabic chronicle.

Unlike Ibn al-Qilāʿī, Duwaihi reveals in his history
a consistent purpose to establish the truth of facts and an
arduous search for those facts. Whereas Ibn al-Qilāʿī seems

al-Baṭīlabakī (c.660–726 A.H./1261–1326 A.D.) was the
author of a little known work, a continuation of Ibn al-
Jauzi (Dhāl mirḥāt az-zamān). See Claude Cahen, "Les
chroniques arabes concernant la Syrie, l’Égypte, et la
Mesopotamie de la conquête arabe à la conquête ottomane
dans les bibliothèques d’Istanbul", in Revue des Études
to have done little more than recording information that
was found largely in the oral tradition of his community,
Duwaihī embarked on a project of seeking out the history of
his community from a wide variety of sources: Crusader chro-
nicles, pilgrim and travel books, Eastern Christian chronicles
and church books, as well as the works of earlier Maronite
historians. A remarkable illustration of his diligence in
research was his use of fragmentary historical material
found on church books and of inscriptions as sources of
history; and it was perhaps in this respect that the influence
of his training in Italy on him as a historian was most
marked. In his various historical writings he seems to have
exhausted the amount of this type of source material access-
ible in his day. Besides, he was a far better Latin scholar
than Ibn al-Qīlāfī, and his own translations of the papal
letters were more correct than Ibn al-Qīlāfī's.

Duwaihī was, in general, a careful historian. He
rendered in direct or indirect quotation most of the primary
material he used for his history. This fact in itself makes
of his historical works an invaluable source of information,
since much of the source material he used is no longer
accessible. In many instances his own critical treatment of
this material is truly remarkable.

Like that of Ibn al-Qīlāfī, Duwaihī's history of the
Maronites as a religious community is strongly coloured by
his attempt to prove their original and unbroken orthodoxy
and union with Rome; but there is an important difference in the way each of them used history for this purpose. In spite of the fact that he was primarily a polemic, Duwaihī showed an interest in historical facts for their own value. He did not distort the facts he obtained from his sources to suit his preconceptions, as Ibn al-Qilāṭī had done, except in cases where such facts had already been distorted. He attempted rather to give the facts as he found them, and then to interpret them in a way that would make them fit into his preconceived scheme. Besides, the Maronites of his day, unlike their predecessors at the time of Ibn al-Qilāṭī, were unanimously reconciled to orthodoxy and to union with Rome. It was not necessary for Duwaihī to derive from history a sermon to prove to his people the vital necessity of union with Rome, as Ibn al-Qilāṭī had done. He noticed the confusion of events in Ibn al-Qilāṭī’s history where such confusion was due to an attempt to show that a national misfortune had been the consequence of a break with Rome and a lapse into heresy, as in the case of Ibn al-Qilāṭī’s account of the expedition against Kisruān in 1305 and Patriarch Ammiā’s voyage to Rome in 1215. In such cases Duwaihī called attention to Ibn al-Qilāṭī’s mistakes and tried to correct them.

Ibn al-Qilāṭī and Duwaihī were both clerical historians, and both of them were primarily interested in the polemical defence of Maronite perpetual orthodoxy. The difference between them as polemics was that whereas Ibn al-
qilä‘i sought to prove this unbroken orthodoxy to his people to attract them to continue in union with Rome, Duwaihī was interested in the establishment of this unbroken orthodoxy as a fact for its own sake. In the work of Shidyāq, however, who was an early representative of the lay school of Maronite historiography, interest in the history of the Maronite church and its union with Rome is absent. In other respects too the history of Shidyāq differs considerably in subject matter from the histories of Ibn al-qilä‘i and Duwaihī.

Like Ibn al-qilä‘i and Duwaihī, Shidyāq was interested in the political history of his community; but it was on the history of non-Maronite Lebanon that he concentrated his attention. His history of Maronite Lebanon in the later Middle Ages is little more than a poor abridgement of the histories of Ibn al-qilä‘i and Duwaihī. It is for the history of non-Maronite Lebanon that his main work, Akhbār al-a‘yān..., is an important source. Whereas Duwaihī had to rely for this history almost entirely on the work of Ibn Sibat, which was mainly a history of the Tanūkhid family in so far as it dealt with the history of Lebanon, Shidyāq used other non-Maronite family histories, the most important of which for the pre-Ottoman period seems to have been the history of the Arslāns, a family which had disputed the governorship of the Gharb with the Tanūkhids throughout the Crusader and Mamlūk periods. By making extensive use of the history of the Arslāns, which seems to have been lost since his day,
Shidyāq preserved in his work a check on the histories of Ṣāliḥ bin Yaḥyā and Ibn Sīḥāṭ, otherwise the main Lebanese sources available for the history of non-Maronite Lebanon in the later Middle Ages.

As a historian, Shidyāq by no means showed the same scholarly qualities apparent in Duwaiḥī's history. His work in mainly an uncritical compilation of facts; and although he showed much diligence in his collection of information, he lacked Duwaiḥī's originality in this respect. Like Ibn al-Qīlāʻī, he depended on oral tradition; but he was careful to note in which cases he did so; and, for the most part, he had written sources.

Shidyāq, however, had not received the same academic training as Duwaiḥī. His approach to his historical sources was naive and overcredulous. The uncomplex nature of his approach has its good points, however. He gave the history of Lebanon in the later Middle Ages as he found it in his sources without making any attempt at interpretation and, apparently, without eliminating any of the source material, even when it was not consistent with other material he included. Unlike the clerical historians, he had no preconceptions into which he sought to fit the facts he obtained from his sources. As such, he was strictly speaking more a copyist than a historian and the value of his work lies mainly in the fact that it is a simple restatement of unexamined source material.
The works of Ibn al-Qilā‘ī, Duwaiḥī, and Shidyāq, taken together, cover a wide variety of topics touching almost every aspect of the internal history of Lebanon in Crusader and Mamlūk times. Some of those topics were dealt with purposively, while others were touched upon unintentionally.

Among those topics was the political geography of medieval Lebanon. Shidyāq devoted a whole chapter in the first section of his history to consider this subject. Although he set out to enumerate and describe the feudal provinces of Lebanon in his own day, the comments he gave on the changes that took place in those provinces, and their subdivisions, are invaluable for the reconstruction of a map of feudal Lebanon in the later Middle Ages. Although neither Ibn al-Qilā‘ī nor Duwaiḥī dealt with this question intentionally, their works contribute greatly to the understanding of the feudal geography of Lebanon. The names of feudal provinces appear very frequently in their works, sometimes with a mention of boundaries.

The history of the feudal families and dynasties of Lebanon, both Maronite and non-Maronite, is another of those topics. It was the main purpose of Shidyāq’s history to tackle the subject; but again the works of Ibn al-Qilā‘ī and Duwaiḥī contribute to its knowledge. The names of the muqaddams of many towns and villages, like Ha‘rdīn, Mishmish,
and Al-Āqūrā', are mentioned by Ibn al-Qilā'ī, but not accounted for by Shidyāq. A dynasty of twelfth century amirs of Kisruān, which is very poorly categorized by Shidyāq, is dealt with also by Ibn al-Qilā'ī, although no definite conclusions about it can be reached from his works. From Duwaiḥī's history an adequate account of the genealogy of the muqaddams of Bsharrāy, who gained supremacy over the other Maronite feudal lords towards the beginning of the fifteenth century, can be derived. The history of Shidyāq, however, is one of the most valuable sources for the history of the Moslem and Druze feudal families.

The relations of the Lebanese feudal dynasties (Maronite, Moslem, and Druze) with the Frankish states and the Moslem states are not dealt with separately by any of the three historians; but their works throw light on these relations. Considerable information can be derived from Shidyāq about the relations between the Moslem and Druze amirs of Lebanon and the Atābeg, Zangīd, Ayyūbid, and Mamlūk rulers of Syria. Ibn al-Qilā'ī's account of the relations of the lords of Jubail with the Maronite amirs and patriarchs reveal some interesting facts, and so does Duwaiḥī's account of the relations between the muqaddams of Bsharrāy and the Mamlūks.

The relations between the Maronites and the Moslems and Druzes of Lebanon do not seem to have been very important.

1. See below, Appendix II.
in the period under consideration. Practically no mention of them is made by Maronite historians. The relations between the Maronites and the other Eastern Christians (Ethiopian Monophysites, Jacobites, and Melchites), however, are dwelt on at length by Ibn al-Qilāʿī, the relevant passages about them in Duwaiḥī adding but slightly to Ibn al-Qilāʿī's account.

The uncertain attitude of the Maronites towards their Eastern Christian neighbours coloured to a great extent their relations with Rome, which seem to have fluctuated between union and practical schism throughout the Crusader and Mamlūk periods. These relations between the Maronites and the Roman Church form one of the most intricate and important questions in the history of medieval Lebanon. Ibn al-Qilāʿī dealt with the subject at considerable length; and Duwaiḥī devoted to it the whole of the second part of Ṭārīkh at-tāʿīfa al-mārūnīyya.

The internal history of the Maronite church in the period under consideration, which can only with difficulty be separated from the history of the Maronite church as a satellite of Rome, was not dealt with as elaborately as the latter subject was by the Maronite historians. Duwaiḥī's chronology of the Maronite patriarchs is the fullest contribution of Maronite historiography to the subject, and (Anaissī's modern work on the subject is basically an expansion and correction of Duwaiḥī's work. Incidental material in
Duwaiḥī's other works as well as Ibn al-Qīlāqī's works helps in the reconstruction of this history, although it is by no means sufficient for the purpose.

None of the three historians considered in this study dealt separately with the social, economic, and cultural history of Lebanon in the period under consideration. From incidental material found in their works, however, some idea can be formed about this subject. Duwaiḥī mentioned plague epidemics, droughts, and excessive rainfall or snow while relating the events of some years in Ṭārīkh al-azmina, and commented briefly on the effects of such misfortunes on the country. He also mentioned the building and reconstruction of churches and forts in Maronite Lebanon while relating the events of other years. Occasionally he mentioned Maronite writers and their works, or the number of copyists found in a particular village at a particular time.

It must be remembered that Maronite historians were partial (or depended on partial sources) in dealing with most of those topics. The information they presented in their works about medieval Lebanon cannot be taken at its face value, and the utmost care must be exercised in its examination and analysis before it can be used for the writing of the history of Lebanon in the later Middle Ages. It must also be remembered, however, in dealing with the history of the relations between the Maronite church and Rome, that some of the accusations made against the fidelity of the medieval
Maronites to Rome, brought up in the writings of contemporary European pilgrims and historians, were not true. The historian of medieval Lebanon, while taking into consideration the tendency of Maronite historiography to defend the Maronites against well-founded charges of schism or heresy, must also bear in mind that some of those charges were without foundation, and have their roots in their authors' ignorance of Maronite affairs and in the ever-present tendency on the part of pilgrims and travellers to depend in their writings what previous ones had noted, without trying to record their own observations.

With all its shortcomings, Maronite historiography is the main source of the history of Maronite Lebanon in the Crusader and Mamluk periods; and, with the exception of the histories of Šāliḥ bin Yahyā and Ibn Sibāṭ, it is also the main source for the history of non-Maronite Lebanon in that period. With careful critical handling, the histories of Ibn al-Qilāʿī, Duwaihī, and Shidyāq, which form a prominent part of the Maronite historiographic heritage, can be used to reap a harvest of facts which will help greatly in reducing the obscurity surrounding the history of medieval Lebanon.

It must be remembered, moreover, that the historians whose works have been examined in this study, although the most prominent, are not the only Maronite historians who
dealt with the history of medieval Lebanon. There are others whose works are found; and there may well have been many more whose works lie forgotten in the monasteries of Maronite Lebanon and are yet to be discovered. This study is only the beginning of research in a field that may be much vaster than it is at present imagined to be.
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CHARTS REPRESENTING THE SOURCES OF
IBN AL-QILA‘I, DUWAIHĪ, AND SHIDYĀQ
FOR THE HISTORY OF LEBANON
IN THE PERIOD 1100 - 1516

Chart I: Sources for the History of the Maronites
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TANNUS ASH-SHIDYĀQ d. 1861

+ These sources are presumed.
Chart II: Sources for the History of Non-Maronite Lebanon
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APPENDIX II

GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE
MUQADDAMS OF BSHARRAY

c. 1382 - 1573
(After Duwaihil)*

Ya'qub bin
Ayyub
confirmed by
Barqug in
1390
(c. 1382-1444)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ya'qub</td>
<td>Ayyub</td>
<td>confirmed by</td>
<td>Barqug in 1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c. 1382-1444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zain ad-Din Sifâ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1444 - ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badr ad-Din Qamar</td>
<td>Mazhar</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1444 - ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamal ad-Din</td>
<td>'Abd al-Mun'im</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1469 - 1487)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mun'im)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1472 - 1495)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Yusuf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1495 - ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Assaf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(? - 1519)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Husam ad-Din)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1519-1537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Allah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1472 - 1495)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1505 - 1523)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Daghir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1570-1573)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For references to Duwaihil, see the following page.
Notes on the Genealogical Table of
the Muqaddams of Bsharry

1. Duwaihī, T.A., p. 207
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. It is not clear from Duwaihī whether Sīfā, Qamar, and Mazhar held the muqaddamiyya jointly or in succession. Duwaihī did not give the dates of their deaths.
4. Ibid., p. 213. Duwaihī only mentioned the date of his death, without saying when he became muqaddam of Bsharry.
5. Ibid., pp. 213 and 215. Duwaihī did not say whether this Jamāl ad-Dīn ever held the position of muqaddam.
6. Ibid., p. 240.
7. Ibid., p. 258.
8. Ibid., p. 215.
10. Ibid., pp. 240 and 258.
11. Ibid., p. 258. This Husām ad-Dīn may have been the same person as Husām ad-Dīn ibn Qamar (see n. 6). Husām ad-Dīn is a title, not a name; and he may have been called Husām ad-Dīn Ayyūb (not ibn Ayyūb; see n. 7). Duwaihī may have seen the name of the same person in different contexts as Husām ad-Dīn Ayyūb, and simply as Husām ad-Dīn, and thus believed them to be two persons, when in reality they may have been one.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., pp. 215, 217, 218, and 221. In the last reference, Duwaihī called him simply ‘Abd al-Munīm ibn Jamāl ad-Dīn ibn Sīfā, omitting his father, ‘Assāf (see n. 8). This must have been a mistake, because Duwaihī mentioned twice (pp. 215 and 217) that ‘Abd al-Munīm was the nephew of Rizq-Allāh, not his brother.
14. Ibid., p. 221. Duwaihī did not give the date of his death.
15. Ibid., p. 240. Duwaihī said his name was also Iliās: "Muqaddam ‘Assāf of Bsharry, and he is Iliās bim Jamāl ad-Dīn bin ‘Abd al-Munīm Ayyūb". (?)
16. Ibid., pp. 240 and 251. He was known as Ibn ‘Ajrema. He took over the muqaddamiyya of Bsharry because the son and successor of ‘Assāf, ‘Abd al-Munīm Ḥannā, was a minor. The latter killed him in 1537, and became thus sole muqaddam of Bsharry.
17. Ibid., pp. 240, 251, and 258. Ṣabd al-Munīm Ḥannā was the last descendant of Yaṣqūb ibn Ayyūb in the male line.
18. Ibid., pp. 258 and 268.
19. Ibid., pp. 258 and 268-269. He did not become muqaddam.
20. Ibid., pp. 258 and 268-269. He did not become muqaddam.
21. Ibid., pp. 258 and 268-269.
22. Ibid., pp. 258 and 272.
23. Ibid., pp. 258 and 272. Dāghir (n. 20) and Ṣassāf were killed in 1573; and with their death the rule of the descendants of Yaṣqūb ibn Ayyūb in Bsharry ended.
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